

The high-order approximation of SPDEs with multiplicative noise via amplitude equations

Shiduo Qu

School of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, PR China
qudjlu@hotmail.com

Hongjun Gao

School of Mathematics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, PR China
hjgao@seu.edu.cn

Abstract The emphasis of this paper is to investigate the high-order approximation of a class of SPDEs with cubic nonlinearity driven by multiplicative noise with the help of the amplitude equations. The highlight of our work is that we improve the convergence rate between the real solutions and the approximate ones. Precisely, previous results often focused on deriving the approximate solutions via the first-order amplitude equations. However, the approximate solutions are constructed by the first-order amplitude equations and the second-order ones in this paper. And, we rigorously prove that such approximate solutions enjoy improved convergence property. In order to illustrate this demonstration more intuitively, we apply our main theorem to stochastic Allen-Cahn equation, and provide numerical analysis.

Keywords Amplitude equations, Stochastic partial differential equations, High-order approximation.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 60H15 35R60 60H10.

1 Introduction

In the wake of developments in science and technology, there is a consensus that multi-scale phenomena are important characteristics of complex systems. The reasons for the occurrence of multi-scale phenomena can include perturbations from small-scale external forces, coupling between fast and slow scales, nonlinear interactions between macroscopic and microscopic patterns, and so on. For multi-scale models, it is usually difficult to obtain explicit solutions or analytical expressions due to the presence of small parameter. A typical example is that if the Reynolds number of Navier-Stokes equation for incompressible flows is too large, boundary layers appear and turbulent flows exhibit vortices over a large range of scales, which may cause more complexity [25]. Whereas, it is important to develop effective methods to describe and analyze the asymptotic dynamics of multi-scale systems.

Perturbation theory is a major research field of multi-scale problems. The origin of perturbation theory can be traced back to the work of astronomers, such as Lindstedt, Bohlin, Gylden, etc. They utilized the power series of small parameter to study the planetary motion and develop techniques to eliminate the secular terms in asymptotic solutions. Poincaré further proved that such parameter expansion method is effective. Thereafter, mathematicians develop various methods to investigate the approximate solutions of enormous types of perturbation systems, such as matched asymptotic expansions, averaging method and renormalization group method, and so on. The key idea behind these methods is to expand the solution of the original equation in power series with respect to the small parameter. The coefficients of the same degree are then calculated to construct an approximate solution, followed by the rigorous error estimations. For more backgrounds and details about perturbation theory, please refer [29, 41]. Generally, physicians and engineers are often not satisfied with obtaining only the first-order approximate solutions, but instead focus on the higher-order approximate solutions which enjoy higher accuracy and is more helpful in many practical applications, such as aerospace technology, hydrodynamics, thermodynamics and so on. Motivated by the reason, mathematicians further develop perturbation theory to satisfy the actual requirements.

In 1950s, Tikhonov [47, 48, 49] proved that the solutions for slow-fast ordinary differential equations can converge the solutions of corresponding degenerate equations, while the convergent rate was unknown. To improve the accuracy of Tikhonov's works, Vasil'eva and Butuzov [50] constructed the high-order approximate solutions by analyzing the boundary layer terms and regular ones of formal asymptotic expansions. Their method is called by boundary layer function method, by which there are many developments about high-order approximations during last decades [42, 43, 44, 51]. Scholars also made progress in the researches of renormalization group method. In 1999, Ziane [59] proposed a class of singularly perturbed systems, and obtained the first-order approximate solution by renormalization group method. In 2008, Lee DeVille et al [32] further obtained the approximate solution to second order. Recently, Li and Shi [35] generalized previous results to any order by developing a systematic and explicit strategy of renormalization group method. For the high-order approximation of PDEs, Wu and Ni [56, 57] studied the high-order approximation of reaction-diffusion equations with discontinuous reactive term, which can characterize the phenomena on various media interfaces. Levashova et al [33] considered a class of singularly perturbed elliptic equations, which can model layered semiconductor structures. They proved the existence of smooth solution, and show the accuracy of the asymptotic approximation. Chekroun and Liu [18] developed higher-order finite-horizon parameterizing manifolds, and considered

the pullback limit of two-layer backward–forward system of Burgers-type equation. And, relying on a power series expansion of the manifold function, they derived higher-order approximations of invariant manifolds in [19].

In addition to multi-scale phenomena, uncertainty and random fluctuations are also widespread in the natural world. In the recent two decades, more attentions are paid to asymptotic behaviors of multi-scale stochastic differential equations. So far, many methods are used to investigate effective dynamics of SDEs, such as averaging method [16, 17], homogenization method [54, 55], slow manifolds [5, 46], and so on. In particular, there are also some investigations about the high-order approximation in this field. Birrell and Wehr [15] obtained the high-order approximation of stochastic Langevin equations via the derivation of a hierarchy of SDEs. Following the idea from [15], Li et al [36] used averaging method to derive the high-order approximate solutions of a class of stochastic slow-fast systems. From the view of qualitative analysis, Chekroun et al [20, 21] developed stochastic parameterizing manifolds, showed the general framework of n-layer backward-forward system. Based the results in [20, 21], Li et al [34], and Xiao and Gao [52, 53] used 2-layer backward-forward system to investigate stochastic attractor bifurcation of Swift-Hohenberg equation. For smooth stable invariant manifold, Guo and Duan [27] taked the Taylor expansion of the nonlinear operator at the point of zero, and derived the high-order approximation of the local geometric shape. The previous results are devoted to SDEs or SPDEs with linear multiplicative noise, while few developments are achieved about the high-order approximation fo SPDEs with nonlinear multiplicative noise up to now. In addition, since it is still an open problem that whether SPDEs with nonlinear multiplicative noise can generate random dynamical system, the results in [20, 21, 27] are not applicable to nonlinear multiplicative noise. Whereas, the present work is to use another approach, amplitude equations, to investigate the high-order approximate solutions of multi-scale SPDEs with nonlinear multiplicative noise.

Amplitude amplitudes are the modes, which can dominate the evolution behaviors of complex systems. For SPDEs, the advantages of amplitude equations is not only to construct the approximate solutions of SPDEs, but also analyze whether the noise might shift the bifurcation. In 2001, Blömker et al used amplitude equations to investigate the attractivity and approximation for stochastic Swift-Hohenberg equation with additive noise on bounded domain, which is the first rigorous result in this field. After that, there are many extensions for the case that additive noise and bounded domain [6, 9, 11, 12]. More general cases are concerned in the last few years, such as multiplicative noise [3, 5], non-Markovian noise [4, 13, 58], and large or unbounded domains [1, 2, 8, 40]. Moreover, amplitude equations also contribute to the researches of

the random dynamics, such as invariant measure [6], random attractors [7], and center manifolds [14]. For the investigations of high-order amplitude equations, Blömker and Mohammed in [11] obtained the second-order amplitude equations for SPDEs with additive noise. However, to the best of our knowledge, few results are developed for multiplicative noise.

In this paper, we consider the following SPDEs with multiplicative noise:

$$du(t) = \mathcal{A}u(t) + \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{L}u(t) + \mathcal{F}(u(t))dt + \varepsilon G(u(t))dW(t), \quad u \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathcal{H} is an infinite dimensional separate Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and corresponding norm $\| \cdot \|$, \mathcal{A} is assumed to be a self-adjoint and non-positive operator with finite dimensional kernel space called dominant modes, \mathcal{L} is a linear operator, \mathcal{F} is cubic nonlinearity with dissipativity condition, $G(u(t))$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator with $G(0) = 0$, $W(t)$ is a standard cylindrical Wiener process on some stochastic basis. In (1.1), ε is the small parameter representing the distance from bifurcation in the drift part, while it characterizes the strength of the noise in the diffusion one. It is worthwhile to note that many models fit in the framework of (1.1), such as stochastic Allen-Cahn equation, stochastic Swift-Hohenberg equation. From the perspective of perturbation theory, (1.1) is seen as PDEs with small deterministic perturbation and stochastic force. In [5], Blömker and Fu derived the first-order amplitude equations of (1.1), used it to construct the approximation solutions of (1.1), and proved that the error between the real solutions and the approximate ones is of order ε^2 . Indeed, such convergence rate is comparable to the order of linear perturbation $\mathcal{L}u$. As mentioned earlier, physicists and engineers are interesting in pursuing more precise and valid approximation solutions of perturbation systems to meet the demands in accuracy of physical experiments and practical applications. Therefore, it is meaningful and necessary to further investigate the high-order approximation of (1.1). In order to achieve this goal, we want to abstract more effective information from dominant modes. In other words, we not only need the first-order amplitude equations, but also the second-order ones.

The aim of this paper is to derive the first-order and second-order amplitude equations of (1.1), and use them to obtain the high-order approximate solutions. In brief, (1.1) is firstly decomposed into slow modes and fast ones after time scaling. Secondly, we abstract the first-order amplitude equations from slow modes, and use it to obtain the high-order approximation of fast modes. Finally, we further derive the second-order amplitude equations, and construct the high-order approximate solutions of (1.1). The main difficulties of this paper happen in the last step. Precisely, the first-order amplitude equations can be obtained by separating the terms of order ε from slow modes as [5]. However, in order to obtain the second-order amplitude equations, we

have to eliminate those terms of order ε^2 hiding in slow modes. Moreover, the terms of ε^2 can be separated after careful error estimations, but it exist still the fast fluctuations in the diffusion part. Indeed, if such fast fluctuations are 0, then we can obtain the second-order amplitude equations, and prove the approximate solutions converge to the real ones with convergence rate ε^3 . If else, we need further consideration on the case that such fast fluctuations are not 0. Similar problems were solved in [9, 11, 39], in which the fluctuating fast OU-processes appear in the diffusion part. However, the fast fluctuations that we encounter are more general than OU-processes since they are coupled with the first amplitude equations. Therefore, we need more precise error analysis to overcome this trouble, and obtain the second amplitude equations as well as the approximate solutions. From the technical reason, we just can show the approximate solutions weakly converge the real ones without explicit rate when the kernel space of \mathcal{A} has more than one dimension. But, if such kernel space is one-dimensional, we can rigorously prove that the error rate is of order $\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we list basic assumptions and review relevant concepts. In Section 3, the first-order amplitude equations is shown, and the error analysis about the slow and fast modes are given. In Section 4, we present the second-order amplitude equations and main theorems. In Section 5, we apply our results to stochastic Allen-Cahn equation. The last Section is conclusion and future research interest.

