

Global well posedness and ergodic results in regular Sobolev spaces for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise and arbitrary power of the nonlinearity

Zdzisław Brzeźniak ^{*}, Benedetta Ferrario [†], Mario Maurelli [‡], Margherita Zanella [§]

June 28, 2024

Abstract

We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d , with the nonlinearity of polynomial type $|u|^{2\sigma}u$. For any $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s > \frac{d}{2}$ we prove that adding to this equation a suitable stochastic forcing term there exists a unique global solution for *any* initial data in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. The effect of the noise is to prevent blow-up in finite time, differently from the deterministic setting. Moreover we prove existence of invariant measures and their uniqueness under more restrictive assumptions on the noise term.

Keywords: Stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation - multiplicative noise - regularization (non explosion) by noise - Lyapunov functions - invariant measure - exponential stability.

MSC: 35Q55, 35R60, 60H30, 60G10, 60H15.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Existence of global solutions	2
1.2	No-blow up by noise	4
1.3	Long-time behavior of the solution	5
1.4	Main results	5
2	Mathematical setting, assumptions and main results	6
2.1	The linear operator	7
2.2	The nonlinear operator	8
2.3	The stochastic forcing term	9
2.4	Examples of noise forcing term	10
2.5	Statement of the main results	12
3	Existence and uniqueness of global strong solutions	12
3.1	The Galerkin approximation	13
3.2	Existence of a global martingale solution	19
3.3	Pathwise uniqueness	21

^{*}Department of Mathematics, University of York, Heslington, York, YO105DD, UK E-mail: zdzislaw.brzezniak@york.ac.uk

[†]Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Aziendali, Università di Pavia, 27100 Pavia, Italy. E-mail: benedetta.ferrario@unipv.it

[‡]Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Largo Bruno Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italy. E-mail: mario.maurelli@unipi.it

[§]Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, Via E. Bonardi 9, 20133 Milano, Italy. E-mail: margherita.zanella@polimi.it

4 Ergodic results	23
4.1 Stationary martingale solutions	23
4.2 Existence of invariant measures	25
4.3 Uniqueness of the invariant measure and asymptotic stability of the zero solution	26
A Compactness and tightness results	30
A.1 Deterministic compactness criteria	30
A.2 Tightness results	33
B A technical lemma	33
C Compact Riemannian manifolds	35

1 Introduction

The nonlinear Schrödinger equation is one of the basic models for nonlinear waves and has many physical applications, e.g. to nonlinear optics, plasma physics and quantum field theory, see e.g. [61, 65] and references therein.

In this article, we deal with the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) on the d -dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d := (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^d$, for $d \geq 1$, with stochastic forcing term

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} du(t, x) + [i\Delta u(t, x) + i\alpha|u(t, x)|^{2\sigma}u(t, x)] dt = \phi(u(t, x)) dW(t), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{T}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u^0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \end{cases}$$

Here $i = \sqrt{-1}$, $\sigma > 0$ and $W = (W(t) : t \geq 0)$ is a classical real-valued Wiener process. The equation is called focusing when $\alpha = +1$ and defocusing when $\alpha = -1$. In the present paper we will study a more general case when $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$; therefore one can view equation (1.1) as the stochastic version of the equation considered by Kato in [48], see also [18, Section 4.4].

Our first main result in this paper is a kind of regularization by noise for the deterministic NLS equation, in the following sense. We find sufficient conditions on the diffusion coefficient ϕ for the global-in-time existence of the solutions to the stochastic NLS equation (1.1), whereas a similar result does not hold for the corresponding deterministic problem (i.e. equation (1.1) with $\phi = 0$). To be more precise, for every $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$ we find a sufficient condition on ϕ , such that if $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $s > \frac{d}{2}$ and $u^0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, then the NLS equation (1.1) has a global solution. In particular, the global existence holds in both focusing and defocusing cases. Our proof relies on a tightness method based on the choice of a suitable Lyapunov function. Secondly, we study the long time behavior of the solution process. We prove the existence of *stationary* solutions, again under suitable assumptions on ϕ by modifying the Lyapunov function. Moreover, under additional conditions of ϕ , we prove that all the solutions tend to zero, almost surely, and we establish some stability results for the zero solution. Hence, $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure.

Let us review in more details the known results.

1.1 Existence of global solutions

From the mathematical point of view, the question of the (global or local) existence and of the uniqueness of the solutions has been widely studied; the starting model is the unforced NLS equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u(t, x) + i\Delta u(t, x) + i\alpha|u(t, x)|^{2\sigma}u(t, x) = 0, \\ u(0, x) = u^0(x). \end{cases}$$

Different technical issues have to be faced, depending on the spatial domain (its shape and its dimension), the power of the nonlinearity σ and the parameter $\alpha = \pm 1$.

The first global-in-time existence results for the **deterministic** NLS equation (1.2) have been obtained in the full space \mathbb{R}^d for $\sigma < \sigma_{cr}$, where the critical value σ_{cr} depends on α , the spatial dimension d and

the state space in which the dynamics leaves. Then big efforts have been done to deal with the critical case $\sigma = \sigma_{cr}$ and the supercritical case $\sigma > \sigma_{cr}$.

A lot of papers treat what is called the energy subcritical and critical cases, i.e. $0 \leq \sigma \leq \frac{2}{(d-2)_+}$ in the defocusing case ($\alpha = -1$) and $0 \leq \sigma \leq \frac{2}{d}$ in the focusing case ($\alpha = 1$). It is well known that solutions of the NLS equation (1.2) satisfy various conservation laws. In particular, for any smooth enough solution the mass

$$\mathcal{M}(u) := \|u\|_{L^2}^2$$

and the energy

$$\mathcal{E}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2+2\sigma} \|u\|_{L^{2+2\sigma}}^{2+2\sigma}$$

are conserved in time. Thus, it seems natural to study the problem in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the so-called energy space. In fact, both in the focusing and defocusing case, the conserved quantities can be used to get bounds in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and show the existence of global solutions for (1.1); see e.g. [18]. The H^1 -theory has been limited to sub-critical and critical powers; for larger values of σ (supercritical power), the nonlinear term is difficult to handle. In the supercritical case the Cauchy problem for (1.2) considered in \mathbb{R}^d is solved only locally in time or globally for small data on some Sobolev spaces (see [18, Section 6.2] and [19]). Moreover, cases in which there is blow-up in finite time are known. For instance, there is blow-up in finite time to (1.2) in the focusing supercritical case, i.e. $\frac{2}{d} \leq \sigma \leq \frac{2}{(d-2)_+}$ and $\alpha = 1$, provided, e.g. the energy of the initial data is negative (see e.g. [18, Chapter 6.5]). In [52] for the defocusing NLS equation there are examples of energy supercritical parameters σ when $d \geq 5$ for which there is blow-up in finite time if the initial data C^∞ are well localized spherically symmetric functions.

A challenging open problem is the global well-posedness of the NLS equation (1.1) in the more regular Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $s > \frac{d}{2}$. The proof of the existence of a local solution is not an issue in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ since, via the Sobolev embedding $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, one easily controls the nonlinear term (with an arbitrary large power); see e.g. [18, Section 4.10]. However the existence of a *global* solution is harder, since a priori control in the H^1 -norm of the solution no longer implies a priori control of the H^s -norm, when $d \geq 2$. Hence, one cannot use the conservation of the mass and the energy to deduce the existence of a global solution.

For what concerns the NLS equation (1.2) on a d -dimensional torus the literature is much scarcer. The behaviour in the periodic setting is strictly worse than in the case of the full space. The $H^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -critical and subcritical cases are the more studied, starting from the work by Bourgain [9]; see also [17, 44] and the references therein. On the torus case as well, sufficient conditions for blow-up have been studied; see, e.g., [53] for the the one dimensional quintic focusing NLS equation and the therein references.

The global well-posedness of the NLS equation (1.2) in the Sobolev space H^s , for $s > \frac{d}{2}$ remains a challenging problem also in the case of \mathbb{T}^d , but recently some progress in this direction has been done in the beautiful paper by Sy [62]. He considers the NLS equation on \mathbb{T}^3 with arbitrary large parameter σ and constructs non-trivial invariant probability measures μ supported on the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $s \geq 2$. Then, he shows that the equations are globally well-posed on the supports of these measures. As far as we know, this is the only paper proving a global well posedness result, for an arbitrarily large power of the nonlinearity, in the smooth Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $s \geq 2$ (as stated in [62, Remark 1.1] the result can be generalized to the case of \mathbb{T}^d , for $d \geq 3$, considering the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $s > \frac{d}{2}$). The only restriction lies in the fact that the global existence result holds for μ -a.e. initial data (that, on the other hand, are not required to be small).

In the last years the effect of a stochastic perturbation affecting equation (1.2) has been investigated. Well-posedness results have been proved for the **stochastic** NLS equation, that is the NLS equation with a random forcing, both in additive and multiplicative (Itô or Stratonovitch) form, by many authors. The first results are due to De Bouard and Debussche see e.g. [26] and [29], that, in particular, address the $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -subcritical case, both in the focusing and defocusing case. Then, in the same setting, we mention the paper by Barbu, Röckner and Zhang [6] and by Hornung [45]. For the critical case we mention the recent papers [54, 66].

In the stochastic setting as well, working in the full space \mathbb{R}^d is easier than in the periodic setting. The papers by Brzeźniak and Millet [14] and Brzeźniak, Hornung and Weis [12] address the case of compact

riemannian manifolds dealing with the H^1 -subcritical (focusing and defocusing) case. To the best of our knowledge, there are no results in the stochastic case for an arbitrary large power of the nonlinearity, both in the full space \mathbb{R}^d or in the torus case \mathbb{T}^d .

1.2 No-blow up by noise

When dealing with the stochastic case, an interesting question is understanding if the presence of a (suitable) noise guarantees the existence of a global solution, especially in cases where it is known the deterministic counterpart presents blow up phenomena. The answer to this question depends strongly on the type of nonlinearity and on the type of noise. As mentioned above, when working in the energy space H^1 , there are blow-up phenomena for the NLS equation (1.2) in the focusing supercritical case. In this context, working on the full space \mathbb{R}^d , De Bouard and Debussche proved in [27, 28] that, with an additive, nondegenerate and coloured-in-space noise, for any initial data, the blow-up happens before an arbitrary $t > 0$ with positive probability. Still in the focusing supercritical case, the same authors proved in [30] that the conservative, i.e. Stratonovich, noise accelerates the blow-up with positive probability. The effect of the noise changes completely in the non-conservative case: Barbu et al studied in [7] a stochastic NLS equation with linear non-conservative noise, i.e. not in the Stratonovich form, and proved that, for every initial condition in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the probability of no blow-up converges to 1, as the noise coefficient tends to infinity.

Another, quite different case is when the noise coefficient ϕ is actually a Schrödinger operator itself, namely $\phi(u) = i\Delta u$ (modulated Schrödinger equation). In this case, the noise is also regularizing: Debussche and Tsutsumi showed in [32] that this noise makes the 1D quintic focusing NLS globally well-posed. Chouk and Gubinelli in [22] extended this result (applying also new techniques à la Young integral) to global well-posedness in other regularity classes and to local well-posedness for other critical NLS equations, in dimension $d = 1$ and $d = 2$; a further extension to the critical case in any dimension is given by Duboscq and Réveillac in [33].

The question of the effect of nonlinear noise on blow-up has been widely studied also outside the context of Schrödinger equation. The problem is already of interest for finite-dimensional ODEs, where the drift has superlinear growth. In this context, it is known that a suitable noise with superlinear growth can avoid blow-up, even with just a one-dimensional radial structure, see e.g. [2], [38, Example 5.4] among many other examples; in those cases, no blow-up can be inferred by the application of a Lyapunov function criterion, the Lyapunov function being a logarithmic or power function of the Euclidean norm. There are also situations where blow-up happens for the ODE only along special directions, in such cases blow-up can be avoided even by an additive noise, with a suitable choice of an anisotropic Lyapunov function, see e.g. [4] again among many other works.

Concerning nonlinear noise in infinite dimension, a case that has been studied is when the noise multiplies the nonlinear flux: regularizing properties of this type of noise have been proved for scalar conservation laws (e.g. Gess and Souganidis [41], Chouk and Gess [21]) and for Hamilton-Jacobi equations (e.g. Gassiat and Gess [39], Gassiat, Gess, Lions and Souganidis [40]), in a similar spirit to case of modulated Schrödinger equation. The use of a smooth superlinear growth noise - like the one we use here - in the context of SPDEs, seems more recent. Among the first works in this direction, Ren, Tang and Wang considered in [58] a general framework for no blow-up for SPDEs and used it to show no blow-up by a superlinear noise in two examples, one of which is related to KdV equation. Alonso-Oran et al. showed in [1] no blow-up for a one-dimensional, transport-type PDE by a superlinear noise. Tang and Wang [63] and Bagnara, Maurelli and Xu [5] give general settings for no blow-up by superlinear noise in SPDEs and applied these settings to Euler equations and (for [63]) other SPDEs in fluid dynamics and KdV equation; see also [24]. The no blow-up criterion [63, Theorem 3.1] could also be applied to the NLS equation, yielding a no blow-up result similar to the one here though with some technical differences (they would need $s > 2 + d/2$ and a large noise intensity). Nevertheless, we are not aware of a direct example of no blow-up by superlinear noise in Schrödinger equations.

1.3 Long-time behavior of the solution

Another important question on stochastic NLS equations is about the effect of the noise on invariant distributions and long-time behaviour. Most of the literature considers the case of invariant measures for damped versions of the NLS equation: the idea is that invariant distributions arise in the competition between the noise injecting energy and the damping term dissipating this energy; for example, see [10, 11, 31, 35, 36, 50].

Without the damping term, the effect of other noises on invariant distributions and long-time behaviour is different and seems less studied. Concerning the modulated Schrödinger equation, that is the NLS equation (1.2) with $= i\Delta u$ replaced by $i\Delta u\partial_t W$, Dumont, Goubet and Mammeri showed in [34] the exponential decay in L^∞ around the zero solution, for a high-order nonlinearity in the one-dimensional case.

Outside the context of the Schrödinger equation, in the finite-dimensional setting it is known (see, e.g., [49]) that the existence of a suitable Lyapunov function implies the existence of an invariant distribution. Moreover, in the infinite-dimensional case there are several examples of noises with stabilizing effects, though in most of them the coefficient in front of the white noise is constant (i.e., the noise is additive) or a linear or Lipschitz continuous nonlinearity (for a multiplicative noise). We only mention some results, without any claim of completeness. In the celebrated result [3] by Arnold, Crauel and Wihstutz, stabilization is achieved by a linear noise which averages over stable and unstable directions. In a setting closer to ours, Cerrai in [20] has shown a stabilization effect by a Lipschitz (non conservative) noise for a reaction diffusion equation. We mention also [64] by Tsutsumi for a stabilization phenomenon for KdV equation with linear multiplicative noise.

