

On the chaotic behavior of the Lagrangian flow of the 2D Navier–Stokes system with bounded degenerate noise

Vahagn Nersesyan* Deng Zhang† Chenwan Zhou‡

June 26, 2024

Abstract

We consider a fluid governed by the randomly forced 2D Navier–Stokes system. It is assumed that the force is bounded, acts directly only on a small number of Fourier modes, and satisfies some natural decomposability and observability properties. Under these assumptions, we show that the Lagrangian flow associated with the random fluid exhibits chaotic behavior characterized by the strict positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent. To achieve this, we introduce a new abstract result that allows to derive positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent from controllability properties of the underlying deterministic system.

AMS subject classification: 35Q30, 37A50, 37H15, 76F20, 93B05

Keywords: Lagrangian chaos, top Lyapunov exponent, Navier–Stokes system, degenerate noise, Furstenberg’s criterion, controllability

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Background on random dynamical systems	9
3	Abstract result	12
4	Application to the Navier–Stokes system	17
5	Controllability of the nonlinear Lagrangian flow	20

*NYU-ECNU Institute of Mathematical Sciences at NYU Shanghai, 3663 Zhongshan Road North, Shanghai, 200062, China, e-mail: Vahagn.Nersesyan@nyu.edu

†School of mathematical sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 200240, Shanghai, China, e-mail: dzhang@sjtu.edu.cn

‡School of mathematical sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 200240, Shanghai, China; Department of Mathematical Sciences, Durham University, DH1 3LE, UK, e-mail: daydayupzwcw@sjtu.edu.cn

6	Controllability of the linearized Lagrangian flow	25
7	Appendix	33
	Bibliography	42

1 Introduction

The study of chaotic behavior of dynamical systems has been an important topic in recent decades. It is widely accepted that chaos is the sensitive dependence on initial conditions characterized by the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent. Given the significant challenges in proving such properties in purely deterministic scenarios, increasing attention has shifted towards randomly forced systems. In these systems, the presence of noise has averaging effects making the analysis of chaotic properties more tractable [You13, BBPS23].

1.1 Lagrangian chaos

Chaos plays an important role in the study of fluid dynamics, providing critical insights into the turbulence phenomena [BJPV98]. Despite its significance, there are only a few mathematically rigorous results on fluid models.

In this paper, we consider the Lagrangian flow associated with the randomly forced 2D Navier–Stokes system on the torus $\mathbb{T}^2 := \mathbb{R}^2/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^2$. The Lagrangian flow is a family of diffeomorphisms

$$\phi^t : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2, \quad x \mapsto y(t), \quad t \geq 0$$

defined through the ODE

$$\dot{y}(t) = u(t, y(t)), \quad y(0) = x \in \mathbb{T}^2, \quad (1.1)$$

where $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a sufficiently smooth velocity field of an incompressible fluid governed by the Navier–Stokes system

$$\partial_t u - \nu \Delta u + \langle u, \nabla \rangle u + \nabla p = \eta, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^2, \quad (1.2)$$

$$u(0) = u_0. \quad (1.3)$$

Here $p = p(t, x)$ represents the pressure of the fluid, $\nu > 0$ is the kinematic viscosity, and η is a random force (noise) defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The pair (u_t, ϕ^t) contains the information about the velocities and positions of fluid particles at time t .

Chaoticity of the Lagrangian flow or *Lagrangian chaos* in the context of the system (1.1), (1.2) refers to the strict positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent for the Lagrangian flow ϕ^t . That is, to establish Lagrangian chaos,

one seeks to prove the existence of a deterministic constant $\lambda_+ > 0$ such that the following limit holds:

$$\lambda_+ = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |D_x \phi^t| \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost surely}$$

for typical (in some sense) initial data (u_0, x) . Here, $D_x \phi^t$ is the Jacobian matrix of ϕ^t at the point $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and $|D_x \phi^t|$ denotes its norm. Thus, the exponent λ_+ provides information about the exponential growth of the Jacobian. Heuristically, this means that

$$d_{\mathbb{T}^2}(\phi^t(x_1), \phi^t(x_2)) \approx e^{\lambda_+ t} d_{\mathbb{T}^2}(x_1, x_2)$$

for sufficiently close points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{T}^2$. Therefore, the positivity of λ_+ indicates exponential sensitivity of Lagrangian trajectories with respect to the initial data, which is the essence of Lagrangian chaos.

The Lagrangian chaos for the Navier–Stokes system has been studied in [BBPS22c] in the case when η is a *non-degenerate* white-in-time noise. In that work, the non-degeneracy of the noise plays a crucial role as it ensures the *strong Feller property*, which is essential for the employed methods.

The main objective of this paper is to demonstrate Lagrangian chaos when the noise η is a bounded *highly degenerate (hypoelliptic)* process that directly perturbs only a small number of low Fourier modes. In order to establish this result, we introduce a new abstract criterion for chaoticity of random dynamical systems, by developing the mixing results and the framework of the papers [KNS20a, KNS20b]. This criterion relies on the controllability properties of the underlying deterministic system and can be applied in many other interesting situations. This paper addresses a question raised in [BBPS22c] (see Remark 1.11) and [BBPS23] (see Section 6).

1.2 Main result in the case of a Haar noise

The main results of this paper apply to the system (1.1), (1.2) driven by a wide class of bounded noises. However, in this Introduction, we focus on a particular case when η is a *Haar coloured noise*. More precisely, we assume that the following condition is satisfied.

Structure of the noise. *The process η in (1.2) is of the form*

$$\eta(t, x) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \eta^j(t) E_j(x),$$

where

- $\{E_j\}$ are the trigonometric functions

$$E_j(x) = j^\perp \begin{cases} \cos\langle j, x \rangle & \text{for } j_1 > 0 \text{ or } j_1 = 0, j_2 > 0, \\ \sin\langle j, x \rangle & \text{for } j_1 < 0 \text{ or } j_1 = 0, j_2 < 0 \end{cases}$$

with $j^\perp = (-j_2, j_1)$, and $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{Z}_*^2$ is a finite set given by

$$\mathcal{I} = \{j = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_*^2 : |j_i| \leq 1, i = 1, 2\},$$

- $\{\eta^j\}$ are independent copies of a random process $\tilde{\eta}$ given by

$$\tilde{\eta}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \xi_i h_0(t-i) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \xi_{il} h_{il}(t),$$

with $\{h_0, h_{il}\}$ being the L^∞ -normalized Haar system, $c_i = A^{-i}$ with some $A > 1$ or $c_i = Ci^{-q}$ with some $C > 0$ and $q > 1$, and $\{\xi_i, \xi_{il}\}$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) scalar random variables with Lipschitz-continuous density ρ such that

$$\text{supp } \rho \subset [-1, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(0) > 0. \quad (1.4)$$

We consider the Navier–Stokes system (1.2) in the usual space of divergence-free vector fields with zero mean value

$$H := \left\{ u \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) : \text{div } u = 0, \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u(x) dx = 0 \right\},$$

as well as in more regular spaces $V^k := H^k \cap H$, where $H^k := H^k(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ is the Sobolev space of order $k \geq 1$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^k}$. For any $u_0 \in H$, the problem (1.2), (1.3) has a unique solution whose restriction to integer times u_n forms a Markov process. It is proved in [KNS20a] that under the above conditions this process has a unique stationary measure μ which is exponentially mixing. The inclusion part in (1.4) implies that the process η is bounded; as a result, the support X of the stationary measure μ is a compact set in V^3 . The pair (u_n, y_n) , called *Lagrangian process*, is well-defined due to the regularity of the velocity field and is Markovian in the compact metric space $X \times \mathbb{T}^2$. The incompressibility of the fluid implies that $\mu \times \text{Leb}$ is a stationary measure for this process, where Leb is the normalized Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^2 . However, ergodicity of μ does not necessarily guarantee ergodicity of the product measure $\mu \times \text{Leb}$. Establishing the ergodicity of the latter is a considerably more challenging task, especially when dealing with a highly degenerate noise. The following is our main result in the setting of the Haar noise.

Main Theorem. *Under the above conditions, the measure $\mu \times \text{Leb}$ is a mixing stationary measure for the Lagrangian process (u_n, y_n) . Moreover, there exists a deterministic constant $\lambda_+ > 0$ such that the following limit holds:*

$$\lambda_+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |D_x \phi^n| \quad (1.5)$$

for $\mu \times \text{Leb} \times \mathbb{P}$ -a.e. $(u_0, x, \omega) \in X \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times \Omega$.

A more general version of this result is presented in Theorem 4.2, which applies to a broader class of random processes η satisfying some decomposability and observability assumptions.

1.3 Related literature

In the physics literature, there has been extensive research on Lagrangian and Eulerian chaos, as well as their interconnections; e.g., see [AGM96, BJPV98, CFVP91, FdCN01, GV94]. However, the number of mathematically rigorous results remains limited despite the importance of the topic.

Chaoticity of the Galerkin approximations of the 2D Navier–Stokes system with a degenerate noise has been proved in [BPS24]. The proof relies on a version of a sufficient condition for chaoticity obtained in [BBPS22d], whose hypotheses are verified by using a reduction to genericity properties of a diagonal sub-algebra and some computational algebraic geometry. This approach not only allows to show the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent but also furnishes a quantitative lower bound.

Chaoticity of the Eulerian component (i.e., the velocity field) of the stochastic Navier–Stokes system is an open problem. Lagrangian chaos has been established in the paper [BBPS22c] for the system (1.1), (1.2) driven by a white-in-time noise that is non-degenerate at high Fourier modes. More precisely, the noise is assumed to be of the form

$$\eta(t, x) = \partial_t W(t, x), \quad W(t, x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_*^2} b_j \beta_j(t) E_j(x),$$

where $\{\beta_j\}$ is a sequence of independent standard Brownian motions and $\{b_j\}$ is a sequence of real numbers such that

$$\frac{c}{|j|^\alpha} \leq |b_j| \leq \frac{C}{|j|^\alpha} \quad \text{for } |j| \geq L \quad (1.6)$$

with some constants $c, C, L > 0$ and $\alpha > 5$. The non-degeneracy assumption (1.6) ensures the *strong Feller property* for the Lagrangian process (u_t, y_t) which is essential for the arguments of [BBPS22c]. Indeed, the strong Feller property allows to prove the ergodicity of the Lagrangian process, which combined with the multiplicative ergodic theorem guarantees the existence of the exponent λ_+ . Since the Lagrangian flow $\phi^t : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$ is volume-preserving, we have $\lambda_+ \geq 0$. The strong Feller property allows to prove the positivity of λ_+ . Indeed, according to Furstenberg’s criterion [Fur63, Led86], if $\lambda_+ = 0$, then there is a measurable deterministic structure that is almost surely invariant under the dynamics of the triple $(u_t, y_t, D_x \phi^t)$ (the precise formulation is recalled below in Theorem 2.3). When the velocity u is provided by a finite-dimensional system, e.g., by Galerkin approximations of the 2D Navier–Stokes system, the existence of invariant structure can be ruled out (thus establishing the positivity of λ_+) by showing that the probability law of $D_x \phi^t$ is sufficiently non-degenerate; for details see Section 2.4 in [BBPS22c]. In the case when u is infinite-dimensional and is given by the 2D Navier–Stokes system, this strategy does not work anymore. Under the strong Feller assumption, the paper [BBPS22c] furnishes a refined version of

Furstenberg’s criterion with an alternative of two possible continuous invariant structures. Then the existence of such structures is ruled out by using an approximate controllability property.

In a series of subsequent papers by the same authors, building on the Lagrangian chaos derived in [BBPS22c], further important results have been established. These include almost-sure exponential mixing [BBPS22a] and enhanced dissipation [BBPS21] for the Navier–Stokes equations driven by a non-degenerate noise. Furthermore, for a version of Batchelor’s law a rigorous proof has been provided in [BBPS22b]. In all these papers the noise is white-in-time and non-degenerate with coefficients satisfying (1.6). The current paper paves the way for extending these results in the setting of degenerate forces, where the strong Feller property does not hold.

1.4 Ideas of the proof

The proof of the Main Theorem can be summarized as follows.

Ergodicity of the Lagrangian process. The first step in Main Theorem’s proof is the study of the ergodicity of the Lagrangian process (u_n, y_n) . Given that the process is considered in a compact phase space, the existence of a stationary measure follows from the classical Bogolyubov–Krylov argument (see, for instance, [KS12]). The uniqueness of stationary measure and mixing are much more delicate and are derived by developing the controllability approach of the paper [KNS20a] (see also [KNS20b]). In the case of a non-degenerate bounded noise, the mixing for the process (u_n, y_n) has been shown in [JNPS21].

The ODE component (1.1) of the Lagrangian process does not necessarily depend analytically on the force η in (1.2). Consequently, the abstract result of [KNS20a] cannot be applied directly to prove mixing for the process (u_n, y_n) in the highly degenerate setting. Instead, using an approximation argument by analytic maps, we show that the analyticity condition required in [KNS20a] can be dropped completely. As a result, we derive the uniqueness and mixing of the stationary measure for the process (u_n, y_n) by checking the approximate controllability of the system (1.1), (1.2) and its linearization.

The ergodicity of the Lagrangian process ensures the existence of the Lyapunov exponents. In particular, the limit (1.5) towards the top Lyapunov exponent λ_+ holds for $\mu \times \text{Leb}$ -almost any initial data (u_0, x) . The proof of the positivity of λ_+ is much more challenging and requires taking into consideration also the Jacobian process $\{D_x \phi^n\}$.

