

# Polynomial mixing for white-forced Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation on the whole line

Peng Gao

School of Mathematics and Statistics, and Center for Mathematics  
and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University,  
Changchun 130024, P. R. China

Email: gaopengjilindaxue@126.com

August 2, 2024

## Abstract

Our goal in this paper is to investigate ergodicity of white-forced Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation (KSE) on the whole line. Under the assumption that sufficiently many directions of the phase space are stochastically forced, we can prove that the dynamics is attractive toward a unique invariant probability measure with polynomial rate of any power. In order to prove this, we further develop coupling method and establish a sufficiently general criterion for polynomial mixing. The proof of polynomial mixing for KSE is obtained by the combination of the coupling criterion and the Foias-Prodi estimate of KSE on the whole line.

*Keywords:* ergodicity; polynomial mixing; Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation; Foias-Prodi estimate; degenerate random force

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 60H15, 35R60, 37A25

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Main results . . . . .	2
1.2	Related literature . . . . .	4
1.3	Methodology in our work . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Probability estimates</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Construct an mixing extension . . . . .	6
2.2	Moment estimates for solutions . . . . .	7
2.3	Weighted estimates for solutions . . . . .	8
2.4	Weighted estimates for the truncated process . . . . .	13
<b>3</b>	<b>Foias-Prodi estimate</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Foias-Prodi estimate . . . . .	15
3.2	Growth estimate for the auxiliary process . . . . .	17

<b>4</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 1.1</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	Recurrence . . . . .	20
4.2	Polynomial squeezing . . . . .	25
<b>5</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 1.2</b>	<b>28</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation (KSE)

$$u_t + u_{xxxx} + uu_x = 0$$

was derived independently by Kuramoto et al. in [1, 3, 2] as a model for phase turbulence in reaction-diffusion systems and by Sivashinsky in [4] as a model for plane flame propagation, describing the combined influence of diffusion and thermal conduction of the gas on stability of a plane flame front.

KSE as a bridge between partial differential equations and dynamical systems has received a lot of attention since [5]. Mathematicians first focused on deterministic KSE. Global attracting set, attractors, stability, instability, inertial manifolds, approximate inertial manifolds, determining modes, determining nodes has been studied in [5, 6, 7, 8] and the reference therein. Recently, two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation has attracted the attention of many people, see [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] and the reference therein. In order to consider a more realistic model for physical problem, it is sensible to consider some kind of random perturbation represented by a noise term in the system. In the last 20 years, people have focused on KSE driven by random noise, it has been studied from the perspective of random dynamical systems. KSE driven by white noise is a popular one, a large amount of work has been devoted to the study of this kind equation, random attractors, invariant measures, averaging principle, irreducibility, large deviation principle, moderate deviations principle, absolute continuity of laws have been studied in [15, 20, 24, 25, 26, 16, 17, 27, 28].

## 1.1 Main results

In this paper, we investigate the polynomial mixing for the white-forced KSE on the whole line  $\mathbb{R}$ . To be specific, we consider the following white-forced KSE

$$\begin{cases} u_t + au + u_{xxxx} + uu_x = h + \eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $a > 0$  is a constant,  $h = h(x)$ ,  $\eta$  is a white noise of the form

$$\eta(t) := \frac{\partial}{\partial t} W(t), \quad W(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i \beta_i(t) e_i(x),$$

and  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\{\beta_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  is a sequence of independent real-valued standard Brownian motions defined on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$  satisfying the usual conditions,  $\{e_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  is an orthonor-

mal basis in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Let  $H := L^2(\mathbb{R}), V := H^1(\mathbb{R})$ . We introduce the following assumption

$$(A) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi h \in H, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |(h, e_i)| \|e_i\|_3 < +\infty, \quad B_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 < +\infty, \\ B_2 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \|\varphi e_i\|^2 < +\infty, \quad B_3 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \|e_i\|_3^2 < +\infty, \end{array} \right.$$

where  $\varphi(x) := \ln(x^2 + 2)$ . Under the assumption **(A)**, following the similar arguments as in [21, 23], we can show that the stochastic KSE (1.1) is globally well-posed and defines a Markov process in  $V$ .

Now, we are in a position to present the main result in this paper.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let the assumption **(A)** hold. Then, there exists an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that if*

$$b_i \neq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1.2)$$

*then there exists a unique stationary measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(V)$  for (1.1). Moreover, for any  $p > 1$ , there exists a  $C_p > 0$  such that for any  $u_0 \in V$ , the solution  $u$  of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\|P_t(u_0, \cdot) - \mu\|_{L(V)}^* \leq C_p (1 + \|u_0\|_1^2 + \|u_0\|_3^{\frac{14}{3}}) (t+1)^{-p}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we develop a general criterion, which gives sufficient conditions for polynomial mixing.

Let  $X$  be a separable Banach space with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_u)$  be a Feller family of Markov processes in  $X$ ,  $P_t(u, A) := \mathbb{P}(u_t(u, \omega) \in A)$  is the transition function. We introduce the following associated Markov operators

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_t : C_b(X) &\rightarrow C_b(X), \quad \mathcal{B}_t f(u) := \int_X f(v) P_t(u, dv), \quad \forall f \in C_b(X), \\ \mathcal{B}_t^* : \mathcal{P}(X) &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X), \quad \mathcal{B}_t^* \lambda(A) := \int_X P_t(u, A) \lambda(du), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(X). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1.1.** *Let  $(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  be a Markov family in  $X \times X$ .  $(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  is called an **extension** of  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_u)$  if for any  $\mathbf{u} = (u, u') \in X \times X$  the laws under  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}$  of processes  $\{\Pi_1 \mathbf{u}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{\Pi_2 \mathbf{u}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  coincide with those of  $\{u_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_u$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{u'}$  respectively, where  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  denote the projections from  $X \times X$  to the first and second component.*

Let  $B$  be a closed subset in  $X$  and  $\mathbf{B} := B \times B$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathbf{B}} &= \tau_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \mathbf{u}_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega) \in \mathbf{B}\}, \\ \sigma &= \sigma(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|u_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega) - u'_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega)\| \geq C(t+1)^{-p}\}, \\ \rho &= \sigma + \tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma} = \sigma(\mathbf{u}, \omega) + \tau_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{u}_{\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \omega)}(\mathbf{u}, \omega), \theta_{\sigma(\mathbf{u}, \omega)} \omega). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 1.2.** *The family  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_u)$  is called satisfies the **coupling hypothesis** if there exists an extension  $(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$ , a stopping time  $\sigma$ , a closed set  $B \subset X$ , and an increasing function  $g(r) \geq 1$  of the variable  $r \geq 0$  such that the following two properties hold*

**Recurrence** There exists  $p > 1$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^p \leq G(\mathbf{u})$$

for all  $\mathbf{u} = (u, u') \in \mathbf{X}$ , where we set  $G(\mathbf{u}) = g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|)$ .

**Polynomial squeezing** There exist positive constants  $\delta_1, \delta_2, c, K$  and  $1 \leq q \leq p$  such that, for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\sigma = \infty) &\geq \delta_1, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} \sigma^p) &\leq c, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} G(\mathbf{u}_\sigma)^q) &\leq K. \end{aligned}$$

Any extension of  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  satisfying the above properties will be called a **mixing extension**.

Now, we are in a position to present an abstract criterion for polynomial mixing.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  be a Feller family of Markov processes that possesses a mixing extension  $(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$ . Then there exists a random time  $\ell \in \mathcal{T}_+$  such that, for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$ , with  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}$ -probability 1, for any  $p_0 < p$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_t - u'_t\| &\leq C_1(t - \ell + 1)^{-p}, \quad \forall t \geq \ell, \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \ell^{p_0} &\leq C_1(G(\mathbf{u}) + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$  is an arbitrary initial point,  $g(r)$  is the function in Definition 1.2, and  $C_1, \alpha$ , and  $\beta$  are positive constants not depending on  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $t$ . If, in addition, there is an increasing function  $\tilde{g}(r) \geq 1$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} g(\|u_t\|) \leq \tilde{g}(u), \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

for all  $u \in X$ , then the family  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  has a unique stationary measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , and it holds that

$$\|P_t(u, \cdot) - \mu\|_L^* \leq V(\|u\|)(t + 1)^{-p_0}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

for  $u \in X$ , where  $V$  is given by the relation

$$V(r) = 3C_1(g(r) + \tilde{g}(0)).$$

## 1.2 Related literature

In the last thirty years, there was a substantial progress in ergodicity for partial differential equations with random forcing, we refer the readers to [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36] and the books [22, 38] for a detailed discussion of this direction. In the beginning, people mainly focus on exponential mixing for stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs), such as Navier-Stokes system, reaction-diffusion equation and so on. Most of the existing literature has been mainly concerned with the situation of exponential mixing for SPDEs, we refer readers to [38, 39, 40, 34, 35, 37] and the references therein. It is important to point out that in the above works, the exponential convergent rate is valid thanks to the advantage of strong dissipation. Generally speaking, this is difficult to achieve for weakly dissipative SPDEs.

In recent years, polynomial mixing for weakly dissipative SPDEs has received more and more attention, this kind of SPDEs does not possess a strong dissipative mechanism, it seems to be less hope for exponential mixing of this kind of SPDEs. Up to now, polynomial mixing for SPDEs is studied less, here we recall them. [42] established the polynomial mixing for the white-forced Schrödinger equation, [43] investigated polynomial mixing for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation perturbed by a random force at random times, [45] investigated uniform polynomial mixing for the white-forced complex Ginzburg-Landau equation, and [44] investigated polynomial mixing for white-forced wave equation. All the above results are established on bounded domain. This paper is an attempt for polynomial mixing of SPDEs on unbounded domain. We emphasize that in comparison with exponential mixing for SPDEs, it is more difficult to handle polynomial mixing situations due to the disadvantage of weak dissipation.

Up to now, there is less work on the ergodicity for KSE. The existence and uniqueness of invariant measures for KSE driven by non-degenerate and mild degenerate white noise has been established in [23, 19]. Both works are concerned with KSE on bounded domain and without convergence rate, in this paper, we will establish polynomial mixing of KSE on the whole line  $\mathbb{R}$ .

