

REGULARIZATION BY ROUGH KRAICHNAN NOISE FOR THE GENERALISED SQG EQUATIONS

MARCO BAGNARA, LUCIO GALEATI, AND MARIO MAURELLI

ABSTRACT. We consider the generalised Surface Quasi-Geostrophic (gSQG) equations in \mathbb{R}^2 with parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$, an active scalar model interpolating between SQG ($\beta = 1$) and the 2D Euler equations ($\beta = 0$) in vorticity form. Existence of weak ($L^1 \cap L^p$)-valued solutions in the deterministic setting is known, but their uniqueness is open. We show that the addition of a rough Stratonovich transport noise of Kraichnan type regularizes the PDE, providing strong existence and pathwise uniqueness of solutions for initial data $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$, for suitable values $p \in [2, \infty]$ related to the regularity degree α of the noise and the singularity degree β of the velocity field; in particular, we can cover any $\beta \in (0, 1)$ for suitable α and p and we can reach a suitable (“critical”) threshold. The result also holds in the presence of external forcing $f \in L^1_t(L^1 \cap L^p)$ and solutions are shown to depend continuously on the data of the problem; furthermore, they are well approximated by vanishing viscosity and regular approximations.

Keywords: generalised SQG equations, rough Kraichnan noise, regularization by noise.

MSC (2020): 35Q35, 60H15, 60H50.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminaries and main result. Consider the generalised Surface Quasi-Geostrophic equations (gSQG for short), a family of 2D active scalar PDEs on \mathbb{R}^2 indexed by a parameter $\beta \in (0, 2)$, of the form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta = f, \\ u = -\nabla^\perp \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Lambda = (-\Delta)^{1/2} = |\nabla|$. The gSQG equations were introduced in [19, 20], as a family of PDEs interpolating between the 2D Euler in vorticity form, corresponding to $\beta = 0$, and SQG, corresponding to $\beta = 1$. Recalling the Riesz kernel representation of $\Lambda^{-2+\beta}$, we may express the velocity u in function of θ by the nonlocal relation

$$u = -\nabla^\perp \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta = K_\beta * \theta, \quad K_\beta(x) = c_\beta \frac{x^\perp}{|x|^{2+\beta}} \quad (1.2)$$

so that (1.1) can be regarded as a closed equation in the variable θ . To this day, we lack a satisfactory solution theory for (1.1); let us shortly mention some key results in different regularity classes (see Section 1.3 for more details):

- i) For sufficiently regular θ_0 , local existence of regular solutions holds [19]; however, instantaneous norm inflation may happen in positive regularity classes H^s or C^β [58, 27, 21], to the point where even non-existence results can be established.
- ii) For $L^1 \cap L^p$ -valued θ_0 , thanks to the transport structure of the PDE and the divergence-free property of u , global existence of L^p -valued solutions can be established by classical compactness arguments, for instance for $p \geq 2$, cf. [68, 19, 71]. Their uniqueness is an open problem.
- iii) Convex integrations schemes yield non-uniqueness of very weak solutions θ in negative Hölder spaces, cf. [67, Section 3.3].

(M. Bagnara) SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE, PIAZZA DEI CAVALIERI 7, 56126 PISA, ITALY.

(L. Galeati) EPFL, BÂTIMENT MA, STATION 8, 1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.

(M. Maurelli) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA, LARGO BRUNO PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA, ITALY.

E-mail addresses: marco.bagnara@sns.it, lucio.galeati@epfl.ch, mario.maurelli@unipi.it.

Date: May 21, 2024.

In particular, the situation for $\beta > 0$ is drastically different from the Euler case, where we have well-posedness for $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$ and propagation of higher regularity thanks to the classical results of Wolibner and Yudovich.

Motivated by the theoretical study of turbulent fluids, we would like to understand whether the introduction of a transport noise term may affect the resulting solution theory for gSQG. In particular, we introduce the SPDE

$$d\theta + (K_\beta * \theta) \cdot \nabla \theta dt + \circ dW \cdot \nabla \theta = f dt. \quad (1.3)$$

Here $W = W(t, x)$ is a divergence-free Gaussian velocity field, corresponding to the Kraichnan model of turbulence [61, 62], with covariance function (formally) given by

$$\mathbb{E}[W(t, x) \otimes W(s, y)] = (t \wedge s) Q(x - y), \quad \widehat{Q}(n) \sim (1 + |n|^2)^{-1-\alpha} \left(I - \frac{n \otimes n}{|n|^2} \right);$$

in particular, W is Brownian in time, coloured but rough in space (more precisely, W is $(\alpha - \varepsilon)$ -Hölder continuous in space for any $\varepsilon > 0$); $\circ dW$ in (1.3) denotes Stratonovich integration, which is the correct physical choice in view of the Wong-Zakai principle.

From the Lagrangian viewpoint, W is an external turbulent fluid in which all the particles are immersed; although its introduction is somewhat artificial, the theoretical interest in SPDEs of fluid dynamics in the style of (1.3) comes from the idea that W is just a proxy for the small, turbulent scales of the velocity u itself, in a regime of fully developed turbulence. In particular, such an exogeneous noise is expected reproduce and highlight features of intrinsically stochastic turbulent solutions θ to the original PDE (1.1). The latter might generically display self-stabilizing and self-regularizing properties, thanks to anomalous dissipation of kinetic energy happening at small scales. In this sense, another main reason for studying (1.3) comes from the investigation of regularization by noise phenomena in fluids [33] and their connection to turbulence.

With this goal in mind, it is convenient to consider an additional forcing term f on the r.h.s. (1.3). Indeed, already in the Euler case $\beta = 0$, it was recently shown by Vishik (see [79, 80] and the monograph [3]) that a carefully chosen forcing f , acting as an unstable background, may produce non-uniqueness of L^p -valued solutions. Here, we would like to understand whether a sufficiently turbulent background noise is additionally able to prevent this kind of non-uniqueness scenario.

Our results, building on the techniques first developed by one of the authors in [23] for the 2D Euler equations, answer positively to the above questions. Here is a statement summarizing our main findings.

Theorem 1.1. *Let α, β and p be parameters satisfying*

$$0 < \frac{\beta}{2} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{\beta}{2} + \alpha \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p}, \quad p \in [2, \infty). \quad (1.4)$$

Then, for any $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ and any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, +\infty); L^1 \cap L^p)$, there exists a global probabilistically strong, analytically weak solution θ to (1.3), with the property that

$$\theta \in L^\infty(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; L^1 \cap L^p)) \quad \forall T < \infty. \quad (1.5)$$

Furthermore, pathwise uniqueness and uniqueness in law holds in the class of solutions θ satisfying (1.5).

Moreover, solutions depend continuously on the data of the problem: if (θ_0^n, f^n) is a sequence of data such that $\theta_0^n \rightarrow \theta_0$ in $L^1 \cap L^p$, $\{f^n\}_n$ is bounded in $L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, +\infty); L^1 \cap L^p)$ and $f^n \rightarrow f$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, +\infty); \dot{H}^{\beta/2-1})$, then the corresponding solutions θ^n converge in probability to θ . More precisely, for any $T < \infty$, any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^n - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-\delta}}^m \right] = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Remark 1.2. The convergence statement also holds if $f^n \rightarrow f$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, +\infty); L^1 \cap L^2)$, by the embedding $L^1 \cap L^2 \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}$ (see Lemma A.2).

Remark 1.3. Let us emphasize some aspects of Theorem 1.1:

- Our result covers the whole range $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, for such β , upon choosing $\alpha = \beta/2 + \delta$ with $\delta > 0$ small enough, we deduce strong well-posedness of the SPDE for $\theta \in L^p$ as soon as

$$p \geq 2, \quad p > \frac{1}{1 - \beta};$$

for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we can always find $p \in [2, \infty)$ large enough such that the above holds. For instance, for such choice of α , we deduce well-posedness for $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^2$ as soon as $\beta < 1/2$.

- Formally taking $\beta = 0$, our condition (1.4) recovers the main constraint $\alpha < 1 - 1/p$ from [23]. However, differently from there, we can allow the somewhat critical equality $\alpha + \beta/2 = 1 - 1/p$; this is achieved by more refined arguments, based on a clever decomposition of our solutions, weak-strong uniqueness techniques and Yamada-Watanabe arguments.
- So far we are unable to treat the SQG case $\beta = 1$. Indeed, even replacing all $<$ with \leq in (4.1), in order for it to be satisfied we would be forced to take $\alpha = 1/2$ and $p = \infty$. This is currently beyond our methods and an interesting problem for the future.
- As a consequence of well-posedness, we can deduce that solutions of (1.3) are the unique limit of vanishing viscosity (Proposition 4.6) and smoothing approximations (Proposition 4.8).

While preparing this paper, the work [59] appeared on arXiv. In particular, [59, Theorem 1.4] establishes uniqueness by rough incompressible Kraichnan noise for gSQG, for certain values of the parameters α and β ; existence by noise in certain L^p spaces for $p < 2$ is also shown. However, their uniqueness result does not cover every $\beta \in (0, 1)$ nor the full range (1.4) (for example, in our notation, they need to assume $\beta < 2/3$ and, for $p = 2$, they need $\beta < 1/3$); moreover, here we can deal with the “critical” case $\alpha + \beta/2 = 1 - 1/p$.

1.2. Main ideas of the proof. For simplicity, we focus here on the case with zero forcing, $f = 0$. Firstly we describe the properties of the solutions and of the noise that we are going to use, then we sketch the main computations and arguments to deal with both the subcritical and critical case.

We recall the existence of two important formal invariants for (1.1): since $\nabla \cdot u = 0$, we have the Casimir invariants

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi(\theta_t(x)) dx = 0 \tag{1.7}$$

for all sufficiently nice $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, implying in particular formal preservation of all L^p norms. This property (formally) transfers to the SPDE (1.3), thanks to the noise being Stratonovich and divergence free.

The second invariant, only valid in the deterministic case, is the energy or Hamiltonian:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

To get (1.8), one can use (1.1) and integration by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 &= \langle \partial_t \theta, \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta \rangle = -\langle u \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta, \theta \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla^\perp \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta, \theta \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Defining the gSQG nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}(\theta) = \nabla \cdot ((K_\beta * \theta)\theta)$, notice that the above computation reveals the general cancellation property

$$\langle (K_\beta * \theta) \cdot \nabla \psi, \theta \rangle_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}} = \langle (K_\beta * \theta) \cdot \nabla \psi, \Lambda^{-2+\beta} \theta \rangle = 0, \tag{1.9}$$

valid for all sufficiently regular θ and ψ such that the above pairings are well defined.

In light of (1.7), fairly standard a priori estimates and compactness/tightness arguments yield weak existence of solutions $\theta \in L_\omega^\infty L_t^\infty L_x^p$, such that $\|\theta_t\|_{L^p} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^p}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore let us only focus here on the most important part of Theorem 1.1, namely uniqueness. This is where we expect the non-trivial structure of the noise W to play an important role.

A celebrated and striking property of the Kraichnan noise is the intrinsic stochasticity of the underlying Lagrangian particles X_t^x , see e.g. [9, 65]: particles starting at the same position x split with positive probability, at any $t > 0$, and their evolution is correctly described by kernels of probability measures. At

the Eulerian level, this translates into anomalous dissipation of $t \mapsto \|\theta_t\|_{L^2}$, which decreases over time. Unfortunately, the last property is only known to hold for linear transport equations, and so far has not been successfully transferred to the nonlinear setting. A fundamental intuition of the work [23] (see also [28, 41]) is that the presence of transport noise strongly affects the evolution of negative Sobolev norms \dot{H}^{-s} of solutions: if ξ is an L^p -valued Itô process satisfying

$$d\xi_t + h_t dt + \circ dW_t \cdot \nabla \xi_t = 0, \quad (1.10)$$

then for a large class of random processes h one can show that the \dot{H}^{-s} -norm of ξ satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^2] \leq -K \mathbb{E}[\|\theta\|_{\dot{H}^{-s+1-\alpha}}^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, h_t \rangle_{\dot{H}^{-s}}] + C \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^2] \quad (1.11)$$

for suitable constants $K, C > 0$, as long as $s > 1 - \alpha$. Heuristically, on average the noise W gives rise to a coercive term $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{-s+1-\alpha}}^2$, corresponding to an increase in regularity of a factor $1 - \alpha$ compared to the initial norm $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{-s}}^2$ in consideration. We see that, as α gets smaller, while W becomes spatially rougher, the energy balance gets better. For a rigorous formalization of (1.11), we refer to Theorem 4.4, which is taken from [41].

Armed with (1.11), we can present a bit loosely the regularity counting yielding condition (4.1). To this end, given two solutions θ^i , denoting by u^i the corresponding velocity fields, we set $\xi = \theta^1 - \theta^2$; it solves

$$d\xi + u^1 \cdot \nabla \xi dt + (K_\beta * \xi) \cdot \nabla \theta^2 dt + \circ dW \cdot \nabla \xi = 0 \quad (1.12)$$

which is exactly of the form (1.10). In order to handle the nonlinear term in estimates of the form (1.11), it is convenient to try to produce the best possible cancellations; in view of (1.9), we pick $s = 1 - \beta/2$, which requires the constraint $\beta/2 < \alpha$. In this way, the term $K_\beta * \xi \cdot \nabla \theta^2$ gives no contribution and from (1.11) (upon computing the $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}$ -pairing and doing integration by parts) we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] = -K \mathbb{E}[\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}}^2] + \mathbb{E}[\langle u^1 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi, \xi \rangle] + C \mathbb{E}[\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2]. \quad (1.13)$$

In order to close the estimate by a Grönwall-type argument, using duality pairings, we expect uniqueness to be within reach as soon as we establish a (deterministic) functional inequality of the form

$$\|u_t^1 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2}} \lesssim \|\theta_t^1\|_{L^p} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}} \lesssim \|\theta_0^1\|_{L^p} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}} \quad (1.14)$$

possibly with a small multiplicative constant in front, so that the above right-hand side is absorbed into (1.13). Inequality (1.14) provides another natural constrain on the parameters α, β . Indeed, in order to have $u^1 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi \in \dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}$, it is natural to require $\nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi \in \dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}$; for $\xi \in \dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}$, in view of the smoothing properties of Λ , in general this requires $\dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2} \subset \dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2}$ and thus (combined with our previous constraint)

$$\frac{\beta}{2} < \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Next, we can do a quick regularity counting: if $\theta^1 \in L^p$, then $u^1 = \nabla^\perp \Lambda^{\beta-2} \theta^1$ belongs to the homogeneous Bessel space $\dot{L}^{1-\beta, p}$ (i.e. $\Lambda^{1-\beta} u^1 \in L^p$); similarly, if $\xi \in \dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}$, then $\nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi \in \dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2}$. The desired estimate (1.14) can then be deduced by a combination of the fractional Leibniz rule and functional embeddings, resulting in our Lemma 4.3 on products in fractional Bessel spaces, provided that

$$\alpha + \frac{\beta}{2} = 1 - \frac{1}{p}. \quad (1.15)$$

Constraint (1.15) is somewhat critical, in the sense that a direct application of Lemma 4.3 does not allow us to produce a small constant in (1.14). The situation would be different in the case of strict inequality (which we could regard as a subcritical regime) in (1.15), in which case one can gain a “ δ of space” in regularity estimates by means of

$$\|u_t^1 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{\beta-2} \xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta}} \lesssim \|\theta_0^1\|_{L^p} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha-\delta}}; \quad (1.16)$$

in this case, by interpolation estimates, the r.h.s. can always be controlled by a small multiple of $\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}}^2$, at the price of producing an additional term $C\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2$, with C possibly very large. The latter term is however harmless, as it can always be controlled by Grönwall's lemma.

Our main intuition in order to reach equality (1.15) is to combine the nice estimates available in the subcritical regime, with the incompressible transport nature of the SPDE. In particular, given any $\theta_0 \in L^p$, we can always decompose it as $\theta_0 = \theta_0^< + \theta_0^>$, where $\theta_0^>$ can be made arbitrarily small in L^p , while $\theta_0^<$ enjoys higher integrability, in the sense that $\theta_0^< \in L^p \cap L^\infty$. Correspondingly, if we think of the SPDE (1.3) as being “linear in θ for fixed u ”, the solution θ should decompose as $\theta = \theta^< + \theta^>$, where θ^{\leq} respectively solve

$$d\theta^{\leq} + u \cdot \nabla \theta^{\leq} dt + \circ dW \cdot \nabla \theta^{\leq} = 0, \quad \theta^{\leq}|_{t=0} = \theta_0^{\leq}.$$

As u and W are divergence free, we then expect both the smallness property of $\theta_0^>$ in L^p and the higher integrability of $\theta_0^<$ to be propagated at positive times, and thus transfer to the decomposition $\theta = \theta^< + \theta^>$ of our solution. We can now combine both estimates (1.14) and (1.16), applied respectively to terms associated to $\theta^>$ and $\theta^<$, to produce the desired small constant in front of (1.14), for any choice of initial data $\theta_0 \in L^p$.

