

# Stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients: existence, uniqueness and averaging principle

Shuaishuai Lu<sup>a 1</sup>, Xue Yang<sup>a 2</sup>, Yong Li<sup>a,b,\* 3</sup>

<sup>a</sup>College of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, P. R. China.

<sup>b</sup>Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, P. R. China.

---

## Abstract

This paper investigates the stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients in the whole space as well as in the three-dimensional torus, which play a crucial role in turbulent flows analysis. A significant issue is addressed in this work, specifically, the reduced regularity of the coefficients and the inapplicability of Gronwall’s lemma complicates the establishment of pathwise uniqueness for weak solutions. Initially, the existence of a martingale solution for the system is established via Galerkin approximation; thereafter, the pathwise uniqueness of this martingale solution is confirmed by constructing a specialized control function. Ultimately, the Yamada-Watanabe theorem is employed to establish the existence and uniqueness of the strong solution to the system. Furthermore, an averaging principle, referred to as the first Bogolyubov theorem, is established for stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with highly oscillating components, where the coefficients satisfy the assumptions of linear growth and locally weak monotonicity. This result is achieved using classical Khasminskii time discretization, which illustrates the convergence of the solution from the original Cauchy problem to the averaged equation over a finite interval  $[0, T]$ .

**keywords:** Averaging principle; Locally weak monotonicity; Stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations; Yamada-Watanabe theorem

**MSC codes:** 35Q30, 60H15, 70K65

---

\*Corresponding author

<sup>1</sup>E-mail address : luss23@mails.jlu.edu.cn

<sup>2</sup>E-mail address : xueyang@jlu.edu.cn

<sup>3</sup>E-mail address : liyong@jlu.edu.cn

## 1. Introduction

The Navier-Stokes systems represent fundamental equations in fluid mechanics, describing the motion of incompressible fluids. When randomness is introduced, as observed in atmospheric turbulence and uncertainties in financial markets, these equations are reformulated as stochastic Navier-Stokes equations to describe turbulent incompressible flows, typically represented as follows.

$$\begin{cases} du = [\nu\Delta u - (u, \nabla)u + \nabla p_1 + f]dt + [(\mathcal{K} \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p_2 + g]dW(t), \\ \operatorname{div}u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $u$  is the unknown velocity field,  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are the pressure,  $\nu > 0$  is the kinematic viscosity,  $f$  is the external driving force, and  $W(t)$  is a cylindrical Wiener process, which reflects the influence of random factors in the environment on fluid motion. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{K}$  is used to model turbulence. This equation illustrates that the fluid flow velocity varies over time, influenced by external forces and random perturbations. The stochastic 2D Navier-Stokes equations have been extensively studied, with details available [1, 3, 6, 23–25, 33–35, 39] and among others. In three-dimensional scenarios, the classical Navier-Stokes equations are characterized by their nonlinearity and high complexity, which pose significant challenges, particularly in the study of turbulence. Specifically, the complexities related to the nonlinear convection term, the failure of the Sobolev embedding theorem in higher dimensions, and the uniqueness of solution paths represent notable challenges. Collectively, these factors present considerable challenges in addressing the stochastic three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. In view of this, Flandoli, Gatarek [17] and Mikulevičius, Rozovskii [40] established the existence of martingales solutions and steady-state solutions. Concurrently, in [28, 29], Hofmanová et al. demonstrated the non-uniqueness of solutions of the classical stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes system. Further results pertaining to the stochastic three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations can be found in references [9, 12–14, 16, 18, 19, 32, 55, 56] and the associated literature.

Consequently, the tame term is introduced, which holds considerable significance for the stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations in both theoretical and practical contexts. The taming technique is a modification of the Navier-Stokes equations designed to prevent solution blow-up by mitigating nonlinear effects in high-energy regions. The stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equation was first proposed by Röckner and Zhang in [47] and is defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} du = [\nu\Delta u - (u, \nabla)u + \nabla p_1 - \Psi_N(|u|^2)u + f]dt + [(\mathcal{K} \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p_2 + g]dW(t), \\ \operatorname{div}u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where the tamed function  $\Psi_N : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is smooth and satisfies, for some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{cases} \Psi_N(z) = 0, & z \leq N, \\ \Psi_N = \frac{z-N}{\nu}, & z \geq N+1, \\ 0 \leq \Psi'_N(z) \leq \frac{2}{\nu \wedge 1}, & z \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

and the notation  $m \vee n$  denotes  $\max\{m, n\}$  and  $m \wedge n$  signifies  $\min\{m, n\}$ . It is known that if a bounded smooth solution exists for the classical stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations, one can identify a sufficiently large  $N$  to construct the tame term  $\Psi_N$  such that the solution complies with equation (1.2). Conversely, by choosing  $N$  sufficiently large, one can investigate the existence of weak solutions for system (1.1). Thus, another significant motivation for studying stochastic tame systems is to elucidate certain properties of system (1.1) through the analysis of system (1.2). The stochastic tame 3D Navier-Stokes equations have been extensively investigated in the existing literature. For instance, in [47], Röckner and Zhang proved the uniqueness of the strong solution of system (1.2) under both full space and periodic boundary conditions, and also demonstrated the uniqueness of the invariant measure in the context of periodic boundary conditions and degenerate additive noise. Subsequently, Röckner et al. [46] employed the weak convergence method to prove a Freidlin-Wentzell-type large deviation principle for (1.2) driven by multiplicative noise. For the small time large deviation principle, Röckner and Zhang [45] conducted further research based on Galerkin approximation method. Recently, for stochastic tame 3D Navier-Stokes equations with fast oscillations, Hong et al. [30] established a strong averaging principle and demonstrated a Freidlin-Wentzell-type large deviation principle. Additional relevant properties regarding the 3D tame Navier-Stokes equations can also be found in references [2, 5, 42, 58].

It is noteworthy that the aforementioned literature is established on the assumption that the diffusion and drift coefficients of the system satisfy the smoothness conditions such as Lipschitz continuity. However, in practical fluid dynamics models, particularly within heterogeneous media or those characterized by high complexity (e.g., multiphase flow, flows with obstacles), the properties of the fluid (such as density and viscosity) frequently exhibit irregularities and lack smoothness. This implies that the formation and evolution of turbulence often rely on these irregular boundary conditions and the properties of the medium. The introduction of locally weak monotonicity coefficients facilitates a more accurate characterization of these irregularities and non-uniformities, rendering the turbulence model more appropriate for actual complex environments. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the development of stochastic models that exhibit non-Lipschitz continuity. For example, Fang and Zhang [15] studied stochastic differential equations characterized by non-Lipschitz coefficients, specifically investigating the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions. In [37], Kulik and Scheutzow established the weak uniqueness of weak solutions for a class of stochastic functional differential equations with Hölder continuous coefficients through

the method of generalized coupling. Han [26] established the well-posedness and small mass limit for the stochastic wave equation with Hölder noise coefficient. Furthermore, Röckner et al. [44] investigated the averaging principle of semilinear slow-fast stochastic partial differential equations with additive noise, employing the Poisson equation in Hilbert space under the assumption of Hölder continuity for the fast variables. In [3], Agresti and Veraar considered Hölder coefficients for the transport noise, and obtained local well-posedness for the true Navier-Stokes equations. For further relevant properties, please refer to [8, 38, 41, 48, 52, 54, 57] and references therein.

To the best of our knowledge, the problem of stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients has not been studied in earlier works. Therefore, one of the primary objectives of this study is to establish the existence of a unique strong solution for system (1.2), under the condition that the coefficients  $f$  and  $g$  satisfy locally weak monotonicity and linear growth conditions. The existing literature suggests that path uniqueness plays a crucial role in determining the well-posedness of (strong) solutions in stochastic differential systems. A classical result demonstrates that under Lipschitz conditions, the Gronwall lemma can be employed to establish the path uniqueness of weak solutions. However, when the regularity of the coefficients falls below Lipschitz conditions, particularly under irregular conditions such as locally weak monotonicity, this presents a significant challenge, as Gronwall lemma are not applicable. Consequently, in the first step of this study, the Galerkin projection technique is employed to transform system (1.2) into a finite-dimensional system, thereby preliminarily establishing the existence of a weak solution for the finite-dimensional system. Subsequently, by constructing a specialized control function, the path uniqueness of the weak solution is established via a proof by contradiction. Furthermore, the Yamada-Watanabe theorem is employed to ascertain the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions. In the second step, referring to the conclusion (Theorem 3.8) in [47], the martingale solution of system (1.2) is derived by approximating the finite-dimensional strong solution, and similarly, the pathwise uniqueness is established. Ultimately, the existence of a unique strong solution to the stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients is established through the Yamada-Watanabe theorem.

In traditional fluid dynamics, especially when dealing with complex turbulent phenomena, the instantaneous behavior of the flow field is frequently intricate, exhibiting significant oscillatory components. These high-frequency oscillations pose considerable challenges for the direct analysis and simulation of system properties. Thus, it is very important to find a simplified system that can effectively control the evolution of the original system over long time scales. In this context, the averaging principle is an effective method. A fundamental aspect of the averaging principle is to “average out” the highly oscillatory components under suitable conditions, thereby yielding an averaged system that, in a certain sense, replaces the original system. The concept of the averaging

principle can be traced back to Bogoliubov's research on nonlinear oscillation in deterministic systems, where Bogoliubov and Mitropolsky [4] provided the first rigorous proof of the averaging principle within deterministic finite-dimensional systems. Subsequently Khasminskii [31] extended the notion of the averaging principle to stochastic differential equations. The averaging principle for both finite and infinite-dimensional stochastic systems has been extensively investigated in recent decades, building upon the foundational work of Khasminskii. The interested readers might see [7, 10, 11, 20–22, 36, 43, 49] and references therein for this direction.