### 1.3 Methodology in our work

Main difficulties to establish ergodicity for the white-forced KSE (1.1) on the whole line come from the nonlinear term  $uu_x$  and the unbounded domain, the two difficulties lead to polynomial mixing for (1.1) not exponential mixing. In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we further develop coupling idea and establish an abstract criterion Theorem 1.2 for polynomial mixing. In order to apply this new criterion to KSE, we employ the coupling method with the Foias-Prodi estimate for KSE on the whole line, this heavily depends on a weight estimate, this kind weight estimate for KSE is harder to obtain than that for Schrödinger equation, complex Ginzburg-Landau equation and reaction-diffusion equation. Compared with the nonlinear term  $u^3$  or  $|u|^2u$  which appears in reaction-diffusion equation, complex Ginzburg-Landau equation and Schrödinger equation, we can not simply deal with it by using the sign condition. Here, we deal with  $uu_x$  by introducing the arguments of the high order moment estimates and maximal martingale inequality, this is quite different from traditional way. On the other hand, due to the lack of strong dissipation and compactness, the method and technique on bounded domain do not work for the whole line case, such as the Poincaré inequality. In order to overcome this difficulty, we introduce the cut-off technique to KSE (1.1). With the help of the above idea and method, we can prove Theorem 1.1.

Although the argument is specifically presented for KSE, we believe that the technique may be applicable for other systems where neither strong dissipation nor bounded domain are available.

#### *Notation*

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

Let  $X$  be a Polish space with a metric  $d_X(u, v)$ , the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  and the set of Borel probability measures by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .  $C_b(X)$  is the space of continuous functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  endowed with the norm  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{u \in X} |f(u)|$ .  $B_X(R)$  stands for the ball in  $X$  of

radius  $R$  centred at zero. We write  $C(X)$  when  $X$  is compact.  $L_b(X)$  is the space of functions  $f \in C_b(X)$  such that

$$\|f\|_{L(X)} = \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{u \neq v} \frac{|f(u) - f(v)|}{d_X(u, v)} < \infty.$$

The dual-Lipschitz metric on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is defined by

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_{L(X)}^* = \sup_{\|f\|_{L(X)} \leq 1} |\langle f, \mu_1 \rangle - \langle f, \mu_2 \rangle|, \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(X),$$

where  $\langle f, \mu \rangle = \int_X f(u) \mu(du)$ .

Let  $H^s := \tilde{H}^s(\mathbb{R})$  we denote the Sobolev space of real-valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  with the norm

$$\|u\|_s^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + |\xi|^2)^s |(\mathcal{F}u)(\xi)|^2 d\xi,$$

where  $\mathcal{F}u$  is the Fourier transform of  $u$ . When  $s = 0$ , we denote  $\|\cdot\|_0$  by  $\|\cdot\|$ .

For  $q > 1$ ,  $Q_q(r) := r^{1-q}$  ( $r > 0$ ).

If  $p$  and  $q$  are real numbers, then  $p \vee q$  ( $p \wedge q$ ) stands for their maximum (minimum).

$a_0 := a \wedge 1$ , where  $a$  is the damping coefficient in (1.1).

## 2 Probability estimates

### 2.1 Construct an mixing extension

For initial points  $u, u' \in H$ , let  $\{u(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{u'(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  denote the solutions of the equation (1.1) issued from  $u, u'$ , respectively. We introduce an auxiliary process  $\{v(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  which is the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + av + v_{xxxx} + vv_x + P_N(uu_x - vv_x) = h + \eta & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ v(x, 0) = u'(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $P_N$  denotes the orthogonal projection in  $H$  onto the space by the family  $\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$  with integer  $N \geq 1$ . Let  $T > 0$  be a time parameter that will be chosen later. We denote by  $\lambda_T(u, u')$  and  $\lambda'_T(u, u')$  the distributions of processes  $\{v(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  and  $\{u'(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ , respectively. Then  $\lambda_T(u, u')$  and  $\lambda'_T(u, u')$  are probability measures on  $C([0, T]; H)$ . By [38, Theorem 1.2.28], there exists a maximal coupling  $(V_T(u, u'), V'_T(u, u'))$  for the pair  $(\lambda_T(u, u'), \lambda'_T(u, u'))$  defined on some probability space  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ . We denote by  $\{\tilde{v}(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  and  $\{\tilde{u}'(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  the flows of this maximal coupling. Then,  $\tilde{v}$  is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_t + a\tilde{v} + \tilde{v}_{xxxx} + \tilde{v}\tilde{v}_x - P_N(\tilde{v}\tilde{v}_x) = h + \tilde{\eta} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{v}(x, 0) = u'(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

with  $\mathcal{D}(\{\int_0^t \tilde{\eta}(s) ds\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}) = \mathcal{D}(\{\int_0^t (\eta(s) - P_N(u(s)u_x(s)) ds)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T})$ . Let  $\tilde{u}$  be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{u}_t + a\tilde{u} + \tilde{u}_{xxxx} + \tilde{u}\tilde{u}_x - P_N(\tilde{u}\tilde{u}_x) = h + \tilde{\eta} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ \tilde{u}(x, 0) = u(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

this implies that  $\mathcal{D}(\{\tilde{u}(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}) = \mathcal{D}(\{u(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T})$ . We define operators  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$  by

$$\mathcal{R}_t(u, u', \omega) = \tilde{u}(t), \quad \mathcal{R}'_t(u, u', \omega) = \tilde{u}'(t)$$

for any  $u, u' \in H, \omega \in \tilde{\Omega}, t \in [0, T]$ . Then, let  $\{(\Omega^k, \mathcal{F}^k, \mathbb{P}^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$  be a sequence of independent copies of  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$  and let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be the direct product of  $\{(\Omega^k, \mathcal{F}^k, \mathbb{P}^k)\}_{k \geq 0}$ . For any  $\omega = (\omega^1, \omega^2, \dots) \in \Omega$  and  $u, u' \in H$ , we set  $\tilde{u}_0 = u, \tilde{u}'_0 = u'$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_t(\omega) &= \mathcal{R}_s(\tilde{u}_k(\omega), \tilde{u}'_k(\omega), \omega^k), \quad \tilde{u}'_t(\omega) = \mathcal{R}'_s(\tilde{u}_k(\omega), \tilde{u}'_k(\omega), \omega^k), \\ \mathbf{u}_t &= (\tilde{u}_t, \tilde{u}'_t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $t = s + kT, s \in [0, T]$ . The construction implies that  $(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  is an extension for  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_u)$ . We will show that it is a mixing extension for  $(u_t, \mathbb{P}_u)$ .

## 2.2 Moment estimates for solutions

**Proposition 2.1.** *For any  $p \geq 1, u_0 \in H, h \in H$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|^{2p} \leq e^{-pat}\|u_0\|^{2p} + \frac{C(p, h, B_1)}{pa} \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|^{2p} ds \leq C(u_0, p, h, B_1)(t+1) \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* By applying Itô formula to  $\|u\|^2$ , it holds that

$$d\|u\|^2 + 2[a\|u\|^2 + \|u_{xx}\|^2]dt = 2(h, u)dt + B_1dt + 2(u, dW), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $B_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2$ . This leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}\|u\|^2 + 2[a\mathbb{E}\|u\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|u_{xx}\|^2] = 2\mathbb{E}(h, u) + B_1 \leq a\mathbb{E}\|u\|^2 + \frac{\|h\|^2}{a} + B_1,$$

this implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}\|u\|^2 + a\mathbb{E}\|u\|^2 + 2\mathbb{E}\|u_{xx}\|^2 \leq \frac{\|h\|^2}{a} + B_1,$$

thus, Gronwall inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|^2 \leq e^{-at}[\|u_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{a}(\frac{\|h\|^2}{a} + B_1)].$$

According to (2.6) and applying Itô formula to  $\|u\|^{2p}$ , we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} d\|u\|^{2p} &= [2p\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, h - au - u_{xxxx} - uu_x) + p\|u\|^{2p-2}B_1]dt \\ &\quad + 2p(p-1)\|u\|^{2(p-2)}(u, dW)^2 + 2p\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, dW). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(u, dW)^2 = \|u\|^2 B_1 dt$ , we have

$$d\|u\|^{2p} = [2p\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, h - au - u_{xxxx} - uu_x) + (2p^2 - p)\|u\|^{2p-2} B_1] dt + 2p\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, dW).$$

This leads to

$$\|u(t)\|^{2p} + pa \int_s^t \|u(r)\|^{2p} dr \leq \|u(s)\|^{2p} + C(p, \|h\|, B_1)(t - s) + 2p \int_s^t \|u\|^{2p-2}(u, dW) \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} &= 2p\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, h - au - u_{xxxx} - uu_x) + (2p^2 - p)B_1\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2} \\ &= 2p\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}[(u, h) - a\|u\|^2 - \|u_{xx}\|^2] + (2p^2 - p)B_1\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}, \end{aligned}$$

then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} + 2pa\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} + 2p\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}\|u_{xx}\|^2 &= 2p\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}(u, h) + (2p^2 - p)B_1\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2} \\ &\leq \frac{pa}{4}\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} + C(p, h, B_1), \end{aligned}$$

this implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} + pa\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p} + 2p\mathbb{E}\|u\|^{2p-2}\|u_{xx}\|^2 \leq C(p, h, B_1),$$

the above estimates imply that (2.4) and (2.5) hold.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 2.3 Weighted estimates for solutions

We introduce the following functionals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u(t) &= \|u(t)\|^2 + a_0 \int_0^t \|u\|_2^2 ds, \\ \mathcal{E}_u^p(t) &= \|u(t)\|^{2p} + pa \int_0^t \|u\|^{2p} ds, \\ \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) &= \|u(t)\|^2 + \|(\psi u)(t)\|^2 + a_0 \int_0^t (\|u\|_2^2 + \|\psi u\|_2^2) ds, \\ \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t) &= \|(\psi u)(t)\|^2 + a_0 \int_0^t (\|\psi u_{xx}\|^2 + \|\psi u\|^2) ds. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 2.2.** *There exist constants  $K_1, \gamma_1 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_u(t + T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) - K_1 t] \geq \rho) \leq e^{-\gamma_1 \rho}, \quad (2.8)$$

for all  $\rho > 0, T \geq 0$ , and  $u \in H$ .