Rigorously, the construction of a solution θ satisfying the aforementioned decomposition is a bit more technical, requiring to argue via a priori estimates and compactness arguments; once we have θ , any other weak L^p -valued solution $\tilde{\theta}$ can be compared to θ , by employing a PDE weak-strong uniqueness type argument and a Yamada-Watanabe type coupling. Overall, this allows to conclude that any other weak solution must coincide with θ , and so that pathwise uniqueness and uniqueness in law hold.

1.3. Review of existing literature. We discuss here more in detail several results in the literature related to our (S)PDE of interest. To simplify the exposition, we divide them in different thematic blocks.

SQG equations. The rigorous mathematical study of the SQG equations was initiated in [24], which established local existence of smooth solutions and a blow-up criterion. Global existence of weak L^p -valued solutions was established in [73] for $\theta_0 \in L^2$ and then extended in [68] to $\theta_0 \in L^p$ with $p > 4/3$; uniqueness of such solutions remains an open problem.

After these works, there have been several attempts at understanding whether loss of regularity and blow-up of strong norms might hold. Examples of self-similar solutions with infinite energy blowing up in finite time were provided in [16]; instead specific examples of global smooth solutions were constructed in [17], with a rigorous computer-assisted proof. The construction from [51] provides initial data θ_0 such that either finite time blow-up or exponential growth of strong norms must happen. More recently, the work [26] provides initial data θ_0 for which strong norm inflation in C^k -spaces (as well in H^s , for $s \in (3/2, 2)$) takes place, resulting also in non-existence of solutions $\theta \in C([0, \delta]; C^k)$ for any $\delta > 0$; similar results were provided in [58], in the setting of the critical scales $H^2 \cap W^{1, \infty}$. In a different direction, the existence of invariant measures for SQG supported on $H^2 \cap W^{1,4}$ has been shown in [39].

Convex integration schemes have been successfully applied to SQG to deduce non-uniqueness of very weak solutions in [13]; these solutions belong to $C_t^0 C^{\gamma-1}$, for $\gamma \in (1/2, 4/5)$. It is important to mention here that the SQG (as well as gSQG and Euler) equations belong to a class of active scalar equations with *odd Fourier multiplier*, which is especially hard to tackle by convex integration schemes, and for which the h -principle is not expected to hold, see the discussions in [78, 56]. For this reason, the scheme is not implemented at the level of θ , and does not produce L^p -valued solutions; rather in [13] the SQG system is rewritten in its momentum form and applied to the potential velocity v implicitly defined by $\theta = -\nabla^\perp \cdot v$. After [13], alternative constructions have been presented in [54] and in the presence of forcing in [14]; the last reference yields non-uniqueness for $\theta \in C_t C^{\gamma-1}$ in the presence of a forcing $f \in C_t C^{\gamma-1}$, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

Generalised SQG equations. The inviscid gSQG equations belong to a general class of active scalar models first introduced in [20]; local well-posedness of smooth solutions and global existence of weak L^2 solutions were established in [19]. The latter result has been extended to bounded domains in [71]. It has been recently shown in [55] that such weak solutions preserve angular momentum.

In analogy to Euler, the vortex patch problem for gSQG has received considerable attention. Finite time blow-up for the patch equation has been shown in [60], see also [43] for more refined results and [25] for some global existence results. Existence of very weak solutions with white noise marginals has been shown in [70, 38], generalising a classical result for 2D Euler by Albeverio and Cruzeiro [2]. The aforementioned results on strong norm inflation and non-existence of solutions have been extended to gSQG as well. Let us mention in this regard: i) the work [27], for parameters $\beta \in (1, 2)$ (a regime in which $u = -\nabla^\perp \Lambda^{2-\beta}$ is less regular than θ); ii) the aforementioned [58], whose techniques readapt to show ill-posedness for gSQG case in $H^{1+\beta}$ (cf. Section 1C therein); iii) the recent [21], proving local well-posedness in $C^\gamma \cap L^1$ for $\gamma > \beta$, as well as constructing θ_0 for which non-existence of solutions in $C([0, \delta]; C^\beta)$ holds for any $\delta > 0$. Convex integrations schemes have been applied to gSQG in [67]; in particular, Theorem 3 from Section 3.3 therein implies non-uniqueness of very weak solutions such that $\Lambda^{-1+\beta/2}\theta \in C_t C^\gamma$, for suitable values $\gamma = \gamma(\beta) < 3/10$. We finally mention the recent work [18], revisiting the arguments by Vishik [79, 80], who first constructed non-unique L^p -valued solutions to the forced 2D Euler equations in vorticity form, for a carefully chosen forcing $f \in L_t^1 L^p$. In [18], similar upcoming results for gSQG and SQG are announced.

Kraichnan noise and turbulence. An idealized description of the effects of small, possibly turbulent, fluid scales by means of a Brownian-in-time, coloured-in-space noise W was first proposed by Kraichnan in the context of passive scalar turbulence, see [61] and later [62]. This model has become very popular after [9, 30], where it was shown that in the low regularity regime $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ particle splitting and intrinsic stochasticity take place, resulting in anomalous dissipation for the passive scalar; the link between these properties holds in great generality in transport equations, see [29]. At the same time, solutions to the inviscid equation are still unique and can be recovered by the vanishing viscosity limit. For more details on the physical features of the model, we refer to the lecture notes [15], and for rigorous mathematical results to [65, 66, 42]. Indeed, Le Jan and Raimond [65, 66] conducted a very deep mathematical study of a wider class of Brownian flows; according to their classification, the incompressible Kraichnan model is diffusive without hitting. We also mention the recent work [75], quantifying anomalous L^2 dissipation for the rough Kraichnan model (on \mathbb{T}^2).

More recently, there has been an increasing interest in incorporating transport noise in nonlinear fluid dynamics. We shortly mention some key references: i) the Lagrangian-based approach proposed in [12], where the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations with transport noise were derived by computing the stochastic material derivative along the trajectories of the fluid particles; ii) the variational approach by Holm [53]; iii) the Location Uncertainty method by Memin [69]. In most approaches, the Stratonovich form of the noise arises naturally and is physically justified by the Wong–Zakai principle.

Regularization by transport noise in PDEs. The realization that transport noise can have a strongly regularizing effect on linear SPDEs is due to Flandoli, Gubinelli and Priola [32], who showed well-posedness of stochastic transport equations with Hölder continuous drifts. The result has been subsequently refined in several ways, see [31] for the propagation of Sobolev regularity of initial data and [37] for the prevention of blow-up due to stretching. Since then, the literature has flourished, see [33, 44] for an overview. At the same time, it was already understood in [32, Section 6.2] that the situation can be much more complicated in the nonlinear setting, where too simple noise might not help. This intuition has been recently confirmed by the stochastic convex integration results from [52, 72], which imply non-uniqueness for stochastic 3D Euler and Navier–Stokes equations in the presence of regular transport noise.

On the other hand, a “sufficiently active” transport noise still has the ability to suppress blow-up with high probability, for a large class of parabolic equations; this was shown e.g. for 3D Navier–Stokes [36], Keller–Segel and Kuramoto–Sivashinsky [34], reaction-diffusion equations [1] and Tao’s averaged version of Navier–Stokes [64]. These results build on the scaling limit argument introduced in [40], which allows the noise to be smooth, but supported on very high Fourier modes. The suppression mechanism is closely connected to the mixing properties of Kraichnan noise [45] and bears strong similarities with deterministic results like [57]; it crucially relies on the parabolic nature of the problem and does not transfer easily to the analysis of inviscid PDEs. In the inviscid setting, apart from the work [23] which we build upon, let us mention an alternative approach based on Girsanov transform, applied to 2D logEuler equations in [42], in part based on [7] for 3D Leray- α Euler.

1.4. Structure of the paper. We conclude this introduction by recalling the most relevant notations and conventions we will adopt in the paper in Section 1.5. Then in Section 2 we describe in detail the properties of the Kraichnan noise W we consider and define our notion of solutions to (1.3). Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1, which ensures the existence of weak solutions, for a large class of θ_0 and f . It is based on a standard probabilistic compactness argument, based on first studying a class of regularized SPDEs and deriving a priori estimates, and then passing to the limit removing the mollification. Finally, Section 4 is devoted to the proof of pathwise uniqueness and stability of solutions (Theorem 4.1), which allows to complete of the proof of our main Theorem 1.1. As a consequence, we deduce the convergence of vanishing viscosity and regular approximations to the unique solutions to the SPDE in Section 4.3. We collect some useful analysis facts that were used throughout the paper in Appendix A.

1.5. Notation. In this subsection we summarize the notations and conventions used throughout the manuscript.

Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $x \cdot y$ their scalar product, while $|x|$ stands for the Euclidean norm. For $d = 2$, $x^\perp := (-x_2, x_1)^T$ will denote the counterclockwise 90 degrees rotation of x and similarly $\nabla^\perp := (-\partial_2, \partial_1)$ will indicate the orthogonal gradient. When $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix, $\text{Tr } A$ will stand for its trace. We will use the symbol \otimes to indicate the tensor product $x \otimes y$, when $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

When dealing with inequalities, we will write $a \lesssim b$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $a \leq cb$; to stress the dependence of the hidden constant with respect to some parameter family λ , we will sometimes write $a \lesssim_\lambda b$.

We denote by $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ the space of smooth functions with compact support and by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ the space of Schwartz functions; \mathcal{S}' , the dual of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$, denotes the so-called tempered distributions. For $p \in [1, \infty]$, we write $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for the standard Lebesgue spaces. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ will stand for the classical Sobolev spaces. In general, when clear from the context, we will drop from the notation possibly both the domain and codomain of such functions, writing for instance L^p instead of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Further, we will use the subscript loc when dealing with functions that have some regularity only locally. For example, L_{loc}^p will denote the functions f such that $f\varphi \in L^p$ for every $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and similarly for other function spaces. Such localized spaces can be endowed with a countably family of seminorms, inducing a metric and a Fréchet topology.

We adopt the convention that the Fourier transform of an integrable function f is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(f)(n) = \widehat{f}(n) := (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{-ix \cdot n} dx,$$

and suitably extended to tempered distributions. With this notation set, we introduce both homogeneous and inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces. First, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the inhomogeneous Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of tempered distributions f such that $\widehat{f} \in L_{\text{loc}}^2$ and

$$\|f\|_{H^s}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle n \rangle^{2s} |\widehat{f}(n)|^2 dn < \infty,$$

where $\langle n \rangle := (1 + |n|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. On the other hand, the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of tempered distributions f such that $\widehat{f} \in L_{\text{loc}}^1$ and

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |n|^{2s} |\widehat{f}(n)|^2 dn < \infty.$$

We will indistinctly denote by $\langle f, g \rangle$ the scalar product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^m)$ or any duality pairing; $f * g$ will denote the convolution between f and g , whenever they have enough integrability. Let $\Lambda = |\nabla| := (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, notice that $\|f\|_{H^s} = \|(\text{Id} - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f\|_{L^2}$, while $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^2}$. For $s > 0$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$, we introduce the homogeneous Bessel potential space $\dot{L}^{s,p}$ as the space of functions f such that $\Lambda^s f \in L^p$, and we set $\|f\|_{\dot{L}^{s,p}} := \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^p}$. Given $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, r \in [1, \infty]$, $B_{p,r}^s$ will denote the nonhomogeneous Besov space as defined in [6, Definition 2.68].

In this work, the time variable will always belong to the interval $[0, T]$, for an arbitrary large but finite $T > 0$. We will use the subscripts $t \in [0, T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ to refer to functional spaces in the time

and sample variables. For example, given a Banach space E , $L_t^q E$ will denote the space $L^q([0, T]; E)$ of q -integrable functions with values in E (defined in the Bochner sense). Similarly, for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $C_t^\gamma E$ will denote γ -Hölder functions with values in E , and $L_{\omega, t}^\infty L^p = L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Notice also that, given two Banach spaces E and F , we endow their intersection $E \cap F$ with $\|\cdot\|_{E \cap F} = \|\cdot\|_E + \|\cdot\|_F$, which makes it Banach.

With $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ we will denote a filtered probability space satisfying the standard assumption. \mathbb{E} or $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}$ will stand for the expectation with respect to the probability measure \mathbb{P} . Similarly, $\text{Law}(X)$ or $\text{Law}_\mathbb{P}(X)$, will denote the law of the random variable X under \mathbb{P} .

When W is a Wiener process, $\circ dW_t$ refers formally to a stochastic integration in the Stratonovich sense. On the other hand, if \circ is missing, stochastic integrals should be intended in the Itô sense.

We say that a process X with values in a Banach space $E \hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}'$ has \mathbb{P} -a.s. weakly continuous trajectories if, for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$, the real valued process $t \mapsto \langle X_t, \varphi \rangle$ has \mathbb{P} -a.s. continuous paths.

Finally, we endow $C_t^\mathbb{N} = C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})^\mathbb{N}$ with the product topology, which makes it a Polish space. In particular, if $F = \{f^i\}_i$, $G = \{g^i\}_i$ and $F, G \in C_t^\mathbb{N}$, it is the topology induced by the distance

$$d(F, G) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-i} \frac{\|f^i - g^i\|_{C_t}}{1 + \|f^i - g^i\|_{C_t}}.$$

In other words, it is the topology induced by the convergence $F_n \rightarrow F$ if and only if $f_n^i \rightarrow f^i$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we collect all relevant facts concerning the structure of the Kraichnan noise W and the nonlinearity of the gSQG equation that we will need in order to carry our analysis. This will culminate in providing rigorous meaning to what we mean by weak solutions, cf. Definition 2.4. Most of the material contained in this section is fairly standard and recalled here for convenience; an experienced reader may consider skipping it.

2.1. Structure of the noise. Throughout the paper we will always work with a centered vector-valued Gaussian noise $W = W_t(x)$ which is Brownian in time and coloured, divergence-free in space. W is uniquely determined by its covariance function $Q : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, determined by the formula

$$\mathbb{E}[W_t(x) \otimes W_s(y)] = (s \wedge t)Q(x - y).$$

The noise will be taken homogenous (as seen from Q only depending on $x - y$) and isotropic; correspondingly, Q can be described in Fourier space by

$$Q(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} q(\xi) P_\xi^\perp e^{i\xi \cdot z} d\xi \quad \text{for} \quad P_\xi^\perp := I - \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \otimes \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$$

where we assume $q : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to be a radially symmetric function, $q \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$. P_ξ^\perp is the projection matrix on ξ^\perp , ensuring that Q and W are divergence free (alternatively, it is the Fourier multiplier representation of the Leray–Helmholtz projector).

We will soon specify q to be $q(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-d/2 - \alpha}$, which renders W the incompressible Kraichnan noise of parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. It is however useful to recall a few facts which hold in higher generality for any q as above, which we will exploit in Section 3 when considering regular approximations of W .

We may identify the matrix-valued kernel Q with the convolutional operator

$$(\mathcal{Q}\psi)(x) := (Q * f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q(x - y)\psi(y) dy \quad \forall \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

This operator is semipositive definite and admits a square root $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$, so that $\langle \mathcal{Q} * \psi, \psi \rangle = \|\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}\psi\|_{L^2}^2$.

Lemma 2.1. *The following hold:*

- 1) $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$ is a bounded operator from L^p to L^2 for any $p \in [1, 2]$;
- 2) $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$ is a bounded operator from L^2 to L^q , for any $q \in [2, \infty]$;
- 3) $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$ is a bounded operator from H^s to itself, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Notice that $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$ corresponds in Fourier space to multiplication by the matrix-valued function $h(\xi) = q(\xi)^{1/2} P_\xi^\perp$, which belongs to $L^2 \cap L^\infty$. Since h belongs to L^2 , it maps L^1 into L^2 ; since it belongs to L^∞ , it maps L^2 into itself; the general case of $p \in [1, 2]$ follows by interpolation, proving 1). 2) follows from 1) by duality, since $\mathcal{Q}^{1/2}$ is a self-adjoint operator. 3) follows again from the fact that $h \in L^\infty$. \square

For simplicity, in the following we will assume that q does not vanish anywhere, so that \mathcal{Q} is a non-degenerate operator.

