

Quantifying the effect of random dispersion for logarithmic Schrödinger equation

Jianbo Cui and Liying Sun

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with the random effect of the noise dispersion for stochastic logarithmic Schrödinger equation emerged from the optical fibre with dispersion management. The well-posedness of the logarithmic Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion is established via the regularization energy approximation and a spatial scaling property. For the small noise case, the effect of the noise dispersion is quantified by the proven large deviation principle under additional regularity assumptions on the initial datum. As an application, we show that for the regularized model, the exit from a neighborhood of the attractor of deterministic equation occurs on a sufficiently large time scale. Furthermore, the exit time and exit point in the small noise case, as well as the effect of large noise dispersion, is also discussed for the stochastic logarithmic Schrödinger equation.

1. Introduction

The stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation describes the propagation of varying envelopes of a wave packet in media with both weakly nonlinear and dispersive responses ([38]), and has been applied in nonlinear optics, hydrodynamics, biology, crystals and Fermi-Pasta-Ulam chains of atoms. In nonlinear optics, the spontaneous emission noise in stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation appears since the amplifiers are placed along the fiber line to compensate for the loss caused by the weak damping in the fiber [28]. Due to the inherent uncertainty on the amplified signal and quantum considerations, amplification is intrinsically associated with small noise [35]. In the context of crystal and Fermi-Pasta-Ulam chains of atoms, the noise accounts for thermal effects.

In this paper, we are interested in studying the random effect of the noise dispersion for the following stochastic logarithmic Schrödinger equation (SLogSE)

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} du^\epsilon(t) = & \mathbf{i}\sqrt{\epsilon}\Delta u^\epsilon(t) \circ dB(t) + \mathbf{i}\lambda \log(|u^\epsilon(t)|^2)u^\epsilon(t)dt \\ & + \mathbf{i}V[u^\epsilon(t)]u^\epsilon(t)dt - \alpha_1 u^\epsilon(t)dt \end{aligned}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35Q55; Secondary 35R60, 60H15, 60F10.

Key words and phrases. stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation, logarithmic nonlinearity, noise dispersion, large deviation principle, exit problem .

The research is partially supported by the Hong Kong Research Grant Council ECS grant 25302822, internal grants (P0039016, P0041274, P0045336) from Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the CAS AMSS-PolyU Joint Laboratory of Applied Mathematics. The research of the second author is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12101596, No. 12031020, No.12171047).

emerged from the optical fibre with dispersion management ([1, 2]). Here $u^\epsilon(0) = u_0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}/\{0\}$ shows the force of nonlinear interaction of the logarithmic potential, $\epsilon > 0$ characterizes the intensity of noise dispersion and $\alpha_1 > 0$ is the weak damping coefficient over long distances. The Laplacian operator is defined on \mathbb{R}^d , $V[\cdot]$ represents a nonlocal interaction defined by $V[u](y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(y-x)|u(x)|^2 dx$ for some function V , $B(\cdot)$ is the standard Brownian motion on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, and the symbol “ \circ ” means that the stochastic integral is understood in the Stratonovich sense.

In the last two decades, there have been fruitful results and studies on stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations with polynomial and smooth nonlinearities driven by random forces. For instance, results on the well-posedness and the effect of a noise on the blow-up phenomenon have been proved in [3, 7, 16, 20, 21, 22, 37] and references therein. Due to the loss of analytical expression of the solution, several numerical methods have been designed to simulate the behaviors of stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations, such as in [6, 9, 12, 13, 15, 24], just to name a few. Recently, more and more attention has been paid on stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations with random dispersion emerged from dispersion management (see, e.g., [23, 26, 29, 34, 36]). In [23], it has been shown that stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion is the limit of nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a scaling sequence of real-valued stationary random processes. Many researchers are also devoted into its numerical study (see, e.g., [4, 5, 11, 14, 36]). In contrast, less result is known for the effect of white noise dispersion on stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations with logarithmic nonlinearities, which is one motivation of this current study.

In deterministic case, it is known that the logarithmic nonlinearity makes the logarithmic Schrödinger equation,

$$(2) \quad \partial_t u(t) = \mathbf{i}\Delta u(t) + \mathbf{i}\lambda \log(|u(t)|^2)u(t),$$

unique among many nonlinear wave equations. It has been shown in [8] that when $\lambda < 0$, the modulus of the solution converges to a universal Gaussian profile by scaling in space via the dispersion rate. The idea of scaling in space and time plays an important role in studying (2). Inspired by such idea, one may formally define $e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2}v(t, l(t)x) = u(t, x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and some positive (or negative) and continuous differentiable function l . Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2} v(t, l(t)x) \\ &= \partial_t v(t, l(t)x) e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2} + \dot{l}(t) \nabla_x v(t, l(t)x) \cdot x e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2} - \mathbf{i}\dot{l}(t)|x|^2 e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2} v(t, l(t)x) \\ &= \mathbf{i}\Delta (e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2} v(t, l(t)x)) + \mathbf{i}\lambda \log(|v(t, l(t)x)|^2) v(t, l(t)x) e^{-\mathbf{i}l(t)|x|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Direct calculations yield that v satisfies

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t v(t, x) &= \mathbf{i}(l(t))^2 \Delta v(t, x) + \mathbf{i}\lambda \log(|v(t, x)|^2) v(t, x) \\ &\quad + (4(l(t))^2 - \dot{l}(t)) \nabla v \cdot x + (\mathbf{i}\dot{l}(t)|x|^2 - \mathbf{i}4(l(t))^2|x|^2 + 2l(t)) v(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under suitable conditions on $l(t)$, the properties of (2) can be transformed into those of (3) with the dispersion $l^2(t)$ via the above scaling technique. Unfortunately, this approach fails for studying (1) since $\epsilon \dot{W}(t) \neq (l(t))^2$ for any $l(t)$.

Since (1) involves with the logarithmic nonlinearity, the techniques in [23, 26] could not be used directly to show its well-posedness. To deal with the singularity caused by the possible vacuum of logarithmic nonlinearity, we will exploit the idea and functional setting in [8, 18] where the regularized approximation is used. Moreover, in section 2 we present several subtle estimates on the uniform bound of the regularized approximations such that the global well-posedness of (1) could be established under certain assumptions on V . We also find an interesting scaling result in space for (1) and its regularization approximation. More precisely, denote the solution $u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t, x)$ of the following regularized SlogSE

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} du^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) &= \mathbf{i}\Delta u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) \circ \sqrt{\epsilon} dB(t) + \mathbf{i}\lambda f_{\delta}(|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)|^2)u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)dt \\ &\quad + \mathbf{i}V[u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)]u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)dt - \alpha_1 u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)dt \end{aligned}$$

with $u^{\epsilon, \delta}(0) = u_0$. Here f_{δ} is an approximation of the logarithmic function for $\delta > 0$. For convenience, we also denote $f_0(\cdot) = \log(\cdot)$ and $u^{\epsilon, 0} = u^{\epsilon}$. Then defining $v^{\delta}(t, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}x) := u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t, x)$, v^{δ} should satisfy

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} dv^{\delta}(t) &= \mathbf{i}\Delta v^{\delta}(t) \circ dB(t) + \mathbf{i}\lambda f_{\delta}(|v^{\delta}(t)|^2)v^{\delta}(t)dt \\ &\quad + \mathbf{i}V[v^{\delta}(t)]v^{\delta}(t)dt - \alpha_1 v^{\delta}(t)dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $v^{\delta}(0, x) = u_0(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}}x)$. It can be seen that (4) is equivalent to (5) up to a scaling in space. As a by-product, we can have the following scaling properties, i.e., for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t, \cdot)\|_{L_{\alpha}^2} &= \|v^{\delta}(t, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}(\cdot))\|_{L_{\alpha}^2} = \|v^{\delta}(t, \cdot)\|_{L_{\alpha}^2}, \\ \|\nabla u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t, \cdot)\| &= \|\nabla v^{\delta}(t, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}(\cdot))\| \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} = \|\nabla v^{\delta}(t, \cdot)\| \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \end{aligned}$$

for any $u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) \in L_{\alpha}^2 \cap H^1$ and $t \geq 0$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -norm, $H^s, s \geq 0$, is the standard Sobolev space and the weighted Sobolev space $L_{\alpha}^2, \alpha \geq 0$, is defined by

$$L_{\alpha}^2 := \{z \in L^2 | x \mapsto (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} z(x) \in L^2\}$$

with the norm $\|z\|_{L_{\alpha}^2} := \|(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} z\|^2$.

Another motivation of this work lies on the study of the random effect of the noise dispersion for stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations. In the small noise case, the large deviation principle (LDP) of stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations with polynomial nonlinearities driven by additive and multiplicative noises have been addressed in [31, 32]. Then the LDP are applied to studying the asymptotic of the time jitter in soliton transmission in [25] and to quantify the exit time and exit points for the exit problem from a basin of attractor for weakly damped stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations in [33]. When the LDP holds, the first order of the probability of rare event is that of Boltzmann theory and the square of the amplitude of the small noise acts as the temperature. The rate functional of LDP generally characterizes the transition between two states and the exit from the basin of attractor of the deterministic system, which is also related to *minimum action paths*. However, it is still unknown about the asymptotic behaviors and LDP of (1) due to the singularity on the possible vacuum.

Thanks to the established well-posedness result of (1) and its regularization approximation (4), we are able to partially answer the LDP problem of (1). By imposing additional regularity on the initial datum, in section 3 we derive the large deviation principle and its rate functional for the regularization approximation of (1), and then pass the limit to prove

the LDP of the original system via the strong convergence property and Varadhan's contraction principle (see, e.g., [10]). As an application, in section 4, we use the LDP to study the exit problem from a neighborhood of an asymptotically stable equilibrium point for the regularized equation (4) (or equivalently (5)), and prove that on an exponentially large time scale, the exit from the domains of attraction for (4) occurs due to large fluctuations. We would like to remark that it is still hard to establish the LDP and quantify the exit problem for (1) directly when the considered support is $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^1 \cap L_\alpha^2)$. In section 5, we give further discussions on the related topics, including giving a rough result on the exiting points for (1), proving an exponential estimate on a special rare event, and presenting the effect of the large dispersion, which may help understand the dynamics of (1).

