

THE INVISCID LIMIT FOR LONG TIME STATISTICS OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STOCHASTIC GINZBURG-LANDAU EQUATION

HUNG D. NGUYEN¹

ABSTRACT. We consider the long time statistics of a one-dimensional stochastic Ginzburg-Landau equation with cubic nonlinearity while being subjected to random perturbations via an additive Gaussian noise. Under the assumption that sufficiently many directions of the phase space are stochastically forced, we find that the dynamics is attractive toward the unique invariant probability measure with a polynomial rate that is independent of the vanishing viscosity. This relies on a coupling technique exploiting a Foias-Prodi argument specifically tailored to the system. Then, in the inviscid regime, we show that the sequence of invariant measures converges toward the invariant measure of the stochastic Schrödinger equation in a suitable Wasserstein distance. Together with the uniform polynomial mixing, we obtain the validity of the inviscid limit for the solutions on the infinite time horizon with a log log rate.

1. INTRODUCTION

For each $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we consider the following stochastic system in the unknown variable $u^\gamma(t) = u^\gamma(x, t) : [0, 1] \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^\gamma(t) &= (\gamma + i)\Delta u^\gamma(t) + i|u^\gamma(t)|^2 u^\gamma(t) - \alpha u^\gamma(t) + Q\partial_t W(t), \\ u^\gamma(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \{0, 1\}, t > 0, \\ u^\gamma(x, 0) &= u_0(x), \quad x \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

System (1.1) is the complex Ginzburg-Landau (CGL) equation, arising in the modeling of traveling waves in dissipative dynamics. On the right-hand side of (1.1), $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ represents the viscosity, $\alpha > 0$ denotes the damping constant, $QdW(t)$ is a Gaussian process which is white in time and whose spatial correlation is characterized by the symmetric bounded operator Q that satisfies certain conditions. Historically, equation (1.1) was developed in the seminal work of [29] describing superconductivity. Since then, it has found many applications in various areas of physics, e.g., chemical reaction [39, 47], hydrodynamic instability theory [9, 51, 52, 54, 61], and waves on deep water [21].

In the absence of viscosity, that is when setting $\gamma = 0$, equation (1.1) is formally reduced to the following focusing nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u(t) &= i\Delta u(t) + i|u(t)|^2 u(t) - \alpha u(t) + Q\partial_t W(t), \\ u(x, t) &= 0, \quad x \in \{0, 1\}, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) &= u_0(x), \quad x \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Not only equation (1.2) be derived in similar phenomena as in the case of the CGL equation, it is also employed to study nonlinear optics [2, 4], the propagation of laser beams [24], and the propagation of solitons [1, 53]. Under suitable assumptions on the noise structure, the large time behaviors of (1.1) and (1.2) are well-known. More specifically, for fixed $\gamma > 0$, equation (1.1) possesses unique ergodicity [33, 58] and that the equilibrium relaxation rate is exponentially fast. On the other hand, equation (1.2) was established to be only polynomially attractive toward the unique invariant probability measure, owing to the lack of strong dissipation [20]. It is therefore a matter of interest to compare the statistically steady states of (1.1) and those of (1.2) in the

inviscid limit, i.e., as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Notably, when the random force is proportional to the square root of the viscosity, there is a literature in this direction on the following equation

$$\partial_t u^\gamma(t) = (\gamma + i)\Delta u^\gamma(t) \pm i|u^\gamma(t)|^2 u^\gamma(t) - \alpha u^\gamma(t) + \sqrt{\gamma} Q \partial_t W(t). \quad (1.3)$$

It has been shown that the stationary solutions of (1.3) converge toward those of the deterministic NLS equation

$$\partial_t u(t) = i\Delta u(t) \pm i|u(t)|^2 u(t) - \alpha u(t). \quad (1.4)$$

See for examples the work of [45, 46, 60, 66]. However, much less is known about the approximation of (1.1) by (1.2) in the vanishing viscosity, and particularly whether the mixing rates and invariant measures of (1.1) resemble those of (1.2). In light of recent works dealing with similar issues for singular parameter limits [31, 32, 56], our main goal of the article is two-fold. Firstly, we seek to identify a general set of conditions on the random forcing so as to establish ergodic properties for (1.1) via a spectral gap that is uniform with respect to the viscosity constant γ . Secondly, we demonstrate that the statistically steady states of (1.1) can be related to (1.2), allowing for verifying the validity of the inviscid limit for the solutions of (1.1) on the infinite time horizon. In what follows, we provide an overview of our main theorems and refer the reader to Section 2 for a more rigorous description.

1.1. Summary of main results. Our first result giving the uniform ergodicity of (1.1) is summarized as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Under general conditions on the noise structure $QdW(t)$, equation (1.1) admits a unique invariant probability measure ν^γ . Furthermore, for all $q \geq 2$, initial data u_1^0, u_2^0 with sufficient spatial regularity, and suitable Lipschitz bounded function f , the following holds*

$$|\mathbb{E}f(u^\gamma(t; u_1^0)) - \mathbb{E}f(u^\gamma(t; u_2^0))| \leq \frac{C}{(1+t)^q}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.5)$$

for some positive constant C independent of t and γ .

We refer the reader to Theorem 2.3 for a precise statement of Theorem 1.1. As mentioned above, we remark that the problem of large time behaviors for (1.1) is not new as it was previously shown to possess geometric ergodicity in $L^2(0, 1)$ [33, 58]. The novelty of Theorem 1.1 is the polynomial mixing rate that does not depend on the parameter γ provided that one starts the dynamics from initial data with higher spatial regularity.

Turning to equation (1.2), we recall from [20] that (1.2) also admits a unique invariant probability measure ν^0 . Our second main result below asserts that as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, ν^γ is well approximated by ν^0 with respect to suitable Wasserstein distances.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 1.1, there exist suitable Wasserstein distances \mathcal{W} such that the following holds for all $q \geq 2$*

$$\mathcal{W}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) = O\left((\log |\log \gamma|)^{-q}\right), \quad \gamma \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.6)$$

The rigorous statement of the above result is presented in Theorem 2.4. We remark that the distance \mathcal{W} appearing in Theorem 1.2 is neither the usual total variation nor a weighted variation. While they are typically the case for finite dimensional systems [50], solutions starting from distinct initial data in infinite dimensional dynamics tend to be singular with each other [34, 35, 36, 37], requiring a modification of the measuring Wasserstein metric. See Section 2.3 for a precise description of \mathcal{W} .

Finally, as a consequence of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, we obtain the validity of the inviscid limit on the infinite time horizon.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $u^\gamma(t; u_0)$ and $u(t; u_0)$ respectively be the solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) with the same initial data u_0 . Then, for all $q \geq 2$, u_0 with sufficient spatial regularity, and suitable observable f , the following holds*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |\mathbb{E}f(u^\gamma(t; u_0)) - \mathbb{E}f(u(t; u_0))| \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad \gamma \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.7)$$

for some positive constant C independent t and γ .

We refer the reader to Theorem 2.5 for a rigorous statement of the estimate (1.7).

1.2. Previous related literature. Before diving into the methodology employed for proving the main theorems, we briefly review the literature on asymptotic behaviors of the CGL and the NLS equations. Concerning deterministic settings, that is when $Q \equiv 0$, the inviscid limit on finite time windows was investigated as early as in the work of [65]. It was also studied in a variety of related systems [5, 8, 38, 48, 64] justifying the approximation of the CGL equation by the NLS equation. With regard to the impact of stochastic forcing, as mentioned above, the stationary solutions of (1.3) are known to weakly converge to those of (1.4) [45]. The argument relies on a tightness property, which in turn is deduced from the uniformity of suitable energy estimates with respect to γ . In a subsequent work [60], these processes are shown to satisfy certain smoothness properties in the sense that their moments in L^p and H_0^1 are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measures. Analogous results for more generalized settings of (1.3)-(1.4) were established in [46] making use of the same strategy from [45]. More recently, in [66], the inviscid limit of (1.3) was explored for the space-time white noise with Gibbs measure initial data.

Concerning the large time asymptotic of (1.1), ergodicity was studied in [7] with the hypothesis that noise is invertible. While the existence of an invariant measure was obtained via the construction of stationary solutions, the uniqueness was a consequence of an irreducibility together with the strong Feller property. On the other hand, in the case of degenerate additive noise, (1.1) was demonstrated to possess geometric ergodicity in [33] via the method of asymptotic coupling, which had previously been employed in [10, 23, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 59]. In the same spirit of [33] with sufficiently rich random perturbations, exponential mixing was established for the CGL equation in [58] under a variety of assumptions on the nonlinearity structures. It is important to point out that in [33, 58], the exponential convergent rate is valid thanks to the advantage of strong dissipation, i.e., when $\gamma > 0$. In particular, this allows for leveraging the exponential Martingale inequality as well as deriving a path-wise Foias-Prodi estimate, showing that when the low frequencies of the solutions agree, the high frequencies must be close too. In contrast, the work of [20] studied the NLS equation (1.2) and proved that it only admitted a polynomial rate of any order, owing to the unavailability of critical ingredients that are otherwise present in the CGL equation. It is worthwhile to mention that for (1.2), the damping constant $\alpha > 0$ is necessary so as to ensure at least the existence of statistically steady states. It turns out that α 's positivity is also crucial to establish a mixing rate. More specifically, it was exploited in the approach of [20] together with the coupling argument developed in [58] to produce a Foias-Prodi estimate in expectation for (1.2). In turn, this is sufficient to dominate the nonlinearity to the extent that one can still extract a polynomial rate. We remark that in comparison with the more popular geometric ergodicity in the literature of SPDEs, it is more difficult to handle sub-exponential situations due to the disadvantage of weak dissipation. This is found to be the case for a conservation laws with multiplicative noise [22], and for a stochastic wave equation with nonlinear damping [57].

1.3. Methodology of the proofs. Turning back to Theorem 1.1, as γ is close to zero, the dissipation nature is essentially inactive and does not help deducing a mixing property. To circumvent the problem, we shift our analysis to focusing on the constant α as employed in the framework of [20] dealing with the same issue for the NLS equation (1.2). More specifically, the first ingredient of the proof of (1.6) is the existence of a Lyapunov function, cf. Lemma 3.3, proving the returning

time to the origin is exponentially fast. This can be constructed by appealing to the damping effect $\alpha > 0$ while performing a priori estimates. We note that the Lyapunov condition is quite popular and can be found in many works for SPDEs [11, 12]. In literature, the second ingredient is typically an asymptotic strong Feller property [35, 36] showing a large time smoothing behavior of the dynamics, resulting in a contraction property for the associated Markov semigroup. This relies on delicate bounds on the derivatives of the solutions with respect to both the initial conditions and the noise directions. Unfortunately, in case of equation (1.1), this approach is not applicable owing to the complication from estimating the cubic nonlinearity in higher regularity. To overcome the issue, we resort to the coupling technique developed in [20, 49, 58] by carefully facilitating the Foias-Prodi structure of (1.1), cf. Lemma 3.5. In particular, we demonstrate that starting from distinct initial data, the solutions can be coupled in a way that a certain number of low modes agree with each other whereas the total energy can be effectively controlled. It is important to point out that the chosen number of low frequencies is dictated by the number of directions of the phase space that are directly excited by the stochastic forcing. On the one hand, this coupling behavior can be shown to occur for a long time with very high probability, cf. Proposition 4.3. On the other hand, the likelihood that they decouple immediately is established to be low with a power law order, cf. Proposition 4.4, which ultimately produces the polynomial mixing rate. We note that the restriction on the one dimensional setting stems from the fact that the stochastic Foias-Prodi estimate is actually not available in higher dimensions. As an analytic trade-off, we are able to leverage several Sobolev inequalities pertaining to dimension one, cf. Remark 3.7, and successfully derive the coupling argument to ultimately obtain the powerful polynomial mixing. We refer the reader to Section 2.2 for the rigorous statement of the estimate (1.5), and to Section 4 where its proof is supplied.

The second main result of the paper, as captured in Theorem 1.2, concerns the approximation of the invariant measure ν^γ by ν^0 in the vanishing viscosity regime. This result can be regarded as an analogue of the convergence of stationary solutions in the settings of (1.3)-(1.4) [45, 66]. We remark that in literature, there are situations where the stationary solutions can be explicitly computed. More surprisingly, they turn out to coincide with that of the targeting equation, resulting in limit (1.6) becoming a trivial identity. To name a few examples, we refer the reader to the work of [13] on a gradient system and to [55] on a generalized Langevin equation. In general, such a phenomenon is rare and particularly is not expected for (1.1)-(1.2). Nevertheless, motivated by recent works in [15, 18, 25, 26, 27, 28] studying different asymptotic behaviors of statistically steady states, the argument for (1.6) can be reduced to proving the convergence of $u^\gamma(t)$ toward $u(t)$ on any finite time window. In other words, it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \lesssim \mathbb{E}\|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \mathcal{W}(\text{Law}(u(t)), \nu^0),$$

where $u^\gamma(0) = u(0) \sim \nu^\gamma$ and $\text{Law}(X)$ denotes the distribution of the random variable X . We note that by invoking uniform energy estimates, the first term on the above right hand side can be controlled by $e^{ct}|\log \gamma|^{-1}$, cf. Proposition 5.1, whereas in accordance with the mixing property of equation (1.2), the second term has the order of $(1+t)^{-q}$, cf. Theorem A.2 and Lemma A.3. Combining the two estimates allows for deducing the limit (1.6) by optimizing the powers on t . The precise statement of Theorem 1.2 is given in Section 2.3, whose detailed argument will be carried out in Section 5.1.

Lastly, making use of the results from (1.5) and (1.6), we obtain, via Theorem 1.3, the global in time validity of the solutions of (1.2) as an approximation for those of (1.1) in the inviscid regime. Indeed, we invoke the fact that \mathcal{W} can be related to suitable observables by virtue of the dual Kantorovich formula [63] and proceed in a similar fashion as in the proof of (1.6), namely,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}f(u^\gamma(t; u_0)) - \mathbb{E}f(u(t; u_0))| \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}\|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \mathcal{W}(\text{Law}(u^\gamma(t)), \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}(\text{Law}(u(t)), \nu^0). \end{aligned}$$

While the first and the last terms are bounded as mentioned in the previous paragraph, the second term is a consequence of (1.5), cf. Lemma 5.6. Altogether, one can once again optimize the powers on time t so as to produce (1.7). We note that although limit (1.7) might give the impression of a Lipschitz condition on test functions, it can actually be applied to a large class of observables, including functions with polynomial growth. We refer the reader to Remark 2.6 for a further discussion of this point. Finally, for the sake of simplicity, we restrict our attention to the focusing settings, but expect that analogous results should also hold for the defocusing case, i.e., when the term $i|u|^2u$ in (1.1)-(1.2) is replaced by $-i|u|^2u$. In Section 2.3, we provide the rigorous statement of (1.7) through Theorem 2.5 whereas its detailed proof will be supplied in Section 5.2.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce all the functional settings as well as the main assumptions on the noise structures. We also formulate our results in this section, including Theorem 2.3 on the uniform polynomial mixing for the CGL equation (1.1), and the main results concerning the inviscid limit stated in Theorem 2.4 established for invariant measures and Theorem 2.5 for the infinite time horizon. In Section 3, we perform a priori moment bounds on the solutions of (1.1) that will be employed to prove the main results. We then discuss the asymptotic coupling and prove the polynomial ergodicity in Section 4. In Section 5, we provide the detailed proofs of the inviscid limits making use of the previous sections. In Appendix A, we briefly review several auxiliary estimates on the NLS equation (1.2) that were employed to prove the inviscid results. In Appendix B, we collect an irreducibility condition for a linear version of the NLS equation (1.2), that was invoked to deduce the mixing property presented in Section 4.

2. ASSUMPTIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Functional settings and assumptions. Considering the bounded interval $[0, 1]$, we denote by $L^2(0, 1)$, $H_0^1(0, 1)$ and $H^2(0, 1)$ the usual Sobolev spaces of real-valued functions on $(0, 1)$. Let A denote the negative Dirichlet Laplacian operator $-\Delta$ in $L^2(0, 1)$ endowed with the Dirichlet boundary condition and the domain $\text{Dom}(A) = H_0^1(0, 1) \cap H^2(0, 1)$. For now on, we will fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ in $L^2(0, 1)$ that diagonalizes A , i.e.,

$$Ae_k = \alpha_k e_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$e_k = \sqrt{2} \sin(k\pi x), \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_k = (k\pi)^2, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (2.2)$$

Next, we denote by H the complexified Sobolev space of $L^2(0, 1)$. More specifically, for $u = u_1 + iu_2$, $v = v_1 + iv_2$, $u_i, v_i \in L^2(0, 1)$, $i = 1, 2$, let $\langle u, v \rangle_H$ denote the inner product given by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_H = \int_0^1 (u_1 + iu_2)(v_1 + iv_2) dx,$$

and the norm is defined as

$$\|u\|_H^2 = \langle u, \bar{u} \rangle_H = \|u_1\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2 + \|u_2\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

More generally, for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by H^r the complex domain of $A^{r/2}$ together with the inner product defined as

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^r} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \alpha_k^r \langle u, e_k \rangle_H \langle v, e_k \rangle_H.$$

Particularly, the corresponding norm is given by

$$\|u\|_{H^r}^2 = \langle u, \bar{u} \rangle_{H^r} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \alpha_k^r |\langle u, e_k \rangle_H|^2.$$

In addition to H^r , we will work with the complex L^p spaces, $p \geq 1$ namely

$$L^p = \left\{ u : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \|u\|_{L^p} := \int_0^1 |u|^p dx < \infty \right\}.$$

Next, for each integer $N \geq 1$, we let P_N be the projection of $u \in H$ on $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$, i.e.,

$$P_N u = \sum_{k=1}^N \langle u, e_k \rangle_H e_k.$$

The complement of P_N is denoted as $Q_N = I - P_N$, i.e.,

$$Q_N u = \sum_{k \geq N+1}^{\infty} \langle u, e_k \rangle_H e_k.$$

We may now recast the Ginzburg-Landau equation (1.1) as

$$du^\gamma(t) = -(\gamma + i)Au^\gamma(t)dt + i|u^\gamma(t)|^2u^\gamma(t)dt - \alpha u^\gamma(t)dt + QdW(t), \quad u^\gamma(0) = u_0 \in H. \quad (2.3)$$

Regarding the noise term in (2.3), we assume that $W(t)$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on H , whose decomposition is given by

$$W(t) = \sum_{k \geq 1} e_k (B_k^1(t) + iB_k^2(t)),$$

where $\{(B_k^1, B_k^2)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d two-dimensional Brownian motions, each defined on the same stochastic basis $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\})$ [40]. Concerning the operator Q , we impose the following assumption [7, 20, 33, 58]

Assumption 2.1. $Q : H \rightarrow H$ satisfies

$$Qe_k = \lambda_k e_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad \text{and} \quad Qe_k = 0, \quad k \geq N + 1. \quad (2.4)$$

for some integer $N \geq 1$ and positive constants λ_k , $k = 1, \dots, N$. Furthermore, there exists a positive constant C_Q independent of N such that

$$\text{Tr}(A^{\frac{3}{2}}QQ^*) = \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k^{\frac{3}{2}} \lambda_k^2 < C_Q, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is the sequence of eigenvalues of A as in (2.1)-(2.2).