2 Assumptions and Notations

Referring to the framework of [5, 11, 39], some assumptions and notations we use later are presented here. In the sequel, we take C as a positive constant, which may be different between occurrences but does not depend on the parameter ε unless otherwise specified.

Assumption 2.1 *Assume that \mathcal{A} is a non-positive and self-adjoint operator on \mathcal{H} with eigenvalues $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k \dots$, and $\lambda_k \geq Ck^m$ holds for all sufficiently large k , positive constants m and C . Suppose that there is a complete orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mathcal{A}e_k = -\lambda_k e_k$. Denote $\ker \mathcal{A}$ and the orthogonal complement of it by \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{S} . Suppose $\dim \mathcal{N} = N < \infty$.*

Define projections $P_c : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ and $P_s = I - P_c$ with identical operator I . For a map L , we use $L_c := P_c L$ and $L_s := P_s L$.

Definition 2.1 *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the space \mathcal{H}^α as*

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha := \mathcal{D}(I - \mathcal{A})^\alpha = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k^2 (\lambda_k + 1)^{2\alpha} < \infty \right\}$$

with the norm

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k \right\|_{\alpha} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k^2 (\lambda_k + 1)^{2\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If \mathcal{A} satisfies Assumption 2.1, it generates an analytic semi-group $\{e^{\mathcal{A}t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ on any space \mathcal{H}^{α} , defined by

$$e^{\mathcal{A}t} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k e_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_k t} \gamma_k e_k, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Another property of \mathcal{A} is the following inequality.

Lemma 2.1 [45] *Under Assumption 2.1, for all $\beta \leq \alpha$, $\rho \in (\lambda_n, \lambda_{n+1}]$, there is a constant $M > 0$, such that for all $u \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta}$,*

$$\|e^{\mathcal{A}t} P_s u\|_{\alpha} \leq M t^{-\frac{\alpha-\beta}{m}} e^{-\rho t} \|P_s u\|_{\beta}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Assumption 2.2 *Assume that $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\beta}$ is a linear continuous mapping that commutes with P_c and P_s , for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta \in [0, m)$.*

We remark that it is sufficient for the above assumptions that \mathcal{A} is polynomial of the Laplacian and \mathcal{L} is a lower order differential operator commuting with \mathcal{A} .

Assumption 2.3 *Let α and β be given in Assumption 2.2. Assume that $\mathcal{F} : (\mathcal{H}^{\alpha})^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\beta}$ is a trilinear, symmetric mapping that satisfies the following conditions:*

$$\|\mathcal{F}(u, v, w)\|_{\alpha-\beta} \leq C_0 \|u\|_{\alpha} \|v\|_{\alpha} \|w\|_{\alpha}, \quad \forall u, v, w \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}, \quad (2.1)$$

and $\forall u, v, w \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_c(u, u, w), w \rangle \leq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_c(u + v + w) - \mathcal{F}_c(v), u \rangle \leq -C_2 \|u\|^4 + C_3 \|w\|^4 + C_4 \|w\|^2 \|v\|^2, \quad (2.3)$$

where C_0, C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 are positive constants, and $\mathcal{F}(u) := \mathcal{F}(u, u, u)$.

Assumption 2.4 *Let U be a separable Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U$. Assume that $W(t)$ be a standard cylindrical Wiener process in U on a stochastic base $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$.*

Note that $W(t)$ has the expansion [24]

$$W(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_k(t) f_k,$$

where $\{\beta_k(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are real valued Brownian motions mutually independent on the above stochastic basis, and $\{f_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a complete orthonormal system in U .

We remark $W(t)$ is not U -valued random process, but the stochastic integral is well defined in this paper. For stochastic integral for cylindrical Wiener processes, please see [24].

Here we recall the definition of a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Suppose that U_1, U_2 are two separable Hilbert spaces. A linear and bounded operator $L : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ is said to be Hilbert-Schmidt if

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|Ll_j\|_{U_2}^2 < \infty,$$

where $\{l_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a complete orthonormal basis in U_1 . We remark the norm is independent of the choice of the basis $\{l_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Denote the set of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from U_1 to U_2 by $\mathcal{L}_2(U_1, U_2)$. Note that $\mathcal{L}_2(U_1, U_2)$ is separable Hilbert space, with the scalar product

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2(U_1, U_2)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle l_j, \cdot l_j \rangle_{U_2},$$

by which the norm of $\mathcal{L}_2(U_1, U_2)$ is induced.

Assumption 2.5 *Suppose that $G : \mathcal{H}^\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)$ with α as in Assumption 2.2, and $G(0) = 0$. Moreover, $G(\cdot)$ is Fréchet differentiable up to order 3, and satisfies $\forall u, v, w, x \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha$ with $\|u\|_\alpha \leq r$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(u)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)} &\leq l_r \|u\|_\alpha, \\ \|G'(u) \cdot v\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)} &\leq l_r \|v\|_\alpha, \\ \|G''(u) \cdot (v, w)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)} &\leq l_r \|v\|_\alpha \|w\|_\alpha, \\ \|G'''(u) \cdot (v, w, x)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)} &\leq l_r \|v\|_\alpha \|w\|_\alpha \|x\|_\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where l_r depends on r . Here $G'(u)$, $G''(u)$ and $G'''(u)$ are the first, second and third Fréchet derivatives with respect to u , respectively. Specially, $G'(0)(\cdot)$ is a linear operator: $\mathcal{H}^\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)$.

Definition 2.2 *An \mathcal{H}^α -valued process $u(t)$ is called a local mild solution of problem (1.1), if there exists some stopping time τ_{ex} , we have on a set of probability 1 that $\tau_{ex} > 0$, $u \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, \tau_{ex}), \mathcal{H}^\alpha)$ and*

$$u(t) = e^{At}u(0) + \int_0^t e^{A(t-s)}[\varepsilon^2 \mathcal{L}u(t) + \mathcal{F}(u(t))]ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{A(t-s)}G(u(t))dW(s),$$

$\forall t \in [0, \tau_{ex})$.

In view of the cut-off technique and Theorem 7.2 in [24], we can prove that (1.1) has a unique local mild solution as the next theorem shown.

Theorem 2.2 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for any given $u(0) \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha$, there exists a unique local mild solution of problem (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.2 such that $\tau_{ex} = \infty$ or $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_{ex}} \|u(t)\|_\alpha = \infty$.*

We would like to state that a solution in the sense of Theorem 2.2 with τ_{ex} maximal is always used in the paper.

3 Preliminary Lemmas

Introduce slow time-scale $T = \varepsilon^2 t$ and decompose the local mild solution of (1.1) as

$$u(t) = \varepsilon a_1(T) + \varepsilon^2 a_2(T) + \varepsilon \psi(T), \quad (3.1)$$

where $a_1 \in \mathcal{N}$ is the first-order term of slow modes, $a_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ is the second-order term of slow modes, and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}$ is the fast modes. Since the main motivation of the paper is to capture the effective dynamics of $u(t)$ up to second-order approximation, we hope to pay more attention to the study of $a_2(T)$ and corresponding second-order amplitude equations. Hence, it is natural and intuitive to suppose that $a_1(T)$ satisfy the first-order amplitude equations of $u(t)$ [5]:

$$a_1(T) = a_1(0) + \int_0^T [\mathcal{L}_c a_1 + \mathcal{F}_c(a_1)] ds + \int_0^T G'_c(0)(a_1) d\tilde{W}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\tilde{W}(T) := \varepsilon W(\varepsilon^{-2}T)$ is a rescaled version of the Wiener process $W(T)$ with the same law. Then, the second-order term $a_2(T)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(T) &= a_2(0) + \int_0^T [\mathcal{L}_c a_2 + \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}_c(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi) - \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}_c(a_1)] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T [\varepsilon^{-2} G_c(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi) - \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(a_1)] d\tilde{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and the fast modes satisfy

$$\psi(T) = \mathcal{Q}(T) + J(T) + V(T), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(T) &= e^{\mathcal{A}_s T \varepsilon^{-2}} \psi(0), \\ J(T) &= \int_0^T e^{\mathcal{A}_s (T-s) \varepsilon^{-2}} [\mathcal{L}_s \psi + \mathcal{F}_s(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi)] ds, \\ V(T) &= \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^T e^{\mathcal{A}_s (T-s) \varepsilon^{-2}} [G_s(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi)] d\tilde{W}. \end{aligned}$$

3.1 Estimations on Fast Modes

We are going to provide some estimations about $\psi(T)$, which can allow us to analyze $a_2(T)$ with more convenience. Let us introduce a stopping time τ^* such that $a_1(T)$, $a_2(T)$ and $\psi(T)$ do not blow up for $T \in [0, \tau^*]$.

Definition 3.3 For an $\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{S}$ -valued stochastic process $(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2, \psi)$ given by (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4), we define, for $T_0 > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{20})$, the stopping time τ^* as

$$\tau^* := T_0 \wedge \inf\{T > 0, \|a_1(T)\|_\alpha > \varepsilon^{-\kappa} \text{ or } \|a_2(T)\|_\alpha > \varepsilon^{-\kappa} \text{ or } \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha > \varepsilon^{-\kappa}\}.$$

Lemma 3.3 Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|J(T)\|_\alpha^p\right) \leq C\varepsilon^{2p-3\kappa p}.$$

Proof Letting $\hat{J} = \mathcal{L}_s\psi + \mathcal{F}_s(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi)$, it is easy to own

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|J(T)\|_\alpha^p\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left(\int_0^T \|e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} \hat{J}\|_\alpha ds\right)^p \\ & \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta p}{m}} \mathbb{E}\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left(\int_0^T e^{-\varepsilon^{-2}\rho(T-s)} (T-s)^{-\frac{\beta}{m}} \|\hat{J}\|_{\alpha-\beta} ds\right)^p \\ & \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta p}{m}-3\kappa p} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left(\int_0^T e^{-\varepsilon^{-2}\rho(T-s)} (T-s)^{-\frac{\beta}{m}} ds\right)^p \\ & \leq C\varepsilon^{2p-3\kappa p}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds by Lemma 2.1, and the third one holds due to Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3.