Concerning nonlinear multiplicative noise, in the context of scalar conservation laws, with nonlinear flux multiplying the noise, Gess and Souganidis [41] have shown the long-time convergence to the constant solution, which is the unique invariant distribution; the idea in [41] is that the noise has an averaging effect over the kinetic random variable. This result has been later extended in [42] to include a deterministic nonlinear flux. Gassiat, Gess, Lions and Souganidis considered in [40] the case of anisotropic flux and get the convergence in the long-time limit to non-constant stationary solutions.

In the case of SPDEs with a smooth superlinear growth noise, as the one we consider here, to our knowledge the existence and uniqueness of invariant measures has not been proved yet. Crisan and Lang [24] mention that, in a future paper, they will show existence of invariant measures for stochastically controlled fluid dynamics models.

1.4 Main results

Compared to the literature quoted above, our result present novelities in different directions. When compared to the stochastic literature, as far as we know, this is the first result providing the existence of a unique global solution in the regular Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $s > \frac{d}{2}$, for an arbitrary large power of the nonlinear term and for any initial data in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (both in the focusing and defocusing case). When compared to the deterministic literature, our result can be understood as a regularization (no blow-up) by noise result. As mentioned above, for the NLS equation (1.2) it is known that there might be blow-up phenomena, e.g. in the focusing supercritical case. The superlinear stochastic perturbation ϕ we consider in equation (1.1) is able to prevent these phenomena without any requirement on the initial data.

Our technique to prove the existence of a global solution relies on some ideas contained in [5] and is based on a tightness argument for the sequence of finite-dimensional Galerkin approximations. Roughly speaking, a superlinear noise coefficient "kills the growth" of the nonlinear term so to get good a priori estimates by means of a suitable Lyapunov function. This proves the non-explosion in finite-time.

For what concerns the problem of existence and uniqueness of invariant measures, this is in general a quite challenging problem for the stochastic NLS equation. By slightly strengthen the assumptions on the diffusion coefficient ϕ and by modifying the Lyapunov function, the same argument used to prove the existence of global solutions, is adapted first to prove the existence of invariant measures supported on $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then, when $\phi(u) = f(u)u$ for suitable f , we prove that the zero solution is a global attractor so that $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure. Roughly speaking, the (even stronger) superlinear noise coefficient "force the dynamics" to converge to the zero solution, which is an equilibrium of the system.

As far as we know, this is the first result proving the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure (as well as some stability results) for the NLS on \mathbb{T}^d for an arbitrary large power of the nonlinearity.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the mathematical framework, state the assumptions and formulate the main results. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the existence of a unique global solution. First we introduce the sequence of Galerkin approximations, then we prove its tightness and convergence to a martingale solution of the NLS equation (1.1). Moreover pathwise uniqueness is obtained. In Section 4 we prove the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure and some stability result for the zero solution. In Appendix A we collect some compactness and tightness criteria, whereas in Appendix B we provide the proof of a technical lemma. In Appendix C we provide a generalization of our results in the case of Riemannian manifolds.

2 Mathematical setting, assumptions and main results

Let $\mathbb{T}^d := (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^d$. For $p \in [1, \infty)$ we denote by $L^p := L^p(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the Lebesgue space of all complex-valued measurable p -integrable functions on \mathbb{T}^d . By $L^\infty := L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we denote the Banach space of Lebesgue measurable essentially bounded complex-valued functions.

We expand a periodic function in Fourier series as

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{u}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}, \quad \hat{u}(k) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} u(x) e^{-ik \cdot x} dx.$$

We set $\langle k \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |k|^2}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $J^s := (I - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}$ as the operator defined in terms of Fourier series

$$J^s u(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \langle k \rangle^s \hat{u}(k) e^{ik \cdot x}.$$

For $p \in [1, \infty)$ we define the *Bessel potential space* $H^{s,p} := H^{s,p}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ as the space of all distributions u such that $J^s u \in L^p$. We have that J^σ is an isomorphism between the spaces $H^{s,p}$ and $H^{s-\sigma,p}$. The norm in $H^{s,p}$ will be denoted by

$$\|u\|_{H^{s,p}} := \|J^s u\|_{L^p}.$$

For $p = 2$ the space $H^s := H^{s,2}$ is a complex Hilbert space with inner product

$$(2.1) \quad (u, v)_s = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \langle k \rangle^{2s} \hat{u}(k) \overline{\hat{v}(k)}$$

where \bar{v} denotes the complex conjugate of v . We abbreviate $H := L^2$.

We have the equivalence of the norms (see e.g. [23, Remark 2.3])

$$(2.2) \quad \|u\|_s \simeq \|u\|_{L^2} + \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u\|_{L^2}.$$

The dual of the space H^s is H^{-s} . We denote by ${}_{H^{-s}}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^s}$ the $H^s - H^{-s}$ -duality bracket; it reduces to the H -scalar product $(u, v)_0$ when $u \in H$ and $v \in H^s$.

The space H^1 is usually called the energy space (see, e.g., [18]). Differently from the approach to prove global existence by using the a priori estimates of the mass and of the energy, we will be able to work in any space H^s with $s > \frac{d}{2}$. The main point in considering $s > \frac{d}{2}$ is that $H^s \subset L^\infty$. Actually, two parameters will play a crucial role later on: s and s' such that

$$(2.3) \quad s > s' > \frac{d}{2},$$

so there are the continuous embeddings

$$(2.4) \quad H^{s+1} \subset H^s \subset H^{s'} \subset H \simeq H^* \subset H^{-s'} \subset H^{-s} \subset H^{-s-1},$$

$$(2.5) \quad H^s \subset H^{s'} \subset L^\infty,$$

and the compact embedding

$$(2.6) \quad H^s \subset H^{s'}.$$

It follows that the embedding $H^s \subset H^{-s-1}$ is compact as well.

We will deal with the following functional spaces for a given $r > 0$:

- $C_w([0, T]; H^r)$ with the topology generated by the family of seminorms $\|u\|_{k,v} := \sup_{t \in [0, k]} |\langle u(t), v \rangle|$,
 $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in H^{-r}$;
- $L^\infty(0, T; H^r)$ with the topology induced by the norm $\text{esssup}_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_r$;
- $C([0, T]; H^r)$ with the topology induced by the norm $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_r$;
- $C^{0,\beta}([0, T]; H^{-r})$ with the topology induced by the norm

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^{0,\beta}([0, T]; H^{-r})} &:= \|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^{-r})} + [u]_{C^{0,\beta}([0, T]; H^{-r})} \\ &:= \text{esssup}_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{-r} + \sup_{s, t \in [0, T]; s \neq t} \frac{\|u(t) - u(s)\|_{-r}}{|t - s|^\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

From [60] we know that for any $s < r$ we have

$$C_w([0, T]; H^s) \cap L^\infty(0, T; H^r) = C_w([0, T]; H^r).$$

Notation 2.1. We write $u = \Re u + i\Im u$ to specify the real and imaginary parts of $u \in \mathbb{C}$.

We write $a \lesssim b$ when there exists a constant C such that $a \leq Cb$; to highlight the role of this constant, we write $a \lesssim_C b$.

Given two Hilbert spaces E and F , we denote by $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ the space of all linear bounded operators $B : E \rightarrow F$ and abbreviate $\mathcal{L}(E) := \mathcal{L}(E, E)$.

We denote the open ball centered at the origin with radius R by \mathbb{B}_R and its complement by \mathbb{B}_R^c . In order to emphasize the underlying topology, we write $\mathbb{B}_{R, \mathcal{H}}$, i.e. $\mathbb{B}_{R, \mathcal{H}}$ is a subset of \mathcal{H} and the radius R of the ball is measured in the \mathcal{H} -norm.

2.1 The linear operator

We set

$$A = -\Delta, \quad \mathcal{D}(A) = H^2.$$

A is a non-negative self-adjoint operator on H , densely defined. We will consider it as a linear self-adjoint operator in H^s with domain H^{s+2} . Moreover, it defines a unitary C_0 -group $(e^{itA})_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ in H^s .

In the space H we consider the complete orthonormal basis $\{e_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ of the eigenfunctions of the operator A . We have $Ae_k = |k|^2 e_k$, with

$$e_k(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d}{2}}} e^{ik \cdot x}$$

So the eigenvalues are $\lambda_k = |k|^2$. Moreover, $\|e_k\|_s = \langle k \rangle^s$.

Later on we will need the finite dimensional operator $P_n : H \rightarrow H_n = \text{Span}\{e_k : |k| \leq n\}$ defined by

$$(2.8) \quad P_n u = \sum_{k: |k| \leq n} (u, e_k)_0 e_k.$$

2.2 The nonlinear operator

We write the nonlinearity as

$$(2.9) \quad F(u) := |u|^{2\sigma} u$$

and assume that

$$(2.10) \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In Remark 2.3 we consider non integer values of σ .

In the following Lemma we collect some properties of the nonlinear operator F . The proof of the result relies on the Moser Estimate (see [8]) that we recall here in the form more suitable for our needs. Let $r \geq 0$, then

$$(2.11) \quad \|v_1 v_2\|_r \lesssim_{r,d} \|v_1\|_{L^\infty} \|v_2\|_r + \|v_1\|_r \|v_2\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall v_1, v_2 \in L^\infty \cap H^r.$$

Lemma 2.2. (i) Let $r \geq 0$. Then F maps the space $H^r \cap L^\infty$ into $H^r \cap L^\infty$ and

$$(2.12) \quad \|F(u)\|_r \lesssim_{r,d,\sigma} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u\|_r, \quad u \in H^r \cap L^\infty.$$

(ii) Let $r > \frac{d}{2}$. Then F maps H^r into H^r and, for any $u, v \in H^r$, it holds

$$(2.13) \quad \|F(u) - F(v)\|_r \lesssim_{r,d,\sigma} (\|u\|_r^{2\sigma} + \|v\|_r^{2\sigma}) \|u - v\|_r.$$

Proof. (i) We proceed by an induction argument on σ . For $\sigma = 1$, using twice the Moser inequality we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \| |u|^2 u \|_r &\lesssim_{r,d} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u\|_r + \| |u|^2 \|_r \|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_{r,d} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u\|_r + (\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\bar{u}\|_r + \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_r) \|u\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim_{r,d} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|u\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose for some $\sigma \geq 1$ it holds

$$(2.14) \quad \| |u|^{2\sigma} u \|_r \lesssim_{r,d} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u\|_r;$$

let us prove the same estimate for $\sigma + 1$. Using repeatedly the Moser inequality and the inductive hypothesis (2.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \| |u|^{2(\sigma+1)} u \|_r &\lesssim_{r,d} \| |u|^{2\sigma} u \|_{L^\infty} \| |u|^2 \|_r + \| |u|^{2\sigma} u \|_r \| |u|^2 \|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma+1} 2 \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_r + \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u\|_r \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim_{r,d} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2(\sigma+1)} \|u\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We exploit the estimate

$$(2.15) \quad \| |a|^{2\sigma} a - |b|^{2\sigma} b \| \lesssim_\sigma (|a|^{2\sigma} + |b|^{2\sigma}) |a - b|,$$

valid for any $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. Since H^r is a multiplicative algebra for $r > \frac{d}{2}$ we easily get

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u) - F(v)\|_r &\lesssim_{r,d,\sigma} (\| |u|^{2\sigma} \|_r + \| |v|^{2\sigma} \|_r) \|u - v\|_r \\ &\lesssim_{r,d,\sigma} (\|u\|_r^{2\sigma} + \|v\|_r^{2\sigma}) \|u - v\|_r. \end{aligned}$$

□

From (2.12) we infer the existence of a positive constant $K = K(s, \sigma, d)$ such that

$$(2.16) \quad \|F(u)\|_s \leq K \|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u\|_s, \quad \forall u \in H^s \cap L^\infty, s > 0.$$

Remark 2.3. We can consider $\sigma > 0$ not integer but in this case the results are less general than in Lemma 2.2. Indeed, the mapping $F : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, defined as $F(u) = |u|^{2\sigma} u$, has continuous derivatives of all orders when σ is an integer number, and till the order $1 + \lfloor 2\sigma \rfloor$ when σ is not integer. Following Lemma 4.10.2 of [18] when $\sigma \notin \mathbb{N}$ we can deal with the H^r -regularity of $F(u)$ for $\frac{d}{2} < r < 1 + \lfloor 2\sigma \rfloor$ and r integer.

2.3 The stochastic forcing term

To prove the existence of a unique strong (in the probabilistic sense) solution to (1.1) we work under the following assumptions on the noise.

We say that a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ satisfies the standard conditions when the filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is right-continuous and all \mathbb{P} -negligible sets of \mathcal{F} are elements of \mathcal{F}_0 .

Fix s' and s as in (2.3).

(H1) W is a real-valued one-dimensional Brownian motion on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ satisfying the standard assumptions.

(H2) The diffusion coefficient ϕ is such that

- i) $\phi : H^s \rightarrow H^s$ is bounded on balls,
- ii) $\phi : H^{s'} \rightarrow H^{-s-1}$ is continuous and bounded on balls;

(H3) the projected coefficient $P_n \phi : H_n \rightarrow H_n$ is locally Lipschitz continuous for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$;

(H4) there exists a measurable function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ which is locally bounded (i.e. bounded on bounded sets) and such that

$$\|\phi(u) - \phi(v)\|_s \leq \psi(\|u\|_s, \|v\|_s) \|u - v\|_s \quad \forall u, v \in H^s;$$

(H5) there exist $r > 1$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.17) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\phi(u)\|_s^2}{\|u\|_s^2} - \frac{[\Re(u, \phi(u))_s]^2}{\|u\|_s^4} \leq B \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{B}_{r, H^s}^c$$

where K is the constant appearing in (2.16).

Remark 2.4. Working under assumptions (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H5) is enough to prove the existence of global-in-time martingale solutions. Assumption (H4) is only needed to prove pathwise uniqueness.

Notice that Assumption (H4) implies Assumption (H3) due to the equivalence of norms in finite dimensional spaces. We explicitly mention (H3) to make clear in what follows what assumptions are needed to infer the existence of global-in-time martingale solutions and what are needed to infer the pathwise uniqueness.

Remark 2.5. Assumptions (H5) could be weakened: see Remark 3.6. The auxiliary space $H^{s'}$, that appears in Assumption (H2)(ii), plays a role in the construction of martingale solutions, see Remark 3.9.

To prove the existence of invariant measures μ for (1.1) we need to strengthen Assumption (H5) as follows.

(H5') There exist $p \in (0, 1)$, $r > 1$ and $B < 0$ such that

$$(2.18) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\phi(u)\|_s^2}{\|u\|_s^2} - \frac{2-p}{2} \frac{[\Re(u, \phi(u))_s]^2}{\|u\|_s^4} \leq B \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{B}_{r, H^s}^c.$$

To prove that $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure and the zero solution is asymptotically stable, we will strengthen Assumption (H5) as follows.