In the above, we recall the definition $\text{Tr}(g) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle g e_k, e_k \rangle_H$ for $g \in L(H)$.

Remark 2.2. 1. We remark that condition (2.4) states that noise is directly excited only in the first N directions of the phase space, resulting in Q being invertible on $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$. As shown below in Section 4, cf. Proposition 4.4, N will be chosen to be sufficiently large so as to ensure the validity of the Foias-Prodi estimate. On the other hand, condition (2.5) requires that the noise's regularity be at least H^3 regardless of the size of N . It will be exploited to establish an irreducible condition for (2.3) as well as energy estimates that do not depend on N . In turn, all of these properties will be employed to conclude the uniformity of the polynomial mixing rate with respect to the inviscid parameter γ .

2. We also remark that in this work, we opt for the choice of Q being diagonalized by the same basis $\{e_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, so as to simplify computations [20, 33]. Analogous results should hold for more general additive noise structures as long as Q is invertible on $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ and that condition (2.5) is satisfied.

Under Assumption 2.1, the existence and uniqueness of mild solutions in H of (2.3) can be derived using the Galerkin approximation by exploiting the Lyapunov structures in Section 3. The argument is classical and can be found in many previous works for SPDE, e.g., [3, 30]. See also [6, 7].

As a consequence of the well-posedness, for each $\gamma > 0$, we can thus introduce the Markov transition probabilities of the solutions $u^\gamma(t; u_0)$ by

$$P_t^\gamma(u_0, A) := \mathbb{P}(u^\gamma(t; u_0) \in A),$$

which are well-defined for $t \geq 0$, initial states $u_0 \in H$ and Borel sets $A \subset H$. Letting $\mathcal{B}_B(H)$ denote the set of bounded Borel measurable functions $\varphi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the associated Markov semigroup $P_t^\gamma : \mathcal{B}_b(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_b(H)$ is defined and denoted by

$$P_t^\gamma \varphi(u_0) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_0))], \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H).$$

Let $\mathcal{Pr}(H)$ be the space of probability measures in H . For each $\nu \in \mathcal{Pr}(H)$, we denote by $P_t^\gamma \nu$ the measure given by

$$P_t^\gamma \nu(A) = \int_H P_t^\gamma(u_0, A) \nu(du_0).$$

Recall that a probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{Pr}(H)$ is said to be invariant for P_t^γ if

$$P_t^\gamma \nu = \nu.$$

Alternatively, this is equivalent to

$$\int_H \varphi(u) P_t^\gamma \nu(du) = \int_H \varphi(u) \nu(du), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H).$$

2.2. Uniform polynomial mixing. We now turn to the topic of uniform mixing rate for (2.3). Following the framework of [11, 12, 35, 37], we recall that a function $d : H^k \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called *distance-like* if it is symmetric, lower semi-continuous, and $d(u, v) = 0$ if and only if $u = v$; see [37, Definition 4.3]. Let \mathcal{W}_d denote the corresponding coupling distance or Wasserstein-type distance in $\mathcal{Pr}(H^k)$ associated with d , given by

$$\mathcal{W}_d(\nu_1, \nu_2) := \inf \mathbb{E} d(X, Y), \tag{2.6}$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs of random variables (X, Y) such that $X \sim \nu_1$ and $Y \sim \nu_2$. When d is a distance in H^k , by the dual Kantorovich Theorem, \mathcal{W}_d is equivalent defined as [63, Theorem 5.10]

$$\mathcal{W}_d(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_{[f]_{\text{Lip}, d} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathcal{H}} f(u) \nu_1(du) - \int_{\mathcal{H}} f(u) \nu_2(du) \right|, \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$[f]_{\text{Lip}, d} = \sup_{u \neq v} \frac{|f(u) - f(v)|}{d(u, v)}. \tag{2.8}$$

On the other hand, if d is only distance-like, then the following one-sided inequality holds

$$\mathcal{W}_d(\nu_1, \nu_2) \geq \sup_{[f]_{\text{Lip}, d} \leq 1} \left| \int_H f(U) \nu_1(dU) - \int_H f(U) \nu_2(dU) \right|. \tag{2.9}$$

We refer the reader to [32, Proposition A.3] for a further discussion of this point.

In our settings, we will particularly pay attention to the following two distances in H : the former is the discrete metric, i.e., $d(u, v) = 1$ when $u \neq v$ and $d(u, v) = 0$ otherwise. The corresponding \mathcal{W}_d is the usual total variation distance, denoted by \mathcal{W}_{TV} . The latter is the distance d_k , $k = 0, 1$, given by

$$d_k(u, v) := \|u - v\|_{H^k} \wedge 1, \quad u, v \in H^k. \tag{2.10}$$

Particularly, the corresponding W_{d_1} (with $k = 1$) will be used to measure the convergent rate of (2.3) toward equilibrium.

In order to tackle the inviscid regime $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, it is essential to establish suitable a priori bounds on the solution $u^\gamma(t)$. To this end, we recall the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \leq \frac{1}{4}\|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\|u\|_H^6, \quad u \in H^1, \quad (2.11)$$

holds for some positive constant κ . We introduce the function $\Psi : H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\Psi(u) = \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{L^4}^4 + \kappa\|u\|_H^6. \quad (2.12)$$

It is well-known that Ψ is the conserved Hamiltonian for the focusing NLS equation in the absence of noise and damping, i.e., $Q \equiv 0$ and $\alpha = 0$ [20, 62]. The auxiliary results concerning Ψ and the NLS equation are collected in Appendix A and will be employed to study the approximation of (2.3) by the NLS equation. Next, let Φ be the functional given by

$$\Phi(u) = \Psi(u) + \kappa\|u\|_H^{18} = \|u\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{L^4}^4 + \kappa\|u\|_H^6 + \kappa\|u\|_H^{18}. \quad (2.13)$$

In view of (2.11), we note that Φ satisfies the lower bound

$$\Phi(u) \geq \frac{3}{4}\|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{L^4}^4 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\|u\|_H^6 + \kappa\|u\|_H^{18}, \quad (2.14)$$

and that

$$\Psi^3 \geq \Phi \geq \Psi.$$

The former will be useful to establish energy estimates for (2.3) in Section 3 whereas the latter will be invoked to investigate the inviscid limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ in Section 5.

Letting N be the constant as in Assumption 2.1, we recall from [58] that for fixed $\gamma > 0$ and for all N sufficiently large possibly depending on γ , it can be shown that P_t^γ admits a unique invariant probability measure ν^γ and that P_t^γ is exponentially attractive toward ν^γ with respect to the Wasserstein distance \mathcal{W}_{d_0} [58, Theorem 2.1].

We now state our first main result, concerning the unique ergodicity of P_t^γ as well as the polynomial mixing rate independent of the parameter γ .

Theorem 2.3. *1. Let N be the parameter as in Assumption 2.1. Then, there exists a positive integer N_1 sufficiently large independent of γ such that for $N \geq N_1$, P_t^γ admits a unique invariant probability measure ν^γ in H .*

2. Furthermore, let $u_1, u_2 \in H^1$ be given and $\varphi : H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1} < \infty$ where d_1 is as in (2.10) and $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1}$ is defined in (2.8). Then, the following holds for all $q \geq 2$

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_2))| \leq C_q(1+t)^{-q}\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1}(1 + \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.15)$$

for some positive constant C_q independent of u_1, u_2, t, γ and φ . In the above, Φ is defined in (2.13).

It is important to point out that the limit (2.15) does not hold for any initial data in H , owing to the fact that the estimates in Section 4 requires sufficient regularity on the solutions whose moment bounds are uniform with respect to γ . In contrast, while the exponential mixing result in [58] can be applied to any $u_1, u_2 \in H$, it imposes a correlation between N and γ . In particular, [58, Theorem 2.1] implicitly implies that $N \rightarrow \infty$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. See also Remark 3.7 below.

The proof of Theorem 2.3 makes use of the coupling framework in [20, 49, 58] tailored to the Ginzburg-Landau equation (2.3). The technique relies on three crucial ingredients: a stochastic version of the classical Foias-Prodi argument allowing for coupling the solution trajectories, the high probability of coupling inside a ball and the small probability of decoupling. Together with suitable moment bounds, we are able to deduce the uniformity of a polynomial rate for every $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

All of this will be carried out in Section 4. In turn, the result of Theorem 2.3 will be exploited to study the inviscid regime, which we describe next.

2.3. Inviscid limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Having established the uniform mixing rate for (2.3), we turn to the main topic of the paper concerning the limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. We first recast the Schrödinger equation (1.2) as

$$du(t) = -iAu(t)dt + i|u(t)|^2u(t)dt - \alpha u(t)dt + QdW(t), \quad u(0) = u_0 \in H^1. \quad (2.16)$$

Similar to (2.3), under Assumption 2.1, it is not difficult to derive the well-posedness of (2.16). Indeed, the local solutions of (2.16) in H^1 follows from the fact that the semigroup $S(t) = e^{-iAt - \alpha t}$ is contracting in H^1 [20]. Then, the argument can be extended to deduce the global well-posedness by appealing to suitable a priori estimates supplied in Lemma A.1. As a result, the corresponding Markov semigroup P_t^0 is well-defined as in the case of P_t^γ . In the work of [20], it can be shown that P_t^0 admits a unique invariant probability measure ν^0 in $\mathcal{Pr}(H^1)$, and that the convergent rate is polynomial of any order, owing to the lack of strong dissipation. For the convenience of the reader, the precise statement is presented in Theorem A.2, whose proof can be found in [20].

Our next goal is to rigorously describe in what sense we are comparing ν^γ obtained from Theorem 2.3 with ν^0 . To this end, following the framework of [31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 56], we introduce the following distance-like function

$$d_0^\xi(u_1, u_2) = \sqrt{d_0(u_1, u_2)(1 + e^{\xi\|u_1\|_H^2} + e^{\xi\|u_2\|_H^2})}, \quad u_1, u_2 \in H. \quad (2.17)$$

As mentioned in the introduction, there are singular limit regimes where the limiting measure is shown to agree with those of the approximating dynamics [13, 55]. This remarkable observation stems from the fact that those measures can be explicitly computed. Such an approach is not available in our settings and in many other situations [15, 16, 18, 25, 26, 27, 28, 56]. Nevertheless, our second main result of the paper states that ν^γ resembles ν^0 in the regime of vanishing viscosity.

Theorem 2.4. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 2.3, let ν^γ and ν^0 be the unique invariant probability measures of (2.3) and (2.16), respectively. Then, for all $q \geq 2$ and $\xi \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C_{q,\xi}}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.18)$$

In the above, d_0^ξ is the distance-like function defined in (2.17), $\mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}$ is the corresponding Wasserstein distance defined in (2.6), and $C_{q,\xi}$ is a positive constant independent of γ .

The proof of Theorem 2.4 relies on two crucial ingredients: the approximation of (2.3) by (2.16) on any finite time window, cf. Proposition 5.1, and the polynomial mixing rate of (2.16) toward ν^0 , cf. Theorem A.2. In particular, the former estimate draws upon the framework typically found in the settings of dispersive equations, e.g., the wave equation [13, 14, 16, 17, 18]. Then, we combine with the fact that ν^γ satisfies uniform exponential moment bounds independent of γ to ultimately deduce the convergence (2.18). All of this will be clearer in Section 5, where the proof of Theorem 2.4 is supplied.

Finally, as a consequence of Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 2.3, let $\{u_0^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in (0,1)}$ be a sequence of deterministic initial conditions such that*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \|u_0^\gamma\|_{H^1} < R.$$

Then, for all $R > 0$, $q \geq 2$, $\xi \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, and $\varphi : H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi} < \infty$ where d_0^ξ is as in (2.17) and $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi}$ is defined in (2.8), the following holds

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |\mathbb{E}\varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(u(t; u_0^\gamma))| \leq C_{R,q,\xi} \frac{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi}}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.19)$$

for some positive constant $C_{R,q,\xi}$ independent of φ , u_1, u_2 and γ .

In order to prove Theorem 2.5, we will draw upon the framework of [32] tailored to our settings by employing the uniform polynomial rate in Theorem 2.3 and the convergence of ν^γ toward ν^0 in Theorem 2.4. We note that our argument is slightly different from those in [31, 32, 56], which typically require a generalized triangle inequality for $\mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}$. In our setting, instead of dealing directly with d_0^ξ , we prove an analogue of (2.19) for the distance d_0 . Then, we will upgrade to d_0^ξ making use of the fact that both $u^\gamma(t)$ and $u(t)$ satisfy appropriate exponential moment bounds independent of time t and γ . The detailed proof of Theorem 2.5 will be carried out in Section 5.

Remark 2.6. In view of [32, Theorem A.9], a sufficient condition for φ to satisfy $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi} < \infty$ is that

$$\sup_{u \in H} \frac{\max\{|\varphi(u)|, \|D\varphi(u)\|_H\}}{\sqrt{1 + e^{\xi\|u\|_H^2}}} < \infty.$$

In particular, it is not difficult to check that the class of polynomial functions satisfies the above condition.

3. A PRIORI MOMENT ESTIMATES

Throughout the rest of the paper, c and C denote generic positive constants that may change from line to line. The main parameters that they depend on will appear between parenthesis, e.g., $c(T, q)$ is a function of T and q .

In this section, we consider the solutions u^γ of (2.3) and establish several useful energy estimates that will be employed to prove the main results. We start with the bounds in H norm in Lemma 3.1 below. In particular, Lemma 3.1, part 1, will be invoked to obtain higher regularity in Lemma 3.3 whereas the result of Lemma 3.1, part 2, appears in the proof of Lemma 5.2 giving the uniform exponential moment of ν^γ .

Lemma 3.1. 1. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H)$ be given and $u^\gamma(t)$ be the solution of (2.3). Then, for all $n \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|u^\gamma(t)\|_H^{2n}] + \alpha n \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|u^\gamma(r)\|_H^{2n}] dr \leq \mathbb{E}[\|u_0\|_H^{2n}] + 2^n \left(\frac{n-1}{\alpha}\right)^{n-1} |\text{Tr}(QQ^*)|^n t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|u^\gamma(t)\|_H^{2n}] \leq e^{-\alpha n t} \mathbb{E}[\|u_0\|_H^{2n}] + 2^n \frac{(n-1)^{n-1}}{n\alpha^n} |\text{Tr}(QQ^*)|^n, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

2. For all $\xi > 0$ sufficiently small independent of γ , the following holds

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\xi\|u^\gamma(t)\|_H^2}] \leq e^{-c_\xi t} \mathbb{E}[e^{\xi\|u_0\|_H^2}] + C_\xi, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.3)$$

for some positive constants c_ξ and C_ξ independent of t, γ and u_0 .

Remark 3.2. In light of Assumption 2.1, cf. (2.5), it is important to note that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \text{Tr}(QQ^*) = \sup_{N \geq 1} \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k^2 < C_Q,$$

which is independent of the size of N .

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For notation convenience, throughout the proofs in this section, we will drop the superscript γ in u^γ .

We first compute the derivatives of $\|u\|_H^2$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D(\|u\|_H^2), v \rangle_H &= \langle u, \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle \bar{u}, v \rangle_H, \\ \langle D^2(\|u\|_H^2)(z), v \rangle_H &= \langle z, \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle \bar{z}, v \rangle_H.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\|u\|_H^2$ gives

$$d\|u(t)\|_H^2 = -2\gamma\|A^{1/2}u(t)\|_H^2 dt - 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt + 2\text{Tr}(QQ^*)dt + dM_0(t), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$dM_0(t) = \langle u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_H + \langle \bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_H, \quad (3.5)$$

whose quadratic variation is given by

$$d\langle M_0 \rangle(t) = 4\|Qu(t)\|_H^2 dt. \quad (3.6)$$

Next, for $n \geq 2$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}d\|u(t)\|_H^{2n} &= n\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-2} \left(-2\gamma\|A^{1/2}u(t)\|_H^2 dt - 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt + 2\text{Tr}(QQ^*)dt + dM_0(t) \right) \\ &\quad + n(2n-2)\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-4}\|Qu(t)\|_H^2.\end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

1. Turning back to (3.1) and (3.2), we employ Young inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}2\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-2}\text{Tr}(QQ^*) + (2n-2)\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-4}\|Qu(t)\|_H^2 \\ \leq 2\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-2}\text{Tr}(QQ^*) + (2n-2)\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-4} \cdot \|Q\|_{L(H)}^2\|u(t)\|_H^2 \\ \leq 2n\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-2}\text{Tr}(QQ^*) \\ \leq \alpha\|u\|_H^{2n} + 2^n \left(\frac{n-1}{\alpha} \right)^{n-1} |\text{Tr}(QQ^*)|^n.\end{aligned}$$

From (3.7), we deduce the bound

$$d\|u(t)\|_H^{2n} \leq -\alpha n\|u(t)\|_H^{2n} dt + 2^n \left(\frac{n-1}{\alpha} \right)^{n-1} |\text{Tr}(QQ^*)|^n dt + n\|u(t)\|_H^{2n-2} dM_0(t). \quad (3.8)$$

Taking expectation on both sides yields

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|_H^{2n} \leq -\alpha n \mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|_H^{2n} + 2^n \left(\frac{n-1}{\alpha} \right)^{n-1} |\text{Tr}(QQ^*)|^n.$$

On the one hand, integrating the above estimate with respect to time t produces (3.1). On the other hand, from Gronwall's inequality, we establish (3.2), thereby finishing the proof.