2. Logarithmic Schrödinger equation with random dispersion

The rigorous derivation of (1) can be understood in the way of [23, 36], once the well-posedness of (1) is established. Namely, (1) can be viewed as the limit of the following Schrödinger equation as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$,

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = \mathbf{i} \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma} m\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \Delta z + \mathbf{i} V[z]z + \mathbf{i} \lambda \log(|z|^2)z - \alpha_1 z,$$

under suitable conditions on the centered stationary random process $m(\cdot)$. Thus, (1) also belongs to the category of stochastic Wasserstein Hamiltonian flows in the sense of [17]. Recall that the mild solution of (4) is defined by a stochastic process $u^{\epsilon, \delta}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) = & S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, 0)u_0 + \int_0^t \mathbf{i} \lambda S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, r) f_\delta(u^{\epsilon, \delta}(r)) dr \\ & + \mathbf{i} \int_0^t S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, r) (V([u^{\epsilon, \delta}(r)])u^{\epsilon, \delta}(r)) dr - \int_0^t \alpha_1 S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, r) u^{\epsilon, \delta}(r) dr, \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Here $S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, r) = e^{\mathbf{i} \Delta \sqrt{\epsilon}(B(t) - B(r))}$, where $0 \leq r \leq t$. Due to $B(0) = 0$, we denote $S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t) := S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, 0)$. To prove the well-posedness of (1), thanks to the spatial scaling technique, our idea is studying the regularization approximation (5) at first and then passing the limit on δ .

Throughout this paper, we assume that $V \in \mathcal{C}_b^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$. We use C to denote various constants which may change from line to line. Due to the Leibniz rule and integration by parts, similar to [5], one can verify that the mapping $\mathbf{i}V[(\cdot)](\cdot)$ satisfies that for $h \in H^m, m = 0, 1$,

$$(6) \quad \|\mathbf{i}V[(v)]v\|_{H^m} \leq C(m, V) \|v\|^2 \|v\|_{H^m},$$

$$(7) \quad \|\partial_v(\mathbf{i}V[(v)]v) \cdot h\|_{H^m} \leq C(m, V) (\|v\|^2 \|h\|_{H^m} + \|v\| \|h\| \|v\|_{H^m}).$$

Assume that $f_\delta(|x|^2) := \log\left(\frac{\delta + |x|^2}{1 + \delta|x|^2}\right)$. Then [18, Lemma 1] yields that

$$(8) \quad \|\lambda \mathbf{i} f_\delta(|v|^2)v\| \leq |\lambda| |\log(\delta)| \|v\|,$$

$$(9) \quad |\langle \lambda \mathbf{i} f_\delta(|v|^2)v - \lambda \mathbf{i} f_\delta(|w|^2)w, v - w \rangle| \leq 4|\lambda| \|v - w\|^2,$$

$$(10) \quad \|\lambda \mathbf{i} f_\delta(|v|^2)v - \lambda \mathbf{i} f_\delta(|w|^2)w\| \leq |\lambda| (|\log(\delta)| + 2) \|v - w\|.$$

Here the complex inner product is defined by $\langle w, z \rangle := \Re \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{w}(x)z(x)dx$. We suppose that the deterministic initial value $u_0 \in L^2_\alpha \cap H^1$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. For convenience, we denote $H = H^0$ and $L^p := L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$

In the following, we will frequently use the weighted Sobolev embedding inequality ([18, Lemma 6]), i.e., for $d \in \mathbb{N}^+, \eta \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha > \frac{d\eta}{2-2\eta}$, it holds that

$$(11) \quad \|z\|_{L^{2-2\eta}} \leq C \|z\|^{1-\frac{d\eta}{2\alpha(1-\eta)}} \|z\|_{L^2_\alpha}^{\frac{d\eta}{2\alpha(1-\eta)}}, \quad z \in L^2_\alpha,$$

and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg interpolation inequality, i.e.,

$$(12) \quad \|z\|_{L^{2+2\eta'}} \leq C \|z\|^{1-\frac{\eta'd}{2+2\eta'}} \|\nabla z\|_{L^{2+2\eta'}}, \quad z \in L^{2+2\eta'} \cap H^1,$$

where $\frac{\eta'd}{2+2\eta'} \in (0, 1)$ with $\eta' > 0$.

Now we are in a position to present the well-posedness result of (4).

THEOREM 1. *Let $T > 0$, $\delta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. There exists a unique mild solution $u^{\epsilon, \delta} \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H)$, a.s., of (4) satisfying for any $p \geq 2$,*

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)\|_{H^1}^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)\|_{L^2_\alpha}^p \right] \\ & \leq C(T, \lambda, \alpha_1, p, \|u_0\|) (\|u_0\|_{H^1}^p + \|u_0\|_{L^2_\alpha}^p). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Since $v^\delta(t, \epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}x) := u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t, x)$, it suffices to prove the well-posedness of (5). The proof combines the following two steps.

Step 1: We first prove the well-posedness of (5) for $\delta > 0$. Making use of the properties (6)-(7), (8) and (10), standard procedures in [18, section 2] lead to the well-posedness of (5) in $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H))$ for $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$. Next we provide several useful uniform a priori estimates of v^δ . To apply the Itô formula rigorously, one needs to use suitable approximation procedures as in [18]. Here we omit these tedious and standard arguments.

From the Itô formula and the chain rule it follows that

$$(14) \quad \|v^\delta(t)\| = e^{-\alpha_1 t} \|v^\delta(0)\|, \quad a.s.$$

In order to study the well-posedness for the case of $\delta = 0$, we consider the moment estimates under the H^1 -norm and the weighted Sobolev L^2_α -norm with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. By the Itô formula and the integration by parts, it holds that

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} d\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla v^\delta(t)\|^2 &= -\langle \mathbf{i}\Delta v^\delta(t), \Delta v^\delta(t) \rangle \circ dB(t) + \langle \lambda \mathbf{i} \log(|v^\delta(t)|^2) \nabla v^\delta(t), \nabla v^\delta(t) \rangle dt \\ &+ 2\langle \lambda \mathbf{i} \frac{\Re(\bar{v}^\delta(t) \nabla v^\delta(t))}{|v^\delta(t)|^2} v^\delta(t), \nabla v^\delta(t) \rangle dt + \langle \mathbf{i}V([v^\delta(t)]) \nabla v^\delta(t), \nabla v^\delta(t) \rangle dt \\ &+ \langle \mathbf{i}\nabla V([v^\delta(t)]) v^\delta(t), \nabla v^\delta(t) \rangle dt - \alpha_1 \|\nabla v^\delta(t)\|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Using the skew-symmetric property of the complex inner product, and applying Hölder's, Young's and Gronwall's inequalities, together with (6), we obtain that for any $p \geq 1$,

$$(16) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla v^\delta(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq \exp \left(C(V, \lambda, \alpha_1, T, \|u_0\|) p \right) \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla v^\delta(0)\|^{2p}].$$

By applying the Itô's formula to the weighted Sobolev norm, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|v^\delta(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 &= \langle \mathbf{i} \Delta v^\delta(t), (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha v^\delta(t) \rangle dB(t) - \frac{1}{2} \langle (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha v^\delta(t), \Delta^2 v^\delta(t) \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \langle (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha \Delta v^\delta(t), \Delta v^\delta(t) \rangle dt - \alpha_1 \|v^\delta(t)\|_{L_x^2}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed, recall that $\Delta u = \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i}^2 u$ and $\Delta^2 u = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i}^2 \partial_{x_j}^2 u$. By using integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \frac{1}{2} \langle (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha u, \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i}^2 \partial_{x_j}^2 u \rangle = - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle \partial_{x_j}^2 [(1 + |x|^2)^\alpha u], \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle \partial_{x_j} [(1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j u + (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha \partial_{x_j} u], \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha u + (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u(t), \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u + (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha \partial_{x_j}^2 u, \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha u, \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u, \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \langle (1 + |x|^2)^\alpha \partial_{x_j}^2 u, \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $j \neq i$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u, \partial_{x_i}^2 u \rangle \\ &= \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_i} u, \partial_{x_i} u \rangle + \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-2} 2(\alpha - 1)x_i 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u, \partial_{x_i} u \rangle \\ &= - \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} u, u \rangle - \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-2} 2(\alpha - 1)x_i 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_i} u, u \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-2} 2(\alpha - 1)x_i 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u, \partial_{x_i} u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using the integration by parts again, we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle \partial_{x_j} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} u, (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j u \rangle \\ &= \langle \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} u, (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha x_j \partial_{x_j} u \rangle + \langle \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} u, (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-1} 2\alpha u \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_i} u, (1 + |x|^2)^{\alpha-2} 2(\alpha - 1)x_j 2\alpha x_j u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2\langle (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-1}2\alpha x_j\partial_{x_j}u, \partial_{x_i}^2u \rangle \\
& = \langle \partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_i}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-1}2\alpha u \rangle + \langle \partial_{x_i}\partial_{x_i}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)x_j2\alpha x_ju \rangle \\
& \quad - \langle (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)x_i2\alpha x_j\partial_{x_j}\partial_{x_i}u, u \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)x_i2\alpha x_j\partial_{x_j}u, \partial_{x_i}u \rangle \\
& = -\langle \partial_{x_i}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-1}2\alpha\partial_{x_i}u + (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_iu \rangle \\
& \quad - \langle \partial_{x_i}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_j^2\partial_{x_i}u \rangle \\
& \quad - \langle \partial_{x_i}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-3}2(\alpha-2)2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_j^2x_iu \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle \partial_{x_j}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_ix_j\partial_{x_i}u \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle \partial_{x_j}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-3}2(\alpha-2)2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_ix_jx_iu \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle \partial_{x_j}u, (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)2\alpha x_ju \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-2}2(\alpha-1)x_i2\alpha x_j\partial_{x_j}u, \partial_{x_i}u \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(1+|x|^2)^{-1}|x|^\zeta \leq C_\zeta$ for $\zeta \in [0, 2]$. It holds that for $j \neq i$,

$$(17) \quad |\langle (1+|x|^2)^{\alpha-1}2\alpha x_j\partial_{x_j}u, \partial_{x_i}^2u \rangle| \leq C(\|\partial_{x_i}u\|^2 + \|u\|^2 + \|\partial_{x_j}u\|^2).$$

Similarly, one can verify (17) for $j = i$. By the BDG inequality and Gronwall's inequality, as well as (16), we obtain that

$$(18) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|v^\delta(t)\|_{L_x^{2p}}^2 \right] \leq C_1(T, p) \exp \left(C(V, \lambda, \alpha_1, T, \|u_0\|)p \right) \left(\|v^\delta(0)\|_{H^1}^{2p} + \|v^\delta(0)\|_{L_x^{2p}}^{2p} \right),$$

where $C_1(T, p)$ depends on p quadratically. The estimates (16) and (18) lead to (13) for $\delta > 0$ by the spatial scaling property.