Therefore, based on the above consideration, by systematically applying the averaging principle to the stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes system, we can derive the statistical properties of the fluid and reveal its stationary state under random perturbations. The averaging principle provides a novel mathematical framework for elucidating and characterizing the global behavior of turbulence, while also facilitating a deeper understanding of some properties of stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations. Concurrently, it is recognized that in numerous practical fluid dynamics problems, the physical characteristics of the fluid are frequently non-uniformly distributed. The locally weak monotonicity conditions enable the equation to adapt to the characteristics of the inhomogeneous medium. This adaptability allows the analysis of the average behavior of the fluid within the inhomogeneous medium, thereby revealing the influence of irregularities on the statistical characteristics of the fluid. The second objective of this study is to establish an averaging principle for the following systems:

$$\begin{cases} du^\varepsilon(t) = [\eta_1(\frac{t}{\varepsilon})\Delta u - \eta_2(\frac{t}{\varepsilon})[(u, \nabla)u + \Psi_N(|u|^2)u] + \nabla p_1 + f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u)]dt \\ \quad + [(\mathcal{K}(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, x) \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p_2 + g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u)]dW(t), \\ \text{div}u^\varepsilon(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0^\varepsilon, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is a small parameter and coefficients  $f, g$  satisfy the conditions of linear growth and locally weak monotonicity with respect to  $u$ . Consequently, a fundamental question arises: what is the asymptotic behavior of the solution to the averaged system (1.3) as the time scale  $\varepsilon$  approaches zero? This is a challenging task because the locally weak monotonicity coefficients can be quite irregular and the Gronwall lemma are not applicable. Therefore, we will continue to utilize a specialized control function and apply a proof by contradiction. In comparison to the existing conclusions, besides relaxing the coefficients to locally weak monotonicity, we also consider the addition of these terms  $\eta_1(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}), \eta_2(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}), \mathcal{K}(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, x)$ , thereby enhancing the robustness of the turbulence model. However, this also introduces some difficulties. To address these problems, we will employ the classical Khasminskii time discretization method to establish the averaging principle for systems (1.3). Under appropriate conditions, we derive the following conclusions:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0,$$

for all  $T > 0$  provided that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0$ . Here  $u^*$  denotes the solution of the corresponding averaged equation (for a detailed discussion, please refer to Theorem 4.2 below). If  $\eta_1(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}) = 1$ ,  $\eta_2(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}) = 1$  and  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = 0$ , we can derive a further assertion in the first-order Sobolev space, i.e, for all  $T > 0$ , when  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0.$$

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some standard notations and results and necessary estimates. In Section 3, employing Galerkin projection techniques, we rigorously prove the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations pertaining to turbulent incompressible flows characterized by locally weak monotonicity coefficients. In Section 4, within the framework of the locally weak monotonicity conditions, we establish the strong averaging principle for the stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations with highly oscillating components in spaces  $\mathcal{H}^0$  and  $\mathcal{H}^1$ , which can be viewed as the functional law of large numbers.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{R}^3$  or  $\mathbb{T}^3$  (representing the standard torus) and  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  denote the set of all smooth functions from  $\mathbb{D}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with compact supports. We write  $L^p(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) to be the vector valued  $L^p$ -space in  $\mathbb{D}$ , whose norm is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ . Specifically, when  $p = 2$ , the space  $L^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  forms a real Hilbert space equipped with an inner product:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{D}} u(x) v^T(x) dx.$$

The corresponding norm is given by  $\|u\|_{L^2} = \langle u, u \rangle_{L^2}^{1/2}$ , where  $v^T$  denotes the transposition of the row vector  $v$ . Let  $W^{m,2}(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  represent the Sobolev space on  $\mathbb{D}$ , equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{m,2}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left| (I - \Delta)^{\frac{m}{2}} u(x) \right|^2 dx,$$

where  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $(I - \Delta)^{\frac{m}{2}}$  is defined by Fourier transformation. Define

$$\mathcal{H}^m = \{u \in W^{m,2}(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) : \operatorname{div} u = 0\},$$

where “div” denotes the divergence operator. Then the  $(\mathcal{H}^m, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^m})$  represents a separable Hilbert space. Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a complete probability space, equipped with a filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  that satisfies the usual conditions. We consider the following the stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes

equations:

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\nu\Delta u - (u, \nabla)u + \nabla p_1(t, x) - \Psi_N(|u|^2)u + f(t, u)]dt \\ \quad + [(\mathcal{K}(t, x) \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p_2(t, x) + g(t, u)]dW(t), \\ \text{div}u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\nu > 0$  represents the kinematic viscosity and  $p_1, p_2$  are unknown scalar functions. Additionally, let  $W(t)$  be a cylindrical Wiener processes on a separable Hilbert space  $K$  with respect to a complete filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . For a fixed time horizon  $T$ ,

$$f : [0, T] \times L^2(\mathbb{D}) \times \Omega \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{D}), \quad \mathcal{K} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(K, L^2(\mathbb{D})) \quad g : [0, T] \times L^2(\mathbb{D}) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(K, L^2(\mathbb{D})),$$

are measurable mappings, where  $\mathcal{L}(K, L^2(\mathbb{D}))$  denotes the space of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from  $K$  into  $L^2(\mathbb{D})$ .

Let  $\Pi$  denote the orthogonal projection from  $L^2(\mathbb{D})$  to  $\mathcal{H}^0$ . It is well known that  $\Pi$  commutes with the differential operators. We define the Stokes operator  $S_1$  as follows:

$$S_1 : W^{2,2}(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^0, \quad S_1(u) = \Pi\Delta u$$

and define

$$S_2^1 : \mathcal{D}(S_2) \subset \mathcal{H}^0 \times \mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^0, \quad S_2(u) = S_2^1(u, u) + \Pi\Psi_N(|u|^2)u, \quad S_2^1(u, v) = \Pi(u, \nabla)v.$$

Applying the operator  $\Pi$  to both sides of (2.1), the Navier–Stokes equations can be reformulated in the following abstract form:

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\nu S_1(u) - S_2(u) + F(t, u)]dt + G(t, u)dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $F(t, u) := \Pi f(t, u)$  and  $G(t, u) := \Pi(\mathcal{K}(t, x) \cdot \nabla)u + \Pi g(t, u)$ . Hence. for any  $u \in \mathcal{H}^0$  and  $v \in L^2(\mathbb{D})$ ,

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} := \langle u, \Pi v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} = \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2}.$$

### 3. Existence and uniqueness

Let  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  be the family of all probability measures defined on  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ . We begin by introducing the following concept of weak solutions of (2.2).

**Definition 3.1.** [47] *We describe (2.2) as possessing a weak solution if there exist a stochastic basis  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , a process  $u(t)$  adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  taking values in  $\mathcal{H}^1$  such that*

(I)  $u \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{H}^1) \cap L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{H}^2)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., for any  $T > 0$ ;

(II) It holds that in  $\mathcal{H}^0$

$$u(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t [\nu S_1(u(s)) - S_2(u(s)) + F(s, u(s))] ds + \int_0^t G(s, u(s)) dW(s),$$

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

The investigation of the existence and uniqueness of solutions to equation (2.2), characterized by locally weak monotonicity coefficients, assumes that the initial value  $u_0$  to be independent of  $W(t)$ . Initially, we posit that the coefficients in (2.2) satisfy the following hypotheses:

(H1) For continuous functions  $f, g$ , there exist constants  $C$  and  $M$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

$$\langle u, f(t, u) \rangle_{L^2} \vee \|g(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, L^2)}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + M;$$

and for any  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$ ,

$$\langle u, f(t, u) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \vee \|g(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M.$$

(H2) Let  $\mathcal{A} : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is an increasing, concave and continuous function satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}(0) = 0, \int_{0^+} \frac{dr}{\mathcal{A}(r)} = +\infty.$$

The functions  $f, g$  satisfy, for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\|u - v\|_{L^2} \leq \zeta$  ( $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ ),

$$\langle u - v, f(t, u) - f(t, v) \rangle_{L^2} \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{L^2}^2), \quad \|g(t, u) - g(t, v)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, L^2)}^2 \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u, v \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq \zeta$ ,

$$\langle u - v, f(t, u) - f(t, v) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2), \quad \|g(t, u) - g(t, v)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2).$$

(H3) For any  $T > 0$ , there exists a constant  $C$  such that for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{D}$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{D}} |\partial x_i \mathcal{K}(t, x)| \leq C, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{D}} |\mathcal{K}(t, x)|^2 = a^* \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\nu}{73}, & p \in [1, \frac{75}{2}], \\ \frac{p\nu - \epsilon}{2p(p-1)}, & p > \frac{75}{2}, \end{cases}$$

where  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrarily small.

In this paper,  $C_T$  represents certain positive constants dependent on  $T$ , which may vary from line to line. In addition to the aforementioned assumptions, the following two inequalities will be extensively employed. These inequalities play a pivotal role in the analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations (see [27, 45, 50]):



(1) Let  $q \in [1, \infty]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . If

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{m\theta}{3}, \quad \theta \in [0, 1],$$

then, for any  $u \in W^{m,2}$ ,

$$\|u\|_{L^q} \leq C_{q,m} \|u\|_{W^{m,2}}^\theta \|u\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta}. \quad (3.1)$$

(2)

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{D}} |u(x)|^2 \leq C \|\Delta u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}. \quad (3.2)$$

A considerable body of research has been devoted to investigating the existence and uniqueness of solutions under the condition that the system coefficients satisfy Lipschitz continuity. Conversely, research concerning coefficients with lower regularity, such as those meeting only locally weak monotonicity conditions, remains relatively scarce. We investigate the existence and uniqueness of solutions, as well as additional asymptotic properties of equation (2.2), employing the Galerkin-type approximation technique.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Consider (2.2). Under assumptions (H1)–(H3), for any initial value  $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}^1$ , there exists a unique solution  $u(t, x) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, T], \mathcal{H}^1)) \cap L^2(\Omega; L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H}^2))$  for (2.2) in the sense of Definition 3.1 such that for any  $p \geq 1$  and  $T > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \right) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \| |u| |\nabla u \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2] ds \\ & \leq C_{\nu, T, M, \epsilon, p, N} (\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* To establish the existence and uniqueness of a strong solution for system (2.2) characterized by locally weak monotonicity coefficients, we delineate the proof into two distinct steps:

### Step1: Galerkin's approximation

We commence by employing the Galerkin projection technique to convert system (2.2) into a finite-dimensional framework. Let

$$B = \{u \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3) : \operatorname{div} u = 0\},$$

and assume the existence of orthonormal bases  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots\} \subset B$  for  $\mathcal{H}^1$  and  $\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, \dots\}$  for  $K$ . By selecting the first  $k$  orthonormal bases from each set, we define the following operators:

$$\Lambda_1^k : B^* \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k^1 := \operatorname{span}\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\}, \quad \Lambda_2^k : K \rightarrow K^k := \operatorname{span}\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \dots, \varrho_k\}.$$

For any  $u \in B^*$  and  $k \geq 1$ , we derive  $u^k = \Lambda_1^k(u) = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle u, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} e_i$  and  $W^k(t) = \Lambda_2^k[W(t)] = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle W(t), \varrho_i \rangle_K \varrho_i$ . Building upon the aforementioned approximation techniques, we will first analyze the finite-dimensional stochastic ordinary differential equation within  $\mathcal{H}_k^1$ :

$$\begin{cases} du^k(t) = \Lambda_1^k[\nu S_1(u) - S_2(u) + F(t, u)]dt + \Lambda_1^k G(t, u) dW^k(t), \\ u^k(0) = \Lambda_1^k u_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