Refined Furstenberg’s criterion. As mentioned before, Furstenberg’s criterion indicates that the alternative to the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent is the existence of a certain almost surely invariant structure under the dynamics of the triple $(u_t, \phi^t, D_x \phi^t)$. One cannot rule out the existence of this structure by applying the approach of [BBPS22c] since the strong Feller property is not satisfied. In the case when the phase space is compact and the

process is uniformly mixing with respect to the total variation metric, there is a refinement of Furstenberg’s criterion obtained in [Bou88] and further developed in [BCZG23]. According to that result, if $\lambda_+ = 0$, then there is a continuous deterministic structure that is almost surely invariant under the dynamics. In the case of a degenerate noise, the process (u_n, y_n) is mixing with respect to the (weaker) dual-Lipschitz metric. We show that the refinement of Furstenberg’s criterion obtained in [Bou88] can be generalized to the case when the process is mixing in dual-Lipschitz (see Theorem 2.4 below). Then, we rule out the existence of a continuous invariant structure by using an approximate controllability property for the triple $(u_t, y_t, D_x \phi^t)$.

Controllability. We establish both the existence of the top Lyapunov exponent λ_+ and its positivity from appropriate controllability properties of the system (1.1), (1.2) and its linearization. The verification of these properties for the Lagrangian system is more subtle than in the case of only the Navier–Stokes system considered in [KNS20a], since in the current case the control acts directly only on the velocity equation making the problem much more degenerate.

Elements of controllability have been used in [BBPS22c] as well in order to rule out the degenerate scenario in Furstenberg’s criterion. However, in the current situation, less information is known about the invariant structure which we compensate by employing a stronger controllability property for the triple $(u_t, y_t, D_x \phi^t)$: we use the fact that the triple can be steered approximately to any target state $(u^\sharp, y^\sharp, A^\sharp) \in X \times \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ by using controls from the support of the noise.

To make the presentation as general as possible, we establish an abstract criterion for positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent for general random dynamical systems. We build on the dynamical system framework and the results of the papers [KNS20a, KNS20b]. This criterion reduces the problem of the positivity of the top exponent to the verification of regularity, decomposability, and approximate controllability hypotheses for both non-linear and linearized systems. We establish the Main Theorem by checking the validity of these hypotheses in the case of the Lagrangian process of the Navier–Stokes system. This abstract criterion is general enough and can be applied in many other contexts.

Thus, the following are the new key ingredients in our proofs:

- abstract criterion for positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent,
- removal of the analyticity requirement in [KNS20a],
- refinement of Furstenberg’s criterion for random dynamical systems in compact spaces that are mixing in the dual-Lipschitz metric,
- approximate controllability of the triple $(u_t, y_t, D_x \phi^t)$ using controls from the support of the noise,

- approximate controllability of the linearization of the system (1.1), (1.2) using only a few Fourier modes.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some basic facts from the theory of random dynamical systems. Section 3 establishes the above-mentioned abstract criterion. In Section 4, we formulate and prove the general version of the Main Theorem. In Sections 5 and 6, we check the validity of the nonlinear and linear controllability properties for the system (1.1), (1.2). Finally, the Appendix contains the proofs of several results used throughout the paper.

Acknowledgments

The work of D. Zhang is partially supported by NSFC (No.12271352, 12322108) and Shanghai Rising-Star Program 21QA1404500.

Notation

Let (Z, d_Z) be a Polish space endowed with its Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(Z)$. We denote by $B_Z(a, R)$ the closed ball in Z of radius $R > 0$ centered at $a \in Z$. We shall use the following spaces.

$L^\infty(Z)$ is the space of bounded measurable functions $f : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ endowed with the sup-norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, and $C_b(Z)$ is its subspace consisting of continuous functions.

$L_b(Z)$ is the space of functions $f \in C_b(Z)$ such that

$$\|f\|_L := \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{0 < d_Z(u,v) \leq 1} \frac{|f(u) - f(v)|}{d_Z(u,v)} < \infty.$$

When Z is compact, we write $C(Z)$ and $L(Z)$.

$\mathcal{P}(Z)$ is the set of Borel probability measures on Z endowed with the dual-Lipschitz metric

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

where $\langle f, \mu \rangle := \int_Z f(u) \mu(du)$ for $f \in C_b(Z)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$.

We shall use the following matrix-related notations. For any integer $d \geq 2$, $M_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the collection of all $d \times d$ matrices with real entries, $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the group of invertible matrices, and $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the subgroup of matrices with determinant 1. Given a matrix $A \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$, we denote by $|A|$ its Euclidean norm and by A^T its transpose. The real $d-1$ -dimensional projective space P^{d-1} is the quotient space $(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}) / \sim$ for the equivalence relation defined by $x \sim y$ if there is a non-zero real number λ such that $x = \lambda y$; the projective space P^{d-1} is a compact analytic manifold. Note that any matrix $A \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ defines a map from P^{d-1} to P^{d-1} which we denote by the

same symbol A . Given a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ and a matrix $A \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$, we write $A_*\nu$ for the pushforward measure of ν under A .

To simplify notation, we shall often use the symbol \lesssim to indicate that an inequality holds up to an unessential multiplicative constant C .

2 Background on random dynamical systems

In this section, we briefly recall some basic concepts and results on random dynamical systems (RDS) relevant to this paper. Given the forthcoming application to the 2D Navier–Stokes system with bounded noise, we only focus here on RDS with independent increments in a compact metric space. For more details and proofs, we refer the reader to the books [Kif86, Arn98, KS12].

2.1 Definitions

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, Z be a compact metric space endowed with its Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(Z)$, and $\varphi : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow Z$ be a measurable mapping such that $\varphi_\omega : Z \rightarrow Z$ is continuous for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. We consider an RDS $\Phi = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \theta^n, \varphi^n)$ defined as follows.

- $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) := (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})^{\mathbb{N}}$ with elements $\omega \in \Omega$ written as $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$.
- $\theta : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is the shift $\theta\omega = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots)$. Note that it is measure-preserving, that is, $\mathbb{P}(\theta(\Gamma)) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma)$ for any $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}$. We denote $\theta^n : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ the n -fold composition of θ with itself and $\theta^0 = \text{Id}_\Omega$.
- $\varphi^n : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow Z$ are the compositions of φ with itself given by

$$\varphi_\omega^0 := \text{Id}_Z, \quad \varphi_\omega^n := \varphi_{\omega_n} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\omega_1}, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that the following cocycle property is satisfied for any $n, m \geq 0$:

$$\varphi_\omega^{n+m} = \varphi_{\theta^m \omega}^n \circ \varphi_\omega^m \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

A process $\{z_n\}$ is associated with the RDS Φ via $z_n = \varphi_\omega^n(z)$; it is a Markov process with transition function

$$P_n(z, \Gamma) := \mathbb{P}\{z_n \in \Gamma\}, \quad z \in Z, \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(Z)$$

and Markov semigroups

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}_n : L^\infty(Z) &\rightarrow L^\infty(Z), & \mathfrak{P}_n f(z) &:= \int_Z P_n(z, dy) f(y), \\ \mathfrak{P}_n^* : \mathcal{P}(Z) &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Z), & \mathfrak{P}_n^* \mu(\Gamma) &:= \int_Z P_n(z, \Gamma) \mu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

The continuity of φ_ω implies that \mathfrak{P}_n is Feller, that is, \mathfrak{P}_n maps the space $C(Z)$ into itself. Recall that a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ is called *stationary* if $\mathfrak{P}_1^* \mu = \mu$.

As Z is compact, there is at least one stationary measure. Given a stationary measure μ , a set $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(Z)$ is said to be (\mathfrak{P}_1, μ) -invariant if the equality $\mathfrak{P}_1 \chi_\Gamma = \chi_\Gamma$ holds μ -a.s., where χ_Γ is the indicator function of Γ . A stationary measure μ is *ergodic* if all (\mathfrak{P}_1, μ) -invariant sets have μ -measure zero or one, and μ is *mixing* if there is a sequence of positive numbers $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$|\mathfrak{P}_n f(z) - \langle f, \mu \rangle| \leq \gamma_n \|f\|_L$$

for any $z \in Z$ and $f \in L(Z)$. A mixing measure is ergodic.

2.2 MET and Furstenberg's criterion

Let the probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, the compact metric space Z , and the RDS $\Phi = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, \theta^n, \varphi^n)$ be as in the previous subsection. Assume that $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $d \geq 2$ is a measurable mapping such that $\mathcal{A}_{\omega, \cdot} : Z \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is continuous for \mathbb{P} -a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. We define a sequence of mappings $\mathcal{A}^n : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^0 := \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n := \mathcal{A}_{\omega_n, \varphi_\omega^{n-1}(z)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{A}_{\omega_1, z} \in \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}), \quad n \geq 1 \quad (2.2)$$

and note that the cocycle property

$$\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^{n+m} = \mathcal{A}_{\theta^m \omega, \varphi_\omega^m(z)} \circ \mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

holds for any $n, m \geq 0$ and $z \in Z$. The sequence $\{\mathcal{A}^n\}$ is called a *linear cocycle* over the RDS Φ generated by \mathcal{A} . The following is a version of the multiplicative ergodic theorem (MET) of Oseledets [Ose68]; for a proof we refer to the books [Arn98, Via14] or the paper [Rag79].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ be an ergodic stationary measure for Φ , and let $\{\mathcal{A}^n\}$ be a linear cocycle over Φ generated by \mathcal{A} satisfying the following integrability condition:*

$$\mathbb{E} \int_Z (\log^+ |\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}| + \log^+ |(\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z})^{-1}|) \mu(dz) < \infty, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\log^+(x) := \max\{0, \log(x)\}$ for $x > 0$ and \mathbb{E} is the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P} . Then there are $r \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ deterministic real numbers

$$\lambda_r < \cdots < \lambda_1$$

and for $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. (ω, z) , a flag of subspaces

$$\{0\} =: F_{r+1} \subsetneq F_r(\omega, z) \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq F_2(\omega, z) \subsetneq F_1 := \mathbb{R}^d$$

such that

$$\lambda_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n v|, \quad v \in F_i(\omega, z) \setminus F_{i+1}(\omega, z).$$

Moreover, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, the mapping $(\omega, z) \mapsto F_i(\omega, z)$ is measurable and $\dim F_i(\omega, z)$ is constant for $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. (ω, z) .

The numbers λ_i are called *Lyapunov exponents* and

$$m_i := \dim F_i(\boldsymbol{\omega}, z) - \dim F_{i+1}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, z)$$

are their *multiplicities*. In the proof of Theorem 2.1 it is shown that the Lyapunov exponents λ_i are among the values obtained by

$$\chi_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sigma_i(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n),$$

where $\sigma_i(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n)$ is the i -th singular value of the matrix $\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n$. The existence of the limit and the fact that it is constant for $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. $(\boldsymbol{\omega}, z)$ is derived from Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem (see [Kin73]). The multiplicities m_i satisfy the relation

$$m_i = \# \{1 \leq j \leq d : \chi_j = \lambda_i\}.$$

From the fact that $\sigma_1(A) = |A|$ and $\sigma_d(A) = |A^{-1}|^{-1}$ for any $A \in \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n| =: \lambda_+, \\ \lambda_r &= - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n)^{-1}| =: \lambda_-. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, as $|\det(A)| = \prod_{i=1}^d \sigma_i(A)$, we have

$$\lambda_\Sigma := \sum_{i=1}^r m_i \lambda_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\det(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n)|.$$

Thus, $\lambda_\Sigma = 0$ if $\det(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n) = 1$. We arrive at the following corollary of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.2. *If, additionally to the conditions of Theorem 2.1, we assume that the generator \mathcal{A} takes values in $\text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, then $\lambda_\Sigma = 0$.*

Recall that P^{d-1} is the real projective space of \mathbb{R}^d , and $\mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ is the set of Borel probability measures on P^{d-1} endowed with the weak convergence topology and the associated Borel σ -algebra. Given a set $D \in \mathcal{B}(Z)$, we shall say that $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in D} \subset \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ is a measurable family if the mapping $z \mapsto \nu_z$ is measurable from D to $\mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$. A family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in D} \subset \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ is said to be weakly continuous if the mapping $z \mapsto \nu_z$ is continuous from D to $\mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$.

The next theorem is Furstenberg's criterion originally established in [Fur63] in a particular case of i.i.d. matrices. The version presented here follows from Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 in [Led86].

Theorem 2.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.1 and the assumption that $\lambda_+ = \lambda_-$, there is a measurable family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu} \subset \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ such that*

$$(\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n)_* \nu_z = \nu_{\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^n z} \tag{2.4}$$

for any $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. $(\boldsymbol{\omega}, z)$.

Note that the family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ is deterministic, which makes the invariance relation (2.4) a strong rigidity property for the dynamical system. According to Furstenberg’s criterion and Corollary 2.2, this rigidity is incompatible with the chaoticity (i.e., the positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent λ_+) in the case when \mathcal{A} takes values in $\text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$.

Based only on the measurability information available in Theorem 2.3 it is not clear how to rule out the possibility of the existence of a family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ satisfying (2.4). Under the additional assumption that the stationary measure μ is mixing, one can choose the family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ to be weakly continuous. Then, the relation (2.4) becomes impossible if the support of the law of $(\varphi_\omega^n, \mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)$ is rich enough. The following improvement of Furstenberg’s criterion will play an important role in our proofs; it is a version of results established in Section 4 of [Bou88] and Proposition 2.10 in [BCZG23].

Theorem 2.4. *Additionally to the conditions of Theorem 2.1, assume that μ is a mixing stationary measure for Φ . If $\lambda_+ = \lambda_-$, then there is a weakly continuous family $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu} \subset \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ such that the relation (2.4) holds for any $n \geq 1$, any $z \in \text{supp } \mu$, and \mathbf{P} -a.e. ω .*

While the general strategy of the proof of this theorem aligns with that of [Bou88] and [BCZG23], there is an important difference: in our case, we assume that the mixing holds with respect to the dual-Lipschitz metric, whereas in the two references the mixing is required in total variation. Let us emphasize that the mixing in the dual-Lipschitz metric is essential for our analysis in the forthcoming sections, as it remains unknown whether the Navier–Stokes system is mixing in total variation under degenerate noises. A detailed proof of Theorem 2.4 is given in Section 7.1.

3 Abstract result

This section aims to establish a criterion for positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent for random dynamical systems. This is achieved by developing the sufficient conditions for ergodicity obtained in [KNS20a, KNS20b] and building upon the results presented in the previous section.

