

The Kolmogorov backward equation for stochastic Burgers equations and for stochastic 2D-Navier-Stokes equations

Martin Hutzenthaler¹, Robert Link²,

¹ Faculty of Mathematics, University of Duisburg-Essen,
Essen, Germany; e-mail: martin.hutzenthaler@uni-due.de

² Faculty of Mathematics, University of Duisburg-Essen,
Essen, Germany; e-mail: robert.link@uni-due.de

Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	5
1.1. Notation	7
Chapter 2. Main properties of viscosity solutions	11
2.1. Semijets	11
2.2. Setting	12
2.3. Notation	12
2.4. Definition and basic properties of viscosity solutions	13
2.5. An approximation result for viscosity solutions	19
2.6. Chain rule for semijets	22
2.7. Lifting viscosity solutions to bigger Hilbert spaces	30
Chapter 3. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of parabolic PDEs	33
3.1. Setting	33
3.2. Notation	33
3.3. Construction of semijets	34
3.4. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of nonlinear 2nd order PDEs	47
3.5. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations	73
Chapter 4. Existence of viscosity solutions	95
4.1. Setting	95
4.2. Convergence of Galerkin approximations	96
4.3. Existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations	104
Chapter 5. Regularity estimates	117
5.1. Notation	117
5.2. Hölder-Sobolev type inequalities	117
5.3. Estimates for Nemytskij operators on Besov spaces	133
Chapter 6. Application	153
6.1. Stochastic Burgers equations	153
6.2. Stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations	161
Bibliography	177

Abstract

In this book we establish under suitable assumptions the uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov backward equations for stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs). In addition, we show that this solution is the semigroup of the corresponding SPDE. This generalizes the Feynman-Kac formula to SPDEs and establishes a link between solutions of Kolmogorov equations and solutions of the corresponding SPDEs. In contrast to the literature we only assume that the nonlinear part of the drift is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets (and not globally Lipschitz continuous) and we allow the diffusion coefficient to be degenerate and non-constant. In the last part of this book we apply our results to stochastic Burgers equations and to stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35D40; Secondary 60H30.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic partial differential equation, viscosity solution, Kolmogorov backward equation, stochastic Burgers equation, stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equation.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Kolmogorov proved in his seminal contribution [21, Section 13] that continuous-time real-valued Markov processes solve the Kolmogorov backward equation under suitable assumptions. It is by now common knowledge that finite-dimensional linear parabolic partial differential equations (PDEs) without zero order terms can be represented as semigroups of stochastic differential equations (SDEs) under suitable assumptions. This connection between macroscopic models (PDEs) and microscopic models (SDEs) is very fruitful. The case of infinite-dimensional linear PDEs is, however, not well understood. To the best of our knowledge, there exists no stochastic representation in the literature for solutions of infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov backward equations with superlinearly growing drift functions and unbounded initial functions. The main contribution of this book is to establish the stochastic representation

$$(1.1) \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, 1] \times H: u(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^x)]$$

between the solution u of an infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov backward equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \forall (t, x) \in (0, 1) \times H: & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - ((Du)(t, x))(x'' - F(x)) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(B(x) (D^2 u)(t, x) [B(x)]^*) = 0 \\ & u(0, x) = \varphi(x) \end{aligned}$$

and the solution X of the corresponding SPDE in the case of superlinearly growing coefficients under suitable assumptions. In particular, our results include the benchmark cases of stochastic Burgers equations and stochastic 2D-Navier-Stokes equations.

A major challenge is the notion of solution for the Kolmogorov backward equation (1.2). We cannot expect (1.2) to have a classical (C^2 -)solution. Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] proved that even in finite dimensions and for bounded and smooth functions F , B , and φ the solution of (1.2) might not be classical. For this reason we will consider the notion of viscosity solutions. A viscosity solution is informally speaking a function which in each point can be approximated from above with classical subsolutions and from below with classical supersolutions; see Definition 2.5 for a precise definition. We note that Definition 2.5 is a slight generalization of [16, Definition 3.3] in order to allow for unbounded initial function; see Remark 2.6 below. To the best of our knowledge there exists no result in the literature establishing existence and uniqueness of solutions of infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov backward equations if F is unbounded and not globally one-sided Lipschitz continuous and B is non-constant. To illustrate our main results, we consider in the following theorem the stochastic Burgers equation.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, let $H = L^2((0, 1); \mathbb{R})$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a normal filtration¹ $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, let $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an Id_H -cylindrical $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -Wiener process and for every $x \in H$ let $X^x: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H$ be a mild solution of the stochastic Burgers equation*

$$(1.3) \quad X_t^x = x + \int_0^t \Delta X_s^x - \frac{1}{2} ((X_s^x)^2)' ds + \int_0^t X_s^x \cdot (-\Delta)^{-1} dW_s,$$

let $\varphi \in C(H, \mathbb{R})$ have at most polynomial growth, and let $u: [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in H$ that $u(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^x)]$. Then it holds that $u \in C([0, T] \times$

¹This means $\forall t \in [0, T]: \{A \subseteq \Omega: \mathbb{P}(A) = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_t = \bigcap_{s \in (t, T]} \mathbb{F}_s$

H, \mathbb{R}) and that u is the unique viscosity solution (cf. Definition 2.5) of

(1.4)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - \int_0^1 (x''(r) - \frac{1}{2}(x^2)'(r))((D_{\mathbb{H}}u)(t, x))(r) dr - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(x \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x) \cdot x^* (-\Delta)^{-2}) = 0$$

for $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in H$, relative to $((0, T) \times H \ni (t, u) \rightarrow 1/2 \|u\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{1/2})$ which grows at most polynomially and satisfies $u(0, \cdot) = \varphi(\cdot)$.

Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Corollary 6.3² and Remark 6.4³.

Stochastic representations of finite-dimensional PDEs are well known. Theorem 4.3 in Pardoux & Peng [27] shows that the semigroup of an SDE is the unique viscosity solution of the corresponding Kolmogorov equation if the drift and the diffusion functions are globally Lipschitz continuous. Furthermore, Theorem 4.14 and Theorem 4.16 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] imply that the semigroup is the unique viscosity solution satisfying a growth condition of the corresponding Kolmogorov equation if the drift and the diffusion functions are locally Lipschitz continuous and there exists a Lyapunov function. Moreover, existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions for finite-dimensional Kolmogorov equations have been established e.g. in Theorem 8.2 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] if the drift is globally one-sided Lipschitz continuous and the diffusion is globally Lipschitz continuous and for at most polynomially growing solutions in Theorem C.3.4 in Peng [28] if the drift is locally Lipschitz continuous and the diffusion is constant.

There are mainly two different approaches to show existence and uniqueness of solutions for infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov equations. The first one is using the notion of viscosity solution. In this approach with the exception of Gozzi, Sritharan & Świąch [12] (which assumes B to be constant) it is assumed that F and B are globally (one-sided) Lipschitz continuous which is a very strong tool. In particular, Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 in Lions [22] assume that the drift and the diffusion function are globally Lipschitz continuous and there exists a classical unbounded subsolution, Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.2 in Ishii [16] establish existence and uniqueness of bounded viscosity solutions for infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs if the nonlinearity and diffusion functions are globally Lipschitz continuous. Moreover, Theorem 3.8 in Gozzi, Rouy & Świąch [11] proves existence and uniqueness of bounded viscosity solutions of elliptic infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs, if F is globally one-sided Lipschitz continuous with respect to suitable norms, if B is globally Lipschitz continuous with respect to suitable norms, and if F and B have at most linear growth and are uniformly continuous. Theorem 6.3 in Gozzi, Sritharan & Świąch [12] shows the uniqueness and existence of at most polynomially growing viscosity solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellmann equations associated with the stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations with periodic boundary conditions, if B is constant, if φ is Lipschitz continuous on bounded sets with respect to suitable norms and at most polynomially growing, and if some other conditions are fulfilled. Moreover, Theorem 3.1 in Bang & Tran [1] shows the uniqueness and existence of at most linear growing viscosity solutions of infinite-dimensional Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs, if F is globally one-sided Lipschitz continuous with respect to suitable norms, if B is globally Lipschitz continuous with respect to suitable norms, if F and B have at most linear growth, and if φ is bounded and uniformly continuous.

The other approach is to study the equation (1.4) using the smoothing property of the semigroup. These methods need as a very strong tool that B is non-degenerate and often assume B to be constant. For example Theorem 5.3.5 in Cerrai [2] proves that the semigroup is the unique classical solution of (1.4) if F is globally Lipschitz continuous, B is non-degenerate and constant, φ is bounded, and if suitable additional assumptions are fulfilled. In addition, Da Prato [8] studies elliptic Kolmogorov equations and establishes in Theorem 5.25 (resp. Theorem 6.14) that the semigroup is the unique strong solutions of the elliptic Kolmogorov

²with $B \leftarrow \text{Id}_{H_{-1}}$, $U \leftarrow H_{-1}$

³with $s \leftarrow 1$, $b \leftarrow ([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \ni (x, y) \rightarrow y \in \mathbb{R})$

equations of stochastic Burgers equations (resp. stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations) with periodic boundary conditions if B satisfies $B = (-\Delta)^\gamma$, with $\gamma > 1/4$ (resp. $B = (-\Delta)^\gamma$, with $\gamma > 1$). Furthermore, Theorem 2.15 in Flandoli, Luo & Ricci [10] shows uniqueness and existence of a suitable mild solution, if F is bounded, B is non-degenerate and constant, and if φ is bounded. Further result showing uniqueness and existence of solutions includes Theorem 9.27 in Da Prato & Zabczyk [7] for Kolmogorov backward equations of SPDEs if F is bounded and Lipschitz continuous and B is constant, Theorem 3.6 in Gubinelli & Perkowski [13] for Kolmogorov backward equations of stochastic Burgers equations with additive space-time white noise, Theorem 2.2 in Röckner & Sobol [30] for Kolmogorov forward equations of stochastic Burgers with additive trace-class noise and Theorem 2.2 in Röckner & Sobol [29] for Kolmogorov forward equations of stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations with multiplicative trace-class noise.

1.1. Notation

The following notation is used throughout this book. We denote by $(0, \infty]$, $[0, \infty]$, \mathbb{N} , and by \mathbb{N}_0 the sets satisfying that $(0, \infty] = (0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$, $[0, \infty] = [0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, and that $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and we denote by $\sup(\emptyset)$, $\inf(\emptyset)$, $\frac{0}{0}$, 0^0 , $0 \cdot \infty$, 1^∞ , and by ∞^0 the extended real number satisfying that $\sup(\emptyset) = -\infty$, $\inf(\emptyset) = \infty$, $\frac{0}{0} = 0$, $0^0 = 1$, $0 \cdot \infty = 0$, $1^\infty = 1$, and that $\infty^0 = 1$. For all sets A, B, C, D with $D \subseteq C$ and every function $f: A \rightarrow B$ we denote by $\mathbb{1}_D: C \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the function satisfying for all $x \in C$ that

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbb{1}_D(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in D \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin D \end{cases}$$

by $f(A)$ the set satisfying that $f(A) = \{f(x) : x \in A\}$, by $\mathcal{P}(A)$ the power set of A , by $\mathbb{M}(A, B)$ the set of all mappings from A to B , and by $f|_C: C \cap A \rightarrow B$ the function satisfying for all $x \in C \cap A$ that $f|_C(x) = f(x)$. Moreover, for real Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{H}_1 = (H_1, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1}, \|\cdot\|_{H_1})$ and $\mathbb{H}_2 = (H_2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_2}, \|\cdot\|_{H_2})$ we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1 \times H_2}: H_1 \times H_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the scalar product satisfying for all $(x_1, x_2), (x_3, x_4) \in H_1 \times H_2$ that $\langle (x_1, x_2), (x_3, x_4) \rangle_{H_1 \times H_2} = \langle x_1, x_3 \rangle_{H_1} + \langle x_2, x_4 \rangle_{H_2}$, by $\|\cdot\|_{H_1 \times H_2}: H_1 \times H_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the norm satisfying for all $(x_1, x_2) \in H_1 \times H_2$ that $\|(x_1, x_2)\|_{H_1 \times H_2}^2 = \|x_1\|_{H_1}^2 + \|x_2\|_{H_2}^2$, by $\mathbb{H}_1 \times \mathbb{H}_2$ the Hilbert space satisfying that $\mathbb{H}_1 \times \mathbb{H}_2 = (H_1 \times H_2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1 \times H_2}, \|\cdot\|_{H_1 \times H_2})$, by $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)}: L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the norm satisfying for all $A \in L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)$ that

$$(1.6) \quad \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)} = \begin{cases} \sup_{x \in H_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|Ax\|_{H_2}}{\|x\|_{H_1}}, & \text{if } H_1 \neq \{0\} \\ 1, & \text{if } H_1 = \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

by $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)$ the Banach space satisfying that $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2) = (L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)})$, by $\mathbb{H}'_1 = \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R})$ its dual space, and by $\mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2) = (HS(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)}, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)})$ the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from H_1 to H_2 . Furthermore, for Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{H}_1 = (H_1, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1}, \|\cdot\|_{H_1})$, $\mathbb{H}_2 = (H_2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_2}, \|\cdot\|_{H_2})$, a closed linear subspace $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{H}_1$, the dual spaces $\mathbb{H}'_1 = (H_1, \|\cdot\|_{H_1})$, $(\mathbb{H}_1 \times \mathbb{H}_2)' = ((H_1 \times H_2)', \|\cdot\|_{(H_1 \times H_2)'})$, and $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{V'})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, subsets $A, B \subseteq H_1$, a dense subset $M \subsetneq H_1$ an open set $O \subseteq H_1$, a function $f: O \rightarrow H_2$, we denote by $\text{span}_{\mathbb{H}_1}(A)$ the set satisfying that $\text{span}_{\mathbb{H}_1}(A) = \{x \in H_1 : (\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \exists \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}, \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in A : x = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i)\}$, by $\overline{A}_{\mathbb{H}_1} \subseteq H_1$ the set satisfying that $\overline{A}_{\mathbb{H}_1} = \{x \in H_1 : (\exists (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq A : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x - x_n\|_{H_1} = 0)\}$, by $A + B$ the set satisfying that $A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$, by $A - B$ the set satisfying that $A - B = \{a - b : a \in A, b \in B\}$, by rA the set satisfying that $rA = \{ra : a \in A\}$, by $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}_1}: H_1 \times \mathcal{P}(H_1) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the function satisfying for all $x \in H_1$ and all $A \in \mathcal{P}(H_1)$ that $\text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}_1}(x, A) = \inf\{\|x - y\|_{H_1} : y \in A\}$, by $\pi_M^{H_1}: H_1 \rightarrow H_1$ the operator satisfying that $\pi_M^{H_1} = \text{Id}_{H_1}$, by $\pi_V^{H_1}: H_1 \rightarrow V$ the projection from H_1 to V , by $\pi_{V'}^{H_1}: H_1 \rightarrow H_1'$ the operator satisfying for all $\xi \in H_1'$ that $\pi_{V'}^{H_1} \xi = \xi \pi_V^{H_1}$, by $\pi_1^{(H_1 \times H_2)'}: (H_1 \times H_2)' \rightarrow H_1'$, the operator satisfying for all $\xi \in (H_1 \times H_2)'$ and all $x \in H_1$ that $(\pi_1^{(H_1 \times H_2)'})'(\xi)(x) = \xi(x, 0)$, by $\pi_2^{(H_1 \times H_2)'}: (H_1 \times H_2)' \rightarrow H_2'$ the operator satisfying for all

$\xi \in (H_1 \times H_2)'$ and all $y \in H_2$ that $(\pi_2^{(H_1 \times H_2)'})\xi(y) = \xi(0, y)$, by $C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^n(A, H_2)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the sets satisfying that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that

$$(1.7) \quad C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^n(O, H_2) = \{f \in \mathbb{M}(O, H_2) : f \text{ is } n \text{ times continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to the } \|\cdot\|_{H_1}\text{-norm and the } \|\cdot\|_{H_2}\text{-norm}\},$$

by $C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}(O, H_2)$ the set satisfying that $C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}(O, H_2) = C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^0(O, H_2)$, by $C_{\mathbb{H}_1}^n(O, \mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the sets satisfying that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that $C_{\mathbb{H}_1}^n(O, \mathbb{R}) = C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}}^n(O, \mathbb{R})$, by $C_{\mathbb{H}_1}(O, \mathbb{R})$ the set satisfying that $C_{\mathbb{H}_1}(O, \mathbb{R}) = C_{\mathbb{H}_1}^0(O, \mathbb{R})$, by $D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}$ the first Fréchet derivative with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_1}$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|_{H_2}$ -norm, by $D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2$ the second Fréchet derivative with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_1}$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|_{H_2}$ -norm, by $D_{\mathbb{H}_1}$ the operator satisfying that $D_{\mathbb{H}_1} = D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}}$, by $D_{\mathbb{H}_1}^2$ the operator satisfying that $D_{\mathbb{H}_1}^2 = D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}}^2$, for an open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}}^1(U \times O, H_2)$ (resp. $u \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}}^2(U \times O, H_2)$) we denote by $D_{\mathbb{H}_1} u \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R})}(U \times O, L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}))$ (resp. $D_{\mathbb{H}_1}^2 u \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R}))}(U \times O, L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{R})))$) the partial derivative satisfying for all $(t, x) \in O \times U$ and all $y \in H_1$ that $(D_{\mathbb{H}_1} u)(t, x)(y) = (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1} u)(t, x)(0, y)$ (resp. the partial derivative satisfying for all $(t, x) \in O \times U$ and all $y, z \in H_1$ that $(D_{\mathbb{H}_1}^2 u)(t, x)(y)(z) = (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_1}^2 u)(t, x)(0, y)(0, z)$), and we call a set $B \subseteq H_1$ \mathbb{H}_1 -bounded if $\sup\{\|x\|_{H_1} : x \in B\} < \infty$ and \mathbb{H}_1 -closed if $\overline{B}_{\mathbb{H}_1} = B$, and we call the function f \mathbb{H}_2 -bounded if $f(O)$ is \mathbb{H}_2 -bounded. Furthermore, we denote by $\Gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ the Gamma function, that is, the function satisfying for all $x \in (0, \infty)$ that $\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$. For an \mathbb{R} -vector space V , and a mapping $\|\cdot\| : V \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ which satisfies for all $v, w \in V$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ that $(\|v\| = 0 \Leftrightarrow v = 0)$, $\|\lambda v\| = |\lambda| \|v\|$, and $\|v + w\| \leq \|v\| + \|w\|$ we call $\|\cdot\|$ an extended norm on V and we call $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ an extendedly normed \mathbb{R} -vector space. For a metric space (M, d) , an extendedly normed vector space $(E, \|\cdot\|)$, a real number $r \in [0, 1]$, and a set $A \subseteq (0, \infty)$ we denote by $|\cdot|_{C^{r,A}(M, \|\cdot\|)}$, $|\cdot|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{C(M, \|\cdot\|)}$, $\|\cdot\|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)} : \mathbb{M}(M, E) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the mappings satisfying for all $f \in \mathbb{M}(M, E)$ that

$$(1.8) \quad |f|_{C^{r,A}(M, \|\cdot\|)} = \sup\left\{\frac{\|f(e_1) - f(e_2)\|}{|d(e_1, e_2)|^r} : e_1, e_2 \in M, d(e_1, e_2) \in A\right\} \cup \{0\} \in [0, \infty],$$

$$(1.9) \quad |f|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)} = |f|_{C^{r,(0,\infty)}(M, \|\cdot\|)} \in [0, \infty],$$

$$(1.10) \quad \|f\|_{C(M, \|\cdot\|)} = \sup(\{|f(e)| : e \in M\} \cup \{0\}) \in [0, \infty],$$

$$(1.11) \quad \|f\|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)} = \|f\|_{C(M, \|\cdot\|)} + |f|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)} \in [0, \infty]$$

and we denote by $C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)$ the set satisfying that

$$(1.12) \quad C^r(M, \|\cdot\|) = \{f \in C(M, E) : \|f\|_{C^r(M, \|\cdot\|)} < \infty\}.$$

For a measure space $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mu)$, an extendedly normed vector space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$, and real numbers $p \in [0, \infty)$, $q \in (0, \infty)$ we denote by $L^0(\mu; \|\cdot\|)$ the set given by

$$(1.13) \quad L^0(\mu; \|\cdot\|) = \{f \in \mathbb{M}(\Omega, V) : f \text{ is } (\mathbb{F}, \|\cdot\|)\text{-strongly measurable}\},$$

we denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^q(\mu; \|\cdot\|)} : L^0(\mu; \|\cdot\|) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the mapping which satisfies for all $f \in L^0(\mu; \|\cdot\|)$ that

$$(1.14) \quad \|f\|_{L^q(\mu; \|\cdot\|)} = \left[\int_\Omega \|f(\omega)\|^q \mu(d\omega) \right]^{1/q} \in [0, \infty],$$

we denote by $L^q(\mu; \|\cdot\|)$ the set given by

$$(1.15) \quad L^q(\mu; \|\cdot\|) = \{f \in L^0(\mu; \|\cdot\|) : \|f\|_{L^q(\mu; \|\cdot\|)} < \infty\}.$$

In addition, for a real Hilbert space $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$, a subset $A \subseteq H$, and a function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ we call an element $x \in A$ a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of f , if x is a global maximum of f and if for all $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq A$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(x)$ it holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x\|_H = 0$. For the rest of this section fix real Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $\mathbb{X} = (X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ satisfying that $X \subseteq H$, \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously in \mathbb{H} , and X is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and fix the dual spaces $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ and $\mathbb{X}' = (X', \|\cdot\|_{X'})$. Then we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H, H'} : H \times H' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H', H} : H' \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

the functions satisfying for all $x \in H$ and $y \in H'$ that $\langle y, x \rangle_{H', H} = \langle x, y \rangle_{H, H'} = y(x)$, by $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} = \{B \in L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'): (\forall x, y \in H: \langle x, By \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle y, Bx \rangle_{H, H'})\}$ the set of all bounded symmetric linear operators from H into H' , and by $\otimes: H' \times H' \rightarrow L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ the operator satisfying for all $x \in H$ and all $y_1, y_2 \in H'$ that

$$(1.16) \quad (y_1 \otimes y_2)(x) = \langle x, y_1 \rangle_{H, H'} \cdot y_2.$$

Moreover, we denote by $I_{\mathbb{H}}: H \rightarrow H'$ the function from H to H' satisfying for all $x, y \in H$ that

$$(1.17) \quad \langle I_{\mathbb{H}}x, y \rangle_{H', H} = \langle x, y \rangle_H,$$

by $\cdot: \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ the multiplication operator satisfying for all $A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ that $A \cdot B = AI_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}B$, and by $E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}: D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}) \subseteq X' \rightarrow H'$ the extension operator satisfying that

$$(1.18) \quad D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}) = \{x \in X': (\exists C \in (0, \infty): \forall y \in X: \langle x, y \rangle_{X', X} \leq C\|y\|_H)\}$$

and satisfying that for all $x \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})$ and all $y \in X$ it holds that

$$(1.19) \quad \langle E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}(x), y \rangle_{H', H} = \langle x, y \rangle_{X', X}.$$

Note that $X \subseteq H$ implies that for all $y \in H'$ it holds that $y|_X \in X'$ and thus we have for all $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ that $(A|_X)|_X \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ and it holds for all $y \in H'$ and all $x \in X \subseteq H$ that $\langle x, y|_X \rangle_{X, X'} = \langle x, y \rangle_{H, H'}$. Furthermore, for all $B, C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ we write $B \leq C$ in the following if for all $x \in X$ it holds that $\langle x, Bx \rangle_{X, X'} \leq \langle x, Cx \rangle_{X, X'}$. Moreover, for a set $W \subseteq X$ we call a function $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *degenerate elliptic* (see, e.g., (F0) in Ishii [16]) if for all $x \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$ and all $A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ with $A \geq B$ we have $F(x, r, p, A) \leq F(x, r, p, B)$. In addition, for a set $O \subseteq H$, a dense subset $W \subseteq O$, and a function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ we denote by $\bar{u}_{\mathbb{H}}^W: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and by $\underline{u}_{\mathbb{H}}^W: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ the functions satisfying for all $x \in O$ that

$$(1.20) \quad \bar{u}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{u(y): y \in W, \|x - y\|_H \leq \varepsilon\}$$

and that

$$(1.21) \quad \underline{u}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{u(y): y \in W, \|x - y\|_H \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Main properties of viscosity solutions

The classical notion of viscosity solutions introduced in Crandall & Lions [6] (see also Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5]) are not suited to deal with discontinuous differential equation. For this reason Ishii introduced in [16] a more general notion of viscosity solutions which overcomes this problem. In Definition 2.5 below we slightly generalize the notion of viscosity solution of Ishii [16, Definition 3.3] to allow for unbounded initial function; see Remark 2.6 below.

In the first part of this chapter we define viscosity solutions and we show that many important properties of viscosity solutions also hold for our more general notion of viscosity solutions. In the next two parts we prove two important lemmas needed in chapter 4. In particular we prove in the second part that viscosity solutions are stable under limits (Lemma 2.18). And in the final part of this chapter we prove a chain rule for semijets and a lifting result for viscosity solutions (Lemma 2.22). This will allow us in chapter 4 to treat finite-dimensional viscosity solutions as viscosity solutions over an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. This chapter is based on Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] and Section 2 in Ishii [16]. Throughout this book we use the notation from Section 2.1 below.

2.1. Semijets

First we recall (a minor generalization since we allow for all $x \in O$ that $u(x) \in \{-\infty, \infty\}$ of) the definition of the *semijets* (see, e.g., Section 2 in Ishii [16]).

Definition 2.1 (Second-order semijets). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space and denote by H' the set satisfying that $H' = L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R})$ and by \mathbb{H}' the Hilbert space satisfying that $\mathbb{H}' = \mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R})$, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open set and let $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ be a function. Then we denote by $J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u, J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u, \hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u, \hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u: O \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'})$ the functions satisfying for all $x \in O$ with $u(x) \notin \mathbb{R}$ that $(J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x) = (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x) = (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x) = (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x) = \emptyset$ and for all $x \in O$ with $u(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ that*

(2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ (p, A) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \limsup_{O \ni y \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y-x \rangle_{H',H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle y-x, A(y-x) \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}}{\|x-y\|_H^2} \right) \leq 0 \right\}, \\ (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ (p, A) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists (x_n, p_n, A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq O \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \\ (\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : (p_n, A_n) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x_n)) \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x - x_n\|_H + |u(x) - u(x_n)| \\ + \|p - p_n\|_{H'} + \|A - A_n\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')}) = 0 \end{array} \right) \right\}, \\ (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ (p, A) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \liminf_{O \ni y \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y-x \rangle_{H',H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle y-x, A(y-x) \rangle_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}}{\|y-x\|_H^2} \right) \geq 0 \right\}, \\ (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ (p, A) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists (x_n, p_n, A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq O \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} : \\ (\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : (p_n, A_n) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x_n)) \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x - x_n\|_H + |u(x) - u(x_n)| \\ + \|p - p_n\|_{H'} + \|A - A_n\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')}) = 0 \end{array} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. *Note that $J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ and $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ are monotone in the second argument and that $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ is closed under limits. The corresponding statements holds for $J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2$ resp. $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},-}^2$. Moreover, for every function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ it holds that $J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u = -J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(-u)$ and that $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u = -\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(-u)$.*

2.2. Setting

Throughout this chapter the following setting is frequently used. Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $\mathbb{X} = (X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ be real separable Hilbert spaces with the property that $X \subseteq H$, that \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously in \mathbb{H} , and that X is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ and $\mathbb{X}' = (X', \|\cdot\|_{X'})$ be the dual spaces, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open set, let $W \subseteq O$ be a subset satisfying that W is dense in O with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, let $h: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm lower semicontinuous function with the property that $h|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X}}^2(X \cap O, \mathbb{R})$ and that $W = \{y \in X \cap O: (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}), (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$, let \mathcal{U} be the set satisfying that $\mathcal{U} = O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ and let \mathcal{W} be the set satisfying that $\mathcal{W} = W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$.

2.3. Notation

Before we now give the definition of a viscosity solution let us introduce some additional notation.

Definition 2.3. Assume the Setting in Section 2.2, for functions $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, and for $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, we will denote by $u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}, u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ the functions satisfying for all $x \in O$ that

$$(2.2) \quad u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(x) = \underline{(u + \delta h)}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x)$$

and that

$$(2.3) \quad u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) = \overline{(u - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x),$$

by $F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+, F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-: \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the functions satisfying for all $(x, r, p, B) \in \mathcal{W}$ that

$$(2.4) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+(x, r, p, B) = F(x, r + \delta h(x), p + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), (B|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))$$

and that

$$(2.5) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-(x, r, p, B) = F(x, r - \delta h(x), p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), (B|_X)|_X - \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)),$$

by $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}: \mathcal{U}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the functions satisfying for all $(\xi, \eta) = ((x, r, p, B), (y, s, q, C)) \in \mathcal{U}^2$ that

$$(2.6) \quad d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} \|x - y\|_H \vee |r - s| \vee \|p - q\|_{H'} \vee \|B - C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \vee |u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(x) - u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(y)| & \text{if } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(x), u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(y) \in \mathbb{R} \\ \infty & \text{if } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(x) \text{ or } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(y) \notin \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(2.7) \quad d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} \|x - y\|_H \vee |r - s| \vee \|p - q\|_{H'} \vee \|B - C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \vee |u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) - u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(y)| & \text{if } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x), u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(y) \in \mathbb{R} \\ \infty & \text{if } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) \text{ or } u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(y) \notin \mathbb{R} \end{cases},$$

by $F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^+, F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^-: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ the functions satisfying for all $\xi \in \mathcal{U}$ that

$$(2.8) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^+(\xi) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+(\eta): \eta \in \mathcal{W}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}(\xi, \eta) \leq \varepsilon\}$$

and that

$$(2.9) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^-(\xi) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-(\eta): \eta \in \mathcal{W}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}(\xi, \eta) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Remark 2.4. By construction, $F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^+$ (resp. $F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^-$) is lower (resp. upper) semicontinuous with respect to the distance function $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}$ (resp. $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}$).

2.4. Definition and basic properties of viscosity solutions

With this notation we give the definition of viscosity solutions.

Definition 2.5 (Viscosity solution). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2 and let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function. A function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is said to be a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ (or, equivalently, a viscosity solution of $F \leq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$) if u is locally bounded from above and if it holds for all $x \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and all $\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ with $\phi \geq u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}$ and $\phi(x) = u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x)$ that*

$$(2.10) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^+(x, \phi(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \leq 0.$$

Similarly, a function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is said to be a viscosity supersolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ (or, equivalently, a viscosity solution of $F \geq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$) if u is locally bounded from below and if it holds for all $x \in O$ and all $\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ with $\phi \leq u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}$ and $\phi(x) = u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(x)$ that

$$(2.11) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^-(x, \phi(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \geq 0.$$

Finally, a function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a viscosity solution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ if u is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. In addition, we call $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a classical viscosity solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) if $u \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(O, \mathbb{R})$ and if u is a viscosity solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) relative to $(x \in H \rightarrow 0 \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H})$.

Remark 2.6. *With the additional assumption that h is convex and that $\{x \in H: (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2)_-(x) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq X$ we get the Definition 2.3 in Ishii [16].*

Remark 2.7. *For continuous F and with $X \leftarrow H$ and $h \leftarrow 0$ we get the "classical" definition of viscosity solution (see, e.g., Section 2 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] and also Definition 1.2 in Appendix C in Peng [28]).*

The following elementary lemma for viscosity solutions slightly generalizes, e.g., Lemma 4.2 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14]. The proof is straight-forward and therefore omitted.

LEMMA 2.8 (Sign changes of viscosity solutions). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function, and let $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a viscosity solution of $F \geq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. Then the function $\tilde{F}: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $(x, r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ that $\tilde{F}(x, r, p, A) = -F(x, -r, -p, -A)$ is degenerate elliptic and the function $O \ni x \mapsto -u(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of $\tilde{F} \leq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. The corresponding statement holds for viscosity solutions of $F \leq 0$ and $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ respectively.*

In the next lemma we give an alternative characterization of the semijets via test functions (see also Remark 2.3 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] and Lemma 4.4 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14]). More precisely, the upper semijet $(J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u)(x)$ of a function $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ at a point $x \in O$ is the set of tuples of first and second order derivatives at x of C^2 -functions lying above u and touching u in x .

LEMMA 2.9 (Properties of semijets). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space and let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ be its dual space, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open set, and let $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ be locally bounded from above (resp. below). Then we have for all $x \in O$ with $u(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ that*

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ ((D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \right. \\ &\quad \left. : (\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } u(x) = \phi(x) \text{ and } u \leq \phi) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ ((D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \right. \\ &\quad \left. : (\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) \text{ and } u - \phi \text{ has a local maximum at } x) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

(resp. that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.13) \quad (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 u)(x) &= \left\{ ((D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} \right. \\
&\quad \left. : (\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with } u(x) = \phi(x) \text{ and } u \geq \phi) \right\} \\
&= \left\{ ((D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'} \right. \\
&\quad \left. : (\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) \text{ and } u - \phi \text{ has a local minimum at } x) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As an immediate consequence we get the following corollary (see also Remark 2.3 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] and Corollary 4.5 in Hairer, Hutzenhaller & Jentzen [14]).

Corollary 2.10 (Characterizations of viscosity solutions). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function, and let $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be locally bounded from above. Then the following three assertions are equivalent:*

- u is a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ (u is a viscosity solution of $F \leq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$),
- for every $x \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ with $u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$, and every $\phi \in \{\psi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) : x \text{ is a local maximum of } (u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W} - \psi) : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}\}$ it holds that $F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W}(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(x)) \leq 0$,
- for every $x \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and every $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W})(x)$ it holds that $F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W}(x), p, A) \leq 0$.

The corresponding statement holds for viscosity supersolutions relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ and viscosity solutions relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$.

For convenience of the reader we recall another characterization of viscosity solutions which corresponds to the statement given on page 608 and 609 in Ishii [16] (see also Remark 2.4 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] and Corollary 4.6 in Hairer, Hutzenhaller & Jentzen [14]). It follows immediately from Corollary 2.10, Remark 2.4, and the fact that for all $x \in O$ with $u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W}(x) \in \{-\infty, \infty\}$ it holds that $(J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W})(x) = \emptyset$.

Corollary 2.11 (Alternative characterizations of viscosity solutions). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function, and let $u: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be locally bounded from above. Then u is a viscosity solution of $F \leq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ if and only if it holds for every $x \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and every $(p, A) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W})(x)$ that $F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^{-,W}(x), p, A) \leq 0$. The corresponding statement holds for viscosity solutions of $F \geq 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ and of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$, respectively.*

For the next proposition we need an additional lemma from functional analysis.

LEMMA 2.12. *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open and convex set, let $h: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ be a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm lower semicontinuous and convex function, and let $x \in O$ and $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq O$ satisfy that $w - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$. Then it holds that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) \geq h(x)$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.12. Without loss of generality we assume that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n)$ (else take a subsequence). Next notice that the uniform convergence principle implies that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq O$ is \mathbb{H} -bounded and thus the Banach-Saks Theorem implies that there exists a subsequence $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ satisfying that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N x_{n_j} = x$. Moreover, the assumption that O is convex ensures that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N x_{n_j} \in O$ and combining this with the assumption that h is convex and lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm shows then that

$$(2.14) \quad h(x) \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} h \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N x_{n_j} \right) \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N h(x_{n_j}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(x_{n_j}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(x_n),$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 2.12. \square

The next two propositions, which basically are Proposition 2.2 in Ishii [16], give sufficient conditions for the assumptions on h in Definition 2.5.

Proposition 2.13 (Points with nonempty semijet are dense for convex, semicontinuous functions). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ be its dual space, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open and convex set, and let $h: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm lower semicontinuous and convex function. Then $\{y \in O: (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$ is a dense subset of O with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.13. If $O = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $O \neq \emptyset$. In addition, for the rest of the proof fix $\hat{x} \in O$ and denote by $K \subseteq H$ the set satisfying that $K = \{y \in O: \|y - \hat{x}\|_H \leq (\text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(\hat{x}, H \setminus O)/2) \wedge 1\}$. Furthermore, for every $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ let $(x_\alpha^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq K$ be a sequence with the property that

$$(2.15) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (h(x_\alpha^{(n)}) + \alpha \|x_\alpha^{(n)} - \hat{x}\|_H^2) = \inf_{x \in K} (h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2).$$

Since K is \mathbb{H} -closed, \mathbb{H} -bounded, and convex it follows from the Banach-Saks Theorem and from Lemma 5.1.4 in Kato [20] that it is also weakly compact. Therefore for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $\hat{y}_\alpha \in K$ and a sequence $(n_j^\alpha)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $w - \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_\alpha^{(n_j^\alpha)} = \hat{y}_\alpha$. This together with (2.15), Lemma 2.12, and the fact that the functions $O \ni x \rightarrow h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, are convex and lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm shows that for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(x_\alpha^{(n_j^\alpha)}) + \alpha \|x_\alpha^{(n_j^\alpha)} - \hat{x}\|_H^2 &\geq h(\hat{y}_\alpha) + \alpha \|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \geq \inf_{x \in K} (h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} h(x_\alpha^{(n_j^\alpha)}) + \alpha \|x_\alpha^{(n_j^\alpha)} - \hat{x}\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, \hat{y}_α is the minimum of the function $K \ni x \rightarrow h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and we hence have for all $x \in K$ that

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} h(x) &\geq h(\hat{y}_\alpha) + \alpha \|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2 - \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \\ &= h(\hat{y}_\alpha) + \alpha \langle (\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}) - (x - \hat{x}), (\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}) + (x - \hat{x}) \rangle_H \\ &= h(\hat{y}_\alpha) - \alpha \langle x - \hat{y}_\alpha, 2\hat{y}_\alpha - 2\hat{x} + x - \hat{y}_\alpha \rangle_H = h(\hat{y}_\alpha) - 2\alpha \langle x - \hat{y}_\alpha, \hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x} \rangle_H - \alpha \|\hat{y}_\alpha - x\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since h is convex and lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, Lemma 2.12 shows that it is also bounded from below on the weakly compact set K . Thus it holds that $\inf_{x \in K} h(x) > -\infty$ and this yields that for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ and all $r \in (0, 1 \wedge \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(\hat{x}, H \setminus O)/2)$ it holds that

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\inf_{x \in K} h(x)) + \alpha \|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \leq h(\hat{y}_\alpha) + \alpha \|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2 = \inf_{x \in K} (h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2) \\ &\leq \inf_{\substack{x \in O \\ \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r}} (h(x) + \alpha \|x - \hat{x}\|_H^2) \leq \inf_{\substack{x \in O \\ \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r}} (h(x) + \alpha r^2). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing now by α and taking the limits $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow 0$ we get

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} &\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\inf_{x \in K} h(x)}{\alpha} + \|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2 \right) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} (\|\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}\|_H^2) \\ &\leq \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{x \in O \\ \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r}} \left(\frac{h(x)}{\alpha} + r^2 \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \hat{y}_\alpha = \hat{x}$. Thus choosing $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ big enough we get that \hat{y}_α is an inner point of K and combining this with (2.17) shows that $(-2\alpha I_{\mathbb{H}}(\hat{y}_\alpha - \hat{x}), -2\alpha I_{\mathbb{H}}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(\hat{y}_\alpha)$. Thus, since \hat{x} was arbitrary, we obtain that $\{y \in O: (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$ is a dense subset of O with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and this completes the proof of Proposition 2.13. \square

Proposition 2.14. *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, and let $x \in X \cap O$ and $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x)$. Then it holds that $(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})$, that $E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)) = p$, and that $(A|_X)|_X \leq (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)$.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.14. Since \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously and densely in \mathbb{H} and $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x)$ we have that $\liminf_{O \cap X \ni y \rightarrow x} \frac{h(y) - h(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle_{H', H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A(y - x), (y - x) \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x - y\|_X^2} \geq 0$. This yields that

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \liminf_{O \cap X \ni y \rightarrow x} \frac{\langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) - p|_X, y - x \rangle_{X', X}}{\|x - y\|_X^2} \\ & + \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x) - (A|_X)|_X)(y - x), y - x \rangle_{X', X}}{\|x - y\|_X^2} \\ & = \liminf_{O \cap X \ni y \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{h(y) - h(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle_{H', H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle A(y - x), y - x \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x - y\|_X^2} - \frac{h(y) - h(x)}{\|x - y\|_X^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{-\langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x), y - x \rangle_{X', X} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)(y - x), y - x \rangle_{X', X}}{\|x - y\|_X^2} \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by choosing $y = x + te$ we get for all $e \in X$ with $\|e\|_X = 1$ that

$$(2.21) \quad \liminf_{0 \neq t \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) - p|_X, e \rangle_{X', X}}{t} + \frac{1}{2} \langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))e - (Ae)|_X, e \rangle_{X', X} \right) \geq 0$$

and thus it holds for all $e \in X$ with $\|e\|_X = 1$ that $\langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) - p|_X, e \rangle_{X', X} = 0$ and that $\langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))e - (Ae)|_X, e \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0$. Combining this with the fact that X is dense in H then shows that $(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) = p|_X$ and that $(A|_X)|_X \leq (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)$. In addition, $(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) = p|_X$ implies that for all $y \in X$ it holds that $|\langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x), y \rangle_{X', X}| = |\langle p, y \rangle_{H', H}| \leq \|p\|_{H'} \cdot \|y\|_H$ and therefore $(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.14. \square

The next proposition ensures that h still fulfills the assumptions in Definition 2.5 if it is multiplied by a sufficiently nice function.

Proposition 2.15 (Stability of the set of "h-functions" under multiplication with positive C^2 -functions). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2 and let $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, (0, \infty))$. Then Vh is lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and it holds that $(Vh)|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X}}^2(X \cap O, \mathbb{R})$ and that $\{y \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(Vh)|_X)(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = \{y \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = W$.*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.15. First note that the lower semicontinuity of h with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm together with $h|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X}}^2(X \cap O, \mathbb{R})$ and with $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, (0, \infty))$ ensures that Vh is lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, that $(Vh)|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X}}^2(X \cap O, \mathbb{R})$, and that $\{z \in O \cap X : (D_{\mathbb{X}}((Vh)|_X))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = \{z \in O \cap X : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$. Next, Lemma 2.9 implies that for every $z \in \{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$ there exists a $\phi_z \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\phi_z(z) = h(z)$ and that $\phi_z \leq h$. Thus we have for every $z \in \{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$ that $V(z)\phi_z(z) = V(z)h(z)$ and that $V\phi_z \leq Vh$ and this implies that $((D_{\mathbb{H}}(\phi_z V))(z), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\phi_z V))(z)) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 (Vh))(z)$. Hence we get that $\{z \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(z) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq \{z \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 (Vh))(z) \neq \emptyset\}$. Analogously it follows that $\{z \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 (Vh))(z) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq \{z \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(z) \neq \emptyset\}$ and this together with $\{z \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}((Vh)|_X))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = \{z \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ shows that

$$(2.22) \quad \{y \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}((Vh)|_X))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = \{y \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} = W.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.15. \square

Next we show that classical solutions are also viscosity solutions, cf. Ishii [16].

LEMMA 2.16 (Classical solutions are viscosity solutions). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, assume that $\{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq X$, let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate*

elliptic function, and let $u \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ be a classical subsolution of $F = 0$, i.e., suppose that for all $x \in W$ it holds that

$$(2.23) \quad F(x, u(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(x)|_X)|_X) \leq 0.$$

Then u is also a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.16. If $O = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $O \neq \emptyset$. In addition, note that the assumption that h is lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, and u is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm implies that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $u - \delta h$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, and thus it holds for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $x \in W$ that $u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) = \overline{(u - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x) = u(x) - \delta h(x)$. Moreover, since $u \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ we get for all $x \in H$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(2.24) \quad \delta(J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x) = (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u)(x) - (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u - \delta h))(x).$$

This together with the assumption that W is dense in O with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and with $O \neq \emptyset$ shows that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $\{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u - \delta h))(y) \neq \emptyset\} \supseteq \{y \in O : \delta(J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\} \supseteq W \neq \emptyset$. In the next step fix $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in \{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u - \delta h))(y) \neq \emptyset\}$, and $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u - \delta h))(x)$. Then (2.24) implies that $((D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(x) - p, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(x) - A) \in \delta(J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x)$ and thus the assumption $\{y \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq X$ implies that $x \in X$. Furthermore, it follows from Proposition 2.14 that

$$(2.25) \quad (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}) , \quad (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(x) - p = \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), \quad \text{and that} \\ ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(x) - A)|_X \leq \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x).$$

This shows that $x \in W$. Combining this with (2.8), the fact that $u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) = u(x) - \delta h(x)$, the assumption that F is degenerate elliptic, the assumption that $W \subseteq X$, and the assumption that u is a classical subsolution of $F = 0$, shows that

$$(2.26) \quad F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x), p, A) \leq F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+(x, (u - \delta h)(x), p, A) \\ = F(x, (u - \delta h)(x) + \delta h(x), p + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), (A|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)) \\ = F(x, u, (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(x), (A|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)) \\ \leq F(x, u(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(x)|_X)|_X) \leq 0.$$

Thus Corollary 2.10 shows that u is a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ and this completes the proof of Lemma 2.16. \square

The next lemma connects the definition of the viscosity solution given above with the definition given in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5].

LEMMA 2.17 (Continuous viscosity solutions are almost classical viscosity solutions). Assume the setting in Section 2.2, assume that for all $x \in X$ it holds that

$$(2.27) \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{h(y) - h(x) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x), y - x \rangle_{X', X} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)(y - x), y - x \rangle_{X', X}}{\|x - y\|_H^2} : \right. \\ \left. y \in X, \|y - x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \geq 0,$$

let $F: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function such that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $F_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}$ and that for all $x \in W$, $p \in H'$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ and all $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying for all $\xi \in X$ that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A_n(\xi)|_X - A(\xi)|_X\|_{X'} = 0$ it holds that

$$(2.28) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x, r, p, (A_n|_X)|_X) \geq F(x, r, p, A),$$

and let $u \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(O, \mathbb{R})$ be a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. Then for all $x \in W$ satisfying that the set $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ is dense in X with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_X$ -norm and all $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u)(x)$ it holds that $F(x, u(x), p, (A|_X)|_X) \leq 0$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.17. As before note that the assumption that h is lower semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and u is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm implies that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $u - \delta h$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and thus it holds for all $x \in W$ and for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ that $u_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(x) = \overline{(u - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W}(x) = u(x) - \delta h(x)$. Moreover, without loss of generality we can assume that there exist an $x \in W$ and $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u)(x)$ such that the set $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ is dense in X with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_X$ -norm (else the assertion is trivial). From the definition of W it follows that there exists a $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x)$ and Proposition 2.14 then implies that $E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)) = \tilde{p}$ and that $(\tilde{A}|_X)|_X \leq (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)$. Furthermore, it follows that the operator $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} \ni z \rightarrow I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}\left(\left((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)\right)(z)\right) - I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \tilde{A}(z) \in H$ is self-adjoint and nonnegative and thus there exists a sequence $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}}$ satisfying for all $\xi \in \{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ that

$$(2.29) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n \xi = I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}\left(\left((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)\right)(\xi)\right) - I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \tilde{A}(\xi)$$

and satisfying for all $\xi \in \{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$(2.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle A_n \xi, \xi \rangle_H &\leq \langle (I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}[(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)] - I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \tilde{A}) \xi, \xi \rangle_H \\ &= \langle (E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}[(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)] - \tilde{A}) \xi, \xi \rangle_{H', H} = \langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)) \xi - (\tilde{A} \xi)|_X, \xi \rangle_{X', X} \end{aligned}$$

(take e.g. $A_n = \int_0^n \lambda dE_\lambda$ where E denotes a projection-valued measure associated to the operator $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\} \ni z \rightarrow I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}\left(\left((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)\right)(z)\right) - I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \tilde{A}(z) \in H$ (see, e.g., Ch. 6 §5 in Kato [20])). In addition, (2.30) together with the assumption that the set $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ is dense in X with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_X$ -norm implies that for all $\xi \in X$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(2.31) \quad \langle (I_{\mathbb{H}} A_n \xi)|_X, \xi \rangle_{X', X} = \langle A_n \xi, \xi \rangle_H \leq \langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)) \xi - (\tilde{A} \xi)|_X, \xi \rangle_{X', X}.$$

This together with (2.27) shows then that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(2.32) \quad \begin{aligned} &\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{h(y) - h(x) - \langle E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), y - x \rangle_{H', H}}{\|y - x\|_H^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle (\tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}} A_n)(y - x), y - x \rangle_{H', H}}{\|y - x\|_H^2} : y \in X, \|y - x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ &\geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{h(y) - h(x) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x), y - x \rangle_{X', X} - \frac{1}{2} \langle ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y - x), y - x \rangle_{X', X}}{\|y - x\|_H^2} : \right. \\ &\quad \left. y \in X, \|y - x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the assumption that \mathbb{X} is continuously embedded in \mathbb{H} shows for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), \tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}} A_n) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(x)$. Furthermore, (2.29) implies that for all $\xi \in \{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$ it holds that

$$(2.33) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(I_{\mathbb{H}} A_n \xi)|_X - ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(\xi) + (\tilde{A}(\xi))|_X\|_{X'} = 0.$$

Moreover, Lemma 3.2.4 in Zimmer [36] and (2.31) implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\|(I_{\mathbb{H}}(A_n|_X))|_X\|_{L(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}')} \leq \|(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)\|_{L(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}')} + \|(\tilde{A}|_X)|_X\|_{L(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}')}$ and this together with (2.33)

yields that for all $\xi \in X$ and all $\hat{\xi} \in \{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'})\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n\xi)|_X - ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(\xi) + (\tilde{A}(\xi))|_X\|_{X'} \\
(2.34) \quad & \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|(I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n\hat{\xi})|_X - ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(\hat{\xi}) + (\tilde{A}(\hat{\xi}))|_X\|_{X'} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|(I_{\mathbb{H}}(A_n(\xi - \hat{\xi})))|_X - ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(\xi - \hat{\xi}) + (\tilde{A}(\xi - \hat{\xi}))|_X\|_{X'} \right) \\
& \leq \|\xi - \hat{\xi}\|_X \cdot (2\|(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)\|_{L(\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}')} + 2\|(\tilde{A}|_X)|_X\|_{L(\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}')} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the assumption that $\{y \in X : ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'})\}$ is dense in X with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_X$ -norm then shows that for all $\xi \in X$ it holds that

$$(2.35) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n\xi)|_X - ((D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x))(\xi) + (\tilde{A}(\xi))|_X\|_{X'} = 0.$$

In addition, it follows from the fact that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u - \delta h))(x) \supseteq (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x) - \delta(J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(x)$, the fact that $(E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), \tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(x)$, and the fact that $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u)(x)$ that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), A - \delta(\tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n)) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u - \delta h))(x)$. Thus we get with Corollary 2.10 and with the assumption that u is a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-, W(x), p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), A - \delta(\tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n)) \leq 0$. Combining this with (2.8), (2.28), (2.31), the assumption that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to $d_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h,u}^-, W$, and with the fact that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $x \in W$ it holds that $u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-, W(x) = u(x) - \delta h(x)$ shows that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.36) \quad & 0 \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u}^+(x, u_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-, W(x), p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), A - \delta(\tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n)) \right) \\
& = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+(x, (u - \delta h)(x), p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x)), A - \delta(\tilde{A} + I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n)) \right) \\
& = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(F(x, u(x), p, (A|_X)|_X - \delta((\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + (I_{\mathbb{H}}A_n|_X)|_X) + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x)) \right) \\
& \geq F(x, u(x), p, (A|_X)|_X),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of lemma 2.17. \square

2.5. An approximation result for viscosity solutions

The next lemma implies that locally uniform limits of viscosity solutions are again viscosity solutions. Lemma 2.18 will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

LEMMA 2.18 (Stability of viscosity solutions under limits). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, assume that h is bounded from below on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , let $u_n \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(O, \mathbb{R})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , let $F_n : W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be degenerate elliptic functions, assume that for all $(x_n, r_n, p_n, A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h,u_0}^-, W((x_0, r_0, p_0, A_0), (x_n, r_n, p_n, A_n)) = 0$ and with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (F_n)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u_0}^+(x_n, r_n, p_n, A_n) \leq 0$ it holds that*

$$(2.37) \quad (F_0)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u_0}^+(x_0, r_0, p_0, A_0) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (F_n)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u_0}^+(x_n, r_n, p_n, A_n),$$

that for all $\tilde{x} \in O$ there exists an $R_{\tilde{x}} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(2.38) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \{y \in O : \|y - \tilde{x}\|_H \leq R_{\tilde{x}}, h_{\mathbb{H}}^W(y) \leq R\}} |u_n(x) - u_0(x)| = 0,$$

and that

$$(2.39) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in \{y \in O : \|y - \tilde{x}\|_H \leq R_{\tilde{x}}\}} (u_n(x) - u_n(x_0)) < \infty,$$

and assume for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that u_n is a viscosity subsolution of $F_n = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. Then u_0 is a viscosity subsolution of $F_0 = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.18. If $O = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $O \neq \emptyset$. Then the proof is divided into two steps. *Step 1:* For the rest of Step 1 fix $x_0 \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and $r \in [0, 1]$ such that $r = \min(1, R_{x_0}, \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x_0, H \setminus O))$. Moreover, assume that there exist a $\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$, such that ϕ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O and such that x_0 is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of $(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} - \phi$. We obtain from the assumption that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that $u_n \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(O, \mathbb{R})$ that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that

$$(2.40) \quad (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} = \overline{(u_n - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W} = u_n - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W.$$

This together with (2.6) and the continuity of u_n with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm ensures that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_n}^{+, W}$ induce the same topology as $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, 0}^{+, W}$. Since $O \subseteq H$ is an open set and $O \neq \emptyset$, we have that $r \in (0, 1]$. In addition, the fact that $\{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\}$ is convex, \mathbb{H} -bounded, and closed together with the Banach-Saks Theorem and with Lemma 5.1.4 in Kato [20] implies that it is weakly compact. Therefore it follows from page 3 in Stegall [33] that the set $\{x \in H : \|x\|_H \leq r\}$ is also an RNP set (for the definition see page 3 in Stegall [33]) and this together with boundedness of the function ϕ and of the functions u_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , the assumption that h is bounded from below on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , upper semicontinuity with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm of the function $-\phi$ and of the functions $(u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and with the theorem starting on page 4 in Stegall [33] proves that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $p_n \in H$ and a sequence $x_n \in \{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\} \subseteq O$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of vectors such that $\|p_n\|_H \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that x_n is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of $\{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\} \ni x \rightarrow (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) - \phi(x) + \langle x, p_n \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Thus (2.40) implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(2.41) \quad \begin{aligned} & u_n(x_n) - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_n) - \phi(x_n) = (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) - \phi(x_n) + \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H \\ & \geq (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0) + \langle x_0, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H \\ & \geq u_n(x_0) - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_0) - \phi(x_0) - (\|x_0\|_H + \|x_n\|_H) \|p_n\|_H \\ & \geq u_n(x_0) - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_0) - \phi(x_0) - \frac{2\|x_0\|_H + 1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

and this together with (2.39) and the fact that ϕ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O shows that

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_n)) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(u_n(x_n) - u_n(x_0) + \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_0) + \phi(x_0) - \phi(x_n) + \frac{2\|x_0\|_H + 1}{n} \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (u_n(x_n) - u_n(x_0)) + \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_0) + \phi(x_0) - \left(\inf_{x \in \{y \in O : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\}} \phi(x) \right) + 2\|x_0\|_H + 1 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Next we prove that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to x_0 . Therefore note, that we get from (2.40) and from the fact that x_n is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of $\{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\} \ni x \rightarrow (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) - \phi(x) + \langle x, p_n \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ that

$$(2.43) \quad \begin{aligned} & (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) - \phi(x_n) \\ & = (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) - (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) + (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) - \phi(x_n) + \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H \\ & \geq u_0(x_n) - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_n) - u_n(x_n) + \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x_n) + (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0) + \langle x_0, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H \\ & = u_0(x_n) - u_n(x_n) + (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0) + \langle x_0, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, observe that from (2.43), (2.38), (2.42), (2.40), and from the facts that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $x_n, x_0 \in \{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\}$, that $r \leq 1$, and that $\|p_n\|_H \leq \frac{1}{n}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) - \phi(x_n) \\
(2.44) \quad & \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(u_0(x_n) - u_n(x_n) + (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0) + \langle x_0, p_n \rangle_H - \langle x_n, p_n \rangle_H \right) \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left((u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0) - \frac{1}{n}(1 + 2\|x_0\|_H) \right) = (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0) - \phi(x_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the fact that x_0 is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of $(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} - \phi$ together with (2.44) and with the continuity of ϕ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_0\|_H = 0$ and that

$$(2.45) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n) = (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0).$$

The continuity of u_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, of $D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi: O \rightarrow H'$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{H'}$ -norm and of $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi: O \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, H')}$ -norm together with the fact that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \|p_n\|_H \leq \frac{1}{n}$ hence implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.46) \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W} \left((x_n, (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_n) + p_n, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_n)), \right. \\
& \left. (x_0, (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_0)) \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_0\|_H = 0$ and the fact that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that x_n is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of $\{y \in H : \|y - x_0\|_H \leq r\} \ni x \rightarrow (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) - \phi(x) + \langle x, p_n \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ show that there exists a natural number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots\}$ it holds that $\|x_n - x_0\|_H < r$ and that $x_n \in O$ is a local maximum of the function $O \ni x \rightarrow (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x) - \phi(x) + \langle x, p_n \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Hence, it follows from Corollary 2.10, the fact that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_n}^{-, W}$ induce the same topology as $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, 0}^{-, W}$, and from the assumption that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that u_n is a viscosity subsolution of $F_n = 0$ that for all $n \in \{n_0, n_0 + 1, \dots\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.47) \quad & (F_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_0}^+ (x_n, (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_n) + p_n, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_n)) \\
& = (F_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, 0}^+ (x_n, (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_n) + p_n, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_n)) \\
& = (F_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_n}^+ (x_n, (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_n) + p_n, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_n)) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Assumption (2.37), Equation (2.46), and Inequality (2.47) therefore yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.48) \quad & (F_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_0}^+ (x_0, (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_0)) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left((F_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_0}^+ (x_n, (u_n)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_n), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_n) + p_n, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_n)) \right) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus have proved that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in O$, and all $\phi \in \{\psi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R}) : x \text{ is a strict } \mathbb{H}\text{-maximum of } ((u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} - \psi) : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \psi \text{ is bounded on } \mathbb{H}\text{-bounded subsets of } O\}$ it holds that

$$(2.49) \quad (F_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_0}^+ (x_0, (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_0)) \leq 0.$$

Step 2: For the rest of Step 2 fix $x_0 \in O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and $\phi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\phi(x_0) = (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0)$ and $\phi \geq (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0)$. Next denote by $\tilde{\phi}: O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function satisfying for all $x \in O$ that $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \phi(x) + \|x - x_0\|_H^4$. Note that $\tilde{\phi} \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(O, \mathbb{R})$ implies that $\tilde{\phi}$ is locally bounded. Therefore there exists an open set $\tilde{O} \subseteq O$ such that $x_0 \in \tilde{O}$ and such that $\tilde{\phi}$ is bounded on \tilde{O} . Moreover, it follows from the definition of ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ that x_0 is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of the function $((u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} - \tilde{\phi}): \tilde{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Step 1 can thus be applied with $O \leftarrow \tilde{O}$, $\phi \leftarrow \tilde{\phi}|_{\tilde{O}}$ and with $u_0 \leftarrow u_0|_{\tilde{O}}$ to obtain

$$(2.50) \quad (F_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, u_0}^+ (x_0, (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(x_0), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(x_0)) \leq 0.$$

This and Corollary 2.10 show that u_0 is a viscosity subsolution of $F_0 = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. The proof of Lemma 2.18 is thus completed. \square

Remark 2.19. Lemma 2.8 implies that the corresponding result also holds for viscosity supersolutions.

2.6. Chain rule for semijets

The following lemma is used in the proof of Lemma 2.21 below.

LEMMA 2.20. Let $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $H_1 \subseteq H$ be a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm closed linear subset of H , let $g \in C_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}}(H \times H, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy for all $x, y, z \in H$, $x_1 \in H_1$, and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ that

$$(2.51) \quad \begin{aligned} tg(x, y) &= g(tx, y) = g(y, tx), & g(x + y, z) &= g(x, z) + g(y, z), & g(x, x) &\geq 0, \\ g(x_1, x_1) &\geq \lambda \|x_1\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

and let $H_2 \subseteq H$ be the set satisfying that $H_2 = \{x \in H : (\forall x_1 \in H_1 : g(x, x_1) = 0)\}$. Then H_2 is a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm closed linear subset of H , satisfying that $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{0\}$ and that $H_1 + H_2 = H$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.20. Note that (2.51) ensures that $g|_{H_1 \times H_1}$ is a scalar product on H_1 and that H_1 is also closed with respect to the norm induced by $g|_{H_1 \times H_1}$. Therefore there exists an orthonormal basis $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq (H_1, g(\cdot, \cdot))$ such that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{A}$ it holds that $g(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\alpha\}}(\beta)$. Moreover we have for every $x \in H$ and every finite set $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ that

$$(2.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{B}} (g(x, \alpha))^2 &= - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{B}} (g(x, \alpha))^2 + 2 \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{B}} g(x, \alpha)g(x, \beta)g(\alpha, \beta) \\ &= g(x, x) - g\left(x - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{B}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha, x - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{B}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha\right) \leq g(x, x). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for all $x \in H$ it holds that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} (g(x, \alpha))^2 < \infty$ and, since H_1 is closed with respect to the norm induced by $g|_{H_1 \times H_1}$, it follows that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha \in H_1$. In addition, it holds for all $x \in H$ and all $\beta \in \mathfrak{A}$ that

$$(2.53) \quad g\left(x - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha, \beta\right) = g(x, \beta) - g(x, \beta)g(\beta, \beta) = 0.$$

Combining this with the fact that for all $x \in H$ it holds that $x = (x - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha) + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} g(x, \alpha)\alpha$ shows that $H_1 + H_2 = 0$. Furthermore, $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{0\}$ follows directly from the definition of H_2 and the fact that for all $x_1 \in H_1$ it holds that $g(x_1, x_1) \geq \lambda \|x_1\|_H^2$. Finally let $(x_2^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H_2$ be a Cauchy sequence with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm. Since \mathbb{H} is a Hilbert space we get that there exists an $x^{(0)} \in H$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_2^{(n)} - x^{(0)}\|_H = 0$. Moreover, we obtain from $H_1 + H_2 = H$ that there exists $x_1^{(0)} \in H_1$ and $x_2^{(0)} \in H_2$ such that $x_1^{(0)} + x_2^{(0)} = x^{(0)}$. Combining this with (2.51), the definition of H_2 , and the continuity of g yields that

$$(2.54) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x_2^{(n)} - x^{(0)}, x_2^{(n)} - x^{(0)}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g((x_2^{(n)} - x_2^{(0)}) - x_1^{(0)}, (x_2^{(n)} - x_2^{(0)}) - x_1^{(0)}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g((x_2^{(n)} - x_2^{(0)}), (x_2^{(n)} - x_2^{(0)})) + g(x_1^{(0)}, x_1^{(0)})) \geq \lambda \|x_1^{(0)}\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have that $x_1^{(0)} = 0$ and thus that $x^{(0)} = x_2^{(0)} \in H_2$. This proves that H_2 is closed with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and therefore finishes the proof of Lemma 2.20. \square

With this lemma we can now generalize the ordinary chain rule to semijets. To the best of our knowledge the chain rule for semijets is new.

