

# INVARIANT MANIFOLDS AND STABILITY FOR ROUGH DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

M. GHANI VARZANEH AND S. RIEDEL

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of local stable, unstable, and center manifolds for stochastic semiflows induced by rough differential equations driven by rough paths valued stochastic processes around random fixed points of the equation. Examples include stochastic differential equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter  $H > \frac{1}{4}$ . In case the top Lyapunov exponent is negative, we derive almost sure exponential stability of the solution.

## INTRODUCTION

Rough paths theory is a solution theory for ordinary differential equations that is rich enough to handle equations that are driven by paths with an arbitrary low Hölder regularity [LCL07, FV10b, FH20]. In particular, it can be used to study equations driven by Brownian trajectories and thus opens the possibility to study stochastic differential equations (SDEs) completely pathwise. This clear separation between *probabilistic* aspects of the driving process and the *deterministic* analysis of the equation makes it possible to define solutions to SDEs that are driven by very general driving signals. In particular, in contrast to Itô's stochastic calculus, rough paths theory allows to study SDEs driven by stochastic processes lacking the martingale property. A famous class of stochastic processes serving as possible driving signals for rough differential equations are Gaussian processes and, most prominently among them, fractional Brownian motions with a Hurst parameter  $H > \frac{1}{4}$  [CQ02, FV10a, FGGR16].

Using SDEs driven by more general processes than Brownian motion can be more realistic in modelling real-world phenomena, but their analysis is significantly more complicated. This is due to the fact that the solution process lacks two properties that are heavily used in classical stochastic analysis: the *martingale*- and the *Markov property*. The question of how results that are known for SDEs driven by a Brownian motion can (or cannot) be generalized to equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion (or even more general Gaussian processes) has attracted many researcher's interest and still is an important, yet challenging problem.

One aspect of great interest is the question of how to describe the *long-time behaviour* of the solution to a rough differential equation (RDE) driven by signals more general than Brownian motion. Let us recall that in case of classical SDEs, two core concepts that are used frequently to describe the long-time behaviour are *invariant measures for the Markov semigroup* and *stochastic stability* (see e.g. [Kha12]). However, both concepts are not easy to generalize to rough differential equations. Concerning invariant measures, the lack of the Markov property does not even tell us how an invariant measure should be defined, leaving alone the questions of existence, uniqueness and convergence towards it. In a series of papers, Hairer and coauthors proposed a solution to

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60L20, 60L99, 37H10, 37H15, 37H30.

*Key words and phrases.* invariant manifolds, rough differential equations, random dynamical systems, stability.

this problems by generalizing the theory of invariant measures to solutions of equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion [Hai05, HO07, HP11, HP13]. Several researchers adopted his ideas and used it to study related questions within this framework, cf. e.g. [CP11, CPT14, FP17, DPT19, PTV20]. Concerning stochastic stability, there exist only a few works that deal with this problem. For a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter  $H > \frac{1}{2}$ , this question was studied in [GANS18, DHC19, DH23]. For lower Hurst parameters, we are only aware of the two works [GAS18] and [Duc22] that study the case  $H \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$ .

Although invariant measures and stochastic stability are two important concepts, much more can be said about the long-time behaviour of SDE solutions by using the concepts of *random dynamical systems* (RDS) [Arn98]. Indeed, RDS offer very fine tools (Lyapunov exponents, invariant manifolds, random attractors...) that allow for a detailed description of the behaviour of SDE solutions. One important applications of RDS is the study of *stochastic bifurcation*, i.e. qualitative changes of the solution that appear when perturbing the coefficients of the equation. For Itô stochastic differential equations, the use of RDS is well-established. More importantly, RDS are flexible enough to deal with RDEs driven by stochastic processes having stationary increments such as fractional Brownian motions [BRS17]. This makes RDS a perfect tool for the analysis of the long-time behaviour of RDE solutions.

The present article offers a way to study the long-time behaviour of nonlinear RDE solutions by establishing the existence *local random invariant manifolds* around stationary points. An invariant manifold has the property that it is invariant under the solution flow of the RDE. In fact, our main theorems, cf. Theorem 2.11, Theorem 2.13, and Theorem 2.15, formulate sufficient conditions for the existence of stable, unstable, and center manifolds around stationary points and describe their properties. It is well-known that stable manifolds are closely related to exponential stability of the solution flow. Indeed, as a by-product of our stable manifold theorem, we can deduce local exponential stability for RDE solutions provided the largest Lyapunov exponent is negative, cf. Corollary 2.17. We discuss an explicit example for which this property holds in Example 2.19.

In the following, we compare our main results to existing theorems in the literature. For Itô-SDEs, stable and unstable manifolds were established in [MS99] and center manifolds are the topic of [Box89]. Center manifolds for rough differential equations were recently studied in [NK21]. Let us highlight some key features of our main results and how they are related to the results cited above.

- This article is the first that proves stable and unstable manifold theorems for rough differential equations. In particular, we think that the stable manifold theorem is an important result since it implies almost sure exponential stability of the solution provided that the top Lyapunov exponent is negative (cf. Section 2.1 and the discussion below). Compared to [MS99], note that we do not need to assume that the flow generated by our equation goes backward in time, too, i.e. we can drop the assumption that the cocycle should be injective. Note, however, that we are still able to prove an unstable manifold theorem although we cannot just apply the stable manifold theorem to the time-inversed flow which is a common strategy in the case of an injective cocycle.
- Throughout the paper, we assume that the driving rough paths are geometric  $\gamma$ -Hölder paths with  $\gamma > \frac{1}{4}$ . Consequently, our main results can be applied to RDEs driven by a fractional Brownian motions with Hurst parameter  $H > \frac{1}{4}$ . Note that the authors of [NK21] only consider the case  $H > \frac{1}{3}$ . Therefore, our paper establishes the first time a center manifold theorem for an RDE driven by a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter

$H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}]$ . Working with rough paths of lower Hölder regularity is technically more involved since we have to consider third-order iterated integrals and controlled rough paths with second Gubinelli-derivatives. However, we think that our arguments will even work for RDEs driven by geometric Hölder rough paths having arbitrary low Hölder regularity, but since our main example is the fractional Brownian motion, we refrained working in this generality and to keep the calculations as simple as possible.

- We prove the existence of stable, unstable, and center manifolds around stationary points that are allowed to be random. In contrast, the center manifold theorem in [NK21] only applies if the equation has 0 as a deterministic fixed point (in fact, in [NK21], it is even assumed that the first derivative of the drift and first and second derivative of the diffusion vector field have 0 as a fixed point). There are many equations that fail to have deterministic fixed points but admit random ones, cf. the discussion in [MS99, pages 15 - 18]. The reason why we can formulate a more general result here is that we use the *Multiplicative Ergodic Theorem* that ensures the existence of Lyapunov exponents in a very general framework.
- In [NK21], the drift parameter in the RDE is assumed to be a linear map plus a Lipschitz continuous nonlinearity. In particular, the drift is assumed to have a linear growth. In many applications, this assumption is too restrictive (for example, it does not allow to study the important case  $V_0(z) = -z|z|^2 + z$ ). Our main results are formulated in a generality that allows drift vector fields with superlinear growth by imposing e.g. only one one-sided growth conditions as formulated in [RS17].
- The stability result that we discuss in Section 2.1 differs from those we mentioned above in several regards. First, it is formulated in a generality that allows to apply it to RDEs driven by a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter  $H > \frac{1}{4}$ . In particular, this is the first stability statement that holds in the regime  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}]$ . Second, our assumptions on the equation are less restrictive. For instance, we are still able to prove stability when the derivative of the diffusion part is not necessarily equal to zero at the equilibrium point, cf. [GAS18, Equation (22)], but is allowed to fluctuate around it. This, in particular, is interesting for studying possible bifurcations. Third, even for the simple regime  $H \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}]$ , our proof is much briefer and, we think, more conceptual than those given in [GAS18] and [Duc22]. Fourth, our result can be used to prove stability around any stationary point if some estimation of the Lyapunov exponent is provided.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 1, we first provide some background about the rough path theory and prove some auxiliary Lemmas. We then obtain some crucial estimates. The main results of this section are formulated in Proposition 1.15, Proposition 1.16, and Proposition 1.20. These three Propositions are our tools for proving the main results of this paper. Section 2 includes our main results. We introduce random fixed points for cocycles (*stationary trajectories*) around which the invariant manifolds exist. The main results of this section are Theorem 2.11, Theorem 2.13, Theorem 2.15, and Corollary 2.17. At the end of our paper, we provide some examples for which our findings apply.

**Preliminaries and notation.** In this section, we gather some conventions, notation, and basic definitions, which will be used for the rest of the paper.

- For all finite Banach spaces, we will use the same notation  $\|\cdot\|$  to denote the norm. Also, For two Banach spaces  $U$  and  $V$ , by  $\mathcal{L}(U, V)$ , we mean all bounded linear functions from  $U$  to  $V$  with the usual operator norm.
- We will identify  $\mathcal{L}(U, \mathcal{L}(V, W))$  with  $\mathcal{L}(U \otimes V, W)$  .

- By  $C_b^n(V, W)$ , we mean the space of bounded functions  $G: V \rightarrow W$  having  $n$  bounded derivatives.
- Assume  $I$  is an interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $U$  be a finite Banach space. A map  $\xi: I \rightarrow U$ , will also be called a *path*. For  $\xi$ , we denote its increment by  $\delta\xi_{s,t} = \xi_t - \xi_s$  where by  $\xi_t$  we mean  $\xi(t)$ . We set

$$\|\xi\|_{\infty, I} := \sup_{s \in I} \|\xi_s\|.$$

For  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , we define the  $\gamma$ -Hölder seminorm by

$$\|\xi\|_{\gamma, I} := \sup_{\substack{s, t \in I \\ s \neq t}} \frac{\|\xi_{s,t}\|}{|t-s|^\gamma}.$$

Also, we set  $\|\xi\|_{C^\gamma, I} = \max\{\|\xi\|_{\infty, I}, \|\xi\|_{\gamma, I}\}$ .

