

**PROBABILISTIC GLOBAL-WELLPPOSEDNESS FOR THE
ENERGY-SUPERCritical SCHRÖDINGER EQUATIONS ON COMPACT
MANIFOLDS**

SEYNABOU GUEYE, FILONE G. LONGMOU-MOFFO AND MOUHAMADOU SY

ABSTRACT. We consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equations with a general nonlinearity power in all dimensions. We construct invariant measures concentrated on Sobolev spaces H^s of singular orders, $s \leq \frac{d}{2}$. We prove almost sure global wellposedness and bounds on the growth in time of the solutions via invariant measure arguments. Our setting includes a generic compact Riemannian manifold; we specify the cases of the torus and Zoll manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Context.** In the present work, we consider the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS)

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t u - i(\Delta u - |u|^{2q}u) = 0, \quad (u(t, x), t, x) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} \times M^d$$

supplemented with an initial condition

$$(1.2) \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in H^s(M^d)$$

where $M^d = (M^d, g)$ is a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension d with metric g , and $H^s(M^d)$ is the Sobolev space of order $s \in \mathbb{R}$ defined on M^d . The operator Δ entering the equation is the classical Laplace-Beltrami operator associated to g .

When M^d has boundary, which will be assumed to be smooth enough, we will supplement (1.1), (1.2) with the Dirichlet condition

$$(1.3) \quad u|_{\partial M^d} = 0.$$

Formally, the NLS equation (1.1) is invariant under the scaling transformation $u_\lambda(t, x) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{q}} u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$. One can easily observe that the corresponding scaling invariant L^2 -based Sobolev space is $H^{s_{q,d}}$, where

$$s_{q,d} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q}.$$

We will refer this number as the critical exponent. It describes, from a heuristics, the threshold of regularity above which local wellposedness is expected to occur. Namely, we generally expect local wellposedness of NLS for initial data in H^s , $s > s_{q,d}$.

Smooth enough solutions of NLS also enjoy the following two conservation laws

$$(1.4) \quad M(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{M^d} |u(t, x)|^2 dx, \quad (\text{Mass})$$

$$(1.5) \quad E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{M^d} |\nabla u(t, x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{2q+2} \int_{M^d} |u(t, x)|^{2q+2} dx. \quad (\text{Energy})$$

The equation can then be classified as energy subcritical, energy critical or energy supercritical depending on whether the critical exponent is smaller, equal or greater than the energy exponent $s = 1$. This reflects the controllability issue of the potential part of the energy by the kinetic part; in other words, the control of nonlinear effects by linear ones. The energy supercritical regimes correspond to the situation where the nonlinear contributions can no longer be controlled by the linear effects. In this case, the local theory is generally illposed on the energy space. This leads to serious obstructions in the global in time analysis even for higher-order regularities, making the supercritical energy NLS much less understood than the subcritical or critical counterparts. Their global regularity problem remains a very difficult open question. Below, we recall some recent developments regarding this problem. In this paper, we aim to address this issue and to construct well-behaved global solutions for energy supercritical NLS on compact

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35A01, 35Q55, 35R11, 60H15, 37K06, 37L50.

Key words and phrases. Energy supercritical NLS, compact manifolds, invariant measure, GWP, long-time behavior.

Riemannian manifolds of any dimension, for *singular data* (i.e. below the $H^{\frac{d}{2}}$ -regularity).

1.2. Background and earlier results. The nonlinear Schrödinger equation arises from diverse physics theories and has applications in areas such as nonlinear optics, plasma physics, quantum mechanics, and fluid dynamics. Its mathematical analysis has a remarkably rich history, driving the development of many analysis tools of independent interest. We are concerned with the following three general questions.

- (1) Local wellposedness
- (2) Global regularity
- (3) Asymptotic behavior in time

1.2.1. Local wellposedness. As for local wellposedness, Strichartz estimates are fundamental tools for establishing useful controls allowing a fixed-point strategy. These estimates reflect the dispersive properties of the equation, which are very sensitive to the geometry of the physical space. Let us define the scaling admissibility condition of a pair (r, p) for the Schrödinger equation

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{2}{r} = d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

- For Euclidean spaces \mathbb{R}^d , we can combine functional analytic techniques (such as interpolation and duality arguments) with the dispersive inequality provided by the linear Schrödinger flow to obtain the following Strichartz estimate [52, 29, 37]. For the endpoint case, one uses the TT^* argument of Keel-Tao:

$$\|e^{it\Delta}u\|_{L_t^r(L_x^p)} \leq C\|u\|_{L_x^2}, \quad \text{with } r \geq 2 \text{ and } (r, p) \neq (2, \infty) \text{ satisfying (1.6).}$$

- For a generic compact Riemannian manifold, the properties of the linear Schrödinger flow are less conspicuous. In particular, the dispersion inequality that was obtained from the properties of Fourier transform in Euclidean spaces is not directly available. However, following Burq-Gérard-Tzvetkov, one can proceed by localization arguments, using a semiclassical analysis, to obtain a localized version of the dispersion inequality. Then, a reconstruction argument yields an estimate with a loss of a fraction of regularity compared to the Euclidean case. This holds for compact Riemannian manifolds without /or with boundary [51, 15, 36, 2, 4]:

$$(1.7) \quad \|e^{it\Delta}u\|_{L_t^r(I; L_x^p)} \leq C(I)\|u\|_{H_x^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad \text{with } |I| < \infty, \quad r \geq 2, \quad q < \infty \text{ satisfying (1.6).}$$

- For specific geometries, refined Strichartz type estimates are available (see Section 2).

It is worth mentioning the use of multilinear versions of Strichartz estimates in establishing local wellposedness (see, e.g. [5, 16, 63, 62, 1, 33, 56, 59]). This is performed within the framework of Bourgain spaces, that appear more suited to analyze dispersive problems than the parabolic spaces $L_t^p L_x^q$, specifically in low regularities. Local well-posedness results for NLS on both Euclidean spaces and compact settings can be found in [18, 5, 15, 16, 32] and references therein.

1.2.2. Global well posedness. In the context of energy subcritical local theories posed in H^1 , a blow-up criteria can be stated as follows:

$$(1.8) \quad T < \infty \implies \lim_{t \uparrow T} \|u(t)\|_{H^1} = +\infty.$$

Hence, energy conservation can be used in an iteration procedure to obtain global regularity in H^1 . Global H^1 solutions were obtained in various settings, including \mathbb{R}^d and compact manifolds [29, 12, 5, 14, 16]. As for regularities $s \in (s_{q,d}, 1)$, more sophisticated arguments such as the high-low method of Bourgain [8] and the I-method introduced by Colliander-Keel-Staffilani-Takaoka-Tao [20] exploit the energy in decomposition/truncation procedures to perform globalization for local solutions living below the energy space H^1 (see also [26] and references therein).

Returning to H^1 global regularity, for the energy critical NLS, the time of local existence is not only a function of the size of the data, but also depends on its profile (or, say, the energy accumulation). To treat the possible concentration of the energy density which would lead to finite time blow up, it is required to perform more sophisticated analysis aimed at ruling out such scenario. This was achieved in radial setting in [9, 30, 60], for the general Euclidean case in [21, 48, 64], on other unbounded manifolds (hyperbolic space) in [34], and on compact manifolds (torus, sphere-like manifolds) in [33, 35, 32, 47].

As for energy-supercritical regimes, a blow-up criterion was obtained for the Euclidean spaces by Killip and Visan [39] (see also [38]) at least for $d \geq 5$:

$$(1.9) \quad T < \infty \implies \lim_{t \uparrow T} \|u(t)\|_{H^{s_q, d}} = +\infty.$$

Recently, Merle-Raphaël-Rodnianski-Szeftel showed, in a groundbreaking work, the finite-time explosion of (1.1) on \mathbb{R}^d for the regimes $(d, q) \in \{(5, 9), (6, 5), (8, 3), (9, 3)\}$ [45]. Partial solutions were constructed in \mathbb{R}^d in [3]. We also note the quasiperiodic solutions constructed by Wang in the periodic setting [65]. The third author of the present work developed the Inviscid-Infinite dimensional limit (IID limit) approach in the context of the energy supercritical NLS posed in \mathbb{T}^d and constructed various invariant measures and proved global well-posedness in the corresponding statistical ensembles [55]. These measures are supported by regular data, that is, H^s with $s > \frac{d}{2}$. Then the work [56, 57] proved similar results on the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^d , $d = 3, 4, 5$ for singular data, namely on H^s with $s \leq \frac{d}{2}$.

1.2.3. Long-time behavior. On Euclidean spaces, global solutions of the NLS equation (1.1) are known to exhibit scattering as time goes to infinity. This follows from decay estimates that can be established in this setting (see [61] and references therein). Hence in the long run the flow of the NLS acts nearly linearly on the phase space.

However, on bounded domains, such estimates are no longer available, and the solutions of the NLS equation do not scatter. The generic long-time behavior issue still remains an unsolved case. Nevertheless, intensive work has been done on the question. Some directions have been investigated, such as the weak turbulence behavior studied through the growth of Sobolev norms of the solutions (see e.g. [22, 31]); or the recurrence phenomena via invariant measures (see the literature mentioned below concerning probabilistic arguments).

1.3. Probabilistic approaches to the global regularity problem. Probabilistic globalization methods rely on the idea of using invariant measures as a substitute for a conservation law. This is achieved through very elaborated procedures combining both deterministic and probabilistic/stochastic arguments. Below, we will present these methods in more details since our globalization argument relies on such techniques.

- (1) **Gibbs measures** (see e.g. [44, 6, 7, 62, 63, 17, 46, 25, 13, 10]). This approach relies on the construction of a Gibbs measure based on the energy functional

$$(1.10) \quad d\mu = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-E(u)} du = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\frac{1}{2q+2} \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2}} d\nu;$$

where the measure $d\nu$ is interpreted as a Gaussian measure with covariance operator $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ on an appropriate Hilbert space. Once we have that $u \in L^{2q+2}$ almost surely, we can obtain $d\mu$ well-defined (and non-degenerate) via Radon-Nikodym theorem. Here Z is a normalizing constant. The measure $d\nu$ can be seen as the distribution of the Gaussian random variable

$$(1.11) \quad \xi(\omega, x) = \sum_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \xi_n(\omega) e_n(x),$$

where (ξ_n) are i.i.d. complex Gaussian random variables and (λ_n, e_n) are spectral data of $-\Delta$ on (M, g) . This results in that ξ is a H^s -valued Gaussian random variable with $s < 1 - \frac{d}{2}$.

A fundamental future of this theory is the construction of an statistical ensemble. From technical point of view, it can be seen as containing data whose local solutions enjoy, individually, some apriori estimate derived from the moment bounds on the invariant measure. Such an apriori estimate allows the iteration of the local theory to obtain global wellposedness.

- (2) **The fluctuation-dissipation** (see e.g. [42, 40, 41, 53, 54, 27, 43]). This method consists in coupling the PDE with a ‘‘heat bath’’ which can be decomposed into a dissipation term plus a fluctuation one.

$$(1.12) \quad \text{LHS of (1.1)} = \alpha \mathbf{Dissip} + \sqrt{\alpha} \mathbf{Fluct}.$$

Here $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a small ‘coupling’ parameter. The dissipation and the fluctuation are correctly scaled w.r.t. α to produce useful bounds to be used in the inviscid limit ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$). The dissipation is modeled by a negative operator and the fluctuations by a stochastic forcing. An stationary measure will result from the existence of a Lyapunov functional combined with the Markov property of the new system. The fluctuation-dissipation relation makes the dissipation effects uniformly controlled by the fluctuation ones. This provides bounds on the moments of the measure that are independent of the coupling parameter α . An inviscid limit combined with

a compactness argument allows to establish global unique solutions through invariant measure consideration.

- (3) **IID limit** (see e.g. [55, 56, 58, 28]). The Gibbs measures approach meets strong limitations when facing supercritical PDEs due to the singularity of its support ($s < 1 - \frac{d}{2}$); as soon as $d \geq 2$ the data become distributions for which the definition of the nonlinear term is problematic. On the other hand, the fluctuation-dissipation method does not suffer from support regularity issues ; however, it faces a limitation coming from the fact it doesn't include a detailed construction of a statistical ensemble. In addition, the bounds on the solutions obtained via this approach involve relatively weak integrability in time for the relevant space norm. The latter is usually quadratic, which limits its applicability to high power nonlinearity that characterizes many supercritical regimes.

To overcome these difficulties, the IID limit was introduced in [55] as a hybrid method that combines fluctuation-dissipation and Gibbs measures approaches. More precisely, it provides a framework where statistical ensembles can be built upon the fluctuation-dissipation measures. This in particular includes generalizations to non Gaussian-like measures of the overall approximation procedure of Bourgain, and a technical design of the "heat bath" to ensure the existence of the necessary large deviation bounds. This is the method that is adopted in the current work, due to the supercritical nature of the problems that are being studied.

1.4. Problematic and exposition of the main result. The globalization in the context of IID-limit heavily relies on a technical step consisting of the design of a suitable dissipation operator. This determines the regularity and dimensions for which the overall approach could work. In Sy ([55]), the dissipation operator allowed to treat smooth regularities $s > \frac{d}{2}$.