LEMMA 2.21 (Chain rule for semijets). Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be real Hilbert spaces, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ and $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{V'})$ be their dual spaces, let $O \subseteq H$ and $U \subseteq V$ be open sets, and let $u \in \mathbb{M}(U, \mathbb{R})$ and $f \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2(O, U)$. Then

i) for all $x_0 \in O$, $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ there exist $p \in V'$ and $(A, B) \in \mathbb{S}_{V, V'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ such that $(p, A) \in (J_{V, +}^2 u)(f(x_0))$, $B \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))}^H$ and that for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ it holds that

$$(2.55) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V', V} &= \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H', H} \quad \text{and that} \\ \langle A((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V', V} &+ \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\ &+ \langle x_1, Bx_2 \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H, H'}, \end{aligned}$$

it holds that

$$(2.56) \quad (\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u \circ f))(x_0),$$

and

ii) for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, $x_0 \in O$, $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 (u \circ f))(x_0)$ and that $(D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ is surjective, there exist $B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ and $(p, A) \in (J_{V, +}^2 u)(f(x_0))$ such that $B \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))}^H$ and that for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ it holds that

$$(2.57) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V', V} &= \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H', H} \quad \text{and that} \\ \langle A((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V', V} &+ \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\ &+ \langle x_1, Bx_2 \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H, H'}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.21. If $O = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $O \neq \emptyset$. We start with the first part of the assertion. Therefore fix $x_0 \in O$ and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ such that for every $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ there exist $(p_\lambda, A_\lambda) \in V' \times \mathbb{S}_{V, V'}$ and $B_\lambda \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ such that $(p_\lambda, A_\lambda) \in (J_{V, +}^2 u)(f(x_0))$, $B_\lambda \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))}^H$ and such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ it holds that

$$(2.58) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle p_\lambda, (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V', V} &= \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H', H} \quad \text{and that} \\ \langle A_\lambda((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V', V} &+ \langle p_\lambda, (((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\ &+ \langle x_1, B_\lambda x_2 \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H, H'}. \end{aligned}$$

Next denote by H_1 the set satisfying that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))$. From $f \in C_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2(O, U)$ it follows that there exists an $r_2 \in \mathbb{M}(O, U)$ such that

$$(2.59) \quad \lim_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\|r_2(x)\|_V}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} = 0$$

and that for all $x \in O$ it holds that

$$(2.60) \quad f(x) - f(x_0) = ((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2}(((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x - x_0))(x - x_0) + r_2(x).$$

Furthermore, we denote by $r_1 \in \mathbb{M}(O, U)$ the function satisfying for all $x \in O$ that

$$(2.61) \quad r_1(x) = r_2(x) + \frac{1}{2}(((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x - x_0))(x - x_0).$$

Then we get from (2.58), (2.60), from (2.61), and from the fact that $\forall \lambda \in (0, \infty): B_\lambda \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_1}^H$ that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(2.62) \quad \begin{aligned} &u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle \tilde{p}, x - x_0 \rangle_{H', H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x_0, \tilde{A}(x - x_0) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ &= u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p_\lambda, ((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))(x - x_0) \rangle_{V', V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x - x_0), B_\lambda(x - x_0) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \langle ((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))(x - x_0), A_\lambda((D_{\mathbb{H}, V} f)(x_0))(x - x_0) \rangle_{V, V'} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \langle p_\lambda, (((D_{\mathbb{H}, V}^2 f)(x_0))(x - x_0))(x - x_0) \rangle_{V', V} \\ &\leq u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p_\lambda, f(x) - f(x_0) - r_2(x) \rangle_{V', V} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{H_1}^H(x - x_0)\|_H^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \langle f(x) - f(x_0) - r_1(x), A_\lambda(f(x) - f(x_0) - r_1(x)) \rangle_{V, V'} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p_\lambda, f(x) - f(x_0) \rangle_{V',V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle f(x) - f(x_0), A_\lambda(f(x) - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V,V'} \\ &\quad + \langle p_\lambda, r_2(x) \rangle_{V',V} + \langle r_1(x), A_\lambda(f(x) - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V,V'} - \frac{1}{2} \langle r_1(x), A_\lambda r_1(x) \rangle_{V,V'} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - x_0\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.59), the fact that $\lim_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\|r_1(x)\|_V}{\|x - x_0\|_H} = 0$, and the assumption that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(p_\lambda, A_\lambda) \in (J_{\mathbb{V},+}^2 u)(f(x_0))$ shows that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle \tilde{p}, x - x_0 \rangle_{H',H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x_0, \tilde{A}(x - x_0) \rangle_{H,H'}}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} \\ &\leq \limsup_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\left(\frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p_\lambda, f(x) - f(x_0) \rangle_{V',V}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle f(x) - f(x_0), A_\lambda(f(x) - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V,V'}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \cdot \frac{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \\ &\leq \limsup_{U \ni y \rightarrow f(x_0)} \left(\left(\frac{u(y) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p_\lambda, y - f(x_0) \rangle_{V',V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle y - f(x_0), A_\lambda(y - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V,V'}}{\|y - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \right. \\ (2.63) \quad &\left. \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V})}^2 \right) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\lambda \downarrow 0$ then implies that

$$(2.64) \quad \limsup_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle \tilde{p}, x - x_0 \rangle_{H',H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x_0, \tilde{A}(x - x_0) \rangle_{H,H'}}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} \leq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{\lambda}{2} = 0.$$

Thus we obtain that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f))(x_0)$ which completes the proof of the first part.

For the second part of the assertion fix $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, $x_0 \in O$, and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},H'}$ such that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f))(x_0)$, and that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ is surjective. Next denote by $\mathfrak{A}_1 \subseteq H_1$ an orthonormal basis of $(H_1, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H |_{H_1^2}, \|\cdot\|_H |_{H_1})$, by $\mathfrak{B}_1 \subseteq H$ an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} satisfying that $\mathfrak{A}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_1$, by $H_2 \subseteq H$ the set satisfying that $H_2 = \overline{\text{span}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathfrak{B}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{A}_1)}_{\mathbb{H}}$ and by $\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2$ the Hilbert spaces satisfying that $\mathbb{H}_1 = (H_1, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H |_{H_1 \times H_1}, \|\cdot\|_H |_{H_1})$ and that $\mathbb{H}_2 = (H_2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H |_{H_2 \times H_2}, \|\cdot\|_H |_{H_2})$. From this definition, the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0))$, and from the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ is surjective it follows that $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{0\}$, $H_1 + H_2 = H$, $H_1 \perp H_2$, and that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)|_{H_2}: H_2 \rightarrow V$ is bijective. Moreover, denote by $F: H_1 \times H_2 \rightarrow V$ the function satisfying for all $x_1 \in H_1$ and all $x_2 \in H_2$ that $F(x_1, x_2) = f(x_0 + x_1 + x_2)$. Note that $H_2 \ni x_2 \rightarrow ((D_{H_1 \times H_2, \mathbb{V}} F)(0, 0))(0, x_2) = ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0))(x_2) \in V$ is bijective and thus the implicit function theorem for Hilbert spaces (see eg. page 417 in Edwards [9]) yields that there exist a neighborhood $O_1 \subseteq H_1$ of 0 and a function $h \in C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2(O_1, H_2)$ such that $h(0) = 0$, that for all $x_1 \in O_1$ it holds that

$$(2.65) \quad f(x_0) = F(0, 0) = F(x_1, h(x_1)) = f(x_0 + x_1 + h(x_1)),$$

that for all $x_1 \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(2.66) \quad -((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0))(x_1) = ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0))(((D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0))(x_1)),$$

and that for all $x_1, \tilde{x}_1 \in O_1$ it holds that

$$(2.67) \quad \begin{aligned} &- \left(((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1 + ((D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0))(x_1)) \right) (\tilde{x}_1 + ((D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0))(\tilde{x}_1)) \\ &= \left((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0) \right) \left((((D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2 h)(0))(x_1))(\tilde{x}_1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, (2.66) together with the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0))$ and that $(D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0) \in L(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)$ shows that for all $x_1 \in H_1$ it holds that $((D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0))(x_1) \in H_1 \cap H_2$ and combining

this with the fact that $H_1 \cap H_2 = \{0\}$ yields then

$$(2.68) \quad (D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2} h)(0) = 0.$$

Furthermore, we obtain from (2.67) and from (2.68) that for all $x_1, \tilde{x}_1 \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(2.69) \quad -\left(\left((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0)\right)(x_1)\right)(\tilde{x}_1) = \left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f\right)(x_0)\right)\left(\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2 h\right)(0)\right)(x_1)\right)(\tilde{x}_1)$$

and this with the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)|_{H_2}$ is bijective shows that for all $x_1, \tilde{x}_1 \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(2.70) \quad \left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2 h\right)(0)\right)(x_1)(\tilde{x}_1) = -\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f\right)(x_0)|_{H_2}\right)^{-1}\left(\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f\right)(x_0)\right)(x_1)\right)(\tilde{x}_1).$$

Moreover, (2.68) together with (2.70), with $h(0) = 0$, and with $h \in C_{\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2}^2(O_1, H_2)$ implies that

$$(2.71) \quad \lim_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|h(x_1)\|_H}{\|x_1\|_H} = 0$$

and that there exists a function $\tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{M}(O_1, H_2)$ such that $\lim_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\tilde{r}_2(x_1)\|_H}{\|x_1\|_H^2} = 0$ and that for all $x_1 \in O_1$ it holds that

$$(2.72) \quad h(x_1) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f\right)(x_0)|_{H_2}\right)^{-1}\left(\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f\right)(x_0)\right)(x_1)\right)(x_1) + \tilde{r}_2(x_1).$$

In addition, (2.71) yields that

$$(2.73) \quad \limsup_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|x_1\|_H^2}{\|x_1 + h(x_1)\|_H^2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H \neq \{0\} \\ 0 & \text{if } H = \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

Combining now (2.65), (2.71), (2.72), (2.73), the fact that $\lim_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\tilde{r}_2(x_1)\|_H}{\|x_1\|_H^2} = 0$ and the fact that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2(u \circ f))(x_0)$ shows then

$$(2.74) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \limsup_{O \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle \tilde{p}, x - x_0 \rangle_{H', H} - \frac{1}{2} \langle x - x_0, \tilde{A}(x - x_0) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} \\ &\geq \limsup_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{u(f(x_0 + x_1 + h(x_1))) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 + h(x_1) \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x_1 + h(x_1)\|_H^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle x_1 + h(x_1), \tilde{A}(x_1 + h(x_1)) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\|x_1 + h(x_1)\|_H^2} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \left(\left(\frac{u(f(x_0)) - u(f(x_0)) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_1 + h(x_1), \tilde{A}(x_1 + h(x_1)) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\|x_1\|_H^2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\langle \tilde{p}, x_1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f\right)(x_0)|_{H_2}\right)^{-1} \left(\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f\right)(x_0)\right)(x_1)\right)(x_1)\right) + \tilde{r}_2(x_1) \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x_1\|_H^2} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\|x_1\|_H^2}{\|x_1 + h(x_1)\|_H^2} \Big) \\ &= \limsup_{O_1 \ni x_1 \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{-\langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H', H} + \left\langle \tilde{p}, \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}} f\right)(x_0)|_{H_2}\right)^{-1} \left(\left(\left(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f\right)(x_0)\right)(x_1)\right)(x_1)\right) \right\rangle_{H', H}}{\|x_1\|_H^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle x_1, \tilde{A}(x_1) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\|x_1\|_H^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get for every $x_1 \in H_1$ with $\|x_1\|_H = 1$ that

$$(2.75) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{-\langle \tilde{p}, tx_1 \rangle_{H',H} + \left\langle \tilde{p}, \frac{1}{2}((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1} \left((((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(tx_1))(tx_1) \right) \right\rangle_{H',H}}{\|x_1\|_H^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2}\langle tx_1, \tilde{A}(tx_1) \rangle_{H,H'}}{t^2\|x_1\|_H^2} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{-\langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H',H}}{t} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \tilde{p}, ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1} \left((((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_1) \right) \right\rangle_{H',H} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \langle x_1, \tilde{A}(x_1) \rangle_{H,H'} \end{aligned}$$

and this shows that for every $x_1 \in H_1$ with $\|x_1\|_H = 1$ it holds that $-\langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H',H} = 0$ and that $\langle x_1, \tilde{A}(x_1) \rangle_{H,H'} - \left\langle \tilde{p}, ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1} \left((((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_1) \right) \right\rangle_{H',H} \geq 0$. Therefore we obtain that for all $x_1 \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(2.76) \quad \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H',H} = 0$$

and that

$$(2.77) \quad \langle x_1, \tilde{A}(x_1) \rangle_{H,H'} - \left\langle \tilde{p}, ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1} \left((((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_1) \right) \right\rangle_{H',H} \geq 0.$$

Next denote by $p \in V'$ the function satisfying for all $x_1 \in H$ that

$$(2.78) \quad \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V',V} = \langle \tilde{p}, x_1 \rangle_{H',H},$$

by $g: \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}') \times H \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function satisfying for all $C \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')$ and all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ that

$$(2.79) \quad \begin{aligned} g(C, x_1, x_2) &= \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H,H'} - \langle C((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V',V} \\ &\quad - \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} + \lambda \langle \pi_{H_1}^H x_1, x_2 \rangle_H \end{aligned}$$

and by $S \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'}$ the set satisfying that

$$(2.80) \quad S = \{C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'} : (\forall x \in H : g(C, x, x) \geq 0)\}.$$

Note that (2.76) together with the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ is surjective ensures that p is well defined and note that we have for all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'}$ and all $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in H$ that $g(C, x_1 + x_2, x_3 + x_4) = g(C, x_1, x_3) + g(C, x_1, x_4) + g(C, x_2, x_3) + g(C, x_2, x_4)$. In addition we get from (2.77), (2.78), (2.79) and the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))$ that for all $x_1 \in H_1$ and all $C \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')$ it holds that

$$(2.81) \quad g(C, x_1, x_1) \geq \lambda \|x_1\|_H^2.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2}$ is bijective that for all $x_2 \in H_2$ it holds that

$$(2.82) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))(x_2)\|_V \\ &= \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-1} \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)} \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))(x_2)\|_V \\ &\geq \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-1} \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}(((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})(x_2))\|_H \\ &= \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-1} \|x_2\|_H. \end{aligned}$$

We now show with Zorn's lemma that S contains a maximal element. First observe that we get from (2.77), (2.78), (2.79), (2.82), and from the fact that $H_1 \perp H_2$ that for all $x_1 \in H_1$, $x_2 \in H_2$, $R, \Lambda \in (0, \infty)$ with $R = \|\tilde{A}\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')} + \|p\|_{V'} \|(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0)\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}))}$ and with $\Lambda \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-2} \geq \frac{R^2}{\lambda} + R$ it holds that

$$g(-\Lambda I_{\mathbb{V}}, x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2) = g(-\Lambda I_{\mathbb{V}}, x_1, x_1) + 2g(-\Lambda I_{\mathbb{V}}, x_1, x_2) + g(-\Lambda I_{\mathbb{V}}, x_2, x_2)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_1 \rangle_{H,H'} - \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_1) \rangle_{V',V} + 2\langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H,H'} \\
&\quad - 2\langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} + \langle x_2, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H,H'} + \Lambda \langle (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x_2, (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_V \\
&\quad - \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_2))(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} + \lambda \|x_1\|_H^2 \\
(2.83) \quad &\geq \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_1 \rangle_{H,H'} - \left\langle \tilde{p}, ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1} \left((((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_1) \right) \right\rangle_{H',H} \\
&\quad - 2\|x_1\|_H \|x_2\|_H (\|\tilde{A}\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')} + \|p\|_{V'} \|(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0)\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}))}) \\
&\quad - \|x_2\|_H^2 (\|\tilde{A}\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')} + \|p\|_{V'} \|(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0)\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}))}) \\
&\quad + \Lambda \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-2} \|x_2\|_H^2 + \lambda \|x_1\|_H^2 \\
&\geq \lambda \left(\|x_1\|_H - \frac{R}{\lambda} \|x_2\|_H \right)^2 + \left(\Lambda \|((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)|_{H_2})^{-1}\|_{L(\mathbb{V},\mathbb{H}_2)}^{-2} - \frac{R^2}{\lambda} - R \right) \|x_2\|_H^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with $H_1 + H_2 = H$ shows that $S \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, let $P \subseteq S$ be a totally ordered subset. We denote by $C_P \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')$ the function satisfying for all $y_1, y_2 \in V$ that $\langle C_P y_1, y_2 \rangle_{V',V} = \frac{1}{4} (\sup_{C \in P} (\langle C(y_1 + y_2), y_1 + y_2 \rangle_{V',V}) - \sup_{C \in P} (\langle C(y_1 - y_2), y_1 - y_2 \rangle_{V',V}))$. Note, that we get from (2.79) and from (2.80) that for all $C \in S$ and all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.84) \quad &\langle C((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x \rangle_{V',V} \\
&\leq \langle x, \tilde{A}x \rangle_{H,H'} - \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x))(x) \rangle_{V',V} + \lambda \langle \pi_{H_1}^H x, x \rangle_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the surjectivity of $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ ensures that C_P is well defined. Moreover, (2.79) together with (2.80) and with $P \subseteq S$ shows for all $x \in H$ that

$$(2.85) \quad g(C_P, x, x) = \inf_{C \in P} g(C, x, x) \geq 0.$$

This together with (2.79), and the fact that for all $C \in P$ it holds that $C_P \geq C$ ensures that for all $x \in H$ and all $C \in P$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.86) \quad &\langle C((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x \rangle_{V',V} \leq \langle C_P((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0)x \rangle_{V',V} \\
&\leq \langle x, \tilde{A}x \rangle_{H,H'} - \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x))(x) \rangle_{V',V} + \lambda \langle \pi_{H_1}^H x, x \rangle_H
\end{aligned}$$

and thus the assumption that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}} f)(x_0): H \rightarrow V$ is surjective implies that

$$(2.87) \quad \sup_{y \in \{\tilde{y} \in V: \|\tilde{y}\|_V \leq 1\}} |\langle C_P y, y \rangle_{V',V}| < \infty.$$

In addition, it follows directly from the definition that C_P is symmetric and therefore it remains to prove that C_P is linear to conclude that $C_P \in S$. Let \bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2 , and $\bar{y}_3 \in V$ and denote for every $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ by $(C_{i,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq P$ sequences satisfying that

$$(2.88) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{1,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V},$$

$$(2.89) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3), (C_{2,n})(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V},$$

$$(2.90) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2), (C_{3,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V',V},$$

$$(2.91) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2), (C_{4,n})(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V',V},$$

$$(2.92) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{5,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V},$$

$$(2.93) \quad \text{and that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3), (C_{6,n})(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V} = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V',V}.$$

Furthermore, denote by $(C_{0,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq P$ the sequence satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $C_{0,n} = \max\{C_{i,n} : i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}\}$. Note that the fact that P is totally ordered ensures that $(C_{0,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is well defined. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.94) \quad & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{0,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{1,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{0,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'}
\end{aligned}$$

and thus $\sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), (C_{0,n})(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'}$. The corresponding equations follows for $(C_{i,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ analogously. Therefore we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.95) \quad & 4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_P(\bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} - \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} - \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_2 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_{0,n}\bar{y}_2 \rangle_{V,V'} + 4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_{0,n}\bar{y}_3 \rangle_{V,V'}) \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V,V'} - \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V,V'}) \\
& \quad + \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} - \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3), C_{0,n}(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'}) \\
& = \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V,V'} - \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& \quad + \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 + \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} - \sup_{C \in P} \langle (\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3), C(\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_3) \rangle_{V,V'} \\
& = 4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_P\bar{y}_2 \rangle_{V,V'} + 4\langle \bar{y}_1, C_P\bar{y}_3 \rangle_{V,V'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2, \bar{y}_3$ were arbitrary, this shows that $C_P \in S$ and that P has a maximal element. Zorn's lemma now implies the existence of a maximal element $A \in S$. Next denote by $\tilde{H}_2 \subseteq H$ the set satisfying that $\tilde{H}_2 = \{x_2 \in H : (\forall x_1 \in H_1 : g(A, x_1, x_2) = 0)\}$. Then we obtain from (2.81) and from Lemma 2.20 that \tilde{H}_2 is a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm closed linear subspace such that $H_1 \cap \tilde{H}_2 = \{0\}$ and such that $H_1 + \tilde{H}_2 = H$. Combining this with the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))$ and the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)$ is surjective yields that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{\tilde{H}_2}$ is bijective. Next we show that for all $x \in \tilde{H}_2$ it holds that $g(A, x, x) = 0$. Therefore denote for every $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ by $\hat{A}_y \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'}$ the function satisfying for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ that

$$(2.96) \quad \langle \hat{A}_y(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} = \frac{g(A, x_1, y) \cdot g(A, x_2, y)}{g(A, y, y) + 1}.$$

Note that it follows from the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))$, the fact that for all $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ and all $x \in H_1$ it holds that $g(A, x, y) = 0$, and from the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)$ is surjective that for every $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ it holds that \hat{A}_y is well defined. Moreover, we get with (2.79), (2.96), the fact that $H_1 = \ker((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))$, the fact that for all $x \in H_1$ and all $z \in H_2$ it holds that $g(A, x, z) = 0$ and with the fact for all $x \in H$ it holds that $g(A, x, x) \geq 0$ that for all $x_1 \in H_1$

and all $x_2, y \in \tilde{H}_2$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& g(A + \hat{A}_y, x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2) \\
&= g(A, x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2) - \langle \hat{A}_y(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_1 + x_2), (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_1 + x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\
&= g(A, x_1, x_1) + g(A, x_2, x_2) - \langle \hat{A}_y(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_2), (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\
(2.97) \quad &= g(A, x_1, x_1) + g(A, x_2, x_2) - \frac{g(A, x_2, y) \cdot g(A, x_2, y)}{g(A, y, y) + 1} \\
&\geq g(A, x_1, x_1) + g(A, x_2, x_2) - \frac{g(A, x_2, x_2) \cdot g(A, y, y)}{g(A, y, y) + 1} \\
&\geq g(A, x_1, x_1) + g(A, x_2, x_2) - g(A, x_2, x_2) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we get for all $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ that $A + \hat{A}_y \in S$ and this with the fact that for all $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ it holds that $\hat{A}_y \geq 0$ and the fact that $A \in S$ is a maximal element shows for every $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ that $\hat{A}_y = 0$. Taking now $x_1 = x_2 = y$ in (2.96) yields for all $y \in \tilde{H}_2$ that $g(A, y, y) = 0$. Next note that the fact that $(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)|_{\tilde{H}_2}: \tilde{H}_2 \rightarrow V$ is bijective together with the inverse function theorem implies that there exist a relative to $\{x_0\} + \tilde{H}_2$ open set $O_2 \subseteq O \cap (\{x_0\} + \tilde{H}_2)$ and an open set $U_2 \subseteq U$ such that $x_0 \in O_2$, and that $(f|_{O_2})^{-1} \in C_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H}}^2(U_2, O_2)$. Therefore we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.98) \quad \|D_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H}}(f|_{O_2})^{-1}(f(x_0))\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H})}^2 &\geq \limsup_{U_2 \ni y \rightarrow f(x_0)} \frac{\|(f|_{O_2})^{-1}(y) - (f|_{O_2})^{-1}(f(x_0))\|_{\tilde{H}}^2}{\|y - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \\
&\geq \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \frac{\|x - x_0\|_H^2}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again denote by $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{M}(O, U)$ the functions satisfying (2.59), (2.60), and (2.61). Then it follows from (2.98), (2.61), and from (2.59) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{r_2(x)}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} + \frac{r_1(x)}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V} \right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{r_2(x) \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H}}(f|_{O_2})^{-1}(f(x_0))\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H})}^2}{\|x - x_0\|_H^2} + \frac{r_1(x) \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H}}(f|_{O_2})^{-1}(f(x_0))\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{H})}}{\|x - x_0\|_H} \right) \\
(2.99) \quad &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the fact that $f|_{O_2}: O_2 \rightarrow U_2$ is bijective, (2.60), (2.61), (2.99), (2.78), (2.79), the fact that for all $x \in O_2$ it holds that $x - x_0 \in \tilde{H}_2$ and thus $g(A, x - x_0, x - x_0) = 0$, (2.98), and $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2(u \circ f))(x_0)$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{U_2 \ni y \rightarrow f(x_0)} \left(\frac{u(y) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p, y - f(x_0) \rangle_{V', V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle y - f(x_0), A(y - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V, V'}}{\|y - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{U_2 \ni y \rightarrow f(x_0)} \left(\frac{u(y) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p, y - f(x_0) \rangle_{V', V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle y - f(x_0), A(y - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V, V'}}{\|y - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p, f(x) - f(x_0) \rangle_{V', V} - \frac{1}{2} \langle f(x) - f(x_0), A(f(x) - f(x_0)) \rangle_{V, V'}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \left((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0)(x - x_0) \right)(x - x_0) + r_2(x) \rangle_{V', V}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right. \\
(2.100) \quad &\quad \left. - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x - x_0) + r_1(x), A \left((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x - x_0) + r_1(x) \right) \rangle_{V, V'}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{u(f(x)) - u(f(x_0)) - \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} \left((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0)(x - x_0) \right)(x - x_0) \rangle_{V', V}}{\|f(x) - f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{\frac{1}{2} \langle ((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))(x-x_0), A(((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0))(x-x_0)) \rangle_{V,V'}}{\|f(x)-f(x_0)\|_V^2} \\
= & \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{u(f(x))-u(f(x_0))-\langle \tilde{p}, (x-x_0) \rangle_{H',H} + \frac{1}{2}g(A,(x-x_0),(x-x_0)) - \frac{1}{2}\langle (x-x_0), \tilde{A}(x-x_0) \rangle_{H,H'}}{\|x-x_0\|_H^2} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{-\frac{\lambda}{2}\|\pi_{H_1}^H x - \pi_{H_1}^H x_0\|_H^2}{\|f(x)-f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \\
\leq & \limsup_{O_2 \ni x \rightarrow x_0} \left(\frac{u(f(x))-u(f(x_0))-\langle \tilde{p}, (x-x_0) \rangle_{H',H} - \frac{1}{2}\langle (x-x_0), \tilde{A}(x-x_0) \rangle_{H,H'}}{\|x-x_0\|_H^2} \cdot \frac{\|x-x_0\|_H^2}{\|f(x)-f(x_0)\|_V^2} \right) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $(p, A) \in (J_{\mathbb{V},+}^2 u)(f(x_0))$. Moreover, let $B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},H'}$ be the function satisfying for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ that $\langle x_1, Bx_2 \rangle_{H,H'} = g(A, x_1, x_2) - \lambda \langle \pi_{H_1}^H x_1, x_2 \rangle_H$. Then we have that $B \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_1}^H$ and it follows from (2.79) that for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle A((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V',V} + \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} + \langle x_1, Bx_2 \rangle_{H,H'} \\
(2.101) \quad & = \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H,H'}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows the second part of the assertion and therefore completes the proof of Lemma 2.21. \square

2.7. Lifting viscosity solutions to bigger Hilbert spaces

The chain rule for semijets allows us to lift viscosity solutions to bigger spaces. To the best of our knowledge, lifting of viscosity solutions to bigger Hilbert spaces is new.

Proposition 2.22 (Lifting of classical viscosity solutions to viscosity solutions in bigger Hilbert spaces). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2 and assume that $\{y \in X \cap O : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'})\} = \{y \in X \cap O : (J_{\mathbb{H},-}^2 h)(y) \neq \emptyset\}$, that for all $x \in O \cap X$ it holds that $h_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x) = h(x)$, and that for all $x \in O \setminus X$ it holds that $h(x) = \infty$, let $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ be its dual space, let $f \in C_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}(O, V)$ satisfy that $f|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}^2(O \cap X, V)$ and that for all $x_0 \in X \cap O$ it holds that $(D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0) \in C_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}(X, V)$ and that $(D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0) : X \rightarrow V$ is surjective, denote for every $x \in X$ by K_x^\perp the orthogonal set of $\ker((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x))$ satisfying that $K_x^\perp = \{y \in X : (\forall v \in \ker((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x)) : \langle y, v \rangle_X = 0)\}$, let $F : W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{F} : f(O) \times \mathbb{R} \times V' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be degenerate elliptic functions such that for all $x_0 \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{p} \in H'$, $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'}$, $p \in V'$, $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V}'}$, and all $(A_\lambda)_{\lambda \in (0,\infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}$, with*

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.102) \quad & \forall x_1 \in X : \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V',V} = \langle \tilde{p}|_X, x_1 \rangle_{X',X} \quad \text{and with} \\
& \forall x_1, x_2 \in X : \langle A((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V',V} + \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}^2 f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V',V} \\
& = \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{X,X'}
\end{aligned}$$

it holds that

$$(2.103) \quad \tilde{F}(f(x_0), r, p, A) = F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, \tilde{A}),$$

that

$$(2.104) \quad \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X - \lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^X) \leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X),$$

and that

$$(2.105) \quad \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X + \lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^X) \geq \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X),$$

assume that \tilde{F} is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{V \times \mathbb{R} \times V' \times L(V, V')}$ -norm and let $u \in C_V(f(O), \mathbb{R})$ be a classical viscosity solution of $\tilde{F} = 0$. Then $u \circ f$ is a viscosity solution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.22. If $\{x \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W)(x) \neq \emptyset\} = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $\{x \in O : (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W)(x) \neq \emptyset\} \neq \emptyset$. Fix $x_0 \in O$, $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W)(x_0)$. Note that the continuity with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm of u and f together with the assumption that for all $x \in X \cap O$ it holds that $\underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W(x) = h(x)$ shows that

$$(2.106) \quad (u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W = \overline{(u \circ f - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W} = u \circ f - \delta \underline{h}_{\mathbb{H}}^W = u \circ f - \delta h.$$

Furthermore, the assumption that for all $x \in O \setminus X$ it holds that $h(x) = \infty$ implies that $x_0 \in O \cap X$ and this together with the assumption that \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously in \mathbb{H} and the assumption that $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2(u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W)(x_0)$ ensures that $(\tilde{p}|_X, (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X) \in (J_{\mathbb{X},+}^2(u \circ f|_X - \delta h|_X))(x_0)$. Moreover, the assumption that $h|_X \in C_{\mathbb{X}}^2(X \cap O, \mathbb{R})$ yields that $(\tilde{p}|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0), (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0)) \in (J_{\mathbb{X},+}^2(u \circ f|_X))(x_0)$. Thus Lemma 2.21 (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{X}$, $U \leftarrow f(O)$, $\tilde{p} \leftarrow \tilde{p}|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0)$, and with $\tilde{A} \leftarrow (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0)$) implies that for every $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ there exist $B_\lambda \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{X}'}$ and $(p, A_\lambda) \in (J_{\mathbb{V},+}^2 u)(f(x_0))$ such that $B_\lambda \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^X$ and that for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ it holds that

$$(2.107)$$

$$\langle p, (D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V',V} = \langle \tilde{p}|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0), x_1 \rangle_{X',X} \quad \text{and that}$$

$$(2.108) \quad \langle A_\lambda((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V',V} + \langle p, ((D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}^2(f|_X))(x_0))(x_1)(x_2) \rangle_{V',V}$$

$$+ \langle x_1, B_\lambda x_2 \rangle_{X,X'} = \langle x_1, ((\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0))x_2 \rangle_{X,X'}.$$

Note that (2.107) ensures that p does not depend on λ . Moreover, we get from (2.107) and the assumption $(D_{\mathbb{X},\mathbb{V}}(f|_X))(x_0) \in C_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{V}}(X, V)$ that $(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'})$ and thus it holds that $x_0 \in W$. Combining now $x_0 \in W$, (2.8), (2.4), the fact that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $B_\lambda \geq -\lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^X$ and the assumption that F is degenerate elliptic, the assumption that for all $x \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in H'$, and all $(A_\lambda)_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}$ it holds that $\liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, q, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X - \lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{V_\perp}^X) \leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, q, (A_\lambda|_X)|_X)$ yields that

$$(2.109)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u \circ f}^+(x_0, (u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W(x_0), \tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \leq F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+(x_0, u(f(x_0)) - \delta h(x_0), \tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \\ & = F(x_0, u(f(x_0)) - \delta h(x_0) + \delta h(x_0), \tilde{p} + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0)), (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0)) \\ & \leq \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, u(f(x_0)), \tilde{p} + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0)), (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0) - B_\lambda \\ & \quad - \lambda I_{\mathbb{X}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^X) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, u(f(x_0)), \tilde{p} + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0)), (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0) - B_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it follows from (2.103), (2.107), (2.108), the assumption that u is a classical viscosity subsolution of $\tilde{F} = 0$, the fact that for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(p, A_\lambda) \in (J_{\mathbb{V},+}^2 u)(f(x_0))$, and from the continuity of \tilde{F} that

$$(2.110)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h,u \circ f}^+(x_0, (u \circ f)_{\mathbb{H},\delta,h}^-; W(x_0), \tilde{p}, \tilde{A}) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x_0, u(f(x_0)), \tilde{p} + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}',\mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_X))(x_0)), (\tilde{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_X))(x_0) - B_\lambda) \\ & = \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \tilde{F}(f(x_0), u(f(x_0)), p, A_\lambda) = \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \tilde{F}_{\mathbb{V},\mathbb{V},1,0,u}(f(x_0), u(f(x_0)), p, A_\lambda) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Corollary 2.10 shows that $u \circ \pi_V$ is a viscosity subsolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. In the same way, it can be shown that $u \circ \pi_V$ is a viscosity supersolution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$ and we thereby obtain that $u \circ \pi_V$ is a viscosity solution of $F = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X})$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.22. \square

Corollary 2.23 (Lifting classical viscosity solutions to classical viscosity solutions in bigger Hilbert spaces). *Assume the setting in Section 2.2, let $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ be its dual space, let $f \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2(O, V)$, satisfy for all $x_0 \in O$ that $(D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0): X \rightarrow V$ is surjective, denote for every $x \in H$ by K_x^\perp the orthogonal set of $\ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x))$ satisfying that $K_x^\perp = \{y \in H: (\forall v \in \ker((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x)): \langle y, v \rangle_H = 0)\}$, let $F: O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{F}: f(O) \times \mathbb{R} \times V' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be degenerate elliptic functions such that for all $x_0 \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{p} \in H'$, $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $p \in V'$, $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'}$, and all $(A_\lambda)_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, with*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \in H: \langle p, (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1 \rangle_{V', V} &= \langle \tilde{p}|_X, x_1 \rangle_{H', H} \quad \text{and with} \\ \forall x_1, x_2 \in H: \langle A((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_1), (D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}f)(x_0)x_2 \rangle_{V', V} &+ \langle p, (((D_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{V}}^2f)(x_0))(x_1))(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \\ (2.111) \quad &= \langle x_1, \tilde{A}x_2 \rangle_{H, H'} \end{aligned}$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(f(x_0), r, p, A) &= F(x_0, r, \tilde{p}, \tilde{A}), \\ (2.112) \quad \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, \tilde{p}, A_\lambda - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^H) &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, \tilde{p}, A_\lambda), \\ \text{and that } \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, \tilde{p}, A_\lambda + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{K_{x_0}^\perp}^H) &\geq \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F(x, r, \tilde{p}, A_\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

let \tilde{F} be continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{V \times \mathbb{R} \times V' \times L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')} -$ norm and let $u \in C_{\mathbb{V}}(f(O), \mathbb{R})$ be a classical viscosity solution of $\tilde{F} = 0$. Then $u \circ f$ is a classical viscosity solution of $F = 0$.

PROOF. The proof follows directly from Proposition 2.22 (with $\mathbb{X} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}$ and $h \leftarrow 0$). \square

CHAPTER 3

Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of parabolic PDEs

The main result of this chapter is a comparison result for viscosity solutions of parabolic PDEs (Theorem 3.8) and its application to Kolmogorov equations (Corollary 3.9) under suitable assumptions. This generalizes Lemma 4.13 and Corollary 4.14 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] to separable Hilbert spaces. Moreover, in contrast to Theorem 6.1 in Ishii [16] we don't have a global Lipschitz assumption and we allow unbounded viscosity solution as long as they satisfy a suitable growth condition (often polynomial growth).

In Section 3.3 we show several results on constructing suitable semijets. In particular Lemma 3.1 is a small improvement on Theorem 3.2 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5]. Lemma 3.2 then generalizes Lemma 4 in Lions [22] to arbitrary linear functions and Corollary 3.3 generalizes this result to general C^2 -functions. Corollary 3.4 is a special case of Corollary 3.3 and will be needed in the proof of Lemma 3.5. In the Section 3.4 we prove our main theorem (Theorem 3.8). To achieve this, we establish a comparison result for bounded viscosity solutions vanishing at infinity (Lemma 3.5). Using a scaling argument (Lemma 3.6) we can transfer this result to viscosity solutions satisfying a certain growth condition (Theorem 3.8). In Section 3.5 we apply Theorem 3.8 to Kolmogorov equations (Corollary 3.9). This chapter is based on Section 4.3 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] and Section 6 in Ishii [16].

Throughout this chapter we use the notation from Section 3.2 below.

3.1. Setting

Throughout this chapter the following setting is frequently used. Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $\mathbb{X} = (X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ be real separable Hilbert spaces such that $X \subseteq H$, \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously in \mathbb{H} , and X is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$, $\mathbb{X}' = (X, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X'}, \|\cdot\|_{X'})$, $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})' = ((\mathbb{R} \times H)', \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'})$, $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})' = ((\mathbb{R} \times X)', \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times X)'})$, and $((\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2)' = (((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', \|\cdot\|_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'})$ be the corresponding dual spaces, let $O \subseteq H$ be an open set, let $O_n \subseteq O$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the \mathbb{H} -bounded and \mathbb{H} -closed sets satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that, $O_n = \{x \in O : \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O) \geq \frac{1}{n} \text{ and } \|x\|_H \leq n\}$, and denote for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $O_n^c = O \setminus O_n$ the complement of O_n in O , let $W \subseteq (0, T) \times O$ satisfy that W is dense in $(0, T) \times O$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm, let $h : [0, T] \times O \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm lower semicontinuous function with the property that $h|_{(0, T) \times X} \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}}^2((0, T) \times (X \cap O))$ and that $W = \{z \in (0, T) \times (X \cap O) : (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times X}))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'})\}$.

3.2. Notation

Assume the setting in Section 3.1 and let $G : W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then we will in the following always consider the function $F : W \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $((t, x), r, (q, p), A, \tilde{A}) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ with $\forall y \in X : \tilde{A}y = \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times X)'} A(0, y)$ that

$$(3.1) \quad F((t, x), r, (q, p), A) = I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}q - G((t, x), r, p, \tilde{A}),$$

and the corresponding equation

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & F((t, x), u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}u)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2u)(t, x)|_{\mathbb{R} \times X})|_{\mathbb{R} \times X}) \\ & = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u(t, x) - G((t, x), u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}u)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2u)(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we will use the following notation, which is more suitable for parabolic equations throughout this chapter. More precisely a function $G: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is here called *degenerate elliptic* if for all $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$ and all $A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ with $A \leq B$ it holds that $G((t, x), r, p, A) \leq G((t, x), r, p, B)$ (see, e.g., inequality (1.2) in Appendix C in Peng [28] and compare also with Section 2.4 above). Moreover, for $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ we will denote by $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}$, $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}: ((0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'})^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the functions satisfying for all $(\xi, \eta) = ((t, x, r, p, B), (v, y, s, q, C)) \in ((0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'})^2$ that

$$(3.3) \quad d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{+, W}(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} \|x - y\|_H \vee |t - v| \vee |r - s| \vee \|p - q\|_{H'} \vee \|B - C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ \vee |u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(t, x) - u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(v, y)| \\ \quad \text{if } u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(t, x), u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(v, y) \in \mathbb{R} \\ \infty \\ \quad \text{if } u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(t, x), u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{+, W}(v, y) \notin \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(3.4) \quad d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u}^{-, W}(\xi, \eta) = \begin{cases} \|x - y\|_H \vee |t - v| \vee |r - s| \vee \|p - q\|_{H'} \vee \|B - C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ \vee |u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(t, x) - u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(v, y)| \\ \quad \text{if } u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(t, x), u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(v, y) \in \mathbb{R} \\ \infty \\ \quad \text{if } u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(t, x), u_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(v, y) \notin \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

and by $G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+$, $G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the functions satisfying for all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ that

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \\ &= G\left((t, x), r + \delta h(t, x), p + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h(t, x)|_{(0, T) \times (X \cap O)}))\right)(t, x), \\ & \quad (A|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (X \cap O)})(t, x)) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((t, x), r, p, A) \\ &= G\left((t, x), r - \delta h(t, x), p - \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h(t, x)|_{(0, T) \times (X \cap O)}))\right)(t, x), \\ & \quad (A|_X)|_X - \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (X \cap O)})(t, x)) \end{aligned}$$

(compare this also with the Section 2.4 above).

3.3. Construction of semijets

First we recall a minor improvement (since we don't assume that u_i is upper semicontinuous) of Theorem 3.2 (with $k \leftarrow 2$) in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5]. It will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.2 below.

LEMMA 3.1 (Construction of suitable semijets). *Let for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ $N_i \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{O}_i be a locally compact subset of \mathbb{R}^{N_i} , and let for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ $u_i: \mathcal{O}_i \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy that $N = N_1 + N_2$, let \mathcal{O} be the set satisfying that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2$, let $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$, and let $\hat{x} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) \in \mathcal{O}$ be a local maximum of $\mathcal{O} \ni (x_1, x_2) \rightarrow u_1(x_1) + u_2(x_2) - \varphi(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $X_i \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R}^{N_i}, (\mathbb{R}^{N_i})'}$ such that $(\pi_i^{\mathcal{O}} D_{\mathbb{R}^N} \varphi(\hat{x}), X_i) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{R}^{N_i}, +}^2 u_i)(x_i)$ and that*

$$(3.7) \quad - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 \varphi)(\hat{x})\| \right) I \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq (D_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 \varphi)(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon ((D_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 \varphi)(\hat{x}))^2.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1. The proof follows analogously to Theorem 3.2 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5] but instead of the upper semicontinuity in the last inequality (the one after (A.11) on page 62) we use

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} u_1(0) = 0 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \left(\xi_n + \frac{q_n}{\lambda}, 0 \right), A \left(\xi_n + \frac{q_n}{\lambda}, 0 \right) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^N, (\mathbb{R}^N)'} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(u_1 \left(\xi_n + \frac{q_n}{\lambda} \right) + u_2(0) \right) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_1 \left(\xi_n + \frac{q_n}{\lambda} \right) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\hat{u}_1(\xi_n) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} |q_n|^2 \right) = \hat{u}_1(0) \geq u_1(0). \end{aligned}$$

For u_2 this follows analogously, which completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. \square

The next lemma generalizes Lemma 4 in Lions [22] to arbitrary linear functions.

LEMMA 3.2 (Construction of suitable semijets for strict maxima wrt. to a linear operator). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{V^2}, \|\cdot\|_{V^2})$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of H , let $\mathbb{H}' = (H, \|\cdot\|_{H'})$, $(\mathbb{H}^2)' = ((H^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(H^2)'})$, $\mathbb{V}' = (V, \|\cdot\|_{V'})$, $(\mathbb{V}^2)' = ((V^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(V^2)'})$, be the dual spaces, let $u_1, u_2: H \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ be upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, let $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'}$, let $(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \in H^2$ be a strict \mathbb{H}^2 -maximum of $H^2 \ni (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow u_1(z_1) + u_2(z_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (z_1, z_2), A(z_1, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'}$ in $[-\infty, \infty)$, denote by $E_1, E_2: H \rightarrow H^2$ the canonical embeddings satisfying for all $x \in H$ that $E_1(x) = (x, 0)$ and that $E_2(x) = (0, x)$, and let $\varepsilon, \delta, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy that*

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda \geq \frac{1}{\delta} &\left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \vee \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\ &+ \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exist operators $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $X_1 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_1 \pi_V^H$, $X_2 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_2 \pi_V^H$, that

$$(3.10) \quad - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'}) \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right),$$

and satisfying that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.11) \quad \left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), X_i + \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A E_i \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H}, +}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2. Let $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2 \in V$ be the elements satisfying that $\bar{x}_1 = \pi_V^H(\bar{z}_1)$ and that $\bar{x}_2 = \pi_V^H(\bar{z}_2)$, let $\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2 \in V^\perp$ be the elements satisfying that $\bar{y}_1 = \pi_{V^\perp}^H(\bar{z}_1)$ and that $\bar{y}_2 = \pi_{V^\perp}^H(\bar{z}_2)$, let $\hat{z} \in H^2$ be the element satisfying that $\hat{z} = \frac{(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)}{2}$, and let $B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'}$ be the function satisfying that

$$(3.12) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -I_{\mathbb{H}}(\delta \pi_V^H + \lambda \pi_{V^\perp}^H) & \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_V^H \\ \pi_2^{(H^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_2^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H & -I_{\mathbb{H}}(\delta \pi_V^H + \lambda \pi_{V^\perp}^H) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, denote by $\Phi: H^2 \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $z_1, z_2 \in H$ that

$$(3.13) \quad \Phi(z_1, z_2) = u_1(z_1) + u_2(z_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (z_1, z_2), A(z_1, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'},$$

denote by $\phi_1, \phi_2: H \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ the functions satisfying for all $x \in H$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_i(x) &= u_i(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, (\pi_i^{(H^2)'} A E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A E_i \pi_V^H) x \rangle_{H, H'} \\ &+ \left\langle (\hat{z} - E_i(x)), B(\hat{z} - E_i(x)) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(x)\|_H^2 \end{aligned}$$

denote by $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2: V \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ the functions satisfying for all $x \in V$ that

$$(3.15) \quad \tilde{u}_1(x) = \sup_{y \in V^\perp} \phi_1(x + y), \quad \tilde{u}_2(x) = \sup_{y \in V^\perp} \phi_2(x + y),$$

and denote by $\tilde{\Phi}: V^2 \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ the function satisfying for all $x_1, x_2 \in V$ that

$$(3.16) \quad \tilde{\Phi}(x_1, x_2) = \tilde{u}_1(x_1) + \tilde{u}_2(x_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1, x_2), A(x_1, x_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'}$$

Furthermore, using the symmetry of B and (3.12) we derive that for every $x_1, x_2 \in V$ and for every $y_1, y_2 \in V^\perp$ it holds that

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2), B(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ &= -\delta \langle x_1 + y_1, x_1 \rangle_H - \delta \langle x_2 + y_2, x_2 \rangle_H - \lambda \langle x_1 + y_1, y_1 \rangle_H - \lambda \langle x_2 + y_2, y_2 \rangle_H \\ & \quad - 2 \left\langle x_1 + y_1, \left((\pi_{V'}^{H'} + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'}) \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 (\pi_V^H + \pi_{V^\perp}^H) - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H \right) (x_2 + y_2) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &= -\delta \|x_1\|_H^2 - \delta \|x_2\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_1\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_2\|_H^2 - 2 \left\langle x_1 + y_1, \left(\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) (x_2 + y_2) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &= -\delta \|x_1\|_H^2 - \delta \|x_2\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_1\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_2\|_H^2 - 2 \left\langle x_1, \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H y_2 \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ & \quad - 2 \left\langle y_1, \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H x_2 \right\rangle_{H, H'} - 2 \left\langle y_1, \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H y_2 \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\leq -\delta \|x_1\|_H^2 - \delta \|x_2\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_1\|_H^2 - \lambda \|y_2\|_H^2 + 2 \|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \cdot \|y_2\|_H \|x_1\|_H \\ & \quad + 2 \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \cdot \|x_2\|_H \|y_1\|_H \\ & \quad + 2 \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \cdot \|y_1\|_H \|y_2\|_H \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain that for every $x_1, x_2 \in V$ and for every $y_1, y_2 \in V^\perp$ it holds that

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2), B(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ &\leq - \left(\sqrt{\delta} \cdot \|x_1\|_H - \frac{\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H \times H)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|y_2\|_H \right)^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\sqrt{\delta} \cdot \|x_2\|_H - \frac{\|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}}{\sqrt{\delta}} \|y_1\|_H \right)^2 \\ & \quad - \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} (\|y_1\|_H - \|y_2\|_H)^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\lambda - \frac{\|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2}{\delta} - \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \right) \|y_1\|_H^2 \\ & \quad - \left(\lambda - \frac{\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2}{\delta} - \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \right) \|y_2\|_H^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus B is negative semi-definite. Moreover, we have for all $z_1, z_2 \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle (z_1, 0), (A - \pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(z_1, z_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(z_1, z_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ &= - \langle (z_1, 0), B(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + 2 \langle \hat{z}, B \hat{z} \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - 4 \left\langle \frac{(z_1, z_2)}{2}, B \hat{z} \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ & \quad + 2 \left\langle \frac{(z_1, z_2)}{2}, B \left(\frac{(z_1, z_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ &= \langle \hat{z}, B \hat{z} \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - 2 \langle (z_1, 0), B \hat{z} \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \langle (z_1, 0), B(z_1, 0) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\ & \quad + \langle \hat{z}, B \hat{z} \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - 2 \langle (0, z_2), B \hat{z} \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \langle (0, z_2), B(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.19) \quad & + \frac{1}{2} \langle (z_1, 0) + (0, z_2), B((z_1, 0) + (0, z_2)) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - \langle (z_1, 0), B(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \langle (z_1, 0), B(z_1, 0) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - \langle (0, z_2), B(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = \langle (\hat{z} - (z_1, 0)), B(\hat{z} - (z_1, 0)) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \langle (\hat{z} - (0, z_2)), B(\hat{z} - (0, z_2)) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (z_1, 0), B(z_1, 0) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (0, z_2), B(0, z_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = \langle (\hat{z} - (z_1, 0)), B(\hat{z} - (z_1, 0)) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \langle (\hat{z} - (0, z_2)), B(\hat{z} - (0, z_2)) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(z_1)\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(z_1)\|_H^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(z_2)\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(z_2)\|_H^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for all $x_1, x_2 \in V$ and all $y_1, y_2 \in V^\perp$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \geq \Phi(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \\
& \geq \Phi(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = u_1(x_1 + y_1) + u_2(x_2 + y_2) + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2), A(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = u_1(x_1 + y_1) + u_2(x_2 + y_2) + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2), (A - \pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}) A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2), (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}) A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = u_1(x_1 + y_1) + u_2(x_2 + y_2) + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
(3.20) \quad & - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1 + y_1, 0), (A - \pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}) A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} (x_1 + y_1, 0) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (0, x_2 + y_2), (A - \pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}) A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} (0, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \langle (x_1 + y_1, 0), (A - \pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}) A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} (0, x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1, x_2), A(x_1, x_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = u_1(x_1 + y_1) + u_2(x_2 + y_2) + \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - (x_1 + y_1, 0) \right), B \left(\hat{z} - (x_1 + y_1, 0) \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& + \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - (0, x_2 + y_2) \right), B \left(\hat{z} - (0, x_2 + y_2) \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} + \frac{\delta}{2} \|x_1\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y_1\|_H^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|x_2\|_H^2 \\
& + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y_2\|_H^2 - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1 + y_1), (\pi_1^{(H^2)'}) A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'}) A E_1 \pi_V^H (x_1 + y_1) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_2 + y_2), (\pi_2^{(H^2)'}) A E_2 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_2^{(H^2)'}) A E_2 \pi_V^H (x_2 + y_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1, x_2), A(x_1, x_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = \phi_1(x_1 + y_1) + \phi_2(x_2 + y_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_1, x_2), A(x_1, x_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} .
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.20) it follows that \tilde{u}_1 and \tilde{u}_2 are well-defined and that it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.21) \quad & \tilde{\Phi}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = \tilde{u}_1(\bar{x}_1) + \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2), A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \\
& = \sup_{y_1 \in V^\perp} \sup_{y_2 \in V^\perp} (\phi_1(\bar{x}_1 + y_1) + \phi_2(\bar{x}_2 + y_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2), A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'}) \\
& \geq \phi_1(\bar{x}_1 + \bar{y}_1) + \phi_2(\bar{x}_2 + \bar{y}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2), A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} = \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have that

$$(3.22) \quad \tilde{u}_1(\bar{x}_1) = \phi_1(\bar{z}_1), \quad \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2) = \phi_2(\bar{z}_2)$$

and that (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) is a global maximum of $\tilde{\Phi}$. Lemma 3.1 (with $\varphi \leftarrow \tilde{\Phi}$) implies the existence of $\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'}$ (which we fix for the rest of the proof) such that it holds that

$$(3.23) \quad - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A|_{V^2}\|_{L(V^2, (V^2)')} \right) I_{V^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{X}_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A|_{V^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A|_{V^2})^2 \right),$$

$$(3.24)$$

$$((\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2))|_V, \tilde{X}_1) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{V}, +}^2 \tilde{u}_1)(\bar{x}_1), \quad ((\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_2^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2))|_V, \tilde{X}_2) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{V}, +}^2 \tilde{u}_2)(\bar{x}_2).$$

From (3.24) it follows that there exist sequences $(x_{1,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (x_{2,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq V, (\xi_{1,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (\xi_{2,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq V'$ and $(\tilde{X}_{1,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (\tilde{X}_{2,k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'}$ (which we fix for the rest of the proof) such that

$$(3.25) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{1,k} - \bar{x}_1\|_H = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{2,k} - \bar{x}_2\|_H = 0,$$

$$(3.26) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) = \tilde{u}_1(\bar{x}_1), \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}_2(x_{2,k}) = \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2),$$

$$(3.27) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_{1,k} - (\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2))|_V\|_{V'} = 0,$$

$$(3.28) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_{2,k} - (\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_2^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2))|_V\|_{V'} = 0,$$

$$(3.29) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{X}_{1,k} - \tilde{X}_1\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V})} = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{X}_{2,k} - \tilde{X}_2\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V})} = 0,$$

$$(3.30) \quad (\xi_{1,k}, \tilde{X}_{1,k}) \in (J_{\mathbb{V}, +}^2 \tilde{u}_1)(x_{1,k}), \quad (\xi_{2,k}, \tilde{X}_{2,k}) \in (J_{\mathbb{V}, +}^2 \tilde{u}_2)(x_{2,k}).$$

Now denote by $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ the functions satisfying for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ that

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle X_1(x_1), x_2 \rangle_{H', H} &= \langle \tilde{X}_1(\pi_V^H(x_1)), \pi_V^H(x_2) \rangle_{V', V}, \\ \langle X_2(x_1), x_2 \rangle_{H', H} &= \langle \tilde{X}_2(\pi_V^H(x_1)), \pi_V^H(x_2) \rangle_{V', V} \end{aligned}$$

and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by $X_{1,k}, X_{2,k} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ the functions satisfying for all $x_1, x_2 \in H$ that

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle X_{1,k}(x_1), x_2 \rangle_{H', H} &= \langle \tilde{X}_{1,k}(\pi_V^H(x_1)), \pi_V^H(x_2) \rangle_{V', V}, \\ \langle X_{2,k}(x_1), x_2 \rangle_{H', H} &= \langle \tilde{X}_{2,k}(\pi_V^H(x_1)), \pi_V^H(x_2) \rangle_{V', V}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (3.32), (3.29), (3.23) and $\|\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A|_{V^2}\|_{L(V^2, (V^2)')} \leq \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')}$ imply

$$(3.33) \quad X_{1,k} = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_{1,k} \pi_V^H, \quad X_{2,k} = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_{2,k} \pi_V^H,$$

$$(3.34) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{1,k} - X_1\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{2,k} - X_2\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0$$

$$(3.35) \quad - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right).$$

Moreover, (3.27), (3.28), and the definition of $\pi_{V'}^{H'}$ show for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$(3.36) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_{i,k} \pi_V^H - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)\|_{H'} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_{i,k} \pi_V^H - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \pi_V^H\|_{H'} = 0.$$

To conclude the theorem we pull back the expansion implied by (3.30) on \tilde{u}_1 or \tilde{u}_2 to the level of u_1 and u_2 . We will do this only for \tilde{u}_1 since for \tilde{u}_2 it follows exactly the same way. From (3.30) and Lemma 2.9 we deduce for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the existence of $\varphi_k \in C_{\mathbb{V}}^2(V, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying for all $x \in V$ that

$$(3.37)$$

$$\tilde{u}_1(x) \leq \varphi_k(x), \quad \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}), \quad (D_{\mathbb{V}} \varphi_k)(x_{1,k}) = \xi_{1,k}, \quad (D_{\mathbb{V}}^2 \varphi_k)(x_{1,k}) = (X_{1,k}|_V)|_V.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $x_{1,k}$ is a strict \mathbb{V} -maximum of $V \ni x \rightarrow \tilde{u}_1(x) - \varphi_k(x) \in [-\infty, \infty)$ and that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that φ_k grows at least not slower than $V \ni x \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|x\|_H^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ at infinity in the sense that there exists an $M_k \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H$ with $\|x\|_H \geq M_k$ it holds that

$$(3.38) \quad \varphi_k(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|x\|_H^2,$$

otherwise take a function $\eta \in C_{\mathbb{V}}^2(V, [0, 1])$ satisfying for all $x \in V$ with $\|x\|_H \leq 1$ that $\eta(x) = 1$ and for all $x \in V$ with $\|x\|_H \geq 2$ that $\eta(x) = 0$ and replace φ_k by the function $V \ni x \rightarrow \eta(x - x_{1,k})(\varphi_k(x) + \|x - x_{1,k}\|_H^4) + (1 - \eta(x - x_{1,k}))(\frac{1}{2}\|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|x\|_H^2 + (\varphi_k(x))^2 + 1) \in \mathbb{R}$. From (3.38) we obtain for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H \geq M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) - \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2 \\
(3.39) \quad & \leq - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H \geq M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H < M_k\}} \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 \\
& \leq - \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 \leq - \frac{1}{2} \langle \pi_V^H(x), \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H(x) \rangle_{H, H'} \\
& = - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H x \rangle_{H, H'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the fact that (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) is a maximum of Φ ensures for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& u_1(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, (\pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H) x \rangle_{H, H'} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H \geq M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) \\
(3.40) \quad & - \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2 \\
& \leq u_1(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, (\pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H) x \rangle_{H, H'} - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H x \rangle_{H, H'} \\
& = u_1(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x, 0), A(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'} = \Phi(x, 0) - u_2(0) \leq \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) - u_2(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus equation (3.14) and inequality (3.40) imply for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.41) \quad & \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) \\
& = u_1(x) - \frac{1}{2} \langle x, (\pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{H}^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H) x \rangle_{H, H'} + \left\langle (\hat{z} - (x, 0)), B(\hat{z}(x, 0)) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'} \\
& \quad + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(x)\|_H^2 - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H \geq M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H < M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2 \\
& \leq \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) - u_2(0) + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(x)\|_H^2 + \langle (x, 0), B(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'} + \langle \hat{z}, B \hat{z} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'} \\
& \quad - 2 \langle \hat{z}, B(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)'} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H < M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2 \\
& \leq \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) - u_2(0) - \frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\pi_{V^\perp}^H(x)\|_H^2 + \|B\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|\hat{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \\
& \quad + 2 \|B\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \|\hat{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^2} \|x\|_H - \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\pi_V^H(x)\|_H < M_k\}} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \frac{1}{2} \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} M_k^2.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.41) and $\delta, \lambda > 0$ it follows then that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.42) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{ \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \} = -\infty.$$

In a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, (3.42) would be enough to conclude the existence of a global maximum but in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space we need a perturbation argument to get the existence of a maximum. Since u_1 is upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and $A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ it follows from (3.14) that ϕ_1 is upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and this together with the fact that φ_k is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm implies that also $H \ni x \rightarrow \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x))$ is upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm. Furthermore, it follows from the fact that for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $\{x \in H : \|x\|_H \leq r\}$ is convex, \mathbb{H} -bounded, and closed that it is weakly compact. Therefore it follows from page 3 in Stegall [33] that for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ $\{x \in H : \|x\|_H \leq r\}$ is also an RNP set and this together with the theorem starting on page 4 in Stegall [33] implies that for all $r \in (0, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ there exist $p_{\gamma, k, r} \in H'$ and $\hat{x}_{\gamma, k, r} \in H$ such that $\|p_{\gamma, k, r}\|_{H'} < \gamma$ and $\hat{x}_{\gamma, k, r}$ is a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of

$$(3.43) \quad \{x \in H : \|x\|_H \leq r\} \ni x \rightarrow \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \langle p_{\gamma, k, r}, x \rangle_{H', H} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore from (3.41) it follows that for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.44) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \sup \left\{ \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \langle p_{\gamma,k,r}, x \rangle_{H',H} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = -\infty.$$

Thus for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $\hat{r}_k \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and all $x \in H$ with $\|x\|_H \geq \hat{r}_k$ it holds that

$$(3.45) \quad \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \langle p_{\gamma,k,\hat{r}_k}, x \rangle_{H',H} \leq \phi_1(0_H) - \varphi_k(0_V) - 1.$$

Moreover, equation (3.42) implies that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $r_k \in (\hat{r}_k, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H$ with $\|x\|_H \geq r_k$ it holds that

$$(3.46) \quad \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) \leq \phi_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - 1.$$

Then from (3.46) it follows that for all $x \in V$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.47) \quad \sup_{\substack{y \in V^\perp \\ \|y\|_H \geq r_k}} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) \right] \leq \phi_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - 1 \leq \sup_{\substack{y \in V^\perp \\ \|y\|_H \leq r_k}} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) \right]$$

and this ensures that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.48) \quad \sup_{\substack{y \in V^\perp \\ \|y\|_H \leq r_k}} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) \right] = \sup_{y \in V^\perp} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) \right].$$

For every $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denote by $p_{\gamma,k}$, $\hat{x}_{\gamma,k} \in H$ the elements satisfying that $p_{\gamma,k} = p_{\gamma,k,r_k}$ and that $\hat{x}_{\gamma,k} = \hat{x}_{\gamma,k,r_k}$. Then from (3.43) and (3.45) it follows that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and for all $x \in H$ with $\|x\|_H \geq r_k$ it holds that

$$(3.49) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \langle p_{\gamma,k}, x \rangle_{H',H} \leq \phi_1(0_H) - \varphi_k(0_V) - 1 \\ & \leq \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) + \langle p_{\gamma,k}, x \rangle_{H',H} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.43) and (3.49) we get for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ that $\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}$ is also a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum of

$$(3.50) \quad H \ni x \rightarrow \phi_1(x) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(x)) + \langle p_{\gamma,k}, x \rangle_{H',H} \in \mathbb{R}$$

and that

$$(3.51) \quad \sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \|\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}\|_H \leq r_k.$$

Moreover equation (3.15) implies that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ it holds that

$$(3.52) \quad \begin{aligned} & \tilde{u}_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) = \sup_{\tilde{y} \in V^\perp} \left[\phi_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) + \tilde{y}) \right] - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \\ & \geq \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and all $y \in V^\perp$ with $\|y\|_H \leq r_k$ (3.50) and (3.51) imply that

$$(3.53) \quad \begin{aligned} & \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \\ & = \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) + \langle p_{\gamma,k}, \hat{x}_{\gamma,k} \rangle_{H',H} - \langle p_{\gamma,k}, \hat{x}_{\gamma,k} \rangle_{H',H} \\ & \geq \phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) + \langle p_{\gamma,k}, x_{1,k} + y \rangle_{H',H} - \langle p_{\gamma,k}, \hat{x}_{\gamma,k} \rangle_{H',H} \\ & \geq \phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k} + y\|_H + \|\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}\|_H) \\ & \geq \phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k}\|_H + 2r_k). \end{aligned}$$

Maximizing over $\{y \in V^\perp : \|y\|_H \leq r_k\}$ together with (3.15) and (3.48) yields that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.54) \quad & \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \geq \sup_{\substack{y \in V^\perp \\ \|y\| \leq r_k}} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k}\|_H + 2r_k) \right] \\
& = \sup_{y \in V^\perp} \left[\phi_1(x_{1,k} + y) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k}\|_H + 2r_k) \right] \\
& = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k}\|_H + 2r_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from (3.52) and (3.54) that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.55) \quad & \liminf_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\tilde{u}_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \right) \geq \liminf_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \right) \\
& \geq \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k})
\end{aligned}$$

and since $x_{1,k}$ is a strict \mathbb{V} -maximum of $V \ni x \rightarrow \tilde{u}_1(x) - \varphi_k(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ we have for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$(3.56) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\tilde{u}_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \right) = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k})$$

$$(3.57) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) = x_{1,k}.$$

From (3.52) and (3.54) it follows then that for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.58) \quad & \tilde{u}_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \geq \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \\
& \geq \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) - \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) - \gamma(\|x_{1,k}\|_H + 2r_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get with (3.56), (3.57), and with (3.58) that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.59) \quad \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (\tilde{u}_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}))) \geq \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (\phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \geq \liminf_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (\phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) \geq \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k})$$

and this shows that

$$(3.60) \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}).$$

Now with (3.20), (3.22), (3.57), and (3.60) we derive for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.61) \quad & \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \geq \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2) \\
& \geq \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2) + 2 \left\langle \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2)}{2} \right), B \left(\hat{z} - \frac{(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2)}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\
& = \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\phi_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) + \phi_2(\bar{z}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}), \bar{x}_2), A(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}), \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\
& = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) + \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_{1,k}, \bar{x}_2), A(x_{1,k}, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then letting k go to infinity (3.61) together with (3.25) and (3.26) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.62) \quad & \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2) \\
& \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) + \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (x_{1,k}, \bar{x}_2), A(x_{1,k}, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\
& = \tilde{u}_1(\bar{x}_1) + \tilde{u}_2(\bar{x}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2), A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} = \tilde{\Phi}(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.62) it follows then that

$$(3.63) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}, \bar{z}_2) = \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2).$$

In addition we get from (3.33), (3.37), and (3.57) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) = \varphi_k(x_{1,k}) = \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k})$$

$$(3.64) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) &= (D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(x_{1,k}) = \xi_{1,k} \pi_V^H \\ \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) &= (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(x_{1,k}) = \pi_V^{H'} X_{1,k} \pi_V^H = X_{1,k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a $C_k \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, C_k)$ it holds that

$$(3.65) \quad \begin{aligned} |\varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k})) - \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k})| &\leq \frac{1}{k}, \\ \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - \xi_{1,k} \pi_V^H\|_{H'} &\leq \frac{1}{k}, \quad \text{and that} \\ \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma,k}) - X_{1,k}\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} &\leq \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.63) it follows now that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist a $\gamma_k \in (0, C_k)$ such that

$$(3.66) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}, \bar{z}_2) = \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2).$$