*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* It follows from (2.6) that

$$\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) + 2 \int_T^{t+T} [a\|u(s)\|^2 + \|u_{xx}(s)\|^2] ds = 2 \int_T^{t+T} (u, h) ds + B_1 t + M(t),$$

where  $M(t) := 2 \int_T^{t+T} (u, dW) = 2 \int_T^{t+T} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i(u, e_i) d\beta_i$ , it is easy to see that  $M(t)$  is a martingale and its quadratic variation is given by

$$\langle M \rangle(t) = 4 \int_T^{t+T} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2(u(s), e_i)^2 ds \leq 4B_1 \int_T^{t+T} \|u(s)\|^2 ds.$$

Noting the fact

$$\int_T^{t+T} (u, h) ds \leq a \int_T^{t+T} \|u(s)\|^2 ds + \frac{\|h\|^2}{a} t,$$

there exist some suitable positive constants  $K_1$  and  $\gamma_1$  such that

$$\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) \leq K_1 t + M(t) - \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \langle M \rangle(t),$$

exponential supermartingale inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} (\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - K_1 t) \geq \mathcal{E}_u(T) + \rho) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} (\gamma_1 M(t) - \frac{\gamma_1^2}{2} \langle M \rangle(t)) \geq \gamma_1 \rho) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} \exp(\gamma_1 M(t) - \frac{1}{2} \langle \gamma_1 M \rangle(t)) \geq e^{\gamma_1 \rho}) \\ &\leq e^{-\gamma_1 \rho}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

**Proposition 2.3.** For any  $p \geq 2, q > 1$ , there exists a constant  $L_p > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_u^p(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^p(T) - (L_p + 1)t - 2] \geq \rho) \leq C Q_q(\rho + 1),$$

for all  $\rho > 0, T \geq 0$ , and  $u \in H$ , where  $C$  is a constant depends on  $u, q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* It follows from (2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u^p(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^p(T) &= \|u(t+T)\|^{2p} - \|u(T)\|^{2p} + pa \int_T^{t+T} \|u(s)\|^{2p} ds \\ &\leq L_p t + M^p(t), \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where  $M^p(t) := 2p \int_T^{t+T} \|u\|^{2p-2}(u, dW)$ . It follows from (2.9) that

$$\mathcal{E}_u^p(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^p(T) - (L_p + 1)t - 2 \leq M^p(t) - t - 2.$$

We define  $M_*^p(t) = \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M^p(s)|$ . For any  $q > 1$ , according to the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy and Hölder inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(M_*^p(t))^{2q} &\leq C\mathbb{E}\langle M^p(t) \rangle^q \leq C(p, q)\mathbb{E}\left(\int_T^{t+T} \|u\|^{4p-2} ds\right)^q \\ &\leq C(p, q)t^{q-1}\mathbb{E}\int_T^{t+T} \|u\|^{(4p-2)q} ds \leq C(u_0, p, q, h, B_1)(t+1)^q. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Noting the following fact for all  $\rho > 0$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sup_{t \geq 0} [M^p(t) - t - 2] \geq \rho\} &\subset \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \{\sup_{t \in [m, m+1]} [M^p(t) - t - 2] \geq \rho\} \\ &\subset \bigcup_{m \geq 0} \{M_*^p(m+1) \geq \rho + m + 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $q > 1$ , it follows from the above analysis, the maximal martingale inequality, the Chebyshev inequality and (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\sup_{t \geq 0} [M^p(t) - t - 2] \geq \rho\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{m \geq 0} \{M_*^p(m+1) \geq \rho + m + 2\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(M_*^p(m+1) \geq \rho + m + 2) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}(M_*^p(m+1))^{2q}}{(\rho + m + 2)^{2q}} \\ &\leq C(u_0, p, q, h, B_1) \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{(m+2)^q}{(\rho + m + 2)^{2q}} \\ &\leq C(u_0, p, q, h, B_1) \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{1}{(\rho + m + 2)^q} \\ &\leq \frac{C(u_0, p, q, \|h\|, B_1)}{(\rho + 1)^{q-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** *For any  $q > 1$ , there exist two positive constants  $K_2$  and  $M_2$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(T) - K_2 t - M_2(\|u(T)\|^2 + \|u(T)\|^{2p_1} + 1)] \geq \rho) \leq CQ_q(\rho + 1),$$

for all  $\rho > 0, T \geq 0$  and  $u \in H$ , where  $p_1 = \frac{7}{3}$  and  $C$  is a constant depends on  $u, q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.4.* By applying Itô formula to  $\|\psi u\|^2$ , it holds that

$$d\|\psi u\|^2 = 2(\psi u, \psi(h - uu_x - au - u_{xxx})) + \psi_t u dt + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \|\psi e_i\|^2 dt + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i (\psi u, \psi e_i) d\beta_i,$$

this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\psi u)(t+T)\|^2 - \|(\psi u)(T)\|^2 + 2 \int_T^{t+T} (\psi^2 u, u_{xxxx}) ds + 2a \int_T^{t+T} \|\psi u\|^2 ds \\
& = 2 \int_T^{t+T} (\psi^2 u, h - uu_x) ds + 2 \int_T^{t+T} (\psi u, \psi_t u) ds + \int_T^{t+T} B_2^\psi(s) ds + M_2(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where  $B_2^\psi(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \|\psi e_i\|^2$ ,  $M_2(t) = 2 \int_T^{t+T} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i (\psi u, \psi e_i) d\beta_i$  and we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
B_2^\psi(t) & \leq B_2, \\
\langle M_2(t) \rangle & = 4 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \int_T^{t+T} (\psi u, \psi e_i)^2 ds \leq 4B_2 \int_T^{t+T} \|\psi u\|^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

We take  $\gamma_2 = \frac{a}{8B_2}$ , then

$$\gamma_2 \langle M_2(t) \rangle \leq \frac{a}{2} \int_T^{t+T} \|\psi u\|^2 ds.$$

Noting the fact

$$(\psi^2 u, u_{xxxx}) = ((\psi^2 u)_{xx}, u_{xx}) = \int (\psi^2 u_{xx}^2 + 2\psi_x^2 uu_{xx} + 2\psi\psi_{xx}uu_{xx} + 4\psi\psi_x u_x u_{xx}) dx,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \psi_x^2 uu_{xx} dx & \leq C \|u\|_2^2, \\
\int \psi\psi_{xx}uu_{xx} dx & \leq \delta \|\psi u_{xx}\|^2 + C \|u\|^2, \\
\int \psi\psi_x u_x u_{xx} dx & \leq \delta \|\psi u_{xx}\|^2 + C \|u_x\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

thus, we have

$$\left| \int (2\psi_x^2 uu_{xx} + 2\psi\psi_{xx}uu_{xx} + 4\psi\psi_x u_x u_{xx}) dx \right| \leq \delta \|\psi u_{xx}\|^2 + C \|u\|_2^2.$$

By some calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\psi^2 u, h) & \leq \delta \|\psi u\|^2 + C_\delta \|\psi h\|^2, \\
(\psi u, \psi_t u) & \leq \delta \|\psi u\|^2 + C_\delta \|u\|^2, \\
|(\psi^2 u, uu_x)| & \leq C |(\psi u, \psi_x u^2)| \\
& \leq \delta \|\psi u\|^2 + C_\delta \int u^4 dx \\
& \leq \delta \|\psi u\|^2 + C_\delta \|u\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_2^{\frac{7}{2}} \\
& \leq \delta \|\psi u\|^2 + C_\delta (\|u\|_2^2 + \|u\|^{2p_1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above estimates in (2.11), by taking  $\delta > 0$  small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(\psi u)(t+T)\|^2 - \|(\psi u)(T)\|^2 + a_0 \int_T^{t+T} (\|\psi u_{xx}\|^2 + \|\psi u\|^2) ds \\ & \leq (B_2 + \|\varphi h\|^2)t + M_2(t) - \gamma_2 \langle M_2(t) \rangle + C \int_T^{t+T} \|u(s)\|_2^2 ds + C \int_T^{t+T} \|u(s)\|^{2p_1} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} C \int_T^{t+T} \|u\|_2^2 ds & \leq C_2(\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) + \|u(T)\|^2), \\ C \int_T^{t+T} \|u\|^{2p_1} ds & \leq C_{p_1}(\mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(T) + \|u(T)\|^{2p_1}), \end{aligned}$$

(2.12) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(T) & \leq (B_2 + \|\varphi h\|^2)t + (M_2(t) - \gamma_2 \langle M_2(t) \rangle) + C_2(\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) + \|u(T)\|^2) \\ & \quad + C_{p_1}(\mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(T) + \|u(T)\|^{2p_1}), \end{aligned}$$

namely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(T) - [B_2 + \|\varphi h\|^2 + C_2 K_1 + C_{p_1}(L_{p_1} + 1)]t - C_2 \|u(T)\|^2 - C_{p_1} \|u(T)\|^{2p_1} - 2C_{p_1} \\ & \leq (M_2(t) - \gamma_2 \langle M_2(t) \rangle) + C_2(\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) - K_1 t) \\ & \quad + C_{p_1}(\mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^{p_1}(T) - (L_{p_1} + 1)t - 2), \end{aligned}$$

here, we take  $K_2 = B_2 + \|\varphi h\|^2 + C_2 K_1 + C_{p_1}(L_{p_1} + 1)$ ,  $M_2 = \max(C_2, 2C_{p_1})$ . According to Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3 and exponential supermartingale inequality, we can prove the desired result.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.5.** *For any  $q > 1$ , there exist a  $Q_q$  and positive constants  $K_3$  and  $M_3$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(T) - K_3 t - M_3(\|u(T)\|^2 + \|u(T)\|^{2p_1} + 1)] \geq \rho \right) \leq C Q_q(\rho + 1),$$

for all  $\rho > 0, T \geq 0$ , and  $u \in H$ , where  $C$  is a constant depends on  $u, q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.5.* Since  $\|\psi u\|_2^2 \leq C(\|\psi u\|^2 + \|u\|^2 + \|u_x\|^2 + \|\psi u_{xx}\|^2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(T) & \leq \mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T) + \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(T) + C \int_T^{t+T} (\|u\|^2 + \|u_x\|^2) ds \\ & \leq C_3(\mathcal{E}_u(t+T) - \mathcal{E}_u(T)) + \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(t+T) - \mathcal{F}_u^\psi(T) + C_3 \|u(T)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3, Proposition 2.4, we can find suitable  $K_3$  and  $M_3$ .

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We introduce the following stopping time

$$\tau^u := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) \geq (K + L)t + \rho + M(\|u(0)\|^2 + \|u(0)\|^{2p_1} + 1)\}.$$

**Proposition 2.6.** For any  $q > 1$ , there exists a  $Q_q$  such that if  $K \geq K_3$  and  $M \geq 1 + M_3$

$$\mathbb{P}(l \leq \tau^u < +\infty) \leq CQ_q(\rho + Ll + 1), \quad (2.13)$$

for all  $L, l \geq 0$ , and  $u \in H$ , where  $C$  is a constants depends on  $u, q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.6.* On the event  $\{l \leq \tau^u < \infty\}$ , the definition of  $\tau^u$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(\tau^u) &\geq (K + L)\tau^u + \rho + M(\|u(0)\|^2 + \|u(0)\|^{2p_1} + 1) \\ &\geq K_3\tau^u + Ll + \|u(0)\|^2 + M_3(\|u(0)\|^2 + \|u(0)\|^{2p_1} + 1) + \rho \\ &\geq \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(0) + K_3\tau^u + M_3(\|u(0)\|^2 + \|u(0)\|^{2p_1} + 1) + Ll + \rho, \end{aligned}$$

thus, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) - \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(0) - K_3t - M_3(\|u(0)\|^2 + \|u(0)\|^{2p_1} + 1)] \geq Ll + \rho,$$

with the help of Proposition 2.5, we have (2.13).