Lemma 3.4 Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|V(T)\|_\alpha^p\right) \leq C\varepsilon^{p-2\kappa p},$$

Proof This proof is based on factorization method and fairly standard, but we provide it for the sake of completeness. For $p > 2$, let $\gamma \in (\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2})$, and introduce

$$\mathcal{D}(T) = \int_0^T (T-s)^{-\gamma} e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} [G_s(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi)] d\tilde{W}. \quad (3.5)$$

By Stochastic Fubini Theorem, we obtain

$$\int_0^T e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} [G_s(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi)] d\tilde{W} = C_\gamma \int_0^T (T-s)^{\gamma-1} e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} \mathcal{D}(s) ds,$$

where C_γ is a constant dependent of γ . Then, in view of Lemma 2.1 and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V(T)\|_\alpha^p &\leq C\varepsilon^{-p} \left(\int_0^T (T-s)^{\gamma-1} e^{-\rho(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} \|\mathcal{D}(s)\|_\alpha ds \right)^p \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{-p} \left(\int_0^T (T-s)^{\frac{p(\gamma-1)}{p-1}} e^{\frac{-\rho(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}p}{p-1}} ds \right)^{p-1} \int_0^T \|\mathcal{D}(s)\|_\alpha^p ds \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{2\gamma p-2-p} \int_0^T \|\mathcal{D}(s)\|_\alpha^p ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Furthermore, we obtain that for $T \in [0, \tau^*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{D}(T)\|_\alpha^p &\leq C\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T (T-s)^{-2\gamma} \|e^{\mathcal{A}_s(t-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} \bar{G}_s(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^p \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T (T-s)^{-2\gamma} e^{-2\rho(t-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \tau^*]}(s) \|a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi\|_\alpha^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{2p-2\gamma p} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_1(T) + \varepsilon a_2(T) + \psi(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{2p-2\gamma p-\kappa p}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where the first inequality holds because of Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality without the supremum in time (Lemma 7.2 of [24]), and the second inequality holds due to Lemma 2.1 and Assumption 2.5.

By (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain that for $p > 2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|V(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C\varepsilon^{p-\kappa p-2}.$$

Obviously, this proof can be completed by Hölder inequality.

According to Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, we show the boundedness of ψ as follows.

Lemma 3.5 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $a_1(T)$ defined in (3.2), and $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C(\varepsilon^{p-3\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p), \quad (3.8)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|K(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C(\varepsilon^{p-2\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{p-\kappa p}), \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T) - \mathcal{Q}(T) - K(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C\varepsilon^{2p-3\kappa p}, \quad (3.10)$$

where $K(T) = \int_0^T e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(a_1 + \mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}$.

Proof It is easy to obtain (3.8) by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4. The proof of (3.9) is similar to that of Lemma (3.4). And, we can also prove (3.10) with the help of Assumption 2.5 and factorization method. In fact, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|V(T) - K(T)\|_\alpha \right)^p \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{p-2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\varepsilon^{-1} G(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi) - G'(0)(a_1 + \mathcal{Q})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

By Taylor expansion, we notice that there exists $\theta(T)$ on the line between 0 and $\varepsilon(a_1(T) + \varepsilon a_2(T) + \psi(T))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^{-1} G(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi) - G'(0)(a_1 + \mathcal{Q}) \\ & = \varepsilon^{-1} [(G(0) + G'(0)(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} G''(\theta)(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi, \varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon \psi)] - G'(0)(a_1 + \mathcal{Q}) \\ & = G'(0)(\varepsilon a_2 + J + V) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} G''(\theta)(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Then, combining (3.11) with (3.12), we complete the proof.

Here, we would like to comment Lemma 3.5. From (3.8), we know the first-order approximation of $\psi(T)$ is just $\mathcal{Q}(T)$ (i.e., the information about the initial value of $\psi(T)$). As shown in (3.10), we can improve the approximation of ψ up to second-order if we take account into the information about the first-order amplitude equations $a_1(T)$.

3.2 Estimations on Slow modes

This subsection is devoted to getting rid of the high-order terms from $a_2(T)$, and deriving the second-order amplitude equations. Let us start with the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.6 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$ $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_i, a_j, \psi) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C (\varepsilon^{p-5\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p-2\kappa p}), \\ & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_i, \psi, \psi) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C (\varepsilon^{2p-7\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^{2p} \varepsilon^{2p-\kappa p}), \\ & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(\psi) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C (\varepsilon^{3p-9\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^{3p} \varepsilon^{2p}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof Since the proof of the above inequalities are similar, we just prove the first one for simplicity. Recalling the fact that for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, all \mathcal{H}^α norms are

equivalent on \mathcal{N} , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_i, a_j, \psi) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left[\int_0^T \|\mathcal{F}_c(a_i, a_j, \psi)\|_{\alpha-\beta} ds \right]^p \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left[\int_0^T \|a_i\|_\alpha \|a_j\|_\alpha (\|\mathcal{Q}\|_\alpha + \|J\|_\alpha + \|V\|_\alpha) ds \right]^p \right) \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^{\frac{2\beta p}{m} - 2\kappa p} \left(\int_0^{T_0} s^{-\frac{\beta}{m}} e^{-\rho \varepsilon^{-2}s} \|\psi(0)\|_{\alpha-\beta} ds \right)^p + C \varepsilon^{p-5\kappa p} \\
& \leq C (\varepsilon^{p-5\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p-2\kappa p}),
\end{aligned}$$

where Assumption 2.3 is used in the second inequality, Lemmas 2.1, 3.3 and 3.4 are used in the third one.

Lemma 3.7 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, K) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C (\varepsilon^{2p-6\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p-5\kappa p}).$$

Proof For completing the proof, it is sufficient to prove that for $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left| \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, K), e_i \rangle ds \right|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C (\varepsilon^{2p-6\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p-5\kappa p}),$$

Let us achieve this goal in the followings. Recall $K(T)$ satisfies

$$dK = \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{A}_s K dT + G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q} + a_1) d\tilde{W}.$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K), e_i \rangle$, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1(T), a_1(T), \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K(T)), e_i \rangle - \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1(0), a_1(0), \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K(0)), e_i \rangle \\
& = \int_0^T [2 \langle \mathcal{F}_c(\mathcal{L}_c a_1 + \mathcal{F}_c(a_1), a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K), e_i \rangle + \varepsilon^{-2} \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, K), e_i \rangle] ds \\
& + \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \mathcal{F}_c(G'_c(0)(a_1) f_j, G'_c(0)(a_1) f_j, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K), e_i \rangle ds \\
& + 2 \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \mathcal{F}_c(G'_c(0)(a_1) f_j, a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q} + a_1) f_j), e_i \rangle ds \\
& + 2 \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, G'_c(0)(a_1) \cdot, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}K), e_i \rangle d\tilde{W} \\
& + \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1}G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q} + a_1) \cdot), e_i \rangle d\tilde{W}
\end{aligned}$$

Noting \mathcal{A}_s^{-1} is a bounded linear operator from \mathcal{H}^α to $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \subset \mathcal{H}^\alpha$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T^*} \left| \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(\mathcal{L}_c a_1 + \mathcal{F}_c(a_1), a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1} K), e_i \rangle ds \right|^p \right) \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T^*} \left[\int_0^T \|a_1\|_\alpha^4 \|K\|_\alpha ds \right]^p \right) \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon^{p-6\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{p-5\kappa p}), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (3.9) in the last inequality. Similarly, other drift terms can be estimated. Using Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we can also estimate diffusion terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T^*} \left| \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, G'_c(0)(a_1) \cdot, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1} K), e_i \rangle d\tilde{W} \right|^p \right) \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon^{p-4\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{p-3\kappa p}), \\ & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T^*} \left| \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, \mathcal{A}_s^{-1} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q} + a_1) \cdot), e_i \rangle d\tilde{W} \right|^p \right) \\ & \leq C(\varepsilon^{-3\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{p-2\kappa p}). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all the estimations, we complete the proof.

By Lemma 3.7, it is straightforward to have the next result.

Lemma 3.8 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, \psi) ds \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C(\varepsilon^{2p-6\kappa p} + \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p-5\kappa p}).$$

Lemma 3.9 *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, for $T_0 > 0$ and $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left\| \int_0^T G'_c(0) \left[\int_0^s e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}(r) \right] d\tilde{W}(s) \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \varepsilon^{2p}.$$

Proof For $p > 2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left\| \int_0^T G'_c(0) \left[\int_0^s e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}(r) \right] d\tilde{W}(s) \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\int_0^{T_0} (\mathbb{E} \left\| G'_c(0) \left[\int_0^s e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}(r) \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_0^{T_0} (\mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^s e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}(r) \right\|_\alpha^p ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \int_0^s \|e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^2 dr ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0}\int_0^s\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\|e^{A_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}}G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q})f_j\|_{\alpha}^2drds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0}\int_0^se^{-2\rho(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\|G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q})f_j\|_{\alpha}^2drds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&= C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0}\int_0^se^{-\rho(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}}\|G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,\mathcal{H}^{\alpha})}^2drds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0}\int_0^se^{-\rho(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}}\|\mathcal{Q}\|_{\alpha}drds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0}e^{-\rho s\varepsilon^{-2}}sds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\|\psi(0)\|_{\alpha}^p \\
&\leq C\|\psi(0)\|_{\alpha}^p\varepsilon^{2p},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 7.7 of [24] in the second line, and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality in the fourth one. The case for $1 < p \leq 2$ still holds due to Hölder inequality.