With the assumption that (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) is a strict $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ -maximum of Φ we get

$$(3.67) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k} = \bar{z}_1.$$

Now (3.66) and (3.67) imply that

$$(3.68) \quad \begin{aligned} &u_1(\bar{z}_1) + u_2(\bar{z}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), A(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} = \Phi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}, \bar{z}_2) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(u_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) + u_2(\bar{z}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}, \bar{z}_2), A(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}, \bar{z}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(u_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) + u_2(\bar{z}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), A(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(3.69) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) = u(\bar{z}_1).$$

Moreover, (3.26), (3.34), (3.36), (3.65), and the fact that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: \gamma_k < C_k$ ensure that

$$(3.70) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k})) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\varphi_k(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k})) - \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k}) + \tilde{u}_1(x_{1,k})) = \tilde{u}_1(\bar{x}_1), \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} ((D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k})) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} ((D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - \xi_{1,k} \pi_V^H + \xi_{1,k} \pi_V^H) \\ &= \pi_V^{H'} \pi_1^{(H \times H)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2), \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - X_{1,k} + X_{1,k}) = X_1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we obtain from (3.14) and from (3.50) that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.71) \quad \begin{aligned} &((D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - p_{\gamma_k,k}, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k})) \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 \phi_1)(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) \\ \Leftrightarrow &(D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_1(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - \pi_V^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_1(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k})) \\ &- 2\pi_1^{(H^2)'} B((\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}, 0) - \hat{z}) - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) - p_{\gamma_k,k}, (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H))(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}) \\ &+ \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_1 - \pi_V^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} AE_1 \pi_V^H - 2\pi_1^{(H^2)'} BE_1 - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H \in (J_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_1)(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k,k}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting k go to infinity we deduce from (3.67) and (3.70) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(D_{\mathbb{H}}(\varphi_k \pi_V^H)(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}) + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}, 0) - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}, 0)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 2\pi_1^{(H^2)'} B((\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}, 0) - \hat{z}) - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}) - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H(\hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k}) - p_{\gamma_k, k} \right) \\
(3.72) \quad & = \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{z}_1, 0) - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{x}_1, 0) - \pi_1^{(H^2)'} B(\bar{z}_1, -\bar{z}_2) \\
& \quad - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{x}_1 - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{y}_1 \\
& = \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(0, \bar{x}_2) + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{z}_1, 0) + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{x}_1 + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{y}_1 \\
& \quad + (\pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_V^H) \bar{z}_2 - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{x}_1 - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \bar{y}_1 \\
& = \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\varphi_k \pi_V^H) \hat{x}_{\gamma_k, k} + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H - 2\pi_1^{(H^2)'} B E_1 - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \\
& = X_1 + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1^{(H^2)'} - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H + 2\delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + 2\lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H - \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H - \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \\
(3.73) \quad & = X_1 + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \\
& = X_1 + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.67), (3.69), and (3.71) shows that

$$(3.74) \quad (\pi_1^{(H^2)'} A(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), X_1 + \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_1 \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_1)(\bar{z}_1)$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

For completeness we also state the result for general C^2 functions. It follows from Lemma 3.2 and a standard translation technique (see, e.g., First and Second Reduction on page 57 in Crandall, Ishii & Lions [5])

Corollary 3.3 (Construction of suitable semijeets for strict maxima wrt. to a C^2 function). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$, be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{H} , let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$, $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{V'})$, $(\mathbb{H}^2)' = ((H^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(H^2)'})$, $(\mathbb{V}^2)' = ((V^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(V^2)'})$ be the dual spaces, let $O, U \subseteq H$ be open sets, let $u_1: O \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$, $u_2: U \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ be upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, let $\Psi \in C_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2(O \times U, \mathbb{R})$, let $(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \in O \times U$ be a strict \mathbb{H}^2 -maximum of $O \times U \ni (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow u_1(z_1) + u_2(z_2) - \Psi(z_1, z_2) \in [-\infty, \infty)$, denote by $E_1, E_2: H \rightarrow H^2$ the canonical embeddings satisfying for all $x \in H$ that $E_1(x) = (x, 0)$ and that $E_2(x) = (0, x)$, and let $\varepsilon, \delta, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.75) \quad & \lambda > \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. \vee \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then there exist operators $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $X_1 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_1 \pi_V^H$, $X_2 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_2 \pi_V^H$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.76) \quad & - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2))\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
& \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$\left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)), X_i + \pi_i^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \right)$$

$$(3.77) \quad -\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i).$$

PROOF. Let $\tilde{\Psi} \in C_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2(H^2, \mathbb{R})$ be the function satisfying for all $z \in H^2$ that

$$(3.78) \quad \tilde{\Psi}(z) = \begin{cases} \Psi(z + (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) - \Psi(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), z \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}, & \text{if } z + (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \in O \times U \\ -\infty, & \text{if } z + (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \notin O \times U, \end{cases}$$

let $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2: H \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ be the function satisfying for all $z \in H$ that

$$(3.79) \quad \tilde{u}_1(z) = \begin{cases} u_1(z + \bar{z}_1) - u_1(\bar{z}_1) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), (z, 0) \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}, & \text{if } z + \bar{z}_1 \in O \\ -\infty, & \text{if } z + \bar{z}_1 \notin O, \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(3.80) \quad \tilde{u}_2(z) = \begin{cases} u_2(z + \bar{z}_2) - u_2(\bar{z}_2) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), (0, z) \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}, & \text{if } z + \bar{z}_2 \in U \\ -\infty, & \text{if } z + \bar{z}_2 \notin U, \end{cases}$$

denote by $\bar{\eta} \in (0, 1]$ a real number satisfying that

$$(3.81) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\eta} \leq & \frac{\delta}{1+\delta} \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right. \right. \\ & \vee \left. \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\ & \left. - \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and denote for every $\eta \in [0, \infty)$ by $A_\eta \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ the operator satisfying that

$$(3.82) \quad A_\eta = (D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) + \eta I_{\mathbb{H}^2}.$$

Then it holds that $\tilde{u}_1(0) = \tilde{u}_2(0) = \tilde{\Psi}(0, 0) = 0$, $(D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \tilde{\Psi})(0, 0) = (0, 0)$, $(D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \tilde{\Psi})(0, 0) = (D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$, and that $(0, 0)$ is a strict \mathbb{H}^2 -maximum of $H^2 \ni (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \tilde{u}_1(z_1) + \tilde{u}_2(z_2) - \tilde{\Psi}(z_1, z_2) \in [-\infty, \infty)$. Moreover, the fact that $\tilde{\Psi} \in C_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2(O \times U, \mathbb{R})$ shows that for all $\eta \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.83) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{H^2 \ni z \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\tilde{\Psi}(z) - \tilde{\Psi}(0) - \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \tilde{\Psi})(0), z \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2} - \langle (D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \tilde{\Psi})(0) z, z \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}}{\|z\|_{H^2}^2} \right) \\ & = \lim_{H^2 \ni z \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\tilde{\Psi}(z) - \langle (A_\eta - \eta I_{\mathbb{H}^2}) z, z \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}}{\|z\|_{H^2}^2} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for every $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ there exists an $r_\eta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $z \in (H^2) \setminus \{0\}$ with $\|z\|_{H^2}^2 \leq 2r_\eta$ it holds that $\tilde{\Psi}(z) < \langle A_\eta z, z \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}$. Now denote for every $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ by $\tilde{u}_{1,\eta}, \tilde{u}_{2,\eta}: H \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ the functions satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $z \in H$ that

$$(3.84) \quad \tilde{u}_{i,\eta}(z) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}_i(z) & \text{if } \|z\|_H^2 < r_\eta \\ -\infty & \text{if } \|z\|_H^2 \geq r_\eta. \end{cases}$$

Then we have for all $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ that $\tilde{u}_{1,\eta}, \tilde{u}_{2,\eta}$ are upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and that $(0, 0)$ is a strict \mathbb{H}^2 -maximum of

$$(3.85) \quad H^2 \ni (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \tilde{u}_{1,\eta}(z_1) + \tilde{u}_{2,\eta}(z_2) - \langle A_\eta(z_1, z_2), (z_1, z_2) \rangle_{(H^2)', H^2}.$$

Moreover, for all $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \geq & \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \vee \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\ & + \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \eta \left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.86) \quad & \geq \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \vee \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\
& + \frac{\eta^2}{\delta} + \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \eta \\
& \geq \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\|\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \vee \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_2 \pi_V^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}^2 \right) \\
& - \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for every $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ Lemma 3.2 (with $A \leftarrow A_\eta$, $u_1 \leftarrow \tilde{u}_{1,\eta}$, $u_2 \leftarrow \tilde{u}_{2,\eta}$, $(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \leftarrow (0, 0)$) yields that for every $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ there exist operators $X_{1,\eta}, X_{2,\eta} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $X_{1,\eta} = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_{1,\eta} \pi_V^H$, $X_{2,\eta} = \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} X_{2,\eta} \pi_V^H$,

$$(3.87) \quad - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|A_\eta\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_{1,\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & X_{2,\eta} \end{pmatrix} \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A_\eta \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'} A_\eta \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right),$$

and satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$(3.88) \quad \left(0, X_{i,\eta} + \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_i \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 \tilde{u}_{i,\eta})(0).$$

In addition, it holds for all $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$(3.89) \quad (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 \tilde{u}_{i,\eta})(0) = (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 \tilde{u}_i)(0) = (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i) - \{ (\pi_i^{(H^2)'} (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), 0) \}.$$

Combining (3.88) and (3.89) shows then that for all $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.90) \quad & \left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'} (D_{\mathbb{H}^2} \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2), X_{i,\eta} + \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} A_\eta E_i \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \\
& \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i).
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude the theorem we need to let η go to 0 and ensure that the limits $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} X_{1,\eta}$ and $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} X_{2,\eta}$ exists. To this end, note that (3.82) and (3.87) show that $(X_{1,\eta})_{\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]}$ and $(X_{2,\eta})_{\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}]}$ are uniformly $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ -bounded and combining this with the fact that the Banach space $(\{A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} : A = \pi_{V'}^{H'} A \pi_V^H\}, \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}})$ is isomorphic to the finite-dimensional Banach space $(\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'}, \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')}})$ yields that there exist a sequence $(\eta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \bar{\eta}]$ and operators $X_1, X_2 \in \{A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} : A = \pi_{V'}^{H'} A \pi_V^H\}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_i = 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{1,\eta_i} - X_1\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0$, and that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{2,\eta_i} - X_2\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0$. This together with (3.90), the fact that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|A_{\eta_i} - (D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} = 0$, and the fact that $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ is closed under limits then completes the proof of Corollary 3.3. \square

The next corollary is an application of Corollary 3.3 to special functions. It will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.5 below.

Corollary 3.4 (Construction of suitable semijets for strict maxima wrt. to a C^2 function with suitable 2nd derivative). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real Hilbert space, let $\mathbb{V} = (V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H) \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ be a finite-dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{H} , let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$, $\mathbb{V}' = (V', \|\cdot\|_{V'})$, $(\mathbb{H}^2)' = ((H^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(H^2)'})$, $(\mathbb{V}^2)' = ((V^2)', \|\cdot\|_{(V^2)'})$, be the dual spaces, let $O, U \subseteq H$ be open sets, let $u_1 : O \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$, $u_2 : U \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ be upper semicontinuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm, let $\Psi \in C_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2(O \times U, \mathbb{R})$, let $(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \in O \times U$ be a strict \mathbb{H}^2 -maximum of $H \times H \ni (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow u_1(z_1) + u_2(z_2) - \Psi(z_1, z_2) \in [-\infty, \infty)$, denote by $E_1, E_2 : H \rightarrow H^2$ the canonical embeddings satisfying for all $x \in H$ that $E_1(x) = (x, 0)$ and that $E_2(x) = (0, x)$, assume that $\pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H = 0$, that $\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_V^H = 0$, that $\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_1 \pi_V^H = 0$, and that $\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_2^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_V^H = 0$, and let $\varepsilon, \lambda \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.91) \quad & \lambda > \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \left(\|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \right) \\
& + \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_1^{(H^2)'} ((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} .
\end{aligned}$$

Then there exist operators $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $X_1 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_1 \pi_V^H$, $X_2 = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_2 \pi_V^H$,

$$(3.92) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2))\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that

$$(3.93) \quad \left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)), X_i + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i).$$

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.4. For the rest of the proof let $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \infty)$ be the real number satisfying that

$$(3.94) \quad \tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - \max_{i \in \{1,2\}} \left(\|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \right),$$

Then it follows from Corollary 3.3 and from the assumptions that for every $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ there exist operators $X_{1,\delta}, X_{2,\delta} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $X_{1,\delta} = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_{1,\delta} \pi_V^H$, $X_{2,\delta} = \pi_{V'}^{H'} X_{2,\delta} \pi_V^H$,

$$(3.95) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \|((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2))\|_{L(\mathbb{H}^2, (\mathbb{H}^2)')} \right) I_{\mathbb{H}^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X_{1,\delta} & 0 \\ 0 & X_{2,\delta} \end{pmatrix} \\ & \leq \left(\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2} + \varepsilon (\pi_{(V^2)'}^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) \pi_{V^2}^{H^2})^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and satisfying that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.96) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)), X_{i,\delta} + \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \right. \\ & \left. - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \tilde{\lambda} I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we obtain from the assumptions and from the fact that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.97) \quad \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H = (\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H)^*$$

that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.98) \quad \begin{aligned} & \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H \\ & = (\pi_{V'}^{H'} + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'}) \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i (\pi_V^H + \pi_{V^\perp}^H) - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H \\ & = \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H \\ & \quad + \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H \\ & = \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from (3.98) that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.99) \quad \begin{aligned} & \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i - \pi_{V'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_V^H + \tilde{\lambda} I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \\ & \leq \|\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} \pi_i^{(H \times H)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_i \pi_{V^\perp}^H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H + \tilde{\lambda} I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \leq \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.96) and with the fact that $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ is monotone in the second argument then shows for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(3.100) \quad \left(\pi_i^{(H^2)'}((D_{\mathbb{H}^2}^2 \Psi)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)), X_{i,\delta} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_V^H + \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \right) \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2 u_i)(\bar{z}_i).$$

To this end, note that (3.92) shows that $(X_{1,\delta})_{\delta \in (0, \infty)}$ and $(X_{2,\delta})_{\delta \in (0, \infty)}$ are uniformly $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ -bounded and combining this with the fact that the Banach space $(\{A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} : A = \pi_{V'}^{H'} A \pi_V^H\}, \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}})$ is isomorphic to the finite-dimensional Banach space $(\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}'}, \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{V}')}})$ yields that there exist a sequence $(\delta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \infty)$ and operators $X_1, X_2 \in \{A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} : A = \pi_{V'}^{H'} A \pi_V^H\}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i = 0$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{1,\delta_i} - X_1\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0$, and that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|X_{2,\delta_i} - X_2\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} = 0$. This

together with the fact that $\hat{J}_{\mathbb{H},+}^2$ is closed under limits then completes the proof of Corollary 3.4. \square

3.4. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of nonlinear 2nd order PDEs

The next lemma establishes a comparison result for bounded viscosity solutions vanishing at infinity. It generalizes Lemma 4.10 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] (which assumed finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and used the classical notion of viscosity solutions) and in contrast to Theorem 6.1 in Ishii [16] we don't have a one sided global uniform continuity condition.

LEMMA 3.5 (A domination result for viscosity subsolutions). *Assume the setting in Section 3.1, assume that O is convex, and assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $\Lambda_R \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in (0, T)$ and all $x \in X \cap O$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that*

$$(3.101) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(t, x) \right| \leq \Lambda_R \cdot h(t, x).$$

Moreover, let $G_1, G_2: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be degenerate elliptic functions and let $u_1, u_2: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be bounded from above on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$ such that for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $u_i|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of

$$(3.102) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u_i(t, x) - G_i((t, x), u_i(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u_i)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u_i)(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. Furthermore, assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.103) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup_{\varepsilon} \{ |(G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, q, A)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\ \left. p, q \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -R \} \right] = 0,$$

assume that there exist an increasing sequence of finite-dimensional linear subspaces $H_1 \subseteq H_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq H$ and a function $m: (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that $\cup_{N=1}^{\infty} H_N$ is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and that

$$(3.104) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup_{N} \{ (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N}^H) - (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \\ \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \\ \left. (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -R \} \right] \leq 0,$$

assume that there exist sequences $(\tilde{\beta}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \infty)$ and $(\tilde{\delta}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in (0, 1]$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\delta}_n = 0$ and such that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $((t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), r_i^{(n)}, A_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, satisfying that $w - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}) \in [0, T) \times O$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_2^{(n)} - x_1^{(n)}\|_H) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_n} |t_2^{(n)} - t_1^{(n)}| \right) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{\delta}_n (h(t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}) + h(t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}))) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^2 r_i^{(n)} > 0$, that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^2 |r_i^{(n)}| < \infty$, and that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $(z_1^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(z_2^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^2 \langle z_i^{(n)}, A_i^{(n)} z_i^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (3 \|z_2^{(n)} - z_1^{(n)}\|_H^2)$ it holds that

$$(3.105) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{i=1}^2 (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \tilde{\delta}_n, h}^+ \left((t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), r_i^{(n)}, n I_{\mathbb{H}} (x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), n A_i^{(n)} \right) \right] \leq 0,$$

assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.106) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 u_i(t_i, x_i) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, t_1 \vee t_2 \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0,$$

and assume that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.107) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, x) \in ([0, T] \times O_n^c) \cap W} u_i(t, x) \leq 0.$$

Then for all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.108) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 u_i(t_i, x_i) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, t_1 \vee t_2 \leq \tilde{T}, \right. \\ \left. h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5. If $O = \emptyset$, then the assertion is trivial. So for the rest of the proof, we assume that $O \neq \emptyset$. We will show that for all $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.109) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(u_i(t_i, x_i) - \frac{\mu}{(T-t_i)} \right) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, \right. \\ \left. h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

Letting $\mu \rightarrow 0$ then will yield that for all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.110) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 u_i(t_i, x_i) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, t_1 \vee t_2 \leq \tilde{T}, \right. \\ \left. h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

For the rest of the proof we thus fix $\mu \in (0, 1]$. In a first step of this proof, we modify the problem. More precisely, denote by W_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $W_n = ([0, T] \times O_n) \cap W$, by W_n^c , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $W_n^c = ([0, T] \times O_n^c) \cap W$, by $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ the functions satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $t \in [0, T]$, and all $x \in O$ that $\tilde{u}_i(t, x) = u_i(t, x) - \frac{\mu}{(T-t)}$, and by $\tilde{G}_1, \tilde{G}_2: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the functions satisfying for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ that

$$(3.111) \quad \tilde{G}_i((t, x), r, p, A) = G_i\left((t, x), r + \frac{\mu}{(T-t)}, p, A\right) - \frac{\mu}{(T-t)^2}.$$

Then it holds for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that $\tilde{u}_i|_{([0, T] \times O)}$ is a viscosity subsolution of

$$(3.112) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{u}_i(t, x) - \tilde{G}_i((t, x), \tilde{u}_i(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{u}_i)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{u}_i)(t, x)) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. It remains to prove that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.113) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{u}_i(t_i, x_i) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

Aiming at a contradiction, let $S_0 \in (-\infty, \infty]$ be the extended real number satisfying that

$$(3.114) \quad S_0 = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{u}_i(t_1, x_1) : (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in W, \right. \\ \left. h(t_1, x_1) \vee h(t_2, x_2) \leq R, \|x_1 - x_2\|_H \leq r, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

and assume that $S_0 \in (0, \infty]$. Assumption (3.107) then implies that there exists a natural number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that W_{n_0-1} is non-empty and such that for all $z \in W_{n_0-1}^c$ it holds that

$$(3.115) \quad \tilde{u}_1(z) \vee \tilde{u}_2(z) \leq u_1(z) \vee u_2(z) \leq \min(1, \frac{S_0}{4}).$$

Denote now by K the set satisfying $K = O_{n_0}$ that and note that the functions u_1, u_2 are bounded from above on the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded set $[0, T] \times K$. Thus there exists an $L \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $z \in [0, T] \times K$ it holds that

$$(3.116) \quad \tilde{u}_1(z) \vee \tilde{u}_2(z) \leq u_1(z) \vee u_2(z) \leq L.$$

Combining this with (3.115) proves that $S_0 < \infty$ and we thus get $S_0 \in (0, \infty)$. For several $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and suitable $p_n \in ((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'$ and $\beta_n \in (0, \infty)$ we will apply Corollary 3.4 (with $\mathcal{O} \leftarrow (0, T) \times O$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \frac{1}{n}$, $\Psi \leftarrow ((0, T) \times O)^2 \ni ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \rightarrow n\|x_1 - x_2\|_H^2 + \beta_n|t_1 - t_2|^2 + \langle p_n, ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \in \mathbb{R}$) below. For this we now check the assumptions of Corollary 3.4. Denote by $\eta: ([0, T] \times K)^2 \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $z_1, z_2 \in [0, T] \times K$ and all $\delta \in [0, \infty)$ that $\eta(z_1, z_2, \delta) = \sum_{i=1}^2 (\tilde{u}_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(z_i)$. Note that we obtain from (3.116) that $(\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-$ and $(\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-$ are bounded from above on the set $[0, T] \times K$ and thus we have for every $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ that the function $([0, T] \times K)^2 \ni ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \mapsto \eta(((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_1 - x_2\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2}|t_1 - t_2|^2 \in [-\infty, \infty)$ is bounded from above. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 5.1.4 in Kato [20], the Banach-Saks Theorem, and from the fact that $[0, T] \times K$ is convex, $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded, and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -closed that it is weakly compact. Therefore it follows from page 3 in Stegall [33] that $[0, T] \times K$ is also an RNP set and this together with the theorem starting on page 4 in Stegall [33] implies that for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} = ((q_{1, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, p_{1, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}), (q_{2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, p_{2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta})) \in ((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'$ satisfying for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ that $\|p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}\|_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} < \gamma$ and that

$$(3.117) \quad ([0, T] \times K)^2 \ni ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \mapsto \eta(((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_1 - x_2\|_H^2 \\ - \frac{\beta}{2}|t_1 - t_2|^2 + \langle p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \in [-\infty, \infty)$$

attains a strict \mathbb{H} -maximum

$$(3.118) \quad S_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} = \sup_{((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \in ([0, T] \times K)^2} \left(\eta(((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|x_1 - x_2\|_H^2 \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\beta}{2}|t_1 - t_2|^2 + \langle p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right) < \infty$$

in a point $\underline{z}^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)} = ((t_1^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}, x_1^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}), (t_2^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)}, x_2^{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)})) \in ([0, T] \times K)^2$. In addition, from (3.114) and from $S_0 < \infty$ it follows that for all $\varepsilon, r \in (0, \infty)$ and all $l \in (0, \infty]$ there exist $(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}), (s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) \in W$ and $\tilde{R}_l \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\tilde{u}_1(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}) + \tilde{u}_2(s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) \geq S_0 - l$, that $h(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}) \vee h(s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) \leq \tilde{R}_l$, that $\|x_{l, r, \varepsilon} - y_{l, r, \varepsilon}\|_H^2 \leq r$, and that $|t_{l, r, \varepsilon} - s_{l, r, \varepsilon}| \leq \varepsilon$. Furthermore, it follows from (3.115) and from the definition of O_n that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{n_0(n_0-1)})$, and all $l \in (0, \frac{S_0}{2})$ it holds that $x_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon} \in K$. Combining this with the fact that for all $x \in K$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$ we get that for all $l \in (0, \frac{S_0}{2})$, $\alpha \in [n_0, \infty)$,

$\beta \in (0, \infty)$, $r \in (0, \frac{2l}{\alpha}]$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{l}{R_l}]$, $\gamma \in (0, l]$, and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2l}{\beta}]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.119) \quad S_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} &= \sup_{((t, x), (s, y)) \in ([0, T] \times K)^2} \left(\eta((t, x), (s, y)), \delta \right) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t - s|^2 \\
&\quad + \langle p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, ((t, x), (s, y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\geq \overline{(\tilde{u}_1 - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W}(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}) + \overline{(\tilde{u}_2 - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W}(s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x_{l, r, \varepsilon} - y_{l, r, \varepsilon}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta}{2} |t_{l, r, \varepsilon} - s_{l, r, \varepsilon}|^2 + \langle p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, ((t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}), (s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon})) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\geq \tilde{u}_1(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}) - \delta h(t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}) + \tilde{u}_2(s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) - \delta h(s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon}) - \frac{\alpha r}{2} \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta \varepsilon}{2} - \gamma \left\| ((t_{l, r, \varepsilon}, x_{l, r, \varepsilon}), (s_{l, r, \varepsilon}, y_{l, r, \varepsilon})) \right\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\geq S_0 - l - 2 \frac{l}{R_l} \tilde{R}_l - \frac{2\alpha l}{2\alpha} - \frac{2\beta l}{2\beta} - 2l \cdot (n_0 + T) = S_0 - l \cdot (5 + 2(n_0 + T)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now denote for all $\varepsilon, r, R \in (0, \infty)$ by $\Omega_{1, \varepsilon, r, R} \subseteq W_{n_0}^2$ the set satisfying that

$$(3.120) \quad \Omega_{1, \varepsilon, r, R} = \left\{ ((t, x), (s, y)) \in W_{n_0}^2 : |t - s|^2 < \varepsilon, \|x - y\|_H^2 < r, h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) < R, \right. \\
\left. t^2 \wedge s^2 \geq \varepsilon \right\},$$

by $\Omega_{2, \varepsilon, r, R} \subseteq W_{n_0}^2$ the set satisfying that

$$(3.121) \quad \Omega_{2, \varepsilon, r, R} = \left\{ ((t, x), (s, y)) \in W_{n_0}^2 : |t - s|^2 < \varepsilon, \|x - y\|_H^2 < r, h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) < R, \right. \\
\left. t^2 \wedge s^2 < \varepsilon \right\},$$

by $\Omega_{3, \varepsilon, r, R} \subseteq W_{n_0}^2$ the set satisfying that

$$(3.122) \quad \Omega_{3, \varepsilon, r, R} = \left\{ ((t, x), (s, y)) \in W_{n_0}^2 : |t - s|^2 \geq \varepsilon \right\},$$

by $\Omega_{4, \varepsilon, r, R} \subseteq W_{n_0}^2$ the set satisfying that

$$(3.123) \quad \Omega_{4, \varepsilon, r, R} = \left\{ ((t, x), (s, y)) \in W_{n_0}^2 : \|x - y\|_H^2 \geq r \right\},$$

and by $\Omega_{5, \varepsilon, r, R} \subseteq W_{n_0}^2$ the set satisfying that

$$(3.124) \quad \Omega_{5, \varepsilon, r, R} = \left\{ ((t, x), (s, y)) \in W_{n_0}^2 : h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) \geq R \right\}.$$

From (3.118), the fact that for all $\varepsilon, r, R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $\bigcup_{i=1}^5 \Omega_{i, \varepsilon, r, R} = W_{n_0}^2$, the fact that norm and scalar product are continuous, from the density of $W \in O$, and from the definition of η it follows that for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon, r, R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.125) \quad S_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} = \max \left\{ \sup_{((t, x), (s, y)) \in \Omega_{i, \varepsilon, r, R}} \left\{ \eta((t, x), (s, y)), \delta \right\} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t - s|^2 \right. \\
\left. + \langle p_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta}, ((t, x), (s, y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} : i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}.$$

Furthermore, we get from (3.106), (3.114), from $S_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and from $W_{n_0} \subseteq W$ that for all $l \in (0, \infty]$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exist $\tilde{r}_{l, R}, \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l, R} \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\sup\{\tilde{u}_1(t, x) + \tilde{u}_2(s, y) : (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0}, h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) < R, \|x - y\|_H^2 < \tilde{r}_{l, R}, |t - s|^2 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l, R}\} \leq S_0 + l$ and that $\sup\{\tilde{u}_1(t, x) + \tilde{u}_2(s, y) : (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0}, h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) < R, \|x - y\|_H^2 < \tilde{r}_{l, R}, t^2 \vee s^2 < 4\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l, R}\} \leq l$. Thus we obtain from the fact that for all $(t, x) \in W_{n_0}$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$ and the fact that for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ it holds that $h(t, x) \geq 0$ that for all $l \in (0, \infty]$,

$\delta, R, \alpha, \beta \in (0, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.126) \quad & \sup_{((t,x),(s,y)) \in \Omega_{1,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}} \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x-y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t-s|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, ((t,x),(s,y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), 0) + \gamma \|((t,x),(s,y))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : (t,x), (s,y) \in W_{n_0}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. h(t,x) \vee h(s,y) < R, \|x-y\|_H^2 < \tilde{r}_{l,R}, |t-s|^2 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} \right\} \\
& \leq S_0 + l \cdot (1 + 2(n_0 + T)).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we get from the fact that for all $(t,x) \in W_{n_0}$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$, from the fact that for all $(t,x) \in (0, T) \times O$ it holds that $h(t,x) \geq 0$ and from the fact that for all $t, s \in (0, T)$ it holds that $t^2 \vee s^2 = ((t \vee s) - (t \wedge s) + (t \wedge s))^2 \leq 2(t-s)^2 + 2(t \wedge s)^2$ that for all $l \in (0, \infty]$, $\delta, R, \alpha, \beta \in (0, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.127) \quad & \sup_{((t,x),(s,y)) \in \Omega_{2,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}} \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x-y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t-s|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, ((t,x),(s,y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), 0) + \gamma \|((t,x),(s,y))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : (t,x), (s,y) \in W_{n_0}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. h(t,x) \vee h(s,y) < R, \|x-y\|_H^2 < \tilde{r}_{l,R}, |t-s|^2 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R}, t^2 \wedge s^2 < \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ \tilde{u}_1(t,x) + \tilde{u}_2(s,y) + 2l \cdot (n_0 + T) : (t,x), (s,y) \in W_{n_0}, h(t,x) \vee h(s,y) < R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x-y\|_H^2 < \tilde{r}_{l,R}, t^2 \vee s^2 < 4\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} \right\} \\
& \leq l \cdot (1 + 2(n_0 + T)).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, (3.116), the fact that for all $(t,x) \in W_{n_0}$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$ and the fact that for all $(t,x) \in (0, T) \times O$ it holds that $h(t,x) \geq 0$ implies that for all $l \in (0, \infty]$, $\delta, R, \alpha \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R}}, \infty)$ and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.128) \quad & \sup_{((t,x),(s,y)) \in \Omega_{3,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}} \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x-y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t-s|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, ((t,x),(s,y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), 0) - \frac{\beta}{2} |t-s|^2 + \gamma \|((t,x),(s,y))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : \right. \\
& \quad \left. (t,x), (s,y) \in W_{n_0}, |t-s|^2 \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ 2L - \frac{\beta}{2} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} + \gamma \|((t,x),(s,y))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : (t,x), (s,y) \in W_{n_0} \right\} \\
& \leq 2l \cdot (n_0 + T).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have for all $l \in (0, \infty]$, $\delta, \beta, R \in (0, \infty)$, $\alpha \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{r}_{l,R}}, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.129) \quad & \sup_{((t,x),(s,y)) \in \Omega_{4,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}} \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x-y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t-s|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, ((t,x),(s,y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ \eta(((t,x),(s,y)), 0) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x-y\|_H^2 + \gamma \|((t,x),(s,y))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0}, \|x - y\|_H^2 \geq \tilde{r}_{l,R} \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ 2L - \frac{\alpha}{2} \tilde{r}_{l,R} + \gamma \left\| ((t, x), (s, y)) \right\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0} \right\} \\
& \leq 2l \cdot (n_0 + T)
\end{aligned}$$

and finally we obtain with (3.116), the fact that for all $(t, x) \in W_{n_0}$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$, and with the lower semicontinuity of h with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm that for all $l \in (0, \infty]$, $\alpha, \beta, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $R \in [\frac{l}{\delta}, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{((t,x),(s,y)) \in \Omega_{5,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}} \left\{ \eta((t, x), (s, y), \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - y\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t - s|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, ((t, x), (s, y)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right\} \\
(3.130) \quad & \leq \sup \left\{ \eta((t, x), (s, y), 0) - \delta(h(t, x) + h(s, y)) + \gamma \left\| ((t, x), (s, y)) \right\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : \right. \\
& \quad \left. (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0}, h(t, x) \vee h(s, y) \geq R \right\} \\
& \leq \sup \left\{ 2L - 2\delta R + \gamma \left\| ((t, x), (s, y)) \right\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} : (t, x), (s, y) \in W_{n_0} \right\} \\
& \leq 2l \cdot (n_0 + T).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.125), (3.126), (3.127), (3.128), (3.129), and (3.130) then results for all $l \in (0, \infty]$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $R \in [\frac{l}{\delta}, \infty)$, $\alpha \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{r}_{l,R}}, \infty)$, $\beta \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R}}, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ in

$$(3.131) \quad S_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} \leq S_0 + l(1 + 2(n_0 + T)).$$

In addition (3.119) yields for all $l \in (0, \frac{S_0}{2(5+2(n_0+T))})$, $\alpha \in [n_0, \infty)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{l}{R_l}]$, $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ that

$$(3.132) \quad l(1 + 2(n_0 + T)) < \frac{S_0}{2} < S_0 - l(5 + 2(n_0 + T)) \leq S_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}.$$

Combining this with (3.125), (3.127), (3.128), (3.129), (3.130), and the fact that for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.133) \quad S_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} &= \eta(\underline{z}^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)}, \delta) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x_1^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)} - x_2^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)}\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta}{2} |t_1^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)} - t_2^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)}|^2 \\
& \quad + \langle p_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta}, \underline{z}^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)} \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

shows that for all $l \in (0, \frac{S_0}{2(5+2(n_0+T))})$, $R \in [\frac{2L}{\delta}, \infty)$, $\alpha \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{r}_{l,R}} \vee n_0, \infty)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{l}{R_l}]$, $\beta \in [\frac{4L}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R}}, \infty)$, and all $\gamma \in (0, l]$ it holds that $\underline{z}^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)} \in \Omega_{1,\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R},\tilde{r}_{l,R},R}$ and therefore that

$$(3.134) \quad (t_1^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)})^2 \wedge (t_2^{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta)})^2 \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{l,R} > 0.$$

Moreover, from (3.103) it follows that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$, there exists a constant $C_{R,\delta} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, q \in H'$, $A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}'}$, and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ satisfying that $\max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H},\mathbb{H}')}\} \leq R$, $(G_i)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -R$, and satisfying that $\|p - q\|_{H'} \leq 4C_{R,\delta}$ it holds that

$$(3.135) \quad |(G_i)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - (G_i)_{\mathbb{H},\mathbb{X},\delta,h}^+((t, x), r, q, A)| \leq \frac{1}{R}.$$

Next denote by $(l_\alpha, \delta_\alpha, \beta_\alpha, K_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq (0, \infty]^4$, $(\gamma_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq (0, \infty]$, by $(\underline{z}^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq ([0, T] \times K)^2$, by $(t_1^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)}$, $(t_2^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq [0, T]$, by $(x_1^{(\alpha)}, x_2^{(\alpha)})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq K^2$, by $(p_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq ((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'$, $(q_{1,\alpha}, q_{2,\alpha})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq (\mathbb{R}')^2$, by $(p_{1,\alpha})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)}$, $(p_{2,\alpha})_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq H'$, and by $(S_\alpha)_{\alpha \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ the sequences satisfying for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ that $l_\alpha = \inf\{l \in [\alpha, \infty) : \alpha \leq \frac{l}{R_l}\}$, that $\delta_\alpha = \inf\{\delta \in$

$[\tilde{\delta}_{[\alpha]}, \infty): \alpha \geq \frac{8L}{\tilde{r}_{l_\delta, 2L\delta^{-1}}} \cup \{1\}$, that $\beta_\alpha = \frac{8L}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l_\delta, 2L\delta^{-1}}} \vee \alpha \vee \tilde{\beta}_{[\alpha]} \vee \mathbb{1}_{(1, \infty)}(\alpha) \beta_{(\alpha-1)\vee \frac{1}{2}}$, that

$$(3.136) \quad K_\alpha = \left(\frac{1}{\delta_\alpha}\right) \vee (l_{\delta_\alpha} \cdot (5 + 4(n_0 + T)) + \frac{1}{\alpha} + L) \vee (2\alpha \cdot n_0 + \frac{1}{\alpha} + l_{\delta_\alpha}) \\ \vee (4\alpha + 2\beta_\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha}) \vee \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} + l_{\delta_\alpha} + 1 + \Lambda_{n_0}\right),$$

that $\gamma_\alpha = l_{\delta_\alpha} \wedge C_{K_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, that $z^{(\alpha)} = z^{(\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha)}$, that $t_1^{(\alpha)} = t_1^{(\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha)}$, that $t_2^{(\alpha)} = t_2^{(\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha)}$, that $x_1^{(\alpha)} = x_1^{(\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha)}$, that $x_2^{(\alpha)} = x_2^{(\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha)}$, that $p_\alpha = p_{\alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, that $p_{1, \alpha} = p_{1, \alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, that $p_{2, \alpha} = p_{2, \alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, that $q_{1, \alpha} = q_{1, \alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, that $q_{2, \alpha} = q_{2, \alpha, \beta_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha, \delta_\alpha}$, and that

$$(3.137) \quad S_\alpha = (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_\alpha, h}^{-, W}(t_1^{(\alpha)}, x_1^{(\alpha)}) + (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_\alpha, h}^{-, W}(t_2^{(\alpha)}, x_2^{(\alpha)}) - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x_1^{(\alpha)} - x_2^{(\alpha)}\|_H^2 \\ - \frac{\beta_\alpha}{2} |t_1^{(\alpha)} - t_2^{(\alpha)}|^2 + \langle p_\alpha((t_1^{(\alpha)}, x_1^{(\alpha)}), (t_2^{(\alpha)}, x_2^{(\alpha)})) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2}.$$

Furthermore denote for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\Psi_n: ((0, T) \times O)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \in ((0, T) \times O)^2$ that

$$(3.138)$$

$$\Psi_n((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) = \frac{n}{2} \|x_1 - x_2\|_H^2 + \frac{\beta_n}{2} |t_1 - t_2|^2 + \langle p_n, ((t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2)) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2}.$$

Note that (3.119), (3.131), and the fact that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\alpha = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} l_\delta = 0$ imply that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} S_\alpha = S_0$. Moreover the set $([0, T] \times K)^2$ is closed, $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2$ -bounded, and convex and therefore the Banach-Saks Theorem and Lemma 5.1.4 in Kato [20] show that it is also weakly compact. Thus there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and a point $\hat{z} = ((\hat{t}_1, \hat{x}_1), (\hat{t}_2, \hat{x}_2)) \in ([0, T] \times K)^2$ such that $w - \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} z^{(n_j)} = \hat{z}$. Clearly, $\tilde{u}_i(T, x) = -\infty$ for all $x \in K$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ implies that for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $t_1^{(\alpha)}, t_2^{(\alpha)} \in [0, T)$. In addition, observe that if $(\hat{t}_1, \hat{t}_2) \in [0, T]^2 \setminus [0, T - \frac{\mu}{2L}]^2$, then (3.116), $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} S_\alpha = S_0$, the fact that for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times O$ it holds that $h(t, x) \geq 0$, the fact that for all $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $\|p_\alpha\|_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} \leq l_{\delta_\alpha}$ and the fact that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} l_{\delta_\alpha} = 0$ imply that

$$(3.139) \quad 0 < S_0 = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} S_\alpha = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} S_{n_j} \\ = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\eta(z^{(n_j)}, \delta_{n_j}) - \frac{n_j}{2} \|x_1^{(n_j)} - x_2^{(n_j)}\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta_{n_j}}{2} |t_1^{(n_j)} - t_2^{(n_j)}|^2 \right. \\ \left. + \langle p_{n_j}, z^{(n_j)} \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right) \\ \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\eta(z^{(n_j)}, 0) + l_{\delta_{n_j}} \cdot \|z^{(n_j)}\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \right) \\ \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\sup_{z \in [0, T] \times K} u_i(z) \right] \right) - \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\mu}{T - t_1^{(n_j)}} + \frac{\mu}{T - t_2^{(n_j)}} \right) \\ \leq 2L - 2L = 0$$

and this contradiction shows that $(\hat{t}_1, \hat{t}_2) \in [0, T - \frac{\mu}{2L}]^2$. Now denote by $(N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ the natural numbers satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$(3.140)$$

$$N_n = \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \left\{ \inf \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} : \sup \left\{ (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+(\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + 3\alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_m^H} \right\} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+(\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) : m \in \{N, N+1, \dots\}, \alpha \in (0, K_n/3), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq K_n, h(\tau, \xi) \leq K_n, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. |t_i^{(n)} - \tau| \vee \|x_i^{(n)} - \xi\|_H \vee |(u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) - \nu| \vee \|n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}) - \rho\|_{H'} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \leq m(K_n, t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}, (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), \delta_n), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+(\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -K_n \right\} \leq \frac{1}{K_n} \right\}.$$

Note that (3.104) ensures that $(N_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is well defined. Moreover, denote by $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ the operators satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $B_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta_n}{n} I_{\mathbb{R}} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathbb{H}} \end{pmatrix}$, by \mathcal{N}_0 the set with the property that $\mathcal{N}_0 = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \underline{z}_n \in ((0, T) \times \overset{\circ}{K})^2, l_{\delta_n} < \infty, \delta_n < 1, t_1^{(n)} \vee t_2^{(n)} \leq T - \frac{\mu}{3L} - \frac{1}{\beta_n}\} \cap \{n_j \in \mathbb{N} : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and by $E_1, E_2 : \mathbb{R} \times H \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2$ the operator satisfying for all $z \in \mathbb{R} \times H$ that $E_1(z) = (z, 0)$ and that $E_2(z) = (0, z)$. Note that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\alpha = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} l_\delta = 0$, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} S_\alpha = S_0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta_n} = 0$, $(\hat{t}_1, \hat{t}_2) \in [0, T - \frac{\mu}{2L}]^2$, (3.115), and (3.134) ensure that $\#\mathcal{N}_0 = \infty$. Furthermore, observe that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all closed linear subspaces $V \subseteq H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\
&= \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} \begin{pmatrix} nB_n & -nB_n \\ -nB_n & nB_n \end{pmatrix} E_2 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\
(3.141) \quad &= \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (-nB_n) \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} = \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \begin{pmatrix} -\beta_n I_{\mathbb{R}} & 0 \\ 0 & -nI_{\mathbb{H}} \end{pmatrix} \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -\beta_n I_{\mathbb{R}} \cdot 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} n I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \end{pmatrix} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_1 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\
&= \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} \begin{pmatrix} nB_n & -nB_n \\ -nB_n & nB_n \end{pmatrix} E_1 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\
(3.142) \quad &= \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} nB_n \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\
&= \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_n I_{\mathbb{R}} & 0 \\ 0 & nI_{\mathbb{H}} \end{pmatrix} \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\
&= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \cdot \beta_n I_{\mathbb{R}} \cdot 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \pi_{(V^\perp)'}^{H'} n I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V^\perp}^H \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} = n.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all closed linear subspaces $V \subseteq H$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times V}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\
(3.143) \quad &= \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_1 \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times V}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\
&= \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_2^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times V}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_2^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\
(3.144) \quad &= \left\| \pi_{((\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp)'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \pi_1^{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} ((D_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2}^2 \Psi_n)(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)) E_2 \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times V)^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} = n.
\end{aligned}$$

Then Corollary 3.4 (with $O \leftarrow (0, T) \times O$, $U \leftarrow (0, T) \times O$, $V \leftarrow \mathbb{R} \times H_{N_n}$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \frac{1}{n}$, $\lambda \leftarrow 3n$, $u_1 \leftarrow (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^-|_{(0, T) \times O}$, $u_2 \leftarrow (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^-|_{(0, T) \times O}$, $\Psi \leftarrow \Psi_n$, and with the local maximum point $(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) \leftarrow \underline{z}^{(n)}$) yields that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ there exist linear operators $A_1^{(n)}, A_2^{(n)} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$, such that

$$(3.145) \quad A_1^{(n)} = \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times H_{N_n})'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} A_1^{(n)} \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times H_{N_n}}^{\mathbb{R} \times H}, \quad A_2^{(n)} = \pi_{(\mathbb{R} \times H_{N_n})'}^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} A_2^{(n)} \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times H_{N_n}}^{\mathbb{R} \times H},$$

$$(3.146) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(\beta_n(t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}), n(x_1^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)})) + (q_{1,n}, p_{1,n}), nA_1^{(n)} + 3nI_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H} \right) \\ & \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, +}^2(\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W})(t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}), \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.147) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(\beta_n(t_2^{(n)} - t_1^{(n)}), n(x_2^{(n)} - x_1^{(n)})) + (q_{2,n}, p_{2,n}), nA_2^{(n)} + 3nI_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H} \right) \\ & \in (\hat{J}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, +}^2(\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W})(t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.148) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \left[n + n \left\| \begin{pmatrix} B_n & -B_n \\ -B_n & B_n \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{L((\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2, ((\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2)')} \right] I_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} nA_1^{(n)} & 0 \\ 0 & nA_2^{(n)} \end{pmatrix} \\ & \leq n \begin{pmatrix} B_n & -B_n \\ -B_n & B_n \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{n} \left[n \begin{pmatrix} B_n & -B_n \\ -B_n & B_n \end{pmatrix} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that

$$(3.149) \quad \left\| \begin{pmatrix} B_n & -B_n \\ -B_n & B_n \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{L((\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2, ((\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2)')} = 2 \|B_n\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} = 2 \frac{\beta_n}{n}$$

then implies for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ that

$$(3.150) \quad - \left(1 + 2 \frac{\beta_n}{n} \right) I_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})^2} \leq \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{(n)} & 0 \\ 0 & A_2^{(n)} \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} B_n + 2B_n^2 & -B_n - 2B_n^2 \\ -B_n - 2B_n^2 & B_n + 2B_n^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, Corollary 2.11 together with (3.146), (3.147), and with the fact for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $\tilde{u}_i|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of (3.112) relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$ then proves that all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ there exist $((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)}, \sigma_i^{(n)}, \rho_i^{(n)}, \mathfrak{Q}_i^{(n)})_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \subseteq W \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}' \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'}'$ such that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.151) \quad \begin{aligned} & |t_i^{(n)} - \tau_i^{(n)}| \vee \|x_i^{(n)} - \xi_i^{(n)}\|_H \vee |(\tilde{u}_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) - (\tilde{u}_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)})| \\ & \vee |\nu_i^{(n)} - (\tilde{u}_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)})| \vee \|n\mathfrak{Q}_i^{(n)} - nA_i^{(n)} - 3nI_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H} \|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \\ & \vee \|(\sigma_i^{(n)}, \rho_i^{(n)}) - I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(\beta_n(t_i^{(n)} - t_{3-i}^{(n)}), n(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)})) - (q_{i,n}, p_{i,n})\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\beta_n} \wedge \frac{C_{K_n, \delta_n}}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2n} m(K_n, t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}, (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), \delta_n) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.152) \quad I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_i^{(n)} + \delta_n \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) - (\tilde{G}_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)}, \rho_i^{(n)}, n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{Q}_i^{(n)} \Big|_H \right) \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.151), (3.150), the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} B_n \Big|_H = I_{\mathbb{H}}$, the fact that for $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $\beta_n \geq n$, and from (3.136) that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ and all $l \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.153) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{Q}_l^{(n)} \Big|_H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \|n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} A_l^{(n)} \Big|_H\| + 3nI_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H} \|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \frac{1}{n} \\ & \leq n \left((1 + 2 \frac{\beta_n}{n}) \vee 3 \right) + 3n + \frac{1}{n} = 4n + 2\beta_n + \frac{1}{n} \leq K_n. \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.154) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{Q}_l^{(n)} \Big|_H - 3nI_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H} \|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \|n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} A_l^{(n)} \Big|_H\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \frac{1}{n} \\ & \leq n \left((1 + 2 \frac{\beta_n}{n}) \vee 3 \right) + \frac{1}{n} = n + 2\beta_n + \frac{1}{n} \leq K_n. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.151), the lower semicontinuity of h with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm, the fact that for all $x \in K$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $\beta_n \geq n$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $\|p_n\|_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)'} \leq \gamma_n \leq l_{\delta_n}$, and from the

fact that for all $a, b, c \in H$ it holds that $\|a - b - c\|_H^2 = \frac{3}{4}\|a\|_H^2 - 6\|b\|_H^2 - 6\|c\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}a - 2b - 2c\|_H^2 + 3\|b - c\|_H^2 \geq \frac{3}{4}\|a\|_H^2 - 6\|b\|_H^2 - 6\|c\|_H^2$ that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that

(3.155)

$$\begin{aligned}
S_n &= \eta(\underline{z}^{(n)}, \delta_n) - \frac{n}{2}\|x_1^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta_n}{2}|t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}|^2 + \langle p_n, \underline{z}^{(n)} \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\leq (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}) + (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}) \\
&\quad - \frac{n}{2}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)} - (\xi_1^{(n)} - x_1^{(n)}) - (x_2^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)})\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_n}{2}(|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}| - |t_1^{(n)} - \tau_1^{(n)}| - |t_2^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|)^2 + \gamma_n \|\underline{z}^{(n)}\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\leq (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) + \frac{2}{\beta_n} - \frac{3n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{3\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 + \frac{6n}{\beta_n^2} + \frac{6}{\beta_n} + 2l_{\delta_n}(n_0 + T) \\
&\leq (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n/2, h}^{-, W}(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n/2, h}^{-, W}(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) - \frac{\delta_n}{2}(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) \\
&\quad - \frac{n}{4}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 - \frac{n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 - \frac{\beta_n}{4}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 - \frac{\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 + \frac{14}{n} \\
&\quad + 2l_{\delta_n}(n_0 + T) + \frac{l_{\delta_n}}{2}\|((\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}), (\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}))\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\quad + \langle p_{n/2, \beta_n/2, \gamma_n/2, \delta_n/2}, ((\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}), (\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} \\
&\leq S_{n/2, \beta_n/2, \gamma_n/2, \delta_n/2} - \frac{\delta_n}{2}(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) - \frac{n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 + \frac{14}{n} + 3l_{\delta_n}(n_0 + T).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain from (3.119), (3.155), (3.131), and from the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $l_n < \infty$, $n \geq \frac{8L}{\tilde{r}_{l_{\delta_n}, 2L\delta_n^{-1}}}$, $\delta_n \leq \frac{l_{\delta_n}}{\tilde{R}l_{\delta_n}}$, and that $\beta_n \geq \frac{8L}{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l_{\delta_n}, 2L\delta_n^{-1}}}$ that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.156) \quad &S_0 - l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 2(n_0 + T)) \leq S_n \\
&\leq S_{n/2, \beta_n/2, \gamma_n/2, \delta_n/2} - \frac{\delta_n}{2}(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) - \frac{n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 + 3l_{\delta_n}(n_0 + T) + \frac{14}{n} \\
&\leq S_0 + l_{\delta_n}(1 + 5(n_0 + T)) + \frac{14}{n} - \frac{\delta_n}{2}(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) - \frac{n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking now the limit $\limsup_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty}$ in (3.156) together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} l_{\delta_n} = 0$ shows then

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.157) \quad &\limsup_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\delta_n}{2}(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) + \frac{n}{8}\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 + \frac{\beta_n}{8}|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left[l_{\delta_n}(6 + 7(n_0 + T)) + \frac{14}{n} \right] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and this yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.158) \quad &\lim_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\delta_n(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)})) \right] = \lim_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left[n\|\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \right] \\
&= \lim_{\mathcal{N}_0 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\beta_n|\tau_1^{(n)} - \tau_2^{(n)}|^2 \right] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (3.101), (3.151), (3.158), and the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_0$ it holds that $\|\xi_1^{(n)}\|_H \vee \|\xi_2^{(n)}\|_H \leq n_0$ imply that

$$\limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_i^{(n)} + \delta_n \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) \right) - \frac{2}{n} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left| I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_1^{(n)} - \beta_n (t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}) \right| + \left| I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_2^{(n)} - \beta_n (t_2^{(n)} - t_1^{(n)}) \right| \right. \\
(3.159) \quad & \quad \left. + \Lambda_{n_0} \delta_n \cdot \left(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \right) + \frac{2}{n} \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{2}{\beta_n} + |q_{1,n}| + |q_{2,n}| + \Lambda_{n_0} \delta_n \cdot \left(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \right) + \frac{2}{n} \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{2}{\beta_n} + 2\gamma_n + \Lambda_{n_0} \delta_n \cdot \left(h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) + h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \right) + \frac{2}{n} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote now by $\mathcal{N}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ the set satisfying that $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{n \in \mathcal{N}_0 : h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) \vee h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_n}, |t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}| \leq \frac{1}{\beta_n}, n \geq \frac{9L^2}{\mu}\}$. Then (3.158) together with $\#\mathcal{N}_0 = \infty$ implies that $\#\mathcal{N}_1 = \infty$. In addition, we get from (3.152), (3.151), (3.101), (3.136), the fact that for all $x \in K$ it holds that $\|x\|_H \leq n_0$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $|I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} q_{i,n}| \leq \|p_n\|_{H'} \leq l_{\delta_n}$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $|t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}| \leq \frac{1}{\beta_n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$, and from the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_n}$ that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}}, \rho_i^{(n)}, n\mathfrak{B}_i^{(n)} \right) \\
(3.160) \quad & \geq -\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\mu}{(T - \tau_i^{(n)})^2} + I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_i^{(n)} + \delta_n \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) \\
& \geq -\frac{1}{n} - \beta_n |t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}| - |I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} q_{i,n}| - \frac{1}{\beta_n} - \Lambda_{n_0} \delta_n \cdot h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) \geq -\frac{2}{n} - l_{\delta_n} - 1 - \Lambda_{n_0} \\
& \geq -K_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.116), (3.119), (3.137), (3.151), and from the fact that $S_0 \geq 0$ that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 4(n_0 + T)) - \frac{1}{n} - L \\
& \leq S_0 - l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 2(n_0 + T)) - (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}) - 2l_{\delta_n}(n_0 + T) - \frac{1}{n} \\
(3.161) \quad & \leq S_n - (\tilde{u}_2)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}) + \frac{n}{2} \|x_1^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 + \frac{\beta_n}{2} |t_1^{(n)} - t_2^{(n)}|^2 \\
& \quad - \langle p_n, ((t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}), (t_2^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)})) \rangle_{((\mathbb{R} \times H)^2)', (\mathbb{R} \times H)^2} - \frac{1}{n} \\
& \leq (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}) - \frac{1}{\beta_n} \\
& \leq \nu_1^{(n)} \leq (\tilde{u}_1)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_1^{(n)}, x_1^{(n)}) + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \leq L + \frac{1}{n} \leq l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 4(n_0 + T)) + \frac{1}{n} + L.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar we get for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ that

$$(3.162) \quad -l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 4(n_0 + T)) - \frac{1}{n} - L \leq \nu_2^{(n)} \leq l_{\delta_n} \cdot (5 + 4(n_0 + T)) + \frac{1}{n} + L$$

and this together with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $t_1^{(n)} \vee t_2^{(n)} \leq T - \frac{\mu}{3L}$ and with (3.136), proves that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that

$$(3.163) \quad \max_{\{i \in \{1, 2\}\}} \left| \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}} \right| \leq L + l_n + \frac{4(n_0 + T + 1)}{n} + \frac{\mu}{T - (T - \frac{\mu}{3L})} = 4L + l_n + \frac{4(n_0 + T + 1)}{n} \leq K_n.$$

In addition, (3.151), the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\|p_{1,n}\|_{H'} + \|p_{2,n}\|_{H'} \leq C_{K_n, \delta_n} \wedge l_{\delta_n}$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\beta_n \geq n$, and (3.136) show that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that

$$(3.164) \quad \|\rho_i^{(n)}\|_{H'} \leq n \|x_1^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)}\|_H + \|p_{i,n}\|_{H'} + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \leq 2n \cdot n_0 + \frac{1}{n} + l_{\delta_n} \leq K_n$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\rho_i^{(n)} - nI_{\mathbb{H}}(\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_{3-i}^{(n)})\|_{H'} \\
(3.165) \quad & \leq \|\rho_i^{(n)} - nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)})\|_{H'} + \|n(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}) - n(\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_{3-i}^{(n)})\|_H
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{C_{K_n, \delta_n}}{n} + \|p_{i,n}\|_{H'} + n\|x_1^{(n)} - \xi_1^{(n)}\|_H + n\|x_2^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}\|_H \leq \frac{C_{K_n, \delta_n}}{n} + 3C_{K_n, \delta_n} \\ &\leq 4C_{K_n, \delta_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then (3.135) (with $R \leftarrow K_n$, $\delta \leftarrow \delta_n$, $(t, x) \leftarrow (\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)})$, $r \leftarrow \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}}$, $p \leftarrow \rho_i^{(n)}$, and with $A \leftarrow n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H$) together with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) \vee h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_n} \leq K_n$, the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\|\xi_1^{(n)}\|_H \vee \|\xi_2^{(n)}\|_H \leq n_0 + 1$, (3.163), (3.164), (3.153), (3.160), (3.165), (3.135), and with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\frac{1}{K_n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$ implies that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.166) \quad &(G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}}, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_i^{(n)}), n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right) + \frac{1}{n} \\ &\geq (G_1)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}), \nu_1^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_1^{(n)}}, \rho_1^{(n)}, n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right) \geq -\frac{3}{n} - 1 - \Lambda_{n_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (3.151) ensures that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.167) \quad &\|nI_{\mathbb{H}}(\xi_1^{(n)} - \xi_2^{(n)}) - nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_1^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)})\|_{H'} \leq n\|\xi_1^{(n)} - x_1^{(n)}\|_H + n\|\xi_2^{(n)} - x_2^{(n)}\|_H \\ &\leq \min \left\{ m(K_n, t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}, (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), \delta_n) : i \in \{1, 2\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.151), the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $t_i^{(n)} \vee \tau_i^{(n)} \leq T - \frac{3L}{\mu}$, and the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $n \geq \frac{9L^2}{\mu}$ imply that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.168) \quad &\left| (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) + \frac{\mu}{T-t_i^{(n)}} - \nu_i^{(n)} - \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) - \nu_i^{(n)} \right| + \left| \frac{\mu\tau_i^{(n)} - \mu t_i^{(n)}}{(T-t_i^{(n)})(T-\tau_i^{(n)})} \right| \\ &\leq 1/2 \cdot m(K_n, t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}, (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), \delta_n) + \left| \mu |\tau_i^{(n)} - t_i^{(n)}| \cdot \frac{(3L)^2}{\mu^2} \right| \\ &\leq m(K_n, t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}, (u_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_i^{(n)} - x_{3-i}^{(n)}), \delta_n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.152) and (3.166) together with (3.140) (3.151), (3.168), (3.167), (3.154), the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $h(\tau_1^{(n)}, \xi_1^{(n)}) \vee h(\tau_2^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_n} \leq K_n$, (3.160), (3.136), and with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\frac{1}{K_n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$ proves that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.169) \quad &\sum_{i=1}^2 \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_i^{(n)} + \delta_n \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) + \frac{\mu}{(T-\tau_i^{(n)})^2} \right) - \frac{2}{n} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left((G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}}, \rho_i^{(n)}, n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left((G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}}, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_{3-i}^{(n)}), n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right) \right) + \frac{2}{n} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \left((G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T-\tau_i^{(n)}}, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_{3-i}^{(n)}), n\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - 3nI_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^{\perp}}^H \right) \right) + \frac{4}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.163) ensures that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{i \in \{1,2\}} \left(\nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}} \right) < \infty$ and (3.151) together with $\lim_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = S_0$ and with the fact that $\lim_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_1^{(n)}, \tau_2^{(n)}) = (\hat{t}_1, \hat{t}_1)$ shows that

$$(3.170) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}} \right) \\ &= \lim_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left((\tilde{u}_i)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta_n, h}^{-, W}(t_i^{(n)}, x_i^{(n)}) + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}} + \frac{1}{\beta_n} \right) = S_0 + \frac{2\mu}{T - \hat{t}_1} \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}} \right) = S_0 + \frac{2\mu}{T - \hat{t}_1} > 0$. In addition, we get with (3.151), with (3.150), and with the fact that for all $n \in \mathcal{N}_1$ it holds that $\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} B_n|_H = I_{\mathbb{H}}$ that for all sequences $(z_1^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (z_2^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ satisfying that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|z_1^{(n)}\|_H + \|z_2^{(n)}\|_H < \infty$ it holds that

(3.171)

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \left\langle z_i^{(n)}, \left(\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H - 3I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H}^H \right) z_i^{(n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \left\langle z_i^{(n)}, \left(\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} A_i^{(n)}|_H \right) z_i^{(n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} + \frac{\|z_1^{(n)}\|_H^2 + \|z_2^{(n)}\|_H^2}{\beta_n} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left\langle (z_1^{(n)}, z_2^{(n)}), \begin{pmatrix} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (B_n|_H + 2(B_n|_H)^2) & \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (-B_n|_H - 2(B_n|_H)^2) \\ \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (-B_n|_H - 2(B_n|_H)^2) & \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (B_n|_H + 2(B_n|_H)^2) \end{pmatrix} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (z_1^{(n)}, z_2^{(n)}) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\left\langle (z_1^{(n)}, z_2^{(n)}), \begin{pmatrix} 3I_{\mathbb{H}} & -3I_{\mathbb{H}} \\ -3I_{\mathbb{H}} & 3I_{\mathbb{H}} \end{pmatrix} (z_1^{(n)}, z_2^{(n)}) \right\rangle_{H^2, (H^2)'} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(3 \|z_1^{(n)} - z_2^{(n)}\|_H^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally (3.159), $\lim_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} (\tau_1^{(n)}, \tau_2^{(n)}) = (\hat{t}_1, \hat{t}_1)$, (3.169), (3.105) (with $(t_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \leftarrow (\tau_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(x_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \leftarrow (\xi_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(r_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \leftarrow (\nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and with $(A_i^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \leftarrow (\pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H - 3I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H}^H)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$) and (3.171) yield that

$$(3.172) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &< \frac{2\mu}{(T - \hat{t}_1)^2} = \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \sigma_i^{(n)} + \delta_n \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}) + \frac{\mu}{(T - \tau_i^{(n)})^2} \right) - \frac{2}{n} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{\mathcal{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \left((G_i)_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+ \left((\tau_i^{(n)}, \xi_i^{(n)}), \nu_i^{(n)} + \frac{\mu}{T - \tau_i^{(n)}}, n I_{\mathbb{H}} (\xi_i^{(n)} - \xi_{3-i}^{(n)}), n \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \mathfrak{A}_i^{(n)}|_H \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - 3n I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_{N_n}^H}^H \right) \right) + \frac{4}{n} \right) \\ & \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction implies that $S_0 \leq 0$. This proves (3.109) and finishes the proof of Lemma 3.5. \square

As a direct consequence of Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 3.5 we get the following result. Its proof is clear and therefore omitted.

Corollary 3.6 (A comparison result for viscosity sub- and supersolutions). *Assume the setting in Section 3.1, assume that O is convex, and assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $\Lambda_R \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in (0, T)$ and all $x \in X \cap O$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that*

$$(3.173) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(t, x) \right| \leq \Lambda_R \cdot h(t, x).$$

Moreover, let $u_1: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be bounded from above on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, let $u_2: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be bounded from below on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, let $G: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function and assume that $u_1|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of

$$(3.174) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - G(t, x, u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}u)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$ and that $u_2|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity supersolution of (3.174) relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. Furthermore, assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ it holds that

$$(3.175) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, q, A)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\ \left. p, q \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -R, \right. \\ \left. \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R \} \right] = 0$$

and that

$$(3.176) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((t, x), r, p, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((t, x), r, q, A)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\ \left. p, q \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((t, x), r, p, A) \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R \} \right] = 0,$$

assume that there exist an increasing sequence of finite-dimensional linear subspaces $H_1 \subseteq H_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq H$ and a function $m: (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ that $\cup_{N=1}^{\infty} H_N$ is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, that

$$(3.177) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^{\perp}}^H) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \\ \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \\ \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -R \} \right] \leq 0,$$

and that

$$(3.178) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A - \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^{\perp}}^H) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \\ \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \\ \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \leq R \} \right] \leq 0,$$

and assume that there exists a sequence $(\tilde{\beta}_n, \tilde{\delta}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\delta}_n = 0$ and such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $((t_n, x_n), r_n, A_n)$ and all $((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, \hat{A}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ satisfying that $w\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t_n, x_n) \in [0, T] \times O$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{\tilde{\beta}_n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{\delta}_n (h(t_n, x_n) + h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) = 0$, that $0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty$, and that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $(z^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\hat{z}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ with

$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle z^{(n)}, A^{(n)} z^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle \hat{z}^{(n)}, \hat{A}^{(n)} \hat{z}^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 3 \|z^{(n)} - \hat{z}^{(n)}\|_H^2$ it holds that

$$(3.179) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \tilde{\delta}_n, h}^+((t_n, x_n), r_n, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n), nA_n) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \tilde{\delta}_n, h}^-((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n), n\hat{A}_n) \right] \leq 0.$$

In addition, assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.180) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0$$

and assume that

$$(3.181) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, x) \in ([0, T] \times O_n^c) \cap W} u_1(t, x) \vee (-u_2(t, x)) \leq 0.$$

Then for all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.182) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

Next we state a scaling result for viscosity solutions. Lemma 3.7 generalizes Lemma 4.12 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] to the general notion of viscosity solutions and general separable Hilbert spaces and will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.8 below.