Step 2: We show that the limit of v^δ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ is the unique mild solution of (1). Notice that $v^\delta(0, x) = u_0(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}}x)$ is independent of δ . We take arbitrary small positive parameters $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ such that $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2$. Then considering the evolution of $\frac{1}{2}\|v^{\delta_1}(t) - v^{\delta_2}(t)\|^2$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\|v^{\delta_1}(t) - v^{\delta_2}(t)\|^2 \\
& = \frac{1}{2}\|v^{\delta_1}(0) - v^{\delta_2}(0)\|^2 + \int_0^t \langle v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s), \mathbf{i}\Delta(v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)) \rangle \circ \sqrt{\epsilon}dB(s) \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \langle v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s), \lambda \mathbf{i}f_{\delta_1}(|v^{\delta_1}(s)|^2)v^{\delta_1}(s) - \lambda \mathbf{i}f_{\delta_2}(|v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2)v^{\delta_2}(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_0^t \langle v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s), \mathbf{i}V[v^{\delta_1}(s)]v^{\delta_1}(s) - \mathbf{i}V[v^{\delta_2}(s)]v^{\delta_2}(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad - \int_0^t \alpha_1\|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds \\
& = : \frac{1}{2}\|v^{\delta_1}(0) - v^{\delta_2}(0)\|^2 + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t) + I_4(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $B(\cdot)$ is independent of the spatial variable, it follows that $I_1 = 0$. The property of the logarithmic function and (9) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2(t)| &\leq C(\lambda) \int_0^t \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t |\langle v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s), \mathbf{i}\lambda(f_{\delta_1}(|v^{\delta_1}(s)|^2) - f_{\delta_2}(|v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2))u^{\delta_2}(s) \rangle| ds \\
&\leq C(\lambda) \int_0^t \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds \\
&\quad + |\lambda| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)| |\log(\delta_1 + |v^{\delta_1}(s)|^2) - \log(\delta_2 + |v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2)| |v^{\delta_2}(s)| dx ds \\
&\quad + |\lambda| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)| |\log(1 + \delta_1 |v^{\delta_1}(s)|^2) - \log(1 + \delta_2 |v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2)| |v^{\delta_2}(s)| dx ds \\
&\leq C(\lambda) \int_0^t \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds \\
&\quad + |\lambda| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)| \log\left(1 + \frac{(\delta_1 - \delta_2)}{\delta_2 + |v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2}\right) |v^{\delta_2}(s)| dx ds \\
&\quad + |\lambda| \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} |v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)| \log\left(1 + \frac{(\delta_1 - \delta_2)|v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2}{1 + \delta_2 |v^{\delta_2}(s)|^2}\right) |v^{\delta_2}(s)| dx ds \\
&=: C(\lambda) \int_0^t \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds + I_{21} + I_{22}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Young's inequality, (11) and (12), it follows that for $\eta \in [0, \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+d})$, $\frac{\eta'd}{2\eta'+2} \in [0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{21} + I_{22} &\leq \int_0^t C|\lambda| \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds + \int_0^t C|\lambda| \delta_1^\eta \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|_{L^{2-2\eta}}^{2-2\eta} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t C|\lambda| \delta_1^{\eta'} \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|_{L^{2+2\eta'}}^{2+2\eta'} ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t C|\lambda| \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds + \int_0^t C\delta_1^\eta \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|_{L^\alpha}^{\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^{2-2\eta-\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t C\delta_1^{\eta'} \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^{d\eta'} \|\nabla v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^{2\eta'+2-d\eta'} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (7) yields that

$$|I_3(t)| = C(m, V) \int_0^t (\|v^{\delta_1}(s)\|^2 + \|v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2) \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds,$$

which, together with the mass evolution law (14), implies that

$$|I_3(t)| \leq C(m, V)(1 + \|u_0\|^2) \int_0^t \|v^{\delta_1}(s) - v^{\delta_2}(s)\|^2 ds.$$

Based on the estimates of I_1 - I_3 and using Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$\|v^{\delta_1} - v^{\delta_2}\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H))} \leq C(V, \lambda, T, p, \alpha_1, \|u_0\|)(\delta_1^{\frac{\eta}{2}} + \delta_1^{\frac{\eta'}{2}}).$$

Thus for any $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\{v^{\delta_n}\}_n$ forms a Cauchy sequence in $L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H))$. Then standard arguments as in [18, section 4] show that there exists a unique limit of the Cauchy sequence u^δ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, which is also the mild solution of (5) with $\delta = 0$. By the spatial scaling property between v^δ and $u^{\epsilon, \delta}$, we get (13) for $\delta = 0$ and complete the proof. \square

By an interpolation argument, one can also prove that for any $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\{v^{\delta_n}\}_n$ forms a Cauchy sequence in $L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([0, T]; L_\alpha^2)) \cap L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^s))$ with $s \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

3. Large deviation principle

Thanks to Schilder's theorem (see e.g., [27]), it is known that $\sqrt{\epsilon}B(\cdot)$ satisfies the large deviation principle (LDP) with a good rate function

$$I^W(g) = \begin{cases} \frac{\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_P}^2}{2}, & g \in \mathcal{H}_P, \\ +\infty, & g \notin \mathcal{H}_P, \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{H}_P is the Cameron–Martin space of the standard Brownian motion defined by $\{g \in W^{1,2}([0, T]; \mathbb{R}), g(0) = 0\}$ equipped with the norm $\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_P} := \sqrt{\int_0^T |h|^2 dt}$, where $h = \dot{g}$. For the considered models, we have the following LDP result.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let $T > 0$, $\delta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. The family $\{u^{\epsilon, \delta}\}_{\epsilon > 0}$ satisfies an LDP of speed ϵ and good rate function*

$$I_{u_0}^{\delta, T}(z) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{L_{u_0}^\delta(g)=z} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_P}^2, \quad z \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H),$$

where $L_{u_0}^\delta$ is defined by the solution operator of the skeleton equation,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) &= S_g(t)u_0 + \int_0^t S_g(t, s) \mathbf{i} \lambda f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t S_g(t, s) \mathbf{i} V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s) ds - \int_0^t S_g(t, s) \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

with $S_g(t, s) = \exp(\mathbf{i} \Delta(g(t) - g(s)))$.

PROOF. For the case that $\delta > 0$, by the contraction principle, it suffices to prove the continuity of $L_{u_0}^\delta$, which is obtain in Lemma 1. Notice that $u^{\epsilon, \delta}$ is proven to be an exponentially good approximation of u^δ in Lemma 2. By [27, Theorem 4.2.23], to verify that $I_{u_0}^{0, T}$ the good rate function for (4) with $\delta = 0$, it suffices to show that

$$(19) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\{g: \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_P} \leq R\}} \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^0(g)\| = 0$$

for every positive $R < +\infty$. Since $g \in \mathcal{H}_P$, by similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, it is not hard to show that there exists a unique solution for

$$\begin{aligned} dL_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) &= \mathbf{i} \Delta L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) dg(t) + \mathbf{i} \lambda f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) dt \\ &\quad + \mathbf{i} V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) dt - \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

satisfying

$$(20) \quad \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\| = e^{-\alpha_1 t} \|u_0\|, \quad \|\nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\| \leq C(V, \lambda, T, \alpha_1) \|\nabla u_0\|,$$

$$(21) \quad \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{L_x^2} \leq C(V, \lambda, T, \alpha_1) (\|u_0\|_{L_x^2} + \|u_0\|_{H^1} \|g\|_{W^{1,2}([0,T];\mathbb{R})}).$$

The properties (7) and (9) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & d\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) - L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)\|^2 \\ & \leq C(\lambda) \|(f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)|^2)L_{u_0}^0(g)(t) - \log(|L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)|^2))L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)\|^2 dt \\ & \quad + C(V, \lambda, \alpha_1) (1 + \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|^2 + \|L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)\|^2) \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) - L_{u_0}^0(g)(t)\|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates with (22) in the proof of Lemma 2, (19) follows. \square

LEMMA 1. *Let $T > 0$, $\delta \geq 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}_P$. The operator $L_{u_0}^\delta$ is continuous from $\mathcal{C}_0([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ to $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H)$.*

PROOF. For any $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{H}_P$, using the mild formulations of $L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)$ and $L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(t) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(t)\| \leq \|S_{g_1}(t)u_0 - S_{g_2}(t)u_0\| \\ & + \left\| \int_0^t (S_{g_1}(t, s) - S_{g_2}(t, s)) \left(\mathbf{i} \lambda f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) \right) ds \right\| \\ & + \left\| \int_0^t (S_{g_1}(t, s) - S_{g_2}(t, s)) \mathbf{i} V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) ds \right\| \\ & + \left\| \int_0^t S_{g_2}(t, s) \mathbf{i} \lambda \left(f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) - \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) \right) ds \right\| \\ & + \left\| \int_0^t S_{g_2}(t, s) \mathbf{i} \left(V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) \right) ds \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, for any $u_0 \in H^1$, by Fourier's transformation, it holds that for $\|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R})} \rightarrow 0$,

$$\|(S_{g_1}(t) - S_{g_2}(t))u_0\| = \|(I - S_{g_2 - g_1}(t))u_0\| \leq C\|u_0\|_{H^1} |g_2(t) - g_1(t)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0.$$