3.1 Formulation

Given any integer $d \geq 2$ and separable Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H} and E , let us denote by \mathcal{H} the product space¹ $\mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{T}^d$, and assume that the mappings

$$\begin{aligned} S &: \mathcal{H} \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, & (z, \eta) &\mapsto S(z, \eta), \\ \mathcal{A} &: \mathcal{H} \times E \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}), & (z, \eta) &\mapsto \mathcal{A}_{\eta, z} \end{aligned}$$

are continuous. For any $z_0 = z \in \mathcal{H}$, let us consider random sequences $\{z_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ and $\{\mathcal{A}_z^n\} \subset \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$z_n = S(z_{n-1}, \eta_n), \quad n \geq 1, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_z^n = \mathcal{A}_{\eta_n, z_{n-1}} \circ \mathcal{A}_z^{n-1}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_z^0 = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ and $\{\eta_n\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables in E defined on a probability space $(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$. Let us assume that the common law ℓ of the random variables $\{\eta_n\}$ has compact support denoted by \mathcal{K} , and that there is a compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{H}$ that is invariant for the system (3.1), i.e., $S(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{X}$. In what follows, we consider the restriction of the system (3.1) to \mathcal{X} . Under the above conditions, $\{z_n\}$ is a discrete-time Markov process in \mathcal{X} with transition function

$$P_n(z, \Gamma) := \mathbb{P}_0\{z_n \in \Gamma\}, \quad z \in \mathcal{X}, \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$$

and corresponding Markov semigroups \mathfrak{P}_n and \mathfrak{P}_n^* . For any $z \in \mathcal{H}$ and sequence $\{\zeta_n\} \subset E$, we set

$$S_n(z; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) := z_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_z^n(z; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) := \mathcal{A}_z^n,$$

where z_n and \mathcal{A}_z^n are defined recursively by (3.1) and (3.2) with $z_0 = z$, $\mathcal{A}_z^0 = \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}$, and $\eta_k = \zeta_k$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. We assume that the following four hypotheses are satisfied.

(H₁) Regularity. *There exists a Hilbert space \mathcal{V} compactly embedded into \mathcal{H} such that the mapping S is twice continuously differentiable from $\mathcal{H} \times E$ to $\mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{T}^d$ with bounded derivatives on bounded subsets of $\mathcal{H} \times E$.*

(H₂) Approximate controllability to a point. *There is a point $\hat{z} \in \mathcal{X}$ with the following property: for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an integer $m \geq 1$ such that, for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and suitable controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(S_m(z; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m), \hat{z}) < \varepsilon.$$

¹We choose the second component to be the torus \mathbb{T}^d to make the presentation easier; this choice suffices for our purposes. Abusing the notation, we will identify the tangent spaces $T_y \mathbb{T}^d$ with \mathbb{R}^d and ignore the dependence on y . The results of this section extend without difficulties to the case when \mathbb{T}^d is replaced by a general smooth compact Riemannian manifold without boundary.

For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$, let \mathcal{K}^z be the collection of all $\eta \in \mathcal{K}$ for which the derivative

$$(D_\eta S)(z, \eta) : E \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}^d =: \mathcal{T}$$

has a dense image in \mathcal{T} . It is easy to see that \mathcal{K}^z is a Borel subset of E (see Section 1.1 in [KNS20a] for the details).

(H₃) Approximate controllability of the linearization. *The set \mathcal{K}^z has full ℓ -measure for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$.*

(H₄) Decomposability of the noise. *There exists an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_j\}$ in E such that the sequence $\{\eta_k\}$ can be represented in the form*

$$\eta_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j \xi_{jk} \varphi_j,$$

where $\{b_j\}$ are real numbers with $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_j^2 < \infty$ and $\{\xi_{jk}\}$ are independent random variables with Lipschitz-continuous densities ρ_j with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .

The following result is a version of Theorem 1.1 in [KNS20a] and Theorem 1.1 in [KNS20b]. The key difference is that we no longer assume the analyticity of the mapping $\eta \mapsto S(z, \eta)$. See also Theorem 3.1 in [JNPS21], where analyticity is not required, instead, it is assumed that $\mathcal{K}^z = \mathcal{K}$ for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$; the latter condition is satisfied when the noise is non-degenerate.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Hypotheses (H₁)–(H₄) are satisfied. Then the Markov process $\{z_n\}$ has a unique stationary measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, and there is a sequence $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

$$\|\mathfrak{P}_n^* \lambda - \mu\|_L^* \leq \gamma_n \tag{3.3}$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, where $\|\cdot\|_L^*$ is the dual-Lipschitz metric on \mathcal{X} .

The proof of this theorem is discussed in Section 7.2. It is easy to see that the support of the stationary measure μ is invariant for the system (3.1), i.e., $S(\text{supp } \mu \times \mathcal{K}) \subset \text{supp } \mu$. In what follows, we will assume that $\mathcal{X} = \text{supp } \mu$.

To simplify notation, we write $R_n((z, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$ instead of the couple $(S_n(z; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n), \mathcal{A}^n(z; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n))$ and introduce the space $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{H} \times \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. We will assume that the following controllability hypothesis is satisfied for R_n .

(H₅) Approximate controllability of the extended system. *There is an open set $U \subset \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and points $z_0, z^\sharp \in \mathcal{X}$ with the following property: for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any target matrix $A^\sharp \in U$, there is an integer $m \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \left(R_m((z_0, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m), (z^\sharp, A^\sharp) \right) < \varepsilon.$$

The main result of this section is the following theorem, which provides a sufficient condition for positivity of the top Lyapunov exponent of the linear cocycle (3.2) over the RDS (3.1). Its proof is given in the next subsection.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that Hypotheses (H₁)–(H₅) are satisfied. Then there exists a deterministic constant $\lambda_+ > 0$ such that*

$$\lambda_+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{A}_z^n| \quad \text{for } \mathbb{P}_0 \times \mu\text{-a.e. } (\omega, z). \quad (3.4)$$

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is divided into two steps: first, we show that the limit λ_+ in (3.4) exists and is constant for $\mathbb{P}_0 \times \mu$ -a.e. (ω, z) , then we prove that $\lambda_+ > 0$. To achieve this, we represent the systems (3.1) and (3.2) in the form discussed in Section 2 and apply the MET together with the improved version of Furstenberg's criterion.

Step 1: The system (3.1) defines an RDS of the form discussed in Section 2 by choosing

- the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) := (\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}), \ell)$,
- the compact metric space $Z := \mathcal{X}$,
- the mapping $\varphi : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow Z$, $(\omega, z) \mapsto S(z, \omega) =: \varphi_\omega(z)$ and its compositions φ_ω^n defined by (2.1),
- the product space $(\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}) := (\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}), \ell)^\mathbb{N}$ with elements written as $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$ and the shift $\theta\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots)$,
- the mapping $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and its compositions $\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n$ defined by (2.2).

By Theorem 3.1, this RDS has a unique stationary measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ which is mixing in the sense that (3.3) holds. Furthermore, the integrability condition (2.3) is satisfied as $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is continuous and \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{K} are compact. Thus, by Theorem 2.1, there exists a deterministic constant λ_+ such that

$$\lambda_+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}, z}^n| \quad \text{for } \mathbf{P} \times \mu\text{-a.e. } (\boldsymbol{\omega}, z).$$

This clearly implies (3.4). As \mathcal{A} is $\text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ -valued, we have $\lambda_+ \geq 0$.

Step 2. Arguing by contradiction, let us assume that $\lambda_+ = 0$. From Corollary 2.2 it follows that $\lambda_+ = \lambda_- = 0$, which, combined with Theorem 2.4, implies the existence of a family of weakly continuous measures $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ satisfying the equality (2.4) for any $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. $(\boldsymbol{\omega}, z)$.

Let the open set $U \subset \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and the points $z_0, z^\sharp \in \mathcal{X}$ be as in Hypothesis (H₅). For any given measures $\nu, \nu' \in \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$, the set

$$\{A \in \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}) : A_*\nu = \nu'\}$$

has an empty interior in $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, there exists $A^\sharp \in U$ such that

$$(A^\sharp)_*\nu_{z_0} \neq \nu_{z^\sharp};$$

let us denote

$$\|(A^\sharp)_*\nu_{z_0} - \nu_{z^\sharp}\|_L^* =: \varepsilon > 0, \quad (3.5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_L^*$ is the dual-Lipschitz metric on $\mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$. By Theorem 2.4, we have the continuity of the maps $z \mapsto \nu_z$, $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$ and $(z, A) \mapsto A_*\nu_z$, $\mathcal{X} \times \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$. Hence, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|\nu_{\widehat{z}} - \nu_{z^\sharp}\|_L^* + \|(\widehat{A})_*\nu_z - (A^\sharp)_*\nu_{z_0}\|_L^* < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad (3.6)$$

for any $z \in B_{\mathcal{X}}(z_0, \delta)$, $\widehat{z} \in B_{\mathcal{X}}(z^\sharp, \delta)$, and $\widehat{A} \in B_{\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})}(A^\sharp, \delta)$. Now, according to Hypothesis (H₅), there is an integer $m \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$ verifying

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \left(R_m((z_0, \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m), (z^\sharp, A^\sharp) \right) < \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (3.7)$$

For any $\delta' > 0$, let the event $\Gamma_{\delta'} \in \mathcal{F}$ be defined by

$$\Gamma_{\delta'} = \prod_{l=1}^m B_{\mathcal{K}}(\zeta_l, \delta') \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K} \times \dots$$

By the continuity of S and \mathcal{A} , we have

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \left((\varphi_{\omega}^m z, \mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^m), R_m((z_0, \mathrm{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) \right) < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

for any $z \in B_{\mathcal{X}}(z_0, \delta')$ and $\omega \in \Gamma_{\delta'}$ and sufficiently small $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$. Therefore, in view of (3.7),

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}} \left((\varphi_{\omega}^m z, \mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^m), (z^\sharp, A^\sharp) \right) < \delta.$$

Taking into account (3.6), we obtain

$$\|\nu_{\varphi_{\omega}^m z} - \nu_{z^\sharp}\|_L^* + \|(\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^m)_*\nu_z - (A^\sharp)_*\nu_{z_0}\|_L^* \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

This, along with (3.5), yields that

$$\|(\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^m)_*\nu_z - \nu_{z^\sharp}\|_L^* \geq \|(A^\sharp)_*\nu_{z_0} - \nu_{z^\sharp}\|_L^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0,$$

which violates the equality (2.4) on the positive $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -probability set $\Gamma_{\delta'} \times B_{\mathcal{X}}(z_0, \delta')$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

4 Application to the Navier–Stokes system

Here, we present a more general version of the Main Theorem introduced earlier and establish its proof by using the abstract result of the previous section, along with the controllability properties obtained in Sections 5 and 6.

4.1 Formulation

Let us consider the system (1.1), (1.2) driven by a random process η that has independent and stationary increments and takes values in a finite-dimensional subspace \mathcal{E} of V^3 . More precisely, we assume that η is of the form

$$\eta(t, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}_k(t) \eta_k(t - k + 1, x), \quad (4.1)$$

where \mathbb{I}_k is the indicator function of the interval $[k - 1, k)$ and $\{\eta_k\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables in $L^2(J, \mathcal{E})$ with $J := [0, 1]$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$. We denote by $\ell \in \mathcal{P}(L^2(J, \mathcal{E}))$ the common law of the random variables $\{\eta_k\}$ and assume that $\mathcal{K} := \text{supp } \ell$ is compact in $L^2(J, \mathcal{E})$. Under these assumptions, for any initial data $(u_0, x) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{T}^2$, the system (1.1), (1.2) has a unique solution $(u(t), \phi^t)$. The incompressibility condition $\text{div } u = 0$ implies that the Jacobian $D_x \phi^t$ of ϕ^t at any point $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$ belongs to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

The *Lagrangian process* (u_n, y_n) obtained by restricting $(u(t), \phi^t)$ to integer times is Markovian. In what follows, we will study this process within the framework of the previous section by setting $\mathcal{H} := V^3 \times \mathbb{T}^2$ and $E := L^2(J, \mathcal{E})$ and denoting

$$S : \mathcal{H} \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad ((u, x), \eta) \mapsto (u_1, y_1) \quad (4.2)$$

the time-1 shift along the trajectories of the system (1.1), (1.2). We choose V^3 as a phase space for the velocity component since then S is well defined and twice continuously differentiable from $\mathcal{H} \times E$ to $V^4 \times \mathbb{T}^2$ (cf. Hypothesis (H₁)). We have the relations

$$(u_n, y_n) = S((u_{n-1}, y_{n-1}), \eta_n), \quad n \geq 1. \quad (4.3)$$

Let X be the set attainable from the origin by the velocity field, that is, X is the closure in V^3 of the union $\cup_{n \geq 0} X_n$, where

$$X_0 := \{0\}, \quad X_n := S^u(X_{n-1}, \mathcal{K}), \quad n \geq 1$$

with S^u being the u -component of S . It is easy to see that X is compact in V^3 and the set $\mathcal{X} := X \times \mathbb{T}^2$ is compact in \mathcal{H} and invariant under the dynamics, i.e., $S(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{K}) \subset \mathcal{X}$. Below, we consider the restriction of the RDS (4.3) to \mathcal{X} .

To be able to apply Theorem 3.2, we need additional assumptions on the finite-dimensional space \mathcal{E} and the law ℓ . To this end, let us recall the notion of *observable* functions from [KNS20a].

Definition 4.1. Let $T > 0$, and let the finite-dimensional space \mathcal{E} be endowed with an inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathcal{E}}$ and an orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}}$. A function $\zeta \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{E})$ is said to be *Lipschitz-observable* if for any Lipschitz-continuous functions $a_j : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \mathcal{I}$ and any continuous function $b : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the equality

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} a_j(t) (\zeta(t), e_j)_{\mathcal{E}} + b(t) = 0 \text{ in } L^2([0, T], \mathbb{R})$$

implies that $a_j \equiv b \equiv 0$ on $[0, T]$ for $j \in \mathcal{I}$.