This was developed further for regularities $s \leq \frac{d}{2}$ in Sy and Yu [57],[56] in dimension 3 (and 4 and 5 for the case $q = 1$), in the context of the unit ball, and includes the setting of fractional NLS.

While the work [57] included algebraic powers of NLS on the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3 , [56] studied only the case $q = 1$ in higher dimensions (the classical theory of global well-posedness were studied in $d = 3, 4, 5$).

In this paper, we address the extension of these results in the following directions:

- (1) Extension on the physical space. Our result includes general compact Riemannian manifold settings;
- (2) Extension on the dimension. We consider all dimensions;
- (3) We include all ranges of singular Sobolev spaces ($s \leq \frac{d}{2}$) for which local wellposedness is established. We globalize these local theories;
- (4) We also include all power nonlinearities beyond certain threshold.

This leads us to three problems determined following the structure of the available Strichartz estimate. Based on three relevant characteristics: type of manifold (M^d), the nonlinearity power of the equation (q), and the Sobolev regularity order of the initial data H^s :

(1.13)

	Riemannian Manifold	Nonlinearity order $q \geq$	Regularity of the initial data $s >$
Problem 1.	General compact	1	$\frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} \left(= s_{q,d} + \frac{1}{2q} \right)$
Problem 2.	Tori	$1 + \frac{2}{d}$	$s_{q,d}$
Problem 3.	Zoll manifolds	2	$s_{q,d}$
Notation	M^d	$=: q_{M^d}$	$=: s_{M^d}$

Here is our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M^d, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $d \geq 3$.*

Let $s \in (s_{M^d}, \frac{d}{2}]$ and $q \geq q_{M^d}$. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there are a set $\Sigma = \Sigma_{q,s,\epsilon} \subset H^s$ and a probability measure $\mu = \mu_{q,s,\epsilon}$ such that :

- (1) *There is a global flow ϕ^t for NLS on Σ , and $\phi^t \Sigma = \Sigma$ for all t ;*

- (2) *For all $u_0 \in \Sigma$, we have the bound*

$$(1.14) \quad \|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s-\epsilon}} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^s})(1 + |t|)^\epsilon \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R};$$

- (3) $\mu(\Sigma) = 1$;

- (4) *The measure μ is invariant under ϕ^t ;*

- (5) *The distribution of functional $u \mapsto \|u\|_{L^2}$ under μ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .*

Remark 1.2. Notice that for tori and Zoll manifolds we can cover all regularities above $s_{q,d}$, which is not the case for the general manifold. This is due to Strichartz estimates obtained in Bourgain [5] (for the torus) and Burq-Gérard-Tzvetkov [15] (for Zoll manifolds). To simplify the presentation, we opted for establishing a local wellposedness theory relying only on linear Strichartz estimates. This leads to the restriction on the nonlinearity power q_{M^d} . However, using a multilinear analysis within the framework of Bourgain spaces, one could push the local wellposedness theory for the lower powers (see e.g. [5, 16]), and then globalize the solutions by employing our argument. We will not pursue this direction here since higher powers are our main target. \triangle

Remark 1.3. Our proof includes also a noticeable simplification of the infinite dimensional limit step in the IID limit approach (and possibly the corresponding step in the usual Gibbs measure approach). We bypass the use of restriction measures by employing a new and shorter argument in the proof of Lemma 4.9 on the estimation of the size of the statistical ensemble. Beyond this, several technical modifications in this step were necessary due to the power nature of our large deviation estimate. \triangle

1.5. Organization of the paper. In Section 2, we present a general local wellposedness theory of (1.1) and determine the LWP regularity ranges corresponding to the considered manifolds. This theory is based on Strichartz estimates. We establish a local convergence lemma of Galerkin projections of the equation and formulate a globalization lemma. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of dissipation operators and a priori estimates that will be useful in the globalization arguments. In Section 4, we construct invariant measures for the damped-driven Galerkin approximation. We perform the inviscid limit, and construct the statistical ensemble. We present the closing arguments of the proof of the main theorem.

1.6. Acknowledgement. The research of M. Sy is funded by the Alexander von Humboldt foundation under the ‘‘German Research Chair programme’’ financed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). He also thanks the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) for supporting his research at AIMS Senegal. S. Gueye and F. G. Longmou-Moffo are grateful to the DAAD for funding their ongoing doctoral research at AIMS Senegal. The authors express their gratitude to Bielefeld University for support as part of a research cooperation that includes hosting programs.

1.7. General notations.

We denote by $M := (M, g)$ be a Riemannian compact manifold of dimension d , Δ be the Laplace Beltrami operator on M and $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a normalized eigenfunctions basis of $-\Delta$, orthonormal in $L^2(M)$. The associated eigenvalues are noted $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq \dots$. Therefore for $u \in L^2(M)$, we have

$$u(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} u_n e_n(x).$$

By Parseval identity,

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 := \int_M |u(x)|^2 dx = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |u_n|^2.$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ the norm of the Lebesgue space $L^p(M)$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ the norm of Sobolev space $H^s(M)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|\cdot|$ denotes the modulus of a complex number. The Sobolev norm of H^s is defined by

$$\|u\|_{H^s} := \sqrt{|(1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u|_2^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + \lambda_n)^s |u_n|^2}$$

We define a real inner product on L^2 by

$$(u, v) = \operatorname{Re} \left(\int_M u(x) \overline{v(x)} dx \right).$$

We have the important property $(u, iu) = 0$.

We denote by E_N the subspace of L^2 generated by the finitely many family $\{e_n; n \leq N\}$, the operator P_N is the projector onto E_N and E_∞ refers to L^2 , and the projector P_∞ to the identity operator.

For a Banach space X and an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $C(I, X) = C_I^t X$ the space of continuous functions $f : I \rightarrow X$. The corresponding norm is

$$\|f\|_{C_I^t X} = \sup_{t \in I} \|f(t)\|_X.$$

Let $T > 0$, we define by $X_T^s := C((-T, T); H^s)$ the set of continuous functions $f : (-T, T) \rightarrow H^s$.

For $p \in [1, \infty)$, we also denote by $L^p(I, X) = L_I^p X$, the spaces given by the norm

$$\|f\|_{L_I^p X} = \left(\int_I \|f(t)\|_X^p dt \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Let $T > 0, r, \sigma, p, s$ all positives numbers, we define

$$Y_T^s := C((-T, T); H^s) \cap L^r((-T, T); W_x^{\sigma, p}).$$

We have omitted to mention the dependence in r, σ, p in the notation since they will be of secondary interest in our analysis. However, we will precise their range later, in the local theory. The corresponding norm is given by

$$\|u\|_{Y_T^s} = \left(\sup_{t \in (-T, T)} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \left(\int_0^T \|u(\tau)\|_{W^{\sigma, p}}^r d\tau \right)^{\frac{2}{r}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The notation $B_R(X)$ refers to the closed ball with center 0 and radius $R > 0$ of the Banach space X .

The inequality $A \lesssim B$ between two positive quantities A and B means $A \leq CB$ for some $C > 0$.

We denote by $s^- = s - \varepsilon$, for $\varepsilon > 0$ close enough to 0 (we use s^+ in a similar way).

We denote by $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ the integer part of a number.

2. LOCAL WELLPOSEDNESS

This section is devoted to establishing local wellposedness for NLS and to establish deterministic devices that are helpful in the globalization procedure. Here are the results:

- (1) Establishing a general local wellposedness result based on a hypothetical Strichartz type estimate for NLS;
- (2) Applying the general LWP for cases where Strichartz estimates are known. Hence the regularity ranges will be concretly determined;
- (3) We highlight the uniformity of some quantities, such as the time of size increment, with respect to approximation parameter, such as N . This prepares us for the next step
- (4) Proving local convergence and globalization lemmas.

2.1. Local well posedness. Let us consider the Galerkin projected NLS

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u = i [\Delta P_N u - P_N (|P_N u|^{2q} P_N u)], \\ u(0) = P_N u_0 \in E^N. \end{cases}$$

where $1 \leq N \leq \infty$. The following proposition establishes a general local well-posedness result conditioned on availability of a Strichartz estimate. In subsequent corollaries, we will specify the result case by case.

Proposition 2.1. *Let r, p, δ be positive real numbers with $r > \max(2, 2q)$ and $p \geq 1$. Assume that, for any finite time interval I , we have*

$$(2.2) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} v_0\|_{L^r(I; L^p(M))} \leq C(I) \|v_0\|_{H^s}.$$

Let $s > \frac{d}{p} + \delta$ and $\sigma = s - \delta$. Then we have the following

- (LWP) For any $R > 0$, there is $T := T(R, s) > 0$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, any $u_0 \in B_R(H^s)$, there is a unique $u_N \in Y_T^s$ satisfying (2.1), where

$$Y_T^s := C((-T, T); H^s) \cap L^r((-T, T); W_x^{\sigma, p}).$$

- (Increment property) Moreover, the existence time $T > 0$ can be chosen such that for some independent constant $C > 0$, for any $u_0 \in H^s$, we have that

$$\|u_N\|_{Y_T^s} \leq 2C\|P_N u_0\|_{H^s}.$$

Before we present the proof of the proposition 2.1, let us establish the following inhomogeneous Strichartz type inequality based on (2.2).

Lemma 2.2. *Assume (2.2), then we have, for any $f \in L^1([0, T]; H^s)$,*

$$(2.3) \quad \left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))} \leq C_T \|f\|_{L^1([0, T], H^s(M))}.$$

Proof. Following [15], let us set $F_\tau = \mathbf{1}_{\tau \leq t} e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)$ and $J = \left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))}$.

We have that

$$J \leq \int_0^T \|F_\tau\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))} d\tau \leq \int_0^T \|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))} d\tau.$$

In fact we have

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{W^{\sigma, p}}^r \leq \left(\int_0^t \|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{W^{\sigma, p}} d\tau \right)^r.$$

Then

$$\left(\int_0^T \left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau) d\tau \right\|_{W^{\sigma, p}}^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \left(\int_0^T \left(\int_0^t \|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{W^{\sigma, p}} d\tau \right)^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

By using now the Minkowski inequality on the right term, we obtain

$$J \leq \int_0^T \|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))} d\tau.$$

Now by using the Strichartz estimate (2.2) and the isometry property, we have

$\|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{L^r([0, T], L^p(M))} = \|e^{it\Delta} e^{-i\tau\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{L^r([0, T], L^p(M))} \leq C(T) \|f(\tau)\|_{H^s}$ and since $\sigma = s - \delta$, we see easily that $\|e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} f(\tau)\|_{L^r([0, T], W^{\sigma, p}(M))} \leq C(T) \|f(\tau)\|_{H^s}$ and we then obtain

$$J \leq C_T \int_0^T \|f(\tau)\|_{H^s} d\tau = C_T \|f\|_{L^1([0, T], H^s(M))}.$$

We arrive at the claim. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We use the Duhamel principle. The contraction argument relies on the use of the crucial bound (2.2). Let us fix $u_0 \in B_R(H^s)$, and set the map

$$u \mapsto F(u) = e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0 - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} P_N (|P_N u|^{2q} P_N u) d\tau; \quad Y_T^s \rightarrow Y_T^s.$$

By standard product inequality, one has

$$\|F(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + C_1 \int_0^T \|P_N u\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \|P_N u\|_{H^s} d\tau.$$

Since we assumed $s > \frac{d}{p} + \delta$, we have, for $\sigma = s - \delta$, that $W^{\sigma, p} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\|F(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + C_2 \|P_N u\|_{X_T^s} \int_0^T \|P_N u\|_{W^{\sigma, p}}^{2q} d\tau.$$

According to Holder's inequality, we have, by using the fact that $r > 2q$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u)\|_{X_T^s} &\leq \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + C_2 T^{(1-\frac{2q}{r})} \|P_N u\|_{X_T^s} \left(\int_0^T \|P_N u\|_{W^{\sigma, p}}^r d\tau \right)^{\frac{2q}{r}} \\ &\leq \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + C_2 T^{(1-\frac{2q}{r})} \|P_N u\|_{X_T^s} \|P_N u\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma, p}}^{2q} \\ &\leq \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + C_2 T^{(1-\frac{2q}{r})} \|P_N u\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\|F(u)\|_{X_T^s} \leq C_3(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + T^\gamma \|u\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q+1})$ where $\gamma = 1 - \frac{2q}{r}$, $C_3 = \max(1, C_2)$.

So, we have by using (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u)\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma,p}} &\leq C_T \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{i(t-\tau)\Delta} P_N (|P_N u|^{2q} P_N u) d\tau \right\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma,p}} \\ &\leq C_T \left(\|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + \int_0^T \|(|P_N u|^{2q} P_N u)\|_{H^s} d\tau \right) \\ &\leq C'_T \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + T^\gamma \|u\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we arrive at the following estimate

$$\|F(u)\|_{Y_T^s} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + T^\gamma \|u\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q+1} \right).$$

Since $u_0 \in B_R(H^s)$, we remark that if

$$u \in B_{2RC}(Y_T^s) \text{ and } T^\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2^{2q+2} R^{2q} c^{2q+1}}$$

where $c = \max(C, C_6)$, with C_6 is some absolute constant, we have that $F(u) \in B_{2RC}(Y_T^s)$. So, the map $u \mapsto F(u)$ transforms B_{2RC} into itself.

