

Continuous dependence on parameters for invariant measures and its application to multiscale stochastic systems*

Jinghai Shao[†]

March 28, 2023

Abstract

The asymptotic behavior for fully coupled multiscale stochastic systems becomes much complicated when the fast processes do not locate in a compact space. An illustrative example is constructed, which shows that the averaged coefficients may become discontinuous even they are originally Lipschitz continuous. We aim to reveal the impact of the ergodicity of the fast process on the limit process and the averaging principle. The crucial point is the continuous dependence on parameters related to the slow process for the invariant probability measures in various distances over the Wasserstein space.

AMS MSC 2010: 60H10, 34K33, 60J60, 37A30

Keywords: Averaging principle, Strong ergodicity, Parabolic equation, Hölder continuous

*Supported in part by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1000033) and NNSFs of China (No. 12271397, 11831014)

[†]Center for Applied Mathematics, Tianjin University, Tianjin, China.

1 Introduction

In this work we are concerned with the following fully coupled two time-scale stochastic systems:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^\varepsilon = b(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)dt + \sigma(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)dW_t, & X_0^\varepsilon = x_0, \\ dY_t^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}f(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}g(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)dB_t, & Y_0^\varepsilon = y_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where (W_t) and (B_t) are d -dimensional mutually independent Wiener processes, $b(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are drifts, $\sigma(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $g(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are diffusion coefficients. The parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ represents the ratio between the time scale of processes (X_t^ε) and (Y_t^ε) . We are interested in the case $\varepsilon \ll 1$, in which (X_t^ε) is called the slow component, and (Y_t^ε) is called the fast component.

In the study of fully coupled stochastic systems, when the fast component does not locate in a compact space, the limit system becomes very complicated. Our purpose is to reveal the essential impact of various ergodicity of the fast component on the limit system. We shall show the wellposedness of the limit system and the averaging principle under different ergodicity of the fast component. To this end, it is crucial to show the continuous dependence of the invariant probability measure π^x of the fast component (Y_t^ε) on the fixed state x of the slow component (X_t^ε) .

In applications many real systems can be viewed as a combination of slow and fast motions such as in modeling climate-weather interaction [6, 19], in biology [16], in mathematical finance [7, 8] and references therein. The averaging principle has been established for various multiscale systems which says that the slow component (X_t^ε) will converge to some limit process (\bar{X}_t) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in suitable sense. Also, there are many works devoted to the study of central limit theorems and large deviations of multiscale stochastic models. For a two-time scale system where both slow and fast components are continuous processes given as solutions of SDEs, these problems have been extensively studied in e.g. [17, 18, 22, 21, 27, 31, 32], in [13] for SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motions. For a two-time scale system where the slow component is a continuous process but the fast process is a jump process over a discrete space, these problems have been studied in e.g. [3, 9, 24] and references therein.

When the fast component does not depend on the slow component, we arrive at the classical uncoupled setup, and the averaging principle usually holds in quite general conditions. However, when the fast component depends on the slow component, the situation becomes more complicated. Anosov [1] established the first relatively general

result on fully coupled averaging principle. See the monograph of Kifer [20] for a detailed discussion on averaging of fully coupled dynamical systems. The averaging principle for fully coupled stochastic processes have been investigated in e.g. Freidlin and Wentzell [10] and Veretennikov [30], the corresponding large deviation principle has been studied by Veretennikov [31, 32] and recently by Puhalskii [27]. This work focuses on the averaging principle for fully coupled two time-scale stochastic processes.

To be precise, for each fixed slow component x , let π^x denote the invariant probability measure of the fast component. As usual, put $\bar{b}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x, y)\pi^x(dy)$ and $\bar{\sigma}(x)$ the square root of $\bar{a}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\sigma\sigma^*)(x, y)\pi^x(dy)$, and consider the SDE

$$d\bar{X}_t = \bar{b}(\bar{X}_t)dt + \bar{\sigma}(\bar{X}_t)dW_t, \quad \bar{X}_0 = x_0. \quad (1.2)$$

The averaging principle suggests that often (X_t^ε) converges to a process (\bar{X}_t) . To show this, a premise is the wellposedness of the SDE (1.2). In the uncoupled setup, Lipschitz continuity of b and σ implies already that \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$ are also Lipschitz continuous in x , and so there exists a unique solution (\bar{X}_t) to SDE (1.2). However, in the fully coupled case even when b is Lipschitz continuous, we construct an example (see Example 2.1 in Section 2) to show that the averaged coefficients $\bar{b}(x)$ may even not be continuous in x , let alone Lipschitz. So, SDE (1.2) may not have solution at all.

The wellposedness of SDE (1.2) depends not only on the regularity of coefficients b and σ but also on the ergodicity of the fast component at each fixed slow component x via the invariant probability measure π^x . So, to establish the averaging principle we first study the continuity of π^x in x under the two kinds of strongly ergodic conditions for the fast component w.r.t. total variation distance, bounded Lipschitz distance and L^1 -Wasserstein distance respectively. As the space of probability measures is an infinite dimensional space, the previous mentioned distances are not equivalent, and so the continuity of π^x w.r.t. different distances can be applied to deal with the regularity of \bar{b} , $\bar{\sigma}$ for different kinds of b and σ . Furthermore, under the wellposedness of the limit process (\bar{X}_t) the averaging principle is established for fully coupled two time-scale stochastic processes under certain conditions.

In the study of fully coupled stochastic systems, there are limited works on the ergodicity of the fast component to ensure the averaging principle holds, especially when the fast component locates in a noncompact space. Usually, the focus is on how to weaken the conditions on the slow component. Among these limited study, the results in Veretennikov [30] are representative, where the key condition on the fast component is the following ergodicity condition.

- There exist functions \bar{b} , $\bar{\sigma}$ and $K(T)$ such that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} K(T) = 0$, $\bar{\sigma}(x)$ is nondegenerate, continuous in x , and for all $t \geq 0$, $T > 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+T} b(x, Y_s^{x,y}) ds - \bar{b}(x) \right| &\leq K(T)(1 + |x|^2 + |y|^2), \\ \left| \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+T} a(x, Y_s^{x,y}) ds - \bar{a}(x) \right| &\leq K(T)(1 + |x|^2 + |y|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $a(x, y) = (\sigma\sigma^*)(x, y)$, $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is the solution to

$$dY_t^{x,y} = f(x, Y_t^{x,y})dt + g(x, Y_t^{x,y})dB_t, \quad Y_0^{x,y} = y. \quad (1.3)$$

In application, the verification of the previous ergodicity and continuity condition on \bar{b} and \bar{a} is not easy. In particular, as explained by Example 2.1 below, \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}(x)$ may be discontinuous even b and σ are Lipschitz continuous. So, a widely used condition is the monotonicity condition on the fast component (cf. e.g. [12, 22]), that is, there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$2(y_1 - y_2) \cdot (f(x, y_1) - f(x, y_2)) + \|g(x, y_1) - g(x, y_2)\|^2 \leq -\beta|y_1 - y_2|^2, \quad x, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.4)$$

Besides the monotonicity condition to characterize the ergodicity of the fast component, certain strict coercivity condition is also needed to establish the averaging principle (cf. [22, Remark 2.1]).