- Assume  $A \in \mathcal{L}(U, W)$  and  $B \in U$ . By  $AB$  we mean  $A \circ B \in W$ , i.e. the composition of  $A$  and  $B$ .
- We call  $V: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$  a  $\text{Lip}^p$ -vector field, if  $V$  be  $[p]$ -times continuously differentiable with bounded derivatives and for  $r = p - [p]$

$$(0.1) \quad \sup_{\substack{z_1, z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \\ z_1 \neq z_0}} \frac{\|D_{z_1}^{[p]} V - D_{z_0}^{[p]} V\|}{\|z_1 - z_0\|^r} < \infty.$$

- We say  $V_0: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous vector field with linear growth on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , if there are constants  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geq 0$  such that

$$(0.2) \quad \|V_0(z)\| \leq \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \|z\|,$$

for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

- Assume  $X: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a locally  $\gamma$ -Hölder path,  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . The second *Lévy area* for  $X$ , is a continuous function

$$\mathbb{X}^2: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with the following algebraic identity

$$\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 = \mathbb{X}_{s,u}^2 + \mathbb{X}_{u,t}^2 + \delta X_{s,u} \otimes \delta X_{u,t},$$

is true for every  $s, u, t \in \mathbb{R}$  and for which  $\|\mathbb{X}\|_{2\gamma, I} = \sup_{\substack{s, t \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ s \neq t}} \frac{\|\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2\|}{|t-s|^{2\gamma}} < \infty$  holds on every compact interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ . The third *Lévy area* for  $X$ , is a continuous function

$$\mathbb{X}^3: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$$

with the following algebraic identity

$$\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3 = \mathbb{X}_{s,u}^3 + \mathbb{X}_{u,t}^3 + \mathbb{X}_{s,u}^2 \otimes \delta X_{u,t} + \delta X_{s,u} \otimes \mathbb{X}_{u,t}^2,$$

for every  $s, u, t \in \mathbb{R}$  and the property  $\|\mathbb{X}^3\|_{3\gamma, I} = \sup_{\substack{s, t \in I \\ s \neq t}} \frac{\|\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3\|}{|t-s|^{3\gamma}} < \infty$  on every compact interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ . We call  $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}^2, \mathbb{X}^3)$  a  $\gamma$ -rough path. We set

$$(0.3) \quad \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, I} = \max\{\|X\|_{\gamma, I}, \sqrt{\|\mathbb{X}^2\|_{2\gamma, I}}, \sqrt[3]{\|\mathbb{X}^3\|_{3\gamma, I}}\}.$$

- By  $a \lesssim b$ , we mean for a constant  $C$ , which is not dependent on  $\mathbf{X}$  we have  $a \leq Cb$ . Also, whenever we talk about a constant, we mean it is independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

- We say  $\gamma$ -rough path  $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}^2, \mathbb{X}^3)$  is geometric, if for  $X_t = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} X_t^i e_i$ ,  $\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{i,j} e_i \otimes e_j$  and  $\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3 = \sum_{1 \leq i, j, k \leq d} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{i,j,k} e_i \otimes e_j \otimes e_k$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{i,j} + \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{j,i} &= \delta X_{s,t}^i \delta X_{s,t}^j \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \pi_{i,j,k}} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{\sigma(i), \sigma(j), \sigma(k)} &= \delta X_{s,t}^i \delta X_{s,t}^j \delta X_{s,t}^k \end{aligned}$$

holds for every  $(i, j, k) \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}^3$  and  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Here by  $\pi_{i,j,k}$ , we mean set of all permutations on  $\{i, j, k\}$  and  $(e_i)_{i \leq d}$ , the usual basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

## 1. ROUGH DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

In this section we consider the rough differential equation of the form

$$(1.1) \quad dZ_t = V(Z_t) d\mathbf{X}_t + V_0(Z_t) dt, \quad Z_0 = z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

We will study several aspects of this equation. In particular, we obtain several estimates which are essential for analyzing the long-time behavior of the solutions of this type of equations. We will accept the following assumption until the end of this section.

**Assumption 1.1.** • We assume  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}^2, \mathbb{X}^3)$  is a  $\gamma$ -Hölder geometric rough path where  $X$  takes values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

- We assume  $V_0 : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a  $C^1$ -vector field such that we can find a polynomial  $P$ , such that

$$(1.2) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \quad \|V_0(Z)\| \leq P(\|Z\|).$$

- For  $\frac{1}{\gamma} + 1 < p \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{\gamma} \rfloor + 2$ ,  $V : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$  is a  $\text{Lip}^p$ -vector field.
- We assume equations (1.1) for every initial value  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , admits a unique solution such that we can find a polynomial  $R$  and a continuous function  $\Phi$

$$(1.3) \quad \forall T > 0 : \quad \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]} \leq \Phi(T) R(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}).$$

We now state three examples in which the above assumption is fulfilled.

**Example 1.2.** • The easiest case is when  $V$  and  $V_0$  are  $\text{Lip}^p$ -vector fields. It is well understood that (1.1) for every  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$  admits a unique solution [FV10b, Theorem 10.26] which is also differentiable in the initial condition [FV10b, Theorem 11.6]. In addition the Assumption (1.1) is fulfilled.

- Assume  $V_0$  is a locally Lipschitz continuous vector field with linear growth on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Then from [RS17, Theorem 3.1] the priori bound (1.3) holds. Therefore, Assumption (1.1) is fulfilled.
- If  $V_0$  satisfies the one-sided conditions formulated in [RS17, Equation (4.2) and (4.2)], it is shown in [RS17, Theorem 4.3] that the a priori bound (1.3) still holds.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Strictly speaking, the bounds in [RS17, Theorem 3.1] and [RS17, Theorem 4.3] are formulated for the  $p$ -variation and not for the Hölder-norm. However, an inspection of the proof reveals that the same strategy applied there works also for the Hölder norm provided the equations are driven by Hölder rough paths.

**1.1. Basic objects, definitions and auxiliary Lemmas.** *In this part, we introduce some elements of rough path theory and the definition of integral in this concept. We will also prove several auxiliary Lemmas for future purposes.*

*Remark 1.3.* If we assume  $\frac{1}{3} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , then our calculations become much easier, and the third Lévy area is superfluous. During this paper, we are considering the more involving case, i.e.,  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{3}$ . All statements remain true for  $\frac{1}{3} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$  under our assumption.

To understand the forthcoming calculations, it will be useful to recall what a path *controlled by*  $\mathbf{X}$  means [FH20, Section 4.5].

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma$  and  $Y : [a, b] \rightarrow W$  is a  $\gamma_1$ -Hölder path taking values in some finite dimensional Banach space  $W$ . If there are  $\gamma_1$ -Hölder paths  $Y^{(1)}$  and  $Y^{(2)}$  taking values in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, W)$  resp.  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, W)) \approx \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d, W)$  that satisfy

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} s, t \in [a, b] : \quad & \delta Y_{s,t} - Y_s^{(1)} \delta X_{s,t} - Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 = Y_{s,t}^\# = \mathcal{O}(|t-s|^{3\gamma}) \quad \text{and} \\ & \delta Y_{s,t}^{(1)} - Y_s^{(2)} \delta X_{s,t} = (Y^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# = \mathcal{O}(|t-s|^{2\gamma}), \end{aligned}$$

the triple  $(Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)})$  is a *path controlled by*  $\mathbf{X}$ . We call  $Y^{(1)}$  and  $Y^{(2)}$  the first and second Gubinelli derivatives, also  $Y^\#$  and  $(Y^{(1)})^\#$  the reminder terms. We use  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])$  to denote the spaces of controlled path. We also impose the following norm

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])} \\ & := \max \left\{ \|Y\|_{\infty, [a, b]}, \|Y^{(1)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]}, \|Y^{(2)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]}, \|Y^{(2)}\|_{\gamma_1, [a, b]}, \|(Y^{(1)})^\#\|_{2\gamma_1, [a, b]}, \|Y^\#\|_{3\gamma_1, [a, b]} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that if  $(Z, Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$  be another path controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ , then

$$\left\| (Y + Z, Y^{(1)} + Z^{(1)}, Y^{(2)} + Z^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])} \leq \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])} + \left\| (Z, Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])}.$$

*Remark 1.5.* Following estimates are direct consequences of (1.4) and (1.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y\|_{\gamma_1, [a, b]} & \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a, b]}^2) \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])}, \\ \|Y^{(1)}\|_{\gamma_1, [a, b]} & \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a, b]}) \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])}. \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 1.6.* To avoid using too many notations, we might sometimes drop  $W$  and use  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])$  instead of  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}, W}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])$ .

*Remark 1.7.* From (1.4),

$$\begin{aligned} s, u, t \in [a, b] : \quad & Y_{s,t}^\# = Y_{s,u}^\# + Y_{u,t}^\# + (Y^{(1)})_{s,u}^\# \delta X_{u,t} + \delta Y_{s,u}^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{u,t}^2, \\ & (Y^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# = (Y^{(1)})_{s,u}^\# + (Y^{(1)})_{u,t}^\# + \delta Y_{s,u}^{(2)} \delta X_{u,t}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the following inequality

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a, c])} \leq (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a, c]} + 1)^2 \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])} \\ & + \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([b, c])}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a < b < c$  and  $c - a \leq 1$ .

For the composition of two controlled paths, we have the following Lemma.

**Lemma 1.8.** *Assume  $U$  and  $W$ , two finite Banach spaces and  $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma$ . Let  $A$  be a  $\gamma_1$ -Hölder path which takes value in  $U$  and  $(A, A^{(1)}, A^{(2)})$  is controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ . Also, we assume  $B$  is  $\gamma_1$ -Hölder path which takes value in  $\mathcal{L}(U, W)$  and  $(B, B^{(1)}, B^{(2)})$  is controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ . Set*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sym} : \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \text{Sym}(v_1 \otimes v_2) &= \frac{v_1 \otimes v_2 + v_2 \otimes v_1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} (AB)_s^{(1)} &= A_s^{(1)}B_s + A_sB_s^{(1)}, \\ (AB)_s^{(2)} &= A_s^{(2)}B_s + A_sB_s^{(2)} + 2(A_s^{(1)}B_s^{(1)}) \circ \text{Sym}, \end{aligned}$$

with the following actions

$$v \in \mathbb{R}^d : (AB)_s^{(1)}(v) = A_s^{(1)}(v)B_s + A_sB_s^{(1)}(v),$$

$$v_1 \otimes v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d :$$

$$(A_s^{(1)}B_s^{(1)})(v_1 \otimes v_2) = A_s^{(1)}(v_1)B_s^{(1)}(v_2),$$

$$(AB)_s^{(2)}(v_1 \otimes v_2) := A_s^{(2)}(v_1 \otimes v_2)B_s + A_sB_s^{(2)}(v_1 \otimes v_2) + A_s^{(1)}(v_1)B_s^{(1)}(v_2) + A_s^{(1)}(v_2)B_s^{(1)}(v_1).$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} (AB)_{s,t}^\# &= A_{s,t}^\#B_s + A_sB_{s,t}^\# + (A_s^{(1)}(\delta X_{s,t}))(B_s^{(2)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t} + B_{s,t}^\#) + (A_s^{(2)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t} + A_{s,t}^\#)(\delta B_{s,t}), \\ ((AB)_{s,t}^{(1)})^\# &= (A^{(1)})_{s,t}^\#B_s + A_s(B^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# + A_s^{(1)}(B^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# + (A^{(1)})_{s,t}^\#B_s^{(1)} \\ &\quad + (\delta A_{s,t}^{(1)})(\delta B_{s,t}) + (\delta A_{s,t})(\delta B_{s,t}^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $(AB, (AB)^{(1)}, (AB)^{(2)})$  is a path controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ . In addition,  $(A \circ B)^\#$  and  $((AB)^{(1)})^\#$  are the reminders terms as (1.4). Furthermore

$$(1.7) \quad \left\| \left\| (AB, (AB)^{(1)}, (AB)^{(2)}) \right\| \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a,b])} \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a,b]}^4) \|A\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a,b])} \|B\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a,b])}.$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$(1.8) \quad \delta(AB)_{s,t} = A_s(\delta B_{s,t}) + (\delta A_{s,t})B_s + (\delta A_{s,t})(\delta B_{s,t}).$$

For the rest of the proof, it is enough to replace the expansions of  $A$  and  $B$  in (1.8) and notice that since  $\mathbf{X}$  is geometric, we have

$$2(A_s^{(1)}B_s^{(1)}) \circ \text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t}) = (A_s^{(1)}B_s^{(1)})\delta X_{s,t} \otimes \delta X_{s,t}.$$

Also, (1.7) follows from Remark 1.5 and the expressions that we provide in the statement of Lemma.  $\square$

*Remark 1.9.* In case it is obvious what we mean with the first and second Gubinelli derivatives, we might use the convention of  $\|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X},W}^{\gamma}([a,b])}$  instead of  $\|(Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X},W}^{\gamma_1}([a,b])}$ .

It is known that when we composite a controlled path by  $\mathbf{X}$  with a smooth function, then this new path is again controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ . In the next Lemma, we make this statement precise and explicitly make some calculations for our future aims.