2. With regard to (3.3), let $\xi > 0$ be given and be chosen later. From (3.4), we readily have

$$d\xi\|u(t)\|_H^2 \leq -2\alpha\xi\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt + 2\xi\text{Tr}(QQ^*)dt + d\xi M_0(t). \quad (3.9)$$

Note also that the quadratic process $\langle M_0 \rangle(t)$ given by (3.6) satisfies the bound

$$d\langle M_0 \rangle(t) \leq 4\|Q\|_{L(H)}^2\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt \leq 4\text{Tr}(QQ^*)\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}de^{\xi\|u(t)\|_H^2} &= \xi e^{\xi\|u(t)\|_H^2} (d\|u(t)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2}\xi d\langle M_0 \rangle(t)) \\ &\leq \xi e^{\xi\|u(t)\|_H^2} (-2\alpha\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt + 2\text{Tr}(QQ^*)dt + dM_0(t) + 2\xi\text{Tr}(QQ^*)\|u(t)\|_H^2 dt).\end{aligned}$$

Picking ξ sufficiently small, e.g.,

$$\xi < \frac{\alpha}{2\text{Tr}(QQ^*)},$$

produces the bound in expectation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t)\|_H^2} \leq \xi \mathbb{E} [e^{\xi \|u(t)\|_H^2} (-\alpha \|u(t)\|_H^2 + 2\text{Tr}(QQ^*))].$$

We employ the elementary inequality

$$e^{\xi x} (-\alpha x + 2\text{Tr}(QQ^*)) \leq -c e^{\xi x} + C, \quad x \geq 0,$$

to infer the existence of positive constants $c = c(\xi)$ and $C = C(\xi)$ independent of γ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t)\|_H^2} \leq -c \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t)\|_H^2} + C, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In turn, this implies estimate (3.3) by virtue of Gronwall's inequality. The proof is thus complete. \square

Next, in Lemma 3.3 stated and proven below, we establish moment bounds in H^1 . The result of Lemma 3.3, part 1, will be particularly employed to obtain the uniform polynomial rate in Section 4 whereas part 2 will be useful in proving the convergence of $u^\gamma(t)$ toward $u(t)$ in Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 3.3. 1. Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$ be given and $u^\gamma(t)$ be the solution of (2.3) with initial condition u_0 . Then, for all $n \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} [\Phi(u^\gamma(t))^n] + \frac{1}{2} \alpha n \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\Phi(u^\gamma(r))^n] dr \leq \mathbb{E} [\Phi(u_0)^n] + C_{1,n} t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.10)$$

and that

$$\mathbb{E} [\Phi(u^\gamma(t))^n] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} \alpha n t} \mathbb{E} [\Phi(u_0)^n] + \frac{2}{\alpha n} C_{1,n}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

for some positive constant $C_{1,n}$ independent of u_0, t, γ and N .

2. For all $T > 0$, the following holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{[0, T]} \Phi(u^\gamma(t))^n \right] \leq \mathbb{E} [\Phi(u_0)^n] + \mathbb{E} [\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + C_{1,n} T. \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. Recalling Φ from (2.13), we first consider $\|u\|_{L^4}^4$ and compute the derivatives as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(\|u\|_{L^4}^4), v \rangle_H &= 2\langle |u|^2 u, \bar{v} \rangle_H + 2\langle |u|^2 \bar{u}, v \rangle_H, \\ \langle D^2(\|u\|_{L^4}^4)(z), v \rangle_H &= 4\langle |u|^2, z\bar{v} + \bar{z}v \rangle_H + 2\langle u^2, \bar{z}\bar{v} \rangle_H + 2\langle \bar{u}^2, zv \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Itô's formula to $\|u\|_{L^4}^4$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 &= -8\gamma \|\text{Re}(u(t)\nabla \bar{u}(t))\|_H^2 dt - 4\gamma \langle |u(t)|^2, |\nabla u(t)|^2 \rangle_H dt + 2\text{Re} \left(\langle |u(t)|^2 u(t), iA\bar{u}(t) \rangle_H \right) dt \\ &\quad - 4\alpha \|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 dt + 8 \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k^2 \langle |u(t)|^2, e_k^2 \rangle_H dt \\ &\quad + 2\langle |u(t)|^2 u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_H + 2\langle |u(t)|^2 \bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_H. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Next, regarding $\|u\|_{H^1}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 &= -2\gamma \|u(t)\|_{H^2}^2 dt - 2\alpha \|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + \text{Re} \left(\langle |u(t)|^2 u(t), iA\bar{u}(t) \rangle_H \right) dt \\ &\quad + \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) dt + \langle u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_{H^1} + \langle \bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_{H^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Combining two above identities produces

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}d\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 \\
&= -2\gamma\|u(t)\|_{H^2}^2 dt + 4\gamma\|\operatorname{Re}(u(t)\nabla\bar{u}(t))\|_H^2 dt + 2\gamma\langle|u(t)|^2, |\nabla u(t)|^2\rangle_H dt \\
&\quad - 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 dt + \operatorname{Tr}(AQQ^*)dt \\
&\quad - 4\sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k^2 \langle|u(t)|^2, e_k^2\rangle_H dt + dM_{1,1}(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
dM_{1,1}(t) &= \langle u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_{H^1} + \langle \bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_{H^1} \\
&\quad - \langle |u(t)|^2 u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_H - \langle |u(t)|^2 \bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_H.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the terms involving $\nabla u(t)$ on the above right-hand side, we note that $\gamma > 0$ is taken to be sufficiently small. Also, using $H^{3/4} \subset L^\infty$ (in dimension $d = 1$) and interpolation inequalities, we have the following chain of estimates

$$\langle |u|^2, |\nabla u|^2 \rangle_H \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u\|_H^2 \leq c\|\nabla u\|_{H^{3/4}}^2 \|u\|_H^2 \leq c\|u\|_{H^2}^{7/4} \|u\|_H^{9/4}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 4\gamma\|\operatorname{Re}(u\nabla\bar{u})\|_H^2 + 2\gamma\langle|u|^2, |\nabla u|^2\rangle_H \\
&\leq 6\gamma\langle|u|^2, |\nabla u|^2\rangle_H \leq c\gamma^{8/7}\|u\|_{H^2}^2 + \kappa\alpha\|u\|_H^{18}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the positive constant $c = c(\kappa, \alpha)$ is independent of γ . Hence, by taking γ sufficiently small, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}d\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 \\
&\leq \kappa\alpha\|u(t)\|_H^{18} - 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 dt + \operatorname{Tr}(AQQ^*)dt + dM_{1,1}(t), \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Turning back to Φ defined in (2.13), from (3.8) (with $2n = 6$ and $2n = 18$) and (3.15), we set $\Phi(t) := \Phi(u(t))$ and deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
d\Phi(t) &\leq -2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + 2\alpha\|u(t)\|_{L^4}^4 dt - 3\alpha\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^6 dt - 8\alpha\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^{18} dt \\
&\quad + \operatorname{Tr}(AQQ^*)dt + 2^5 \frac{|\operatorname{Tr}(QQ^*)|^3}{\alpha^2} dt + 2^{33} \frac{|\operatorname{Tr}(QQ^*)|^9}{\alpha^8} dt \\
&\quad + dM_{1,1}(t) + 3\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^4 dM_0(t) + 9\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^{16} dM_0(t).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.11), it holds that

$$2\alpha\|u\|_{L^4}^4 \leq \frac{1}{2}\alpha\|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \alpha\kappa\|u\|_H^6.$$

We combine the above two estimates to obtain

$$d\Phi(t) \leq -\alpha\Phi(u(t))dt + C_{1,1}dt + dM_1(t), \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$C_{1,1} = \operatorname{Tr}(AQQ^*) + 2^5 \frac{|\operatorname{Tr}(QQ^*)|^3}{\alpha^2} + 2^{33} \frac{|\operatorname{Tr}(QQ^*)|^9}{\alpha^8},$$

and the semi Martingale process $M_1(t)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
dM_1(t) &= \langle Au(t) - |u(t)|^2 u(t) + (3\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^4 + 9\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^{16})u(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_H \\
&\quad + \langle A\bar{u}(t) - |u(t)|^2 \bar{u}(t) + (3\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^4 + 9\kappa\|u(t)\|_H^{16})\bar{u}(t), QdW(t) \rangle_H, \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

whose quadratic variation is given by

$$d\langle M_1 \rangle(t) = 4 \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \langle Au(t) - |u(t)|^2 u(t) + (3\kappa \|u(t)\|_H^4 + 9\kappa \|u(t)\|_H^{16}) u(t), Qe_k \rangle \right|^2 dt. \quad (3.18)$$

In particular, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & 4 \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \langle Au - |u|^2 u + (3\kappa \|u\|_H^4 + 9\kappa \|u\|_H^{16}) u, Qe_k \rangle \right|^2 \\ & \leq 12 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + 12 \text{Tr}(QQ^*) \left[\|u\|_{L^6}^6 + (3\kappa \|u\|_H^4 + 9\kappa \|u\|_H^{16})^2 \|u\|_H^2 \right] \\ & \leq 12 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + 12 \text{Tr}(QQ^*) \left[\|u\|_{L^6}^6 + 18\kappa^2 \|u\|_H^{10} + 162\kappa^2 \|u\|_H^{34} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

With regard to $\|u\|_{L^6}^6$ on the above right-hand side, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we invoke Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation to see that the following holds

$$\|u\|_{L^6}^6 \leq c \|u\|_{H^1}^2 \|u\|_H^4,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle M_1 \rangle(t) & \leq 12 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + 12 \text{Tr}(QQ^*) \left[c \|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(t)\|_H^4 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 18\kappa^2 \|u(t)\|_H^{10} + 162\kappa^2 \|u(t)\|_H^{34} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In light of (2.14), since $\text{Tr}(QQ^*) < C\infty$ and $\|u\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}\Phi(u)$, we deduce further that

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle M_1 \rangle(t) & \leq 16 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \Phi(t) dt + C \left[\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(t)\|_H^4 + \|u(t)\|_H^{10} + \|u(t)\|_H^{34} \right] \\ & \leq \Phi(t)^2 dt + C dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Next, for each $n \geq 2$, by Itô's formula, we compute

$$d\Phi(t)^n = n\Phi(t)^{n-1} dH(t) + \frac{1}{2} n(n-1) \Phi(t)^{n-2} d\langle M_1 \rangle(t).$$

From (3.16) and (3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi(t)^n & \leq -n\alpha \Phi(t)^n dt + n(8n-7) \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \Phi(t)^{n-1} dt + n\Phi(t)^{n-1} dM_1(t) \\ & \quad + c \Phi(t)^{n-1} dt + c \Phi(t)^{n-2} \left(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(t)\|_H^4 + \|u(t)\|_H^{10} + \|u(t)\|_H^{34} \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by virtue of Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & n(8n-7) \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) \Phi(t)^{n-1} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} n\alpha \Phi(t)^n + (8n-7)^n \left(\frac{n}{4(n-1)} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^n}{\alpha^{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} & c \Phi(t)^{n-1} + c \Phi(t)^{n-2} \left(\|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(t)\|_H^4 + \|u(t)\|_H^{10} + \|u(t)\|_H^{34} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} n\alpha \Phi(t)^n + C dt. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned} d\Phi(t)^n & \leq -\frac{1}{2} n\alpha \Phi(t)^n dt + (8n-7)^n \left(\frac{n}{4(n-1)} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^n}{\alpha^{n-1}} dt \\ & \quad + C dt + n\Phi(t)^{n-1} dM_1(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

In the above right-hand side, we emphasize that the positive constant $C = C(n, \alpha) > 0$ is independent of γ , u and Q .

1. Turning back to (3.10) and (3.11), we note that (3.20) implies the bound in expectation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \Phi(t)^n \leq -\frac{1}{2} n \alpha \mathbb{E} \Phi(t)^n dt + (8n - 7)^n \left(\frac{n}{4(n-1)} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^n}{\alpha^{n-1}} + C, \quad t \geq 0.$$

On the one hand, we integrate the above estimate on both sides with respect to time t and immediately obtain (3.10). On the other hand, by virtue of Gronwall's inequality, we establish (3.11), as claimed.

2. With regard to the sup norm estimate (3.12), we note that (3.20) implies the almost surely bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{[0, T]} \Phi(t)^n &\leq \Phi(0)^n + (8n - 7)^n \left(\frac{n}{4(n-1)} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^n}{\alpha^{n-1}} T + CT \\ &\quad + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t n \Phi(r)^{n-1} dM_1(r). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Concerning the semi Martingale on the above right-hand side, we invoke (3.19) while making use of Burkholder's inequality to infer

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(r)^{n-1} dM_1(r) \right| \\ &\leq n \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-1} \cdot 16 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-2} \left[\|u(r)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(r)\|_H^4 + \|u(r)\|_H^{10} + \|u(r)\|_H^{34} \right] dr \right|^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} n + n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-1} \cdot 8 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) dr \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-2} \left[\|u(r)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(r)\|_H^4 + \|u(r)\|_H^{10} + \|u(r)\|_H^{34} \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, \alpha, \text{Tr}(QQ^*))$ is a positive constant independent of T , γ and u_0 . We employ Young's inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-2} \left[\|u(r)\|_{H^1}^2 \|u(r)\|_H^4 + \|u(r)\|_H^{10} + \|u(r)\|_H^{34} \right] dr \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \alpha n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n} dr + CT, \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} &n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n-1} \cdot 8 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*) dr \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \alpha n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n} dr + 4 \left(\frac{2n-1}{n} \right)^{2n-1} \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^{2n}}{\alpha^{2n-1}} T. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(r)^{n-1} dM_1(r) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \alpha n \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \Phi(r)^{2n} dr + 4 \left(\frac{2n-1}{n} \right)^{2n-1} \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^{2n}}{\alpha^{2n-1}} T + CT, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $C = C(n, \alpha, \text{Tr}(QQ^*))$ is a positive constant independent of T, γ and u_0 . In view of (3.10), we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(r)^{n-1} dM_1(r) \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(0)^{2n}] + \left[(16n - 7)^{2n} \left(\frac{2n}{4(2n-1)} \right)^{2n-1} + 4 \left(\frac{2n-1}{n} \right)^{2n-1} \right] \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^{2n}}{\alpha^{2n-1}} T + CT. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.21) implies the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{[0, T]} \Phi(t)^n \right] & \leq \mathbb{E}[\Phi(0)^n] + \mathbb{E}[\Phi(0)^{2n}] + CT \\ & \quad + (8n - 7)^n \left(\frac{n}{4(n-1)} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^n}{\alpha^{n-1}} T \\ & \quad + \left[(16n - 7)^{2n} \left(\frac{2n}{4(2n-1)} \right)^{2n-1} + 4 \left(\frac{2n-1}{n} \right)^{2n-1} \right] \frac{|\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)|^{2n}}{\alpha^{2n-1}} T, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired estimate (3.12). The proof is thus finished. \square

Having established moment bounds in H and H^1 , we turn to controlling the energy growth in probability, which is crucial in proving uniform ergodicity in Section 4. For this purpose, we introduce the following functional for $n \geq 1$

$$E_n(t; u_0) = \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_0))^n + \frac{1}{2} n \alpha \int_0^t \Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_0))^n ds, \quad (3.22)$$

where we recall Φ defined in (2.13). In Lemma 3.4 below, we provide two tail probabilities on E_n . The former appears in the proof of Lemma 4.6 whereas the latter is an ingredient for proving Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $n \geq 1, p \geq 1$ and $\rho \geq 0$, the followings hold*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho \sqrt{T} \right) \leq K_{n,p} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{np}] + 1}{\rho^p}, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [T, \infty)} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho \right) \leq K_{n,p} \frac{T^p + 1}{T(\rho + T)^{2p-1}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2np}] + 1), \quad (3.24)$$

for some positive constants $C_n, K_{n,p}$ independent of u_0, T, ρ and γ . In the above, $E_n(t; u_0)$ is defined in (3.22).

Proof. With regard to (3.23), from (3.20), there exists C_n independent of γ, T and u_0 such that

$$E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t \leq \Phi(u_0)^n + \int_0^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s),$$

where $M_1(t)$ is the semi Martingale process given by (3.17). It follows that for all $\rho > 0$, Markov's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho \sqrt{T} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right| \geq \rho \sqrt{T} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\rho^{2p} T^p} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right|^{2p} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, Burkholder's inequality together with estimate (3.19) produces the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right|^{2p}\right] &\leq c \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_0^T \Phi(s)^{2n-2} d\langle M_1 \rangle(s) \right|^p\right] \\ &\leq c \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_0^T (\Phi(s)^{2n} + 1) ds \right|^p\right].\end{aligned}$$

We invoke Holder's inequality while making use of (3.11) to infer

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_0^T (\Phi(s)^{2n} + 1) ds \right|^p\right] \leq c T^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\Phi(s)^{2np} + 1) ds \leq c T^p (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1),$$

whence

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right|^{2p}\right] \leq c T^p (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1).$$

Altogether, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho \sqrt{T}\right) \leq \frac{c}{\rho^{2p} T^p} \cdot T^p (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1),$$

which establishes (3.23), as claimed.