According to the definition of operators  $S_1, S_2$  we ascertain the following for any  $u \in \mathcal{H}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, \nu S_1(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} &= \langle (I - \Delta)u, \nu \Delta u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &= -\nu \|(I - \Delta)u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \nu \langle (I - \Delta)u, u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &\leq -\nu \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + C_\nu \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Furthermore, applying Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle u, S_2^1(u) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} &\leq \frac{\nu}{2} \|(I - \Delta)u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu} \|(u, \nabla)u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu} \|u\| |\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

For  $\langle u, \Psi_N(|u|^2)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1}$ , according to the definition of function  $\Psi_N$ , refer to Lemma 2.3 of [47], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle u, \Psi_N(|u|^2)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} &= -\langle (I - \Delta)u, \Psi_N(|u|^2)u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{D}} |u|^2 \Psi_N(|u|^2) dx - \sum_{n,i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{D}} \partial_i u^n \partial_i [\Psi_N(|u|^2)u^n] dx \\ &\leq -\sum_{n,i=1}^3 \int_{\mathbb{D}} \partial_i u^n [\Psi_N(|u|^2) \partial_i u^n + \Psi_N'(|u|^2) \partial_i |u|^2 u^n] dx \\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{D}} |\nabla u|^2 \Psi_N(|u|^2) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \Psi_N'(|u|^2) |\nabla |u|^2|^2 dx \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{\nu} \|u\| |\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \frac{N}{\nu} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

In addition, for  $G(t, u)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|G(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 &= \|G(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 + \|\nabla G(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{D}} \|\mathcal{K}(t, x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, U)}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 dx + C_T \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{D}} [(\nabla \mathcal{K}(t, x), \nabla)u + (\mathcal{K}(t, x), \nabla) \nabla u] dx + C_T \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M \\ &\leq \frac{\nu}{73} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + C_{\nu, T} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Consequently, the assumptions **(H1)**, (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8) imply that for any  $\chi \in \mathcal{H}_k^1$ ,

$$2 \left\langle \chi, \Lambda_1^k [\nu S_1(\chi) - S_2(\chi) + F(t, \chi)] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} + \left\| \Lambda_1^k G(t, \chi) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)}^2 \leq C_{k, T, \nu, M, N} (\|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + 1). \quad (3.9)$$

Furthermore, based on assumption **(H2)**, we establish that the mappings  $\Lambda_1^k [\nu S_1(\chi) - S_2(\chi) + F(t, \chi)]$  and  $\Lambda_1^k G(t, u)$  satisfy locally weak monotonicity conditions, i.e., for any  $\chi_{1,2} \in \mathcal{H}_k^1$  with  $\|\chi_1 - \chi_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \leq \zeta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \chi_1 - \chi_2, \Lambda_1^k [\nu S_1(\chi_1) - S_2(\chi_1) + F(t, \chi_1)] - \Lambda_1^k [\nu S_1(\chi_2) - S_2(\chi_2) + F(t, \chi_2)] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \\ & \leq C_{k, T, \nu} [\|\chi_1 - \chi_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + \mathcal{A}(\|\chi_1 - \chi_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)], \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\left\| \Lambda_1^k G(t, \chi_1) - \Lambda_1^k G(t, \chi_2) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)}^2 \leq C_{k, T, \nu} [\|\chi_1 - \chi_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + \mathcal{A}(\|\chi_1 - \chi_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)]. \quad (3.11)$$

For the sake of clarity in the subsequent discussion, we provide the following definition:

$$\mathcal{F}(t, \chi) := \Lambda_1^k [\nu S_1(\chi) - S_2(\chi) + F(t, \chi)], \quad \mathcal{G}(t, \chi) := \Lambda_1^k G(t, \chi).$$

Let the support of  $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be contained in  $\mathcal{O}^\mathcal{M} = \{\chi \in \mathcal{H}_k^1 : \|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \leq \mathcal{M}\}$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \rho(\|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}) = 1, & \chi \in \mathcal{O}^\mathcal{M}, \\ \rho(\|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}) = 0, & \chi \notin \mathcal{O}^\mathcal{M}. \end{cases}$$

For any  $\chi \in \mathcal{H}_k^1$ , let  $\mathcal{F}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) = \mathcal{F}(t, \chi)\rho(\|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1})$  and  $\mathcal{G}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) = \mathcal{G}(t, \chi)\rho(\|\chi\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1})$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{F}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$  are uniformly bounded on  $\mathcal{H}_k^1$  and locally weak monotonicity. By Proposition 3.3 of [26], there exist two sequences of uniformly bounded local Lipschitz continuous functions  $\mathcal{F}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{F}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) - \mathcal{F}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\mathcal{G}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) - \mathcal{G}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.12)$$

uniformly on each bounded subset of  $\mathcal{H}_k^1$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Furthermore, it is readily apparent that  $\mathcal{F}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_m^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi)$  satisfy (3.9) for any  $m \geq 1$ . Consequently, by the theory of stochastic differential equations (SDE), there exists a unique global strong solution  $\chi_m(t)$  satisfying

$$\chi_m(t) = u_0^k + \int_0^t \mathcal{F}_m^\mathcal{M}(s, \chi_m(s)) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{G}_m^\mathcal{M}(s, \chi_m(s)) dW^k(s). \quad (3.13)$$

Indeed, the weak limit point of  $\chi_m(t)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  constitutes a weak solution  $\chi(t)$  to the following system:

$$\begin{cases} d\chi(t) = \mathcal{F}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) dt + \mathcal{G}^\mathcal{M}(t, \chi) dW^k(t), \\ \chi(0) = u_0^k. \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

This proof adheres to a standard approach; for a detailed exposition, please refer to **Appendix I**.

We shall now proceed to establish the pathwise uniqueness of these weak solutions. Let us consider two stochastic processes  $\chi_1(t)$  and  $\chi_2(t)$  that satisfy the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \chi_1(t) = \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_1(t))ds + \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_1(t))dW^k(t), \\ \chi_1(0) = \chi_1^0 \in \mathcal{H}_k^1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \chi_2(t) = \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_2(t))ds + \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_2(t))dW^k(t), \\ \chi_2(0) = \chi_2^0 \in \mathcal{H}_k^1. \end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} < 1$  and  $\beta \in (\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}, 1]$ . Let us denote

$$\tau_R = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{\|\chi_1(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \vee \|\chi_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} > R\}, \quad \tau_\beta = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{\|\chi_1(t) - \chi_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} > \beta\},$$

where  $\|\chi_1^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \vee \|\chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} < R$ . Indeed, we assert that the following property holds:

$$\lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

By Itô's formula, Young's inequality, the B-D-G inequality and (3.10), (3.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) \\ &= \|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [2 \langle \chi_1(s) - \chi_2(s), \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_1(s)) - \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_2(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \\ & \quad + \|\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_1(s)) - \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_2(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)}^2] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \int_0^{r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [\chi_1(s) - \chi_2(s)]^T [\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_1(s)) - \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi_2(s))] dW^k(s)) \quad (3.16) \\ & \leq \|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + C_{k, T, \nu} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [\mathcal{A}(\|\chi_1(s) - \chi_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) + \|\chi_1(s) - \chi_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2] ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) \\ & \leq \|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + C_{k, T, \nu} \int_0^t [\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_1(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)] ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_1(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 ds \\
& := \varphi(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Gamma(t) = \int_0^t (\mathcal{A}(s) + s)^{-1} ds$ , which implies that  $\Gamma(t)$  is a monotonically increasing function and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \Gamma(t) = -\infty$ . Thus,  $\Gamma(t)$  satisfies  $\Gamma(t) > -\infty$  for any  $t > 0$ . Therefore,

$$\Gamma(\mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)) \leq \Gamma(\varphi(t)). \quad (3.17)$$

We subsequently get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma(\varphi(t)) \\
& = \Gamma(\varphi(0)) + \int_0^t \Gamma'(\varphi(s)) d\varphi(s) \\
& = \Gamma(C_{k, T, \nu} \|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) + C_{k, T, \nu} \int_0^t \left[ \frac{\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_1(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)}{\mathcal{A}(\varphi(s)) + \varphi(s)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_1(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(s \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2}{\mathcal{A}(\varphi(s)) + \varphi(s)} \right] ds \\
& \leq \Gamma(C_{k, T, \nu} \|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) + C_{k, T, \nu} t.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

By (3.17) and (3.18), we have when  $\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$\Gamma(\mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)) \rightarrow -\infty,$$

which implies

$$\lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) = 0,$$

for any  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Furthermore, by applying (4.63) and Fatou's lemma, and letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we derive

$$\lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) = 0.$$

Then, by the definition of  $\tau_\beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(t \geq \tau_\beta) \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2) + \mathbb{P}(t < \tau_\beta) \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \mathbb{P}(t \geq \tau_\beta) \beta^2,$$

which implies  $\lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(t \geq \tau_\beta) = 0$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r) - \chi_2(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 \right) \\ & \leq \lim_{\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r \wedge \tau_\beta) - \chi_2(r \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 \right) \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when  $\|\chi_1^0 - \chi_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_1(r) - \chi_2(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 = 0 \right) = 1, \quad (3.19)$$

i.e., the pathwise uniqueness for (3.14) holds. Subsequently, by applying the Yamada-Watanabe theorem, we demonstrate the existence and uniqueness of the global strong solution for (3.14). Finally, for (3.4), using a standard argument (e.g., see Lemma 3.1 of [53] similarly), we establish the existence of a unique maximal local strong solution  $u^k(t)$ . Furthermore, let  $\tau$  be the explosion time or life time. Then, for any  $t \in [0, \tau)$ , by Itô's formula and (4.63), we have

$$\left\| u^k(t) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 \leq \left\| u_0^k \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + C \int_0^t \left( \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \left\| u^k(r) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^2 + 1 \right) ds + 2 \int_0^t (u^k(r))^T \mathcal{G}^N(s, u^k(r)) dW^k(s),$$

which implies that  $\tau = \infty$  almost surely by the stochastic Gronwall lemma of [51]. Consequently, the unique maximal local strong solution  $u^k(t)$  is non-explosive almost surely within any finite time.

## Step2: Existence and uniqueness of stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations

Our primary strategy involves first establishing the existence of weak solutions for (2.2) through the application of the Galerkin-type approximation technique. In **Step1**, we have established the existence and uniqueness of the solution for the finite-dimensional system (3.4) with the locally weak monotonicity coefficients. Next, to address the existence problem of the weak solution for the system (2.2), we require a priori estimates of the solution  $u^k(t)$  and the compactness of the space. And a similar proof procedure for the existence of a weak solution for System (2.2) is presented in Theorem 3.8 of [47], where a detailed proof procedure is provided. Specifically, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the strong solution  $u^k(t)$  of the finite-dimensional system (3.4) can yield a weak solution of the original system (2.2). Subsequently, we will proceed to establish the pathwise uniqueness of these weak solutions. Then, by applying the Yamada-Watanabe theorem, we demonstrate the existence of a global strong solution for (2.2).