It is easy to see that the observability property does not depend on the choice of the basis $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{I}}$ (see Remark 4.2 in [KNS20a]). In what follows, we denote by $\{e_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_*^2}$ the orthonormal basis in V^3 obtained by normalizing the functions

$$E_j(x) := j^\perp \begin{cases} \cos\langle j, x \rangle & \text{for } j_1 > 0 \text{ or } j_1 = 0, j_2 > 0, \\ \sin\langle j, x \rangle & \text{for } j_1 < 0 \text{ or } j_1 = 0, j_2 < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $j^\perp = (-j_2, j_1)$, and assume that the space \mathcal{E} is of the particular form

$$\mathcal{E} := \text{span}\{E_j : j \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

with $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{Z}_*^2$ being given by

$$\mathcal{I} := \{j = (j_1, j_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_*^2 : |j_i| \leq 1, i = 1, 2\}. \quad (4.4)$$

The following hypothesis gathers all the requirements on the sequence $\{\eta_k\}$.

(N) *The random variables $\{\eta_k\}$ are of the form*

$$\eta_k(t, x) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l \xi_{jl}^k \psi_l(t) e_j(x),$$

where

- $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{Z}_*^2$ is the set defined by (4.4),
- $\{b_l\}$ are non-zero numbers such that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l^2 < \infty$,
- $\{\xi_{jl}^k\}$ are independent scalar random variables such that $|\xi_{jl}^k| \leq 1$ a.s. and

$$\mathcal{D}(\xi_{jl}^k) = \rho_{jl}(r) dr$$

with Lipschitz-continuous density ρ_{jl} such that $\rho_{jl}(0) > 0$,

- $\{\psi_l\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $L^2(J, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi_1(t) = 1$, $t \in J$.

Moreover, there is $T \in (0, 1)$ such that the restrictions of $\{\eta_k\}$ to $[0, T]$ are observable a.s. in the sense of Definition 4.1.

In particular, this hypothesis guarantees that the support \mathcal{K} of the law ℓ of random variables $\{\eta_k\}$ is compact in V^3 and $0 \in \mathcal{K}$.

The following is a more general version of the Main Theorem formulated in the Introduction.

Theorem 4.2. *Under Hypothesis (N), the Lagrangian process (u_n, y_n) has a unique stationary measure $\mu \times \text{Leb} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ which is mixing and its support is equal to \mathcal{X} . Moreover, there exists a deterministic constant $\lambda_+ > 0$ such that the following limit holds:*

$$\lambda_+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |D_x \phi^n|$$

for $\mu \times \text{Leb} \times \mathbb{P}_0$ -a.e. $(u, x, \omega) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Omega_0$.

The Haar coloured noise mentioned in the Introduction satisfies Hypothesis (N). Indeed, the observability is shown in Section 5.2 in [KNS20a], and the remaining properties follow directly from the construction. Consequently, the Main Theorem is a particular case of Theorem 4.2.

As noted in the Introduction, this result is the first to establish Lagrangian chaos for the Navier–Stokes system with a degenerate noise. In the case of a non-degenerate white-in-time noise the problem has been considered in [BBPS22c]. The ergodicity of the Lagrangian process in the case of a non-degenerate bounded noise has been shown in [JNPS21].

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Theorem 4.2 is established by applying Theorem 3.2 within the framework described in the previous subsection by considering the *derivative cocycle* generated by the mapping

$$\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}), \quad (u, x, \eta) \mapsto \mathcal{A}_{\eta, u, x} := D_x \phi^1.$$

Thus, it is necessary to check the validity of Hypotheses (H₁)–(H₅). The regularity property (H₁) with $\mathcal{H} = V^3$ and $\mathcal{V} = V^4$ follows from the parabolic regularization of the Navier–Stokes system and the smooth dependence of the solution on the right-hand side and the initial data (e.g., see [BV92]). The approximate controllability of the nonlinear system to a point (H₂) is verified according to Corollary 5.6, and the approximate controllability of the linearized system (H₃) is checked in Theorem 6.1. The decomposability property (H₄) follows immediately from Hypothesis (N). Therefore, the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, so $\mu \times \text{Leb}$ is a mixing stationary measure for the Lagrangian process (u_n, y_n) . Corollary 5.6 implies that $\text{supp}(\mu \times \text{Leb}) = \mathcal{X}$. Finally, the approximate controllability of the extended system (H₅) is verified in Theorem 5.1. Thus, applying Theorem 3.2, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.2.

5 Controllability of the nonlinear Lagrangian flow

In what follows, we use the notation of the previous sections and assume that the conditions of Theorem 4.2 are satisfied. The aim of this section is to check the validity of Hypotheses (H₂) and (H₅) for the Lagrangian process. To this end, we consider the controllability of the nonlinear system with Navier–Stokes equations written in the projected form:

$$\partial_t u + Lu + B(u) = \eta(t, x), \quad (5.1)$$

$$\dot{y}(t) = u(t, y(t)), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\dot{A}(t) = D_x u(t, y(t))A(t), \quad (5.3)$$

supplemented with the initial condition

$$u(0) = u_0, \quad y(0) = y_0, \quad A(0) = \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \quad (5.4)$$

Here $L := -\nu\Delta$ is the Stokes operator, $B(u) := \Pi((u, \nabla)u)$ is the nonlinear term, and $\Pi : L^2(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}^2) \rightarrow H$ is the Leray projection. For any $(u_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\eta \in L^2([0, T], H)$, the system (5.1)–(5.4) has a unique solution (u, y, A) in $C([0, T], \widehat{\mathcal{H}})$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{H} \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. The following result implies that Hypothesis (H₅) is verified.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, any initial data $(u_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{X}$, and any target $(u^\sharp, y^\sharp, A^\sharp) \in \mathcal{X} \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, there is $m \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}\left(R_m((u_0, y_0, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m), (u^\sharp, y^\sharp, A^\sharp)\right) < \varepsilon. \quad (5.5)$$

As a preparation for the proof of this theorem, we establish two propositions. The first one shows that it is possible to control exactly the particle position $y(t)$ while keeping the velocity $u(t)$ and the matrix $A(t)$ in the same place.

Proposition 5.2. *There is an integer $m \geq 1$ with the following property: for any $y_0, y^\sharp \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and $A_0 \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, there are controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$R_m((0, y_0, A_0); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) = (0, y^\sharp, A_0).$$

Proof. Using a simple compactness argument and the fact that $u \equiv 0$ is a solution of the Navier–Stokes system (5.1), we see that it suffices to prove the following local version of the result: there is a number $\kappa > 0$ such that, for any $y_0, y^\sharp \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $|y_0 - y^\sharp| < \kappa$, any $A_0 \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, and appropriate controls $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, we have

$$S_2((0, y_0); \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (0, y^\sharp) \quad \text{and} \quad A(t) \equiv A_0, \quad t \in [0, 2].$$

First, let us show that we can shift the y -component horizontally; that is, let us take sufficiently close points $y_0, \hat{y} \in \mathbb{T}^2$ of the form $y_0 = (y_{01}, y_{02})$ and $\hat{y} = (y_1^\sharp, y_{02})$ and construct $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $S((0, y_0); \zeta_1) = (0, \hat{y})$. Indeed,

since $\{\psi_l\}_{l \geq 1}$ is an orthonormal basis in $L^2(J, \mathbb{R})$ with $\psi_1 = 1$ almost surely (see Hypothesis (N)), we have that $\int_0^1 \psi_l(s) ds = 0$ for any $l \geq 2$, and there is $j \geq 2$ such that $\int_0^1 e^{\nu s} \psi_j(s) ds \neq 0$, where $\nu > 0$ is the viscosity in (5.1). Then, the function g defined by

$$g(t) := \nu a_1 + a_j \psi_j(t), \quad t \in J \quad (5.6)$$

with coefficients a_1 and a_j given by

$$a_1 := y_1^\sharp - y_{01} \quad \text{and} \quad a_j := \frac{a_1(1 - e^\nu)}{\int_0^1 e^{\nu s} \psi_j(s) ds} \quad (5.7)$$

satisfies the relations

$$\int_0^1 g(s) ds = \nu a_1, \quad \int_0^1 e^{\nu s} g(s) ds = 0.$$

It follows that the function

$$f(t) := \int_0^t e^{-\nu(t-s)} g(s) ds, \quad t \in J \quad (5.8)$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) = f(1) = 0, \quad \int_0^1 f(s) ds = a_1, \\ f'(t) + \nu f(t) = g(t), \quad t \in J. \end{aligned}$$

Based on this, it is easy to see that for the shear flow defined by

$$u(t, x) := f(t) \begin{pmatrix} \cos(x_2 - y_{02}) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (t, x) \in J \times \mathbb{T}^2$$

the following properties hold:

- (a) $u(0) = u(1) = 0$,
- (b) the solution $y(t) = (y_1(t), y_2(t))$ of

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) = u(t, y(t)), \\ y(0) = y_0 \end{cases}$$

satisfies $y_1(1) = y_1^\sharp$ and $y_2(t) = y_{02}$, $t \in [0, 1]$,

- (c) $u(t, x)$ is a solution of the Navier–Stokes system (5.1) with control ζ_1 given explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(t, x) &= (f'(t) + \nu f(t)) \cos y_{02} \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + (f'(t) + \nu f(t)) \sin y_{02} \begin{pmatrix} \sin x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= g(t) \cos y_{02} \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + g(t) \sin y_{02} \begin{pmatrix} \sin x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us check that ζ_1 belongs to \mathcal{K} provided that $|y_0 - \hat{y}| < \kappa \ll 1$. Indeed, if κ is sufficiently small, then also a_1 and a_j are small enough (cf. (5.7)). Taking into account the assumption that $\rho_{lj}(0) > 0$ (see Hypothesis (N)), we derive that $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{K}$.

To see that the control ζ_1 does not affect the matrix flow, we note that the above-defined shear flow u satisfies

$$D_x u(t, x) = f(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sin(x_2 - y_{02}) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Evaluating along the Lagrangian flow $y(t)$ appearing in property (b), we derive

$$\dot{A}(t) = D_x u(t, y(t)) = 0,$$

which yields that $A(t) = A_0$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.

In a similar way, we can shift the y -component vertically; that is, for sufficiently close points $\hat{y}, y^\sharp \in \mathbb{T}^2$ of the form $\hat{y} := (y_1^\sharp, y_{02})$ and $y^\sharp := (y_1^\sharp, y_2^\sharp)$, we choose g as in (5.6) with $a_1 := y_2^\sharp - y_{02}$ in (5.7). Then, we define f as in (5.8) and take the shear flow

$$u(t, x) = f(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \cos(x_1 - y_1^\sharp) \end{pmatrix}.$$

As above, the following properties are satisfied:

(a') $u(0) = u(1) = 0$;

(b') the solution $y(t) = (y_1(t), y_2(t))$ of

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) = u(t, y(t)), \\ y(0) = \hat{y} \end{cases}$$

verifies $y_1(t) = y_1^\sharp$, $t \in J$ and $y_2(1) = y_2^\sharp$;

(c') $u(t, x)$ is a solution of (5.1) with control given by

$$\zeta_2(t, x) = g(t) \cos y_1^\sharp \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \cos x_1 \end{pmatrix} + g(t) \sin y_1^\sharp \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sin x_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For κ small enough, we have $\zeta_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, and the corresponding matrix flow satisfies $A(t) = A_0$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Hence, combining the horizontal and vertical shifts, we conclude that, for any $y_0, y^\sharp \in \mathbb{T}^2$ with $|y_0 - y^\sharp| < \kappa \ll 1$, we have $S_2((0, y_0); \zeta_1, \zeta_2) = (0, y^\sharp)$. This completes the proof. \square

The second proposition shows that it is possible to control exactly the matrix $A(t)$, while keeping the velocity $u(t)$ and the particle position $y(t)$ in the same place.

Proposition 5.3. *For any matrices $A_0, A^\sharp \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, there is an integer $m \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$R_m((0, \tilde{y}, A_0); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) = (0, \tilde{y}, A^\sharp), \quad (5.9)$$

where $\tilde{y} := (\pi/2, \pi/2) \in \mathbb{T}^2$.

The proof of this proposition follows from the below two lemmas. Let us recall that the transvection or shear matrices are of the form

$$T_{12}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_{21}(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \beta & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R},$$

and let $\mathrm{TV}_2(\mathbb{R})$ be the collection of all such matrices:

$$\mathrm{TV}_2(\mathbb{R}) := \{T_{12}(\alpha), T_{21}(\beta), \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The following lemma is straightforward to verify.

Lemma 5.4. *Transvection matrices generate the special group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. More precisely, for any $A \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, there are matrices $T_1, \dots, T_4 \in \mathrm{TV}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $A = T_1 \circ \dots \circ T_4$.*

Lemma 5.5. *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A_0 \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, there is an integer $m_\alpha \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m_\alpha} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that*

$$R_{m_\alpha}((0, \tilde{y}, A_0); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m_\alpha}) = (0, \tilde{y}, T_{12}(\alpha)A_0), \quad (5.10)$$

where $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{T}^2$ is as in Proposition 5.3. Similarly, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, there is an integer $m_\beta \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m_\beta} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$R_{m_\beta}((0, \tilde{y}, A_0); \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{m_\beta}) = (0, \tilde{y}, T_{21}(\beta)A_0). \quad (5.11)$$

Proof. We first prove that for sufficiently large $m_\alpha \geq 1$, there is $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$R_1((0, \tilde{y}, A_0); \zeta_1) = (0, \tilde{y}, T_{12}(\alpha/m_\alpha)A_0).$$

Indeed, similar to the proof of Proposition 5.2, we choose $g(t)$ as in (5.6) with $a_1 = -\alpha/m_\alpha$ in (5.7). We again define f as in (5.8) and take the shear flow

$$u(t, x) = f(t) \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which verifies the following properties:

- (a) $u(0) = u(1) = 0$,
- (b) the solution $y(t) = (y_1(t), y_2(t))$ of

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) = u(t, y(t)), \\ y(0) = \tilde{y} \end{cases}$$

satisfies $y(t) = \tilde{y}$, $t \in J$,

(c) $u(t, x)$ is a solution of (5.1) with control

$$\zeta_1(t, x) := (f'(t) + \nu f(t)) \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = g(t) \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.12)$$

Choosing m_α sufficiently large, we make the numbers a_1 and a_j in (5.7) small enough to guarantee that $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{K}$. Now let us consider the corresponding matrix process

$$\begin{cases} \dot{A}(t) = D_x u(t, y(t))A(t), \\ A(0) = A_0. \end{cases}$$

By direct computation, we see that

$$A(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha/m_\alpha \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} A_0 = T_{12}(\alpha/m_\alpha)A_0.$$

Thus, we proved the exact controllability of the matrix process $A(t)$ from A_0 to $T_{12}(\alpha/m_\alpha)A_0$, while keeping $u(t)$ and $y(t)$ unchanged. Note that the choice of m_α does not depend on A_0 .