Turning to (3.24), for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n(t - kT)) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho + kT\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} \Phi(kT)^n - \Phi(u_0)^n + \left| \int_{kT}^t n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right| \geq \rho + kT\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(\rho + kT)^{2p}} \mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(kT)^{2np} + \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + \sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} \left| \int_{kT}^{kT+t} n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right|^{2p}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (3.23), we employ Holder's inequality and (3.11) to infer

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} \left| \int_{kT}^{kT+t} n \Phi(s)^{n-1} dM_1(s) \right|^{2p}\right] \\ &\leq c \mathbb{E}\left[\left| \int_{kT}^{(k+1)T} (\Phi(s)^{2n} + 1) ds \right|^p\right] \leq c T^p (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1),\end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho\right) \leq \frac{c}{(\rho + kT)^{2p}} (T^p + 1) (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1).$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [T, \infty)} (E_n(t; u_0) - C_n t) \geq \Phi(u_0)^n + \rho\right) \\ &\leq c (T^p + 1) (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1) \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{(\rho + kT)^{2p}} \leq c \frac{T^p + 1}{T(\rho + T)^{2p-1}} (\mathbb{E} \Phi(u_0)^{2np} + 1).\end{aligned}$$

The proof is thus complete. \square

Finally, we turn to the stochastic Foias-Prodi estimate, stating that if the low modes are close, then so are the high modes. In order to precisely state the result, we introduce the function

$$J(u_1, u_2) = \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^1}^2 - \operatorname{Re}\{\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2)^2 \rangle_H\} + \kappa_2(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2))\|u_1 - u_2\|_H^2. \quad (3.25)$$

By Sobolev embedding $H^1 \subset L^\infty$, we may pick κ_2 sufficiently large such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\kappa_2(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2))\|u_1 - u_2\|_H^2 \geq |\operatorname{Re}\{\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2)^2 \rangle_H\}|.$$

In other words,

$$J(u_1, u_2) \geq \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_2(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2))\|u_1 - u_2\|_H^2. \quad (3.26)$$

Lemma 3.5. *For all $N \geq 1$, let $u_1^0, u_2^0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$ be such that $P_N u_1^0 = P_N u_2^0$ where P_N is the projection on $\operatorname{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ and let τ be the stopping time defined as*

$$\tau_N = \inf\{t \geq 0 : P_N u^\gamma(t; u_1^0) \neq P_N u^\gamma(t; u_2^0)\}. \quad (3.27)$$

Then, for all $t \geq 0$, the following holds

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\alpha(t \wedge \tau_N) - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_N} [\Phi(u_1(s))^2 + \Phi(u_2(s))^2 + 1] ds\right\} J(t \wedge \tau_N)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}[J(u_1^0, u_2^0)], \quad (3.28)$$

for some positive constant c_* independent of u_1^0, u_2^0, t, N and γ . In the above, J is given by (3.25) and α_N is the eigenvalue of A as in (2.1).

Remark 3.6. In the case of fixed $\gamma > 0$, in view of [58, Proposition], we note that one can also deduce the following path-wise estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u^\gamma(t \wedge \tau_N; u_1^0) - u^\gamma(t \wedge \tau_N; u_2^0)\|_H \\ & \leq \|u_1^0 - u_2^0\|_H \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma\mu_{N+1}(t \wedge \tau_N) + c[F(t \wedge \tau_N; u_1^0) + F(t \wedge \tau_N; u_2^0)]\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(t; u_i^0) = \|u^\gamma(t; u_i^0)\|_H^2 + \gamma \int_0^t \|u^\gamma(s; u_i^0)\|_H^2 ds, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In particular, it is clear that as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, N must arbitrarily large accordingly, allowing for a dissipative effect strong enough to dominate the F terms.

Here, in the vanishing viscosity regime, we are only able to derive an estimate in expectation, owing to the lack of dissipation as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Nevertheless, the result of Lemma 3.5 is sufficient to carry out the coupling argument presented in Section 4 so as to establish ergodicity. Lemma 3.5 can also be considered as an analogue of [20, Proposition 2.1] adapted to the setting of the Ginzburg-Landau equation.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. For notation convenience, we denote

$$u_1(t) = u^\gamma(t; u_1^0), \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 = u^\gamma(t; u_2^0).$$

Letting $v = u_1 - u_2$, observe that v satisfies the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}v = -\gamma Av - iAv - \alpha v + i[|u_1|^2 u_1 - |u_2|^2 u_2].$$

We note that the last term on the above right hand side can be recast as

$$|u_1|^2 u_1 - |u_2|^2 u_2 = (|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2)v + u_1 u_2 \bar{v}.$$

A routine calculation produces

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|v\|_H^2 = -2\gamma\|v\|_{H^1}^2 - 2\alpha\|v\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\{i\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H\},$$

Using Holder's inequality and $H^1 \subset H^{3/4} \subset L^\infty$, we have

$$|\operatorname{Re}\{i\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H\}| \leq \|u_1\|_H \|u_2\|_H \|v\|_{H^{3/4}}^2 \leq c(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_{H^{3/4}}^2. \quad (3.29)$$

Under the condition that $P_N u_1 = P_N u_2$, it holds that

$$\|v\|_{H^{3/4}} = \|Q_N v\|_{H^{3/4}} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1},$$

whence

$$|\operatorname{Re}\{i\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H\}| \leq \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/4}} (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_{H^1}^2.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_H^2 = -2\gamma \|v\|_{H^1}^2 - 2\alpha \|v\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/4}} (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (3.30)$$

Next, we turn to $\|v\|_{H^1}^2$ and compute

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 = -2\gamma \|Av\|_H^2 - 2\alpha \|v\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\{i(G_1 + \langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H)\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \langle \bar{u}_1 \nabla u_1, v \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle u_1 \nabla \bar{u}_1, v \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle \bar{u}_2 \nabla u_2, v \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \langle u_2 \nabla \bar{u}_2, v \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle u_2 \nabla u_1, \bar{v} \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H + \langle u_1 \nabla u_2, \bar{v} \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the argument for (3.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{u}_1 \nabla u_1, v \nabla \bar{v} \rangle_H &\leq \|u_1\|_{L^\infty} \|v\|_{L^\infty} \|U_1\|_{H^1} \|v\|_{H^1} \leq c \|v\|_{H^1} \|v\|_{H^{3/4}} \|u_1\|_{H^1}^2 \\ &\leq c \|v\|_{H^1} \|v\|_{H^{3/4}} (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the same argument can also be carried out for other terms on the right-hand side of G_1 equation. Hence, G_1 can be estimated as

$$|G_1| \leq c \|v\|_{H^1} \|v\|_{H^{3/4}} (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \leq \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)). \quad (3.31)$$

where in the last estimate, we once again employed the fact that $P_N u_1 = P_N u_2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 &\leq -2\gamma \|Av\|_H^2 - 2\alpha \|v\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \\ &\quad + 2\operatorname{Re}\{i\langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

In the above, we emphasize that c is a positive constant independent of γ , N and t .

Next, from (3.25), we consider the term $\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} &d\langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H \\ &= \langle u_2 (\bar{v})^2, -\gamma A u_1 - i A u_1 - \alpha u_1 + i |u_1|^2 u_1 \rangle_H dt + \langle u_2 (\bar{v})^2, Q dW \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \langle u_1 (\bar{v})^2, -\gamma A u_2 - i A u_2 - \alpha u_2 + i |u_2|^2 u_2 \rangle_H dt + \langle u_1 (\bar{v})^2, Q dW \rangle_H \\ &\quad + 2\langle u_1 u_2 \bar{v}, -\gamma A \bar{v} + i A \bar{v} - \alpha \bar{v} - i[|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2] \bar{v} + \bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_2 v \rangle_H dt \\ &=: G_2 dt + \langle (u_1 + u_2) (\bar{v})^2, Q dW \rangle_H - 2\gamma \langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H dt + 2i \langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H dt. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.31), we employ $H^1 \subset H^{3/4} \subset L^\infty$ to infer

$$|G_2| \leq \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)).$$

Also, since $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is assumed to be sufficiently small, we have

$$|2\gamma \langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H| \leq \gamma (\|u_1\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u_2\|_{H^1}^2) \|v\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & -d \operatorname{Re} \{ \langle u_1 u_2, (\bar{v})^2 \rangle_H \} \\ & \leq \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \|v\|_{H^1}^2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) dt - 2 \operatorname{Re} \{ i \langle u_1 u_2, (\nabla \bar{v})^2 \rangle_H \} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

With regard to the last term involving Φ on the right-hand side of (3.25), on the one hand, we employ (3.16) to infer

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_H^2 d(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) & \leq -\alpha (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_H^2 dt + C \|v\|_H^2 dt \\ & \quad + \|v\|_H^2 [dM_1(t; u_1^0) + dM_1(t; u_2^0)], \end{aligned}$$

where $M_1(t; u_i^0)$ is the semi Martingale process M_1 as in (3.17) with the initial condition u_i^0 , $i = 1, 2$. On the other hand, from (3.30), we readily have

$$(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \frac{d}{dt} \|v\|_H^2 \leq -2\alpha (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_H^2 + \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/4}} (\Phi(u_1)^2 + \Phi(u_2)^2) \|v\|_H^2.$$

Altogether, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & d[(\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_H^2] \\ & \leq -3\alpha (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_H^2 dt + \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/4}} [\Phi(u_1)^2 + \Phi(u_2)^2 + 1] \|v\|_H^2 dt \\ & \quad + \|v\|_H^2 [dM_1(t; u_1^0) + dM_1(t; u_2^0)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Turning back to J as in (3.25), we collect (3.32), (3.33) and (3.34) to deduce the bound

$$\begin{aligned} dJ & \leq -2\alpha \|v\|_{H^1}^2 dt - 3\alpha \kappa_2 (\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \|v\|_H^2 dt + \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} [\Phi(u_1)^2 + \Phi(u_2)^2 + 1] \|v\|_{H^1}^2 dt \\ & \quad + \|v\|_H^2 [dM_1(t; u_1^0) + dM_1(t; u_2^0)]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for all $0 \leq t \leq \tau$

$$\begin{aligned} & d \left[\exp \left\{ \alpha t - \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^t [\Phi(u_1(s))^2 + \Phi(u_2(s))^2 + 1] ds \right\} J(t) \right] \\ & \leq \exp \left\{ \alpha t - \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^t [\Phi(u_1(s))^2 + \Phi(u_2(s))^2 + 1] ds \right\} \|v(t)\|_H^2 [dM_1(t; u_1^0) + dM_1(t; u_2^0)], \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \alpha \tau - \frac{c}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^\tau [\Phi(u_1(s))^2 + \Phi(u_2(s))^2 + 1] ds \right\} J(\tau) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[J(0)].$$

This establishes (3.28), thereby finishing the proof. \square

Remark 3.7. The dimensional restriction of the Foias-Prodi estimate (3.28) follows from the bound (3.29) where we invoke Sobolev embedding $H^{1/2+} \subset L^\infty$, which is only available in dimension one, but not in higher dimensions. See also the proof of [20, Proposition 2.1].

4. UNIFORM POLYNOMIAL MIXING OF (2.3)

4.1. Proof of Theorem 2.3. In this section, we establish the uniform polynomial convergent rate of P_t^γ toward ν^γ . Before discussing the proof of Theorem 2.3, it is illuminating to recapitulate the framework of [20, 58] on the coupling argument, which is the key tool for proving ergodicity. For this purpose, we set

$$X_N^\gamma(t) = X_N^\gamma(t; u_0) = P_N u^\gamma(t; u_0), \quad Y_N^\gamma(t) = Y_N^\gamma(t; u_0) = Q_N u^\gamma(t; u_0) = (I - P_N)u^\gamma(t; u_0), \quad (4.1)$$

where we recall $P_N u$ is the projection of u on $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} dX_N^\gamma(t) &= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)X_N^\gamma(t)dt + QdW(t) \\ &\quad + iP_N[|X_N^\gamma(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t)|^2(X_N^\gamma(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t))]dt, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} dY_N^\gamma(t) &= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)Y_N^\gamma(t)dt \\ &\quad + iQ_N[|X_N^\gamma(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t)|^2(X_N^\gamma(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t))]dt, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

with the initial conditions $X_N^\gamma(0) = P_N u_0$ and $Y_N^\gamma(0) = Q_N u_0$. Next, we introduce the following discrete random variables:

Definition 4.1. [20] *1. For every $u_1^0, u_2^0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$, $N \geq 1$, $\beta > 0$, $T > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define*

$$\ell_\beta(k) = \min\{l \in \{0, \dots, k\} : P_{l,k} \text{ holds}\},$$

where $\min \emptyset = \infty$ and

$$P_{l,k} = \begin{cases} X_N^\gamma(t; u_1^0) = X_N^\gamma(t; u_2^0), & \forall t \in [lT, kT], \\ E_4(t, u_i) \leq \beta^4 + C_4(t - lT), & \forall t \in [lT, kT], i = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

In the above, Φ is as in (2.13), E_4 is given by (3.22) and C_4 is the constant from Lemma 3.4 with $n = 4$.

2. The pair $(u^\gamma(t; u_1^0), u^\gamma(t; u_2^0))$ is said to be coupled on $[lT, kT]$ if $\ell_\beta(k) = l$.

As mentioned in Section 2.2, the motivation for ℓ_β stems from the Foias-Prodi typed estimates producing an effective control on the solutions' energy provided that a sufficiently large number of low modes of the solutions are close [20, 58, 62]. For the convenience of the reader, we summarize the idea of the coupling technique in [20, Theorem 2.9] and [58, Theorem 1.8]. The argument essentially consists three steps as follows.

Step 1: Starting from two initial conditions u_1^0, u_2^0 , we let τ be the first time the solutions enter a ball of radius R , i.e.,

$$\tau = \inf\{k \geq 0 : \Phi(u^\gamma(kT; u_1^0)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(kT; u_2^0)) \leq R\}.$$

In view of the Lyapunov estimate presented in Lemma 3.3, it can be shown that

$$\mathbb{E}e^{\xi\tau} < c(1 + \mathbb{E}\Phi(u_1^0) + \mathbb{E}\Phi(u_2^0)),$$

for some positive constant c independent of γ , T and the initial conditions. See for example [58, Section 1.4]. In particular, as a consequence, τ is a.s. finite.

Step 2: Once inside the ball, we show that the probability the two solutions will couple is always bounded from below independent of γ , cf. Proposition 4.3. The proof of which relies on two auxiliary results collected in Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6.

Step 3: Once the solutions are coupled, on the one hand, the probability that they are close with respect to d_1 distance is high and is independent of γ . This is established in Lemma 4.2 exploiting the Foias-Prodi estimate collected in Lemma 3.5. On the other hand, for all $\beta > 0$ sufficiently small and T sufficiently large, the probability of decoupling is small with a power law order, which is also

independent of γ . The precise statement is discussed in detailed in Proposition 4.4. Altogether, we are able to deduce the mixing rate (2.15) uniformly with respect to γ .

See [20, Theorem 2.9] and [58, Theorem 1.8] for a more detailed explanation of the above steps. We now provide the auxiliary results whose proofs are deferred to the end of this section. We start by stating Lemma 4.2 giving the high probability that two coupled solutions are close.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $N_1 = N_1(\alpha)$ sufficiently large independent of γ such that for all $N \geq N_1$, $\beta > 0$, $q > 0$, $t \geq 0$, and $0 \leq l \leq k$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\{d_1(u^\gamma(t; u_1^0), u^\gamma(t; u_2^0)) \geq c_0(t - lT)^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) \leq l\}) \leq c_0(t - lT)^{-q}, \quad t \in [lT, kT], \quad (4.4)$$

holds for some positive constant $c_0 = c_0(\beta, N)$ independent of γ and t . In the above, d_1 is the distance as in (2.10).

Next, we state Proposition 4.3, establishing a lower bound for the probability of coupling once the solutions enter a ball.

Proposition 4.3. *Let ℓ_β be the random variable as in Definition 4.1. Then, for all $N \geq 1$, $R > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, there exists a positive constant $T_1 = T_1(N, R, \beta)$ independent of γ such that for all $T \geq T_1$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) = k+1 | \ell_\beta(k) = \infty, \Phi(u^\gamma(kT; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(kT; u_2)) \leq R) \geq \varepsilon_1,$$

for some positive constant $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(N, R, \beta, T)$ independent of γ . In the above, Φ is the function defined in (2.13).

Finally, we state the auxiliary result in Proposition 4.4 ensuring a low probability of decoupling.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $N_1 = N_1(\alpha)$ be the constant as in Lemma 4.2. Then, for all $q \geq 2$ and $N \geq N_1$, there exist positive constants $\beta_1 = \beta_1(q, N)$ sufficiently small and $T_2 = T_2(q)$ sufficiently large both independent of γ such that the following holds*

$$\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq l | \ell_\beta(k) = l) \leq \frac{1}{2}[1 + (k-l)T]^{-q}, \quad (4.5)$$

for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_1)$, $0 \leq l \leq k$ and $T \geq T_2$.

Assuming the above results, let us conclude Theorem 2.3, whose argument is the same as that of [20, Theorem 2.9]. See also the proof of [58, Theorem 1.8].

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let N_1 be the integer constant as in Lemma 4.2 and $R > 0$, $q \geq 2$ be arbitrary. Then, there exist $\beta = \beta(q, N_1)$ sufficiently small and $T = T(N_1, R, \beta, q)$ sufficiently large such that Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 hold.

Now, we proceed to prove Theorem 2.3 by verifying the assumptions of [20, Theorem 2.9]. First of all, Lemma 4.2 establishes [20, Condition (2.12)]. Next, the results in Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 respectively provides the essential bounds in [20, Condition (2.14)] and [20, Condition (2.13)]. Finally, Lemma 3.3, part 1. supplies the Lyapunov functions required in [20, Condition (2.15)]. Altogether, by virtue of [20, Theorem 2.9], we deduce that there exists a unique invariant probability measure ν^γ such that $\nu^\gamma(H^1) = 1$. In particular, the desired convergent rate (2.15) holds regardless of γ .