LEMMA 3.7 (Scaling of viscosity sub- and supersolutions). *Assume the setting in Section 3.1. Moreover, let $V \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2((0, T) \times O, (0, \infty))$ be Lipschitz continuous with respect to the $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -norm on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $(0, T) \times O$, let $G: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function, let $u: (0, T) \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ be bounded from above (below) on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$ and be a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (3.174) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$ and let $\tilde{G}: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying for all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ that*

$$(3.183) \quad \begin{aligned} & \tilde{G}((t, x), r, p, A) \\ &= \frac{1}{V(t, x)} G \left((t, x), rV(t, x), pV(t, x) + r(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), AV(t, x) + p|_X \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)|_X \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)|_X \otimes p|_X + r((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x)|_X)|_X \right) - r \frac{\partial_t V(t, x)}{V(t, x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then \tilde{G} is degenerate elliptic and the function $\tilde{u}: (0, T) \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ that $\tilde{u}(t, x) = \frac{u(t, x)}{V(t, x)}$ is a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of

$$(3.184) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{u}(t, x) - \tilde{G}((t, x), \tilde{u}(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{u})(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\tilde{u})(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.7. We proof Lemma 3.7 in the case where u is a viscosity subsolution of (3.174) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. The case where u is a viscosity supersolution of (3.174) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$ follows analogously. We thus assume in the following that u is a viscosity subsolution of (3.174) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. First note that Proposition 2.15 shows that Vh fulfills the assumption of Definition 2.5. In the next step assume that there exist a vector $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$, a value $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and a function $\phi \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2((0, T) \times O, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying that $\phi(t, x) = \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t, x)$ and that $\phi \geq \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t, x)$. Then the function $(0, T) \times O \ni (s, y) \mapsto \phi(s, y) V(s, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is in $C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2((0, T) \times O, \mathbb{R})$ and satisfies that $\phi(t, x) V(t, x) = \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t, x) V(t, x) = \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^-, W(t, x) V(t, x) = \overline{(u - \delta Vh)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^-, W(t, x)$

and that $\phi \cdot V \geq \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W} \cdot V = \overline{\tilde{u} - \delta h}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W \cdot V = \overline{u - \delta V h}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W$. As u is a viscosity subsolution of (3.174) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$, we get that

$$(3.185) \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sigma + \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+(\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \right. \\ \left. \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, |\sigma - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(V\phi)(t, x)| \leq \varepsilon, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W} \left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. (t, x, \phi(t, x) V(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}(\phi V))(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\phi V))(t, x)) \right) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+(\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \right. \\ & \left. \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W} \left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (t, x, \phi(t, x) V(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}(\phi V))(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\phi V))(t, x)) \right) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ = & \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G \left((\tau, \xi), \nu + \delta V(\tau, \xi) h(\tau, \xi), \rho + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \right. \right. \\ & \cdot E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)})))(\tau, \xi) + \delta(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \cdot h(\tau, \xi), (\mathfrak{A}|_X)|_X \\ & + \delta((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)|_X)|_X \cdot h(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \\ & + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X \\ & \otimes (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \Big) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \\ & d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W} \left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x) V(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \cdot \phi(t, x) \right. \right. \\ & \quad + V(t, x) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x) \cdot \phi(t, x) + V(t, x) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x) \\ & \quad \left. \left. + (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x) \right) \right) \leq \varepsilon \Big\} \\ = & \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G \left((\tau, \xi), \nu \cdot V(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) h(\tau, \xi), (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \cdot \nu \right. \right. \\ & + V(\tau, \xi) \cdot \rho + \delta(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \cdot h(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \cdot E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)})))(\tau, \xi)), \\ & ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)|_X)|_X \cdot \nu + V(\tau, \xi) \cdot (\mathfrak{A}|_X)|_X + \rho|_X \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X \\ & \otimes \rho|_X + \delta((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)|_X)|_X \cdot h(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \\ & + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X \\ & \otimes (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \Big) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.186}$$

$$d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W} \left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x) \right) \right) \leq \varepsilon \Big\}.$$

In addition, the Lipschitz continuity of V with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $(0, T) \times O$ implies that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exist a $C_R \in (1, \infty)$ such that for all $z_1, z_2 \in \{z \in (0, T) \times O : \|z\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \leq R\}$ it holds that $V(z_1) \leq C_R$ and that $|V(z_1) - V(z_2)| \leq C_R \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$. This yields that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $z_1, z_2 \in \{z \in (0, T) \times O : \|z\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \leq R\}$ it holds that

$$(3.187) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{(u - \delta Vh)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_1) - \overline{(u - \delta Vh)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) \right| \\ & = \left| \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_1) V(z_1) - \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) V(z_2) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_1) - \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) \right| V(z_1) + \left| \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) \right| \cdot |V(z_1) - V(z_2)| \\ & \leq \left| \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_1) - \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) \right| C_R + \left| \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2) \right| \cdot \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}} \cdot C_R. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.4) shows that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $z_1, z_2 \in \{z \in (0, T) \times O : \|z\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \leq R\}$, $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_1, p_2 \in H'$ and all $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}$ it holds that

(3.188)

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) \\
& \leq d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) \\
& \quad \vee \left(|\overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_1) - \overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2)| C_R + |\overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2)| \cdot \|z_1 - z_2\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \cdot C_R \right) \\
& \leq d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) \vee \left(C_R d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + C_R |\overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2)| \cdot d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) \right) \\
& = C_R d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}((z_1, r_1, p_1, A_1), (z_2, r_2, p_2, A_2)) (|\overline{(\tilde{u} - \delta h)}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^W(z_2)| + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus replacing the metric $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W}$ by the metric $d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}$ in (3.186) can only decrease the infimum. This results in

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G\left((\tau, \xi), \nu \cdot V(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi)h(\tau, \xi), (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \cdot \nu + V(\tau, \xi) \cdot \rho \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \delta (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \cdot h(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \cdot E_{\mathbb{X}', H'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)})))(\tau, \xi), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)|_X)|_X \cdot \nu + V(\tau, \xi) \cdot (\mathfrak{A}|_X)|_X + \rho|_X \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \otimes \rho|_X + \delta((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)|_X)|_X \cdot h(\tau, \xi) + \delta V(\tau, \xi) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi)|_X \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \otimes (D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \right) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}, \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left. d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W}\left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x)\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (Vh)(\tau, \xi) - \tilde{G}\left((\tau, \xi), \nu + \delta h(\tau, \xi), \rho + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', H'}((D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)})))(\tau, \xi), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (\mathfrak{A}|_X)|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (O \cap X)}))(\tau, \xi) \right) \cdot V(\tau, \xi) - (\nu + \delta h(\tau, \xi)) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\tau, \xi) : \right. \\
& \quad \left. (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}, \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left. d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}\left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x)\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta V(\tau, \xi) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h \right)(\tau, \xi) - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) \cdot V(\tau, \xi) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W}\left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x)\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

(3.189)

$$- \phi(t, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x).$$

Now (3.185), (3.186) and (3.189) imply

(3.190)

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sigma + \delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (Vh)(\tau, \xi) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \right. \\
& \quad \left. |\sigma - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (V\phi)(t, x)| \leq \varepsilon, \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, Vh, u}^{-, W}\left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left(t, x, \phi(t, x) V(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}(\phi V))(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\phi V))(t, x)\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \delta V(\tau, \xi) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h \right)(\tau, \xi) - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) \cdot V(\tau, \xi) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in H', \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, H'}, d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^+, W\left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}\phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\phi)(t, x)\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(V\phi)(t, x) - \phi(t, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \\
& = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ V(\tau, \xi) \left(\sigma + \delta \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h \right) (\tau, \xi) \right) - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}) \cdot V(\tau, \xi) : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \rho \in H', \mathfrak{A} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \left| \sigma - \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi \right) (t, x) \right| \leq \varepsilon, \right. \\
& \quad \left. d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^{-, W} \left((\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{A}), \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(t, x) \right) \right) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = V(t, x) \cdot \left(W \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \ni ((\tau, \xi), \nu, (\rho_1, \rho_2), \mathfrak{A}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \rightarrow I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \rho_1 - \tilde{G}((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho_2, \mathfrak{A}) \in \mathbb{R} \right)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}, \delta, h, \tilde{u}}^+ \\
& \quad \left(t, x, \phi(t, x), \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi \right) (t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} \phi)(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \phi)(t, x) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves inequality (3.190) for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, and all $\phi \in \{\psi \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2((0, T) \times O, \mathbb{R}) : \psi(t, x) = \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(t, x) \text{ and } \psi \geq \tilde{u}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^{-, W}(t, x)\}$. Therefore, \tilde{u} is a viscosity subsolution of (3.184) and the proof of Lemma 3.7 is completed. \square

Next we state our main theorem of this section. For the proof we use a suitable classical supersolution and Lemma 3.7 to rescale our equation. After this transformation we can apply Lemma 3.5. This theorem generalizes Lemma 4.13 in Hairer, Hutzenhaller & Jentzen [14] to the general notion of viscosity solutions and arbitrary separable Hilbert spaces.

Theorem 3.8 (A comparison result for viscosity sub- and supersolutions). *Assume the setting in Section 3.1, assume that O is convex, and assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $\Lambda_R \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in (0, T)$ and all $x \in X \cap O$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that*

$$(3.191) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} h(t, x) \right| \leq \Lambda_R \cdot h(t, x).$$

Moreover, let $u_1 : [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be bounded from above on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, let $u_2 : [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be bounded from below on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, let $V \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}^2([0, T] \times O, (1, \infty))$ satisfy that $D_{\mathbb{H}} V$ is \mathbb{H}' -bounded on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, and that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}$ -norm on every $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subset of $[0, T] \times O$, let $G : W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a degenerate elliptic function and assume that $u_1|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of

$$(3.192) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - G((t, x), u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$, that $u_2|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity supersolution of (3.192) relative to $(Vh, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$, and that for every $r \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $rV|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a classical supersolution of (3.192) i.e., suppose that for all $(t, x) \in W$ it holds that

$$(3.193) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} rV \right) (t, x) - G((t, x), rV(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} rV)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 rV)(t, x)|_X)|_X) \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, assume that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.194) \quad & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, q, B)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. p, q \in H', A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, \|A - B\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -R \right] = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.195) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \left\{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((t, x), r, p, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((t, x), r, q, B)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. p, q \in H', A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, \|A - B\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((t, x), r, p, A) \leq R \right\} \right] = 0,$$

assume that there exist an increasing sequence of finite-dimensional linear subspaces $H_1 \subseteq H_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq H$ and a function $m: (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ that $\cup_{N=1}^{\infty} H_N$ is dense in H with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, that

$$(3.196) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \left\{ G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^H}^H) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -R \right\} \right] \leq 0,$$

and that

$$(3.197) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \left\{ G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A - \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^H}^H) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \tilde{A}) \leq R \right\} \right] \leq 0,$$

and assume that there exists a sequence $(\beta_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$ and such that for all $((t_n, x_n), r_n, A_n, B_n), ((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, \hat{A}_n, \hat{B}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \tilde{A}_n \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying that $w - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t_n, x_n) \in [0, T) \times O$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{\beta_n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n h(t_n, x_n) \vee \delta_n h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) = 0$, that $0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty$, that $A_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t_n, x_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t_n, x_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t_n, x_n)$, that $\hat{A}_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)$, that $\tilde{A}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t_n, x_n)$, and that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and for all $(z^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\hat{z}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ with

$$(3.198) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\langle z^{(n)}, B_n z^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle \hat{z}^{(n)}, \hat{B}_n \hat{z}^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 3 \|z^{(n)} - \hat{z}^{(n)}\|_H^2$$

it holds that

$$(3.199) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{V(t_n, x_n)} G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, Vh}^+ \left((t_n, x_n), r_n, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) V(t_n, x_n) + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t_n, x_n), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. A_n + nB_n V(t_n, x_n) \right) - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, Vh}^- \left((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{A}_n + n\hat{B}_n V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \right) \right) \\ \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G((t_n, x_n), r_n - \hat{r}_n, (r_n - \hat{r}_n)(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t_n, x_n), (\tilde{A}_n|_X)|_X)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right).$$

In addition, assume that for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.200) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \right. \\ \left. \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0$$

and assume that

$$(3.201) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup_{(t,x) \in ((0,T) \times O_n^c) \cap W} \left(\frac{u_1(t,x)}{V(t,x)} \vee \frac{-u_2(t,x)}{V(t,x)} \right) \right] \leq 0.$$

Then for all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ and all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.202) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t,x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t,x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t,x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \right. \\ \left. t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8. First note that Proposition 2.15 shows that $(Vh)|_{(0,T) \times O}$ fulfills the assumption of Definition 2.5. Now let $\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and let $\tilde{G}: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the functions with the property that for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times O$ it holds that $\tilde{u}_1(t, x) = \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)}$ and that $\tilde{u}_2(t, x) = \frac{u_2(t, x)}{V(t, x)}$ and for all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}'}$ it holds that

$$(3.203) \quad \begin{aligned} & \tilde{G}(t, x, r, p, A) \\ &= \frac{1}{V(t, x)} G \left(t, x, r V(t, x), p V(t, x) + r (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t, x), A V(t, x) + p|_X \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t, x)|_X \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t, x)|_X \otimes p|_X + r ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x)|_X)|_X \right) - r \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x)}{V(t, x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.7 then ensures that \tilde{G} is degenerate elliptic, that $\tilde{u}_1|_{(0,T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of

$$(3.204) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - \tilde{G}(t, x, u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(t, x), ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x)|_X)|_X) = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$ and that $\tilde{u}_2|_{(0,T) \times O}$ is viscosity supersolution of (3.204) relative to $(h, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X})$. Below we will finish this proof by an application of Corollary 3.6 with \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2 and \tilde{G} . For this we now check the assumptions of Corollary 3.6. First, observe that the assumption that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(V|_{(0,T) \times O})$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}$ -norm on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, and that $D_{\mathbb{H}}(V|_{(0,T) \times O})$ is \mathbb{H}' -bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$ imply that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(V|_{(0,T) \times O})$ is $\mathbb{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ -bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, and that V is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm and therefore also bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$. This together with the assumption that $u_1 \vee -u_2$ is bounded from above on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$ shows that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $C_R \in (1, \infty)$ such that for all $(t, x), (\tau, \xi) \in (0, T) \times O$ with $\|x\|_H \vee \|\xi\|_H \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.205) \quad \begin{aligned} & |V(t, x) \vee \|(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \vee \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \vee \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \right| \vee u_1(t, x) \vee -u_2(t, x) \leq C_R, \\ & |V(t, x) - V(\tau, \xi)| \leq C_R \|(t, x) - (\tau, \xi)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.191) yields then that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times (X \cap O)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.206) \quad \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (hV)(t, x) \right| \leq \left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h \right)(t, x) \cdot V(t, x) \right| + \left| h(t, x) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V \right)(t, x) \right| \leq (\Lambda_R \cdot C_R + C_R) h(t, x).$$

Next, note (3.201) ensures that (3.181) is fulfilled. Moreover, (3.200) and the assumption $V > 1$ imply that for all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$ and for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_H \leq n, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
(3.207) \quad & \vee \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_H \geq n, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \leq \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_H \leq n, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \quad \vee \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in ((0, T) \times O_{[n-r]}^c) \cap W \right\} \vee 0 \\
& \leq 0 \vee \left(2 \sup \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} \vee \frac{-u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in ((0, T) \times O_{n-1}^c) \cap W \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting n tend to infinity together with (3.201) then shows that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
(3.208) \quad & \left. \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \leq 0 \vee \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2 \sup \left\{ \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} \vee \frac{-u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in ((0, T) \times O_{n-1}^c) \cap W \right\} \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and this shows (3.180). Furthermore, we have for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.209) \quad & \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \\
& = \tilde{G}((t, x), r + \delta h(t, x), p + \delta E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x), (A|_X)|_X \\
& \quad + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x)) \\
& = \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \left(G\left((t, x), V(t, x)r + \delta V(t, x) \cdot h(t, x), V(t, x)p + \delta V(t, x) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \cdot E_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{H}'}(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x) + (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), V(t, x) \cdot (A|_X)|_X \\
& \quad + \delta V(t, x) \cdot (D_{\mathbb{X}}^2(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x) + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)|_X \\
& \quad \otimes (p|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x) + (p|_X + \delta(D_{\mathbb{X}}(h|_{(0, T) \times (0, N_X)}))(t, x)) \\
& \quad \left. \left. \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)|_X + (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x)|_X)|_X \right) \right) - (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial V(t, x)}{V(t, x)} \\
& = \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, V, h}^+ \left((t, x), V(t, x)r, V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), V(t, x) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p \right. \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x) - (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x).$$

Analogously we obtain for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ that

$$(3.210) \quad \begin{aligned} & \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^-((t, x), r, p, A) \\ &= \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^-((t, x), V(t, x)r, V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), V(t, x) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p \right. \\ & \quad \left. + p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x) \right) - (r - \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, (3.205) yields that for all $((t, x), r, p, A) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ with $h(t, x) \vee \|x\|_H \vee |r| \vee \|p\|_{H'} \vee \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.211) \quad \begin{aligned} & h(t, x) \leq R \leq 4C_R \cdot R, \quad \|x\|_H \leq R \leq 4C_R \cdot R, \quad |V(t, x)r| \leq C_R \cdot R \leq 4C_R \cdot R, \\ & \|V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \leq 2C_R \cdot R \leq 4C_R \cdot R, \\ & \|V(t, x) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p + p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq 4C_R \cdot R, \\ & (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \geq -2C_R \cdot R. \end{aligned}$$

We thus get from (3.194), (3.209), from (3.211), and from the assumption that $V > 1$ that for all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.212) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ |\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, q, A)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, p, q \in H', \right. \\ & \quad \left. A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -R \} \right] \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \left\{ \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \left| G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), V(t, x)r, V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), V(t, x) \cdot A \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p + p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x) \right) - (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), V(t, x)r, V(t, x)q + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), V(t, x) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes q \right. \\ & \quad \left. + q \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x) \right) + (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \Big| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \\ & \quad p, q \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, \\ & \quad \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), V(t, x)r, V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x), \right. \\ & \quad \left. V(t, x) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p + p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x) \right) \\ & \quad \left. - (r + \delta h(t, x)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t, x) \right) \geq -R \Big\} \right] \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup \left\{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, p, A) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, q, B)| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, p, q \in H', \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. A, B \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq 4C_R R, \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq C_R \varepsilon, \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \|A - B\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq 2C_R \cdot \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((t, x), r, p, A) \geq -3C_R \cdot R \right\} \vee 0 = 0. \right] \end{aligned}$$

and thus (3.175) is fulfilled. Analogously it follows (3.176). Moreover, the assumption that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}$ -norm ensures that there exist a function $K : (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for all $(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \in (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1]$, and all $(\tau, \xi) \in (0, T) \times O$ with $|t - \tau| \vee \|\xi - x\|_H \leq K(R, t, x, r, p, \delta)$ it holds that

$$(3.213) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \frac{m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2(|r| + 1)}.$$

Now denote by $\tilde{m}: (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times (0, 1]$ that

$$(3.214) \quad \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) = \frac{m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2C_R(2R + 4\|p\|_{H'} + 2|r| + 7)} \wedge K(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \wedge 1.$$

Combining then (3.205), (3.213), and (3.214) yields that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$, $(t, x, r, p, A) \in (0, T) \times O \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$, and all $((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H'$ satisfying that $\|x\|_H + 1 \leq R$, $h(\tau, \xi) \leq R$, $\|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R$, and that $|t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta)$ it holds that

$$(3.215) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq C_R \cdot R + C_R(\|p\|_{H'} + 1) + C_R(\|p\|_{H'} + 1) + C_R(|r| + 1) \leq C_R(2R + |r| + 2\|p\|_{H'} + 3), \end{aligned}$$

that

$$(3.216) \quad (r + \delta h(\tau, \xi)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\tau, \xi) \leq (|r| + R) \cdot C_R \leq C_R(R + |r| + 2\|p\|_{H'} + 3),$$

that

$$(3.217) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\nu \cdot V(\tau, \xi) - rV(t, x)| \leq |\nu - r| \cdot V(t, x) + |\nu| \cdot |V(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x)| \\ & \leq \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R + (|r| + 1) \cdot C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \\ & \leq \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R(1 + 2|r| + 2) \leq m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

that

$$(3.218) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|V(\tau, \xi)\rho + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x)p - r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \\ & \leq |V(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x)| \cdot \|\rho\|_{H'} + V(t, x)\|\rho - p\|_{H'} + |\nu| \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \\ & \quad + \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \cdot |\nu - r| \\ & \leq C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \cdot (\|p\|_{H'} + 1) + C_R \cdot \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \\ & \quad + (|r| + 1) \cdot C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} + \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R \\ & \leq 2\tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R(3 + \|p\|_{H'} + |r|) \leq m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

that

$$(3.219) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p - p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \cdot \|\rho\|_{H'} + \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \cdot \|\rho - p\|_{H'} \\ & \quad + \|\rho\|_{H'} \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} + \|\rho - p\|_{H'} \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x)\|_{H'} \\ & \leq C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \cdot (\|p\|_{H'} + 1) + C_R \cdot \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \\ & \quad + (\|p\|_{H'} + 1) \cdot C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} + \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R \\ & \leq C_R \cdot \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta)(4\|p\|_{H'} + 6), \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(3.220) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x) \cdot A - r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq |V(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x)| \cdot \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \cdot |\nu - r| \\ & \quad + |\nu| \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq C_R \|(\tau, \xi) - (t, x)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \cdot \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} + \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta) \cdot C_R \\ & \quad + (|r| + 1) \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x)\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq C_R \cdot \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta)(2R + 1) + (|r| + 1) \cdot \frac{m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2(|r| + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.219), (3.220), and (3.214) proves

$$(3.221) \quad \|V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -V(t, x) \cdot A - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p - p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) - r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x) \Big\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\
& \leq \left\| V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) - V(t, x) \cdot A - r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(t, x) \right\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\
& \quad + \left\| (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \otimes p - p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) \right\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\
& \leq C_R \cdot \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta)(2R + 4\|p\|_{H'} + 7) + \frac{m(C_R(2R+2\|p\|_{H'}+|r|+3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2} \\
& \leq \frac{m(C_R(2R+2\|p\|_{H'}+|r|+3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2} + \frac{m(C_R(2R+2\|p\|_{H'}+|r|+3), t, x, r, p, \delta)}{2} \\
& \leq m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.196), (3.209), (3.214), (3.215), (3.216), (3.217), (3.218), (3.221), and the assumption $V > 1$ shows that for all $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, $R \in (\|x\|_H + 1, \infty)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$ it holds that

(3.222)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^{\perp}}^H) - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) : \alpha \in (0, R), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\
& \quad (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \\
& \quad |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \\
& \quad \left. \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -R \} \right] \\
& = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\tau, \xi)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi)\nu, V(\tau, \xi)\rho + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi) \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \cdot (A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^{\perp}}^H) + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) \\
& \quad \left. \left. - (\nu + \delta h(\tau, \xi)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\tau, \xi) \right) - \frac{1}{V(\tau, \xi)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi)\nu, V(\tau, \xi)\rho \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes \rho + \rho \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) + \nu \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - (\nu + \delta h(\tau, \xi)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\tau, \xi) \right) : \alpha \in (0, R), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \\
& \quad h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq \tilde{m}(R, t, x, r, p, \delta), \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{V(\tau, \xi)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi)r, V(\tau, \xi)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi), V(\tau, \xi) \cdot A + (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) \otimes p \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + p \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\tau, \xi) + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\tau, \xi) \right) - (r + \delta h(\tau, \xi)) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\tau, \xi) \right) \geq -R \} \right] \\
& \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \left\{ \frac{1}{V(\tau, \xi)} \left(G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{H_N^{\perp}}^H) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \right) : \right. \right. \\
& \quad \alpha \in (0, C_R \cdot R), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', A \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \\
& \quad \|A\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |V(t, x)r - \nu| \\
& \quad \left. \vee \|V(t, x)p + r \cdot (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(t, x) - \rho\|_{H'} \leq m(C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3), t, x, r, p, \delta), \right. \\
& \quad \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta, Vh}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, A) \geq -C_R(2R + 2\|p\|_{H'} + |r| + 3) \right\} \right] \\
& \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously (3.222) then also holds for all $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, $R \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1]$. and this implies (3.177). Analogously it follows (3.178). It remains to verify (3.179). Therefore note that without loss of generality we can assume that $\beta_n \geq n$ since otherwise we can replace β_n by $\beta_n \vee n$. Now let $((t_n, x_n), r_n, A_n), ((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, \hat{A}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be sequences satisfying that $w - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t_n, x_n) \in [0, T) \times O$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{\beta_n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{\delta}_n (h(t_n, x_n) + h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) = 0$, that $0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty$, and that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, and all

$(z^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\hat{z}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ it holds that

$$(3.223) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\langle z^{(n)}, A^{(n)} z_i^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle \hat{z}^{(n)}, \hat{A}^{(n)} \hat{z}_i^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 3 \|z^{(n)} - \hat{z}^{(n)}\|_H^2.$$

To verify (3.179), we will apply assumption (3.199). For this we denote by $((\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbf{x}_n), \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{p}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H'$, by $((\hat{\mathbf{t}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n), \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H'$, by $\mathbf{A}_n, \mathbf{B}_n, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, and by $(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n) \in \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the elements satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $(\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{r}_n) = (t_n, x_n, r_n V(t_n, x_n))$, that $(\hat{\mathbf{t}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n) = (\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n, \hat{r}_n V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))$, that $\mathbf{B}_n = A_n$, that $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n = \hat{A}_n$, and that

$$(3.224) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) V(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.225) \quad \mathbf{p}_n = n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) V(t_n, x_n) + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.226) \quad \hat{\mathbf{p}}_n = n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n),$$

$$(3.227) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.228) \quad \mathbf{A}_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t_n, x_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(t_n, x_n) \otimes (n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.229) \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \otimes (n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n),$$

$$(3.230) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(t_n, x_n).$$

Moreover the assumption $V > 1$ together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{\beta_n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, the Lipschitz continuity of V with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, and with the fact $0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty$ then imply that

$$(3.231) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &< \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \inf_{(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O} V(t, x) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} ((r_n - \hat{r}_n) V(t_n, x_n) - \hat{r}_n (V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) - V(t_n, x_n))) \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n V(t_n, x_n) - \hat{r}_n V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{r}_n - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\mathbf{r}_n| + |\hat{\mathbf{r}}_n|) \\ &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| \|V(t_n, x_n)\| + |\hat{r}_n| \|V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus assumption (3.199) shows that

$$(3.232) \quad \begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, V, h}^+((\mathbf{t}_n, \mathbf{x}_n), \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{A}_n + n \mathbf{B}_n V(t_n, x_n))}{V(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, V, h}^-((\hat{\mathbf{t}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n), \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n + n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))}{V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G((t_n, x_n), \tilde{\mathbf{r}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_n, (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n|_X)|_X)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, (3.209), (3.210), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n (h(t_n, x_n) \vee h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) = 0$ the uniform continuity with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V$ and of V on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, the definition of \tilde{G} , and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n - \hat{r}_n > 0$ hence imply that

$$(3.233) \quad \begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^+((t_n, x_n), r_n, n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n), n A_n) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, h}^-((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, n I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n), n \hat{A}_n) \right) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, V, h}^+((t_n, x_n), \mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{p}_n, \mathbf{A}_n + n \mathbf{B}_n V(t_n, x_n)) - (r_n + \delta_n h(t_n, x_n)) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t_n, x_n)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{X}, \delta_n, V, h}^-((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n + n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) - (\hat{r}_n - \delta_n h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G((t_n, x_n), \tilde{r}_n, \tilde{p}_n, (\tilde{A}_n|_X)|_X)}{V(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{(r_n - \hat{r}_n) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t_n, x_n)}{V(t_n, x_n)} + \hat{r}_n \left(\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t_n, x_n)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \delta_n h(t_n, x_n) \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(t_n, x_n)}{V(t_n, x_n)} - \delta_n h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t} V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{-\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) V(t_n, x_n)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{G((t_n, x_n), (r_n - \hat{r}_n) V(t_n, x_n), (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n), (r_n - \hat{r}_n) ((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)|_X)|_X)}{V(t_n, x_n)} \right) \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n - \hat{r}_n > 0$ and $(r_n - \hat{r}_n)V$ is by assumption for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r_n - \hat{r}_n > 0$ a classical supersolution of (3.192). We can thus apply Corollary 3.6 to obtain that for all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ it holds that

$$(3.234) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
\left. \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 0.$$

In the last step we need to show that (3.234) implies Theorem 3.8. Therefore, note that (3.205) shows that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ $x, \hat{x} \in O$ and all $t, \hat{t} \in (0, T)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$, $\|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$, and with $\frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} - \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \geq 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.235) \quad u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) &\leq \left(\frac{C_{2\tilde{R}}}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} (u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) \right) \vee 0 \\
&\leq C_{2\tilde{R}} \left(\frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} - \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} + \frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \right) \vee 0 \\
&\leq \left(C_{2\tilde{R}} (\tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) + C_{2\tilde{R}} \left(\frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} - \frac{1}{V(t, x)} \right) \right) \vee 0.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (3.205) implies that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ $x, \hat{x} \in O$ and all $t, \hat{t} \in (0, T)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$, $\|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$, and with $\frac{1}{V(t, x)} - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \geq 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.236) \quad u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) &\leq \left(\frac{C_{2\tilde{R}}}{V(t, x)} (u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) \right) \vee 0 \\
&\leq C_{2\tilde{R}} \left(\frac{u_1(t, x)}{V(t, x)} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} + \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} - \frac{u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})}{V(t, x)} \right) \vee 0 \\
&\leq \left(C_{2\tilde{R}} (\tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) + C_{2\tilde{R}} \left(\frac{1}{V(t, x)} - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \right) \right) \vee 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequalities yields then that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ $x, \hat{x} \in O$ and all $t, \hat{t} \in (0, T)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$ and with $\|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq \tilde{R}$ it holds that

$$(3.237) \quad u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq \left(C_{2\tilde{R}} (\tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) + C_{2\tilde{R}} \left| \frac{1}{V(t, x)} - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \right| \right) \vee 0.$$

Finally we obtain with (3.234), (3.237), and with the fact that $\frac{1}{V}$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$ that for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\tilde{T} \in (0, T)$ it holds that

$$(3.238) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(t, x) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
\left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \left(C_{2\tilde{R}}(\tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x})) + C_{2\tilde{R}} \left| \frac{1}{V(t, x)} - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \right| \right) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, \right. \\
&\quad \left. t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \vee 0 \\
&\leq \left(C_{2\tilde{R}} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \tilde{u}_1(t, x) - \tilde{u}_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_{2\tilde{R}} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{V(t, x)} - \frac{1}{V(\hat{t}, \hat{x})} \right| : (t, x), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, t, \hat{t} \leq \tilde{T}, h(t, x) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |t - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \right) \vee 0 \\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 3.8. \square

3.5. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations

Next we apply Theorem 3.8 to Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs. This generalizes Corollary 4.14 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] (which assumed finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces and classical viscosity solutions).

Corollary 3.9 (Uniqueness of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov type equations). *Let $T, \theta \in (0, \infty)$, let $\mathbb{U} = (U, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ and $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be real separable Hilbert spaces, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ be the dual space, let $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} , let $\lambda: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ be a function with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = -\infty$, let $A: D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be the linear operator such that $D(A) = \{x \in H: \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_H|^2 < \infty\}$ and such that for all $x \in D(A)$ it holds that $Av = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_{H} e_n$, let $\mathbb{H}_r = (H_r, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_r}, \|\cdot\|_{H_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated to $-A$, (see e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]), and let $\mathbb{H}'_r = (H'_r, \|\cdot\|_{H'_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be the corresponding dual spaces. By abuse of notation we will also denote by A and by $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the extended functions $A: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_r$, and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that*

$$(3.239) \quad \|y\|_{H_r} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_r} & \text{if } z \in H_r \\ \infty & \text{if } z \notin H_r \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(3.240) \quad (A(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|A(\xi) - y\|_{H_{r-1}}: \xi \in D(A), \|x - \xi\|_{H_r} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0),$$

let $O \subseteq H$ be an open and convex set, let $O_n, O_n^c \subseteq O$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the sets satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $O_n = \{x \in O: \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O) \geq \frac{1}{n} \text{ and } \|x\|_H \leq n\}$, and that $O_n^c = O \setminus O_n$, let $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}((0, T) \times O, \mathbb{R})$, let $K: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be increasing, let $\omega: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfy that $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \omega(x) = 0$ and that $\sup_{x \in [0, \infty)} \omega(x) < \infty$, let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, \infty)$, $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$, $\kappa \in (-1/2, 0]$, let $v: (0, T) \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $F: (0, T) \times O \rightarrow H_{-1}$, and let $B: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\kappa})$ satisfy that for all $t, \hat{t} \in (0, T)$ and all $x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(3.241) \quad \|F(t, x)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1}} \leq K(\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}), \quad \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\kappa})} \leq K(\|x\|_H), \quad |v(t, x)| \leq K(\|x\|_H)$$

$$(3.242) \quad \|F(t, x)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \leq K(\|x\|_H)(\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1),$$

$$(3.243) \quad \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}^2 \leq K(\|x\|_H)(\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1),$$

$$(3.244) \quad \|F(t, x) - F(\hat{t}, \hat{x})\|_{H_{-1/2}} \leq K(\|x\|_H \vee \|\hat{x}\|_H)(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t - \hat{t}|),$$

$$(3.245) \quad \|B(t, x) - B(\hat{t}, \hat{x})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \leq K(\|x\|_H \vee \|\hat{x}\|_H)(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} + |t - \hat{t}|),$$

$$(3.246) \quad |v(t, x) - v(\hat{t}, \hat{x})| \leq K(\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \cdot (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t - \hat{t}|^2)),$$

let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}: L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}') \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})}: L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the extended norms satisfying for all $C \in L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ that

$$(3.247) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}C\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} = \|C\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} = \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\langle x, Cy \rangle_{H, H'}|}{\|x\|_{H_\kappa} \|y\|_{H_\kappa}},$$

and let $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(O, (1, \infty))$, satisfy that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V: H \rightarrow L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}$ -norm on all \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , that for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O \cap H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(3.248) \quad v(t, x)V(x) + \langle F(t, x) + A(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ + 1/2 \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) B(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \leq \theta \cdot V(x),$$

that for all $x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(3.249) \quad \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)}{V(x)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x})}{V(\hat{x})} \right\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \leq K(\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)),$$

$$(3.250) \quad \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)}{V(x)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x})}{V(\hat{x})} \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \leq K(\|x\|_H \vee \|\hat{x}\|_H) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}},$$

$$(3.251) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \leq K(\|x\|_H),$$

and that

$$(3.252) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)\|_{H_{1/2}} \leq K(\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2).$$

Then there exists at most one with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm continuous function $u: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, which fulfills for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(3.253) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u(t, x) - \varphi(\hat{t}, \hat{x}): x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta} \cap O, t, \hat{t} \in (0, T), \frac{e^{-\theta t} \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{e^{-\theta \hat{t}} \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} = 0,$$

which fulfills $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times O_n^c} \frac{|u(t, x)|}{V(x)} = 0$, and which fulfills that $u|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity solution of

$$(3.254) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - v(t, x) u(t, x) - \langle F(t, x) + A(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}}u)(t, x) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ - \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x) B(t, x))|_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ relative to $((0, T) \times O \ni (t, x) \rightarrow \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.9. First denote for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ by $V_N = \text{span}_{\mathbb{H}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_N\})$ the linear span of the first N basis vectors, by $W \subseteq (0, T) \times O$ the set satisfying that $W = (0, T) \times (H_{2\vartheta} \cap O)$, by $G: W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'_\vartheta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function satisfying for all $((t, x), r, p, C) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'_\vartheta}$ that

$$(3.255) \quad G((t, x), r, p, C) = v(t, x)r + \langle F(t, x) + A(x), p \rangle_{H, H'} + \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}C B(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)},$$

by $\tilde{V}: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times O$ that

$$(3.256) \quad \tilde{V}(t, x) = e^{\theta t} \cdot V(x),$$

and by $h: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ the function satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $x \in O$ that

$$(3.257) \quad h(t, x) = \frac{\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\tilde{V}(t, x)}.$$

Note that we obtain for all $(t, x) \in W$ that

$$(3.258) \quad \begin{aligned} E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'}((D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(\tilde{V}h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(t, x)) &= 2 \cdot E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'}(I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}x) = 2 \cdot E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'}(H_\vartheta \ni y \rightarrow \langle y, x \rangle_{H_\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}) \\ &= 2 \cdot E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'}(H_\vartheta \ni y \rightarrow \langle y, (-A)^{2\vartheta}x \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R}) = 2 \cdot I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{2\vartheta}x). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the assumption that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V: H \rightarrow L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O implies that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V: H \rightarrow L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ is also uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O and therefore V is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O . Moreover, for all $x \in H_\vartheta$ and all $x_0 \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that $\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 = \|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 + 2\langle x_0, x - x_0 \rangle_{H_\vartheta} + \langle x - x_0, x - x_0 \rangle_{H_\vartheta} \geq \|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 + 2\langle I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(x_0), x - x_0 \rangle_{H'_\vartheta, H_\vartheta}$. This shows that $\{y \in H_\vartheta: (J_{\mathbb{H}, -}^2 \|\cdot\|_{H_\vartheta}^2)(y) \neq \emptyset\} = \{y \in H_\vartheta: I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'})\} = H_{2\vartheta}$. Combining this with (3.258) yields that $\{z \in (0, T) \times (O \cap H_\vartheta): (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(h\tilde{V}|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}'})\} = W$ and this together with Proposition 2.15 implies that $\{z \in (0, T) \times (O \cap H_\vartheta): (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(z) \in D(E_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}'_\vartheta, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}'})\} = W$. Next let $u_1, u_2: [0, T] \times O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm continuous functions such that u_1, u_2 are bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times O$, such that for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$(3.259) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_i(t, x) - \varphi(\hat{t}, \hat{x}): x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta} \cap O, t, \hat{t} \in (0, T), \frac{\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{\|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} = 0,$$

such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O_n^c} \frac{|u_1(t, x)| + |u_2(t, x)|}{V(x)} = 0$ and such that $u_1|_{(0, T) \times O}$ and $u_2|_{(0, T) \times O}$ are viscosity solutions of (3.254) relative to $(h\tilde{V}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$, let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and let $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{U} . We show Corollary 3.9 by applying Theorem 3.8 with $\mathbb{X} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\vartheta$ and with $V \leftarrow \tilde{V}$. Note that we have for all $x \in H$ that

$$(3.260) \quad \begin{aligned} (-A)^{2\vartheta} I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((H \ni y \rightarrow \langle x, y \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R})|_{H_\vartheta}) &= (-A)^{2\vartheta} I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(H_\vartheta \ni y \rightarrow \langle (-A)^{-2\vartheta}x, y \rangle_{H_\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}) = x \\ &= I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(H \ni y \rightarrow \langle x, y \rangle_H \in \mathbb{R}) \end{aligned}$$

and from this it follows that for all $(t, x) \in W$ and all $C \in L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ it holds that

$$(3.261) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((CB(t, x))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \langle B(t, x)\tilde{e}_i, I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((CB(t, x)\tilde{e}_i)|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{H_\vartheta} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \langle (-A)^\vartheta B(t, x)\tilde{e}_i, (-A)^\vartheta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((CB(t, x)\tilde{e}_i)|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_H \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \langle B(t, x)\tilde{e}_i, (-A)^{2\vartheta} I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((CB(t, x)\tilde{e}_i)|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_H \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \langle B(t, x)\tilde{e}_i, I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}CB(t, x)\tilde{e}_i \rangle_H = \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}CB(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, observe that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ there exist an $M_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(3.262) \quad \|x\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} \vee \|x\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} \vee \|x\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x\|_H$$

and that

$$(3.263) \quad \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \vee \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}} \vee \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x\|_H.$$

In addition we get from (3.258), (3.242), the monotonicity of K , and from (3.263) that for all $(t, x) \in W$ and all $R, \varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.264) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle F(t, x) + A(x), \delta E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta}((D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(\tilde{V}h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(t, x)) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ & 2 \langle F(t, x) + A(x), \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(x) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ & = 2 \langle F(t, x), \delta(-A)^{2\vartheta}(x) \rangle_H + 2 \langle A(x), \delta(-A)^{2\vartheta}(x) \rangle_H \\ & \leq 2\delta \|F(t, x)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} - 2\delta \|x\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 \\ & \leq 2\delta \left(K(R) \cdot (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} - \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2\delta \left(K(R) \cdot (\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \cdot \|x\|_H + 1) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} - \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2\delta \left(K(R) (M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} - (1 - \varepsilon \cdot K(R)) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.257), (3.243), the monotonicity of K , (3.263), and from the fact that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ that for all $(t, x) \in W$ and all $R, \varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ with $\|x\|_H \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.265) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle B(t, x), \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2(h\tilde{V})(t, x)) B(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} = \langle B(t, x), \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} 2I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} B(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\ & = 2\delta \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 \leq 2\delta K(R) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1) \\ & \leq 2\delta K(R) ((\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \cdot \|x\|_H)^2 + 1) \leq 2\delta K(R) (2\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + 2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot \|x\|_H^2 + 1) \\ & \leq 2\delta K(R) (2\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + 2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (3.261), (3.242), (3.243), the monotonicity of K , (3.263), and the fact that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ imply that for all $(t, x) \in W$, $R, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in H'$, and all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\|x\|_H \vee \|p\|_{H'} \vee \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.266) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle F(t, x) + A(x), p \rangle_{H, H'} + \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((CB(t, x))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\ & = \langle F(t, x) + A(x), p \rangle_{H, H'} + \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}CB(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\ & \leq (\|F(t, x)\|_H + \|x\|_{H_1}) \|p\|_{H'} + \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\ & \leq (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|F(t, x)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}) \cdot R \\ & \quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 \cdot R \\ & \leq (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) K(R) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}) \cdot R \\ & \quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1) \cdot R \\ & \leq (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) K(R) (\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x\|_H + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}) \cdot R \\ & \quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) ((\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|x\|_H)^2 + 1) \cdot R \\ & \leq \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} R \cdot \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\varepsilon K(R) + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R (M_\varepsilon R + 1) \\ & \quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R (2\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + 2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain from (3.241), the monotonicity of K , (3.263), and the fact that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ that for all $(t, x) \in W$ and all $R, \varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$

with $\|x\|_H \vee |r| \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.267) \quad \begin{aligned} v(t, x)(r + \delta \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) &\leq K(R) (R + \delta(\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|x\|_H)^2) \\ &\leq K(R) (R + 2\varepsilon \cdot \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + 2\delta M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2). \end{aligned}$$

Combining now (3.264), (3.265), (3.266), (3.267) yields that for all $(t, x) \in W$, $R, \varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $r, K_1, K_2, K_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, and all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with

$$(3.268) \quad \begin{aligned} K_1 &= 8\delta K(R) + 2 \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R, \\ K_2 &= 2\delta K(R) (M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \cdot R (\varepsilon K(R) + 1), \\ K_3 &= 2\delta K(R) (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot (M_\varepsilon R + 1) \\ &\quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2 + 1) + K(R)(R + 2\delta M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2), \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta - \varepsilon K_1 > 0$, and with $\|x\|_H \vee |r| \vee \|p\|_{H'} \vee \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.269) \quad \begin{aligned} G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, p, C) &= G((t, x), r + \delta \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2, p + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{2\vartheta} x), (C|_{H_\vartheta})|_{H_\vartheta} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) \\ &= v(t, x)(r + \delta \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) + \langle F(t, x) + A(x), p + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{2\vartheta} x) \rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\quad + \langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C B(t, x))|_{H_\vartheta} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} B(t, x)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\ &\leq - \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 (2\delta - \varepsilon(2\delta K(R) + 4\delta K(R) + 2 \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R + 2\delta K(R))) \\ &\quad + \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} (2\delta K(R) (M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\varepsilon K(R) + R)) \\ &\quad + 2\delta K(R) (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot (M_\varepsilon R + 1) \\ &\quad + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) K(R) \cdot R (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2 + 1) + K(R)(R + 2\delta M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 R^2) \\ &\leq - \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 (2\delta - \varepsilon K_1) + \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \cdot K_2 + K_3 \\ &\leq - \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - (\delta - \varepsilon K_1) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + \frac{K_2}{2\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1})^2 + \frac{K_2^2}{4\delta - 4\varepsilon K_1} + K_3 \\ &\leq - \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + \frac{K_2^2}{4\delta - 4\varepsilon K_1} + K_3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we derive that for all $R, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ there exist an $L_{R, \delta} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, and all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\|x\|_H \vee |r| \vee \|p\|_{H'} \vee \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R$ and with $G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \geq -R$ it holds that

$$(3.270) \quad \|x\|_{\vartheta+1/2} \leq L_{R, \delta}.$$

Moreover, we get from (3.261), (3.242), and from (3.243) that for all $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $p, q \in H'$, $C, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\|C - \mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \vee \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon$ it holds that

$$(3.271) \quad \begin{aligned} &|G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, p, C) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, q, \mathfrak{C})| \\ &\leq |\langle F(t, x) + A(x), p - q \rangle_{H, H'}| + |\langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(((C - \mathfrak{C}) B(t, x))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}| \\ &\leq \|p - q\|_{H'} \|F(t, x)\|_H + \|p - q\|_{H'} \|A(x)\|_H + |\langle B(t, x), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(C - \mathfrak{C}) B(t, x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|F(t, x)\|_H + \varepsilon \|x\|_{H_1} + \|C - \mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|F(t, x)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) \|B(t, x)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \left(K(\|x\|_H) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + K(\|x\|_H) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.270), (3.271), and the monotonicity of K show that for all $\delta, R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that (3.272)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ |G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, p, C) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, q, \mathfrak{C})| : (t, x) \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. p, q \in H', C, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, \max\{h(t, x), \|x\|_H, |r|, \|p\|_{H'}, \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \} \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|p - q\|_{H'} \leq \varepsilon, \|C - \mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq \varepsilon, G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \geq -R \} \right] \\
& \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left[\sup \{ \varepsilon (K(\|x\|_H) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + K(\|x\|_H) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) (\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1) : (t, x) \in W, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{R, \delta}, \|x\|_H \leq R \} \right] \\
& \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left[\varepsilon \sup \{ K(R) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-\alpha_1}) \cdot \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + 1) + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + K(R) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-\beta_1}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + 1) : (t, x) \in W, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{R, \delta} \} \right] = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.194). Analogously it follows (3.195). Next fix $R \in (0, \infty)$, $t \in (0, T)$, $x \in O$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in H'$, and $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and denote by $M \in (0, \infty)$ the value satisfying that $M = (\|x\|_H \vee |r| \vee \|p\|_{H'} \vee \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \vee R) + 1$. In addition, let $(\tau_N, \xi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq W$, be a sequence satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\|\xi_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{M, \delta}$, that $\|x - \xi_N\|_H \leq \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle B(\tau_N, \xi_N), \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H B(\tau_N, \xi_N) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
(3.273) \quad & = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \langle B(\tau, \xi), \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H B(\tau, \xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{M, \delta}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x - \xi\|_H \leq \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from the fact that $\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta+1/2}$ is compactly embedded in $\mathbb{H}_{1/2-\beta_2}$ that the set $\{y \in O : \|y\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{M, \delta}, \|x - y\|_H \leq \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2\}$ is compact with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}}$ -norm and therefore there exist a subsequence $(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (\tau_N, \xi_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a $(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\xi}) \in [0, T] \times O$ satisfying that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|(\tau_{N_i} - \hat{\tau}, \xi_{N_i} - \hat{\xi})\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_{1/2-\beta_2}} = 0$. Thus, we have with (3.257), (3.270), (3.261), (3.273), and with (3.245) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.274) \quad & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, C + \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H) - G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, C) : \alpha \in (0, R), \right. \\
& \quad \left. \nu \in \mathbb{R}, (\tau, \xi) \in W, \rho \in H', C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, h(\tau, \xi) \leq R, \|C\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \leq R, \right. \\
& \quad \left. |t - \tau| \vee \|x - \xi\|_H \vee |r - \nu| \vee \|p - \rho\|_{H'} \leq (\text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2) \vee 1, \right. \\
& \quad \left. G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, \tilde{V}h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, C) \geq -R \} \right] \\
& \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \langle B(\tau, \xi), \alpha I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} ((I_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H B(\tau, \xi))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} : \alpha \in (0, R), (\tau, \xi) \in W, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x - \xi\|_H \leq (\text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2), \|\xi\|_{\vartheta+1/2} \leq L_{M, \delta} \right] \\
& \leq R \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \langle B(\tau, \xi), \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H B(\tau, \xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} : (\tau, \xi) \in W, \|x - \xi\|_H \leq \text{dist}_{\mathbb{H}}(x, H \setminus O)/2, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq L_{M, \delta} \right] \\
& = R \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle B(\tau_N, \xi_N), \pi_{V_N^\perp}^H B(\tau_N, \xi_N) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} = R \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \langle B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}), \pi_{V_{N_i}^\perp}^H B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
& = R \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\langle B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}), \pi_{V_{N_i}^\perp}^H (B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}) - B(\hat{\tau}, \hat{\xi})) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \langle B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}), \pi_{V_{N_i}^\perp}^H B(\hat{\tau}, \hat{x}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
& \leq R \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i}) - B(\hat{\tau}, \hat{x})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \|\pi_{V_{N_i}^\perp}^H B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \|\pi_{V_{N_i}^\perp}^H B(\hat{\tau}, \hat{x})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \right) \\
& = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left[R \left(\sum_{j=N_i+1}^{\infty} \| [B(\hat{\tau}, \hat{x})]^* e_j \|_U^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|B(\tau_{N_i}, \xi_{N_i})\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \right] = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.196). Analogously it follows (3.197). To this end we now verify (3.199). For this let $\delta_n \in (0, 1]$, $((t_n, x_n), r_n, p_n, C_n, \mathbf{c}_n)$, $((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, \hat{p}_n, \hat{C}_n, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_n) \in W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $(\tilde{p}_n, \tilde{C}_n) \in H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy that $w - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (t_n, x_n) \in [0, T) \times O$, that

$$(3.275) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0,$$

$$(3.276) \quad \delta_n = \inf \left\{ \delta \in (1/n, \infty) : (K(\frac{1}{\delta}))^2 + \frac{1}{\delta^2} + 1 \leq \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) + n^{-1/2} \right)^{-1/2} \right\} \cup \{1\},$$

$$(3.277) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (h(t_n, x_n) \vee h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) = 0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty,$$

$$(3.278) \quad p_n = nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n) + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.279) \quad \hat{p}_n = nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n),$$

$$(3.280) \quad \tilde{p}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.281) \quad C_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \\ + r_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n),$$

$$(3.282) \quad \hat{C}_n = n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + (D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \\ + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n),$$

$$(3.283) \quad \tilde{C}_n = (r_n - \hat{r}_n) (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n),$$

and that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$, and for all $(z^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\hat{z}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ it holds that

$$(3.284) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\langle z^{(n)}, \mathbf{c}_n z^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle \hat{z}^{(n)}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_n \hat{z}^{(n)} \rangle_{H, H'} \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 3 \|z^{(n)} - \hat{z}^{(n)}\|_H^2.$$

First note, that the fact that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\hat{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are weakly convergent, the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = 0$, and the fact that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|r_n| + |\hat{r}_n|) < \infty$ imply that there exists a $R \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(3.285) \quad \|x_n\|_H \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_H \vee |r_n| \vee |\hat{r}_n| \vee (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \vee (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) \leq R.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the monotonicity of K and from (3.276) that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\delta_n (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \leq 1$ and with $\delta_n < 1$ it holds that

$$(3.286) \quad \left((K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2))^2 \vee K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \right. \\ \left. \vee (K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2)) \right) \cdot (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)) \\ \leq ((K(\frac{1}{\delta_n}))^2 + \frac{1}{\delta_n^2} + 1) \cdot \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) + n^{-1/2} \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) + n^{-1/2} \right)^{-1/2} \\ \cdot \left(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) \right) + \left(\sup_{m \in [0, \infty)} \omega(m) \right) \cdot n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \right) \\ \leq n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sup_{m \in [0, \infty)} \omega(m) \right) \cdot n^{1/2} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2,$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}
& K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \\
(3.287) \quad & \leq \left(\left(K\left(\frac{1}{\delta_n}\right) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\delta_n^2} + 1 \right) \cdot \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) \right) + n^{-1/2} \cdot \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) \right) + n^{-1/2} \Big)^{-1/2} \\
& \leq n^{1/4},
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \cdot (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|^2)) \\
(3.288) \quad & \leq (n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \left(\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}) \right)^{1/2} + \left(\sup_{m \in [0, \infty)} \omega(m) \right)) \\
& \quad \cdot n^{1/2} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition we get with (3.241), the monotonicity of K , and the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (h(t_n, x_n) \vee h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.289) \quad & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (v(t_n, x_n) h(t_n, x_n) + v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) \leq K(R) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (h(t_n, x_n) + h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, combining (3.264) and (3.265) together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$, and the fact that $\tilde{V} > 1$, yields for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{3K(R)})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.290) \quad & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n) + A(x_n), \delta_n E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}', \mathbb{H}'} (\langle D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} (\tilde{V} h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}) (t_n, x_n) \rangle)_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), \delta_n I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} (\langle D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2 (h\tilde{V}) (t_n, x_n) B(t_n, x_n) \rangle)_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2\delta_n \frac{-(1-3\varepsilon K(R)) \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + K(R) (M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1) \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + 2\delta_n \frac{K(R) (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2\delta_n \frac{-(1-3\varepsilon K(R)) (\|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} - K(R) \cdot \frac{M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1}{2(1-3\varepsilon K(R))})^2}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + 2\delta_n \frac{(K(R))^2 \cdot \frac{(M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1)^2}{4(1-3\varepsilon K(R))} + K(R) (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2\delta_n \frac{(K(R))^2 \cdot \frac{(M_\varepsilon \cdot R + 1)^2}{4(1-3\varepsilon K(R))} + K(R) (2M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^2 \cdot R^2 + 1)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follow that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.291) \quad & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + A(\hat{x}_n), \delta_n E_{\mathbb{H}'_\vartheta} \rangle_{\mathbb{H}', \mathbb{H}'} (\langle D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} (\tilde{V} h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}) (\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \rangle)_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \delta_n I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} (\langle D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2 (h\tilde{V}) (\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \rangle)_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we get from $\tilde{V} > 1$ (3.241), (3.246), (3.285), and from the monotonicity of K that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \\
& \leq \left| \frac{v(t_n, x_n) - v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \hat{r}_n \right| + \left| v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \hat{r}_n \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{1}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \right| \\
(3.292) \quad & \leq |v(t_n, x_n) - v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)| \cdot |\hat{r}_n| + |\hat{r}_n| |v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)| \cdot \left| \frac{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \cdot \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right| \\
& \leq K(\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \cdot (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t - \hat{t}|^2)) R \\
& \quad + R \cdot K(R) |\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the definition of $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\hat{p}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, (3.256), (3.249), (3.252), and (3.285) implies that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.293) \quad & \frac{\langle A(x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&= \langle A(x_n), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle A(\hat{x}_n), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{H, H'} + \left\langle A(x_n), \frac{r_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\quad - \left\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \left\langle A(x_n), \frac{(r_n - \hat{r}_n)(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&= \langle A(x_n - \hat{x}_n), n(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_H + \left\langle A(x_n - \hat{x}_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\quad + \left\langle A(x_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\leq -n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \cdot \frac{|\hat{r}_n| \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{H_{1/2}}}{|V(\hat{x}_n)|} \\
&\quad + |\hat{r}_n| \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}} \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \\
&\leq -n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + R \cdot K(\|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2) \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
&\quad + R \cdot K(\|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2) \cdot \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we obtain from the definition of $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\hat{p}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and from (3.256) that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.294) \quad & \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&= \langle F(t_n, x_n), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{H, H'} - \langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\quad + \left\langle F(t_n, x_n), \frac{r_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \left\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\quad - \left\langle F(t_n, x_n), \frac{(r_n - \hat{r}_n)(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&= \langle F(t_n, x_n) - F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), n(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \rangle_H + \left\langle F(t_n, x_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\quad + \left\langle F(t_n, x_n) - F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \frac{\hat{r}_n(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
&\leq n\|F(t_n, x_n) - F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{H_{-1/2}} \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
&\quad + \|F(t_n, x_n) - F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{H_{-1/2}} \cdot \frac{|\hat{r}_n| \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{H_{1/2}}}{|V(\hat{x}_n)|} \\
&\quad + |\hat{r}_n| \|F(t_n, x_n)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1}} \cdot \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}}
\end{aligned}$$

and this together with (3.241), (3.244), (3.249), (3.252), (3.285), the monotonicity of K , $V > 1$, with (3.262) and with (3.287) shows for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&\leq nK(R) (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
&\quad + R \cdot K(R) \cdot K(\|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2) (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \\
&\quad + R \cdot (K(\|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2))^2 (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.295) \quad &\leq n K(R) (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
&\quad + R \cdot K(R) \cdot K(\|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \\
&\quad + R \cdot (K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2))^2 (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)) \\
&\leq n K(R) (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
&\quad + R \cdot K(R) \cdot n^{1/4} (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + (M_\varepsilon + 1) \frac{R}{\sqrt{n}}) \\
&\quad + R \cdot (K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2))^2 (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2))
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.256) and from $V > 1$ that for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times O$ it holds that $\tilde{V}(t, x) > 1$ and thus we get from (3.261) that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.296) \quad &\frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(((C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&= \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&= \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), (-A)^{-2\kappa} I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), (-A)^{-2\kappa} I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&= \left\langle B(t_n, x_n), (-A)^{-2\kappa} I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \left(\frac{C_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\hat{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) B(t_n, x_n) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n) - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), (-A)^{-2\kappa} I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}\hat{C}_n (B(t_n, x_n) + B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&\leq \|B(t_n, x_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}^2 \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \left(\frac{C_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\hat{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&\quad + \|B(t_n, x_n) - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)} \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}\hat{C}_n\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&\quad \cdot (\|B(t_n, x_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)} + \|B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition the definition of \hat{C}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (3.256), (3.247), (3.251), and (3.285) imply that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.297) \quad &\|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}\hat{C}_n\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&= \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} (n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + n(D_{\mathbb{H}}\tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \hat{r}_n (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2\tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&\leq \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} (n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes (D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n))\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&\quad + \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} ((D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n) \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)))\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} + \|\hat{r}_n I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&= \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|n \langle x_n - \hat{x}_n, x \rangle_H \cdot \langle I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n), y \rangle_H|}{\|x\|_{H_\kappa} \|y\|_{H_\kappa}} + \\
&\quad \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|n \langle x_n - \hat{x}_n, y \rangle_H \cdot \langle I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n), x \rangle_H|}{\|x\|_{H_\kappa} \|y\|_{H_\kappa}} + \|\hat{r}_n I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\
&= 2n \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \cdot \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{H_{-\kappa}} + |\hat{r}_n| \cdot \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2n(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \cdot K(R) + R \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}$$

and the definition of C_n , \hat{C}_n , and of \tilde{C}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (3.256), (3.250), (3.285), (3.262), and imply that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.298) \quad & \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \left(\frac{C_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\hat{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\ &= \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \left(n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \right. \right. \\ & \quad + r_n \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \otimes (nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \hat{r}_n \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \tilde{V})(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\ &= \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \left(n(I_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n)) \otimes \left(\frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \left(\frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right) \otimes \left(nI_{\mathbb{H}}(x_n - \hat{x}_n) \right) + \hat{r}_n \left(\frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right) \right) \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} \\ &\leq 2n \|x - x_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \cdot \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} + |\hat{r}_n| \cdot \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \\ &\leq 2n \|x - x_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \cdot K(R) \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{n}(\varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) \cdot K(R) \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\ & \quad + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon n K(R) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 2\sqrt{n} R \cdot K(R) M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\ & \quad + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.245), (3.285), the monotonicity of K , and (3.262) yield that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.299) \quad & \|B(t_n, x_n) - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\kappa)} \leq (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} \|B(t_n, x_n) - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\ &\leq K(R) \cdot (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \\ &\leq K(R) \cdot (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \\ &\leq K(R) \cdot (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{R}{\sqrt{n}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain from (3.241), (3.296), (3.297), (3.298), and from (3.299) that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.300) \quad & \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(((C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\ & - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\ &\leq (K(R))^2 \left(2n \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \cdot K(R) \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \right) \\ & \quad + 2(K(R))^2 \cdot (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left(2n (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1+2\kappa} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \cdot K(R) + R \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(((C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
& - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
(3.301) \quad & \leq (K(R))^2 (2\varepsilon n K(R) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 2\sqrt{n} R \cdot K(R) M_\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
& + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}) \\
& + 2(K(R))^2 \cdot \left(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m| \right)^{1/2+\kappa} (\varepsilon \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \cdot \frac{R}{\sqrt{n}}) \sqrt{n} \\
& \cdot \left(2\sqrt{n} \left(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m| \right)^{1+2\kappa} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \cdot K(R) + \frac{R}{\sqrt{n}} \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (3.261), the properties of \mathfrak{C} and $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$, (3.245), (3.285), the monotonicity of K , (3.262), and the fact that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ show that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\
& \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] \\
(3.302) \quad & \leq n \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n) \tilde{e}_i, I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n) \tilde{e}_i \rangle_H - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \tilde{e}_i, I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \tilde{e}_i \rangle_H \right] \\
& \leq n \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} 3 \|B(t_n, x_n) \tilde{e}_i - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \tilde{e}_i\|_H^2 = 3n \|B(t_n, x_n) - B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\
& \leq 3K(R) \cdot n (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|)^2 \\
& \leq 3K(R) \cdot n (\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} + M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|)^2 \\
& \leq 6\varepsilon n K(R) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 6K(R) (M_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \cdot R + R)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (3.292), (3.293), (3.295), (3.301), (3.302), (3.286), (3.287), (3.288), (3.285), together with the fact that \tilde{V} is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ - bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times O$, the fact that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is $\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)$ -bounded on \mathbb{H} - bounded subsets of O , the fact that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $n^{1/4} \leq \sqrt{n} + 1$, and the fact that $\sup_{x \in [0, \infty)} \omega(x) < \infty$ imply that there exists $R_1 \in (1, \infty)$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/(4R_1))$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap (64(R_1)^2, \infty)$ with $\delta_n (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \leq 1$ and with $\delta_n < 1$ there exist $R_{2,\varepsilon}, R_{3,\varepsilon} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

(3.303)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n + \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
& + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
& + n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\
& \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \\
& - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
& - \left\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} B(t_n, x_n) \right) \Big|_{H_\vartheta} \right) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\
& \leq -n \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 R_1 (1 + \sqrt{n} + n\varepsilon) + \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} R_{2,\varepsilon} (1 + \sqrt{n}) + R_{3,\varepsilon} \\
& = -n/2 \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 - (n(1/2 - R_1\varepsilon) - \sqrt{n}R_1 - R_1) \left(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} - \frac{R_{2,\varepsilon}(1+\sqrt{n})}{(n(1-2R_1\varepsilon) - 2\sqrt{n}R_1 - 2R_1)} \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (R_{2,\varepsilon})^2 \frac{(1+\sqrt{n})^2}{2(n(1-2R_1\varepsilon)-2\sqrt{n}R_1-2R_1)} + R_{3,\varepsilon} \\
\leq & -n/2 \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + (R_{2,\varepsilon})^2 \frac{2+2n}{2(\frac{n}{4}-2R_1)} + R_{3,\varepsilon} \\
\leq & -n/2 \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 12(R_{2,\varepsilon})^2 + R_{3,\varepsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

and this together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$ yields that

(3.304)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 > L} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n + \frac{\langle A(x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right. \right. \\
& - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
& + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
& - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \\
& + n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathbf{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\
& - \left. \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
& \left. - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \left\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} B(t_n, x_n) \right) \Big|_{H_\vartheta} \right) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, it follows from (3.292), (3.288), (3.256), the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(1/n) = 0$, the fact that $\sup_{x \in (0, \infty)} \omega(x) < \infty$, and from the fact that V is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O that for all $L \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

(3.305)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \right) \right) \\
\leq & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(K (\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) R \cdot (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t - \hat{t}|^2)) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + R \cdot K(R) \left| \tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n) \right| \right) \right) \\
\leq & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left((n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + ((\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}))^{1/2} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (\sup_{m \in [0, \infty)} \omega(m)) \cdot n^{1/2} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|^2)) R \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + R \cdot K(R) \left| \tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) - \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n) \right| \right) \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we get from (3.293), (3.295), (3.286), (3.287), the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_n (\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2)) = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$, that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(1/n) = 0$, the fact that $\sup_{x \in (0, \infty)} \omega(x) < \infty$, and from the fact that $\forall (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H_2: ((\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_H = 0) \wedge (\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_{H_{1/2}} < \infty)) \Rightarrow (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} = 0)$ that for

all $L \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(\frac{\langle A(x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right) \right) \\
(3.306) \quad & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(-n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + R \cdot K(\|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \right. \right. \\
& \quad + R \cdot K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) \cdot \|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)) \\
& \quad + nK(R) (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
& \quad + R \cdot K(R) \cdot K(\|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2) (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \\
& \quad \left. \left. + R \cdot (K(\|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2))^2 (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)) \right) \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(-n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + R \cdot n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \right. \right. \\
& \quad + R \cdot K(R) n^{1/4} (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) + (n^{1/4} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \\
& \quad + ((\sup_{m \in [n, \infty)} \omega(m^{-1/4}))^{1/2} + (\sup_{m \in [0, \infty)} \omega(m)) \cdot n^{1/2} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}) \cdot 2R \\
& \quad \left. \left. + nK(R) (\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\alpha_2}} + |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) \cdot \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \right) \right) \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (3.300), the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$, the fact that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)}$ -norm on all \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of O , and from the fact that $\forall (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H_2: ((\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_H = 0) \wedge (\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_{H_{1/2}} < \infty)) \Rightarrow (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|z_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} + \|z_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}}) = 0)$ show that for all $L \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.307) \quad & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(\frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(((C_n - \tilde{C}_n) B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right) \right) \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{n\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(K^2(R) (2\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \cdot K(R) \sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \right. \right. \\
& \quad + R \left\| \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x_n)}{V(x_n)} - \frac{(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)}{V(\hat{x}_n)} \right\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \right) + 2K^2(R) \cdot (\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1/2+\kappa} \sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(2(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} 1/|\lambda_m|)^{1+2\kappa} \sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}} \cdot K(R) + \frac{R}{\sqrt{n}} \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(\hat{x}_n)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_\kappa, \mathbb{H}'_\kappa)} \right) \Big) \\
& = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and (3.302) together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_H) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|) = 0$ and with the fact that $\forall (z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H_2: ((\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_H = 0) \wedge (\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_{H_{1/2}} < \infty)) \Rightarrow (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|z_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} = 0)$ shows that for all $L \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.308) \quad & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] \right) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(3K(R) (\sqrt{n} \|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}} + \sqrt{n} |t_n - \hat{t}_n|)^2 \right) \right) = 0.$$

Combining (3.305), (3.306), (3.307), (3.308) implies that for all $L \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.309) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\|x_n - \hat{x}_n\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \leq L} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n + \frac{\langle A(x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right. \right. \\ - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\ + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\ - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \\ + n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\ \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\ \left. - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \left\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} B(t_n, x_n) \right) \Big|_{H_\vartheta} \right) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \right) \\ \leq 0$$

and this together with (3.304) yields that

$$(3.310) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} r_n - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \hat{r}_n + \frac{\langle A(x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle A(\hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right. \\ + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), p_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\ + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\ - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} - \frac{v(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} (r_n - \hat{r}_n) \\ + n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\ \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] - \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\ \left. - \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \left\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \left(\left(\frac{\tilde{C}_n}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} B(t_n, x_n) \right) \Big|_{H_\vartheta} \right) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \\ \leq 0.$$

Thus we obtain from (3.261), (3.289), (3.290), (3.291), and from (3.310) that

$$(3.311) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta_n, \tilde{V}h}^+((t_n, x_n), r_n, p_n, C_n + n\mathfrak{C}_n \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} G_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta_n, \tilde{V}h}^-((\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), \hat{r}_n, \hat{p}_n, \hat{C}_n + n\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n \tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)(r_n + \delta_n \tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)h(t_n, x_n))}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} - \frac{v(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)(\hat{r}_n - \delta_n \tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)h(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n) + A(x_n), (\tilde{p}_n + \delta_n (D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(h\tilde{V}))(t_n, x_n)) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\langle F(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) + A(\hat{x}_n), (\tilde{p}_n - \delta_n (D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(h\tilde{V}))(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)) \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&\quad + \frac{\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((C_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) + \delta_n (D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2(h\tilde{V}))(t_n, x_n) B(t_n, x_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{C}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) - \delta_n (D_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2(h\tilde{V}))(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}}{\tilde{V}(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n)} \\
&\quad + n \left[\langle B(t_n, x_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\mathfrak{C}_n B(t_n, x_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \langle B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((\hat{\mathfrak{C}}_n B(\hat{t}_n, \hat{x}_n))|_{H_\vartheta}) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right] \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{v(t_n, x_n)(r_n - \hat{r}_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + \frac{\langle F(t_n, x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + \frac{\langle A(x_n), \tilde{p}_n \rangle_{H, H'}}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} + \langle \frac{B(t_n, x_n)}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)}, I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \tilde{C}_n B(t_n, x_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \right) \\
&= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G(t_n, x_n, (r_n - \hat{r}_n), \tilde{p}_n, (\tilde{C}_n|_{H_\vartheta})|_{H_\vartheta})}{\tilde{V}(t_n, x_n)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows assumption (3.199). Furthermore, by assumption, $u_1|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity subsolution of (3.254) relative to $(h\tilde{V}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$ and $u_2|_{(0, T) \times O}$ is a viscosity supersolution of (3.254) relative to $(h\tilde{V}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$. Moreover, (3.248) shows for every $r \in (0, \infty)$ that the function $r\tilde{V}$ is a classical supersolution of (3.254). In addition, observe that (3.201) follows from $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times O_n^c} \frac{|u_1(t, x)| + |u_2(t, x)|}{V(x)} = 0$ and (3.200) follows from (3.259). Consequently, Theorem 3.8 (with $\tilde{T} \leftarrow t$ and with $\tilde{R} \leftarrow \|x\|_H$) implies that for all $(t, x) \in W$ and all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.312) \quad 0 &\geq \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_1(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - u_2(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) : (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}), (\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \in W, \tilde{t}, \hat{t} \leq t, h(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) \vee h(\hat{t}, \hat{x}) \leq R, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \|\tilde{x}\|_H \leq \|x\|_H, \|\tilde{x} - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, |\tilde{t} - \hat{t}| \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
&\geq u_1(t, x) - u_2(t, x).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain with the assumption that u_1 and u_2 are continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm and the fact that W is dense in $[0, T] \times O$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm that $u_1 \leq u_2$. Repeating these arguments with u_1 and u_2 interchanged finally shows that $u_2 \leq u_1$ so that $u_1 = u_2$. This proves uniqueness and finishes the proof of Corollary 3.9. \square

The next remark gives sufficient conditions on V to satisfy the assumptions in Corollary 3.9.