Based on our constructed example, we shall impose strong ergodicity condition on the fast component using respectively the total variation distance and the L^1 -Wasserstein distance to measure the convergence of the semigroup to its invariant probability measure. The strong ergodicity of diffusion processes is well studied topic, and there are many criteria in the existing literature. The monotonicity condition is a sufficient condition to guarantee the strong ergodicity in the L^1 -Wasserstein distance. Accordingly, the continuity of invariant probability measure π^x in x is proved, which helps us to show the continuity of \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$ and further the wellposedness of the SDE for limit process (\bar{X}_t) . At last, we can use the time discretization method and the coupling method to establish the averaging principle.

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first construct an example in Subsection 2.1 to show the essential impact of π^x on the regularity of $\bar{b}(x)$, $\bar{\sigma}(x)$. Then, we investigate the continuity of π^x in x w.r.t. different distances. In Section 3, the averaging principle for the fully coupled system (1.1) is established under different conditions.

2 Continuous dependence on parameters of invariant probability measures

2.1 An illustrative example

In this part we aim to present the complexity of fully coupled stochastic systems via an explicit example.

Example 2.1 Let (X_t^ε) and (Y_t^ε) be stochastic processes respectively on $[0, 1]$ and on $[0, \infty)$ with reflection boundary satisfying

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^\varepsilon = Y_t^\varepsilon dt + Y_t^\varepsilon dW_t, & X_0^\varepsilon = x_0 \in (0, 1), \\ dY_t^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \tilde{f}(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon) dt + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} dB_t, & Y_0^\varepsilon = y_0 \in (0, \infty), \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(x, y) = \frac{-x^3 e^{-xy} - (1-x)e^{-y}}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}}, \quad x \in [0, 1], y \in [0, \infty).$$

As $\tilde{f}(x, y)$ is continuous on $[0, 1] \times [0, \infty)$, the solution to (2.1) exists and is unique in distribution according to [29]. In this example, $b(x, y) = \sigma(x, y) = y$ and $g(x, y) = 1$ are both Lipschitz continuous.

For each $x \in [0, 1]$, the invariant probability measure π^x associated with the SDE

$$dY_t^{x,y} = \tilde{f}(x, Y_t^{x,y}) dt + dB_t, \quad Y_0^{x,y} = y \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.2)$$

is given by

$$\pi^x(dy) = (x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}) dy.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b}(x) &:= \int_0^\infty b(x, y) \pi^x(dy) = \int_0^\infty y (x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}) dy \\ &= \begin{cases} 2-x, & \text{if } x \in (0, 1], \\ 1, & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\bar{b}(x)$ is not continuous at $x = 0$. Hence, this example is our desired example to show the complexity of the limit behavior of the fully coupled system $(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Next, we investigate the ergodic property of the process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ given by (2.2). To this end, introduce the notation

$$C_x(y) = \ln(x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}), \quad \mu^x(dy) = e^{C_x(y)} dy.$$

So, $\mu^x([0, \infty)) = 1$ and $\pi^x(dy) = \mu^x(dy)/\mu^x([0, \infty)) = \mu^x(dy)$.

1) The process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is unique and ergodic. To this end, one needs to check $\int_0^\infty \mu^x([0, y])e^{-C_x(y)} dy = \infty$ and $\mu^x([0, \infty)) < \infty$. Indeed, $\mu^x([0, \infty)) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^y e^{C_x(z)} dz \right) e^{-C_x(y)} dy \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^y (x^2 e^{-xz} + (1-x)e^{-z}) dz \right) \frac{dy}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{x(1 - e^{-xy}) + (1-x)(1 - e^{-y})}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}} dy \\ &\geq \int_1^\infty \frac{x(1 - e^{-x}) + (1-x)(1 - e^{-1})}{x^2 e^{-x} + (1-x)e^{-1}} dy = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that for each $x \in [0, 1]$ the process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is ergodic on $[0, \infty)$ by the criterion of ergodicity for one-dimensional diffusion processes; see, for instance, [5, Chapter 5].

2) According to [5, Chapter 5], to study the exponential ergodicity of $(Y_t^{x,y})$, we need to study

$$\mu^x([z, \infty)) \int_0^z e^{-C_x(y)} dy = (xe^{-xz} + (1-x)e^{-z}) \int_0^z \frac{dy}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}}.$$

Using L'Hôpital's rule,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} (xe^{-xz} + (1-x)e^{-z}) \int_0^z \frac{dy}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x)e^{-y}} \\ &= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{xe^{(1-x)z} + 1 - x}{x^2 e^{(1-x)z} + 1 - x} \right)^2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $\sup_{z>0} \{ \mu^x([z, \infty)) \int_0^z e^{-C_x(y)} dy \} < \infty$, and then the process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is exponentially ergodic.

3) According to [23, Theorem 2.1], $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is strongly ergodic (also called uniformly ergodic) if and only if

$$\int_0^\infty \mu^x([y, \infty)) e^{-C_x(y)} dy < \infty.$$

However, for this example,

$$\int_0^\infty \mu^x([y, \infty)) e^{-C_x(y)} dy = \int_0^\infty \frac{x e^{-xy} + (1-x) e^{-y}}{x^2 e^{-xy} + (1-x) e^{-y}} dy = \infty,$$

so $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is not strongly ergodic.

2.2 Continuity of π^x in the Wasserstein space

The space of probability measures over \mathbb{R}^d , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is an infinite dimensional space, on which various distances have been defined. These distances are not mutually equivalent. To deal with different coefficients, one needs to consider the continuity of π^x in x in different distances. We shall consider three kinds of distances on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ including the total variation distance $\|\cdot\|_{\text{var}}$, L_1 -Wasserstein distance \mathbb{W}_1 , bounded Lipschitz distance \mathbb{W}_{bL} (also called Fortet-Mourier distance). These distances are defined as follows: for two probability measures μ, ν on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{var}} &:= 2 \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| = \sup_{|h| \leq 1} |\mu(h) - \nu(h)|, \\ \mathbb{W}_p(\mu, \nu) &:= \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x - y|^p \Gamma(dx, dy); \Gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad p \geq 1, \\ \mathbb{W}_{bL}(\mu, \nu) &:= \sup \left\{ \mu(h) - \nu(h); |h(x)| \leq 1, |h(x) - h(y)| \leq |x - y|, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Kantorovich's dual representation theorem for the Wasserstein distance,

$$\mathbb{W}_1(\mu, \nu) = \sup \left\{ \mu(h) - \nu(h); |h(x) - h(y)| \leq |x - y|, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}.$$

We refer the readers to [33, Chapter 6] for more discussion on the relationship of various distances on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

In this work we shall use two kinds of ergodicity condition on $(Y_t^{x,y})$ with respect to the total variation distance and the L_1 -Wasserstein distance respectively. Throughout this section, $P_t^x(y, \cdot)$ denotes the semigroup associated with the Markov process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ given by (1.3), i.e. $P_t^x h(y) := \mathbb{E}[h(Y_t^{x,y})]$ for $h \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, π^x denotes its invariant probability measure and we always assume its existence.