**Lemma 1.10.** *Let  $W$  and  $U$  be finite-dimensional Banach spaces,  $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma$  and  $G: W \rightarrow U$  be 3-times Fréchet differentiable. Assume  $(Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])$ . Then  $(G(Y), G(Y)^{(1)}, G(Y)^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([a, b])$ , where*

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{aligned} G(Y)^{(1)} &= D_Y G(Y^{(1)}), \\ v \in \mathbb{R}^d : G(Y)^{(1)}v &= D_Y G(Y^{(1)}v) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{aligned} G(Y)^{(2)} &= D_Y^2 G(Y^{(1)}, Y^{(1)}) + D_Y G(Y^{(2)}), \\ v_1 \otimes v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d : G(Y)^{(2)}(v_1 \otimes v_2) &= D_Y^2 G(Y^{(1)}v_1, Y^{(1)}v_2) + D_Y G(Y^{(2)}(v_1 \otimes v_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} (G(Y))_{s,t}^{\#} &= D_{Y_s} G(Y_{s,t}^{\#}) + \frac{1}{2} D_{Y_s}^2 G(Y_s^{(1)} \delta X_{s,t}, Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + Y_{s,t}^{\#}) + \frac{1}{2} D_{Y_s}^2 G(Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + Y_{s,t}^{\#}, \delta Y_{s,t}) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{2} D_{\sigma Y_t + (1-\sigma)Y_s}^3 G(\delta Y_{s,t}, \delta Y_{s,t}, \delta Y_{s,t}) d\sigma, \\ (G(Y)^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#} &= D_{Y_s}^2 G(Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + Y_{s,t}^{\#}, Y_s^{(1)}) + D_{Y_s} G((Y^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#}) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 (1-\sigma) D_{\sigma Y_t + (1-\sigma)Y_s}^3 G(\delta Y_{s,t}, \delta Y_{s,t}, Y_s^{(1)}) d\sigma + (D_{Y_t} G - D_{Y_s} G)(\delta Y_{s,t}), \end{aligned}$$

with the following action

$$\begin{aligned} v \in \mathbb{R}^d : (G(Y)^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#} v &= D_{Y_s}^2 G(Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + Y_{s,t}^{\#}, Y_s^{(1)}v) + D_{Y_s} G((Y^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#}v) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 (1-\sigma) D_{\sigma Y_t + (1-\sigma)Y_s}^3 G(\delta Y_{s,t}, \delta Y_{s,t}, Y_s^{(1)}v) d\sigma + (D_{Y_t} G - D_{Y_s} G)(\delta Y_{s,t})v. \end{aligned}$$

If  $G \in C_b^3(W, U)$ , then

$$(1.12) \quad u, v \in [a, b] : \left\| (G(Y), G(Y)^{(1)}, G(Y)^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([u, v])} \lesssim (1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([u, v])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^9).$$

*Proof.* The expression of derivatives and reminders follows from the following Taylor expansions and this fact that  $\mathbf{X}$  is geometric.

(1.13)

$$\forall x, y \in W :$$

$$G(y) - G(x) = D_x G(y - x) + \int_0^1 (1-\sigma) D_{\sigma y + (1-\sigma)x}^2 G(y - x, y - x) d\sigma \quad \text{and}$$

$$G(y) - G(x) = D_x G(y - x) + \frac{1}{2} D_x^2 G(y - x, y - x) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{2} D_{\sigma y + (1-\sigma)x}^3 G(y - x, y - x, y - x) d\sigma.$$

Also when  $G \in C_b^3(W, U)$ , then the inequality (1.12) is a direct consequence of Remark 1.5, (1.9), (1.10), (1.11) and the following simple inequality

$$(1.14) \quad x, y \geq 0 : \max_{\substack{i, j \geq 0, \\ i+j \leq 9}} \{x^i y^j\} \lesssim 1 + x^9 + y^9.$$

□



**Corollary 1.11.** *Assume  $0 < r \leq 1$  and  $G$  is a  $\text{Lip}^{3+r}$ -vector field. Let  $(Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}), (Z, Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])$ . Then for a fix  $0 < \kappa < 1$*

(1.15)

$$u, v \in [a, b] : \quad \|G(Y) - G(Z)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\kappa\gamma}([u, v])} \lesssim \max \left\{ \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^r, \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}, \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^{1-\kappa} \right\}$$

(1.16)

$$\times \left( 1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^9 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^9 \right),$$

*Proof.* First note that

$$\begin{aligned} (G(Y)^{(2)})_t - (G(Z)^{(2)})_t &= D_{Y_t}^2 G(Y_t^{(1)}, Y_t^{(1)}) + D_{Y_t} G(Y_t^{(2)}) - D_{Z_t}^2 G(Z_t^{(1)}, Z_t^{(1)}) - D_{Z_t} G(Z_t^{(2)}) \\ &= \int_0^1 D_{\sigma Y_t + (1-\sigma)Z_t}^3 G(Y_t - Z_t, Y_t^{(1)}, Y_t^{(1)}) d\sigma + (D_{Z_t}^2 G(Y_t^{(1)}, Y_t^{(1)}) - D_{Z_t}^2 G(Z_t^{(1)}, Z_t^{(1)})) \\ &\quad + (D_{Y_t} G(Y_t^{(2)}) - D_{Z_t} G(Z_t^{(2)})) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(1.17) \quad \|G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]} \lesssim \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])} (1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2)$$

Also from Remark 1.5

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta(G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)})_{s, t}\| &\leq \|\delta(G(Y)^{(2)})_{s, t}\| + \|\delta(G(Z)^{(2)})_{s, t}\| \\ &\lesssim (t - s)^{\gamma} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a, b]}^2) (1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\delta(G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)})_{s, t}\| &\lesssim \|\delta(G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)})_{s, t}\|^{\kappa} \|G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]}^{1-\kappa} \\ &\lesssim (t - s)^{\kappa\gamma} \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^{1-\kappa} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [a, b]}^2) (1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2). \end{aligned}$$

From our assumption on  $G$

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \|G(Y) - G(Z)\|_{\infty, [u, v]}, \|G(Y)^{(1)} - G(Z)^{(1)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]}, \|G(Y)^{(2)} - G(Z)^{(2)}\|_{\infty, [a, b]} \right\} \\ \lesssim \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])} (1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([a, b])}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $G$  is a  $\text{Lip}^{3+r}$ -vector field, from (1.11) and Remark 1.5

(1.20)

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \|(G(Y))^{\#} - (G(Z))^{\#}\|_{3\kappa\gamma, [u, v]}, \|(G(Y)^{(1)})^{\#} - (G(Z)^{(1)})^{\#}\|_{2\kappa\gamma, [u, v]} \right\} \\ \lesssim \max \left\{ \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^r, \|Y - Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])} \right\} \left( 1 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^9 + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([u, v])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^9 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Our claim now follows from (1.17)-(1.20).  $\square$

We can now define the integral respect to  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Lemma 1.12.** *Assume in Definition 1.4,  $W = \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $3\gamma_1 + \gamma > 1$ . Then, the rough integral*

$$(1.21) \quad \int_s^t Y_{\tau} d\mathbf{X}_{\tau} := \lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0, \pi = \{s = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_m = t\}} \sum_{0 \leq j < m} [Y_{\tau_j}(\delta X)_{\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}} + Y_{\tau_j}^{(1)} \mathbb{X}_{\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}}^2 + Y_s^{(2)} \mathbb{X}^3]$$

exists. Furthermore  $(\int_u Y_\tau d\mathbf{X}_\tau, Y, Y^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([u, b])$  and

(1.22)

$$\begin{aligned} u, v \in [a, b] : \quad & \left\| \int_u^v Y_\tau \circ d\mathbf{X}_\tau - Y_u(\delta X)_{u,v} - Y_u^{(1)}\mathbb{X}_{u,v}^2 - Y_u^{(2)}\mathbb{X}_{u,v}^3 \right\| \\ & \lesssim \left[ \|Y^\# \|_{3\gamma_1, [u, v]} \|X\|_{\gamma, [u, v]} + \|(Y^{(1)})^\# \|_{2\gamma_1, [u, v]} \|\mathbb{X}^2\|_{2\gamma, [u, v]} + \|Y^{(2)}\|_{\gamma_1, [u, v]} \|\mathbb{X}^3\|_{3\gamma, [u, v]} \right] (v-u)^{3\gamma_1+\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The definition of (1.21) follows by the usual Sewing lemma [FH20, Lemma 4.2]. Also (1.22), is a consequence of [FH20, Lemma 4.2].  $\square$

*Remark 1.13.* Assume  $u, v \in [a, b]$  and  $3\gamma_1 > 2\gamma$ . From (1.22), we can obtain the following inequality

(1.23)

$$\begin{aligned} u, v \in [a, b] : \quad & \left\| \left( \int_u Y_\tau d\mathbf{X}_\tau, Y, Y^{(1)} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([u, v])} \lesssim \|Y_u\| + \|Y_u^{(1)}\| \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^2 + \|Y_u^{(2)}\| \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^3 \\ & + \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([u, v])} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^3) (v-u)^{3\gamma_1-2\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$(1.24) \quad \left\| \left( \int_u Y_\tau d\mathbf{X}_\tau, Y, Y^{(1)} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([u, v])} \lesssim \left\| (Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([u, v])} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [u, v]}^3).$$

Equations of type (1.1) are first studied in [RS17]. Also, the authors obtained a priori bounded for the solutions in  $C^\gamma$ -norm. For our purposes,  $C^\gamma$ -norm is insufficient. Therefore, we will investigate this equation further and obtain a prior bound in  $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma$ -norm.

*Remark 1.14.* Recall in equation (1.1), the solution is satisfied

$$Z_t = Z_0 + \int_0^t V(Z_\tau) d\mathbf{X}_\tau + \int_0^t V_0(Z_\tau) d\tau.$$

Where  $(Z, V(Z), D_Z V(V(Z))) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma$  and  $\int_0^t V(Z_\tau) d\mathbf{X}_\tau$  is defined in the sense of (1.21).