Lemma 2.2. *Let W be a Gaussian noise with covariance function Q as above, defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. Let $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any smooth orthonormal system in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and set $\sigma_k := \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}(e_k)$. Then σ_k are smooth, divergence-free vector fields and it holds*

$$W_t(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_k(x) W_t^k \quad \text{for} \quad W_t^k := \langle W, \mathcal{Q}^{-1/2} e_k \rangle \quad (2.1)$$

where the series is \mathbb{P} -a.s. convergent in $C_t L_{\text{loc}}^2$ and $\{W^k\}_k$ is a collection of independent standard Brownian motions. Moreover it holds

$$Q(x - y) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_k(x) \otimes \sigma_k(y) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (2.2)$$

where the series is absolutely convergent, uniformly on compact sets. Conversely, given a collection of independent Brownian motions $\{W^k\}_k$, formula (2.1) defines a noise W with covariance Q .

Proof. The fact that σ_k are smooth follows from Lemma 2.1-3). The rest of the statement is mostly a collection of statements from [42, Section 2.1], mostly Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.5-a). \square

In particular, representation (2.1) allows to identify W with the family $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so that it can be regarded as a random variable in $C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$. On the other hand, given a probability space supporting a family of independent Brownian motions $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we can construct therein a noise W for any given covariance operator Q . We refer to the collection $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as a cylindrical Brownian motion.

Given a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$, we say that W is a \mathcal{F}_t -noise if it is adapted to \mathcal{F}_t and $W_t - W_s$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_s for any $t > s$. We next recall some useful estimates concerning stochastic integration w.r.t. W ; the result is taken from [42, Lemma 2.8].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space, W be a \mathcal{F}_t -noise with covariance function Q satisfying the above conditions. Then for any \mathcal{F}_t -adapted process $h : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ such that \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\int_0^T \|\mathcal{Q}^{1/2} h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds < \infty$, the stochastic integral $M_t := \int_0^t \langle h_s, dW_s \rangle$ is a well-defined continuous real-valued local martingale. Moreover it holds*

$$[M]_t = \int_0^t \|\mathcal{Q}^{1/2} h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |M_t|^p \right] \lesssim_p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \|\mathcal{Q}^{1/2} h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty)$$

where $[M]$ denotes the quadratic variation process associated to M . Similarly, if \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\int_0^T \|h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds < \infty$, then $N_t := \int_0^t h_s \cdot dW_s$ is a well-defined continuous L^2 -valued local martingale. Moreover it holds

$$[N]_t = \frac{\text{Tr}(Q(0))}{2} \int_0^t \|h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|N_t\|_{L^2}^p \right] \lesssim_p \text{Tr}(Q(0))^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \|h_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \quad \forall p \in [1, \infty).$$

In light of the series representation (2.1), we may write the above stochastic integrals as

$$\int_0^t \langle h_s, dW_s \rangle = \sum_k \int_0^t \langle h_s, \sigma_k \rangle dW_s^k, \quad \int_0^t h_s(x) \cdot dW_s(x) = \sum_k \int_0^t h_s(x) \cdot \sigma_k(x) dW_s^k. \quad (2.3)$$

With these preparations, we are finally ready to give an explicit description of the noise we will use. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we say that W^α is an incompressible Kraichnan noise of parameter α if its covariance function Q^α is given by

$$Q^\alpha(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-\frac{d}{2} - \alpha} P_\xi^\perp e^{i\xi \cdot z} d\xi, \quad (2.4)$$

in other words if $q(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-\frac{d}{2} - \alpha}$. In this case it can be shown that Q^α is $C^{2\alpha}$ -regular and \mathbb{P} -a.s. $W \in C_{\text{loc}}^{\alpha - \varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, but nowhere $C^{\alpha + \varepsilon}$ -regular; in particular, W is not Lipschitz continuous. Standard arguments based on isotropy (and the fact that $d = 2$) imply that

$$Q^\alpha(0) = 2c_0^\alpha I \quad \text{for} \quad c_0^\alpha = \frac{\text{Tr}(Q^\alpha(0))}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-\frac{d}{2} - \alpha} d\xi. \quad (2.5)$$

From now on, whenever the parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is fixed and clear, for simplicity we will drop it and write W , Q , c_0 in place of W^α , Q^α and c_0^α .

2.2. Properties of the nonlinearity and notion of weak solutions. Having described in detail the noise W and stochastic integrals with respect to it, we can pass to define rigorously the SPDE (2.9) and provide a notion of weak solutions.

To this end, we first need to recall some properties of the nonlinear term in the SPDE. By formula (1.2), we may write the quadratic nonlinearity in (1.3) as

$$\mathcal{N}(\theta) = \nabla \cdot [(K_\beta * \theta) \theta] \quad (2.6)$$

Notice that, being a Fourier multiplier with symbol $-\nabla^\perp |\nabla|^{\beta-2}$, K_β maps L^p into $\dot{L}^{1-\beta, p}$, for any $p \in (1, \infty)$. In particular, if $p < 2/(1 - \beta)$, then by Sobolev embeddings

$$K_\beta * \theta \in L^q \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1 - \beta}{2}$$

and so by Hölder's inequality

$$(K_\beta * \theta) \theta \in L^r \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{2}{p} - \frac{1 - \beta}{2}, \quad \|(K_\beta * \theta) \theta\|_{L^r} \lesssim_{\beta, p} \|\theta\|_{L^p}^2. \quad (2.7)$$

Combining these facts, we can conclude that $(K_\beta * \theta) \theta$ is a well-defined L^1_{loc} function (and thus $\mathcal{N}(\theta)$ is a well-defined distribution) as soon as

$$\theta \in L^p \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{4}{3 - \beta} \leq p < \frac{2}{1 - \beta}. \quad (2.8)$$

In particular, this condition is always satisfied if $\theta \in L^1 \cap L^p$ with $p \geq 4/(3 - \beta)$.

Next, we need to spend a few words about the Stratonovich formulation of the SPDE (1.3) and its Itô reformulation. Although the Stratonovich formalism is the more correct one from the physical point of view, being related to the Wong–Zakai principle and the Lagrangian representation of solutions, when dealing with low regularity solutions it is very convenient to rewrite the equation in Itô form. As standard in stochastic fluid dynamics equations, we will derive the Itô version of the SPDE from the Stratonovich one as if all terms involved were regular enough, and then work systematically in Itô form. Rigorously defining the Stratonovich form of the equation can be a delicate issue, see [42, Section 2.2] and [46, Section 2.3] for a deeper discussion.

Therefore assume for the moment we are given a regular solution to (1.3). With the notations (2.6)–(2.3) in mind, applying the standard rules of stochastic calculus to pass from Stratonovich to Itô, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} d\theta_t(x) + \mathcal{N}(\theta_t)(x) dt &= - \sum_k \sigma_k(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_t(x) \circ dW_t^k \\ &= - \sum_k \sigma_k(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_t(x) \circ dW_t^k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sigma_k(x) \cdot \nabla (\sigma_k(x) \cdot \nabla \theta_t(x)) dt \\ &= - \nabla \theta_t(x) \cdot dW_t(x) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot \left(\sum_k \sigma_k(x) \otimes \sigma_k(x) \nabla \theta_t(x) \right) dt \\ &= - \nabla \theta_t(x) \cdot dW_t(x) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (Q(0) \nabla \theta_t(x)) dt \\ &= - \nabla \theta_t(x) \cdot dW_t(x) + c_0 \Delta \theta_t(x) dt; \end{aligned}$$

in the above, we used the fact that σ_k are divergence-free, Q admits representation (2.2) and finally our definition of c_0 from (2.5).

In light of the above, the previous estimates on \mathcal{N} and the content of Section 2.1, we can now rigorously define weak solutions (both in the analytical and probabilistic sense) to the stochastic gSQG equations as follows.

Definition 2.4. Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, Q^α be given by (2.4) and $\{\sigma_k\}_k$ be any collection of smooth divergence free velocity fields such that (2.2) holds. Let $p \geq 4/(3 - \beta)$, $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ and $f \in L^1_t(L^1 \cap L^p)$ be deterministic data. A weak $L^1 \cap L^p$ solution to the stochastic gSQG equation

$$d\theta_t + (K_\beta * \theta_t) \cdot \nabla \theta_t dt + \circ dW_t \cdot \nabla \theta_t = f_t dt, \quad \theta|_{t=0} = \theta_0 \quad (2.9)$$

is a tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \theta)$ satisfying the following:

- i) $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ is a filtered probability space satisfying the standard assumptions and $(W^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent real \mathcal{F}_t -Brownian motions;
- ii) $\theta : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow L^1 \cap L^p$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -progressively measurable process, $\theta \in L^2_{\omega, t}(L^1 \cap L^p)$ and its trajectories $t \mapsto \theta_t$ are \mathbb{P} -a.s. weakly continuous in the sense of distributions;
- iii) For any $\psi \in C_c^\infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds

$$\langle \theta_t, \psi \rangle = \langle \theta_0, \psi \rangle + \int_0^t [\langle (K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r, \nabla \psi \rangle + c_0 \langle \theta_r, \Delta \psi \rangle + \langle f_r, \psi \rangle] dr + \sum_k \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k \theta_r, \nabla \psi_r \rangle dW_r^k \quad (2.10)$$

We sometimes say that θ is a weak solution on a tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k)$ if $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k, \theta)$ is a weak solution.

Remark 2.5. Under the above assumptions, all integrals appearing on the r.h.s. of (2.10) are well-defined continuous stochastic processes. For instance, for the nonlinear term, thanks to (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T | \langle (K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r, \nabla \psi \rangle | dr \right] &\leq \| \nabla \psi \|_{L^\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| (K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r \|_{L^1} dr \right] \\ &\lesssim \| \nabla \psi \|_{L^\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| \theta_r \|_{L^{\frac{4}{3-\beta}}}^2 dr \right] = \| \nabla \psi \|_{L^\infty} \| \theta \|_{L^2_{\omega, t} L^{\frac{4}{3-\beta}}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last quantity is finite since $\theta \in L^2_{\omega, t}(L^1 \cap L^p)$ with $p \geq 4/(3 - \beta)$. The terms related to $c_0 \Delta$ and f can be estimated similarly. For the stochastic integral in (2.10), recalling our convention (2.3) and Lemma 2.3, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \langle \theta_r \nabla \varphi, dW_r \rangle \right|^2 \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}(\theta_r \nabla \varphi) \|_{L^2}^2 dr \right] \\ &\lesssim \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^\infty}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| \theta_r \|_{L^1}^2 dr \right] = \| \nabla \varphi \|_{L^\infty}^2 \| \theta \|_{L^2_{\omega, t} L^1}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 2.1-i). As these computations suggest, Definition 2.4 admits several variants, for instance by considering solutions defined only up to a stopping time τ , or by weakening the integrability on θ to just requiring that \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\int_0^T \| \theta_r \|_{L^{\frac{4}{3-\beta}}}^2 dr < \infty$. For simplicity we will not pursue this direction, since the transport structure of the equation and the upcoming Theorem 3.1 provide us with weak solutions satisfying much better a priori bounds.

Remark 2.6. In the setting of Definition 2.4, if additionally $p \geq 2$, then the weak formulation (2.10) based on testing against $\psi \in C_c^\infty$ can be equivalently understood as an integral identity

$$\theta_t = \theta_0 + \int_0^t \nabla \cdot [(K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r] dr + c_0 \int_0^t \Delta \theta_r dr + \int_0^t f_r dr + \int_0^t \nabla \theta_r \cdot dW_r \quad (2.11)$$

where all processes involved take values in H^{-2} . In particular, the first three integrals are meaningful in the Lebesgue–Bochner sense, while the last one as a stochastic integral in H^{-1} . Indeed, for the nonlinear term, by (2.7) and Sobolev embeddings it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| \nabla \cdot [(K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r] \|_{H^{-2}} dr \right] \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \| (K_\beta * \theta_r) \theta_r \|_{L^{\frac{2}{1+\beta}}} dr \right] \lesssim \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [\| \theta_r \|_{L^2}^2] dr;$$

the terms associated to $\Delta\theta$, f can be treated similarly. For the stochastic integral, using the fact that W is divergence-free and Lemma 2.3, it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \nabla \cdot \left(\int_0^t \theta_r \, dW_r \right) \right\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \int_0^t \theta_r \, dW_r \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right] \lesssim \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [\|\theta_r\|_{L^2}^2] \, dr.$$

3. WEAK EXISTENCE

The aim of this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $p \in [2, \infty]$, $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$, $f \in L_t^1(L^1 \cap L^p)$ be deterministic data. Then there exists a weak solution θ to (2.9), in the sense of Definition 2.4. Moreover \mathbb{P} -a.s. θ has weakly continuous trajectories in L^2 and it satisfies the pathwise bound*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t\|_{L^q} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_t\|_{L^q} \, dt \quad \forall q \in [1, p]. \quad (3.1)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Then such a weak solution can be constructed in such a way that it satisfies the following decomposition: $\theta = \theta^< + \theta^>$, where θ^{\leq} are \mathcal{F}_t -adapted processes with trajectories in $C_t H^{-2}$, such that we have the \mathbb{P} -a.s. bounds

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta^>\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta^<\|_{L^q} \leq C_q \quad \forall q \in [\check{p}, \infty] \quad (3.2)$$

where C_q is a deterministic constant which depends on q , θ_0 , f and ε , but not on the weak solution.

This result will be proved by a standard stochastic compactness argument. To this end, we will first introduce a family of regularized equations and derive a priori estimates in Section 3.1, then deduce tightness and pass to the limit in Section 3.2.

3.1. Regular approximations and tightness. We set ourselves on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ satisfying the standard assumptions, carrying a family $(W^k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent Brownian motions. Correspondingly, we can construct on such space a noise W with covariance Q by means of formula (2.1). Let $\{\rho^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$ be a family of standard mollifiers associated to a radially symmetric probability density $\rho \in C_c^\infty$; we proceed to mollify all the terms of the SPDE (2.9), namely we set

$$\theta_0^\delta := \rho^\delta * \theta_0, \quad f_t^\delta := \rho^\delta * f, \quad K_\beta^\delta := \rho^\delta * K_\beta, \quad W_t^\delta := \rho^\delta * W_t = \sum_k (\rho^\delta * \sigma_k) W_t^k =: \sum_k \sigma_k^\delta W_t^k.$$

Notice that, by construction, the noise W^δ has covariance operator

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\delta(x - y) &= \sum_k \sigma_k^\delta(x) \otimes \sigma_k^\delta(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_k(x - z) \otimes \sigma_k(y - z') \rho^\delta(z) \rho^\delta(z') \, dz \, dz' \\ &= (Q * \rho^\delta * \rho^\delta)(x - y) = (Q * (\rho * \rho)^\delta)(x - y) \end{aligned}$$

where $(\rho * \rho)^\delta = \delta^{-2}(\rho * \rho)(\delta^{-1} \cdot)$. In particular, Q^δ is still a mollification of Q , associated to the probability density $\rho * \rho \in C_c^\infty$. Correspondingly, the noise W^δ is infinitely smooth in space, since W belongs to $C_t L_{\text{loc}}^2$.

With these preparations, for any $\delta > 0$, we introduce the regularized stochastic gSQG model given by

$$d\theta^\delta + (K_\beta^\delta * \theta^\delta) \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta \, dt + \sum_k \sigma_k^\delta \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta \circ dW^k = f^\delta \, dt, \quad \theta^\delta|_{t=0} = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

We have the following lemma providing existence and a priori bounds for (3.3).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$, $f \in L_t^1(L^1 \cap L^p)$. Then for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a probabilistically strong, spatially smooth solution θ^δ to (3.3); moreover \mathbb{P} -a.s. it holds*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^q} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_t\|_{L^q} \, dt \quad \forall q \in [1, p]. \quad (3.4)$$

Additionally, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the solutions θ^δ can be decomposed as $\theta^\delta = \theta^{\delta, >} + \theta^{\delta, <}$ in such a way that, for any $\delta > 0$ fixed, \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\theta^{\delta, <} \in L_t^\infty(L^p \cap L^\infty)$ and we have the bounds

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\theta^{\delta, >}\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|\theta^{\delta, <}\|_{L^q} \leq C_q \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty]$$

where C_q is a deterministic constant which depends only on θ_0 , f and ε , but not on δ .

Proof. By construction, θ_0^δ and f^δ are spatially smooth, and moreover K_β^δ is a smooth kernel. For these reasons, strong existence of a smooth solution to (3.3) holds by standard arguments, e.g. by adopting Kunita's approach [63, Section 6] or by performing a similar contraction argument as in [22], further generalised in [23, Appendix C] (and then bootstrapping regularity).