Remark 3.10 (Sufficient conditions for V). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a real separable Hilbert space and $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ its dual space, let $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} , let $\lambda: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ be a function with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = -\infty$, let $A: D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be the linear operator such that*

$$(3.313) \quad D(A) = \left\{ v \in H : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i \langle e_i, v \rangle_H|^2 < \infty \right\}$$

and such that for all $v \in D(A)$ it holds that

$$(3.314) \quad Av = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \langle e_i, v \rangle_H e_i,$$

let $\mathbb{H}_r = (H_r, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_r}, \|\cdot\|_{H_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $-A$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]), and let $\mathbb{H}'_r = (H'_r, \|\cdot\|_{H'_r})$ be the corresponding dual spaces. By abuse of notation we will also denote by A and by $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ the extended operators $A: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_r$, $y \in H_{r-1}$ and all $z \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that

$$(3.315) \quad (A(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|A(\xi) - y\|_{H_{r-1}} : \xi \in H_1, \|x - \xi\|_{H_r} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0)$$

and that

$$(3.316) \quad \|z\|_{H_r} = \begin{cases} \|z\|_{H_r} & \text{if } z \in H_r \\ \infty & \text{if } z \notin H_r \end{cases}.$$

Let $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$, $\kappa \in (-1/2, 0]$, $l \in [-\kappa, \infty)$, let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)}: L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}') \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})}: L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the extended norms satisfying for all $C \in L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ that

$$(3.317) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}C\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_{-\kappa})} = \|C\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)} = \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\langle Cx, y \rangle_{H, H'}|}{\|x\|_{H_{\kappa}} \|y\|_{H_{\kappa}}},$$

let $f \in C^1([0, \infty), (1, \infty))$ satisfy that $f|_{(0, \infty)} \in C^2((0, \infty), (1, \infty))$ and that $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} (tf''(t)) = 0$, and let $V: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy for all $x \in H$ that $V(x) = f(1/2)\|(-A)^{-l}x\|_H^2$. Then it holds that $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(H, (1, \infty))$, that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V: H \rightarrow L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)}$ -norm on all \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H , and that there exist functions $K: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $\omega: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that K is increasing, such that $\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \omega(x) = 0$, such that $\sup_{x \in [0, \infty)} \omega(x) < \infty$, and such that for all $x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(3.318) \quad \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)}{V(x)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x})}{V(\hat{x})} \right\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \leq K(\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2) (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + \omega(\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}}^2)),$$

$$(3.319) \quad \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)}{V(x)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x})}{V(\hat{x})} \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \leq K(\|x\|_H \vee \|\hat{x}\|_H) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1/2}},$$

$$(3.320) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \leq K(\|x\|_H),$$

and that

$$(3.321) \quad \|I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)\|_{H_{1/2}} \leq K(\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2).$$

PROOF. First note that we get from the assumption $l \geq -\kappa$ that

$$(3.322) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(1/2\|\cdot\|_{H_{-l}}^2)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)} = \|(-A)^{-2l}\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)} = \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle (-A)^{-2l}x, y \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x\|_{H_{\kappa}} \|y\|_{H_{\kappa}}} \\ & = \sup_{x, y \in H_{-\kappa} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle (-A)^{-2l}(-A)^{-\kappa}x, (-A)^{-\kappa}y \rangle_{H', H}}{\|(-A)^{-\kappa}x\|_{H_{\kappa}} \|(-A)^{-\kappa}y\|_{H_{\kappa}}} = \sup_{x, y \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle (-A)^{-2l-2\kappa}x, y \rangle_{H', H}}{\|x\|_H \|y\|_H} \\ & \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-2l-2\kappa}) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain that

$$(3.323) \quad D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(1/2\|\cdot\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)}(H, L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')).$$

Combining this with $f|_{(0, \infty)} \in C^2((0, \infty), (1, \infty))$ shows then that

$$(3.324) \quad D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(V|_{H \setminus \{0\}}) \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'_l)}(H \setminus \{0\}, L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')).$$

Next note that we have for all $x \in H \setminus \{0\}$ that

$$(3.325) \quad \begin{aligned} & (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) \\ & = f''(1/2)\|(-A)^{-l}x\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l}x) \otimes I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l}x) + f'(1/2)\|(-A)^{-l}x\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{-2l}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.326) \quad & \lim_{H \setminus \{0\} \ni x \rightarrow 0} \frac{|V(x) - V(0) - 1/2 f'(0) \cdot \langle (-A)^{-2l} x, x \rangle_H|}{\|x\|_H^2} \\
& \leq \lim_{H \setminus \{0\} \ni x \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) - f(0) - 1/2 f'(0) \cdot \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2|}{(\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|)^l \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2} \\
& = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{|f(t) - f(0) - f'(0) \cdot t|}{2(\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|)^l t} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and this yields that

$$(3.327) \quad (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(0) = f'(0) I_{\mathbb{H}} (-A)^{-2l}.$$

In addition, it follows from the assumptions $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} t f''(t) = 0$ and $l + \kappa \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.328) \quad & \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \|f''(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} x) \otimes I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} x)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} : \right. \\
& \quad \left. x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \|x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{y, z \in H \setminus \{0\}} f''(1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \frac{\langle (-A)^{-2l} x, y \rangle_H \cdot \langle (-A)^{-2l} x, z \rangle_H}{\|y\|_{H_{\kappa}} \|z\|_{H_{\kappa}}} : x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \|x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ f''(1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \sup_{y, z \in H_{-\kappa} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\langle (-A)^{-2l} x, (-A)^{-\kappa} y \rangle_H \cdot \langle (-A)^{-2l} x, (-A)^{-\kappa} z \rangle_H}{\|y\|_H \|z\|_H} : \right. \\
& \quad \left. x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \|x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& = \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ f''(1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \|(-A)^{-l} (-A)^{-l-\kappa} x\|_H^2 : x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \|x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ f''(1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-l-\kappa}) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 : x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \|x\|_H \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\
& \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-l-\kappa}) |f''(1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2)| \cdot \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 : x \in H \setminus \{0\}, \|x\|_{H_{-l}} \leq \varepsilon \right\} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.324) and with (3.327) ensures that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})}(H, L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'))$. In particular the assumption $\kappa \leq 0$ verifies that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V \in C_{\mathbb{H}, L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} (H, L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'))$ and therefore $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(H, \mathbb{R})$. In addition, note that the fact that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(1/2 \|\cdot\|_{H_{-l}}^2)$ is constant shows that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2(1/2 \|\cdot\|_{H_{-l}}^2)$ is also uniform continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})}$ -norm and the fact that $(f|_{(0, \infty)})''$ is continuous implies for all $r, R \in (0, \infty)$ that $(f|_{(0, \infty)})''$ is uniform continuous on the compact set $[r, R]$. Combining this with the fact that the function $H \ni x \rightarrow 1/2 \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H yields that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ uniform continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of $\{x \in H : r \leq \|x\|_H\}$. This means that for all $\varepsilon, r, R \in (0, \infty)$ there exist a $\delta_{\varepsilon, r, R}$ such that for all $x, y \in \{z \in H : r \leq \|z\|_H \leq R\}$ with $\|x - y\|_H \leq \delta_{\varepsilon, r, R}$ it holds that

$$(3.329) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(y)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand it follows from (3.323) that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ there exist a δ_{ε} such that for all $x \in \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq \delta_{\varepsilon}\}$ it holds that

$$(3.330) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(0)\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

and this ensures that for all $x, y \in \{z \in H : \|z\|_H \leq \delta_\varepsilon\}$ it holds that

$$(3.331) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(y) \|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} \\ & \leq \| (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(0) \|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} + \| (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(y) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(0) \|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Finally note that we have for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $x, y \in H$ with $\|x - y\|_H \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ that

$$(3.332) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\|x\|_H \leq \frac{\delta}{2}) \vee (\|y\|_H \leq \frac{\delta}{2}) \vee (\min\{\|x\|_H, \|y\|_H\} > \frac{\delta}{2}) \\ & \Rightarrow ((\|x\|_H \leq \frac{\delta}{2}) \wedge (\|y\|_H \leq \|x\|_H + \|x - y\|_H \leq \delta)) \\ & \quad \vee ((\|y\|_H \leq \frac{\delta}{2}) \wedge (\|x\|_H \leq \|y\|_H + \|x - y\|_H \leq \delta)) \vee (\min\{\|x\|_H, \|y\|_H\} > \frac{\delta}{2}) \\ & \Rightarrow (\max\{\|x\|_H, \|y\|_H\} \leq \delta) \vee (\min\{\|x\|_H, \|y\|_H\} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining now (3.329), (3.331), (3.332) implies that for all $(\varepsilon, R) \in (0, \infty)^2$ and all $(x, y) \in H^2$ with $\|x - y\|_H \leq \frac{\delta_\varepsilon}{2} \wedge \delta_{\varepsilon, \delta_\varepsilon/2, R}$ and with $\|x\|_H \vee \|y\|_H \leq R$ it holds that

$$(3.333) \quad \| (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(x) - (D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(y) \|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})} < \varepsilon$$

and this verifies that $(D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)$ is uniform continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{L}(\mathbb{H}_{\kappa}, \mathbb{H}'_{\kappa})}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H . Next note that we have for all $x \in H$ that

$$(3.334) \quad (D_{\mathbb{H}} V)(x) = f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) I_{\mathbb{H}} ((-A)^{-2l} x).$$

Moreover, the fact that f' and f are continuous and the fact that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $[0, R]$ is compact implies that there exist an increasing function $\tilde{K}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and a function $\tilde{\omega}: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \tilde{\omega}(t) = 0$ and with $\sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} \tilde{\omega}(t) < \infty$ such that for all $t, \hat{t} \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(3.335) \quad |f(\frac{t}{2}) - f(\frac{\hat{t}}{2})| \leq \tilde{K}(t \vee \hat{t}) \cdot |t - \hat{t}|, \quad f(\frac{t}{2}) \vee |f'(\frac{t}{2})| \leq \tilde{K}(t)$$

and such that for all $t, \hat{t} \in [0, 2]$ it holds that

$$(3.336) \quad |f'(\frac{t}{2}) - f'(\frac{\hat{t}}{2})| \leq \tilde{\omega}(|t - \hat{t}|).$$

This implies that for all $x, \hat{x} \in H$ with $\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \leq 2$ it holds that

$$(3.337) \quad |f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2)| \leq \tilde{\omega}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 - \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, 4]} \omega(t \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}).$$

In addition, (3.335) shows that for all $x, \hat{x} \in H$ with $\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \geq 2$ and with $\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \wedge \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \leq 1$ it holds that

$$(3.338) \quad \begin{aligned} & |f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2)| \leq (\tilde{K}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) + \tilde{K}(\|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2)) \\ & \leq (\tilde{K}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) + \tilde{K}(\|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2)) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we get for all $x, \hat{x} \in H$ with $\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \wedge \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \geq 1$ that

$$(3.339) \quad |f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2)| \leq \left(\sup_{t \in [1, \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2]} |f''(\frac{t}{2})| \right) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}.$$

Combining (3.337), (3.338), and (3.339) shows that for all $x, \hat{x} \in H$ it holds that

$$(3.340) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2) (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \\ & \leq \| (f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2)) (-A)^{-2l} x \|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \\ & \quad + \|f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2) (-A)^{-2l} (x - \hat{x})\|_{H_{1-\vartheta}} \\ & \leq |f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2) - f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2)| \cdot \|x\|_{H_{1-\vartheta-2l}} \\ & \quad + |f'(1/2 \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2)| \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1-\vartheta-2l}} \\ & \leq \left(\left(\sup_{t \in [1, \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2]} |f''(\frac{t}{2})| \right) + \tilde{K}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) + \tilde{K}(\|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2) + 1 \right) \cdot \|x\|_{H_{1-\vartheta-2l}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \cdot (\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 + (\mathbb{1}_{\|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \leq 1} \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} + \sup_{t \in [0,4]} \tilde{\omega}(t \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}))) \\ & + |f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2| \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{1-\vartheta-2l}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have for all $(x, \hat{x}) \in H^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ that

(3.341)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \left\| f''(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot \langle (-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x}), (-A)^{-l} (x - \hat{x}) \rangle_H \right. \\ & \quad \cdot (-A)^{-2l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x}) + f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot (-A)^{-2l} (x - \hat{x}) \left. \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} dt \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \left\| f''(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot \|tx + (1-t)\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} \right. \\ & \quad \cdot (-A)^{-2l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x}) \left. \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \\ & \quad + \left\| f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot (-A)^{-2l} (x - \hat{x}) \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} dt \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in (0,1)} \left(f''(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot \|tx + (1-t)\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} \cdot \|tx + (1-t)\hat{x}\|_{H_{-2l-\kappa}} \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} + f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} (tx + (1-t)\hat{x})\|_H^2 \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-2l-\kappa}} \left. \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{t \in (0, \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2]} \left(|f''(\frac{t}{2})| \cdot t \right) \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-l-\kappa}) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}} \\ & \quad + \sup_{t \in (0, \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}^2]} \left(|f'(\frac{t}{2})| \right) \cdot \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-2l-\kappa}}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, (3.334), the assumption $f > 1$, and (3.335) imply for all $r \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and all $x, \hat{x} \in H$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.342) \quad & \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x)}{V(x)} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(\hat{x})}{V(\hat{x})} \right\|_{H_r} \\ & = \left\| \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} x)}{f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2} - \frac{I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} \hat{x})}{f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2} \right\|_{H_r} \\ & \leq \frac{\|f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_r}}{f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2} \\ & \quad + \|(-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_r} \left| \frac{1}{f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2} - \frac{1}{f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2} \right| \\ & \leq \|f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_r} \\ & \quad + \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{r-2l}} |f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 - f(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2| \\ & \leq \|f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_r} \\ & \quad + \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{r-2l}} \tilde{K} (\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \cdot \left| \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 - \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 \right| \\ & \leq \|f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} x - f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} \hat{x}\|_H^2 (-A)^{-2l} \hat{x}\|_{H_r} \\ & \quad + \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{r-2l}} \tilde{K} (\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2 \vee \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \cdot (\|x\|_{H_{-l}} + \|\hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}) \|x - \hat{x}\|_{H_{-l}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.342) (with $r \leftarrow 1 - \vartheta$) with (3.340), the fact that for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $x \in H$ it holds that $\|x\|_{H_s} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{s-r}) \|x\|_{H_r}$, the fact that $1 - \vartheta - 2l \leq \vartheta$, the fact that $-l \leq 1/2 \leq \vartheta$, the fact that f' is continuous on $[0, \infty)$, and with the fact that f'' is continuous on $[1, \infty)$, verifies (3.318). Moreover, (3.342) (with $r \leftarrow -\kappa$), (3.341), the fact that for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $x \in H$

it holds that $\|x\|_{H_s} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{s-r}) \|x\|_{H_r}$, the fact that $-\kappa - 2l \leq -l - \kappa \leq 0 \leq 1/2$, the fact that $-l \leq 0 \leq 1/2$, the fact that f' is continuous on $[0, \infty)$, the fact that f'' is continuous on $(0, \infty)$, and the fact that $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} f''(t)t = 0$ proves (3.319). In addition, note that we obtain from (3.334), (3.335), and the monotonicity of \tilde{K} that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.343) \quad & \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x) \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} = \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} x) \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} \\
 & = |f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2| \left\| ((-A)^{-2l} x) \right\|_{H_{-\kappa}} = |f'(1/2) \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2| \|x\|_{H_{-\kappa-2l}} \\
 & \leq \tilde{K}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-\kappa-2l}) \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{K}(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-l}) \|x\|_H^2) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-\kappa-2l}) \|x\|_H
 \end{aligned}$$

and this together with $-l \leq 0$ and with $-\kappa - 2l \leq 0$ implies (3.320), Furthermore, (3.334), (3.335), and the monotonicity of \tilde{K} yield that for all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.344) \quad & \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(x) \right\|_{H_{1/2}} = \left\| I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2 I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{-2l} x) \right\|_{H_{1/2}} \\
 & = |f'(1/2) \|(-A)^{-l} x\|_H^2| \left\| ((-A)^{-2l} x) \right\|_{H_{1/2}} = |f'(1/2) \|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2| \|x\|_{H_{1/2-2l}} \\
 & \leq \tilde{K}(\|x\|_{H_{-l}}^2) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-2l-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}} \leq \tilde{K}(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{-l-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (|\lambda_n|^{1/2-2l-\vartheta}) \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining this, $-l - \vartheta \leq 0$, and $1/2 - 2l - \vartheta \leq 0$ implies (3.321), which finishes the proof of Remark 3.10. \square

Existence of viscosity solutions

Existence of viscosity solutions of 2nd-order PDEs in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces has been established e.g. in Lions [22, Theorem 3] and in Ishii [16, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 6.3] with Perron's method. In this chapter we prove existence of viscosity solutions using the stability of limits (Lemma 2.18). This allows us to get a representation of the solution. Moreover, we do not need to assume that the initial function is bounded.

In Section 4.2 we recall several results of Cox et al. [4, Section 4], which we slightly generalized to fit our purposes. In particular we prove the convergence of Galerkin approximations for SPDEs in probability uniformly on bounded sets (Theorem 4.4). In Section 4.3 we prove Theorem 4.5, which shows the existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs under suitable assumptions and that the solutions can be represented by the solution of the corresponding SPDEs. For its proof we use Theorem 4.16 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] to show that the Kolmogorov equation of every Galerkin approximation has a finite-dimensional classical viscosity solution. Then we apply Proposition 2.22 to extend these to viscosity solutions of a common infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. To conclude the result we then use the convergence of the Galerkin approximations (Theorem 4.4) and the stability of viscosity solutions under limits (Lemma 2.18). This chapter is based on Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14, Section 4.4] and Cox et al. [4, Section 4].

4.1. Setting

Throughout this chapter the following setting is frequently used. Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $\mathbb{U} = (U, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ be real separable \mathbb{R} -Hilbert spaces, let $\mathbb{H}' = (H', \|\cdot\|_{H'})$ and $\mathbb{U}' = (U', \|\cdot\|_{U'})$ be the corresponding dual spaces, let $(e_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} , let $T \in (0, \infty)$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a normal filtration $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, let $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an Id_U -cylindrical $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -Wiener process, let $\lambda: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ be a function with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = -\infty$, let $A: D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be the linear operator such that

$$(4.1) \quad D(A) = \left\{ v \in H : \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_i \langle e_i, v \rangle_H|^2 < \infty \right\}$$

and such that for all $v \in D(A)$ it holds that

$$(4.2) \quad Av = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \langle e_i, v \rangle_H e_i,$$

let $\mathbb{H}_r = (H_r, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_r}, \|\cdot\|_{H_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $-A$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]) and $\mathbb{H}'_r = (H'_r, \|\cdot\|_{H'_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be the corresponding dual spaces. Then we can extend the operator A and the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, to an operator $A: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and semi-norms $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_r$ and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ it holds that

$$(4.3) \quad \|y\|_{H_r} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_r} & \text{if } y \in H_r \\ \infty & \text{if } y \notin H_r \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(4.4) \quad (A(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|A(\xi) - y\|_{H_{r-1}} : \xi \in D(A), \|x - \xi\|_{H_r} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0).$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{E}_r: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $r \in (0, \infty)$, be the functions satisfying for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ and all $x \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{E}_r(x) = \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(x^2 \Gamma(r))^n}{\Gamma(nr + 1)} \right)^{1/2}$$

(cf. Chapter 7 in Henry [15] and, e.g., Definition 1.3.1 in Jentzen [18]), let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$, $\chi \in [\beta, 1/2)$, $F \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\alpha}}(H_\gamma, H_{\gamma-\alpha})$, $B \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}(H_\gamma, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta}))$ satisfy that for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets $E \subseteq H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(4.6) \quad |(F|_E)|_{C^1(E, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |(B|_E)|_{C^1(E, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} < \infty,$$

let $\mathfrak{A}_N \subseteq \{e_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be finite non-empty sets satisfying that $\cup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathfrak{A}_N = \{e_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and that $\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}$: $(\mathfrak{A}_i \cap \mathfrak{A}_j) = \mathfrak{A}_{i \wedge j}$, let $V_N \subseteq H_\gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be the sets satisfying that $V_0 = H_\gamma$ and that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $V_N = \overline{\text{span}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathfrak{A}_N)}_{\mathbb{H}}$, let \mathbb{V}_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be the real linear subspaces of \mathbb{H} satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\mathbb{V}_N = (V_N, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H |_{V_N \times V_N}, \|\cdot\|_H |_{V_N})$, let $\mathcal{P}_N \in L(U)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $X^{N,x}: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H_\gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $x \in H_\gamma$, be $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted stochastic processes with continuous sample paths satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in [0, T]$, and all $x \in H_\gamma$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$(4.7) \quad X_t^{N,x} = e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F(X_s^{N,x}) ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(X_s^{N,x}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s.$$

4.2. Convergence of Galerkin approximations

The following Lemma 4.1 is a minor improvement on Lemma 4.2 in Cox et al. [4] since we allow different (but deterministic) starting points on the left hand side of (4.9). The proof follows closely the proof of Lemma 4.2 in Cox et al. [4] and in some parts literally.

LEMMA 4.1 (*L^p -approximation bound for the Galerkin approximation for SPDEs with globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients*). *Assume the setting in Section 4.1, let $p \in [2, \infty)$, $\eta \in [\max\{\alpha, 2\beta\}, 1)$, $x, \hat{x} \in H_\gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and assume that*

$$(4.8) \quad |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} < \infty.$$

Then

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - X_t^{N, x} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \\ & \leq \left[\sqrt{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| (\text{Id}_H - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}) X_t^{0, \hat{x}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} + \sqrt{2} \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}(\hat{x} - x)\|_{H_\gamma} + \frac{T^{1/2-\chi} \sqrt{p(p-1)}}{\sqrt{1-2\chi}} \right] \\ & \left(1 + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{N, x}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right) \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \\ & \cdot \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta} \sqrt{2} |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta} p(p-1)} |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \|\mathcal{P}_0\|_{L(U)} \right] \\ & < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.1. First of all, observe that Lemma 4.1 in Cox et al. [4] ensures that

$$(4.10) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \max \left\{ \|X_t^{0, \hat{x}}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})}, \|X_t^{N, x}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right\} < \infty.$$

Hence we can apply Proposition 7.1.6 in Jentzen [18] to obtain

$$(4.11) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - X_t^{N, x} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta}\sqrt{2} \left| \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\alpha} F(\cdot) \right|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta}p(p-1)} \left| \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(\cdot) \mathcal{P}_0 \right|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\alpha} F(X_s^{0, \hat{x}}) ds - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{0, \hat{x}}) \mathcal{P}_0 dW_s \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\alpha} F(X_s^{N, x}) ds - X_t^{N, x} + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{N, x}) \mathcal{P}_0 dW_s \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta}\sqrt{2} \left| \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\alpha} F(\cdot) \right|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta}p(p-1)} \left| \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(\cdot) \mathcal{P}_0 \right|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\alpha} F(X_s^{0, \hat{x}}) ds - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{0, \hat{x}}) \mathcal{P}_0 dW_s \right. \\
&\quad \left. - e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma} \hat{x} + e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma} \hat{x} - e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma} x - \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{N, x}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{N, x}) \mathcal{P}_0 dW_s \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.12) \quad &\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - X_t^{N, x} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta}\sqrt{2} |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta}p(p-1)} |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \|\mathcal{P}_0\|_{L(U)} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left[\left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}) X_t^{0, \hat{x}} \right\| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(X_s^{N, x}) (\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N) dW_s \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} + \|e^{tA} (\pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} \hat{x} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} x)\|_{H_\gamma} \Big].
\end{aligned}$$

The Burkholder-Davis-Gundy type inequality in Lemma 7.7 in Da Prato & Zabczyk [7] hence implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad &\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, \hat{x}} - X_t^{N, x} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta}\sqrt{2} |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta}p(p-1)} |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \|\mathcal{P}_0\|_{L(U)} \right] \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{2} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}) X_t^{0, \hat{x}} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} + \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} (\hat{x} - x)\|_{H_\gamma} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|B(X_s^{N, x}) [\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N]\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})})} \sqrt{\frac{p(p-1)}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t (t-s)^{-2\chi} ds} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This and (4.10) complete the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

The following Lemma 4.2 (resp. Corollary 4.3) complements the result on positive convergence rates established in Corollary 4.3 (resp. Corollary 4.4) in Cox et al. [4] with converging starting points (without positive rate). The proof follows closely Corollary 4.3 in Cox et al. [4] and in some parts literally.

LEMMA 4.2 (L^p -convergence of Galerkin approximations for SPDEs with globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients). *Assume the setting in Section 4.1, let $\vartheta \in (0, \min\{1 - \alpha, \frac{1}{2} - \beta\})$,*

$p \in [2, \infty)$, $(x_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$, and assume that $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|x_N - x_0\|_{H_\gamma} = 0$,

$$(4.14) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left(\|x_N\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \right) + |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} < \infty,$$

and that

$$(4.15) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) = 0.$$

Then it holds that

$$(4.16) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\|F(X_t^N)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + \|B(X_t^N)\mathcal{R}_N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})})} \right) < \infty$$

and that

$$(4.17) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, x_0} - X_t^{N, x_N} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} = 0.$$

PROOF. Fix $\eta \in [\max\{\alpha, 2\beta\}, 1)$ for the rest of the proof and note that we get from Lemma 4.1 that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{0, x_0} - X_t^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \\ & \leq \left[\sqrt{2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}) X_t^{0, x_0} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} + \sqrt{2} \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}(x_0 - x_N)\|_{H_\gamma} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{T^{1/2-\chi} \sqrt{p(p-1)}}{\sqrt{1-2\chi}} \left(1 + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right) \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \right] \\ & \quad \cdot \mathcal{E}_{(1-\eta)} \left[\frac{T^{1-\eta} \sqrt{2} |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})}}{\sqrt{1-\eta}} + \sqrt{T^{1-\eta} p(p-1)} |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\eta/2})})} \|\mathcal{R}\|_{L(U)} \right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, observe that Lemma 4.1 in Cox et al. [4] and $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|x_N\|_{H_\gamma} < \infty$ imply that

$$(4.19) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < \infty.$$

Moreover, we get from $x_0 \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ that $\forall t \in [0, T]: \mathbb{P}(X_t^{0, x_0} \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}) = 1$ and that

$$(4.20) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{1}_{X_t^{0, x_0} \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^p] < \infty$$

(see eg. Proposition 7.1.19 in Jentzen [18] and Proposition 7.1.10 in Jentzen [18]). Therefore it follows from $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|x_N - x_0\|_{H_\gamma} = 0$, from the definition of \mathfrak{A}_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and from $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_N = -\infty$ that

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left[\left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}) X_t^{0, x_0} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} + \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma}(x_0 - x_N)\|_{H_\gamma} \right] \\ & \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left[\left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma})(-A)^{-\vartheta} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{H}_\gamma)} \|\mathbb{1}_{\{X_t^{0, x_0} \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}\}} X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}})} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(x_0 - x_N)\|_{H_\gamma} \right] \\ & \leq \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (\text{Id}_{H_\gamma} - \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma})(-A)^{-1} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{H}_\gamma)}^\vartheta \right] \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbb{1}_{\{X_t^{0, x_0} \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}\}} X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}})} \right] \\ & = \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\sup\{1/|\lambda_N|: e_N \in \mathfrak{A}_N\}]^\vartheta \right] \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbb{1}_{\{X_t^{0, x_0} \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}\}} X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}})} \right] \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we get from (4.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\|B(X_t^N) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})})} \right) \\
& \leq \left(1 + \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right) \left(\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \\
(4.22) \quad & \leq \left(1 + \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v) \mathcal{P}_0\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} + \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v) (\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \\
& < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining then (4.15), (4.18), (4.19), and (4.21) shows that

$$(4.23) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| X_t^{0, x_0} - X_t^{N, x_N} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} = 0.$$

Finally note that (4.19) verifies that $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|F(X_t^N)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha})})} < \infty$ and this together with (4.22) and (4.23) completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

The proof of the following corollary follows closely Corollary 4.4 in Cox et al. [4] and in some parts literally.

Corollary 4.3 (*L^p -Hölder-convergence of Galerkin approximations for SPDEs with globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients*). *Assume the setting in Section 4.1, let $\vartheta \in (0, \min\{1 - \alpha, 1/2 - \beta\})$, $p \in (1/\vartheta, \infty)$, $(x_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$, and assume that, $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|x_N - x_0\|_{H_\gamma} = 0$, $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \left[\frac{\|B(v) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] < \infty$,*

$$(4.24) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left(\|x_N\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} + |F|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} \right) < \infty,$$

and that

$$(4.25) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B(v) (\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) = 0.$$

Then for all $\delta \in [0, \vartheta - 1/p)$ it holds that

$$(4.26) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} < \infty$$

and that

$$(4.27) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|X^{0, x_0} - X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} = 0.$$

PROOF OF COROLLARY 4.3. Throughout this proof denote by $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ the real number satisfying that $\eta = \max\{\alpha, 2\beta\}$. Note that Lemma 4.2 proves that

$$(4.28) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{0, x_0} - X_t^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \right] = 0.$$

In the next step note that, e.g., (Corollary 11.3.2 in Jentzen [17]) yields that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{1 + \gamma - \eta, 1/2 + \gamma - \beta\} - \gamma)$ it holds that

$$(4.29) \quad \sup_{\substack{t_1, t_2 \in [0, T], \\ t_1 \neq t_2}} \left(\frac{|\min\{t_1, t_2\}|^{\max\{\gamma + \varepsilon - (\gamma + \vartheta), 0\}} \|X_{t_1}^{N, x_N} - X_{t_2}^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})}}{|t_1 - t_2|^\varepsilon} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \|x_N\|_{H_{\min\{\gamma+\vartheta, \gamma+\varepsilon\}}} + \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left\| \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F(X_s^{N, x_N}) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})} \right] \frac{2T^{(1+\gamma-\eta-\min\{\gamma+\vartheta, \gamma+\varepsilon\})}}{(1-\eta-\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left\| \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(X_s^{N, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} \right] \frac{\sqrt{2} T^{(1/2+\gamma-\beta-\min\{\gamma+\vartheta, \gamma+\varepsilon\})}}{(1-2\beta-2\varepsilon)^{1/2}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This and the fact that $\min\{1 + \gamma - \eta, 1/2 + \gamma - \beta\} - \gamma = \min\{1 - \max\{\alpha, 2\beta\}, 1/2 - \beta\} = \min\{1 - \alpha, 1/2 - \beta\} > \vartheta > 0$ show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{\substack{t_1, t_2 \in [0, T], \\ t_1 \neq t_2}} \left(\frac{\|X_{t_1}^{N, x_N} - X_{t_2}^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})}}{|t_1 - t_2|^\vartheta} \right) \\ (4.30) \quad &\leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|x_N\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} + \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|F(X_s^{N, x_N})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})} \right] \frac{2T^{(1-\eta-\vartheta)}}{(1-\eta-\vartheta)} \\ &\quad + \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|B(X_s^{N, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} \right] \frac{\sqrt{2} T^{(1/2-\beta-\vartheta)}}{(1-2\beta-2\vartheta)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore Lemma 4.2 and estimate (4.25) ensure that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|X^{N, x_N}\|_{C^\vartheta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} \\ (4.31) \quad &\leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|x_N\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} + \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|F(X_s^{N, x_N})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\eta}})} \right] \frac{2T^{(1-\eta-\vartheta)}}{(1-\eta-\vartheta)} \\ &\quad + \left[\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|B(X_s^{N, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} \right] \frac{\sqrt{2} T^{(1/2-\beta-\vartheta)}}{(1-2\beta-2\vartheta)^{1/2}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.28), the fact that $\vartheta \in (1/p, 1]$, and Corollary 2.11 in Cox et al. [4] shows that for all $\delta \in [0, \vartheta - 1/p)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, and all $(d_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq (0, \infty)$ satisfying that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left((d_N)^{-\vartheta} \|X^{0, \hat{x}_N} - X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} \right) = 0$ and that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_N = 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\|X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} \right. \\ (4.32) \quad &\quad \left. + (d_N)^{-(\vartheta-\delta-1/p-\varepsilon)} \|X^{0, x_0} - X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} \right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have for all $\delta \in [0, \vartheta - 1/p)$ that

$$(4.33) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|X^{0, x_0} - X^{N, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} \right) = 0$$

and this completes the proof of Corollary 4.3. \square

The next theorem complements Corollary 4.5 in Cox et al. [4] with uniform convergence in probability on bounded subsets. It will be needed in the proof of Theorem 4.5 below. The proof follows closely Corollary 4.5 in Cox et al. [4].

Theorem 4.4 (Convergence and boundedness of Galerkin projections in probability). *Assume the setting in Section 4.1, let $R \in (0, \infty)$, let $\vartheta \in (0, \infty)$, let $\delta \in [0, \vartheta)$, and assume for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets $E \subseteq H_\gamma$ that*

$$(4.34) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] < \infty$$

and that

$$(4.35) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] = 0.$$

Then it holds that

$$(4.36) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta} \\ \|x\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \leq R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|X^{N,x} - X^{0,x}\|_{C^\delta([0,T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1 \right] = 0$$

and that

$$(4.37) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta} \\ \|x\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \leq R}} \mathbb{P}(\|X^{0,x}\|_{C^0([0,T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \geq N) = 0.$$

PROOF. First note that the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $s \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_s$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_s} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$ ensures that it is enough to prove the assertion for $\vartheta \in (0, \min\{1 - \alpha, 1/2 - \beta\})$. Therefore assume for the rest of the proof that $\vartheta \in (0, \min\{1 - \alpha, 1/2 - \beta\})$. Next denote for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $M \in (0, \infty)$ by $\phi_{r,M}: H_r \rightarrow H_r$ the function satisfying for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $M \in (0, \infty)$, and all $v \in H_r$ that

$$(4.38) \quad \phi_{r,M}(v) = v \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{M+1}{1 + \|v\|_{H_r}} \right\},$$

by $F_M: H_\gamma \rightarrow H_{\gamma-\alpha}$ and $B_M: H_\gamma \rightarrow HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})$ the functions satisfying that $F_M = F \circ \phi_{\gamma,M}$ and that $B_M = B \circ \phi_{\gamma,M}$ and by $S_M \subseteq H_\gamma$ the set satisfying that $S_M = \{v \in H_\gamma: \|v\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M+1\}$. Note that for all $v, w \in H_\gamma$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

(4.39)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\phi_{\gamma,M}(v) - \phi_{\gamma,M}(w)\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &= \left\| \frac{v(1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\} - w(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}}{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma})(1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma})} \right\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &\leq \|v - w\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{w[(1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\} - (1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}]}{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma})(1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma})} \right\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &\leq \|v - w\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &\quad + \frac{|(1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\} - (1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) \min\{1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}|}{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma})} \end{aligned}$$

and this implies that for all $v, w \in H_\gamma$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(4.40) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\phi_{\gamma,M}(v) - \phi_{\gamma,M}(w)\|_{H_\gamma} \\ &\leq \|v - w\|_{H_\gamma} + \frac{|\|w\|_{H_\gamma} - \|v\|_{H_\gamma}| \min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}}{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma})} \\ &\quad + \frac{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) |\min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\} - \min\{1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}|}{(1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma})} \\ &\leq \|v - w\|_{H_\gamma} + |\|w\|_{H_\gamma} - \|v\|_{H_\gamma}| + |\min\{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\} - \min\{1 + \|w\|_{H_\gamma}, M+1\}| \\ &\leq 3\|v - w\|_{H_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows that for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $|\phi_{\gamma,M}|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \leq 3$. Combining this with the fact that for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $|(F|_{S_M})|_{C^1(S_M, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |(B|_{S_M})|_{C^1(S_M, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} +$

$|\phi_{\gamma,M}|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < \infty$, and the fact that for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\phi_{\gamma,M}(H_\gamma) \subseteq S_M$ show that for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.41) \quad |F_M|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}})} + |B_M|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} < \infty.$$

Hence, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, and all $x \in H_\gamma$ there exists an $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted stochastic process $\mathcal{X}^{N, M, x}: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H_\gamma$ with continuous sample paths such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$(4.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x} &= e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} \phi_{\gamma+\vartheta, M}(x) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x}) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s \end{aligned}$$

(cf. e.g., Proposition 7.1.19 in Jentzen [18] or Theorem 6.1 in van Neerven, Veraar & Weis [35]). We now proof the assertion by contradiction. Therefore assume that

$$(4.43) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta} \\ \|x\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \leq R}} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|X^{N, x} - X^{0, x}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \vee \mathbb{P}[\|X^{0, x}\|_{C^0([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \geq N] \right) > 0.$$

Then there exist a sequence $(x_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ such that $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|x_N\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \leq R$ and that

$$(4.44) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|X^{N, x_N} - X^{0, x_N}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \vee \mathbb{P}[\|X^{0, x_N}\|_{C^0([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \geq N] \right) > 0.$$

Since $H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ is compactly embedded in H_γ we can assume that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|x_0 - x_N\|_{H_\gamma} = 0$ (otherwise take a subsequence and choose x_0 accordingly). Next denote for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\tau_{N, M}: \Omega \rightarrow [0, T]$ the function satisfying that

$$(4.45) \quad \tau_{N, M} = \left\{ T \mathbb{1}_{R \leq M} \wedge \inf\{t \in [0, T]: \|\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq M\} \right\}.$$

Moreover, note that (4.45) and the fact that $\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|x_N\|_{\gamma+\vartheta} \leq R$ ensure that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $M \in \mathbb{N} \cap (R, \infty)$, and all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$(4.46) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N} - e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} x_N \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau_{N, M}\}} = \left(\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N} - e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} \phi_{\gamma+\vartheta, M}(x_N) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau_{N, M}\}} \\ &= \left(\int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau_{N, M}\}} \\ &= \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s < \tau_{N, M}\}} e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s < \tau_{N, M}\}} e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B_M(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau_{N, M}\}} \\ &= \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s < \tau_{N, M}\}} e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{s < \tau_{N, M}\}} e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(\mathcal{X}_s^{N, M, x_N}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau_{N, M}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$(4.47) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\forall t \in [0, T]: \mathbb{1}_{\{R \leq M\}} \mathcal{X}_{\min\{t, \tau_{N, M}\}}^{N, M, x_N} = \mathbb{1}_{\{R \leq M\}} X_{\min\{t, \tau_{N, M}\}}^{N, x_N}\right) = 1$$

(cf. e.g., Proposition 7.1.10 in Jentzen [18] or Lemma 8.2 in van Neerven, Veraar & Weis [35]). This ensures that for all $M \in \mathbb{N} \cap (R, \infty)$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds that

$$(4.48) \quad \mathbb{P}(\forall t \in [0, T]: \mathcal{X}_{\min\{t, \tau_{N, M}\}}^{N, M, x_N} = X_{\min\{t, \tau_{N, M}\}}^{N, x_N}) = 1.$$

Combining this with (4.45) shows that for all $M \in \mathbb{N} \cap (R, \infty)$, $m \in (0, M]$, and all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ it holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. that

$$(4.49) \quad \inf(\{t \in [0, T]: \|X_t^{N, x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq m\} \cup \{T\}) = \inf(\{t \in [0, T]: \|\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq m\} \cup \{T\}).$$

Therefore, we obtain for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $M \in \mathbb{N} \cap (R, \infty)$ that

$$(4.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} < M\right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|\mathcal{X}_t^{0, M, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma}) + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|\mathcal{X}_t^{N, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}_t^{0, M, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma}) < M\right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|\mathcal{X}_t^{0, M, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma}) + \|\mathcal{X}^{N, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < M\right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathcal{X}_t^{0, M, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1, \|\mathcal{X}^{N, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1\right) \\ & = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1, \|\mathcal{X}^{N, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $M \in \mathbb{N} \cap (R, \infty)$ that

$$(4.51) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathcal{X}_t^{0, M, x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} < M\right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t^{0, x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1, \|\mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the fact that for all $x \in H_\gamma$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\|\phi_{\gamma, M}(x)\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M + 1$ together with the assumptions ensures that for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$(4.52) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B_M(v)(\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{v \in S_M} \frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$(4.53) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sup_{v \in H_\gamma} \frac{\|B_M(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) \leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sup_{v \in S_M} \frac{\|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right) < \infty.$$

This, (4.41), and Corollary 4.3 then imply for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $p \in (1/\vartheta, \infty)$ that

$$(4.54) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0} - \mathcal{X}^{N, M, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} = 0$$

and that

$$(4.55) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_N}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})})} = 0.$$

Thus we get for all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$(4.56) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{X}^{N, M, x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0, M, x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1\right) \right) = 1$$

and that

$$(4.57) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{P} \left(\|\mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1 \right) \right) = 1.$$

Combining now (4.45), (4.50), (4.56), and the fact that $\forall \omega \in \Omega: \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}(\omega)\|_{H_\gamma} < \infty$ yields that

$$(4.58) \quad \begin{aligned} & \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\{\tau_{N,M} = T\}) \geq \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\mathcal{X}_t^{N,M,x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} < M \right) \\ & \geq \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1, \|\mathcal{X}^{N,M,x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1 \right) \\ & = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1 \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we derive from (4.51), (4.57), and from the fact that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ it holds that $\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}(\omega)\|_{H_\gamma} < \infty$ that

$$(4.59) \quad \begin{aligned} & \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\|X^{0,x_N}\|_{C^0([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < N \right) \geq \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\|X^{0,x_N}\|_{C^0([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \leq M \right) \\ & = \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\mathcal{X}_t^{0,M,x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M \right) \\ & \geq \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1, \|\mathcal{X}_t^{0,M,x_N} - \mathcal{X}_t^{0,M,x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} < 1 \right) \\ & = \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_0}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq M - 1 \right) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and therefore it holds that

$$(4.60) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq N \right) = 1 - \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} < N \right) = 0.$$

Finally we obtain from (4.54), (4.55), (4.58), and from (4.60) that

$$(4.61) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|X^{N,x_N} - X^{0,x_N}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \\ & \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|X^{N,x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{N,M,x_N}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \right. \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{X}^{N,M,x_N} - \mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_0}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_0} - \mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_N}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{X}^{0,M,x_N} - X^{0,x_N}\|_{C^\delta([0,T],\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma})} \wedge 1] \right) \\ & \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{P}(\{\tau_{N,M} < T\}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|X_t^{0,x_N}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq M \right) \right) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.60) is a contradiction to (4.44). This finishes the proof of Theorem 4.4. \square

4.3. Existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations

In this section we prove the main theorem of this chapter (Theorem 4.5). This shows the existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations of SPDEs and establishes a representation of the viscosity solutions using the corresponding solutions of the SPDEs. Theorem 4.5

generalizes Theorem 4.16 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] to infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces.

Theorem 4.5 (Existence of viscosity solutions of Kolmogorov equations). *Assume the setting in Section 4.1, assume that $\gamma = 0$, and assume for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and all $x \in H$ that*

$$(4.62) \quad \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(\|X_r^{0,x} - X_r^{0,y}\|_H \geq \varepsilon) = 0,$$

let $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \theta \in (0, \infty)$, $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$, let $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(H, \mathbb{R})$ be bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded sets, let $u_0: [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function satisfying for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H$ that

$$(4.63) \quad u_0(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{0,x})],$$

let $V \in C_{\mathbb{H}}^2(\mathbb{H}, (1, \infty))$ satisfy that $D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V$ is uniformly continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ and the $\|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}^{\vartheta})}$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H , assume for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.64) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^{N,x})] < \infty,$$

assume that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \inf\{V(x) : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r\} = \infty$, and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup\{\frac{|\varphi(x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r\} = 0$, assume that

$$(4.65) \quad \begin{aligned} F|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} &\in C_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta-1/2}}(H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}, H_{\vartheta-1/2}) \quad \text{and that} \\ B|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}} &\in C_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}, \mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}(H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}, \mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})), \end{aligned}$$

assume that for all $x \in H_{2\vartheta}$ there exist $r_x \in (0, \infty)$, $R_x \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\xi \in H_{\vartheta}$ with $\|x - \xi\|_{H_{\vartheta}} \leq r_x$ it holds that

$$(4.66) \quad \|F(\xi)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \leq R_x(\|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1)$$

and that

$$(4.67) \quad \|B(\xi)\|_{\mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}^2 \leq R_x(\|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1),$$

assume that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \text{Id}_U$, that \mathcal{P}_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$, are finite-dimensional projections, and assume that for all \mathbb{H} -bounded sets $E \subseteq H$ it holds that

$$(4.68) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{\mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] < \infty$$

and that

$$(4.69) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\mathcal{P}_0 - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{\mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] = 0.$$

Then it holds that u_0 is continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm, that u_0 is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times H$, that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.70) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_0(t, x) - \varphi(\hat{x}) : x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}, t \in (0, \varepsilon), \frac{\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{\|\hat{x}\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r \right\} = 0,$$

that

$$(4.71) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|u_0(t, x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0,$$

and that $u_0|_{(0, T) \times H}$ is a viscosity solution of

$$(4.72) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) - \langle F(x) + A(x), (D_{\mathbb{H}} u)(t, x) \rangle_{H, H^{\vartheta}} - 1/2 \langle B(x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 u)(t, x) B(x)) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} = 0$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times H$ relative to $((0, T) \times H \ni (t, x) \rightarrow 1/2\|x\|_{H_{\vartheta}}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})$.

PROOF. We will show this theorem by an application of Lemma 2.18. In the first step we introduce some notation. Denote by $\phi: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $r \in [0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.73) \quad \phi(r) = \sqrt{r} \cdot \inf \left(\left\{ \sqrt{V(y)} : y \in H, |\varphi(y)| = r \right\} \cup \{r\} \right),$$

by $u_N: [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions satisfying for all $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in H$, and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$(4.74) \quad u_N(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{N,x})],$$

by $W \subseteq (0, T) \times H$ the set satisfying that $W = (0, T) \times H_{2\vartheta}$, by $F_N: ((0, T) \times H_1) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the functions satisfying for all $((t, x), r, p, C, \tilde{C}) \in ((0, T) \times H_1) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)'} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}'$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\forall y \in H_\vartheta: \tilde{C}y = \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} C(0, y)$ that

$$(4.75) \quad \begin{aligned} F_N((t, x), r, p, C) &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \tilde{C} B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}, \end{aligned}$$

by $\tilde{F}_N: ((0, T) \times V_N) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N, (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the functions satisfying for all $((t, x), r, p, C, \tilde{C}) \in ((0, T) \times V_N) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N, (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} \times \mathbb{S}_{V_N, V_N}'$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\forall y \in V_N: \tilde{C}y = \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} C(0, y)$ that

$$(4.76) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_N((t, x), r, p, C) &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p - \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H F(x) + \pi_{V_N}^H A(x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p \right\rangle_{V_N, V_N'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H B(x), I_{V_N}^{-1} \tilde{C} \pi_{V_N}^H B(x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, V_N)}, \end{aligned}$$

by $h: (0, T) \times H \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ the function satisfying for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times H$ that

$$(4.77) \quad h(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2,$$

let $d \in (0, \vartheta)$ satisfy that

$$(4.78) \quad \alpha + d < 1, \quad d + \chi < 1/2,$$

let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and let $(\tilde{e}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{U} . Note that (4.65) assures that \tilde{F}_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is well defined. Moreover, it holds for all $j \in (0, \infty)$ that the set $\{x \in H: \|x\|_{H_d} \leq j\}$ is compact in H . Thus it follows from the continuity of φ that for all $j \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that φ is uniformly continuous on the set $\{x \in H: \|x\|_{H_d} \leq j\}$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_d}$ -norm and therefore it holds that for all $j, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ there exists an $\varepsilon_{j, \delta} \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $x, y \in H$ with $\|x\|_{H_d} \vee \|y\|_{H_d} \leq j$ and with $\|x - y\|_H \leq \varepsilon_{j, \delta}$ it holds that

$$(4.79) \quad |\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq \delta.$$

In addition, note that (4.78) and Theorem 4.4 (with $\gamma \leftarrow d$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha + d$, $\beta \leftarrow \beta + d$, $\chi \leftarrow \chi + d$, $\vartheta \leftarrow \vartheta - d$, $F \leftarrow F|_{H_d}$, and with $B \leftarrow B|_{H_d}$) ensure for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.80) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_\vartheta \\ \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R}} \mathbb{E}[\|X^{N,x} - X^{0,x}\|_{C^0([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_d})} \wedge 1] = 0$$

and that

$$(4.81) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_\vartheta \\ \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R}} \mathbb{P}(\|X^{0,x}\|_{C^0([0, T], \|\cdot\|_{H_d})} \geq N) = 0$$

and therefore we get for all $R, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.82) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_\vartheta \\ \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq \varepsilon) = 0$$

and that

$$(4.83) \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{x \in H_\vartheta \\ \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq j) = 0.$$

Furthermore, note that (4.82), Fatou's lemma and (4.64) show that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.84) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0, T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^{0,x})] = \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0, T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} V(X_t^{N,x})] \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0, T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^{N,x})] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we get from $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{|\varphi(x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0$ and from the fact that φ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ there exist a $C_\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$(4.85) \quad |\varphi(x)| \leq C_\delta + \delta V(x)$$

and this together with (4.64) and with (4.84) ensures that u_N , $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, are well-defined. In the second step we will show (2.38). We derive with the fact that for all $j, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $\varepsilon_{j,\delta} < 1$, with (4.79) and with (4.85) that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $j, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $t \in (0, T)$ and all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$(4.86) \quad \begin{aligned} & |u_N(t, x) - u_0(t, x)| = \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{N,x})] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{0,x})] \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \varphi(X_t^{N,x}) - \varphi(X_t^{0,x}) \right| \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \leq \varepsilon_{j,\delta}} \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \leq j-1} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \varphi(X_t^{N,x}) - \varphi(X_t^{0,x}) \right| \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq j-1} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \varphi(X_t^{N,x}) - \varphi(X_t^{0,x}) \right| \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq \varepsilon_{j,\delta}} \right] \\ & \leq \delta + \mathbb{E} \left[(2C_\delta + \delta V(X_t^{N,x}) + \delta V(X_t^{0,x})) \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq j-1} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(2C_\delta + \delta V(X_t^{N,x}) + \delta V(X_t^{0,x})) \mathbb{1}_{\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq \varepsilon_{j,\delta}} \right] \\ & \leq \delta + 2C_\delta (\mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq j-1) + \mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq \varepsilon_{j,\delta})) + 2\delta \mathbb{E} \left[V(X_t^{N,x}) + V(X_t^{0,x}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.77), the fact for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $s \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_s$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_s} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, (4.64), (4.84), (4.86), (4.83), and (4.82) then shows for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.87) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t,x) \in \{(s,y) \in (0, T) \times H : \|(s,y)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H} \leq \tilde{R}, h(s,y) \leq R\}} |u_N(t, x) - u_0(t, x)| \\ & \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(t,x) \in \{(s,y) \in (0, T) \times H : \|(s,y)\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta} \leq R\}} |u_N(t, x) - u_0(t, x)| \\ & \leq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \{y \in H : \|y\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R\}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\delta + 4C_\delta (\mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq j-1) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}(\|X_t^{N,x} - X_t^{0,x}\|_{H_d} \geq \varepsilon_{j,\delta})) + 2\delta \mathbb{E} \left[V(X_t^{N,x}) + V(X_t^{0,x}) \right] \right) \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

and this proves (2.38). Furthermore, it follows from (4.85) and from (4.64) that for all $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, T) \times H$ it holds that

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0, T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} |u_N(t, x) - u_N(t_0, x_0)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{N,x})] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_0}^{N,x_0})] \right| \\
(4.88) \quad &\leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \mathbb{E} \left[(2C_1 + V(X_t^{N,x}) + V(X_{t_0}^{N,x_0})) \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{(t,x) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|x\|_H \leq R}} \left(2C_1 + \mathbb{E} \left[V(X_t^{N,x}) + V(X_{t_0}^{N,x_0}) \right] \right) < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

and this verifies (2.39). Moreover it follows from (4.62) and the continuity of φ that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H$ it holds that

$$(4.89) \quad \limsup_{(s,y) \rightarrow (t,x)} \mathbb{P}(\|\varphi(X_t^{0,x}) - \varphi(X_s^{0,y})\|_H > \varepsilon) = 0.$$

In addition note that we get from (4.73) the fact that φ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded sets and from the fact that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{|\varphi(x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.90) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(r)}{r} &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \inf \left(\{ \sqrt{V(y)} : y \in H, |\varphi(y)| = r \} \cup \{r\} \right) \right) \\
&= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\inf \left(\{ \sqrt{\frac{V(y)}{|\varphi(y)|}} : y \in H, |\varphi(y)| = r \} \cup \{ \sqrt{r} \} \right) \right) = \infty
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.91) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{\phi(|\varphi(x)|)}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\
&= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{|\varphi(x)|}}{V(x)} \cdot \inf \left(\{ \sqrt{V(y)} : y \in H, |\varphi(y)| = |\varphi(x)| \} \cup \{r\} \right) : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\
&\leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{|\varphi(x)|}}{V(x)} \cdot \sqrt{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the fact that φ is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded sets and (4.73) show that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$(4.92) \quad \phi(|\varphi(x)|) \leq V(x) + C$$

and therefore it follows from (4.84) that there exist a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H$ it holds that

$$(4.93) \quad \sup_{\substack{(s,y) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|y\|_H \leq \|x\|_H + 1}} \mathbb{E}[\phi(|\varphi(X_s^{0,y})|)] \leq \sup_{\substack{(s,y) \in (0,T) \times H \\ \|y\|_H \leq \|x\|_H + 1}} \mathbb{E}[V(X_s^{0,y}) + C] < \infty.$$

Combining (4.93) and (4.90) ensures that for all $x \in H$ it holds that $\{\varphi(X_s^{0,y}) : (s, y) \in [0, T] \times H, \|y\|_H \leq \|x\|_H + 1\}$ is uniformly integrable and combining this and (4.89) proves that

$$(4.94) \quad \lim_{(s,y) \rightarrow (t,x)} |u_0(t, x) - u_0(s, y)| \leq \lim_{(s,y) \rightarrow (t,x)} \mathbb{E}[|\varphi(X_s^{0,y}) - \varphi(X_t^{0,x})|] = 0.$$

This verifies that $u_0 \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}([0, T] \times H, \mathbb{R})$. In the next step we show (2.37). Observe that similarly as in Theorem 4.16 in Hairer, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [14] where we can replace the assumption on V by (4.64) and the time set $[0, \infty)$ by $[0, T]$ it follows that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $u_N|_{(0,T) \times V_N}$ is a classical viscosity solution of

$$(4.95) \quad \tilde{F}_N((t, x), u(t, x), (D_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N} u)(t, x)), (D_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N}^2 u)(t, x)) = 0,$$

for $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times V_N$ and therefore is also continuous with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N}$ -norm. Furthermore, it holds that $h|_{(0,T) \times H_\vartheta} \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2((0, T) \times H_\vartheta, \mathbb{R})$. Moreover, we get for all $x, y \in H_\vartheta$ that $\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 = \|y\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 + 2\langle y, x - y \rangle_{H_\vartheta} + \langle x - y, x - y \rangle_{H_\vartheta} \geq \|y\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 + 2\langle I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(x_0), x - y \rangle_{H'_\vartheta, H_\vartheta}$ and thus we get from Definition 2.1 and from the fact that for all $x \in H_\vartheta$ and all $y \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that $\langle I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(y), x \rangle_{H'_\vartheta, H_\vartheta} = \langle y, x \rangle_{H_\vartheta} = \langle (-A)^{2\vartheta} y, x \rangle_H = \langle I_{\mathbb{H}}((-A)^{2\vartheta} y), x \rangle_{H', H}$ that $\{(t, y) \in (0, T) \times$

$H: (J_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, -}^2 h)(t, y) \neq \emptyset\} = \{(t, y) \in (0, T) \times H: I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(y) \in D(E_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'})\} = (0, T) \times H_{2\vartheta} = W$. In addition, note that we have for all $(t, x) \in W$ that

$$(4.96) \quad \begin{aligned} E_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)', (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}((D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}(h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(t, x)) &= I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(0, (-A)^{2\vartheta}(x)), \\ (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2(h|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}))(t, x) &= I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we obtain from (4.75) that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, and all $(C_\lambda)_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$ it holds that

$$(4.97) \quad \begin{aligned} &\liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left(F_N((t, x), r, p, (C_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta} - \lambda I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times V_N^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}) \right) \\ &= \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left(F_N((t, x), r, p, (C_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}) + 1/2 \langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \lambda I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{V_N^\perp}^{H_\vartheta} B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F_N((t, x), r, p, (C_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}). \end{aligned}$$