(E1) There exist constants $\kappa_1, \lambda_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|P_t^x(y, \cdot) - \pi^x\|_{\text{var}} \leq \kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t}, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(E2) There exist constants $\kappa_2, \lambda_2 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{W}_1(P_t^x(y, \cdot), \pi^x) \leq \kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 t}, \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Ergodicity for diffusion processes is an extensively studied topic (cf. [4, 25]). We shall present some criteria on the coefficients f, g to verify (E1) and (E2) in Section 3; see, Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2.

Now we collect the conditions on the coefficients of $(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)$ used in this work.

Assumptions on slow component:

(A1) There exists a constant $K_1 > 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|b(x_1, y_1) - b(x_2, y_2)|^2 + \|\sigma(x_1, y_1) - \sigma(x_2, y_2)\|^2 \leq K_1(|x_1 - x_2|^2 + |y_1 - y_2|^2).$$

(A2) There exists a constant $K_2 > 0$ such that

$$|b(x, y)| + \|\sigma(x, y)\| \leq K_2, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(A3) Let $a(x, y) = (\sigma\sigma^*)(x, y)$. Assume that

$$\inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, |\xi|=1} \xi^* a(x, y) \xi > 0.$$

Assumptions on fast component:

(B1) There exists $K_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (f(x_1, y) - f(x_2, y)) \cdot z &\leq K_3 |x_1 - x_2| |z|, \quad x_1, x_2, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \\ (f(x_1, y_1) - f(x_2, y_2)) \cdot (y_1 - y_2) + \|g(x_1, y_1) - g(x_2, y_2)\|^2 &\leq K_3(|x_1 - x_2|^2 + |y_1 - y_2|^2) \end{aligned}$$

for $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

(B2) There exists a constant $K_4 > 0$ such that $|f(x, y)| + |g(x, y)| \leq K_4$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

(B3) There exists a constant $\lambda_3 > 0$ such that and

$$\eta^*(gg^*)(x, y)\eta \geq \lambda_3 |\eta|^2, \quad x, y, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Consider the following parabolic equation:

$$\partial_t u(t, y) = \mathcal{L}^x u(t, y), \quad t > 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2.3)$$

with initial condition $u(0, y) = h(y)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where \mathcal{L}^x is the infinitesimal generator of the process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}^x v(y) = \sum_{k=1}^d f_k(x, y) \frac{\partial v(y)}{\partial y_k} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d G_{kl}(x, y) \frac{\partial^2 v(y)}{\partial y_k \partial y_l}, \quad v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad (2.4)$$

and $(G_{kl}(x, y)) = (gg^*)(x, y)$. Let $\Theta^x(t, z; s, y)$, $0 \leq s < t$, denotes the fundamental solution to PDE (2.3); see, e.g. [11] for the definition of fundamental solutions to parabolic equations. We shall use the Gaussian type estimates on the derivatives of $\Theta^x(t, z; s, y)$: there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\frac{1}{c_1(t-s)^{d/2}} e^{-\frac{|y-z|^2}{c_2(t-s)}} \leq \Theta^x(t, z; s, y) \leq \frac{c_1}{(t-s)^{d/2}} e^{-c_2 \frac{|y-z|^2}{t-s}}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$|\nabla_z \Theta^x(t, z; s, y)| \leq \frac{c_1}{(t-s)^{(d+1)/2}} e^{-c_2 \frac{|y-z|^2}{t-s}} \quad (2.6)$$

for $0 \leq s \leq t$, $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. According to [11, Chapter 9, Theorem 2], under conditions (B1)-(B3), the estimates (2.5) and (2.6) hold. Moreover, there are many works to study the Gaussian estimates for the fundamental solutions when the coefficients are singular such as in some Kato's class. See, e.g. [35, 36] and references therein.

Proposition 2.1 *Assume (E1), (B1) and the estimate (2.6) hold. In addition, assume $g(x, y)$ depends only on y , i.e. $g(x, y) = g(y)$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}} \leq C|x_1 - x_2|^{2/3}, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. For any $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_\infty := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |h(x)| \leq 1$, due to (E1),

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| &\leq \left| \pi^{x_1}(h) - \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) ds \right| + \left| \pi^{x_2}(h) - \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_s^{x_2} h(y_0) ds \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) - P_s^{x_2} h(y_0)| ds \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (\|P_s^{x_1}(y_0, \cdot) - \pi^{x_1}\|_{\text{var}} + \|P_s^{x_2}(y_0, \cdot) - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}}) ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) - P_s^{x_2} h(y_0)| ds \\
&\leq \frac{2\kappa_1}{t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1 s} ds + \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) - P_s^{x_2} h(y_0)| ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Consider the function $\phi(r) := P_r^{x_1}(P_{s-r}^{x_2} h)(y_0)$ for $r \in [0, s]$. It is easy to see

$$P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) - P_s^{x_2} h(y_0) = \int_0^s \phi'(r) dr = \int_0^s P_r^{x_1} (\mathcal{L}^{x_1} - \mathcal{L}^{x_2}) P_{s-r}^{x_2} h(y_0) dr. \tag{2.9}$$

Notice that $u(s, y) := P_s^{x_2} h(y)$ is the unique solution to (1.4) with $x = x_2$, which can be represented by the fundamental solution $\Theta^{x_2}(s, y; t, z)$ via

$$u(s, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Theta^{x_2}(s, y; 0, z) h(z) dz$$

by virtue of [11, Chapter 1, Theorem 12]. Then, by (B1) and (2.6), it follows from (2.9) that for $s \in [0, t]$

$$\begin{aligned}
|P_s^{x_1} h(y_0) - P_s^{x_2} h(y_0)| &\leq \int_0^s \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} |(f(x_1, y) - f(x_2, y)) \cdot \nabla P_{s-r}^{x_2} h(y)| dr \\
&\leq K_3 |x_1 - x_2| \int_0^s \left(\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} r^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} e^{-c_1 \frac{|z-y|^2}{r}} h(z) dz \right) dr \\
&\leq K_3 |x_1 - x_2| \int_0^s r^{-\frac{1}{2}} dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-c_1 |z|^2} dz \\
&\leq C\sqrt{s} |x_1 - x_2|.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this estimate into (2.8), we get

$$|\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| \leq \frac{2\kappa_1}{t} (1 - e^{-\lambda_1 t}) + C\sqrt{t} |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Furthermore, by taking $t = |x_1 - x_2|^{-2/3}$, it holds for some $C > 0$ that

$$|\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| \leq C|x_1 - x_2|^{2/3}. \quad (2.10)$$

By the arbitrariness of $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_\infty \leq 1$, we get that

$$\|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\mathbb{V}} := \sup\{|\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)|; h \in C(\mathbb{R}^d), |h|_\infty \leq 1\} \leq C|x_1 - x_2|^{2/3}.$$

To show the desired conclusion (2.7), we only need to show

$$\|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\mathbb{V}} = \|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Indeed, by Lusin's theorem (cf. [28, Theorem 2.23]), for every $h \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_\infty \leq 1$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a function $h_\varepsilon \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$(\pi^{x_1} + \pi^{x_2})(\{h \neq h_\varepsilon\}) < \varepsilon, \quad \text{and } |h_\varepsilon|_\infty \leq |h|_\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| &\leq |\pi^{x_1}(h_\varepsilon) - \pi^{x_2}(h_\varepsilon)| + |\pi^{x_1}(h - h_\varepsilon)| + |\pi^{x_2}(h - h_\varepsilon)| \\ &\leq |\pi^{x_1}(h_\varepsilon) - \pi^{x_2}(h_\varepsilon)| + 2\varepsilon \\ &\leq \|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\mathbb{V}} + 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

From this, it is easy to see (2.11) holds. Thus, the proof is completed. \square

Corollary 2.2 *Let the conditions of Proposition 2.1 be valid. In addition, suppose (A1) and (A2) hold. Let*

$$\bar{b}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x, y)\pi^x(dy), \quad \bar{a}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x, y)\pi^x(dy). \quad (2.12)$$

Then \bar{b} and \bar{a} are locally Hölder continuous of exponent 2/3.