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 2.4 Weighted estimates for the truncated process

**Proposition 2.7.** For any  $q > 1$ , there exists a  $Q_q$  and positive constants  $K_4$  and  $M_4$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_{u'}^\psi(t) - K_4t - M_4(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)] \geq \rho\right) \leq CQ_q(\rho + 1),$$

for all  $\rho > 0$ , and  $u' \in H$ , where  $C$  is a constant depends on  $u', q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.7.* Let us first consider the auxiliary equation

$$z_t + az + z_{xxxx} = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}.$$

For any  $t, T \geq 0$ , we have

$$\|z(t + T)\|^2 + a_0 \int_T^{t+T} \|z(s)\|_2^2 ds \leq \|z(T)\|^2.$$

By the similar arguments as in Proposition 2.4, it holds that

$$\|(\psi z)(t + T)\|^2 + a_0 \int_T^{t+T} (\|(\psi z)(s)\|^2 + \|(\psi z_{xx})(s)\|^2) ds \leq C(\|(\psi z)(T)\|^2 + \|z(T)\|^2).$$

Since  $\|\psi z\|_2^2 \leq C(\|\psi z\|^2 + \|z\|^2 + \|z_x\|^2 + \|\psi z_{xx}\|^2)$ , we have

$$\|z(t + T)\|^2 + \|(\psi z)(t + T)\|^2 + a_0 \int_T^{t+T} (\|z(s)\|_2^2 + \|(\psi z)(s)\|_2^2) ds \leq C(\|z(T)\|^2 + \|(\psi z)(T)\|^2)$$

this implies that

$$\mathcal{E}_z^\psi(t + T) \leq C\mathcal{E}_z^\psi(T) \quad \text{for } t, T \geq 0,$$

this implies that on the event  $\{\tau < \infty\}$ , it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t + \tau) \leq C\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(\tau) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

then, on the event  $\{\tau < \infty\}$ , there exists a constant  $C' > 1$  such that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - C'K_3t \leq C' \sup_{t \geq 0} (\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - K_3t) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0.$$

On the event  $\{\tau = +\infty\}$ , it is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - C'K_3t \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} (\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - K_3t) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - C'K_3t - C'(M_3 + 1)(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1) \\ & \leq \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - C'K_3t - C'(\|u'\|^2 + M_3(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)) \\ & \leq C' \sup_{t \geq 0} (\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - K_3t - \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(0) - M_3(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $K_4 = C'K_3, C_4 = C'(M_3 + 1)$ , with the help of Proposition 2.5, we can prove Proposition 2.7.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *For any  $q > 1$ , there exists a  $Q_q$  such that if  $K \geq K_4$  and  $M \geq 1 + M_4$*

$$\mathbb{P}(l \leq \tau^{\hat{u}'} < +\infty) \leq CQ_q(\rho + Ll + 1), \quad (2.14)$$

for all  $L, l \geq 0, \rho > 0$ , and  $u \in H$ , where  $C$  is a constants depends on  $u, q, h, B_1, B_2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.8.* On the event  $\{l \leq \tau^{\hat{u}'} < \infty\}$ , the definition of  $\tau^{\hat{u}'}$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(\tau^{\hat{u}'}) & \geq (K + L)\tau^{\hat{u}'} + \rho + M(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1) \\ & \geq K_4\tau^{\hat{u}'} + Ll + \|u'\|^2 + M_4(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1) + \rho \\ & \geq \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(0) + K_4\tau^{\hat{u}'} + M_4(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1) + Ll + \rho, \end{aligned}$$

thus, we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} [\mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(t) - \mathcal{E}_{\hat{u}'}^\psi(0) - K_4t - M_4(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)] \geq Ll + \rho,$$

with the help of Proposition 2.7, we have (2.14).

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Foias-Prodi estimate

Foias-Prodi estimate was firstly established in [46], now, it is a powerful tool to establish the ergodicity for SPDEs, and it is often used to compensate the degeneracy of the noise, see [38, 42, 43, 41] and the reference therein. Now, we establish Foias-Prodi estimate of KSE on the whole line.

### 3.1 Foias-Prodi estimate

Let us consider the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + au + u_{xxxx} + uu_x &= h + \eta \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ v_t + av + v_{xxxx} + vv_x + P_N(uu_x - vv_x) &= h + \eta \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Inspired by [29, 41], let us introduce a smooth space-time weight function given by

$$\psi(t, x) := \varphi(x)(1 - \exp(-\frac{t}{\varphi(x)})), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where  $\varphi(x) := \ln(x^2 + 2)$ . The following properties are useful for establishing Foias-Prodi estimate.

- (1)  $0 < \psi(t, x) < \varphi(x)$  for  $t > 0$  and  $\psi(0, x) = 0$ ;
- (2) For any  $k \geq 1$ ,  $|\partial_k \psi| \leq C_k$ , where  $C_k$  is some constants;
- (3)  $\lim_{t, |x| \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(t, x) = +\infty$ .

Let  $w = u - v$ , then we have

**Theorem 3.1.** *For  $w$ , we have the following estimates.*

- (1) *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2 \leq \|w(s)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-a(t-s) + C \int_s^t (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) dr\right),$$

for any  $t \geq s \geq 0$ .

- (2) *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a time  $T > 0$  and an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that*

$$\|w(t+T)\|_1^2 \leq \|w(s+T)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-a(t-s) + C_* \varepsilon \int_{s+T}^{t+T} (\|u\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2 + \|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2) dr\right)$$

for any  $t \geq s \geq 0$ , where  $C_* > 0$  is a constant depending on  $a$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* We can see that  $w$  satisfies that

$$w_t + aw + w_{xxxx} + Q_N(uu_x - vv_x) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where  $Q_N := Id - P_N$ . Taking the  $L^2$ -inner product of (3.1) with  $w$ , we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|w\|^2 + a \|w\|^2 + \|w_{xx}\|^2 + (Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w) = 0.$$

Taking the  $L^2$ -inner product of (3.1) with  $-w_{xx}$ , we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|w_x\|^2 + a \|w_x\|^2 + \|w_{xxx}\|^2 + (Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), -w_{xx}) = 0,$$

the above facts imply that

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_t \|w\|_1^2 + a \|w\|_1^2 + (\|w_{xxx}\|^2 + \|w_{xx}\|^2) + (Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w - w_{xx}) = 0.$$

- (1) By using the Cauchy inequality, we have

$$-(Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w - w_{xx}) \leq C(\|u\|_1 + \|v\|_1) \|w\|_1 \|w\|_2 \leq \frac{a_0}{4} \|w\|_2^2 + C(\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) \|w\|_1^2,$$

thus, Gronwall inequality implies (1).

- (2) Let us first recall the following lemma

**Lemma 3.1.** [41, Lemma 2.1] *Let us fix any  $s > 0$ . For any  $\varepsilon, A > 0$ , there is an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that*

$$\|Q_N \chi_A f\| \leq \varepsilon \|f\|_s, \quad \forall f \in H^s,$$

where  $Q_N := Id - P_N$  and  $\chi_A$  is any smooth cut-off function from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $[0, 1]$  such that

$$\chi_A = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in [-\frac{A}{2}, \frac{A}{2}], \\ 0 & x \in [-A, A]^c. \end{cases}$$

We split  $(Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w)$  into two parts,

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w) &= (Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x), w) + (Q_N(1 - \chi_A)(uu_x - vv_x), w) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Lemma 3.1 with  $s = 1$  to  $I_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= (Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x), w) \\ &\leq \|w\| \|Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x)\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\| \|uu_x - vv_x\|_1 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\| \|u^2 - v^2\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\| \|w\|_2 \|u + v\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_\delta \|w\|^2 (\|u\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2) + \delta \|w\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

For  $I_2$ , it follows from the property of the weight function  $\psi$  that

$$\psi^{-1}(x, t) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq T, |x| \geq \frac{A}{2},$$

provided that  $T, A > 0$  are large enough. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= ((1 - \chi_A)(uu_x - vv_x), Q_N w) \\ &= (Q_N w, (1 - \chi_A)(\psi uu_x - \psi vv_x) \psi^{-1}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\| \|\psi uu_x - \psi vv_x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi uu_x - \psi vv_x\| &= \|w \psi u_x + \psi v w_x\| \\ &\leq \|w\|_1 \|\psi u_x\| + \|\psi v\|_1 \|w\|_1 \\ &= \|w\|_1 (\|(\psi u)_x - \psi_x u\| + \|\psi v\|_1) \\ &\leq C \|w\|_1 (\|\psi u\|_1 + \|\psi v\|_1 + \|u\|), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \varepsilon C \|w\| \|w\|_1 (\|\psi u\|_1 + \|\psi v\|_1 + \|u\|) \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_\delta \|w\|^2 (\|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2 + \|u\|^2) + \delta \|w\|_1^2, \end{aligned}$$



by taking  $\delta > 0$  small enough, we have

$$\partial_t \|w\|^2 + [a - \varepsilon C(\|u\|_{s+1}^2 + \|v\|_{s+1}^2 + \|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2)] \|w\|^2 \leq 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_N(uu_x - vv_x), w_{xx}) &= (Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x), w_{xx}) + (Q_N(1 - \chi_A)(uu_x - vv_x), w_{xx}) \\ &=: I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Lemma 3.1 with  $s = 1$  to  $I_3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= (Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x), w_{xx}) \\ &\leq \|w_{xx}\| \|Q_N \chi_A(uu_x - vv_x)\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w_{xx}\| \|uu_x - vv_x\|_1 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w_{xx}\| \|u^2 - v^2\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w_{xx}\| \|w\|_2 \|u + v\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\|_2^2 \|u + v\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w\|_1 \|w\|_3 \|u + v\|_2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_\delta \|w\|_1^2 (\|u\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2) + \delta \|w\|_3^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= ((1 - \chi_A)(uu_x - vv_x), Q_N w_{xx}) \\ &= (Q_N w_{xx}, (1 - \chi_A)(\psi uu_x - \psi vv_x) \psi^{-1}) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \|w_{xx}\| \|\psi uu_x - \psi vv_x\| \\ &\leq \varepsilon C \|w_{xx}\| \|w\|_1 (\|\psi u\|_1 + \|\psi v\|_1 + \|u\|) \\ &\leq \varepsilon C_\delta \|w\|_1^2 (\|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2 + \|u\|^2) + \delta \|w_{xx}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $\delta > 0$  small enough, we have

$$\partial_t \|w\|_1^2 + [a - \varepsilon C(\|u\|_{s+1}^2 + \|v\|_{s+1}^2 + \|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2)] \|w\|_1^2 \leq 0,$$

thus, Gronwall inequality implies (2).