Suppose that two stochastic processes  $u_1(t), u_2(t)$  are weak solution of (2.2) with initial conditions  $u_1(0) = u_1^0 \in \mathcal{H}^1, u_2(0) = u_2^0 \in \mathcal{H}^1$ . Let us denote

$$\tau_R = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{ \|u_1(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \vee \|u_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} > R \}, \quad \tau_\beta = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{ \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} > \beta \}.$$

By Itô's formula, the B-D-G inequality, Young's inequality and (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|u_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - u_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ &= \|u_1^0 - u_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \int_0^{r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [2\nu \langle u_1(s) - u_2(s), \Delta u_1(s) - \Delta u_2(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &\quad - 2 \langle u_1(s) - u_2(s), (u_1(s) \cdot \nabla) u_1(s) - (u_2(s) \cdot \nabla) u_2(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &\quad - 2 \langle u_1(s) - u_2(s), \Psi_N(|u_1(s)|^2) u_1(s) - \Psi_N(|u_2(s)|^2) u_2(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ &\quad + 2 \langle u_1(s) - u_2(s), f(s, u_1(s)) - f(s, u_2(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} + \|G(s, u_1(s)) - G(s, u_2(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2] ds \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \int_0^{r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} \langle u_1(s) - u_2(s), G(s, u_1(s)) - G(s, u_2(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} dW(s) \right) \\ &\leq \|u_1^0 - u_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \int_0^{r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [-2\nu \|\nabla u_1(s) - \nabla u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \langle \nabla u_1(s) - \nabla u_2(s), u_1^T(s) u_1(s) - u_2^T(s) u_2(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} + 8 \| |u_1(s) - u_2(s)| (|u_1(s)| + |u_2(s)|) \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\ &\quad + C_T \mathcal{A}(\|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) + \sup_{t \in [0, t], x \in \mathbb{D}} \|\mathcal{K}(t, x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)} (\|\nabla u_1(s) - \nabla u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) \quad (3.20) \\ &\quad + 12 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \|G(s, u_1(s)) - G(s, u_2(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \Big]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|u_1^0 - u_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [-\nu \|\nabla u_1(s) - \nabla u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \frac{\nu}{73} \|\nabla u_1(s) - \nabla u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\ &\quad + 2C_{\nu, R} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} + C_T (\mathcal{A}(\|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2))] ds \\ &\quad + 72 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} \|G(s, u_1(s)) - G(s, u_2(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|u_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - u_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ &\leq \|u_1^0 - u_2^0\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta} [C_{R, \nu} \|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C_T \mathcal{A}(\|u_1(s) - u_2(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|u_1(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta) - u_2(r \wedge \tau_R \wedge \tau_\beta)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Based on the conclusion of (3.20), we will again employ a proof, similar to the proof procedures outlined in (3.15)-(3.19), to establish the pathwise uniqueness of the weak solution. Subsequently, we will apply the Yamada-Watanabe theorem to demonstrate the existence and uniqueness of the strong solution for system (2.2).

We will now examine the regularity of solutions to (2.2). Utilizing (3.5), (3.6), (3.7), Young's inequality and (3.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \\
&= \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [2 \langle u(s), \nu \Delta u(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} - 2 \langle u(s), (u(s), \nabla) u(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\
&\quad + 2 \langle u(s), \Psi_N(|u(s)|^2) u(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} + 2 \langle u(s), f(s, u(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} + \|G(s, u(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2] ds \\
&\quad + 2p(p-1) \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} \|G(s, u(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \tag{3.21} \\
&\leq \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [-2\nu \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \nu \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \| |u| |\nabla u| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 - \frac{2}{\nu} \| |u| |\nabla u| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\
&\quad + C_{N,\nu} \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 2 \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|f(s, u(s))\|_{L^2} ds \\
&\quad + p(2p-1) \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [\frac{p\nu - \epsilon}{p(2p-1)} \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + C_{\nu,T} \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M] ds \\
&\leq \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [-\epsilon \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 - \frac{1}{\nu} \| |u| |\nabla u| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,p,N} (\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Gronwall's lemma, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \| |u(s)| |\nabla u(s)| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2] ds \\
&\leq C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,p,N} (\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) \tag{3.22}
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $T > 0$ . Furthermore, by utilizing (3.21), Young's inequality and the B-D-G inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \right) &\leq \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,N} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) ds \\
&\quad + 2p \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} \langle u(s), G(s, u(s)) dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)} \\
&\leq \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,N} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) ds \\
&\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^{4p-2} \|G(s, u(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.23} \\
&\leq \|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,N} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) ds \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \right) + C_p \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|G(s, u(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \right)^p \\
&\leq C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon} (\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \right) + C_{\nu,T,M,\epsilon,N} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} ds.
\end{aligned}$$



Then, in view of Gronwall's lemma, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p}) \leq C_{\nu, T, M, \epsilon, N} (\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1).$$

□

**Remark 3.1.** *Indeed, similar to the proof of the aforementioned theorem, we can also derive the following estimate:*

$$\mathbb{E}(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{2p}) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{2p-2} \|u(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq C_{\nu, T, M, \epsilon, p, N} (\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{2p} + 1),$$

for any  $T > 0$ .

#### 4. The averaging principle of Stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients

in this paper, we consider the following system

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\eta_1(\frac{t}{\epsilon})\Delta u - \eta_2(\frac{t}{\epsilon})[(u, \nabla)u + \Psi_N(|u|^2)u] + \nabla p_1 + f(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, u)]dt \\ \quad + [(\mathcal{K}(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, x) \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p_2 + g(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, u)]dW(t), \\ \text{div}u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0^\epsilon, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and the functions  $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in C([0, +\infty))$ , such that  $0 < a_1 \leq \eta_1(t) \leq a_2$ , and  $0 < a_3 \leq \eta_2(t) \leq a_4$  for any  $t \in [0, +\infty)$ . Letting  $\nu = a_1$  and applying the operator  $\Pi$  act to both sides of (4.1), we define  $\eta_1^\epsilon(t) = \eta_1(\frac{t}{\epsilon})$ ,  $\eta_2^\epsilon(t) = \eta_2(\frac{t}{\epsilon})$ ,  $f^\epsilon(t, u) = \Pi f(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, u)$ ,  $S_3^\epsilon(t, x, u) = \Pi(\mathcal{K}(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, x) \cdot \nabla)u$  and  $g^\epsilon(t, \varphi) = \Pi g(\frac{t}{\epsilon}, \varphi)$ . Then we eliminate the pressure, thereby obtain an evolution system for the velocity field

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\eta_1^\epsilon(t)S_1(u) - \eta_2^\epsilon(t)S_2(u) + f^\epsilon(t, u)]dt + [S_3^\epsilon(t, x, u) + g^\epsilon(t, u)]dW(t) \\ \text{div}u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0^\epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

To facilitate a more comprehensive analysis of the averaging principle applied to systems (4.2) with locally weak monotonicity coefficients, it is essential to introduce the following assumptions:

**(H4)** There exist constants  $\eta_1^*$ ,  $\eta_2^*$  with  $0 < a_1 \leq \eta_1^* \leq a_2$ ,  $0 < a_3 \leq \eta_2^* \leq a_4$  and functions  $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2$  such that for any  $T > 0$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \left| \int_t^{t+T} \eta_i(s) - \eta_i^* ds \right| \leq \mathcal{R}_i(T),$$

$i = 1, 2$ .

**(H5)** There exist functions  $\mathcal{R}_3, \mathcal{R}_4, \mathcal{R}_5$  and  $f^* \in C(L^2(\mathbb{D}), L^2(\mathbb{D}))$ ,  $g^* \in C(L^2(\mathbb{D}), \mathcal{L}(K, L^2(\mathbb{D})))$  and  $\mathcal{K}^* \in L^2(\mathbb{D})$  such that for any  $T > 0$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in L^2(\mathbb{D})$  and  $x \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \left\| \int_t^{t+T} [f(s, u) - f^*(u)] ds \right\|_{L^2} \leq \mathcal{R}_3(T)(\|u\|_{L^2} + M),$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|g(s, u) - g^*(u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, L^2)}^2 ds \leq \mathcal{R}_4(T)(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 + M),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\mathcal{K}(s, x) - \mathcal{K}^*(x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, L^2)}^2 ds \leq \mathcal{R}_5(T),$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is decreasing, positive bounded functions and  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_i(T) = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ .

Now we consider the following averaged equation

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\eta_1^* S_1(u) - \eta_2^* S_2(u) + f^*(u)] dt + [S_3^*(x, u) + g^*(u)] dW(t), \\ \operatorname{div} u(t) = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0^*, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

where  $S_3^*(x, u) = \Pi(\mathcal{K}^*(x) \cdot \nabla)u$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider (4.3). If  $f, \mathcal{K}$  and  $g$  satisfy (H1)–(H5) and  $a_4 \leq 2a_3$ , then  $f^*, \mathcal{K}^*$  and  $g^*$  also satisfy (H1)–(H3). Consequently, the following statement holds: for any  $u_0^* \in \mathcal{H}^1$ , there exist a unique strong solution  $u^*(t)$  to (4.3) with  $u^*(0) = u_0^*$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^*(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} \right) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p-2} [\|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \| |u^*| |\nabla u^*| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2] ds \\ & \leq C_{\nu, T, M, \epsilon, p, N} (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{2p} + 1) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* A similar proof can be found in Lemma 4.2 of [10]. □

For any given function  $\psi$ , define a piecewise function  $\bar{\psi}$  such that

$$\bar{\psi}(t) = \begin{cases} \psi(0) & t \in [0, d), \\ \psi(d) & t \in [d, 2d), \\ \dots & \dots \\ \psi(nd) & t \in [nd, (n+1)d), \\ \dots & \dots, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$  and  $d$  is a fixed constant. Without loss of generality, we let  $d \leq 1$ . To delve deeper into the long-term asymptotic behavior of systems (4.2) and (4.5), it is essential to introduce the ensuing lemma:

**Lemma 4.1.** *If  $f$ ,  $k$  and  $g$  satisfy **(H1)**–**(H5)** and  $a_4 \leq 2a_3$ , the following statements hold: for any  $T > 0$  and  $u_0^\varepsilon, u_0^* \in \mathcal{H}^1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s; u_0^\varepsilon) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s; u_0^\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq C_T(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s; u_0^*) - \bar{u}^*(s; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where  $u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon)$  is the solution of (4.2) with the initial value  $u^\varepsilon(0) = u_0^\varepsilon$  and  $u^*(t; u_0^*)$  is the solution of (4.5) with the initial value  $u^*(0) = u_0^*$ .