Proof. By (2.7), (A1), and (A2), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{b}(x_1) - \bar{b}(x_2)| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x_1, y)(\pi^{x_1}(dy) - \pi^{x_2}(dy)) \right| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(x_1, y) - b(x_2, y)|\pi^{x_2}(dy) \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} |b(x_1, y)| \|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}} + \sqrt{K_1}|x_1 - x_2| \\ &\leq K_2(1 + |x_1|)|x_1 - x_2|^{2/3} + \sqrt{K_1}|x_1 - x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that \bar{b} is locally Hölder continuous of exponent 2/3. Similar deduction yields the result for \bar{a} . Hence, this corollary is proved. \square

Proposition 2.3 (i) Assume (E1), (B1) hold. Then for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathbb{W}_{bL}(\pi^{x_1}, \pi^{x_2}) \leq |x_1 - x_2| \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| \geq 2\kappa_1\}} + |x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| < 2\kappa_1\}}. \quad (2.13)$$

(ii) Assume (E2), (B1) hold. Then for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathbb{W}_1(\pi^{x_1}, \pi^{x_2}) \leq |x_1 - x_2| \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| \geq 2\kappa_2\}} + |x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2 + K_3}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| < 2\kappa_2\}}. \quad (2.14)$$

Proof. (i) For $x_1, x_2, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, consider

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^{x_1, y} &= f(x_1, Y_t^{x_1, y})dt + g(x_1, Y_t^{x_1, y})dB_t, & Y_0^{x_1, y} &= y, \\ dY_t^{x_2, y} &= f(x_2, Y_t^{x_2, y})dt + g(x_2, Y_t^{x_2, y})dB_t, & Y_0^{x_2, y} &= y. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Itô's formula and (B1),

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{x_1, y} - Y_t^{x_2, y}|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t K_3 (|x_1 - x_2|^2 + |Y_s^{x_1, y} - Y_s^{x_2, y}|^2) ds.$$

This yields

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{x_1, y} - Y_t^{x_2, y}|^2 \leq (e^{K_3 t} - 1)|x_1 - x_2|^2. \quad (2.15)$$

For any $h \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_\infty \leq 1$ and $|h|_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{z_1 \neq z_2} \frac{|h(z_1) - h(z_2)|}{|z_1 - z_2|} \leq 1$, by virtue of (2.15) and (E1),

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| &\leq |\pi^{x_1}(h) - P_t^{x_1}h(y)| + |\pi^{x_2}(h) - P_t^{x_2}h(y)| \\ &\quad + |P_t^{x_1}h(y) - P_t^{x_2}h(y)| \\ &\leq \|P_t^{x_1}(y, \cdot) - \pi^{x_1}\|_{\text{var}} + \|P_t^{x_2}(y, \cdot) - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}|h(Y_t^{x_1, y}) - h(Y_t^{x_2, y})| \\ &\leq 2\kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} + |h|_{\text{Lip}} (\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{x_1, y} - Y_t^{x_2, y}|^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2\kappa_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} + (e^{K_3 t} - 1)^{1/2} |x_1 - x_2| =: (I). \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

To estimate (I), when $|x_1 - x_2| \geq 2\kappa_1$, it holds

$$(I) \leq |x_1 - x_2| + (e^{K_3 t} - 1)^{1/2} |x_1 - x_2|,$$

which yields (I) $\leq |x_1 - x_2|$ by letting $t \rightarrow 0$. When $|x_1 - x_2| < 2\kappa_1$, take $t = -\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \ln \frac{|x_1 - x_2|^p}{2\kappa_1}$ for some $p > 0$ to be determined later. Then $e^{-\lambda_1 t} = \frac{|x_1 - x_2|^p}{2\kappa_1}$, and

$$(I) \leq |x_1 - x_2|^p + e^{K_3 t} |x_1 - x_2|$$

$$\leq |x_1 - x_2|^p + (2\kappa_1)^{\frac{K_3 p}{\lambda_1}} |x_1 - x_2|^{1 - \frac{K_3 p}{\lambda_1}}.$$

Take $p = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}$, then $p = 1 - \frac{K_3 p}{\lambda_1}$. Finally, (I) $\leq (1 + (2\kappa_1)^{\frac{K_3}{\lambda_1 + K_3}}) |x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}}$. By the arbitrariness of h with $|h|_\infty \leq 1$ and $|h|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$, we get (2.13) from the definition of $\mathbb{W}_{bL}(\pi^{x_1}, \pi^{x_2})$.

(ii) For any $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| \\ & \leq |\pi^{x_1}(h) - P_t^{x_1}h(y)| + |\pi^{x_2}(h) - P_t^{x_2}h(y)| + |P_t^{x_1}h(y) - P_t^{x_2}h(y)| \\ & \leq \mathbb{W}_1(P_t^{x_1}(y, \cdot), \pi^{x_1}) + \mathbb{W}_1(P_t^{x_2}(y, \cdot), \pi^{x_2}) + |h|_{\text{Lip}} (\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{x_1, y} - Y_t^{x_2, y}|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq 2\kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 t} + (e^{K_3 t} - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} |x_1 - x_2|, \end{aligned}$$

due to (2.15). Then, completely similar to assertion (i), by choosing suitable $t > 0$, we have

$$|\pi^{x_1}(h) - \pi^{x_2}(h)| \leq |x_1 - x_2| \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| \geq 2\kappa_2\}} + |x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2 + K_3}} \mathbf{1}_{\{|x_1 - x_2| < 2\kappa_2\}},$$

which yields (2.14) by taking supremum over $h \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $|h|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$. \square

Corollary 2.4 (i) Assume (E1), (B1) and (A1), (A2) hold. Then \bar{b} , \bar{a} defined in (2.12) are locally Hölder continuous of exponent $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}$.

(ii) Assume (E2), (B1) and (A1) hold. Then \bar{b} , \bar{a} are Hölder continuous of exponent $\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2 + K_3}$.

Proof. (i) We only prove the assertion for \bar{b} , and the assertion for \bar{a} can be proved in the same way. By (A1) and (A2), for $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{b}(x_1) - \bar{b}(x_2)| & \leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x_1, y) (\pi^{x_1}(dy) - \pi^{x_2}(dy)) \right| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(x_1, y) - b(x_2, y)| \pi^{x_2}(dy) \\ & \leq K_2(1 + |x_1|) \|\pi^{x_1} - \pi^{x_2}\|_{\text{var}} + \sqrt{K_1} |x_1 - x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking (2.13), it is clear that for any $R > 0$

$$\sup_{\substack{|x_1|, |x_2| \leq R, \\ x_1 \neq x_2}} \frac{|\bar{b}(x_1) - \bar{b}(x_2)|}{|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}}} < \infty.$$

Thus, \bar{b} is locally Hölder continuous of exponent $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + K_3}$.