As a consequence, by (20)-(21), (6) and (8), we have that for $\|g_1 - g_2\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathbb{R})} \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_0^t (S_{g_1}(t, s) - S_{g_2}(t, s)) \left(\mathbf{i} \lambda f_\delta(|L_x^\delta(g_1)(s)|^2) L_x^\delta(g_1)(s) - \alpha_1 L_x^\delta(g_1)(s) \right) ds \right\| \\ & + \left\| \int_0^t (S_{g_1}(t, s) - S_{g_2}(t, s)) \mathbf{i} V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) ds \right\| \\ & \leq C(\lambda, \alpha_1) \int_0^t \|(S_{g_1}(t, s) - S_{g_2}(t, s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(H; H^1)} \left(\|V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)\|_{H^1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)\|_{H^1} + \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)\|_{H^1} \right) ds \\ & \leq C(T, V, \lambda, |\log(\delta)|) (1 + \|u_0\|^2) \int_0^t |g_1(t) - g_1(s) - g_2(t) + g_1(s)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{H^1} ds \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Making use of properties (7) and (10), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \int_0^t S_{g_2}(t, s) \mathbf{i} \lambda \left(f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \alpha_1 L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) - \alpha_1 L_x^\delta(g_1)(s) \right) ds \right\| \\
& + \left\| \int_0^t S_{g_2}(t, s) \mathbf{i} \left(V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - V[L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s)] L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s) \right) ds \right\| \\
& \leq C(V, \lambda, |\log(\delta)|, T, \alpha_1) (1 + \|u_0\|^2) \int_0^t \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)(s)\| ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Then standard arguments yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g_1) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g_2)\|_{C([0, T]; H)} \\
& \leq C(V, \lambda, |\log(\delta)|, T, \alpha_1) (1 + \|u_0\|^2) (1 + \|u_0\|_{H^1}) \|g_1 - g_2\|_{C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 2. *Let $T > 0$, $\delta \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. The sequence $\{u^{\epsilon, \delta}\}_{\delta > 0}$ is an exponentially good approximation of u^ϵ , i.e., for any $\delta_1 > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon\|_{C([0, T]; H)} > \delta_1) = -\infty.$$

PROOF. We prove that $u^{\epsilon, \delta}$ is an exponentially good approximation of u^ϵ by the strong convergence property under the $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm. By the chain rule, the proprieties (9) and (7), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
d\|u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon\|^2 & = 2\langle \mathbf{i} \Delta(u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon), u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon \rangle \circ dB(t) \\
& \quad + 2\langle \mathbf{i} \lambda (f_\delta(|u^{\epsilon, \delta}|^2) u^{\epsilon, \delta} - \log(|u^\epsilon|^2) u^\epsilon), u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon \rangle dt \\
& \quad + 2\langle \mathbf{i} (V[u^{\epsilon, \delta}] u^{\epsilon, \delta} - V[u^\epsilon] u^\epsilon), u^{\epsilon, \delta} - u^\epsilon \rangle \\
& \quad - 2\alpha_1 \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) - u^\epsilon(t)\|^2 dt \\
& \leq C(\lambda) \|(f_\delta(|u^\epsilon(t)|^2) u^\epsilon(t) - \log(|u^\epsilon(t)|^2)) u^\epsilon(t)\|^2 dt \\
& \quad + C(V, \lambda, \alpha_1) (1 + \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}\|^2 + \|u^\epsilon\|^2) \|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) - u^\epsilon(t)\|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

According to (12) and (11), it follows that for $\eta \in [0, \frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+d})$, $\frac{\eta'd}{2\eta'+2} \in [0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(22) \quad & \| (f_\delta(|u_1|^2) u_1 - \log(|u_1|^2)) u_1 \|^2 \\
& \leq C(\| \log(1 + \delta |u_1|^2) u_1 \|^2 + \| \log(1 + \frac{\delta}{|u_1^2|}) u_1 \|^2) \\
& \leq C(\delta^\eta + \delta^{\eta'}) (\|u_1\|_{L_\alpha^2}^{\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} \|u_1\|^{2-2\eta-\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} + \|u_1\|^{d\eta'} \|\nabla u_1\|^{2\eta'+2-d\eta'}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $u_1 \in L_\alpha^2 \cap H^1$. By using (22) and Gronwall's inequality, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t) - u^\epsilon(t)\|^2 & \leq e^{C(V, \lambda, \alpha_1)(1 + \|u_0\|^2)T} (\delta^\eta + \delta^{\eta'}) (1 + \|u_0\|^{2-2\eta-\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} + \|u_0\|^{d\eta'}) \\
& \quad \int_0^T (\|u^\epsilon\|_{L_\alpha^2}^{\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} + \|\nabla u^\epsilon\|^{2\eta'+2-d\eta'}) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Then according to the priori estimate of u^ϵ and applying Chebyshev's inequality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon,\delta} - u^\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];H)} \geq \delta_1) \\
& \leq \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon,\delta} - u^\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];H)}^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \geq \delta_1^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}) \\
& \leq \epsilon \log \frac{C(V, \lambda, T, \alpha_1, u_0)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^T (\|u^\epsilon\|_{L_\alpha^2}^{\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} + \|\nabla u^\epsilon\|^{2\eta'+2-d\eta'}) dt\right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right] \delta^{\max(\frac{\eta}{2\epsilon}, \frac{\eta'}{2\epsilon})}}{\delta_1^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}} \\
& \leq C_1(V, \lambda, T, \alpha_1, u_0) + \log\left(\frac{\delta^{\frac{1}{2} \max(\eta, \eta')}}{\delta_1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have use the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\|u^\epsilon(t)\|_{L_\alpha^2}^{\frac{d\eta}{\alpha}} + \|\nabla u^\epsilon(t)\|^{2\eta'+2-d\eta'}\right)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right] \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} C_2(V, \lambda, T, \alpha_1, u_0)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}.$$

which can be obtained by Itô's formula similar to (16) and (18). Then letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have complete the proof for the exponentially good approximation property. \square

REMARK 1. *From the above analysis, it can be seen that the strongly convergent approximation with explicit convergence rate and finite moment bounds under $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm for sufficiently large $p \geq 1$ is also an exponentially good approximation for stochastic (partial) differential equation. By a classical approach in [27, Chapter 5], one could also prove the uniform LDP for (4) with $\delta \geq 0$, for any compact set $K \subset L_\alpha^2 \cap H^1$, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}([0, T]; H))$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(23) \quad & - \sup_{u_0 \in K} \inf_{w \in \text{Int}(A)} I_{u_0}^{\delta, T}(w) \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \inf_{u_0 \in K} \mathbb{P}(u^\epsilon \in A) \\
& \leq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in K} \mathbb{P}(u^\epsilon \in A) \leq - \inf_{w \in \bar{A}, u_0 \in K} I_{u_0}^{\delta, T}(w).
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we present a useful LDP result of (4) with $\delta > 0$ when the domain of $I_{u_0}^\delta$ is considered on $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$, whose proof is in the appendix. Here $\mathcal{X}_1 := H^1 \cap L_1^2$.

For any $a \geq 0$, denote $K_T^{u_0, \delta}(a) = (I_{u_0}^{\delta, T})^{-1}([0, a])$, i.e.,

$$K_T^{u_0, \delta}(a) = \left\{ y \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1) \mid y = L_{u_0}^\delta(g), \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |h|^2 dt \leq a, h = \dot{g} \right\}.$$

THEOREM 2. *Let $\delta > 0, T > 0, u_0 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $d \leq 2$. For every a, ρ, κ, γ positive,*

(i) *there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and $\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \leq \rho$ and $\tilde{a} \in (0, a]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, K_T^{u_0}(\tilde{a})) \geq \gamma) < \exp\left(-\frac{\tilde{a} - \kappa}{\epsilon}\right),$$

(ii) *there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and $\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \leq \rho$ and $w \in K_T^{u_0, \delta}(a)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} - w\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)} < \gamma) > \exp\left(-\frac{I_{u_0}^{\delta,T}(w) - \kappa}{\epsilon}\right).$$

The assumption $d \leq 2$ is technical for deriving a priori estimates in the Sobolev space of higher order. It should be remarked that our current approach does not give the LDP result of Theorem 2 in $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$ for the case $\delta = 0$ due to the strong singularity of the

logarithmic nonlinearity in the Sobolev space of higher order. For further discussion, we refer to section 5.

4. Application: exit from a basin of attraction

This section is devoted to the first exit time from a neighborhood of an asymptotically stable equilibrium point for (4) with $\delta > 0$ and $\alpha_1 > 0$. For simplicity, we may assume that $V = 0$. We refer to [27, 30] for more backgrounds for the exit problems and its connection to LDP.

Considering the following infinite-dimensional ordinary differential equation with weakly damping effect,

$$(24) \quad dw = \mathbf{i}\lambda f_\delta(|w|^2)w dt - \alpha_1 w dt,$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |w(t, x)| &= e^{-\alpha_1 t} |w(0, x)|, \\ w(t, x) &= \exp\left(-\alpha_1 t + \int_0^t \mathbf{i}f_\delta(|w(0, x)|^2 e^{-2\alpha_1 s}) ds\right) w(0, x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, 0 is the unique attractor of the above equation in H . Note that in the H -topology, the exit problems are not interesting since

$$\|w^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)\| \leq e^{-\alpha_1 t} \|w^{\epsilon, \delta}(0)\|.$$

Similarly, one may consider the topology in L_α^2 since 0 is also the attractor of the considered equation. For simplicity, we can take $\alpha = 1$ and obtain

$$\|w(t)\|_{L_1^2} \leq e^{-\alpha_1 t} \|w(0)\|_{L_1^2}.$$

However, 0 may be not the attractor in H^s , $s > 0$. For example, when $s = 1$, by Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d\|\nabla w(t)\|^2 &= \langle \mathbf{i}\lambda f'_\delta(|w(t)|^2) \operatorname{Re}(\bar{w}(t) \nabla w(t)) w(t), \nabla w(t) \rangle dt - 2\alpha_1 \|\nabla w(t)\|^2 \\ &\leq (-2\alpha_1 + 4|\lambda|) \|\nabla w(t)\|^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that if $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$, 0 is also the attractor in H^1 .