Analogous it follows for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $z \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, and all $(C_\lambda)_{\lambda \in (0, \infty)} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$ it hold that

$$(4.98) \quad \begin{aligned} &\limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \left(F_N(z, r, p, (C_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta} + \lambda I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times V_N^\perp}^{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}) \right) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\lambda \downarrow 0} F_N(z, r, p, (C_\lambda|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we derive that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t, x) \in W$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{p} \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)'}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'$, and all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N, (\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'}$ with

$$(4.99) \quad \forall (t_1, x_1) \in \mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta: \langle p, (t_1, \pi_{V_N}^H x_1) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)', \mathbb{R} \times V_N} = \langle \tilde{p}|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}, (t_1, x_1) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)', \mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta}$$

and with

$$(4.100) \quad \begin{aligned} &\forall (t_1, x_1), (t_2, x_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta: \\ &\langle C(t_1, \pi_{V_N}^H x_1), (t_2, \pi_{V_N}^H x_2) \rangle_{V_N, V_N} = \langle (t_1, x_1), \tilde{C}(t_2, x_2) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta, (\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} \end{aligned}$$

it holds that

$$(4.101) \quad \begin{aligned} &F_N((t, x), r, \tilde{p}, \tilde{C}) \\ &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \tilde{p} - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \tilde{p} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} \tilde{C}(0, B(\pi_{V_N}^H x)) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\ &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p - \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + \pi_{V_N}^H A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \tilde{p} \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \tilde{e}_i, \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} \tilde{C}(0, B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \tilde{e}_i) \right\rangle_{H_\vartheta, H_\vartheta'} \\ &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p - \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + \pi_{V_N}^H A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p \right\rangle_{V_N, V_N'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \tilde{e}_i, \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} C(0, \pi_{V_N}^H B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \tilde{e}_i) \right\rangle_{V_N, V_N'} \\ &= I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p - \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + \pi_{V_N}^H A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times V_N)'} p \right\rangle_{V_N, V_N'} \\ &\quad - 1/2 \left\langle \pi_{V_N}^H B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{V_N}^{-1} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta)'} C(0, \pi_{V_N}^H B(\pi_{V_N}^H x)) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, V_N)} \\ &= \tilde{F}(\pi_{V_N}^H x, r, p, C). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Proposition 2.22 (with $f \leftarrow \pi_{\mathbb{R} \times V_N}^{\mathbb{R} \times H}$, $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{V} \leftarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{V}_N$, $\mathbb{X} \leftarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta$) yields that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that u_N is a viscosity solution of $F_N|_{W \times \mathbb{R} \times H' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}'_\vartheta}} = 0$ relative to $(h, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$. Next observe that the continuity of u_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm together with the definition of h shows that for all $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times H$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t, x) = \overline{(u_n - \delta h)_{\mathbb{H}}^W}(t, x) = u_0(t, x) - \frac{\delta}{2} \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2$. Thus the continuity of u_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm implies that for all $(t_n, x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq (0, T) \times H$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ with

$$(4.102) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(|(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_0, x_0) - (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_n, x_n)| \vee |t_0 - t_n| \vee \|x_n - x_0\|_H \right) = 0$$

it holds that

$$(4.103) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(|(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_0, x_0) - (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_n, x_n)| \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(|u_0(t_0, x_0) - \frac{\delta}{2} \|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 - u_0(t_n, x_n) + \frac{\delta}{2} \|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2| \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\delta}{2} \left| \|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 - \|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \right| \right). \end{aligned}$$

This the fact that for all $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq H$ and all $x_0 \in H_\vartheta$ it holds that $(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} = 0) \Leftrightarrow (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x_n - x_0\|_H \vee \left| \|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 - \|x_n\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \right|) = 0)$, the continuity of u_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}$ -norm, and the continuity of $h|_{(0, T) \times H_\vartheta}$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}$ -norm show that for all $(t_n, x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, T) \times H$, $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, T) \times H_\vartheta$, and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.104) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(|(u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_0, x_0) - (u_0)_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h}^-, W(t_n, x_n)| \vee |t_0 - t_n| \vee \|x_n - x_0\|_H \right) = 0 \right) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x_n - x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} \vee |t_0 - t_n|) = 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain with (2.7) that for all $((t_n, x_n), r_n, p_n, C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq ((0, T) \times H) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.105) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^-, W(((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0), ((t_n, x_n), r_n, p_n, C_n)) = 0 \right) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left(\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x_n - x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} \vee |t_n - t_0| \vee \|p_0 - p_n\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \vee \|C_0 - C_n\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')}) = 0 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \wedge (x_0 \in H_\vartheta) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, note that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ there exists an $M_\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $x \in H_\vartheta$ it holds that

$$(4.106) \quad \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}, \text{ and that } \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + M_\varepsilon \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2$$

and this together with (4.66) and with $\vartheta \geq 1/2$ implies that for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $\xi \in H_{2\vartheta}$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, and all $\rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$ with $\|x - \xi\|_\vartheta \leq r_x$ it holds that

$$(4.107) \quad \begin{aligned} &-\left\langle F(\xi) + A(\xi), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ &\geq -\delta \|F(\xi)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} - \|F(\xi)\|_H \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} - \|\xi\|_{H_1} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + \delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 \\ &\geq -\delta \|F(\xi)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} - \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|F(\xi)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \\ &\quad - \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + \delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 \\ &\geq -\|F(\xi)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \left(\delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \right) \\ &-\left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + \delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 \\ &\geq -R_x (\|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} + 1) \left(\delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + \delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 \\
\geq & - R_x (\varepsilon \|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} + M_\varepsilon \|\xi\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1) (\delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'}) \\
& - \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} \|\rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } + \delta \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (4.67) and (4.106) that for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $\xi \in H_{2\vartheta}$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ and all $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle z, \mathfrak{D}y \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle (0, z), \mathfrak{C}(0, y) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'}$ and with $\|x - \xi\|_\vartheta \leq r_x$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \langle B(\xi), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\
\geq & - \delta \|B(\xi)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 - \langle B(\xi), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1} \mathfrak{D} B(\xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
\geq & - \delta \|B(\xi)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 - \|B(\xi)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \|\mathfrak{D}\|_{L(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}')} \\
(4.108) \quad \geq & - \|B(\xi)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 (\delta + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta} \right) \|\mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')}) \\
\geq & - R_x (\|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + 1) (\delta + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta} \right) \|\mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')}) \\
\geq & - R_x (\varepsilon \|\xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 + M_\varepsilon \|\xi\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 + 1) (\delta + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta} \right) \|\mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain from (4.107) and from (4.108) that for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $\xi \in H_{2\vartheta}$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, \rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$, $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, and all $K_1, K_2, K_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying that $\|x - \xi\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq 1 \wedge r_x$, that $\|p - \rho\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } \leq 1$, that $\|C - \mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} \leq 1$, that $\forall y, z \in H: \langle z, \mathfrak{D}y \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle (0, z), \mathfrak{C}(0, y) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &= \frac{3}{2} R_x \delta + \frac{1}{2} R_x \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta} \right) (\|C\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} + 1), \\
K_2 &= R_x \varepsilon \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) (\|p\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } + 1) + \delta R_x (M_\varepsilon (\|x\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1) + 1) \\
(4.109) \quad & + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) (\|p\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } + 1), \\
K_3 &= (\|p\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } + 1) + R_x (M_\varepsilon (\|x\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1) + 1) \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta} \right) (\|p\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)' } + 1) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} R_x (M_\varepsilon (\|x\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1)^2 + 1) (\delta + \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta} \right) (\|C\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} + 1)),
\end{aligned}$$

and satisfying that $\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1 > 0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho - \left\langle F(\xi) + A(\xi), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
& - 1/2 \langle B(\xi), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \\
(4.110) \quad \geq & \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 (\delta - \varepsilon K_1) - \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} K_2 - K_3 \\
& = \frac{\delta}{2} \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 + \left(\frac{\delta}{2} - \varepsilon K_1 \right) \left(\|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} - \frac{K_2}{\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1} \right)^2 - \frac{K_2^2}{2(\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1)} - K_3 \\
& \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 - \frac{K_2^2}{2(\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1)} - K_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, (2.4) and (4.96) yield that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $\xi \in H_{2\vartheta}$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, $\tau \in (0, T)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ and all $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle z, \mathfrak{D}y \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle (0, z), \mathfrak{C}(0, y) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C}) \\
(4.111) \quad & = F_0((\tau, \xi), \nu + \frac{\delta}{2} \|\xi\|_{H_\vartheta}^2, \rho + \delta I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(0, (-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi)), (\mathfrak{C}|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta})|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta} + \delta I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) \\
& = I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho - \left\langle F(\xi) + A(\xi), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi) \right\rangle_{H, H'}
\end{aligned}$$

$$-1/2 \langle B(\xi), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\xi) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}.$$

Combining (2.8), (4.105), (4.110), and (4.111) implies then that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, and all $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$ there exist an $L_{\delta, x, p, C} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(4.112) \quad \begin{aligned} & (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \\ &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C}) : \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)', \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}', d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((t, x), r, p, C), ((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ &= \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C}) : \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)', \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}', \|\xi\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}} \leq L_{\delta, x, p, C}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((t, x), r, p, C), ((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that for all $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H$ with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} < \infty$ and with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_0\|_H = 0$ it holds that $x_0 \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$ and that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to x_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}$ -norm. Hence, we derive from the fact that $H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}$ and $H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}$ are compactly embedded in $H_{\vartheta+1/2}$ that for all $y \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$ and all $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H$ with $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} < \infty$ and with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - x_0\|_H = 0$ it holds that

$$(4.113) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|x_0 - x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}}^2 + \|x_0 - x_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 + |\langle y, x - x_0 \rangle_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}| \right) = 0.$$

Thus we get from (2.8), (4.65), (4.96), (4.113), the lower semicontinuity of $H \ni y \rightarrow \|y\|_{\vartheta+1/2}^2 \in [0, \infty]$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, and from $1 \leq \vartheta + 1/2$, that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $((\tau_n, \xi_n), \nu_n, \rho_n, \mathfrak{C}_n, \mathfrak{D}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq W \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, $x \in H_\vartheta$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, with

$$(4.114) \quad \forall y, z \in H: \langle (0, x), C(0, y) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'} = \langle y, \tilde{C}z \rangle_{H, H'},$$

$$(4.115) \quad \forall y, z \in H, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \langle (0, y), \mathfrak{C}_n(0, z) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'} = \langle y, \mathfrak{D}_n z \rangle_{H, H'},$$

$$(4.116) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_n\|_{\vartheta+1/2} < \infty,$$

$$(4.117) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x - \xi_n\|_H \vee \|p - \rho_n\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \vee \|C - \mathfrak{C}\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} = 0$$

it holds that

$$(4.118) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h}^+((\tau_n, \xi_n), \nu_n, \rho_n, \mathfrak{C}_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_0((\tau_n, \xi_n), \nu_n + \delta \|\xi_n\|_\vartheta^2, \rho_n + I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}, (0, (-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi_n)), \mathfrak{C}_n + \delta I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho_n - \left\langle F(\xi_n) + A(\xi_n), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho_n + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi_n) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 1/2 \langle B(\xi_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D}_n + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\xi_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} \rho_n - \left\langle F(\xi_n) + A(\xi_n), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad - \left\langle F(\xi_n) + A(\xi_n), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (\rho_n - p) \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(\xi_n) \rangle_H \\ & \quad - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} (F(x) - F(\xi_n)), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(\xi_n) \rangle_H + \delta \|\xi_n\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\ & \quad \left. - 1/2 \langle B(\xi_n), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{D}_n + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\xi_n) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right) \\ &\geq I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(x) + A(x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x) \rangle_H \\ & \quad + \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - 1/2 \langle B(x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(x) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (4.112) and (4.118) ensure that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle (0, y), C(0, z) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'} = \langle y, \tilde{C}z \rangle_{H, H'}$, it holds that

$$(4.119) \quad \begin{aligned} & (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \\ & \geq I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(x) + A(x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x) \rangle_H \\ & \quad + \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - 1/2 \left\langle B(x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, it holds for all $x \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$ that $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}: \pi_{V_N}^H x \in H_{2\vartheta}$ and that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|x - \pi_{V_N}^H x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} = 0$. Thus (2.8), (2.4), (4.65), (4.96), (4.105), and (4.111) shows for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle (0, y), C(0, z) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'} = \langle y, \tilde{C}z \rangle_{H, H'}$, that

$$(4.120) \quad \begin{aligned} & (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \\ & \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h}^+((t, \pi_{V_N}^H x), r, p, C) \\ & = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_0((t, \pi_{V_N}^H x), r + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x\|_{\vartheta}^2, p + I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}, (0, (-A)^{2\vartheta}(\pi_{V_N}^H x)), C + \delta I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}} \pi_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) \\ & = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}} (-A)^{2\vartheta}(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \right) \\ & = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(\pi_{V_N}^H x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \rangle_H + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \right) \\ & = I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(x) + A(x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x) \rangle_H \\ & \quad + \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - 1/2 \left\langle B(x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.118) and (4.120) yields that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$, with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle (0, y), C(0, z) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'} = \langle y, \tilde{C}z \rangle_{H, H'}$, it holds that

$$(4.121) \quad \begin{aligned} & (F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((x, t), r, p, C) \\ & = I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(x) + A(x), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} - \delta \langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x) \rangle_H \\ & \quad + \delta \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - 1/2 \left\langle B(x), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the fact that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that V_N is finite-dimensional implies for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq H$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi_{V_N}^H(x_n - x_0)\|_H = 0$ that

$$(4.122) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi_{V_N}^H(x_n - x_0)\|_{H_r} = 0.$$

Therefore, we get from (2.4), (2.8), (4.65), and from (4.122) that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, $x \in H$, $p \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)'$, $C \in \mathbb{S}_{(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}), (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $\tilde{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}$ with $\forall y, z \in H: \langle y, \tilde{C}z \rangle_{H, H'} = \langle (0, y), C(0, z) \rangle_{\mathbb{R} \times H, (\mathbb{R} \times H)'}$ it holds that

$$(4.123) \quad \begin{aligned} & (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t, x), r, p, C) \\ & = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h}^+((\tau, \xi), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C}) : \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}, \quad d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((x, t), r, p, C), ((\xi, \tau), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \} \\
& = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{ F_N((\tau, \pi_{V_N}^H \xi), \nu + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H \xi\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2, \rho + I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(0, (-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi)), \mathfrak{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta} \pi_{\{0\} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) : \\
& \quad \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \nu \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in (\mathbb{R} \times H)', \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}, \\
& \quad d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((x, t), r, p, C), ((\xi, \tau), \nu, \rho, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \} \\
& = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{ \rho_1 - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \rho_2 + \delta \pi_{V_N}^{H'} I_{\mathbb{H}}(-A)^{2\vartheta}(\xi) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\
& \quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} : \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \\
& \quad \nu, \rho_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \rho_2 \in H', \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, |\rho_1 - I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p| \leq \varepsilon, \\
& \quad d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}((t, x, r, \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p, \tilde{C}), (\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho_2, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \} \\
& = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{ \rho_1 - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \rho_2 \right\rangle_{H, H'} + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H \xi\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\
& \quad - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2} (\pi_{V_N}^H \xi) \right\rangle_H \\
& \quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\mathfrak{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H \xi) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} : \xi \in H_{2\vartheta}, \tau \in (0, T), \\
& \quad \nu, \rho_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \rho_2 \in H', \mathfrak{C} \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H}'}, |\rho_1 - I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p| \leq \varepsilon, \\
& \quad d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}((t, x, r, \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p, \tilde{C}), (\tau, \xi, \nu, \rho_2, \mathfrak{C})) \leq \varepsilon \} \\
& = I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p \right\rangle_{H, H'} + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\
& \quad - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(\pi_{V_N}^H x), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2} (\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_H \\
& \quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.105), (4.110), and (4.123) yields for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq (\mathbb{R} \times H_\vartheta) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})}'$, and all $K_1, K_2, K_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$(4.124) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} = \infty,$$

$$(4.125) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0), ((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)) = 0,$$

$$(4.126) \quad K_1 = 2R_{x_0} \delta + R_{x_0} (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta}) (\|C_0\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} + 1),$$

$$(4.127) \quad \begin{aligned} K_2 &= R_{x_0} \varepsilon (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\|p_0\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + 1) + \delta R_{x_0} (M_\varepsilon (\|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1) + 1) \\ &+ (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\|p_0\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + 1), \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.128) \quad \begin{aligned} K_3 &= (\|p_0\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + 1) + R_{x_0} (M_\varepsilon (\|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1) + 1) (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{1/2-\vartheta}) (\|p_0\|_{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} + 1) \\ &+ R_{x_0} (M_\varepsilon (\|x_0\|_{H_\vartheta} + 1)^2 + 1) (\delta + (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\lambda_n|^{-2\vartheta})) (\|C_0\|_{L(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})')} + 1), \end{aligned}$$

and with $\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1 > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \\
& = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_N - \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_N \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\
(4.129) \quad & \quad \left. + \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2} (\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) \right\rangle_H \right. \\
& \quad \left. - 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}(\tilde{C} + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\delta}{2} \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta}}^2 - \frac{K_2^2}{2(\delta - 2\varepsilon K_1)} - K_3 \right) = \infty.$$

Thus we derive from the lower semicontinuity of $H \ni y \rightarrow \|y\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \in [0, \infty]$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and all $((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq ((0, T) \times H) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0), ((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)) = 0$ and with $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \leq 0$ it holds that

$$(4.130) \quad \|x_0\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}} < \infty$$

and therefore

$$(4.131) \quad x_0 \in H_{\vartheta+1/2}.$$

Combining (4.65), (4.105), (4.113), (4.123), (4.121), (4.130), (4.131), the fact that $\vartheta + 1/2 \geq 1$, and the lower semicontinuity of $H \ni x \rightarrow \|x\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \in [0, \infty]$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm shows that for all $((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq ((0, T) \times H) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ with

$$(4.132) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{-, W}(((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0), ((t_n, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)) = 0$$

and with $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \leq 0$ it holds that

$$(4.133) \quad \begin{aligned} & \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left((F_0)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (F_N)_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}, \delta, h, u_0}^+((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \right) \\ &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_0 - \left\langle F(x_0) + A(x_0), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_0 \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x_0), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x_0) \right\rangle_H + \delta \|x_0\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\ & \quad - 1/2 \left\langle B(x_0), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C}_0 + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(x_0) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} - I_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1} \pi_1^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_N \\ & \quad + \left\langle F(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) + A(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), \pi_{V_N}^{H'} \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_N \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ & \quad + \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) \right\rangle_H - \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\ & \quad \left. + 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C}_N + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \right) \\ &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(- \left\langle F(x_0) - F(x_N) + A(x_0) - A(x_N), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} p_0 \right\rangle_{H, H'} \right. \\ & \quad - \left\langle F(x_N) + A(x_N), \pi_2^{(\mathbb{R} \times H)'} (p_0 - p_N) \right\rangle_{H, H'} \\ & \quad - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} F(x_0), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x_0 - x_N) \right\rangle_H \\ & \quad - \delta \left\langle (-A)^{\vartheta-1/2} (F(x_0) - F(x_N)), (-A)^{\vartheta+1/2}(x_N) \right\rangle_H + \delta \|x_0\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \\ & \quad - \delta \|x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - 1/2 \left\langle B(x_0), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C}_0 + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(x_0) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \\ & \quad \left. + 1/2 \left\langle B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}(\tilde{C}_N + \delta I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}) B(\pi_{V_N}^H x_N) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \right) \\ &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\delta \|x_0\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 - \delta \|\pi_{V_N}^H x_N\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2}}^2 \right) \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

which shows (2.37). Analogously it follows that for all $((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq ((0, T) \times H) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R} \times H)' \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H})'}$ and all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ with

$$(4.134) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \delta, h, u_0}^{+, W}(((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0), ((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N)) = 0$$

and with $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} (F_N)^-_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h, u_0}((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \geq 0$ it holds that

$$(4.135) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left((F_0)^-_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h, u_0}((t_0, x_0), r_0, p_0, C_0) - (F_N)^-_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \delta, h, u_0}((t_N, x_N), r_N, p_N, C_N) \right) \geq 0.$$

It remains to prove that u_0 is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H and fulfills (4.70) and (4.71). Therefore note that it follows from (4.84) and from (4.85) that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.136) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in \{y \in H : \|y\|_H \leq R\}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |u_0(t, x)| \leq \sup_{x \in \{y \in H : \|y\|_H \leq R\}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[|\varphi(X_t^{0,x})|] \\ & \leq \sup_{x \in \{y \in H : \|y\|_H \leq R\}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[C_1 + V(X_t^{0,x})] \leq C_1 + V(R)e^{\theta T} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, combining (4.84) and (4.85) yields that for all $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(4.137) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|u_0(t, x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\ & \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}[|\varphi(X_t^{0,x})|]}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\ & \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}[C_\delta + \delta V(X_t^{0,x})]}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\ & \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{C_\delta + \delta V(x)e^{\theta t}}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} \\ & = \delta e^{\theta T} \end{aligned}$$

and thus it holds that

$$(4.138) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|u_0(t, x)|}{V(x)} : x \in H, \|x\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0.$$

In addition, the continuity of φ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H , the continuity of u_0 with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times H$, the fact that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that the set $\{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H : \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R\}$ is compact and the fact that V is bounded on \mathbb{H} -bounded subsets of H imply for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(4.139) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ u_0(t, x) - \varphi(\hat{x}) : x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}, t, \hat{t} \in (0, T), \frac{e^{-\theta t} \|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{e^{-\theta \hat{t}} \|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ & = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sup \left\{ u_0(0, x) - \varphi(\hat{x}) : x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}, \frac{\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{\|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r \right\} \\ & = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sup \left\{ \varphi(x) - \varphi(\hat{x}) : x, \hat{x} \in H_{2\vartheta}, \frac{\|x\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(x)} \vee \frac{\|\hat{x}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{V(\hat{x})} \leq R, \|x\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|x - \hat{x}\|_H \leq r \right\} \\ & = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and this finishes the proof of Theorem 4.5. \square

Regularity estimates

In this chapter we establish some auxiliary results, which we need for the next chapter. In particular in Section 5.2 we estimate the product of two functions in a Besov space. More precisely, given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $p \in (1, 2]$, $s \in [0, \infty)$, a Lipschitz domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and a suitable family of Hilbert spaces H_r , $r \in \mathbb{R}$, having the interpolation properties (e.g. Sobolev spaces, see also Setting 5.1) we establish sufficient conditions for $r_1, r_2, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1} \cap H_{\tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.1) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^s(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}),$$

where $B_{p,2}^s(\Omega)$ denotes the Besov space (see Notation 5.1). In Section 5.3 we establish estimates for compositions of functions. Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.14 give bounds on the Slobodeckij semi-norm, Lemma 5.12 and Lemma 5.15 on the L^2 -norm, and Corollary 5.13 and Corollary 5.16 combine these results.

Throughout this chapter the following notation is used.

5.1. Notation

Let $|\cdot|: \bigcup_{d=1}^\infty \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function satisfying for all $d \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $(y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that

$$(5.2) \quad |x| = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -x & \text{if } x < 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and that} \quad |y| = \sum_{i=1}^d |y_i|.$$

For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we say that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a Lipschitz set if Ω is either \mathbb{R}^d , the graph above a Lipschitz function, or a bounded Lipschitz domain. Moreover, for $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$ the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure μ^d , and an Lipschitz set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $L^0(\Omega)$ the set of all Lebesgue measurable functions, by $\mathbb{B}_{p,q}^l(\Omega)$, $l \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, $q \in [1, \infty]$ the Besov spaces (see, e.g., Definition 2 on page 8 in Runst & Sickel [31] and Definition 1.1 and Section 1.2 in Rychkov [32]) satisfying for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $(p, q) \in [1, \infty]^2 \setminus \{2, 2\}$ that $\mathbb{B}_{p,q}^l(\Omega) = (B_{p,q}^l(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_{B_{p,q}^l(\Omega)})$, and that $\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^l(\Omega) = (B_{2,2}^l(\Omega), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{B_{2,2}^l(\Omega)}, \|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^l(\Omega)})$, by $\mathbb{L}^p(\Omega)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, the Banach spaces satisfying for all $p \in [1, \infty] \setminus \{2\}$ that $\mathbb{L}^p(\Omega) = (L^p(\Omega), \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\Omega)}) = (L^p(\mu^d, \Omega), \|\cdot\|_{L^p(\mu^d, \Omega)})$ and that $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega) = (L^2(\Omega), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) = (L^2(\mu^d, \Omega), \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2(\mu^d, \Omega)}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mu^d, \Omega)})$, by $\mathbb{B}_{p,q}^l(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $l \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, $q \in [1, \infty]$ the Besov spaces satisfying for all $l \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, and all $q \in [1, \infty]$ that $\mathbb{B}_{p,q}^l(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) = \otimes_{i=1}^n \mathbb{B}_{p,q}^l(\Omega)$, and by $\mathbb{L}^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, the Banach spaces satisfying for all $p \in [1, \infty]$ that $\mathbb{L}^p(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n) = \otimes_{i=1}^n \mathbb{L}^p(\Omega)$.

5.2. Hölder-Sobolev type inequalities

Throughout this subsection the following setting is frequently used.

Setting 5.1. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain, let $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, let $\mathbb{H}_r = (H_r, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_r}, \|\cdot\|_{H_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of Hilbert spaces satisfying for all $r \in [0, \infty)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $t \in [s, \infty)$ that $H_r \subseteq B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)$, that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r , and that $H_t \subseteq H_s$ and satisfying that for all $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]$ and for all $x \in H_r$ with $s_1 + s_2 = 1$, and with $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$ it holds that*

$$(5.3) \quad \|x\|_{H_r} \leq (K_{r_1} \|x\|_{H_{r_1}})^{s_1} \cdot (K_{r_2} \|x\|_{H_{r_2}})^{s_2}.$$

Let $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H) = \mathbb{H}_0$, and let $\mathbb{H}'_r = (H'_r, \|\cdot\|_{H'_r})$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, be the corresponding dual spaces. By abuse of notation we will also denote by $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the extended functions $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_r$, and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that

$$(5.4) \quad \|y\|_{H_r} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_r} & \text{if } y \in H_r \\ \infty & \text{if } y \notin H_r. \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 5.2. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain, let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a separable Hilbert space, let e_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} , let $\lambda: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ be a function with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = -\infty$, let $A: D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be the linear operator such that $D(A) = \{x \in H: \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_H|^2 < \infty\}$ and such that for all $x \in D(A)$ it holds that $Ax = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_H e_n$, let $\mathbb{H}_t = (H_t, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_t}, \|\cdot\|_{H_t})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $-A$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]), let $r_1 \in [0, \infty)$, $r_2 \in [r_1, \infty)$, $r \in [r_1, r_2]$, $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, satisfy that $H_{r_1} \subseteq B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega)$ and that $H_{r_2} \subseteq B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega)$, and let $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ it holds that

$$(5.5) \quad C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega)}$$

and that for all $u \in H_{r_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.6) \quad C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega)}.$$

Then there exist $C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_r$ it holds that

$$(5.7) \quad C_3 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{H_r} \leq C_4 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)}.$$

PROOF. Throughout this proof we will use the notation in Section 1.3.2 on page 24 in Triebel [34]. For $r \in \{r_1, r_2\}$ the assertion is trivial. Therefore assume for the rest of the proof that $r \in (r_1, r_2)$. Moreover, denote by $\theta \in (0, 1)$ the value satisfying that $r = (1 - \theta)r_1 + \theta r_2$. Next note that the theorem on page 182 in Triebel [34] yields that

$$(5.8) \quad (B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,2} = B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Combining this with the Theorem on page 25 in Triebel [34] and with the fact that there exist a linear bounded operator $\xi \in L(\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\xi|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega)} \in L(\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, that $\xi|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)} \in L(\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and that for all $u \in \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega)$ it holds that $(\xi(u))|_{\Omega} = u$ (see, e.g., Theorem 4.1 in Rychkov [32]) shows that

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega) &= (B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d))|_{\Omega} = ((B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,2})|_{\Omega} \subseteq (B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2} \\ &= \left(\xi((B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2}) \right)|_{\Omega} \subseteq ((B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,2})|_{\Omega} = (B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d))|_{\Omega} = B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

and that there exist $K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)} &\leq \|\xi u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K_1 \|\xi u\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,2}} \\ &\leq K_2 \|u\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2}} = K_2 \|(\xi u)|_{\Omega}\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2}} \\ &\leq K_2 \|\xi u\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d))_{\theta,2}} \leq K_3 \|\xi u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K_4 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the theorem on page 141 in Triebel [34] ensures that

$$(5.11) \quad (H_{r_1}, H_{r_2})_{\theta,2} = H_r$$

and that there exist $K_1, K_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_r$ it holds that

$$(5.12) \quad K_1 \|u\|_{H_r} \leq \|u\|_{(H_{r_1}, H_{r_2})_{\theta,2}} \leq K_2 \|u\|_{H_r}.$$

Moreover, it follows from (5.5) and from (5.6) that for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $\text{Id}_{H_{r_i}} \in L((H_{r_i}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_{r_i}}, \|\cdot\|_{H_{r_i}}), \mathbb{H}_{r_i})$ and that $\text{Id}_{H_{r_i}} \in L(\mathbb{H}_{r_i}, \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{\alpha r_i})$ and combining this with (5.10),

the theorem on page 25 in Triebel [34] and with (5.12) verifies that there exist $K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_r$ it holds that

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)} &\leq C_1 K_1 \|\text{Id}_{H_{r_1}} u\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2}} \leq K_1 \|u\|_{(H_{r_1}, H_{r_2})_{\theta,2}} \leq K_2 \|u\|_{H_r} \\ &\leq K_3 \|\text{Id}_{H_{r_1}} u\|_{(H_{r_1}, H_{r_2})_{\theta,2}} \leq C_2 K_3 \|u\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_1}(\Omega), B_{2,2}^{\alpha r_2}(\Omega))_{\theta,2}} \leq K_4 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\alpha r}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.2. \square

Before we come to the main results of this subsection we give two examples of families of Hilbert spaces which satisfy the interpolation property.

LEMMA 5.3 (Interpolation results for H). *Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ be a separable Hilbert space, let e_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H} , let $\lambda: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$ be a function with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = -\infty$, let $A: D(A) \subseteq H \rightarrow H$ be the linear operator such that $D(A) = \{x \in H: \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_H|^2 < \infty\}$ and such that for all $x \in D(A)$ it holds that $Av = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \langle e_n, x \rangle_H e_n$, let $\mathbb{H}_t = (H_t, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_t}, \|\cdot\|_{H_t})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $-A$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]). By abuse of notation we will also denote by A and by $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the extended operators $A: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_t$, and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that*

$$(5.14) \quad \|y\|_{H_t} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_t} & \text{if } y \in H_t \\ \infty & \text{if } y \notin H_t \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(5.15) \quad (A(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|A(\xi) - y\|_{H_{t-1}}: \xi \in H_1, \|x - \xi\|_{H_t} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0).$$

Let $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]$, satisfy that $s_1 + s_2 = 1$, and that $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$. Then it holds for all $x \in H_r$ that

$$(5.16) \quad \|x\|_{H_r} \leq \|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^{s_1} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^{s_2}.$$

PROOF. Observe that (5.16) is trivial for $r_1 = r_2$. Moreover it follows from the fact that $H_{r_2} \cap H$ is dense in H_r that it is enough to show the equation for $x \in H_{r_2} \cap H$. Therefore for the rest of the proof fix $x \in H_{r_2} \cap H$ and assume that $r_1 < r_2$. Now denote by $S \subseteq [0, 1]$ the set satisfying that

$$(5.17) \quad S = \left\{ s_3 \in [0, 1]: \left(\exists \tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2 \in [0, 1], \exists r_3 \in [r_1, r_2]: \left((\|x\|_{H_r} \leq \|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_3}}^{s_3}) \right. \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \left. \wedge (\tilde{s}_1 + \tilde{s}_2 + s_3 = 1) \wedge (\tilde{s}_1 r_1 + \tilde{s}_2 r_2 + s_3 r_3 = r) \right) \right\}.$$

As s_1, s_2 are uniquely determined by the equation $s_1 + s_2 = 1$ and the equation $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$ it is sufficient to show $0 \in S$. Note that $\|x\|_{H_r} \leq \|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^0 \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^0 \cdot \|x\|_{H_r}^1$ and hence it holds that $1 \in S$. This ensures that $S \neq \emptyset$. Next denote by $s \in [0, 1]$ the value satisfying that $s = \inf S$. This implies that there exist a sequence $(s^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq S$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^{(n)} = s$. Moreover, it follows from the definition of S that there exist sequences $(s_1^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (s_2^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq [0, 1]$, $(r^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq [r_1, r_2]$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\|x\|_{H_r} \leq \|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^{s_1^{(n)}} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^{s_2^{(n)}} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r^{(n)}}}^{s^{(n)}}$, $s_1^{(n)} + s_2^{(n)} + s^{(n)} = 1$, and that $s_1^{(n)} r_1 + s_2^{(n)} r_2 + s^{(n)} r^{(n)} = r$. By going to subsequences we can assume that there exist $\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2 \in [0, 1]$, $r_3 \in [r_1, r_2]$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (|s_1^{(n)} - \tilde{s}_1| + |s_2^{(n)} - \tilde{s}_2| + |r^{(n)} - r_3|) = 0$. Thus we get from $x \in H_{r_2}$ that

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x\|_{H_r} &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^{s_1^{(n)}} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^{s_2^{(n)}} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r^{(n)}}}^{s^{(n)}}) = \|x\|_{H_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_3}}^s, \\ \tilde{s}_1 + \tilde{s}_2 + s &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_1^{(n)} + s_2^{(n)} + s^{(n)}) = 1, \quad \text{and that} \\ \tilde{s}_1 r_1 + \tilde{s}_2 r_2 + s r_3 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_1^{(n)} r_1 + s_2^{(n)} r_2 + s^{(n)} r^{(n)}) = r \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we obtain that $s \in S$. We will now show that $\frac{s}{2} \in S$ and therefore we will consider two cases.

1. *case:* $r_3 \geq \frac{r_1+r_2}{2}$. First observe that we have that

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x\|_{H_r} &\leq \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_3}}^s = \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot (((-A)^{2r_3-r_2}x, (-A)^{r_2}x)_H)^{s/2} \\ &\leq \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot (\|x\|_{H_{2r_3-r_2}} \|x\|_{H_{r_2}})^{s/2} = \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2+s/2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{2r_3-r_2}}^{s/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, it follows from $r_3 \in [\frac{r_1+r_2}{2}, r_2]$ that $2r_3 - r_2 \in [r_1, r_2]$. Furthermore, we obtain that $r = \tilde{s}_1 r_1 + \tilde{s}_2 r_2 + s r_3 = \tilde{s}_1 r_1 + (\tilde{s}_2 + \frac{s}{2}) r_2 + \frac{s}{2} (2r_3 - r_2)$ and this shows that $\frac{s}{2} \in S$ and thus verifies the first case.

2. *case:* $r_3 < \frac{r_1+r_2}{2}$. We then get that

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x\|_{H_r} &\leq \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{r_3}}^s = \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot (((-A)^{r_1}x, (-A)^{2r_3-r_1}x)_H)^{s/2} \\ &\leq \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot (\|x\|_{H_{r_1}} \|x\|_{H_{2r_3-r_1}})^{s/2} = \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_1}}^{\tilde{s}_1+s/2} \cdot \|x\|_{\tilde{H}_{r_2}}^{\tilde{s}_2} \cdot \|x\|_{H_{2r_3-r_1}}^{s/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the fact that $r_3 \in [r_1, \frac{r_1+r_2}{2}]$ yields that $2r_3 - r_1 \in [r_1, r_2]$. In addition, we have that $r = \tilde{s}_1 r_1 + \tilde{s}_2 r_2 + s r_3 = (\tilde{s}_1 + \frac{s}{2}) r_1 + \tilde{s}_2 r_2 + \frac{s}{2} (2r_3 - r_1)$ and this shows that $\frac{s}{2} \in S$ and finishes the second case.

Combining the two cases then ensures that $\frac{s}{2} \in S$. Hence we derive from the fact that $s = \inf S$ that $s \leq \frac{s}{2}$ and therefore $s = 0$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.3. \square

LEMMA 5.4 (Interpolation results for Sobolev spaces). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz domain. Then there exist a $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]$, and all $u \in B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)$ with $s_1 + s_2 = 1$, and with $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$ it holds that*

$$(5.21) \quad \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)} \leq (K_{r_1} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)})^{s_1} \cdot (K_{r_2} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)})^{s_2}.$$

PROOF. First denote by $\xi: \cup_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\Omega) \rightarrow \cup_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ an operator satisfying that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that that $\xi|_{\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\Omega)} \in L(\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\Omega), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\mathbb{R}^d))$, and that for all $u \in \cup_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\Omega)$ it holds that $(\xi(u))|_{\Omega} = u$ (the existence follows from Theorem 4.1 in Rychkov [32]) and by $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ that

$$(5.22) \quad K_r = \|\xi\|_{L(\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\Omega), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^r(\mathbb{R}^d))} \vee 1.$$

Next note that Remark 2 on page 87 in Runst & Sickel [31] (with $s \leftarrow r$, $s_0 \leftarrow r_1$, $s_1 \leftarrow r_2$, $\theta \leftarrow s_2$, $p \leftarrow 2$, $p_0 \leftarrow 2$, $p_1 \leftarrow 2$, $q \leftarrow 2$, $q_0 \leftarrow 2$, $q_1 \leftarrow 2$) implies that for all $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1, s_2 \in (0, 1)$, and all $u \in B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)$ with $s_1 + s_2 = 1$, $r_1 \neq r_2$, and with $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$ it holds that

$$(5.23) \quad \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)} \leq \|\xi u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\xi u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{s_1} \cdot \|\xi u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{s_2} \leq (K_{r_1} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)})^{s_1} \cdot (K_{r_2} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)})^{s_2}.$$

Thus, the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $K_r \geq 1$ ensures that for all $r, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $s_1, s_2 \in [0, 1]$, and all $u \in B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)$ with $s_1 + s_2 = 1$ and with $s_1 r_1 + s_2 r_2 = r$ it holds that

$$(5.24) \quad \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega)} \leq (K_{r_1} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)})^{s_1} \cdot (K_{r_2} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)})^{s_2}.$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.4. \square

The next lemma establishes another interpolation result.

LEMMA 5.5 (Another interpolation result). *Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $r_1, r_2, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2, s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that $r_2 < s_1 \leq r_1$ and that $\tilde{r}_2 = s_2 \frac{r_1-r_2}{s_1-r_2} - \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{s_1-r_2}$ then it holds for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ that*

$$(5.25) \quad \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \leq \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2} K_{r_1} \|u\|_{H_{r_1}} K_{\tilde{r}_2} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} K_{r_2} \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} K_{\tilde{r}_1} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}.$$

PROOF. Note that it holds that $r_1 \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2} + r_2 \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} = s_1$ and thus (5.3) (with $r \leftarrow s_1, r_1 \leftarrow r_1, r_2 \leftarrow r_2, s_1 \leftarrow \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2}$, and with $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2}$) implies for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ that

$$(5.26) \quad \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} \leq (K_{r_1} \|u\|_{H_{r_1}})^{\frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2}} (K_{r_2} \|u\|_{H_{r_2}})^{\frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2}}.$$

Furthermore, we get from the definition of \tilde{r}_2 that

$$(5.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} + \tilde{r}_2 \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2} &= \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} + \left(s_2 \frac{r_1-r_2}{s_1-r_2} - \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{s_1-r_2} \right) \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2} \\ &= \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} + s_2 - \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} = s_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.3) (with $r \leftarrow s_2, r_1 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_1, r_2 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_2, s_1 \leftarrow \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2}$, and with $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2}$) shows for all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ that

$$(5.28) \quad \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \leq (K_{\tilde{r}_1} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}})^{\frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2}} (K_{\tilde{r}_2} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}})^{\frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2}}.$$

Combining (5.26), (5.28) together with the fact that $\forall a, b \in (0, \infty), \forall t \in [0, 1]: a^t b^{1-t} \leq ta + (1-t)b$ yields that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} &\leq (K_{r_1} \|u\|_{H_{r_1}} K_{\tilde{r}_2} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}})^{\frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2}} (K_{r_2} \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} K_{\tilde{r}_1} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}})^{\frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2}} \\ &\leq \frac{s_1-r_2}{r_1-r_2} K_{r_1} \|u\|_{H_{r_1}} K_{\tilde{r}_2} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \frac{r_1-s_1}{r_1-r_2} K_{r_2} \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} K_{\tilde{r}_1} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \end{aligned}$$

and this completes the proof of Lemma 5.5. \square

The next lemma is a combination of the Hölder inequality and the Sobolev inequality.

LEMMA 5.6. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Lipschitz set, let $p \in [1, \infty]$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that $r_1 \wedge r_2 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ and that $r_1 + r_2 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})$. Then there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that*

$$(5.30) \quad \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)}.$$

PROOF. First note that we get from Hölder's inequality that for all $p_1, p_2 \in [1, \infty]$ with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p}$, for all $u \in L^{p_1}(\Omega)$ and for all $v \in L^{p_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$(5.31) \quad \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|u\|_{L^{p_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^{p_2}(\Omega)}.$$

Combining this with the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31] (applied with $s \leftarrow 0, s_0 \leftarrow \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p_1} + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_1), p \leftarrow p_1, p_0 \leftarrow 2, q \leftarrow 2, u \leftarrow 2$, and applied with $s \leftarrow 0, s_0 \leftarrow \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p_2} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_2), p \leftarrow p_2, p_0 \leftarrow 2, q \leftarrow 2, u \leftarrow 2$) and Theorem 1 on page 32 (applied with $s \leftarrow \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p_1} + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_1), p \leftarrow 2, q \leftarrow 2$ and applied with $s \leftarrow \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p_2} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_2), p_0 \leftarrow 2, q \leftarrow 2$)) shows that for all $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, \infty)$ and all $p_1, p_2 \in [2, \infty]$ with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p}$ there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p_1+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_1)}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p_2+\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_2)}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$(5.32) \quad \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p_1+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_1)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p_2+\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p_2)}(\Omega)}.$$

We will now divide the proof into 4 cases.

1. case: $r_1 = 0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})$. Note that the assumption $r_1 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ then implies that $p \neq \infty$. Moreover we get from the assumption $r_1 + r_2 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})$ and from the assumption $r_1 \wedge r_2 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ that

$$(5.33) \quad \begin{aligned} r_2 &\geq d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) - r_1 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r_1 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \\ &= ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2}) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty]}(p) > ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2}) - \mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (5.32) (with $p_1 \leftarrow p\vee 2$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p\vee 2}$, $\delta_1 \leftarrow 1$, and with $\delta_2 \leftarrow r_2 - ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2}) + \mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p)$) and the fact that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, s]$ there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)}$ (see, e.g., the Proposition on page 29 in Runst & Sickel [31]) shows that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p\vee 2)+\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/p-d/(p\vee 2))+r_2-(d/2\wedge(d-d/p))+\mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p)\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}(\Omega)} \\
(5.34) \quad & = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-((d/p)\wedge(d/2))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p+((d/p)\wedge(d/2))+r_2-((d/2)\wedge(d-d/p))\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-((d/p)\wedge(d/2))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{((d/2)\wedge(d-d/p))+r_2-((d/2)\wedge(d-d/p))(1-\mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p))}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{(d/2-d/p)\vee 0}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2-(r_2-(d/2\wedge(d-d/p))\mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p))}(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

2. case: $(0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) < r_1 < (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p}))$. In this case we get that

$$(5.35) \quad \frac{d}{\frac{d}{2} - r_1} > \frac{d}{\frac{d}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))} = \frac{d}{\frac{d}{2} \wedge \frac{d}{p}} = 2 \vee p$$

and that

$$(5.36) \quad \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\frac{d}{2} - r_1}{d} < \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\frac{d}{2} - (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p}))}{d} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{(0 \vee (\frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2}))}{d} = (\frac{1}{p} \wedge \frac{1}{2}).$$

Thus (5.32) (with $p_1 \leftarrow \frac{d}{\frac{d}{2}-r_1}$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{\frac{d}{2}-r_1}{d}$, $\delta_1 \leftarrow 1$, and with $\delta_2 \leftarrow 1$), the fact that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, s]$ there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)}$ (see, e.g., the Proposition on page 29 in Runst & Sickel [31]), and the assumption $r_1 + r_2 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})$ ensure that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.37) \quad & \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/2-r_1)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/p-(d/2-r_1))}(\Omega)} = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d-d/p-r_1}(\Omega)} \\
& \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

3. case: $r_1 = \frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})$. Note that the assumption $r_1 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ shows that $p \neq \infty$ and the assumption $r_1 + r_2 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.38) \quad & r_2 \geq d - \frac{d}{p} - r_1 + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) = d - \frac{d}{p} - (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}((r_1 \wedge r_2) - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \\
& \geq d - \frac{d}{p} - \frac{d}{2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r_2 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r_2 - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $r_2 > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$ and hence it holds that $\frac{\frac{d}{2}-r_2}{d} < \frac{\frac{d}{2}-(\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{p})}{d} = \frac{1}{p}$. Furthermore we get from $r_2 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ that $\frac{\frac{d}{2}-r_2}{d} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore (5.32) (with $\frac{1}{p_1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - (\frac{\frac{d}{2}-r_2}{d} \vee \frac{1}{2p})$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{\frac{d}{2}-r_2}{d} \vee \frac{1}{2p}$, $\delta_1 \leftarrow 1$, $\delta_2 \leftarrow 1$), the assumption that it holds that $r_2 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$, the fact that $p \neq \infty$, and the fact that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, s]$ there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)}$ (see, e.g., the Proposition on page 29 in Runst & Sickel [31]) yield that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$

such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/p-((d/2-r_2)\vee(d/(2p))))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-((d/2-r_2)\vee(d/(2p)))}(\Omega)} \\
(5.39) \quad & \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p+((d/2-(0\vee(d/2-d/p))\vee(d/(2p)))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/2-r_2)}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p+(((d/p)\wedge(d/2))\vee(d/(2p)))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/2-r_2)}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/p+((d/p)\wedge(d/2))}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)} = C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

4. case: $r_1 > \frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})$. Then it follows from (5.32) (with $\frac{1}{p_1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2\vee p}$ and with $p_2 \leftarrow 2\vee p$), the assumption that $r_1 \wedge r_2 \geq (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$, and from the fact that for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, s]$ there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)}$ (see, e.g., the Proposition on page 29 in Runst & Sickel [31]) that for all $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying that $\delta_1 = r_1 - (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p}))$ and that $\delta_2 = r_2 - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + \mathbb{1}_{[1,\infty)}(p)$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.40) \quad & \|uv\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-(d/p-(d/2\wedge d/p))+\delta_1\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-((d/2)\wedge(d/p))+\delta_2\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{((d-d/p)\wedge(d/2))+\delta_1\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{(0\vee(d/2-d/p))+r_2-(0\vee(d/2-d/p))\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)}(\Omega)} \\
& = C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1-\delta_1\mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2-(r_2-(0\vee(d/2-d/p))\mathbb{1}_{[1,\infty)}(p))}(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{r_2}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the 4 cases then proves Lemma 5.6. \square

The next corollary combines Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.6.

Corollary 5.7 (Sobolev-Hölder inequality for the L^p -norm). *Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $p \in [1, \infty]$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $\delta \in [0, \infty)$, let $\alpha, \beta \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^d$, let $r_1, r_2, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that*

$$(5.41) \quad 2r_2 + 2\tilde{r}_1 = |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p),$$

that

$$(5.42) \quad 2r_1 + 2\tilde{r}_2 \geq 2r_2 + 2\tilde{r}_1 - \frac{2\delta \cdot (2r_1 - 2r_2)}{|\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - 2r_2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty) \times [2,\infty)}((\delta, p)),$$

that $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, and that $2r_2 \leq |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p)$. Then there exists a real number $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.43) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).$$

PROOF. First note that for all $s_1, s_2, \tilde{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r_2 + \tilde{r}_1 - s_1 - s_2 = \tilde{\delta}$ and with $s_1 \neq r_2$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.44) \quad & s_2 \frac{r_1 - r_2}{s_1 - r_2} - \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1 - s_1}{s_1 - r_2} = \tilde{r}_1 + (r_1 - r_2) \left(\frac{s_2}{s_1 - r_2} - \frac{\tilde{r}_1}{s_1 - r_2} \right) \\
& = \tilde{r}_1 + (r_1 - r_2) \left(\frac{s_1 + s_2 - \tilde{r}_1 - r_2}{s_1 - r_2} - 1 \right) = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 - \frac{\tilde{\delta}(r_1 - r_2)}{s_1 - r_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will now divide the proof into 3 cases.

1. case: $\delta = 0$. Observe that it holds that $\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$, that $\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} \geq \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$, that $\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} \geq 0$, and that $\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} > -\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[1,2)}(p)$. Hence we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.45) \quad & |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - ((|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \wedge (2r_1)) + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - |\beta| \\
& \geq |\alpha| + d - \frac{d}{p} - (|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \\
& \geq ((\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}) \vee 0) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p),
\end{aligned}$$

that

$$(5.46) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - \left((|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \wedge (2r_1) \right) + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - |\beta| \\ & \geq |\alpha| + d - \frac{d}{p} - \left(|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \right) + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \\ & > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}, \end{aligned}$$

that

$$(5.47) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left((|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \wedge (2r_1) \right) - |\alpha| = \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \right) \wedge (2r_1 - |\alpha|) \\ & \geq \left(\left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p} \right) \vee 0 \right) + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \wedge (2r_1 - |\alpha|) \\ & = \left(\left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p} \right) \vee 0 \right) + \left(\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \wedge (2r_1 - |\alpha| - \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p} \right) \vee 0) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and from the assumption $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ that

$$(5.48) \quad \left((|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \wedge (2r_1) \right) - |\alpha| = \left(\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) \right) \wedge (2r_1 - |\alpha|) > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}.$$

Moreover, the assumption $r_2 \leq |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[1,2]}(p)$ implies that

$$(5.49) \quad r_2 \leq |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[1,2]}(p) < |\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p).$$

Therefore the assumption $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, Lemma 5.6 (with $r_1 \leftarrow 2s_1 - |\alpha|$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2s_2 - |\beta|$, and with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon \wedge (2r_1 - |\alpha| - ((\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}) \vee 0))$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r , (5.44) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow 0$), the assumption $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) \geq 2r_2$, Lemma 5.5 (with $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, and (5.42) show that for all $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $2s_1 = ((|\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \wedge (2r_1))$ and with $2s_2 = |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - 2s_1 + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1 - |\alpha|}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2 - |\beta|}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2}(\Omega)} \leq C_3 \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \leq C_4 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}) \\ & \leq C_5 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}). \end{aligned}$$

2. case: $\delta > 0$ and $2r_2 < |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$. We hence get from the assumption $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ that there exists a real number $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, r_1 - \frac{|\alpha|}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})))$ such that

$$(5.51) \quad \begin{aligned} & - \frac{(\delta + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty]}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \cdot (2r_1 - 2r_2)}{|\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - 2r_2} \\ & \leq - \frac{\delta \cdot (2r_1 - 2r_2)}{|\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - 2r_2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty) \times [2,\infty]}((\delta, p)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the fact that it holds that $(0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) \leq (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p}))$, that $(0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})) = d - \frac{d}{p}$, and that $((0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}) \Leftrightarrow (p \in [2, \infty])$, Lemma 5.6 (with $r_1 \leftarrow 2s_1 - |\alpha|$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2s_2 - |\beta|$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \tilde{\varepsilon}$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r , (5.44) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow \delta + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty]}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$), the fact that $2\tilde{\varepsilon} < 2r_1 - |\alpha| - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, Lemma 5.5 (with $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow r_2 + \tilde{r}_1 - r_1 - \frac{(\delta + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty]}(p) - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)) \cdot (2r_1 - 2r_2)}{|\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - 2r_2}$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, (5.51), and (5.42) ensure that for all $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $2s_1 = |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)$ and with $2s_2 = |\beta| + (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty]}(p)$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.52) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1 - |\alpha|}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2 - |\beta|}(\Omega)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2}(\Omega)} \leq C_3 \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \\
&\leq C_4 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{r_2+\tilde{r}_1-r_1-(\delta+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)-\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)-\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)}\cdot(2r_1-2r_2))/(|\alpha|+(0\vee(d/2-d/p))+2\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)-2r_2)}} \\
&\quad + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}) \\
&\leq C_5 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

3. case: $\delta > 0$ and $2r_2 = |\alpha_1| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$. Note that it follows from the assumption $2r_1 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ that there exists a real number $\hat{\varepsilon} \in (0, r_1 - \frac{|\alpha|}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})))$ such that

$$(5.53) \quad r_2 + \tilde{r}_1 - r_1 - \frac{(\delta + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - 2\hat{\varepsilon}) \cdot (r_1 - r_2)}{\hat{\varepsilon}} \leq \tilde{r}_2.$$

Moreover, the fact that it holds that $(0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) \leq (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p}))$ and that $(0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})) = d - \frac{d}{p}$, Lemma 5.6 (with $r_1 \leftarrow 2s_1 - |\alpha|$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2s_2 - |\beta|$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \hat{\varepsilon}$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r , (5.44) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow \delta + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p) - 2\hat{\varepsilon}$, the fact that $2\hat{\varepsilon} < 2r_1 - |\alpha| - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, Lemma 5.5 (with $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow r_2 + \tilde{r}_1 - r_1 - \frac{(\delta+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)-2\hat{\varepsilon})\cdot(r_1-r_2)}{\hat{\varepsilon}}$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, and (5.53) show that for all $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $2s_1 = |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\hat{\varepsilon}$ and with $2s_2 = |\beta| + (\frac{d}{2} \wedge (d - \frac{d}{p})) + 2\hat{\varepsilon}$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.54) \quad &\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1-|\alpha|}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2-|\beta|}(\Omega)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s_2}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C_3 \|u\|_{H_{s_1}} \|v\|_{H_{s_2}} \leq C_4 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{r_2+\tilde{r}_1-r_1-(\delta+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(p)-2\hat{\varepsilon})\cdot(r_1-r_2)/\varepsilon}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}) \\
&\leq C_5 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the 3 cases then proves Corollary 5.7. \square

The next lemma establishes a similar result as in Corollary 5.7 for positive Besov spaces. It generalizes Lemma 1 on page 345 in Runst & Sickel [31].

LEMMA 5.8 (Sobolev-Hölder inequality for positive Besov spaces). *Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $p \in (1, \infty)$, let $s \in (0, \infty)$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $\delta \in [0, \infty)$, let $\alpha, \beta \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^d$, let $r_1, r_2, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that*

$$(5.55) \quad 2r_2 + 2\tilde{r}_1 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta,$$

that

$$(5.56) \quad 2r_1 + 2\tilde{r}_2 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - \frac{2\delta \cdot (2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})))}{2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) - 2r_2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty) \times [2,\infty)}((\delta, p)),$$

that $2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, that $2\tilde{r}_1 \geq 2s + |\beta| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, that $r_1 \geq r_2$, that either $2r_2 \leq 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ or $\delta = 0$, that either $r_1 > r_2$ or $\delta = 0$ and that $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$. Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.57) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \leq C (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).$$

PROOF. First observe that for all $s_1, s_2, \tilde{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r_2 + \tilde{r}_1 - s_1 - s_2 = \tilde{\delta}$ and with $s_1 \neq r_2$ it holds that

$$(5.58) \quad \begin{aligned} & s_2 \frac{r_1 - r_2}{s_1 - r_2} - \tilde{r}_1 \frac{r_1 - s_1}{s_1 - r_2} = \tilde{r}_1 + (r_1 - r_2) \left(\frac{s_2}{s_1 - r_2} - \frac{\tilde{r}_1}{s_1 - r_2} \right) \\ & = \tilde{r}_1 + (r_1 - r_2) \left(\frac{s_1 + s_2 - \tilde{r}_1 - r_2}{s_1 - r_2} - 1 \right) = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 - \frac{\tilde{\delta}(r_1 - r_2)}{s_1 - r_2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition it follows from Theorem 4.1 in Rychkov [32] that there exists a

$$(5.59) \quad \mathcal{E} : \cup_{\hat{s} \in \mathbb{R}} \cup_{\hat{p} \in [1, \infty]} B_{\hat{p}, 2}^{\hat{s}}(\Omega) \rightarrow \cup_{\hat{s} \in \mathbb{R}} \cup_{\hat{p} \in [1, \infty]} B_{\hat{p}, 2}^{\hat{s}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

such that for all $\hat{s} \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $\hat{p} \in [1, \infty]$ it holds that $\mathcal{E}|_{B_{\hat{p}, 2}^{\hat{s}}(\Omega)}$ is a linear and bounded extension operator from $B_{\hat{p}, 2}^{\hat{s}}(\Omega)$ to $B_{\hat{p}, 2}^{\hat{s}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover, we get from Lemma 1 on page 345 in Runst & Sickel [31] (with $r_1 \leftarrow q_2, r_2 \leftarrow q_1, p_1 \leftarrow p_1, p_2 \leftarrow p_2$, and $q \leftarrow 2$) and from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31] and Theorem 1 on page 32) that for all $q_i, p_i \in [2, \infty]$ and all $\delta_i \in (0, \infty)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$ with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{q_1}$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_1) \vee (-d/q_1 + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)))}(\Omega)$ and all $v \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_2) \vee (-d/q_2 + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)))}(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$(5.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \|uv\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} &= \inf_{z \in B_{p,2}^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^d), z|_{\Omega} = uv} \|z\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \inf_{\tilde{u} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_1) \vee (-d/q_1 + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)))}(\mathbb{R}^d), \tilde{u}|_{\Omega} = u} \inf_{\tilde{v} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_2) \vee (-d/q_2 + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)))}(\mathbb{R}^d), \tilde{v}|_{\Omega} = u} \|\tilde{u} \cdot \tilde{v}\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq \inf_{\tilde{u} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_1) \vee (-d/q_1 + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)))}(\mathbb{R}^d), \tilde{u}|_{\Omega} = u} \inf_{\tilde{v} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_2) \vee (-d/q_2 + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)))}(\mathbb{R}^d), \tilde{v}|_{\Omega} = u} \left(C_1 \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{p_1,2}^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^{q_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{q_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{B_{p_2,2}^{2s}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right) \right. \\ &\leq \inf_{\tilde{u} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_1) \vee (-d/q_1 + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)))}(\Omega), \tilde{u}|_{\Omega} = u} \inf_{\tilde{v} \in B_{2,2}^{d/2 + ((2s-d/p_2) \vee (-d/q_2 + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)))}(\Omega), \tilde{v}|_{\Omega} = u} \left(C_2 \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_2+\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right) \right) \\ &\leq C_2 \left(\|\mathcal{E}u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{E}v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_2+\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\mathcal{E}u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\mathcal{E}v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right) \\ &\leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_2+\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}(\Omega)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_2}(\Omega)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and this shows that for all $q_i, p_i \in [2, \infty]$ and all $\delta_i \in (0, \infty)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, with $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{q_1}$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{(s-d/(2p_1)) \vee (-d/(2q_1) + \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1))}$ and all $v \in H_{(s-d/(2p_2)) \vee (-d/(2q_2) + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2))}$ it holds that

$$(5.61) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_1}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_2+2\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}(\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+2\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+d/2-d/p_2}(\Omega)} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+|\alpha|+d/2-d/p_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{|\beta|+d/2-d/q_2+2\delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}(\Omega)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{|\alpha|+d/2-d/q_1+2\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s+|\beta|+d/2-d/p_2}(\Omega)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_3(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2p_1)}}\|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2q_2)+\delta_2\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_2)}} \\ &\quad + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2q_1)+\delta_1\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}}\|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p_2)}}). \end{aligned}$$

We will now divide the proof into 5 cases.

1. *case*: $\delta = 0, r_1 = r_2$. First observe that the assumption $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$ ensures that

$$(5.62) \quad 2r_2 = 2r_1 > 2s + |\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$$

and that

$$(5.63) \quad 2\tilde{r}_1 > 2s + |\beta| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}.$$

Moreover, (5.55) the assumptions $2\tilde{r}_1 \geq 2s + |\beta| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, and the assumptions $2r_2 = 2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ show that $2r_2 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta - \tilde{r}_1 \leq |\alpha| + ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2})$ and that $2\tilde{r}_1 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta - r_2 \leq |\beta| + ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2})$. Hence there exists $\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2 \in (p, \infty) \cap [2, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]$ such that

$$(5.64) \quad s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\hat{p}_1} = r_2,$$

and that

$$(5.65) \quad s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\hat{p}_2} = \tilde{r}_1.$$

Thus (5.61) (with $p_1 \leftarrow \hat{p}_1, p_2 \leftarrow \hat{p}_2, \frac{1}{q_1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\hat{p}_2}$, and with $\frac{1}{q_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\hat{p}_1}$) and (5.55) yield that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_2}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2\hat{p}_1)}}\|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\hat{p}_1)}} \\ &\quad + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\hat{p}_2)}}\|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2\hat{p}_2)}}) \\ (5.66) \quad &= C(\|u\|_{H_{r_2}}\|v\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+|\beta|/2+d/2-d/(2p)-r_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+|\beta|/2+d/2-d/(2p)-\tilde{r}_1}}\|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}) \\ &= 2C \cdot \|u\|_{H_{r_2}}\|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

2. *case*: $\delta = 0, r_1 > r_2$. Again the assumption $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$ verifies that

$$(5.67) \quad 2r_1 > 2s + |\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$$

and that

$$(5.68) \quad 2\tilde{r}_1 > 2s + |\beta| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}.$$

In addition, (5.55) and the assumption $2\tilde{r}_1 \geq 2s + |\beta| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ show that

$$(5.69) \quad 2r_2 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta - \tilde{r}_1 \leq |\alpha| + ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2}).$$

Therefore the assumption $r_1 > r_2$ and the assumption $2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ imply that there exists a $\tilde{p}_1 \in (p, \infty) \cap [2, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]$ such that

$$(5.70) \quad r_2 < s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_1} \leq r_1.$$

Moreover, we get from the assumption $r_1 > r_2$, (5.55), the assumption $2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, and from (5.67) that it holds that

$$(5.71) \quad \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 < \tilde{r}_1,$$

that

$$(5.72) \quad 2\tilde{r}_1 + 2r_2 - 2r_1 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - 2r_1 \leq |\beta| + ((d - \frac{d}{p}) \wedge \frac{d}{2})$$

and that

$$(5.73) \quad 2\tilde{r}_1 + 2r_2 - 2r_1 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - 2r_1 < |\beta| + \frac{d}{2}.$$

Combining this with the assumption that $2\tilde{r}_1 \geq 2s + |\beta| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ and (5.68) yields that there exists a $\tilde{p}_2 \in [2, \infty)$ such that $\tilde{p}_2 > p$, that $\frac{1}{\tilde{p}_2} \geq \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}$, and that

$$(5.74) \quad \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 < s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_2} \leq \tilde{r}_1.$$

Thus (5.61) (with $p_1 \leftarrow \tilde{p}_1$, $\frac{1}{q_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_1}$, $p_2 \leftarrow \tilde{p}_2$, $\frac{1}{q_1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\tilde{p}_2}$), Lemma (5.5) (applied with $s_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_1}$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_1}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1$ and applied with $s_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_2}$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\tilde{p}_2}$, $r_1 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_1$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow r_1$, $r_2 \leftarrow \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow r_2$), (5.58) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow 0$), (5.70), (5.74), (5.56), and the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$ yields that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.75) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v) \|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2\tilde{p}_1)}} \|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\tilde{p}_1)}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\tilde{p}_2)}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2\tilde{p}_2)}} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1+r_2-r_1}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right) \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

3. case $\delta > 0$, $2r_2 = 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$. Denote by $\tilde{q} \in [2 \vee p, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]$ the real number satisfying that

$$(5.76) \quad \tilde{q} = \sup\{q \in [2 \vee p, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]: \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2q} + (\frac{s}{2} \wedge \delta) \leq r_2\}.$$

Then it follows from $2r_2 = 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ that \tilde{q} is well defined and that $\tilde{q} > 2 \vee p$ and from the definition that

$$(5.77) \quad \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{q}} + (\frac{s}{2} \wedge \delta) \leq r_2.$$

Moreover, we obtain from $\frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\tilde{q}} + s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\tilde{q}} = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - \delta$ and from $s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d((2-p)\vee 0)}{4p} = s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) \leq \tilde{r}_1$ that

$$(5.78) \quad s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\tilde{q}} \leq \tilde{r}_1.$$

Therefore (5.61) (with $p_1 \leftarrow 2 \vee p$, $\frac{1}{q_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2 \vee p}$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\tilde{q}}$, $q_1 \leftarrow \tilde{q}$, $\delta_1 \leftarrow (\frac{s}{2} \wedge \delta)$, and $\delta_2 \leftarrow \delta$), (5.77), (5.78), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, the fact that $2r_2 = 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$, and (5.55) verify that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_2}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1}$ it holds that

$$(5.79) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v) \|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(4 \vee (2p))}} \|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(4 \vee (2p))+\delta \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2\tilde{q})+(\frac{s}{2} \wedge \delta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q})}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\tilde{q})}} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+|\beta|/2+d/2-d/(2p)-r_2+\delta \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p)}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right) \\ & \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

4. case $\delta > 0$ and $|\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p})) < 2r_2 < 2s + |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$. First observe that there exists an $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(5.80) \quad -\frac{(\delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p))(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2} \leq -\frac{\delta(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(p).$$

Next denote by $\hat{q} \in [2 \vee p, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]$ the real number satisfying that

$$(5.81) \quad \hat{q} = \sup\{q \in [2 \vee p, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0}]: \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2q} + ((r_2 - \frac{|\alpha|}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p}))) \wedge \delta) \leq r_2\}.$$

Then we get from $2r_2 > |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$ that \hat{q} is well defined and from the definition that

$$(5.82) \quad \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\hat{q}} + ((r_2 - \frac{|\alpha|}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p}))) \wedge \delta) \leq r_2.$$

Furthermore, the fact that $\frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2\hat{q}} + s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\hat{q}} = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - \delta$ and the fact that $s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d((2-p)\vee 0)}{4p} = s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) \leq \tilde{r}_1$ ensure that

$$(5.83) \quad s + \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2\hat{q}} \leq \tilde{r}_1.$$

Hence (5.61) (with $p_1 \leftarrow 2 \vee p$, $\frac{1}{q_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2\vee p}$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\hat{q}}$, $q_1 \leftarrow \hat{q}$, and $\delta_2 \leftarrow \tilde{\varepsilon}$), Lemma (5.5) (with $s_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p}))$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{|\beta|}{2} + (\frac{d}{4} \wedge (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p})) + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)$, and $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow r$), (5.58) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow \delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)$) (5.82), (5.83), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, (5.80) and (5.56) shows that for all $\delta_1 \in (0, (r_2 - \frac{|\alpha|}{2} - (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p}))) \wedge \delta)$ and all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 - \frac{(\delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p))(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2}$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.84) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v) \|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(4\vee(2p))}} \|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(4\vee(2p))+\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2\hat{q})+\delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\hat{q})}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2\hat{q})}} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_r} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{\tilde{r}_1} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right) \\ & \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

5. case $\delta > 0$ and $2r_2 \leq |\alpha| + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}))$. The Assumption $s > 0$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ then ensure that there exists a $q^* \in (2 \vee p, \frac{2p}{(2-p)\vee 0})$ such that

$$(5.85) \quad \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) < \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2q^*} < s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})).$$

Moreover, there exists an $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(5.86) \quad -\frac{(\delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p))(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2} \leq -\frac{\delta(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2} + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p).$$

Combining (5.61) (with $p_1 \leftarrow 2 \vee p$, $\frac{1}{q_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2\vee p}$, $\frac{1}{p_2} \leftarrow \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q^*}$, $q_1 \leftarrow q^*$, and $\delta_2 \leftarrow \tilde{\varepsilon}$), Lemma (5.5) (with $s_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p}))$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{|\beta|}{2} + (\frac{d}{4} \wedge (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2p})) + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \tilde{r}$ and with $s_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2q^*}$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{|\beta|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p} + \frac{d}{2q^*}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \hat{r}$), (5.58) (with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow \delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)$ and with $\tilde{\delta} \leftarrow \delta$), (5.85), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_t$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_t} \leq C\|u\|_{H_r}$, (5.86), and (5.56) show that for all $\tilde{r}, \hat{r} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 - \frac{(\delta - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p))(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + (0 \vee (\frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2p})) - r_2}$ and with $\hat{r} = \tilde{r}_1 + r_2 - r_1 - \frac{\delta(r_1 - r_2)}{s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{d}{2q^*} - r_2}$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1}$ it holds that

$$(5.87) \quad \begin{aligned} & \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v) \|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(4\vee(2p))}} \|v\|_{H_{|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(4\vee(2p))+\tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(p)}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u\|_{H_{|\alpha|/2+d/4-d/(2q^*)}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\beta|/2+d/4-d/(2p)+d/(2q^*)}} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\hat{r}}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{\tilde{r}_1} \right) \\ & \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the 4 cases then finishes the proof of Lemma 5.8. \square

The next corollary combines Corollary 5.7 and Lemma 5.8.