Now let u_1 and u_2 be two elements of $B_{2RC}(Y_T^s)$. Repeating the arguments above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u_1) - F(u_2)\|_{X_T^s} &\leq \int_0^T \| |P_N u_1|^{2q} P_N u_1 - |P_N u_2|^{2q} P_N u_2 \|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq C_4 \int_0^T \left(\|P_N u_1\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} + \|P_N u_2\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \right) \|P_N u_1 - P_N u_2\|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq C_4 \|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^s} \left(\int_0^T \|u_1\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} d\tau + \int_0^T \|u_2\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} d\tau \right) \\ &\leq C_4 \|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^s} T^\gamma (\|u_1\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q} + \|u_2\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by using (2.2 - 2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(u_1) - F(u_2)\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma,p}} &\leq C_T \int_0^T \| |P_N u_1|^{2q} P_N u_1 - |P_N u_2|^{2q} P_N u_2 \|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq C_5 \|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^s} T^\gamma (\|u_1\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q} + \|u_2\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q}). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\|F(u_1) - F(u_2)\|_{Y_T^s} \leq C_6 \|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^s} T^\gamma (\|u_1\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q} + \|u_2\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q}),$$

with T^γ defined as above. Therefore, we have

$$\|F(u_1) - F(u_2)\|_{Y_T^s} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_1 - u_2\|_{Y_T^s}.$$

This finishes the contraction argument.

Now to show the last claim, let us observe that, the solution stay in $B_{2RC}(Y_T^s) \forall |t| < T$.

Therefore, we have by using the Duhamel's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_N\|_{Y_T^s} &\leq C \left(\|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + T^\gamma \|u_N\|_{Y_T^s}^{2q+1} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|P_N u_0\|_{H^s} + \frac{1}{2C} \|u_N\|_{Y_T^s} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|u_N\|_{Y_T^s} \leq 2C \|P_N u_0\|_{H^s}.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

We remark that the local existence constructed above does not depend on N , this is an important property that will be exploited later. Let us now turn to applications.

Our first corollary is generic and is based on the Strichartz estimates on compact manifolds, obtained in [15, 4].

Corollary 2.3 (General compact Riemannian manifold M^d).

Let $u_0 \in H^s(M^d)$, then the equation (2.1) is locally well-posed for $s > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} = s_{q,d} + \frac{1}{2q}$.

Proof. Let us recall the Strichartz estimate with the loss of $\frac{1}{r}$ as seen in (1.7). We have for all numbers r, p with $r \geq 2, p < \infty$, and satisfying the scaling condition $\frac{2}{r} + \frac{d}{p} = \frac{d}{2}$:

$$(2.4) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0\|_{L_t^r([-T, T]; L^p(M^d))} \leq C(T) \|P_N u_0\|_{H^{\frac{1}{r}}}$$

Therefore by taking $r = 2q + \epsilon$, since $q \geq 1$, then $r > \max(2, 2q)$, we will have according to the Proposition (2.1), the local well-posed for $s > \frac{d}{p} + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{2}{r} + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{2q} = s_{q,d} + \frac{1}{2q}$. \square

The following two corollaries concern the specific geometries of the torus and Zoll manifolds, where the Schrödinger propagator enjoys bilinear properties that enabled to improve the generic Strichartz estimate used in the above result (See [5, 15]). This allows to cover the regularities all the way to the critical threshold.

Corollary 2.4 (Case of the Torus $\mathbb{T}^d, d \geq 3$).

Let $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, then the equation (2.1) is locally well-posed for $s > s_{q,d} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q}$ with $q \geq 1 + \frac{4}{2d}$.

Proof. Let us recall first the periodic Strichartz inequalities, we refer to [5, 11]

$$(2.5) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}^{d+1})} \lesssim N^{\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d+2}{r} + \epsilon} \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for } r \geq \frac{2(d+2)}{d}$$

Now by using the Littlewood-Paley inequality, we will have

$$(2.6) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} u_0\|_{L^r(\mathbb{T}^{d+1})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d+2}{r} + \epsilon}} \quad \text{for } r \geq \frac{2(d+2)}{d}$$

Therefore we can see that by taking $r = 2q + \epsilon$, we will have for $q \geq \frac{2(d+2)}{2d} = 1 + \frac{2}{d}$; $r > \max(2, 2q)$ and $r \geq \frac{2(d+2)}{d}$; therefore, according to the estimate (2.6) and Proposition 2.1, we obtain local well-posedness for

$$s > \frac{d}{r} + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{r} - \frac{2}{2q} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q} = s_{q,d}.$$

\square

Corollary 2.5 (Case of Zoll manifold M^d of dimension $d \geq 3$).

Let $u_0 \in H^s(M^d)$, where M^d stands for a Zoll manifold, then the equation (2.1) is locally well-posed for $s > s_{q,d} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q}$ with $q \geq 2$.

Proof. Let us recall the Strichartz estimate on the Zoll manifold of dimension $d \geq 3$ (obtained in [14]):

$$(2.7) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0\|_{L^4(M^d \times [-T, T])} \lesssim N^{\frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2}.$$

We have also by using the L^2 -norm conservation and the fact that $H^{\frac{d}{2}+} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$

$$(2.8) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0\|_{L^\infty(M^d \times [-T, T])} \lesssim N^{\frac{d}{2}+} \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Now using again the Riesz-Thorin interpolation by taking $\theta = \frac{4}{r}$ with $r > 4$, we have

$$(2.9) \quad \|e^{it\Delta} P_N u_0\|_{L^r(M^d \times [-T, T])} \lesssim N^{\frac{d}{2}(1 - \frac{4}{r}) + \frac{4}{r}(\frac{d}{4} - \frac{1}{2}) + \epsilon} \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Therefore by taking $r = 2q + \epsilon$, for $q \geq 2$, then $r > 4$, so we have according the estimate (2.9) and the Proposition 2.1, the local well-posed for $s > \frac{d}{r} + \frac{d}{2} - \frac{2d}{r} + \frac{d}{r} - \frac{2}{2q} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q} = s_{q,d}$. \square

Remark 2.6. Notice that for N finite, the local solutions of (2.1) can be extended globally in time due to preservation of the L^2 -norm (and the equivalence of norms). Let us define the associated global flow by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_N^t : E_N &\rightarrow E_N \\ P_N u_0 &\mapsto \phi_N^t P_N u_0 \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_N^t(P_N u_0) := u(t, u_0)$ represents the solution to (2.1) starting at u_0 . We also set the corresponding Markov groups on bounded functionals

$$\phi_N^t f(v) = f(\phi_N^t(P_N v)); \quad C_b(L^2) \rightarrow C_b(L^2),$$

and on probability measures

$$\phi_N^{t*} \lambda(\Gamma) = \lambda(\phi_N^{-t}(\Gamma)); \quad P(L^2) \rightarrow P(L^2).$$

△

2.2. Deterministic devices for the globalization. Here we prove two results that play key role in the globalization procedure. The convergence lemma locally compares the NLS with its Galerkin projections. The globalization lemma is rather a general result that exploits uniform global well-posedness of Galerkin projections together with the convergence lemma in order to deduce GWP of the NLS. These two devices heavily rely on the LWP theory established previously and critically make use of the uniformity property of the time of increment T .

Lemma 2.7 (Convergence lemma). *Let r, p, δ with $r > \max(2, 2q)$ be defined as in Proposition 2.1. Let $s > \frac{d}{p} + \delta$. Let $u_0 \in H^s$ and $(u_{0,N})_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence such that $u_{0,N} \rightarrow u_0$ in H^s with $u_{0,N} \in E_N$. Let $R > 0, B_R := B_R(H^s)$ and $T := T(R, s)$ be the associated uniform existence time for the problem (2.1) with initial data $u_{0,N}$; we have*

$$\forall \frac{d}{p} + \delta < s' < s, \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N})\|_{Y_T^{s'}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

Proof. Let us write down the Duhamel Formulas,

$$\phi^t u_0 = S(t)u_0 - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) (|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0) d\tau,$$

$$\phi_N^t u_{0,N} = S(t)u_{0,N} - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) P_N (|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}|^{2q} \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}) d\tau.$$

We take the difference

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N} &= S(t)(u_0 - u_{0,N}) - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) P_N (|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0 - |\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}|^{2q} \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}) d\tau \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) (|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0 - P_N(|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0)) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} &\leq \|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + C_2 \int_0^t \left(\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \right) (\|\phi^\tau u_0 - \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}}) d\tau \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|(1 - P_N)(|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0)\|_{H^{s'}} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\|(1 - P_N)f\|_{H^{s'}} \leq (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \|(1 - P_N)f\|_{H^s} \leq (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \|f\|_{H^s}$$

and $W^{\sigma,p} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$; so that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} &\leq \|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \int_0^t \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,q}}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\quad + C_2 \int_0^t \left(\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \right) \|\phi^\tau u_0 - \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Gronwall lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} &\leq \left(\|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \int_0^t \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau \right) + \\ &\int_0^t \left(\|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \int_0^\tau \|\phi^\epsilon u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,q}}^{2q} \|\phi^\epsilon u_0\|_{H^s} \right) C_2 \left(\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,q}}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{W^{\sigma,q}}^{2q} \right) e^{\int_\tau^t f(\epsilon) d\epsilon} d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where $f(\epsilon) = C_2 \left(\|\phi^\epsilon u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,q}}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\epsilon u_{0,N}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \right)$.

Now, let us remark that on $[0, T_R)$, we have $\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s}; \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} \leq C(R)$ and

$$\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} d\tau \leq T^\gamma \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L_T^\tau W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q}; \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} d\tau \leq T^\gamma \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{L_T^\tau W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \leq C_1(R).$$

Therefore, we arrive at

$$\sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N})\|_{X_T^{s'}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand, we have by using Strichartz estimate,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma',p}} &\leq C_T \left(\|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + \int_0^T \|(1-P_N)(|\phi^\tau u_0|^{2q} \phi^\tau u_0)\|_{H^{s'}} d\tau \right) \\ &\quad + C_T C_2 \int_0^T \left(\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \right) (\|\phi^\tau u_0 - \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}}) d\tau \\ &\leq C_T \left(\|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} (C(R)) + C_3(R) \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N})\|_{X_T^{s'}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma',p}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Overall,

$$\forall \frac{d}{p} + \delta < s' < s, \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N})\|_{Y_T^{s'}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.8 (A sufficient condition for global existence in H^s). *Let $u_0 \in H^s$, Let r, p, δ with $r > \max(2, 2q)$ be defined as in the above lemma. Let s, s' such that $\frac{d}{p} + \delta < s' < s$. Assume that $\phi^t u_0 \in Y_T^{s'}$ for all $T > 0$, then $\phi^t u_0$ is global (and belongs to Y_T^s for all T).*

Proof. From the Duhamel formula, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^s} &\leq \|u_0\|_{H^s} + C_1 \int_0^t \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau \\ &\leq \|u_0\|_{H^s} + C \int_0^t \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

According to the Gronwall Lemma, we have

$$\|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^s} \leq e^{C \int_0^t \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^{2q} d\tau} \|u_0\|_{H^s}.$$

Therefore, if for some initial datum $u_0 \in H^s$ we have that $\int_0^T \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^{2q} d\tau < \infty \forall T > 0$, then the solution $\phi^t u_0$ will belong to $C([-T, T]; H^s)$.

Next, by Holder inequality, we have

$$\int_0^T \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^{2q} d\tau \leq T^\gamma \left(\int_0^T \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^r d\tau \right)^{\frac{2q}{r}} \leq T^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q}.$$

So,

$$\|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^s} \leq e^{CT^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q}} \|u_0\|_{H^s}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L_T^r W^{\sigma',p}} &\leq C(T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \int_0^T \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{L^\infty}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau \right) \\ &\leq C(T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \int_0^T \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma',p}}^{2q} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{H^s} d\tau \right) \\ &\leq C(T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + e^{CT^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q}} \|u_0\|_{H^s} T^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^s} \leq e^{CT^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q}} \|u_0\|_{H^s} + C(T) \left(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + e^{CT^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q}} \|u_0\|_{H^s} T^\gamma \|\phi^t u_0\|_{Y_T^{s'}}^{2q} \right).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.9 (Globalization lemma). *Let r, p, δ with $r > \max(2, 2q)$ be defined as above. Let s, s' such that $\frac{d}{p} + \delta < s' < s$.*

- *Let $u_0 \in H^s$ and T_0 be the associated existence time, let $(u_{0,N})_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence such that $u_{0,N} \in E_N$ and $u_{0,N} \rightarrow u_0$ in H^s*
- *Assume that there exists a non decreasing function $f : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ independent of N such that*

$$\|\phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq f(|t|) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then

- (1) $\phi^t u_0$ is global in $H^{s'}$;
- (2) $\|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq f(|t|) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (3) $\phi^t u_0$ is global in H^s .

Proof. From the hypothesis, we have, for $|t| \leq T$,

$$(2.10) \quad \sup_{|t| \leq T} \|\phi^t u_N u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq f(T).$$

Then, in particular,

$$(2.11) \quad \|u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq f(T) < \Lambda,$$

which implies that $(u_{0,N})_N \subset B_\Lambda$. Passing to the limit, we obtain that $u_0 \in B_\Lambda$.