Now to prove (5.10), let us introduce the points $\Upsilon_k = (0, \tilde{y}, T_{12}(k\alpha/m_\alpha)A_0)$ with $k = 1, \dots, m_\alpha$. Applying the above exact controllability property, we find controls $\zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{m_\alpha} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $R_1(\Upsilon_{k-1}; \zeta_k) = \Upsilon_k$ for $2 \leq k \leq m_\alpha$ (actually, we can take ζ_k , $k = 2, \dots, m_\alpha$ equal to ζ_1 in (5.12)). This proves (5.10).

In a similar way, for sufficiently large $m_\beta \geq 1$, we use the shear flow

$$u(t, x) = f(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \cos x_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with f defined by (5.8) and g defined by (5.6) with $a_1 = -\beta/m_\beta$ to control from $(0, \tilde{y}, A_0)$ to $(0, \tilde{y}, T_{21}(\beta/m_\beta)A_0)$. In this case, the control generated by this shear flow is

$$\zeta_1(t, x) = g(t) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \cos x_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which belongs to \mathcal{K} for large enough m_β . Moreover, repeating the above argument, we can find controls $\zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{m_\beta} \in \mathcal{K}$ that steer the system from $(0, \tilde{y}, T_{21}(\beta/m_\beta)A_0)$ to $(0, \tilde{y}, T_{21}(\beta))$. This completes the proof of (5.11). \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 5.3 and Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.3. From Lemma 5.4 it follows that there are transvection matrices T_1, \dots, T_4 such that $A^\sharp = T_4 \circ \dots \circ T_1 \circ A_0$. Let us set

$$B_0 := A_0, \quad B_j := T_j \circ \dots \circ T_1 \circ A_0, \quad j = 1, \dots, 4.$$

By Lemma 5.5, for any $j = 1, \dots, 4$, there is an integer $m_j \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1^j, \dots, \zeta_{m_j}^j$ steering the system from $(0, \tilde{y}, B_{j-1})$ to $(0, \tilde{y}, B_j)$. Thus, taking $m = \sum_{j=1}^4 m_j$ and

$$(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) = (\zeta_1^1, \dots, \zeta_{m_1}^1, \dots, \zeta_1^4, \dots, \zeta_{m_4}^4),$$

we obtain the required result (5.9). \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof is divided into three steps.

Step 1. By the dissipativity of the Navier–Stokes system, the velocity field $u(t)$ of the unforced equation converges to zero in V^3 . As a result, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, sufficiently large $m_1 \geq 1$, and any initial state $(u_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{X}$, we have

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}(R_{m_1}((u_0, y_0, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}); 0, \dots, 0), (0, y_1, A_1)) < \varepsilon_1$$

for some $y_1 \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and $A_1 \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Step 2. By the definition of the set \mathcal{X} , for any $\varepsilon_3 > 0$, there is an integer $m_3 \geq 1$ such that, for any target $(u^\sharp, y^\sharp, A^\sharp) \in \mathcal{X} \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, we can find controls $\zeta_1^3, \dots, \zeta_{m_3}^3 \in \mathcal{K}$ verifying

$$d_{\widehat{\mathcal{H}}}(R_{m_3}((0, y_2, A_2); \zeta_1^3, \dots, \zeta_{m_3}^3), (u^\sharp, y^\sharp, A^\sharp)) < \varepsilon_3$$

for some $y_2 \in \mathbb{T}^2$ and $A_2 \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Step 3. By Propositions 5.2 and 5.3, for the initial state $(0, y_1, A_1)$ obtained in Step 1 and the target $(0, y_2, A_2)$ obtained in Step 2, there exists an integer $m_2 \geq 1$ and controls $\zeta_1^2, \dots, \zeta_{m_2}^2 \in \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$R_{m_2}((0, y_1, A_1); \zeta_1^2, \dots, \zeta_{m_2}^2) = (0, y_2, A_2).$$

Thus, setting $m = m_1 + m_2 + m_3$, and using the continuity of R_m , we see that (5.5) holds with the controls

$$(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m) = (0, \dots, 0, \zeta_1^2, \dots, \zeta_{m_2}^2, \zeta_1^3, \dots, \zeta_{m_3}^3).$$

□

Combining Proposition 5.2 with Steps 1 and 2 of the proof of Theorem 5.1, we obtain the following stronger version of Hypothesis (H₂).

Corollary 5.6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an integer $m \geq 1$ such that, for any $z_0, z^\sharp \in \mathcal{X}$ and appropriate controls $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m \in \mathcal{K}$, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(S_m(z_0; \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_m), z^\sharp) < \varepsilon.$$

6 Controllability of the linearized Lagrangian flow

In the present section, we consider the linearized system

$$\partial_t v + Lv + Q(u)v = \zeta, \quad v(0) = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = (D_x u)(t, y(t))z(t) + v(t, y(t)), \quad z(0) = 0, \quad (6.2)$$

where

$$Q(u)v := \Pi(\langle u, \nabla \rangle v + \langle v, \nabla \rangle u), \quad (6.3)$$

$\zeta \in E$, and $(u(t), y(t))$ is a solution of the nonlinear system (5.1), (5.2) with initial data $(u(0), y(0)) = z \in \mathcal{X}$ and force $\eta \in E$. For any $T \in (0, 1]$, let us consider the linear mapping

$$A_T(z, \eta) : E \rightarrow \mathcal{T} := V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \zeta \mapsto (v(T), z(T)),$$

and denote $A := A_1$. Notice that $A(z, \eta) = D_\eta S(z, \eta)$, where S is defined by (4.2). Recall that ℓ stands for the law of the random variables $\{\eta_k\}$ in (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis (N). The following theorem is the main result of this section. It shows that Hypothesis (H₃) is verified.

Theorem 6.1. *For any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and ℓ -a.e. $\eta \in E$, the image of $A(z, \eta)$ is dense in \mathcal{T} .*

This theorem is proved by extending some ideas from Section 4 in [KNS20a]. As the current situation is more degenerate (the control ζ acts directly only on the velocity equation), the verification of the controllability of the linearized system (6.1), (6.2) is more subtle.

Let $T \in (0, 1)$ be the time in the observability part of Hypothesis (N). To prove Theorem 6.1, we will first show that the image of the mapping $A_T(z, \eta)$ is dense in the space $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ by combining the observability assumption with a saturation property of the space \mathcal{E} . Then, we will conclude the proof of Theorem 6.1 by using the regularizing property of the linearized system (6.1), (6.2) on the time interval $[T, 1]$ together with the density in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ of the attainable set of the homogeneous problem.

6.1 Forward and backward flows

Let us consider the following homogeneous version of system (6.1), (6.2) with $\zeta = 0$ and initial data $(v_0, z_0) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\partial_t v + Lv + Q(u)v = 0, \quad v(s) = v_0, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) - (D_x u)(t, y(t))z(t) - v(t, y(t)) = 0, \quad z(s) = z_0. \quad (6.5)$$

Let $R(t, s) : H \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow H \times \mathbb{R}^2$, $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ be the two-parameter processes solving this system. Additionally, let us introduce the following backward system:

$$\partial_t w - Lw - Q^*(u)w + F(p, y) = 0, \quad w(1) = w_0, \quad (6.6)$$

$$\dot{p}(t) + (D_x u)^T(t, y(t))p(t) = 0, \quad p(1) = p_0, \quad (6.7)$$

where $Q^*(u)$ is the (formal) H -adjoint of $Q(u)$ given by

$$Q^*(u)w = -\Pi(\langle u, \nabla \rangle w + (\nabla \otimes w)u)$$

with $\nabla \otimes w$ being the 2×2 matrix with entries $\partial_i w_j$, $(D_x u)^T(t, y(t))$ is the transpose matrix of $(D_x u)(t, y(t))$, and $F(p, y)$ is defined by duality as follows. For any fixed $\sigma \in (1, 3/2)$ and any given $(p, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{T}^2$, we define $F(p, y)$ to be the unique element of $V^{-\sigma}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ such that

$$V^\sigma \langle \xi, F(p, y) \rangle_{V^{-\sigma}} = \langle \xi(y), p \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} \quad \text{for any } \xi \in V^\sigma. \quad (6.8)$$

The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the Sobolev embedding $V^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2) \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{T}^2)$ imply that

$$|\langle \xi(y), p \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2}| \leq \|\xi(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|p\|_{\mathbb{R}^2} \leq \|\xi\|_{V^\sigma} \|p\|_{\mathbb{R}^2},$$

which shows that $F(p, y) \in V^{-\sigma}$ is well defined and $\|F(p, y)\|_{V^{-\sigma}} \leq \|p\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}$. Consequently, for any $y \in C(J, \mathbb{T}^2)$ and $p \in C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)$, we have

$$\|F(p(\cdot), y(\cdot))\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})} \leq \|p\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)}. \quad (6.9)$$

The following lemma establishes the well-posedness of the system (6.6), (6.7); its proof is postponed to the Appendix.

Lemma 6.2. *For any $(w_0, p_0) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists a unique solution $(w, p) \in C(J, H \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ to the backward system (6.6), (6.7). Moreover,*

$$\|w\|_{C(J, H)} + \|p\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C(\|w_0\|_H + \|p_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}).$$

Let $R(t, s)^*$ be the dual operator of $R(t, s)$ in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$. The next lemma shows that the backward system (6.6), (6.7) is actually the dual of the forward system (6.4), (6.5).

Lemma 6.3. *For any $f_0 := (w_0, p_0) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2$, we have that*

$$(w(t), p(t)) = R(1, t)^* f_0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1$$

is the solution of the backward system (6.6), (6.7).

Proof. Let $J(t, \tau) : H \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow H \times \mathbb{R}^2$, $0 \leq \tau \leq t \leq 1$ be the resolving operator for the backward system (6.6), (6.7) with final condition at time t : $w(t) = w_0$, $p(t) = p_0$. By virtue of Lemma 6.2, we have that $J(t, \tau)$ is a bounded operator in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and

$$\partial_\tau J(t, \tau) \in C([0, t], H^{-2} \times \mathbb{R}^2). \quad (6.10)$$

Let us show that, for any $h, g \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ and $0 \leq s \leq \tau \leq t \leq 1$, the quantity

$$\langle R(\tau, s)h, J(t, \tau)g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2}$$

is independent of τ . Once this is proved, evaluating at $\tau = s$ and $\tau = t$, we get

$$\langle h, J(t, s)g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} = \langle R(t, s)h, g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2},$$

which yields $J(t, s) = R(t, s)^*$. In order to prove the independence of τ , we take the derivative in τ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau \langle R(\tau, s)h, J(t, \tau)g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} &= \langle \partial_\tau R(\tau, s)h, J(t, \tau)g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} \\ &\quad + {}_{H^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \langle R(\tau, s)h, \partial_\tau J(t, \tau)g \rangle_{H^{-2} \times \mathbb{R}^2} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq s < \tau < t \leq 1$. Note that, by the smoothing property of $R(\tau, s)$ and (6.10), the right-hand side above is well-defined. Then, using the expressions of the derivatives $\partial_\tau R(\tau, s)$ and $\partial_\tau J(t, \tau)$ from the systems (6.4), (6.5) and (6.6), (6.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_\tau \langle R(\tau, s)h, J(t, \tau)g \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} \\ &= \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -L - Q(u(\tau)) & 0 \\ 0 & (D_x u)(\tau, y(\tau)) \end{pmatrix} R(\tau, s)h + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v(\tau, y(\tau)) \end{pmatrix}, J(t, \tau)g \right\rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} \\ &\quad + {}_{H^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2} \left\langle R(\tau, s)h, \begin{pmatrix} L + Q^*(u(\tau)) & 0 \\ 0 & -(D_x u)^\top(\tau, y(\tau)) \end{pmatrix} J(t, \tau)g - \begin{pmatrix} F(p, y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_{H^{-2} \times \mathbb{R}^2} \\ &= \langle v(\tau, y(\tau)), p(\tau) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} - v_\sigma \langle v(\tau), F(p(\tau), y(\tau)) \rangle_{V^{-\sigma}} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used (6.8). Thus, the proof is complete. \square

The following backward system is the dual of the system (6.4), (6.5) in the space $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\partial_t w - Lw - \Lambda^{-6} Q^*(u) \Lambda^6 w + \Lambda^{-6} F(p, y) = 0, \quad w(1) = w_0, \quad (6.11)$$

$$\dot{p}(t) + (D_x u)^\top(t, y(t)) p(t) = 0, \quad p(1) = p_0, \quad (6.12)$$

where $\Lambda := (-\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The proof of the following well-posedness result is postponed to the Appendix.