(ii) By (A1), it holds $|b(x_1, y) - b(x_1, y')| \leq \sqrt{K_1}|y - y'|$ for $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Using (2.14),

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{b}(x_1) - \bar{b}(x_2)| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(x_1, y) (\pi^{x_1}(\mathrm{d}y) - \pi^{x_2}(\mathrm{d}y)) \right| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |b(x_1, y) - b(x_2, y)| \pi^{x_2}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_1} \mathbb{W}_1(\pi^{x_1}, \pi^{x_2}) + \sqrt{K_1} |x_1 - x_2| \\ &\leq \sqrt{K_1} (|x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2 + K_3}} + 2|x_1 - x_2|). \end{aligned}$$

This yields immediately that \bar{b} is Hölder continuous of exponent $\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2 + K_3}$. This corollary is proved. \square

3 Averaging principle for fully coupled systems

Before establishing the averaging principle using the ergodicity condition (E1) or (E2), we would like introduce some sufficient conditions to verify (E1) and (E2) based on the coefficients f, g of the fast component. We refer the readers to the monograph [5] for more discussion on (E1), especially its connection of functional inequalities, that is, Nash inequality can yield (E1) (cf. [5, Chapter 1]). Recall that the diffusion process $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is defined in (1.3) for each fixed slow component x and its semigroup is denoted by $P_t^x(y, \cdot)$.

Lemma 3.1 ([23]) (1) *When $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is a diffusion process on $[0, \infty)$ with reflection boundary at 0. Assume $g(x, y) > 0$ for $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. Let $C_x(y) = \int_1^y \frac{f(x,z)}{g^2(x,z)} \mathrm{d}z$. Then $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is strongly ergodic in the sense of (E1) if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-C_x(y)} \mathrm{d}y \int_0^y g(x, z)^{-z} e^{C_x(z)} \mathrm{d}z &= \infty, \\ \int_0^\infty e^{-C_x(y)} \mathrm{d}y \int_y^\infty g^{-2}(x, z) e^{C_x(z)} \mathrm{d}z &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *Generally, assume $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is a reversible process in \mathbb{R}^d , i.e. for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a function $V^x \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{V^x(y)} \mathrm{d}y < \infty$,*

$$g(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^d G_{ij}(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} V^x(y) + \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} G_{ij}(x, y),$$

where $G(x, y) = (G_{ij}(x, y)) = (gg^*)(x, y)$. Suppose that $G(x, y) = \text{diag}(G_{ii}(x, y))$ and $G_{ii}(x, y) = G_{ii}(x, y_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_x(y, y') &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \left(\int_{y_i}^{y'_i} G_{ii}(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dz \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ h_i^x &= \sqrt{G_{ii}(x, y)} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} V^x(y) + (2\sqrt{G_{ii}(x, y)})^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} G_{ii}(x, y), \\ \gamma_x(r) &= \sup_{\rho_x(y, y')=r} \sum_{i=1}^d (h_i^x(y) - h_i^x(y')) \int_{y_i}^{y'_i} G_{ii}(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dz, \\ C_x(r) &= \exp \left[\int_0^r \frac{\gamma_x(s)}{4s} ds \right].\end{aligned}$$

If $\int_0^\infty \left(C_x(s)^{-1} \int_s^\infty \frac{C_x(r)}{4} dr \right) ds < \infty$, then $(Y_t^{x,y})$ is strongly ergodic in the sense of (E1).

The exponential decay of the semigroup (P_t^x) in the Wasserstein distance is heavily related to geometry of the underlying space as illustrated in [34]. The best convergence rate in the inequality is called the Wasserstein curvature in [15] or the coarse Ricci curvature in [26]. Here, we shall provide a criterion for (E2) based on the coupling method.

Recall the generator \mathcal{L}^x of $(Y_t^{x,y})$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}^x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d G_{kl}(x, y) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_k \partial y_l} + \sum_{k=1}^d f_k(x, y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}.$$

For simplicity, we write $\mathcal{L}^x \sim (G(x, y), f(x, y))$. An operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is called a coupling operator of \mathcal{L}^x and itself if

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}h(y, y') &= \mathcal{L}^x h(y) \quad \text{if } h \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and independent of } y', \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}h(y, y') &= \mathcal{L}^x h(y') \quad \text{if } h \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and independent of } y.\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients of any coupling operator must be of the form $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \sim (a_x(y, y'), \tilde{f}_x(y, y'))$ with

$$a_x(y, y') = \begin{pmatrix} G(x, y) & c_x(y, y') \\ c_x(y, y') & G(x, y') \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{f}_x(y, y') = \begin{pmatrix} f(x, y) \\ f(x, y') \end{pmatrix},$$

where $c_x(y, y')$ is a matrix such that $a_x(y, y')$ is nonnegative definite. When taking $c_x(y, y') = 0$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is called an independent coupling of \mathcal{L}^x and itself, denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{ind}$.

The monotonicity condition (1.4) means that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{ind}(|y - y'|^2) = 2(y - y') \cdot (f(x, y) - f(x, y')) + \|g(x, y) - g(x, y')\|^2 \leq -\beta|y - y'|^2. \quad (3.1)$$

Together with the following coercivity condition, i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}^x(|y|^2) = -y \cdot f(x, y) + \|g(x, y)\|^2 \leq c_1 - \beta_1|y|^2$$

for some $c_1, \beta_1 > 0$, similar to Lemma 3.2 below, we obtain from the monotonicity condition (3.1) that

$$\mathbb{W}_1(P_t^x(y, \cdot), \pi^x) \leq \mathbb{W}_2(P_t^x(y, \cdot), \pi^x) \leq \frac{c_1}{\beta_1} e^{-\beta t}, \quad t > 0,$$

and hence (E2) holds.

Lemma 3.2 *Assume (B3) holds. Let $\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be in $C^2([0, \infty))$ satisfying $\rho(0) = 0$, $\rho' > 0$, $\rho'' < 0$, and $\rho(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. There is a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that $\rho(x) > c_2 x$ for $x \geq 0$. If there exist constants $c_3, \beta_2, \beta_3 > 0$, a coupling $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^x$ of \mathcal{L}^x and itself such that*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^x \rho(|y - y'|) \leq -\beta_2 \rho(|y - y'|), \quad x, y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}^x \rho(|y|) \leq c_3 - \beta_3 \rho(|y|), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.3)$$

Then for any $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{W}_1(P_t^x(y, \cdot), \pi^x) \leq \frac{c_3}{\beta_3 c_2} e^{-\beta_2 t}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proof. Associated with the coupling operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}^x$, there is a coupling process (Y_t^x, \tilde{Y}_t^x) with initial value $Y_0^x = y$ and $\tilde{Y}_0^x = \xi$, where ξ is a random variable with distribution π^x . By virtue of (3.3), it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_t^{x,y}|)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_0^{x,y}|)] + \int_0^t (c_3 - \beta_3 \mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_s^{x,y}|)]) ds.$$

Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_t^{x,y}|)] \leq \frac{c_3}{\beta_3} (1 - e^{-\beta_3 t}) + \rho(|y|) e^{-\beta_3 t}. \quad (3.4)$$

This implies the existence of invariant probability measure π^x for the process $(Y_t^{x,y})$. Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.4), Fatou's lemma implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(|y'|) \pi^x(dy') \leq \frac{c_3}{\beta_3}. \quad (3.5)$$

Note that the uniform nondegenerate condition (B3) yields that π^x admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure.