Corollary 5.9 (Sobolev-Hölder inequality for non-negative Besov spaces). *Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $p \in (1, 2]$, let $s \in [0, \infty)$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $\delta \in [0, \infty)$, let $\alpha, \beta \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^d$, let $r_1, r_2, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that*

$$(5.88) \quad 2r_2 + 2\tilde{r}_1 = 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} + 2\delta,$$

that

$$(5.89) \quad 2r_1 + 2\tilde{r}_2 \geq 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - \frac{2\delta \cdot (2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha|)}{2s + |\alpha| - 2r_2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty) \times \{2\}}((\delta, p)),$$

that $2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha|$, that $2\tilde{r}_1 \geq 2s + |\beta|$, that $r_1 \geq r_2$, that either $2r_2 \leq 2s + |\alpha|$ or $\delta = 0$, that either $r_1 > r_2$ or $\delta = 0$ and that $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$. Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_1 \vee \tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.90) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \leq C(\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).$$

PROOF. First note that it follows from the Theorem on page 30 in Runst & Sickel [31], from Proposition (iii) on page 14 in Runst & Sickel [31] and from $p \leq 2$ that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^p(\Omega)$ it holds that

$$(5.91) \quad \|u\|_{B_{p,2}^0(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

We will now divide the proof into 4 cases.

1. case: $s > 0$. This follows directly from Lemma 5.8.

2. case: $s = 0$, $2r_1 > |\alpha|$, $\exists \tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \varepsilon]: 2r_2 \leq |\alpha| - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{(1,2)}(p)$. This follows from Corollary 5.7 (with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \tilde{\varepsilon}$) and from (5.91).

3. case: $s = 0$, $2r_1 \leq |\alpha|$. Then the assumption $2r_1 \geq 2s + |\alpha|$ ensures that $2r_1 = |\alpha|$. In addition $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$ yields that $(p = 2) \Rightarrow (\delta > 0)$ and thus (5.89) shows that

$$(5.92) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\tilde{r}_2 - |\beta| &\geq 2s + |\alpha| + |\beta| + d - \frac{d}{p} - \frac{2\delta \cdot (2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha|)}{2s + |\alpha| - 2r_2} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty) \times \{2\}}((\delta, p)) - 2r_1 - |\beta| \\ &= d - \frac{d}{p} + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(p) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (5.91), Lemma 5.6 (with $r_1 \leftarrow 0$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2\tilde{r}_2 - |\beta|$, $u \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u$, and with $v \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v$), and the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r imply that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$(5.93) \quad \begin{aligned} \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^0(\Omega)} &\leq C_1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_2 (\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r_1 - |\alpha|}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\tilde{r}_2 - |\beta|}(\Omega)}) \leq C_3 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r_1}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\tilde{r}_2}(\Omega)}) \leq C_4 (\|u\|_{H_{r_1}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_2}}). \end{aligned}$$

4. case: $s = 0$, $\forall \tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \varepsilon]: 2r_2 > |\alpha| - \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{(1,2)}(p)$. The assumption then verifies that there exists a $\hat{\varepsilon} \in (0, \varepsilon]$ such that $2r_2 \geq |\alpha| + \hat{\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(p) > |\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$. Furthermore the assumption $\delta \vee ((2r_1 - 2s - |\alpha| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p}) \cdot (2\tilde{r}_1 - 2s - |\beta| - \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{p})) > 0$ assures that $\delta > 0$ or $2\tilde{r}_1 > |\beta| + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{p}$. Thus (5.91), Lemma 5.6 (with $r_1 \leftarrow 2r_2 - |\alpha|$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2\tilde{r}_1 - |\beta|$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \min((\{\delta\} \cap (0, \infty)) \cup \{1\})$), $u \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u$, and with $v \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v$, (5.88), and the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that the $\|\cdot\|_{H_r}$ -norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(\Omega)}$ -norm on H_r show that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$

such that for all $u \in H_{r_1}$ and all $v \in H_{\tilde{r}_2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{B_{p,2}^0(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
(5.94) \quad & \leq C_2 (\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r_2-|\alpha|}(\Omega)} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\beta v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\tilde{r}_1-|\beta|}(\Omega)}) \leq C_3 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r_2}(\Omega)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\tilde{r}_1}(\Omega)}) \\
& \leq C_4 (\|u\|_{H_{r_2}} \|v\|_{H_{\tilde{r}_1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the 4 cases then finishes the proof of Corollary 5.9. \square

The next corollary is an implication of Corollary 5.9. It will be needed in the proof of Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.6.

Corollary 5.10. *Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $s, \gamma \in [0, \infty)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1/2)$, and let $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$ satisfy that $|\alpha| \leq 1$, that $\gamma > \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$, and that $\alpha_1 \vee \alpha_2 < \gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}$. Then there exist a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that*

$$(5.95) \quad \|u^2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2$$

$$(5.96) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}} \leq C \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}}$$

$$(5.97) \quad \|uv\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \|v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}},$$

$$(5.98) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \leq \begin{cases} C \|u\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}} \|v\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}} & \text{if } 4s < d - 2|\alpha| \\ C \|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}} \|v\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}} & \text{if } 4s \geq d - 2|\alpha| \end{cases}.$$

Moreover if $\gamma + \vartheta - 1 \geq 0$ then it holds for all $u \in H_\gamma$ that

$$(5.99) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-2}(\Omega)} \leq C \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2$$

and if $2\gamma - 1 \geq 0$ and $|\alpha| = 1$ then it hold for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ that

$$(5.100) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)u - (D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha v)v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma-1}(\Omega)} \leq C (\|u\|_{H_\gamma} + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}.$$

PROOF. We will first proof (5.95). Therefore note that $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$ and $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$ imply that $2\gamma + 2\vartheta - 1 \geq 0$. Moreover, the assumption $\gamma > \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$ yields that $\frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} < \gamma < \gamma + \vartheta$. Therefore Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow 0$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $s \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - \frac{1}{2}$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$, $u \leftarrow u$, $v \leftarrow u$) and the fact that $\frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} < \gamma + \vartheta$ yields that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.101) \quad \|u^2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \|u\|_{H_{d/4-1/2}} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2.$$

Next we will show (5.96). Note that we get from the assumption $\alpha_1 < 1/2$ and from the assumption $|\alpha| \leq 1$ that $\gamma + \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1 > (\gamma + \vartheta - \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{|\alpha|}{2}$. In addition it follows from $\alpha_1 < \gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}$, from $|\alpha| \leq 1$, and from $\alpha_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ that $\frac{d}{4} - 1 + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \alpha_1 < \gamma < \gamma + \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1$. Hence, Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $s \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - \frac{1}{2}$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - 1 + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \alpha_1$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - 1 + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \alpha_1$, $u \leftarrow u$, $v \leftarrow u$) and the assumption $\alpha_1 < \gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2}$ establishes that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.102) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_{d/4-1+|\alpha|/2+\alpha_1}} \\ & \leq C_2 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_{d/4-1/2+\gamma-d/4+1/2}} = C_2 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we proof (5.97). Note that it holds that $(2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2) + (\gamma + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2) = 2\gamma + \frac{d}{2} + (\gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2)$. Moreover, we have that $2\gamma + (2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2) = 2\gamma + \frac{d}{2} + (2\gamma - \frac{d}{2} + 1 - 2\alpha_2)$. In addition, the assumption $\alpha_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ assures that $2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2 > 2\gamma$. Furthermore, the assumption $\gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2} > \alpha_2$ verifies that $\gamma > \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$. Thus Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow 0$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow \frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{d}{8} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma - \frac{d}{2} + 1 - 2\alpha_2$, $s \leftarrow \gamma$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$,

$\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2$) and the fact that $\gamma > \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$ show that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.103) \quad \begin{aligned} \|uv\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}(\Omega)} &\leq C_1(\|u\|_{H_\gamma}\|v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma/2+d/8-1/4+\alpha_2/2}}\|v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}) \\ &\leq C_2\|u\|_{H_\gamma}\|v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We will divide the proof of (5.98) into 2 cases.

1. *case* $4s \geq d - 2|\alpha|$. We then get that $2(s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|)) + 2(\frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}) = 2s + |\alpha| + \frac{d}{2} + (s - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + 2\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|))$, that $s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \frac{d}{4} \leq 2s + |\alpha|$, and that $s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|) > \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$. Therefore, Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} - \frac{d}{8} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|)$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow s - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + 2\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|)$, $s \leftarrow s$, $r_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|)$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|)$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$) and the fact that $s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2} + \varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d - 2|\alpha|) > \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$ yield that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.104) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_1(\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}}\|v\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}} + \|v\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}}\|u\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}}) \\ &\leq C_2\|u\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}}\|v\|_{H_{s+|\alpha|/2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{4s\}}(d-2|\alpha|)}}. \end{aligned}$$

2. *case* $4s < d - 2|\alpha|$. This shows that $\frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8} > s + \frac{|\alpha|}{2}$ and thus Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $s \leftarrow s$, $r_1 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{s}{2} + \frac{|\alpha|}{4} + \frac{d}{8}$) verifies that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.105) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2s}(\Omega)} \leq C_1\|u\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}}\|v\|_{H_{s/2+|\alpha|/4+d/8}}.$$

For the proof of (5.99) we assume that $\gamma + \vartheta - 1 \geq 0$. Observe that the assumption $\gamma < \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$ and the assumption that $|\alpha| \leq 1$ ensure that $\frac{d}{2} - 2 + |\alpha| < 2\gamma < 2\gamma + 2\vartheta$. Thus Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $s \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - 1$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - 1 + \frac{|\alpha|}{2}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - 1 + \frac{|\alpha|}{2}$, $u \leftarrow u$, $v \leftarrow u$) and the fact that $\frac{d}{2} - 2 + |\alpha| < 2\gamma + 2\vartheta$ imply that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.106) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-2}(\Omega)} \leq C_1\|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}\|u\|_{H_{d/4-1+|\alpha|/2}} \leq C_2\|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}\|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}.$$

Next assume that $2\gamma - 1 \geq 0$ and that $|\alpha| = 1$. Then it holds that $(2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2) + (\gamma + \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2) = (2\gamma - 1) + 1 + \frac{d}{2} + (\gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2)$. Furthermore, we have that $2\gamma + (2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2) = (2\gamma - 1) + 1 + \frac{d}{2} + (2\gamma - \frac{d}{2} + 1 - 2\alpha_2)$. In addition, the assumption $\alpha_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ verifies that $2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2 > 2\gamma - 1$. Moreover, it follows from the assumption $\gamma - \frac{d}{4} + \frac{1}{2} > \alpha_2$ that $\gamma > \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$. Thus Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\delta \leftarrow \frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{d}{8} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma - \frac{d}{2} + 1 - 2\alpha_2$, $s \leftarrow \gamma - \frac{1}{2}$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2$, $u \leftarrow u$, $v \leftarrow u - v$) and the fact that $\gamma > \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha_2}{2}$ show that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.107) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha u)(u - v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma-1}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C_1(\|u\|_{H_\gamma}\|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma/2+d/8-1/4+\alpha_2/2}}\|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}) \\ &\leq C_2\|u\|_{H_\gamma}\|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the assumption $\alpha_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ ensures that $2\gamma + 1 - 2\alpha_2 > (2\gamma - 1) + 1$ and the assumption $\alpha_2 < \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{4}$ ensures that $\gamma > \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2$. Therefore, Corollary 5.9 (with $p \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow 0$, $\beta \leftarrow \alpha$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $s \leftarrow \gamma - \frac{1}{2}$, $r_1 \leftarrow \gamma$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \gamma + \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{d}{4}$, $u \leftarrow v$, $v \leftarrow u - v$) and the fact that $\gamma > \frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2$ yield that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(5.108) \quad \begin{aligned} \|v D_{\mathbb{R}^d}^\alpha(u - v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma-1}(\Omega)} &\leq C_1(\|v\|_{H_\gamma} \|u - v\|_{H_{d/4}} + \|v\|_{H_{d/4-1/2+\alpha_2}} \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}) \\ &\leq C_2 \|v\|_{H_\gamma} \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\alpha_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.107) and (5.108) proves (5.100) and thus finishes the proof of Corollary 5.10. \square

5.3. Estimates for Nemytskij operators on Besov spaces

In this subsection we establish bounds for Nemytskij operators. For a more detailed overview on this subject we refer to Chapter 5 in Runst & Sickel [31].

LEMMA 5.11 (Upper bound for the Slobodeckij semi-norm of Nemytskij operators). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in [0, \infty]$, $q \in [2, \infty]$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s)$, satisfy that $pq \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p)$, let $b \in C_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $K_1 : [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, and all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$ and that*

$$(5.109) \quad K_1(r, u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 0 \\ \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(rq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2r} + 1 & \text{if } r \in (0, \infty) \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$, it holds that

$$(5.110) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|b(x, u(x)) - b(y, u(y))|^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq C K_1(p, u) \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1).$$

PROOF. We will divide the proof into 3 cases.

1. case $p = 0$. First note that we get from the assumption that for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ it holds that $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$, from the fact that Ω is bounded, from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25], and from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$, that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.111) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|b(x, u(x)) - b(y, u(y))|^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)), \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (x - y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 dt dx dy \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)' }^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \\ &\quad \cdot (\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 + \|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2) dt dx dy \\ &\leq K^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(s-1)+d}} + \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dt dx dy \\ &\leq C_1(1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \leq C_2(1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \\ &= C_2 K_1(0, u) \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

2. case $p \in (0, \infty)$. Note that we get from Hölder's inequality, the fact that Ω is bounded, from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25], and from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page

31 in Runst & Sickel [31]) that for all $\delta \in (0, 1 - s)$ and all $q_1, q_2 \in (2, \infty)$ with $1/q_1 + 1/q_2 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and all $v \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_1}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\delta q_1}} dx dy \right)^{2/q_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{q_2/2(2s+d-(d-\delta q_1)2/q_1)}} dx dy \right)^{2/q_2} \\
(5.112) \quad & \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\delta q_1}} dy \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_1} dx \right)^{2/q_1} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{q_2 s + d q_2/2 - d q_2(1/2 - 1/q_2) + \delta q_2}} dx dy \right)^{2/q_2} \\
& \leq C_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_1} dx \right)^{2/q_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{q_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{q_2(s+\delta)+d}} dx dy \right)^{2/q_2} \\
& \leq C_2 \|u\|_{L^{q_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\delta}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \leq C_3 \|u\|_{L^{q_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\delta+d/q_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, it follows from Hölder's inequality, the fact that Ω is bounded, and from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., item (e) in the Theorem on page 327 in Triebel [34]) that for all $\delta \in (0, 1 - s)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.113) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-2\delta}} dx dy \cdot \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{\|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+2\delta}} \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-2\delta}} dy \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dx \cdot \|v\|_{C^{s+\delta}(\Omega, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\delta+d/2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar we obtain that from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25] that for all $\delta \in (0, 1 - s)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.114) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq C \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.112) (with $u \leftarrow u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), (5.113) (with $u \leftarrow u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), (5.114) (with $u \leftarrow u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), the fact that $pq \geq 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(0,\infty)}(p)$, and the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 and Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]) verifies that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p} \|v(x) - v(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 \|u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}\|_{L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
(5.115) \quad & \leq C_2 \| \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p \|u\|_{L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_3 \|u\|_{L^{pq}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_4 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we get from the assumption that for all $x \in \Omega$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ it holds that $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$, from (5.115), from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea

[25], from the fact that $q \geq 2$, from the fact that Ω is bounded, from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$, the fact that $pq \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(p)$, and from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]) that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.116) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|b(x, u(x)) - b(y, u(y))|^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (x - y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 dt dx dy \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \\
& \quad \cdot (\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 + \|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2) dt dx dy \\
& \leq K^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{(\|tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^{2p}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(s-1)+d}} \\
& \quad + \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot (\|tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^{2p}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dt dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p} + 1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(s-1)+d}} + \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p} + 1)}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C_2 (1 + \|u\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \\
& \leq C_3 (1 + \|u\|_{L^{pq}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + 1) \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \\
& \leq C_4 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + 1) (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1) \\
& = C_4 K_1(p, u) \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

3. case $p = \infty$. Then, it follows from the fact that Ω is bounded, from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25], and from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.117) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|b(x, u(x)) - b(y, u(y))|^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (x - y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 dt dx dy \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \\
& \quad \cdot (\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 + \|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2) dt dx dy \\
& \leq \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}), \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(s-1)+d}} + \frac{\|u(x)-u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dt dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)), \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \\
& \leq C_2 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)), \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \\
& = C_2 K_1(\infty, u) \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1)
\end{aligned}$$

and this together with (5.111) and with (5.116) completes the poof of Lemma 5.11. \square

The next lemma establish a bound on the L^2 -norm.

LEMMA 5.12 (Upper bound for the L^2 -norm of Nemytskij operators). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in [0, \infty]$, $b \in C_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $K_2: [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$ and all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$ and that*

$$(5.118) \quad K_2(r, u) = \begin{cases} (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(2r+2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2r+2}) & \text{if } r \in [0, \infty) \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$, it holds that

$$(5.119) \quad \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x))|^2 dx \leq C \cdot K_2(p, u) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx.$$

PROOF. We will divide the proof into 2 cases

1. case $p \in [0, \infty)$. Then it follows from $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$ that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.120) \quad & \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x))|^2 dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x)), (0, u(x)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)} dt + b(x, 0) \right|^2 dx \\
& \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 + |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
& \leq 2K^2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 (1+t|u(x)|)^p dt \cdot \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we derive from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]) that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.121) \quad & \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x))|^2 dx \leq 2^{p+1} K^2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 1 + t^p \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p dt \cdot \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
& \leq 2^{p+1} K^2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p+1}}{p+1} \right|^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
& \leq 2^{p+2} K^2 \int_{\Omega} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p+2}}{(p+1)^2} dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
& \leq C_1 (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^{2p+2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p+2}) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
& \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(2p+2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p+2} \right) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$= C_2 \cdot K_2(p, u) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx.$$

2. case $p = \infty$. Then it holds for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x))|^2 dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x)), (0, u(x)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)} dt + b(x, 0) \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x)) \|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 + |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
(5.122) \quad &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \| D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b \|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 + |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
&= 2 \int_{\Omega} \| D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b \|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
&= 2 \| D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b \|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\
&= 2 \cdot K_2(\infty, u) + 2 \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the two cases finishes the proof of Lemma 5.12. \square

As a direct consequence of Lemma 5.11 and Lemma 5.12 we get the next corollary.

Corollary 5.13 (Upper bound for the Besov-norm of Nemytskij operators). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s)$, $p \in [0, \infty]$, $q \in [2, \infty]$, with $pq \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p)$, let $b \in C^1_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $K_1, K_2 : [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, and all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K(\|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + 1)^p$, that*

$$(5.123) \quad K_1(r, u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 0 \\ \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(rq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2r} + 1 & \text{if } r \in (0, \infty) \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} & \text{if } r = \infty, \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(5.124) \quad K_2(r, u) = \begin{cases} (\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(2r+2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2r+2}) & \text{if } r \in [0, \infty) \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$, it holds that

$$(5.125) \quad \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega)}^2 \leq C K_1(p, u) \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{[2,\infty)}(q)+d/q}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1) + C K_2(p, u) + C \int_{\Omega} |b(x, 0)|^2 dx.$$

PROOF. This Corollary follows directly from Lemma 5.11, Lemma 5.12, and from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25]. \square

The next lemma shows the Lipschitz continuity with respect to Slobodeckij semi-norms of Nemytskij operators on bounded sets.

LEMMA 5.14 (Lipschitz continuity wrt. Slobodeckij semi-norms of Nemytskij operators on bounded sets). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $s \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s)$, $p_1, p_2 \in [0, \infty]$, $q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4, q_5 \in [2, \infty]$, satisfy that $1/q_1 + 1/q_2 + 1/q_3 = 1/q_4 + 1/q_5 = 1/2$, that $p_1 q_3 \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p_1)$, and that $p_2 q_5 \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p_2)$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$,*

$b \in C_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^{1,2}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $b_2'' \in C(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'))$, $K_1: [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $K_2: [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $p \in [0, \infty]$, $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and all $u_1, u_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.126) \quad b_2''(x, y) = \left(D_{\mathbb{R}^m}(\mathbb{R}^m \ni z \rightarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)') \right)(y),$$

that

$$(5.127) \quad K_1(p, u_1, u_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 0 \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq_3)+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty), \\ \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|u_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')}}^2 & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases},$$

that

$$(5.128) \quad K_2(p, u_1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq_5)+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_5)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + 1 & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty), \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases},$$

that

$$(5.129) \quad \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K \cdot (1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^{p_2},$$

and that

$$(5.130) \quad \|b_2''(x, y)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')} \leq K \cdot (1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^{p_1}.$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.131) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{|b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x)) - b(y, u(y)) + b(y, \tilde{u}(y))|^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ & \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right) \cdot K_1(p_1, u, \tilde{u}) \\ & \quad + C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(p_2, \tilde{u}). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. First denote by $\mathbf{1} \in C(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ the function satisfying for all $x \in \Omega$ that

$$(5.132) \quad \mathbf{1}(x) = (1, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Next note that Hölder's inequality and the fact that Ω is bounded verify that for all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2 \in (2, \infty)$ and all $t \in (s, \infty)$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 = 1/2$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that all $v_1, v_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.133) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2t}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ & = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(d+2s-2t)/\tilde{q}_1}} \frac{\|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2(d+2s-2t)/\tilde{q}_2}} dx dy \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_1}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d+2s-2t}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d+2s-2t}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_2} \\ & = \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d+2(s-t)}} dy \|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_1} dx \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d+2(s-t)}} dx \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_2} dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_2} \\ & \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, it holds that for all $t \in (s, \infty)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that all $v_1, v_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

(5.134)

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2t}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d+2(s-t)}} dx \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dy \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.$$

Analogously it follows that for all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2 \in [2, \infty]$ and all $t \in (s, \infty)$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 = 1/2$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that all $v_1, v_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.135) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2t}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.$$

Moreover, Hölder's inequality, the fact that Ω is bounded, Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25], and the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]) imply that for all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty)$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

(5.136)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_1/2)2/\tilde{q}_1}} \frac{\|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_2/2)2/\tilde{q}_2}} \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d-(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_1/2)2/\tilde{q}_1-(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_2/2)2/\tilde{q}_2}} dx dy \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_1}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_1/2}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_2/2}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_2} \\ & \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_3}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{(2s+d-(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_1/2)2/\tilde{q}_1-(d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_2/2)2/\tilde{q}_2)\tilde{q}_3/2}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_3} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_1/2}} dy \|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_1} dx \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_1} \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-\varepsilon\tilde{q}_2/2}} dx \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_2} dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_2} \\ & \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_3}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{(2s+d(1-2/\tilde{q}_1-2/\tilde{q}_2)+2\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_3/2}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_3} \\ &\leq C_1 \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tilde{q}_3}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{\tilde{q}_3(s+\varepsilon)+d}} dx dy \right)^{2/\tilde{q}_3} \\ &\leq C_2 \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{\tilde{q}_3, \tilde{q}_3}^{s+\varepsilon}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\ &\leq C_3 \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously to (5.136) and to (5.112) it follows that for all $\tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3 \in (2, \infty)$ with $1/\tilde{q}_2 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.137) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ &\leq \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ &\leq C \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we get from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25] that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
(5.138) \quad & \leq \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally observe, that (5.133), (5.134) (with $t \leftarrow s + \varepsilon$) and the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., item (e) in the Theorem on page 327 in Triebel [34]) show that for all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 = 1/2$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
(5.139) \quad & \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{d-2\varepsilon}} dx dy \cdot \sup_{x,y \in \Omega} \frac{\|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+2\varepsilon}} \\
& \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \|v_3\|_{C^{s+\varepsilon}(\Omega, \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})}^2 \\
& \leq C \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+\varepsilon+d/2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.136) (with $v_1 \leftarrow v_1 \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), (5.137) (with $v_1 \leftarrow v_1 \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), (5.138) (with $v_1 \leftarrow v_1 \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), (5.139) (with $v_1 \leftarrow v_1 \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p-1}$), and the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 and Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]) yields that for all $p \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ and with $p \cdot \tilde{q}_1 \geq 2$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p} \|v_2(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
(5.140) \quad & \leq C_1 \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{p-1} \|v_1\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \|v_1\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_3 \|v_1\|_{L^{p\tilde{q}_1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v_2\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_4 \|v_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p\tilde{q}_1)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q}_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/\tilde{q}_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q}_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad \cdot \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that for all $p \in (0, \infty)$ and all $\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ and with $p \cdot \tilde{q}_1 \geq 2$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|v_1(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p} \|v_2(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|v_3(x) - v_3(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
(5.141) \quad & \leq C \|v_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p\tilde{q}_1)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q}_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \|v_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/\tilde{q}_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q}_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad \cdot \|v_3\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next note that for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.142) \quad b(x, u(x)) - b(y, u(y)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x)) + b(y, \tilde{u}(y))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, tu(x) + (1-t)u(y)), \right. \\
&\quad \left. (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
&\quad - \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \\
&\quad \left. (x-y, \tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \\
&\quad \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

We will now estimate the first term. Therefore we divide the proof into 3 cases.

1. case $p_1 = 0$. The assumption (5.130) implies that for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

(5.143)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\| b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')} \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 K d\lambda \cdot (t\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + (1-t)\|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}) \\
&\quad \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
&= K \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \int_0^1 (t\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + (1-t)\|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}) dt \\
&= \frac{K}{2} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}).
\end{aligned}$$

We thus get from (5.143), (5.135) (with $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow 2$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$, and with $t \leftarrow 1$), from (5.140) (with $p \leftarrow 1$, $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $v_3 \leftarrow u$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_1$, and with $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$), from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$, and from the fact that $\tilde{q}_3 \leq q_2$ that for all $\tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

(5.144)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \right|^2 \\
&\quad \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{K^2}{4} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
&\leq \frac{K^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
&\quad + \frac{K^2}{2} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
&= K^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
&\quad + K^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
&\leq C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon 1\{\infty\}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon 1(2,\infty)(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
&\leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon 1\{\infty\}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon 1(2,\infty)(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1) \\
&= C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon 1\{\infty\}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon 1(2,\infty)(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1) \cdot K_1(0, u, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

2. case $p_1 \in (0, \infty)$. We then get from the assumption (5.130) that for all $x, y \in \Omega$, $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.145) \quad &\int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \left\| b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')} \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda \\
&\leq \int_0^1 K(1 + \|\lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^{p_1} d\lambda \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \\
&\leq \int_0^1 5^{p_1} \cdot K(1 + \lambda^{p_1} t^{p_1} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \lambda^{p_1} (1-t)^{p_1} \|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} \\
&\quad + (1-\lambda)^{p_1} t^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + (1-\lambda)^{p_1} (1-t)^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) d\lambda \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \\
&= \frac{5^{p_1}}{p_1+1} \cdot K(p_1 + 1 + t^{p_1} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + (1-t)^{p_1} \|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + t^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + (1-t)^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, it holds for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^1 (p_1 + 1 + t^{p_1} \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + (1-t)^{p_1} \|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + t^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + (1-t)^{p_1} \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \\
&\quad \cdot \|t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
&\leq \int_0^1 t(p_1 + 1) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + (1-t)(p_1 + 1) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^1 t^{p_1+1} (\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& + \int_0^1 (1-t)t^{p_1} (\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& + \int_0^1 (1-t)^{p_1} t (\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
(5.146) \quad & + \int_0^1 (1-t)^{p_1+1} (\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& = \frac{(p_1+1)}{2} \cdot (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}) \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1+2} (\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \\
& + \frac{1}{(p_1+1)(p_1+2)} (\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \\
& + \frac{1}{(p_1+1)(p_1+2)} (\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1+2} (\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore it follows from (5.135) (with $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow 2$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$, and with $t \leftarrow 1$), (5.140) (with $p \leftarrow 1$, $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $v_3 \leftarrow u$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_1$, and with $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$), from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$, and from the fact that $\tilde{q}_3 \leq q_2$ that for all $\tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_3 + 1/q_3 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.147) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& + 2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& = 4 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& + 4 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we obtain from (5.135) (with $v_1 \leftarrow u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1-1}$ resp. $\tilde{u} \cdot \|\tilde{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1-1}$, $v_2 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_3$, and with $t \leftarrow 1$) and from (5.141) (with $p \leftarrow p_1$, $v_1 \leftarrow u$ resp. \tilde{u} , $v_2 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_3 \leftarrow u$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_3$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow q_1$, and with $\tilde{q}_3 \leftarrow q_2$), that for all $\tilde{q}_2 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/\tilde{q}_2 + 1/q_3 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.148) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1})^2 \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_1}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 (\|u \cdot \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1-1} \|_{L^{q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + \|\tilde{u} \cdot \|\tilde{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1-1} \|_{L^{q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2) \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad + C_1 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 (\|u\|_{L^{p_1q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{p_1q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1}) \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad + C_1 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 and Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]), the fact that $\tilde{q}_2 \leq q_1$, and the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ shows that for all $\tilde{q}_2 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/q_3 + 1/\tilde{q}_2 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1})^2 \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \\
& \quad \cdot \|(x - y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2 dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 (\|u\|_{L^{p_1q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{p_1q_3}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1}) \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\tilde{q}_2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad + C_1 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
(5.149) \quad & \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/\tilde{q}_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(\tilde{q}_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + C_2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad \cdot \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.150) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1})^2 \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|(x - y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1q_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

that

$$(5.151) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1})^2 \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy$$

$$\leq C \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right)$$

$$\cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right),$$

and that

$$(5.152) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_1}) \cdot \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \cdot \|(x-y, u(x) - u(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy$$

$$\leq C \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right)$$

$$\cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right).$$

Combining (5.145), (5.146), (5.147), (5.149), (5.150), (5.151), and (5.152) establishes that there exist a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.153) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \right.$$

$$\left. \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \right|^2$$

$$\cdot \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy$$

$$\leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right)$$

$$+ C \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} \right)$$

$$\cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right)$$

$$= C \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_1 q_3)+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_1} + 1 \right)$$

$$\cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right)$$

$$= C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right) \cdot K_1(p_1, u, \tilde{u}).$$

3. case $p_1 = \infty$. We then get that for all $x, y \in \Omega$, $R \in [0, \infty]$, and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq R$ it holds that

$$(5.154) \quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right.$$

$$\left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\| b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) \right.$$

$$\left. + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')} d\lambda dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot \left\| t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \cdot \left\| (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} d\lambda \cdot (t\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + (1-t)\|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}) \\
& \quad \cdot \left\| (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& = \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \cdot \left\| (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \\
& \quad \int_0^1 (t\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + (1-t)\|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}) dt \\
& = 1/2 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times (-R, R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \left\| (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} \\
& \quad \cdot (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (5.154), (5.135) (with $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow 2$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$, $t \leftarrow 1$), (5.140) (with $p \leftarrow 1$, $v_1 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $v_3 \leftarrow u$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_1$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$), the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ and the fact that $\tilde{q}_3 \leq q_2$ assures that for all $\tilde{q}_3 \in [2, \infty]$ with $1/q_1 + 1/\tilde{q}_3 = 1/2$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $R \in [0, \infty]$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ with $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} = R$ it holds that

(5.155)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \right|^2 \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq 1/4 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \\
& \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\left\| (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq 1/2 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \\
& \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 (\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + \|u(y) - \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2)}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \right) \\
& = \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \left(\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - u(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \right) \\
& \leq C_1 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \left(\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/\tilde{q}_3+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(\tilde{q}_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C_2 \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(R), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \quad \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right) \cdot K_1(\infty, u, \tilde{u}).$$

Combining the 3 cases (5.144), (5.153), and (5.155) proves that there exist a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.156) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle b_2''(tx + (1-t)y, \lambda tu(x) + \lambda(1-t)u(y) + (1-\lambda)t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-\lambda)(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \cdot (t(u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) + (1-t)(u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))), (x-y, u(x) - u(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} d\lambda dt \right|^2 \\ \cdot \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right) \cdot K_1(p_1, u, \tilde{u})$$

and this finishes the estimation of the first term in (5.142). Next we will estimate the 2nd term in (5.142). Therefore we will again divide the proof into 3 cases.

1. *case* $p_2 = 0$. Note that assumption (5.129) verifies that for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.157) \quad \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \\ \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\ \leq \int_0^1 \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \\ \cdot \| (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\ \leq \int_0^1 K \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt = K \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}.$$

Hence we derive from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25] and from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.158) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx dy \\ \leq K^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\ \leq C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\ = C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(0, \tilde{u}).$$

2. *case* $p_2 \in (0, \infty)$. Assumption (5.129) yields that for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \\ \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\ \leq \int_0^1 \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)) \|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.159) \quad & \cdot \|(0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 K(1 + \|t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_2}) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 3^{p_2} K(1 + \|t\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_2} + \|(1-t)\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_2}) dt \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \\
& = \frac{3^{p_2}}{p_2+1} K(p_2 + 1 + \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_2} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{p_2}) \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we obtain from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25] and from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.160) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \leq C_1 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon_1(2,\infty)(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, (5.140) (with $v_1 \leftarrow \tilde{u}$, $v_2 \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$, $v_3 \leftarrow u - \tilde{u}$, $p \leftarrow p_2$, $\tilde{q}_1 \leftarrow q_5$, $\tilde{q}_2 \leftarrow \infty$, $\tilde{q}_3 \leftarrow q_4$) implies that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.161) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_2} + \|\tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_2}) \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& = 2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p_2} \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_2q_5)+\varepsilon_1\{\infty\}(q_5)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_2} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon_1(2,\infty)(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.159), (5.160), and (5.161) thus ensures that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.162) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \\
& \quad \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx dy \\
& \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon_1(2,\infty)(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(p_2q_5)+\varepsilon_1\{\infty\}(q_5)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p_2} + 1 \right) \\
& = C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon_1(2,\infty)(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(p_2, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

3. case $p_2 = \infty$. Note that we have for all $x, y \in \Omega$ and all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.163) \quad & \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \\
& \quad (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& \leq \int_0^1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \\
& \quad \cdot \|(0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& \leq \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \int_0^1 \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \\
& = \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25] and the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$

establish that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.164) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx dy \\
& \leq \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{\|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - (u(y) - \tilde{u}(y))\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} dx dy \\
& \leq C_1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s,d}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2,\infty\}}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
& = C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2,\infty\}}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(\infty, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the 3 cases (5.158), (5.162), and (5.164) shows that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.165) \quad & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\|x-y\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{2s+d}} \left| \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(tx + (1-t)y, t\tilde{u}(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(y)), \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x) - u(y) + \tilde{u}(y)) \right\rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx dy \\
& \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2,\infty\}}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(p_2, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (5.142), (5.156), and (5.165) finishes the proof of Lemma 5.14. \square

The next lemma shows the Lipschitz continuity of Nemytskij operators on bounded sets in the L^2 -norm.

LEMMA 5.15 (Lipschitz continuity wrt. the L^2 -norm of Nemytskij operators on bounded sets). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $p \in [0, \infty]$, $q \in [2, \infty]$, satisfy that $pq \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(p)$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$, $b \in C_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^1(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $K_1 : [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$, $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and all $u_1, u_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that*

$$(5.166) \quad K_1(r, u_1, u_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r = 0 \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(rq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2r} & \text{if } r \in (0, \infty) \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } r = \infty \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(5.167) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K \cdot (1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^p.$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.168) \quad \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x))|^2 dx \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 K_1(p, u, \tilde{u}).$$

PROOF. We will divide the proof into 3 cases.

1. case $p = 0$. We thus get from (5.167) and from the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq$

$C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.169) \quad & \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x))|^2 dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x)), (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 K \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx = K^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \\
&= C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 K_1(0, u, \tilde{u}).
\end{aligned}$$

2. case $p \in (0, \infty)$. Hence, it follows from (5.167) that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and all $x \in \Omega$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.170) \quad & |b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x))|^2 \\
&= \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x)), (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 \\
&\leq \left| \int_0^1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 \\
&\leq \left| \int_0^1 (1 + \|tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^p \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 \\
&\leq \left| 3^p \int_0^1 1 + t^p \|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p + (1-t)^p \|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p dt \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \right|^2 \\
&= 9^p \left(1 + \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p}{p+1} + \frac{\|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p}{p+1} \right)^2 \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 and Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]) and with the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ implies that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and all $q' \in [2, \infty]$ with $\frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.171) \quad & \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x))|^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} 9^p \left(1 + \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p}{p+1} + \frac{\|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p}{p+1} \right)^2 \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} 9^{p+1} \left(1 + \frac{\|u(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p}}{(p+1)^2} + \frac{\|\tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{2p}}{(p+1)^2} \right) \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dx \\
&\leq C_1 \left(\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} + \left(\| \|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^2 + \| \|\tilde{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^p \|_{L^q(\Omega)}^2 \right) \cdot \| \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|_{L^{q'}(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C_2 \left(\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} + \left(\|u\|_{L^{pq}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{pq}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \right) \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^{q'}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C_3 \left(\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} + \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q'+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q')}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C_4 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + 1 \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$= C_4 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 K_1(p, u, \tilde{u}).$$

3. case $p = \infty$. Note that the fact that for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $t \in (-\infty, r]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that $\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^t(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^r(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ establishes that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.172) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |b(x, u(x)) - b(x, \tilde{u}(x))|^2 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x)), (0, u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)', \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)\tilde{u}(x))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \int_0^1 \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m))}, \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})} \cdot \|u(x) - \tilde{u}(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} dt \right|^2 dx \\ &= \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 K_1(\infty, u, \tilde{u}) \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 K_1(\infty, u, \tilde{u}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the 3 cases (5.169), (5.171), and (5.172) completes the proof of Lemma 5.15. \square

The next corollary is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.14 and Lemma 5.15.

Corollary 5.16 (Lipschitz continuity wrt. Besov-norms of Nemytskij operators on bounded sets). *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain, denote by $B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $r \in [0, \infty]$, the ball satisfying that for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ it holds that $B(r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq r\}$, let $s \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1 - s)$, $p_1, p_2 \in [0, \infty]$, $q, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4, q_5 \in [2, \infty]$, satisfy that $1/q_1 + 1/q_2 + 1/q_3 = 1/q_4 + 1/q_5 = 1/2$, that $p_1 q_3 \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p_1)$, that $p_2 q_5 \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p_2)$, and that $p_2 q \geq 2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(p_2)$, let $K \in (0, \infty)$, $b \in C_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m}^{1,2}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R})$, $b_2'' \in C(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m, L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'))$, $K_1, K_3: [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $K_2: [0, \infty] \times L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, satisfy that for all $p \in [0, \infty]$, $x \in \Omega$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $u_1 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and all $u_2 \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that*

$$(5.173) \quad b_2''(x, y) = \left(D_{\mathbb{R}^m}(\mathbb{R}^m \ni z \rightarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b(x, z) \in (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)') \right)(y),$$

that

$$(5.174) \quad K_1(p, u_1, u_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 0 \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq_3)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_3)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty), \\ \|b_2''\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|u_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}), \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases}$$

that

$$(5.175) \quad K_2(p, u_1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq_5)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_5)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} + 1 & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty), \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}), \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases}$$

that

$$(5.176) \quad K_3(p, u_1, u_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 0 \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/(pq)+\varepsilon\mathbb{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^{2p} & \text{if } p \in (0, \infty), \\ \|D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b\|_{C(\Omega \times B(\|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)} \vee \|u_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}), \|\cdot\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'})}^2 & \text{if } p = \infty \end{cases}$$

that

$$(5.177) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m} b)(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)'} \leq K \cdot (1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^{p_2},$$

and that

$$(5.178) \quad \|b_2''(x, y)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^m, (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)')} \leq K \cdot (1 + \|y\|_{\mathbb{R}^m})^{p_1}.$$

Then there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, \tilde{u} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)$ it holds that

$$(5.179) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, \tilde{u}(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^s(\Omega, \mathbb{R})}^2 \\ & \leq C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/2-d/q_1+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{\infty\}}(q_1)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_2+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_2)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 + 1 \right) \cdot K_1(p_1, u, \tilde{u}) \\ & + C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s+d/2-d/q_4+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{(2,\infty]}(q_4)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_2(p_2, \tilde{u}) \\ & + C \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{d/q+\varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{\{2\}}(q)}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 \cdot K_3(p_2, u, \tilde{u}). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 5.14, Lemma 5.15, and from Proposition 2.28 in Mitrea [25]. \square

CHAPTER 6

Application

In this chapter we apply the results of Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 to stochastic Burgers equations and stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations. In Section 6.1 we apply Corollary 3.9 and Theorem 4.5 to Kolmogorov backward equations of stochastic Burgers equations and in Section 6.2 to Kolmogorov backward equations of stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations.

6.1. Stochastic Burgers equations

In this section we prove that Kolmogorov equations of stochastic Burgers equations have a unique viscosity solution having at most polynomial growth.

Setting 6.1. Let $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H) = \mathbb{L}^2(0, 1)$ be the L^2 space, let $\Delta: L^2(0, 1) \supseteq D(\Delta) \rightarrow L^2(0, 1)$ be the Laplace operator with Dirichlet boundary condition i.e. the operator satisfying that $D(\Delta) = \{u \in B_{2,2}^2(0, 1): u(0) = u(1) = 0\}$, and that for all $u \in D(\Delta)$ it holds that $\Delta(u) = u''$, let $\mathbb{H}_t = (H_t, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_t}, \|\cdot\|_{H_t})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $-\Delta$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in Jentzen [18]). By abuse of notation we will also denote by Δ and by $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the extended operators $\Delta: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_t$, and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that

$$(6.1) \quad \|y\|_{H_t} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_t} & \text{if } y \in H_t \\ \infty & \text{if } y \notin H_t \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(6.2) \quad (\Delta(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|\Delta(\xi) - y\|_{H_{t-1}}: \xi \in H_1, \|x - \xi\|_{H_t} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0).$$

Let $e_k \in L^2(0, 1)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be the eigenfunction of Δ satisfying for all $x \in (0, 1)$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $e_k(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(k\pi x)$, let $\lambda_k \in (-\infty, 0)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be the eigenvalues of e_k i.e. the real number satisfying for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\lambda_k = -\pi^2 k^2$, let $\alpha \in (3/4, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$, $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ let $\mathbb{U} = (U, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ be a real separable Hilbert space, let $B \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \text{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta})}(H, \text{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta}))$, and denote by $F: H \rightarrow H_{-\alpha}$ the function satisfying for all $u \in H$ that $F(u) = -\frac{c}{2}(u^2)'$.

LEMMA 6.2. Assume the Setting 6.1 and let $r \in [0, \infty)$. Then there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_r$ it holds that

$$(6.3) \quad C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1)} \leq \|u\|_{H_r} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1)}.$$

PROOF. Note that we obtain from (2.200) on page 54 in Mitrea [25] and from Theorem 1.8 in Nečas [26] that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_n$ it holds that

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2n}(0,1)} &\leq K_1 (\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}}^i u\|_{L^2(0,1)}) \leq K_2 (\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|D_{\mathbb{R}}^{2n} u\|_{L^2(0,1)}) \\ &= K_2 (\|u\|_H + \|\Delta^n u\|_H) \leq K_2 (|\lambda_1|^{-n} \|u\|_{H_n} + \|u\|_{H_n}) \leq K_3 \|u\|_{H_n} = K_3 \|D_{\mathbb{R}}^{2n} u\|_{L^2(0,1)} \\ &\leq K_3 (\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}}^i u\|_{L^2(0,1)}) \leq K_4 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2n}(0,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and Lemma 5.2 finishes the proof of Lemma 6.2. □

The next corollary establishes our main result of this section. It follow from Corollary 3.9 and Theorem 4.5.

Corollary 6.3. *Assume the Setting 6.1, let $\vartheta \in [1/2, \infty)$, $T, \theta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta_3 \in (0, 1)$, $\chi \in [\beta, 1/2)$, let $\mathcal{P}_0 \in L(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U})$ be the function satisfying that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \text{Id}_U$, let $\mathcal{P}_N \in L(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be finite-dimensional projection, let $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{H}}(H, \mathbb{R})$ have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, let $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be increasing, and assume that*

$$(6.5) \quad B|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta-\beta_3}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{1/2+\vartheta-\beta_3}, \mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}(H_{1/2+\vartheta-\beta_3}, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)),$$

that for all $u, v \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.6) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq \theta \cdot (1 + \|u\|_H^2),$$

$$(6.7) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)}^2 \leq K(\|u\|_H)(\|u\|_{H_{1/2+\vartheta-\beta_1}}^2 + 1),$$

$$(6.8) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \leq K(\|v\|_H \vee \|u\|_H)\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2-\beta_2}},$$

$$(6.9) \quad |B|_{C^1(H, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta})})} < \infty,$$

and that for all \mathbb{H} -bounded sets $E \subseteq H$ it holds that

$$(6.10) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] < \infty$$

and that

$$(6.11) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\text{Id}_U - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] = 0,$$

let $V_N \subseteq L^2(0, 1)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be the linear subspaces satisfying that $V_0 = H$ and that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $V_N = \text{span}_{\mathbb{H}}(\{e_k: k \in \{1, \dots, N\}\})$, let $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a normal filtration $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, let $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an Id_U -cylindrical $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -Wiener process and let $X^{N, u}: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $u \in H$, be $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted stochastic processes with continuous sample paths satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in [0, T]$, and all $u \in H$ that

$$(6.12) \quad X_t^{N, u} = e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^H u + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H-\alpha} F(X_s^{N, u}) ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H-\beta} B(X_s^{N, u}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s,$$

and let $f: [0, T] \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that for all $(t, u) \in [0, T] \times H$ it holds that $f(t, u) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{0, u})]$. Then $f|_{(0, T) \times H}$ is the unique viscosity solution of

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, u) - \left\langle u'' - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(u^2)', I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}} f)(t, u) \right\rangle_H \\ & - \left\langle B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 f)(t, u) B(u)) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $(t, u) \in (0, T) \times H$ relative to $((0, T) \times H \ni (t, u) \rightarrow 1/2\|u\|_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$ which satisfy that $f \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}([0, T] \times H, \mathbb{R})$, that f is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times H$, that f have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, and that for all $u \in H$ it holds that $f(0, u) = \varphi(u)$.

PROOF. First note that the existence of $X^{N, u}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $u \in H$, follows from Theorem 1.1 and Remark 3.1. in Liu & Röckner [23]. Moreover, the fact that φ have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth verifies that there exists a $p \in [2, \infty)$, which we fix for the rest of the proof, such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{\varphi(u)}{\|u\|_H^p}: u \in H, \|u\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0$. Denote by $V: H \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $u \in H$ that $V(u) = \|u\|_{L^2(0, 1)}^p + 2$. We will now apply Theorem 4.5 to show that f is a viscosity solution. Therefore observe that it follows from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]), from the fact that $2\alpha - 1 > \frac{1}{2}$, and from Lemma 6.2 that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $w \in H_\alpha$ it holds that

$$(6.14) \quad \|w'\|_{L^\infty(0, 1)} \leq C_1 \|w'\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\alpha-1}(0, 1)} \leq C_2 \|w\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\alpha}(0, 1)} \leq C_3 \|w\|_{H_\alpha}.$$

Thus there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.15) \quad & \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_{-\alpha}} = \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha}} \left(\int_0^1 -\frac{c}{2}(u^2 - v^2)'(x) \frac{w(x)}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha}}} dx \right) \\
& = \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha}} \left(\frac{c}{2} \int_0^1 (u^2 - v^2)(x) \frac{w'(x)}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha}}} dx \right) \\
& \leq \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha}} \left(\frac{c}{2} \|(u - v)(u + v)\|_{L^1(0,1)} \cdot \frac{\|w'\|_{L^{\infty}(0,1)}}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha}}} \right) \leq C \|u - v\|_H \cdot \|u + v\|_H
\end{aligned}$$

and this together with (6.9) shows (4.6) (with $\gamma \leftarrow 0$). In addition, we obtain that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and all $u \in H_{2\vartheta} \cap V_N$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.16) \quad & \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\alpha}} F(u), I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(u) \rangle_H = -\frac{cp}{2} \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\alpha}} (u^2)', u \rangle_{L^2(0,1)} \\
& = \frac{cp}{2} \|u\|_H^{p-2} \int_0^1 uu' \cdot u dx = \frac{cp}{6} \|u\|_H^{p-2} \int_0^1 (u^3)' dx = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (6.6) yields that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $u \in H_{2\vartheta} \cap V_N$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.17) \quad & \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\alpha}} F(u) + \Delta u, I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}}V)(u) \rangle_H + 1/2 \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\vartheta}}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 V)(u) \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \\
& = p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle \Delta u, u \rangle_H + p(p-2) \|u\|_H^{p-4} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u), (-\Delta)^{-2\vartheta} u \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \\
& \quad + p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u), (-\Delta)^{-2\vartheta} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta})} \\
& \leq -p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \|u\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + p(p-2) \|u\|_H^{p-4} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u), u \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
& \quad + p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\
& \leq p(p-2) \|u\|_H^{p-2} \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 + p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \|\pi_{V_N}^{H_{-\beta}} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\
& \leq \theta p(p-1) \|u\|_H^{p-2} (1 + \|u\|_H^2) \\
& \leq 2\theta p(p-1) (1 + \|u\|_H^p) \leq 2\theta p(p-1) V(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we get from the product-to-sum identity that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in (0, 1)$ and all $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in [1, N] \cap \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.18) \quad & \left(F \left(\sum_{k=1}^N c_k e_k \right) \right) (x) = -c \sum_{k,l=1}^N 2\pi l c_k c_l \sin(k\pi x) \cos(l\pi x) \\
& = -c \sum_{k,l=1}^N l \pi c_k c_l \cdot (\sin((k-l)\pi x) + \sin((k+l)\pi x))
\end{aligned}$$

and this ensures that for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $F(V_N) \subseteq \bigcap_{r=1}^{\infty} H_r$. Combining this and Lemma 6.2 shows that for all $r, s \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.19) \quad F|_{H_r} \in C_{\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{2s}(0,1)}(H_r, B_{2,2}^{2s}(0,1)) \Leftrightarrow F|_{H_r} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_r, \mathbb{H}_s}(H_r, H_s).$$

Next note that it follows from Lemma 5.3, Lemma 6.2, and from Corollary 5.10 (5.98) (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $s \leftarrow \frac{1}{2} + r$, and with $\alpha \leftarrow 0$) that for all $r \in [-1/2, \infty) \setminus \{-1/4\}$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{(1/2+r) \vee (r/2+3/8)}$ it holds that

$$(6.20) \quad \|(u - v)(u + v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2r}(0,1)} \leq C \|u + v\|_{H_{(1/2+r) \vee (r/2+3/8)}} \|u - v\|_{H_{(1/2+r) \vee (r/2+3/8)}}.$$

Moreover, Lemma 4.9 in Jentzen, Lindner & Pušnik [19] yields that for all $r \in [-1/2, 0]$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{(1/2+r) \vee (r/2+3/8)}$ it holds that

$$(6.21) \quad \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_r} = \| -c(uu' - vv') \|_{H_r} = \frac{c}{2} \|(u^2 - v^2)'\|_{H_r} \leq C \|(u - v)(u + v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2r}(0,1)}.$$

In addition, for all $r \in [0, \infty)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2+r}$ it holds that

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1)} = \| -c(uu' - vv') \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1)} = c/2 \|((u-v)(u+v))'\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}(0,1)} \\ & \leq C \|(u-v)(u+v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1}(0,1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.21), (6.22), (6.20), and (6.19) ensures that for all $r \in [-1/2, \infty) \setminus \{-1/4\}$ it holds that

$$(6.23) \quad F|_{H_{(r+1/2) \vee (r/2+3/8)}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{(r+1/2) \vee (r/2+3/8)}, \mathbb{H}_r}(H_{(r+1/2) \vee (r/2+3/8)}, H_r)$$

and combining (6.21), (6.22), (6.23), and Lemma 6.2 establishes that for all $r \in [-1/2, \infty)$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{(1/2+r+\varepsilon 1_{\{r\}(-1/4)}) \vee (r/2+3/8)}$ it holds that

$$(6.24) \quad \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_r} \leq C \|(u-v)(u+v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2r}(0,1)}.$$

In particular we get from (6.23) (with $r \leftarrow \vartheta - 1/2$) that

$$(6.25) \quad F|_{H_\vartheta} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta-1/2}}(H_\vartheta, H_{\vartheta-1/2}).$$

Combining (6.25), and (6.5) verifies (4.65) (with $\alpha_1 \leftarrow 1/8$). Furthermore, it follows from (6.25), Lemma 6.2, Lemma 5.3, and from (5.96) in Corollary 5.10 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $\gamma \leftarrow 0$, $\alpha_1 \leftarrow 1/8$ and $\alpha \leftarrow 1$) that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{\vartheta+3/8}$ it holds that

$$(6.26) \quad \|F(u)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1/2}} \leq C_1 \|u'u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta-1}(0,1)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_H \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+1/2-1/8}}$$

and this ensures (4.66) (with $\alpha_1 \leftarrow 1/8$, $r_x \leftarrow 1$ and $R_x \leftarrow C_2(\|x\|_H + 1)$). In addition, (6.17) assures that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $(t, u) \in [0, T] \times V_N$ it holds that

$$(6.27) \quad \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^{N,u})] \leq V(u)e^{2\theta p(p-1)t}$$

which shows (4.64). Moreover, it follows from (5.14) in Cox, Hutzenthaler & Jentzen [3] (with $r \leftarrow 3$) that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(\|X_r^{0,x} - X_r^{0,y}\|_H \geq \varepsilon) \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \frac{\|X_r^{0,x} - X_r^{0,y}\|_{L^3(\mathbb{P}; \|\cdot\|_H)}^3}{\varepsilon^3} \\ & \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \left[\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon^3} \|x - y\|_H^3 \cdot \exp(C_2(\|x\|_H^2 + \|y\|_H^2 + 1)) \right] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and this proves (4.62). Furthermore, note that (6.7) verifies (4.67) (with $r_x \leftarrow 1$ and $R_x \leftarrow K(\|x\|_H + 1)$), that (6.10) verifies (4.68), and that (6.11) verifies (4.69). Therefore we derive from Theorem 4.5 that $f \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}(\mathbb{R} \times H, \mathbb{R})$, that f is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times H$, that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.29) \quad \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ f(t, u) - \varphi(v) : u, v \in H_{2\vartheta}, t \in (0, T), \|u\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \vee \|v\|_{H_\vartheta}^2 \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|u\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - v\|_H \leq r, t \leq \varepsilon \right\} = 0,$$

that for all $q \in [p, \infty)$

$$(6.30) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(t, u)|}{\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^q + 2} : u \in H, \|u\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0,$$

and that $f|_{(0, T) \times H}$ is a viscosity solution of

$$(6.31) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, u) - \left\langle \Delta u - \frac{c}{2}(u^2)', I_{\mathbb{H}}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}} f)(t, u) \right\rangle_H - \left\langle B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}}^2 f)(t, u) B(u)) \right\rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)} = 0$$

for $(t, u) \in (0, T) \times H$ relative to $((0, T) \times H \ni (t, u) \rightarrow 1/2 \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}_\vartheta}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\vartheta)$. For the uniqueness we apply Corollary 3.9 (with $O \leftarrow H$, $v \leftarrow 0$, and $\kappa \leftarrow 0$). Therefore assume that g is another viscosity solution of (6.13), which satisfy that $g \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}}([0, T] \times H, \mathbb{R})$, that g is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times H$, that g have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, and that for all $u \in H$ it holds that $g(0, u) = \varphi(u)$. Thus there exists a $q \in [p, \infty)$, which we fix for the rest of the proof, such that

$$(6.32) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|g(t, u)|}{\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^q + 2} : u \in H, \|u\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0.$$

Furthermore, the continuity of φ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_H$ -norm, the continuity of g with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H}$ -norm, and the fact that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that the set $\{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H : \|x\|_{H_\vartheta} \leq R\}$ is compact in \mathbb{H} ensure for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(6.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ g(t, u) - \varphi(\hat{u}) : u, \hat{u} \in H_{2\vartheta}, t, \hat{t} \in (0, T), \frac{e^{-\theta t} \|u\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} \vee \frac{e^{-\theta \hat{t}} \|\hat{u}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|\hat{u}\|_H^q + 2} \leq R, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \|u\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - \hat{u}\|_H \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{r \downarrow 0} \left\{ g(0, u) - \varphi(\hat{u}) : u, \hat{u} \in H_{2\vartheta}, \frac{\|u\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} \vee \frac{\|\hat{u}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|\hat{u}\|_H^q + 2} \leq R, \|u\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - \hat{u}\|_H \leq r \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{r \downarrow 0} \left\{ \varphi(u) - \varphi(\hat{u}) : u, \hat{u} \in H_{2\vartheta}, \frac{\|u\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} \vee \frac{\|\hat{u}\|_{H_\vartheta}^2}{\|\hat{u}\|_H^q + 2} \leq R, \|u\|_H \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - \hat{u}\|_H \leq r \right\} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next note that we derive from (6.24) (with $r \leftarrow \vartheta - 1$, $v \leftarrow 0$, and $\varepsilon \leftarrow 1/2$), Lemma 5.3, and from (5.95) in Corollary 5.10 (with $d \leftarrow 1$ and $\gamma \leftarrow 0$) that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.34) \quad \|F(u)\|_{H_{\vartheta-1}} \leq C_1 \|u^2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta-1}(0,1)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{H_\vartheta}^2.$$

Combining this and (6.6) verifies (3.241). In addition, (6.26) and (6.7) imply (3.242) (with $\alpha_1 \leftarrow 1/8$) and (3.243). In addition, we get from (6.24) (with $r \leftarrow -1/2$) and from (5.97) in Corollary 5.10 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $\gamma \leftarrow 0$, $\alpha_2 \leftarrow 1/8$, $u \leftarrow u + v$, and $v \leftarrow u - v$) that there exists $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.35) \quad \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_{-1/2}} \leq C_1 \|(u+v)(u-v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{\vartheta,2}} \leq C_2 \|u+v\|_H \|u-v\|_{H_{1/2-1/8}}$$

and this shows (3.244) (with $\alpha_2 \leftarrow 1/8$). Furthermore, (6.8) verifies (3.245), (6.17) verifies (3.248), and Remark 3.10 (with $\kappa \leftarrow 0$, $l \leftarrow 0$, and with $f \leftarrow (\mathbb{R} \ni x \rightarrow (2x)^{p/2} + 2 \in (1, \infty))$) verifies (3.249), (3.250), (3.251), and (3.252). Thus Corollary 3.9 (with $V \leftarrow \|\cdot\|_H^q + 2$) shows that $f = g$ which finishes the proof of Corollary 6.3. \square

In the next remark we give examples of functions $B \in C_{\mathbb{H}, \text{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta})}(H, \text{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{-\beta}))$ satisfying the assumptions of Corollary 6.3.