Lemma 3.10 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$ and $\|\psi(0)\|_{\alpha} \leq \varepsilon$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*}\left\|\int_0^T\mathcal{M}(s)d\tilde{W}\right\|_{\alpha}^p\right) \leq C\varepsilon^{p-9\kappa p},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}(T) &= \varepsilon^{-2}G_c(\varepsilon a_1(T) + \varepsilon^2 a_2(T) + \varepsilon\psi(T)) - \varepsilon^{-1}G'_c(0)(a_1(T)) - G'_c(0)(a_2(T)) \\
&\quad - \varepsilon^{-1}G'_c(0)\left(\int_0^Te^{A_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}}G'_s(0)(a_1)d\tilde{W}\right) - \frac{1}{2}G''_c(0)(a_1(T), a_1(T))
\end{aligned}$$

Proof By Taylor expansion, we know that there exists $\tilde{\theta}(t)$ on the line between 0 and $\varepsilon(a_1(T) + \varepsilon a_2(T) + \psi(T))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon^{-2}G(\varepsilon a_1 + \varepsilon^2 a_2 + \varepsilon\psi) \\
&= \varepsilon^{-1}G'(0)(a_1 + \psi) + G'(0)(a_2) + \frac{1}{2}G''(0)(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi) \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{6}G'''(\tilde{\theta})(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi). \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Based on (3.13), we turn to prove that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*}\left\|\int_0^T\bar{\mathcal{M}}(s)d\tilde{W}\right\|_{\alpha}^p\right) \leq C\varepsilon^{p-9\kappa p}, \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}(T) = \varepsilon^{-1}G'_c(0)[\mathcal{Q}(T) + J(T) + V(T) - K(T)]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0) \left(\int_0^T e^{A_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}(s) \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi) - \frac{1}{2} G''(0)(a_1, a_1) \\
& + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} G'''_c(\tilde{\theta})(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi, a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi).
\end{aligned}$$

By Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W} \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \\
& \leq C \|\psi(0)\|_\alpha^p \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^p,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \left\| \int_0^T G''_c(0)(\psi, \psi) d\tilde{W} \right\|_\alpha^p \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \tau^*]} \|G''_c(0)(\psi, \psi)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \tau^*]} \|\psi\|_\alpha^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \tau^*]} (\|\mathcal{Q}\|_\alpha^2 + \|J\|_\alpha^2 + \|V\|_\alpha^2) ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^{2p-3\kappa p}.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimations of other terms can be obtained in view of Lemmas 3.3, 3.4 and 3.9.

Remark 3.11 In [5], the initial value of fast modes is assumed to be of order $\varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, but we need $\psi(0)$ is of order ε as provided in Lemma 3.10. Indeed, it is reasonable and plausible to adopt this assumption. If else, fast modes could be involved in the second-order amplitude equations. However, our aim is to obtain the approximation of SPDEs via SDEs, so it is better to study the amplitude equations without information about the fast modes. The other reason is from the technical aspect. In other words, $\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Q}) d\tilde{W}$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha)$, and we can not separate any high-order terms from it. Nevertheless, an alternative assumption is $G'_c(0)(\psi(0))\mathcal{U} = 0$, for any $\mathcal{U} \in U$, but we dismiss this case for the sake of simplicity.

Thanks to previous preliminaries, we now can separate some high-order terms from $a_2(T)$.

Lemma 3.12 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$ and $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(T) &= a_2(0) + \int_0^T [\mathcal{L}_c a_2 + 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, a_2)] ds + \int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} \\ &\quad + \int_0^T [G'_c(0)(a_2) + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1)] d\tilde{W} + R_1(T), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}(T) = \int_0^T e^{\mathcal{A}_s(T-s)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(a_1) d\tilde{W},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_1(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{p-9\kappa p}.$$

Proof By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8, we can obtain that

$$\int_0^T [\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}_c(a_1 + \varepsilon a_2 + \psi) - \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{F}_c(a_1) - 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, a_2)] ds = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-9\kappa}).$$

Then, using Lemma 3.10 to bound the high-order terms of the diffusion term, we complete the proof.

With the help of Lemma 3.12, we get rid of the high-order terms $R_1(T)$ from (3.15), and derive the reduced system of $a_2(T)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} b(T) &= a_2(0) + \int_0^T [\mathcal{L}_c b + 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, b)] ds + \int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} \\ &\quad + \int_0^T [G'_c(0)(b) + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1)] d\tilde{W}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Note that there still exists the fast fluctuation $\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W}$ in (3.16), which results in that (3.16) can be not the second-order amplitude equations as desired. Before further analyzing such fast fluctuation term, let us present some estimations about $a_1(T)$, $a_2(T)$ and $b(T)$ as follows.

Lemma 3.13 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $a_1(T)$ given in (3.2), $T_0 > 0$ and $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|a_1(T)\|^p \right) \leq C \|a_1(0)\|^p.$$

Proof The proof follows from Lemma 4.8 in [5].

Lemma 3.14 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $a_1(T)$ given in (3.2), $T_0 > 0$ and $p > 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \int_0^T \|G'_c(0) \int_0^s [e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_r(0)(a_1)] d\tilde{W}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p ds \right) \leq C \varepsilon^p \|a_1(0)\|^p.$$

Proof For $p > 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \int_0^T \|G'_c(0) \int_0^s [e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(a_1)] d\tilde{W}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p ds \right) \\
& \leq \int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{E} \|G'_c(0) \int_0^s [e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(a_1)] d\tilde{W}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p ds \\
& \leq C \int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^s [e^{\mathcal{A}_s(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} G'_s(0)(a_1)] d\tilde{W}(r) \right\|_\alpha^p ds \\
& \leq C \int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^s (e^{2\rho(s-r)\varepsilon^{-2}} \|a_1\|^2) dr \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} ds \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^p \|a_1(0)\|^p,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds from Assumption 2.5, the third one holds due to Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, and the last one holds by Lemma 3.13.

Lemma 3.15 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $a_2(T)$ and $b(T)$ given in (3.15) and (3.16) respectively, $T_0 > 0$, $p > 1$ and $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|b(T)\|^p \right) \leq C(1 + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p} + \|a_2(0)\|^p), \quad (3.17)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|b(T) - a_2(T)\|^p \right) \leq C\varepsilon^{p-18\kappa p}(1 + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p}), \quad (3.18)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|a_2(T)\|^p \right) \leq C(1 + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p} + \|a_2(0)\|^p). \quad (3.19)$$

Proof This proof of (3.17) is similar to Lemma 3.13, but we would like to show it for the completeness.

Set the stopping time $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}$:

$$\tau_{\mathcal{K}} := \inf\{T > 0, \|b(T)\| > \mathcal{K}\}.$$

For $p \geq 2$ and $T \in [0, T_0 \wedge \tau_{\mathcal{K}}]$, applying Itô's formula to (3.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|b(T)\|^p & \leq C\|a_2(0)\|^p + C \int_0^T \|b\|^{p-2} [\langle \mathcal{L}_c b, b \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, b), b \rangle] ds \\
& \quad + C \int_0^T \|b\|^{p-2} \langle b, G'_c(0)(b) + G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} \rangle \\
& \quad + C \int_0^T \|b\|^{p-2} \|G'_c(0)(b) + G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain that for any $T_1 \in [0, T_0]$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_1 \wedge \tau_{\mathcal{K}}} \|b(T)\|^p \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|a_2(0)\|^p + C\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0}\|a_1(t)\|^{2p}\right) + C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_1\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b_1(s)\|^p ds\right) \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_1\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b_1(s)\|^{2p} ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\varepsilon^p\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_1\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,\mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^p ds\right) \\
&\quad + C\varepsilon^{-p}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_1\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,\mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^{2p} ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C(1 + \|a_2(0)\|^p + \|a(0)\|^{2p}) + C\int_0^{T_1}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq s_1\leq s\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(s_1)\|^p\right) ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_1\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(T)\|^p\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, the second one follows from Young's inequality and Lemma 3.14. Furthermore, using Gronwall's lemma, we derive that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(T)\|^p\right) \leq C(1 + \|a_2(0)\|^p + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p}).$$

Next task is to replace $T_0 \wedge \tau_{\mathcal{K}}$ with T_0 . Denoting the right side of the last inequality by \tilde{C} , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{\mathcal{K}} > T_0\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{T\leq T_0\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(T)\| < \mathcal{K}\right) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{T\leq T_0\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(T)\| \geq \mathcal{K}\right) \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{\tilde{C}}{\mathcal{K}^p},
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the above inequality that if $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \infty$, $\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(t)\|^p$ monotonously converges to $\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0}\|b(t)\|^p$ *a.s.*. Then, monotone convergence theorem yields that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0}\|b(T)\|^p\right) = \lim_{\mathcal{K}\rightarrow\infty}\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq T\leq T_0\wedge\tau_{\mathcal{K}}}\|b(T)\|^p\right) \leq \tilde{C}.$$

We can further use Hölder inequality to prove (3.17) for $1 < p < 2$.

Now, let us prove (3.18) and (3.19). Let $h(T) = b(T) - a_2(T) + R_1(T)$, $T \in [0, \tau^*]$. Then, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
h(T) &= \int_0^T \mathcal{L}_c(h - R_1) ds + 3 \int_0^T \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, h - R_1) ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^T G'_c(0)(h - R_1) d\tilde{W}(s).
\end{aligned}$$

For $p \geq 2$, we use Itô's formula again to obtain that

$$\|h(T)\|^p$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{L}_c(h - R_1), h \rangle ds + C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, h - R_1), h \rangle ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \langle h, \bar{G}'_c(0)(h - R_1) d\tilde{W} \rangle + C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \|h - R_1\|^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to condition (2.2), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Young's inequality, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|h(T)\|^p \\
&\leq C \int_0^T (\|h\|^p + \|R_1\|^p + \|R_1\|^p \|a_1\|^{2p}) ds + C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \|h - R_1\|^2 ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^T \|h\|^{p-2} \langle h, \bar{G}'_c(0)(h - R_1) d\tilde{W} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.12, we know $R_1(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-9\kappa})$. Then, in virtue of Lemma 3.13 and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, it is easy to obtain that for any $T_2 \in [0, T_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_2 \wedge \tau^*} \|h(T)\|^p \right) \\
&\leq C \varepsilon^{p-18\kappa p} (1 + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p}) + C \int_0^{T_2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s_1 \leq s \wedge \tau^*} \|h(s_1)\|^p \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, with the help of Gronwall's lemma, we own that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|h(T)\|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{p-18\kappa p} (1 + \|a_1(0)\|^{2p}). \quad (3.20)$$

Therefore, (3.18) and (3.19) are the consequent results of (3.17) and (3.20).