By employing either of the above references, one ends up obtaining a representation formula for θ^δ through stochastic characteristics as

$$\theta_t^\delta(X_t(x)) = \theta_0^\delta(x) + \int_0^t f_s^\delta(X_s(x)) ds, \quad (3.5)$$

where X is the stochastic flow associated to the SDE

$$dX_t = u^\delta(X_t) dt + W^\delta(\circ dt, X_t) =: (K_\beta^\delta * \theta_t^\delta)(X_t) dt + \sum_k \sigma^\delta(X_t) \circ dW_t^k;$$

notice that, since u^δ and W^δ are smooth and divergence-free, the stochastic flow X leaves the Lebesgue measure invariant. As a consequence, taking the L^q -norm on both side of (3.5) and applying Minkowski's inequality, we obtain the \mathbb{P} -a.s. estimate

$$\|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^q} \leq \|\theta_0^\delta\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_s^\delta\|_{L^q} ds \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_s\|_{L^q} ds$$

where in the second step we used the property of standard mollifiers that $\|\rho^\delta * g\|_{L^q} \leq \|g\|_{L^q}$ for any g . This proves (3.4).

It remains to show the decomposition property into $\theta^{\delta, >} + \theta^{\delta, <}$. For a parameter $R > 0$ large enough to be chosen later, let us set

$$\theta_0^{\delta, >R} := \theta_0^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|\theta^\delta| > R}, \quad \theta_0^{\delta, \leq R} := \theta_0^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|\theta^\delta| \leq R}, \quad f^{\delta, >R} := f^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|f^\delta| > R}, \quad f^{\delta, \leq R} := f^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|f^\delta| \leq R};$$

and correspondingly let us define $\theta^{\delta, >R}$ and $\theta^{\delta, \leq R}$ implicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t^{\delta, >R}(X_t(x)) &= \theta_0^{\delta, >R}(x) + \int_0^t f_s^{\delta, >R}(X_s(x)) ds, \\ \theta_t^{\delta, \leq R}(X_t(x)) &= \theta_0^{\delta, \leq R}(x) + \int_0^t f_s^{\delta, \leq R}(X_s(x)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

In light of (3.5), it is clear that $\theta^\delta = \theta^{\delta, >R} + \theta^{\delta, \leq R}$. Notice that, by properties of mollifiers, it holds $\theta_0^\delta \rightarrow \theta_0$ in L^p and $f^\delta \rightarrow f$ in $L_t^1 L^p$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. As a consequence, we can invoke Lemma A.3 and repeat the argument used to derive (3.4), to find the \mathbb{P} -a.s. estimates

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta^{\delta, >R}\|_{L^p} \leq \sup_{\delta > 0} \|\theta_0^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|\theta^\delta| > R}\|_{L^p} + \sup_{\delta > 0} \int_0^T \|f_s^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|f^\delta| > R}\|_{L^p} ds \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta^{\delta, \leq R}\|_{L^q} &\leq \|\theta_0^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|\theta^\delta| \leq R}\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_s^\delta \mathbb{1}_{|f^\delta| \leq R}\|_{L^q} ds \\ &\lesssim_T R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \left(\|\theta_0^\delta\|_{L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} + \int_0^T \|f_s^\delta\|_{L^p} ds \right) \leq R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} + \int_0^T \|f_s\|_{L^p} ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By Lemma A.3, we can choose R such that the r.h.s. of (3.6) becomes arbitrarily small, in particular, smaller than ε . Having fixed such R , the constant C_q is then determined by the r.h.s. of (3.7). \square

We now want to obtain uniform-in- δ estimates for the time continuity of the solutions θ^δ , possibly in weak topologies. To this end, rather than working with (3.3), it is convenient to pass to consider its equivalent Itô formulation; arguing as in Section 2.2, this is given by

$$d\theta^\delta + (K_\beta^\delta * \theta^\delta) \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta dt - c_\delta \Delta \theta^\delta + \sum_k \sigma_k^\delta \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta dW^k = f^\delta dt, \quad \theta^\delta|_{t=0} = \theta_0^\delta. \quad (3.8)$$

where $c_\delta = \text{Tr}(Q^\delta(0))/4$. Recalling that Q is a bounded, Hölder continuous function and that Q^δ is a mollified approximation, it follows from (2.5) that

$$\sup_{\delta>0} c_\delta \lesssim \|Q\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} c_\delta = c_0 = \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(Q(0)). \quad (3.9)$$

In order to establish uniform bounds for (3.8), it is useful to collect here a few properties of the (mollified) nonlinearity of the PDE; for simplicity, we already state here also a convergence property as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, which will be used later in Section 3.2 when passing to the limit. Notice that, since K_β and σ are divergence-free (thus also K_β^δ and σ^δ), we have

$$(K_\beta^\delta * \theta^\delta) \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta = \text{div}[(K_\beta^\delta * \varphi)\varphi], \quad \sigma^\delta \cdot \nabla \theta^\delta = \text{div}(\sigma^\delta \varphi).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$. For $\delta \geq 0$, define*

$$\mathcal{N}^\delta(\varphi) := \text{div}[(K_\beta^\delta * \varphi)\varphi], \quad \mathcal{N}(\varphi) = \mathcal{N}^0(\varphi) := \text{div}[(K_\beta * \varphi)\varphi]. \quad (3.10)$$

Then the following hold:

- i) *There exists a constant $C = C_\beta > 0$ such that $\sup_{\delta \geq 0} \|\mathcal{N}^\delta(\varphi)\|_{H^{-1-\beta}} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2$.*
- ii) *If $(\varphi^\delta)_{\delta>0} \subset L^2$ is such that $\varphi^\delta \rightharpoonup \varphi$ weakly in L^2 , then $\mathcal{N}^\delta(\varphi^\delta) \rightharpoonup \mathcal{N}(\varphi)$ weakly in $H^{-1-\beta}$.*

Proof. i): By similar estimates as in (2.8), if $\varphi \in L^2$ then $K_\beta^\delta * \varphi \in L^{2/\beta}$ with

$$\sup_{\delta \geq 0} \|K_\beta^\delta * \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta}}} = \sup_{\delta \geq 0} \|\rho^\delta * (K_\beta * \varphi)\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta}}} \leq \|K_\beta * \varphi\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta}}} \lesssim \|K_\beta * \varphi\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\beta}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^2}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, we deduce that

$$\sup_{\delta \geq 0} \|(K_\beta^\delta * \varphi)\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta+1}}} \leq \sup_{\delta \geq 0} \|(K_\beta^\delta * \varphi)\|_{L^{\frac{2}{\beta}}} \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The conclusion now follows from $\|\nabla \cdot g\|_{H^{-1-\beta}} \leq \|g\|_{H^{-\beta}}$ and the embedding $L^{\frac{2}{1+\beta}} \hookrightarrow H^{-\beta}$.

ii): By i), the sequence $\mathcal{N}^\delta(\varphi^\delta)$ is bounded in $H^{-1-\beta}$, so in order to verify weak convergence it suffices to test against smooth functions; namely, we need to show that

$$\langle (K_\beta^\delta * \varphi^\delta) \cdot \nabla \psi, \varphi^\delta \rangle \rightarrow \langle (K_\beta * \varphi) \cdot \nabla \psi, \varphi \rangle \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty.$$

By the assumption $\varphi^\delta \rightharpoonup \varphi$ and weak-strong convergence, it suffices to show that $K_\beta^\delta * \varphi^\delta \rightarrow K_\beta * \varphi$ in L^2_{loc} . We now split this term as

$$K_\beta^\delta * \varphi^\delta - K_\beta * \varphi = (\rho^\delta - \delta_0) * (K_\beta * \varphi) + \rho^\delta * (K_\beta * \varphi^\delta - K_\beta * \varphi).$$

The first term converges to 0 in $L^{2/\beta}$, thus also in L^2_{loc} , by standard properties of mollifiers. For the second term, we can use the compactness of the operator $g \mapsto K_\beta * g$ from L^2 to L^2_{loc} (due to compact embedding $H^{1-\beta}(B_R) \hookrightarrow L^2(B_R)$ on bounded balls B_R) and our standing assumption $\varphi^\delta \rightharpoonup \varphi$, to deduce that $K_\beta * \varphi^\delta \rightarrow K_\beta * \varphi$ in L^2_{loc} . This convergence is then preserved by the mollifier ρ^δ . \square

Armed with Lemma 3.3, we can now establish Hölder continuity of the solutions to the regularized model.

Lemma 3.4. *Let θ^δ be a solution to (3.3) and set $v_t^\delta := \theta_t^\delta - \int_0^t f_s^\delta ds$. Then, for any $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\eta \in [2, \infty)$, there exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, \eta, \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}, \|f\|_{L^1_t(L^1 \cap L^2)})$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|v^\delta\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-2}}^\eta] \leq C \quad \forall \delta > 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. Let us keep using the notation (3.10). By writing (3.8) in integral form, we have

$$v_t^\delta - \theta_0^\delta = \int_0^t \mathcal{N}^\delta(\theta_s) ds - c_\delta \int_0^t \Delta \theta_s^\delta ds + \int_0^t \nabla \theta_s^\delta \cdot dW_s^\delta =: S_t^1 + S_t^2 + S_t^3.$$

We estimate each term separately. For the nonlinear term, thanks to the uniform estimate (3.4) and Lemma 3.3-i), we have the pathwise bound

$$\|S_t^1 - S_s^1\|_{H^{-1-\beta}} \leq \int_s^t \|\mathcal{N}^\delta(\theta_r^\delta)\|_{H^{-1-\beta}} dr \leq |t-s| \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^2}^2$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|S^1\|_{W_t^{1, \infty} H^{-1-\beta}}^\eta \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^2}^{2\eta} \right] \lesssim \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T \|f_t\|_{L^2} dt \right)^{2\eta}. \quad (3.12)$$

For S_2 we can follow a similar argument, using the fact that $c_\delta = \text{Tr}(Q^\delta(0))$ are uniformly bounded by (3.9) and that $\|\Delta g\|_{H^{-2}} \leq \|g\|_{L^2}$ for any g . As a consequence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|S^2\|_{W_t^{1, \infty} H^{-2}}^\eta \right] \leq \left(\sup_{\delta > 0} c_\delta^\eta \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^2}^\eta \right] \lesssim \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T \|f_t\|_{L^2} dt \right)^\eta. \quad (3.13)$$

It remains to handle the stochastic integral term. Let us preliminary observe that, since W^δ is divergence free, $S_t^3 = \nabla \cdot \left(\int_0^t \theta_s^\delta dW_s^\delta \right) =: \nabla \cdot \tilde{S}_t^3$. By virtue of Lemma 2.3 and the uniform estimate (3.4), for any $s \leq t$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|S_t^3 - S_s^3\|_{H^{-1}}^\eta \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{S}_t^3 - \tilde{S}_s^3\|_{L^2}^\eta \right] \lesssim (c_\delta)^{\eta/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_s^t \|\theta_r^\delta\|_{L^2}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{\eta}{2}} \right] \\ &\lesssim |t-s|^{\eta/2} \left(\sup_{\delta > 0} c_\delta^{\eta/2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta_t^\delta\|_{L^2}^\eta \right] \\ &\lesssim |t-s|^{\eta/2} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T \|f_t\|_{L^2} dt \right)^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of $\eta \in [2, \infty)$ and Kolmogorov's continuity theorem in Banach spaces, we deduce that for any $\gamma < 1/2$ and any $\eta \in [2, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|S^3\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-1}}^\eta \right] \lesssim_{\gamma, \eta} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T \|f_t\|_{L^2} dt \right)^\eta. \quad (3.14)$$

Combining the bounds (3.12), (3.13) and (3.14), which are all uniform in δ , we obtain (3.11). \square

For the sake of showing tightness of the laws of the processes θ^δ and u^δ , we introduce suitable weighted Sobolev spaces, in order to overcome the difficulties coming from working on the whole \mathbb{R}^2 . Let us define the weight $w(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{-2}$; correspondingly, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the weighted Sobolev space H_w^s as the closure of smooth functions under the norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{H_w^s} := \|\varphi w\|_{H^s},$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. H_w^s defines an Hilbert space; properties of H_w^s are recalled in Appendix A.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $T \in (0, +\infty)$, $\gamma > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we have the compact embedding*

$$L^\infty([0, T]; L^2) \cap C^\gamma([0, T]; H^{-2}) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H_w^{-\varepsilon}).$$

Proof. By Lemma A.4-ii), the embedding $H^{-2} \hookrightarrow H_w^{-2-\varepsilon}$ is compact, which implies by Ascoli–Arzelà that the embedding $C^\gamma([0, T]; H^{-2}) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H_w^{-2-\varepsilon})$ is compact as well. On the other hand, since $L^2 \hookrightarrow H_w^0$ by Lemma A.4-i), we have the interpolation estimate

$$\|\varphi\|_{C([0, T]; H^{-\varepsilon})} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; L^2)}^{2/(2+\varepsilon)} \|\varphi\|_{C([0, T]; H^{-2-\varepsilon})}^{\varepsilon/(2+\varepsilon)}$$

as a consequence of Lemma A.4-iv). Combining these facts, we obtain the conclusion. \square

As a consequence of Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the laws of $(\theta^\delta, (W^k)_{k \geq 1})_{\delta > 0}$ are tight in $C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon} \times C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $(W^k)_{k \geq 1}$ is tight in $C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$ since it doesn't depend on δ , so we only need to verify tightness of $\{\theta^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$. Recall that $\theta^\delta = v^\delta + \int_0^\cdot f_s^\delta ds$; by construction, $f^\delta \rightarrow f$ in $L_t^1 L_x^2$, therefore $\int_0^\cdot f_s^\delta ds \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot f_s ds$ in $C_t L^2 \hookrightarrow C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon}$. Since they converge therein, the functions $\{\int_0^\cdot f_s^\delta ds\}_{\delta > 0}$ are tight in $C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, a combination of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4 yields

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v^\delta\|_{L_t^\infty L^2}^2 + \|v^\delta\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-2}}^2 \right] < \infty$$

for any $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$. Together with Markov's inequality and Lemma 3.5, this implies tightness of $\{v^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$ in $C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon}$. Combining the results for $\int_0^\cdot f_s^\delta ds$ and v^δ , we deduce tightness of $\{\theta^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$ in $C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon}$ as well. \square

3.2. Passage to the limit and weak existence. With the preparations from the previous section, we are now ready to complete the

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Given $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ and $f \in L_t^1(L^1 \cap L^p)$, consider the sequence of solutions $\{\theta^n\}_n$ obtained by taking $\delta = 1/n$ in the regularization scheme from Section 3.1. By Corollary 3.6, $(\theta^n, (W^k)_k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are tight in $C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon} \times C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$. Therefore we can invoke Prokhorov's and Skorokhod's theorems [10, Theorems 5.1 and 6.7] to find a new probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ supporting a (not relabelled for simplicity) subsequence of random variables $\{\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_k\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta^n, (W^k)_{k \geq 1}) = \text{Law}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}(\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_{k \geq 1})$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and with the property that there exists another pair $(\tilde{\theta}, (\tilde{W}^k)_{k \geq 1})$ such that

$$(\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_k) \rightarrow (\tilde{\theta}, (\tilde{W}^k)_k) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s. in } C_t H_w^{-\varepsilon} \times C_t^{\mathbb{N}}. \quad (3.15)$$

We claim that $(\tilde{\theta}, (\tilde{W}^k)_k)$ is the desired weak solution, w.r.t. the filtration $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}_r, \tilde{W}_r^k : k \in \mathbb{N}, r \leq t)$.

We start by noticing that, since $\text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta^n, (W^k)_k) = \text{Law}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}(\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_k)$, by (3.4) we still have the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. bound

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\theta}_t^n\|_{L^q} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_t\|_{L^q} dt \quad \forall q \in [1, p]. \quad (3.16)$$

Combining this with (3.15), lower-semicontinuity of L^q -norms, it's easy to deduce (cf. [35, Lemma 3.5]) that $\tilde{\theta} \in L_{\omega, t}^\infty(L^1 \cap L^p)$, the trajectories $t \mapsto \tilde{\theta}_t$ are $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. weakly continuous in L^q for any $q \in (1, p]$, and the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. convergence

$$\tilde{\theta}_t^n \rightharpoonup \tilde{\theta}_t \text{ in } L^2 \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.17)$$

Again by lower-semicontinuity, this implies the validity of the bound (3.16) with $\tilde{\theta}$ in place of $\tilde{\theta}^n$, proving (3.1).