Let $T \gg 1$ be arbitrary. It suffices to show that the solution $\phi^t u_0$ exists on $[-T, T]$. Set $\Lambda = f(T) + 1$. Consider the ball $B_\Lambda(H^{s'})$ and the associated time existence T_0 .

We write, with the use of estimation arguments similar to lemmas above,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^t(u_0) - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N}) &= S(t)(u_0 - u_{0,N}) - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) P_N (|\phi^\tau(u_0)|^{2q} \phi^\tau(u_0) - |\phi_N^\tau(u_{0,N})|^{2q} \phi_N^\tau(u_{0,N})) d\tau \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t S(t-\tau) (1 - P_N) |\phi^\tau(u_0)|^{2q} \phi^\tau(u_0) d\tau; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{Y_{T_0}^{s'}} &\lesssim \|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + \int_0^{T_0} \left(\|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} + \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \right) \|\phi^\tau u_0 - \phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} d\tau \\ &\quad + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}} \int_0^{T_0} \|\phi^\tau u_0\|_{W^{\sigma,p}}^{2q} \|\phi_N^\tau u_{0,N}\|_{H^s} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Using the properties of T_0 , we infer that

$$(2.12) \quad \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{Y_{T_0}^{s'}} \lesssim \|u_0 - u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + (1 + \lambda_N)^{\frac{s'-s}{2}}.$$

In particular, as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\|\phi^t(u_0) - \phi_N^t(u_{0,N})\|_{X_{T_0}^{s'}} \rightarrow 0.$$

We have by using the triangle inequality and the passage to the limit that $\forall |t| \leq T_0$,

$$\|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + \|\phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq o(1) + \Lambda.$$

We obtain that $\phi^{T_0} u_0$ still belongs to B_Λ .

By repeating this procedure n times, with $nT_0 \leq T$, we will see that $\phi^{nT_0}(u_0)$ remains in the ball B_Λ , which allows to extend the solution on $[-T, T]$, as desired. Moreover, as $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\forall t \in [-T, T], \|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} + \|\phi^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq o(1) + f(|t|).$$

Now, Lemma 2.8 implies that $\phi^t u_0$ is global in H^s . □

3. DISSIPATION MODELS AND APRIORI ESTIMATES

In Section 4, we aim use the IID limit method the globalize the local solutions constructed previously. A key step in this method lies in designing a suitable dissipation model, which constitutes one of its challenging aspects. This is because it involves identifying dissipation that incorporates linear and non-linear effects taking into account parameters related to dimensions and nonlinearity powers. Finding a dissipation mechanism that considers both linear and nonlinear phenomena can be a difficult task for supercritical regimes. In this section, we construct a dissipation model that captures all powers of the nonlinearity and dimensions. In some regimes, we will need the following very useful inequalities.

3.1. Some useful inequalities.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Δ be the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the Riemannian manifold M . Let $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. For any $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C})$,*

- we have the inequality

$$(3.1) \quad \langle |f|^2 f, (-\Delta)^\gamma f \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} |f|^2\|_{L^2}^2.$$

- for any real number $q > 1$, we have the inequality

$$(3.2) \quad \langle |f|^{2q} f, (-\Delta)^\gamma f \rangle \geq \frac{1}{q+1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} |f|^{q+1}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The proof of the proposition relies on the following famous inequality of Córdoba-Córdoba [23].

Lemma 3.2 (Córdoba-Córdoba inequality). *Under the setting of the proposition above, let Φ be a convex $C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ -function satisfying $\Phi(0) = 0$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. For any $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$, the inequality*

$$(3.3) \quad \Phi'(f)(-\Delta)^\gamma f \geq (-\Delta)^\gamma \Phi(f)$$

holds pointwise almost everywhere in M .

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let us start by proving a complex version of the Córdoba-Córdoba inequality. For $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{C})$

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{R}[f(-\Delta)^\gamma \bar{f}] \geq \frac{1}{2} (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2.$$

Indeed, let us write $f = a + ib$. We have that

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{R}[f(-\Delta)^\gamma \bar{f}] = a(-\Delta)^\gamma a + b(-\Delta)^\gamma b \geq \frac{1}{2} (-\Delta)^\gamma (a^2 + b^2) = \frac{1}{2} (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2,$$

where, in the last step, we used the (real) Córdoba-Córdoba inequality.

Now, applying the complex inequality above, we have

$$(3.6) \quad \langle |f|^{2q} f, (-\Delta)^\gamma f \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \langle |f|^{2q}, (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2 \rangle.$$

We distinguish two cases:

- for $q = 1$. We obtain the corresponding claim.
- for $q > 1$, we write

$$(3.7) \quad \langle |f|^{2q} f, (-\Delta)^\gamma f \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \langle |f|^{2q}, (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2 \rangle$$

$$(3.8) \quad = \frac{1}{2} \langle (|f|^2)^{\frac{q+1}{2}}, (|f|^2)^{\frac{q-1}{2}} (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2 \rangle$$

and apply the real Córdoba-Córdoba inequality with $\Phi(x) = x^{\frac{q+1}{2}}$ (which is convex for $q > 1$), and obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{1}{2} \langle (|f|^2)^{\frac{q+1}{2}}, (|f|^2)^{\frac{q-1}{2}} (-\Delta)^\gamma |f|^2 \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{q+1} \langle (|f|^2)^{\frac{q+1}{2}}, (-\Delta)^\gamma (|f|^2)^{\frac{q+1}{2}} \rangle.$$

Hence we obtain the claim. \square

3.2. The dissipation model and estimation of the dissipation rates. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough, introduce the dissipation operator

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{L}_s(u) = (-\Delta)^{s-1} u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-\epsilon}}^{3\epsilon-1} u$$

where $s_{M^d} < s$, $C_{d,s}$ and ϵ will be determined below (as required of the estimation of the dissipation rate of energy).

Here, we derive some apriori estimates on the dissipation rates of the mass $M(u)$ and the energy $E(u)$ of (1.1). We denote $\tilde{k} = \epsilon^{-1}$ and use both notations.

The dissipation rate of a functional $F(u)$ against $\mathcal{L}_s(u)$ is given by

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{F}(u) = \langle \delta_u F, \mathcal{L}_s(u) \rangle,$$

where $\delta_u F$ stands for the functional derivative (in the sense of Gateaux) at u of a functional F on L^2 :

$$(3.12) \quad F'(u, v) = \langle \delta_u F, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in L^2.$$

Hence, for the mass we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}(u) = \langle \delta_u M, \mathcal{L}_s(u) \rangle = \|u\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

As for the dissipation rate of the energy, the estimations are more involved:

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{E}(u) = \langle \delta_u E, \mathcal{L}_s(u) \rangle = \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2} + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \langle (-\Delta)^{s-1} u, |u|^{2q} u \rangle.$$

In order to show that the quantity above is coercive, we need to absorb the last term by the first ones. We separate two cases:

- For $s_{Md} < s \leq 2$, we have by using Proposition 3.1

$$\mathcal{E}(u) \geq \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2} + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{q+1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s-1}{2}} |u|^{q+1}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

- Let now $\frac{d}{2} \geq s > 2$. We first notice that d must be larger than 4. Write

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{s-1} u, |u|^{2q} u \rangle = \langle (-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} u, (-\Delta)^{\frac{s-2}{2}} |u|^{2q} u \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s-2}{2}} |u|^{2q} u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Now, by using the following chain (see e.g. Christ-Weinstein [19]) with $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2+\gamma} + \frac{1}{(2+\gamma)^*}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s-2}{2}} |u|^{2q} u\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \| |u|^{2q} \|_{L^{(2+\gamma)^*}}^2 \|u\|_{W^{s-2, 2+\gamma}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{2q(2+\gamma)^*}}^{4q} \|u\|_{W^{s-2, 2+\gamma}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have $W^{s-1+\delta, 2} \hookrightarrow W^{s-2, 2+\gamma}$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$ for $1 + \delta = (\frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2+\gamma})^+$. So, $2(1+\delta^-)(2+\gamma) = \gamma d$, then $\gamma = \frac{4(1+\delta^-)}{d-2-2\delta^-}$ and $(2+\gamma)^* = \frac{d}{1+\delta^-}$. Recall that $d > 4$, therefore γ is still positive.

We remark that $H^{s-} \hookrightarrow L^{2q(2+\gamma)^*}$ if $s > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2q(2+\gamma)^*} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{\frac{2qd}{1+\delta^-}} = \frac{d}{2} - \frac{(1+\delta^-)}{2q}$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

By taking $\delta = 1^-$, we can then have this embedding for $s > \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{q} = s_{q,d}$.

Now, let $s > \max(2, s_{q,d})$, $\delta = 1^-$, so $s - 1 + \delta \approx s^-$, then $s - 1 + \delta = s^-(1 - \beta) + \beta \times 0$ with $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is close enough to 0.

By interpolating $H^{s-1+\delta}$ between H^{s^-} and L^2 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s-2}{2}} |u|^{2q} u\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{4q} \|u\|_{H^{s-1+\delta}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{4q+2-2\beta} \|u\|_{L^2}^{2\beta} \\ &\lesssim C + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}}, \text{ according the Young's inequality where} \\ &\quad 3\tilde{k} = \frac{4q+2-2\beta}{\beta} \text{ i.e } \tilde{k} \rightarrow \infty \text{ large enough (or } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ small enough)} \\ &= 2K_{s,d} + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{E}(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2} + \frac{C_{d,s}}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} - K_{s,d} = \mathcal{E}_0(u) - K_{s,d}.$$

Overall, we have that

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{E}_0(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2} + \frac{C_{d,s}}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \leq \mathcal{E}(u) + K_{s,d}.$$

Therefore an estimate from above on $\mathcal{E}(u)$ yields an estimate on $\mathcal{E}_0(u)$, which is a coercive functional.

4. IID-LIMIT AND GLOBALIZATION

In this section, we perform our globalization argument following the IID limit strategy. Here are the main steps:

- Step 1: We consider a stochastic equation consisting in damped-driven Galerkin projection of NLS. We prove global well-posedness and construct stationary measures. Useful bounds on the measure are proven.

- Step 2: We pass to the inviscid limit, hence recovering a statistical theory of the Galerkin projections of NLS.
- Step 3: We construct ensembles selecting “well behaved” approximate solutions that enjoy uniform individual bounds allowing to use our previous globalization lemma.
- Step 4: We prove properties of the statistical ensemble and of the measure.

We denote by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a complete probability space. For a Banach space E , we consider random variables $X : \Omega \rightarrow E$ being Bochner measurable functions with respect to \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{B}(E)$, where $\mathcal{B}(E)$ is Borel σ -algebra of E .

For any positive integer N , we define the N -dimension Brownian motion by

$$\mathcal{W}^N(t, x) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e_n(x) \mathcal{B}_n(t)$$

where $(\mathcal{B}_n(t))$ is a one dimensional independent Brownian motions with filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

The numbers $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are such that $A^0 = \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n^2 < \infty$.

We denote by $A_N^s = \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n^s a_n^2$ and $A^s = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda_n^s a_n^2$ where $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_g$ such that $A^{\frac{s}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} < \infty$.

Let us recall that (\cdot, \cdot) denote the real dot product in $L^2(M; \mathbb{C})$.

Let $F : E_N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, u \mapsto F(u)$ be a smooth function. We denote by $F'(u; v)$ and $F''(u; v, w)$ respectively the first and second derivative of F at u .

4.1. Estimates on the stationary measures of the stochastic problems.

Let us consider the following problem

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} du = \left[i(\Delta u - P_N(|u|^{2q}u)) - \alpha \left((-\Delta)^{s-1}u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^s}^{3\bar{k}} u \right) \right] dt + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e_n(x) d\mathcal{B}_n(t), \\ u(0) = P_N u_0 \in E_N. \end{cases}$$

Definiton 4.1. (*Stochastic global well-posedness*).

We say that (4.1) is stochastically globally well-posed on E_N if the following properties hold:

- For any E_N -valued random variable u_0 independent of \mathcal{F}_t ,
 - for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω , there exists a solution $u = u^\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}^+; E_N)$ of (4.1) with initial datum $u_0 = u_0^\omega$ in the integral sense, i.e.,

$$u(t) = u_0 + \int_0^t \left[i(\Delta u - P_N(|u|^{2q}u)) - \alpha \left((-\Delta)^{s-1}u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^s}^{3\bar{k}} u \right) \right] d\tau + \sqrt{\alpha} \mathcal{W}^N(t)$$

with equality as elements of $C(\mathbb{R}^+; E_N)$.

- For any $u_1^\omega, u_2^\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}^+; E_N)$ two solutions with the same initial data $u_{1,0}^\omega = u_{2,0}^\omega$, then $u_1^\omega \equiv u_2^\omega$.
- The process $(\omega, t) \mapsto u^\omega(t)$ is adapted to the filtration $\sigma(u_0, \mathcal{F}_t)$.