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2 Growth estimate for the auxiliary process

**Proposition 3.1.** *If (1.2) holds for some  $N \geq 1$ , then there exist constants  $\kappa, C > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^v < \infty) \leq C Q_q(\rho + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \exp(C e^{C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1+1})} d^2) - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for any  $\rho > 0$  and  $u, u' \in V$  with  $d = \|u - u'\|_1$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* The proof is divided into the following steps.

**Step 1.** Let  $\tau = \tau^v \wedge \tau^u \wedge \tau^{u'}$ . We introduce the truncated processes  $\{\hat{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ ,  $\{\hat{u}'(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{\hat{v}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{u}(t) &= \begin{cases} u(t), & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ \text{solves } z_t + Az = 0, & \text{for } t \geq \tau, \end{cases} \\ \hat{u}'(t) &= \begin{cases} u'(t), & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ \text{solves } z_t + Az = 0, & \text{for } t \geq \tau, \end{cases} \\ \hat{v}(t) &= \begin{cases} v(t), & \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ \text{solves } z_t + Az = 0, & \text{for } t \geq \tau. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 2.6 with  $l = 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^v < \infty) \leq CQ_q(\rho + 1) + \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\hat{v}} < \infty).$$

**Step 2.** Without loss of generality, we assume that the underlying probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is of a particular form  $\Omega := C_0([0, +\infty); H)$  is the space of all continuous functions taking values in  $H$  and vanishing at  $t = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$  is the distribution of the Wiener process

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i \beta_i(t) e_i,$$

$\mathcal{F}$  is the completion of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of associated with the topology of uniform convergence on every compact set. For any integer  $N \geq 1$ , we define the transform

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^{u, u'} : \Omega &\longrightarrow \Omega \\ \omega(t) &\rightarrow \omega(t) - \int_0^t \mathbb{I}_{s \leq \tau} P_N [\hat{u} \hat{u}_x - \hat{v} \hat{v}_x] ds.\end{aligned}$$

Due to the pathwise uniqueness for the stochastic KSE, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{u}'(\Phi^{u, u'}(\omega), t) = \hat{v}(\omega, t), \forall t \geq 0\} = 1,$$

this leads to

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^{\hat{v}} < \infty) = \Phi_*^{u, u'} \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\hat{u}'} < \infty) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau^{\hat{u}'} < \infty) + \|\mathbb{P} - \Phi_*^{u, u'} \mathbb{P}\|_{var}.$$

We express  $\Omega = C([0, +\infty); P_N H) \oplus C([0, +\infty); Q_N H)$ , for  $\omega = (\omega^{(1)}, \omega^{(2)}) \in \Omega$ ,

$$\Phi^{u, u'}(\omega) = \Phi^{u, u'}(\omega^{(1)}, \omega^{(2)}) = (\Psi^{u, u'}(\omega^{(1)}, \omega^{(2)}), \omega^{(2)}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^{u, u'} : \Omega &\longrightarrow C([0, +\infty); P_N H) \\ \omega(t) &\rightarrow \omega^{(1)}(t) + \int_0^t A(s, \omega^{(1)}, \omega^{(2)}) ds\end{aligned}$$

with

$$A(s) := -\mathbb{I}_{s \leq \tau} P_N [\hat{u} \hat{u}_x - \hat{v} \hat{v}_x].$$

By applying [38, Lemma 3.3.13], we have

$$\|\mathbb{P} - \Phi_*^{u,u'} \mathbb{P}\|_{var} \leq \int_{C([0,+\infty); Q_N H)} \|\mathbb{P}_N - \Psi_*^{u,u'}(\mathbb{P}_N, \omega^{(2)})\|_{var} \mathbb{P}_N^1(d\omega^{(2)}).$$

If for any  $C > 0$  and  $\omega^{(2)}$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_N \exp\left(C \int_0^\infty \|A(t)\|^2 dt\right) < \infty, \quad (3.2)$$

then Girsanov theorem shows that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_N - \Psi_*^{u,u'}(\mathbb{P}_N, \omega^{(2)})\|_{var} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_N \exp\left(6 \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} b_i^{-2} \int_0^\infty \|A(t)\|^2 dt\right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

**Step 3.** Let us estimate  $w(t) := \hat{u}(t) - \hat{v}(t)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq \tau$ , for any  $t \in [0, \tau)$ , it holds that

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2 \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}t + C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)\right) d^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Indeed, noting the fact  $w(t) = u(t) - v(t)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq \tau$  and the definition of  $\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) &= \mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) \leq (K+L)t + \rho + M(\|u\|^2 + \|u\|^{2p_1} + 1), \\ \mathcal{E}_v^\psi(t) &= \mathcal{E}_v^\psi(t) \leq (K+L)t + \rho + M(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq \tau$ . Now, we distinguish the following two cases.

Case 1.  $\tau \leq T$ .

Foias-Prodi estimate in Theorem 3.1 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(t)\|_1^2 &\leq \|w(0)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-at + C \int_0^t (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) dr\right) \\ &\leq \|w(0)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-at + C((K+L)T + \rho + M(\|u\|^2 + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 2))\right), \end{aligned}$$

this implies that

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2 \leq C \exp\left(-at + C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)\right) d^2 \quad (3.5)$$

Case 2.  $\tau > T$ .

We can see that (3.5) holds for  $w$  on  $[0, T]$ . We apply Foias-Prodi estimate in Theorem 3.1 with  $\varepsilon = \frac{aa_0}{4C_*(K+L)}$  to  $w$  on  $[T, \tau)$ , it holds that

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2 \leq \|w(T)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-a(t-T) + C_* \varepsilon \int_T^t (\|u\|_2^2 + \|v\|_2^2 + \|\psi u\|_1^2 + \|\psi v\|_1^2) dr\right).$$

(3.4) leads to

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2 \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}t + C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)\right) d^2.$$

Case 1 and Case 2 imply (3.3).

**Step 4.** Let us verify the Novikov condition (3.2).

Indeed, since  $\|A(t)\| \leq C \cdot 1_{t \leq \tau} \cdot \|w\|_1^2 (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2)$ , by integrating by parts and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty \|A(t)\|^2 dt &= \int_0^\tau \|A(t)\|^2 dt \\
&\leq C \int_0^\tau \|w\|_1^2 (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) dt \\
&\leq C \exp(C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)) d^2 \int_0^\tau \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}t\right) (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) dt \\
&= C \exp(C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)) d^2 \int_0^\tau \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}t\right) d\left(\int_0^t (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2) ds\right) \\
&\leq C \exp(C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)) d^2,
\end{aligned}$$

namely, we prove Novikov condition (3.2). Then, we can obtain

$$\|\mathbb{P} - \Phi_*^{u,u'} \mathbb{P}\|_{var} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \exp(Ce^{C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1)} d^2) - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.6)$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

With the help of Theorem 1.2, in order to prove Theorem 1.1, we only need to prove recurrence and polynomial mixing squeezing.

### 4.1 Recurrence

**Proposition 4.1.** *For any  $R, d > 0$ , there exist constants  $p, T > 0$  and an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(u(T) \in B_V(0, d)) \geq p \quad (4.1)$$

*holds for any  $u_0 \in B_V(0, R)$ , provided that (1.2) holds.*

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Let us take  $T, \delta > 0$  and denote  $y_1(t) := th + W(t)$  and

$$\Gamma_\delta := \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|y_1(t)\|_3 \leq \delta \right\}.$$

Let  $y_2(t) := u(t) - y_1(t)$ . The proof is divided into the following steps.

*Step 1.* For any  $T > 0$ , there exists sufficiently small  $0 < \delta < 1$  such that  $\|y_2(t)\|$  is uniformly bounded on  $[0, T] \times \Gamma_\delta$ . We can see that  $y_2$  satisfies that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y_2 + ay_2 + y_{2xxxx} = -ay_1 - y_{1xxxx} - uu_x & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ y_2(x, 0) = u_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

Indeed, multiplying the above equation by  $y_2 - y_{2xx}$  and then performing integration by parts over  $\mathbb{R}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \partial_t (\|y_2\|^2 + \|y_{2x}\|^2) + a(\|y_2\|^2 + \|y_{2x}\|^2) + (\|y_{2xx}\|^2 + \|y_{2xxx}\|^2) \\ &= -a(y_1, y_2 - y_{2xx}) - (y_{1xxxx}, y_2 - y_{2xx}) - (uu_x, y_2 - y_{2xx}). \end{aligned}$$

On the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -a(y_1, y_2 - y_{2xx}) &\leq C\|y_1\|^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_2^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_2^2, \\ -(y_{1xxxx}, y_2) &= -(y_{1xx}, y_{2xx}) \leq C\|y_1\|_2^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_2^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_2^2, \\ -(y_{1xxxx}, -y_{2xx}) &= (y_{1xxx}, y_{2xxx}) \leq C\|y_{1xxx}\|^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_3^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon\|y_2\|_3^2, \\ -(uu_x, y_2) &= -((y_1 + y_2)(y_1 + y_2)_x, y_2) = -(y_1y_{1x} + y_1y_{2x} + y_{1x}y_2, y_2) \\ &= -(y_1y_{1x}, y_2) + \frac{1}{2}(y_{1x}, y_2^2) \leq C\delta(1 + \|y_2\|^2), \\ -(uu_x, -y_{2xx}) &= ((y_1 + y_2)(y_1 + y_2)_x, y_{2xx}) = (y_1y_{1x} + y_1y_{2x} + y_{1x}y_2 + y_{2x}y_{2x}, y_{2xx}), \\ (y_1y_{1x} + y_1y_{2x} + y_{1x}y_2, y_{2xx}) &\leq C\delta^2\|y_{2xx}\| + C\delta\|y_{2x}\|^2 + C\delta\|y_2\|_2^2 \leq C\delta(1 + \|y_2\|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(y_2y_{2x}, y_{2xx}) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y_{2x}^3 dx \leq \varepsilon\|y_2\|_3^2 + C\|y_2\|_2^{\frac{22}{5}}$$

By taking  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , we have

$$\partial_t \|y_2\|^2 \leq C\delta(1 + \|y_2\|^2),$$

this implies that if we  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|y_2\|^2 \leq 2(1 + R^2).$$

By taking  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  and  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ , we have

$$\partial_t (\|y_2\|^2 + \|y_{2x}\|^2) + a(\|y_2\|^2 + \|y_{2x}\|^2) + (\|y_{2xx}\|^2 + \|y_{2xxx}\|^2) \leq C(R, T),$$

this implies that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|y_2\|_1^2 + \int_0^T \|y_2\|_3^2 dt \leq C(R, T).$$

Moreover, on the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u\|_1^2 + \int_0^T \|u\|_3^2 dt \leq C(R, T).$$

*Step 2.* Now we prove that there exist sufficiently large  $T > 0$  and small  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|u(T)\|_1 < d$  on the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ .

Indeed, let  $y_3$  be the solution of unforced KSE

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y_3 + ay_3 + y_{3xxxx} + y_3 y_{3x} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ y_3(x, 0) = u_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

by the similar argument as in Proposition 4.3, we have

$$\|y_3(t)\| \leq e^{-at} \|u_0\|. \quad (4.2)$$

Since

$$(y_3 y_{3x}, y_{3xx}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|y_{3xxx}\|^2 + C \|y_3\|^2 + C \|y_3\|^{\frac{22}{5}},$$

we have

$$\partial_t \|y_{3x}\|^2 + (2a \|y_{3x}\|^2 + \|y_{3xxx}\|^2) \leq C \|y_3\|^2 + C \|y_3\|^{\frac{22}{5}} \leq C(u_0) e^{-2at}.$$

Combining this with (4.2), we can prove that

$$\|y_3(t)\|_1^2 \leq C(u_0) e^{-2at} (1+t),$$

we can choose a large  $T = T(R, d)$  such that  $\|y_3(T)\|_1 \leq \frac{d}{4}$ .

Now we estimate the difference  $y(t) := y_2(t) - y_3(t)$ , then  $y$  is the solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y + ay + y_{xxxx} = -ay_1 - y_{1xxxx} - (uu_x - y_3 y_{3x}) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \\ y(x, 0) = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

On the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -a(y_1, y) &\leq C \|y_1\|^2 + \varepsilon \|y\|^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon \|y\|^2, \\ -(y_{1xxxx}, y) &= -(y_{1xx}, y_{xx}) \leq C \|y_{1xx}\|^2 + \varepsilon \|y\|_2^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon \|y\|_2^2, \\ -(uu_x - y_3 y_{3x}, y) &= -((y_1 + y)u_x + y_3(y_1 + y)_x, y) \\ &\leq C \|y_1\|_1 \|u\|_1 \|y\| + C \|u\|_2 \|y\|^2 + C \|y_1\|_1^2 + C(\|y_3\|_1^2 + \|y_3\|_2) \|y\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , these estimates imply that

$$\partial_t \|y\|^2 \leq C(\delta^2 + (\|u\|_1^2 + \|u\|_2 + \|y_3\|_1^2 + \|y_3\|_2) \|y\|^2),$$

then we have

$$\|y(T)\|^2 \leq C\delta^2.$$

On the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} -a(y_1, -y_{xx}) &\leq C \|y_1\|^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2, \\ -(y_{1xxxx}, -y_{xx}) &= -(y_{1xxx}, y_{xxx}) \leq C \|y_{1xxx}\|^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xxx}\|^2 \leq C\delta^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xxx}\|^2, \\ -(uu_x - y_3 y_{3x}, -y_{xx}) &= -((y_1 + y)u_x + y_3(y_1 + y)_x, y_{xx}) \\ -(y_1 u_x, y_{xx}) &\leq \delta \|u\|_1 \|y_{xx}\| \leq C\delta^2 \|u\|_1^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2, \\ -(u_x y, y_{xx}) &\leq \|u\|_1 \|y\|_1 \|y_{xx}\| \leq C_\varepsilon \|u\|_1^2 \|y\|_1^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2, \\ -(y_3 y_{1x}, y_{xx}) &\leq \|y_3\|_1 \|y_1\|_1 \|y_{xx}\| \leq C_\varepsilon \delta^2 \|y_3\|_1^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2, \\ -(y_3 y_x, y_{xx}) &\leq \|y_3\|_1 \|y_x\| \|y_{xx}\| \leq C_\varepsilon \|y_3\|_1^2 \|y_x\|^2 + \varepsilon \|y_{xx}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , these estimates imply that

$$\partial_t \|y\|_1^2 \leq C(\delta^2 + (\|u\|_1^2 + \|u\|_2 + \|y_3\|_1^2 + \|y_3\|_2) \|y\|_1^2),$$

then we have

$$\|y(T)\|_1^2 \leq C\delta^2.$$

We choose  $0 < \delta \ll \min\{1, \frac{d}{4\sqrt{C}}\}$ , we have  $\|y(T)\|_1 \leq \frac{d}{4}$ , and  $\|u(T)\|_1 \leq d$  on the event  $\Gamma_\delta$ .

*Step 3.* Since we have proven that

$$P_T(u_0, B_V(0, d)) \geq \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_\delta)$$

for all  $u_0 \in B_V(0, R)$ . Now, we prove  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_\delta) > 0$ . Let us choose  $N \geq 1$  large enough so that

$$\|Q_N h\|_3 \leq \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} |(h, e_i)| \|e_i\|_3 < \frac{\delta}{3T}.$$

According to the independence of  $Q_N W$  and  $P_N W$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_\delta) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|P_N h t + P_N W(t)\|_3 < \frac{\delta}{3}\right) \times \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Q_N W(t)\|_3 < \frac{\delta}{3}\right).$$

Condition (1.2) implies that  $\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|P_N h t + P_N W(t)\|_3 < \frac{\delta}{3}\right) > 0$ . It follows from  $B_3 < +\infty$  and

the property of Gaussian measure that  $\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Q_N W(t)\|_3 < \frac{\delta}{3}\right) > 0$ . These show  $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_\delta) > 0$ .

This completes the proof.  $\square$

It follows from [40, Proposition 3.3] that the above facts imply that the recurrence holds for the extension  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$ . Now, we state that the extension  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}})$  of  $(u, \mathbb{P}_u)$  is irreducible.

**Proposition 4.2.** *For any  $R, d > 0$ , there exist constants  $p, T > 0$  and an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{u}(T) \in B_V(0, d) \times B_V(0, d)) \geq p$$

*holds for any  $\mathbf{u} \in B_V(0, R) \times B_V(0, R)$ , provided that (1.2) holds.*

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Without loss of generality, we can assume  $R \geq d$ . We define the events

$$G_d(T) := \{\|\tilde{u}(T)\|_1 \leq d\},$$

$$G'_d(T) := \{\|\tilde{u}'(T)\|_1 \leq d\},$$

$$E_\rho := \{\mathcal{E}_u^\psi(t) \leq M(\|u\|^2 + \|u\|^{2p_1} + 1) + Kt + \rho\} \cap \{\mathcal{E}_{u'}^\psi(t) \leq M(\|u'\|^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_1} + 1) + Kt + \rho\},$$

$$\mathcal{N} := \{\tilde{v}(t) \neq \tilde{u}'(t) \text{ for some } t \geq 0\}.$$

By the similar arguments as in [40], [18] and [41], we can prove the following facts:

(1) For any  $u \in B_V(0, R)$  and  $k \geq 1$ .

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(G_{\frac{d}{2}}(kT)) \wedge \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(G'_{\frac{d}{2}}(kT)) \geq p_0.$$

(2) For any  $r > 0$ , there exists  $k \geq 1$  such that

$$G_{\frac{d}{2}}(kT)E_r\mathcal{N}^c \subset G_d(kT)G'_d(kT)$$

for any  $\mathbf{u} \in B_V(0, R) \times B_V(0, R)$ .

With the help of the above facts and by the similar arguments as in [40], [18] and [41], we can complete the proof.  $\square$

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(u(t), \mathbb{P}_u)$  be a Markov process in a separable space  $X$ , and  $F : X \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  be a continuous functional such that

$$\lim_{\|u\|_X \rightarrow +\infty} F(u) = +\infty.$$

Then,  $F$  is said to be a **Lyapunov function** for  $(u(t), \mathbb{P}_u)$ , if there are positive constants  $t_*, R_*, C_*$ , and  $q_* < 1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_u F(u(t_*)) &\leq q_* F(u), \quad \forall \|u\| \geq R_*, \\ \mathbb{E}_u F(u(t)) &\leq C_*, \quad \forall \|u\| \leq R_*, t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 4.3.** The functional  $F(u) := 1 + \|u\|_1^2 + \|u\|^{2p_2}$  is a Lyapunov function for  $(u(t), \mathbb{P}_u)$  corresponding to (1.1), where  $p_2 = \frac{11}{5}$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.3.* By applying Itô formula to  $\|u_x\|^2$ , it holds that

$$d\|u_x\|^2 + 2[a\|u_x\|^2 + \|u_{xxx}\|^2]dt = 2[(h_x, u_x) + (uu_x, u_{xx})]dt + B_2dt + 2(-u_{xx}, dW),$$

where  $B_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^2 \|e_{ix}\|^2$ . Noting the fact

$$(uu_x, u_{xx}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u_{xxx}\|^2 + C\|u\|^2 + C\|u\|^{2p_2},$$

then, with the help of Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}\|u_x(t)\|^2 + a\mathbb{E}\|u_x\|^2 + \mathbb{E}\|u_{xxx}\|^2 &\leq C\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|^2 + C\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|^{2p_2} + C(\|h_x\|^2 + B_2) \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|^{2p_2} + C(1 + \|h\|_1^2 + B_2) \\ &\leq Ce^{-p_2at}\|u_0\|^{2p_2} + D, \end{aligned}$$

where  $D$  doesn't depend on  $u_0$ . This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\|u_x(t)\|^2 \leq e^{-at}\|u_{0x}\|^2 + e^{-at}\|u_0\|^{2p_2} + \frac{D}{a},$$



namely, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|u(t)\|_1^2 \leq e^{-at}(\|u_0\|_1^2 + \|u_0\|^{2p_2}) + \frac{D}{a},$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}F(u(t)) \leq e^{-at}F(u_0) + E \quad (4.4)$$

where  $E$  doesn't depend on  $u_0$ . There exist constants  $t_*, R_*$  such that  $e^{-at_*} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ ,  $F(u_0) \geq 4E$  for any  $\|u_0\|_1 \geq R_*$ , namely, we have

$$\mathbb{E}F(u(t_*)) \leq \frac{1}{2}F(u_0).$$

Moreover, according to (4.4), there exists a  $C_*$  such that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\|u_0\|_1 \leq R_*$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}F(u(t)) \leq C_*.$$

□

It follows from Proposition 4.2, Proposition 4.3 and Proposition 3.3 in [40] that the recurrence property holds for  $(u(t), \mathbb{P}_u)$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *For any  $d > 0$ , there exist constants  $C, \delta > 0$  and an integer  $N \geq 1$  depending on  $d, a, h, B_1, B_2, B_3$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} e^{\delta\tau_B} \leq C(1 + \|u\|_1^2 + \|u\|^{2p_2} + \|u'\|_1^2 + \|u'\|^{2p_2})$$

for any  $\mathbf{u} \in V \times V$ , provided that (1.2) holds.