By Itô's formula and (3.2), for $0 \leq s \leq t$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_t^x - \tilde{Y}_t^x|)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_s^x - \tilde{Y}_s^x|)] - \beta_2 \int_s^t \mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_r^x - \tilde{Y}_r^x|)] dr.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(|Y_t^x - \tilde{Y}_t^x|)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\rho(|y - \xi|)] e^{-\beta_2 t}.$$

Hence, by (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_1(P_t^x(y, \cdot), \pi^x) &\leq c_2^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(|y - y'|) \pi^x(dy') e^{-\beta_2 t} \\ &= c_2^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(|y'|) \pi^x(dy') e^{-\beta_2 t} \leq \frac{c_3}{\beta_3 c_2} e^{-\beta_2 t}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

According to Stroock and Varadhan [29] (see, also, [14, Chapter IV]), when \bar{b} , $\bar{\sigma}$ are continuous satisfying the linear growth condition, and $\bar{\sigma}$ is nondegenerate, SDE

$$d\bar{X}_t = \bar{b}(\bar{X}_t)dt + \bar{\sigma}(\bar{X}_t)dB_t, \quad \bar{X}_0 = x_0, \quad (3.6)$$

admits a weak solution whose distribution is unique. Of course, the wellposedness of SDE (3.6) is a precondition of the averaging principle. Corollaries 2.2 and 2.4 provide us different sufficient conditions for the wellposedness of SDE (3.6).

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{L}}h(x) &= \bar{b}(x) \cdot \nabla h(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\bar{a}(x) \nabla^2 h(x)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d \bar{b}_k(x) \frac{\partial h(x)}{\partial x_k} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d \bar{a}_{kl}(x) \frac{\partial^2 h(x)}{\partial x_k \partial x_l}, \quad h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $\bar{a}(x) = (\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}^*)(x)$.

Let us introduce some notations. For $T > 0$, $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the set of continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to \mathbb{R}^d endowed with uniform norm, i.e. $\|x - y\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |x_t - y_t|$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_{X^\varepsilon}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}}$ the law of the stochastic processes (X_t^ε) and (\bar{X}_t) in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively. Let

$$\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon h(x, y) = b(x, y) \cdot \nabla h(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\sigma\sigma^*)(x, y) \nabla^2 h(x)), \quad h \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d), x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.8)$$

Theorem 3.3 *Let $(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)$ be the solution to (1.1) and (\bar{X}_t) the solution to (3.6). Assume (E1), (A1)-(A3), and (B1) hold. Then for any $T > 0$ the process $(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges weakly in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to the process $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$.*

Proof. By virtue of Corollary 2.4, \bar{b} and \bar{a} are continuous in x . By [29, Lemma 5.2.1], $\bar{\sigma}$ as the square root of \bar{a} is given by an absolutely convergent series in terms of \bar{a} and hence $\bar{\sigma}$ is also continuous in x . Then, the limit process (\bar{X}_t) exists and is unique in distribution. Due to the linear growth condition (A2), it is standard to show

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon|^p \right] \leq C(T, x_0, p), \quad \text{for } p \geq 1.$$

By Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_s^\varepsilon|^4 &\leq 8\mathbb{E} \left| \int_s^t b(X_r^\varepsilon, Y_r^\varepsilon) dr \right|^4 + 8\mathbb{E} \left| \int_s^t \sigma(X_r^\varepsilon, Y_r^\varepsilon) dW_r \right|^4 \\ &\leq 8(t-s)^3 \mathbb{E} \int_s^t |b(X_r^\varepsilon, Y_r^\varepsilon)|^4 dr + 288(t-s) \mathbb{E} \int_s^t |\sigma(X_r^\varepsilon, Y_r^\varepsilon)|^4 dr \\ &\leq C(t-s)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Combining this with the fact $X_0^\varepsilon = x_0$, the collection of the laws of $\{(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \in [0, T]}; \varepsilon > 0\}$ over $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is tight by [2, Theorem 12.3]. As a consequence, there is a subsequence $\{\mathcal{L}_{X^{\varepsilon'}}; \varepsilon' > 0\}$ and a limit law $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}}$ over $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{X^{\varepsilon'}}$ converges weakly to $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{X}}$ as $\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0$. According to Skorokhod's representation theorem, we may assume that $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges almost surely to some random process $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as $\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0$.

We proceed to characterize the process $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. To this end, we shall prove that for any $h \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of functions with compact support and continuous second

order derivatives,

$$h(\tilde{X}_t) - h(x_0) - \int_0^t \bar{\mathcal{L}}h(\tilde{X}_s)ds \text{ is a martingale,} \quad (3.9)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is defined in (3.7). This means that (\tilde{X}_t) is a solution to SDE (3.6), and hence $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{X}}$ equals to $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\tilde{X}}$ due to the uniqueness of distribution for solutions to SDE (3.6).

To prove (3.9), it suffices to show that for $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, for any bounded \mathcal{F}_s measurable function Φ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(h(\tilde{X}_t) - h(\tilde{X}_s) - \int_s^t \bar{\mathcal{L}}h(\tilde{X}_r)dr \right) \Phi \right] = 0, \quad \forall h \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.10)$$

As a solution to SDE (1.1), $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})$ satisfies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(h(X_t^{\varepsilon'}) - h(X_s^{\varepsilon'}) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}^{\varepsilon'} h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'})dr \right) \Phi \right] = 0.$$

The almost sure convergence of $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})_{t \in [0, T]}$ to $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ yields that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(h(X_t^{\varepsilon'}) - h(X_s^{\varepsilon'}) \right) \Phi \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(h(\tilde{X}_t) - h(\tilde{X}_s) \right) \Phi \right].$$

Hence, for (3.10) we only need to show

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left(\mathcal{L}^{\varepsilon'} h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{\mathcal{L}}h(\tilde{X}_r) \right) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] = 0.$$

In view of the expression of $\mathcal{L}^{\varepsilon'}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$, we need to show

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left(b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) \cdot \nabla h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(\tilde{X}_r) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) \right) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left(\text{tr}((\sigma\sigma^*)(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'})\nabla^2 h(X_r^{\varepsilon'})) - \text{tr}(\bar{a}(\tilde{X}_r)\nabla^2 h(\tilde{X}_r)) \right) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

We shall use the time discretization method and the coupling method to show (3.11) and (3.12). Since the method is similar, we only present the proof of (3.11).