4 Main results

Recalling that there exists the term dependent of the parameter ε in (3.16), thus we need to further deal with the trouble. Let us now investigate (3.16) in two cases.

Case I: $\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} = 0$, for $T \in [0, T_0]$, *a.s.*.

In this case, we assume

$$\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} = 0, \text{ for } T \in [0, T_0], \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.1)$$

We remark that the sufficient condition for (4.1) is either $G'_s(0)\bar{n}\mathcal{U} = 0$, for any $\bar{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{U} \in U$, or $G'_c(0)\bar{s}\mathcal{U} = 0$, for any $\bar{s} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{U} \in U$. In this case, we can easily obtain the second-order amplitude equations as follows:

$$\bar{b}(T) = a_2(0) + \int_0^T [\mathcal{L}_c \bar{b} + 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1, a_1, \bar{b})] ds + \int_0^T [G'_c(0)(\bar{b}) + \frac{1}{2}G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1)] d\tilde{W}. \quad (4.2)$$

By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.15, we conclude the following result.

Lemma 4.16 *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and condition (4.1) hold. For $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{3p-19\kappa p},$$

where

$$R_2(T) = u(\varepsilon^{-2}T) - \varepsilon a_1(T) - \varepsilon^2 \bar{b}(T) - \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(T) - \varepsilon K(T).$$

From Lemma 4.16, we obtain the second-order approximation of $u(t)$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon^{-2}\tau^*]$. We are going to show such approximation is still valid for $t \in [0, \varepsilon^{-2}T_0]$ with high probability. For $\kappa > 0$, set $\Omega^* \subset \Omega$ of all $\omega \in \Omega$ such that all these estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_1(T)\| &< \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}, & \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_2(T)\| &< \varepsilon^{-\frac{5\kappa}{6}}, \\ \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha &< \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}, & \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha &< \varepsilon^{3p-20\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

hold.

Lemma 4.17 *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and condition (4.1) hold. For $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) \geq 1 - C\varepsilon^p.$$

Proof For fixed $p > 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) &\geq 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_1(T)\| \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_2(T)\| \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{5\kappa}{6}}\right) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{2}}\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha \geq \varepsilon^{3-20\kappa}\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa q}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_1(T)\|^q\right) - \varepsilon^{\frac{5\kappa q}{6}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_2(T)\|^q\right) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^{\frac{\kappa q}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha^q\right) - \varepsilon^{20\kappa q - 3q} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha^q\right) \\ &\geq 1 - C\varepsilon^p, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Chebyshev inequality in the second inequality, and use Lemmas 3.5, 3.13, 3.15 and 4.16 with q large enough in the last one.

Theorem 4.18 *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and condition (4.1) hold. For $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, and $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{20})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon^{-2}T_0} \|u(t) - \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) - \varepsilon^2 \bar{b}(\varepsilon^2 t) - \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(\varepsilon^2 t) - \varepsilon K(\varepsilon^2 t)\|_\alpha \geq \varepsilon^{3-20\kappa}\right) \leq C\varepsilon^p.$$

Proof Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^* &\subseteq \left\{ \omega \left| \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_1(T)\| < \varepsilon^{-\kappa}, \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|a_2(T)\| < \varepsilon^{-\kappa}, \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|\psi(T)\|_\alpha < \varepsilon^{-\kappa} \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \omega \left| \tau^* = T_0 \right. \right\} \subseteq \Omega.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha = \sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha < \varepsilon^{3-20\kappa}, \omega \in \Omega^*.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.17 that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|R_2(T)\|_\alpha \geq \varepsilon^{3-20\kappa}\right) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) \leq C\varepsilon^p.$$

Case II: $\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W} \neq 0$, for $T \in [0, T_0]$, a.s..

In this case, we consider condition (4.1) can not hold, for $T \in [0, T_0]$, a.s.. The term $\int_0^T \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) d\tilde{W}$ dependent of the parameter ε appears in (3.16), which motivates us to pay more attention to such term. Our key approach is to separate the high-order terms from the quadratic variation of the diffusion term of (3.16). On the one hand, for the case that $1 < \dim \mathcal{N} < \infty$, the second-order amplitude equations can be obtained as desired by such approach, but we just can prove that the approximate solutions weakly converge the real solutions without any precise rate. Since our motivation is to improve the convergence rate between the approximate solutions and the real ones in the paper, we ignore the argument about the weak convergence. On the other hand, for the case that $\dim \mathcal{N} = 1$, relying on Lemma 6.1 in [9], we not only can obtain the second-order amplitude equations, but also provide the rigorous convergence rate. Therefore, we focus on the case that $\dim \mathcal{N} = 1$ in the remainder of the section. As preparation, we provide the following notations and lemmas.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{g}_1(T) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(b) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle ds, \\ \bar{g}_2(T) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle ds, \\ \bar{g}_3(T) &= \mathcal{L}_c b(T) + 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1(T), a_1(T), b(T)), \\ \bar{g}_4(T) &= G'_c(0)(b(T)) + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1(T), a_1(T)) + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}(T)).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.19 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists some constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\bar{g}_1(T)|^p \right) \leq C\varepsilon^{2p-3\kappa p}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\bar{g}_2(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{2p-4\kappa p}, \quad (4.4)$$

Proof Since the proof of (4.3) and (4.4) are similar, we just prove (4.3) here. Recall that $\mathcal{Y}(T)$ satisfies

$$d\mathcal{Y} = \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{A}_s \mathcal{Y} dT + G'_s(0)(a_1) d\tilde{W}.$$

Following the similar proof as in Lemma 3.4, we can obtain $\mathcal{Y}(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-\frac{4\kappa}{3}})$.

Applying Itô's formula to $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(b) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} \mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(b) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle ds \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(b(T)) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} \mathcal{Y}(T)) f_j \rangle \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(b) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1}(G'_s(0)(a_1) \cdot)) f_j \rangle d\tilde{W} \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(\bar{g}_3) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} \mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle ds \\ & \quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(\bar{g}_4 \cdot) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} \mathcal{Y}) f_j \rangle d\tilde{W} \\ & \quad - \sum_{j,l=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \langle G'_c(0)(\bar{g}_4 f_l) f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} G'_s(0)(a_1) f_l) f_j \rangle ds \\ & =: \sum_{i=1}^5 I_i(T). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling \mathcal{A}_s^{-1} is a bounded and linear operator, it is easy to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |I_1(T)|^p \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|G'_c(0)(b(T)) f_j\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1} \mathcal{Y}(T)) f_j\|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|b(T)\|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|\mathcal{Y}(T)\|_{\alpha}^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{p-2\kappa p}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the first inequality, use Hölder inequality and Assumption 2.5 in the second one, and use Lemma 3.15 in the

last one. By Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we can have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|I_2(T)\|^p \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(b)f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1}(G'_s(0)(a_1)\cdot))f_j \rangle \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathbb{R})}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& = C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(b)f_j, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1}(G'_s(0)(a_1)f_l))f_j \rangle \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|G'_c(0)(b)f_j\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|G'_c(0)(\mathcal{A}_s^{-1}(G'_s(0)(a_1)f_l))f_j\|^2 \right) ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{T_0} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (\|b\|^2 \|\mathcal{A}_s^{-1}(G'_s(0)(a_1)f_l)\|_{\alpha}^2) ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|b\|^p \|a_1\|^p \right) \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^{-\kappa p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogous arguments as above can yield that

$$\sum_{i=3}^5 \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \|I_i(T)\|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{-3\kappa p}.$$

Consequently, collecting all the estimations, we complete the proof.

Here, we introduce some notations from [9]. For a Hilbert Space \mathcal{H} , denote the tensor product of it by $v_1 \otimes v_2$, and the symmetric tensor product of it by $v_1 \otimes_s v_2 = \frac{1}{2}(v_1 \otimes v_2 + v_2 \otimes v_1)$, where $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, define the scalar product in the tensor product space $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\beta}$ by $\langle u_1 \otimes v_1, u_2 \otimes v_2 \rangle_{\alpha, \beta} := \langle u_1, u_2 \rangle_{\alpha} \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle_{\beta}$, where $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}, v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta}$. For simplicity of notation, we adopt $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\alpha}$ instead of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\alpha, \alpha}$. The norm of $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\beta}$ is induced by such scalar product. For two linear operators \mathcal{L}_a and \mathcal{L}_b on \mathcal{H} , define the symmetric tensor product of them by $(\mathcal{L}_a \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_b)(v_1 \otimes v_2) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}_a v_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}_b v_2 + \mathcal{L}_b v_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}_a v_1)$.

We note $\|v_1 \otimes_s v_2\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}} \leq \|v_1\|_{\alpha} \|v_2\|_{\alpha}$, for any $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. It is also easy to check $\mathbb{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A}$ is an operator with eigenvalues $-\frac{\lambda_k + \lambda_j}{2}$ in the basis $e_k \otimes_s e_j$. Then, we assert that $(\mathbb{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}$ as pseudo-inverse (i.e., $(\mathbb{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\mathcal{N} \otimes_s \mathcal{N}) = 0$) is a bounded operator from $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}}$ to $\mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}$, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. In fact, for $\mathcal{X} = \sum_{k, j=1}^{\infty} x_{kj} e_k \otimes_s e_j \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}$, we have

$$\|(\mathbb{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}} = \left(\sum_{\substack{k, j=1 \\ k=j \neq 1}}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{\lambda_k + \lambda_j} \right)^2 x_{kj}^2 (\lambda_k + 1)^{2\alpha} (\lambda_j + 1)^{2\alpha} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \left(\sum_{k,j=1}^{\infty} x_{kj}^2 (\lambda_k + 1)^{2\alpha-1} (\lambda_j + 1)^{2\alpha-1} \right) \\
&= C \|\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ be a linear and bounded operator from $\mathcal{H}^\alpha \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^\alpha$ to \mathbb{R} by

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{X}) := \sum_{k,j,l=1}^{\infty} x_{kj} \langle G'_c(0)(e_k) f_l, G'_c(0)(e_j) f_l \rangle.$$

Then $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) f_l, G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y}) f_l \rangle$.