**Proposition 1.15.** *Let us accept the Assumption 1.1. Let  $\gamma \neq \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)$  be the solution of (1.1). Set*

$$(1.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^\# & := (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t} - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))\delta X_{s,t} - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)))\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 \quad \text{and} \\ (\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# & := (\delta V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)))_{s,t} - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)))\delta X_{s,t}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for the a polynomial  $Q$  which depends on  $V$  and  $V_0$ , we have

$$(1.26) \quad \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])} \leq Q(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}).$$

*Proof.* From (1.1),  $\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)$  is controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)^{(1)} & = V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)), \\ \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)^{(2)} & = D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))). \end{aligned}$$

From the first identity in (1.13) and our expressions in (1.25)

$$(1.27) \quad \begin{aligned} (\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V \left( \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^{\#} + (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)))) \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 \right) \\ &+ \int_0^1 (1-\sigma) D_{\sigma\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)+(1-\sigma)\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V \left( (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}, (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t} \right) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

So, it is sufficient to find a polynomial bound for  $\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{\#}\|_{3\gamma,[0,T]}$ . Recall  $V : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ . We expand  $V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))$  as (1.4). From Lemma (1.10)

$$(1.28) \quad \begin{aligned} V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))), \\ V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^2 V \left( V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)), V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \right) + D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V \left( D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$(1.29) \quad \begin{aligned} V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}^{\#} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^{\#}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^2 V \left( V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \delta X_{s,t}, D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))) \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^{\#} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^2 V \left( D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))) \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^{\#}, (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t} \right) \\ &+ \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{2} D_{\sigma\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)+(1-\sigma)\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^3 V \left( (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}, (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}, (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t} \right) d\sigma, \\ (V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^2 V \left( D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))) \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{s,t}^{\#}, V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \right) \\ &+ D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V \left( (\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)}_{s,t} \right) \\ &+ \int_0^1 (1-\sigma) D_{\sigma\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)+(1-\sigma)\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^3 V \left( (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}, (\delta\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}, V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \right) d\sigma \\ &+ (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)} V) \left( (\delta V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)))_{s,t} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma (1.10),  $(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)), V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)}, V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)})$  is controlled by  $\mathbf{X}$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)))_{s,t} &= V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} \delta X_{s,t} + V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}^{\#} \\ (\delta V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)})_{s,t} &= V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} \delta X_{s,t} + (V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)})_{s,t}^{\#}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0) \\ &= \int_s^t V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}(z_0)) d\mathbf{X}_{\tau} - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) X_{s,t} - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3 \\ &\quad + \int_s^t V_0(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}(z_0)) d\tau + V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) X_{s,t} + V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3. \end{aligned}$$

From (1.22),

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.30) \quad & \left\| \int_s^t V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)) d\mathbf{X}_\tau - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \delta X_{s,t} - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(2)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3 \right\| \\
& \leq C_2 \left[ \|(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)))^\# \|_{3\gamma, [s,t]} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]} + \|(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)})^\# \|_{2\gamma, [s,t]} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(2)} \|_{\gamma, [s,t]} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^3 \right] (t-s)^{4\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$(1.31) \quad (\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{s,t}^\# = \int_s^t V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)) d\mathbf{X}_\tau - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)) \delta X_{s,t} - V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0))^{(1)} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + \int_s^t V_0(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)) d\tau.$$

Assume  $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ . From (1.28), (1.29) and our assumption on  $V$ , we can find a constant  $M_1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.32) \quad & \|(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)))^\# \|_{3\gamma, [s,t]} \\
& \leq M_1 \left[ (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]} + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}) \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{3\gamma, [s,t]}^\# \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^2 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^2) \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [s,t]} + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^3 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Also from (1.27), (1.28) and (1.29)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.33) \quad & \|(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(1)})^\# \|_{2\gamma, [s,t]} \leq M_1 [\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{3\gamma, [s,t]}^\# + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^2 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}^2], \\
& \|V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^{(2)} \|_{\gamma, [s,t]} \leq M_1 \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}.
\end{aligned}$$

The goal is to use the inequality (1.30) to find a priori bound for  $\|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^\# \|_{3\gamma, [s,t]}$  in an arbitrary interval  $[s, t]$ . The idea is to apply the bounds that we obtained in (1.32), (1.33) and replace them on the right side of (1.30). We assume  $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$  and  $t-s \leq 1$ . Recall (1.3) and our assumption on  $V_0$  in (1.2). Since  $(t-s)^\gamma \leq (t-s)^{1-3\gamma}$ , after replacing the bounds, we conclude there exist two increasing (in both variables) polynomials  $Q_1, Q_2$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.34) \quad & \|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^\# \|_{3\gamma, [s,t]} \leq \\
& (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} Q_1(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [s,t]}) \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{3\gamma, [s,t]}^\# + Q_2(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s,t]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [s,t]}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . We choose a finite sequence  $(\tau_n)_{0 \leq n \leq N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)}$  in  $[0, T]$ , such that  $\tau_0 = 0$ ,  $\tau_{N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)} = T$  and for  $0 \leq n < N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$ ,  $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n = \tau$ . Also

$$(1.35) \quad \tau^{1-3\gamma} Q_1(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]}) = 1 - \epsilon.$$

Then since  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are two increasing (in both variables) polynomials, from (1.34), for  $M_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  and  $0 \leq n < N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$

$$(1.36) \quad \|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))^\# \|_{3\gamma, [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]} \leq M_\epsilon Q_2(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]}).$$

Note that from (1.35),

$$(1.37) \quad N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) = \lfloor \frac{T}{\tau} \rfloor + 1 = \lfloor TM\epsilon^{\frac{1}{1-3\gamma}} Q_1(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]})^{\frac{1}{1-3\gamma}} \rfloor + 1.$$

Assume  $\tau < \nu < v$ , then from (1.31),

$$(1.38) \quad \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, v}^{\#} = \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, \nu}^{\#} + \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\nu, v}^{\#} + (\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{(1)})_{\tau, \nu}^{\#} \delta X_{\nu, v} + \delta(D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)} V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))))_{\tau, \nu} \mathbb{X}_{\nu, v}^2.$$

Therefore for a constant  $M_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, v}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau, v]} &\leq \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, \nu}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau, \nu]} + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\nu, v}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\nu, v]} \\ &\quad + \|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{(1)})_{\tau, \nu}^{\#}\|_{2\gamma, [\tau, \nu]} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} + M_2 \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From (1.27), we can find a constant  $M_3$  such that for every  $[\tau, \nu] \subseteq [0, T]$ ,

$$(1.39) \quad \|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)^{(1)})_{\tau, \nu}^{\#}\|_{2\gamma, [\tau, \nu]} \leq M_3 \left( \|(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0))_{\tau, \nu}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau, \nu]} + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2 \right).$$

From and (1.38) and (1.39),

$$(1.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, v}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau, v]} &\leq (1 + M_3 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau, \nu}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau, \nu]} + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\nu, v}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\nu, v]} \\ &\quad + M_4 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $M_4$  is a constant. Consequently from (1.36) and  $0 \leq n < N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$ ,

$$(1.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_n, T}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau_n, T]} &\leq (1 + M_3 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}]} + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_{n+1}, T}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau_{n+1}, T]} \\ &\quad + M_4 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2) \\ &\leq \underbrace{M_\epsilon (1 + M_3 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) Q_2(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]}) + M_4 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^2)}_{Q_4(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]})} \\ &\quad + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_{n+1}, T}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau_{n+1}, T]} = Q_4(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]}) + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_{n+1}, T}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [\tau_{n+1}, T]}. \end{aligned}$$

So, if we start with  $\tau_0 = 0$  and recursively apply on (1.41),

$$(1.42) \quad \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)_{\tau_0, T}^{\#}\|_{3\gamma, [0, T]} \leq (N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) + 1) Q_4(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{C^\gamma, [0, T]}).$$

From (1.3) and (1.37), we can see  $N(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)$  has a polynomial growth in the terms of  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}$  and  $\|z_0\|$ . Therefore, our claim follows from (1.3) and (1.42).  $\square$

The following result gives us a priori bound for the linearized equation. This bound is important when we want to apply the multiplicative ergodic theorem.

**Proposition 1.16.** *Assume there exists an increasing polynomial  $P_1$  such that*

$$(1.43) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \quad \|D_z V_0\| \leq P_1(\|z\|).$$

*Then the solution to equation (1.1) is differentiable and for a polynomial  $Q_1$ ,*

$$(1.44) \quad \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\mathbf{X}}}^2([0, T])} \leq \|\bar{z}\| \exp(Q_1(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}))$$

*for every  $\bar{z}, z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\gamma \neq \frac{1}{3}$ .*

*Proof.* Note that by our regularity assumption on  $V_0$  and  $V$ ,  $\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(\cdot)$  is differentiable with respect to initial values. To show this claim, let  $\delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , be a  $C^\infty$ -function such that  $\text{support}(\delta) \subset B(0, 2)$  and  $\delta|_{B(0,1)} = 1$ . For  $R > 0$ , set  $\bar{V}_0(z) := \delta(\frac{z}{R})V_0(z)$ . Consider the following equation

$$(1.45) \quad dZ_t = V(Z_t)d\mathbf{X}_t + \bar{V}_0(Z_t) dt, \quad Z_0 = z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Then by construction  $\bar{V}_0 \in C_b^1$ , therefore by our assumption on  $V$ , from by [FV10b, Theorem 11.6], the solutions of the above equation are differentiable. Since the solutions of (1.45) are locally in time equal to the original equation, i.e., (1.1), we can conclude the differentiability of the solution. In addition, the derivative solves equation

$$(1.46) \quad dD_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}] = D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}])d\mathbf{X}_t + D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)}V_0(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}])dt, \quad D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^0[\bar{z}] = \bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

We use (1.47), to obtain the priori bound (1.44). Note that

$$(1.47) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}] - D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}] \\ &= \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}])d\mathbf{X}_\tau - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])\delta X_{s,t} - (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(1)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 \\ & \quad - (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(2)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3 + \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)}V_0(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]) d\tau + D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])\delta X_{s,t} \\ & \quad + (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(1)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 + (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(2)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]$ , solves (1.46), we can calculate the elements of expansion  $D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]$  as (1.4). From Lemma 1.10

$$(1.48) \quad \begin{aligned} (D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])^{(1)} &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]), \\ (D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])^{(2)} &= (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(1)} \\ &= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}^2V(V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)), D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]) + D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])), \\ (D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}])_{s,t}^\# &= (\delta D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}])_{s,t} - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}])\delta X_{s,t} - (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(1)}\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^2 \quad \text{and} \\ ((D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}])^1)_{s,t}^\# &= (\delta D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]))_{s,t} - (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]))^{(1)}\delta X_{s,t}. \end{aligned}$$

From our assumption on  $V$  and (1.12)

$$(1.49) \quad \left\| D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)}V \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s,t])} \lesssim (1 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([u,v])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^9).$$

By (1.7)

$$(1.50) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)}V(D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s,t])} \\ & \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^4)(1 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([u,v])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^9) \left\| D_{z_0}\phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}] \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s,t])}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume  $t - s \subseteq [0, T]$ . From (1.23), (1.48), (1.50) and our assumption on  $V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.51) \quad & \left\| \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}(z_0)} V(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_{\tau} \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])} \\
& \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^3) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]\| + (t-s)^{\gamma} \underbrace{(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^4)^2 (1 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])}^9 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}^9)}_{Q_5(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[s,t]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])})} \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])}.
\end{aligned}$$

From (1.43)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.52) \quad & \left\| \left( \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}(z_0)} V_0(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau}[\bar{z}]) d\tau, 0, 0 \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])} \\
& \lesssim (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])}) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])}
\end{aligned}$$

Assume  $[s, t]$ , be an arbitrary subse of  $[0, T]$  such that  $t - s \leq 1$ . Then since  $(t - s)^{\gamma} \leq (t - s)^{1-3\gamma}$ , from (1.51) and (1.52), for a constant  $M > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])} \leq M \left( (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}^3) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}]\| \right. \\
& \left. + (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} (Q_5(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\gamma,[0,T]})) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([s,t])} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . We choose a finite sequence  $(\tau_n)_{0 \leq n \leq \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)}$  in  $[0, T]$ , such that  $\tau_0 = 0$  and  $\tau_{\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)} = T$ . For  $0 \leq n < \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$ , we assume  $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n = \tau$  and

$$\tau^{1-3\gamma} M (Q_5(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])})) = 1 - \epsilon.$$

From (1.51), (1.52) and the choice of  $\tau$ , for  $M_{\epsilon} = \frac{M}{\epsilon}$

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.53) \quad & 0 \leq n < \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1 : \\
& \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} \leq M_{\epsilon} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}^3) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^{\tau_n}[\bar{z}]\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.54) \quad & \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) = \lfloor \frac{T}{\tau} \rfloor + 1 \\
& = \left\lceil T (M_{\epsilon} (Q_5(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([0,T])}))^{\frac{1}{1-3\gamma}} \right\rceil + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Since (1.53) holds for every  $0 \leq n < \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$  and  $M_{\epsilon} > 1$ , we conclude

$$(1.55) \quad \sup_{0 \leq n < \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1} \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} \leq (M_{\epsilon} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}^3))^{\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) + 1} \|\bar{z}\|.$$