(H5'') There exists $f : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\phi(u) = f(u)u$. Moreover, there exist $p \in (0, 1)$ and $B < 0$ such that

$$(2.19) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} |f(u)|^2 - \frac{2-p}{2} [\Re f(u)]^2 \leq B, \quad \forall u \in H^s.$$

Notice that **(H5'')** is stronger than **(H5')**, which is stronger than **(H5)**. Anyway, we presented all these three assumptions, because we gradually prove stronger and stronger results: no blow-up for solutions under **(H5)**, existence of invariant measures under **(H5')**, and asymptotic stability of the zero solution as well as the uniqueness of the invariant measure $\mu = \delta_0$ under **(H5'')**.

Finally, rewriting **(H5'')** as

$$|\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}[\Im f(u)]^2 \leq \frac{1-p}{2}[\Re f(u)]^2 + B, \quad \forall u \in H^s$$

we realize that a key role is played by the real part of f , which dominates the intensity of its imaginary part and of the nonlinear term.

2.4 Examples of noise forcing term

Let us provide examples of function ϕ appearing in the noise term.

We introduce the function $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as

$$h(x) = a(1+x)^b + ic(1+x)^d,$$

with $a \neq 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, d > 1$. We have that

$$(2.20) \quad x \mapsto |h(x)| \quad \text{is increasing.}$$

Moreover, h is continuously differentiable with

$$(2.21) \quad x \mapsto |h'(x)| \quad \text{increasing.}$$

As a consequence of the Mean Value Theorem we obtain the estimate

$$(2.22) \quad |h(x) - h(y)| \leq (|h'(x)| \vee |h'(y)|) |x - y|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Let now $f : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be defined as

$$(2.23) \quad f(u) = h(\|u\|_{L^\infty});$$

we consider a diffusion term ϕ of the following form

$$(2.24) \quad \phi(u) = f(u)u.$$

Let us verify that this choice satisfies Assumptions **(H2)**, **(H4)** and **(H5'')**. These in turns imply **(H3)**, **(H5)** and **(H5')**.

(H2) Using the Sobolev embeddings (2.5) it is easy to see that ϕ is bounded on balls as a map from H^s into itself and from $H^{s'}$ into H^{-s-1} .

Let us prove that $\phi : H^{s'} \rightarrow H^{s'}$ is continuous; this implies that $\phi : H^{s'} \rightarrow H^{-s-1}$ is continuous as well. Let $u, v \in H^{s'}$. Bearing in mind (2.22) and (2.5) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(u) - \phi(v)\|_{s'} &\leq |f(u) - f(v)|\|u\|_{s'} + |f(v)|\|u - v\|_{s'} \\ &\leq [|h'(\|u\|_{L^\infty})| \vee |h'(\|v\|_{L^\infty})|] \| \|u\|_{L^\infty} - \|v\|_{L^\infty} \| \|u\|_{s'} + |h(\|v\|_{L^\infty})| \|u - v\|_{s'} \\ &\lesssim \|u - v\|_{s'} (\|u\|_{s'} [|h'(\|u\|_{L^\infty})| \vee |h'(\|v\|_{L^\infty})|] + |f(v)|) \\ &\lesssim \psi(\|u\|_{s'}, \|v\|_{s'}) \|u - v\|_{s'}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a locally bounded map. In the last equality we used (2.20), (2.21) and (2.5).

(H5'') Setting $\tilde{B} = -B > 0$ estimate (2.19) becomes

$$(2.25) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}[\Im f(u)]^2 \leq \frac{(1-p)}{2}[\Re f(u)]^2 - \tilde{B}.$$

Therefore, (2.19) is fulfilled when there exists a positive constant \tilde{B} such that

$$(2.26) \quad 2|\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + c^2(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2d} \leq (1-p)a^2(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2b} - 2\tilde{B}$$

for any $u \in H^s$. We then choose the parameters a, b, c, d as follows.

- When $b = d = \sigma \geq 1$, for a fixed $p \in (0, 1)$ we require a and c to fulfil

$$2|\alpha|K + c^2 < (1 - p)a^2.$$

In this way $2\tilde{B} := (1 - p)a^2 - 2|\alpha|K - c^2 > 0$.

- When $b \geq d > \sigma \geq 1$, we use

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \leq (1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2d} \leq (1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2b}$$

and we can proceed in a similar way to the previous case.

(H4) One argues as done for **(H2)**.

Notice that **(H5)** would require less restrictive assumptions on the parameters than **(H5'')**. Indeed, estimate (2.17) becomes

$$(2.27) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}[\Im f(u)]^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}[\Re f(u)]^2 + B.$$

Therefore, (2.17) is fulfilled when there exists $B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.28) \quad |\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{c^2}{2}(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2d} \leq \frac{a^2}{2}(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2b} + B.$$

We then choose the parameters as follows.

- When $b = d = \sigma \geq 1$, we require $2|\alpha|K + c^2 \leq a^2$; then B can be any non-negative constant.
- When $b = d > \sigma \geq 1$, we use Young inequality to get that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$2|\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \leq \epsilon\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2b} + C_\epsilon \leq \epsilon(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2b} + C_\epsilon.$$

Therefore (2.28) holds when $c^2 < a^2$ and B is chosen large enough, i.e. $B \geq C_\epsilon$ when we choose $\epsilon \leq a^2 - c^2$ (notice that C_ϵ depends also on α, K, b, σ).

- When $b > d > \sigma \geq 1$, we use the Young inequality to bound also the power $2d$, i.e.

$$2|\alpha|K\|u\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + c^2(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2d} \leq \epsilon(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty})^{2b} + C_\epsilon.$$

Therefore (2.28) holds for every $a \neq 0$ and B chosen large enough as in the previous case.

Remark 2.6. Another possible example is given by a diffusion term ϕ of the form (2.24), with f as in (2.23) and

$$h(x) = ax^b + icx^d,$$

for $a \neq 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, d > 1$.

Remark 2.7. One could consider a slightly more general example for the noise: ϕ is of the form (2.24) with $f : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$(2.29) \quad f(u) = a(1 + \|u\|_{X_1})^b + ic(1 + \|u\|_{X_2})^d,$$

with $a \neq 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b, d > 1$.

The spaces X_1 and X_2 are chosen in such a way that for some constants K_0, K_1 and K_2

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{X_2} &\leq K_2\|u\|_{X_1} \leq K_1\|u\|_{s'}, & \forall u \in H^s \\ \|u\|_{L^\infty} &\leq K_0\|u\|_{X_1} & \forall u \in H^s, \end{aligned}$$

where, as usual, we consider $\frac{d}{2} < s' < s$.

To show that conditions **(H5)**–**(H5'')** are satisfied one imposes conditions on the parameters a, b, c, d that involve also the constants K_0, K_1 and K_2 .

2.5 Statement of the main results

The following hypotheses stand throughout the paper

$$(2.30) \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{N}, \quad s > \frac{d}{2}.$$

We summarize our main results as follows.

Theorem 2.8. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5). Then, for any initial datum $u^0 \in H^s$ there exists a unique global-in-time strong solution to (3.1) with \mathbb{P} -a.s. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$.*

Theorem 2.9. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5'). Then there exists at least one invariant measure μ for equation (3.1), supported in H^s .*

Theorem 2.10. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5''). Then $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure for equation (3.1) and the zero solution is exponentially stable.*

For a more precise statement of the results concerning the ergodic properties to the solution process see Theorems 4.5 and 4.7.

3 Existence and uniqueness of global strong solutions

In this section we prove Theorem 2.8, that is that equation (1.1) admits a unique strong (in the probabilistic sense) solution.

We rewrite equation (1.1) in the following abstract form

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} du(t) + i[-Au(t) + \alpha F(u(t))] dt = \phi(u(t)) dW(t), & t > 0 \\ u(0) = u^0. \end{cases}$$

We consider martingale solutions, i.e. weak solutions in the probabilistic sense, and strong solutions as well. Here are the definitions.

Definition 3.1 (martingale solution). *Let $u^0 \in H^s$. A martingale solution of the equation (3.1) on the time interval $[0, \infty)$ with initial datum u^0 is a system $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{W}, u)$ consisting of*

- a filtered probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$ satisfying the standard conditions;
- a real valued one dimensional Brownian motion \tilde{W} on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$;
- an H -valued continuous and $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ -adapted process u with $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost all paths in $C_w([0, \infty); H^s)$, such that for every $t \in [0, \infty)$ the equality

$$(3.2) \quad u(t) = u^0 + i \int_0^t [Au(s) - \alpha F(u(s))] ds + \int_0^t \phi(u(s)) d\tilde{W}(s)$$

holds $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely in H^{-s-1} .

Definition 3.2. *Let $u^0 \in H^s$. Assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, W, \mathbb{F})$ is a system consisting of*

- a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ satisfying the standard conditions;
- a real valued one dimensional Brownian motion W on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$.

A strong solution of the equation (3.1) on the time interval $[0, \infty)$ with the initial datum u^0 is a H -valued continuous and \mathbb{F} -adapted process u with \mathbb{P} -almost all paths in $C_w([0, \infty); H^s)$, such that for every $t \in [0, \infty)$ the equality

$$(3.3) \quad u(t) = u^0 + i \int_0^t [Au(s) - \alpha F(u(s))] ds + \int_0^t \phi(u(s)) dW(s)$$

holds \mathbb{P} -almost surely in H^{-s-1}

Remark 3.3. We will deal with deterministic initial data, the extension to random initial data is straightforward.

To prove Theorem 2.8 we proceed as follows. In subsection 3.1 we introduce the finite-dimensional Galerkin approximation of equation (3.1). In Propositions 3.5 and 3.7 we prove uniform a-priori bounds for the solution of the approximated problem. These bounds allow to infer the tightness of the laws defined by the solution of the Galerkin approximation (see Proposition A.4). In section 3.2 we prove the convergence of the Galerkin approximations to the martingale solution of problem (3.1). In subsection 3.3 we prove pathwise uniqueness of the solution, from which we also infer that the solution is strong in the probabilistic sense.

3.1 The Galerkin approximation

We introduce a finite-dimensional approximation of equation (3.1). To this end we introduce the projector operator $P_n : H \rightarrow H_n = \text{Span}\{e_k : |k| \leq n\}$ introduced in (2.8). For any $r \geq 0$ we have

$$(3.4) \quad (P_n u, v)_r = (u, P_n v)_r, \quad \|P_n u\|_r \leq \|u\|_r, \quad \forall u, v \in H^r$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P_n - I\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^r)} = 0.$$

By density, we can extend P_n to an operator $P_n : H^{-r} \rightarrow H_n$ with

$$(3.6) \quad \|P_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{-r})} \leq 1.$$

We consider the Faedo-Galerkin approximation in the space H_n , obtained by projecting the NLS equation (3.1) onto the finite dimensional space H_n :

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} du_n(t) + i[-Au_n(t) + \alpha P_n F(u_n(t))] dt = P_n \phi(u_n(t)) dW(t) \\ u_n(0) = P_n(u^0), \end{cases}$$

It is a classical result to show that the Faedo-Galerkin equation has a unique solution. This is a strong solution in the probabilistic sense. First we consider local existence.

Proposition 3.4. Assume (2.30), (H1) and (H3). Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u^0 \in H^s$ there exists a unique local solution u_n of (3.7) with continuous paths in H_n and maximal existence time τ_n , which is a blow-up time in the sense that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau_n(\omega)} \|u_n(t, \omega)\|_{H_n} = +\infty$$

for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ with $\tau_n(\omega) < \infty$.

Proof. The result is a consequence of the well-known theory for finite-dimensional stochastic differential equations with locally Lipschitz continuous coefficients.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we are done if we prove that the functions

$$h_n(x) := -iAx + iP_n(F(x)), \quad l_n(x) := P_n \phi(x), \quad x \in H_n,$$

are locally Lipschitz continuous in H_n . Let $x, y \in H_n$ with $\|x\|_0 \leq R$ and $\|y\|_0 \leq R$. Using (3.4), (2.13), (2.5) and the equivalence of norms in H_n , we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_n F(x) - P_n F(y)\|_0 &\leq \|F(x) - F(y)\|_0 \lesssim (\|x\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \|y\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma}) \|x - y\|_0 \\ &\lesssim (\|x\|_s^{2\sigma} + \|y\|_s^{2\sigma}) \|x - y\|_0 \lesssim_n (\|x\|_0^{2\sigma} + \|y\|_0^{2\sigma}) \|x - y\|_0 \leq 2R^{2\sigma} \|x - y\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A|_{H_n}$ is a bounded operator, we get

$$\|h_n(x) - h_n(y)\|_0 \lesssim_{n,R} \|x - y\|_0.$$

From (H3) we immediately see that l_n is locally Lipschitz continuous in H_n . This concludes the proof. \square

Now we show that the local solution to (3.7) is actually a global solution.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume (2.30), (H1), (H2)(i), (H3) and (H5). Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u^0 \in H^s$ there exists a unique solution u_n of (3.7) defined on the time interval $[0, +\infty)$ and with \mathbb{P} -a.e. path in $C([0, +\infty); H_n)$. Moreover, for any T and $\delta > 0$, there exists $C_{\delta, T} > 0$ such that*

$$(3.8) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \geq C_{\delta, T}) \leq \delta.$$

Proof. We follow the approach of [5]. We divide the proof in two parts: first we prove global existence and then the estimate (3.8).

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we endow the H_n space with the H^s -scalar product. We fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and take the unique maximal solution (u_n, τ_n) from Proposition 3.4. We prove that the solution is global, that is $\tau_n = +\infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., appealing to the Khasmiskii's test for non explosion, see [43, Theorem III.4.1] (for the finite-dimensional case). The idea is as follows. We introduce a sequence $\{\tau_{n, k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of stopping times defined by

$$\tau_{n, k} := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|u_n(t)\|_s \geq k\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In order to prove that $\tau_n = +\infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., it is sufficient to find a Lyapunov function $\mathcal{V} : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{V} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } H^s,$$

$$(3.10) \quad a_k := \inf \{\mathcal{V}(v) : \|v\|_s \geq k\} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) < \infty,$$

such that

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{V}(u_n(t \wedge \tau_{n, k}))] \leq \mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) + Ct,$$

for a constant $C < \infty$ and all $t \in [0, T]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_{n, k} < t) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{n, k} < t\}}) \leq \frac{1}{a_k} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{n, k} < t\}} \mathcal{V}(u_n(t \wedge \tau_{n, k}))] \leq \frac{\mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) + Ct}{a_k}.$$

Passing to the limit, we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{n, k} < t) = 0,$$

for every fixed $t \geq 0$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(\tau_n < t) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_{n, k} < t) = 0$ for every fixed $t \geq 0$, which means $\mathbb{P}(\tau_n = +\infty) = 1$.