For $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $r(\delta) = s + \left[\frac{r-s}{\delta} \right] \delta$ for $r \in [s, t]$, where $\left[\frac{r-s}{\delta} \right]$ denotes the integer part of $\frac{r-s}{\delta}$.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left(b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) \cdot \nabla h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(\tilde{X}_r) \cdot h(\tilde{X}_r) \right) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left\{ b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) \cdot (\nabla h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r)) + (b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) \right. \right. \\
&\quad + (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)}) \\
&\quad + (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)})) \cdot (\nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) - \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)})) \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (\bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(\tilde{X}_r)) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) \right\} dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right]
\end{aligned}$$

By the continuity of b and \bar{b} due to (A1) and Corollary 2.2, it follows from the almost sure convergence of $(X_r^{\varepsilon'})$ to (\tilde{X}_r) in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\varepsilon', \delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t \left\{ b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) \cdot (\nabla h(X_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r)) + (b(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) \right. \right. \\
&\quad + (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot (\nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) - \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)})) \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (\bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(\tilde{X}_r)) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) \right\} dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to prove (3.11) we only to show that for suitable choice of δ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon' \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.13)$$

Let $N_t = \lceil (t - s)/\delta \rceil$, $s_k = s + k\delta$ for $0 \leq k \leq N_t$ and $s_{N_t+1} = t$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{N_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} (b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{s_k}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right]. \quad (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

On each time interval $[s_k, s_{k+1})$, $0 \leq k \leq N_t$, we introduce a coupling process $(Y_r^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k})$ by the following SDEs

$$\begin{cases} dY_r^{\varepsilon'} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} f(X_r^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) dr + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} g(Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) dB_r, \\ d\tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} f(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}) dr + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} g(\tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}) dB_r, \quad \tilde{Y}_{s_k}^{\varepsilon', k} = Y_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Notice that under the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}]$, the distribution of $\tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}$ equals to $P_{(r-s_k)/\varepsilon'}^{X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}}(Y_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \cdot)$ due to the homogeneity and the uniqueness of solution to (3.15). It follows from (A2), (B1) and Itô's formula that for $r \in [s_k, s_{k+1})$,

$$\mathbb{E} [|Y_r^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}] \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon'} \int_{s_k}^r \mathbb{E} [|X_u^{\varepsilon'} - X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}|^2 + |Y_u^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_u^{\varepsilon', k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}] du$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon'} \int_{s_k}^r (u - s_k) + \mathbb{E}[|Y_u^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_u^{\varepsilon',k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}] du \\
&\leq \frac{C\delta^2}{\varepsilon'} + \frac{C}{\varepsilon'} \int_{s_k}^r \mathbb{E}[|Y_u^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_u^{\varepsilon',k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}] du.
\end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_r^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon',k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}] \leq \frac{C\delta^2}{\varepsilon'} e^{C(r-s_k)/\varepsilon'}. \quad (3.16)$$

Therefore, using (A1), (A2), (E1), and (3.16),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} (b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{s_k}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \right| \\
&\leq |\nabla h|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} |b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon',k})| dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \\
&\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} (b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon',k}) - \bar{b}(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{s_k}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \right| \\
&\leq |\nabla h|_\infty \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[K_1 |Y_r^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon',k}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{s_k}]^{\frac{1}{2}} dr \\
&\quad + K_2 |\nabla h|_\infty \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \|P_{\frac{r-s_k}{\varepsilon'}}^{X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}}(Y_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \cdot) - \pi^{X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}}\|_{\text{var}} dr \\
&\leq |\nabla h|_\infty \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \left\{ \frac{C\delta\sqrt{K_1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C(r-s_k)}{2\varepsilon'}} + K_2 C_0 e^{-\kappa\frac{r-s_k}{\varepsilon'}} \right\} dr \\
&\leq |\nabla h|_\infty \frac{C\delta^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C\delta}{2\varepsilon'}} + |\nabla h|_\infty K_2 C_0 \int_0^\delta e^{-\kappa\frac{r}{\varepsilon'}} dr.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Inserting this estimate into (3.14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_r) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] \right| \\
&\leq |\nabla h|_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{N_t} \left(\frac{C\delta^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C\delta}{2\varepsilon'}} + C_0 K_2 \int_0^\delta e^{-\kappa\frac{r}{\varepsilon'}} dr \right) \\
&\leq C |\nabla h|_\infty \frac{t\delta}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C\delta}{2\varepsilon'}} + C |\nabla h|_\infty \frac{t\varepsilon'}{\kappa\delta} (1 - e^{-\kappa\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon'}}).
\end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Take $\delta = \varepsilon' \ln \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon'}\right)$, then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon'} = \infty, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C\delta}{2\varepsilon'}} = \lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon'} \left(\ln \ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon'}\right) \right) \left(\ln \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon'}\right) \right)^{\frac{C}{2}} = 0.$$

Hence, using this choice of δ , we get from (3.18) that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon' \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_s^t (b(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{r(\delta)}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{r(\delta)}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right] = 0.$$

This is the desired (3.13), and further (3.11) holds.

Consequently, we have shown that $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges weakly to $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. The arbitrariness of weakly convergent subsequence of $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})_{t \in [0, T]}$ and the uniqueness of $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ imply that the whole sequence $(X_t^{\varepsilon'})_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges weakly to $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. We have completed the proof. \square

Theorem 3.4 *Assume (E2), (B1), (A1)-(A3) hold. Then for any $T > 0$ $(X_t^{\varepsilon})_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges weakly in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(\bar{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Proof. This theorem can be proved along the line of the argument of Theorem 3.3. We only point out the different point caused by using the L^1 -Wasserstein distance instead of the total variation distance in ergodicity condition. Namely, instead of (3.17), we now have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} (b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - \bar{b}(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'})) \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_{s_k}) dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \right| \\ & \leq |\nabla h|_{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} |b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, Y_r^{\varepsilon'}) - b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k})| + |b(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}) - \bar{b}(X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'})| dr \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k} \right] \\ & \leq |\nabla h|_{\infty} \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} [K_1 |Y_r^{\varepsilon'} - \tilde{Y}_r^{\varepsilon', k}|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{s_k}]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{K_1} \mathbb{W}_1(P_{\frac{r-s_k}{\varepsilon'}}^{X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}}(Y_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}, \cdot), \pi^{X_{s_k}^{\varepsilon'}}) \right\} dr \quad (3.19) \\ & \leq |\nabla h|_{\infty} \int_{s_k}^{s_{k+1}} \left\{ \frac{C\delta\sqrt{K_1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C(r-s_k)}{2\varepsilon'}} + \sqrt{K_1} \kappa_2 e^{-\lambda_2 \frac{r-s_k}{\varepsilon'}} \right\} dr \\ & \leq |\nabla h|_{\infty} \frac{C\delta^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon'}} e^{\frac{C\delta}{2\varepsilon'}} + |\nabla h|_{\infty} \kappa_2 \sqrt{K_1} \int_0^{\delta} e^{-\lambda_2 \frac{r}{\varepsilon'}} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Other details are omitted to save space. Then this theorem can be proved. \square

4 Further discussions

We have proposed appropriate conditions to ensure the fully coupled system $(X_t^{\varepsilon}, Y_t^{\varepsilon})$ satisfies the averaging principle in the weak convergence sense. In this study of slow-fast

systems, there are also some works to study the averaging principle in the L^2 -convergence sense with the restriction that the diffusion coefficient of the slow process does not depend on the fast process, such as [22]. Inspired by an example in [37], we shall illustrate that generally the averaging principle in the L^2 -convergence sense does not hold for the slow-fast systems with the diffusion coefficients of the slow processes depending on the fast processes. In [37], the fast process is a Markov chain on the state space $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2\}$, and hence its transition probability and invariant probability measure can be explicitly calculated. Now we can generalize this result to any ergodic fast processes under the help of the ergodic theorem.