## 4.2 Polynomial squeezing

We define the following stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &:= \tilde{\tau} \wedge \sigma_1, \\ \tilde{\tau} &:= \tau^{\tilde{u}} \wedge \tau^{\tilde{u}'}, \\ \sigma_1 &:= \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \tilde{u}'(t) \neq \tilde{v}(t)\} \end{aligned}$$

and the following events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}'_k &:= \{kT \leq \sigma \leq (k+2)T, \sigma_1 \geq \tilde{\tau}\}, \\ \mathcal{Q}''_k &:= \{kT \leq \sigma \leq (k+2)T, \sigma_1 < \tilde{\tau}\}, k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\mathcal{Q}'_k, \mathcal{Q}''_k$ , we have the following property.

**Proposition 4.5.** *For any  $q > 1$ , there exist large enough constants  $\rho, L, T > 0$  and small enough  $d > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}'_k) \vee \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_k) \leq \frac{1}{2(k+2)^q}$$

for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \bar{B}_H(0, d) \times \bar{B}_H(0, d)$ , provided that (1.2) holds.

*Proof of Proposition 4.5.* The proof is divided into the following steps.

**Step 1.** Estimate for  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}'_k)$ .

According to Proposition 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}'_k) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(kT \leq \tilde{\tau} < +\infty) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(kT \leq \tau^{\tilde{u}} < +\infty) \\ &\leq CQ_q(\rho + kLT + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(k+2)^q},\end{aligned}$$

where we take  $\rho, L, T$  large enough.

**Step 2.** Estimate for  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_0)$ .

For any  $\mathbf{u} = (u, u') \in H \times H$ , by the same argument as in Proposition 3.1 and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_0) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(0 \leq \sigma_1 \leq T) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau^u < \infty) + 2\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau^{u'} < \infty) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau^{\tilde{u}'} < \infty) + 2\|\mathbb{P} - \Phi_*^{u, u'}\mathbb{P}\|_{var} \\ &\leq CQ_q(\rho + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \exp(Ce^{C(\rho + \|u\|^{2p_1} + \|u'\|^{2p_1 + 1})}d^2) - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

By taking  $\rho$  large enough and  $d$  small enough, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_0) \leq \frac{1}{2^{q+1}}.$$

**Step 3.** Estimate for  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_k)$ .

Indeed, by the Markov property we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_k) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_k, \sigma \geq kT) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{Q}''_k} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(0 \leq \sigma_1 \leq T)),$$

combining this with (4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}''_k) &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(\tau^u < \infty)) + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(\tau^{u'} < \infty)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(\tau^{\tilde{u}'} < \infty)) + 2\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \|\mathbb{P} - \Phi_*^{\tilde{u}(kT), \tilde{u}'(kT)}\mathbb{P}\|_{var}) \\ &:= 2I_1 + 2I_2 + I_3 + 2I_4.\end{aligned}$$

For the term  $I_4$ , let  $u_k, u'_k$  be the solutions of (2.6) issued from  $\tilde{u}(kT), \tilde{u}'(kT)$ , respectively,  $v_k$  be the solution of (2.6) issued from  $\tilde{u}'(kT)$ ,  $\tau^k := \tau^{u_k} \wedge \tau^{u'_k} \wedge \tau^{v_k}$ . Define  $w_k(t) := u_k(t) - v_k(t)$ , when  $0 \leq t \leq \tau^k$ , with the help of Theorem 3.1 with  $\varepsilon = \frac{aa_0}{4C_*(K+L)}(1 \wedge \frac{1}{2M})$ , we have

$$\|w_k(t)\|_1^2 \leq C\|w_k(0)\|_1^2 \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}t + C(\rho + \|\tilde{u}(kT)\|^{2p_1} + \|\tilde{u}'(kT)\|^{2p_1} + 1)\right) d^2.$$

Noting the fact on the set  $\{\sigma \geq kT\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{u}(kT)\|^2 &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}}^{\psi}(kT) \leq (K+L)kT + \rho + M(d^2 + d^{2p_1} + 1), \\ \|\tilde{u}'(kT)\|^2 &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}'}^{\psi}(kT) \leq (K+L)kT + \rho + M(d^2 + d^{2p_1} + 1), \\ \|w_k(0)\|^2 &\leq Ce^{C(\rho + d^{2p_1 + 1})}d^2 e^{-\frac{akT}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

the above facts imply that for  $t \leq \tau^k$  on the set  $\{\sigma \geq kT\}$ , we have

$$\|w_k(t)\|^2 \leq C e^{C(\rho+d^{2p_1+1})} d^2 e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}t - \frac{\alpha kT}{2}}.$$

Since  $\|A(t)\| \leq C \cdot \mathbf{1}_{t \leq \tau} \cdot \|w\|_1^2 (\|u\|_1^2 + \|v\|_1^2)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{u_k}^\psi(t) + \mathcal{E}_{v_k}^\psi(t) \leq C(t + kT + \rho + d^{2p_1} + 1)$  for  $t \leq \tau^k$  on the set  $\{\sigma \geq kT\}$ , this leads to

$$\int_0^\infty \|A_k(t)\|^2 dt \leq C \exp(C(\rho + d^{2p_1} + 1)) d^2 e^{-\frac{\alpha kT}{2}},$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq (\exp(C e^{C(\rho+d^{2p_1+1})} d^2 e^{-\frac{\alpha kT}{2}}) - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq (\exp(e^{-\frac{\alpha kT}{2}}) - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ (by take } d \text{ small enough)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} e^{-\frac{\alpha kT}{4}} \text{ (by take } T \text{ large enough)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16(k+2)^q}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term  $I_1$ , by Proposition 2.6 and the Markov property we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{16(k+2)^q} &\geq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(kT \leq \tau^u < \infty) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{kT \leq \tau^u < \infty} | \mathcal{F}_{kT})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(\tau^u < \infty)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \geq kT} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}(kT)}(\tau^u < \infty)] = I_1. \end{aligned}$$

For the term  $I_2, I_3$ , we also have

$$I_2, I_3 \leq \frac{1}{16(k+2)^q}.$$

Combining the above estimates for  $I_i$ , we conclude

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{Q}_k'') \leq \frac{1}{2(k+2)^q}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Now we can establish the polynomial squeezing in Theorem 1.2.

For any  $p > 1$ , we take  $q' > p + 1$ . First, Proposition 4.5 (with  $q = q'$ ) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\sigma = \infty) \geq 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\sigma \in [kT, (k+1)T]) \geq 1 - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2(k+2)^{q'}} := \delta_1.$$

It follows from Proposition 4.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} \sigma^p) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma \in [kT, (k+1)T]} \sigma^p) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+2)^{q'}} (k+1)^{pT^p} := c. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Noting for  $\sigma < \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}}(\sigma) &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}}(0) + (K + L)\sigma + M(d^2 + d^{2p_1} + 1), \\ \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}'}(\sigma) &\leq \mathcal{E}_{\tilde{u}'}(0) + (K + L)\sigma + M(d^2 + d^{2p_1} + 1),\end{aligned}$$

thus, for  $1 \leq q \leq p$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} G(\mathbf{u}(\sigma))^q) &\leq C\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} (\|\tilde{u}(0)\|^2 + \|\tilde{u}'(0)\|^2 + 2(K + L)\sigma + 2M(d^2 + d^{2p_1} + 1))^q) \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} (1 + \sigma)^q) \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbb{I}_{\sigma < \infty} \sigma^p) \\ &\leq K,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.6).

## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* The proof is divided into the following steps.

*Step 1.* Since  $\{\rho = \infty\} = \{\sigma = \infty\}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\rho = \infty) \geq \delta_1$ . For any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\rho < \infty\}}\rho^p \leq M, \tag{5.1}$$

where  $M$  is independent from  $\mathbf{u}$ .

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\rho < \infty\}}\rho^p &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}(\sigma + \tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p \\ &\leq 2^p \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}[\sigma^p + (\tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p] \\ &= 2^p \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}\sigma^p + 2^p \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, according to Recurrence and the second inequality and third inequality in Polynomial squeezing, we can prove

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}(\tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p | \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[(\tau_{\mathbf{B}} \circ \theta_{\sigma})^p | \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}_{\sigma}}\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^p \text{ (strong Markov property)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}G(\mathbf{u}_{\sigma}) \leq K,\end{aligned}$$

this implies (5.1).

*Step 2.* We define a sequence of stopping times  $\rho_k = \rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega)$  as follows

$$\rho_0 := \tau_{\mathbf{B}}, \quad \rho_k := \rho_{k-1} + \rho \circ \theta_{\rho_{k-1}}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

It follows from the above fact

$$\rho_k = \rho_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i} = \tau_{\mathbf{B}} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i}.$$

For any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$ , (5.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} \rho_k^p &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} (\tau_{\mathbf{B}} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i})^p \\
&\leq (k+2)^p \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} [\tau_{\mathbf{B}}^p + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i})^p] \\
&\leq (k+2)^p [\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \tau_{\mathbf{B}}^p + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} (\rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i})^p \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho \circ \theta_{\rho_i} < \infty\}}] \\
&\leq (k+2)^p [G(\mathbf{u}) + kM] \\
&\leq (k+2)^{p+1} [G(\mathbf{u}) + M].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

For any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$ , define

$$\bar{k} = \bar{k}(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \sup\{k \geq 0 : \rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega) < +\infty\},$$

then, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\rho_k < \infty) &\leq (1 - \delta_1) \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\rho_{k-1} < \infty) \\
&\leq (1 - \delta_1)^k \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\rho_0 < \infty) \\
&\leq (1 - \delta_1)^k := a^k,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

the Borel-Cantelli lemma implies

$$\bar{k} < +\infty \text{ for } \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}} - a.e.$$

We define

$$\ell = \ell(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = \begin{cases} \rho_{\bar{k}(\mathbf{u}, \omega)}(\mathbf{u}, \omega), & \text{if } \bar{k}(\mathbf{u}, \omega) < +\infty, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \bar{k}(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = +\infty. \end{cases}$$