Moreover, we need a notation to simplify the representation. For a family of real-valued processes $\{X_\varepsilon(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$, we call $X_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(f_\varepsilon)$ if for every $p > 1$, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq \tau^*} |X_\varepsilon(T)|^p \right) \leq C f_\varepsilon^p,$$

where τ^* is given in Definition 3.3.

With the above convenient notations, we present the following lemma.

Lemma 4.20 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^T \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{Y}) ds &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1} (G'_s(0)(b) f_l \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b) f_l) ds \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-3\kappa}).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have for $T \in [0, T_0]$,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1} (G'_s(0)(b) f_l \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b) f_l)(T) \geq 0, \quad a.s.. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof Applying Itô's formula to $\mathcal{Y} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^T (\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{A}\mathcal{Y}) ds &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{Y})(T) - \int_0^T \mathcal{Y} \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b) d\tilde{W} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left[\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} G'_s(0)(b) f_l \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b) f_l \right] ds. \quad (4.6)
\end{aligned}$$

Noticing $\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{A}\mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes_s \mathcal{H}^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}$, we then apply $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}$ to both sides of (4.6) to have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left| \varepsilon^{-2} \int_0^T \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{Y}) ds \right| \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T |\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}(G'_s(0)(b)f_l \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b)f_l) ds|^p \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s \mathcal{Y})(T)|^p \right) \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left| \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\mathcal{Y} \otimes_s G'_s(0)(b)f_l) d\beta_l \right|^p \right) \\
& \leq C \varepsilon^{p-3\kappa p},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\mathcal{Y}(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-\frac{4\kappa}{3}})$, $b(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\kappa}{3}})$ and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality in the last inequality.

As for the proof of (4.5), it is sufficient to prove $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \sum_{k,j=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_k + \lambda_j} m_k m_j \geq 0$, for any $m_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_1 = (e^{-\lambda_2 x}, \dots, e^{-\lambda_n x}, \dots)$, $\mathcal{P}_2 = (m_2, \dots, m_n, \dots)$. Notice that $\mathcal{P}_2 \mathcal{P}_1^T \mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2^T$ is non-negative. Then, we have

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \int_0^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_2 \mathcal{P}_1^T \mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{P}_2^T dx \geq 0.$$

The second-order amplitude equation considered here is just one-dimensional ODE, so we introduce the following notations for the sake of convenience:

$$\tilde{a}_2(0) = \langle a_2(0), e_1 \rangle$$

$$\tilde{b}_1(T) = \langle b(T), e_1 \rangle,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_1 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(e_1) f_j, G'_c(0)(e_1) f_j \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{I} \otimes_s \mathcal{A})^{-1}(G'_s(0)(e_1) f_j \otimes_s G'_s(0)(e_1) f_j)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sigma_2(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G'_c(0)(e_1) f_j, G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) f_j \rangle,$$

$$\sigma_3(T) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) f_j, G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) f_j \rangle,$$

$$\sigma_4(T) = \langle \mathcal{L}_c e_1 + 3\mathcal{F}_c(a_1(T), a_1(T), e_1), e_1 \rangle$$

$$\bar{g}_5(T) = \int_0^T \|G'_c(0)(b) + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)}^2 ds, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\bar{g}_6(T) = \int_0^T [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s)] ds, \quad (4.8)$$

$$M_1(T) = \left\langle \int_0^T [G'_c(0)(b) + \frac{1}{2} G''_c(0)(a_1, a_1) + \varepsilon^{-1} G'_c(0)(\mathcal{Y})] d\tilde{W}, e_1 \right\rangle.$$

Then, Lemmas 4.19 and 4.20 immediately yield the following lemma .

Lemma 4.21 Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$\bar{g}_5(T) = \bar{g}_6(T) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1-3\kappa}).$$

The next lemma plays an important role in the process of dealing with the high-order terms of the diffusion part.

Lemma 4.22 Let $\bar{M}_1(T)$ be a continuous martingale with respect to some filtration $(\mathcal{F}_T)_{T \geq 0}$. Denote the quadratic variation of $\bar{M}_1(T)$ by $\bar{f}_1(T)$ and let $\bar{f}_2(T)$ be an arbitrary \mathcal{F}_T -adapted increasing process with $\bar{f}_2(0) = 0$. Then, for $p > 1$, there exists a filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ with $\mathcal{F}_T \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ and a continuous $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ martingale $M_2(T)$ with quadratic variation $\bar{f}_2(T)$ such that, for every $r_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, there exists a constant C with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} \left| \bar{M}_1(T) - M_2(T) \right|^p &\leq C (\mathbb{E} |\bar{f}_2(T_0)|^{2p})^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\bar{f}_1(T) - \bar{f}_2(T)|^p \right)^{r_0} \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\bar{f}_1(T) - \bar{f}_2(T)|^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting $M_1(T)$ is a continuous real-valued martingale with the quadratic variation $\bar{g}_5(T)$ given in (4.7), then we have the following lemma in view of Lemma 4.22.

Lemma 4.23 Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, there exists a continuous $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ martingale $M_2(T)$ with the quadratic variation $\bar{g}_6(T)$ given (4.8), a constant $C > 0$ and $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |M_1(T) - M_2(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\gamma}p - 3\kappa p}. \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, there exists a Brownian motion $B(T)$ with respect to the filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$, such that

$$M_2(T) = \int_0^T [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dB. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof Thanks to Lemmas 3.12 and 3.15, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\bar{g}_5(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{-\frac{4\kappa p}{3}}. \quad (4.11)$$

Then, Lemma 4.22 and (4.11) imply (4.9). And, applying martingale representation theorem to $M_2(T)$, we derive (4.10).

In view of Lemma 4.23, we can get rid of the high-order terms hiding in M_1 , and obtain the second-order amplitude equation as follows:

$$\tilde{b}_2(T) = \tilde{a}_2(0) + \int_0^T \sigma_4(s) \tilde{b}_2 ds + \int_0^T [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_2^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_2 + \sigma_3(s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dB. \quad (4.12)$$

Here, we need to note that (4.12) is well defined. Indeed, $\sigma_2(t)$ and $\sigma_3(t)$ are random processes with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t , while $B(T)$ is a Brownian motion with respect to the filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ containing \mathcal{F}_T . Thus, it is reasonable to estimate the error between $\tilde{b}_1(T)$ and $\tilde{b}_2(T)$ on the stochastic base $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. In order to achieve this goal, an auxiliary equation is considered as follows:

$$\tilde{b}_3(T) = \tilde{a}_2(0) + \int_0^T \sigma_4(s) \tilde{b}_3 ds + \int_0^T [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} dB.$$

Let us present $\tilde{b}_1(T)$ can be approximated by $\tilde{b}_3(T)$ well as the following lemma.

Lemma 4.24 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $T_0 > 0$, $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\tilde{b}_3(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{-\frac{4\kappa p}{3}}, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\tilde{b}_1(T) - \tilde{b}_3(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{r}p - \frac{20\kappa p}{3}}. \quad (4.14)$$

Proof This proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.15. In fact, applying Itô's formula to $\tilde{b}_3(T)$, we derive for $p \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b}_3^p(T) &= \tilde{a}_2^p(0) + \int_0^T [p\sigma_4(s)\tilde{b}_3^p + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}(\sigma_1\tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s)\tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s))\tilde{b}_3^{p-2}]dT \\ &\quad + \int_0^T p(\sigma_1\tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s)\tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s))^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{b}_3^{p-1}dB. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 3.13 and 3.15, we know $a_1(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}})$ and $b_1(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-\frac{2\kappa}{3}})$. Then, performing the similar deductions provided in the proof of Lemma 3.15, it is easy to obtain (4.13). And, following from $M_1(T) - M_2(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\tilde{r}-3\kappa})$, (4.14) can be obtained immediately.

Next lemma is devoted to the error between $\tilde{b}_2(T)$ and $\tilde{b}_3(T)$.

Lemma 4.25 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $T_0 > 0$, $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\tilde{b}_2(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\kappa p}{3}}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\tilde{b}_2(T) - \tilde{b}_3(T)|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{r}p - \frac{20\kappa p}{3}}. \quad (4.16)$$

Proof Noting $\sigma_2(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2\kappa})$ and $\sigma_3(T) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-4\kappa})$, we can obtain (3.16) as the analogous arguments in the proof of Lemma 3.15. Let us move to prove (4.16). Setting $\tilde{b}_4(T) = \tilde{b}_2(T) - \tilde{b}_3(T)$, we have

$$\tilde{b}_4(T) = \int_0^T \sigma_4(s) \tilde{b}_4 ds + \int_0^T (\bar{g}_7(s) - \bar{g}_8(s)) dB,$$

where $\bar{g}_7(s) = [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_2^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_2 + \sigma_3(s)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\bar{g}_8(s) = [\sigma_1 \tilde{b}_1^2 + \sigma_2(s) \tilde{b}_1 + \sigma_3(s)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Note that there exists a positive constant C such that for any $T \in [0, T_0]$,

$$|\bar{g}_7(T) - \bar{g}_8(T)| \leq C|\tilde{b}_2(T) - \tilde{b}_1(T)|, \quad a.s.. \quad (4.17)$$

For $p > 2$, Itô's formula yields that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{b}_4(T)|^p &\leq C \int_0^T |\tilde{b}_4|^p ds + C \int_0^T |\tilde{b}_4|^{p-2} |\bar{g}_7(s) - \bar{g}_8(s)|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^T |\tilde{b}_4|^{p-1} |\bar{g}_7(s) - \bar{g}_8(s)| dB. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Taking the expectations of both sides of (4.18) and using the property (4.17), we derive

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{b}_4(T)|^p\right) \leq C \int_0^T \mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{b}_4|^p\right) ds + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{b}_1 - \tilde{b}_3|^p\right) ds.$$

Then, by Gronwall's lemma and (4.14), it is easy to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{b}_4(T)|^p\right) \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{r}p - \frac{20\kappa p}{3}}, \quad T \in [0, T_0]. \quad (4.19)$$

Next, let us return to (4.18) and estimate the expectation of the supremum of $|\tilde{b}_4(T)|^p$. Using Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Young inequality, we can have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq T \leq T_0} |\tilde{b}_4(T)|^p\right) \leq C \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0} |\tilde{b}_4|^p ds\right) + C \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{T_0} |\tilde{b}_1 - \tilde{b}_3|^{2p} ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Consequently, it follows from (4.14) and (4.19) that (4.16) holds.