Define a new norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}_s}$ defined by $\sqrt{\|\cdot\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\cdot\|_{L_1^2}^2}$ with $s \geq 0$. We will consider the exit problem under $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}_1}$ -norm. Consider an open bounded domain D containing 0 in the interior of \mathcal{X}_1 such that $D \subset B_R$ for a large enough $R > 0$. The above analysis indicates that D is invariant under the deterministic flow of (24) if $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$.

Define $\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} = \inf\{t \geq 0 | u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}(t) \in D^c\}$ the first exit time of the regularized SlogS equation from D . Similar to [33], we introduce

$$\overline{M^\delta} = \inf\{I_0^{\delta, T}(y) : y(T) \in (\overline{D})^c, T > 0\}.$$

For any sufficient positive $\rho > 0$, set

$$M_\rho^\delta = \inf\{I_{u_0}^{\delta, T}(y) : \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \leq \rho, y(T) \in (D_{-\rho})^c, T > 0\}$$

with $D_{-\rho} := D \setminus \mathcal{N}^0(\partial D, \rho)$ where $\mathcal{N}^0(\partial D, \rho)$ is the open neighbourhood of ∂D with the distance ρ . Here ∂D is the boundary of D in \mathcal{X}_1 . Define $\underline{M^\delta} = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} M_\rho^\delta$. It can be seen that

$\underline{M}^\delta \leq \overline{M}^\delta$. Below, we shall prove that the lower bound of \underline{M}^δ is strictly larger than 0 thanks to special structure of the skeleton equation.

LEMMA 3. *Let $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. Then it holds that $0 < \inf_{\delta > 0} \underline{M}^\delta \leq \inf_{\delta > 0} \overline{M}^\delta$.*

PROOF. Let $d(0, \partial D) > 0$ denote the distance between 0 and ∂D . Choose ρ small enough such that $B_\rho^0 \subset D$ and that the distance between B_ρ^0 and $(D_{-\rho})^c$ is larger than $\frac{1}{2}d(0, \partial D)$. By studying the functional $\mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)) := \frac{1}{2}\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{\mathcal{X}_1}^2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & d\mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)) \\ &= \langle 2xL_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t), \mathbf{i}\nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) \rangle h(t) dt - \alpha_1 \mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)) dt \\ & \quad + \langle \nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t), \mathbf{i}\lambda f'_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)|^2) \operatorname{Re}(\overline{L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)}) \nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) \rangle L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t) dt \\ & \leq 2\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{L_1^2} \|\nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\| h(t) dt - \alpha_1 \mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)) dt + 2|\lambda| \|\nabla L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $h = \dot{g}$. Using the Duhamel formula, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(T)) - e^{-(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda| + 2\delta)T} \mathcal{H}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(0)) \leq \int_0^T e^{-(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda| + 2\delta)(T-s)} 2R^2 |h(s)| ds.$$

As a consequence, if $L_{u_0}(g)(T) \in (D_{-\rho})^c$, it holds that

$$\frac{d^2(0, \partial D) - 4d(0, \partial D)\rho}{16} \leq R^2 \sqrt{\int_0^T e^{-2(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda|)(T-s)} ds} \|h\|_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R})}.$$

Taking ρ sufficient small leads to

$$\frac{d^2(0, \partial D)}{32R^2 \sqrt{2\alpha_1 - 4|\lambda|}} \leq \|h\|_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R})},$$

thus the desired results follow. \square

We are not able to prove $\underline{M}^\delta = \overline{M}^\delta$ due to loss of the approximate controllability at this current study. The argument to prove the approximate controllability of the original system (i.e., $\delta = 0$) is hard since the nonlinearity is not locally Lipschitz and the Schrödinger group relies on the control. In the ideal case, it is expected that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} M^\delta = \inf_{v \in \partial D} U(0, v),$$

with the quasi-potential defined by

$$U(u_0, u_1) := \inf\{I_{u_0}^{0, T}(y) \mid y \in \mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathcal{X}_1), y(0) = u_0, y(T) = u_1, T > 0\}.$$

Define $\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}(t) \in B_\rho^0 \cup D^c\}$.

LEMMA 4. *Let $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. For every ρ small enough and L positive with $B_\rho^0 \subset D$, there exists $T > 0$ and ϵ_0 such that for every $u_0 \in D$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > T) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{L}{\epsilon}\right).$$

PROOF. The proof for the case that u_0 belongs to B_ρ^0 is straightforward. Below we focus on the case that $u_0 \in D \setminus B_\rho^0$. Since D is uniformly attracted to zero by the deterministic flows (24), there exists a positive time $T_1 > 0$ such that for every u_1 in $\mathcal{N}^0(D \setminus B_\rho^0, \frac{\rho}{8})$ and $t \geq T_1$, $L_{u_1}^\delta(0)(t) \in B_{\frac{\rho}{8}}^0$. Notice that

$$\sup_{u_1 \in \mathcal{N}^0(D \setminus B_\rho^0, \frac{\rho}{8})} \|L_{u_1}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T_1], \mathcal{X}_1)} \leq C(T_1, |\lambda|, |\alpha_1|, R).$$

Next, we prove that for sufficient large $T \geq T_1$,

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\rho &= \{y \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1) \mid \forall t \in [0, T], y(t) \in \mathcal{N}^0(D \setminus B_\rho^0, \frac{\rho}{8})\} \\ &\subset (K_T^{u_0, \delta}(2L))^c. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to consider $y = L_{u_0}^\delta(g) \in \mathcal{T}_\rho$. Indeed, we have that

$$\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(T_1) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)(T_1)\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \geq \frac{3}{4}\rho.$$

On the other hand, there exists small $t_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \\ &\leq C(R', \delta, R) \left| \int_0^{t_1} |h(s)| ds \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \alpha_1 t_1 \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \\ &\quad + |\lambda| |\log(\delta)| t_1 \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \\ &\leq C(R', \delta, R) t_1^{\frac{1}{4}} \left| \int_0^{t_1} |h(s)|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{1}{4}} + \alpha t_1 \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \\ &\quad + |\lambda| |\log(\delta)| t_1 \|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting t_1 sufficient small such that $|\lambda| |\log(\delta)| t_1 + \alpha t_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $C(R', \delta, R) t_1^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain that

$$\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, t_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \leq \left| \int_0^{t_1} |h(s)|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Then by iterating the above estimate for each small interval $[kt_1, (k+1)t_1]$ for $k = 1, \dots, [T_1/t_1 - 1]$, ($[\cdot]$ is the floor function), it follows that

$$\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \leq 2^{[T_1/t_1]+1} \|h\|_{L^2([0, T_1]; \mathbb{R})}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{2^{4[T_1/t_1]+5}} \left(\frac{3}{4}\rho\right)^4 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{L^2([0, T_1]; \mathbb{R})}^2.$$

Similarly, for any $[T_1, 2T_1]$, by the inverse triangle inequality and the fact that 0 is an attractor of the deterministic flow, one has that

$$\|L_{L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(T_1)}^\delta(g) - L_{L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(T_1)}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho.$$

This also implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{L^2([T_1, 2T_1]; \mathbb{R})}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2^{4[T_1/t_1]+5}} \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\right)^4 =: M''.$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|h\|_{L^2([0,2T_1];\mathbb{R})}^2 \geq 2M''.$$

For any $T > 0$, there exists positive number j such that $T > jT_1$, iterating the above arguments, one has $\frac{1}{2}\|h\|_{L^2([0,jT_1];\mathbb{R})}^2 \geq jM''$. To obtain (25), we will take $jM'' > 2L$.

Finally, we are able to show the desired result since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} > T) &= \mathbb{P}(\forall t \in [0, T], u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \in D \setminus B_\rho^0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \mathcal{T}_\rho^c) > \frac{\rho}{8}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, K_T^{u_0}(2L)) \geq \frac{\rho}{8}). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2 (i), it follows that for small $\epsilon > 0$ and $\rho \leq R$,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, K_T^{u_0}(2L)) \geq \frac{\rho}{8}) \leq e^{-\frac{\rho}{\epsilon}}.$$

□

The below lemma indicates that at the time $\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,u_0,\delta}$, the probability that $u^{\epsilon,u_0,\delta}$ escapes D is at most exponentially small.

LEMMA 5. *Let $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. For every $\rho > 0$ such that $B_\rho^0 \subset D$ and $u_0 \in D$, there exists $L > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}) \in \partial D) \leq -L.$$

PROOF. When $u_0 \in B_\rho^0$, the desired bound is trivial. Thus we only deal with the case that $u_0 \in D \setminus B_\rho^0$. Since zero is the attractor of the deterministic flow, define $T = \inf\{t \geq 0 | L_{u_0}^\delta(0)(t) \in B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}^0\}$ and it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}) \in \partial D) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \min\left(\frac{\rho}{2}, \frac{d(0, \partial D)}{2}\right)\right).$$

By the LDP, we get

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}\left(\|u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} - L_{u_0}^\delta(0)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \min\left(\frac{\rho}{2}, \frac{d(0, \partial D)}{2}\right)\right) \leq -L,$$

where

$$L = \inf_{\|L_{u_0}^\delta(0) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0,T];\mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \min(\frac{\rho}{2}, \frac{d(0, \partial D)}{2})} \|h\|_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R})}^2 > 0.$$

□

LEMMA 6. *Let $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. For every $\rho > 0$ and $L > 0$ such that $B_{2\rho}^0 \subset D$, there exists $T < +\infty$ such that*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in S_\rho^0} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\mathcal{H}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}) - \mathcal{H}(u_0)) \geq \frac{3}{2}\rho^2\right) \leq -L,$$

where S_ρ^0 is the sphere in \mathcal{X}_1 .