We consider $R > \frac{1}{2}$, $a \in (0, \log(2R))$ and a non-decreasing C^2 -function $l : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [a, +\infty)$, such that

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{cases} l(\rho) = a, & 0 \leq \rho < R \\ l(\rho) = \log_e \rho, & \rho > 2R. \end{cases}$$

Then as Lyapunov function we consider

$$\mathcal{V}(u) = l(\|u\|_s).$$

It is trivial to verify that \mathcal{V} fulfills (3.10) and (3.11). In order to get (3.12), we apply Itô formula to $\mathcal{V}(u_n)$, up to the maximal existence time of the process u_n . We obtain

$$(3.14) \quad d\mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) = (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n(t)) dt + \mathcal{V}'(u_n(t))[P_n \phi(u_n(t))] dW(t),$$

where $(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n(t))$ and $\mathcal{V}'(u_n(t))$ vanish when $\|u_n(t)\|_s < R$; however, when $\|u_n(t)\|_s \geq R$ they are given by

$$(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) = \mathcal{V}'(u_n)[iAu_n - i\alpha P_n(F(u_n))] + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}''(u_n)[P_n \phi(u_n), P_n \phi(u_n)],$$

where

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{V}'(u_n)[h] = l'(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{\Re(u_n, h)_s}{\|u_n\|_s}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}''(u_n)[h, k] = l''(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{\Re(u_n, h)_s \Re(u_n, k)_s}{\|u_n\|_s^2} + l'(\|u_n\|_s) \left(\frac{\Re(h, k)_s}{\|u_n\|_s} - \frac{\Re(u_n, h)_s \Re(u_n, k)_s}{\|u_n\|_s^3} \right).$$

We notice the following simplification:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}'(u_n)[iAu_n - i\alpha P_n(F(u_n))] &= \frac{l'(\|u_n\|_s)}{\|u_n\|_s} \Re(u_n, iAu_n - i\alpha P_n(F(u_n)))_s \\ &= \frac{l'(\|u_n\|_s)}{\|u_n\|_s} \Re(u_n, -i\alpha P_n(F(u_n)))_s \\ &= \frac{l'(\|u_n\|_s)}{\|u_n\|_s} \Im(u_n, \alpha P_n(F(u_n)))_s, \end{aligned}$$

since the operators A and $(I + A)^{\frac{\sigma}{2}}$ commute and so

$$(3.16) \quad \Re(u_n, iAu_n)_s = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) &= \frac{l'(\|u_n\|_s)}{\|u_n\|_s} \Im(u_n, \alpha P_n(F(u_n)))_s + \frac{1}{2} l''(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} l'(\|u_n\|_s) \left(\frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s} - \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^3} \right) \\ (3.17) \quad &\leq |\alpha| K l'(\|u_n\|_s) \|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u_n\|_s + \frac{1}{2} l''(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} l'(\|u_n\|_s) \left(\frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s} - \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^3} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where K is the constant in the estimate (2.16).

We will now show that

$$(3.18) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{u \in H_n} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) < \infty.$$

Since $(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) = 0$ when the H^s -norm of u_n is smaller than R , we have to consider two cases: when the H^s -norm of u_n is in $[R, 2R]$ or in $(2R, +\infty)$.

• If $R \leq \|u_n\|_s \leq 2R$, from (3.17) we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) &\leq |\alpha| K l'(\|u_n\|_s) \|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|u_n\|_s + \frac{1}{2} l''(\|u_n\|_s) \|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2 + l'(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s} \\ &\lesssim l'(\|u_n\|_s) \|u_n\|_s^{2\sigma+1} + \frac{1}{2} l''(\|u_n\|_s) \|\phi(u_n)\|_s^2 + l'(\|u_n\|_s) \frac{\|\phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $l'(\|u_n\|_s)$, $l''(\|u_n\|_s)$ are continuous, they are bounded when $R \leq \|u_n\|_s \leq 2R$; also $\|\phi(u_n)\|_s$ is bounded when $R \leq \|u_n\|_s \leq 2R$ in virtue of Assumption (H2)(i). Therefore

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{R \leq \|u_n\|_s \leq 2R} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) < \infty.$$

• If $\|u_n\|_s > 2R$, then $l'(\|u_n\|_s) = \frac{1}{\|u_n\|_s}$ and $l''(\|u_n\|_s) = -\frac{1}{\|u_n\|_s^2}$. Hence, from estimate (3.17) we infer

$$(3.19) \quad (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) \leq |\alpha|K\|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s^2} - \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^4}.$$

Thanks to (2.17) in Assumption (H5), this quantity is finite if we choose $R = \frac{r}{2}$ (r given in (2.17)). Indeed we use $\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s \leq \|\phi(u_n)\|_s$ and $(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s = (u_n, \phi(u_n))_s$, so

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\|u_n\|_s \geq 2R} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) < \infty.$$

Combining all the above cases we conclude that $(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V}(u_n))$ is bounded in H_n , uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that is there must exist a positive constant C - independent of k and n - such that

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V} \leq C \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{V}(u_n(t \wedge \tau_{n,k})) \leq \mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) + Ct + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{n,k}} \mathcal{V}'(u_n(r))[\phi(u_n(r))] dW(r).$$

Taking the expected value on both sides of the above estimate we get (3.12), from which we infer that $\tau_n = +\infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., that is, the solution is defined at any time $t \geq 0$.

Let us now prove estimate (3.8). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define

$$\tau_M^n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) \geq M\}$$

for $M > 0$, to be chosen later on. We have $\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) \geq M \right\} = \{\tau_M^n \leq T\}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}(u_n(\tau_M^n)) \geq M) = 1$, so $\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) \geq M \right\} = \{\tau_M^n \leq T\} \cap \{\mathcal{V}(u_n(\tau_M^n)) \geq M\} \subseteq \{\mathcal{V}(u_n(T \wedge \tau_M^n)) \geq M\}$.

From (4.17) and (3.20) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{V}(u_n(t \wedge \tau_M^n))] \leq \mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) + Ct \leq \mathcal{V}(u(0)) + Ct$$

By the Markov inequality we infer

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) \geq M\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}(u_n(T \wedge \tau_M^n)) \geq M) \leq \frac{\mathcal{V}(u(0)) + Ct}{M}.$$

Hence, for any $\delta > 0$ we choose $M \geq \max(\log_e(2R), \frac{\mathcal{V}(u(0)) + CT}{\delta})$; therefore there exists $C_{\delta, T}$ such that

$$(3.21) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \geq C_{\delta, T}) \leq \delta.$$

□

Remark 3.6. From the proof we see that the same result can be obtained if in Assumption (H5) we assume the bound (2.17) only on the set $\mathbb{B}_{r, H^s}^c \cap \mathbb{B}_{\rho, L^\infty}^c$ for some $\rho > 0$ and we add the condition

$$(3.22) \quad \exists L > 0 : \|\phi(u)\|_s \leq L\|u\|_s, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{B}_{r, H^s}^c \cap \mathbb{B}_{\rho, L^\infty}^c.$$

Indeed, using $\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s \leq \|\phi(u_n)\|_s$ and $|(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s| = |(u_n, \phi(u_n))_s| \leq \|u_n\|_s \|\phi(u_n)\|_s$, starting from (3.19) we estimate on $\mathbb{B}_{r, H^s}^c \cap \mathbb{B}_{\rho, L^\infty}^c$

$$(3.23) \quad (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) \leq |\alpha|K\|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s^2} - \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^4}$$

$$(3.24) \quad \leq |\alpha|K\rho^{2\sigma} + \frac{3}{2}L^2.$$

The bound (3.21) is one of the two estimates appearing in the tightness criterium given in Proposition A.4. Now we look for the other estimate, i.e. we provide a uniform estimate in probability for u_n in $C^{0,\beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$ with $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$.

Proposition 3.7. *Assume (2.30), (H1), (H2)(i), (H3) and (H5). Let u_n be the unique solution to equation (3.7) given in Proposition 3.5. Let $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$. For any $T > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists a positive constant $C_{\delta, T}$ such that*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} \left(\|u_n\|_{C^{0,\beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} \geq C_{\delta, T} \right) \leq \delta.$$

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$. Estimate (3.8) and the continuous embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow H^{-s-1}$ yield the existence of a constant $\tilde{C}_{\delta, T} > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} \left(\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^{-s-1})} \geq \tilde{C}_{\delta, T} \right) \leq \delta.$$

Thus, bearing in mind (2.7), it is sufficient to prove a uniform bound in probability for the semi-norm $[u_n]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})}$, defined in (2.7). Let $M > 0$, we introduce the stopping time

$$(3.25) \quad \rho_M^n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|u_n(t)\|_s \geq M\},$$

and the event

$$A_M^n := \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_n(t)\|_s \geq M \right\}.$$

We have that $A_M^n \supseteq \{\rho_M^n \leq T\}$. In virtue of (3.8) it also holds $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(A_M^n) < \delta$, provided that M is sufficiently large. Hence, for such an M , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left([u_n]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})} > a \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left((A_M^n)^c \cap [u_n]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})} > a \right) + \mathbb{P}(A_M^n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left([u_n(\cdot \wedge \rho_M^n)]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})} > a \right) + \delta \leq \frac{1}{a^p} \mathbb{E} \left[[u_n(\cdot \wedge \rho_M^n)]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})}^p \right] + \delta, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive a and p . Thus, if we show that

$$(3.26) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[[u_n(\cdot \wedge \rho_M^n)]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})}^p \right] < \infty,$$

then, for suitable $a_\delta > 0$, we can infer

$$\mathbb{P} \left([u_n]_{C^{0,\beta}(H^{-s-1})} > a_\delta \right) \leq 2\delta,$$

which will conclude the proof. Let us thus prove (3.26). For $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n(t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n) - u_n(t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1}^p &\lesssim_p \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|iAu_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1} dr \right)^p + \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|iP_n(F(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)))\|_{-s-1} dr \right)^p \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_{t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n}^{t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n} \phi(u_n(r)) dW(r) \right\|_{-s-1}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Set $I_1 := \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|iAu_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1} dr \right)^p$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|Au_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1}^p \lesssim |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{1-s}^p \\ &\lesssim |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_s^p, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of the continuous embedding $H^s \subset H^{1-s}$, since we assumed (2.3). Hence, (3.25) yields the existence of $M_1 = M_1(M) > 0$ such that $I_1 \leq M_1 |t_2 - t_1|^p$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{P} -a.s..

Set $I_2 := \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|iP_n(F(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)))\|_{-s-1} dr \right)^p$. Exploiting the continuous embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow H^{-s-1}$, (3.4), (2.16) and the continuous embedding $H^s \subset L^\infty$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|P_n(F(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)))\|_{-s-1}^p \lesssim |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|P_n(F(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)))\|_s^p \\ &\lesssim |t_2 - t_1|^p \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_s^{(2\sigma+1)p}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (3.25) yields the existence of $M_2 = M_2(\sigma, p, M) > 0$ such that $I_2 \leq M_2|t_2 - t_1|^p$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Set $I_3 := \left\| \int_{t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n}^{t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n} \phi(u_n(r)) dW(r) \right\|_{-s-1}^p$. To estimate this term we introduce the process

$$a_n(t) := \mathbf{1}_{t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n \leq t \leq t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n}$$

and we notice that

$$\int_{t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n}^{t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n} \phi(u_n(r)) dW(r) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} a_n(r) \phi(u_n(r)) dW(r).$$

For $p > 1$, the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, (3.6) and the embedding $H^s \hookrightarrow H^{-s-1}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_3] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} a_n(r) \phi(u_n(r)) dW(r) \right\|_{-s-1}^p \right] \lesssim_p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|a_n(r) \phi(u_n(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|\phi(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\phi(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n))\|_{-s-1}^p \right] \lesssim |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\phi(u_n(r \wedge \rho_M^n))\|_s^p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In virtue of Assumption (H2), we infer the existence of $M_3 = M_3(\sigma, \beta, p, M) > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[I_3] \leq M_3|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{p}{2}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Putting together the above estimates, we thus infer

$$(3.27) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\|u_n(t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n) - u_n(t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1}^p \right] \lesssim_{p, M, \sigma, \beta, T} |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

At this point we recall that for $1 < p < \infty$ and $\beta < \gamma - \frac{1}{p}$ we have the Sobolev embedding $W^{\gamma, p}(0, T) \subset C^{0, \beta}([0, T])$. In particular, see [25, Theorem B.1.5], for a continuous function $\varphi : [0, T] \rightarrow H^{-s-1}$ and p, β, γ as above, we have

$$(3.28) \quad [\varphi]_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})}^p \lesssim [\varphi]_{W^{\gamma, p}(0, T; H^{-s-1})}^p := \int_0^T \int_0^T \frac{\|\varphi(t_2) - \varphi(t_1)\|_{H^{-s-1}}^p}{|t_2 - t_1|^{1+\gamma p}} dt_1 dt_2.$$

Thus, from (3.27) and (3.28) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|u_n(\cdot \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{C^{0, \beta}(H^{-s-1})}^p \right] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\|u_n(\cdot \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{W^{\gamma, p}(H^{-s-1})}^p \right] = \int_0^T \int_0^T \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\|u_n(t_2 \wedge \rho_M^n) - u_n(t_1 \wedge \rho_M^n)\|_{-s-1}^p \right]}{|t_2 - t_1|^{1+\gamma p}} dt_1 dt_2 \\ &\lesssim_{p, M, \sigma, \gamma, T} \int_0^T \int_0^T |t_2 - t_1|^{(\frac{1}{2}-\gamma)p-1} dt_1 dt_2. \end{aligned}$$

The double integral is finite when $(\frac{1}{2} - \gamma)p - 1 > -1$. Hence the right-hand side of the above inequality is uniformly bounded w.r.t. $n \in \mathbb{N}$ when $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, given $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ there exist $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\beta < \gamma - \frac{1}{p}$. This proves (3.26) and concludes the proof. \square

3.2 Existence of a global martingale solution

In this section we will construct a global-in-time martingale solution of equation (3.1) as a limit of the Galerkin sequence u_n as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. For arbitrary $T > 0$ we will work on a finite time interval $[0, T]$, for arbitrary $T > 0$. Let us recall from Section A.2 the definition of the set

$$Z_T := C([0, T]; H^{s'}) \cap C_w([0, T]; H^s).$$

Proposition 3.5 and 3.7 provide the a priori estimates on the Galerkin approximating sequence: its law is tight in Z_T thanks to Proposition A.4. In metric spaces, one can apply Prokhorov Theorem and Skorohod Theorem to obtain convergence from tightness. Even if we consider a subsequence, we denote it again by u_n for simplicity of notation. Since the space Z_T is a locally convex space, one uses the Jakubowski generalization to non-metric spaces (see [46], [47]). This result allows to infer the existence of a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ and $Z_T \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ -valued random variables $\{(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, (\tilde{u}, \tilde{W}) , living in this probability space, such that the distribution of $\{(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the same as $\{(u_n, W_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$(3.29) \quad \text{the sequence } \{(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ converges to } (\tilde{u}, \tilde{W}) \text{ in } Z_T \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}), \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$$

We denote the filtration generated by \tilde{u}, \tilde{W} , and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -null sets by $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ and we define $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t := \bigcap_{s > t} \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_s$, a filtration satisfying the standard assumptions. The filtrations $\{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t^n\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ for \tilde{u}_n and \tilde{W}_n are defined similarly.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \tilde{W}_n is an $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted Brownian motion, and the limit process \tilde{W} is an $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted Brownian motion (see [5, Lemma 4.1]).