From (1.6), for every  $0 \leq n < \tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) - 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([\tau_n, T])} \leq \\
& (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]} + 1)^2 \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} + \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma}([\tau_{n+1}, T])}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore from (1.55)

(1.56)

$$\|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0,T])} \leq (\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) + 1)(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]} + 1)^2 (M_\epsilon(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}^3))^{\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0) + 1} \|\bar{z}\|.$$

Recall from Proposition 1.15, for a polynomial  $Q$

$$\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0,T])} \leq Q(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]})$$

So,  $\tilde{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_0)$  has a polynomial growth in the terms of  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]}$  and  $\|z_0\|$ . Now from (1.56), we can drive (1.44).  $\square$

Proposition 1.16, immediately gives the following result:

**Corollary 1.17.** *For  $z_0, z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , then for a polynomial  $Q_2$ ,*

$$\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0,T])} \leq \|z_1 - z_0\| \exp(Q_2(\|z_0\|, \|z_1\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]})).$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0) = \int_0^1 D_{z_0 + \theta(z_1 - z_0)} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[z_1 - z_0] d\theta.$$

Now, it is enough to apply on Proposition 1.16.  $\square$

*Remark 1.18.* Let  $(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, u, z_0))_{u \geq s}$ , solves equation

$$d\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0) = V(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0)) d\mathbf{X}_t + V_0(\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0)) dt, \quad \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, s, z_0) = z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

In particular,  $\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(0, t, z_0) = \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t(z_0)$ . Also for every  $0 \leq s < T$ , the bound which we obtained in Proposition 1.15, holds for  $\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, \cdot, z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s,T])}$ . In addition, we have the flow property, i.e.

$$0 \leq s \leq u \leq t: \quad \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0) = \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, u, \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(u, t, z_0)).$$

Assume further that  $(\psi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, u, z_0))_{u \geq s}$ , solves

$$d\psi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0)[\bar{z}]$$

$$= D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s,t,z_0)} V(\psi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0)[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_t + D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(s,t,z_0)} V_0(\psi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t, z_0)[\bar{z}]) dt, \quad \psi_{\mathbf{X}}(s, s, z_0)[\bar{z}] = \bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

It is clear that  $\psi_{\mathbf{X}}(0, t, z_0) = D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t$  and the flow property holds for  $\psi_{\mathbf{X}}$ .

Note that since we have the flow property,  $D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is also invertible. For the future purposes, we also need to obtain a similar bound as (1.44) for  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}$ . In the next Lemma, we sketch how this bound can be obtained.

**Lemma 1.19.** *Assume the same setting as Proposition 1.4. Then the for a same polynomial*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq \exp(Q_1(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma,[0,T]})).$$

*Proof.* Let us to fix  $0 \leq t_0 \leq T$  and define

$$s, t \leq: \quad \tilde{X}_t := X_{t_0-t}, \quad \tilde{X}_{s,t}^2 := -\mathbb{X}_{t_0-t, t_0-s}^2, \quad \tilde{X}_{s,t}^3 := -\mathbb{X}_{t_0-t, t_0-s}^3.$$



Assume  $W$  is a finite-dimensional Banach space and  $[a, b] \subseteq [0, T]$  such that  $t_0 \geq b$ . We say  $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}^{(1)}, \tilde{Y}^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, W}^\gamma([a, b])$ , if  $\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}^{(1)}$  and  $\tilde{Y}^{(2)}$  be three  $\gamma$ -Hölder paths which taking value in  $W, \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d, W)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d, W)$  respectively. Also

$$(1.57) \quad \begin{aligned} s, t \in [a, b]: \quad & \delta \tilde{Y}_{s,t} - \tilde{Y}_t^{(1)} \tilde{X}_{s,t} - \tilde{Y}_t^{(2)} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{s,t}^2 = \tilde{Y}_{s,t}^\# = \mathcal{O}(|t-s|^{3\gamma}) \quad \text{and} \\ & \delta \tilde{Y}_{s,t}^{(1)} - \tilde{Y}_t^{(2)} \delta \tilde{X}_{s,t} = (\tilde{Y}^{(1)})_{s,t}^\# = \mathcal{O}(|t-s|^{2\gamma}), \end{aligned}$$

Note that from the Sewing Lemma, the following expression is well-defined

$$\int_a^b \tilde{Y}_\tau d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_\tau := \lim_{|\Pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\Pi} [\tilde{Y}_{\tau_j} (\delta \tilde{X})_{\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}} + \tilde{Y}_{\tau_{j+1}}^{(1)} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}}^2 + \tilde{Y}_{\tau_{j+1}}^{(2)} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}}^3].$$

Also, same results as Lemma 1.8 and Lemma 1.10 can be stated for  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, W}^\gamma([a, b])$ . Assume  $(Y, Y^{(1)}, Y^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, W}^\gamma([a, b])$ , then

$$(1.58) \quad \begin{aligned} (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}^{(1)}, \tilde{Y}^{(2)}) &= (Y_{t_0-}, Y_{t_0-}^{(1)}, Y_{t_0-}^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, W}^\gamma([a, b]), \quad \text{and} \\ \int_a^b \tilde{Y}_\tau d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_\tau &= - \int_{t_0-b}^{t_0-a} Y_\tau d\mathbf{X}_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

For  $0 \leq t \leq t_0$ , we set  $(\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t(z_0), \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t(z_0)^{(1)}, \tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t(z_0)^{(2)}) = (\phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-t}(z_0), \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-t}(z_0)^{(1)}, \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-t}(z_0)^{(2)})$ . Let  $(\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^u)_{0 \leq u \leq t_0}$ , solves equation

$$(1.59) \quad d\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t[\bar{z}] = D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t(z_0)} V(\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t[\bar{z}]) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t - D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t(z_0)} V_0(\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t[\bar{z}]) dt, \quad \tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^0[\bar{z}] = \bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

We claim  $\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0}[z] = (D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0})^{-1}[z]$ . To prove this claim, note that from (1.47) for  $s, t \in [0, t_0]$  with  $s < t$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-s}[z] - D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-t}[z] \\ &= \int_{t_0-t}^{t_0-s} D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau(z_0)} V(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau[z]) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_\tau + \int_{t_0-t}^{t_0-s} D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau[z]) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

From (1.58)

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-t}[z] - D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-s}[z] \\ &= \int_s^t D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau(z_0)} V(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-\tau}[z]) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_\tau - \int_s^t D_{\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-\tau}[z]) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-u}[z])_{0 \leq u \leq t_0}$ , is the solution to equation (1.59) with  $\bar{z} = D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0}[z]$ . So for  $0 \leq u \leq t_0$

$$\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^u[D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0}[z]] = D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0-u}[z].$$

In particular for  $u = t_0$ , we conclude  $\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0}[D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^{t_0}[z]] = z$ . This proves our claim. Finally we can argue as Proposition 1.16 with equation (1.59) to prove

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|(D_{z_0} \phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}^t)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq \exp(Q_1(\|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})).$$

□

We need one further estimate.

**Proposition 1.20.** *Recall for  $\frac{1}{\gamma} + 1 < p < 5$ ,  $V$  is a  $Lip^p$ -vector field. Assume further for  $0 < r_1 \leq 1$ , there exists a polynomial  $P_2$  such that*

$$(1.60) \quad \forall z_1, z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m : \quad \|D_{z_1} V_0 - D_{z_0} V_0\| \leq P_2(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|) \|z_1 - z_0\|^{r_1}.$$

*Let fix  $\frac{2}{3} < \kappa < 1$ . Then, there exists a polynomial  $Q_3$  such that for  $\gamma \neq \frac{1}{3}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall z_1, z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad & \left\| \|D_{z_1} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}] - D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^s[\bar{z}] \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])} \\ & \leq \max\{\|z_1 - z_0\|, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{r_1}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{p-4}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{1-\kappa}\} \exp(Q_3(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})) \|\bar{z}\|. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Set  $A(t, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z}) = D_{z_1} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}] - D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^t[\bar{z}]$ , then

$$(1.61) \quad \begin{aligned} A(t, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z}) - A(s, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z}) &= \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V(A(\tau, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \\ &+ \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0(A(\tau, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})) d\tau + \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V)(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \\ &+ \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0 - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0) D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}] d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\frac{2}{3} < \kappa < 1$ , by (1.15),

$$(1.62) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \|D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)} V \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\kappa\gamma}([0, T])} \\ & \lesssim \max\{\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}^{p-4}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}^{1-\kappa}\} \\ & \times (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^9 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}^9 + \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}^9). \end{aligned}$$

From (1.7) and (1.24), for  $\gamma_1 = \kappa\gamma$

$$(1.63) \quad \begin{aligned} [s, t] \subseteq [0, T] : \quad & \left\| \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V)(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([s, t])} \\ & \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^4)^2 \left\| \|D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)} V \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\kappa\gamma}([0, T])} \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\kappa\gamma}([0, T])} \\ & \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^4)^2 \left\| \|D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)} V \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\kappa\gamma}([0, T])} \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (1.62), (1.63), Proposition 1.16 and Corollary 1.17, we can find a polynomial  $Q_6$  such that

$$(1.64) \quad \begin{aligned} [s, t] \subseteq [0, T] : \quad & \left\| \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V)(D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([s, t])} \\ & \leq \max\{\|z_1 - z_0\|, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{p-4}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{1-\kappa}\} \exp(Q_6(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})) \|\bar{z}\|. \end{aligned}$$

From our assumptions on  $V_0$  in (1.60),

$$\begin{aligned} [s, t] \subseteq [0, T] : \quad & \left\| \left( \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0 - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0) D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}] d\tau, 0, 0 \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\gamma_1}([s, t])} \\ & \lesssim (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} P_2(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) \|D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])} \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1) - \phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_0)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])}^{r_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently from Proposition 1.16 and Corollary 1.17, we can find a polynomial  $Q_7$  such that

$$(1.65) \quad [s, t] \subseteq [0, T] : \left\| \left( \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0 - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0) D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}] d\tau, 0, 0 \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])} \\ \leq \|z_1 - z_0\|^{r_1} \exp(Q_7(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})) \|\bar{z}\|.$$

Therefore, from (1.64) and (1.65)

$$(1.66) \quad \max \left\{ \left\| \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V) (D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}]) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])}, \right. \\ \left. \left\| \left( \int_s^t (D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0 - D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_0)} V_0) D_{z_0} \phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau[\bar{z}] d\tau, 0, 0 \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])} \right\} \\ \leq \max\{\|z_1 - z_0\|, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{r_1}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{p-4}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{1-\kappa}\} \exp(Q_8(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})) \|\bar{z}\|,$$

where  $Q_8$  is a polynomial. From our assumption in (1.43) and similar to (1.52),

$$(1.67) \quad [s, t] \subseteq [0, T] : \left\| \left( \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V_0 (A(\tau, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})) d\tau, 0, 0 \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])} \\ \lesssim (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])}.$$

Like (1.51), for a polynomial  $Q_9$

$$(1.68) \quad \left\| \int_s^t D_{\phi_{\mathbf{X}}^\tau(z_1)} V (A(\tau, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})) d\mathbf{X}_\tau \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])} \lesssim (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s, t]}^3) \|A(s, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\| \\ + (t-s)^\gamma Q_9(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])}.$$

We are now ready to obtain our estimate. Assume  $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ , such that  $t-s \leq 1$ . From (1.66), (1.68) and Proposition 1.15, there exist a constant  $M \geq 1$  such that

$$(1.69) \quad \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])} \leq M(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^3) \|A(s, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\| \\ M \underbrace{\max\{\|z_1 - z_0\|, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{r_1}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{p-4}, \|z_1 - z_0\|^{1-\kappa}\} \exp(Q_8(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})) \|\bar{z}\|}_{B(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]})} \\ + (t-s)^{1-3\gamma} M (Q_9(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])})) \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([s, t])}.$$