PROOF. The evolution of $\mathcal{H}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0})$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(t)) - \mathcal{H}(u_0) \\ &= \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{i}2xu^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \rangle dW(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \epsilon \langle (1+|x|^2)u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \Delta^2 u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \rangle ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \epsilon \langle (1+|x|^2)\Delta u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \Delta u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \rangle ds - \alpha_1 \int_0^t \mathcal{H}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(s)) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \mathbf{i}2\lambda \langle \partial_x f_\delta(|u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}|^2) \operatorname{Re}(\overline{u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}} \nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}) u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts, Holder's and Young's inequalities, it is enough to show for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ with small $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and for small $T(\rho, L) < 1$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in S_\rho^0} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T(\rho, L)]} |Z(t)| \geq \frac{\rho^2}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \leq -L,$$

where $Z(t) = \int_0^t \langle 2xu^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}, \mathbf{i}\nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \rangle dW(t)$. By using [19, Proposition 4.31], it holds that for any $b > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{[0, T(\rho, L)]} |Z(t)| \geq \frac{\rho^2}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \leq \frac{b\epsilon}{\rho^4} + \mathbb{P} \left(\int_0^{T(\rho, L)} 4\|xu^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 \|\nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 ds \geq b \right).$$

Note that by Chebyshev's inequality and the moment bound of $H(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0})$, it holds that for $q = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(4 \int_0^{T(\rho, L)} \|xu^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 \|\nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 ds \geq b \right) &\leq \frac{4^q T_{\rho, L}^q \sup_{t \in [0, T_{\rho, L}]} \mathbb{E}[H(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0})^{2q}]}{b^q} \\ &\leq \frac{4^q T_{\rho, L}^q C(\lambda_1, \alpha_1, T_{\rho, L})^q q \rho^{4q}}{b^q}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $b = (\frac{1}{L'})^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}$ for a sufficient large L' , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in S_\rho^0} \mathbb{P} \left(4 \int_0^{T(\rho, L)} \|xu^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 \|\nabla u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}\|^2 ds \geq b \right) \\ & \leq \log(4T_{\rho, L}) - \log(b) + \log(\rho^4) + \epsilon \log\left(\frac{1}{L'}\right) + \log(C(\lambda_1, \alpha_1, T_{\rho, L})). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in S_\rho^0} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T(\rho, L)]} |Z(t)| \geq \frac{\rho^2}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right) \\ & \leq \max \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{L'}\right) - \log(\rho^4), \log(4T_{\rho, L}) - \log\left(\frac{1}{L'}\right) + \log(\rho^4) + \log(C(\lambda_1, \alpha_1, T_{\rho, L})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, one just takes $T_{\rho, L} \leq \frac{1}{4C(\lambda_1, \alpha_1, T_{\rho, L})\rho^4 L'}$ with L' sufficient large. \square

Now we are able to present the theorem to characterize the first exist time from a given domain D for the regularized problem ($\delta > 0$). Its proof is put in the appendix.

PROPOSITION 2. Let $\delta > 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. For every $u_0 \in D$ and small $\kappa > 0$, there exists positive L such that

$$(26) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \notin (e^{\frac{M^\delta - \kappa}{\epsilon}}, e^{\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \kappa}{\epsilon}})) \leq -L,$$

and for every $u_0 \in D$,

$$(27) \quad \underline{M}^\delta \leq \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] \leq \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] \leq \overline{M}^\delta.$$

Furthermore, for every small $\kappa > 0$, there exists $L > 0$ such that

$$(28) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \geq e^{\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \kappa}{\epsilon}}\right) \leq -L,$$

$$(29) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \log \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] \leq \overline{M}^\delta.$$

5. Further discussions

For the limit model, i.e., (4) with $\delta = 0$, there are still a lot of unclear parts on the random effect of the noise. Below we briefly discuss about some potential and interesting aspects in studying the effect of stochastic dispersion on the logarithmic Schrödinger equation.

5.1. Exit time and exit points. Similar to [33], one can also formally characterize the exit points of the regularised problem. However, it is still difficult to derive a rigorous result on the exit points of (4) with $\delta = 0$ and $V = 0$ since Proposition 2 may fail if $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Thanks to the special structures (14) and (15) when $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$, we have the following rough result on the exit points.

PROPOSITION 3. Let $\delta \geq 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. For (4), the exit from an open bounded domain D containing 0 in the interior of \mathcal{X}_1 appears in \mathcal{X}_1 if and only if the exit appears in L_1^2 .

The proof is straightforward by noticing that

$$\|u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)\| \leq e^{-\alpha_1 t} \|u_0\|, \quad \|\nabla u^{\epsilon, \delta}(t)\| \leq e^{-(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda|)t} \|\nabla u_0\|.$$

Furthermore, we have the following finding on the exit time of (4) with $\delta = 0$ based on the exponential integrability property.

PROPOSITION 4. Let $\delta = 0$, $\alpha_1 > 2|\lambda|$ and $\alpha = 1$. Assume that $R > \| |x| u_0 \|$. Then for any $T > 0$, it holds that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, u_0} \leq T) = -(R^2 - \| |x| u_0 \|^2),$$

Where τ^{ϵ, u_0} is the exit time from the ball \mathcal{B}_R^0 in L_1^2 .

PROOF. According to Proposition 3, it suffices to analyze the exit problem in L_1^2 . For any $T > 0$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, u_0} \leq T) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| |x| u^{\epsilon, u_0} \| \geq R\right).$$

By applying [13, Lemma 3.1], it holds that for any $p \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(t)\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u_0\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) + \int_0^t (C(\lambda, p)\|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(s)\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{\alpha_1 p}{\epsilon}\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(t)\|^2) \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(s)\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t p \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(t)\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) \langle \mathbf{i}\nabla u^{\epsilon,u_0}, 2xu^{\epsilon,u_0} \rangle \sqrt{\epsilon} dB(t). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimate with the BDG inequality, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(t)\|^2}{\epsilon}\right)\right] \\ & \leq \exp\left(\frac{p\|x|u_0\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) \exp\left(\int_0^t C(\lambda, p, \alpha_1) e^{-2(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda|)s} ds \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $p = 1$, by Chebyshev's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}\| \geq R\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left(-\frac{R^2}{\epsilon}\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \exp\left(\frac{\|x|u^{\epsilon,u_0}(t)\|^2}{\epsilon}\right)\right] \\ & \leq \exp\left(-\frac{R^2 - \|x|u_0\|^2}{\epsilon}\right) \exp\left(C(\lambda, \alpha_1) \frac{1}{2(\alpha_1 - 2|\lambda|)} \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

If $R^2 > \|x|u_0\|^2$, then it holds that for any $T > 0$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, u_0} \leq T) = -(R^2 - \|x|u_0\|^2).$$

□

In order to predict more delicate result on the exit time and exit points for the limit model, we aim to design some structure-preserving methods to simulate its asymptotic behaviors in the future.

5.2. Effect on the large dispersion. Another interesting problem lies on the effect of large random dispersion for (4) with $\delta = 0$, i.e., $\epsilon \rightarrow +\infty$. For example, let us assume that $V = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = 0$. In order to avoid confusions, we denote the solution of (4) with $\delta = 0$ by X^ϵ for large enough $\epsilon > 0$. By the analysis in section 2, it is not hard to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|X^\epsilon(t)\| = \|u_0\|, \quad \|X^\epsilon(t)\|_{H^1} \leq e^{C(\lambda, \|u_0\|)t} \|u_0\|_{H^1}, \\ & \|X^\epsilon(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L_\alpha^2)} \leq e^{C(\lambda, \|u_0\|, p)t} \epsilon \|u_0\|_{H^1} + C(p) \|u_0\|_{L_\alpha^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the decaying estimate of $S_{\sqrt{\epsilon}B}(t, s)$ holds [23], i.e., for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$ and $s < t$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|S_B(t, s)z\|_{L^p} = \left\| \frac{1}{4\pi \mathbf{i}(\sqrt{\epsilon}B(t) - \sqrt{\epsilon}B(s))^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left(\mathbf{i} \frac{|x-y|^2}{4(\sqrt{\epsilon}B(t) - \sqrt{\epsilon}B(s))}\right) z dy \right\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq C_d \epsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})} (B(t) - B(s))^{-d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})} \|z\|_{L^{p'}}, \end{aligned}$$

Thus it holds that for $p' = 2 - 2\eta$ and $p = \frac{2-2\eta}{1-2\eta}$ with $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|X^\epsilon(t)\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq \|S_B(t)u_0\|_{L^p} + \left\| \int_0^t S_B(t,s) \log(|X^\epsilon|^2) X^\epsilon ds \right\|_{L^p} \\ & \leq C_d \epsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} B(t)^{-d(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} \|u_0\|_{L^{p'}} \\ & \quad + C_d \int_0^t \epsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} (B(t) - B(s))^{-d(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})} \|\log(|X^\epsilon|^2) X^\epsilon\|_{L^{p'}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by the weighted Sobolev inequality, GN inequality and the properties of logarithmic function, it holds that for $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha > \frac{d\eta}{2-2\eta}$,

$$\|X^\epsilon\|_{L^{2-2\eta}} \leq C \|X^\epsilon\|^{1-\frac{d\eta}{2\alpha(1-\eta)}} \|X^\epsilon\|_{L_{\alpha}^{\frac{d\eta}{2\alpha(1-\eta)}}}$$

and that for $\eta_1, \eta'_1 > 0$ small enough and $\alpha_1 > \frac{d(\eta+\eta_1)}{2-2\eta-2\eta_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\log(|X^\epsilon|^2) X^\epsilon\|_{L^{2-2\eta}} & \leq C (\|X^\epsilon\|_{L^{2-2\eta-2\eta_1}} + \|X^\epsilon\|_{L^{2-2\eta-2\eta'_1}}) \\ & \leq C \|u_0\|^{1-\frac{d(\eta+\eta_1)}{2\alpha_1(1-\eta-\eta_1)}} \|X^\epsilon\|_{L_{\alpha_1}^{\frac{d(\eta+\eta_1)}{2\alpha_1(1-\eta-\eta_1)}}} \\ & \quad + C \|u_0\|_{L_{\alpha_1}^{\frac{d(\eta+\eta'_1)}{2+2\eta+2\eta'_1}}} \|\nabla X^\epsilon\|^{1-\frac{d(\eta+\eta'_1)}{2+2\eta+2\eta'_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the a priori estimate on X^ϵ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\log(|X^\epsilon|^2) X^\epsilon\|_{L^{p'}} \\ & \leq e^{C(\lambda, \|u_0\|, d, \eta, \eta_1, \eta'_1)t} \left[1 + (\epsilon \|u_0\|_{H^1} + \|u_0\|_{L_{\alpha}^2})^{\frac{d(\eta+\eta_1)}{2\alpha_1(1-\eta-\eta_1)}} + \|\nabla u_0\|^{1-\frac{d(\eta+\eta'_1)}{2+2\eta+2\eta'_1}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then one may expect that

$$\|X^\epsilon(t)\|_{L^p} \sim O(\epsilon^{-\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})+\frac{d(\eta+\eta_1)}{2\alpha(1-\eta-\eta_1)}}), \quad a.s.$$

Note that the above asymptotic estimate is not trivial especially in the case that the Sobolev embedding theorem $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^p$ does not hold.