Moreover, arguing as in [5, Lemma 4.2], one proves that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^n\}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)$ is a solution to (3.7).

The next result shows how the convergence of \tilde{u}_n to \tilde{u} in Z_T can be used for the convergence of the terms that appear in the Galerkin equation (3.7).

Lemma 3.8. *Let s and s' be as in (2.3). Assume (2.30), (H1)–(H3) and (H5). For all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}_n(t) = \tilde{u}(t) \quad \text{in } H^{s'},$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t A \tilde{u}_n(r) dr = \int_0^t A \tilde{u}(r) dr, \quad \text{in } H^{s'-2},$
- (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t P_n F(\tilde{u}_n(r)) dr = \int_0^t F(\tilde{u}(r)) dr, \quad \text{in } H^{s'}.$
- (iv) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr = 0.$

Proof. We know from (3.29) that $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in Z_T , $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. In particular, $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in $C([0, T]; H^{s'})$ $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.. This implies i). Also ii) follows easily

$$\left\| \int_0^t A \tilde{u}_n(r) dr - \int_0^t A \tilde{u}(r) dr \right\|_{s'-2} \leq \int_0^t \|A \tilde{u}_n(r) - A \tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'-2} dr \leq t \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\tilde{u}_n(r) - \tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'}.$$

For iii):

$$\left\| \int_0^t P_n F(\tilde{u}_n(r)) dr - \int_0^t F(\tilde{u}(r)) dr \right\|_{s'} \leq \int_0^t \|P_n F(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - P_n F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} dr + \int_0^t \|P_n F(\tilde{u}(r)) - F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} dr.$$

We estimate each addend in the right hand side:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|P_n F(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - P_n F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} dr &\leq \int_0^t \|F(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} dr \\
&\lesssim_{s', d, \sigma} \int_0^t (\|\tilde{u}_n(r)\|_{s'}^{2\sigma} + \|\tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'}^{2\sigma}) \|\tilde{u}_n(r) - \tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'} dr \\
&\lesssim t \left(\sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\tilde{u}_n(r)\|_{s'}^{2\sigma} + \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'}^{2\sigma} \right) \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\tilde{u}_n(r) - \tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|P_n F(\tilde{u}(r)) - F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} dr &\leq t \|P_n - I\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{s'})} \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{s'} \\
&\lesssim t \|P_n - I\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{s'})} \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\tilde{u}(r)\|_{s'}^{2\sigma+1}, \quad \text{by Lemma 2.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Both terms converge to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in virtue of (3.5) and since $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in Z_T .

It remains to show the convergence of the stochastic term. To prove assertion (iv) we exploit Assumption (H2) (ii). We write

$$\int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr \leq \int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - P_n \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr + \int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}(r)) - \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr.$$

We estimate each addend in the right hand side.

$$\int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - P_n \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr \leq t \|P_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{-s-1})} \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\phi(\tilde{u}_n(r)) - \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2,$$

which converges to zero, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since ϕ is a continuous map from $H^{s'}$ into H^{-s-1} in virtue of Assumption (H2) (ii) and $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in Z_T .

$$\int_0^t \|P_n \phi(\tilde{u}(r)) - \phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2 dr \leq t \|P_n - I\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{-s-1})} \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \|\phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_{-s-1}^2,$$

which converges to zero, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ thanks to (H2) (ii). \square

Remark 3.9. From the proof of statement (iv) in Proposition 3.8 it is clear the role played by the auxiliary space $H^{s'}$ that appears in Assumption (H2). From the tightness in the space Z_T we infer the strong convergence in $H^{s'}$ and the weak convergence in H^s : this last convergence is not enough to pass to the limit in the stochastic term.

We have now all the ingredients to prove the following.

Proposition 3.10. Assume (2.30), (H1)-(H3) and (H5), and let s and s' be as in (2.3). Then for every $u^0 \in H^s$ there exists a martingale solution to (1.1) defined on the time interval $[0, +\infty)$, with \mathbb{P} -a.a. paths in $C([0, +\infty); H^{s'}) \cap C_w([0, +\infty); H^s)$.

Proof. We prove the existence of a solution on any finite time interval $[0, T]$, for arbitrary $T > 0$. As said at the beginning of this section, we have proved that on a common probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ there exist random variables $\{(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{W}) such that, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. $(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{W}_n)$ converges to (\tilde{u}, \tilde{W}) in $Z_T \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ and satisfies

$$(3.30) \quad \tilde{u}_n(t) = \tilde{u}_n(0) + \mathbf{i} \int_0^t A \tilde{u}_n(s) ds - \mathbf{i} \alpha \int_0^t P_n F(\tilde{u}_n(s)) ds + \int_0^t P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(s)) d\tilde{W}^n(s), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In view of Lemma 3.8 (iv) and [5, Lemma 4.3], passing to $n \rightarrow \infty$ along a subsequence, we have that

$$\int_0^t P_n \phi(\tilde{u}_n(s)) d\tilde{W}^n(s) \rightarrow \int_0^t \phi(\tilde{u}(s)) d\tilde{W}(s), \quad \text{in } H^{-s-1}, \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$$

Bearing in mind Lemma 3.8(i)-(iii), passing to the $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. limit in each term in the equation (3.30), we obtain, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\tilde{u}(t) = \tilde{u}(0) + i \int_0^t A\tilde{u}(s) ds - i\alpha \int_0^t F(\tilde{u}(s)) ds + \int_0^t \phi(\tilde{u}(s)) d\tilde{W}(s),$$

$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s., understood as an identity in H^{-s-1} . Thus $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{W})$ is a martingale solution to (3.1) on $[0, T]$. This concludes the proof. \square

We now exploit the mild formulation of equation (3.1) to infer that the solution process has $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{W})$ be the martingale solution to (3.1), given in Proposition 3.10. Then, \tilde{u} has $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. trajectories in $C([0, +\infty); H^s)$.*

Proof. Let $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{W})$ be the martingale solution to (3.1), given in Proposition 3.10. Let us choose and fix $t > 0$. We apply the Itô formula, see [16, Theorem 2.4], to the process $if(r, \tilde{u}(t-r))$, $r \in [0, t]$, where f is the function defined as

$$f : [0, t] \times H^{-s-1} \ni (r, x) \mapsto e^{-i(t-r)A}x \in H^{-s-3}.$$

The function f is of $C^{1,2}$ -class and we deduce that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.,

$$(3.31) \quad \tilde{u}(t) = e^{-itA}u^0 - i\alpha \int_0^t e^{-i(t-r)A}F(\tilde{u}(r)) dr + \int_0^t e^{-i(t-r)A}\phi(\tilde{u}(r)) d\tilde{W}(r),$$

in H^{-s-3} . We now show that, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s., each addend in the right hand side is in $C([0, +\infty); H^s)$. Since $u^0 \in H^s$, this is trivial for the first term. For the second term, it is enough to show that the integrand $[0, t] \ni r \mapsto e^{-i(t-r)A}F(\tilde{u}(r)) \in H^s$ is integrable. From estimate (2.16) and the continuous Sobolev embedding (2.5) we have

$$\|e^{-i(t-r)A}F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_s \leq \|F(\tilde{u}(r))\|_s \leq K\|\tilde{u}(r)\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \|\tilde{u}(r)\|_s \lesssim_{s,\sigma,K} \|\tilde{u}(r)\|_s^{2\sigma+1},$$

which is integrable on any finite time interval $[0, t]$, since pathwise we have that $\tilde{u} \in C_w([0, t]; H^s) \subset L^\infty(0, t; H^s)$.

For the stochastic integral in (3.31) it is enough to show that the integrand is square integrable, \mathbb{P} -a.s.; in this way the stochastic integral exists as a local martingale and has a continuous version. We have

$$\int_0^t \|e^{-i(t-r)A}\phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_s^2 dr \leq \int_0^t \|\phi(\tilde{u}(r))\|_s^2 dr$$

which is $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. finite from Assumption (H2)(i), since $\tilde{u} \in C_w([0, t]; H^s) \subset L^\infty(0, t; H^s)$. This concludes the proof. \square

3.3 Pathwise uniqueness

We now prove the pathwise uniqueness of the martingale solutions.

Proposition 3.12. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5). Then, the pathwise uniqueness holds for equation (3.1), i.e., given any $T > 0$, if u_1, u_2 are two martingale solutions to (3.1) on the time interval $[0, T]$, defined on the same filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with respect to the same Brownian motion W , with the same initial data in H^s , then*

$$\mathbb{P}(u_2(t) = u_1(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $T > 0$, we consider two martingale solutions on the time interval $[0, T]$, defined on the same filtered probability space with the same Brownian motion and initial data in H^s . Given $M > 0$ we consider the stopping times

$$\tau_M^i := \inf\{t \in [0, T] : \|u_i(t)\|_s > M\}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and set $\tau_M := \tau_M^1 \wedge \tau_M^2$.

Set $v := u_1 - u_2$. Thanks to Lemma B.1 the equality

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} d\|v(t)\|_s^2 &= 2\Re(v(t), -i\alpha F(u_1(t)) + i\alpha F(u_2(t)))_s dt \\ &\quad + 2\Re(v(t), \phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t)))_s dW(t) + \|\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))\|_s^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

is satisfied \mathbb{P} -a.s. on the time interval $[0, \tau_M]$.

By means of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, (2.13) and (2.3), we estimate, within the interval $[0, \tau_M]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(v(t), -i\alpha F(u_1(t)) + i\alpha F(u_2(t)))_s| &\leq |\alpha| \|v(t)\|_s \|F(u_1(t)) - F(u_2(t))\|_s \\ &\lesssim (\|u_1(t)\|_s^{2\sigma} + \|u_2(t)\|_s^{2\sigma}) \|v(t)\|_s^2 \lesssim C_M \|v(t)\|_s^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C_M . Assumption (H5) yields

$$\|\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))\|_s \leq \psi(\|u_1(t)\|_s, \|u_2(t)\|_s) \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_s,$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a measurable locally bounded function. Hence, for $t \in [0, \tau_M]$, there exists a positive constant C_M such that

$$\|\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))\|_s^2 \leq C_M \|v(t)\|_s^2.$$

Now we go back to (3.32), in its integral form. Taking into account the previous estimates, by applying the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy and the Hölder inequality to estimate the stochastic integral in (3.32), we obtain

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 \right] \\ &\lesssim_{M, p} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|v(r)\|_s^2 dr \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))\|_s^2 \|v(r)\|_s^2 dr \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim_{M, p} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|v(r)\|_s^2 dr \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|v(r)\|_s^4 dr \right) \right] \\ &\lesssim_{M, p, T} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|v(r)\|_s^4 dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M} \|v(r)\|_s^4 dr \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 dr \right] \leq \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, r]} \|v(s \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 \right] dr,$$

from (3.33) we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 \right] \lesssim_{M, p, T} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, \rho]} \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 \right] d\rho.$$

By the Gronwall lemma we infer

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 \right] = 0$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$; hence

$$\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|v(r \wedge \tau_M)\|_s^4 = 0 \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Since both u_1 and u_2 live in $C([0, T]; H^s)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., then $\tau_M^1 \rightarrow T$ and $\tau_M^2 \rightarrow T$, as $M \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|v(r)\|_s^4 = 0 \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Existence of a martingale solution and pathwise uniqueness yield the existence of a unique strong solution (see e.g. [55, Theorem 2] and [51, Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4]). Thus Theorem 2.8 follows as an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.10, 3.11 and 3.12.

4 Ergodic results

In this section we are concerned with the study of the ergodic properties of the solution to equation (3.1).

Following an idea of [37], in section 4.1 we prove that, under Assumptions (H1)–(H3) and (H5'), we can construct stationary martingale solutions of equation (3.1) as the limit of stationary solutions of the approximating finite-dimensional Galerkin system (3.7). To prove the existence of at least one invariant measure, in section 4.2, we notice that, under assumptions (H1)–(H4) and (H5'), the transition semigroup associated to (3.1) is well defined and we readily have existence of invariant measures. In section 4.3 we work under the stronger Assumption (H5'') and we prove that $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure. Moreover, we prove the stability of the zero solution process.

4.1 Stationary martingale solutions

Let us start with the definition of stationary martingale solutions.

Definition 4.1 (stationary martingale solution). *A stationary martingale solution of the equation (3.1) on the time interval $[0, \infty)$ is a system $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{W}, u)$ consisting of*

- a filtered probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$, satisfying the standard conditions;
- a real valued one dimensional Brownian motion \tilde{W} on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}})$;
- an $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ -adapted process u with $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost all paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$, such that for every $t \in [0, T]$ equation (3.3) holds $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely in H^{-s-1} . This is a stationary process in H^s .

Proposition 4.2. *Assume (2.30), (H1), (H2)(i), (H3) and (H5'). Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a stationary solution u_n^{st} of the Galerkin equation (3.7) such that, for any $t \geq 0$*

$$(4.1) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} [\|u_n^{st}(t)\|_s^p] < \infty,$$

where $p \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter in condition (2.18). Moreover,

- for any T and $\delta > 0$, there exists $C_{\delta, T} > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} (\|u_n^{st}(t)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \geq C_{\delta, T}) \leq \delta,$$

- given $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$, for any $T > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists a positive constant $C_{\delta, T, \beta}$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} (\|u_n^{st}\|_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} \geq C_{\delta, T, \beta}) \leq \delta.$$

Proof. We construct a stationary solution appealing to the Krilov-Bogoliubov's theorem, which provides an invariant measure μ_n for the Galerkin equation (3.7). Let us consider the Galerkin equation (3.7) with vanishing initial data $u_n(0) = 0$. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(u_n(t; 0))$ the law of this solution process evaluated

at time $t > 0$. The law is supported on the finite-dimensional space H_n . We construct the sequence of time-averaged measures

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(u_n(t; 0)) dt, \quad T \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If we show that this sequence is tight in H_n , then we can infer the existence of a converging subsequence whose limit (as $T_k \rightarrow \infty$) is an invariant measure for the Galerkin equation (see e.g. [25, Theorem 3.1.1]).