We now argue as before, for  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  set

$$\tau^{1-3\gamma} M (Q_9(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])})) = 1 - \epsilon.$$

We define a finite sequence  $(\tau_n)_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)}$  in  $[0, T]$ , such that  $\tau_0 = 0$  and  $\tau_{\bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)} = T$ . For  $0 \leq n < \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)$ , we assume  $\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n = \tau$ . Therefore

$$(1.70) \quad \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0) = \left\lfloor \frac{T}{\tau} \right\rfloor + 1 \\ = \left\lfloor T \left( \frac{M(Q_9(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}, \|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}) + P_1(\|\phi_{\mathbf{X}}(z_1)\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])}))}{1 - \epsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-3\gamma}} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

From (1.69) for  $M_\epsilon = \frac{M}{\epsilon}$ ,

$$0 \leq n < \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0) : \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} \leq M_\epsilon(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^3) \|A(\tau_n, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\| \\ + M_\epsilon B(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\bar{z}\|.$$

In particular since  $A(0, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z}) = 0$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq n < \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)} \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} \\ \leq \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)} (M_\epsilon(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^3))^n M_\epsilon B(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\bar{z}\| \\ \lesssim (M_\epsilon(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}^3))^{\bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)+1} B(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\bar{z}\|.$$

Recall from (1.6),

$$\|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([\tau_n, T])} \leq \\ (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} + 1)^2 \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([\tau_n, \tau_{n+1}])} + \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([\tau_{n+1}, T])}.$$

Consequently,

$$(1.71) \quad \|A(\mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0, \bar{z})\|_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma([0, T])} \lesssim (\bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0) + 1) (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} + 1)^2 \\ \times (M_\epsilon(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [s, t]}^3))^{\bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)+1} B(\|z_1\|, \|z_0\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}) \|\bar{z}\|.$$

From (1.70) and (1.26),  $\bar{N}(\epsilon, \mathbf{X}, z_1, z_0)$  has a polynomial growth in terms of  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, T]}$ ,  $\|z_0\|$  and  $\|z_1\|$ . Therefore inequality (1.71), yields our claim.  $\square$

*Remark 1.21.* In our Propositions, for some technical reason, we excluded the case of  $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ . However, if  $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ , then we simply can work with any  $\gamma'$  such that  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma' < \gamma$ .

## 2. INVARIANT MANIFOLDS AND STABILITY

In this section, we apply our estimates from the previous sections to deduce the existence of a Lyapunov spectrum. Also, we will prove the existence of invariant manifolds. As a result, we can prove path-wise exponential stability in a neighborhood of stationary points, provided all Lyapunov exponents are negative. Let us first recall some basic definitions.

**Definition 2.1.** Assume  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space and  $\mathbb{T}$  be either  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $\mathbb{R}$ . Assume further that there exists a family of measurable maps  $\{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  on  $\Omega$ , such that

- (i)  $\theta_0 = \text{id}$ ,
- (ii) for every  $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$ :  $\theta_{t+s} = \theta_t \circ \theta_s$ ,
- (iii) if  $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}$ , then  $(t, \omega) \rightarrow \theta_t \omega$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}$ - measurable ,
- (iv) for every  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ :  $\mathbb{P}\theta_t = \mathbb{P}$ .

We then call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  an *invertible measure-preserving dynamical system*. We say  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  is *ergodic* if for every  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\theta_t : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be an ergodic map.

Another basic concept is the definition of a cocycle.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a separable Banach space and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  an invertible measure-preserving dynamical system. Assume  $\mathbb{T}^+$  be the non-negative part of the  $\mathbb{T}$ . A map

$$\phi: \mathbb{T}^+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X},$$

that is jointly measurable and satisfies

$$\forall s, t \in \mathbb{T}^+, s < t: \phi(s+t, \omega, x) = \phi(s, \theta_t \omega, \phi(t, \omega, x)),$$

is called a *measurable cocycle*. This map is a  $C^k$ -cocycle if for every fixed  $(s, \omega) \in \mathbb{T}^+ \times \Omega$ ,  $\phi(s, \omega, \cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a  $C^k$ -map. If the same map is linear, we call it a *linear cocycle*.

In the rough path theory, we solve the equation path-wise. Therefore, this field naturally fits with the theory of random dynamical systems. We now recall some definitions and results from [BRS17], where the authors studied solutions of rough equations in the framework of random dynamical systems.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$  be an (ergodic) measure-preserving dynamical system. Let  $p \geq 1$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $p-1 < N \leq p$ . We call a process  $\mathbf{X} : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow T^N(\mathbb{R}^d)$  a *p-variation geometric rough path cocycle* if for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and every  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $s \leq t$ ,

- (i)  $\mathbf{X}(\omega)$ , is a geometric  $p$ -variation rough path,
- (ii)  $\mathbf{X}_{s+t}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_s(\omega) \otimes \mathbf{X}_t(\theta_s \omega)$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{X}_{s,s+t}(\omega) = \mathbf{X}_t(\theta_s \omega)$ .

Let us go back to the rough differential equation (1.1). We will assume  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$  (while we concentrate on  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{3}$ ) and (1.1) is driven by a geometric  $\gamma$ -rough path cocycle  $\mathbf{X}$ . Note that the solutions of this equation generates flow (cf. [RS17]). Therefore, from [BRS17, Theorem 21], there exists a unique continuous random dynamical system  $\phi_{\mathbf{X}(\omega)}^t$ , that solves this equation. Setting  $\varphi_\omega^t(\cdot) := \phi_{\mathbf{X}(\omega)}^t(\cdot)$ , yields

$$\varphi_\omega^{t+s}(\cdot) = \varphi_{\theta_s \omega}^t(\varphi_\omega^s(\cdot)).$$

We now define a random variable that can be regarded as a generalization of a fixed point.

**Definition 2.4.** We call a random point  $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  a *stationary point* if

- (i)  $Y$  is a measurable map and
- (ii) for every  $t > 0$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\varphi_\omega^t(Y_\omega) = Y_{\theta_t \omega}$ .

*Remark 2.5.* Let  $Y$  be a stationary point. Then the linearized map  $\psi_\omega^t(\zeta) := D_{Y_\omega} \varphi_\omega^t[\zeta]$  is a linear cocycle.

For the rest of this section, we will additionally assume the following items:

**Assumption 2.6.** (i)  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  is an invertible measure-preserving dynamical system.

(ii)  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  is ergodic.

(iii) For  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , we assume  $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}^2, \mathbb{X}^3) : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow T^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is a  $\gamma$ -Hölder geometric rough path, which is also a  $\frac{1}{\gamma}$ -variation geometric rough path cocycle.

(iv) We assume for every  $T > 0$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} \in \cap_{p \geq 1} \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega).$$

(iv) We assume that  $\varphi$  has a stationary trajectory  $Y$ , such that

$$\|Y(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, T]} \in \cap_{p \geq 1} \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega).$$

(v) We accept Assumption 1.1.

(vi) We accept the assumptions that we impose on  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  in Proposition 1.16 and Proposition 1.20.

*Remark 2.7.* The fractional Brownian motions are typical rough paths that fulfill our assumptions.

*Remark 2.8.* As we stated earlier, all the results of this paper are also valid for the case that  $\frac{1}{3} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . But we are focusing on the more involving regime  $\frac{1}{4} < \gamma \leq \frac{1}{3}$ .

The following result is a direct consequence of the multiplicative ergodic theorem.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Assume  $\psi_\omega^t := D_{Y_\omega} \varphi_\omega^t : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ . Then on a set of full measure  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , invariant under  $(\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ , there exists a sequence of deterministic values  $\mu_k < \dots < \mu_1$ ,  $\mu_i \in [-\infty, \infty)$  (Lyapunov exponents) and  $m_i$ -dimensional subspaces  $H_\omega^i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  such that*

- (i)  $\mathbb{R}^m = \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq k} H_\omega^i$ .
- (ii) for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ :  $\psi_\omega^t(H_\omega^i) = H_{\theta_t \omega}^i$ .
- (iii)  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\psi_\omega^t(\xi_\omega)\| = \pm \mu_i$  if and only if  $\xi_\omega \in H_\omega^i \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* Let us to fix  $t_0 > 0$ , and assume  $\log^+(x) = \max\{\log x, 0\}$ . Then from Proposition 1.16 and Lemma 1.19, there exists a polynomial (which depends on  $t_0$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|\psi_\omega^t\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}), \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|(\psi_\omega^t)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}) \right\} \\ & \leq Q_1(\|Y_\omega\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Also, again from Proposition 1.16

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|\psi_{\theta_t \omega}^{t_0-t}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|D_{Y_{\theta_t \omega}} \varphi^{t-t_0}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}) \\ & \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} Q_1(\|Y_{\theta_t \omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall  $\varphi_\omega^t(Y_\omega) = Y_{\theta_t \omega}$  and from (1.26)

$$(2.2) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \|Y_{\theta_t \omega}\| \leq Q(\|Y_\omega\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}).$$

From (2.1) and (2.2) we conclude  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|\psi_{\theta_t \omega}^{t_0-t}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)})$  can be bounded by a polynomial in terms of  $\|Y_\omega\|$  and  $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}$ . Therefore

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq t_0} \log^+ (\|\psi_{\theta_t \omega}^{t_0-t}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega).$$

Finally, our claims follow from [Arn98, Theorem 3.4.11] or [GVR23a, Theorem 1.21].  $\square$

*Remark 2.10.* We set (if any of them can be defined)

$$(2.3) \quad S_\omega := \bigoplus_{i: \mu_i < 0} H_\omega^i, \quad U_\omega := \bigoplus_{i: \mu_i > 0} H_\omega^i, \quad \text{and} \quad C_\omega := H_\omega^{i_c} \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_{i_c} = 0.$$

**2.0.1. Stable manifolds and stability.** We are now ready to state our results about the existence of invariant manifolds.