Using an argument of Da-Prato-Debussche [24], we split the unknown as follows $u = v + z$, where

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} dz_\alpha = (i\Delta z_\alpha - \alpha(-\Delta)^{s-1}z_\alpha)dt + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e_n(x) d\mathcal{B}_n(t) \\ z_\alpha(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t v = i(\Delta v - P_N(|v + z_\alpha|^{2q}(v + z_\alpha))) - \alpha \left((-\Delta)^{s-1}v + \|v + z_\alpha\|_{H^s}^{3\bar{k}} (v + z_\alpha) \right) \\ v(0) = P_N u_0 \end{cases}$$

The equation (4.2) is a linear stochastic equation whose solution is given by the stochastic convolution

$$z_\alpha(t) = \sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)(i\Delta - \alpha(-\Delta)^{s-1})} d\mathcal{W}^N.$$

We have by applying the Ito's formula

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_\alpha(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &= 2\sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^t \sum_{n=1}^N a_n(z_\alpha, e_n) d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) - 2\alpha\sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^t \|z_\alpha(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 t, \\ \mathbb{E} \left(\|z_\alpha(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\alpha\sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^t \|z_\alpha(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right) &= \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 t. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix $T > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(2\alpha\sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^T \|z_\alpha(\tau)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\tau \right) \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 T$$

we have also by applying Doob's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|z_\alpha(t)\|_{L^2} \right)^2 \leq 4\mathbb{E} (\|z_\alpha(T)\|_{L^2}^2) \leq 4\sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 T.$$

Consequently, for \mathbb{P} -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, for all $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|z_\alpha(\omega, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_\alpha(w, T).$$

We see clearly that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $z_\alpha^\omega \in C_t(\mathbb{R}, C^\infty(E_N))$.

Let consider the second equation

$$\partial_t v = F(v) \quad v(0) = P_N u_0$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F : E_N &\rightarrow E_N \\ v &\mapsto F(v) = i(\Delta v - P_N(|v + z_\alpha^\omega|^{2q}(v + z_\alpha^\omega))) - \alpha \left((-\Delta)^{s-1} v + \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} (v + z_\alpha^\omega) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $F \in C^\infty(E_N, E_N)$, then thanks to the Cauchy Lipschitz's theorem, the problem has a smooth local solution. Now let us show that this solution is global in time \mathbb{P} -almost surely. We rely on the equivalence of norms in finite dimension.

Proposition 4.2. *The local solution v constructed above exists globally in time, \mathbb{P} -almost surely.*

Proof. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\|v\|_{L^2}^2}{2} \right) &= \left(i(\Delta v - P_N(|v + z_\alpha^\omega|^{2q}(v + z_\alpha^\omega))) - \alpha \left((-\Delta)^{s-1} v + \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} (v + z_\alpha^\omega) \right), v \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\|z_\alpha^\omega\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{C(\beta)} + C_1(\beta) \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} - \alpha \|v\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 - \alpha \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \alpha \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \left(\frac{\|v\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \frac{\|z_\alpha^\omega\|_{L^2}^2}{2} \right) \quad \text{with } \beta = \frac{3\tilde{k}}{2q+1} \\ &\leq \frac{\|z_\alpha^\omega\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{C(\beta)} + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|v + z_\alpha^\omega\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} (C_2(\beta, \alpha) + \|z_\alpha^\omega\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v\|_{L^2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

We have that for \mathbb{P} -almost all $w \in \Omega$, for all T , , there is constant $C_\alpha(w, T)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|z_\alpha(w, t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_\alpha(w, T).$$

For a fixed ω , let $t \in [0, T]$. We have the alternative:

- Either $\|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C(\beta, \alpha) + C_\alpha(w, T)$,
- or $\|v\|_{L^2}^2 > C(\beta, \alpha) + C_\alpha(w, T)$.

In the second case, we will have $\|v + z_\alpha^w\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} (C_2(\beta, \alpha) + \|z_\alpha^w\|_{L^2}^2 - \|v\|_{L^2}^2) < 0$. So, in any case

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\|v\|_{L^2}^2}{2} \right) \leq M_{\alpha, \omega, T, \beta} + \frac{\|z_\alpha^w\|_{L^2}^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}}{C(\beta)} \leq C_{\alpha, \beta}^1(w, T).$$

Hence

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|v\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + C_{\alpha, \beta}^2(w, T).$$

This is the needed control to perform an iteration of the local solution. \square

Uniqueness and continuity. By using the fact that $F \in C^\infty(E_N, E_N)$ and the mean value theorem, it is easy to prove the uniqueness and continuity.

Adaptability. It is clear that the solution $z_\alpha(t)$ is adapted to \mathcal{F}_t and since v is constructed by using the fix point theorem, then v also is adapted, therefore u is adapted.

Let us denote by $u_\alpha(t, u_0)$ the unique stochastic solution to (4.1)

4.2. The Markov semi-group and stationary measure. Let us define the transition probability $P_t^{\alpha, N}(u_0, \Gamma) = \mathbb{P}(u_\alpha(t, P_N u_0) \in \Gamma)$ with $u_0 \in L^2$ and $\Gamma \in \text{Bor}(L^2)$.

The Markov semi-groups are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_t^{\alpha, N} f(u_0) &= \int_{L^2} f(v) P_t^{\alpha, N}(u_0, dv) & C_b(L^2) &\rightarrow C_b(L^2) \\ \mathcal{B}_t^{\alpha, N*} \lambda(\Gamma) &= \int_{L^2} \lambda(du_0) P_t^{\alpha, N}(u_0, \Gamma) & P(L^2) &\rightarrow P(L^2). \end{aligned}$$

From the continuity of the solution with respect to initial data, we obtain the Feller property:

$$\mathcal{B}_t^{\alpha, N} C_b(L^2) \subset C_b(L^2).$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let u_0 be a random variable in E_N independent of \mathcal{F}_t such that $\mathbb{E}M(u_0) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}E(u_0) < \infty$. Let u be the solution to (4.1) starting at u_0 . Then we have*

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{E}M(u) + \alpha \int_0^t \mathbb{E}M(u) d\tau = \mathbb{E}M(u_0) + \alpha \frac{A_N^0}{2} t;$$

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{E}E(u) + \alpha \int_0^t \mathbb{E}E(u) d\tau \leq \mathbb{E}E(u_0) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(A_N^1 t + A_N^{\frac{q}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^{2q}}^{2q} d\tau \right).$$

Proof. Let $F(u)$ be $M(u)$ or $E(u)$. We have by Ito's Formula,

$$\begin{aligned} dF &= \langle \nabla_u F, du \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 \langle \nabla_u^2 F; e_n, e_n \rangle dt \\ &= \langle \nabla_u F, i(\Delta u - P_N(|u|^{2q}u)) \rangle - \alpha \langle \nabla_u F, (-\Delta)^{s-1} u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} u \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle \nabla_u F, e_n \rangle d\mathcal{B}_n(t) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 \langle \nabla_u^2 F; e_n^2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For $F = M(u)$, we have

$$M(u) = M(u_0) - \alpha \int_0^t \langle u, (-\Delta)^{s-1} u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} u \rangle d\tau + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \int_0^t \langle u, e_n \rangle d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 t.$$

By taking the expectation and using the vanishing property of the martingale term, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}M(u) + \alpha \int_0^t \mathbb{E}M(u) d\tau = \mathbb{E}M(u_0) + \alpha \frac{A_N^0}{2} t.$$

For $F = E(u)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dE(u) &\leq \langle -\Delta u + |u|^{2q}u, i(\Delta u - P_N(|u|^{2q}u)) \rangle dt - \alpha \langle -\Delta u + |u|^{2q}u, (-\Delta)^{s-1} u + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} u \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle -\Delta u + |u|^{2q}u, e_n \rangle d\mathcal{B}_n(t) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 (\langle -\Delta e_n, e_n \rangle + \langle |u|^{2q}u, e_n, e_n \rangle) dt \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$E(u) \leq E(u_0) - \alpha \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(u) d\tau + \sqrt{\alpha} \int_0^t \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle -\Delta u + |u|^{2q} u, e_n \rangle d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(A_N^1 t + \sum_{n=1}^N a_n^2 \|e_n\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int_0^t \|u\|_{L^{2q}}^{2q} d\tau \right).$$

Therefore, after using Sogge's inequalities [50], we have

$$\mathbb{E}E(u) + \alpha \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}(u) d\tau \leq \mathbb{E}E(u_0) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(A_N^1 t + A_N^{\frac{d}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^{2q}}^{2q} d\tau \right).$$

Hence the claim. \square

Existence of Stationary measure.

Theorem 4.4. *For any $N \geq 2$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a stationary measure μ_N^α and we have the following estimates:*

$$(4.6) \quad \int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) = \frac{A_N^0}{2} \leq \frac{A^0}{2}$$

$$(4.7) \quad \int_{L^2} \mathcal{E}(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq C,$$

where C does not depend on α and N .

Proof. Let B_R be the ball of H^{s-1} with center 0 and radius R . By using the Bogoliubov-Krylov argument, we have to find the measure λ such that the sequence $\{\bar{\lambda}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is tight, where

$$\bar{\lambda}_t = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathcal{B}_\tau^{\alpha, N, *} \lambda d\tau.$$

By Prokhorov theorem, Let $R > 0$, we just need to find a compact K of L^2 such that $\bar{\lambda}_t(K^c) < \epsilon(R) \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda}_t(B_R^c) &= \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathcal{B}_\tau^{\alpha, N, *} \lambda(B_R^c) d\tau = \int_{L^2} \lambda(du_0) \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t P_\tau^{\alpha, N}(u_0, B_R^c) d\tau \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{L^2} \lambda(du_0) \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{E}\|u_{\alpha, N}(\tau, u_0)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2}{R^2} d\tau \quad (\text{according Chebyshev's inequality}) \\ &\leq \int_{L^2} \lambda(du_0) \frac{\mathbb{E}M(u_0) + \frac{\alpha A_N^0 t}{2}}{\alpha t R^2} \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_\lambda \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\alpha t} + \frac{A_N^0}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose λ the Dirac measure concentrated at 0, δ_0 . Then, we obtain $\bar{\lambda}_t(B_R^c) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2R^2}$, and indeed B_R is compact of L^2 .

Therefore, we have the tightness of $\{\bar{\lambda}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, then there is subsequence $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \tau_+$ and measure μ_N^α such that: $\bar{\lambda}_{t_n} \rightarrow \mu_N^\alpha$ weakly in $P(L^2)$; The classical Bogoliubov-Krylov argument shows that μ_N^α is invariant.

Estimates. Let us define $\chi \in C^\infty$ be a function such that

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in [0, 1], \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in [2, \infty). \end{cases}$$

and $\chi_R(x) = \chi(\frac{x}{R})$.

Since $u \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(u) \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2})$ is continuous and bounded on L^2 , then we have

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}) \bar{\lambda}_{t_n}(du) \leq \int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \bar{\lambda}_{t_n}(du) = \frac{1}{t_n} \int_0^{t_n} \mathbb{E}\mathcal{M}(u) d\tau \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2}.$$

By passing to the limit $t_n \rightarrow \infty, R \rightarrow \infty$ and using the Fatou's lemma, we obtain:

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2},$$

then

$$\int_{L^2} \|u\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2}.$$

Thus

$$\int_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2} \quad \text{so } \mathbb{E}M(u_0) < \infty.$$

Therefore using the (4.4), and the fact that μ_N^α is invariant, we obtain the claim:

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) = \frac{A_N^0}{2} \leq \frac{A^0}{2}.$$

We have in particular

$$\int_{L^2} \|u\|_{L^2}^q \mu_N^\alpha(du) \lesssim \frac{A_N^0}{2}, \quad \forall q \geq 1.$$

Thus by using the fact that we are in finite dimensional, we will have:

$$\int_{L^2} E(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) < \infty \quad \text{so } \mathbb{E}E(u_0) < \infty.$$

Therefore by using (4.5) and the invariant measure, we will have the claim :

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{E}(u) \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq C.$$

□

Proposition 4.5. *For any $R > 0$, we have*

$$(4.8) \quad \int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u)(1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \mu_N^\alpha(du) \leq C_1 R^{-1}$$

where C_1 is independent of α, N .

Proof. Consider the functional

$$F_R(u) = \|u\|_{L^2}^2 (1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)).$$

Applying the Ito formula, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} dF_R + 2\alpha \mathcal{M}(u)(1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) &= -2\alpha \mathcal{M}(u) \chi_R'(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) + \frac{\alpha}{2} (1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) A_N^0 + 2\chi_R'(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) \sum_{n=0}^N a_n^2(u, e_n)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \left[A_N^0 \chi_R'(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) + \chi_R''(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) \sum_{n=0}^N a_n^2(u, e_n)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the invariance and (4.6), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} \mathcal{M}(u)(1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \leq A_N^0 \mathbb{E}(1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) + \frac{C(A^0)}{R}.$$

Now the Markov inequality and the estimate (4.6) imply

$$\int_{L^2} (1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \mu_N^\alpha \leq C R^{-1},$$

where C is independent of (α, N) . Overall, we have:

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u)(1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \mu_N^\alpha \leq C_1 R^{-1},$$

which is the claim. □

4.3. Inviscid limit.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $N \geq 2$, there exist a measure μ_N that is invariant under the flow ϕ_N^t and satisfies the following estimates:*

$$(4.9) \quad \int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N(du) = \frac{A_N^0}{2} \leq \frac{A^0}{2}$$

(4.10)

$$\int_{L^2} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} (\|u\|_{H^1}^2 + \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2}) + \frac{1}{q+1} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s-1}{2}} |u|^{q+1}\|_{L^2}^2 \mu_N(du) \leq C; \quad \text{for } s_{M^d} < s \leq 2$$

(4.11)

$$\int_{L^2} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C_{d,s} \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} - \|u\|_{L^{2q+2}}^{2q+2} + \frac{C_{d,s}}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \|u\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\tilde{k}} \mu_N(du) \leq C + K; \quad \text{for } \max(s_{M^d}, 2) < s$$

(4.12)

$$\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) (1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \mu_N(du) \leq CR^{-1}.$$

Proof.