6. Appendix

Proof of Theorem 2

PROOF. First we show that under the $C([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$ -norm, the considered model satisfies the LDP with the same good rate function in section 3. From the arguments in section 3, it suffices to show that the trajectories of (4) and its skeleton equation are continuous in \mathcal{X}_1 . For simplicity, we only present the detailed proof for the continuity of $L_{u_0}(g)$ in \mathcal{X}_1 since the other argument is similar.

Define $W_{1,x}^2 := \{z \in H^1 \mid \int_{\mathcal{O}} (1 + |x|^2)(|z(x)|^2 + |\nabla z(x)|^2) dx < \infty\}$. Let us consider a sequence of approximations $u_0^{R'} \in H^2 \cap W_{1,x}^2$ to u_0 such that $\|u_0^{R'} - u_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \rightarrow 0$ as $R' \rightarrow$

$+\infty$. By using the mild formulation of $L_{u_0^{R'}}(h)(t)$ and the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality $\|w\|_{L^4} \leq C_d \|\nabla w\|_{H^2}^{\frac{d}{4}} \|w\|^{1-\frac{d}{4}}$, we obtain that for $d \leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{H^2} \\ & \leq \|u_0^{R'}\|_{H^2} + \int_0^t |\lambda| \left\| S_g(t,s) f_\delta(|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s)|^2) L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) \right\|_{H^2} ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \alpha_1 \left\| S_g(t,s) L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) \right\|_{H^2} ds \\ & \leq \|u_0^{R'}\|_{H^2} + \int_0^t C(\lambda, \delta, \alpha_1) (\|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s)\|_{H^2} + \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s)\|_{H^2}^{\frac{d}{2}} \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s)\|_{H^1}^{2-\frac{d}{2}}) ds. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, the global estimate holds,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C(\lambda, \delta, \alpha_1, T, \|u_0^{R'}\|_{H^1}) \|u_0^{R'}\|_{H^2}.$$

Next, we deal with the $W_{1,x}^2$ -estimate. By the chain rule and integration by parts, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \|x \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)\|^2 \\ & \leq 4 \left\langle x \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t), \mathbf{i} \Delta L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) \right\rangle g(t) \\ & \quad + 4|\lambda| \left\langle |x|^2 \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t), f'_\delta(|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)|^2) \operatorname{Re} \left(\overline{L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)} \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) \right) L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) \right\rangle \\ & \quad - 2\alpha_1 \|x \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|x \nabla L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t)\| \leq C(T, \delta, \alpha_1, \lambda) (\|x \nabla u_0^{R'}\| + \|u_0^{R'}\|_{H^2}).$$

Now we prove the convergence of $L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)$ in \mathcal{X}_1 as $R' \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that $L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g) \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$. On the one hand, by the unitary property of S_g and the properties of f_δ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{H^1} \\ & \leq \|S_g(t, 0)(u_0^{R'} - u_0)\|_{H^1} \\ & \quad + \int_0^t |\lambda| \|S_g(t-s) (f_\delta(|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)|^2) L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g) - f_\delta(|L_{u_0}^\delta(g)|^2) L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{H^1} ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t |\alpha_1| \|S_g(t-s) (L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g))\|_{H^1} ds \\ & \leq \|u_0^{R'} - u_0\|_{H^1} + \int_0^t |\lambda| (|\log(\delta)| + 2) \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)\|_{H^1} ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t |\alpha_1| \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)\|_{H^1} ds. \end{aligned}$$

The Gronwall's inequality yields that

$$(30) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C(|\lambda|, \delta, T, \alpha_1) \|u_0^{R'} - u_0\|_{H^1} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } R' \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, applying the chain rule and integration by parts, as well as Young's inequality, one can derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t))\|^2 \\ & \leq \|x(u_0^{R'} - u_0)\|^2 - 2\alpha_1 \int_0^t \|x(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s))\|^2 ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t 4 \langle x(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)), \mathbf{i} \nabla(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s)) \rangle h(s) ds \\ & \leq \|x(u_0^{R'} - u_0)\|^2 + \int_0^t 2 \|\nabla(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(s) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(s))\| h^2(s) ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t (2 - 2\alpha_1) \|x(L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g))\|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

According to (30) and Gronwall's inequality, we obtain that

$$(31) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|L_{u_0^{R'}}^\delta(g)(t) - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)(t)\|_{L_1^2} \leq C(\alpha_1, T) \|u_0^{R'} - u_0\|_{L_1^2} + C(|\lambda|, \delta, T, \alpha_1) \|u_0^{R'} - u_0\|_{H^1} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } R' \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, one can verify that $u^{\epsilon, u_0^{R'}, \delta}$ is an exponentially good approximation of $u^{\epsilon, \delta}$ and thus $I_{u_0}^\delta$ is also a good rate function under $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$.

Now we are able to prove the desired result. Since I^W is a good rate function, $K_T^{u_0}(\tilde{a})$ is compact set of $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)$ for any \tilde{a} . Define

$$A_{\tilde{a}}^{u_0} := \{v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1) \mid d_{\mathcal{C}([0, T])}(v, K_T^{u_0}(\tilde{a})) \geq \gamma\}.$$

Choosing g such that $I^W(g) < \tilde{a}$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \in A_{\tilde{a}}^{u_0}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)} \geq \gamma\right).$$

Then by the LDP, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$,

$$\epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(u^{\epsilon, u_0, \delta} \in A_{\tilde{a}}^{(u_0)}) \leq -(\tilde{a} - \kappa),$$

which implies the upper bound. Next, we consider the lower bound. Due to the continuity of $L_{u_0}^\delta(\cdot)$ and the compactness of C_a , for any $\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{X}_1} \leq \rho$ and $w \in K_T^{u_0, \delta}(a)$, there exists g such that $w = L_{u_0}^\delta(g)$ and $I_{u_0}^\delta(w) = I^W(g)$. By the LDP and the fact that $B_\gamma^w = \{v \mid \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)} < \gamma\}$ is an open set, there exists $\epsilon'_0 > 0$ such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon'_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon, u_0, \delta} - w\|_{\mathcal{C}([0, T]; \mathcal{X}_1)} < \gamma) & \geq - \inf_{v \in B_\gamma^w} I^{u_0, \delta}(v) - \kappa \\ & \geq -I^{u_0}(w) - \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 2

PROOF. Let us first prove the upper bound estimate (28)-(29). Fix $\kappa > 0$ small enough and choose g and T'_1 such that $L_0^\delta(g)(T'_1) \in (\overline{D})^c$ and

$$I_0^{\delta, T_1}(L_0^\delta(g)(T'_1)) = \frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{L^2([0, T'_1]; \mathbb{R})}^2 \leq \overline{M}^\delta + \frac{\kappa}{6}.$$

Let d_0 denote the positive distance between $L_0^\delta(g)(T'_1)$ and \overline{D} . Since f_δ is Lipschitz for a fixed δ , there exist a small ball $B_\rho^0 \subset D$ such that if u_0 belongs to B_ρ^0 ,

$$\|L_{u_0}^\delta(g) - L_0^\delta(g)\|_{C([0, T'_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} < \frac{d_0}{2}.$$

By the LDP in Theorem 2 and triangle inequality, there exists ϵ'_1 such that for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon'_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} < T'_1) &\geq \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} - L_0^\delta(g)\|_{C([0, T'_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} < d_0) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(\|u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} - L_{u_0}^\delta(g)\|_{C([0, T'_1]; \mathcal{X}_1)} < \frac{d_0}{2}) \\ &\geq \exp\left(-\frac{I_{u_0}^{\delta, T'_1} + \frac{\kappa}{6}}{\epsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4, there exist T'_2 and ϵ'_2 such that for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon'_2)$,

$$\inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Applying the Markov property, we get that for $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon'_1 \wedge \epsilon'_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_1 + T'_2) &\geq \inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_2) \inf_{u_0 \in B_\rho^0} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_1) \\ &\geq \exp\left(-\frac{I_{u_0}^{\delta, T'_1} + \frac{\kappa}{3}}{\epsilon}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that ϵ is small enough such that $\frac{1}{2} \geq e^{-\frac{\kappa}{6\epsilon}}$. Then for any $k \geq 1$, using the property of conditional probability, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > (k+1)(T'_1 + T'_2)) \\ &= \left[1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq (k+1)(T'_1 + T'_2) \mid \tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > k(T'_1 + T'_2)\right)\right] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > k(T'_1 + T'_2)) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_1 + T'_2)\right) \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > k(T'_1 + T'_2)) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_1 + T'_2)\right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $I_{u_0}^{\delta, T'_1}(L_{u_0}^\delta(g)) = I_0^{\delta, T'_1}(L_0^\delta(g)) = \frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{L^2([0, T'_1; \mathbb{R}])}^2$. Thus, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] &= \sup_{u_0 \in D} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > t) dt \\ &\leq (T'_1 + T'_2) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} > k(T'_1 + T'_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{(T'_1 + T'_2)}{1 - \inf_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq T'_1 + T'_2)} \\ &\leq (T'_1 + T'_2) \exp\left(\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \frac{\kappa}{2}}{\epsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

One can take ϵ small enough such that

$$(32) \quad \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \frac{2\kappa}{3}}{\epsilon}\right),$$

which implies (29). The Chebyshev inequality yields that

$$\sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \geq e^{\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \kappa}{\epsilon}}) \leq e^{-\frac{\overline{M}^\delta + \kappa}{\epsilon}} \sup_{u_0 \in D} \mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}] \leq e^{-\frac{\kappa}{3\epsilon}}.$$

As a consequence, (28) follows.