Let $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a stochastic process on a general state space \mathcal{S} which could be \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{R}^d . Assume $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic with the invariant probability measure μ , and the ergodic theorem holds, i.e.

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(Y_t) ds = \mu(h), \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathcal{S}).$$

Let $Y_t^\varepsilon = Y_{t/\varepsilon}$ be the fast process with the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the slow process $(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$:

$$dX_t^\varepsilon = \sigma(Y_t^\varepsilon) dt, \quad X_0^\varepsilon = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.1)$$

where (W_t) is a d -dimensional Brownian motion, $\sigma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded measurable. σ is not a constant function; otherwise, $(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon)$ becomes a quite trivial system.

The averaging principle in weak convergence sense tells us that $(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ shall converge weakly to the limit process

$$d\bar{X}_t = \bar{\sigma} dt, \quad \bar{X}_0 = x_0, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}$ is a constant matrix satisfying $\bar{\sigma} \bar{\sigma}^* = \int_{\mathcal{S}} (\sigma \sigma^*)(y) \mu(dy)$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|\sigma(Y_s^\varepsilon) - \bar{\sigma}\|^2 ds \right] \\ &= t \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{t/\varepsilon} \int_0^{t/\varepsilon} \|\sigma(Y_s) - \bar{\sigma}\|^2 ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the ergodic theorem to the ergodic process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the bounded function $h(y) := \|\sigma(y) - \bar{\sigma}\|^2$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|X_t^\varepsilon - \bar{X}_t|^2 = t \int_{\mathcal{S}} \|\sigma(y) - \bar{\sigma}\|^2 \mu(dy). \quad (4.3)$$

No matter what constant matrix $\bar{\sigma}$ equals to, the right hand side of the previous equation cannot be 0, and hence X_t^ε cannot converge in L^2 to any process \bar{X}_t in the form (4.2).

Consequently, we see from the simple process (4.1) that the averaging principle in L^2 -convergence sense will not hold for a fully coupled two time-scale stochastic system.

References

- [1] D. Anosov, Averaging in systems of ordinary differential equations with fast oscillating solutions, *Izv. Acad. Nauk. SSR Scr. Mat.* 24 (1960), 731-742 (in Russian).
- [2] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures*, John Wiley, New York, 1968.
- [3] A. Budhiraja, P. Dupuis, A. Ganguly, Large deviations for small noise diffusions in a fast Markovian environment, *Electron. J. Probab.* 23 (2018), 1-33.
- [4] M. Chen, *From Markov chains to non-equilibrium particle systems*, 2nd ed. World Scientific, Singapore, 2004.
- [5] M. Chen, *Eigenvalues, inequalities, and ergodic theory*, Springer-Verlag London Lim. 2005.
- [6] S. Corti, F. Molteni, F. Palmer, Signature of recent climate change in frequencies of natural atmospheric circulation regimes, *Nature* 398 (1999), 799-802.
- [7] J. Feng, M. Forde, J. Fouque, Short maturity asymptotics for a fast mean reverting Heston stochastic volatility model, *SIAM J. Finac. Math.* 1 (2010), 126-141.
- [8] J. Feng, J. Fouque, R. Kumar, Small-time asymptotics for fast mean-reverting stochastic volatility models, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22 (2012), 1541-1575.
- [9] M. Freidlin, T. Lee, Large deviation principle for the diffusion-transmutation processes and dirichlet problem for PDE systems with small parameter, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 105 (1996), 227-254.
- [10] M. Freidlin, A. Wentzell, *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag New York, 1998.
- [11] A. Friedman, *Partial differential equations of parabolic type*, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964.

- [12] D. Givon, I. Kevrekidis, R. Kupferman, Strong convergence of projective integration scheme for singularly perturbed stochastic differential systems, *Comm. Math. Sci.* 4 (2006), 707-729.
- [13] M. Hairer, X. Li, Averaging dynamics driven by fractional Brownian motion, *Ann. Probab.* 48 (2020), 1826-1860.
- [14] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe, *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, 2nd ed. North-Holland Mathematical Library. 24, 1989.
- [15] A. Joulin, A new Poisson-type deviation inequality for Markov jump processes with positive Wasserstein curvature, *Bernoulli*, 15 (2009), 532-549.
- [16] H. Kang, T. Kurtz, Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic reaction networks, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 23 (2013), 529-583.
- [17] R. Khasminskii, On an averaging principle for Itô stochastic differential equations, *Kibernetika* 4 (1968), 260-279 (in Russian).
- [18] R. Khasminskii, G. Yin, Limit behavior of two-time-scale diffusions revisited, *J. Differential Eqs.* 212 (2005), 85-113.
- [19] Y. Kifer, Averaging and climate models, in: *Stochastic Climate Models*, Progress in Probability 49 (2001), 171-188, Birkhäuser, Basel.
- [20] Y. Kifer, Large deviations and adiabatic transitions for dynamical systems and Markov processes in fully coupled averaging, *American Mathematical Soc.* 2009.
- [21] R. Liptser, Large deviations for two scaled diffusions, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 106 (1996), 71-104.
- [22] W. Liu, M. Rockner, X. Sun, Y. Xie, Averaging principle for slow-fast stochastic differential equations with time dependent locally Lipschitz coefficients, *J. Differ. Equations*, 268 (2020), 2910-2948.
- [23] Y. Mao, Strong ergodicity for Markov processes by coupling methods, *J. Appl. Prob.* 39 (2002), 839-852.
- [24] Y. Mao, J. Shao, Averaging and large deviation principles for two time-scale regime-switching processes, preprint.

- [25] S. Meyn, R. Tweedie, Markov chains and stochastic stability, Springer Verlag, 1993.
- [26] Y. Ollivier, Ricci curvature of Markov chains on metric spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* 256 (2009), 810-864.
- [27] A. Puhalskii, On large deviations of coupled diffusions with time scale separation, *Ann. Probab.* 44 (2016), 3111-3186.
- [28] W. Rudin, Real and complex analysis, 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [29] D. Stroock, S. Varadhan, Multidimensional diffusion processes, Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- [30] A. Veretennikov, On the averaging principle for systems of stochastic differential equations, *Math. USSR Sbornik*, 69 (1991), 271-284.
- [31] A. Veretennikov, On large deviations in the averaging principle for SDEs with a “full dependence”, *Ann. Probab.* 27 (1999), 284-296.
- [32] A. Veretennikov, On large deviations in the averaging principle for SDEs with a “full dependence” revisited, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 18 (2013), 523-549.
- [33] C. Villani, Optimal transport, Old and new, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [34] von Renesse, K. Sturm, Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy, and Ricci curvature, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 58 (2005), 923-940.
- [35] Q. Zhang, On a parabolic equation with a singular lower order term, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 348 (1996), 2811-2844.
- [36] Q. Zhang, On a parabolic equation with a singular lower order term part II: the Gaussian bounds, *Indiana U. Math. J.* 46 (1997), 989-1020.
- [37] C. Zhu, G. Yin, AN. Baran, Feynman-Kac formulas for regime-switching jump diffusions and their applications, *Stochastics*, 87 (2015), 1000-1032.