To prove the tightness we introduce the Lyapunov function

$$\mathcal{V}(u) = l(\|u\|_s),$$

where $l : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [a, +\infty)$ is a non-decreasing C^2 -function such that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} l(\rho) = a, & 0 \leq \rho < R \\ l(\rho) = \rho^p, & \rho > 2R, \end{cases}$$

for some $a \in (0, (r)^p)$ and choosing $R = \frac{r}{2}$. The difference with respect to the function defined in (3.13) is for large values of ρ (i.e. outside the ball of radius $2R$), where we have

$$(4.5) \quad l'(\rho) = p\rho^{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad l''(\rho) = -p(1-p)\rho^{p-2}.$$

Applying the Itô formula to $\mathcal{V}(u_n)$ we obtain

$$(4.6) \quad d\mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) = (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n(t)) dt + \mathcal{V}'(u_n(t))[P_n \phi(u_n(t))] dW(t).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.5 we have that $(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n)$ vanishes for $\|u_n\|_s < R$ and it is bounded when $R \leq \|u_n\|_s \leq 2R$; so

$$\sup_n \sup_{\|u_n\|_s \leq 2R} (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) =: M < \infty.$$

We have to check the estimates when $\|u_n\|_s > 2R$. If $\|u_n\|_s > 2R = r$, from estimate (3.17) and bearing in mind (4.5), we infer

$$(4.7) \quad (\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) \leq p\|u_n\|_s^p \left(|\alpha|K\|u_n\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|P_n \phi(u_n)\|_s^2}{\|u_n\|_s^2} - \frac{2-p}{2} \frac{[\Re(u_n, P_n \phi(u_n))_s]^2}{\|u_n\|_s^4} \right).$$

For $\|u_n\|_s > r$, (2.18) in Assumption (H5') yields (setting $\tilde{B} = -B > 0$)

$$(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) \leq -p\tilde{B}\|u_n\|_s^p.$$

Summing up,

$$(\mathcal{L}_n \mathcal{V})(u_n) \leq M - p\tilde{B}\|u_n\|_s^p \quad \forall u_n \in H^s$$

and coming back to (4.6) we have

$$d\mathcal{V}(u_n(t)) \leq (M - p\tilde{B}\|u_n(t)\|_s^p) dt + \mathcal{V}'(u_n(t))[P_n \phi(u_n(t))] dW(t).$$

We now integrate in time; then we take the expected value on both sides (this requires to consider first a sequence of stopping times ρ_M^n as in (3.25) in order to deal with the stochastic integral which is a local martingale) and obtain

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{E}\mathcal{V}(u_n(T)) + p\tilde{B} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}\|u_n(t)\|_s^p dt \leq \mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) + MT,$$

so, bearing in mind that \mathcal{V} is a non negative function and $\mathcal{V}(u_n(0)) = \mathcal{V}(0) = a$, for any $T \geq 1$ we have

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}(\|u_n(t)\|_s^p) dt \leq \frac{a + M}{p\tilde{B}}.$$

This provides tightness of the sequence u_n in the H^s -norm and the Krylov-Bogoliubov technique applies (since the Markov semigroup associated to the Galerkin system is Feller) showing that there exists an invariant measure μ_n for any Galerkin approximation.

Now we consider the solution of the Galerkin equation with initial datum of law μ_n ; this is a stationary solution u_n^{st} to equation (3.7). From (4.9) we get the estimate

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{E}(\|u_n^{st}(t)\|_s^p) \leq \frac{a+M}{p\tilde{B}} \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

This is a uniform estimate in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and we infer (4.1).

Estimate (4.2) can be proved reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 3.5 but considering the Lyapunov function (4.4) instead of (3.13). Estimate (4.3) is proved arguing exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.7. The only difference is that here we consider random initial data (see Remark 3.3). \square

By taking the limit of the stationary solutions of the Galerkin system (3.7) constructed in Proposition 4.2, we construct a stationary martingale solution to equation (3.1).

Proposition 4.3. *Assume (2.30), (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H5'). Then there exists a stationary martingale solution $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{u}^{st})$ to (3.1) with $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$ that satisfy the estimate*

$$(4.11) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{u}^{st}(t)\|_s^p] < \infty, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $p \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter in condition (2.18).

Proof. Let u_n^{st} be the stationary solution of the Galerkin equation (3.7) given in Proposition 4.2. From the estimates (4.2) and (4.3) the sequence of laws $\{\mathcal{L}(u_n^{st})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in Z_T , for any $T > 0$, thanks to Proposition A.4. In view of Remark A.5 the sequence is tight in Z_∞ . Reasoning as in Section 3.2 (see Proposition 3.10), but bearing in mind that here we are dealing with random initial data (see Remark 3.3), we construct a martingale solution to (3.1). This is a stationary process in H^s , in fact the weak and the strong Borel subsets of H^s coincide. Therefore stationarity in H^s is a consequence of the stationarity of the Galerkin sequence and its convergence in $C_w([0, +\infty); H^s)$. Reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 3.11 one infers that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. \tilde{u}^{st} has trajectories in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$.

The estimate (4.11) is inherited from the same estimate (4.1) for the Galerkin sequence. \square

4.2 Existence of invariant measures

Under Assumptions (H1)-(H5') for any initial datum $x \in H^s$, there exists a unique global-in-time strong solution to (3.1) with \mathbb{P} -a.a. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$. This result follows from section 3, since Assumption (H5') is stronger than Assumption (H5).

We denote the unique solution starting from x by $u(t; x)$. We define the family of operators $P := \{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ associated to equation (3.1) as

$$(4.12) \quad (P_t \varphi)(x) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(u(t; x))], \quad x \in H^s, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H^s),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_b(H^s)$ is the space of Borel measurable bounded functions from H^s to \mathbb{R} . $P_t \varphi$ is bounded for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H^s)$. We know from [56, Cor. 23] that the transition function is jointly measurable, that is for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(H^s)$ the map $H^s \times [0, \infty) \ni (x, t) \mapsto \mathbb{P}\{u(t; x) \in A\} \in \mathbb{R}$ is measurable. So $P_t \varphi$ is also measurable for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H^s)$, hence P_t maps $\mathcal{B}_b(H^s)$ into itself for every $t \geq 0$. Furthermore, since the unique solution of (3.1) is an H^s -valued continuous process, then it is also a Markov process, see [56, Theorem 27]. Therefore, we deduce that the family of operators $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov semigroup, namely $P_{t+s} = P_t P_s$ for any $s, t \geq 0$.

Definition 4.4. *An invariant measure for the transition semigroup P is a probability measure on $(H^s, \mathcal{B}(H^s))$ such that*

$$\int_{H^s} \varphi(x) \mu(dx) = \int_{H^s} P_t \varphi(x) \mu(dx) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H^s).$$

Theorem 4.5. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5'). Then there exists at least one invariant measure μ for equation (3.1) such that*

$$(4.13) \quad \int_{H^s} \|x\|_s^p d\mu(x) < \infty,$$

where $p \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter in condition (2.18).

Proof. Since the transition semigroup P given in (4.12) is well defined, the law at any given time of a stationary martingale solution given in Proposition 4.3 is an invariant measure for equation (3.1). Estimate (4.13) follows from estimate (4.11). \square

Remark 4.6. *In the estimate (4.13) the power p is smaller than 1. This is different from the estimates of the p -moments of the H^1 -norm, which can be obtained for larger p when working in the energy space H^1 for the solution to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with an at most linear noise (see e.g. [11], [36]).*

4.3 Uniqueness of the invariant measure and asymptotic stability of the zero solution

Since Assumption (H5'') is stronger than (H5') and (H5), from the previous sections we obtain the following result: under Assumptions (H1)-(H5'') for any initial datum $x \in H^s$, there exists a unique global-in-time strong solution to (3.1) with \mathbb{P} -a.s. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$. In addition, we now prove that all the solutions converge to 0, that is the noise perturbation preserves the equilibrium solution $u = 0$ of the NLS equation (1.2). Moreover, we prove some asymptotic stability results for the zero solution in the spirit of [13]. It then follows that the invariant measure is unique and coincides with δ_0 .

Theorem 4.7. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5''). Then for any $u^0 \in H^s$*

- i) *the zero solution to (3.1) is exponentially stable in the p -mean, where $p \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter in condition (2.19), that is there exist constants $C < \infty$, $\lambda > 0$, such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|u(t)\|_s^p] \leq C e^{-\lambda t} \|u^0\|_s^p, \quad \forall t \geq 0;$$

- ii) *the zero solution to (3.1) is exponentially stable with probability one, that is, for any $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, \lambda)$, there exists a \mathbb{P} -a.s. finite random time τ_0 such that*

$$\|u(t)\|_s^p \leq C e^{-\bar{\lambda} t} \|u_0\|_s^p, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_0, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.;$$

- iii) *$\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure for equation (3.1).*

The proof is based on the following auxiliary result.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5''). Then there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that the process $\{e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a non-negative continuous supermartingale; here $p \in (0, 1)$ is the parameter in condition (2.19).*

Proof. Let u be the unique solution to (3.1) starting from $u^0 \in H^s$. Since the function $x \mapsto \|x\|_s^p$ is not smooth enough for $p \in (0, 1)$ to apply the Itô formula we use an approximation. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we introduce the function

$$\mathcal{V}(x) := (\|x\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{p/2},$$

for $p \in (0, 1)$ as in (2.19). This is a smooth function and we compute

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{V}'(x)[h] = p(\|x\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \Re(x, h)_s$$

and

$$(4.15) \quad \mathcal{V}''(x)[h, k] = p(p-2)(\|x\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}-2} \Re(x, h)_s \Re(x, k)_s + p(\|x\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \Re(k, h)_s.$$

We apply the Itô formula to the process $X(r) = e^{\lambda r} \mathcal{V}(u(r))$ when $r \in [t_0, t]$ with $0 \leq t_0 < t$. We have

$$(4.16) \quad d(e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t))) = \lambda e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t)) dt + e^{\lambda t} d\mathcal{V}(u(t)),$$

where

$$(4.17) \quad d\mathcal{V}(u(t)) = (\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(u(t)) dt + \mathcal{V}'(u(t))[\phi(u(t))] dW(t),$$

and $(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(u(t))$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(u(t)) = \mathcal{V}'(u(t))[iAu(t) - i\alpha(F(u(t)))] + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}''(u(t))[\phi(u(t)), \phi(u(t))].$$

Arguing in the proof of Proposition 3.5 and bearing in mind that $\phi(u) = f(u)u$ from Assumption **(H5'')**, we have that

$$\Re(u(t), \phi(u(t)))_s = \|u(t)\|_s^2 \Re f(u(t))$$

and

$$\|\phi(u(t))\|_s = \|u(t)\|_s |f(u(t))|.$$

We obtain the estimate

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(u(t)) &= p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \Im(u(t), \alpha(F(u(t))))_s + \frac{p(p-2)}{2} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^4}{(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^2} (\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{p}{2} (\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} |f(u(t))|^2 \\ &\leq p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(|\alpha|K \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} - \frac{2-p}{2} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^4}{(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^2} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} |f(u(t))|^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where K is the constant in the estimate (2.16). Moreover,

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{V}'(u(t))[\phi(u(t))] dW(t) = p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 dW(t).$$

Coming back to estimate (4.16), bearing in mind (4.18) and (4.19) and using assumption **(H5'')**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t))) &\leq \lambda e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t)) dt \\ &\quad + e^{\lambda t} p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} \left(|\alpha|K \|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} - \frac{2-p}{2} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^4}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 + \frac{1}{2} |f(u(t))|^2 \right) dt \\ &\quad + e^{\lambda t} p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 dW(t) \\ &\leq \lambda e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t)) dt + e^{\lambda t} \frac{p(2-p)}{2} \varepsilon \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{2-\frac{p}{2}}} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 dt + B p e^{\lambda t} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{1-\frac{p}{2}}} dt \\ &\quad + e^{\lambda t} p(\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{\|u(t)\|_s^2}{\|u(t)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} [\Re f(u(t))]^2 dW(t). \end{aligned}$$

We now take the integral formulation of the above inequality (bearing in mind that we are working on the time interval $[t_0, t]$) and pass to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda t} \mathcal{V}(u(t)) &\rightarrow e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \\ \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \mathcal{V}(u(r)) dr &\rightarrow \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p dr, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \\ \varepsilon \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \frac{\|u(r)\|_s^2}{(\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{2-\frac{p}{2}}} [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dr &\rightarrow 0, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \frac{\|u(r)\|_s^2}{(\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{1-\frac{p}{2}}} dr \rightarrow \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p dr, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

Moreover, we have the convergence in probability of the stochastic integral:

$$\int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} (\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{p/2} \frac{\|u(r)\|_s^2}{\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dW(r) \rightarrow \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dW(r)$$

as a consequence of the fact that

$$\int_{t_0}^t e^{2\lambda r} [\Re f(u(r))]^4 \left| (\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon)^{p/2} \frac{\|u(r)\|_s^2}{\|u(r)\|_s^2 + \varepsilon} - \|u(r)\|_s^p \right|^2 dr \rightarrow 0,$$

thanks to the Dominated Convergence Theorem (since $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s)$).

Thus, setting $\tilde{B} = -B > 0$ we obtain

$$e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p \leq e^{\lambda t_0} \|u(t_0)\|_s^p + (\lambda - p\tilde{B}) \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p + \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dW(r).$$

If we now choose $\lambda > 0$ such that $\lambda - p\tilde{B} < 0$ we obtain

$$(4.20) \quad e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p \leq e^{\lambda t_0} \|u(t_0)\|_s^p + \int_{t_0}^t e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dW(r).$$

The stochastic integral in the right hand side of the above inequality is a local martingale. In fact, if we define the stopping time $\tau_N := \inf\{t > \tau : \|u(t)\|_s > N\}$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$M_N(t) := \int_{t_0}^{t \wedge \tau_N} e^{\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^p [\Re f(u(r))]^2 dW(r),$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}[|M_N(t)|^2] \leq \int_{t_0}^{t \wedge \tau_N} e^{2\lambda r} \|u(r)\|_s^{2p} [\Re f(u(r))]^4 dr < \infty,$$

since by the assumptions $f : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is bounded on balls and $u \in C([0, T]; H^s)$. Hence, $M_N(t)$ is a square integrable martingale; in particular, $\mathbb{E}[M_N(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t_0}] = 0$ for any $t \geq t_0$. Therefore, taking the conditional expectation on both sides of (4.20), up to the stopping time τ_N , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(t \wedge \tau_N)} \|u(t \wedge \tau_N)\|_s^p | \mathcal{F}_{t_0}] \leq e^{\lambda t_0} \|u(t_0)\|_s^p \quad \forall t_0 < t.$$

Since $t \wedge \tau_N \rightarrow t$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$(4.21) \quad \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p | \mathcal{F}_{t_0}] \leq e^{\lambda t_0} \|u(t_0)\|_s^p \quad \forall t_0 < t.$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Let us now prove Theorem 4.7. Part of the proof is inspired by [13, Proof of Theorem 1.4].