If there exists  $k$  such that  $\rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega) < +\infty$ ,  $\rho_{k+1}(\mathbf{u}, \omega) = +\infty$ , then for any  $t \geq \rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega)$ ,

$$\|u_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega) - u'_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega)\| \leq C(t - \rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega) + 1)^{-p} \text{ for } t \geq \rho_k(\mathbf{u}, \omega),$$

then this implies that

$$\|u_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega) - u'_t(\mathbf{u}, \omega)\| \leq C(t - \ell + 1)^{-p} \text{ for } t \geq \ell,$$

where  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{X}$ . For any  $p_0 < p$ , (5.2) and (5.3) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \ell^{p_0} &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\bar{k}=k\}} \rho_k^{p_0} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} \rho_k^{p_0} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}})^{\frac{1}{q'}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} \rho_k^p)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\rho_k < \infty)^{\frac{1}{q'}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho_k < \infty\}} \rho_k^p)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a^{\frac{k}{q'}} (k+2)^{\frac{p+1}{p'}} (G(\mathbf{u}) + M)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\leq C(G(\mathbf{u}) + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

*Step 3.* For any  $u, u' \in X$ ,

$$\|P_t(u, \cdot) - P_t(u', \cdot)\|_L^* \leq C(g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|))(t+1)^{-p_0}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Indeed, for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ ,  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}} \leq 1$ , noting that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} f(\Pi_X \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathcal{B}_t f(u), \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}'} f(\Pi_X \mathbf{u}'_t) = \mathcal{B}_t f(u'),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
|(f, P_t(u, \cdot) - P_t(u', \cdot))| &= |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}(f(u_t) - f(u'_t))| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} |f(u_t) - f(u'_t)| \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{u}}(\ell \geq \frac{t+1}{2}) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\ell \leq \frac{t+1}{2}\}} |f(u_t) - f(u'_t)| \\
&\leq C(g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|))((t+1)^{-p} + (t+1)^{-p_0}) \\
&\leq C(g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|))(t+1)^{-p_0}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

*Step 4.* For any  $u, u' \in X$ ,

$$\|P_t(u, \cdot) - P_s(u', \cdot)\|_L^* \leq C(g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|))(t+1)^{-p_0}, \quad s \geq t \geq 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Indeed, for any  $f \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ ,  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{L}} \leq 1$ , we have  $s \geq t \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(f, P_t(u, \cdot) - P_s(u', \cdot))| &= \left| \int_X P_{s-t}(u', dz) \int_X (P_t(u, dv) - P_t(z, dv)) f(v) \right| \\
&\leq C(t+1)^{-p_0} \int_X P_{s-t}(u', dz) [g(\|u\|) + g(\|z\|)] \\
&\leq C(t+1)^{-p_0} [g(\|u\|) + \mathbb{E}_{u'} g(\|u_{s-t}\|)] \\
&\leq C(t+1)^{-p_0} [g(\|u\|) + g(\|u'\|)].
\end{aligned}$$

*Step 5.*  $\{u_t(u, \omega)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is polynomial mixing.

Indeed, it follows from Prokhorov theorem that  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a complete metric space, then there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  independent from  $u$  and is a stationary measure, and  $P_t(u, \cdot) \rightarrow \mu$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . We take  $u' = 0$  in (5.4), let  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ , we have

$$\|P_t(u, \cdot) - \mu\|_L^* \leq C(g(\|u\|) + g(0))(t + 1)^{-p_0}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

#### Acknowledgements.

Peng Gao would like to thank Professor Kuksin S, Shirikyan A, Nersesyan V and Zhao M for fruitful discussions. Peng Gao would like to thank the financial support of Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (Grant No. YDZJ202201ZYTS306), NSFC (Grant No. 12371188) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 135122006 and 2412023YQ003).

## References

- [1] Kuramoto Y, Tsuzuki T. On the formation of dissipative structures in reaction-diffusion systems: Reductive perturbation approach[J]. Progress of Theoretical Physics, 1975, 54(3): 687-699.
- [2] Kuramoto Y, Tsuzuki T. Persistent propagation of concentration waves in dissipative media far from thermal equilibrium[J]. Progress of theoretical physics, 1976, 55(2): 356-369.
- [3] Kuramoto Y. Diffusion-induced chaos in reaction systems[J]. Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement, 1978, 64: 346-367.
- [4] Sivashinsky G I. Nonlinear analysis of hydrodynamic instability in laminar flames-I. Derivation of basic equations[J]. Acta astronautica, 1977, 4(11): 1177-1206.
- [5] Nicolaenko B, Scheurer B. Remarks on the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 1984, 12(1-3): 391-395.
- [6] Nicolaenko B, Scheurer B, Temam R. Some global dynamical properties of the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equations: nonlinear stability and attractors[J]. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 1985, 16(2): 155-183.
- [7] Hyman J M, Nicolaenko B. The Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation: a bridge between PDE's and dynamical systems[J]. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 1986, 18(1-3): 113-126.
- [8] Temam, R. Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems in mechanics and physics. Second edition. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 68. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. xxii+648 pp.
- [9] Larios A, Yamazaki K. On the well-posedness of an anisotropically-reduced two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 2020, 411: 132560.
- [10] Kukavica I, Massatt D. On the global existence for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 2021: 1-17.
- [11] Ambrose D M, Mazzucato A L. Global solutions of the two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with a linearly growing mode in each direction[J]. Journal of Nonlinear Science, 2021, 31: 1-26.
- [12] Coti Zelati M, Dolce M, Feng Y, et al. Global existence for the two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with a shear flow[J]. Journal of Evolution Equations, 2021, 21: 5079-5099.

- [13] Feng Y, Mazzucato A L. Global existence for the two-dimensional Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with advection[J]. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 2022, 47(2): 279-306.
- [14] Larios A, Rahman M M, Yamazaki K. Regularity criteria for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation in dimensions two and three[J]. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 2022, 32(6): 85.
- [15] Duan J, Ervin V J. On the stochastic Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 2001, 44(2): 205-216.
- [16] Bo L, Jiang Y. Large deviation for the nonlocal Kuramoto-Sivashinsky SPDE[J]. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 2013, 82: 100-114.
- [17] Amali Paul Rose G, Suvinthra M, Balachandran K. Moderate deviations for stochastic Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 2022, 22(06): 2250023.
- [18] Martirosyan D. Exponential mixing for the white-forced damped nonlinear wave equation[J]. *Evolution Equations and Control Theory*, 2014, 3(4): 645-670.
- [19] E Weinan, Liu D. Gibbsian dynamics and invariant measures for stochastic dissipative PDEs[J]. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 2002, 108: 1125-1156.
- [20] Li Y, Yang S, Zhang Q. Odd random attractors for stochastic non-autonomous Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equations without dissipation[J]. *Electronic Research Archive*, 2020, 28(4): 1529.
- [21] Da Prato G., Zabczyk J. *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [22] Da Prato G., Zabczyk J. *Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems*. Vol. 229. Cambridge university press, 1996.
- [23] Ferrario B. Invariant measures for a stochastic Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. *Stochastic analysis and applications*, 2008, 26(2): 379-407.
- [24] Ferrario B. Absolute continuity of laws for semilinear stochastic equations with additive noise[J]. *Communications on Stochastic Analysis*, 2008, 2(2): 3.
- [25] Yang D. Dynamics for the stochastic nonlocal Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 2007, 330(1): 550-570.
- [26] Yang D. Random attractors for the stochastic Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation[J]. *Stochastic analysis and applications*, 2006, 24(6): 1285-1303.
- [27] Gao P. Averaging principle for stochastic Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation with a fast oscillation[J]. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems*, 2018, 38(11): 5649.
- [28] Gao P. Irreducibility of Kuramoto-Sivashinsky equation driven by degenerate noise[J]. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2022, 28: 20.
- [29] Abergel, F. Attractor for a Navier-Stokes flow in an unbounded domain. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 23.3 (1989): 359-370.
- [30] Maslowski B, Seidler J. Invariant measures for nonlinear SPDE's: uniqueness and stability[J]. *Archivum Mathematicum*, 1998, 34(1): 153-172.
- [31] Albeverio S, Flandoli F, Sinai Y G, et al. An introduction to 3D stochastic fluid dynamics[J]. *SPDE in Hydrodynamic: Recent Progress and Prospects: Lectures given at the CIME Summer School held in Cetraro, Italy August 29-September 3, 2005*, 2008: 51-150.
- [32] Debussche A. Ergodicity results for the stochastic Navier-Stokes equations: an introduction[J]. *Topics in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics: Cetraro, Italy 2010*, Editors: Hugo Beirao da Veiga, Franco Flandoli, 2013: 23-108.



- [33] Hairer M, Mattingly J C. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing[J]. *Annals of Mathematics*, 2006: 993-1032.
- [34] Hairer M, Mattingly J C. Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations[J]. *Annals of Probability*, 2008, 36(6): 2050-2091.
- [35] Hairer M, Mattingly J C. A theory of hypoellipticity and unique ergodicity for semilinear stochastic PDEs[J]. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 2011, 16: 23.
- [36] Hairer M, Mattingly J C, Scheutzow M. Asymptotic coupling and a general form of Harris' theorem with applications to stochastic delay equations[J]. *Probability theory and related fields*, 2011, 149: 223-259.
- [37] Földes J, Glatt-Holtz N, Richards G, et al. Ergodic and mixing properties of the Boussinesq equations with a degenerate random forcing[J]. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 2015, 269(8): 2427-2504.
- [38] Kuksin S, Shirikyan A. *Mathematics of two-dimensional turbulence*[M]. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [39] Kuksin, S., Nersesyan, V., Shirikyan, A. (2020). Exponential mixing for a class of dissipative PDEs with bounded degenerate noise. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 30, 126-187.
- [40] Shirikyan A. Exponential mixing for randomly forced partial differential equations: method of coupling[M]//*Instability in Models Connected with Fluid Flows II*. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2008: 155-188.
- [41] Nersesyan V, Zhao M. Exponential mixing for the white-forced complex Ginzburg–Landau equation in the whole space[J]. *arXiv preprint [arXiv:2308.04918](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04918)*, 2023.
- [42] Debussche A, Odasso C. Ergodicity for a weakly damped stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equation[J]. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 2005, 5: 317-356.
- [43] Nersesyan V. Polynomial mixing for the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation perturbed by a random force at random times[J]. *Journal of Evolution Equations*, 2008, 8: 1-29.
- [44] Nguyen H D. Polynomial mixing of a stochastic wave equation with dissipative damping[J]. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 2024, 89(1): 21.
- [45] Nguyen H D. The inviscid limit for long time statistics of the one-dimensional stochastic Ginzburg-Landau equation[J]. *arXiv preprint [arXiv:2403.08951](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08951)*, 2024.
- [46] Foias C, Prodi G. Sur le comportement global des solutions non-stationnaires des équations de Navier-Stokes en dimension 2[J]. *Rendiconti del Seminario matematico della Università di Padova*, 1967, 39: 1-34.