Lemma 6.4. *For any $(w_0, p_0) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, there exists a unique solution $(w, p) \in C(J, V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ to (6.11), (6.12) satisfying*

$$\|w\|_{C(J, V^3)} + \|w\|_{L^2(J, V^4)} + \|p\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|w_0\|_{V^3} + \|p_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \quad (6.13)$$

Let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$. Abusing the notation, we denote by $R(t, s)^*$ the dual of $R(t, s)$ in the space $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. As in Lemma 6.3, one can show that, for any $f_0 = (w_0, p_0) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, the function $f(t) = R(1, t)^* f_0 = (w(t), p(t))$ is the solution of the backward system (6.11), (6.12).

6.2 Approximate controllability in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$

Let us define recursively a non-decreasing sequence of finite-dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{E}_k \subset V^3$ in the following way:

- $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}$,
- if \mathcal{E}_k is defined, then \mathcal{E}_{k+1} is the space spanned by the vectors

$$\eta + \sum_{l=1}^n Q(\zeta_l) \xi_l, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where Q is defined by (6.3) and the vectors $\eta, \zeta_l \in \mathcal{E}_k$ and $\xi_l \in \mathcal{E}$ are such that $Q(\zeta_l)\xi_l \in V^3$ for $l = 1, \dots, n$.

The next lemma follows from the results proved in Section 6 in [KNS20a].

Lemma 6.5. *The space \mathcal{E} is saturating, that is, the union $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_k$ is dense in H .*

In this subsection, we prove the following result.

Proposition 6.6. *Let T be as in Hypothesis (N). Then, for any $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and ℓ -a.e. $\eta \in E$, the image of $A_T(z, \eta)$ is dense in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$.*

Proof. The proof develops the ideas of Section 4.1 in [KNS20a]. To simplify notation, let us assume that $T = 1$. Let

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}} := \mathcal{E} \times \{0\} \subset \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{R}^2,$$

and let $A = A(z, \eta) : L^2(J, \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \rightarrow H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ be the resolving operator of the system (6.1), (6.2) with extended control $\overline{\zeta}$:

$$\overline{\zeta} = (\zeta, 0) \in L^2(J, \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \mapsto (v(1), z(1)) \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

In what follows, we assume that $\eta \in E$ is observable. By the Duhamel formula,

$$A\overline{\zeta} = \int_0^1 R(1, s)\overline{\zeta}(s)ds.$$

We need to show that the image of A is dense in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$. This will be achieved by showing that the kernel of A^* (the dual of A) is trivial. The operator A^* is given explicitly by

$$A^*f(t) = P_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}}R(1, t)^*f, \quad t \in J, \quad f \in H \times \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $P_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$. Let us take any $f_0 = (w_0, p_0) \in \text{Ker}(A^*)$. Then

$$A^*f_0 = 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(J, \overline{\mathcal{E}}).$$

This implies that, for any $\overline{\xi} = (\xi, 0) \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}$, we have

$$\langle \overline{\xi}, R(1, t)^*f_0 \rangle_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in J. \quad (6.14)$$

As $R(1, t)^*f_0$ is continuous in t , the previous equality holds for any $t \in J$. In particular, taking $t = 1$, we get that $w_0 \perp \mathcal{E}$.

Based on this information, let us show that (6.14) holds for any $\overline{\xi} = (\xi, 0) \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}_k := \mathcal{E}_k \times \{0\}$, any $k \geq 0$, and $t \in J$. For this purpose, we shall use an inductive argument. The base case $k = 0$ has already been considered. Suppose that there exists $k \geq 0$ such that (6.14) holds for any $\overline{\xi} = (\xi, 0) \in \overline{\mathcal{E}}_k$

and $t \in J$. Taking the derivative in time in (6.14) and using Lemma 6.3, we get

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} L + Q^*(u) & 0 \\ 0 & -(D_x u)^T(t, y(t)) \end{pmatrix} f(t) - \begin{pmatrix} F(p, y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle = 0$$

for all $t \in J$, where $f(t) = R(1, t)^* f_0 = (w(t), p(t))$. This is equivalent to

$$\langle L\xi + Q(u)\xi, w(t) \rangle_H - v^\sigma \langle \xi, F(p, y) \rangle_{V^{-\sigma}} = 0, \quad t \in J.$$

We write

$$\tilde{u}(t) := u(t) - \int_0^t \eta(s) ds = u(t) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} e_j \int_0^t \eta^j(s) ds,$$

where $\tilde{u}(t)$ is smoother in time than $u(t)$, and $\eta^j(s) := \langle \eta(s), e_j \rangle_H$. Then, taking into account the relation (6.8), we derive

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \langle Q(e_j)\xi, w(t) \rangle_H \int_0^t \eta^j(s) ds + \langle L\xi + Q(\tilde{u})\xi, w(t) \rangle_H - \langle \xi(y(t)), p(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} = 0$$

for all $t \in J$. Taking the derivative in this equality, we get

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} a_j(t) \eta^j(t) + b(t) = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_j(t) &:= \langle Q(e_j)\xi, w(t) \rangle_H, \\ b(t) &:= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{d}{dt} \langle Q(e_j)\xi, w(t) \rangle_H \int_0^t \eta^j(s) ds + \frac{d}{dt} \langle L\xi + Q(\tilde{u}(t))\xi, w(t) \rangle_H \\ &\quad - \frac{d}{dt} \langle \xi(y(t)), p(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, $a_j(t)$ is differentiable and $b(t)$ is continuous on J , due to the fact that ξ and e_j are smooth, $\partial_t w \in C(J, V^{-2})$, $\tilde{u} \in C(J, V^3)$, and y and p are continuously differentiable. By the observability of η , it follows that

$$a_j(t) = \langle Q(e_j)\xi, w(t) \rangle_H = 0, \quad j \in \mathcal{I}, \quad t \in J$$

for any $\xi \in \mathcal{E}_k$ and $e_j \in \mathcal{E}$. In particular, $w(t) \perp \mathcal{E}_{k+1}$, $t \in J$. Thus, by induction, $w(t)$ is orthogonal to all \mathcal{E}_k , $k \geq 0$, and thus (6.14) holds for any $k \geq 0$ and $t \in J$, as claimed.

Since $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_k$ is dense in H , it follows that $w(t) = 0$, $t \in J$. In particular, $w_0 = w(1) = 0$. This, along with the equation (6.6) of w , yields

$$F(p(t), y(t)) = 0, \quad t \in J,$$

which leads to (cf. (6.8))

$$\langle \xi(y(t)), p(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} = 0, \quad t \in J, \quad \xi \in V^\sigma.$$

Thus, by the arbitrariness of $\xi \in V^\sigma$, we infer that

$$p(t) = 0, \quad t \in J.$$

Evaluating at $t = 1$, we get $p_0 = 0$. Therefore, we conclude that $f_0 = (w_0, p_0) = 0$, that is, the kernel of A^* is trivial. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

6.3 Density of attainable set in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$

Given any $(u, y) \in C(J, V^3) \times C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)$, let us denote by \mathcal{U} the space of all solutions $(v, z) \in C(J, V^3) \times C^1(J, \mathbb{R}^2)$ to (6.1), (6.2) with control $\zeta = 0$ and all possible initial data $(v_0, z_0) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. For any $s \in (0, 1]$, let \mathcal{U}_s be the space obtained by restricting \mathcal{U} at time s , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{U}_s := \{(v, z)(s, \cdot) : (v, z) \in \mathcal{U}\} \subset V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Proposition 6.7. *For any $s \in (0, 1]$, the space \mathcal{U}_s is dense in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $s = 1$. The proof reduces to the backward uniqueness for the (backward) system (6.11), (6.12). As in Subsection 6.1, let $R(t, s)$, $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ denote the two-parameter processes in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ corresponding to the system (6.4), (6.5), and let $R(t, s)^*$ denote the corresponding dual operator in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. Suppose that \mathcal{U}_1 is not dense in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, then there exists $(v_1, z_1) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$0 = \langle R(1, 0)(v, z), (v_1, z_1) \rangle_{V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2} = \langle (v, z), R(1, 0)^*(v_1, z_1) \rangle_{V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}$$

for any $(v, z) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. This yields that $R(1, 0)^*(v_1, z_1) = 0$. Thus, we only need to prove that $(v_1, z_1) = 0$. This follows immediately from the following backward uniqueness result. \square

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(w(t), p(t))$ be the solution to the system (6.11), (6.12) with $(w_0, p_0) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. If $(w(0), p(0)) = 0$, then $(w_0, p_0) = 0$.*

Proof. Reversing the time $t \mapsto 1 - t$ and denoting by the same letters $w(t)$ and $u(t)$ the time-reversed paths $w(1 - t)$ and $u(1 - t)$ (similarly for p and y), we reformulate (6.11), (6.12) as a forward system

$$\partial_t w + Lw + \Lambda^{-6} Q^*(u) \Lambda^6 w - \Lambda^{-6} F(p, y) = 0, \quad w(0) = w_0, \quad (6.15)$$

$$\dot{p}(t) - (D_x u)^T(y(t)) p(t) = 0, \quad p(0) = p_0. \quad (6.16)$$

Thus, we need to prove the backward uniqueness for the system (6.15), (6.16), that is, if $(w(1), p(1)) = 0$, then $(w_0, p_0) = 0$.

For this purpose, let us first consider equation (6.16), which is a linear ODE. As $p(1) = 0$, by the uniqueness of solution, $p \equiv 0$ on J . In particular, $p(0) = p_0 = 0$. Moreover, by the definition (6.8) of $F(p, y)$, we see that

$${}_{V^\sigma} \langle \xi, F(p(t), y(t)) \rangle_{V^{-\sigma}} = \langle \xi(y(t)), p(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^2} = 0, \quad t \in J$$

for any $\xi \in V^\sigma$ with $\sigma > 1$. This yields that $F(p(t), y(t)) = 0$ for any $t \in J$.

Thus, the forward equation (6.15) reduces to

$$\partial_t w + Lw + \Lambda^{-6} Q^*(u) \Lambda^6 w = 0, \quad w(1) = 0,$$

and we need to prove that $w \equiv 0$. By setting $\tilde{w} := \Lambda^2 w$, it is equivalent to proving the backward uniqueness for the following equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{w} + L\tilde{w} + \Lambda^{-4} Q^*(u) \Lambda^4 \tilde{w} = 0, \quad \tilde{w}(1) = 0.$$

To this end, we note from (6.13) that $\tilde{w} \in C(J, V^1) \cap L^2(J, V^2)$ and

$$\langle -L\tilde{w}, \tilde{w} \rangle_H = \nu \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1}^2.$$

Next, let

$$g := \partial_t \tilde{w} + L\tilde{w} = -\Lambda^{-4} Q^*(u) \Lambda^4 \tilde{w}.$$

Claim: The following estimate holds:

$$\|g\|_H \lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1}. \quad (6.17)$$

Once this estimate is proved, since $\|u\|_{H^3} \in C([0, 1]) \subseteq L^2(0, 1)$, we can apply Theorem 8.1 in Chapter 2 of [BV92] to derive that $\tilde{w}(0) = 0$.

To prove (6.17), let us take any $f \in H$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle g, f \rangle_H| &= |\langle \Lambda \tilde{w}, \Lambda^3 Q(u) \Lambda^{-4} f \rangle_H| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1} (\|\Lambda^3 \langle u, \nabla \rangle \Lambda^{-4} f\|_H + \|\Lambda^3 ((\nabla \otimes (\Lambda^{-4} f))u)\|_H) \\ &\lesssim \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1} (\|\nabla^3 \langle u, \nabla \rangle \Lambda^{-4} f\|_H + \|\nabla^3 ((\nabla \otimes (\Lambda^{-4} f))u)\|_H). \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

To estimate the terms on the right-hand side of this inequality, we use the boundedness of the operators

$$\|\nabla^\alpha \Lambda^{-4}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H, H)} < \infty, \quad \forall |\alpha| \leq 4$$

and the Sobolev embeddings

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\mathbb{T}^2) &\hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^2), \\ H^1(\mathbb{T}^2) &\hookrightarrow L^\rho(\mathbb{T}^2), \quad 1 \leq \rho < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^3 \langle u, \nabla \rangle \Lambda^{-4} f\|_H &\lesssim \|\nabla^3 u\|_H \|\nabla \Lambda^{-4} f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p} \|\nabla^2 \Lambda^{-4} f\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^3 \Lambda^{-4} f\|_H + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^4 \Lambda^{-4} f\|_H \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|f\|_H, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^3((\nabla \otimes (\Lambda^{-4}f))u)\|_H &\lesssim \|\nabla^3 u\|_H \|\nabla \Lambda^{-4}f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p} \|\nabla^2 \Lambda^{-4}f\|_{L^q} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^3 \Lambda^{-4}f\|_H + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla^4 \Lambda^{-4}f\|_H \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|f\|_H, \end{aligned}$$

where $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ are such that $1/p + 1/q = 1/2$. Plugging these inequalities into (6.18), we arrive at

$$|\langle g, f \rangle_H| \lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|\tilde{w}\|_{H^1} \|f\|_H \quad (6.19)$$

for any $f \in H$, where the implicit constant does not depend on f . This yields (6.17) and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

6.4 Proof of Theorem 6.1

Let (v^\sharp, z^\sharp) be any given target in $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary number, and let $\eta \in E$ be such that the image of $A_T := A_T(z, \eta)$ is dense in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ (cf. Proposition 6.6). By Proposition 6.7, there exists $(v_T, z_T) \in V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\|R(1, T)(v_T, z_T) - (v^\sharp, z^\sharp)\|_{V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2} < \varepsilon.$$

Since $R(1, T)$ is continuous from $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$ to $V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|R(1, T)(v'_T, z'_T) - (v^\sharp, z^\sharp)\|_{V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2} < \varepsilon, \quad (6.20)$$

provided that

$$\|(v'_T, z'_T) - (v_T, z_T)\|_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} < \delta. \quad (6.21)$$

On the other hand, as the image of A_T is dense in $H \times \mathbb{R}^2$, there is $\zeta \in E$ such that

$$\|A_T \zeta - (v_T, z_T)\|_{H \times \mathbb{R}^2} < \delta. \quad (6.22)$$

Letting $\tilde{\zeta} := \zeta I_{[0, T]} \in L^2(J, \mathcal{E})$, we note that

$$A_1 \tilde{\zeta} = R(1, T) A_T \zeta.$$

Therefore, combining (6.20)-(6.22), we arrive at

$$\|A_1 \tilde{\zeta} - (v^\sharp, z^\sharp)\|_{V^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2} < \varepsilon,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

7 Appendix

7.1 Proof of Theorem 2.4

We follow the notations used in Section 2 and assume that the conditions of Theorem 2.4 are satisfied. The next lemma is the key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 2.4. Its proof is based on the approach of Lemma 4.3 in [Bou88] and Lemma B.2 in [BCZG23], with necessary adjustments due to the weaker mixing property assumed in our setting.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ is a measurable family of measures on P^{d-1} such that*

$$\nu_z = \mathbb{E} \left((\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)_{*}^{\top} \nu_{\varphi_{\omega}^n z} \right) \quad (7.1)$$

for any $n \geq 1$ and μ -a.e. $z \in Z$. Then, there is a weakly continuous family of measures $\{\hat{\nu}_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ such that

$$\nu_z = \hat{\nu}_z \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } z \in Z.$$

As a result, the family $\{\hat{\nu}_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ satisfies the relation (7.1) for any $n \geq 1$ and $z \in \text{supp } \mu$.