Existence. Thanks to the estimate (4.6), we have the weak compactness of any sequence $(\mu_N^\alpha)_{\alpha \in (0,1)}$ with respect to the topology of L^2 , therefore there exists a subsequence $(\mu_N^{\alpha_k} := \mu_N^k)$, converging to a measure μ_N on L^2 .

Estimates. Since μ_N^α and μ_N are supported on E_N and we are actually working on a finite dimensional space, then the functions \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E} are continuous. Hence, the estimates (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) follow respectively from (4.7) and (4.8), the lower semicontinuity of $\mathcal{M}(u)$ and $\mathcal{E}(u)$. Let us prove the estimate (4.9), we have

$$\frac{A_N^0}{2} - \int_{L^2} (1 - \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2)) \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^k(du) \leq \int_{L^2} \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^k(du) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2}.$$

Now, by using (4.8), we will have

$$\frac{A_N^0}{2} - C_1 R^{-1} \leq \int_{L^2} \chi_R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2) \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N^k(du) \leq \frac{A_N^0}{2}.$$

By letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $R \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at the claim $\int_{L^2} \mathcal{M}(u) \mu_N(du) = \frac{A_N^0}{2} \leq \frac{A^0}{2}$.

Invariance. It is enough to show only the invariance under ϕ_N^t for $t > 0$; because for $t < 0$, we have by using the invariance for positives times, $\mu_N(\Gamma) = \mu_N(\phi_N^t \Gamma) = \mu_N(\phi_N^{2t} \phi_N^{-t} \Gamma) = \mu_N(\phi_N^{-t} \Gamma)$ which is what we wanted to show.

Now the proof of the invariance for positives times is summarized in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}_t^{k,N*} \mu_N^k & \xlongequal{\text{(I)}} & \mu_N^k \\ \text{(III)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{(II)} \\ \Phi_N^{t*} \mu_N & \xlongequal{\text{(IV)}} & \mu_N \end{array}$$

The equality (I) represents the invariance of the measure μ_N^k under $\mathcal{B}_t^{k,N*}$, the convergence (II) represents the weak convergence of μ_N^k towards μ_N , the equality (IV) represents the claimed invariance of μ_N under Φ_N^t which will follow once we prove the convergence (III) in the weakly topology of L^2 .

We are going now to prove the convergence (III). For that, let $f : L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a lipschitz function that is also bounded by 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{B}_t^{k,N*} \mu_N^k, f) - (\Phi_N^{t*} \mu_N, f) &= (\mu_N^k, \mathcal{B}_t^{k,N} f) - (\mu_N, \Phi_N^t f) \\ &= (\mu_N^k, \mathcal{B}_t^{k,N} f - \Phi_N^t f) - (\mu_N - \mu_N^k, \Phi_N^t f) \\ &= A_1 - A_2. \end{aligned}$$

By using the fact that ϕ_N^t is Feller, we see that $A_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

On the other hand, by using the boundedness property of f , we have

$$|A_1| \leq \int_{B_R(L^2)} |\phi_N^t f(u_0) - \mathcal{B}_t^{k,N} f(u_0)| \mu_N^k(du_0) + 2\mu_N^k(L^2 \setminus B_R(L^2)) = A_3 + A_4.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3 &= \int_{B_R(L^2)} \left| \left(\int_{L^2} f(v) P_t^{k,N}(u_0, dv) \right) - \phi_N^t f(u_0) \right| \mu_N^k(du_0) \\
&= \int_{B_R(L^2)} \left| \left(\int_{\Omega} f(u_k(t, P_N u_0)) d\mathbb{P} \right) - f(\phi_N^t P_N u_0) \right| \mu_N^k(du_0) \\
&\leq \int_{B_R(L^2)} \left(\int_{\Omega} |(f(u_k(t, P_N u_0)) - f(\phi_N^t P_N u_0))| d\mathbb{P} \right) \mu_N^k(du_0) \\
&\leq \int_{B_R(L^2)} \left(\int_{S_r} |(f(u_k(t, P_N u_0)) - f(\phi_N^t P_N u_0))| d\mathbb{P} \right) \mu_N^k(du_0) \\
&\quad + \int_{B_R(L^2)} \left(\int_{S_r^c} |(f(u_k(t, P_N u_0)) - f(\phi_N^t P_N u_0))| d\mathbb{P} \right) \mu_N^k(du_0) \\
&\leq C_f \int_{B_R(L^2)} \mathbb{E}(\|u_k(t, P_N u_0) - \phi_N^t P_N u_0\|_{L^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r}) \mu_N^k(du_0) + 2 \int_{B_R(L^2)} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{S_r^c} \mu_N^k(du_0)
\end{aligned}$$

by using the Lipschitz property.

Now let us consider for $r > 0$,

$$S_r = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \max \left(\left| \sqrt{\alpha_k} \sum_{n=0}^N a_n \int_0^t (u, e_n) d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) \right|, \|z_k\|_{L^2} \right) \leq r \sqrt{\alpha_k t} \right\}.$$

Let us compute $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{S_r^c}$. We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sqrt{\alpha_k} \sum_{n=0}^N a_n \int_0^t (u, e_n) d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) \right|^2 = \alpha_k \sum_{n=0}^N a_n^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}(u, e_n)^2 d\tau \leq \alpha_k t A_0 \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \alpha_k t.$$

We have also

$$\mathbb{E}\|z_k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \alpha_k t.$$

According to the Chebyshev inequality, we have:

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{S_r^c} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ w \mid \max \left(\left| \sqrt{\alpha_k} \sum_{n=0}^N a_n \int_0^t (u, e_n) d\mathcal{B}_n(\tau) \right|, \|z_k\|_{L^2} \right) \geq r \sqrt{\alpha_k t} \right\} \leq \frac{C \alpha_k t}{r^2 \alpha_k t} = \frac{C}{r^2}.$$

We need to prove now the following statement

Lemma 4.7. *We have for any $R > 0$ and $r > 0$*

$$(4.13) \quad \sup_{u_0 \in B_R(L^2)} \mathbb{E}(\|\phi_N^t P_N u_0 - u_k(t, P_N u_0)\|_{L^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let us recall the equations

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_t u = i [\Delta u - P_N (|u|^{2q} u)], \\
du_{\alpha_k} = i [\Delta u_{\alpha_k} - P_N (|u_{\alpha_k}|^{2q} u_{\alpha_k}) - \alpha_k ((-\Delta)^{s-1} u_{\alpha_k} + C_{d,s} \|u_{\alpha_k}\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\bar{k}} u_{\alpha_k})] dt + \sqrt{\alpha_k} d\mathcal{W}^N, \\
u_{\alpha_k} = v_k + z_{\alpha_k}, \\
dz_k = (i \Delta z_{\alpha_k} - \alpha_k (-\Delta)^{s-1} z_{\alpha_k}) dt + \sqrt{\alpha_k} \sum_{n=1}^N a_n e_n d\mathcal{B}_n(t), \\
\partial_t v_k = i (\Delta v_k - P_N (|v_k + z_{\alpha_k}|^{2q} (v_k + z_{\alpha_k}))) - \alpha_k ((-\Delta)^{s-1} v_k + C_{d,s} \|v_k + z_{\alpha_k}\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\bar{k}} (v_k + z_{\alpha_k})).
\end{cases}$$

Let us set $w_k = u - v_k = \phi_N^t P_N u_0 - v_k(t, P_N u_0)$. We have

$$\partial_t w_k = i [\Delta w_k - P_N (|w_k|^{2q} w_k - |v_k + z_{\alpha_k}|^{2q} (v_k + z_{\alpha_k}))] + \alpha_k ((-\Delta)^{s-1} w_k + C_{d,s} \|w_k + z_{\alpha_k}\|_{H^{s-}}^{3\bar{k}} (w_k + z_{\alpha_k})).$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E}\|z_{\alpha_k}\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad \forall u_0 \in B_R(L^2),$$

we just need to prove that

$$\sup_{u_0 \in B_R(L^2)} \mathbb{E}(\|w_k\|_{L^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let us define f_{p-1} and g_{p-1} such that $|u|^{2q}u - |v_k + z_k|^{2q}(v_k + z_k) = w_k f_{2q}(u, v_k) - g_{2q}(v_k, z_k)z_k$ where f_{2q} and g_{2q} are polynomials of degree $2q$ in the given variables.

By taking the inner product with w_k , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \|w_k\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq 2\|w_k\|_{L^2}^2(1 + \lambda_N^2 + \|f_{2q}(u, v_k)\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty}) + 2\|z_k\|_{L^2}^2 \|g_{2q}(v_k, z_k)\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty}^2 \\ &\quad + \alpha_k C_0(N) \left(\frac{\|v_k\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \frac{\|w_k\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \|v + z_k\|_{L^2}^{3\tilde{k}} \left(\frac{\|v + z_k\|_{L^2}^2}{2} + \frac{\|w_k\|_{L^2}^2}{2} \right) \right) \\ &\leq C_1(N) \|w_k\|_{L^2}^2 \left(1 + \lambda_N^2 + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2q} + \|v_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2q} + \alpha_k + \alpha_k \|u_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{3\tilde{k}} \right) \\ &\quad + C_2(N) \|z_k\|_{L^2}^2 \left(\|v_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{4q} + \|z_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{4q} + \alpha_k \left(\|v_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 + \|u_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{3\tilde{k}+2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By using the Gronwall's lemma and the fact that $w_k(0) = 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}.a.e$

(4.14)

$$\|w_k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_3(N, \alpha_k, u_0, q, \tilde{k}) e^{C_1(N) \int_0^t \left(1 + \lambda_N^2 + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2q} + \|v_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{2q} + \alpha_k + \alpha_k \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^{3\tilde{k}} \right) d\tau} \left(\int_0^t \|z_k\|_{L^2}^2 d\tau \right).$$

We know that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|z_k\|_{L^2} = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}.a.e.$$

Now, by using the Ito formula on the stochastic solution u_k , and using the fact $\alpha_k \leq 1$ and we are on the S_r , we arrive at

$$\|u_k\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2}^2 + C(r, N)t.$$

After that, it is easy to see that on S_r ,

$$\|w_k\|_{L^2} \leq \|v_k\|_{L^2} + \|z_k\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_k\|_{L^2} + 2\|z_k\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2} + 3C(r, N)T.$$

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r} \leq R + 3C(R, N)T, \\ \sup_{k \geq 1} \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r} \leq R + 3C(R, N)T. \end{cases}$$

Thus, using the estimate (4.14) and the L^2 conservation of the deterministic solution $\|u(t)\|_{L^2} = \|P_N u_0\|_{L^2}$, we have

$$\sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \mathbf{1}_{S_r} \leq A(R, N, r, T) \|z_k\|_{L_t^1 L_x^2}.$$

We obtain that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \mathbf{1}_{S_r} = 0$$

So

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2}^2 \mathbf{1}_{S_r} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

Now using the fact that $\forall u_0 \in B_R$, we have $\|w_k(t, P_N u_0)\|_{L^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r} \leq \sup_{u_0 \in B_R} \|w_k(t, P_N u_0)\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r}$.