Furthermore, if $\nu \in \mathcal{Pr}(H)$ is another invariant probability measure, then by the Krylov-Bogoliubov procedure and the estimates in Lemma 3.1, we note that ν must be supported in H^1 . It follows that ν must be the same as ν^γ , hence the uniqueness of ν^γ in H . □

4.2. Proof of the auxiliary results. We turn to the proof of the auxiliary results. First, we provide the proof of Lemma 4.2 while making use of the Foias-Prodi estimate in Lemma 3.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Without loss of generalization, we may assume $l = 0$. Let c_0 be given and be chosen later. Recalling function J defined in (3.25) and the stopping time τ_N from Lemma 3.5, observe that for $t \in [0, kT]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{d_1(u_1(t), u_2(t)) \geq c_0 t^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \\ &= \{d_1(u_1(t), u_2(t)) \geq c_0 t^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \cap \{t < \tau_N\} \\ &\subset \{\|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \geq c_0^2 t^{-2q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \cap \{t < \tau_N\} \\ &= \{\|u_1(t \wedge \tau_N) - u_2(t \wedge \tau_N)\|_{H^1}^2 \geq c_0^2 t^{-2q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \cap \{t < \tau_N\} \\ &\subset \left\{J(t \wedge \tau_N) \geq c_0^2 t^{-2q} \exp\left\{\alpha t - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^t \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds\right\}\right\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, c_* is the constant from Lemma 3.5. Given $\{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\}$, it holds that

$$\int_0^t \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds \leq 2\beta^4 + (2C_4 + 1)t,$$

whence

$$-\frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^t \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds \geq -\frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} [2\beta^4 + (2C_4 + 1)t].$$

Since c_* does not depend on α_N, β and C_4 , we may take $N_1 = N_1(\alpha)$ sufficiently large independent of γ, β such that for all $N \geq N_1$

$$\exp\left\{\alpha t - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^t \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds\right\} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha t - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}}. \quad (4.6)$$

It follows that

$$\{d_1(u_1(t), u_2(t)) \geq c_0 t^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \subset \left\{J(t \wedge \tau_N) \geq c_0^2 t^{-2q} \exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\alpha t - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}}\right\}\right\}.$$

From Lemma 3.5, cf. (3.28), we invoke Markov inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\{d_1(u_1(t), u_2(t)) \geq c_0 t^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[J(0) | \ell_\beta(k) = 0] \frac{t^{2q}}{c_0^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha t + 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}[J(0) | \ell_\beta(k) = 0] \leq \tilde{c}(\beta + \beta^2), \quad \text{and} \quad t^{2q} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha t} \leq \tilde{c}t^{-q}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Picking c_0 such that

$$c_0^3 = \tilde{c}^2(\beta + \beta^2) \exp\left\{2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}}\right\},$$

produces

$$\mathbb{P}(\{d_1(u_1(t), u_2(t)) \geq c_0 t^{-q}\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\}) \leq c_0 t^{-q}.$$

The proof is thus finished. \square

Next, we turn to Proposition 4.3. As mentioned in Section 4.1, the argument relies on two ingredients: the former is an irreducibility condition, cf. Lemma 4.5, allowing for driving the solutions to any arbitrarily small ball whereas the latter, cf. Lemma 4.6, is a lower bound on the probability of coupling inside the small ball. In particular, the proof of Lemma 4.5 will employ Lemma B.1 while Lemma 4.6 will invoke the result of Lemma 3.4, part 1.

Lemma 4.5. *For all $R, r > 0$, there exists $T_* = T_*(R, r) > 0$ independent of γ such that for all $t \geq T_*$ and u_1, u_2 satisfying $\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R$, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{P}(\Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) \leq r) \geq \varepsilon_*, \quad (4.7)$$

for some positive constant $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(t, R, r)$ independent of u_1, u_2 and γ .

Proof. Letting $\eta(t)$ be the process satisfying (B.1), we denote $v^\gamma = u^\gamma - \eta$. From (2.3) and (B.1), we observe that v^γ obeys the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} v^\gamma &= -\gamma A(v^\gamma + \eta) - iAv^\gamma - \alpha v^\gamma + i|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta), \\ &= -\gamma Av^\gamma - iAv^\gamma - \alpha v^\gamma + i|v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma - \gamma A\eta + i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], \end{aligned}$$

with the initial condition $v^\gamma(0) = u^\gamma(0)$.

Considering $\Phi(v^\gamma)$ where Φ is given by (2.13), we employ an argument similar to the proof of (3.16) and obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi(v^\gamma) \leq -2\gamma \|Av^\gamma\|_H^2 - \alpha \Phi(v^\gamma) + \langle D\Phi(v^\gamma), -\gamma A\eta + i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma] \rangle_H,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D\Phi(v^\gamma), -\gamma A\eta + i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma] \rangle_H \\ &= -2\gamma \operatorname{Re}(\langle Av^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) + 2\operatorname{Re}(\langle i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], A\bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H) \\ &\quad - 2\gamma \operatorname{Re}(\langle |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) + 2\operatorname{Re}(\langle i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], |v^\gamma|^2 \bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H) \\ &\quad - 6\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^4 \operatorname{Re}(\langle v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) + 6\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^4 \operatorname{Re}(\langle i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], \bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H) \\ &\quad - 18\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^{16} \operatorname{Re}(\langle v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) + 18\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^{16} \operatorname{Re}(\langle i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], \bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H) \\ &= I_1 + \dots + I_8. \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed to estimate I_k , $k = 1, \dots, 8$ on the above right-hand side. Concerning I_1 , we employ Holder inequality to see that

$$I_1 = -2\gamma \operatorname{Re}(\langle Av^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) \leq \gamma \|Av^\gamma\|_H^2 + \gamma \|A\eta\|_H^2.$$

Similarly, recalling $\gamma < 1$ and using $H^1 \subset L^\infty$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} &I_3 + I_5 + I_7 \\ &= -2\gamma \operatorname{Re}(\langle |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) - 6\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^4 \operatorname{Re}(\langle v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) - 18\kappa\gamma \|v^\gamma\|_H^{16} \operatorname{Re}(\langle v^\gamma, A\bar{\eta} \rangle_H) \\ &\leq c (\|v^\gamma\|_{H^1}^3 + \|v^\gamma\|_H^5 + \|v^\gamma\|_H^{17}) \|A\eta\|_H \\ &\leq c (1 + \Phi(v^\gamma)^2) \|A\eta\|_H. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, $c > 0$ is a constant independent of γ . Next, we employ the inequality

$$\|u + z\|^2(u + z) - |u|^2 u \leq |z|(|u|^2 + |z|^2), \quad u, z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (4.8)$$

to infer

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &= 2\text{Re}\langle \langle i[|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], |v^\gamma|^2 \bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H \rangle \\
&\leq 2\langle |\eta|(|v^\gamma|^2 + |\eta|^2), |v^\gamma|^3 \rangle_H \\
&\leq c\|\eta\|_{L^\infty} (\|v^\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^5 + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^4 + \|v^\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^6) \\
&\leq c(1 + \Phi(v^\gamma)^3 + \|A\eta\|_H^4) \|A\eta\|_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$I_6 + I_8 \leq c(1 + \Phi(v^\gamma)^4 + \|A\eta\|_H^8) \|A\eta\|_H.$$

Regarding I_2 , we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle [|v^\gamma + \eta|^2(v^\gamma + \eta) - |v^\gamma|^2 v^\gamma], A\bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H \\
&= \langle \nabla(|v^\gamma|^2 \bar{\eta} + 2|v^\gamma|^2 \eta + 2v^\gamma |\eta|^2 + \bar{v}^\gamma \eta^2 + |\eta|^2 \eta), \nabla \bar{v}^\gamma \rangle_H \\
&\leq c(\|v^\gamma\|_{H^1}^3 \|\eta\|_{H^1} + \|v^\gamma\|_{H^1}^2 \|\eta\|_{H^1}^2 + \|v^\gamma\|_{H^1} \|\eta\|_{H^1}^3) \\
&\leq c(\|v^\gamma\|_{H^1}^4 + \|\eta\|_{H^1}^4 + 1) \|\eta\|_{H^1} \\
&\leq c(1 + \Phi(v^\gamma)^2 + \|A\eta\|_H^4) \|A\eta\|_H.
\end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Phi(v^\gamma) \leq -\alpha \Phi(v^\gamma) + c(1 + \Phi(v^\gamma)^4 + \|A\eta\|_H^8) \|A\eta\|_H,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(v^\gamma(t)) &\leq e^{-\alpha t} \Phi(v^\gamma(0)) + c \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} (1 + \Phi(v^\gamma(s))^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^8) \|A\eta(s)\|_H ds \\
&\leq e^{-\alpha t} \Phi(u^\gamma(0)) + c \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left[(1 + \Phi(v^\gamma(s))^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^8) \|A\eta(s)\|_H \right]. \tag{4.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling $u^\gamma = v^\gamma + \eta$, we note that

$$\Phi(u^\gamma) \leq c(\Phi(v^\gamma) + \Phi(\eta)) \leq c(\Phi(v^\gamma) + \|A\eta\|_H^{18}).$$

This together with (4.9) produces

$$\Phi(u^\gamma(t)) \leq c e^{-\alpha t} \Phi(u^\gamma(0)) + c \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left[(1 + \Phi(u^\gamma(s))^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^{72}) \|A\eta(s)\|_H \right]. \tag{4.10}$$

Turning back to (4.7), let u_1 and u_2 be given such that $\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R$. From (4.10), we readily have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) &\leq c e^{-\alpha t} [\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)] \\
&+ c \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left[(1 + [\Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_2))]^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^{72}) \|A\eta(s)\|_H \right]. \tag{4.11}
\end{aligned}$$

Denote by τ the stopping time defined as

$$\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) > 3cR\},$$

where $c \geq 1$ is the same constant as in (4.11). For each $t \geq 1$, conditioning on the event

$$B = \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|A\eta(s)\|_H \leq \frac{Rr}{2(2 + (3cR)^4)(1 + R + r + c)^2} \right\},$$

we claim that $\tau \geq t$. Indeed, suppose by means of contradiction, $\tau < t$. From (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(u^\gamma(\tau; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(\tau; u_2)) \\ & \leq ce^{-\alpha\tau}R + c \sup_{s \in [0, \tau]} \left[(1 + [\Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_2))]^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^2) \|A\eta(s)\|_H \right] \\ & \leq cR + c(2 + (3cR)^4) \cdot \frac{Rr}{2(2 + (3cR)^4)(1 + R + r + c)^2} < 2cR. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that $\Phi(u^\gamma(\tau; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(\tau; u_2)) \geq 3cR$. Thus, $\tau \geq t$, as claimed.

Now, we pick

$$T_* = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\frac{2(cR + r)}{r} \right) > 0.$$

For all $t \geq T_*$, conditioning on event B again, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) \\ & \leq ce^{-\alpha T_*}R + c \sup_{s \in [0, \tau]} \left[(1 + [\Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(s; u_2))]^4 + \|A\eta(s)\|_H^2) \|A\eta(s)\|_H \right] \\ & \leq \frac{cR}{2(cR + r)} \cdot r + c(2 + (3cR)^4) \cdot \frac{Rr}{2(2 + (3cR)^4)(1 + R + r + c)^2} < r. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma B.1, we infer a positive constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t, T, r)$ independent of γ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) \leq r) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}(\Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) \leq r | B) \mathbb{P}(B) \geq \mathbb{P}(B) \geq \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (4.7), thereby finishing the proof. □

Lemma 4.6. *For all $\beta > 0$ and $N > 0$, there exist positive constants*

$$t_1 = t_1(\beta, N) \quad \text{and} \quad r_1 = r_1(\beta, N),$$

that are both sufficiently small independent of γ such that the following holds

$$\mathbb{P}(X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2), \Phi(u^\gamma(t_1; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t_1; u_2)) \leq \beta) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (4.12)$$

for all u_1, u_2 satisfying $\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq r_1$. In the above, X_N^γ is the process defined in (4.1)-(4.2).

Proof. Let t_1, r_1 and ρ be given and be chosen later, we aim to prove that there exists a coupling of $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ such that (4.12) holds. We introduce the process \hat{u} defined as

$$\hat{u}(t) = u^\gamma(t; u_1) + \frac{t_1 - t}{t_1} P_N(u_2 - u_1), \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_1.$$

Setting $\hat{X}_N = P_N \hat{u}$ and $\hat{Y}_N = Q_N \hat{u}$, observe that

$$\hat{X}(0) = P_N \hat{u}(0) = P_N u_2 = X_N^\gamma(0; u_2), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{X}(t_1) = P_N \hat{u}(t_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1).$$

Also, recalling E_4 defined in (3.22) and the constant C_4 from Lemma 3.4 (with $n = 4$), let τ_1, τ_2 be stopping times given by

$$\tau_i = \min\{t \geq 0 : E_4(t; u_i) - C_4 t \geq \Phi(u_i)^4 + \rho \sqrt{t_1}\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then, we have the following chain of implications

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\{\forall t \in [0, t_1], \widehat{X}_N(t) = X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\} \cap \left\{\sup_{t \in [0, t_1]} (E_4(t; u_1) - C_4 t) \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \left\{\sup_{t \in [0, t_1]} (E_4(t; u_2) - C_4 t) \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right\}\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\{\forall t \in [0, t_1], \widehat{X}_N(t) = X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\} \cap \{\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \geq t_1\}\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\{\forall t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N(t) = X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\} \cap \{\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \geq t_1\}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
& \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right) - \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1) - \mathbb{P}(\tau_2 \leq t_1). \tag{4.13}
\end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 3.4, cf. (3.23) with $n = 4$ and $p = 1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_2 \leq t_1) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_1]} (E_4(t; u_1) - C_4 t) \geq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_1]} (E_4(t; u_2) - C_4 t) \geq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right) \\
& \leq K_{4,1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_1)^4 + \Phi(u_2)^4] + 2}{\rho},
\end{aligned}$$

where $K_{4,1}$ is the constant on the right-hand side of (3.23). Conditioning on the event $\{\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq r_1\}$, we pick

$$\rho_1 := 8K_1(r_1^4 + 1),$$

so as to deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_2 \leq t_1) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

This together with (4.13) produces

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} - \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right). \tag{4.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we claim that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

To this end, since

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{u}(t) &= -\gamma u^\gamma(t; u_1)dt - iAu^\gamma(t; u_1)dt - \alpha u^\gamma(t; u_1)dt \\ &\quad + i|u^\gamma(t; u_1)|^2 u^\gamma(t; u_1)dt + QdW(t) - \frac{1}{t_1}P_N(u_2 - u_1)dt, \end{aligned}$$

\widehat{X}_N satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{X}_N(t) &= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)\widehat{X}_N(t)dt + iP_N\left[|\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)|^2(\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))\right]dt \\ &\quad + QdW(t) + F_1(u_1, u_2, t)dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(t; u_1, u_2) &:= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)\frac{t_1 - t}{t_1}P_N(u_2 - u_1) - \frac{1}{t_1}P_N(u_2 - u_1) \\ &\quad + iP_N\left[|u^\gamma(t; u_1)|^2 u^\gamma(t; u_1) - |\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)|^2(\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting \widehat{W} be the process given by

$$d\widehat{W} = dW + Q^{-1}F_1 dt,$$

the equation for \widehat{X}_N can be recast as

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{X}_N(t) &= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)\widehat{X}_N(t)dt + iP_N\left[|\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)|^2(\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))\right]dt \\ &\quad + Qd\widehat{W}(t). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the law induced by $(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ on $[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]$ is equivalent to that induced by $(\widehat{X}_N(\cdot), \widehat{W})$. Indeed, thanks to the condition that Q is invertible on $\text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ by virtue of Assumption 2.1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q^{-1}F_1(u_1, u_2, s)\|_H^2 &\leq C(N)\left[\|u_2 - u_1\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{t_1^2}\|u_2 - u_1\|_H^2\right] \\ &\quad + C(N)\left\|\left|u^\gamma(t; u_1)\right|^2 u^\gamma(t; u_1) - \left|\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right|^2(\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))\right\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant $C(N)$ that may be arbitrarily large as N tends to infinity. Concerning the last term on the above right-hand side, we invoke (4.8) while taking into account of the fact that

$$u^\gamma(t; u_1) = \widehat{X}_N(t) - \frac{t_1 - t}{t_1}P_N(u_2 - u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_1),$$

to infer for $0 \leq t \leq t_1$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\left|u^\gamma(t; u_1)\right|^2 u^\gamma(t; u_1) - \left|\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right|^2(\widehat{X}_N(t) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))\right\|_H^2 \\ &\leq c\left(\left|P_N(u_2 - u_1)\right| + \left|Y_N^\gamma(t; u_1)\right| + \left|Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right|\right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\left|u^\gamma(t; u_1)\right|^2 + \left|P_N(u_2 - u_1)\right|^2 + \left|Y_N^\gamma(t; u_1)\right|^2 + \left|Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)\right|^2\right) \\ &\leq c\left[\Phi(u_1)^4 + \Phi(u_2)^4 + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1))^4 + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2))^4\right]. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, conditioning on the event $\{\Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq r_1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2} \|Q^{-1}F_1(u_1, u_2, s)\|_H^2 ds \\ &\leq C(N)\left[\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1\right)(\Phi(u_1)^4 + \Phi(u_2)^4) + C_4 t_1 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right] \\ &\leq C(N)\left[\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1\right)r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where we emphasize again that the positive constant $C(N)$ may be arbitrarily large depending only on N . In particular, this implies

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ a \int_0^{t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2} \|Q^{-1} F_1(u_1, u_2, s)\|_H^2 ds \right\} < \infty, \quad a > 0,$$

which verifies Novikov's condition (with $a = 1/2$), thereby establishing the equivalence in law. As a consequence, employing Pinsker's inequality together with [12, Theorem A.2] we have the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(W_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}), \text{Law}(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}) \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} D_{\text{KL}} \left(\text{Law}(W_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}) \parallel \text{Law}(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}) \right)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2} \|Q^{-1} F_1(u_1, u_2, s)\|_H^2 ds}. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(W_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}), \text{Law}(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}) \right) \\ & \leq C(N) \sqrt{\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1 \right) r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho \sqrt{t_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by the uniqueness of the weak solutions,

$$\{ \exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2) \} \subset \{ W_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]} \neq \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]} \}.$$

In turn, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(\widehat{X}_N), \text{Law}(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2)) \right) & \leq \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(W_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}), \text{Law}(\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_{[0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]}) \right) \\ & \leq C(N) \sqrt{\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1 \right) r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho \sqrt{t_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that up to this point, we have not explicitly chosen a coupling of $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ so as to satisfy (4.12). To this end, we recall that since the discrete metric $\mathbf{1}\{u \neq v\}$ is convex, the infimum in definition (2.6) for \mathcal{W}_{TV} is achieved [63]. In light of [20, Proposition 2.8] (see also [49, lemma 2.7]), there exists a coupling $(W', \widehat{\mathcal{W}}')$ of $(W, \widehat{\mathcal{W}})$ such that $(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2, W'), \widehat{X}_N')$ is an optimal coupling for $(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2, W), \widehat{X}_N)$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}_N'(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2, W') \right) \\ & = \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(\widehat{X}_N), \text{Law}(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2)) \right) \\ & \leq C(N) \sqrt{\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1 \right) r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho \sqrt{t_1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W')$ is a coupling of $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$, from (4.14), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1, W') = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2, W')\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1, W') - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2, W') - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} - \mathbb{P}\left(\exists t \in [0, t_1 \wedge \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2], \widehat{X}'_N(t) \neq X_N^\gamma(t; u_2, W')\right),
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
&\geq 1 - C(N) \sqrt{\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1\right) r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we pick $t_1 = r_1 = r_1(N, r)$ sufficiently small such that

$$C(N) \sqrt{\left(t_1 + \frac{1}{t_1} + 1\right) r_1^4 + C_4 t_1 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}} \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

and that

$$C_4 t_1 + r_1^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1} < \left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right)^4.$$

Recalling from (3.22) that $E_4 \geq \Phi^4$, we arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2), \Phi(u^\gamma(t_1; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t_1; u_2)) \leq \beta) \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u_2)\} \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_1) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_1)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right. \\
& \quad \left. \cap \{E_4(t_1; u_2) - C_4 t_1 \leq \Phi(u_2)^4 + \rho\sqrt{t_1}\}\right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This produces (4.12), thereby finishing the proof. \square

Having established the auxiliary results from Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, we now provide the proof of Proposition 4.3.