Since $(\theta^n, (W^k)_k)$ are strong solutions, the same holds for $(\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_k)$; therefore for any fixed n , $(\tilde{W}^{k,n})_k$ are $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t^n$ -Brownian motions, for $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t^n := \sigma(\tilde{\theta}_r^n, \tilde{W}_r^{k,n} : k \in \mathbb{N}, r \leq t)$. In light of (3.15), a standard argument then implies that $(\tilde{W}^k)_k$ is a family of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ -Brownian motions, for $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ defined as above.

We now want to pass to the limit in the SPDE as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, it is convenient to write (3.8) in integral form and tested against $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$, namely

$$\langle \tilde{\theta}_t^n, \varphi \rangle = \langle \theta_0^n, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{N}^n(\tilde{\theta}_s^n), \varphi \rangle ds + c_n \int_0^t \langle \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \Delta \varphi \rangle ds + \sum_k \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla \varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^{k,n} + \int_0^t f_s^n ds; \quad (3.18)$$

in the above, for notational convenience we replaced all parameters δ with n , although technically $\delta = 1/n$; the notation \mathcal{N}^n for the nonlinearities must be interpreted as in Lemma 3.3.

By construction, $\theta_0^n \rightarrow \theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ and $\int_0^\cdot f_s^n ds \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot f_s ds$ in $C_t(L^1 \cap L^p)$. For the nonlinearities, by 3.3-ii) and (3.17) we have the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. convergence $\mathcal{N}^n(\tilde{\theta}_s^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\theta}_s)$ for all $s \in [0, T]$, which combined with the uniform bounds (3.16) and dominated convergence immediately implies

$$\int_0^\cdot \langle \mathcal{N}^n(\tilde{\theta}_s^n), \varphi \rangle ds \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot \langle \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\theta}_s), \varphi \rangle ds \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s. in } C_t$$

A same argument holds for the term associated to $\Delta\varphi$, which together with convergence $c_n \rightarrow c_0$ (cf. (3.9)) implies

$$c_n \int_0^\cdot \langle \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \Delta\varphi \rangle ds \rightarrow c_0 \int_0^\cdot \langle \tilde{\theta}_s, \Delta\varphi \rangle ds \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s. in } C_t.$$

Convergence of the stochastic integral terms can also be treated standardly, cf. [5, Lemma 4.3]. Alternatively, one can check convergence by hand: thanks to the convergences (3.15)-(3.17), as well as $\sigma_k^n \rightarrow \sigma_k$, one can employ [50, Lemma 5.2] to deduce that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$

$$\int_0^\cdot \langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^{k,n} \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot \langle \sigma_k \tilde{\theta}_s, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^k \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s. in } C_t \quad (3.19)$$

for any fixed k . On the other hand, the tail of the series can be made arbitrarily small; indeed, if $\text{supp}\varphi \subset B_R$, then by Itô isometry and Doob's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \sum_{k \geq N} \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^{k,n} \right|^2 \right] &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq N} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\int_0^T |\langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla\varphi \rangle|^2 ds \right] \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^\infty}^2 \sum_{k \geq N} \int_0^T \tilde{\mathbb{E}} [\|\sigma_k^n\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 \|\tilde{\theta}_s^n\|_{L^2}^2] ds \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^\infty}^2 T \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T \|f_s\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right) \sum_{k \geq N} \|\sigma_k\|_{L^2(B_{R+1})}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used bound (3.16) and the fact that, for each k , $\|\sigma_k^n\|_{L^2(B_R)} \leq \|\sigma_k\|_{L^2(B_{R+1})}$ by properties of mollifiers. Recalling that the series (2.2) is absolutely convergent on compact sets by Lemma 2.2, we conclude that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \sum_{k \geq N} \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^{k,n} \right|^2 \right] = 0; \quad (3.20)$$

a similar estimates holds for the series of stochastic integrals taken w.r.t. $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{W}^k)$. Thanks to (3.19) and (3.20), overall one can conclude that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^\cdot \langle \sigma_k^n \tilde{\theta}_s^n, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^{k,n} \rightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^\cdot \langle \sigma_k \tilde{\theta}_s, \nabla\varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^k \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. in } C_t.$$

Combining the convergence of each term appearing in (3.18), passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.18), we conclude that for any fixed $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$ it holds

$$\langle \tilde{\theta}_t, \varphi \rangle = \langle \theta_0, \varphi \rangle - \int_0^\cdot \langle \nabla \cdot (K_\beta * \tilde{\theta}_s) \tilde{\theta}_s, \varphi \rangle ds + c_0 \int_0^\cdot \langle \Delta \tilde{\theta}_s, \varphi \rangle ds - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^\cdot \langle \sigma_k \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_s, \varphi \rangle d\tilde{W}_s^k.$$

Choosing a countable collections $\{\varphi^j\}_j$ which is dense in H^2 , by standard density arguments we can deduce that (2.10) holds, so that $\tilde{\theta}$ is a weak solution. Finally notice that, by virtue of Remark 2.6, $\tilde{\theta}$ equivalently solves the SPDE in the integral form (2.11) on H^{-2} , without testing against φ .

It remains to show that, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, the above construction can be performed so to obtain the desired decomposition $\tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}^< + \tilde{\theta}^>$ satisfying (3.2). Since $\text{Law}_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta^n, (W^k)_{k \geq 1}) = \text{Law}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}(\tilde{\theta}^n, (\tilde{W}^{k,n})_{k \geq 1})$, by Lemma 3.2 there is a decomposition $\tilde{\theta}^n = \tilde{\theta}^{n,<} + \tilde{\theta}^{n,>}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$ it holds

$$\sup_{n, t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\theta}^{n,>}\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \sup_{n, t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\theta}^{n,<}\|_{L^q} \leq C_q \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty]. \quad (3.21)$$

In fact, by the construction performed in Lemma 3.2, $\tilde{\theta}^{n,\leq}$ are actually solutions to the SPDEs

$$d\tilde{\theta}_t^{n,\leq} + (K_\beta^\delta * \tilde{\theta}_t^{n,\leq}) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_t^{n,\leq} dt - c_n \Delta \tilde{\theta}_t^{n,\leq} + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_k^n \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_t^{n,\leq} d\tilde{W}_t^{k,n} = f_t^{n,\leq} dt, \quad \tilde{\theta}^{n,\leq}|_{t=0} = \tilde{\theta}_0^{n,\leq}. \quad (3.22)$$

Arguing as in Lemma 3.4 it's then easy to check that $\tilde{v}^{n,\leq} = \tilde{\theta}^{n,\leq} - \int_0^t f_s^{n,\leq} ds$ still enjoy the bounds

$$\sup_n \tilde{\mathbb{E}}[\|v^{n,\leq}\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-2}}^\eta] \lesssim_{\gamma,\eta} 1 \quad (3.23)$$

for any $\gamma < 1/2$ and $\eta \in [1, \infty)$. By arguing as in the proof above, up to possibly further refining the subsequence or the probability space, one can pass to the limit in (3.22) to conclude that $\tilde{\theta}^{\leq}$ satisfy the SPDEs

$$d\tilde{\theta}_t^{\leq} + (K_\beta^\delta * \tilde{\theta}_t) \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_t^{\leq} dt - c_0 \Delta \tilde{\theta}_t^{\leq} + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_k \cdot \nabla \tilde{\theta}_t^{\leq} d\tilde{W}_t^k = f_t^{\leq} dt, \quad \tilde{\theta}^{\leq}|_{t=0} = \tilde{\theta}_0^{\leq} \quad (3.24)$$

and moreover $\tilde{v}^{\leq} := \tilde{\theta}^{\leq} - \int_0^t f_s^{\leq} ds$ still belong to $C_t^\gamma H^{-2}$ with estimates of the form (3.23). This implies as before that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. $\tilde{\theta}^{\leq}$ have weakly continuous trajectories in L^2 (in fact, by interpolation $\tilde{v}^{\leq} \in C_t^\gamma H^{-\varepsilon}$) and that one can pass to the limit in (3.21) by weak-lower semicontinuity to find (3.2).

Finally observe that, since $(\tilde{\theta}^n, \tilde{\theta}^{n,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{n,>})$ is adapted to the filtration generated by $(\tilde{W}^{n,k})_k$, then by the usual standard arguments, upon passing to the limit in n , one can deduce that the tuple $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\theta}^<, \tilde{\theta}^>, (\tilde{W}^k)_k)$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{G}'_t = \sigma(\tilde{\theta}_r, \tilde{\theta}_r^<, \tilde{\theta}_r^>, \tilde{W}_r^k : k \in \mathbb{N}, r \leq t)$ and $(\tilde{W}^k)_k$ are \mathcal{G}'_t -Brownian motions. Overall this proves the existence of an adapted decomposition satisfying (3.2). \square

Remark 3.7. For simplicity, we only proved weak existence for $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^2$. Let us also point out that in the proof, the rough Kraichnan structure of the noise didn't play any role, and the same result would be true for regular, divergence free W . It is clear that the result can be generalised for other classes of initial data θ_0 , up to technical details. For instance, one can easily readapt the argument to treat $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ with $p = 4/(3 - \beta)$, since by the estimates leading up to (2.8) the nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}(\theta) = (K_\beta * \theta)\theta$ is a well-defined L^1 function in that case. In light of the result of Marchand [68] for deterministic SQG and those from [59], we expect weak existence to hold for an even larger class of θ_0 , possibly depending on the roughness of W ; we leave this question for future investigations.

4. UNIQUENESS AND STABILITY

The main goal of this section is to prove the following uniqueness and stability result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let α, β and p satisfy*

$$0 < \frac{\beta}{2} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{\beta}{2} + \alpha \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p}, \quad 2 \leq p < \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

Let θ^1, θ^2 be two weak solutions on $[0, T]$, in the sense of Definition 2.4, defined on the same tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k)$, with initial conditions $\theta_0^1, \theta_0^2 \in L^1 \cap L^p$ and forcing terms $f_0^1, f_0^2 \in L_t^1(L^1 \cap L^p)$ respectively. Further assume that

$$\theta_t^i \in L_{\omega,t}^\infty(L^1 \cap L^p).$$

Then there exist a constant $C > 0$, depending on $\alpha, \beta, p, \theta_0^1$ and f^1 , but independent of the solutions θ^i in consideration, such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^1 - \theta_t^2\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2]^{1/2} \leq e^{CT} \left(\|\theta_0^1 - \theta_0^2\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2 + \|f^1 - f^2\|_{L_t^1 \dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2 \right) \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, in the ‘‘subcritical case’’ $\beta/2 + \alpha < 1 - 1/p$, we can choose C to depend on $\|\theta_0^1\|_{L^1 \cap L^p}$ and $\|f^1\|_{L_t^1(L^1 \cap L^p)}$, rather than (θ_0^1, f^1) , and to be monotone and locally bounded in these arguments.

Assuming for the moment the validity of Theorem 4.1, we can complete the proof of our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By applying Theorem 4.1 in the case $\theta_0^1 = \theta_0^2, f^1 = f^2$, we immediately deduce that pathwise uniqueness holds for (2.9), in the class of solutions $\theta_t \in L_{\omega,t}^\infty(L^1 \cap L^p)$. Uniqueness in law follows from the Yamada-Watanabe theorem; combined with the weak existence result from Theorem 3.1, strong existence on $[0, T]$ then holds as well. Since T here can be taken finite but arbitrarily large,

standard gluing arguments then imply that we can construct strong solutions θ globally defined on $[0, +\infty)$; by virtue of Theorem 3.1, they satisfy the pathwise estimate

$$\|\theta_t\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} + \int_0^t \|f_s\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} ds \quad \forall t \in [0, +\infty).$$

Now suppose we are given a sequence (θ_0^n, f^n) as in the second part of the statement, so that in particular for any finite T it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|\theta_0^n - \theta_0\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}} + \int_0^T \|f_s^n - f_s\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}} ds \right) = 0, \quad \sup_n \int_0^T \|f_s^n\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} ds < \infty.$$

Then by Theorem 4.1 we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^n - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] = 0; \quad (4.3)$$

on the other hand, since θ^n and θ satisfy uniform pathwise L^2 -bounds (cf. (3.1)), by interpolation we can upgrade (4.3) to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^n - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-\delta}}^m] = 0 \quad (4.4)$$

for any $m \in [1, \infty)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1 - \beta/2)$. By the estimates considered in Lemma 3.4, it's easy to check that the solutions θ^n are uniformly bounded in $L_\omega^\eta C_t^\gamma H^{-2}$; combined with the L^2 -bound and again interpolation estimates, we can deduce that for any $m \in [1, \infty)$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists $\gamma = \gamma(m, \delta) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|\theta^n\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-\delta}}^m] + \mathbb{E}[\|\theta\|_{C_t^\gamma H^{-\delta}}^m] < \infty.$$

Combining this uniform bound with estimate (4.4) (and the fact that $\dot{H}^{-s} \hookrightarrow H^{-s}$) finally allows to bring the supremum in time inside expectation and conclude the validity of (1.6). \square

4.1. Preparations. In the following, we assume $p \geq 2$. In the critical case $\alpha + \beta/2 = 1 - 1/p$, it will be useful to work with a weak solution θ^0 satisfying the decomposition in (3.2). However, we do not know a priori that such solution θ^0 exists on every probability space, so we cannot compare directly any weak solution with θ^0 . To overcome this issue, we use a Yamada-Watanabe argument.

For this, consider two weak $L^1 \cap L^p$ solutions θ^1, θ^2 on the tuple space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k)$ (see Definition 2.4). Let $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,<} + \theta^{0,>}$ be a solution on the tuple $(\Omega^0, \mathcal{A}^0, \mathcal{F}_t^0, \mathbb{P}^0, (W^{0,k})_k)$ with the bound (3.1) and the decomposition property in (3.2) for some $\varepsilon > 0$. For $p \geq 2$, by Remark 2.6, the stochastic gSQG equation (2.9) is equivalent to the integral equation (2.11) on H^{-2} , in particular we can regard these solutions as random variables with values in $C_t(H^{-2})$. The Yamada-Watanabe argument gives:

Lemma 4.2. *There exists a filtered probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ (satisfying the standard assumption), a cylindrical $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -Brownian motion $(\tilde{W}^k)_k$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -progressively measurable processes $\tilde{\theta}^{0,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,>}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2$ such that $((\tilde{W}^k)_k, \tilde{\theta}^{0,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,>})$, resp. $((\tilde{W}^k)_k, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2)$, has the same law of $((W^{0,k})_k, \theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>})$, resp. of $((W^k)_k, \theta^1, \theta^2)$ (on the space $C_t^{\mathbb{N}} \times C_t(H^{-2})^2$). In particular, taking $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \tilde{\theta}^{0,<} + \tilde{\theta}^{0,>}$, $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, (\tilde{W}^k)_k, \tilde{\theta}^i)$ is a weak solution to (2.9), for $i = 0, 1, 2$.*

The argument to show Lemma 4.2 is classical and there are many variants, see for example [74]. In the context of weak-strong uniqueness for stochastic PDEs, a similar use has been done, for example, in [11, Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4]: in the context of stochastic compressible Navier-Stokes equations, the authors establish a pathwise weak-strong uniqueness and then use a Yamada-Watanabe argument to show weak-strong uniqueness in law. The main point here, working in the critical case, is that we copy the components $\theta^{0,<}$ and $\theta^{0,>}$ of the “good” solution θ^0 and the couple θ^1, θ^2 . This will allow us both to work with $\theta^{0,\leq}$ and to get pathwise uniqueness and uniqueness in law at once.