**Theorem 2.11** (Local stable manifolds). *In addition to Assumption 2.6, suppose  $\mu_1 < 0$ . We fix an arbitrary time step  $t_0 > 0$ . Assume  $0 < \nu < -\mu^- = -\max\{\mu_i : \mu_i < 0\}$ . Then, there exist a set  $\tilde{\Omega}$  (with full measure) and a family of immersed submanifolds  $S_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , such that for every  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ :*

- (i) *There exist two positive and finite random variables  $\rho_1^\nu(\omega), \rho_1^\nu(\omega)$ , such that*

$$\liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \log \rho_i^\nu(\theta_{pt_0} \omega) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, 2$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sup_{n \geq 0} \exp(nt_0\nu) \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\| < \rho_1^\nu(\omega)\} &\subseteq S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) \\ &\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \sup_{n \geq 0} \exp(nt_0\nu) \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\| < \rho_2^\nu(\omega)\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (ii)  $T_{Y_\omega} S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) = S_\omega$  and for  $n \geq N(\omega) : \varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(S_{loc}^\nu(\omega)) \subset S_{loc}^\nu(\theta_{nt_0}\omega)$ .  
 (iii) For  $0 < \nu_1 \leq \nu_2 < -\mu^-$  :  $S_{loc}^{\nu_2}(\omega) \subseteq S_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega)$ , and for  $n \geq N(\omega) : \varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(S_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega)) \subseteq S_{loc}^{\nu_2}(\theta_{nt_0}\omega)$ . Therefor for every  $z \in S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\| \leq t_0\mu^-$ .  
 Moreover,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left[ \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(\tilde{z}) - \varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)\|}{\|\tilde{z} - z\|}, \quad \tilde{z} \neq z, \quad \text{and } \tilde{z}, z \in S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) \right\} \right] \leq t_0\mu^-.$$

*Proof.* The aim is to apply on [GVR23a, Theorem 2.10]. Set

$$P_\omega(z) := \varphi_\omega^{t_0}(z + Y_\omega) - \varphi_\omega^{t_0}(Y_\omega) - \psi_\omega^{t_0}(z),$$

for the same  $\kappa$  in Proposition 1.20, set

$$T(z_1, z_0) := \max\{\|z_1\| + \|z_0\|, \|z_1\|^{r_1} + \|z_0\|^{r_1}, \|z_1\|^{p-4} + \|z_0\|^{p-4}, \|z_1\|^{1-\kappa} + \|z_0\|^{1-\kappa}\}.$$

From Proposition 1.20, we can find a polynomial  $\tilde{Q}$  and an increasing  $C^1$ -function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_\omega(z_1) - P_\omega(z_0)\| &\leq \int_0^1 \|(D_{\theta_{z_1+(1-\theta)z_0+Y_\omega}\varphi_\omega^{t_0}} - D_{Y_\omega}\varphi_\omega^{t_0})[z_1 - z_0]\| d\theta \\ &\leq \exp(\tilde{Q}(\|Y_\omega\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]})) g(\|z_1\| + \|z_0\|) T(z_1, z_0) \|z_1 - z_0\|. \end{aligned}$$

From our assumption

$$f(\omega) = \log(\exp(\tilde{Q}(\|Y_\omega\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}))) = \tilde{Q}(\|Y_\omega\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega).$$

So, from Birkhoff's ergodic theorem on a set of full measure,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log^+ f(\theta_{nt_0}\omega) = 0.$$

Therefore, we can apply on [GVR23a, Theorem 2.10] to obtain the result.  $\square$

*Remark 2.12.* A natural question is to deduce a continuous time version of Theorem 2.11. It turns out that we can obtain a slightly weaker result for continuous time. We briefly explain the procedure. Let  $0 \leq t_1 < t_0$  and  $z \in S_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$ . Then by the cocycle property

$$\varphi_\omega^{nt_0+t_1}(z) - \varphi_\omega^{nt_0+t_1}(Y_\omega) = \varphi_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}^{t_1}(\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)) - \varphi_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}^{t_1}(\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(Y_\omega)).$$

Consequently from Corollary 1.17,

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 \leq t_1 < t_0} \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0+t_1}(z) - \varphi_\omega^{nt_0+t_1}(Y_\omega)\| \\ &\leq \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\| \exp(Q_2(\|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)\|, \|Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\theta_{nt_0}\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]})). \end{aligned}$$

Recall  $z \in S_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$  and

$$\|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)\| \leq \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\| + \|Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\|.$$

Therefore, from Birkhoff's ergodic theorem on a set of full measure

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} Q_2(\|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)\|, \|Y_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\theta_{nt_0}\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}) = 0$$

Let  $t > 0$ , with  $t = mt_0 + t_1$  where  $0 \leq t_1 < t_0$  and  $\nu_1 < \nu$

$$(2.7) \quad \sup_{n \geq 0} \exp(nt_0\nu_1) \|\varphi_\omega^{nt_0}(\varphi_\omega^t(z)) - Y_{\theta_{nt_0+t}\omega}\| \leq \left( \sup_{k \geq 0} \exp(kt_0\nu) \|\varphi_\omega^{kt_0}(\xi) - Y_{\theta_{kt_0}\omega}\| \right) \\ \times \sup_{n \geq 0} \left( \exp(-(m+n)t_0\nu + nt_0\nu_1) \exp(Q_2(\|\varphi_\omega^{(m+n)t_0}(z)\|, \|Y_{\theta_{(m+n)t_0}\omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\theta_{(m+n)t_0}\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]})) \right).$$

Recall  $\nu_1 < \nu$ , so from (2.6) and (2.4), if  $t \geq t(\omega)$  then

$$\varphi_\omega^t(S_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega)) \subseteq S_{loc}^\nu(\theta_t\omega).$$

The next result is about the existence of unstable manifolds.

**Theorem 2.13** (Local unstable manifolds). *In addition to Assumption 2.6, suppose  $\mu_1 > 0$ . Let  $0 < \nu < \mu^+ = \min\{\mu_i : \mu_i > 0\}$ , we fix an arbitrary time step  $t_0 > 0$ . Then, there exist a set  $\tilde{\Omega}$  (with full measure) and a family of immersed submanifolds  $U_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , such that for every  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ :*

- (i) *There exist two positive and finite random variables  $\tilde{\rho}_1^\nu(\omega), \tilde{\rho}_2^\nu(\omega)$ , such that*
- $$\liminf_{p \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{p} \log \tilde{\rho}_i^\nu(\theta_{pt_0}\omega) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, 2 \text{ and}$$

$$\left\{ z_\omega \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \{z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ s.t. } \varphi_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}^{mt_0}(z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}) = z_{\theta_{(m-n)t_0}\omega} \text{ for all } 0 \leq m \leq n \text{ and} \right.$$

$$\left. \sup_{n \geq 0} \exp(nt_0\nu) \|z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega} - Y_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\| < \tilde{\rho}_1^\nu(\omega) \right\} \subseteq U_{loc}^\nu(\omega) \subseteq \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \{z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ s.t.} \right.$$

$$\left. \varphi_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}^{mt_0}(z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}) = z_{\theta_{(m-n)t_0}\omega} \text{ for all } 0 \leq m \leq n \text{ and } \sup_{n \geq 0} \exp(nt_0\nu) \|z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega} - Y_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\| < \tilde{\rho}_2^\nu(\omega) \right\}$$

- (ii)  $T_{Y_\omega} U_{loc}^\nu(\omega) = U_\omega$  and for  $n \geq N(\omega) : U_{loc}^\nu(\omega) \subset \varphi_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}^{nt_0}(U_{loc}^\nu(\theta_{-nt_0}\omega))$ .

- (iii) For  $0 < \nu_1 \leq \nu_2 < \mu^+ : U_{loc}^{\nu_2}(\omega) \subseteq U_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega)$  and for  $n \geq N(\omega) : U_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega) \subseteq \varphi_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}^{nt_0}(U_{loc}^{\nu_2}(\theta_{-nt_0}\omega))$ .

Therefor for every  $z_\omega \in U_{loc}^\nu(\omega) : \limsup_{n \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega} - Y_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\| \leq -t_0\mu^+$ . In addition

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left[ \sup \left\{ \frac{\|\tilde{z}_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega} - z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\|}{\|\tilde{z} - z\|}, \quad \tilde{z} \neq z, \quad \text{and } \tilde{z}, z \in U_{loc}^\nu(\omega) \right\} \right] \leq -t_0\mu^+.$$

*Proof.* Follows from Proposition 1.20 and [GVR23a, Theorem 2.17].  $\square$

*Remark 2.14.* Similar to our discussion in Remark 2.12, we are able to obtain a continuous time result. For  $z_\omega \in U_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$ , let  $\{z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\}_{n \geq 1}$  be the corresponding sequence in item (i) of Theorem (2.13). Let us define

$$\text{for } nt_0 \leq t < (n+1)t_0 : \quad z_{\theta_{-t}\omega} := \varphi_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}^{(n+1)t_0-t}(z_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}).$$

From Corollary 1.17

$$\|z_{\theta_{-t}\omega} - Y_{\theta_{-t}\omega}\| = \|\varphi_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}^{(n+1)t_0-t}(z_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}) - \varphi_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}^{(n+1)t_0-t}(Y_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega})\| \\ \leq \|z_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega} - Y_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}\| \exp(Q_2(\|z_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}\|, \|Y_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]})).$$



Similar to (2.6), from Birkhoff's ergodic theorem on a set of full measure

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} Q_2(\|z_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}\|, \|Y_{\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega}\|, \|\mathbf{X}(\theta_{-(n+1)t_0}\omega)\|_{\gamma, [0, t_0]}) = 0$$

Consequently, by a similar calculation as in (2.7), if  $\nu_1 < \nu$  and  $t \geq t(\omega)$ ,

$$U_{loc}^{\nu_1}(\omega) \subseteq \varphi_{\theta_{-t}\omega}^t(U_{loc}^\nu(\theta_{-t}\omega)).$$

Our final result is about the existence of center manifolds.

**Theorem 2.15** (Local center manifolds). *In addition to Assumption 2.6, suppose for some  $1 \leq i_c \leq k$ ,  $\mu_{i_c} = 0$ . Let fix an arbitrary time step  $t_0 > 0$  and assume  $0 < \nu < \min\{\mu_{i_c-1}, -\mu_{i_c+1}\}$  (If  $i_c = 1$ , we defined  $\mu_0 = \infty$ ). Then for  $\mathbb{N}t_0 = \{mt_0 : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , there exists a continuous cocycle*

$$\bar{\varphi} : \mathbb{N}t_0 \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$$

and a positive random variable  $\rho^c : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \rho^c(\theta_{nt_0}\omega) \geq 0$$

and if  $\|z - Y_\omega\|_\alpha \leq \rho^c(\omega)$ , then  $\bar{\varphi}_\omega^{t_0}(Y_\omega + z) = \varphi_\omega^{t_0}(Y_\omega + z)$ . Also there exists a function

$$h_\omega^c : C_\omega \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\omega^{c,\nu} \subset \mathbb{R}^m,$$

such that

- (i)  $h_\omega^c$  is a homeomorphism and Lipschitz continuous.
- (ii) If we assume  $\varphi$  is  $C^m$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_\omega^{c,\nu}$  is  $C^{m-1}$ .
- (iii)  $\mathcal{M}_\omega^{c,\nu}$  is  $\bar{\varphi}$ -invariant, i.e. for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\bar{\varphi}_\omega^{nt_0}(\mathcal{M}_\omega^{c,\nu}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}^{c,\nu}$ .

Moreover for every  $z_\omega \in \mathcal{M}_\omega^{c,\nu}$ , we can find a sequence  $\{z_{\theta_{-nt_0}\omega}\}_{n \geq 1}$  such that if we define

$$j \leq 0 : \bar{\varphi}_\omega^{jt_0}(z_\omega) := z_{\theta_{jt_0}\omega},$$

then

$$\forall (m, n) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z} : \bar{\varphi}_{\theta_{nt_0}\omega}^{mt_0}(\bar{\varphi}_\omega^{nt_0}(z_\omega)) = \bar{\varphi}_\omega^{(m+n)t_0}(z_\omega),$$

also

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp(-\nu|j|) \|\bar{\varphi}_\omega^{jt_0}(z) - Y_{\theta_{jt_0}\omega}\| < \infty.$$

*Proof.* Follows from [GVR23b, Theorem 2.14] and Theorem 1.20.  $\square$

*Remark 2.16.* Assume that for  $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ , the function  $\varphi_\omega$  is  $C^m$ . Then, from [GVR23a, Remark 2.11, Remark 2.18] and [GVR23b, Theorem 2.14], our invariant manifolds (stable, unstable and center) are  $C^{m-1}$ .

**2.1. Exponential stability.** The stable manifold chart is a local homeomorphism between the  $S_\omega$  and  $S_{loc}^\nu(\omega)$ . Therefore, when all the Lyapunov exponents are negative, it is natural to expect that in a neighborhood of the stationary point, the solutions decay exponentially toward the stationary point. We call this result "Local stability" and formulate it in the next Corollary.