Proof. For any $f \in C(P^{d-1})$, $A \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$, and $z \in X := \text{supp } \mu$, let us set

$$\begin{aligned} G_f(z, A) &:= \int_{P^{d-1}} f(Av) \nu_z(dv), \\ g_f(z) &:= G_f(z, \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^d}) = \int_{P^{d-1}} f(v) \nu_z(dv), \end{aligned}$$

and for any bounded measurable function $G : X \times M_d(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let

$$R^n G(z) := \mathbb{E} G(\varphi_{\omega}^n z, (\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)^{\top}), \quad n \geq 0.$$

It is easy to see that the lemma will be established if we show that for any $f \in C(P^{d-1})$ there is a function $\bar{g}_f \in C(X)$ such that

$$g_f(z) = \bar{g}_f(z) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } z \in X. \quad (7.2)$$

Let us fix any $f \in C(P^{d-1})$ and prove the existence of \bar{g}_f . By Lusin's theorem, there is a sequence of compact sets $C_1 \subset C_2 \subset \dots$ in X such that

- (a) the mapping $z \mapsto \nu_z$ is continuous from C_n to $\mathcal{P}(P^{d-1})$,
- (b) $\mu(C_n) \geq 1 - 1/n$ for any $n \geq 1$.

The property (a) implies that the restriction of the function

$$G := G_f : X \times M_d(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

to the set $C_n \times M_d(\mathbb{R})$ is continuous for any $n \geq 1$. By Tietze's extension theorem, there is a continuous function $G_n : X \times M_d(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$G|_{C_n \times M_d(\mathbb{R})} = G_n|_{C_n \times M_d(\mathbb{R})} \quad \text{and} \quad \|G_n\|_{\infty} \leq \|G\|_{\infty}.$$

Let r_n be the indicator function of the set $C_n \times M_d(\mathbb{R})$, and let $X' \subset X$ be a μ -full measure set such that the equality (7.1) takes place for any $z \in X'$. Then, for any $m, n \geq 0$ and $z \in X'$,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_f(z) - R^m G_n(z)| &= |R^m G(z) - R^m G_n(z)| \\ &\leq |R^m [r_n(G - G_n)](z)| + 2\|G\|_{\infty} |R^m(1 - r_n)(z)| \\ &= 2\|G\|_{\infty} |R^m(1 - r_n)(z)|. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$R^m(1 - r_n)(z) = \mathfrak{P}_m \chi_{C_n^c}(z),$$

where $\chi_{C_n^c}$ is the indicator function of the set C_n^c . If $\mu(C_n) = 1$ for some $n \geq 1$, then

$$g_f(z) = R^m G_n(z) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } z.$$

As $R^m G_n \in C(X)$, the proof of the relation (7.2) is complete. Otherwise, if $\mu(C_n) < 1$ for any $n \geq 1$, let $\psi_n \in L(X)$ be such that $\chi_{C_n^c}(z) \leq \psi_n(z)$ for any $z \in X$ and $\langle \psi_n, \mu \rangle \leq \frac{2}{n}$; such function ψ_n exists due to property (b). Therefore, as μ is mixing, we have

$$\mathfrak{P}_m \chi_{C_n^c}(z) \leq \mathfrak{P}_m \psi_n(z) - \langle \psi_n, \mu \rangle + \langle \psi_n, \mu \rangle \leq \gamma_m \|\psi_n\|_L + \frac{2}{n}, \quad z \in X,$$

where $\gamma_m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we first take $n > 4/\varepsilon$, then choose $m \geq 1$ so large that $\gamma_m \|\psi_n\|_L < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Thus,

$$\sup_{z \in X'} |g_f(z) - R^m G_n(z)| < 2\|G\|_\infty \varepsilon, \quad z \in X'.$$

In this way, we proved that g_f can be uniformly approximated on X' by continuous functions $R^m G_n$. As X' is dense in X , there is a function $\bar{g}_f \in C(X)$ such that (7.2) holds. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Since $\lambda_+ = \lambda_-$, by Theorem 2.3, there exists a measurable family of measures $\{\nu_z\}_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ on P^{d-1} such that (2.4) holds. Then

$$\nu_z = (\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)_*^{-1} \nu_{\varphi_\omega^n z} \quad (7.3)$$

for any $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{P} \times \mu$ -a.e. (ω, z) .

Let the linear cocycle $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z}^n := \mathcal{B}_{\omega_n, \varphi_\omega^{n-1}(z)} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{B}_{\omega_1, z}$ be generated by the mapping $\mathcal{B} : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ given by $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z} := (\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z})^{-\text{T}}$. From the definition it follows that $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z}^n = (\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)^{-\text{T}}$. Therefore, equality (7.3) can be rewritten as

$$\nu_z = (\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z}^n)_*^{\text{T}} \nu_{\varphi_\omega^n z}, \quad (7.4)$$

which yields $\nu_z = \mathbb{E}((\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z}^n)_*^{\text{T}} \nu_{\varphi_\omega^n z})$ for any $n \geq 1$ and μ -a.e. $z \in Z$. Lemma 7.1 applied to the cocycle $\mathcal{B}_{\omega, z}^n$ implies the existence of a weakly continuous family of measures $(\hat{\nu}_z)_{z \in \text{supp } \mu}$ on P^{d-1} such that $\nu_z = \hat{\nu}_z$ for μ -a.e. $z \in Z$. This and (7.4) show that $\hat{\nu}_z = (\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)_*^{-1} \hat{\nu}_{\varphi_\omega^n z}$ for any $n \geq 1$ and μ -a.e. $z \in Z$, which is equivalent to $(\mathcal{A}_{\omega, z}^n)_* \hat{\nu}_z = \hat{\nu}_{\varphi_\omega^n z}$ for any $n \geq 1$ and $z \in \text{supp } \mu$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7.2 Uniform ergodicity

The formulation of Theorem 3.1 is similar to that of Theorem 1.1 in [KNS20b]. A minor difference is that the phase space \mathcal{H} here is a product of a separable Hilbert space and a manifold, instead of being just a separable Hilbert space; this difference does not affect the proofs. A more important difference is that here we do not assume that the nonlinear map $\eta \mapsto S(z, \eta)$ is analytic.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 in [KNS20b] is derived from Proposition 2.1 therein (whose formulation we do not recall here) by using only Hypotheses (H₁), (H₂), and (H₄); therefore, the arguments extend to the current setting as well. The proof of Proposition 2.1 is carried out in [KNS20a], where it is called Proposition 2.3. In the proof of the latter, the only place where the analyticity of the map $\eta \mapsto S(z, \eta)$ is used is Theorem 2.8 in Section 2.5, where approximate right inverse is constructed for linear operators with dense image. Actually, in that theorem only the analyticity of the derivative map $\eta \mapsto (D_\eta S)(z, \eta)$ is used.

Let us recall the framework of Section 2.5 in [KNS20a] and give a proof of the result obtained there under the hypotheses of the current paper, i.e., without analyticity. Thus the proof of our Theorem 3.1 will be established. Let us assume that

- X is a compact metric space,
- E, F , and \mathcal{T} are separable Hilbert spaces and \mathcal{V} is a Hilbert space compactly embedded into \mathcal{T} ,
- $\ell \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ is a measure with a compact support \mathcal{K} ,
- $\{\psi_j\}$ is an orthonormal basis in F and $F_M := \text{span}\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_M\}$ for $M \geq 1$.

The following is the version of Theorem 2.8 in [KNS20a] without analyticity assumption for the linear mapping A .

Theorem 7.2. *Let $A : X \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(F, \mathcal{T})$ be a continuous mapping such that, for any $z \in X$, there is a set $\mathcal{K}^z \subset \mathcal{K}$ verifying*

- (a) $\ell(\mathcal{K}^z) = 1$,
- (b) *the image of $A(z, \eta)$ is dense in \mathcal{T} for any $\eta \in \mathcal{K}^z$.*

Then, for any $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$, there is a continuous function

$$\mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot) : X \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$$

such that $\eta \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(z, \eta)$ is analytic for any $z \in X$, and there is an integer $M_\varepsilon \geq 1$ and positive constants ν_{ε_2} and C_ε such that the following properties are satisfied.

- We have

$$\ell(\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^z) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for } z \in X, \quad (7.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^z := \{\eta \in \mathcal{K} : \mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(z, \eta) \leq \nu_{\varepsilon_2}\}. \quad (7.6)$$

- Let $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon \subset X \times \mathcal{K}$ be the compact subset defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon := \{(z, \eta) \in X \times \mathcal{K} : \mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(z, \eta) \leq 2\nu_{\varepsilon_2}\}. \quad (7.7)$$

There is a continuous mapping $R_\varepsilon : \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)$ such that

$$\text{Im}(R_\varepsilon(z, \eta)) \subset F_{M_\varepsilon}, \quad \|R_\varepsilon(z, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} \leq C_\varepsilon, \quad (z, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon, \quad (7.8)$$

$$\|A(z, \eta)R_\varepsilon(z, \eta)f - f\|_{\mathcal{T}} \leq \varepsilon_2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{V}}, \quad (z, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon, \quad f \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (7.9)$$

Proof. For any number $\gamma > 0$ and integer $M \geq 1$, let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} G(z, \eta) &:= A(z, \eta)A(z, \eta)^*, \\ R_\gamma(z, \eta) &:= A(z, \eta)^*(G(z, \eta) + \gamma I)^{-1}, \\ R_{M, \gamma}(z, \eta) &:= \mathsf{P}_M R_\gamma(z, \eta), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathsf{P}_M : F \rightarrow F$ is the orthogonal projection onto F_M . Note that $(G(z, \eta) + \gamma I)^{-1}$ is well defined, since $G(z, \eta) \geq 0$.

We will show that (7.8) and (7.9) are satisfied for $R_{M, \gamma}$ for some choice of γ , M , and C . Already, note that (7.8) holds for any γ and M . Indeed, by definition, $\text{Im}(R_{M, \gamma}(z, \eta)) \subset F_M$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{M, \gamma}(z, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} &\leq \|A(z, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} \|(G(z, \eta) + \gamma I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} \\ &\leq \gamma^{-1} \sup_{(z, \eta) \in X \times \mathcal{K}} \|A(z, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} =: C < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the bound $\|(G(z, \eta) + \gamma I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, F)} \leq \gamma^{-1}$.

Let us take any $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$ and assume that we have constructed a continuous function $\mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon : X \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\eta \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(z, \eta)$ is analytic for any $z \in X$, and there are positive numbers ν_{ε_2} and γ_ε such that (7.5) holds with the set $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^z$ in (7.6) and the following inequality is verified

$$\sup_{(z, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon} \|A(z, \eta)R_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)f - f\|_{\mathcal{T}} < \varepsilon_2, \quad f \in B_{\mathcal{V}}(0, 1) \quad (7.10)$$

with the set \mathcal{D}_ε in (7.7). Using the compactness of \mathcal{K} , \mathcal{D}_ε , and $B_{\mathcal{V}}(0, 1)$ and the convergence of P_M to I as $M \rightarrow \infty$, it is easy to see that

$$\sup_{(z, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon} \|A(z, \eta)R_{M_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)f - f\|_{\mathcal{T}} < \varepsilon_2, \quad f \in B_{\mathcal{V}}(0, 1)$$

for sufficiently large $M_\varepsilon \geq 1$; see the proof of Theorem 2.8 in [KNS20a] for details.

Thus, it remains to construct \mathfrak{F}_ε , ν_{ε_2} , and γ_ε . To this end, let $\hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} := \varepsilon_2^2/16$, and let us define a continuous function $\hat{\mathfrak{F}}_\gamma : X \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\hat{\mathfrak{F}}_\gamma(z, \eta) = \sum_{j=1}^N \|A(z, \eta)R_\gamma(z, \eta)f_j - f_j\|_{\mathcal{T}}^2,$$

where

$$\{f_j : j = 1, \dots, N\} \text{ is an } \varepsilon_2/4\text{-net for the compact } B_{\mathcal{V}}(0, 1) \subset \mathcal{T}. \quad (7.11)$$

By Lemma 3.1 in [KNS20a], there is $\gamma_\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\ell(\hat{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon^z) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{for } z \in X, \quad (7.12)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{K}}_\varepsilon^z := \left\{ \eta \in \mathcal{K} : \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta) \leq \hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} \right\}.$$

On the other hand, for any $f \in B_{\mathcal{V}}(0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(z, \eta)R_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)f - f\|_{\mathcal{T}} &\leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq N} (\|A(z, \eta)R_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)(f - f_j)\|_{\mathcal{T}} + \|f - f_j\|_{\mathcal{T}}) \\ &\quad + \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} + \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

where we used (7.11) and the fact that the norm of the operator $G(G + \gamma_\varepsilon I)^{-1}$ is bounded by 1. As the map $\eta \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_\gamma(z, \eta)$ is not necessarily analytic, we introduce analytic approximations.