Proof. In the proof, we will use the notation $W = (W^k)_k$, $W^0 = (W^{0,k})_k$, $\tilde{W} = (\tilde{W}^k)_k$. We call $\text{Law}(\theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>})(\cdot \mid W^0 = w^0)$ a regular version of the conditional law of $(\theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>})$ given W^0 , and

analogously $\text{Law}(\theta^1, \theta^2)(\cdot | W = w)$ a regular version of the conditional law of (θ^1, θ^2) given W (existence and a.e. uniqueness of the regular version follow from [4, Theorem 5.3.1]). We define

$$\tilde{\Omega} = C_t^{\mathbb{N}} \times C_t(H^{-2})^2 \times C_t(H^{-2})^2,$$

and we take \tilde{W} and $\tilde{\theta}^{0,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,>}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2$ as the canonical projections on $C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$ and on $C_t(H^{-2})^2 \times C_t(H^{-2})^2$, respectively. We take \mathcal{A} as the Borel σ -algebra on $\tilde{\Omega}$, enlarged with the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -null sets, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\omega}^{0,<}, \tilde{\omega}^{0,>}, \tilde{\omega}^1, \tilde{\omega}^2)) \\ & = \mathbb{P}^W(d\tilde{w}) \otimes \text{Law}(\theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>})(d\tilde{\omega}^{0,<}, d\tilde{\omega}^{0,>} | W^0 = \tilde{w}) \otimes \text{Law}(\theta^1, \theta^2)(d\tilde{\omega}^1, d\tilde{\omega}^2 | W = \tilde{w}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{P}^W is the cylindrical Wiener measure. Finally we take $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^-$ as the filtration generated by $W, \theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>}, \theta^1, \theta^2$ and by the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -null sets and we set $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \bigcap_{s < t} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s^-$, for each $t \geq 0$. One can show as in the proof of [8, Proposition 2.5, point (1)] that $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}, (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ satisfies the standard assumption and that \tilde{W} is a cylindrical $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_t$ -Brownian motion. The fact that $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,>})$, resp. $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2)$, has the same law of $(W^0, \theta^{0,<}, \theta^{0,>})$, resp. of (W, θ^1, θ^2) follows by construction. In particular, since (W, θ^1) , (W, θ^2) and (W^0, θ^0) are weak $L^1 \cap L^p$ solutions, also $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\theta}^i)$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, are weak $L^1 \cap L^p$ solutions to (2.9). \square

The following lemma plays a key role in controlling the nonlinear term; it is crucial to show Theorem 4.1 in the full subcritical and critical range.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ satisfy*

$$\frac{\beta}{2} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \alpha + \frac{\beta}{2} = 1 - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Then for any $f \in \dot{L}^{1-\beta, p}$ and $g \in \dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2}$ it holds $f g \in \dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2}$ with

$$\|f g\|_{\dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}^{1-\beta, p}} \|g\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2}}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. We can apply the fractional Leibniz rule, as stated in [48, Theorem 1], to find

$$\|f g\|_{\dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2}} = \|\Lambda^{\alpha-\beta/2}(f g)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\Lambda^{\alpha-\beta/2} f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{q_1}} + \|f\|_{L^{p_2}} \|\Lambda^{\alpha-\beta/2} g\|_{L^{q_2}} \quad (4.6)$$

for suitably chosen parameters (p_i, q_i) satisfying $1/p_i + 1/q_i = 1/2$. Set $\tilde{f} = \Lambda^{\alpha-\beta/2} f$, $\tilde{g} = \Lambda^{\alpha-\beta/2} g$; then by Lemma A.1, $\tilde{f} \in \dot{L}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2, p}$, $\tilde{g} \in \dot{H}^{1-2\alpha}$. Under our assumptions on α, β, p one can easily check that

$$(1-\beta)p < 2, \quad \left(1 - \alpha - \frac{\beta}{2}\right)2 < 2;$$

in particular, this implies that f and g belong to suitable $\dot{L}^{s, q}$ spaces with $s q < 2$, and the same must hold for \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} . Therefore we are in the position to apply Lemma A.1, to deduce that

$$\tilde{f} \in L^{p_1}, g \in L^{q_1} \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{p_1} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1-\alpha-\beta/2}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1-\alpha-\beta/2}{2}$$

where by assumption

$$\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 + \alpha + \frac{\beta}{2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Similarly, one has

$$f \in L^{p_2}, \tilde{g} \in L^{q_2} \quad \text{for} \quad \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1-\beta}{2}, \quad \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1-2\alpha}{2}$$

where again $1/p_2 + 1/q_2 = 1/2$. Inserting these embeddings in inequality (4.6) yields (4.5). \square

4.2. Proof of uniqueness. We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1. In the following, $G_{1-\beta/2}$ is the Green kernel of the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^{1-\beta/2}$, i.e., in Fourier modes,

$$\widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}(n) = |n|^{-2(1-\beta/2)}.$$

We take $G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta$ as the Fourier cutoff of $G_{1-\beta/2}$. Precisely, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $\varphi_\delta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ be such that $0 \leq \varphi_\delta \leq 1$ on \mathbb{R}_+ , $\varphi_\delta \equiv 1$ on $[\delta, 1/\delta]$, $\varphi_\delta \equiv 0$ on $[0, \delta/2]$ and on $[2/\delta, +\infty)$, we set $\widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(n) = \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}(n)\varphi_\delta(|n|)$. In particular, we have, for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, for every f with finite $\dot{H}^{s-2+\beta}$ norm,

$$\|G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * f\|_{\dot{H}^s} \leq \|G_{1-\beta/2} * f\|_{\dot{H}^s} = \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s-2+\beta}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Step 1: In the first step, we show that it is enough to prove, for some given $\varepsilon > 0$, the stability bound (4.2) for all $\theta^1 = \theta^{1,<} + \theta^{1,>}$ satisfying the decomposition (3.2) for that ε . Let θ^1 and θ^2 be two given solutions on the same tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k)$. Let $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,<} + \theta^{0,>}$ be a solution satisfying the decomposition (3.2), with the same initial condition θ_0^1 and forcing term f^1 of θ^1 . Construct $\tilde{\theta}^{0,<}, \tilde{\theta}^{0,>}, \tilde{\theta}^1$ and $\tilde{\theta}^2$ as in Lemma 4.2. Then, by the stability bound applied to $\tilde{\theta}^0$ and $\tilde{\theta}^1$, we deduce that $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \tilde{\theta}^1$. This in turns implies the stability bound (4.2) for $\tilde{\theta}^1$ and $\tilde{\theta}^2$, which is (4.2) for θ^1 and θ^2 , having (θ^1, θ^2) the same law as $(\tilde{\theta}^1, \tilde{\theta}^2)$. Analogously, in the subcritical case $\alpha + \beta/2 < 1 - 1/p$, it is enough to prove the stability bound (4.2) for all θ^1 satisfying the inequality (3.1).

Step 2: Here we prove the stability estimate (4.2) for two solutions θ^1, θ^2 on the same tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, \mathbb{P}, (W^k)_k)$, assuming that: a) in the critical case, for $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined later, $\theta^1 = \theta^{1,<} + \theta^{1,>}$ satisfies the decomposition (3.2); b) in the subcritical case, θ^1 satisfies the inequality (3.1). For simplicity of notation, in the subcritical case we take $\theta^{1,>} = 0, \theta^{1,<} = \theta^1$.

Take $\xi = \theta^1 - \theta^2$. We consider the evolution of the quantity $\langle \xi, G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi \rangle$, which is an approximation of the negative Sobolev norm $\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2$. Recalling (1.12) and exploiting Itô formula (for the SPDE (2.11) on H^{-2}), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle \xi, G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi \rangle &= -2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, u^1 \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle dt - 2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, u \cdot \nabla \theta^2 \rangle dt + c_0 \langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, \Delta \xi \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla \xi), \sigma_k \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle dt + 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, \sigma_k \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle dW^k \\ &\quad + 2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, f^1 - f^2 \rangle dt \\ &= -2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, u^1 \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle dt - 2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, u \cdot \nabla \theta^2 \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \langle \text{Tr}[(Q(0) - Q(\cdot))D^2 G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(\cdot)] * \xi, \xi \rangle dt - 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle \nabla G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, \sigma_k \xi \rangle dW^k \\ &\quad + 2\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, f^1 - f^2 \rangle dt \\ &=: 2I_1^\delta dt + 2I_2^\delta dt + J^\delta dt + 2 \sum_{k \geq 1} M_k^\delta dW^k + 2I_f^\delta dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

For every $\delta > 0$, the stochastic integral is a martingale with zero expectation, by Lemma 2.3, because $\nabla G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi$ is bounded by Sobolev embedding and so the integrand $\xi \nabla G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi$ is in $L_{t,\omega}^\infty L^2$. Therefore, taking the expectation in (4.7), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \xi_t, G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi_t \rangle = \mathbb{E}\langle \xi_0, G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi_0 \rangle + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^t I_1^\delta ds + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^t I_2^\delta ds + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^t J^\delta ds + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^t I_f^\delta ds. \tag{4.8}$$

For each term above, first we pass to the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then we provide suitable bounds, in view of applying Grönwall inequality.

Term I_1^δ : Calling

$$I_1 = -\langle G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, u^1 \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle$$

and applying the same arguments of the bound (4.9) (with $\rho = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1^\delta - I_1| &\lesssim \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}} \|(\nabla G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta - \nabla G_{1-\beta/2}) * \xi\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\beta/2}} \|\theta^1\|_{L^{\bar{p}}} \\ &\leq \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}} \|\theta^1\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 - \varphi_\delta(n))^2 |n|^{-2\alpha+\beta} |\widehat{\xi}(n)|^2 dn \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling that, $L^1 \cap L^2 \hookrightarrow \dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}$ by Lemma A.2, we obtain $I_1^\delta \rightarrow I_1$ in $L^1_{\omega,t}$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ by dominated convergence.

Now we analyse the term I_1 . We split the term I_1 as

$$I_1 = I_1^> + I_1^< := -\langle G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, u^{1,>} \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle - \langle G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, u^{1,<} \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle,$$

where $u^{1,>} = K_\beta * \theta^{1,>}$, $u^{1,<} = K_\beta * \theta^{1,<}$. Take

$$\rho \in \left(0, 1 - \alpha - \frac{\beta}{2}\right) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha + \rho < \frac{1}{2}, \quad q = \left(1 - \alpha - \frac{\beta}{2} - \rho\right)^{-1}$$

Here we exploit Lemma 4.3 (with α replaced by $\alpha + \rho$), together with integration by parts and duality, getting for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\alpha, \beta, \rho)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1^<| &= |\langle G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, u^{1,<} \cdot \nabla \xi \rangle| = |\langle \nabla G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, \nabla^\perp G_{1-\beta/2} * \theta^1 \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2-\rho}} \|\nabla G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi \cdot \nabla^\perp G_{1-\beta/2} * \theta^1 \xi\|_{\dot{H}^{\alpha-\beta/2+\rho}} \\ &\leq C_1 \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2-\rho}} \|\nabla G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi\|_{\dot{H}^{1-\alpha-\rho-\beta/2}} \|\nabla^\perp G_{1-\beta/2} * \theta^1 \xi\|_{\dot{L}^{1-\beta,\bar{p}}} \\ &\leq C_1 \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2-\rho}}^2 \|\theta^{1,<}\|_{L^{\bar{p}}} \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Note that, by Theorem 3.1,

$$\|\theta^{1,<}\|_{L^{\infty}_{t,\omega} L^{\bar{p}}} \leq \bar{C} < \infty,$$

for some constant $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(\alpha, \beta, \rho, \varepsilon, \theta_0^1, f^1)$, both in the critical case, by the decomposition (3.2), and in the subcritical case, taking $\bar{C} = \|\theta_0^1\|_{L^1 \cap L^p} + \|f^1\|_{L^1_t(L^1 \cap L^p)}$, by the bound (3.1) on $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,<}$. On the other hand, exploiting interpolation ([6, Proposition 1.32]) and Young inequalities, we have

$$\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2-\rho}}^2 \leq \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^{\frac{2\rho}{1-\alpha}} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^{\frac{2(1-\alpha-\rho)}{1-\alpha}} \leq C^{(2)} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 + \eta \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2$$

for some $\eta > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(\eta) > 0$. We obtain

$$|I_1^<| \leq C_1 C_2 \bar{C} \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 + C_1 \bar{C} \eta \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2, \tag{4.10}$$

Concerning the term $I_1^>$, we repeat the bounds in (4.9) with $\rho = 0$ and replacing $\theta^{1,<}$ with $\theta^{1,>}$. We get, for some $C_3 = C_3(\alpha, \beta)$,

$$|I_1^>| \leq C_3 \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 \|\theta^{1,>}\|_{L^p} \leq C_3 \varepsilon \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2. \tag{4.11}$$

Combining (4.10) and (4.11), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |I_1| ds \leq (C_1 \bar{C} \eta + C_3 \varepsilon) \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 ds + C_1 C_2 \bar{C} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 ds. \tag{4.12}$$

Term I_2^δ : Arguing as for I_1^δ , we get that I_2^δ converges in $L^1_{\omega,t}$ to

$$I_2 = -\langle G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, u \cdot \nabla \theta^2 \rangle = \langle \nabla G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta * \xi, \nabla^\perp G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi \theta^2 \rangle = 0 \tag{4.13}$$

(as expected by the conservation of the $\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}$ norm).

Term J^δ : By Parseval identity, we get

$$J^\delta = \langle \text{Tr}[(Q(0) - Q(\cdot))D^2 G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(\cdot)] * \xi, \xi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widehat{\xi}^2(n) \mathcal{F} \left(\text{Tr}[(Q(0) - Q(\cdot))D^2 G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(\cdot)] \right) (n) dn.$$

On the term with Q , we write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(QD^2G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta)(n) &= \left(\mathcal{F}(Q) * \mathcal{F}(D^2G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta)\right)(n) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle n-k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(k) \left(\text{Id} - \frac{(n-k) \otimes (n-k)}{|n-k|^2}\right) k \otimes k \, dk \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle n-k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} |P_{n-k}^\perp n|^2 \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(k) \, dk,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $P_{n-k}^\perp n = P_{n-k}^\perp k$ and that $|P_{n-k}^\perp k|^2 = |k|^2 - \frac{(k \cdot (n-k))^2}{|n-k|^2}$. On the other hand, being $Q(0) = 2c_0^\alpha I$ with c_0 given by (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\text{Tr}[Q(0)D^2G_{1-\beta/2}^\delta])(n) &= 4c_0^\alpha |n|^2 \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(n) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} |P_k n|^2 \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(n) \, dk \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle n-k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} |P_{n-k}^\perp n|^2 \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(n) \, dk.\end{aligned}$$

We arrive at

$$J^\delta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\widehat{\xi}(n)|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle n-k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} |P_{n-k}^\perp n|^2 \left(\widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(n) - \widehat{G}_{1-\beta/2}^\delta(k)\right) \, dk \, dn. \quad (4.14)$$

At this point, we pass to the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and we use the following key results from [41]:

Theorem 4.4. *Let ξ in $L_{t,\omega}^\infty(L^1 \cap L^2)$. Then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t J^\delta \, ds &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\xi}_s(n)|^2 \langle n-k \rangle^{-(2+2\alpha)} |P_{n-k}^\perp n|^2 (|n|^{-2+\beta} - |k|^{-2+\beta}) \, dk \, dn \, ds \\ &=: \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} |\widehat{\xi}_s(n)|^2 F(n) \, dn \, ds =: \mathbb{E} \int_0^t J \, ds\end{aligned}$$

where the function F is bounded and satisfies, for some constants $K = K_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $C_4 = C_4(\alpha,\beta)$,

$$F(n) \leq -K |n|^{-2(\alpha-\beta/2)} + C_4 |n|^{-2(1-\beta/2)}.$$

We conclude on J that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^t J \, ds \leq -K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 \, ds + C_4 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 \, ds. \quad (4.15)$$

Term I_f^δ : As $\delta \rightarrow 0$, the term I_f^δ converges to $I_f = \langle G_{1-\beta/2} * \xi, f^1 - f^2 \rangle$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |I_f| \, ds &\leq \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}] \|f^1 - f^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} \, ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\|\xi\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2]^{1/2} \|f^1 - f^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} \, ds.\end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Conclusion: Now we choose $\eta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \overline{C} \eta \leq K/8, \quad C_3 \varepsilon \leq K/8.$$

We take the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the equality (4.8) and combine (4.12), (4.13), (4.15) and (4.16), obtaining, for some constant $C_5 = C_5(\alpha, \beta, \rho, \eta, \overline{C})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \|\xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 - \mathbb{E} \|\xi_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 + \frac{K}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 \, ds \\ \leq C_5 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 \, ds + 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2]^{1/2} \|f_s^1 - f_s^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} \, ds.\end{aligned}$$

Calling

$$h(t) := \mathbb{E} \|\xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 + \frac{K}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 ds,$$

we have

$$h(t) \leq h(0) + C_5 \int_0^t h(s) ds + 2 \int_0^t \|f^1 - f^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} h(s)^{1/2} ds.$$

Applying Grönwall inequality, we get

$$h(t) \leq e^{C_5 t} \left(h(0) + 2 \int_0^t \|f_s^1 - f_s^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} h(s)^{1/2} ds \right).$$

Applying now Bihari inequality, we arrive at

$$h(t)^{1/2} \leq e^{C_5 t} \left(h(0) + \int_0^t \|f_s^1 - f_s^2\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}} ds \right),$$

which implies (4.2). The proof is complete. \square

4.3. Vanishing viscosity limit and smooth approximations. Having established well-posedness of solutions, we can now pass to understand whether suitable approximations schemes will converge to our solutions. We will do it for vanishing viscosity and smoothing approximations.