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Let $N \geq 1$, $R > 0$, and $\beta > 0$ be given. By the Markov property, it suffices to establish the existence of $T_1 = T_1(N, R, \beta)$ independent of γ such that for all $T \geq T_1$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_N^\gamma(T; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(T; u_2), \Phi(u^\gamma(T; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(T; u_2)) \leq \beta | \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R) \geq \varepsilon_1,$$

holds for some positive $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(N, R, \beta, T)$ independent of γ .

To see this, let $t_1 = t_1(N, \beta)$ and $r_1 = r_1(N, \beta)$ be the constants as in Lemma 4.6. In view of Lemma 4.5, there exists a positive time $T_* = T_*(R, r_1)$ such that for all $t \geq T_*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(t; u_2)) \leq r_1 | \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R) \geq \varepsilon_*,$$

where the positive constant $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(t, R, r_1)$ is independent of u_1, u_2 and γ . Now, for $T \geq T_* + t_1$, we employ Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6 to infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(X_N^\gamma(T; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(T; u_2), \Phi(u^\gamma(T; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(T; u_2)) \leq \beta | \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\{X_N^\gamma(t_1; u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_1)) = X_N^\gamma(t_1; u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_2))\} \right. \\
& \quad \cap \{\Phi(t_1; u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_1)) + \Phi(t_1; u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_2)) \leq \beta\} \\
& \quad \left. | \Phi(u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_2)) \leq r_1, \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R\right) \\
& \times \mathbb{P}(\Phi(u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_1)) + \Phi(u^\gamma(T - t_1; u_2)) \leq r_1 | \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2) \leq R) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_* =: \varepsilon_1.
\end{aligned}$$

This produces (4.12), as claimed. \square

Finally, we provide the proof of Proposition 4.4, which together with the above auxiliary results ultimately concludes Theorem 2.3. In particular, the argument will rely on the estimates on tail probabilities from Lemma 3.4, part 2.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By the Markov property, we may assume that $l = 0$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.3, we aim to construct a coupling of $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ such that (4.5) holds. To achieve this effect, letting $\rho_2 > 0$ be given and be chosen alter, we introduce the following stopping times

$$\tilde{\tau}_i = \inf \{t \geq 0 : E_4(kT + t; u_i) \geq \beta^4 + C_4(kT + t)\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

and

$$\tau_3 = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \int_{kT}^{kT+t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2} [1 + \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4] \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{H^1}^2 ds > \rho_2 e^{-\frac{1}{4}\alpha kT} \right\}.$$

With the above stopping times, for $N \geq N_1$, from Definition 4.1 of ℓ_β , observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0\} \\
& \subset \{\exists t \in [0, T] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \cup \{\tilde{\tau}_1 < T\} \cup \{\tilde{\tau}_2 < T\} \\
& = \{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \cup \{\tilde{\tau}_1 < T\} \cup \{\tilde{\tau}_2 < T\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \\
& = \left(\{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \cap \{\tau_3 > T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2\} \right) \\
& \quad \cup \left(\{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \cap \{\tau_3 \leq T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2\} \right) \\
& \subset \{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \\
& \quad \cup \left(\{\forall t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \cap \{\tau_3 \leq T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the stopping time τ_N as in Lemma 3.5, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\forall t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2)\} \\
& \quad \cap \{\tau_3 \leq T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2\} \cap \{\ell_\beta(k) = 0\} \\
& \subset \{\forall t \in [0, (kT + T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3) \wedge \tau_N], E_4(t; u_i) \leq \beta^4 + C_4 t, i = 1, 2\} \\
& \quad \cap \left\{ \int_{kT}^{(kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3) \wedge \tau_N} [1 + \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4] \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{H^1}^2 ds \geq \rho_2 e^{-\frac{1}{4}\alpha kT} \right\} \\
& \subset \left\{ [1 + 2\beta^4 + 2C_4(k+1)T] \int_{kT}^{(kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3) \wedge \tau_N} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{H^1}^2 ds \geq \rho_2 e^{-\frac{1}{4}\alpha kT} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for all $t \in [kT, (kT + T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3) \wedge \tau_N]$, in view of (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{kT}^{(k+1)T} \exp \left\{ \alpha(t \wedge \tau_N) - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_N} \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds \right\} J(t \wedge \tau_N) dt \\
& \geq \int_{kT}^{(kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3) \wedge \tau_N} \exp \left\{ \alpha t - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\} \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt \\
& \geq \rho_2 \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4}\alpha kT - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce from the above implications that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0, \ell_\beta(k) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0\} \\
& \subset \{\tilde{\tau}_1 < T | \ell_\beta(0) = 0\} \cup \{\tilde{\tau}_2 < T | \ell_\beta(0) = 0\} \\
& \quad \cup \{\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2), \\
& \quad \quad X_N^\gamma(kT; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(kT; u_2) | \ell_\beta(0) = 0\} \\
& \quad \cup \left\{ \int_{kT}^{(k+1)T} \exp \left\{ \alpha(t \wedge \tau_N) - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_N} \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds \right\} J(t \wedge \tau_N) dt \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. \geq \rho_2 \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4}\alpha kT - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right\}. \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

With regard to $\tilde{\tau}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_i < T | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} E_4(kT + t; u_i) - C_4(kT + t) \geq \beta^4 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [kT, (k+1)T]} E_4(kT + t; u_i) - C_4(kT + t) \geq \Phi(u^\gamma(lT; u_i))^4 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [kT, \infty)} E_4(kT + t; u_i) - C_4(kT + t) \geq \Phi(u^\gamma(lT; u_i))^4 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.4, cf. (3.24) with $\rho = 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_i < T | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) &\leq K_{4,q} \frac{(kT)^q + 1}{(kT)^{2q}} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(u^\gamma(lT; u_i))^{8q} + 1 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0] \\
&\leq K_{4,q} \beta^{8q} \frac{(kT)^q + 1}{(kT)^{2q}}, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{4.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Concerning the third conditional event on the right-hand side of (4.16), we will employ an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6 to deduce an upper bound in probability. To see this,

note that the equation (4.2) for X_N^γ can be recast as

$$\begin{aligned} dX_N^\gamma(t; u_1) &= (-\gamma A - iA - \alpha)X_N^\gamma(t; u_1)dt + QdW_2(t) \\ &\quad + iP_N[|X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)|^2(X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))]dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$d\tilde{W}(t) = dW(t) + F_2(t)dt,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(t) &= iP_N[|X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_1)|^2(X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_1)) \\ &\quad - |X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2)|^2(X_N^\gamma(t; u_1) + Y_N^\gamma(t; u_2))]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\|F(t)\|_H^2 \leq (1 + \Phi(u_1(t))^4 + \Phi(u_2(t))^4)\|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{H^1}^2,$$

whence

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{kT}^{kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3} \|Q^{-1}F(s)\|_H^2 ds \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|Q^{-1}\|_{L(H)}^2 \rho_2 e^{-\frac{1}{4}\alpha kT} \right\}.$$

This verifies Novikov's condition, and thus establishes the equivalence in law between $(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), \tilde{W})$ and $(X_N^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ on $[kT, kT + T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]$. Now, by the uniqueness of weak solutions, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2), \right. \\ &\quad \left. X_N^\gamma(kT; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(kT; u_2) | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(W|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} \neq \tilde{W}|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We note that up to this point, we have not chosen a coupling of $(u^\gamma(\cdot; u_1), u^\gamma(\cdot; u_2), W)$ so as to establish (4.5). Instead of doing so directly, we will pick an optimal coupling on $[kT, kT + T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]$ for $((W|_{\ell_\beta(0)=0}), (\tilde{W}|_{\ell_\beta(0)=0}))$. In turn, similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6, this allows for employing Pinsker inequality and [12, Theorem A.2] to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(W|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} \neq \tilde{W}|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{\text{TV}} \left(\text{Law}(W|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0), \text{Law}(\tilde{W}|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} D_{\text{KL}} \left(\text{Law}(W|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0), \text{Law}(\tilde{W}|_{[kT, kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3]} | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{kT}^{kT+T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3} \|Q^{-1}F(s)\|_H^2 ds | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right]} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\|Q^{-1}\|_{L(H)}^2 \rho_2 e^{-\frac{1}{4}\alpha kT}} \\ &\leq C(N) \sqrt{\rho_2} e^{-\frac{1}{8}\alpha kT}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \in [0, T \wedge \tilde{\tau}_1 \wedge \tilde{\tau}_2 \wedge \tau_3] : X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_1) \neq X_N^\gamma(kT + t; u_2), \right. \\ &\quad \left. X_N^\gamma(kT; u_1) = X_N^\gamma(kT; u_2) | \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \leq C(N) \sqrt{\rho_2} e^{-\frac{1}{8}\alpha kT}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Turning to the last event on the right-hand side of (4.16), we invoke Lemma 3.5 to infer

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\int_{kT}^{(k+1)T} \exp \left\{ \alpha(t \wedge \tau_N) - \frac{c_*}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_N} \Phi(u_1(s))^4 + \Phi(u_2(s))^4 + 1 ds \right\} J(t \wedge \tau_N) dt \right. \\
& \quad \left. \geq \rho_2 \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \alpha k T - 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\} \middle| \ell_\beta(0) = 0 \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[J(0) | \ell_\beta(0) = 0] \frac{1}{\rho_2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \alpha k T + 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\} \\
& \leq \tilde{c}(\beta + \beta^2) \frac{1}{\rho_2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \alpha k T + 2c_* \frac{\beta^4}{\alpha_N^{1/8}} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account of (4.16), (4.17) and (4.18), the above estimate implies the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0, \ell_\beta(k) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \\
& \leq 2K_{4,q} \beta^{8q} \frac{(kT)^q + 1}{(kT)^{2q}} + [C(N) \sqrt{\rho_2} + \frac{\tilde{c}}{\rho_2} (\beta + \beta^2) e^{2c_* \beta^4 / \alpha_N^{1/8}}] e^{-\frac{1}{8} \alpha k T}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the sake of simplicity, we pick $\rho_2 = \sqrt{\beta}$ and note that for all T sufficiently large

$$\frac{(kT)^q + 1}{(kT)^{2q}} \leq \frac{1}{(1+kT)^{q-1}}, \quad e^{-\frac{1}{8} \alpha k T} \leq \frac{1}{(1+kT)^{q-1}}.$$

As a consequence, we may choose $\beta_1 = \beta_1(\alpha, N, q)$ sufficiently small such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_1)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0, \ell_\beta(k) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \leq C(N) \beta^{1/4} (1+kT)^{-q} \leq \frac{1}{4} (1+kT)^{-q}. \quad (4.19)$$

Turning back to (4.5), we invoke (4.19) to infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k) \neq 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(j+1) \neq 0, \ell_\beta(j) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(1+kT)^q} \leq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{C(q)}{T^q}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, we may infer the existence of $T_2 = T_2(q)$ sufficiently large such that for all $T \geq T_2$

$$\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k) \neq 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

As a consequence, we combine the above estimate with (4.19) to arrive at the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0 | \ell_\beta(k) = 0) & = \mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0 | \ell_\beta(k) = 0, \ell_\beta(0) = 0) \\
& = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k+1) \neq 0, \ell_\beta(k) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\ell_\beta(k) = 0 | \ell_\beta(0) = 0)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} (1+kT)^{-q}.
\end{aligned}$$

This produces (4.5), thereby finishing the proof. □

5. INVISCID LIMIT AS $\gamma \rightarrow 0$

In this section, we establish the validity of the inviscid limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ for the invariant probability measures as well as for the infinite time horizon.

5.1. Proof of Theorem 2.4. Concerning the convergence of ν^γ toward ν^0 , we will draw upon the framework of [13, 14, 15, 56] dealing with similar issue for stochastic wave equations. For the convenience of the reader, we briefly review the argument, which essentially consists of two main steps. We first establish a convergence of $u^\gamma(t)$ toward $u(t)$ on any finite time window. This is presented in Proposition 5.1. Then, we combine with the fact that ν^0 satisfies a polynomial mixing rate, cf. Theorem A.2, to conclude Theorem 2.4.

We start by considering the solutions $u^\gamma(t)$ and $u(t)$ and establish the inviscid limit on finite time windows. We state the result now, but defer its proof to the end of this subsection.

Proposition 5.1. *For all $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$, let $u^\gamma(t)$ and $u(t)$ respectively be the solutions of (2.3) and (2.16) with initial condition u_0 . Then, the following holds for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] \leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1) e^{2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)T}, \quad T > 0, \quad (5.1)$$

for some positive constant $C = C(n)$ independent of γ, T, Q and u_0 .

Next, we provide the uniform moment bound on ν^γ in the following auxiliary result, whose proof is also deferred to the end of this subsection.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 2.3, let ν^γ be the unique invariant probability measure of (2.3). Then, the followings hold*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in [0, 1]} \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^\gamma(du) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\gamma \in [0, 1]} \int_H \Phi(u)^n \nu^\gamma(du) < \infty. \quad (5.2)$$

for all $\xi > 0$ sufficiently small and $n \geq 1$.

Assuming that Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.2 hold, let us conclude Theorem 2.4. In turn, the result of Theorem 2.4 will be combined with Theorem 2.3 to establish Theorem 2.5 in Section 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Firstly, we prove the following analogue of (2.18) with respect to \mathcal{W}_{d_0}

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.3)$$

To see this, we invoke the triangle inequality and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) &\leq \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^0 \nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \\ &= \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^0 \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^0), \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where the last implication follows from the invariance property.

With regard to the second term on the right-hand side of (5.4), we note that

$$d_0(u_1, u_2) = \|u_1 - u_2\|_H \wedge 1 \leq \|u_1 - u_2\|_H \wedge 1 = d_1(u_1, u_2),$$

implying $\mathcal{W}_{d_0} \leq \mathcal{W}_{d_1}$ by virtue of definition (2.6). In turn, Lemma A.3 can be employed to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^0 \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^0) &\leq \mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^0 \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^0) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(1+t)^q} \left(1 + \int_{H^1} \Psi(u) \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_{H^1} \Psi(u) \nu^0(du) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(1+t)^q} \left(1 + \int_{H^1} \Phi(u) \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_{H^1} \Psi(u) \nu^0(du) \right). \end{aligned}$$

where we recall Ψ and Φ are defined in (2.12) and (2.13), respectively. Taking into account of Lemma 5.2 and Lemma A.4, we obtain the bound

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^0 \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(1+t)^q}, \quad (5.5)$$

for some positive constant C independent of γ and t .

Concerning the first term on the right-hand side of (5.4), we employ definition (2.6) again to see that

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^\gamma) \leq \mathbb{E}[\|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \wedge 1],$$

where $u^\gamma(0) = u(0) \sim \nu^\gamma$. In view of Proposition 5.1, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0f}(P_t^\gamma \nu^\gamma, P_t^0 \nu^\gamma) &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}} \left(\int_{H^1} \Phi(u)^{2n} \nu^\gamma(du) + t + 1 \right) e^{Ct} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{Ct}}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where the last implication follows from (5.2). In the above, we emphasize that $C = C(n)$ is independent of γ and t .

Now, from (5.4) together with (5.5) and (5.6), we arrive at the bound

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(1+t)^q} + \frac{e^{Ct}}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}}.$$

Picking t satisfying

$$t = \frac{1}{C} \log |\log \gamma|, \quad \gamma \in (0, 1/4),$$

implies

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(1 + \log |\log \gamma|)^q} + \frac{1}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}-1}}.$$

Since q and n are arbitrarily chosen, sending γ to 0 produces (5.3), as claimed.