Below we are in a position to deal with lower bound estimate of $\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}$. By Lemma 3, we can choose $\rho > 0$ small enough such that $\underline{M}^\delta - \frac{\kappa}{4} \leq M_\rho^\delta$ and $B_{2\rho}^0 \subset D$, where $0 < \frac{\kappa}{4} < \inf_{\delta > 0} \underline{M}^\delta$.

Similar to [27], one can define two sequences of stopping times,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_k &= \inf\{t \geq \theta_k | u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}(t) \in B_\rho^0 \cup D^c\}, \\ \theta_{k+1} &= \inf\{t > \tau_k | u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}(t) \in S_{2\rho}^0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_0 = 0, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta_{k+1} = +\infty$ if $u^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0}(\tau_k) \in \partial D$.

Choosing T_3 in Lemma 6 that satisfies $L = \underline{M}^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}$, there exists ϵ small enough such that for all $k \geq 1$ and $u_0 \in D$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta_k - \tau_{k-1} \leq T_3) \leq e^{-\frac{\underline{M}^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}.$$

Note that the escapes before mT_3 with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$ occur in three cases, that is, Case 1, the escape occurs without passing B_ρ^0 ; Case 2, the trajectory of $u^{\epsilon, u_0, \delta}$ crosses $S_{2\rho}^0$ with k times and then escapes at τ_k ; Case 3: the escape occurs after τ_m which implies that there exists at least the length of one interval $[\tau_{k-1}, \theta_k]$ is smaller than T_3 .

As a consequence, for $u_0 \in D$,

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} \leq mT_3) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} = \tau_0) + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} = \tau^k) + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\theta_k - \tau_{k-1} < T_3) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} = \tau_0) + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon, \delta, u_0} = \tau^k) + me^{-\frac{\underline{M}^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Below we will estimate $\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} = \tau^k)$, $k \geq 1$, by using the fact that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} = \tau_k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \leq T_4, \tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} = \tau_k) + \sup_{y \in S_{2\rho}^0} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,y} > T_4)$$

for all $T_4 > 0$ with $y = u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(\theta_{k-1}) \in S_{2\rho}$. On the one hand, choosing T_4 as the time in Lemma 5 and $L = \underline{M}^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,y} > T_4) \leq e^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}.$$

On the other hand, using the LDP in Theorem 2, there exists ϵ small enough such that for $u_1 \in B_\rho^0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_1} \leq T_4) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(d_{\mathcal{C}([0,T_4];\mathcal{X}_1)}\left(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_1}, K_{T_4}^{u_1}\left(M^\delta - \frac{\kappa}{4}\right)\right) \geq \rho\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{\kappa}{2}}{\epsilon}} \leq e^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,u_0,\delta} \leq T_4, \tau^{\epsilon,u_0,\delta} = \tau_k) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(\tau^{k-1})} \leq T_4, \tau_k - \tau_{k-1} \leq T_4) \leq e^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}.$$

Combining the above estimates and (33), it holds that for ϵ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} \leq mT_3) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0} = \tau_0) + 3me^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(u^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}(\sigma_\rho^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}) \in \partial D) + 3me^{-\frac{M^\delta - \frac{3\kappa}{4}}{\epsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5, taking $m = \lceil \frac{1}{T_3} \exp(\frac{M^\delta - \kappa}{\epsilon}) \rceil$, we obtain (26). Applying the Chebyshev's inequality, the desired lower bound on $\mathbb{E}[\tau^{\epsilon,\delta,u_0}]$ follows. \square

References

- [1] G. P. Agrawal. Applications of Nonlinear Fiber Optics. Academic Press, San Diego, 2001.
- [2] G. P. Agrawal. Nonlinear Fiber Optics, 3rd ed. Academic Press, San Diego, 2001.
- [3] V. Barbu, M. Röckner, and D. Zhang. Stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations with linear multiplicative noise: rescaling approach. J. Nonlinear Sci., 24(3):383–409, 2014.
- [4] R. Belaouar, A. de Bouard, and A. Debussche. Numerical analysis of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion. Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput., 3(1):103–132, 2015.
- [5] C.-E. Bréhier and D. Cohen. Strong rates of convergence of a splitting scheme for Schrödinger equations with nonlocal interaction cubic nonlinearity and white noise dispersion. SIAM/ASA J. Uncertain. Quantif., 10(1):453–480, 2022.
- [6] C.-E. Bréhier and D. Cohen. Analysis of a splitting scheme for a class of nonlinear stochastic Schrödinger equations. Appl. Numer. Math., 186:57–83, 2023.
- [7] Z. Brzeźniak, F. Hornung, and L. Weis. Uniqueness of martingale solutions for the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on 3d compact manifolds. Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput., 10(3):828–857, 2022.
- [8] R. Carles and I. Gallagher. Universal dynamics for the defocusing logarithmic Schrödinger equation. Duke Math. J., 167(9):1761–1801, 2018.
- [9] C. Chen and J. Hong. Symplectic Runge–Kutta Semidiscretization for Stochastic Schrödinger Equation. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 54(4):2569–2593, 2016.
- [10] X. Chen. Random walk intersections, volume 157 of Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. Large deviations and related topics.

- [11] D. Cohen and G. Dujardin. Exponential integrators for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with white noise dispersion. Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput., 5(4):592–613, 2017.
- [12] J. Cui and J. Hong. Analysis of a splitting scheme for damped stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 56(4):2045–2069, 2018.
- [13] J. Cui, J. Hong, and Z. Liu. Strong convergence rate of finite difference approximations for stochastic cubic Schrödinger equations. J. Differential Equations, 263(7):3687–3713, 2017.
- [14] J. Cui, J. Hong, Z. Liu, and W. Zhou. Stochastic symplectic and multi-symplectic methods for nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion. J. Comput. Phys., 342:267–285, 2017.
- [15] J. Cui, J. Hong, Z. Liu, and W. Zhou. Strong convergence rate of splitting schemes for stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations. J. Differential Equations, 266(9):5625–5663, 2019.
- [16] J. Cui, J. Hong, and L. Sun. On global existence and blow-up for damped stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, 24(12):6837–6854, 2019.
- [17] J. Cui, S. Liu, and H. Zhou. Stochastic Wasserstein Hamiltonian flows. J. Dyn. Diff. Equat. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10884-023-10264-4>.
- [18] J. Cui and L. Sun. Stochastic logarithmic Schrödinger equations: energy regularized approach. arXiv:2102.12607, Accepted by SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 2023.
- [19] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions, volume 152 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2014.
- [20] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. A stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. Comm. Math. Phys., 205(1):161–181, 1999.
- [21] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. On the effect of a noise on the solutions of the focusing supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Probab. Theory Related Fields, 123(1):76–96, 2002.
- [22] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. Blow-up for the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. Ann. Probab., 33(3):1078–1110, 2005.
- [23] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. The nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion. J. Funct. Anal., 259(5):1300–1321, 2010.
- [24] A. Debussche and L. Di Menza. Numerical simulation of focusing stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Phys. D, 162(3-4):131–154, 2002.
- [25] A. Debussche and E. Gautier. Small noise asymptotic of the timing jitter in soliton transmission. Ann. Appl. Probab., 18(1):178–208, 2008.
- [26] A. Debussche and Y. Tsutsumi. 1D quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 96(4):363–376, 2011.
- [27] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. Large deviations techniques and applications, volume 38 of Applications of Mathematics (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [28] E. Desurvire. Erbium-Doped Fiber Amplifiers: Device and System Developments. A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., publication. Wiley, 2002.
- [29] R. Duboscq and A. Réveillac. On a stochastic Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality with application to Strichartz estimates for a noisy dispersion. Ann. H. Lebesgue, 5:263–274, 2022.
- [30] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. Random perturbations of dynamical systems, volume 260 of Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984. Translated from the Russian by Joseph Szücs.
- [31] E. Gautier. Large deviations and support results for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with additive noise and applications. ESAIM Probab. Stat., 9:74–97, 2005.
- [32] E. Gautier. Uniform large deviations for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. Stochastic Process. Appl., 115(12):1904–1927, 2005.
- [33] E. Gautier. Exit from a basin of attraction for stochastic weakly damped nonlinear Schrödinger equations. Ann. Probab., 36(3):896–930, 2008.
- [34] M. Hofmanová, M. Knöller, and K. Schratz. Randomized exponential integrators for modulated nonlinear Schrödinger equations. IMA J. Numer. Anal., 40(4):2143–2162, 2020.
- [35] I. A. Khovanov, D. G. Luchinsky, R. Mannella, and P. V. E. Mc Clintock. Fluctuational escape and related phenomena in nonlinear optical systems, volume 119 of Modern Nonlinear Optics, Part 3, Second Edition, Advances in Chemical Physics. Wiley, 2001.

- [36] R. Marty. Local error of a splitting scheme for a nonlinear Schrödinger-type equation with random dispersion. Commun. Math. Sci., 19(4):1051–1069, 2021.
- [37] T. Oh and M. Okamoto. On the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations at critical regularities. Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput., 8(4):869–894, 2020.
- [38] C. Sulem and P. Sulem. The nonlinear Schrödinger equation, volume 139 of Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. Self-focusing and wave collapse.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUNG HOM, HONG KONG.

Email address: jianbo.cui@polyu.edu.hk

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR. ACADEMY FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES, CAPITAL NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100048, CHINA.

Email address: liyingsun@lsec.cc.ac.cn