Proof of Theorem 4.7. (i) Let u be the unique solution of problem (1.1) starting from $u^0 \in H^s$. Lemma 4.8 yields

$$(4.22) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|u(t)\|_s^p] \leq e^{-\lambda t} \|u^0\|_s^p, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

which proves statement (i).

ii) Take an arbitrary $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, \lambda)$ and set $\varepsilon := \lambda - \bar{\lambda} > 0$. We have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [k, k+1]} e^{\bar{\lambda}t} \|u(t)\|_s^p \geq \|u^0\|_s^p \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [k, k+1]} e^{\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_s^p \geq e^{\varepsilon k} \|u^0\|_s^p \right),$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Without loss of generality we assume $\|u^0\|_s > 0$ (otherwise there is nothing to prove). By the Doob Supermartingale inequality, bearing in mind (4.22), we infer

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [k, k+1]} e^{\lambda t} \|u(s)\|_s^p \geq e^{\varepsilon k} \|u^0\|_s^p \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda s} \|u(s)\|_s^p]}{e^{\varepsilon k} \|u^0\|_s^p} \leq e^{-\varepsilon k}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [k, k+1]} e^{\bar{\lambda}t} \|u(t)\|_s^p \geq \|u^0\|_s^p \right) < \infty,$$

hence statement (ii) follows from the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

iii) For the unique solution of problem (1.1), we put in evidence the initial datum $u^0 \in H^s$ by writing $u(\cdot; u^0)$. From (ii) we know that, for every $\bar{\lambda} \in (0, \lambda)$, there exists a \mathbb{P} -a.s. finite random time τ_0 such that

$$\|u(t; u^0)\|_s^p \leq e^{-\bar{\lambda}t} \|u^0\|_s^p, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_0, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Hence

$$(4.23) \quad \|u(t; u^0)\|_s \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Take any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}(H^s)$ i.e. $\phi : H^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous. From (4.23) we infer

$$\phi(u(t; u^0)) \rightarrow \phi(0), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

for any initial datum $u^0 \in H^s$. By the Dominated Convergence Theorem we also get

$$(4.24) \quad (P_t \phi)(u^0) = \mathbb{E} \phi(u(t; u^0)) \rightarrow \phi(0), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let now μ be any invariant measure. Then, from its definition, we have

$$\int_{H^s} \phi(x) \mu(dx) = \int_{H^s} P_t \phi(x) \mu(dx) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H^s).$$

Taking $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(H^s)$, bearing in mind (4.24), by the Dominated Convergence Theorem the right hand side converges to $\phi(0)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This implies

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{H^s} \phi(x) d\mu(x) = \phi(0) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(H^s).$$

We notice that $\mathcal{C}_b(H^s)$ is a determining set for the measure. In fact, take $\phi(u) = e^{i\langle u, h \rangle_s}$, $h \in H^s$; with this choice the integral defines the characteristic function and this is enough to determine the measure. Thus from equality (4.25) we conclude that $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure since (4.24) holds for any initial datum u^0 . □

As a consequence of Lemma 4.8 we also infer stability in probability for the zero solution.

Proposition 4.9. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 4.7 the zero solution of equation (3.1) is stable in probability, that is for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for any solution u starting from $u^0 \in H^s$,*

$$\|u^0\|_s < \delta \quad \implies \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|u(t)\|_s > \varepsilon \right) < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and set

$$\sigma_\varepsilon := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|u(t)\|_s \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Lemma 4.8 and the optional sampling theorem yields

$$(4.26) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|u(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s^p] \leq \|u^0\|_s^p, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where we recall $p \in (0, 1)$ is as in (2.19). We have $\{\sigma_\varepsilon < t\} = \left\{ \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|u(r)\|_s \geq \varepsilon \right\}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\|u(\sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s \geq \varepsilon) = 1$, so $\{\sigma_\varepsilon < t\} = \{\sigma_\varepsilon < t\} \cap \{\|u(\sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{\|u(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s \geq \varepsilon\}$. Thus, thanks to the Markov inequality and estimate (4.26), we infer

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_\varepsilon < t) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|u(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|u(t \wedge \sigma_\varepsilon)\|_s^p]}{\varepsilon^p} \leq \frac{\|u^0\|_s^p}{\varepsilon^p},$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since $\{\sigma_\varepsilon < t\} \nearrow \{\sigma_\varepsilon < \infty\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_\varepsilon < \infty) \leq \frac{\|u^0\|_s^p}{\varepsilon^p},$$

that is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \|u(t)\|_s \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{\|u^0\|_s^p}{\varepsilon^p}.$$

Taking $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta = \varepsilon^{\frac{p+1}{p}}$, the thesis follows. \square

A Compactness and tightness results

We recall here some deterministic compactness results and the tightness criteria. We work with the triplet of spaces $H^s \subset H^{s'} \subset H^{-s-1}$, for s and s' as in (2.3). Both embeddings are continuous and dense, moreover the embeddings $H^s \subset H^{s'}$ and $H^s \subset H^{-s-1}$ are compact.

A.1 Deterministic compactness criteria

Given $r > 0$ let us consider the ball

$$\mathbb{B}_{r, H^s} := \{x \in H^s : \|x\|_s \leq r\}.$$

We simply write \mathbb{B} for \mathbb{B}_{r, H^s} . Let \mathbb{B}_w denote the ball endowed with the weak topology of H^s . Let us consider the following subspace of $C_w([0, T]; H^s)$

$$C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w) = \{u \in C_w([0, T]; H^s) : \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_s \leq r\}.$$

The space $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ is metrizable w.r.t. a metric ρ (see, e.g., [12, Appendix A]). Since, by the Banach-Alaoglu Theorem, \mathbb{B}_w is compact, $(C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w), \rho)$ is a complete metric space. Moreover, $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ iff for any $h \in H^{-s}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |{}_{H^s} \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| = 0.$$

We start with the following result.

Lemma A.1. *Let $u_n : [0, T] \rightarrow H^s$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be functions s.t.*

$$i) \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_n(t)\|_s \leq r, \text{ for some } r > 0,$$

$$ii) u_n \rightarrow u \text{ in } C([0, T]; H^{-s-1}).$$

Then $u, u_n \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. The proof follows the line of [15, Lemma 2.1] and [12, Lemma 4.1]. From the assumptions and the Strauss Lemma [60], we infer

$$u_n \in L^\infty(0, T; H^s) \cap C_w([0, T]; H^{-s-1}) = C_w([0, T]; H^s)$$

and $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_n(t)\|_s \leq r$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)}.$$

Hence we get $u_n \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It remains to prove that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that is, for all $h \in H^{-s}$ it holds

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| = 0,$$

and that $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$.

Step 1. First, let us fix $h \in H^{s+1}$. Then,

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| = \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |H^{-s-1} \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h \rangle_{H^{s+1}}| \leq \|u_n - u\|_{C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} \|h\|_{s+1} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by (ii).

Step 2. Now we show that (A.1) holds for all $h \in H^{-s}$. Let $\delta > 0$ and let $h \in H^{-s}$. Since H^{s+1} is dense in H^{-s} , there exists $h_\delta \in H^{s+1}$ such that $\|h - h_\delta\|_{-s} \leq \delta$. Using (i), we infer that, for all $s \in [0, T]$, the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| &\leq |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h - h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}| + |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \\ &\leq \|u_n(s) - u(s)\|_s \|h - h_\delta\|_{-s} + |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \\ &\leq \delta \|u_n - u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} + |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \\ &\leq 2\delta \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} + |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \\ &\leq 2\delta r + |H^s \langle u_n(s) - u(s), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we infer

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |H^s \langle u_n(t) - u(t), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \leq 2\delta r + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |H^s \langle u_n(t) - u(t), h_\delta \rangle_{H^{-s}}|.$$

Since $h_\delta \in H^{s+1}$, by Step 1, passing to the upper limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |H^s \langle u_n(t) - u(t), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| \leq 2\delta r,$$

and, by the arbitrariness of δ , we infer

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |H^s \langle u_n(t) - u(t), h \rangle_{H^{-s}}| = 0.$$

Since $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ is a complete metric space, we infer that $u \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ as well. This concludes the proof. \square

Let us now prove the following result.

Proposition A.2. *Let $T > 0$ be any finite time. A set $K \subset C_w([0, T]; H^s)$ is relatively compact in $C_w([0, T]; H^s)$ if the following conditions hold*

- (i) $\sup_{u \in K} \|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \leq r$, for some $r > 0$,

(ii) K is equicontinuous in $C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$, i.e.

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in K} \sup_{|t-s| \leq \delta} \|u(t) - u(s)\|_{-s-1} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset K$: we aim to construct a subsequence converging in $C_w([0, T]; H^s)$.

Step 1. Thanks to (i) we can choose a constant $C > 0$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a null set I_n with $\|z_n(t)\|_s \leq C$ for all $t \in [0, T] \setminus I_n$. The set $I := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n$ is also a nullset and, for each $t \in [0, T] \setminus I$, the sequence $\{z_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in H^s . Let $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, T] \setminus I$ be a sequence which is dense in $[0, T]$. By construction, the embedding $H^s \subset H^{-s-1}$ is compact. Thus, for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we can extract a Cauchy subsequence in H^{-s-1} , still denoted by $\{z_n(t_j)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. One obtains a common Cauchy subsequence $\{z_n(t_j)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, by means of a diagonalization argument.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$; from (ii) we infer the existence of a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(A.2) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{|t-s| \leq \delta} \|z_n(t) - z_n(s)\|_{-s-1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

We now choose finitely many open balls $U_\delta^1, \dots, U_\delta^R$ of radius δ covering the interval $[0, T]$. By density, each of these balls contains an element of the sequence $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, say $t_{j_r} \in U_\delta^r$ for $r \in \{1, \dots, R\}$. In particular, the sequence $\{z_n(t_{j_r})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy for any $r \in \{1, \dots, R\}$. Therefore,

$$(A.3) \quad \|z_n(t_{j_r}) - z_m(t_{j_r})\|_{-s-1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \quad r = 1, \dots, R,$$

for n, m chosen sufficiently large. We now fix $t \in [0, T]$ and take $r \in \{1, \dots, R\}$ with $|t_{j_r} - t| \leq \delta$. Exploiting (A.2) and (A.3) we infer

$$(A.4) \quad \|z_n(t) - z_m(t)\|_{-s-1} \leq \|z_n(t) - z_n(t_{j_r})\|_{-s-1} + \|z_n(t_{j_r}) - z_m(t_{j_r})\|_{-s-1} + \|z_m(t_{j_r}) - z_m(t)\|_{-s-1} \leq \varepsilon.$$

This means that $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$, being the estimate (A.4) uniform in $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, there exists a subsequence of $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, still denoted by $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $z \in C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$ with $z_n \rightarrow z \in C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 2. From (i) we infer the existence of $r > 0$ with $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|z_n\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; H^s)} \leq r$. Hence, by Lemma A.1, we get $z \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$ and $z_n \rightarrow z$ in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{B}_w)$. Thus, $z_n \rightarrow z$ in $C_w([0, T]; H^s)$, and this concludes the proof. \square

Now we deal with the space $C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$ defined in §2.

Corollary A.3. *Let s and s' as in (2.3). Let $0 < \beta < 1$ and $T > 0$ be any finite time. Then the embedding*

$$L^\infty(0, T; H^s) \cap C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1}) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H^{s'}) \cap C_w([0, T]; H^s)$$

is compact.

Proof. The compactness of the embedding $L^\infty(0, T; H^s) \cap C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1}) \hookrightarrow C([0, T]; H^{s'})$ follows from the Aubin-Lions-Simon Theorem, see [59].

As far as the compactness of the embedding $L^\infty(0, T; H^s) \cap C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1}) \hookrightarrow C_w([0, T]; H^s)$ is concerned, consider a set K such that

$$\sup_{u \in K} (\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} + \|u\|_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})}) \leq M,$$

for some positive M . Then, it holds

$$\|u(t) - u(s)\|_{-s-1} \leq |t - s|^\beta \|u\|_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} \leq M|t - s|^\beta.$$

This implies the equicontinuity in $C([0, T]; H^{-s-1})$. We thus conclude by applying Proposition A.2. \square

A.2 Tightness results

Given $T > 0$, and s and s' as in (2.3), we define the locally convex space

$$Z_T := C([0, T]; H^{s'}) \cap C_w([0, T]; H^s),$$

with the topology \mathcal{T} given by the supremum of the corresponding topologies in the right-hand side.

We recall that a family of probability measures $\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined on the σ -algebra of Borel subsets of Z_T is tight if for any $\eta > 0$, there exists a compact subset K_η of Z_T such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu_n(Z_T \setminus K_\eta) \leq \eta.$$

Proposition A.4. *[Tightness criterium] Fix $0 < \beta < 1$. Let $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{F} -adapted Z_T valued processes. Assume that for any $\delta > 0$ there exist positive constants $R_i = R_i(\delta)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that*

$$(A.5) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} > R_1) \leq \delta,$$

$$(A.6) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\|u_n\|_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} > R_2) \leq \delta.$$

Let μ_n be the law of u_n in Z_T . Then, the sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight in Z_T .

Proof. Let

$$B_1 := \{u \in Z_T : \|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^s)} \leq R_1\},$$

and

$$B_2 := \{u \in Z_T : \|u\|_{C^{0, \beta}([0, T]; H^{-s-1})} \leq R_2\}.$$

Let K be the closure of the set $B_1 \cap B_2$ in Z_T . By Corollary A.3, K is compact in Z_T . Then the tightness follows from the estimates (A.5) and (A.6). \square

Remark A.5. *When we work on the infinite time interval, we consider the locally convex topological spaces:*

- $C([0, +\infty); H^{s'})$ with metric $d_1(u, v) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{\|u - v\|_{C([0, k]; H^{s'})}}{1 + \|u - v\|_{C([0, k]; H^{s'})}}$;
- $C_w([0, +\infty); H^s)$ with the topology generated by the family of semi-norms $\|u\|_{k, v} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq k} |\langle u(t), v \rangle|$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in H^{-s}$.

We define the space

$$(A.7) \quad Z_\infty = C([0, +\infty); H^{s'}) \cap C_w([0, +\infty); H^s),$$

which is a locally convex topological space with the topology \mathcal{T} given by the supremum of the corresponding topologies.

The tightness in Z_∞ of the laws of the processes u_n defined on the time interval $[0, +\infty)$ is equivalent to the tightness in Z_k for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ of the laws of the processes u_n defined on the time interval $[0, k]$.

B A technical lemma

In this Section we prove a technical result which is needed for the proof of pathwise uniqueness of solutions in Section 3.3.