Turning back to (2.18), for any bivariate random variable (X, Y) such that $X \sim \nu^\gamma$ and $Y \sim \nu^0$, we invoke Holder inequality to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{d_0(X, Y) (1 + e^{\xi \|X\|_H^2} + e^{\xi \|Y\|_H^2})} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} d_0(X, Y) (1 + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|X\|_H^2} + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|Y\|_H^2})} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E} d_0(X, Y) \left(1 + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^0(du) \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since (X, Y) is arbitrary, from (2.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) &\leq \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \left(1 + \int_H e^{\xi \|X\|_H^2} \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^0(du) \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q} \left(1 + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_H e^{\xi \|X\|_H^2} \nu^0(du) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Furthermore, taking into account of Lemma 5.2 and Lemma A.4, we arrive at (2.18), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}.$$

This completes the proof. □

We now turn to the proof of the auxiliary results. In order to prove Proposition 5.1, we will not compare $u^\gamma(t)$ and $u(t)$ directly, due to the difficulty induced by the cubic nonlinearity. Instead, we tackle the issue by modifying (2.3) and (2.16) as follows: for $R > 0$, we introduce a smooth cut-off function $\varphi_R : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined as

$$\varphi_R(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq x \leq R, \\ \text{decreasing}, & R \leq x \leq R+1, \\ 0, & R+1 \leq x. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Given φ_R above, consider the following truncating version of (2.3)

$$du_R^\gamma(t) = -(\gamma + i)Au_R^\gamma(t)dt + i|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2u_R^\gamma(t)\varphi_R(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2)dt - \alpha u_R^\gamma(t)dt + QdW(t), \quad (5.9)$$

as well as of (2.16)

$$du_R(t) = -iAu_R(t)dt + i|u_R(t)|^2u_R(t)\varphi_R(|u_R(t)|^2)dt - \alpha u_R(t)dt + QdW(t). \quad (5.10)$$

Observe that (5.9) and (5.10) are both Lipschitz systems, which allows for proving that u_R^γ can be approximated by u_R on $[0, T]$. Then, we will remove the Lipschitz restriction by exploiting the uniform moment bounds in Lemma 3.3 and Lemma A.1.

In Lemma 5.3, stated and proven next, we provide a uniform moment bound on u_R^γ . In turn, this will be invoked to establish the convergence of u_R^γ toward u_R .

Lemma 5.3. *For all $R > 0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$, let $u_R^\gamma(t)$ be the solution of (5.9) with initial condition u_0 . Then, the following holds*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \gamma \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_R^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt \leq (\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1)e^{[CR^4 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]T}, \quad T > 0, \quad (5.11)$$

for some positive constant C independent of γ, R, T, Q and u_0 .

Proof. From (5.9), we apply Itô's formula to u_R^γ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\|u_R^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^2 &= -2\gamma\|Au_R^\gamma(t)\|_H^2 dt - 2\alpha\|u_R^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^2 dt + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)dt \\ &\quad + \langle u_R^\gamma(t), \overline{QdW(t)} \rangle_{H^1} + \langle \bar{u}_R^\gamma(t), QdW(t) \rangle_{H^1} \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla \bar{u}_R^\gamma(t), i\nabla(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2u_R^\gamma(t)\varphi_R(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2)) \rangle_H dt \\ &\quad + \langle \nabla u_R^\gamma(t), -i\nabla(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2\bar{u}_R^\gamma(t)\varphi_R(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2)) \rangle_H dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

With regard to the last two terms on the above right-hand side, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &i\langle \nabla \bar{u}, \nabla(|u|^2u\varphi_R(|u|^2)) \rangle_H \\ &= 2\langle |\nabla u|^2, |u|^2\varphi_R(|u|^2) \rangle_H + \langle (\nabla \bar{u})^2, u^2\varphi_R(|u|^2) \rangle_H \\ &\quad + \langle |\nabla u|^2, |u|^4\varphi_R'(|u|^2) \rangle_H + \langle (\nabla \bar{u})^2, u^2|u|^2\varphi_R'(|u|^2) \rangle_H \\ &\leq CR^4\|u\|_{H^1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$-i\langle \nabla u, \nabla(|u|^2\bar{u}\varphi_R(|u|^2)) \rangle_H \leq CR^4\|u\|_{H^1}^2.$$

It follows from (5.12) that

$$\mathbb{E}\|u_R^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)t + CR^4 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\|u_R^\gamma(s)\|_{H^1}^2 ds,$$

whence

$$\mathbb{E}\|u_R^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)t)e^{CR^4 t} \leq (\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1)e^{[CR^4 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]t}.$$

Taking (5.12) into account once again produces

$$\gamma \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|Au_R^\gamma(s)\|_H^2 ds \leq (\mathbb{E} \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) e^{[CR^4 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]t},$$

for some positive constant independent of γ, R, t, Q and u_0 , thereby establishing (5.11) as claimed. \square

Having obtained the moment bound (5.11), we now show that u_R^γ converges toward u_R on $[0, T]$ in H . This is summarized in the following result.

Lemma 5.4. *For all $R > 0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$, let $u_R^\gamma(t)$ and $u_R(t)$ respectively be the solutions of (5.9) and (5.10) with initial condition u_0 . Then, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_R^\gamma(t) - u_R(t)\|_H^2 \right] \leq \gamma (\mathbb{E} \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) e^{[CR^4 + \text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]T}, \quad (5.13)$$

for some positive constant C independent of γ, R, T, Q and u_0 .

Proof. Setting $v = u_R^\gamma - u_R$, we subtract (5.10) from (5.9) and observe that v satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} v(t) &= -\gamma Au_R^\gamma(t) - iAv(t) - \alpha v(t) \\ &\quad + i \left(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2 u_R^\gamma(t) \varphi_R(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2) - |u_R(t)|^2 u_R(t) \varphi_R(|u_R(t)|^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

with initial condition $v(0) = 0$. Recalling φ_R as in (5.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| i \left\langle |u_R^\gamma(t)|^2 u_R^\gamma(t) \varphi_R(|u_R^\gamma(t)|^2) - |u_R(t)|^2 u_R(t) \varphi_R(|u_R(t)|^2), v(t) \right\rangle_H \right| \\ &\leq CR^4 \|v(t)\|_H^2, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v(t)\|_H^2 \leq -\gamma \langle Au_R^\gamma(t), v(t) \rangle_H - \alpha \|v(t)\|_H^2 + CR^4 \|v(t)\|_H^2.$$

We invoke Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to further estimate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|v(t)\|_H^2 \leq \gamma^2 \|Au_R^\gamma(t)\|_H^2 + CR^4 \|v(t)\|_H^2.$$

In turn, this implies the bound

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|v(s)\|_H^2 \leq \gamma^2 \int_0^T \|Au_R^\gamma(t)\|_H^2 dt + CR^4 \int_0^T \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|v(s)\|_H^2 dt.$$

In view of Lemma 5.3, we deduce while making use of Gronwall's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|v(s)\|_H^2 &\leq \gamma^2 \int_0^T \|Au_R^\gamma(t)\|_H^2 dt e^{CR^4 T} \\ &\leq \gamma (\mathbb{E} \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1) e^{[CR^4 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]T}. \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize that the positive constant C is independent of γ, R, T, Q and u_0 . This produces (5.13), thereby finishing the proof. \square

We now provide the proof of Proposition 5.1 by combining Lemma 5.4 together with Lemma 3.3 and Lemma A.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. To remove the Lipschitz truncation as in Lemma 5.4, we shall employ an argument similarly to those in [15, Section 6.2] and [56, Proposition 5.1] tailored to our settings.

Since the initial condition u_0 takes values in $L^2(\Omega; H^1)$, from Lemma 3.3, we note that $u^\gamma(t)$ and $u(t)$ both belong to H^1 . As a consequence, they are elements in L^∞ , thanks to Sobolev embedding in dimension $d = 1$. So, for $R > 0$, we introduce the stopping times τ_R^γ and τ_R given by

$$\tau_R^\gamma = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|u^\gamma(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 > R\},$$

and

$$\tau_R = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 > R\}.$$

With the above stopping times, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\tau_R^\gamma \wedge \tau_R > T\} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\tau_R^\gamma \wedge \tau_R \leq T\} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] \\ &= I_{1,R}^\gamma(T) + I_{2,R}^\gamma(T). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Observe for $0 \leq t \leq \tau_R^\gamma$, $u^\gamma(t) = u_R^\gamma(t)$ where $u_R^\gamma(t)$ is the solution of the truncating system (5.9). Likewise, for $0 \leq t \leq \tau_R$, $u(t) = u_R(t)$ which solves (5.10). Taking into account of these facts, we recast $I_{1,R}^\gamma$ as

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,R}^\gamma(T) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}\{\tau_R^\gamma \wedge \tau_R > T\} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_R^\gamma(t) - u_R(t)\|_H \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_R^\gamma(t) - u_R(t)\|_H \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\gamma} \cdot \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1)} \cdot e^{[CR^4 + \text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]T}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where the last implication follows from Lemma 5.4.

Concerning $I_{2,R}^\gamma$, we invoke Holder's inequality to infer

$$I_{2,R}^\gamma(t) \leq \left(2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t)\|_H^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_H^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{P}(\tau_R^\gamma \leq T) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_R \leq T) \right)^{1/2}.$$

For $n \geq 1$, using Markov's inequality and $H^1 \subset L^\infty$, we further estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau_R^\gamma \leq T) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \geq R \right) \leq \frac{1}{R^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{2n} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{R^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t)\|_{H^1}^{2n} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling Φ defined in (2.13), in view of (2.14) and (3.12), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_R^\gamma \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{R^n} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^n] + \mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T) \leq \frac{C}{R^n} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1).$$

Likewise, from (A.1), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_R \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{R^n} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1).$$

Making use of (3.12) and (A.1) again implies

$$I_{2,R}^\gamma(t) \leq \frac{C}{R^{\frac{n}{2}}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1). \tag{5.16}$$

Turning back to (5.14), we combine (5.15) and (5.16) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] \\ & \leq \sqrt{\gamma} \cdot \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1)} \cdot e^{[CR^4 + 2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)]T} + \frac{C}{R^{\frac{n}{2}}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

We emphasize that the positive constant C on the above right-hand side is independent of γ, R, T, Q and u_0 . For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, we pick $R > 0$ satisfying

$$R^4 = \frac{-\log(\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon})}{CT}.$$

Plugging into (5.17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t) - u(t)\|_H \right] \\ & \leq \gamma^\varepsilon \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + 1)} \cdot e^{2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)T} + C \left(\frac{T}{|\log \gamma|} \right)^{\frac{n}{8}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1) \\ & \leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}} (\mathbb{E}[\Phi(u_0)^{2n}] + T + 1) e^{2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)T}, \quad \gamma \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since n is arbitrarily large, this produces (5.1), thereby completing the proof. \square

Finally, we supply the proof of Lemma 5.2, which together with Proposition 5.1 was employed to conclude Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. To avoid repetition, we provide the proof for the former exponential moment bound in (5.2). The latter polynomial bound in H^1 can be established using an analogous argument.

Consider the set $B_R \subset H$ defined as

$$B_R = \{u \in H^1 : \|u\|_H^2 \leq R\}.$$

Since $\nu^\gamma(H) = 1$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $R = R(\varepsilon, \gamma) > 0$ such that

$$\nu^\gamma(B_R^c) < \varepsilon.$$

Next, given $m > 0$, we set $\varphi_m(u) = e^{\xi\|u\|_H^2} \wedge m$. On the one hand, by the invariance of ν^γ , since φ_m is bounded,

$$\int_{H^1} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) = \int_{H^1} \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du).$$

On the other hand, given the choice of B_R , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{H^1} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) &= \left\{ \int_{B_R} + \int_{B_R^c} \right\} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) \\ &\leq \int_{B_R} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) + m\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

With regard to the first term on the above right-hand side, for all ξ sufficiently small, we invoke (3.3) to see that for $u \in B_R$

$$P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\xi\|u^\gamma(t)\|_H^2} \wedge m \right] \leq e^{-c_\xi t} e^{\xi\|u\|_H^2} + C_\xi \leq e^{-c_\xi t} e^{\xi R^2} + C_\xi,$$

where c_ξ and C_ξ are the constants as in (3.3). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{H^1} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) &\leq \int_{B_R} P_t^\gamma \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) + m\varepsilon \\ &\leq e^{-c_\xi t} e^{\xi R^2} + C_\xi + m\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We may take ε small and then take t large enough, e.g., $\varepsilon < m^{-1}$ and $t > \xi R^2/c_\xi$, to deduce further that

$$\int_{H^1} \varphi_m(u) \nu^\gamma(du) \leq C_\xi + 2.$$

Since the above right-hand side is independent of γ and m , by sending m to infinity, we establish (5.2) by virtue of the Monotone Convergence Theorem. The proof is thus finished. \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5. In this subsection, we will draw upon the framework of [31, 32, 56] tailored to our settings, so as to establish the validity of the inviscid regime $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ on the infinite time horizon. More specifically, the proof of Theorem 2.5 relies on the following intermediate result giving the convergence with respect to Wasserstein distances.

Proposition 5.5. *Under the same hypothesis of Theorem 2.3, let $\{u_0^\gamma\}_{\gamma \in (0,1)}$ be a sequence of deterministic initial conditions such that*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \|u_0^\gamma\|_{H^1} < R.$$

Then, for all $R > 0$, $q \geq 1$ and ξ sufficiently small, the following holds

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad \text{as } \gamma \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.18)$$

for some positive constant $C = C(R, \xi, q)$ independent of γ .

For the sake of clarity, the proof of Proposition 5.5 will be deferred to the end of this subsection. Assuming Proposition 5.5, we are now in a position to conclude Theorem 2.5, whose argument is relatively short making use of observation (2.9).

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let $\varphi : H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi} < \infty$. Since d_0^ξ is only a distance-like function, in view of (2.9), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) &\geq \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi}} \left| \int_H \varphi(u) P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}(du) - \int_H \varphi(u) P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}(du) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi}} \left| \mathbb{E} \varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)) - \mathbb{E} \varphi(u(t; u_0^\gamma)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

In light of Proposition 5.5, we immediately obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{E} \varphi(u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)) - \mathbb{E} \varphi(u(t; u_0^\gamma)) \right| &\leq \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_0^\xi} \frac{C(q, R, \xi)}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes (2.19), thereby finishing the proof. \square

Turning back to Proposition 5.5, we will employ the following auxiliary result, which is considered as an analogue of Theorem 2.3 in terms of Wasserstein distances.

Lemma 5.6. For all $q \geq 1$, and probability measures $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{Pr}(H^1)$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma \mu_1, P_t^\gamma \mu_2) \leq C(1+t)^{-q} \left(1 + \int_H \Phi(u) \mu_1(du) + \int_H \Phi(u) \mu_2(du) \right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.19)$$

where $C = C(q)$ is a positive constant independent of μ_1, μ_2 and t .

Proof. Since \mathcal{W}_{d_0} is convex, cf. [63, Theorem 4.8], it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma \mu_1, P_t^\gamma \mu_2) \leq \int_{H \times H} \mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma(u_1, \cdot), P_t^\gamma(u_2, \cdot)) \pi(du_1, du_2),$$

where for a slight abuse of notation, we denote π to be a generic coupling of (μ_1, μ_2) . From the estimate (2.15), we have

$$\sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1} \leq 1} |\mathbb{E}\varphi(u(t; u_1)) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(u(t; u_2))| \leq C(1+t)^{-q} (1 + \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)), \quad t \geq 0.$$

In light of the dual Kantorovich identity (2.7), we deduce that

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma(u_1, \cdot), P_t^\gamma(u_2, \cdot)) \leq C(1+t)^{-q} (1 + \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)),$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma \mu_1, P_t^\gamma \mu_2) &\leq C(1+t)^{-q} \int_{H \times H} (1 + \Phi(u_1) + \Phi(u_2)) \pi(du_1, du_2) \\ &= C(1+t)^{-q} \left(1 + \int_H \Phi(u) \mu_1(du) + \int_H \Phi(u) \mu_2(du) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the last implication follows from the fact that π is coupling for (μ_1, μ_2) . This produces (5.19), as claimed. \square

Finally, we provide the proof of Proposition 5.5.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Firstly, we proceed to establish an analogue of (5.18) for \mathcal{W}_{d_0} . Then, we will upgrade to $\mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}$ by exploiting the exponential moment bounds in Lemma 3.1 and Lemma A.1.

Let T be given and be chosen later. Since $u_0^\gamma \in H^1$, from definition (2.6) and Proposition 5.1, for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma) - u(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}} (\Phi(u_0^\gamma)^{2n} + T + 1) e^{2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)T}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

Now, for $t \geq T$, by triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \leq \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) + \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^0, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}). \quad (5.21)$$

On the one hand, from Theorem 2.4, we readily have for all $q \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^\gamma, \nu^0) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q},$$

holds for some positive constant $C = C(q)$ independent of γ . On the other hand, we employ invariance property together with Lemma 5.6 and Lemma A.3 to obtain for all $q \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(\nu^0, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \\ & \leq \mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^\gamma \nu^\gamma) + \mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^0 \nu^0, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \\ & \leq C(1+t)^{-q} \left(1 + \Phi(u_0^\gamma) + \int_H \Phi(u) \nu^\gamma(du) + \int_H \Psi(u) \nu^0(du) \right) \\ & \leq C(1+t)^{-q} (1 + \Phi(u_0^\gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

In the last implication above, we invoked the uniform moment bound on ν^γ and ν^0 from Lemma 5.2 and Lemma A.4, respectively. It follows that for all $q_1, q_2 \geq 1$ and $t \geq T$

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^{q_1}} + C(1+T)^{-q_2} (1 + \Phi(u_0^\gamma)).$$

This together with (5.20) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) & \leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{8}}} (\Phi(u_0^\gamma)^{2n} + T + 1) e^{2\text{Tr}(AQQ^*)T} \\ & \quad + \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^{q_1}} + C(1+T)^{-q_2} (1 + \Phi(u_0^\gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

We emphasize once again that the above constant C does not depend on γ, T and u_0^γ . Recall that $\sup_{\gamma \in (0,1)} \|u_0^\gamma\|_{H^1} < R$, for all γ sufficiently small, we pick

$$T = \frac{n \log |\log \gamma|}{32 \text{Tr}(AQQ^*)},$$

and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \\ & \leq \frac{C}{|\log \gamma|^{\frac{n}{16}}} (\log |\log \gamma| + 1) + \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^{q_1}} + \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^{q_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Sending γ to 0 implies the bound for all $q \geq 1$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \leq \frac{C}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q}, \quad (5.22)$$

for some positive constant $C = C(R, q)$ independent of γ .