*Proof.* Let  $N_d$  denote the integer part of  $\frac{T}{d}$  and by applying Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^d \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{N_d d}^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(N_d d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \tag{4.5} \\ &\leq C_T(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d + 2\mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s-d) - u^\varepsilon(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by **(H1)** and Young's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \\ &= \int_{s-d}^s [2 \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_1^\varepsilon(r) S_1(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} - 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(r) S_2(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ & \quad + 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), f^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} + \|S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 + \|g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2] dr \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} + 2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ &\leq \int_{s-d}^s [2 \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_1^\varepsilon(r) S_1(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} - 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(r) S_2(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ & \quad + 2 \|u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \|f^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r))\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} + a^* \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} + C_T \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M] dr \\ & \quad + 2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} + 2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$2 \int_{s-d}^s [\langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_1^\varepsilon(r) S_1(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} dr$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)), \eta_1^\varepsilon(r) S_1(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} dr \\
&\leq \int_{s-d}^s [-2a_1 \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 2\eta_1^\varepsilon(r) \langle \nabla u^\varepsilon(s-d), \nabla u^\varepsilon(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}] dr + 2a_2 \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \\
&\quad + \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \\
&\leq C \left[ \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr + \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and by Hölder's inequality and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&- 2 \int_{s-d}^s [\langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(r) S_2(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1}] dr \\
&= -2 \int_{s-d}^s \langle (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)), \eta_2^\varepsilon(r) S_2(u^\varepsilon(r)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} dr \\
&\leq C \left( \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{s-d}^s \| |u^\varepsilon(r)| |\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \left\| \Psi_N(|u^\varepsilon(r)|^2) u^\varepsilon(r) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} dr \\
&\leq C \left[ \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr + \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr + \int_{s-d}^s \| |u^\varepsilon(r)| |\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 dr \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \right].
\end{aligned}$$

With the help of Fubini's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\leq dC \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds + C \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \int_{s-d}^s [\|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + 1] dr ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \int_{s-d}^s [\| |u^\varepsilon(r)| |\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2] dr ds \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \left[ \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right] ds \tag{4.6} \\
&\leq dC \left[ \mathbb{E} \int_{(n-1)d}^{(n+1)d} [\|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + 1] dr + \mathbb{E} \int_{(n-1)d}^{(n+1)d} [\| |u^\varepsilon(r)| |\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)| \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2] dr \right] \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \left[ \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by applying the B-D-G inequality, **(H2)**, **(H3)**, Hölder's inequality and Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \left[ \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{s-d}^s \langle u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d), g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r)) dW(r) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right] ds \\
& \leq C \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 \|S_3^\varepsilon(r, x, u^\varepsilon(r))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{s-d}^s \|u^\varepsilon(r) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \|g^\varepsilon(r, u^\varepsilon(r))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] ds \\
& \leq C \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{s-d}^s \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left( \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{s-d}^s (\|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] ds \\
& \leq C (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \left[ \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \int_{s-d}^s \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 dr ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + d^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \int_{s-d}^s (\|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) dr ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
& \leq d^{\frac{1}{2}} C (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{(n-1)d}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Thus, from (3.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^\varepsilon(s-d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
& \leq dC \left[ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [\|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + 1] dr + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 dr \right] \\
& \quad + d^{\frac{1}{2}} C (\|u_1^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \left( \mathbb{E} \int_{(n-1)d}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq dC_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) + d^{\frac{1}{2}} C (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq d^{\frac{1}{2}} C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{N_d-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|u^\varepsilon(s-d) - u^\varepsilon(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq d^{\frac{1}{2}} C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^6 + 1). \tag{4.9}$$

Substituting (4.8) and (4.9) into (4.5) gives

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s; u_0^\varepsilon) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s; u_0^\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Then, by applying Theorem 4.1 and following the same steps as in the proof of (4.10), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s; u_0^*) - \bar{u}^*(s; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds \leq C_T (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.11)$$

□

Now we establish the following the averaging principle of stochastic tamed 3D Navier–Stokes equations with locally weak monotonicity coefficients. Below we need additional conditions:

**(H6)** The functions  $f, g$  satisfy, for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u, v \in L^2(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\|u - v\|_{L^2} \leq \zeta$ ,

$$\|f(t, u) - f(t, v)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $u, v \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}; \mathbb{R}^3)$  with  $\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq \zeta$ ,

$$\|f(t, u) - f(t, v)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \leq c\mathcal{A}(\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2).$$

**Theorem 4.2.** Consider (4.2) and (4.5). Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H6)** hold and  $a_4 \leq 2a_3$ . For any initial values  $u_0^\varepsilon, u_0^* \in \mathcal{H}^1$  and  $T > 0$ , assume further that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0$ . Then, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\tau_R = \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{\|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \vee \|u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 > R\}$ . By applying Itô's formula formula to  $u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)$ , and utilizing **(H3)**, Young's inequality and the B-D-G inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ &= \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t [2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ & \quad - 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} + 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ & \quad + \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 + \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [G^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - G^*(u^*(s))] dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \right) \quad (4.13) \\ &\leq \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t [2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ & \quad - 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\ & \quad + 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}] ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ & \quad + 73 \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} [\|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 + \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2] ds, \right) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right) \\
& \leq 2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t [4 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\
& \quad - 4 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \\
& \quad + 4 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}] ds \\
& \quad + 146 \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} [\|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 + \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2] ds \right) \\
& := 2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 4\Sigma_1 + 4\Sigma_2 + 4\Sigma_3 + 146\Sigma_4 + 146\Sigma_5.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Then for  $\Sigma_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& := \Sigma_1^1 + \Sigma_1^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

By (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^1 & = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& = -a_1 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^2 & = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds, \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^*(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& := \Sigma_1^{2,1} + \Sigma_1^{2,2} + \Sigma_1^{2,3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

For  $\Sigma_1^{2,1}$ , by Hölder's inequality, (3.22) and Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} [\|\eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} + \|\eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}] ds \\
&\leq 2a_2 (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C_T (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly, for  $\Sigma_1^{2,3}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^*(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq C_T (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Next, the key problem is to estimate  $\Sigma_1^{2,2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^* S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&:= \Sigma_1^{2,2,1} + \Sigma_1^{2,2,2} + \Sigma_1^{2,2,3},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1^{2,2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(s)) - \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq a_2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \Delta \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \Delta \bar{u}^*(s), u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq a_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\Delta \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \Delta \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq a_2 (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$



and

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1^{2,2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^* S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}},\end{aligned}\quad (4.22)$$

In the subsequent step, we will employ the time discretization technique to address  $\Sigma_1^{2,2,2}$ . Let  $[t]$  denote the integer part of  $t$ ; then, it is important to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1^{2,2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{n=0}^{[t/d]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(nd)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{[t/d]d}^t \langle u^\varepsilon([t/d]d) - u^*([t/d]d), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^*([t/d]d)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*([t/d]d)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{n=0}^{[t/d]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle \nabla u^\varepsilon(nd) - \nabla u^*(nd), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) \nabla u^*(nd) - \eta_1^* \nabla u^*(nd) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{n=0}^{[t/d]-1} \left\| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) \nabla u^*(nd) - \eta_1^* \nabla u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \quad (4.23) \\ &\quad + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) \nabla u^*(nd) - \eta_1^* \nabla u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d \\ &\leq \frac{T}{d} \max_{0 \leq n \leq [T/d]-1, n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) \nabla u^*(nd) - \eta_1^* \nabla u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \\ &\quad + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) \nabla u^*(nd) - \eta_1^* \nabla u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (\mathbb{E} \|u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \left| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) - \eta_1^* ds \right|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_T (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \left( \left| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_0\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) - \eta_1^* ds \right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}\quad (4.24)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)\varepsilon \left| \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} \eta_1(r) - \eta_1^* dr \right| \\
&\leq C_T \mathcal{R}_1\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right)(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.16)-(4.24) into (4.15) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_1^\varepsilon(s) S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_1^* S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq -a_1 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\quad + C_T(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)[d^{\frac{1}{4}} + d + \mathcal{R}_1\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right)].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

We shall now estimate  $\Sigma_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2 &= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&:= \Sigma_2^1 + \Sigma_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

For  $\Sigma_2^1$ , by Young's inequality, Hölder's inequality and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2^1 &= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (u^\varepsilon(s), \nabla) u^\varepsilon(s) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (u^*(s), \nabla) u^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \left\langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) \Psi_N(|u^\varepsilon(s)|^2) u^\varepsilon(s) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) \Psi_N(|u^*(s)|^2) u^*(s) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq \frac{a_1}{4} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds + \frac{a_4}{a_1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|(u^\varepsilon(s))^T u^\varepsilon(s) - (u^*(s))^T u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\quad + 4a_4 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \| |u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)| (|u^\varepsilon(s)| + |u^*(s)|) \|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\leq \frac{a_1}{4} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\quad + C_{a_1, a_4} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{L^4}^2 [\|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^4}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{L^4}^2] ds \\
&\leq \frac{a_1}{4} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + C_{a_1, a_4} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} [\|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2] ds \\
& \leq \frac{a_1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds + C_{a_1, a_4, R} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $\Sigma_2^2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2^2 & = -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds, \\
& \leq -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \quad (4.28) \\
& \quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^*(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& := \Sigma_2^{2,1} + \Sigma_2^{2,2} + \Sigma_2^{2,3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality,  $\Sigma_2^{2,1}$  is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2^{2,1} & = -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|\eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& \leq 2a_4 (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_2(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\|S_2(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 & \leq \|(u^*(s), \nabla) u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|\Psi_N(|u^*(s)|^2) u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{D}} \sum_{j=1}^3 (u_j)^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{k=1}^3 (\partial_k u_i)^2 dx + \|u^*(s)\|_{L^6}^6 \\
& \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{D}} \sum_{j=1}^3 (u_j)^2 \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + C \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 \quad (4.29) \\
& \leq C \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^3 + C \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\Sigma_2^{2,1} \leq C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (4.30)$$