**Corollary 2.17** (Local stability). *In addition to Assumption 2.6, suppose  $\mu_1 < 0$ . Let  $t_0 > 0$ , be the time step we chose in the Theorem 2.11 and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be the same set in this Theorem. Then there exists a positive random variable  $R^\nu(\omega) > 0$ , such that  $\liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \log R^\nu(\theta_{pt_0}) \geq 0$  and*

$$\{z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \|z - Y_\omega\| < R^\nu(\omega)\} = S_{loc}^\nu(\omega).$$

Moreover, for every  $0 < \nu_1 < \nu$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\|z - Y_\omega\| < R^\nu(\omega)$ , on a set of full-measure  $\tilde{\tilde{\Omega}} \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \exp(t\nu_1) \|\varphi_\omega^t(z) - Y_{\theta_{t\omega}}\| < \infty.$$

*Proof.* First we need to slightly modify two result from [GVR23a]. In this paper, the results are stated in a very general form, but since we do not need such generality, we will adapt the notation to our current manuscript. From our assumption,  $F_{\mu_1} : \{z \in \mathbb{R}^m : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{nt_0} \log \|\psi_\omega^{nt_0}(z)\| \leq \mu_1\} = S_\omega = \mathbb{R}^m$ . From [GVR23a, Theorem 2.10]

$$S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) = \{Y_\omega + \Pi^0(\Gamma(z)) : |z| < R^\nu(\omega)\}.$$

Where  $\Pi^0 : \prod_{j \geq 0} \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is the projection in the first component and

$$\Gamma : F_{\mu_1}(\omega) \cap \{z \in F_{\mu_1}(\omega) : \|z\| < R^\nu(\omega)\} \rightarrow \prod_{j \geq 0} \mathbb{R}^m,$$

is defined in [GVR23a, Lemma 2.7]. Also,  $\Gamma$  is a fixed point of the map  $I$ , cf. [GVR23a, Lemma 2.6], i.e.  $I(v, \Gamma(v)) = \Gamma(v)$ . Remember  $F_{\mu_1}(\omega) = \mathbb{R}^m$ , also in the last formula in [GVR23a, page 122], we have  $\Pi^0(I(z, \Gamma(z))) = \Pi^0(\Gamma(z)) = z$ . Consequently

$$(2.8) \quad S_{loc}^\nu(\omega) = \{Y_\omega + z : |z| < R^\nu(\omega)\}.$$

This proves the first claim. If we choose  $0 < \nu_1 < \nu$ , then if we argue as Remark 2.12

$$\|z\| < R^\nu(\omega) \longrightarrow \sup_{t \geq 0} \exp(t\nu_1) \|\varphi_\omega^t(z) - Y_{\theta_{t\omega}}\| < \infty.$$

□

We now aim to formulate sufficient conditions under which we can guarantee that the largest Lyapunov exponent  $\mu_1$  is strictly negative.

**Lemma 2.18.**

$$\mu_1 t_0 \leq \int_{\Omega} \log \|\psi_\omega^{t_0}\| \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

*Proof.* Recall that the first Lyapunov exponent is deduced by applying Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem to  $\log \|\psi_\omega^n\|$ , cf. [GVR22, Theorem 4.17 and Lemma 4.10]. From [Arn98, 3.3.2 Theorem], it follows that

$$\mu_1 = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{nt_0} \int_{\Omega} \log \|\psi_\omega^{nt_0}\| \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \leq \int_{\Omega} \log \|\psi_\omega^{t_0}\| \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

□

**Example 2.19.** Consider the equation

$$(2.9) \quad dZ_t = V(Z_t) d\mathbf{X}_t + V_0(Z_t) dt, \quad Z_0 = z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$$

where  $\mathbf{X}$  is geometric. Assume that  $V_0(0) = V(0) = 0$ . In this case,  $Y_\omega \equiv 0$  is a stationary trajectory. To see this, note that this is true for smooth  $\mathbf{X}$ . If  $\mathbf{X}$  is rough, we can approximate it by smooth

paths and the statement remains true in the limit. Now assume that  $D_0V_0$  has only eigenvalues such that the real parts of all are strictly negative. Let  $\lambda = \max \{Re(\mu) : \mu \text{ is an eigenvalue for } D_0V_0\}$ . Then it holds that

$$\log \|\psi_\omega^{t_0}\| \rightarrow \log(\|\exp(t_0 D_0V_0)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)}) = \lambda t_0 < 0$$

as  $\|V\| \rightarrow 0$ . From Lemma 2.18,

$$\mu_1 \leq \int_{\Omega} \log \|\psi_\omega^{t_0}\| \vee (-N) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \rightarrow \lambda t_0 \vee (-N)$$

as  $\|V\| \rightarrow 0$  for every  $N \geq 1$  where we used the dominated convergence theorem and the bound in Theorem 1.16. Choosing  $N$  large enough implies that  $\mu_1 \leq \lambda t_0 < 0$  if  $\|V\|$  is sufficiently small. In other words, we have shown local exponential stability in this case.

In the next example, we discuss about the existence of invariant manifolds.

**Example 2.20.** Let us consider again equation (2.9) such that  $V_0(0) = V(0) = 0$ . Recall that  $Y_\omega \equiv 0$  is a stationary trajectory. Regardless of our assumption on  $D_0V_0$ , as a consequence of the multiplicative ergodic theorem, we can prove that the Lyapunov exponents exist. Therefore, we can apply our results to obtain the invariant manifolds according to decomposition (2.3). A simple example in which the center manifold exists is the case that  $V(0) = D_0V = 0$  and matrix  $D_0V_0$  has at least one eigenvalue on the unit circle. Indeed, when  $V(0) = D_0V = 0$  and  $V_0(0) = 0$ , then the Lyapunov exponents around the zero are entirely determined by  $D_0V_0$ . In this case, if the real part of one of the eigenvalues is strictly positive (negative), we can deduce the existence of the unstable (stable) manifold.

*Remark 2.21.* An example that a non-trivial stationary point is expected to exist is when  $\mathbf{X}$  is a Brownian motion and  $V_0$  is a linear drift with negative eigenvalues (on the real part). In this case, an example of a non-trivial stationary point is the solution to

$$Y_t(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^t \exp((t-s)V_0)V(Y_s(\omega))\mathbf{B}_\tau(\omega).$$

#### REFERENCES

- [Arn98] Ludwig Arnold. *Random dynamical systems*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [Box89] Petra Boxler. A stochastic version of center manifold theory. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 83(4):509–545, 1989.
- [BRS17] Ismaël Bailleul, Sebastian Riedel, and Michael Scheutzow. Random dynamical systems, rough paths and rough flows. *J. Differential Equations*, 262(12):5792–5823, 2017.
- [CP11] Serge Cohen and Fabien Panloup. Approximation of stationary solutions of Gaussian driven stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 121(12):2776–2801, 2011.
- [CPT14] Serge Cohen, Fabien Panloup, and Samy Tindel. Approximation of stationary solutions to SDEs driven by multiplicative fractional noise. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 124(3):1197–1225, 2014.
- [CQ02] Laure Coutin and Zhongmin Qian. Stochastic analysis, rough path analysis and fractional Brownian motions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 122(1):108–140, 2002.
- [DH23] Luu Hoang Duc and Phan Thanh Hong. Asymptotic dynamics of Young differential equations. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 35(2):1667–1692, 2023.
- [DHC19] Luu Hoang Duc, Phan Thanh Hong, and Nguyen Dinh Cong. Asymptotic stability for stochastic dissipative systems with a Hölder noise. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(4):3046–3071, 2019.
- [DPT19] Aurélien Deya, Fabien Panloup, and Samy Tindel. Rate of convergence to equilibrium of fractional driven stochastic differential equations with rough multiplicative noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(1):464–518, 2019.

- [Duc22] Luu Hoang Duc. Exponential stability of stochastic systems: a pathwise approach. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 22(3):Paper No. 2240012, 21, 2022.
- [FGGR16] Peter K. Friz, Benjamin Gess, Archil Gulisashvili, and Sebastian Riedel. The Jain-Monrad criterion for rough paths and applications to random Fourier series and non-Markovian Hörmander theory. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(1):684–738, 2016.
- [FH20] Peter K. Friz and Martin Hairer. *A course on rough paths*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020. With an introduction to regularity structures, Second edition of [3289027].
- [FP17] Joaquin Fontbona and Fabien Panloup. Rate of convergence to equilibrium of fractional driven stochastic differential equations with some multiplicative noise. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 53(2):503–538, 2017.
- [FV10a] Peter K. Friz and Nicolas B. Victoir. Differential equations driven by Gaussian signals. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 46(2):369–413, 2010.
- [FV10b] Peter K. Friz and Nicolas B. Victoir. *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths*, volume 120 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. Theory and applications.
- [GANS18] María J. Garrido-Atienza, Andreas Neuenkirch, and Björn Schmalfuß. Asymptotical stability of differential equations driven by Hölder continuous paths. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 30(1):359–377, 2018.
- [GAS18] María J. Garrido-Atienza and Björn Schmalfuß. Local stability of differential equations driven by Hölder-continuous paths with Hölder index in  $(1/3, 1/2)$ . *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 17(3):2352–2380, 2018.
- [GVR23a] M. Ghani Varzaneh and S. Riedel. Oseledets Splitting and Invariant Manifolds on Fields of Banach Spaces. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 35(1):103–133, 2023.
- [GVR23b] Mazyar Ghani Varzaneh and Sebastian Riedel. A general center manifold theorem on fields of Banach spaces. *arXiv:2310.15553*, 2023.
- [GVR22] M. Ghani Varzaneh, S. Riedel, and M. Scheutzow. A dynamical theory for singular stochastic delay differential equations I: linear equations and a multiplicative ergodic theorem on fields of Banach spaces. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 21(1):542–587, 2022.
- [Hai05] Martin Hairer. Ergodicity of stochastic differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(2):703–758, 2005.
- [HO07] M. Hairer and A. Ohashi. Ergodic theory for SDEs with extrinsic memory. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(5):1950–1977, 2007.
- [HP11] M. Hairer and N. S. Pillai. Ergodicity of hypoelliptic SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 47(2):601–628, 2011.
- [HP13] Martin Hairer and Natesh S. Pillai. Regularity of laws and ergodicity of hypoelliptic SDEs driven by rough paths. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(4):2544–2598, 2013.
- [Kha12] Rafail Khasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 66 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer, Heidelberg, second edition, 2012. With contributions by G. N. Milstein and M. B. Nevelson.
- [LCL07] Terry J. Lyons, Michael Caruana, and Thierry Lévy. *Differential equations driven by rough paths*, volume 1908 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007. Lectures from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–24, 2004, With an introduction concerning the Summer School by Jean Picard.
- [MS99] Salah-Eldin A. Mohammed and Michael Scheutzow. The stable manifold theorem for stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(2):615–652, 1999.
- [NK21] Alexandra Neamțu and Christian Kuehn. Rough center manifolds. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(4):3912–3957, 2021.
- [PTV20] Fabien Panloup, Samy Tindel, and Maylis Varvenne. A general drift estimation procedure for stochastic differential equations with additive fractional noise. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 14(1):1075–1136, 2020.
- [RS17] Sebastian Riedel and Michael Scheutzow. Rough differential equations with unbounded drift term. *J. Differential Equations*, 262(1):283–312, 2017.

MAZYAR GHANI VARZANEH, FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK, FERNUNIVERSITÄT IN HAGEN, HAGEN, GERMANY

*Email address:* `mazyar.ghanivarzaneh@fernuni-hagen.de`

SEBASTIAN RIEDEL, FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK, FERNUNIVERSITÄT IN HAGEN, HAGEN, GERMANY

*Email address:* `sebastian.riedel@fernuni-hagen.de`