We will have therefore

$$\sup_{u_0 \in B_R(L^2)} \mathbb{E} (\|w_k\|_{L^2} \mathbf{1}_{S_r}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Which is the claim. □

By letting $R, r, k \rightarrow \infty$ and using the lemma, we have $A_3, A_4 \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of invariance. □

4.4. Uniform control on the finite-dimensional dynamics.

Let $B_a = \{u \in L^2 \mid \|u\|_{L^2} \leq a\}$ where the number $a > 0$ is arbitrary small. Let us set $L_a^2 = L^2 \setminus B_a$, and $E_N^a = \{u \in E_N \mid \|u\|_{L^2} > a\}$. We have

$$(4.15) \quad \int_{E_N^a} \|u\|_{H^{s^-}}^{3\bar{k}} d\mu_N \leq C.$$

Indeed,

$$\int_{E_N^a} \|u\|_{H^{s^-}}^{3\bar{k}} \mu_N(du) = \int_{L_a^2} \|u\|_{H^{s^-}}^{3\bar{k}} \mu_N(du) \leq \int_{L_a^2} \frac{\|u\|_{L^2}^2}{a^2} \|u\|_{H^{s^-}}^{3\bar{k}} \mu_N(du) \leq C := C(a).$$

Proposition 4.8. *Let $s_{M^d} < s' \leq s^-$, let $\epsilon > 0$, let $a > 0$ and let $N \geq 0$. There exists a constant $C = C(a) > 0$ and $\tilde{k} := \tilde{k}(\epsilon)$ such that: for any $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, there is a set $\Sigma_{N,s'}^i$ satisfying*

$$(4.16) \quad \mu_N(E_N^a \setminus \Sigma_{N,s'}^i) \leq C i^{-2\tilde{k}},$$

and having the property that: $\forall u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i$:

$$(4.17) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \|\phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq C(\|u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s^-}})((1+|t|))^\epsilon.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we will consider $t \geq 0$. Let us define for $j \geq 1$, the set

$$B_{N,s'}^{i,j} = \{u_{0,N} \in E_N \mid \|u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq ij\}.$$

and let $T_0 \sim (ij)^{\frac{-2q}{\gamma}}$ (with $\gamma < 1$) be the local time existence:

$$(4.18) \quad \forall t \in [0, T_0], \quad \phi_N^t B_{N,s'}^{i,j} \subset \{u \in E_N \mid \|u\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2C ij\}.$$

Let us set

$$\Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j} = \bigcap_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{j\bar{k}}{T_0} \rfloor} \phi_N^{-lT_0} (B_{N,s'}^{i,j}).$$

By using the invariance of μ_N under ϕ_t^N , we see that

$$(4.19) \quad \mu_N(E_N^a \setminus \Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{j\bar{k}}{T_0} \rfloor} \mu(E_N^a \setminus \Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}).$$

Since $s' \leq s^-$, then $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_N} \|u\|_{H^{s'}}^{3\bar{k}} \leq C := C(a)$ and $T_0 \sim (ij)^{\frac{-2q}{\gamma}}$, therefore by using Chebyshev's inequality, we obtain

$$\mu_N(E_N^a \setminus \Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}) \leq C_1 \left(\left\lfloor \frac{j\bar{k}}{T_0} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) (i \cdot j)^{-3\bar{k}} \leq C j^{\bar{k}} (i \cdot j)^{\frac{2q}{\gamma}} (i \cdot j)^{-3\bar{k}} \leq C j^{\bar{k}} (i \cdot j)^{\bar{k}} (i \cdot j)^{-3\bar{k}} \leq C i^{-2\bar{k}} j^{-\bar{k}}.$$

Notice that the series $\sum_{j \geq 1} j^{-\bar{k}}$ converges and let us set

$$\Sigma_{N,s'}^i = \bigcap_{j \geq 1} \Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}.$$

Then we obtain

$$\mu_N(E_N^a \setminus \Sigma_{N,s'}^i) \leq C i^{-2\bar{k}},$$

where C does not depend on N .

We see also that:

$$\forall u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}, \quad \forall t \leq j^{\bar{k}}, \quad \|\phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2C ij$$

In fact, we have $\forall t \leq j^{\bar{k}}, t = lT_0 + \tau$ where $l \in [0, \lfloor \frac{j\bar{k}}{T_0} \rfloor]$ and $\tau \in [0, T_0[$. By definition of $\Sigma_{N,s'}^{i,j}$, $u_{0,N}$ can be written as $\phi_N^{-l_1 T_0} w$ with a fixed integer $l_1 \in [0, \lfloor \frac{j\bar{k}}{T_0} \rfloor]$ and $w \in B_{N,s'}^{i,j}$.

Then $\phi_N^t u_{0,N} = \phi_N^\tau \phi_N^{l_1 T_0} u_{0,N} = \phi_N^\tau w$.

We then obtain, with the use of (4.18),

$$\|\phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2C ij \quad \forall t \leq j^{\bar{k}}.$$

Let $t > 0$, there is $j \geq 1$ such that $j^{\bar{k}} - 1 \leq |t| \leq j^{\bar{k}}$. Then

$$j \leq (1 + |t|)^{\frac{1}{\bar{k}}}.$$

We arrive at

$$\forall u_0 \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \|\phi_N^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2Ci(1+|t|)^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq 2Ci(1+|t|)^\epsilon.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4.5. Construction of the statistical ensemble. The estimates (4.10, 4.11) combined with the Prokhorov theorem establish the existence of a measure μ as a weak limit of a subsequence $\mu^{N_k} \subset (\mu^N)$, and a simple argument show that $\mu(H^s) = 1$.

We employ the Skorokhod representation theorem to obtain a probability space still denoted $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ on which are defined the random variables u_{N_k} and u satisfying the following.

- u is distributed by μ and $\forall N_k, u_{N_k}$ is distributed by μ_{N_k} ;
- u_{N_k} converges to u almost surely in $H^{s'}$.

Let us introduce the set

$$(4.20) \quad \Sigma_{s'}^i = \left\{ u \in H^{s'} \mid \exists (u_{N_k}), u_{N_k} \rightarrow u \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \text{ and } u_{N_k} \in \Sigma_{N_k, s'}^i \right\}.$$

Let us introduce the statistical ensemble

$$(4.21) \quad \Sigma_{s'} = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} \Sigma_{s'}^i.$$

Lemma 4.9. *We have that*

$$(4.22) \quad \mu(\Sigma_{s'}) = 1.$$

Proof. In the line of Skorokhod sequences above, we can find a full probability set $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that the convergence holds for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$. Define the sets

$$(4.23) \quad \mathbb{A}_{N, s'} = \{\omega \in \tilde{\Omega} \mid u_N^\omega \in \Sigma_{N, s'}^i\}$$

$$(4.24) \quad \mathbb{A}_{s'} = \{\omega \in \tilde{\Omega} \mid u^\omega \in \Sigma_{s'}^i\}.$$

We remark that, by the construction of $\tilde{\Omega}$, for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, the sequence $\{u_{N_k}^\omega\}$ converges. Let us prove that

$$(4.25) \quad \limsup_N \mathbb{A}_{N, s'} \subset \mathbb{A}_{s'}.$$

If ω belongs to an infinite number of $\mathbb{A}_{N_k, s'}$, the corresponding L^2 elements form a sequence $\{u_{N_k}^\omega\}$ whose k th element, for any k , belong to $\Sigma_{N_k, s'}^i$. Recalling the convergence established above, we obtain the existence of an element u^ω as its limit. Therefore ω belongs to $\mathbb{A}_{s'}$. We arrive at (4.25).

Next, with the use of the inclusion (4.25), the inequality (4.30) below and the bound (4.16), let us write

$$(4.26) \quad \mu(\Sigma_{s'}^i) = \mathbb{P}(u^{-1}(\Sigma_{s'}^i)) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A}_{s'}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\limsup_N \mathbb{A}_{N, s'}) \geq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A}_{N, s'})$$

$$(4.27) \quad = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(u_N^{-1}(\Sigma_{N, s'}^i))$$

$$(4.28) \quad = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu_N(\Sigma_{N, s'}^i) \geq 1 - i^{-2\bar{k}}.$$

Now, since μ is finite and the sequence $(\Sigma_{s'}^i)_i$ is non decreasing, we have

$$(4.29) \quad 1 \geq \mu(\Sigma_{s'}) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\Sigma_{s'}^i) \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (1 - Ci^{-2\bar{k}}) = 1.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.10. *Let (E, \mathcal{F}, ν) be a measure space, with $\nu(E) < \infty$. Then, for all sequences of measurable sets (E_k) , we have*

$$(4.30) \quad \nu(\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu(E_k).$$

Proof. We have that the sequence $F_k := \cup_{j \geq k} E_j$ is non increasing in k . Then

- (1) $\nu(F_k) \geq \sup_{j \geq k} \nu(E_j)$,
- (2) $\nu(\cap_{k \geq 0} F_k) = \inf_{k \geq 0} \nu(F_k)$.

Putting these together, we obtain

$$(4.31) \quad \nu(\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k) \geq \inf_{k \geq 0} \sup_{j \geq k} \nu(E_j) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu(E_k),$$

which was the claim. \square

Proposition 4.11. *Let M^d be a Riemannian compact manifold of dimension d . For any $s_{M^d} < s$, for every $u_0 \in \Sigma_{s'}$, the solution $\phi^t u_0$ of (1.1) given by Theorem 2.1 is global in H^s . And*

$$(4.32) \quad \|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^s})(1 + |t|)^\epsilon \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. We just need to prove the globalization lemma assumptions.

Let $u_0 \in \Sigma_{s'}$, then $u_0 \in \Sigma_{s'}^i$ for some i . By definition of $\Sigma_{s'}^i, \exists(u_{0,N_k}), u_{0,N_k} \rightarrow u_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and $u_{0,N_k} \in \Sigma_{N_k, s'}^i$.

Hence, we have

- (1) the existence of the sequence that is the first condition of the (globalization) lemma 2.9;
- (2) and using Proposition (4.8), we have that (since $u_{0,N_k} \in \Sigma_{N_k, s'}^i$)

$$\|\phi_{N_k}^t u_0\|_{H^{s'}} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^s})(1 + |t|)^\epsilon \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence we can invoke the globalization lemma 2.9 to obtain the claim. \square

Now let us consider an increasing sequence $(s'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $s_{M^d} < s'_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s'_n = s^-$ and let us set our statistical ensemble:

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_{s, q, \epsilon} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_{s'_n}.$$

Since each of the sets $\Sigma_{s'_n}$ is of full measure, we have that

$$(4.33) \quad \mu(\Sigma) = 1.$$

Remark 4.12. We can summarize all the analysis that we have been done above in the following: For any $u_0 \in \Sigma$, the associated solution $\phi^t u_0$ provided by Proposition 2.1 is global in time, and $\|\phi^t u_0\|_{H^{s^-}} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{H^s})(1 + |t|)^\epsilon \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. \triangle

4.6. Further properties of Σ and μ .

Proposition 4.13. *The following holds:*

- (1) *The distribution of functional $u \mapsto \|u\|_{L^2}$ under μ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} . In particular μ doesn't have an atom.*
- (2) *For any $s_{M^d} < s$, the measure μ is invariant under ϕ^t .*
- (3) *For any $s_{M^d} < s' \leq s^-$, any $s_{M^d} < s_1 < s'$, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $i_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if $u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N, s'}^i$, then we have $\phi_N^t u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N, s_1}^{i i_1}$.*
- (4) *The flow ϕ^t satisfies $\phi^t \Sigma = \Sigma$, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof.

- (1) The proof uses an argument of Shirikyan [49], and follows Theorem 9.1 in Sy [55].

- (2) Let us prove the invariance of μ under the flow ϕ^t .

The Ulam's theorem ensures that μ is regular: for any $S \in \text{Bor}(H^s)$

$$\mu(S) = \sup\{\mu(K), K \subset S \text{ compact}\}.$$

Therefore, it will just suffice to prove invariance for compact sets. Indeed, we then obtain, for any t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\phi^{-t} S) &= \sup\{\mu(K), K \subset \phi^{-t} S \text{ compact}\} = \sup\{\mu(\phi^t K), K \subset \phi^{-t} S \text{ compact}\} \\ &= \sup\{\mu(\phi^t K), \phi^t K \subset S, K \text{ compact}\} \leq \sup\{\mu(C), C \subset S \text{ compact}\} = \mu(S), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that ϕ^t is continuous in space, therefore it transforms compact sets into compact sets.

Using the inequality above, we also have for any t that

$$\mu(S) = \mu(\phi^{-t} \phi^t S) \leq \mu(\phi^t S).$$

Since t is arbitrary, we then obtain the invariance.

Now we claim that it also suffices to show the invariance only on a fixed interval $[-\tau, \tau]$, where $\tau > 0$ can be as small as we want. Indeed, for $\tau \leq t \leq 2\tau$, one has

$$\mu(\phi^{-t}K) = \mu(\phi^{-\tau}\phi^{t-\tau}K) = \mu(\phi^{t-\tau}K) = \mu(K) \quad (\text{using that } 0 \leq t - \tau \leq \tau),$$

and for greater values of t , we can iterate. A similar argument works for negative values of t .

Our proof is then reduced to showing invariance for compact sets on a small time interval. Therefore, it suffices to show it on the balls of H^s . Below is the idea of the proof:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi_N^{t*} \mu_{N_k} & \xrightarrow{\text{(I)}} & \mu_{N_k} \\ \text{(III)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{(II)} \\ \Phi^{t*} \mu & \xrightarrow{\text{(IV)}} & \mu \end{array}$$

We are going to prove the converge (III) to conclude the invariance (IV).

Let $f \in C_b(H^s)$, supported on a ball $B_R(H^s)$. Assume that f is Lipschitz in the topology of $H^{s'}$, $s' < s$. Let τ be the associated time existence provided by Proposition 2.3. Then for $t < \tau$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_N^{t*} \mu_{N_k}, f) - (\Phi^{t*} \mu, f) &= (\mu_{N_k}, \Phi_N^t f) - (\mu, \Phi^t f) \\ &= (\mu_{N_k}, \Phi_N^t f - \Phi^t f) - (\mu - \mu_{N_k}, \Phi^t f) = A_1 - A_2. \end{aligned}$$

By the continuity property of ϕ^t , we have that $\Phi^t f \in C_b(H^s)$. Then by weak convergence of μ_{N_k} to μ on $H^{s'}$, we have that $A_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Now using the Lipschitz property of f , we have thanks the local uniform convergence,

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1| &\leq C_f \sup_{u_0 \in B_R(H^s)} \|\phi_N^t(P_N u_0) - \phi^t(u_0)\|_{H^{s'}} \mu_N(B_R(H^{s'})) \\ &\leq C_f \sup_{u_0 \in B_R(H^s)} \|\phi_N^t(P_N u_0) - \phi^t(u_0)\|_{H^{s'}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the claim.