Similarly, for  $\Sigma_2^{2,3}$ ,

$$\Sigma_1^{2,3} = -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^*(s) - u^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \quad (4.31)$$

$$\leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Next, for  $\Sigma_2^{2,2}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_2^{2,2} &= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^* S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &:= \Sigma_2^{2,2,1} + \Sigma_2^{2,2,2} + \Sigma_2^{2,2,3}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Using Hölder's inequality and (3.1),  $\Sigma_2^{2,2,1}$  is estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_2^{2,2,1} &= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(s)) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (u^*(s), \nabla) u^*(s) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (\bar{u}^*(s), \nabla) \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) \Psi_N(|u^*(s)|^2) u^*(s) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) \Psi_N(|\bar{u}^*(s)|^2) \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \nabla \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (u^*(s))^T u^*(s) - \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) (\bar{u}^*(s))^T \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\quad + a_4 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \left\| \Psi_N(|u^*(s)|^2) u^*(s) - \Psi_N(|\bar{u}^*(s)|^2) \bar{u}^*(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq C (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|(u^*(s))^T u^*(s) - (\bar{u}^*(s))^T \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{L^6}^2 [\|u^*(s)\|_{L^6}^4 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{L^6}^4] ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) [(\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} [\|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4] ds)^{\frac{1}{2}}], \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds)^{\frac{3}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{4}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{8}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & \leq (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 \, ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \, ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\Sigma_2^{2,2,1} \leq C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)(d^{\frac{1}{16}} + d^{\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (4.34)$$

Similarly, for  $\Sigma_2^{2,2,3}$ ,

$$\Sigma_2^{2,2,3} \leq C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)(d^{\frac{1}{16}} + d^{\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (4.35)$$

By employing the time discretization technique to address  $\Sigma_2^{2,2,2}$ , and applying (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_2^{2,2,2} \\ & = -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) - \eta_2^* S_2(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & = -\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(nd)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E} \int_{\lfloor t/d \rfloor d}^t \langle u^\varepsilon(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d) - u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) - \eta_2^* S_2(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle \nabla u^\varepsilon(nd) - \nabla u^*(nd), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^* S_2^1(u^*(nd)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^* S_2^2(u^*(nd)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{\lfloor t/d \rfloor d}^t \langle \nabla u^\varepsilon(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d) - \nabla u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^1(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) - \eta_2^* S_2^1(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E} \int_{\lfloor t/d \rfloor d}^t \langle u^\varepsilon(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d) - u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d), \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^2(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) - \eta_2^* S_2^2(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \, ds \\ & = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \left\| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^* S_2^1(u^*(nd)) \, ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \left\| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s) S_2^2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^* S_2^2(u^*(nd)) \, ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \int_{[t/d]d}^t \|u^\varepsilon([t/d]d) - u^*([t/d]d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \|\eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^1(u^*([t/d]d)) - \eta_2^*S_2^1(u^*([t/d]d))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
& + \mathbb{E} \int_{[t/d]d}^t \|u^\varepsilon([t/d]d) - u^*([t/d]d)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \|\eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^2(u^*([t/d]d)) - \eta_2^*S_2^2(u^*([t/d]d))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
\leq & \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^1(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^2(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d \\
\leq & \frac{T}{d} \max_{0 \leq n \leq [T/d]-1, n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^1(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) \\
& + \frac{T}{d} \max_{0 \leq n \leq [T/d]-1, n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^2(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) \\
& + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $S_2^1(u^*(t)) := (u^*(t))^T u^*(t)$ ,  $S_2^2(u^*(t)) := \Psi_N(|u^*(t)|^2)u^*(t)$ . Based on assumption **(H4)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^1(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^1(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right)(u^*(nd))^T u^*(nd) - \eta_2^*(u^*(nd))^T u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq (\mathbb{E} \|u^*(nd)\|_{L^4}^4 \left| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) - \eta_2^* ds \right|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq (\mathbb{E} \|u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) - \eta_2^* ds \right| \\
& \leq \varepsilon C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + 1) \left| \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} \eta_2(r) - \eta_2^* dr \right| \\
& \leq C_T \mathcal{R}_2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right)(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + 1)d,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2^\varepsilon(s)S_2^2(u^*(nd)) - \eta_2^*S_2^2(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right)\Psi_N(|u^*(nd)|^2)u^*(nd) - \eta_2^*\Psi_N(|u^*(nd)|^2)u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (\mathbb{E} \|u^*(nd)\|_{L^6}^6 \left| \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \eta_2\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) - \eta_2^* ds \right|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C_T \mathcal{R}_2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

Substituting (4.27)-(4.37) into (4.26) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_2 &\leq \frac{a_1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds + C_{a_1, a_4, R} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds \\
&\quad + C(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + 1)(\mathcal{R}_2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) + d^{\frac{1}{4}} + d^{\frac{1}{16}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Given that  $f^\varepsilon$  satisfies locally weak monotonicity conditions, by employing a similar argument as in  $\Sigma_1$ , along with Hölder's inequality, Jensen's inequality and Lemma 4.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_3 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^*(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|f^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|f^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

The next critical task is to estimate  $\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds$ . By Lemma 4.1 and Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(s)) - f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)} ds \tag{4.40} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq [\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)]^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq C \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

In the subsequent step, we will employ the time discretization technique:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle \bar{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \bar{u}^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}^*(s)) - f^*(\bar{u}^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/d \rfloor - 1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(nd)) - f^*(u^*(nd)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{\lfloor t/d \rfloor d}^t \langle u^\varepsilon(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d) - u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d), f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) - f^*(u^*(\lfloor t/d \rfloor d)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \right] \tag{4.41} \\
&\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor T/d \rfloor - 1} \left( \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} f^\varepsilon(s, u^*(nd)) - f^*(u^*(nd)) ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)d \\
&\leq C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) \left[ d + \frac{T\varepsilon}{d} \max_{0 \leq n \leq \lfloor T/d \rfloor - 1, n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} f(r, u^*(nd)) - f^*(u^*(nd)) dr \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) \left[ d + \mathcal{R}_3\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (4.40) and (4.41) into (4.39) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_3 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(t, u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + C \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{4.42}
\end{aligned}$$



$$+ C_T(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)(\mathcal{R}_3(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{1}{4}}).$$

For  $\Sigma_4$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_4 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{D}} \|\mathcal{K}(t, x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, L^2)}^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds + \Sigma_4^1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_4^1 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*(s)) - S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^*(x, \bar{u}^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &:= \Sigma_4^{1,1} + \Sigma_4^{1,2} + \Sigma_4^{1,3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

Then, by Hölder's inequality and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_4^{1,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*(s)) - S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \langle (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla) u^*(s) - (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla) \bar{u}^*(s), (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla) u^*(s) - (\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla) \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \langle \nabla S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*(s)) - \nabla S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s)), \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot u^*(s) - \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \bar{u}^*(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 + \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot u^*(s) - \mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} [\|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + \|\bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 + 1] ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times (\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

Similarly, for  $\Sigma_4^{1,3}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_4^{1,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^*(x, \bar{u}^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{4}}.\end{aligned}\quad (4.46)$$

Subsequently, we will employ the time discretization technique to address  $\Sigma_4^{1,2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_4^{1,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, \bar{u}^*(s)) - S_3^*(x, \bar{u}^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|(\mathcal{K}^\varepsilon(s, x) \cdot \nabla)u^*(nd) - (\mathcal{K}^*(x) \cdot \nabla)u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{[T/d]d}^T \|S_3^\varepsilon(s, x, u^*([T/d]d)) - S_3^*(x, u^*(nd))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \mathbb{E} \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} \|\mathcal{K}(r, x) - \mathcal{K}^*(x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 dr \cdot \mathbb{E} \|u^*(nd)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 \\ &\quad + C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)d \\ &\leq C(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)[d^{\frac{1}{4}} + d + \mathcal{R}_5(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})].\end{aligned}\quad (4.47)$$

In conclusion, by (4.43)-(4.47), we derive

$$\Sigma_4 \leq \frac{a_1}{73} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|\nabla u^\varepsilon(s) - \nabla u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 ds + C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)[d + \mathcal{R}_5(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})]. \quad (4.48)$$

Similarly to the derivation of  $\Sigma_4$ , for  $\Sigma_5$ , by **(H2)**, Hölder's inequality, Jensen's inequality and Lemma 4.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_5 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}_s^*) - g^*(\bar{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^*(\bar{u}_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds. \\ &\leq c[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^*(s) - \bar{u}^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}_s^*) - g^*(\bar{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + C_T \mathcal{A}((\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}})\end{aligned}\quad (4.49)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}_s^*) - g^*(\bar{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \bar{u}_s^*) - g^*(\bar{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^*(nd)) - g^*(u^*(nd))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{[T/d]d}^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_{[T/d]d}^*) - g^*(u_{[T/d]d}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 ds \tag{4.50} \\ &\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{[T/d]-1} \mathbb{E} \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} \|g(r, u_{nd}^*) - g^*(u_{nd}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^0)}^2 dr + C(1 + \mathbb{E} \|u^*([T/d]d)\|_h^2)d \\ &\leq C_T(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + 1)[d + \mathcal{R}_5(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (4.49) and (4.50), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_5 &\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) ds + C_T[\mathcal{A}((\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ & \quad + (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)(d + \mathcal{R}_5(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}))]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.51}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) = (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1),$$

and substituting (4.25), (4.38), (4.42), (4.48) and (4.51) into (4.14) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|u^\varepsilon(r \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(r \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) \\ &\leq 2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C_{a_1, a_4, R, c} \int_0^t [\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_R) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_R)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_R) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_R)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)] ds \\ & \quad + C_T[\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) (\sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{R}_i(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{1}{4}} + d^{\frac{1}{16}}) + \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *)d^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *)d^{\frac{1}{2}})}] \tag{4.52} \\ &:= \phi(t), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $t \in [0, T]$ . For simplicity of description, let  $d = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t) &= 2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C \int_0^t [\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_R) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_R)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_R) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_R)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)] ds \\ & \quad + C_T[\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) (\sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{R}_i(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{32}}) + \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *)\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}) + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *)\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})}]. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, we assert that when  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0$ ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0. \quad (4.53)$$

For any fixed  $T > 0$ ,

$$\Gamma(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) \leq \Gamma(\phi(T)), \quad (4.54)$$

further,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(\phi(T)) \\ &= \Gamma(\phi(0)) + \int_0^T \Gamma'(\phi(s)) d\phi(s) \\ &\leq \Gamma(2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C_T \mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) [(\sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{R}_i(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{32}}) + \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}) + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})})]) \\ &\quad + C \int_0^T \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|u^\varepsilon(r \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(r \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2}{\mathcal{A}(\phi(s)) + \phi(s)} ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^T \frac{\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_R) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_R)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2)}{\mathcal{A}(\phi(s)) + \phi(s)} ds \\ &\leq \Gamma(2 \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 + C_T \mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) [(\sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{R}_i(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{32}}) + \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}) + \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}(\varepsilon, *) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}})})]) + C_T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.55)$$