Lemma B.1. *Assume (2.30) and (H1)-(H5). Given any $T > 0$, if u_1, u_2 are two martingale solutions to (3.1) on the time interval $[0, T]$, defined on the same filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with respect to the same Brownian motion W , with the same initial data in H^s , then for difference $v := u_1 - u_2$ the equality*

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \|v(t)\|_s^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \Re(v(r), -i\alpha F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha F(u_2(r)))_s \, dr \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \Re(v(r), \phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r)))_s \, dW(r) + \int_0^t \|\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))\|_s^2 \, dr \end{aligned}$$

is satisfied \mathbb{P} -a.s. for any $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Let $T > 0$, we consider two martingale solutions on the time interval $[0, T]$, defined on the same filtered probability space with the same Brownian motion and initial data in H^s ; thanks to Proposition 3.11 we have $u_1, u_2 \in C([0, T]; H^s)$. The difference $v := u_1 - u_2$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} dv(t) + i[-Av(t) + \alpha(F(u_1(t)) - F(u_2(t)))] \, dt = [\phi(u_1(t)) - \phi(u_2(t))] \, dW(t) \\ v(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The process v is not regular enough to apply the Itô formula to $\|v\|_s^2$; thus we justify the computations leading to equality (B.1) by a regularization procedure. Given $\lambda > 0$, we define $R_\lambda := \lambda(\lambda I + A)^{-1}$. From [57, Section 1.3] we know that, for any $x \in H^s$,

$$(B.2) \quad R_\lambda x \rightarrow x \text{ in } H^s \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, R_λ is a linear bounded operator from H^s to H^{s+2} . Hence, the equation

$$R_\lambda v(t) = i \int_0^t [R_\lambda Av(s) - \alpha R_\lambda (F(u_1(s)) - F(u_2(s)))] \, ds + \int_0^t R_\lambda [\phi(u_1(s)) - \phi(u_2(s))] \, dW(s)$$

holds \mathbb{P} -a.s. in H^s , for any $t \in [0, T]$. We apply the Itô formula to $\|R_\lambda v(t)\|_s^2$, for $t \in [0, T]$ and obtain

$$(B.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|R_\lambda v(t)\|_s^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \Re(R_\lambda v(r), -iR_\lambda A(v(r)))_s \, dr + 2 \int_0^t \Re(R_\lambda v(r), -i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_2(r)))_s \, dr \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \Re(R_\lambda v(r), R_\lambda [\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))])_s \, dW(r) + \int_0^t \|R_\lambda [\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))]\|_s^2 \, dr. \end{aligned}$$

Since the operators A and R_λ commute, we have

$$\Re(R_\lambda v(r), iR_\lambda Av(r))_s = \Re[i\|A^{\frac{1}{2}}R_\lambda v(r)\|_s^2] = 0, \quad r \in [0, t], \quad \lambda > 0.$$

We take the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ in the terms of equation (B.3). For $r \in [0, t]$, exploiting the regularity $u_1, u_2, v \in C([0, T]; H^s)$ and $F(u_1), F(u_2) \in C([0, T]; H^s)$ in virtue of (2.16), from (B.2), we infer \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\Re(R_\lambda v(r), -i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_2(r)))_s \rightarrow \Re(v(r), -i\alpha F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha F(u_2(r)))_s, \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the Dominated Convergence Theorem yields

$$\int_0^t \Re(R_\lambda v(r), -i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha R_\lambda F(u_2(r)))_s \, dr \rightarrow \int_0^t \Re(v(r), -i\alpha F(u_1(r)) + i\alpha F(u_2(r)))_s \, dr, \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

In virtue of Assumption (H2)(i) and (B.2), we get, for any $r \in [0, t]$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\|R_\lambda [\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))]\|_s^2 \rightarrow \|\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))\|_s^2, \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, by the Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\int_0^t \|R_\lambda[\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))]\|_s^2 dr \rightarrow \int_0^t \|\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))\|_s^2 dr, \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

For the stochastic integral, since by Assumption **(H2)**(i), **(B.2)** and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, it holds

$$\int_0^t |\Re(R_\lambda v(r), R_\lambda[\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))])_s - \Re(v(r), [\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))])_s|^2 dr \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty,$$

passing to the limit along a subsequence we infer \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\int_0^t \Re(R_\lambda v(r), R_\lambda[\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))])_s dW(r) \rightarrow \int_0^t \Re(v(r), [\phi(u_1(r)) - \phi(u_2(r))])_s dW(r), \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, for $t \in [0, T]$, we obtain the equality **(B.1)**. \square

C Compact Riemannian manifolds

All the results we proved so far in the case of a d -dimensional torus hold true also in the more general case of compact Riemannian manifolds.

Let (M, g) be a d -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold without boundary. We consider the stochastic NLS equation

$$(C.1) \quad \begin{cases} du(t) + i[-Au(t) + \alpha F(u(t))] dt = \phi(u(t)) dW(t), & t > 0 \\ u(0) = u^0, \end{cases}$$

where $u : [0, \infty) \times M \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, A is the negative Laplace-Beltrami operator $-\Delta_g$ on (M, g) and F is given by **(2.9)**.

The notion of Sobolev spaces on Riemannian manifold is well known (see e.g. [12, Appendix B] and the therein references) and the same embeddings considered in section 2 hold true in this framework. Moreover, the assumptions on the noise in section 2.3 can be analogously formulated on manifolds.

With the same notation used throughout the paper, understood now for the case of compact Riemannian manifolds, we get the following result.

Theorem C.1. *Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$, $s > \frac{d}{2}$.*

*i) Assume **(H1)**-**(H5)**. Then, for any initial datum $u^0 \in H^s$ there exists a unique global-in-time strong solution to **(C.1)** with \mathbb{P} -a.s. paths in $C([0, \infty); H^s)$.*

*ii) Assume **(H1)**-**(H5')**. Then there exists at least one invariant measure μ for equation **(C.1)** such that*

$$\int_{H^s} \|x\|_s^p d\mu(x) < \infty,$$

*where p is the parameter in condition **(2.18)**.*

*iii) Assume **(H1)**-**(H5'')**. Then the zero solution to **(C.1)** is exponentially stable in the p -mean (with p the parameter in condition **(2.19)**) and exponentially stable with probability one. Moreover, $\mu = \delta_0$ is the unique invariant measure for equation **(C.1)**.*

Proof. The proof is a minor adaptation of the the proofs of the results in sections 3 and 4. One has to be careful just in considering the Moser estimates in the case of compact Riemannian manifolds; they are given in [14, Corollary 2.2]. \square

Acknowledgements

B.F., M.M. and M.Z. are members of Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM), and gratefully acknowledge financial support through the project CUP–E53C22001930001. B.F and M.Z. than the support of the CAMRisk at the University of Pavia.

The authors are grateful to Filippo Giuliani for useful discussion.

References

- [1] D. Alonso-Orán, Y. Miao, and H. Tang. Global existence, blow-up and stability for a stochastic transport equation with non-local velocity. *J. Differential Equations*, 335:244–293, 2022.
- [2] J. A. Appleby, X. Mao, and A. Rodkina. Stabilization and destabilization of nonlinear differential equations by noise. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(3):683–691, 2008.
- [3] L. Arnold, H. Crauel, and V. Wihstutz. Stabilization of linear systems by noise. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 21(3):451–461, 1983.
- [4] A. Athreya, T. Kolba, and J. C. Mattingly. Propagating Lyapunov functions to prove noise-induced stabilization. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 17:no. 96, 38, 2012.
- [5] M. Bagnara, M. Maurelli, and F. Xu. No blow-up by nonlinear itô noise for the euler equations. *Available at SSRN 4606952*, 2023.
- [6] V. Barbu, M. Röckner, and D. Zhang. Stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 136:168–194, 2016.
- [7] V. Barbu, M. Röckner, and D. Zhang. Stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations: no blow-up in the non-conservative case. *J. Differential Equations*, 263(11):7919–7940, 2017.
- [8] Á. Bényi, T. Oh, and T. Zhao. Fractional Leibniz rule on the torus. *preprint arXiv:2311.07998*, 2023.
- [9] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. II. The KdV-equation. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 3(3):209–262, 1993.
- [10] Z. Brzeźniak, B. Ferrario, and M. Zanella. Ergodic results for the stochastic nonlinear schrödinger equation with large damping. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 23(1):Paper No. 19, 31, 2023.
- [11] Z. Brzeźniak, B. Ferrario, and M. Zanella. Invariant measures for a stochastic nonlinear and damped 2D Schrödinger equation. *Nonlinearity*, 37(1):Paper No. 015001, 66, 2024.
- [12] Z. Brzeźniak, F. Hornung, and L. Weis. Martingale solutions for the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the energy space. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 174(3-4):1273–1338, 2019.
- [13] Z. Brzeźniak, B. Maslowski, and J. Seidler. Stochastic nonlinear beam equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 132(1):119–149, 2005.
- [14] Z. Brzeźniak and A. Millet. On the stochastic Strichartz estimates and the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on a compact Riemannian manifold. *Potential Anal.*, 41(2):269–315, 2014.
- [15] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Motyl. The existence of martingale solutions to the stochastic boussinesq equations. *Global and Stochastic Analysis*, 1(2):175–216, 2014.
- [16] Z. Brzeźniak, J. M. A. M. van Neerven, M. C. Veraar, and L. Weis. Itô's formula in UMD Banach spaces and regularity of solutions of the Zakai equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 245(1):30–58, 2008.
- [17] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. Strichartz inequalities and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on compact manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 126(3):569–605, 2004.

- [18] T. Cazenave. *Semilinear Schrödinger Equations*, volume 10. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
- [19] T. Cazenave and F. B. Weissler. The Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^s . *Nonlinear Anal.*, 14(10):807–836, 1990.
- [20] S. Cerrai. Stabilization by noise for a class of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 133(2):190–214, 2005.
- [21] K. Chouk and B. Gess. Path-by-path regularization by noise for scalar conservation laws. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 277(5):1469–1498, 2019.
- [22] K. Chouk and M. Gubinelli. Nonlinear PDEs with modulated dispersion I: Nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(11):2047–2081, 2015.
- [23] M. Cirant and A. Goffi. On the existence and uniqueness of solutions to time-dependent fractional MFG. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 51(2):913–954, 2019.
- [24] D. Crisan and O. Lang. Global solutions for stochastically controlled fluid dynamics models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05923*, 2024.
- [25] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 152 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2014.
- [26] A. De Bouard and A. Debussche. A stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 205(1):161–181, 1999.
- [27] A. De Bouard and A. Debussche. Finite-time blow-up in the additive supercritical stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation: the real noise case. In *The legacy of the inverse scattering transform in applied mathematics (South Hadley, MA, 2001)*, volume 301 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 183–194. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [28] A. De Bouard and A. Debussche. On the effect of a noise on the solutions of the focusing supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 123(1):76–96, 2002.
- [29] A. De Bouard and A. Debussche. The stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^1 . *Stochastic Anal. Appl.*, 21(1):97–126, 2003.
- [30] A. De Bouard and A. Debussche. Blow-up for the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(3):1078–1110, 2005.
- [31] A. Debussche and C. Odasso. Ergodicity for a weakly damped stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equation. *J. Evol. Equ.*, 5(3):317–356, 2005.
- [32] A. Debussche and Y. Tsutsumi. 1D quintic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with white noise dispersion. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 96(4):363–376, 2011.
- [33] R. Duboscq and A. Réveillac. On a stochastic Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality with application to Strichartz estimates for a noisy dispersion. *Ann. H. Lebesgue*, 5:263–274, 2022.
- [34] S. Dumont, O. Goubet, and Y. Mhammeri. Decay of solutions to one dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations with white noise dispersion. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S*, 14(8):2877–2891, 2021.
- [35] I. Ekren, I. Kukavica, and M. Ziane. Existence of invariant measures for the stochastic damped Schrödinger equation. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 5(3):343–367, 2017.
- [36] B. Ferrario and M. Zanella. Stationary solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *arXiv:2305.10393*, 2023.
- [37] F. Flandoli and D. Gatarek. Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 102(3):367–391, 1995.

- [38] T. C. Gard. *Introduction to stochastic differential equations*, volume 114 of *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1988.
- [39] P. Gassiat and B. Gess. Regularization by noise for stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 173(3-4):1063–1098, 2019.
- [40] P. Gassiat, B. Gess, P.-L. Lions, and P. E. Souganidis. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 286(4):110269, 2024.
- [41] B. Gess and P. E. Souganidis. Long-time behavior, invariant measures, and regularizing effects for stochastic scalar conservation laws. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 70(8):1562–1597, 2017.
- [42] B. Gess and P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic non-isotropic degenerate parabolic-hyperbolic equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 127(9):2961–3004, 2017.
- [43] R. Z. Hasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 7 of *Monographs and Textbooks on Mechanics of Solids and Fluids, Mechanics and Analysis*. Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn—Germantown, Md., 1980. Translated from the Russian by D. Louvish.
- [44] S. Herr, D. Tataru, and N. Tzvetkov. Global well-posedness of the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with small initial data in $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$. *Duke Math. J.*, 159(2):329–349, 2011.
- [45] F. Hornung. The stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation in unbounded domains and non-compact manifolds. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 27(4):Paper No. 40, 46, 2020.
- [46] A. Jakubowski. On the Skorokhod topology. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 22(3):263–285, 1986.
- [47] A. Jakubowski. The almost sure Skorokhod representation for subsequences in nonmetric spaces. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 42(1):209–216, 1997.
- [48] T. Kato. On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.*, 46(1):113–129, 1987.
- [49] R. Khasminskii. *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, volume 66 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer, Heidelberg, second edition, 2012. With contributions by G. N. Milstein and M. B. Nevelson.
- [50] J. U. Kim. Invariant measures for a stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(2):687–717, 2006.
- [51] M. C. Kunze. On a class of martingale problems on Banach spaces. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:No. 104, 30, 2013.
- [52] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, and J. Szeftel. On blow up for the energy super critical defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Invent. Math.*, 227(1):247–413, 2022.
- [53] T. Ogawa and Y. Tsutsumi. Blow-up of solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with quartic potential and periodic boundary condition. In *Functional-analytic methods for partial differential equations (Tokyo, 1989)*, volume 1450 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 236–251. Springer, Berlin, 1990.
- [54] T. Oh and M. Okamoto. On the stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations at critical regularities. *Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput.*, 8(4):869–894, 2020.
- [55] M. Ondreját. Uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Banach spaces. *Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.)*, 426:63, 2004.
- [56] M. Ondreját. Brownian representations of cylindrical local martingales, martingale problem and strong Markov property of weak solutions of SPDEs in Banach spaces. *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 55(130)(4):1003–1039, 2005.

- [57] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [58] P. Ren, H. Tang, and F.-Y. Wang. Distribution-path dependent nonlinear spdes with application to stochastic transport type equations. *Potential Analysis*, pages 1–29, 2024.
- [59] J. Simon. Compact sets in the space $L^p(0, T; B)$. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 146:65–96, 1987.
- [60] W. A. Strauss. On continuity of functions with values in various Banach spaces. *Pacific J. Math.*, 19:543–551, 1966.
- [61] C. Sulem and P.-L. Sulem. *The nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, volume 139 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. Self-focusing and wave collapse.
- [62] M. Sy. Almost sure global well-posedness for the energy supercritical Schrödinger equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 154:108–145, 2021.
- [63] H. Tang and F.-Y. Wang. A general framework for solving singular spdes with applications to fluid models driven by pseudo-differential noise. *arXiv:2208.08312*, 2022.
- [64] Y. Tsutsumi. Time decay of solution for the KdV equation with multiplicative space-time noise. *Differential Integral Equations*, 21(9-10):959–970, 2008.
- [65] S. K. Turitsyn, B. G. Bale, and M. P. Fedoruk. Dispersion-managed solitons in fibre systems and lasers. *Physics reports*, 521(4):135–203, 2012.
- [66] D. Zhang. Stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations in the defocusing mass and energy critical cases. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(5):3652–3705, 2023.