Obviously, Lemmas 4.24 and 4.25 yield that $\tilde{b}_1(T) = \tilde{b}_2(T) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\tilde{r}p - \frac{20\kappa p}{3}})$. Then, combining with Lemmas 3.5, 3.15, we present the main result as follows.

Theorem 4.26 *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, for $T_0 > 0$, $p > 1$, $\|a_1(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|a_2(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{\kappa}{3}}$, $\|\psi(0)\|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon$, and $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{20})$, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon^{-2}T_0} \|u(t) - \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) - \varepsilon^2 \tilde{b}_3(\varepsilon^2 t) e_1 - \varepsilon \mathcal{Q}(\varepsilon^2 t) - \varepsilon K(\varepsilon^2 t)\|_\alpha \geq \varepsilon^{2+\tilde{r}-20\kappa}\right) \leq C \varepsilon^p.$$

5 Application

In this section, we are going to apply our results to stochastic Allen-Cahn equation, and highlight that the approximate solution constructed by the second-order amplitude equation is more accurate via numerical stimulation.

Stochastic Allen-Cahn Equation

Consider stochastic Allen-Cahn equation with multiplicative noise written as

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u &= (\partial_{xx} + 1)u + \varepsilon^2 u - u^3 + \varepsilon[\sin u - \cos u + \cos hu] \cdot \partial_t W(t), \\ u(0) &= u_0,\end{aligned}\tag{5.1}$$

with respect to Dirichlet boundary conditions on $[0, \pi]$, where $W(t)$ is Wiener process, and h is constant.

Set $\mathcal{H} := L^2[0, \pi]$, $\mathcal{A} := \partial_{xx} + 1$, $\mathcal{L} := I$ and $\mathcal{F}(u) := -u^3$, $G(u) = \sin u - \cos u + \cos hu$.

Firstly, let us consider **Case I** and check each Assumption as follows.

Note $-\mathcal{A}e_k(x) = \lambda_k e_k(x)$ with $\lambda_k = k^2 - 1$ and $e_k(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin kx$, where $e_k(x)$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} . Then, Assumption 2.1 holds with $m = 2$ and kernel space $\mathcal{N} = \{e_1\}$.

The function space considered here is \mathcal{H}^1 as defined in Definition 2.1. Obviously, Assumption 2.2 is true with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$.

Noticing that \mathcal{H}^1 is Banach algebra, condition (2.1) is satisfied. And, we can easily obtain $-\int_0^\pi \sin(x)^4 dx < 0$, so condition (2.2) is valid. In addition, since \mathcal{F} is a standard cubic nonlinearity, condition (2.3) is also true. Thus, Assumption 2.3 holds.

We suppose that $W(t)$ is one-dimensional real-valued Brownian motion on a stochastic base $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. Obviously, Assumption 2.4 is satisfied.

It is easy to check that $G(\cdot)$ is an Hilbert-Schmidt operator from \mathcal{H}^1 to $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^1, \mathbb{R})$, and satisfy that for any $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathcal{H}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}G'(0)(u_1) \cdot v &= u_1 \cdot v, \\ G''(0)(u_1, u_2) \cdot v &= -(h^2 - 1)u_1 u_2 \cdot v, \\ G'''(0)(u_1, u_2, u_3) \cdot v &= u_1 u_2 u_3 \cdot v.\end{aligned}$$

All conditions of Assumption 2.5 are satisfied.

Denote \mathcal{S} the orthogonal complement of by \mathcal{N} . For any $u_1 \in \mathcal{N}$, $u_2 \in \mathcal{S}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}G'_s(0)(u_1) \cdot v_1 &= 0, \\ G'_c(0)(u_2) \cdot v_1 &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

which imply that condition (4.1) holds.

Therefore, we can apply Theorem 4.18 to (5.1), and derive the first-order amplitude equation:

$$a_1(T) = a_1(0) + \int_0^T (a_1(s) - \frac{3}{2\pi} a_1^3(s)) ds + \int_0^T a_1(s) d\tilde{W}(s),$$

and second amplitude equation:

$$a_2(T) = \int_0^T (a_2(s) - \frac{9}{2\pi} a_2(s) a_1^2(s)) ds + \int_0^T (a_2(s) - \frac{4(h^2 - 1)\sqrt{2}}{3\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} a_1^2(s)) d\tilde{W}(s),$$

where $T = \varepsilon^2 t$, $\tilde{W}(T)$ is the rescaled version of $W(t)$, $a_1(0) = \frac{P_\varepsilon u_0}{\varepsilon}$.

Assuming $u_0 = \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)$, then we obtain

$$u(t) = \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (5.2)$$

$$u(t) = \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \varepsilon^2 a_2(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3), \quad (5.3)$$

where (5.2) follows from Theorem 2.1 in [5], and (5.3) holds due to Theorem 4.18.

In the followings, let us compare (5.2) and (5.3) via numerical analysis. We use drift-implicit Euler–spectral Galerkin scheme [37] to compute the numerical solution of u . And, the numerical solutions of a_1 and a_2 are solved by Euler method [28, 30, 38]. Then, consider error $\bar{R}_1(t) := \|u(t) - \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)\|_{L^2}$, and error $\bar{R}_2(t) := \|u(t) - \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) - \varepsilon^2 a_2(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)\|_{L^2}$. Here, we want to explain that the numerical solution of u is valid in the sense of L^2 (please see Theorem 4.1 in [37]), so the errors are considered in the sense of L^2 rather than H^1 . Nevertheless, the errors are still reliable due to embedding theorem.

In Figure 1, we consider $\varepsilon = 0.01, h = 20$ and $\varepsilon = 0.001, h = 100$ respectively, and show the mean of the error of 100 samples in the sense of L^2 .




Figure 1: Red and blue curves represent the time evolution of the error $\bar{R}_1(t)$ and $\bar{R}_2(t)$, respectively.

Through the comparisons, it is intuitive to illustrate that the approximation solution shown in (5.3) is more accurate.

We proceed to consider **Case II**. Here, we suppose that $W(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin kx\beta_t$, where $\beta(t)$ is one-dimensional real-valued Brownian motion on a stochastic base $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. It is easy to check that Assumptions 2.4 and 2.5 still hold. Then, applying Theorem 4.26 to (5.1), we obtain the first-order amplitude equation:

$$b_1(T) = b_1(0) + \int_0^T (b_1(s) - \frac{3}{2\pi} b_1^3(s)) ds + \int_0^T \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{3\pi^{\frac{3}{2}}} b_1(s) d\tilde{\beta}(s),$$

and the second-order amplitude equation:

$$b_2(T) = \int_0^T (b_2(s) - \frac{9}{2\pi} b_2(s) b_1^2(s)) ds + \int_0^T (\bar{\sigma}_1 b_2^2(s) + \bar{\sigma}_2 b_2(s) b_1^2(s) + \bar{\sigma}_3 b_1^4(s))^{\frac{1}{2}} dB(s),$$

where $\tilde{\beta}(t)$ is the rescaled version of $\beta(t)$, $B(t)$ is one-dimensional real-valued Brownian motion, $b_1(0) = \frac{P_c u_0}{\varepsilon}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_1 &= \frac{2^{12}}{\pi^6} \sum_{k,j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k^2 + j^2 + k + j)(2k + 1)^2(4k^2 + 4k - 3)^2(2j + 1)^2(4j^2 + 4j - 3)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{128}{9\pi^3}, \\ \bar{\sigma}_2 &= -(h^2 - 1) \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{5}{2}}, \quad \bar{\sigma}_3 = \frac{9(h^2 - 1)^2}{16\pi^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $u_0 = \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)$, then we obtain

$$u(t) = \varepsilon b_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (5.4)$$

$$u(t) = \varepsilon b_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \varepsilon^2 b_2(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2}}), \quad (5.5)$$

where (5.4) follows from Theorem 2.1 in [5], and (5.5) is based on Theorem 4.26.

Next, let us compare error $\bar{R}_3(t) := \|u(t) - \varepsilon b_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)\|_{L^2}$, and error $\bar{R}_4(t) := \|u(t) - \varepsilon b_1(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x) - \varepsilon^2 b_2(\varepsilon^2 t) \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(x)\|_{L^2}$ via numerical analysis.

In Figure 2, we consider $\varepsilon = 0.01, h = 10$ and $\varepsilon = 0.001, h = 30$ respectively, and show the mean of the error of 100 samples in the sense of L^2 .

Through the comparisons, it is intuitive to illustrate that the approximation solutions shown in (5.3) and (5.5) are more accurate. In terms of computational efficiency, the time required to solve the first-order and second-order amplitude equations for each sample is only $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ seconds more than that for the first-order amplitude equation. This means that we can construct the approximate

solution by the first-order and second-order amplitude equations for $\varepsilon = 0.01$, which maintains the same accuracy as that constructed by the first-order amplitude equation for $\varepsilon = 0.001$, without requiring excessive computational time.




Figure 2: Red and blue curves represent the time evolution of the error $\bar{R}_3(t)$ and $\bar{R}_4(t)$, respectively.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we obtain the approximate solutions of a class of SPDEs with multiplicative noise by the first-order and second-order amplitude equations. Compared to the approximate solutions constructed by the first-order amplitude equations [5], the approximate ones of us enjoy improved convergence rate. And, we use an example to illustrate this viewpoint in Section 5.

We would like to comment the possible extensions in terms of our results. We can consider that the diffusion part consists of multiplicative and additive noise at the same time. If the additive noise is of order ε^2 , it is possible to obtain the high-order approximate solutions. However, it may be a challenge that the additive noise is of order ε . And, we can attempt to derive the higher-order amplitude equations if we let $u(t) = \varepsilon\psi(\varepsilon^2t) + \varepsilon a_1(\varepsilon^2t) + \varepsilon^2 a_2(\varepsilon^2t) + \varepsilon^3 a_3(\varepsilon^2t) + \dots$. In addition, it is meaningful to consider the high-order approximation of SPDEs with quadratic nonlinearity, which can be used to the study of stochastic Burger's equation and stochastic surface growth model. We also hope our result can be applied to random dynamics. In [14], authors investigated the the approximation of random invariant manifolds of SPDEs with linear multiplicative noise via amplitude equations. So far, few results focus on nonlinear multiplicative noise. Therefore, we want to explore the connection between mean square random invariant manifolds and amplitude equations in future.