By (4.54) and (4.55), when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\Gamma(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2) \rightarrow -\infty, \quad (4.56)$$

which implies

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t \wedge \tau_R; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0.$$

Furthermore, by applying Remark 3.1 and Fatou's lemma, and letting  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^0}^2 = 0.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

If  $\eta_1^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_1^* = \eta_2^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_2^* = 1$  and  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = 0$ , it follows that we can establish the averaging principle within the framework of first-order Sobolev spaces  $\mathcal{H}^1$ . Firstly, it is essential to introduce the following assumptions:

**(H5')** There exist functions  $\mathcal{R}_3, \mathcal{R}_4, \mathcal{R}_5$  and  $f^* \in C(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}), \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}))$ ,  $g^* \in C(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D}), \mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D})))$  such that for any  $T > 0$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{D})$  and  $x \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \left\| \int_t^{t+T} [f(s, u) - f^*(u)] ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \leq \mathcal{R}_3(T)(\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} + M),$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|g(s, u) - g^*(u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \leq \mathcal{R}_4(T)(\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + M).$$

Then the second result on the averaging principle is as follows:

**Theorem 4.3.** Consider (4.2) and (4.5). Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**, **(H2)**, **(H6)** and **(H5')** hold and  $\eta_1^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_1^* = \eta_2^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_2^* = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = 0$ . For any initial values  $u_0^\varepsilon, u_0^* \in \mathcal{H}^1$  and  $T > 0$ , assume further that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0$ . Then, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0. \quad (4.57)$$

**Remark 4.1.** When  $\eta_1^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_1^* = \eta_2^\varepsilon(t) = \eta_2^* = 1$  and  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = 0$ , it follows that the strong convergence (4.57) is established within the first-order Sobolev space  $\mathcal{H}^1$ , and this result is evidently stronger than (4.12). Indeed, under the conditions **(H1)** and **(H2)**, the derivation of the coefficients  $f, g$  is analogous to that in Theorem 4.2, primarily employing the Khasminskii time discretization. The critical aspect involves employing stopping techniques and prior estimation to analyze  $S_1(u)$  and  $S_2(u)$ , ultimately leading to (4.57).

*Proof.* Let

$$\tau_M = \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{ \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \vee \|u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \vee \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds \vee \int_0^t \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds > M \}.$$

By applying Itô's formula formula to  $\|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2$ , and incorporating **(H3)**, Young's inequality and the B-D-G inequality, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \\ &= \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \int_0^t [2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ &\quad - 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} + 2 \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ &\quad + \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2] ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))] dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.58)$$

where

$$\int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^t \langle (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)), S_1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_1(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&= \int_0^t \langle (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)), (u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad - \int_0^t \langle (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)), (I - \Delta)(u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq 2 \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 ds - \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

and according to ([30], (3.31)–(3.32)) and Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), S_2(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_2(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|S_2^1(u^\varepsilon(s)) - S_2^1(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \left\| \Psi_N(|u^\varepsilon(s)|^2)u^\varepsilon(s) - \Psi_N(|u^*(s)|^2)u^*(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^0} ds \\
&\leq C \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} [\|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\
&\quad + \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^{\frac{1}{2}}] ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} (\|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 ds + C \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 [\|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 \\
&\quad + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2] ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

By applying Gronwall's lemma and taking the expectation, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp \left[ \int_0^T (1 + \|u^\varepsilon(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2) ds \right] \cdot [\|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right. \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \\
&\quad + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds \right| \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))] dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right| \right\} \\
&\leq C_{M, T} \{ \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds \right|
\end{aligned} \tag{4.61}$$

$$+ 2\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))] dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right|.$$

Following the derivation of (3.20) and tilizing the B-D-G inequality, Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{M,T} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))] dW(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} \right| \\ & \leq C_{M,T} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_M} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \|g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \|u^\varepsilon(t) - u^*(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( C_{M,T}^2 \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_M} \|g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \|u^\varepsilon(t) - u^*(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \frac{C_{M,T}^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \|u^\varepsilon(t) - u^*(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \\ & \leq C_{M,T} \{ \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds \right| \} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u^\varepsilon(s)) - g^*(u^*(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K, \mathcal{H}^1)}^2 ds \\ & := C_{M,T} [\|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \mathcal{Z}_1 + \mathcal{Z}_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.62)$$

For  $\mathcal{Z}_1$ , analogous to the derivation presented in (4.39)-(4.41), we can derive the following from **(H5')** and Lemma 4.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_1 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_M]} \left| \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), f^\varepsilon(t, u^\varepsilon(s)) - f^*(t, u^*(s)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^1} ds \right| \\ &\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_M} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) ds + C \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + C_T (\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) (\mathcal{R}_3(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{1}{4}}). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ , analogous to the derivation presented in (4.49)-(4.50), we can obtain the following from **(H5')** and Lemma 4.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_2 &\leq c \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_M} \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) ds + C_T [\mathcal{A}(\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}}] \\ &\quad + (\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1) (d + \mathcal{R}_6(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we derive

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t \wedge \tau_M; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t \wedge \tau_M; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_{M,T}[\|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + C_{a_1,a_4,R,c} \int_0^T \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s \wedge \tau_M) - u^*(s \wedge \tau_M)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2) ds \\
&\quad + C_T[\sqrt{\mathcal{A}((\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}})} + \mathcal{A}((\|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}})] \\
&\quad + C_T(\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^4 + \|u_0^*\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^6 + 1)(\sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{R}_i(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{1}{4}})].
\end{aligned}$$

By employing a similar argument as presented in (4.52)-(4.56), we obtain

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{\mathcal{H}^1}^2 = 0.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### Appendix I: The specific proof of weak solutions(the step 1 of Theorem 3.1):

**Proof:** Let  $\chi_m$  be a strong solution of the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\chi(t) = \mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi)dt + \mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi)dW^k(t), \\ \chi(0) = u_0^k. \end{cases}$$

For any fixed  $p \geq 2$ , by applying Itô formula to  $\|\chi_m(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p$ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_m(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p &= \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + \int_0^t [p \|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{p-2} \langle \mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s)), \chi_m(s) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \\
&\quad + \frac{p(p-1)}{2} \|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{p-2} \|\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s))\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)}^2] ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t p \|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{p-2} (\chi_m(s))^T \mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s)) dW^k(s).
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Young's inequality in conjunction with (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_m(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p &\leq \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + C_{k,T,\nu,M,p} \int_0^t (\|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + 1) ds \\
&\quad + C_{k,T,\nu,M,p} \int_0^t (\|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + 1) dW^k(s).
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Cauchy's inequality and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy (B-D-G) inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} \\
&\leq C_p \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + C_{p,M} \mathbb{E} [\int_0^t (\sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + 1) ds]^2 + C_{p,M} \mathbb{E} (\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \int_0^r (\|\chi_m(s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^p + 1) dW^k(s))^2 \\
&\leq C_p \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + C_{p,M} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (\sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + 1) ds + C_{p,M} \int_0^t [\mathbb{E} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + 1] ds \\
&\leq C_p \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + C_{p,M} [\int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} ds + t].
\end{aligned}$$



The application of the Gronwall inequality subsequently yields

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} \leq C_{q, M} \left( \|u_0^k\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} + t + e^t \right) < \infty, \quad (4.63)$$

for any  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $T > 0$ . Furthermore, we deduce from (3.9) that  $\mathcal{F}_m^N(s, \chi_m(s))$  and  $\mathcal{G}_m^N(s, \chi_m(s))$  are bounded on  $\mathcal{H}_k^1$ . That is, there exists a constant  $M_{N, T}$ , independent of  $m$ , such that

$$\|\mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1} \vee \|\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(t, \chi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(K^k, \mathcal{H}_k^1)} \leq M_{T, \mathcal{M}}.$$

Consequently, for any  $0 \leq r, t \leq T < \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\chi_m(t) - \chi_m(r)\|_{\mathcal{H}_k^1}^{2p} \\ & \leq C_p \sup_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s)) ds \right|^{2p} + C_p \mathbb{E} \sup_{m \geq 1} \left| \int_r^t \mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s)) dW^k(s) \right|^{2p} \\ & \leq C_{\mathcal{M}, q, T} |t - r|^p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

This implies that the family of laws of  $\chi_m(t)$  is weakly compact. Thus there exists a stochastic process  $\chi(t)$  such that the law of  $\chi_m(t)$  weakly converges to the law of  $\chi(t)$ . Note that  $\chi_m(t)$  with the initial condition  $\chi_m(0) = u_0^k$  is the unique strong solution of (3.13), which implies that

$$\mathfrak{M}_m(t) = \chi_m(t) - u_0^k - \int_0^t \mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s)) ds$$

is a martingale with the covariance given by  $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \int_0^t [\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s))]_{ik} [\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi_m(s))]_{jk} ds$ , for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . Then we define the following coordinate process:

$$\chi^*(t)\omega = \omega(t),$$

where  $\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n)$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}_t = \sigma\{\omega(s); 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ , hence  $\chi^*(t)\omega$  is  $\mathcal{D}_t$ -adapted. Next let

$$\mathfrak{M}_{*, m}(t) = \chi^*(t) - u_0^k - \int_0^t \mathcal{F}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s)) ds,$$

then  $\mathfrak{M}_{*, m}(t)$  is a martingale relative to  $(\mathcal{L}_{\chi_m(t)}, \mathcal{D}_t)$  with the covariance

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}_{*, m}^i, \mathfrak{M}_{*, m}^j \rangle(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \int_0^t [\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s))]_{ik} [\mathcal{G}_m^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s))]_{jk} ds.$$

Further by (4.63), let  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and we obtain

$$\mathfrak{M}_*(t) = \chi^*(t) - u_0^k - \int_0^t \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s)) ds.$$

Then for any  $t > s$  and  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{D}_t$ , by Problem 2.4.12 of [16], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{X}_\Gamma \mathfrak{M}_*(t) d\mathcal{L}_{\chi^*(t)} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{X}_\Gamma \mathfrak{M}_{*,m}(t) d\mathcal{L}_{\chi_m(t)} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{X}_\Gamma \mathfrak{M}_{*,m}(s) d\mathcal{L}_{\chi_m(s)} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{X}_\Gamma \mathfrak{M}_*(s) d\mathcal{L}_{\chi^*(s)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_\Gamma$  represents the indicator function of  $\Gamma$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{M}_*(t)$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_{\chi^*(s)}$ -martingale. In addition, by (4.63), we get

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}_*^i, \mathfrak{M}_*^j \rangle(t) = \sum_{i=1}^M \int_0^t [\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s))]_{ik} [\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s))]_{jk} ds.$$

for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . Based on Theorem II.7.1' of [26], it can be deduced that there exists an  $m$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $B^*(t)$  on an extended probability space  $(C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^n), \mathcal{D}_t, \mathcal{L}_{\chi^*(s)})$  such that  $\mathfrak{M}_*(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s)) dB^*(s)$ , i.e.,

$$\chi^*(t) = u_0^k + \int_0^t \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s)) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}(s, \chi^*(s)) dB^*(s),$$

hence  $\chi^*(t)$  is a weak solution to (3.14). The proof is complete.  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

The first author (S. Lu) supported by Graduate Innovation Fund of Jilin University. The second author (X. Yang) was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12071175, 12371191). The third author (Y. Li) was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12071175 and 12471183).

## Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

## References

## References

- [1] Antonio Agresti and Eliseo Luongo. Global well-posedness and interior regularity of 2D Navier–Stokes equations with stochastic boundary conditions. *Math. Ann.*, 390(2):2727–2766, 2024.
- [2] Antonio Agresti and Mark Veraar. The critical variational setting for stochastic evolution equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 188(3-4):957–1015, 2024.

- [3] Antonio Agresti and Mark Veraar. Stochastic Navier-Stokes equations for turbulent flows in critical spaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 405(2):Paper No. 43, 57, 2024.
- [4] N. N. Bogoliubov and Y. A. Mitropolsky. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of non-linear oscillations*. International Monographs on Advanced Mathematics and Physics. Hindustan Publishing Corp., Delhi, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Inc., New York, russian edition, 1961.
- [5] Zdzisław Brzeźniak and Gaurav Dhariwal. Stochastic tamed Navier-Stokes equations on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ : the existence and the uniqueness of solutions and the existence of an invariant measure. *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, 22(2):Paper No. 23, 54, 2020.
- [6] Zdzisław Brzeźniak, Xuhui Peng, and Jianliang Zhai. Well-posedness and large deviations for 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations with jumps. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 25(8):3093–3176, 2023.
- [7] Sandra Cerrai. A Khasminskii type averaging principle for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 19(3):899–948, 2009.
- [8] Sandra Cerrai. Averaging principle for systems of reaction-diffusion equations with polynomial nonlinearities perturbed by multiplicative noise. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(6):2482–2518, 2011.
- [9] Robin Ming Chen, Dehua Wang, and Huaqiao Wang. Martingale solutions for the three-dimensional stochastic nonhomogeneous incompressible Navier-Stokes equations driven by Lévy processes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 276(7):2007–2051, 2019.
- [10] Mengyu Cheng and Zhenxin Liu. The second Bogolyubov theorem and global averaging principle for SPDEs with monotone coefficients. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 55(2):1100–1144, 2023.
- [11] V. V. Chepyzhov, V. Pata, and M. I. Vishik. Averaging of 2D Navier-Stokes equations with singularly oscillating forces. *Nonlinearity*, 22(2):351–370, 2009.
- [12] Igor Chueshov and Sergei Kuksin. Random kick-forced 3D Navier-Stokes equations in a thin domain. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 188(1):117–153, 2008.
- [13] Igor Chueshov and Sergei Kuksin. Stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations in a thin domain and its  $\alpha$ -approximation. *Phys. D*, 237(10-12):1352–1367, 2008.
- [14] Peter Constantin and Gautam Iyer. A stochastic Lagrangian representation of the three-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(3):330–345, 2008.
- [15] Shizan Fang and Tusheng Zhang. A study of a class of stochastic differential equations with non-Lipschitzian coefficients. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 132(3):356–390, 2005.
- [16] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, M. Hairer, and M. Romito. Rigorous remarks about scaling laws in turbulent fluids. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 278(1):1–29, 2008.
- [17] Franco Flandoli and Dariusz Gątdrek. Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 102(3):367–391, 1995.
- [18] Franco Flandoli and Alex Mahalov. Stochastic three-dimensional rotating Navier-Stokes equations: averaging, convergence and regularity. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 205(1):195–237, 2012.
- [19] J. Fontbona. A probabilistic interpretation and stochastic particle approximations of the 3-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 136(1):102–156, 2006.
- [20] Peng Gao. Averaging principles for stochastic 2D Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 186(2):Paper No. 28, 29, 2022.
- [21] Peng Gao. Averaging principle for multiscale nonautonomous random 2D Navier-Stokes system. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 285(6):Paper No. 110036, 48, 2023.
- [22] Peng Gao and Sergei Kuksin. Weak and strong versions of the Kolmogorov 4/5-law for stochastic Burgers equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 247(6):Paper No. 109, 14, 2023.

- [23] Martin Hairer and Jonathan C. Mattingly. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(3):993–1032, 2006.
- [24] Martin Hairer and Jonathan C. Mattingly. Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(6):2050–2091, 2008.
- [25] Martin Hairer and Tommaso Rosati. Global existence for perturbations of the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations with space-time white noise. *Ann. PDE*, 10(1):Paper No. 3, 46, 2024.
- [26] Yi Han. Stochastic wave equation with Hölder noise coefficient: well-posedness and small mass limit. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 286(3):Paper No. 110224, 46, 2024.
- [27] John G. Heywood. On a conjecture concerning the Stokes problem in nonsmooth domains. In *Mathematical fluid mechanics*, Adv. Math. Fluid Mech., pages 195–205. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.
- [28] Martina Hofmanová, Rongchan Zhu, and Xiangchan Zhu. Global-in-time probabilistically strong and Markov solutions to stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations: existence and nonuniqueness. *Ann. Probab.*, 51(2):524–579, 2023.
- [29] Martina Hofmanová, Rongchan Zhu, and Xiangchan Zhu. Nonuniqueness in law of stochastic 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 26(1):163–260, 2024.
- [30] Wei Hong, Miaomiao Li, Shihu Li, and Wei Liu. Large deviations and averaging for stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations with fast oscillations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 86(2):Paper No. 15, 54, 2022.
- [31] R. Z. Khasminskii. On the principle of averaging the Itô’s stochastic differential equations. *Kybernetika (Prague)*, 4:260–279, 1968.
- [32] Hideo Kozono, Yutaka Terasawa, and Yuta Wakasugi. Asymptotic properties of steady solutions to the 3D axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with no swirl. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 282(2):Paper No. 109289, 21, 2022.
- [33] Sergei Kuksin, Vahagn Nersesyan, and Armen Shirikyan. Exponential mixing for a class of dissipative PDEs with bounded degenerate noise. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 30(1):126–187, 2020.
- [34] Sergei Kuksin and Armen Shirikyan. Coupling approach to white-forced nonlinear PDEs. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 81(6):567–602, 2002.
- [35] Sergei B. Kuksin. On distribution of energy and vorticity for solutions of 2D Navier-Stokes equation with small viscosity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 284(2):407–424, 2008.
- [36] Sergei B. Kuksin and Andrey L. Piatnitski. Khasminskii-Whitham averaging for randomly perturbed KdV equation. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 89(4):400–428, 2008.
- [37] Alexei Kulik and Michael Scheutzow. Well-posedness, stability and sensitivities for stochastic delay equations: a generalized coupling approach. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(6):3041–3076, 2020.
- [38] Qu Yuan Lin, Rongchang Liu, and Weinan Wang. Global existence for the stochastic Boussinesq equations with transport noise and small rough data. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 56(1):501–528, 2024.
- [39] Jonathan C. Mattingly. Exponential convergence for the stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equations and other partially dissipative dynamics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 230(3):421–462, 2002.
- [40] R. Mikulevicius and B. L. Rozovskii. Global  $L_2$ -solutions of stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(1):137–176, 2005.
- [41] Leonid Mytnik and Edwin Perkins. Pathwise uniqueness for stochastic heat equations with Hölder continuous coefficients: the white noise case. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 149(1-2):1–96, 2011.
- [42] Xuhui Peng and Rangrang Zhang. Approximations of stochastic 3D tamed Navier-Stokes equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 19(12):5337–5365, 2020.
- [43] Michael Röckner and Longjie Xie. Averaging principle and normal deviations for multiscale stochastic systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 383(3):1889–1937, 2021.

- [44] Michael Röckner, Longjie Xie, and Li Yang. Asymptotic behavior of multiscale stochastic partial differential equations with Hölder coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 285(9):Paper No. 110103, 50, 2023.
- [45] Michael Röckner and Tusheng Zhang. Stochastic 3D tamed Navier-Stokes equations: existence, uniqueness and small time large deviation principles. *J. Differential Equations*, 252(1):716–744, 2012.
- [46] Michael Röckner, Tusheng Zhang, and Xicheng Zhang. Large deviations for stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 61(2):267–285, 2010.
- [47] Michael Röckner and Xicheng Zhang. Stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equations: existence, uniqueness and ergodicity. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 145(1-2):211–267, 2009.
- [48] Xiaobin Sun, Longjie Xie, and Yingchao Xie. Averaging principle for slow-fast stochastic partial differential equations with Hölder continuous coefficients. *J. Differential Equations*, 270:476–504, 2021.
- [49] T. Tachim Medjo. Averaging of a 3D Lagrangian averaged Navier-Stokes- $\alpha$  model with oscillating external forces. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 10(4):1281–1305, 2011.
- [50] Kazuaki Taira. *Analytic semigroups and semilinear initial-boundary value problems*, volume 223 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [51] Max-K. von Renesse and Michael Scheutzow. Existence and uniqueness of solutions of stochastic functional differential equations. *Random Oper. Stoch. Equ.*, 18(3):267–284, 2010.
- [52] Jian Wang, Hao Yang, Jianliang Zhai, and Tusheng Zhang. Large deviation principles for SDEs under locally weak monotonicity conditions. *Bernoulli*, 30(1):332–345, 2024.
- [53] Fuke Wu, George Yin, and Hongwei Mei. Stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delay: existence and uniqueness of solutions, solution maps, Markov properties, and ergodicity. *J. Differential Equations*, 262(3):1226–1252, 2017.
- [54] Jie Xiong and Xu Yang. SPDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients and nonhomogeneous boundary conditions. *Bernoulli*, 29(4):2987–3012, 2023.
- [55] Lei Zhang and Bin Liu. Global martingale weak solutions for the three-dimensional stochastic chemotaxis-Navier-Stokes system with Lévy processes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 286(7):Paper No. 110337, 83, 2024.
- [56] Ping Zhang and Weipeng Zhu. Continuous dependence on initial data for the solutions of 3-D anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 288(1):Paper No. 110689, 2025.
- [57] Xicheng Zhang. Homeomorphic flows for multi-dimensional SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 115(3):435–448, 2005.
- [58] Yan Zheng and Jianhua Huang. Exponential mixing properties of the stochastic tamed 3D Navier-Stokes equation with degenerate noise. *Z. Angew. Math. Phys.*, 71(4):Paper No. 125, 15, 2020.