- (3) Let us fix $s' \in (s_{M^d}, s^-]$. Let $u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Without loss of generality, assume $t > 0$ then for any $j \geq 1$, we have

$$\|\phi_N^{t_1} u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2Cij, \quad t_1 \leq j^{\bar{k}}.$$

Let $i_1 := i_1(t)$ be such that for every $j \geq 1$, $j^{\bar{k}} + t \leq (ji_1)^{\bar{k}}$. We then have

$$\|\phi_N^{t_1+t} u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2C i(ji_1), \quad t_1 \leq j^{\bar{k}}.$$

Now, thanks to Proposition 4.8, we have, for every $u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i$

$$\|u_{0,N}\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}} \leq 2Ci,$$

therefore, since the L^2 -norm is preserved, we have, for every $u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i$, that

$$\|\phi_N^{t_1+t} u_{0,N}\|_{L^2} \leq 2Ci.$$

Hence for every $s_{M^d} < s_1 < s'$, we use an interpolation to see that there is $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $t_1 \leq j^{\bar{k}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_N^{t+t_1} u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s_1}} &\leq \|\phi_N^{t+t_1} u_{0,N}\|_{L^2}^{1-\theta} \|\phi_N^{t+t_1} u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s'}}^{\theta} \leq (2C)^{1-\theta} (2C)^{\theta} i^{1-\theta} (ji_1)^{\theta} \\ &\leq (ii_1)j. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality above follows from the fact that i_1 can be taken so large that $2Ci_1^{\theta} \leq i_1$ (since $\theta < 1$). We already have that $j^{\theta} \leq j$. The claim follows.

(4) Since any $\Sigma_{s'}$ is of full μ -measure and the intersection is countable, we obtain the first statement.

To prove the second statement, let us take $u_0 \in \Sigma$, then u_0 belongs to each $\Sigma_{s'}$, $s' \in I$.

Firstly, let us consider $u_0 \in \Sigma_{s'}^i$. Therefore u_0 is the limit of a sequence $(u_{0,N})$ such that $u_{0,N} \in \Sigma_{N,s'}^i$ for every N .

Now, from the above statement, there is $i_1 := i_1(t)$ such that $\phi_N^t(u_{0,N}) \in \Sigma_{N,s_1}^{ii_1}$.

By using the convergence ($\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\phi^t u_0 - \phi_N^t u_{0,N}\|_{H^{s_1}} = 0$), we see that $\phi^t(u_0) \in \Sigma_{s_1}^{ii_1}$. We conclude that

$$\phi^t(\Sigma_{s'}^i) \subset \Sigma_{s_1}^{ii_1} \subset \Sigma_{s_1}.$$

It follows that $\phi^t \Sigma \subset \Sigma$.

Now, let u be in Σ , since ϕ^t is well-defined on Σ , we can set $u_0 = \phi^{-t}u$, we then have $u = \phi^t u_0$ and hence $\Sigma \subset \phi^t \Sigma$.

This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Anton. Cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation on three dimensional balls with radial data. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(10-12):1862–1889, 2008.
- [2] R. Anton. Strichartz inequalities for lipschitz metrics on manifolds and nonlinear schrödinger equation on domains. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 136(1):27–65, 2008.
- [3] M. Beceanu, Q. Deng, A. Soffer, and Y. Wu. Large global solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations iii, energy-supercritical cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07709*, 2019.
- [4] M. D. Blair, H. F. Smith, and C. D. Sogge. Strichartz estimates and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on manifolds with boundary. *Mathematische Annalen*, 354(4):1397–1430, 2012.
- [5] J. Bourgain. Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. *Geom. funct. anal.*, 3(2):107–156, 1993.
- [6] J. Bourgain. Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and invariant measures. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 166:1–26, 1994.
- [7] J. Bourgain. Invariant measures for the 2D-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 176(2):421–445, 1996.
- [8] J. Bourgain. Refinements of Strichartz’ inequality and applications to 2D-NLS with critical nonlinearity. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 1998.
- [9] J. Bourgain. Global wellposedness of defocusing critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 12(1):145–171, 1999.
- [10] J. Bourgain and A. Bulut. Invariant gibbs measure evolution for the radial nonlinear wave equation on the 3d ball. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 266(4):2319–2340, 2014.
- [11] J. Bourgain and C. Demeter. The proof of the l2 decoupling conjecture. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 351–389, 2015.
- [12] H. Brezis and T. Gallouet. Nonlinear schrödinger evolution equations. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 4(4):677–681, 1980.
- [13] B. Bringmann, Y. Deng, A. R. Nahmod, and H. Yue. Invariant gibbs measures for the three dimensional cubic nonlinear wave equation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, pages 1–279, 2024.
- [14] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. The Cauchy problem for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on a compact manifold. *Journal of Nonlinear Mathematical Physics*, 10(Suppl 1):12–27, 2003.
- [15] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. Strichartz inequalities and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on compact manifolds. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 126(3):569–605, 2004.
- [16] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. Bilinear eigenfunction estimates and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 159(1):187–223, 2005.
- [17] N. Burq, L. Thomann, and N. Tzvetkov. Remarks on the Gibbs measures for nonlinear dispersive equations. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 27(3):527–597, 2018.
- [18] T. Cazenave and F. B. Weissler. The Cauchy problem for the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in H^s . *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 14(10):807–836, 1990.
- [19] F. M. Christ and M. I. Weinstein. Dispersion of small amplitude solutions of the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Journal of functional analysis*, 100(1):87–109, 1991.
- [20] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Almost conservation laws and global rough solutions to a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 9(5-6):659–682, 2002.
- [21] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in \mathbb{R}^d . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(3):767–865, 2008.
- [22] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Transfer of energy to high frequencies in the cubic defocusing nonlinear schrödinger equation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 181(1):39–113, 2010.
- [23] A. Córdoba and D. Córdoba. A pointwise estimate for fractionary derivatives with applications to partial differential equations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(26):15316–15317, 2003.
- [24] G. Da Prato and A. Debussche. Two-dimensional navier–stokes equations driven by a space–time white noise. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 196(1):180–210, 2002.
- [25] Y. Deng, A. Nahmod, and H. Yue. Invariant Gibbs measures and global strong solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations in dimension two. *Annals of Mathematics*, 200(2):399–486, 2024.
- [26] B. Dodson. Global well-posedness and scattering for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with algebraic nonlinearity when $d = 2, 3$ and u_0 is radial. *Cambridge journal of mathematics*, 7, 2019.

- [27] J. Földes and M. Sy. Invariant measures and global well posedness for the sqg equation. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 241(1):187–230, 2021.
- [28] J. Földes and M. Sy. Almost sure global well-posedness for 3D Euler equation and other fluid dynamics models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00332*, 2023.
- [29] J. Ginibre and G. Velo. The global Cauchy problem for the non linear Schrödinger equation revisited. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, volume 2, pages 309–327. Elsevier, 1985.
- [30] M. G. Grillakis. On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 25(9-10):1827–1844, 2000.
- [31] Z. Hani, B. Pausader, N. Tzvetkov, and N. Visciglia. Modified scattering for the cubic schrödinger equation on product spaces and applications. In *Forum of mathematics, Pi*, volume 3, page e4. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [32] S. Herr. The quintic nonlinear schrödinger equation on three-dimensional zoll manifolds. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 135(5):1271–1290, 2013.
- [33] S. Herr, D. Tataru, and N. Tzvetkov. Global well-posedness of the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation with small initial data in $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$. *Duke Math. J.*, 159(2):329–349, 2011.
- [34] A. Ionescu, B. Pausader, and G. Staffilani. On the global well-posedness of energy-critical schrödinger equations in curved spaces. *Analysis & PDE*, 5(4):705–746, 2012.
- [35] A. D. Ionescu and B. Pausader. The energy-critical defocusing NLS on \mathbb{T}^3 . *Duke Math. J.*, 161(8):1581–1612, 2012.
- [36] O. Ivanovici. On the Schrödinger equation outside strictly convex obstacles. *Analysis & PDE*, 3(3):261–293, 2010.
- [37] M. Keel and T. Tao. Endpoint Strichartz estimates. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 120(5):955–980, 1998.
- [38] C. E. Kenig and F. Merle. Nondispersive radial solutions to energy supercritical non-linear wave equations, with applications. *American journal of mathematics*, 133(4):1029–1065, 2011.
- [39] R. Killip and M. Visan. Energy-Supercritical NLS: Critical \dot{H}^s -bounds imply scattering. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 35(6):945–987, 2010.
- [40] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. Randomly forced CGL equation: stationary measures and the inviscid limit. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 37(12):3805, 2004.
- [41] S. Kuksin and A. Shirikyan. *Mathematics of two-dimensional turbulence*, volume 194. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [42] S. B. Kuksin. The eulerian limit for 2d statistical hydrodynamics. *Journal of statistical physics*, 115:469–492, 2004.
- [43] M. Latocca. Construction of high regularity invariant measures for the 2d Euler equations and remarks on the growth of the solutions. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 48(1):22–53, 2023.
- [44] J. L. Lebowitz, H. A. Rose, and E. R. Speer. Statistical mechanics of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Journal of statistical physics*, 50(3):657–687, 1988.
- [45] F. Merle, P. Raphaël, I. Rodnianski, and J. Szeftel. On blow up for the energy super critical defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Inventiones mathematicae*, pages 1–167, 2022.
- [46] A. R. Nahmod, T. Oh, L. Rey-Bellet, and G. Staffilani. Invariant weighted wiener measures and almost sure global well-posedness for the periodic derivative nls. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 14(4):1275–1330, 2012.
- [47] B. Pausader, N. Tzvetkov, and X. Wang. Global regularity for the energy-critical NLS on \mathbb{S}^3 . *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 31(2):315–338, 2014.
- [48] E. Ryckman and M. Visan. Global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in r^{1+4} . *American journal of mathematics*, 129(1):1–60, 2007.
- [49] A. Shirikyan. Local times for solutions of the complex Ginzburg–Landau equation and the inviscid limit. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*, 384(1):130–137, 2011.
- [50] C. D. Sogge. Concerning the L_p norm of spectral clusters for second-order elliptic operators on compact manifolds. *Journal of functional analysis*, 77(1):123–138, 1988.
- [51] G. Staffilani and D. Tataru. Strichartz estimates for a Schrödinger operator with nonsmooth coefficients. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 27(7-8):1337–1372, 2002.
- [52] R. S. Strichartz. Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations. 1977.
- [53] M. Sy. Invariant measure and long time behavior of regular solutions of the Benjamin–Ono equation. *Analysis & PDE*, 11(8):1841–1879, 2018.
- [54] M. Sy. Invariant measure and large time dynamics of the cubic Klein–Gordon equation in 3D. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 7(3):379–416, 2019.
- [55] M. Sy. Almost sure global well-posedness for the energy supercritical schrödinger equations. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 154:108–145, 2021.
- [56] M. Sy and X. Yu. Almost sure global well-posedness for the energy supercritical nls on the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3 . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00766*, 2020.
- [57] M. Sy and X. Yu. Global well-posedness and long-time behavior of the fractional nls. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 10(4):1261–1317, 2022.
- [58] M. Sy and X. Yu. Global well-posedness and long-time behavior of the fractional nls. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 10(4):1261–1317, 2022.
- [59] M. Sy and X. Yu. Global well-posedness for the cubic fractional nls on the unit disk. *Nonlinearity*, 35(4):2020, 2022.
- [60] T. Tao. Global well-posedness and scattering for the higher-dimensional energy-critical nonlinear schrödinger equation for radial data. *New York J. Math.*, 11:57–80, 2005.
- [61] T. Tao. *Nonlinear dispersive equations: local and global analysis*. Number 106. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.
- [62] N. Tzvetkov. Invariant measures for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the disc. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 3(2):111–160, 2006.
- [63] N. Tzvetkov. Invariant measures for the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 58(7):2543–2604, 2008.
- [64] M. Visan. The defocusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in higher dimensions. 2007.
- [65] W.-M. Wang. Energy supercritical nonlinear Schrödinger equations: quasiperiodic solutions. 2016.

SEYNABOU GUEYE
AIMS-SENEGAL
KM2 ROUTE DE JOAL
P.O BOX,1418, MBOUR-THIÈS, SÉNÉGAL
Email address: gueyenabou94@gmail.com, seynabou.gueye@aims-senegal.org

FILONE G. LONGMOU-MOFFO
AIMS-SENEGAL
KM2 ROUTE DE JOAL
P.O BOX,1418, MBOUR-THIÈS, SÉNÉGAL
Email address: longmoumoffofilonegilson@gmail.com, longmou.m.f.gilson@aims-senegal.org

MOUHAMADOU SY
AIMS-SENEGAL
KM2 ROUTE DE JOAL
P.O BOX,1418, MBOUR-THIÈS, SÉNÉGAL
Email address: mouhamadous314@gmail.com, mouhamadou.sy@aims-senegal.org