We start with a lemma establishing strong existence and uniqueness of solutions for the dissipative stochastic gSQG equations. The notion of solution we consider is analogous to Definition 2.4, thus for simplicity we omit the full details.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $p \in [2, \infty]$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\nu > 0$; let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space carrying a family $(W^k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent Brownian motions. Then there exists a probabilistically strong solution to the viscous stochastic gSQG equation*

$$d\theta_t^\nu + (K_\beta * \theta_t^\nu) \cdot \nabla \theta_t^\nu dt + \circ dW_t \cdot \nabla \theta_t^\nu = [\nu \Delta \theta^\nu + f_t] dt, \quad \theta|_{t=0} = \theta_0, \quad (4.17)$$

which satisfies the \mathbb{P} -a.s. bounds

$$\|\theta_t^\nu\|_{L^q} \leq \|\theta_0\|_{L^q} + \int_0^t \|f_s\|_{L^q} ds \quad \forall t \geq 0, q \in [1, p], \quad (4.18)$$

$$\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_s^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \|f_s\|_{L^2} ds \right)^2 \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Moreover, pathwise uniqueness holds in the class of solutions to (4.17) satisfying (4.18)-(4.19).

Proof. The existence of weak solutions can be established by compactness arguments, exactly as in Section 3; for this reason, let us only explain a bit loosely how to achieve the bounds (4.18)-(4.19), manipulating everything as if it were smooth. Estimate (4.18) can be derived similarly to (3.4), as the additional presence of $\nu \Delta \theta^\nu$ can only help dissipating L^p -norms faster; for an alternative argument, based on computing the evolution of $d \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(\theta_t^\nu(x)) dx$ for convex functions g (like $a \mapsto |a|^p$), we refer to [42, Proposition 3.1]. Estimate (4.19) follows by energy estimates: testing the SPDE against θ^ν itself, using the fact that the noise is divergence free and in Stratonovich form, one would formally find the \mathbb{P} -a.s. identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 = 2\langle \theta_t^\nu, f_t \rangle.$$

Defining $h(t) := \|\theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla \theta_s^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 ds$, it then holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} h(t)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2h(t)^{1/2}} \frac{d}{dt} h(t) = \frac{1}{h(t)^{1/2}} \langle \theta_t^\nu, f_t \rangle \leq \frac{\|\theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}}{h(t)^{1/2}} \|f_t\|_{L^2} \leq \|f_t\|_{L^2};$$

integrating in time, using the definition of $h(t)$ and the fact that $h(0) = \|\theta_0\|_{L^2}^2$, after some rearrangements one arrives at (4.19).

Assume now that we are given two solutions $\theta^\nu, \tilde{\theta}^\nu$ solving (4.17), then the difference $\xi = \theta^\nu - \tilde{\theta}^\nu$ satisfies

$$d\xi + [\mathcal{N}(\theta^\nu) - \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\theta}^\nu)] dt = \nu \Delta \xi dt - \circ dW \cdot \nabla \xi = (\nu + c_0) \Delta \xi dt - dW \cdot \nabla \xi \quad (4.20)$$

where we used \mathcal{N} to denote the nonlinearity as in Section 2.2. Noticing that $\nabla \xi \in L_\omega^\infty L_t^2 L_x^2$, so that the Itô part of the stochastic integral appearing in (4.20) is a well-defined L^2 -valued martingale, while the term $(\nu + c_0) \Delta \xi$ belongs to $L_t^2 H_x^{-1}$, we can apply [76, Theorem 2.13] and exploit the cancellations coming from the Itô–Stratonovich corrector to deduce that \mathbb{P} -a.s. it holds

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\|\xi_t\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \nu \|\nabla \xi_t\|_{L^2}^2 = -\langle \mathcal{N}(\theta_t^\nu) - \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\theta}_t^\nu), \xi_t \rangle.$$

From here, by classical arguments for monotone (S)PDEs (cf. [34, 77] and the references therein) allow to reduce the problem of uniqueness to devising good estimates for the nonlinear function \mathcal{N} . In our case, since $\beta \in (0, 1)$, using the divergence-free property of K_β it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathcal{N}(\theta_t^\nu) - \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\theta}_t^\nu), \xi_t \rangle| &= |\langle (K_\beta * \xi_t) \cdot \nabla \theta_t^\nu, \xi_t \rangle| \leq \|K_\beta * \xi_t\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2} \|\xi_t\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|K_\beta * \xi_t\|_{\dot{H}^{2-\beta}} \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2} \|\xi_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\xi_t\|_{H^1} \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2} \|\xi_t\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Young's inequality one can then arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\|\xi_t\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla \xi_t\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim (1 + \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}^2) \|\xi_t\|_{L^2}^2$$

and thus deduce that $\xi \equiv 0$ by Grönwall lemma, since $1 + \|\nabla \theta_t^\nu\|_{L^2}^2$ is locally integrable. Having established weak existence and pathwise uniqueness, strong existence then follows by Yamada–Watanabe. \square

Armed with Lemma 4.5, we can now establish convergence of the viscous solutions θ^ν to θ , with quantitative rates as $\nu \rightarrow 0$.

Proposition 4.6. *Let α, β, p be as in Theorem 1.1, $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$, $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1([0, +\infty); L^1 \cap L^p)$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space carrying a family $(W^k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent Brownian motions. For any $\nu > 0$ let θ^ν the unique strong solution to (4.17) associated to (θ_0, f) , similarly θ be the unique strong solution to (2.9). Then there exists a constant $C > 0$, depending on $\alpha, \beta, p, \theta_0$ and f such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] \leq C e^{TC} \nu^{2-\beta/2-\alpha} \quad \forall \nu > 0, T > 0. \quad (4.21)$$

Remark 4.7. Under condition (4.1), $\beta/2 + \alpha < 1$, thus the exponent $2 - \beta/2 - \alpha$ in the viscosity parameter ν satisfies

$$2 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \alpha \geq 1 + \frac{1}{p} > 1;$$

in particular, the r.h.s. of (4.21) vanishes as $\nu \rightarrow 0$. Furthermore, the smaller α and β are, the faster the rate of convergence.

Proof. Define $\xi^\nu = \theta^\nu - \theta$, so that it solves the SPDE in Itô form

$$d\xi^\nu + [\mathcal{N}(\theta^\nu) - \mathcal{N}(\theta)] dt + \nabla \xi^\nu u \cdot dW = [c_0 \Delta \xi^\nu + \nu \Delta \theta^\nu] dt$$

We can now proceed exactly in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, up to replacing the term $f^1 - f^2$ with $\nu \Delta \theta^\nu$. The resulting term I_f^δ , which previously was an approximation of $2\langle \xi, f^1 - f^2 \rangle_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}$, will now converge to

$$2\nu \int_0^t \langle \xi_s^\nu, \nu \Delta \theta_s^\nu \rangle_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}} ds = 2\nu \int_0^t \langle |\nabla|^{\beta-2} \xi_s^\nu, \nu \Delta \theta_s^\nu \rangle ds.$$

Performing the same estimates as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, based on the validity of estimates (4.18) for θ^ν (which takes the role of θ^2) and the decomposition $\theta = \theta^> + \theta^<$ (which takes the role of θ^1), we therefore end up finding constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \|\xi_t^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 + K_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}^2 ds \leq K_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|\xi_s^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{-1+\beta/2}}^2 ds + 2\nu \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\langle |\nabla|^{\beta-2} \xi_s^\nu, \Delta \theta_s^\nu \rangle] ds.$$

(4.22)

We now want to estimate the last term on the r.h.s. of (4.22) in a way that it can be controlled by the a priori estimate (4.19) and the coercive term $\|\xi^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{-\alpha+\beta/2}}$ appearing on the r.h.s. To this end, we perform the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \langle |\nabla|^{\beta-2}(\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t), \Delta \theta_t^\nu \rangle &= \langle |\nabla|^{\beta/2-\alpha}(\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t), |\nabla|^{\beta/2+\alpha-2} \Delta \theta_t^\nu \rangle \\ &\leq \|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}} \| |\nabla|^{\beta/2+\alpha-2} \Delta \theta_t^\nu \|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}} \|\theta_t^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2+\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (4.22) and applying Young's inequality, we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] + \frac{K_1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-\alpha}}^2] \leq \tilde{K}_2 \left(\mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] + \nu^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_r^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2+\alpha}}^2] dr \right).$$

for some new constant \tilde{K}_2 , depending on K_1 and K_2 . Notice that under our assumptions $\beta/2 + \alpha < 1$; thus by interpolation, for any fixed $T > 0$ we have the \mathbb{P} -a.s. estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^2 \int_0^T \|\theta_r^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2+\alpha}}^2 dr &\leq \nu^2 \left(\int_0^T \|\theta_r^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 dr \right)^{\beta/2+\alpha} \left(\int_0^T \|\theta_r^\nu\|_{L^2}^2 dr \right)^{1-\beta/2-\alpha} \\ &\lesssim \nu^{2-\beta/2-\alpha} T^{1-\beta/2-\alpha} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^1([0,T];L^2)} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last passage we applied (4.18)-(4.19). Therefore we are in the position to apply Grönwall to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_t^\nu - \theta_t\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2-1}}^2] &\leq e^{\tilde{K}_2 T} \nu^2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|\theta_r^\nu\|_{\dot{H}^{\beta/2+\alpha}}^2] dr \\ &\leq e^{\tilde{K}_2 T} T^{1-\beta/2-\alpha} \left(\|\theta_0\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{L^1([0,T];L^2)} \right)^2 \nu^{2-\beta/2-\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Up to relabelling constants, using the fact that $T^{1-\beta/2-\alpha}$ can always be reabsorbed in the exponential upon modifying \tilde{K}_2 , we deduce the validity of (4.21). \square

We now pass to consider smoothened approximations. Here, we take the same setting as in the beginning of Section 3.1: given filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ carrying a family $(W^k)_{k \geq 1}$ of independent Brownian motions, and a family of radial mollifiers $\{\rho^\delta\}_{\delta > 0}$, we look at solutions θ^δ to (3.3). In light of Theorem 1.1, we can now assume the solution θ associated to (θ_0, f) to be defined on the same probability space as well.

Proposition 4.8. *Let α, β, p be as in Theorem 1.1, $\theta_0 \in L^1 \cap L^p$, $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}([0, +\infty); L^1 \cap L^p)$. Let θ^δ be solutions to (3.3) associated to $(\theta_0^\delta, f^\delta)$, θ the unique solution to (2.9) associated to (θ_0, f) . Then for any $T < \infty$, $m \in [1, \infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ it holds that*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\theta_t^\delta - \theta_t\|_{H_w^{-\varepsilon}}^m \right] = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. The argument is basically an application of the Gyongy–Krylov Lemma, cf. [49, Lemma 1.1]. Indeed, consider the family of random variables $\{(\theta^\delta, \theta, W)\}_{\delta > 0}$; arguing as in Section 3, in particular applying Lemma 3.5, this family is tight in $C([0, T]; H_w^{-\varepsilon})^2 \times C_t^{\mathbb{N}}$. One can then argue as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 to consider a subsequence $\{(\tilde{\theta}^{\delta_n}, \tilde{\theta}^n, \tilde{W}^n)\}_n$, on a new probability space, which in convergence in that topology. However, by passing to the limit, one then produces two solutions $(\theta^1, \theta^2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{\theta}^{\delta_n}, \tilde{\theta}^n)$ which both solve the SPDE (2.9) for same noise $\tilde{W} = \lim_n \tilde{W}^n$, and same data (θ_0, f) . In light of Theorem 1.1, this implies that $\theta^1 = \theta^2 =: \tilde{\theta}$ and so that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\theta^{\delta_n} - \theta\|_{H_w^{-\varepsilon}} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\tilde{\theta}^{\delta_n} - \tilde{\theta}\|_{H_w^{-\varepsilon}} \right] = 0.$$

As the argument holds for any subsequence $\{\theta^{\delta_n}\}_n$ one can extract, as well as for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\theta^\delta - \theta\|_{H_w^{-\varepsilon}} \right] = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0. \quad (4.24)$$

From here, using the uniform bounds (3.4) in $L^1 \cap L^p$, it is easy to upgrade the convergence in $H_w^{-\varepsilon}$ to remove the weight and obtain (4.23). \square

APPENDIX A. SOME USEFUL LEMMAS

This appendix comprises a collection of standard analytic results we used throughout the paper. Although our setting is on \mathbb{R}^2 , for simplicity here we allow \mathbb{R}^d for any $d \geq 2$.

Recall the notation $\Lambda = |\nabla|$ and the Bessel spaces $\dot{L}^{s,p}$ as defined in Section 1.5.

Lemma A.1. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 < p < \infty$. Then:*

- (1) *For any $r \in (0, s)$, Λ^r is a bijection from $\dot{L}^{s,p}$ to $\dot{L}^{s-r,p}$, and $\|\Lambda^r f\|_{\dot{L}^{s-r,p}} = \|f\|_{\dot{L}^{s,p}}$.*
- (2) *If $s < d$ and $q \in (p, \infty)$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} = \frac{s}{d},$$

then $\dot{L}^{s,p} \hookrightarrow L^q$ and $\|f\|_{L^q} \lesssim \|f\|_{\dot{L}^{s,p}}$

Proof. Point i) is a consequence of the semigroup property $\Lambda^s = \Lambda^{s-r} \Lambda^r$; point ii) follows from [47, Theorem 1.2.3]. \square

Lemma A.2. *$L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ continuously embeds in \dot{H}^{-s} for any $s \in [0, 1)$.*

Proof. Let $p \in (1, 2]$, then by [6, Corollary 1.39] L^p continuously embeds in \dot{H}^γ for $\gamma = 1 - \frac{2}{p}$. By our assumption and interpolation, $f \in L^p$ for any $p \in [1, 2]$, which concludes the proof. \square

The next elementary statement, roughly informing us that we can split any L^p function into a small L^p part and a large $L^p \cap L^\infty$ one, is central to our main strategy to achieve uniqueness for ‘‘critical’’ p .

Lemma A.3. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\varphi \in L^p$; for any $R \in (0, +\infty)$, set $\varphi^{>R}(x) := \varphi(x) \mathbb{1}_{|\varphi(x)| > R}$, $\varphi^{\leq R}(x) := \varphi(x) - \varphi^{>R}(x)$. Then it holds*

$$\|\varphi^{\leq R}\|_{L^q} \leq R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|\varphi\|_{L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty], R \in (0, \infty), \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \|\varphi^{>R}\|_{L^p} = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Similarly, given a sequence $\{\varphi^n\}_n$ such that $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in L^p , it holds

$$\|\varphi^{n, \leq R}\|_{L^q} \leq R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|\varphi^n\|_{L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty], R \in (0, \infty), \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\varphi^{n, > R}\|_{L^p} = 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For p, R as above, $f \in L_t^1 L^p$, similarly defining $f_t^{>R}(x) := f_t(x) \mathbb{1}_{|f_t(x)| > R}$, $f_t^{\leq R}(x) := f_t(x) - f_t^{>R}(x)$, it holds

$$\|f_t^{\leq R}\|_{L_t^{\frac{q}{p}} L^q} \leq R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|f\|_{L_t^1 L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty], R \in (0, \infty), \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \|f^{>R}\|_{L_t^1 L^p} = 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Similarly, given a sequence $\{f^n\}_n$ such that $f^n \rightarrow f$ in $L_t^1 L^p$, it holds

$$\|f_t^{n, \leq R}\|_{L_t^{\frac{q}{p}} L^q} \leq R^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|f^n\|_{L_t^1 L^p}^{\frac{p}{q}} \quad \forall q \in [p, \infty], R \in (0, \infty), \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|f^{n, > R}\|_{L_t^1 L^p} = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proof. It suffices to show (A.3)-(A.4), since the analogues (A.1)-(A.2) follows by regarding φ^n as time-dependent functions. The first bound in (A.3) comes from explicit computation, the second is a consequence of dominated convergence. The second statement in (A.4) is a consequence of Vitali’s convergence theorem. \square

Similarly to Section 3, for $d \geq 2$, let us consider the weight $w(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{-d/2-1}$; correspondingly, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the weighted Sobolev space H_w^s as the closure of smooth functions under the norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{H_w^s} := \|\varphi w\|_{H^s},$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. It is immediate to verify that H_w^s as defined is a Hilbert space.