Acknowledgements

The work is supported in part by the NSFC Grant Nos. 12171084 and the fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities No. RF1028623037.

Data Availability Statements

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] L. A. Bianchi and D. Blömker, Modulation equation for SPDEs in unbounded domains with space-time white noise-linear theory, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 126, 3171-3201, (2016).
- [2] L. A. Bianchi, D. Blömker and G. Schneider, Modulation equation and SPDEs on unbounded domains, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 371, 19-54, (2019).
- [3] D. Blömker, Amplitude equations for stochastic partial differential equations, *Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences*, 3. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, (2007).
- [4] D. Blömker, Approximation of the stochastic Rayleigh-Rénard problem near the onset of convection and related problems, *Stoch. Dyn.* 5, 441-474, (2005).
- [5] D. Blömker and H. Fu, The impact of multiplicative noise in SPDEs close to bifurcation via amplitude equations, *Nonlinearity* 33, 3905-3927, (2020).
- [6] D. Blömker and M. Hairer, Multiscale expansion of invariant measures for SPDEs, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 251, 515-555, (2004).
- [7] D. Blömker and M. Hairer, Amplitude equations for SPDEs: Approximate centre manifolds and invariant measures, in: Waymire E.C., Duan J. (eds) *Probability and Partial Differential Equations in Modern Applied Mathematics. The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, vol 140. Springer, New York, (2005).
- [8] D. Blömker, M. Hairer and G. A. Pavliotis, Modulation equations: stochastic bifurcation in large domains, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 258, 479-512, (2005).
- [9] D. Blömker, M. Hairer and G. A. Pavliotis, Multiscale analysis for stochastic partial differential equations with quadratic nonlinearities, *Nonlinearity* 20, 1721-1744, (2007).
- [10] D. Blömker, S. Maier-Paape and G. Schneider, The stochastic Landau equation as an amplitude equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 1, 527-541, (2001).
- [11] D. Blömker and W. W. Mohammed, Amplitude equations for SPDEs with cubic nonlinearities, *Stochastics* 85, 181-215, (2013).
- [12] D. Blömker and W. W. Mohammed, Amplitude equations for SPDEs with quadratic nonlinearities, *Electron. J. Probab.* 14, 2527-2550, (2009).
- [13] D. Blömker, and A. Neamtu Amplitude equations for SPDEs driven by fractional additive noise with small Hurst parameter. *Stoch. Dyn.* 22, 2240013, (2022).
- [14] D. Blömker and W. Wang, Qualitative properties of local random invariant manifolds for SPDEs with quadratic nonlinearity, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 22, 677-695, (2010).

- [15] J. Birrell and J. Wehr, Langevin equations in the small-mass limit: higher-order approximations, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* 21, 1765-1811, (2020).
- [16] S. Cerrai, A Khasminskii type averaging principle for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 19, 899–948, (2009).
- [17] S. Cerrai, M. Freidlin, Averaging principle for a class of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 144, 137-177, (2009).
- [18] M. D. Chekroun and H. Liu, Finite-horizon parameterizing manifolds, and applications to suboptimal control of nonlinear parabolic PDEs, *Acta Appl. Math.* 135, 81-144, (2015).
- [19] M. D. Chekroun, H. Liu and J. C. McWilliams, Variational approach to closure of nonlinear dynamical systems: autonomous case, *J. Stat. Phys.* 179, 1073-1160, (2020).
- [20] M. D. Chekroun, H. Liu and S. Wang, Approximation of Stochastic Invariant Manifolds-Stochastic Manifolds for Nonlinear SPDEs I, *Springer Briefs in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2015).
- [21] M. D. Chekroun, H. Liu and S. Wang, Stochastic Parameterizing Manifolds and Non-Markovian Reduced Equations-Stochastic Manifolds for Nonlinear SPDEs II, *Springer Briefs in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2015).
- [22] A. Chekhlov and V. Yakhot, Kolmogorov turbulence in a random-force-driven Burgers equation: anomalous scaling and probability density functions *Phys. Rev. E.* 52, 5681-5684, (1995).
- [23] Z. R. Cuerno and A.-L. Barabási. Dynamic scaling of ion-sputtered surfaces, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74, 4746-4749, (1995).
- [24] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2014).
- [25] W. E, *Principles of Multiscale Modeling*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2011).
- [26] H. Fu, X. Liu and J. Duan, Slow manifolds for multi-time-scale stochastic evolutionary systems, *Commun. Math. Sci.* 11, 141-162, (2013).
- [27] Z. Guo, X. Yan and X. Yang, Approximation of smooth stable invariant manifolds for stochastic partial differential equations. *J. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 32, 112-128, (2019).
- [28] D. Higham, X. Mao and A. Stuart, Strong convergence of Euler-type methods for nonlinear stochastic differential equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40, 1041-1063, (2002).
- [29] M. H. Holmes, *Introduction to Perturbation Methods*, 2nd edn. Springer, New York (2013).
- [30] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*, 1st edition, Springer-Verlog, Berlin, (1992).
- [31] K. B. Lauritsen, R. Cuerno and H. A. Makse, Noisy Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation for an erosion model. *Phys. Rev. E.*, 54, 3577-3580, (1996).
- [32] R. E. Lee DeVilla, A. Harkin, M. Holzer, K. Josić and T. J. Kaper, Analysis of a renormalization group method and normal form theory for perturbed ordinary differential equations, *Physica D* 237, 1029-1052, (2008).
- [33] N. T. Levashova, N. N. Nefedov and A. O. Orlov, Time-independent reaction-diffusion equation with a discontinuous reactive term, *Comput. Math. Math. Phys.* 57, 854–866, (2017).
- [34] L. Li, M. Hernandez and K. W. Ong, Stochastic attractor bifurcation for the two-dimensional Swift-Hohenberg equation, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* 41, 2105-2118, (2018).
- [35] W. Li and S. Shi, Singularly perturbed renormalization group method and its significance in dynamical systems theory, *Commun. Math. Res.* 38, 99-122, (2022).
- [36] X. Li, Q. Wang and L. Xie Higher-order approximations in the averaging principle of multiscale systems, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 142, 108651, (2023).
- [37] Z. Liu and Z. Qiao, Strong approximation of monotone stochastic partial differential equations driven by multiplicative noise. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.* 9, 559-602, (2021).
- [38] X. Mao, *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*, Horwood, Chichester, UK, (1997).
- [39] W. W. Mohammed, Fast-diffusion limit for reaction-diffusion equations with degenerate multiplicative and additive noise, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 33, 577-592, (2020).

- [40] W. W. Mohammed, D. Blömker and K. Klepel, Modulation equation for stochastic Swift-Hohenberg equation, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 45, 14-30, (2013).
- [41] A. L. Nayfeh, *Perturbation Methods*, Wiley, New York (1973).
- [42] N. N. Nefedov, The method of differential inequalities for some singularly perturbed partial differential equations, *Differ. Equ.*, 31, 668-671, (1995).
- [43] N. N. Nefedov, An asymptotic method of differential inequalities for the investigation of periodic contrast structures: Existence, asymptotics and stability, *Differ. Equ.*, 36, 298-305, (2000).
- [44] M. Ni, Y. Pan, N. T. Levashova, and O. A. Nikolaeva, Internal Layers for a singularly perturbed second-Order quasilinear differential equation with discontinuous right-hand side, *Differ. Equ.*, 53, 1567-1577, (2017).
- [45] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 44. New York etc., Springer-Verlag, (1983).
- [46] B. Schmalfuß and K. Schneider, Invariant manifolds for random dynamical systems with slow and fast variables, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 20, 133-164, (2008).
- [47] A. N. Tikhonov, On a system of differential equations containing parameters (in Russian), *Mat. Sb.* 27, 147-156, (1950).
- [48] A. N. Tikhonov, On the dependence of the solutions of differential equations on a small parameter, *Mat. Sb.* 22, 193-204, (1948).
- [49] A. N. Tikhonov, Systems of differential equations containing small parameters in the derivatives, *Mat. Sb.* 31, 575-586, (1952).
- [50] A. B. Vasil'eva and V. F. Butuzov, *Asymptotic Expansions of The Singularly Perturbed Equations*, Moscow: Nauka, 1973, (1973).
- [51] V. T. Volkov and N. N. Nefedov, Development of the asymptotic method of differential inequalities for investigation of periodic contrast structures in reaction-diffusion equations, *Comput. Math. Math. Phys.*, 46, 585-593, (2006).
- [52] Q. Xiao, and H. Gao, Stochastic attractor bifurcation for the two-dimensional Swift-Hohenberg equation with multiplicative noise, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, (2023).
- [53] Q. Xiao and H. Gao, Stochastic attractor bifurcation of the one-dimensional Swift-Hohenberg equation with multiplicative noise, *J. Differential Equations*, 336, 565-588, (2022).
- [54] W. Wang, D. Cao and J. Duan, Effective macroscopic dynamics of stochastic partial differential equations in perforated domains, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 38, 1508-1527, (2006).
- [55] W. Wang, J. Duan, Homogenized dynamics of stochastic partial differential equations with dynamical boundary conditions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 275, 163-186, (2007).
- [56] X. Wu and N. Ni, Existence and stability of periodic contrast structure in reaction-advection-diffusion equation with discontinuous reactive and convective terms. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.* 91, 105457, 16 pp, (2020).
- [57] X. Wu and N. Ni, Solution of contrast structure type for a reaction-diffusion equation with discontinuous reactive term, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S* 14, 3249-3266, (2021).
- [58] S. Yuan and D. Blömker, Modulation and amplitude equations on bounded domains for nonlinear SPDEs driven by cylindrical α -stable Lévy processes, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* 21, 1748-1777, (2022).
- [59] M. Ziane, On a certain renormalization group method, *J. Math. Phys.* 41, 3290- 3299, (2000).