Let $A_n : X \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(F, \mathcal{T})$ be a sequence of continuous maps such that

- $\eta \rightarrow A_n(z, \eta)$ is analytic for any $z \in X$ and $n \geq 1$,
- $\sup_{(z, \eta) \in X \times \mathcal{K}} \|A_n(z, \eta) - A(z, \eta)\|_{\mathcal{L}(F, \mathcal{T})} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us set

$$\mathfrak{F}_{n, \varepsilon}(z, \eta) := \sum_{j=1}^N \|A_n(z, \eta)R_{n, \gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)f_j - f_j\|_{\mathcal{T}}^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n, \gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta) &:= A_n(z, \eta)^* (G_n(z, \eta) + \gamma_\varepsilon I)^{-1}, \\ G_n(z, \eta) &:= A_n(z, \eta)A_n(z, \eta)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\mathfrak{F}_{n, \varepsilon}(z, \eta) : X \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a continuous function and $\eta \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}_{n, \varepsilon}(z, \eta)$ is analytic for any $z \in X$. Our goal is to show that (7.5) and (7.10) hold with $\mathfrak{F}_{n, \varepsilon}$ for some number $\nu_{\varepsilon_2} > 0$ and integer $n \geq 1$.

Let us take $\delta := \varepsilon_2^2/24$ and choose $n \geq 1$ so large that

$$\sup_{(z, \eta) \in X \times \mathcal{K}} |\mathfrak{F}_\varepsilon(z, \eta) - \mathfrak{F}_{n, \varepsilon}(z, \eta)| < \delta. \quad (7.14)$$

Clearly,

$$\left\{ \eta \in \mathcal{K} : \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_\varepsilon(z, \eta) \leq \hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} \right\} \subset \left\{ \eta \in \mathcal{K} : \mathfrak{F}_{n,\varepsilon}(z, \eta) \leq \hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} + \delta \right\}.$$

Then, in view of (7.12), we have that (7.5) is satisfied for $\mathcal{K}_\varepsilon^z$ as in (7.6) with $\nu_{\varepsilon_2} := \hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} + \delta$. From (7.13) and (7.14) it follows that, if $\mathfrak{F}_{n,\varepsilon}(z, \eta) \leq 2\nu_{\varepsilon_2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(z, \eta)R_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)f - f\|_{\mathcal{T}} &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} + \hat{\mathfrak{F}}_{\gamma_\varepsilon}(z, \eta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} + (\mathfrak{F}_{n,\varepsilon}(z, \eta) + \delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2} + (2\hat{\nu}_{\varepsilon_2} + 3\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \varepsilon_2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7.3 Well-posedness of backward systems

In this subsection, we prove Lemmas 6.2 and 6.4 concerning the well-posedness of backward systems.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. First note that, since $u \in C(J, V^3)$, by the classical well-posedness theory for ODEs, there exists a unique backward solution $p \in C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)$ to (6.7) satisfying

$$\|p\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|p_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \quad (7.15)$$

Below we focus on the equation (6.6) and prove that it has a unique solution $w \in C(J, H)$ satisfying

$$\|w\|_{C(J, H)} \lesssim \|w_0\|_H + \|p_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}. \quad (7.16)$$

Reversing the time $t \mapsto 1 - t$ and denoting by the same letters $w(t)$ and $u(t)$ the time-reversed paths $w(1 - t)$ and $u(1 - t)$ (similarly for p and y), we rewrite (6.6) as follows:

$$\partial_t w + Lw + Q^*(u)w - F(p, y) = 0, \quad w(0) = w_0,$$

In the Duhamel form, this is equivalent to

$$w(t) = e^{-tL}w_0 - \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)L}Q^*(u)w ds + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)L}F(p, y) ds.$$

Let us define the operator $\Phi : C([0, t_0], H) \rightarrow C([0, t_0], H)$ by

$$\Phi(w)(t) := e^{-tL}w_0 - \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)L}Q^*(u)w ds + \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)L}F(p, y) ds,$$

where $t \in [0, t_0]$, $t_0 > 0$ is a small time to be chosen later. For any $w \in C([0, t_0], H)$ and $t \in [0, t_0]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(w)(t)\|_H &\lesssim \|w_0\|_H + \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)L} Q^*(u)w\|_H ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|e^{-(t-s)L} F(p, y)\|_H ds =: \|w_0\|_H + J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

By the heat semigroup estimate

$$\|e^{-tL}u\|_{L^2} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\tau}{2}} \|u\|_{V^{-\tau}}, \quad \tau \geq 0, \quad t > 0,$$

Hölder's inequality, and Sobolev's embedding $H^2(\mathbb{T}^2) \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\lesssim \int_0^t \left(\|(\nabla \otimes u)w\|_H + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|w \otimes u\|_H \right) ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t \left(\|u\|_{V^3} \|w\|_H + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{V^3} \|w\|_H \right) ds \\ &\lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)} \|w\|_{C([0, t], H)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the inhomogeneous term, we have

$$J_2 \lesssim \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|F(p, y)\|_{V^{-\sigma}} ds \lesssim t^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(w)(t)\|_H &\leq C \left(\|w_0\|_H + t^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)} \|w\|_{C([0, t], H)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + t^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $t_0 \leq 1$ small enough such that $Ct_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)} \leq 1/2$ and taking the supremum over $t \in [0, t_0]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(w)\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} &\leq C \left(\|w_0\|_H + t_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)} \|w\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + t_0^{1-\frac{\sigma}{2}} \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} + C \left(\|w_0\|_H + \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\sigma \in (1, 3/2)$. Moreover, similar arguments also give

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(w_1) - \Phi(w_2)\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} &\leq Ct_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)} \|w_1 - w_2\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|w_1 - w_2\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $w_1, w_2 \in C([0, t_0], H)$. Thus, setting

$$B_M := \{w \in C([0, t_0], H) : \|w\|_{C([0, t_0], H)} \leq M\}$$

and letting $M := 2C(\|w_0\|_H + \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})})$, we derive that Φ is a contracting map in B_M . Hence, an application of the fixed point theorem gives that there exists a unique solution w on $[0, t_0]$ such that $w \in B_M$. Since t_0 is independent of w_0 , we can use an iterative argument to extend the solution to the whole interval J and, for some $\delta > 0$, get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{C(J, H)} &\lesssim e^{\delta \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)}^2} (\|w_0\|_H + \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})}) \\ &\lesssim e^{\delta \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)}^2} (\|w_0\|_{L^2} + \|p\|_{C(J, \mathbb{R}^2)}) \\ &\lesssim e^{\delta \|u\|_{C(J, V^3)}^2} (\|w_0\|_{L^2} + \|p_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last two steps are due to (6.9) and (7.15). This yields (7.16), thereby completing the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.4. The well-posedness of the equation (6.12) follows from the classical ODE theory. In order to show the well-posedness of the backward equation (6.11), we change $1 - t$ by t and denote $\Lambda^3 w(1 - t)$ by $w(t)$, $u(1 - t)$ by $u(t)$, and similarly for p and y . Thus we reduce the problem to the well-posedness of

$$\partial_t w + Lw + \Lambda^{-3} Q^*(u) \Lambda^3 w - \Lambda^{-3} F(p, y) = 0 \quad (7.17)$$

with $w(0) = \Lambda^3 w_0 \in L^2$ and the estimate

$$\|w\|_{C(J, L^2)} + \|w\|_{L^2(J, V^1)} \lesssim \|w(0)\|_{L^2} + \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})}. \quad (7.18)$$

Below we focus on the a priori estimate (7.18), as the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (7.17) then can be derived by standard arguments.

To prove (7.18), we let $g := \Lambda^{-3} Q^*(u) \Lambda^3 w$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle g, f \rangle_H| &= |\langle \Lambda w, \Lambda^2 Q(u) \Lambda^{-3} f \rangle_H| \\ &\lesssim \|w\|_{H^1} (\|\Lambda^2(\langle u, \nabla \rangle \Lambda^{-3} f)\|_H + \|\Lambda^2((\nabla \otimes (\Lambda^{-3} f))u)\|_H) \end{aligned}$$

for any $f \in H$. Arguing as in the proof of the inequality (6.19), we derive that

$$|\langle g, f \rangle_H| \lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|w\|_{H^1} \|f\|_H,$$

which yields

$$\|g\|_H \lesssim \|u\|_{H^3} \|w\|_{H^1}. \quad (7.19)$$

Then, we derive from (7.17) the energy equality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \|w(t)\|_H^2 + \nu \int_0^t \|\nabla w\|_H^2 ds &= \frac{1}{2} \|w(0)\|_H^2 - \int_0^t \langle w, g \rangle_H ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \langle w, \Lambda^{-3} F(p, y) \rangle_H ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.9) and (7.19), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(t)\|_H^2 + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla w\|_H^2 ds &\leq \|w(0)\|_H^2 + C \int_0^t \|w\|_H \|u\|_{H^3} \|w\|_{H^1} ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|w\|_H \|F(p, y)\|_{V^{-\sigma}} ds, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(t)\|_H^2 + \nu \int_0^t \|w\|_{H^1}^2 ds &\leq \|w(0)\|_H^2 + C \int_0^t (1 + \|u\|_{H^3}^2) \|w\|_H^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \|F(p, y)\|_{L^\infty(J, V^{-\sigma})}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, using Gronwall's lemma, we obtain (7.18). \square

References

- [AGM96] C. H. Amon, A. M. Guzmán, and B. Morel. Lagrangian chaos, Eulerian chaos, and mixing enhancement in converging–diverging channel flows. *Physics of Fluids*, 8(5):1192–1206, 1996.
- [Arn98] L. Arnold. *Random dynamical systems*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [BBPS21] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. Almost-sure enhanced dissipation and uniform-in-diffusivity exponential mixing for advection-diffusion by stochastic Navier–Stokes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 179(3-4):777–834, 2021.
- [BBPS22a] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. Almost-sure exponential mixing of passive scalars by the stochastic Navier–Stokes equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 50(1):241–303, 2022.
- [BBPS22b] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. The Batchelor spectrum of passive scalar turbulence in stochastic fluid mechanics at fixed Reynolds number. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 75(6):1237–1291, 2022.
- [BBPS22c] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. Lagrangian chaos and scalar advection in stochastic fluid mechanics. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(6):1893–1990, 2022.
- [BBPS22d] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. A regularity method for lower bounds on the Lyapunov exponent for stochastic differential equations. *Invent. Math.*, 227(2):429–516, 2022.

- [BBPS23] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. Lower bounds on the Lyapunov exponents of stochastic differential equations. In *Proc. Int. Cong. Math, 7. Sections 15–20*, pages 5618–5654. 2023.
- [BCZG23] A. Blumenthal, M. Coti Zelati, and R. S. Gvalani. Exponential mixing for random dynamical systems and an example of Pierrehumbert. *Ann. Probab.*, 51(4):1559–1601, 2023.
- [BJPV98] T. Bohr, M. H. Jensen, G. Paladin, and A. Vulpiani. *Dynamical systems approach to turbulence*, volume 8. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- [Bou88] P. Bougerol. Comparaison des exposants de Lyapounov des processus markoviens multiplicatifs. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 24(4):439–489, 1988.
- [BPS24] J. Bedrossian and S. Punshon-Smith. Chaos in Stochastic 2d Galerkin-Navier–Stokes. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 405(4):Paper No. 107, 2024.
- [BV92] A. V. Babin and M. I. Vishik. *Attractors of evolution equations*, volume 25 of *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1992.
- [CFVP91] A. Crisanti, M. Falcioni, A. Vulpiani, and G. Paladin. Lagrangian chaos: Transport, mixing and diffusion in fluids. *La Rivista del Nuovo cimento*, 14(12):1–80, 1991.
- [FdCN01] J. M. Finn and D. del Castillo-Negrete. Lagrangian chaos and Eulerian chaos in shear flow dynamics. *Chaos*., 11(4):816–832, 2001.
- [Fur63] H. Furstenberg. Noncommuting random products. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 108:377–428, 1963.
- [GV94] S. Galluccio and A. Vulpiani. Stretching of material lines and surfaces in systems with lagrangian chaos. *Physica A*, 212(1):75–98, 1994.
- [JNPS21] V. Jakšić, V. Nersesyan, C.-A. Pillet, and A. Shirikyan. Large deviations and entropy production in viscous fluid flows. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 240(3):1675–1725, 2021.
- [Kif86] Y. Kifer. *Ergodic theory of random transformations*, volume 10 of *Progress in Probability and Statistics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1986.
- [Kin73] J. F. C. Kingman. Subadditive ergodic theory. *Ann. Probability*, 1:883–909, 1973.

- [KNS20a] S. Kuksin, V. Nersesyan, and A. Shirikyan. Exponential mixing for a class of dissipative PDEs with bounded degenerate noise. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 30(1):126–187, 2020.
- [KNS20b] S. Kuksin, V. Nersesyan, and A. Shirikyan. Mixing via controllability for randomly forced nonlinear dissipative PDEs. *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, 7:871–896, 2020.
- [KS12] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. *Mathematics of two-dimensional turbulence*, volume 194 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [Led86] F. Ledrappier. Positivity of the exponent for stationary sequences of matrices. In *Lyapunov exponents (Bremen, 1984)*, volume 1186 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 56–73. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [Ose68] V. I. Oseledets. A multiplicative ergodic theorem. Characteristic Ljapunov, exponents of dynamical systems. *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obs.*, 19:179–210, 1968.
- [Rag79] M. S. Raghunathan. A proof of Oseledec’s multiplicative ergodic theorem. *Israel J. Math.*, 32(4):356–362, 1979.
- [Via14] M. Viana. *Lectures on Lyapunov exponents*, volume 145 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. 2014.
- [You13] L.-S. Young. Mathematical theory of Lyapunov exponents. *J. Phys. A*, 46(25), 2013.