Lemma A.4. *Let $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The following hold:*

- i) *The embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow H_w^s$ is bounded.*
- ii) *The embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow H_w^{s-\varepsilon}$ is compact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.*
- iii) *If $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in H_w^s , then $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in H_{loc}^s .*
- iv) *For any $s_0 < s_1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, setting $s_\theta = \theta s_0 + (1 - \theta)s_1$, we have the interpolation estimate*

$$\|\varphi\|_{H_w^{s_\theta}} \leq \|\varphi\|_{H_w^{s_0}}^\theta \|\varphi\|_{H_w^{s_1}}^{1-\theta} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Proof. i) Notice that w is smooth, $w \in W^{k,1} \cap W^{k,\infty}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, w belongs to the Besov-Hölder space $B_{\infty,\infty}^s$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. By standard paraproducts in Besov spaces [6], it follows that

$$\|\varphi w\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^{-s}} \|w\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{|s|+1}} \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^s}.$$

ii) Let $\{\varphi^n\}_n$ be a bounded sequence in H^s ; by weak compactness, without loss of generality we may assume that $\varphi^n \rightharpoonup \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in H^s$. We claim that $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in $H_w^{s-\varepsilon}$.

To this end, let $h \in C_c^\infty$ be a smooth radial function such that $h \equiv 1$ on B_1 and $h \equiv 0$ on B_2^c ; for any $R > 0$, set $h^R := h(\cdot/R)$, $w^{\leq R} := w h^R$, $w^{> R} := w(1 - h^R)$. Using Leibniz's formula, it's easy to verify that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R > 1$ it holds

$$\|D^k[w(1 - h^R)]\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim R^{-d-2-k}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Now let us decompose

$$\varphi^n = \varphi^{n,\leq R} + \varphi^{n,> R}, \quad \varphi^{n,\leq R} := \varphi^n h^R, \quad \varphi^{n,> R} := \varphi^n (1 - h^R),$$

similarly for $\varphi = \varphi^{\leq R} + \varphi^{> R}$. For any fixed $R > 1$, since h^R is smooth, $\varphi^{n,\leq R} \rightharpoonup \varphi^{\leq R}$ in H^s ; since they are also uniformly compactly supported, it follows that they converge strongly in $H^{s-\varepsilon}$. By Point 1), strong convergence in $H_w^{s-\varepsilon}$ holds as well. On the other hand, in light of (A.6) and paraproducts, the tails $\varphi^{n,> R}$ can be made arbitrarily small in H_w^s by taking R large enough, since

$$\|\varphi^{n,> R}\|_{H_w^s} \lesssim \|\varphi^n\|_{H^s} \|w(1 - h^R)\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{|s|+1}} \lesssim R^{-d-2}.$$

Combining these facts, the desired convergence $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in $H_w^{s-\varepsilon}$ follows

iii) Let $\varphi^n \rightarrow \varphi$ in H_w^s and $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$. Since φ is compactly supported, φw^{-1} is a smooth function; therefore again by paraproducts

$$\|(\varphi^n - \varphi)\psi\|_{H^s} = \|(\varphi^n - \varphi)w w^{-1}\psi\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|(\varphi^n - \varphi)w\|_{H^s} \|w^{-1}\psi\|_{B_{\infty,\infty}^{|s|+1}} \lesssim \|\varphi^n - \varphi\|_{H_w^s}$$

which implies that $\varphi^n \psi \rightarrow \varphi \psi$ in H^s .

iv) This follows immediately from the same interpolation inequality in H^s -spaces, applied to $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi w$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. LG was supported by the SNSF Grant 182565 and by the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI) under contract number M822.00034 through the project TENSE. LG and MM acknowledge support from the Italian Ministry of Research through the project PRIN 2022 ‘‘Noise in fluid dynamics and related models’’, project number I53D23002270006. MB, LG and MM are members of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM), group GNAMPA.

REFERENCES

- [1] Antonio Agresti. Delayed blow-up and enhanced diffusion by transport noise for systems of reaction-diffusion equations. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, pages 1–75, 2023.
- [2] Sergio Albeverio and Ana Bela Cruzeiro. Global flows with invariant (Gibbs) measures for Euler and Navier-Stokes two-dimensional fluids. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 129(3):431–444, 1990.

- [3] Dallas Albritton, Elia Brué, Maria Colombo, Camillo De Lellis, Vikram Giri, Maximilian Janisch, and Hyunju Kwon. *Instability and non-uniqueness for the 2D Euler equations, after M. Vishik*, volume 219 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, [2024] ©2024.
- [4] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.
- [5] Marco Bagnara, Mario Maurelli, and Fanhui Xu. No blow-up by nonlinear Itô noise for the Euler equations. *arXiv:2305.09852*, 2023.
- [6] Hajer Bahouri, Jean-Yves Chemin, and Raphaël Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, volume 343 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [7] David Barbato, Hakima Bessaih, and Benedetta Ferrario. On a stochastic Leray- α model of Euler equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 124(1):199–219, 2014.
- [8] Richard F. Bass. *Stochastic processes*, volume 33 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [9] D. Bernard, K. Gawędzki, and A. Kupiainen. Slow modes in passive advection. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 90(3-4):519–569, 1998.
- [10] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999.
- [11] Dominic Breit, Eduard Feireisl, and Martina Hofmanová. Compressible fluids driven by stochastic forcing: the relative energy inequality and applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 350(2):443–473, 2017.
- [12] Z. Brzeźniak, M. Capiński, and F. Flandoli. Stochastic partial differential equations and turbulence. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 1(1):41–59, 1991.
- [13] Tristan Buckmaster, Steve Shkoller, and Vlad Vicol. Nonuniqueness of weak solutions to the SQG equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 72(9):1809–1874, 2019.
- [14] Aynur Bulut, Manh Khang Huynh, and Stan Palasek. Non-uniqueness up to the Onsager threshold for the forced SQG equation. *arXiv:2310.12947*, 2023.
- [15] John Cardy, Gregory Falkovich, and Krzysztof Gawędzki. *Non-equilibrium statistical mechanics and turbulence*. Number 355. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [16] A. Castro and D. Córdoba. Infinite energy solutions of the surface quasi-geostrophic equation. *Adv. Math.*, 225(4):1820–1829, 2010.
- [17] Angel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Javier Gómez-Serrano. Global smooth solutions for the inviscid SQG equation. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 266(1292):v+89, 2020.
- [18] Ángel Castro, Daniel Faraco, Francisco Mengual, and Marcos Solera. A proof of Vishik’s nonuniqueness theorem for the forced 2D Euler equation. *arXiv:2404.15995*, 2024.
- [19] Dongho Chae, Peter Constantin, Diego Córdoba, Francisco Gancedo, and Jiahong Wu. Generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations with singular velocities. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 65(8):1037–1066, 2012.
- [20] Dongho Chae, Peter Constantin, and Jiahong Wu. Inviscid models generalizing the two-dimensional Euler and the surface quasi-geostrophic equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 202(1):35–62, 2011.
- [21] Young-Pil Choi, Jinwook Jung, and Junha Kim. On well/ill-posedness for the generalized surface quasi-geostrophic equations in Hölder spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01245*, 2024.
- [22] Michele Coghi and Franco Flandoli. Propagation of chaos for interacting particles subject to environmental noise. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 26(3):1407–1442, 2016.
- [23] Michele Coghi and Mario Maurelli. Existence and uniqueness by Kraichnan noise for 2D Euler equations with unbounded vorticity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03216*, 2023.
- [24] Peter Constantin, Andrew J. Majda, and Esteban Tabak. Formation of strong fronts in the 2-D quasigeostrophic thermal active scalar. *Nonlinearity*, 7(6):1495–1533, 1994.
- [25] Diego Córdoba, Javier Gómez-Serrano, and Alexandru D. Ionescu. Global solutions for the generalized SQG patch equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 233(3):1211–1251, 2019.
- [26] Diego Córdoba and Luis Martínez-Zoroa. Non existence and strong ill-posedness in C^k and Sobolev spaces for SQG. *Adv. Math.*, 407:Paper No. 108570, 74, 2022.
- [27] Diego Córdoba and Luis Martínez-Zoroa. Non-existence and strong ill-posedness in $C^{k,\beta}$ for the generalized Surface Quasi-geostrophic equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14385*, 2022.
- [28] Michele Coti Zelati, Theodore D. Drivas, and Rishabh S. Gvalani. Mixing by Statistically Self-similar Gaussian Random Fields. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 191(5):1–11, 2024.
- [29] Theodore D. Drivas and Gregory L. Eyink. A Lagrangian fluctuation-dissipation relation for scalar turbulence. Part I. Flows with no bounding walls. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 829:153–189, 2017.
- [30] G. Falkovich, K. Gawędzki, and M. Vergassola. Particles and fields in fluid turbulence. *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 73(4):913–975, 2001.
- [31] E. Fedrizzi and F. Flandoli. Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(6):1329–1354, 2013.
- [32] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola. Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.*, 180(1):1–53, 2010.

- [33] Franco Flandoli. *Random perturbation of PDEs and fluid dynamic models*, volume 2015 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. Lectures from the 40th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2010, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. [Saint-Flour Probability Summer School].
- [34] Franco Flandoli, Lucio Galeati, and Dejun Luo. Delayed blow-up by transport noise. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(9):1757–1788, 2021.
- [35] Franco Flandoli, Lucio Galeati, and Dejun Luo. Scaling limit of stochastic 2D Euler equations with transport noises to the deterministic Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 21(1):567–600, 2021.
- [36] Franco Flandoli and Dejun Luo. High mode transport noise improves vorticity blow-up control in 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 180(1-2):309–363, 2021.
- [37] Franco Flandoli, Mario Maurelli, and Mikhail Neklyudov. Noise prevents infinite stretching of the passive field in a stochastic vector advection equation. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 16(4):805–822, 2014.
- [38] Franco Flandoli and Martin Saal. mSQG equations in distributional spaces and point vortex approximation. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 19(4):1071–1090, 2019.
- [39] Juraj Földes and Mouhamadou Sy. Invariant measures and global well posedness for the SQG equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 241(1):187–230, 2021.
- [40] Lucio Galeati. On the convergence of stochastic transport equations to a deterministic parabolic one. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 8(4):833–868, 2020.
- [41] Lucio Galeati, Francesco Grotto, and Mario Maurelli. In preparation. 2024.
- [42] Lucio Galeati and Dejun Luo. Weak well-posedness by transport noise for a class of 2D fluid dynamics equations. *arXiv:2305.08761*, 2023.
- [43] Francisco Gancedo and Neel Patel. On the local existence and blow-up for generalized SQG patches. *Ann. PDE*, 7(1):Paper No. 4, 63, 2021.
- [44] Benjamin Gess. Regularization and well-posedness by noise for ordinary and partial differential equations. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and related fields*, volume 229 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 43–67. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [45] Benjamin Gess and Ivan Yaroslavtsev. Stabilization by transport noise and enhanced dissipation in the Kraichnan model. *arXiv:2104.03949*, 2021.
- [46] Daniel Goodair. Stochastic calculus in infinite dimensions and SPDEs. *arXiv:2203.17206*, 2022.
- [47] Loukas Grafakos. *Modern Fourier analysis*, volume 250 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2014.
- [48] Loukas Grafakos and Seungly Oh. The Kato-Ponce inequality. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 39(6):1128–1157, 2014.
- [49] István Gyöngy and Nicolai Krylov. Existence of strong solutions for Itô's stochastic equations via approximations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 105(2):143–158, 1996.
- [50] István Gyöngy and Teresa Martínez. On stochastic differential equations with locally unbounded drift. *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 51(126)(4):763–783, 2001.
- [51] Siming He and Alexander Kiselev. Small-scale creation for solutions of the SQG equation. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(5):1027–1041, 2021.
- [52] Martina Hofmanová, Theresa Lange, and Umberto Pappalettera. Global existence and non-uniqueness of 3D Euler equations perturbed by transport noise. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 188(3-4):1183–1255, 2024.
- [53] Darryl D. Holm. Variational principles for stochastic fluid dynamics. *Proc. A.*, 471(2176):20140963, 19, 2015.
- [54] Philip Isett and Andrew Ma. A direct approach to nonuniqueness and failure of compactness for the SQG equation. *Nonlinearity*, 34(5):3122–3162, 2021.
- [55] Philip Isett and Andrew Ma. On the conservation laws and the structure of the nonlinearity for SQG and its generalizations. *arXiv:2403.08279*, 2024.
- [56] Philip Isett and Vlad Vicol. Hölder continuous solutions of active scalar equations. *Ann. PDE*, 1(1):Art. 2, 77, 2015.
- [57] Gautam Iyer, Xiaoqian Xu, and Andrej Zlatoš. Convection-induced singularity suppression in the Keller-Segel and other non-linear PDEs. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 374(9):6039–6058, 2021.
- [58] In-Jee Jeong and Junha Kim. Strong ill-posedness for SQG in critical Sobolev spaces. *Anal. PDE*, 17(1):133–170, 2024.
- [59] Shuaijie Jiao and Dejun Luo. Well-posedness of stochastic mSQG equations with Kraichnan noise and L^p data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01045*, 2024.
- [60] Alexander Kiselev, Lenya Ryzhik, Yao Yao, and Andrej Zlatoš. Finite time singularity for the modified SQG patch equation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 184(3):909–948, 2016.
- [61] R. H. Kraichnan. Small-scale structure of a scalar field convected by turbulence. *The Physics of Fluids*, 11(5):945–953, 1968.
- [62] Robert H. Kraichnan. Anomalous scaling of a randomly advected passive scalar. *Physical review letters*, 72(7):1016, 1994.
- [63] Hiroshi Kunita. *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, volume 24 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [64] Theresa Lange. Regularization by noise of an averaged version of the Navier–Stokes equations. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, pages 1–26, 2023.
- [65] Y. Le Jan and O. Raimond. Integration of Brownian vector fields. *Ann. Probab.*, 30(2):826–873, 2002.
- [66] Y. Le Jan and O. Raimond. Flows, coalescence and noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(2):1247–1315, 2004.

- [67] Andrew Gahwah Ma. *Some Onsager's conjecture type results for a family of odd active scalar equations*. PhD thesis, 2022.
- [68] Fabien Marchand. Existence and regularity of weak solutions to the quasi-geostrophic equations in the spaces L^p or $\dot{H}^{-1/2}$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 277(1):45–67, 2008.
- [69] Etienne Mémin. Fluid flow dynamics under location uncertainty. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.*, 108(2):119–146, 2014.
- [70] Andrea R. Nahmod, Nataša Pavlović, Gigliola Staffilani, and Nathan Totz. Global flows with invariant measures for the inviscid modified SQG equations. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 6(2):184–210, 2018.
- [71] Huy Quang Nguyen. Global weak solutions for generalized SQG in bounded domains. *Anal. PDE*, 11(4):1029–1047, 2018.
- [72] Umberto Pappalettera. Global existence and non-uniqueness for the Cauchy problem associated to 3D Navier–Stokes equations perturbed by transport noise. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, pages 1–36, 2023.
- [73] Serge G. Resnick. *Dynamical problems in non-linear advective partial differential equations*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1995. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Chicago.
- [74] Michael Röckner, Byron Schmuland, and Xicheng Zhang. Yamada-Watanabe theorem for stochastic evolution equations in infinite dimensions. *Condensed Matter Physics*, 11(2):247–259, 2008. Conference on Infinite Particle Systems - Complex Systems III, Kazimierz Dolny, POLAND, JUN, 2007.
- [75] Keefer Rowan. On anomalous diffusion in the Kraichnan model and correlated-in-time variants. *arXiv:2311.12147*, 2023.
- [76] Boris L. Rozovsky and Sergey V. Lototsky. *Stochastic evolution systems*, volume 89 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, second edition, 2018. Linear theory and applications to non-linear filtering.
- [77] Michael Röckner, Shijie Shang, and Tusheng Zhang. Well-posedness of stochastic partial differential equations with fully local monotone coefficients. *Math. Ann.*, 2024.
- [78] R. Shvydkoy. Convex integration for a class of active scalar equations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 24(4):1159–1174, 2011.
- [79] Misha Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part I. *arXiv:1805.09426*, 2018.
- [80] Misha Vishik. Instability and non-uniqueness in the Cauchy problem for the Euler equations of an ideal incompressible fluid. Part II. *arXiv:1805.09440*, 2018.