Turning back to (5.18), similar to the proof of (5.7), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \\ & \leq \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \left(1 + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}(du) + \int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}(du) \right)} \\ & = \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2} + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1 and Lemma A.1, we see that

$$\mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2} + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2} \leq C(1 + e^{\xi \|u_0^\gamma\|_H^2}) \leq C(\xi, R).$$

Combining with (5.22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{d_0^\xi}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) &\leq \sqrt{\mathcal{W}_{d_0}(P_t^\gamma \delta_{u_0^\gamma}, P_t^0 \delta_{u_0^\gamma}) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u^\gamma(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2} + \mathbb{E} e^{\xi \|u(t; u_0^\gamma)\|_H^2}\right)} \\ &\leq \frac{C(q, R)}{(\log |\log \gamma|)^q} \cdot C(\xi, R). \end{aligned}$$

In turn, this establishes (5.18). The proof is thus complete. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Tuoc Phan for fruitful discussion on the topics of the paper.

APPENDIX A. ESTIMATES ON THE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION (2.16)

In this section, we collect useful estimates on the system (2.16) that were employed to prove the main results. We start with the polynomial bounds in H^1 and exponential moment bounds in H subject to random initial conditions. The former was employed in the proof of Proposition 5.1 whereas the latter appeared in the proof of Proposition 5.5. The proof of Lemma A.1 is similar to those of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, and thus is omitted.

Lemma A.1. *Let $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1)$ be given and $u(t)$ be the solution of (2.16) with initial condition u_0 .*

1. *For all $n \geq 1$ and $T > 0$, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{[0, T]} \Psi(u(t))^n \right] \leq \mathbb{E} [\Psi(u_0)^n] + \mathbb{E} [\Psi(u_0)^{2n}] + C_{2, n} T, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for some positive constant $C_{2, n}$ independent of T and u_0 . In the above, Ψ is the function defined in (2.12).

2. *For all $\xi > 0$ sufficiently small, the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{\xi \|u(t)\|_H^2}] \leq e^{-c_\xi t} \mathbb{E} [e^{\xi \|u_0\|_H^2}] + C_\xi, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for some positive constants c_ξ and C_ξ independent of t and u_0 .

Next, we recall the following ergodicity result from [20] giving the polynomial mixing rate of (2.16). Theorem A.2 was directly invoked in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Theorem A.2. [20, Theorem 2.9] *Let $u_1, u_2 \in H^1$ be given and $\varphi : H^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1} < \infty$ where d_1 and $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1}$ are defined in (2.10) and (2.8), respectively. Then, the following holds for all $q \geq 1$*

$$|\mathbb{E} \varphi(u(t; u_1)) - \mathbb{E} \varphi(u(t; u_2))| \leq C(1+t)^{-q} \|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}, d_1} (1 + \Psi(u_1) + \Psi(u_2)), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for some positive constant $C = C(q)$ independent of u_1, u_2, t and φ . In the above, Ψ is the function defined in (2.12).

As a corollary, we obtain the following mixing result in terms of probability measures in $\mathcal{Pr}(H^1)$. We opt for neglecting the proof of Lemma A.3 and refer the reader to Lemma 5.6 for a detailed argument.

Lemma A.3. *For all $q \geq 1$, and probability measures $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{Pr}(H^1)$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{W}_{d_1}(P_t^0 \mu_1, P_t^0 \mu_2) \leq C(1+t)^{-q} \left(1 + \int_{H^1} \Psi(u) \mu_1(du) + \int_{H^1} \Psi(u) \mu_2(du)\right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $C = C(q)$ is a positive constant independent of μ_1, μ_2 and t .

Lastly, we consider the invariant measure ν^0 and establish two moment bounds on ν^0 . By exploiting the estimates in Lemma A.1, the proof of Lemma A.4 below is similar to that of Lemma 5.2 and is thus omitted.

Lemma A.4. *Let ν^0 be the unique invariant probability measure of (2.16). Then, for all $\xi > 0$ sufficiently small and $n \geq 1$, the followings hold*

$$\int_H e^{\xi \|u\|_H^2} \nu^0(du) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\gamma \in [0,1]} \int_H \Psi(u)^\gamma \nu^0(du) < \infty. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

APPENDIX B. AUXILIARY IRREDUCIBILITY CONDITIONS

In this section, we consider the process $\eta(t)$ solving the following equation

$$d\eta(t) = -iA\eta(t)dt - \alpha\eta(t)dt + QdW(t), \quad \eta(0) = 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Observe that (B.1) is essentially the linear part of (2.16) without the cubic potential. In Lemma B.1, we discuss an irreducibility condition that was invoked to establish Lemma 4.5.

Lemma B.1. *Let N be the constant as in Assumption 2.1 and η be the solution of the linear equation (B.1). Then, for all $r > 0$ and $T > 1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\eta(t)\|_{H^2} \leq r\right) > \varepsilon, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for some positive constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(r, T)$ independent of the choice of N .

Proof. We note that η is explicitly given by

$$\eta(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sum_{k \geq 1} \sin(\alpha_k(t-r)) \lambda_k dB_k^1(r) e_k + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sum_{k \geq 1} \cos(\alpha_k(t-r)) \lambda_k dB_k^2(r) e_k.$$

Concerning the terms involving sine functions, for $0 \leq s \leq t$, we employ Itô's Isometry to compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(t-r)) \lambda_k dB_k^1(r) e_k - \int_0^s e^{-\alpha(s-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(s-r)) \lambda_k dB_k^1(r) e_k \right\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_s^t e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(t-r)) \lambda_k dB_k^1(r) e_k \right\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^s \left[e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(t-r)) - e^{-\alpha(s-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(s-r)) \right] \lambda_k dB_k^1(r) e_k \right\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &= \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \int_s^t e^{-2\alpha(t-r)} |\sin(\alpha_k(t-r))|^2 dr \\ & \quad + \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \int_0^s \left[e^{-\alpha(t-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(t-r)) - e^{-\alpha(s-r)} \sin(\alpha_k(s-r)) \right]^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the analogous computation for cosine functions, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|\langle \eta(t) - \eta(s), e_k \rangle_{H^2}\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &= \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \left[\int_s^t |e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)(t-r)}|^2 dr + \int_0^s |e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)(t-r)} - e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)(s-r)}|^2 dr \right] \\ &= \alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2 \left[\int_s^t e^{-2\alpha(t-r)} dr + |e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)t} - e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)s}|^2 \int_0^s e^{2\alpha r} dr \right] \\ &= \frac{\alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2}{2\alpha} \left[1 - e^{-2\alpha(t-s)} + |1 - e^{-(\alpha+i\alpha_k)(t-s)}|^2 (1 - e^{-2\alpha s}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the elementary inequality $|1 - e^{-(a+ib)x}| \leq (a+b)x$ for $a, b, x \geq 0$, we deduce further that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|\langle \eta(t) - \eta(s), e_k \rangle_{H e_k}\|_{H^2}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_k^2 \lambda_k^2}{2\alpha} [2\alpha(t-s) + 4(\alpha + \alpha_k)(t-s)] \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{\alpha}\right) \alpha_k^3 \lambda_k^2 (t-s), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\mathbb{E} \|\eta(t) - \eta(s)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{\alpha}\right) \text{Tr}(A^3 Q Q^*) (t-s).$$

In light of [19, Lemma 6.2] applying to the Gaussian process $\eta(t)$, for $r \in (0, 1)$ and $T > 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{\alpha}\right) \text{Tr}(A^3 Q Q^*) r\right) \geq e^{-cT/r},$$

holds for some positive constant c independent of T, r and $\text{Tr}(A^3 Q Q^*)$. Recalling Assumption 2.1, cf. condition (2.5), we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\eta(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq \left(3 + \frac{2}{\alpha}\right) C_Q r\right) \geq e^{-cT/r},$$

which does not depend on the size of N . In turn, this produces (B.2), as claimed. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Ablowitz and H. Segur. *Solitons and the Inverse Scattering Transform*. SIAM, 1981.
- [2] G. P. Agrawal. Nonlinear fiber optics: its history and recent progress. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B*, 28(12):A1–A10, 2011.
- [3] S. Albeverio, F. Flandoli, and Y. G. Sinai. *SPDE in Hydrodynamics: Recent Progress and Prospects: Lectures given at the CIME Summer School held in Cetraro, Italy, August 29–September 3, 2005*. Springer, 2008.
- [4] F. Arecchi, S. Boccaletti, P. Ramazza, and S. Residori. Transition from boundary-to bulk-controlled regimes in optical pattern formation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 70(15):2277, 1993.
- [5] W. Baoxiang and W. Youde. The inviscid limit of the derivative complex Ginzburg–Landau equation. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 83(4):477–502, 2004.
- [6] M. Barton-Smith. Global solution for a stochastic Ginzburg–Landau equation with multiplicative noise. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, 22(1):1–18, 2004.
- [7] M. Barton-Smith. Invariant measure for the stochastic Ginzburg Landau equation. *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 11:29–52, 2004.
- [8] P. Bechouche and A. Jüngel. Inviscid limits of the complex Ginzburg–Landau equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 214:201–226, 2000.
- [9] P. Blennerhassett. On the generation of waves by wind. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 298(1441):451–494, 1980.
- [10] J. Bricmont, A. Kupiainen, and R. Lefevre. Exponential mixing of the 2D stochastic Navier–Stokes dynamics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 230:87–132, 2002.
- [11] O. Butkovsky. Subgeometric rates of convergence of Markov processes in the Wasserstein metric. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(2):526–552, 2014.
- [12] O. Butkovsky, A. Kulik, and M. Scheutzow. Generalized couplings and ergodic rates for SPDEs and other Markov models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(1):1–39, 2020.
- [13] S. Cerrai and M. Freidlin. On the Smoluchowski–Kramers approximation for a system with an infinite number of degrees of freedom. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 135(3):363–394, 2006.
- [14] S. Cerrai and M. Freidlin. Smoluchowski–Kramers approximation for a general class of SPDEs. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 6(4):657–689, 2006.
- [15] S. Cerrai and N. Glatt-Holtz. On the convergence of stationary solutions in the smoluchowski–kramers approximation of infinite dimensional systems. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 278(8):108421, 2020.
- [16] S. Cerrai and G. Xi. A Smoluchowski–Kramers approximation for an infinite dimensional system with state-dependent damping. *Ann. Probab.*, 50(3):874–904, 2022.
- [17] S. Cerrai and M. Xie. On the small noise limit in the Smoluchowski–Kramers approximation of nonlinear wave equations with variable friction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05923*, 2022.
- [18] S. Cerrai and M. Xie. On the small-mass limit for stationary solutions of stochastic wave equations with state dependent friction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01549*, 2023.
- [19] M. Csörgö and Q.-M. Shao. On almost sure limit inferior for B-valued stochastic processes and applications. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 99(1):29–54, 1994.

- [20] A. Debussche and C. Odasso. Ergodicity for a weakly damped stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equation. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 5(3):317–356, 2005.
- [21] F. Dias and C. Kharif. Nonlinear gravity and capillary-gravity waves. *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 31(1):301–346, 1999.
- [22] Z. Dong, R. Zhang, and T. Zhang. Ergodicity for stochastic conservation laws with multiplicative noise. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 400(3):1739–1789, 2023.
- [23] W. E, J. C. Mattingly, and Y. Sinai. Gibbsian Dynamics and Ergodicity for the Stochastically Forced Navier–Stokes Equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 224(1):83–106, 2001.
- [24] G. Fibich. *The Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation*, volume 192. Springer, 2015.
- [25] J. Földes, S. Friedlander, N. Glatt-Holtz, and G. Richards. Asymptotic analysis for randomly forced MHD. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(6):4440–4469, 2017.
- [26] J. Földes, N. Glatt-Holtz, G. Richards, and E. Thomann. Ergodic and mixing properties of the Boussinesq equations with a degenerate random forcing. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 269(8):2427–2504, 2015.
- [27] J. Földes, N. Glatt-Holtz, G. Richards, and J. Whitehead. Ergodicity in randomly forced Rayleigh–Bénard convection. *Nonlinearity*, 29(11):3309, 2016.
- [28] J. Földes, N. E. Glatt-Holtz, and G. Richards. Large Prandtl number asymptotics in randomly forced turbulent convection. *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. NoDEA*, 26(6):43, 2019.
- [29] V. Ginzburg and L. Landau. On the theory of superconductivity. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*, 20:1064–1082, 1950.
- [30] N. Glatt-Holtz and M. Ziane. The stochastic primitive equations in two space dimensions with multiplicative noise. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. - B*, 10(4):801, 2008.
- [31] N. E. Glatt-Holtz, V. R. Martinez, and H. D. Nguyen. The short memory limit for long time statistics in a stochastic Coleman–Gurtin model of heat conduction. *preprint*, 2022.
- [32] N. E. Glatt-Holtz and C. F. Mondaini. Mixing rates for Hamiltonian Monte Carlo algorithms in finite and infinite dimensions. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ.: Anal. Comput.*, pages 1–74, 2021.
- [33] M. Hairer. Exponential mixing properties of stochastic PDEs through asymptotic coupling. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 124(3):345–380, 2002.
- [34] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. Math.*, pages 993–1032, 2006.
- [35] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier–Stokes equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(6):2050–2091, 2008.
- [36] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. A theory of hypoellipticity and unique ergodicity for semilinear stochastic PDEs. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 16:658–738, 2011.
- [37] M. Hairer, J. C. Mattingly, and M. Scheutzow. Asymptotic coupling and a general form of Harris’ theorem with applications to stochastic delay equations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 149(1):223–259, 2011.
- [38] C. Huang and B. Wang. Inviscid limit for the energy-critical complex Ginzburg–Landau equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 255(3):681–725, 2008.
- [39] G. Huber, P. Alstr, et al. Universal decay of vortex density in two dimensions. *Physica A*, 195(3-4):448–456, 1993.
- [40] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, volume 113. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [41] S. Kuksin, A. Piatniski, and A. Shirikyan. A coupling approach to randomly forced nonlinear PDE’s. II. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 230:81–85, 2002.
- [42] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. Stochastic dissipative PDE’s and Gibbs measures. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 213:291–330, 2000.
- [43] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. A Coupling Approach to Randomly Forced Nonlinear PDE’s. I. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 221:351–366, 2001.
- [44] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. Coupling approach to white-forced nonlinear PDEs. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 81(6):567–602, 2002.
- [45] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. Randomly forced CGL equation: stationary measures and the inviscid limit. *J. Phys. A*, 37(12):3805, 2004.
- [46] S. B. Kuksin. Weakly nonlinear stochastic CGL equations. 49(4):1033–1056, 2013.
- [47] Y. Kuramoto and T. Tsuzuki. On the formation of dissipative structures in reaction-diffusion systems: Reductive perturbation approach. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 54(3):687–699, 1975.
- [48] S. Machihara and Y. Nakamura. The inviscid limit for the complex Ginzburg–Landau equation. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 281(2):552–564, 2003.
- [49] J. C. Mattingly. Exponential convergence for the stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equations and other partially dissipative dynamics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 230(3):421–462, 2002.
- [50] J. C. Mattingly, A. M. Stuart, and D. J. Higham. Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise. *Stoch. Process. Their Appl.*, 101(2):185–232, 2002.

- [51] H.-T. Moon, P. Huerre, and L. Redekopp. Three-frequency motion and chaos in the Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 49(7):458, 1982.
- [52] H. T. Moon, P. Huerre, and L. Redekopp. Transitions to chaos in the Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Physica D*, 7(1-3):135–150, 1983.
- [53] A. C. Newell. *Solitons in Mathematics and Physics*. SIAM, 1985.
- [54] A. C. Newell and J. A. Whitehead. Finite bandwidth, finite amplitude convection. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 38(2):279–303, 1969.
- [55] H. D. Nguyen. The small-mass limit and white-noise limit of an infinite dimensional generalized Langevin equation. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 173(2):411–437, 2018.
- [56] H. D. Nguyen. The small mass limit for long time statistics of a stochastic nonlinear damped wave equation. *J. Diff. Equ.*, 371:481–548, 2023.
- [57] H. D. Nguyen. Polynomial mixing of a stochastic wave equation with dissipative damping. *Appl. Math. Opt.*, 89:1–31, 2024.
- [58] C. Odasso. Ergodicity for the stochastic complex Ginzburg-Landau equations. 42(4):417–454, 2006.
- [59] A. Shirikyan. Exponential mixing for 2D Navier-Stokes equations perturbed by an unbounded noise. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 6:169–193, 2004.
- [60] A. Shirikyan. Local times for solutions of the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation and the inviscid limit. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 384(1):130–137, 2011.
- [61] J. T. Stuart and D. C. Di Prima. The Eckhaus and Benjamin-Feir resonance mechanisms. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A*, 362:27–41, 1978.
- [62] R. Temam. *Infinite-dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*, volume 68. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [63] C. Villani. *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [64] B. Wang. The limit behavior of solutions for the Cauchy problem of the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 55(4):481–508, 2002.
- [65] J. Wu. The inviscid limit of the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation. *J. Differ. Equ.*, 142(2):413–433, 1998.
- [66] Y. Zine. On the inviscid limit of the singular stochastic complex Ginzburg-Landau equation at statistical equilibrium. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00604*, 2022.

¹ DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE, USA