Remark 6.4 (Sufficient condition for B). *Assume the Setting 6.1, let $C \in (0, \infty)$, $s \in (3/4, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{P}_N \in L(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_s)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be finite-dimensional projections satisfying for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ that*

$$(6.36) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_i\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} = 0$$

and that

$$(6.37) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{P}_N e_i\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \leq C |\lambda_i|,$$

let $b \in C^2([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy that for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$(6.38) \quad \|(D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^2)'} \leq C,$$

let $B: H \rightarrow HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})$ be the function satisfying for all $u \in H$, $v \in H_s$ and all $x \in (0, 1)$ that $(B(u)v)(x) = b(x, u(x))v(x)$. Then B satisfies the condition of Corollary 6.3 with $\vartheta \leftarrow 1/2$, $\beta \leftarrow 0$, $\beta_1 \leftarrow 1/2$, $\beta_2 \leftarrow 1/2$, $\beta_3 \leftarrow 1/2$, $\chi \leftarrow 0$, and with $\mathbb{U} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_s$ i.e. there exists a $\theta \in (0, \infty)$ and an increasing $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, such that

$$(6.39) \quad B|_{H_{1/2}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{1/2}, \mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_{1/2})}(H_{1/2}, HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_{1/2})),$$

that for all $u, v \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(6.40) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq \theta \cdot (1 + \|u\|_H^2),$$

$$(6.41) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_{1/2})}^2 \leq K(\|u\|_H)(\|u\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 1),$$

$$(6.42) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})} \leq K(\|v\|_H \vee \|u\|_H)\|u - v\|_H,$$

$$(6.43) \quad |B|_{C^1(H, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})})} < \infty,$$

and that for all \mathbb{H} -bounded sets $E \subseteq H$ it holds that

$$(6.44) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] < \infty$$

and that

$$(6.45) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}}{1 + \|v\|_H} \right] = 0.$$

PROOF. Denote by $W_0^1(0, 1) \subseteq B_{2,2}^1(0, 1)$ the set satisfying that $W_0^1(0, 1) = \overline{C_0^\infty(0, 1)}_{\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^1(0,1)}$. Then Example 4.34 in Lunardi [24] shows that $H_{1/2} = W_0^1(0, 1)$. Hence the fact that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: e_k \in H_{1/2}$ proves that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence $(u_{n,k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq C_0^\infty(0, 1)$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|e_k - u_{n,k}\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} = 0$. Furthermore, Lemma 5.12 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow 1$, $p \leftarrow 0$), (6.38), and item (iv) in Lemma 4.3 in Jentzen, Lindner & Pušnik [19] establish that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.46) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \\ &= \left(\left\| \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)), (1, u'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_H^2 + \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\left\| (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \right\|_{(\mathbb{R}^2)'} \right\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \left\| (1, u'(\cdot)) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_H^2 + \|u\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx \\ &\leq C_2 \left(1 + \|u'\|_H^2 + \|u\|_H^2 \right) \leq 2C_2(\|u\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + 1) \end{aligned}$$

and this verifies that for all $u \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that $b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \in B_{2,2}^1(0, 1)$. Thus we obtain that for all $u \in H_{1/2}$ there exists a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq C^\infty(0, 1)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|v_n(\cdot) - b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} = 0$. Therefore we get from Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31] that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $u \in H_{1/2}$ there exist sequences $(u_{n,k})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq C_0^\infty(0, 1)$ and $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq C^\infty(0, 1)$ such that

$$(6.47) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))e_k(\cdot) - u_{n,k}(\cdot)v_n(\cdot)\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\| (b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - v_n(\cdot)) e_k(\cdot) \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} + \| (e_k - u_{n,k}) v_n \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\| b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - v_n(\cdot) \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \| e_k \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} + \| e_k - u_{n,k} \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \| v_n \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and this implies that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $u \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.48) \quad b(\cdot, u(\cdot))e_k(\cdot) \in W_0^1(0, 1) = H_{1/2}.$$

Next note that it follows from the fact that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: \|e_k\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} = \sqrt{2}$ and from the fact that $s > 3/4$ that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H$ it holds that

$$(6.49) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k(\cdot)\|_H^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_H^2 \| |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k \|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \\ &= 2 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_H^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_k|^{-2s} = 2 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_H^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\pi k)^{-4s} \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_H^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similar (6.48), Lemma 6.2, Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31], and the fact that $s > 3/4$ imply that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.50) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_{1/2})}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k(\cdot)\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k(\cdot)\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \leq C_2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \| |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k \|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \\ &\leq C_3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \| |\lambda_k|^{-s} e_k \|_{H_{1/2}}^2 = C_3 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_k|^{-2s+1} \\ &= C_3 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\pi k)^{2(-2s+1)} \leq C_4 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously we obtain that there exist a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $i \in \{0, 1/2\}$ and all $u, v \in H_i$ it holds that

$$(6.51) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_i)} \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^i(0,1)}.$$

In addition we deduce from (6.49) and from Lemma 5.12 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow 1$, and $p \leftarrow 0$) that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H$ it holds that

$$(6.52) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_H^2 \leq C_2 (\|u\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx)$$

and this proves (6.40). Moreover, (6.51) and Lemma 5.15 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow 1$, $p \leftarrow 0$, and $q \leftarrow \infty$) verify that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H$ it holds that

$$(6.53) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})} \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H \leq C_2 \|u - v\|_H$$

and this ensures (6.42) and (6.43). Combining (6.50) and (6.46) shows (6.41). Next note that it holds for all $x \in (0, 1)$ and all $u, v \in H$ that

$$(6.54) \quad \begin{aligned} &(D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(x, u(x)) - (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(x, v(x)) \\ &= \int_0^1 (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}^2 b)(x, tu(x) + (1-t)v(x))(0, u(x) - v(x)) dt \\ &\leq \|D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}^2 b\|_{C([0,1] \times (-\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})} \|u(x) - v(x)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]) and Lemma 6.2 assure that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.55) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{H_{1/2}}.$$

Therefore, (6.38), item (iv) in Lemma 4.3 in Jentzen, Lindner & Pušnik [19], (6.54), and (6.55) yield that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.56) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\left\| \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)), (1, u'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} - \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)), (1, v'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_H \right) \\ &\leq \left(\left\| \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)), (0, u'(\cdot) - v'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_H \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\left\| \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)), (1, v') \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_H \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (C\|u' - v'\|_H + \|\|(D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(\mathbb{R}^2)'}(1 + |v'(\cdot)|)\|_H) \\
&\leq C_1(\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2}} + \|\|D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}^2 b\|_{C([0,1] \times (-\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})}, \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}), \cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2)')} \\
&\quad \cdot \|u - v\| (1 + |v'|)\|_H) \\
&\leq C_1(\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2}} + \|D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}^2 b\|_{C([0,1] \times (-\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(0,1)})}, \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}), \cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2)')} \\
&\quad \cdot \|u - v\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}(1 + \|v'\|_H)) \\
&\leq C_2(\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2}} + \|D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}}^2 b\|_{C([0,1] \times (-C_3(\|u\|_{H_{1/2}} \vee \|v\|_{H_{1/2}}), C_3(\|u\|_{H_{1/2}} \vee \|v\|_{H_{1/2}}))}, \cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2)')} \\
&\quad \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2}}(1 + \|v\|_{H_{1/2}})).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, (6.51) assures that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.57) \quad &\|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H}_{1/2})} \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^1(0,1)} \\
&= C_1(\|\langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)), (1, u'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2} - \langle (D_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)), (1, v'(\cdot)) \rangle_{(\mathbb{R}^2)', \mathbb{R}^2}\|_H \\
&\quad + \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{L^2(0,1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.57), (6.56), and (6.53) shows (6.39). Furthermore, it holds for all $v \in H$, and all $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.58) \quad &\|B(v)(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k(\cdot)|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_H^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H^2 \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \\
&\leq \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H^2 \left(\sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^M \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore it follows from (6.58), Lemma 5.12 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow 1$, and $p \leftarrow 0$), (6.36), the fact that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: \|e_k\|_{L^\infty(0,1)} = \sqrt{2}$, (6.37), and from the fact that $s > 3/4$ that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all \mathbb{H} -bounded sets E it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.59) \quad &\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} [\|B(v)(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})}^2] \\
&\leq \sup_{v \in E} (\|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H^2) \left(\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^M \|(\text{Id}_{H_s} - \mathcal{P}_N)e_k|\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \right) \right) \\
&\leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} \left((\|v\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx) \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} |\lambda_k|^{-2s} (\|e_k\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{P}_n e_k\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2) \right) \\
&\leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} \left((\|v\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx) \right) \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} (\pi k)^{-4s} (2 + C(\pi k)^2) \right) \\
&\leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} \left((\|v\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx) \right) \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left((C + 2) \sum_{k=M+1}^{\infty} (\pi k)^{-4s+2} \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and this verifies (6.45). Finally note that Lemma 5.12 (with $d \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow 1$, and $p \leftarrow 0$), the assumption $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}: \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \|\mathcal{P}_N e_k\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \leq C(\pi k)^2$, and the fact that $s > 3/4$ implies that

there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all \mathbb{H} -bounded sets E it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \|B(v) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{H}_s, \mathbb{H})} = \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \mathcal{P}_N e_k(\cdot) |\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_H^2 \right] \\
(6.60) \quad & \leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H^2 \|\mathcal{P}_N e_k |\lambda_k|^{-s}\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \sup_{v \in E} (\|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_H^2) \cdot \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{P}_N e_k\|_{L^\infty(0,1)}^2 (\pi k)^{-4s} \right) \\
& \leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} (\|v\|_H^2 + \int_0^1 |b(x, 0)|^2 dx) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C (\pi k)^{-4s+2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This ensures (6.44) and thus finishes the proof of Remark 6.4. \square

6.2. Stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations

In this section we show that Kolmogorov backward equations of stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations have a unique viscosity solution having at most polynomial growth.

Setting 6.5. Assume the setting in Section 5.1, let $d = 2$, $\eta \in (0, \infty)$, let $C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{n, per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be the set satisfying for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.61) \quad C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{n, per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2) &= \{u \in C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^n([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2) : \forall i \in \{j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |j| < n\}, \forall x \in (0, 1) : \\
& ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u)(x, 0) = (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u)(x, 1)) \wedge ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u)(0, x) = (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u)(1, x))\},
\end{aligned}$$

let $H \subseteq L^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the set satisfying that $H = \{u \in L^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2) : \operatorname{div}(u) = 0\}$ and $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ the Hilbert space satisfying that $\mathbb{H} = (H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}|_H, \|\cdot\|_{L^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}|_H)$, let $\xi_k \in L^2(0, 1)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, be the function satisfying for all $x \in (0, 1)$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\xi_k(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2k\pi x)$, that $\xi_0(x) = 1$, and that $\xi_{-k}(x) = \sqrt{2} \cos(-2k\pi x)$, let $\xi_{k,l} \in L^2((0, 1)^2)$, $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, be the function satisfying for all $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and all $(x, y) \in (0, 1)^2$ that $\xi_{k,l} = \xi_k(x) \cdot \xi_l(y)$, let $e_{k,l} \in H$, $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, be the function satisfying that

$$(6.62) \quad e_{0,0} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and that for all $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ it holds that

$$(6.63) \quad e_{k,l} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^2+l^2}} \begin{pmatrix} l\xi_{k,l} \\ -k\xi_{-k,-l} \end{pmatrix},$$

let $\bar{e}_{0,0} \in H$ be the function satisfying that

$$(6.64) \quad \bar{e}_{0,0} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

let $\lambda_{k,l} \in (-\infty, 0]$, $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, be the real numbers satisfying for all $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ that $\lambda_{k,l} = -(2\pi)^2(k^2+l^2)$, let $\|\cdot\|_{H_1} : B_{2,2}^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the norm satisfying that for all $(u_1, u_2) \in B_{2,2}^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ it holds that $\|(u_1, u_2)\|_{H_1}^2 = \|\Delta u_1\|_{L^2((0, 1)^2)}^2 + \|\Delta u_2\|_{L^2((0, 1)^2)}^2 + \eta \|u_1\|_{L^2((0, 1)^2)}^2 + \eta \|u_2\|_{L^2((0, 1)^2)}^2$, let $H_1 \subseteq B_{2,2}^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the set satisfying that

$$(6.65) \quad H_1 = \overline{\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\cup_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \{e_{k,l}\} \cup \{\bar{e}_{0,0}\} \right)}_{\|\cdot\|_{H_1}},$$

let $\Delta : H \supseteq D(\Delta) \rightarrow H$ be the Laplace operator with periodic boundary condition, i.e. the operator satisfying that $D(\Delta) = H_1$ and that for all $(u_1, u_2) \in D(\Delta)$ it holds that $\Delta(u_1, u_2) = (\Delta u_1, \Delta u_2)$, let $\mathbb{H}_t = (H_t, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_t}, \|\cdot\|_{H_t})$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, be a family of interpolation spaces associated with $\eta - \Delta$ (see, e.g., Definition 3.6.30 in [18]). By abuse of notation we will also denote by Δ

and by $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the extended operators $\Delta: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_t}: \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in H_t$, and all $y \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{-i}$ that

$$(6.66) \quad \|y\|_{H_t} = \begin{cases} \|y\|_{H_t} & \text{if } y \in H_t \\ \infty & \text{if } y \notin H_t \end{cases}$$

and that

$$(6.67) \quad (\Delta(x) = y) \Leftrightarrow (\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{\|\Delta(\xi) - y\|_{H_{t-1}} : \xi \in H_1, \|x - \xi\|_{H_t} \leq \varepsilon\} = 0).$$

Let $\alpha \in (3/4, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$, $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\gamma \in [1 - \alpha, 1/4)$, let $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{L}^2((0, 1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ be the L^2 -space, let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, let \tilde{e}_n , $n \in \mathcal{I}$, be an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{U} , let

$$(6.68) \quad B \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}(H_\gamma, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})),$$

denote by

$$(6.69) \quad F \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\alpha}}(H_\gamma, H_{\gamma-\alpha})$$

the function satisfying for all $u \in H_1$ that

$$(6.70) \quad F(u)(x) = c\pi_H^{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}u)u) + \eta u.$$

LEMMA 6.6. Assume the Setting 6.5 and let $r \in [0, \infty)$. Then there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_r$ it holds that

$$(6.71) \quad C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq \|u\|_{H_r} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

PROOF. First note, that it holds for all $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{1,per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ that

$$(6.72) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle (u_1, u_2), D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}(v_1, v_2) \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 u_1(x, y) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}v_1)(x, y) dx dy + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 u_2(x, y) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}v_2)(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \int_0^1 u_1(0, y)v_1(0, y) - u_1(1, y)v_1(1, y) dy + \int_0^1 u_2(0, y)v_2(0, y) - u_2(1, y)v_2(1, y) dy \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}u_1)(x, y) v_1(x, y) dx dy - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}u_2)(x, y) v_2(x, y) dx dy \\ &= - \langle D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that for all $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{1,per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ it holds that

$$(6.73) \quad \langle (u_1, u_2), D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}(v_1, v_2) \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} = - \langle D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

Therefore we get for all $u \in C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{3,per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ that

$$(6.74) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\Delta u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(2,0)} + D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,2)})u, (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(2,0)} + D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,2)})u \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(2,0)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,2)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 2\langle D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}u, D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}u \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(2,0)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,2)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 2\langle D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}u, D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}u \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &= \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(2,0)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,2)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 2\|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,1)}u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=2} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{2n+1,per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ it holds that

$$(6.75) \quad C \|\Delta^n u\|_H \geq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2.$$

Combining this and the fact that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $H_n \cap C_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{2n+1,per}([0, 1]^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ is dense in H_n shows that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_n$ it holds that

$$(6.76) \quad C \|\Delta^n u\|_H \geq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2.$$

Next note that we obtain from (2.200) on page 54 in Mitrea [25] and from Theorem 1.8 in Nečas [26] that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_n$ it holds that

$$(6.77) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2n}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} &\leq C_1 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i| \leq 2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &\leq C_2 (\|u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}) \\ &\leq C_3 (\|u\|_H + \|\Delta^n u\|_H) \leq C_3 (\eta^{-n} \|u\|_{H_n} + \|u\|_{H_n}) \leq C_3 (\eta^{-n} + 1) \|u\|_{H_n} \\ &\leq C_4 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i| \leq 2n} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_5 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2n}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and Lemma 5.2 finishes the proof of Lemma 6.6. \square

The next corollary applies Corollary 3.9 and Theorem 4.5 to Kolmogorov backward equations of stochastic 2-D Navier-Stokes equations.

Corollary 6.7. *Assume the Setting 6.5, let $\vartheta \in [1/2, 3/4 - \gamma)$, $\alpha_1 \in (0, \gamma)$, $T, \theta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, \infty)$, $\beta_3 \in (0, 1)$, $\chi \in [\beta, 1/2)$, let $\mathcal{R}_0 \in L(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U})$ be the function satisfying that $\mathcal{R}_0 = \text{Id}_U$, let $\mathcal{P}_N \in L(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{U})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be finite-dimensional projection, let $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}(H_\gamma, \mathbb{R})$ have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, let $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be increasing, and assume that*

$$(6.78) \quad B|_{H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_3}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_3}, \mathbb{HS}(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}(H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_3}, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})),$$

that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.79) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq K(1) \cdot (1 + \|u\|_{L^4((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^4) \|u - v\|_H^2,$$

that for all $u, v \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.80) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}^2 \leq K(\|u\|_{H_\gamma}) (\|u\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_1}}^2 + 1),$$

$$(6.81) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\gamma)} \leq K(\|v\|_{H_\gamma} \vee \|u\|_{H_\gamma}) \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_2}}$$

and that for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets $E \subseteq H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(6.82) \quad |(B|_E)|_{C^1(E, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})})} < \infty,$$

$$(6.83) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v) \mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\beta})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] < \infty,$$

and that

$$(6.84) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\text{Id}_H - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma-\chi})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] = 0,$$

let \mathbb{Z}_N^2 , $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be the sets satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\mathbb{Z}_N^2 = \{(l, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2: |l| + |k| \leq N\}$, let $V_N \subseteq H_\gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, be the linear subspaces satisfying that $V_0 = H_\gamma$ and that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $V_N = \text{span}_{\mathbb{H}}(\{e_{k,l}: (l, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2\} \cup \{\bar{e}_{0,0}\})$, let $A: H_1 \rightarrow H$ be the operator satisfying for all $u \in H_1$ that $Au = \Delta u - \eta u$, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with a normal filtration $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, let $(W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an Id_U -cylindrical $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -Wiener process and let $X^{N,u}: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow H_\gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $u \in H_\gamma$, be $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted stochastic processes with continuous sample paths satisfying for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in [0, T]$, $u \in H_\gamma$, and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(6.85) \quad X_t^{N,u} = e^{tA} \pi_{V_N}^{H_\gamma} u + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F(X_s^{N,u}) ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(X_s^{N,u}) \mathcal{P}_N dW_s,$$

and that

$$(6.86) \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{v \in H_\gamma, \|v-u\|_{H_\gamma} \leq \delta} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(\|X_r^{0,u} - X_r^{0,v}\|_{H_\gamma} \geq \varepsilon) = 0,$$

and let $f: [0, T] \times H_\gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that for all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H_\gamma$ it holds that $f(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_t^{0,x})]$. Then $f|_{(0, T) \times H_\gamma}$ is the unique viscosity solution of

$$(6.87) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, u) - \langle Au + F(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma} f)(t, u) \rangle_{H_\gamma} - \langle B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}^2 f)(t, u) B(u)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})} = 0$$

for $(t, u) \in (0, T) \times H_\gamma$ relative to $((0, T) \times H_\gamma \ni (t, u) \rightarrow 1/2\|u\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})$ which satisfy that $f \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma}([0, T] \times H_\gamma, \mathbb{R})$ that f is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times H_\gamma$, that f have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, and that for all $u \in H_\gamma$ it holds that $f(0, u) = \varphi(u)$.

PROOF. First note that the existence of $X^{N,x}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $x \in H_\gamma$, follows from Example 3.3 in Liu & Röckner [23]. In addition, the fact that φ have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth demonstrates that there exists a $p \in [2, \infty)$, which we fix for the rest of the proof, such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{\varphi(u)}{\|u\|_{H^p}^p} : u \in H_\gamma, \|u\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0$. Denote by $V: H_\gamma \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ the function satisfying for all $u \in H_\gamma$ that $V(u) = \|u\|_H^p + 2$. Next we will apply Theorem 4.5 (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$) to verify that f is a viscosity solution. Therefore note that we obtain from the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]), from the fact that $\gamma \geq 1 - \alpha$, and from Lemma 6.6 that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}$ it holds that

$$(6.88) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right\|_{L^{1/(2\gamma)}((0,1)^2)} \leq \left\| \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} w\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} w\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_{L^{1/(2\gamma)}((0,1)^2)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} w\|_{L^{1/(2\gamma)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} w\|_{L^{1/(2\gamma)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} w\|_{B_{2,2}^{1-4\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} w\|_{B_{2,2}^{1-4\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \leq C_3 \|w\|_{B_{2,2}^{2-4\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq C_4 \|w\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\alpha-2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_5 \|w\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it holds for all $u = (u_{(1,0)}, u_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$, $v = (v_{(1,0)}, v_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$, and all $w = (w_{(1,0)}, w_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$ that

$$(6.89) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u)(x, y)(v(x, y)), w(x, y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \\ & = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=|\beta|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_\alpha)(x, y) v_\beta(x, y) w_\alpha(x, y) dx dy \\ & = - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=1} u_\alpha(x, y) w_\alpha(x, y) \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\beta|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta v_\beta)(x, y) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=|\beta|=1} u_\alpha(x, y) v_\beta(x, y) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta w_\alpha)(x, y) dx dy \\ & = - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=|\beta|=1} u_\alpha(x, y) v_\beta(x, y) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta w_\alpha)(x, y) dx dy \\ & = - \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y)(v(x, y)), u(x, y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]), and Lemma 6.6 show that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_1$ it holds that

$$(6.90)$$

$$\|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u)(x, y))(u(x, y)) - ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} v)(x, y))(v(x, y)), \frac{w(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) \\
&\quad + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&= \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}} \left(- \int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y)}{\|u\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(v(x, y)), \frac{v(x, y)}{\|v\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&= \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}} \left(- \int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y) - v(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y)}{\|u\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(v(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y) - v(x, y)}{\|u\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&\leq \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 |c| \cdot \|u(x, y) - v(x, y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\|u(x, y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \|v(x, y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \frac{\|D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w(x, y)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} dx dy \right) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&\leq \sup_{w \in H_{\alpha-\gamma}} \left(|c| \| \|u - v\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} + \|v\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}) \|_{L^{1/(1-2\gamma)}((0,1)^2)} \cdot \frac{\| \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|_{L^{1/(2\gamma)}((0,1)^2)}}{\|w\|_{H_{\alpha-\gamma}}} \right) \\
&\quad + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&\leq C_1 \|u - v\|_{L^{2/(1-2\gamma)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \cdot (\|u\|_{L^{2/(1-2\gamma)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|v\|_{L^{2/(1-2\gamma)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&\leq C_2 \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \cdot (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} \\
&\leq C_3 \|u - v\|_{H_\gamma} \cdot (\|u\|_{H_\gamma} + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}) + \eta^{1-\alpha} \|u - v\|_{H_\gamma} \\
&= C_3 \|u - v\|_{H_\gamma} \cdot (\|u\|_{H_\gamma} + \|v\|_{H_\gamma} + \eta^{1-\alpha})
\end{aligned}$$

and this together with the fact that H_1 is dense in H_γ and (6.82) verifies (4.6) (with $H \leftarrow H_\gamma$ and $\gamma \leftarrow 0$). Furthermore, we have for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and all $u \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta} \cap V_N$ that

(6.91)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}}(F(u) - \eta u), (D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma} V)(u) \rangle_{H_\gamma, H'_\gamma} = cp \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u)u), u \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\
&= cp \|u\|_H^{p-2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=|\beta|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha u_\beta)(x, y) u_\alpha(x, y) u_\beta(x, y) dx dy \\
&= \frac{cp}{2} \|u\|_H^{p-2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=|\beta|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha (u_\beta^2))(x, y) u_\alpha(x, y) dx dy \\
&= - \frac{cp}{2} \|u\|_H^{p-2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\beta|=1} (u_\beta(x, y))^2 \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha u_\alpha)(x, y) dx dy = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from (6.79) (with $u \leftarrow 0$ and $v \leftarrow u$) that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $u \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta} \cap V_N$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.92) \quad &\langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\alpha}} F(u) + Au, (D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma} V)(u) \rangle_{H_\gamma, H'_\gamma} \\
&\quad + 1/2 \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^{-1} ((D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}^2 V)(u) \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})} \\
&= p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle (A + \eta)u, u \rangle_H \\
&\quad + p(p-2) \|u\|_H^{p-4} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u), (-A)^{-2\vartheta-2\gamma} u \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u), u \rangle_H \\
&\quad + p \|u\|_H^{p-2} \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u), (-A)^{-2\vartheta-2\gamma} \pi_{V_N}^{H_{\gamma-\beta}} B(u) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq -p\|u\|_H^{p-2}\|u\|_{H_{1/2}}^2 + p\eta\|u\|_H^p + p(p-2)\|u\|_H^{p-4}\langle \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(u), u \langle \pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(u), u \rangle_H \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
&\quad + p\|u\|_H^{p-2}\|\pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\
&\leq p\eta\|u\|_H^p + p(p-2)\|u\|_H^{p-2}\|\pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 + p\|u\|_H^{p-2}\|\pi_{V_N}^{H\gamma-\beta} B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \\
&\leq p\eta\|u\|_H^p + 2p(p-1)\|u\|_H^{p-2}(\|B(u) - B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 + \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2) \\
&\leq p\eta\|u\|_H^p + 2p(p-1)\|u\|_H^{p-2}(K(1)\|u\|_H^2 + \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2) \\
&\leq p\eta(1 + \|u\|_H^p) + 4p(p-1)(K(1) \vee \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2)(1 + \|u\|_H^p) \\
&\leq \left(p\eta + 4p(p-1)(K(1) \vee \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2) \right) V(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Next note that for all $(k, l), (m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.93) \quad (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} e_{k,l}) e_{m,n} &= \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{k^2+l^2}} \begin{pmatrix} kl\xi_{-k,l} & l^2\xi_{k,-l} \\ k^2\xi_{k,-l} & kl\xi_{-k,l} \end{pmatrix} e_{m,n} \\
&= \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{k^2+l^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m^2+n^2}} \begin{pmatrix} lk n \xi_{-k,l} \xi_{m,n} - l^2 m \xi_{k,-l} \xi_{-m,-n} \\ k^2 n \xi_{k,-l} \xi_{m,n} - lk m \xi_{-k,l} \xi_{-m,-n} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

that

$$(6.94) \quad (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} e_{k,l}) e_{0,0} = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{k^2+l^2}} \begin{pmatrix} kl\xi_{-k,l}\xi_{0,0} \\ k^2\xi_{k,-l}\xi_{0,0} \end{pmatrix},$$

and that

$$(6.95) \quad (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} e_{k,l}) \bar{e}_{0,0} = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{k^2+l^2}} \begin{pmatrix} l^2\xi_{k,-l}\xi_{0,0} \\ kl\xi_{-k,l}\xi_{0,0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, the product to sum identity implies that for all $k, l, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.96) \quad &4 \int_0^1 \cos(2\pi kx) \cos(2\pi lx) \cos(2\pi mx) dx \\
&= 2 \int_0^1 (\cos(2\pi x(k-l)) + \cos(2\pi x(k+l))) \cos(2\pi mx) dx \\
&= \int_0^1 \cos(2\pi x(k-l-m)) + \cos(2\pi x(k-l+m)) \\
&\quad + \cos(2\pi x(k+l-m)) + \cos(2\pi x(k+l+m)) dx \\
&= \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k-l-m) + \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k-l+m) + \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k+l-m) + \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k+l+m).
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that for all $k, l, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ it holds that

$$(6.97) \quad 4 \int_0^1 \sin(2\pi kx) \cos(2\pi lx) \cos(2\pi mx) dx = 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.98) \quad &4 \int_0^1 \sin(2\pi kx) \sin(2\pi lx) \cos(2\pi mx) dx \\
&= \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k-l-m) + \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k-l+m) - \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k+l-m) - \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(k+l+m),
\end{aligned}$$

$$(6.99) \quad 4 \int_0^1 \sin(2\pi kx) \sin(2\pi lx) \sin(2\pi mx) dx = 0.$$

Combining (6.96), (6.97), (6.98), and (6.99) ensures that for all $k, l, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|n| > |k| + |l|$ it holds that

$$(6.100) \quad \int_0^1 \xi_k(x) \xi_l(x) \xi_n(x) dx = 0.$$

Thus we get for all $(k, l), (m, n), (r, s) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $(|r| - |k| - |m|) \vee (|s| - |l| - |n|) > 0$ that

$$(6.101) \quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \xi_{k,l}(x, y) \xi_{m,n}(x, y) \xi_{r,s}(x, y) dx dy = 0.$$

In addition, we have for all $\bar{a}_{0,0} \in \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $a_{k,l} \in \mathbb{R}$, $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2$ that

$$(6.102) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(D_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\bar{a}_{0,0} \bar{e}_{0,0} + \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2} a_{k,l} e_{k,l} \right) \right) \left(\bar{a}_{0,0} \bar{e}_{0,0} + \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2} a_{k,l} e_{k,l} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} a_{k,l} (D_{\mathbb{R}} e_{k,l}) \right) \left(\bar{a}_{0,0} \bar{e}_{0,0} + \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2} a_{k,l} e_{k,l} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} a_{k,l} \bar{a}_{0,0} (D_{\mathbb{R}} e_{k,l}) \bar{e}_{0,0} + \sum_{(k,l) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^2} a_{k,l} a_{m,n} (D_{\mathbb{R}} e_{k,l}) e_{m,n}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.93), (6.94), (6.95), (6.101), (6.102) shows that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in H_N$, and all $(k, l) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $|k| + |l| > 2N$ it holds that

$$(6.103) \quad \langle (D_{\mathbb{R}} u) u, e_{k,l} \rangle_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} = 0$$

and this verifies that for all $u \in H_N$ it holds that $F(u) \in H_{2N}$. Therefore Lemma (6.6) implies that for all $r, s \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.104) \quad F|_{H_r} \in C_{\mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2), \mathbb{B}_{2,2}^{2s}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}(H_r, B_{2,2}^{2s}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)) \Leftrightarrow F|_{H_r} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_r, \mathbb{H}_s}(H_r, H_s).$$

Moreover, Lemma 5.4 and (5.98) in Corollary 5.10 (with $s \leftarrow r$, $d \leftarrow 2$, $\alpha \leftarrow i$ and $H_t \leftarrow B_{2,2}^{2t}((0,1)^2)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$) assures that for all $r \in [0, \infty)$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_{(1,0)}, u_{(0,1)}) \in B_{2,2}^{2r+1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ and all $v = (v_{(1,0)}, v_{(0,1)}) \in B_{2,2}^{2r+1+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ it holds that

$$(6.105)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq c \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u) u - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} v) v \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \eta \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ & \leq (\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} (u - v)) u \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2} v) (u - v) \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}) \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \left(\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i (u_j - v_j)) u_i \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2)} + \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i v_j) (u_i - v_i) \|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2)} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \left(\|u_j - v_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \|v_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \|u_i - v_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\ & \leq C \left(4 \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2r+1+2\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (6.105) and (6.104) prove that for all $r \in [0, \infty)$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.106) \quad F|_{H_{r+1/2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{r+1/2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}, \mathbb{H}_r}(H_{r+1/2+\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}, H_r).$$

Thus (6.106) (with $r \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - 1/2$) the fact that $\alpha_1 < 1/2$ and (6.78) verifies (4.65) (with $H \leftarrow H_\gamma$). In addition, it holds for all $(u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ that

(6.107)

$$\begin{aligned} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2) u_1 &= (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}(u_1 + u_2))(u_1 + u_2) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_1 - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_2 - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2) u_2 \\ &= (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}(u_1 + u_2))(u_1 + u_2) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_1 + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2) u_2 - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2) u_2. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that for all $(u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.108) \quad (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1) u_2 = (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}(u_1 + u_2))(u_1 + u_2) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1) u_1 + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_1 - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2) u_2.$$

Thus (6.106) (with $r \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - 1/2$), Lemma 6.6, (6.107), (6.108), Lemma 5.4, (5.96) in Corollary 5.10 (with $H_r \leftarrow B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2)$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $d \leftarrow 2$), and the fact that $\alpha_1 < \gamma$ establishes that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.109) \quad \|F(u)\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta-1/2}} &\leq C_1(\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u) u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta-1/2}}) \\ &\leq C_1(\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2) u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1) u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2) u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta-1/2}}) \\ &\leq C_1(3\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1) u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + 3\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2) u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1) u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2) u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)}(u_1 + u_2))(u_1 + u_2)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)}(u_1 + u_2))(u_1 + u_2)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2)} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta-1/2}}) \\ &\leq C_2(3\|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} + 3\|u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_1\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} + \|u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|u_1 + u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_1 + u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \\ &\quad + \|u_1 + u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|u_1 + u_2\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}}) \\ &\leq C_2(16\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta+1-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}}) \\ &\leq C_3(\|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_\gamma} + \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\alpha_1}}) \end{aligned}$$

and this proves (4.66) (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$, $r_x \leftarrow 1$, $R_x \leftarrow C_3(\eta^{-\vartheta} + \|x\|_{H_\gamma} + 1)$). Moreover, (6.92) implies that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all all $(t, u) \in [0, T] \times V_N$ it holds that

$$(6.110) \quad \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^{N,u})] \leq V(u) e^{(p\eta+4p(p-1)(K(1)\vee\|B(0)\|_{HS(V,\mathbb{H}}^2))t}$$

which verifies (4.64). In addition, (6.86) proves (4.62), (6.80) proves (4.67) (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$, $r_x \leftarrow 1$, $R_x \leftarrow K(\|x\|_{H_\gamma} + \eta^{-\vartheta})$), (6.83) proves (4.68), and (6.84) proves (4.69). Thus Theorem 4.5 yields that $f \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma}(\mathbb{R} \times H_\gamma, \mathbb{R})$, that f is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma$ -bounded subsets of $(0, T) \times H_\gamma$, that for all $\tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.111) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ f(t, u) - \varphi(v) : u, v \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}, t \in (0, T), \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \vee \|v\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \leq R, \right. \\ \left. \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - v\|_{H_\gamma} \leq r, t \leq \varepsilon \right\} = 0,$$

that for all $q \in [p, \infty)$ it holds that

$$(6.112) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(t, u)|}{\|u\|_{L^2(0,1)}^q + 2} : u \in H, \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \geq r \right\} = 0,$$

and that $f|_{(0,T) \times H_\gamma}$ is a viscosity solution of

$$(6.113) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(t, u) - \langle Au + F(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}^{-1}(D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma} f)(t, u) \rangle_{H_\gamma} \\ & - \langle B(u), I_{\mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^{-1}((D_{\mathbb{H}_\gamma}^2 f)(t, u) B(u)) \rangle_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $(t, u) \in (0, T) \times H_\gamma$ relative to $((0, T) \times H_\gamma \ni (t, u) \rightarrow 1/2 \|u\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \in [0, \infty], \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma, \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})$. Next we apply Corollary 3.9 (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$, $O \leftarrow H_\gamma$, $v \leftarrow 0$, $\kappa \leftarrow -\gamma$, $\alpha_1 \leftarrow \alpha_1$, and $\alpha_2 \leftarrow \alpha_1$) to show that f is the unique viscosity solution. Therefore assume that g is another viscosity solution of (6.13), which satisfy that $g \in C_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma}([0, T] \times H_\gamma, \mathbb{R})$, that g is bounded on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{H}_\gamma$ -bounded subsets of $[0, T] \times H_\gamma$, that g have at most polynomial \mathbb{H} -growth, and that for all $u \in H_\gamma$ it holds that $g(0, u) = \varphi(u)$. Hence, there exists a $q \in [p, \infty)$, which we fix for the rest of the proof, such that

$$(6.114) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sup \left\{ \frac{|g(t, u)|}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} : u \in H_\gamma, \|u\|_H \geq r \right\} = 0.$$

Moreover, the continuity of φ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{H_\gamma}$ -norm, the continuity of g with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{R} \times H_\gamma}$ -norm, and the fact that for all $R \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that the set $\{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times H_\gamma : \|x\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} \leq R\}$ is compact in \mathbb{H}_γ yields for all $R, \tilde{R} \in (0, \infty)$ that

$$(6.115) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ g(t, u) - \varphi(\hat{u}) : u, \hat{u} \in H_{2\vartheta+\gamma}, t, \hat{t} \in (0, T), \frac{e^{-\theta t} \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma}}^2}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} \vee \frac{e^{-\theta \hat{t}} \|\hat{u}\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma}}^2}{\|\hat{u}\|_H^q + 2} \leq R, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - \hat{u}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq r, t \vee \hat{t} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \\ & = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sup \left\{ \varphi(u) - \varphi(\hat{u}) : u, \hat{u} \in H_{2\vartheta+\gamma}, \frac{\|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma}}^2}{\|u\|_H^q + 2} \vee \frac{\|\hat{u}\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma}}^2}{\|\hat{u}\|_H^q + 2} \leq R, \|u\|_{H_\gamma} \leq \tilde{R}, \|u - \hat{u}\|_{H_\gamma} \leq r \right\} \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next note that the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., the Theorem on page 31 in Runst & Sickel [31]), Lemma 6.6, and Lemma 5.6 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $p \leftarrow \frac{2}{2r+1}$, $u \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u_j$, $v \leftarrow u_i$, $r_1 \leftarrow 2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)$, $r_2 \leftarrow 1 + 2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma$) proves that for all $r \in [0, 1/2)$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_{(1,0)}, u_{(0,1)}) \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ and all $v = (v_{(1,0)}, v_{(0,1)}) \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.116) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|F(u)\|_{H_{-r}} \\ & \leq \sup_{w \in H_r} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u)(x, y))(u(x, y)), \frac{w(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_r}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) + \eta \|u\|_{H_{-r}} \\ & = \sup_{w \in H_r} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u_j)(x, y) u_i(x, y) \frac{w_j(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_r}} \right) dx dy \right) + \eta \|u\|_{H_{-r}} \\ & \leq \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \sup_{w \in H_r} \left(|c| \| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u_j) u_i \|_{L^{2/(2r+1)}((0,1)^2)} \cdot \frac{\|w_j\|_{L^{2/(1-2r)}((0,1)^2)}}{\|w\|_{H_r}} \right) + \eta \|u\|_{H_{-r}} \\ & \leq C_1 \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \left(\|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i u_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \right) \sup_{w \in H_r} \left(\frac{\|w\|_{B^{2r}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}}{\|w\|_{H_r}} \right) \\ & \quad + \eta^{-1/2-r-\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)} \|u\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}} \\ & \leq C_2 \left(\sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \left(\|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \|u_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2)} \right) + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\ & \leq 4C_2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(r)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (6.116) (with $r \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - 1$), Lemma 6.6, (6.105) (with $r \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta - 1$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow \gamma$, and $v \leftarrow 0$), the fact that $2\gamma - 1 < 0$ and the fact that $\vartheta \geq 1/2$ yield that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{\gamma+\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.117) \quad & \|F(u)\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta-1}} \\
& \leq C_1 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{(1 \vee (2\gamma+2\vartheta-1))+2\gamma\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(\gamma+\vartheta-1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{(1 \vee (2\gamma+2\vartheta-1))+2\gamma\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(\gamma+\vartheta-1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\
& \leq C_2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\
& \leq C_3 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} (\|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}} + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (6.79) (with $u \leftarrow 0$) proves (3.241) (with $H \leftarrow H_\gamma$, $\kappa \leftarrow -\gamma$). Moreover, it follows from Theorem 4 on page 84 in Runst & Sickel [31], the fact that $2\gamma < 1/2$, Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31] (with $s_1 \leftarrow 2\gamma$, $s_2 \leftarrow 1 + 2\gamma - 2\alpha_1$, $p \leftarrow 2$, $q_1 \leftarrow 2$, and $q_2 \leftarrow 2$) the Proposition on page 29 in Runst & Sickel [31], the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]), and from Lemma 6.6 that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_{(1,0)}, u_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$, $v = (v_{(1,0)}, v_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$, and all $w = (w_{(1,0)}, w_{(0,1)}) \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.118) \quad & \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y)), v(x, y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \\
& = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i w_j)(x, y) u_i(x, y) v_j(x, y) dx dy \\
& \leq \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^i w_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{-2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \|u_i v_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \\
& \leq C_1 \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |i|=|j|=1} \|w_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{1-2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2)} \|v_j\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2)} \\
& \leq 4C_1 \|w\|_{B_{2,2}^{1-2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma-2\alpha_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \\
& \leq C_2 \|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}} \|u\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\alpha_1}} \|v\|_{H_\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v, w \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.119) \quad \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y)), v(x, y) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \leq C \|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}} \|v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_\gamma}.$$

Thus the fact that $H_{1/2}$ is dense in $H_{1/2-\gamma}$ and (6.89) establishes that there exists a $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.120) \quad & \|F(u) - F(v)\|_{H_{\gamma-1/2}} \\
& \leq \sup_{w \in H_{1/2}} \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} u)(x, y))(u(x, y)) - ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} v)(x, y))(v(x, y)), \frac{w(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) \\
& \quad + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-1/2}} \\
& = \sup_{w \in H_{1/2}} \left(- \int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(v(x, y)), \frac{v(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \right) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-1/2}} \\
& = \sup_{w \in H_{1/2}} \left(- \int_0^1 \int_0^1 c \left\langle ((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y))(u(x, y) - v(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ c \left\langle \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2} w)(x, y) \right) (v(x, y)), \frac{u(x, y) - v(x, y)}{\|w\|_{H_{1/2-\gamma}}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} dx dy \Big) + \eta \|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma-1/2}}$$

$$\leq C (\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\alpha_1}} \|u\|_{H_\gamma} + \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\alpha_1}} \|v\|_{H_\gamma} + \eta^{\alpha_1} \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\alpha_1}})$$

and this shows (3.244). In addition, (6.109) ensure (3.242), (6.80) ensure (3.243), (6.81) ensures (3.245), (6.92) ensures (3.248), and Remark 3.10 (with $H \leftarrow H_\gamma$, $\kappa \leftarrow -\gamma$, $l \leftarrow \gamma$, and $f \leftarrow (\mathbb{R} \ni x \rightarrow (2x)^{p/2} + 2 \in (1, \infty))$) ensures (3.249), (3.250), (3.251), and (3.252). Thus Corollary 3.9 (with $\mathbb{H} \leftarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$, $O \leftarrow H_\gamma$, $v \leftarrow 0$, $\kappa \leftarrow -\gamma$, $\alpha_1 \leftarrow \alpha_1$, $\alpha_2 \leftarrow \alpha_1$, and $V \leftarrow \|\cdot\|_H^q + 2$) verifies that $g = f$ which finishes the proof of Corollary 6.7. \square

The next remark establishes sufficient conditions for B to satisfy the conditions of Corollary 6.7.

Remark 6.8 (Sufficient condition for B). *Assume the Setting 6.5, let $\vartheta \in [1/2, 1-\gamma)$, $\beta_1 \in (0, \gamma)$, let $C \in (0, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{P}_N \in L(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be finite-dimensional projection satisfying for all $n \in \mathcal{I}$ and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that*

$$(6.121) \quad \mathcal{P}_N \tilde{e}_n = \mathbb{1}_{[1, N]}(n) \tilde{e}_n,$$

let $b_{ij} \in C^3([0, 1]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R})$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, let $b \in C([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2})$, satisfy that for all $x \in [0, 1]^2$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} b_{ij})(x, y)\|_{(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)'} \leq C$, $\|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^2 b_{ij})(x, y)\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')} \leq C$, and that

$$(6.122) \quad b(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}(x, y) & b_{12}(x, y) \\ b_{21}(x, y) & b_{22}(x, y) \end{pmatrix},$$

let $Q \in HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})$, assume that for all $u \in H$, $v \in U$ and all $x \in (0, 1)^2$ it holds that $(B(u)v)(x) = \pi_H^{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}(b(\cdot, u(\cdot))(Qv)(\cdot))(x)$ and assume that for all $n \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \in \{\gamma, \vartheta + \gamma\}$, and all $u \in H_i$ it holds that

$$(6.123) \quad B(u)\tilde{e}_n \in H_i.$$

Then B satisfies the condition of Corollary 6.7 with $\beta \leftarrow \gamma$, $\beta_1 \leftarrow \beta_1$, $\beta_2 \leftarrow \beta_1$, $\beta_3 \leftarrow \beta_1$, and $\chi \leftarrow \gamma$ i.e. there exists a $\theta \in (0, \infty)$ and an increasing $K: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, such that

$$(6.124) \quad B|_{H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_1}} \in C_{\mathbb{H}_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_1}, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}(H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_1}, HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})),$$

that for all $u, v \in H_{1/2}$ it holds that

$$(6.125) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq C \|u - v\|_H^2$$

and that for all $u, v \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.126) \quad \|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}^2 \leq K(\|u\|_{H_\gamma})(\|u\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma+\vartheta-\beta_1}}^2 + 1),$$

$$(6.127) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\gamma)} \leq K(\|v\|_{H_\gamma} \vee \|u\|_{H_\gamma}) \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_1}},$$

$$(6.128) \quad |B|_{C^1(H_\gamma, \|\cdot\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})})} < \infty,$$

and that for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets $E \subseteq H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$(6.129) \quad \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] < \infty$$

and that

$$(6.130) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} \left[\frac{\|B(v)(\text{Id}_U - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}}{1 + \|v\|_{H_\gamma}} \right] = 0.$$

PROOF. Let $\mathbf{B}(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, $r \in [0, \infty]$ be the set satisfying for all $r \in [0, \infty]$ that $\mathbf{B}(r) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2: \|x\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq r\}$. Moreover, note that (6.123) and Lemma 6.6 imply that for all $i \in \{0, \gamma, \gamma + \vartheta\}$ there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_i$ it holds that

$$\|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_i)}^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \|B(u)\tilde{e}_n\|_{H_i}^2 \leq C_1 \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \|B(u)\tilde{e}_n\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_1 \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot)\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \\
(6.131) \quad &= C_1 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\left\| \left\langle (b_{11}(\cdot, u(\cdot)), b_{12}(\cdot, u(\cdot))), (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left\| \left\langle (b_{21}(\cdot, u(\cdot)), b_{22}(\cdot, u(\cdot))), (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \right\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31] (with $s_1 \leftarrow i$, $s_2 \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $d \leftarrow 2$, $p \leftarrow 2$, $q_1 \leftarrow 2$, $q_2 \leftarrow 2$, $q \leftarrow 2$) and Lemma 6.6 verify that for all $i \in \{0, \gamma, \gamma + \vartheta\}$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_i$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|B(u)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_i)}^2 \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \left((\|b_{11}(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2 + \|b_{12}(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2) \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right. \\
(6.132) \quad &\quad \left. + (\|b_{21}(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2 + \|b_{22}(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2)}^2) \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \right) \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
&\leq C_2 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}} \|Q\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously we derive that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $i \in \{0, \gamma, \gamma + \vartheta\}$ and all $u, v \in H_i$ it holds that

$$(6.133) \quad \|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_i)} \leq C_1 \|Q\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_{\gamma+\vartheta})} \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2i}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}.$$

Combining (6.133) and Lemma 5.15 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $p \leftarrow 0$, $q \leftarrow \infty$) shows that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.134) \quad &\|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(L^2((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\
&\leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 = C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_H^2
\end{aligned}$$

and this verifies (6.125) and (6.128). Furthermore, (6.133), Corollary 5.16 (with $m \leftarrow 2$, $d \leftarrow 2$, $s \leftarrow 2\gamma$, $p_2 \leftarrow 0$, $p_1 \leftarrow 0$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $q_1 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_2 \leftarrow 2$, $q_3 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_4 \leftarrow 2$, $q_5 \leftarrow \infty$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma - 2\beta_1$), and Lemma 6.6 establish that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_\gamma$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H}_\gamma)} \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}} \\
&\leq C_2 \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 (\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1) \\
(6.135) \quad &\quad + C_2 \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + C_2 \|u - v\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
&\leq C_3 (\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_1}}^2 (\|u\|_{H_\gamma}^2 + 1) + \|u - v\|_{H_\gamma}^2 + \|u - v\|_H^2) \\
&\leq C_3 \|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_1}}^2 (\|u\|_{H_\gamma}^2 + 1 + \eta^{\beta_1-1/2} + \eta^{\beta_1-\gamma-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

and this implies (6.127). In addition, note that it holds that

$$(6.136) \quad 2\gamma \frac{1+\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} + \frac{(2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1)(\vartheta-\gamma)}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} = 2\gamma + 2\gamma \frac{\gamma-\vartheta}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} + \vartheta - \gamma + \frac{2\gamma(\vartheta-\gamma)}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} = \vartheta + \gamma$$

and that

$$(6.137) \quad 2\gamma \frac{\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} + \frac{(2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1)(1+\vartheta-\gamma)}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} = 2\gamma + 2\gamma \frac{\gamma-\vartheta-1}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} + 1 + \vartheta - \gamma + \frac{2\gamma(1+\vartheta-\gamma)}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1} = 1 + \vartheta + \gamma.$$

Thus Lemma 5.4 (with $r \leftarrow \vartheta + \gamma$, $r_1 \leftarrow 2\gamma$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2\vartheta + 2\gamma + 1 - 2\beta_1$, $s_1 \leftarrow \frac{1+\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1}$, $s_2 \leftarrow \frac{\vartheta-\gamma}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1}$, and with $r \leftarrow 1 + \vartheta + \gamma$, $r_1 \leftarrow 2\gamma$, $r_2 \leftarrow 2\vartheta + 2\gamma + 1 - 2\beta_1$, $s_1 \leftarrow \frac{\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1}$,

$s_2 \leftarrow \frac{1+\vartheta-\gamma}{2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1}$) demonstrates that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_1 \left(\left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(1+\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(\vartheta-\gamma)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \cdot \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(1+\vartheta-\gamma)/(2\vartheta+1-\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \right) \\
& = C_1 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-4\beta_1)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(2\vartheta-2\gamma+1)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right. \\
(6.138) \quad & \left. + \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(\vartheta+\gamma-2\beta_1)/(2\vartheta+1-2\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2(1+\vartheta-\gamma)/(2\vartheta+1-\beta_1)}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \right) \\
& \leq C_1 \left((1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2) \right) \\
& = 2C_1 \left((1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence Lemma 5.4, Corollary 5.9 (with $H_r \leftarrow B_{2,2}^{2r}((0,1)^2)$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $d \leftarrow 2$, $p \leftarrow 2$, $s \leftarrow \vartheta + \gamma - 1/2$, $\beta \leftarrow \beta$, $\alpha \leftarrow 0$, $r_1 \leftarrow \frac{\vartheta+\gamma}{2}$, $r_2 \leftarrow \frac{\vartheta+\gamma}{2}$, $\tilde{r}_1 \leftarrow \frac{1+\vartheta+\gamma}{2}$, $\tilde{r}_2 \leftarrow \frac{1+\vartheta+\gamma}{2}$, $\delta \leftarrow 0$, $u \leftarrow (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(\cdot, u(\cdot))$, and $v \leftarrow u_i$), the fact that $\vartheta + \gamma < 1$, and Corollary 5.13 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $b \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}$, $s \leftarrow \gamma + \vartheta$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $p \leftarrow 0$) assure that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4$, $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ and all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\
& \leq C_1 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2))}^2 \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right) \\
(6.139) \quad & \leq C_2 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^0((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{(0,1)^2} |(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(x, 0)|^2 dx \right) \|u_i\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_3 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+\vartheta+\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_4 \left((1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this, (6.132), Proposition 2 on page 19 in Runst & Sickel [31], and Corollary 5.13 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $s \leftarrow 2\gamma + 2\vartheta - 1$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $p \leftarrow 0$) establishes that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.140) \quad & \|B(u)\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta+\gamma})}^2 \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \left\| \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4, |\alpha| \leq 1} D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha (b(\cdot, u(\cdot))) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\
& = C_2 \left(\left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0,0,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1)(\cdot) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2)(\cdot) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 + \left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1,0,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1)(\cdot) + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2)(\cdot) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2\times 2}}^2 \\
& \leq C_3 \left((1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\gamma}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2) + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^0((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \\
& \leq C_4 \left((1 + \|u\|_{H_\gamma}^3) (1 + \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2) + \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + \|u\|_H^2 + 1 \right) \\
& \leq C_4 (1 + \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2) \left(1 + \|u\|_{H_\gamma}^3 + \eta^{2(\beta_1-1)} + \eta^{-2\gamma} \|u\|_{H_\gamma}^2 + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and this proves (6.126). Moreover, the Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., Theorem 1 on page 32 in Runst & Sickel [31]), the fact that $\vartheta \geq 1/2$ and Lemma 6.6 yield that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u \in H_{\varepsilon+\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$(6.141) \quad \|u\|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_1 \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\varepsilon}((0,1)^2; \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_2 \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\varepsilon}}.$$

Furthermore, it follows from Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31], Corollary 5.13 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $b \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}$, $s \leftarrow 2\gamma + 2\vartheta - 1$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $p \leftarrow 0$), and from Lemma 6.6 that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v = (v_1, v_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4$, and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.142) \quad & \left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta v_i)(\cdot) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) \right) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2\times 2}}^2 \\
& \leq C_1 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2)}^2 \| D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta v_i - D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i \|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C_2 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left(\|v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) + \|v\|_{B_{2,2}^0((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \int_{(0,1)^2} |(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(x, 0)|^2 dx \right. \\
& \quad \left. \cdot \|v - u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C_3 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\|v\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + 1 + \|v\|_H^2 + \int_{(0,1)^2} |(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(x, 0)|^2 dx \|v - u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we obtain from Theorem 2 on page 191 in Runst & Sickel [31], Corollary 5.16 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $b \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}$, $s \leftarrow 2\vartheta + 2\gamma - 1$, $q_1 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_2 \leftarrow 2$, $q_3 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_4 \leftarrow 2$, $q_5 \leftarrow \infty$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $p_1 \leftarrow \infty$, $p_2 \leftarrow 0$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma - 2\beta_1$), Lemma 6.6, and (6.141) (with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \gamma - \beta_1$) that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $v = (v_1, v_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4$, and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.143) \quad & \left\| \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \right) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2\times 2}}^2 \\
& \leq C_1 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \right\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. \| D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i \|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C_2 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left(\|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \| D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl} \|_{C([0,1] \times \mathbf{B}(\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)})} \cdot \| \cdot \|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')} \right) \\
& \quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|u - v\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma+1-2\beta_1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_3 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left(\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_1}}^2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^2 D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}\|_{C([0,1] \times \mathbf{B}((C_4 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}) \vee (C_4 \|v\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}})) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')})} \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \|u - v\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + \|u - v\|_H^2 \right) \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $v = (v_1, v_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4$, and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.144) \quad &\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta v_i)(\cdot) \|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &\leq \left\| \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \right) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &\quad + \left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \left((D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta v_i)(\cdot) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\beta u_i)(\cdot) \right) \right\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\left(\|u - v\|_{H_{1/2+\gamma-\beta_3}}^2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^2 D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}\|_{C([0,1] \times \mathbf{B}((C_2 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}}) \vee (C_2 \|v\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_1}})) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')})} \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \|u - v\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + \|u - v\|_H^2 \right) \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + 1 + \|u\|_H^2 + \int_{(0,1)^2} |(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl})(x, 0)|^2 dx \right) \|v - u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma+1/2-\beta_1}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, Corollary 5.16 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $b \leftarrow D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}$, $s \leftarrow 2\vartheta + 2\gamma - 1$, $q_1 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_2 \leftarrow 2$, $q_3 \leftarrow \infty$, $q_4 \leftarrow 2$, $q_5 \leftarrow \infty$, $q \leftarrow \infty$, $p_1 \leftarrow \infty$, $p_2 \leftarrow 0$, $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\gamma - 2\beta_1$), Lemma 6.6, and (6.141) (with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \gamma - \beta_1$) imply that there exist $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u, v \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^4$, and all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.145) \quad &\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{1+2\gamma-2\beta_3}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \left(\|u\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^2 D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}\|_{C([0,1] \times \mathbf{B}(\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \vee \|v\|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')})} \\ &\quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \|u - v\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_2 \sum_{k,l \in \{1,2\}} \left(\|u - v\|_{H_{\gamma+1/2-\beta_3}}^2 \left(\|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + 1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^2 D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha b_{kl}\|_{C([0,1] \times \mathbf{B}((C_3 \|u\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_3}}) \vee (C_3 \|v\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta+1/2-\beta_3}})) \cdot \|\cdot\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2, (\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2)')})} \\ &\quad \left. + \|u - v\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-1/2}}^2 + \|u - v\|_H^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (6.133) and Proposition 2 on page 19 in Runst & Sickel [31] yields that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $u = (u_1, u_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$, $v = (v_1, v_2) \in H_{\gamma+2\vartheta}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (6.146) \quad &\|B(u) - B(v)\|_{HS(U, \mathbb{H}_{\vartheta+\gamma})}^2 \leq C_1 \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &\leq C_2 \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^2, |\alpha| \leq 1} \|D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^\alpha (b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot)))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\gamma+2\vartheta-1}((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\ &= C_2 \left(\left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0,0,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0,0,0)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) \right\| + \left\| (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) (D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_1)(\cdot) \right\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} v_1)(\cdot) + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} u_2)(\cdot) \\
& - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(1,0)} v_2)(\cdot) \Big\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 + \|(D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1,0,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot)) \\
& - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1,0,0)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot)) + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_1)(\cdot) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,1,0)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} v_1)(\cdot) \\
& + (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, u(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} u_2)(\cdot) - (D_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,0,0,1)} b)(\cdot, v(\cdot))(D_{\mathbb{R}^2}^{(0,1)} v_2)(\cdot) \Big\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \\
& + \|b(\cdot, u(\cdot)) - b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(B_{2,2}^{2\vartheta+2\gamma-1}((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this, (6.144), (6.145), the assumption that for all $k, l \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $b_{kl} \in C^3([0, 1]^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R})$, and the fact that for all $r \in (-\infty, \vartheta + \gamma - \beta_1]$ and all $u \in H_r$ it holds that $\|u\|_{H_r} \leq \eta^{r-\vartheta-\gamma+\beta_1} \|u\|_{H_{\vartheta+\gamma-\beta_1}}$ proves (6.124). Moreover, (6.121) and (6.141) (with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \gamma$) show that there exist $C_1, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $v \in H$, and all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.147) \quad & \|B(v)(\text{Id}_H - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2 \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))(Q(\text{Id}_H - \mathcal{P}_N)\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot)\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
& = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))(Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot)\|_{L^2((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \| \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{HS(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \| (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot) \|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \| \|_{L^2((0,1)^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_1 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \| \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{HS(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|_{L^2((0,1)^2)}^2 \| \| (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot) \|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2)}^2 \\
& = C_1 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(L^2((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \| (Q\tilde{e}_n)(\cdot) \|_{L^\infty((0,1)^2, \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_2 \|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(L^2((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this and Lemma 5.12 (with $d \leftarrow 2$, $m \leftarrow 2$, $p \leftarrow 0$), establishes that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets E it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.148) \quad & \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v \in E} [\|B(v)(\text{Id}_H - \mathcal{P}_N)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}^2] \\
& \leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} (\|b(\cdot, v(\cdot))\|_{(L^2((0,1)^2))^{2 \times 2}}^2) \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C_1 \sup_{v \in E} \left(\sum_{k, l \in \{1, 2\}} (\|v\|_{L^2((0,1), \mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + 2 \int_{(0,1)^2} |b_{kl}(x, 0)|^2 dx) \right) \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n \in \mathcal{I} \setminus [1, N]} \|Q\tilde{e}_n\|_{H_{\gamma+\vartheta}}^2 \right) \\
& = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and this assures (6.130). Finally observe that we derive from (6.134) that there exists a $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all \mathbb{H}_γ -bounded sets E it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.149) \quad & \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{v \in E} \|B(v)\mathcal{P}_N\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \leq \sup_{v \in E} \|B(v)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} \\
& \leq \sup_{v \in E} (\|B(v) - B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})} + \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}) \\
& \leq \sup_{v \in E} C_1 (\|v\|_H^2 + \|B(0)\|_{HS(\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{H})}) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This verifies (6.129) and thus finishes the proof of Remark 6.8. \square

Acknowledgements. This work has been partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) via RTG 2131 "High-dimensional phenomena in probability - Fluctuations and discontinuity".

Bibliography

- [1] T. V. Bang and D. V. Tran. “Viscosity solutions of the Cauchy problem for second-order nonlinear partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces”. In: *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations* 2006 (Apr. 2006).
- [2] S. Cerrai. *Second Order PDE’s in Finite and Infinite Dimension*. Vol. 1762. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2001. ISBN: 978-3-540-42136-8.
- [3] Sonja Cox, Martin Hutzenthaler, and Arnulf Jentzen. “Local Lipschitz continuity in the initial value and strong completeness for nonlinear stochastic differential equations”. In: *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1309.5595 (Sept. 2013), arXiv:1309.5595. arXiv: [1309.5595 \[math.PR\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1309.5595).
- [4] Sonja Cox, Martin Hutzenthaler, Arnulf Jentzen, Jan van Neerven, and Timo Welti. “Convergence in Hölder norms with applications to Monte Carlo methods in infinite dimensions”. In: *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 41.1 (Apr. 2020), pp. 493–548. ISSN: 0272-4979. DOI: [10.1093/imanum/drz063](https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drz063). eprint: <https://academic.oup.com/imajna/article-pdf/41/1/493/35971344/drz063.pdf>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drz063>.
- [5] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions. “User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 27.1 (1992), pp. 1–67.
- [6] M. G. Crandall and P.-L. Lions. “Condition d’unicité pour les solutions généralisées des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi du premier ordre.” French. In: *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I* 292 (1981), pp. 183–186. ISSN: 0764-4442.
- [7] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Vol. 44. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. ISBN: 0-521-38529-6.
- [8] Giuseppe Da Prato. *Kolmogorov equations for stochastic PDEs*. eng. Basel [u.a.]: Birkhäuser, 2004. ISBN: 3764372168.
- [9] C. H. Edwards. *Advanced Calculus of Several Variables*. Dover books on advanced mathematics. New York: Dover Publications, 1994. ISBN: 0-486-68336-2.
- [10] Franco Flandoli, Dejun Luo, and Cristiano Ricci. “A numerical approach to Kolmogorov equation in high dimension based on Gaussian analysis”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 493.1 (2021), p. 124505. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2020.124505>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X20306673>.
- [11] F. Gozzi, E. Rouy, and A. Świąch. “Second Order Hamilton–Jacobi Equations in Hilbert Spaces and Stochastic Boundary Control”. eng. In: *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 38.2 (2000), pp. 400–430. ISSN: 0363-0129.
- [12] F. Gozzi, S.S. Sritharan, and A. Świąch. “Bellman equations associated to the optimal feedback control of stochastic navier-stokes equations”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 58.5 (2005), pp. 0671–0700. ISSN: 00103640.
- [13] Massimiliano Gubinelli and Nicolas Perkowski. “The infinitesimal generator of the stochastic Burgers equation”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 178 (Dec. 2020). DOI: [10.1007/s00440-020-00996-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-020-00996-5).
- [14] M. Hairer, M. Hutzenthaler, and A. Jentzen. “Loss of regularity for Kolmogorov equations”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 43.2 (2015), pp. 468–527.

- [15] D. Henry. *Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations*. Vol. 840. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Berlin-New York: Springer-Verlag, 1981. ISBN: 3-540-10557-3.
- [16] H. Ishii. “Viscosity solutions of nonlinear second-order partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces”. In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 18.3-4 (1993), pp. 601–650.
- [17] A Jentzen. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Numerical Approximations*. Lecture Notes. 2015. URL: https://people.math.ethz.ch/~grsam/NASPDE_MATH_FS15/script/NASPDE_130.pdf.
- [18] A Jentzen. *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Numerical Approximations*. Lecture Notes. 2016. URL: http://www2.math.ethz.ch/education/bachelor/lectures/fs2016/math/numsol/NASPDE_181.pdf.
- [19] Arnulf Jentzen, Felix Lindner, and Primož Pušnik. *Spatial Sobolev regularity for stochastic Burgers equations with additive trace class noise*. 2019. arXiv: [1908.06128](https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.06128) [math.PR].
- [20] T. Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [21] Andrei Kolmogoroff. “Über die analytischen Methoden in der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 104.1 (1931), pp. 415–458.
- [22] P.-L. Lions. “Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Second-Order Equations and Optimal Stochastic Control in Infinite Dimensions. III. Uniqueness of Viscosity Solutions for General Second-Order Equations”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 86.1 (1989), pp. 1–18.
- [23] W. Liu and M. Röckner. “SPDE in Hilbert space with locally monotone coefficients”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 259 (2010), pp. 2902–2922.
- [24] Alessandra Lunardi. *Interpolation Theory*. eng. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2018. ISBN: 8876426388. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-88-7642-638-4>.
- [25] Irina Mitrea and Marius Mitrea. *Multi-Layer Potentials and Boundary Problems*. Vol. 2063. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. ISBN: 978-3-642-32665-3.
- [26] Jindřich Nečas. *Direct Methods in the Theory of Elliptic Equations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN: 978-3-642-10454-1.
- [27] Etienne Pardoux and Shige Peng. “Backward stochastic differential equations and quasi-linear parabolic partial differential equations”. In: *Stochastic partial differential equations and their applications*. Springer, 1992, pp. 200–217.
- [28] S. Peng. *Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty*. 2010. arXiv: [1002.4546v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.4546v1) [math.PR].
- [29] Michael Röckner and Zeev Sobol. “A new approach to Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensions and applications to the stochastic 2D Navier-Stokes equation”. In: *Comptes Rendus Mathématique - C R MATH* 345 (Sept. 2007), pp. 289–292. DOI: [10.1016/j.crma.2007.07.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2007.07.009).
- [30] Michael Röckner and Zeev Sobol. “Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensions: Well-posedness and regularity of solutions, with applications to stochastic generalized Burgers equations”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 34.2 (Mar. 2006). ISSN: 0091-1798. DOI: [10.1214/009117905000000666](https://doi.org/10.1214/009117905000000666). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/009117905000000666>.
- [31] T. Runst and W. Sickel. *Sobolev Spaces of Fractional Order, Nemytskij Operators, and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. de Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications; 3. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1994. ISBN: 3-11-015113-8.
- [32] V. S. Rychkov. “On Restrictions And Extensions Of The Besov And Triebel–Lizorkin Spaces With Respect To Lipschitz Domains”. In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 60 (1998). DOI: [10.1112/S0024610799007723](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0024610799007723).
- [33] C. Stegall. “Optimization of Functions on Certain Subsets of Banach Spaces”. In: *Math. Ann.* 236 (1978), pp. 171–176.
- [34] H. Triebel. *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*. Vol. 18. Amsterdam, New York, Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1978. ISBN: 0-7204-0710-9.

- [35] J.M.A.M. Van Neerven, M.C. Veraar, and L. Weis. “Stochastic evolution equations in UMD Banach spaces”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 255.4 (2008), pp. 940–993. ISSN: 0022-1236. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2008.03.015>.
- [36] R. J. Zimmer. *Essential Results of Functional Analysis*. The University of Chicago Press, 1990. ISBN: 0-226-98337-4.