arXiv:1607.00029v2 [math.PR] 2 Mar 2023

Correction to "Well-posedness of semilinear stochastic wave equations with Hölder continuous coefficients" *

Federica Masiero
Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università di Milano Bicocca
via Cozzi 55, 20125 Milano, Italy
e-mail: federica.masiero@unimib.it,

Enrico Priola
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Pavia
Pavia, Italy
e-mail: enrico.priola@unipv.it

Abstract

We prove that semilinear stochastic abstract wave equations, including wave and plate equations, are well-posed in the strong sense with an α-Hölder continuous drift coefficient, if $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$. The uniqueness may fail for the corresponding deterministic PDE and well-posedness is restored by adding an external random forcing of white noise type. This shows a kind of regularization by noise for the semilinear wave equation. To prove the result we introduce an approach based on backward stochastic differential equations, differentiability along subspaces and control theoretic results. We stress that the well-posedness holds despite the Markov semigroup associated to the linear stochastic wave equation is not strong Feller.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): Primary 60H15; secondary 35R60.

Key words: Nonlinear stochastic wave equation, Hölder continuous drift, strong uniqueness.

1 Introduction

We prove well-posedness in the strong sense for semilinear stochastic abstract wave equations, including wave and plate equations. Let us consider the following non-linear stochastic wave equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \tau^2} y(\tau,\xi) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} y(\tau,\xi) + b(\tau,\xi,y(\tau,\xi)) + \dot{W}(\tau,\xi), \quad \xi \in (0,1), \\ y(\tau,0) = y(\tau,1) = 0, \\ y(0,\xi) = x_0(\xi), \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial \tau}(0,\xi) = x_1(\xi), \quad \tau \in (0,T], \quad \xi \in [0,1], \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $x_0 \in H_0^1([0,1])$, $x_1 \in L^2([0,1])$ and $\dot{W}(\tau,\xi)$ is a space-time white noise on $[0,T] \times [0,1]$ which describes an external random forcing; we treat it as a time-derivative of a cylindrical Wiener process with

*This is a correction of *Masiero and Priola, J. Differential Equations, 263, 2017* [33]. In that paper there is a mistake in the proof of the main uniqueness result. Indeed we have used the strong feller property for the Markov semigroup associated to the linear stochastic wave equation which does not hold (cf. Theorem 9.2.1 in [13]). We thank Paolo De Fazio (Parma) for pointing out this mistake. Here we correct the proof in [33] avoiding the strong Feller property. We obtain pathwise uniqueness starting from any initial condition as in [33]. The assumptions on the drift term of the semilinear stochastic wave equation are the same as the ones considered in [33]. The main changes are in Section 4, in Appendix and in the proof of Theorem 6.3.

values in $L^2([0,1])$. Moreover b can be a bounded measurable function which is Hölder continuous of exponent $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$ with respect to the y-variable; see Hypothesis 3.1 for the more general assumption.

To get pathwise uniqueness for (1.1) (see Theorem 6.3) we introduce an approach based on backward stochastic differential equations. Our main result holds despite the Markov semigroup associated to the linear stochastic wave equation (the so-called Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup) does not have the strong Feller property (cf. Theorem 9.2.1 in [13] and Remark A.2). This is in contrast with other papers dealing with strong uniqueness (see, for instance, [8], [9], [10], [11]).

We will use the regularizing effect of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup along special directions and interpolation results involving spaces of Hölder continuous functions along special directions (cf. Section 4.1). Related results have been considered in [5] in a different context to investigate infinite dimensional elliptic equations involving the Gross Laplacian; see in particular Lemma 4.2. We partially extend Lemma 4.2 obtaining Lemma 4.4 which deals with interpolation of vector-valued functions. This lemma will be important in our proof of pathwise uniqueness (see in particular Theorem 4.13 and the proof of Theorem 6.3).

Without the noise $\dot{W}(\tau, \xi)$ the corresponding nonlinear deterministic equation is in general not well-posed; see Section 3.3. Thus our result is a kind of regularization by additive noise for semilinear stochastic wave equations. There are already results in this direction at the level of SPDEs of parabolic type (see [26], [8], [9], [34], [11], [42] and the references therein). For related results on well-posedness of SPDEs by a kind of multiplicative noise perturbations, see [19], [16], [18], [17] and the references therein. Coming into the details of the problem we treat in the present paper, we study semilinear abstract wave equations of the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d^2y}{d\tau^2}(\tau) = -\Lambda y(\tau) + B(t, y(\tau), \frac{dy}{d\tau}(\tau)) + \dot{W}(\tau), \\ y(0) = x_0, \\ \frac{dy}{d\tau}(0) = x_1, \quad \tau \in (0, T], \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\Lambda : \mathscr{D}(\Lambda) \subset U \to U$ is a positive self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space U (see, for instance, Example 5.8 and Section 5.5.2 in [15], [3] and the references therein) and $\{W(\tau) = W_\tau, \tau \geq 0\}$ is a cylindrical Wiener process with values in U. Many linear stochastic equations modelling the vibrations of elastic structures can be written in the form (1.2) with $B = 0$ where y stands for the displacement field (for instance, we consider the stochastic plate equation in Section 3.2).

Comparing with (1.1), we have that $\Lambda = -\dfrac{d^2}{dx^2}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions,

$$U = L^2([0,1]), \quad \mathscr{D}(\Lambda) = H_0^1([0,1]) \cap H^2([0,1]), \quad \mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{1/2}) = H_0^1([0,1]) = V \tag{1.3}$$

and $\mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{-1/2}) = H^{-1}([0,1])$ (cf. Section 2 and [29]).

To study equations (1.2) we consider two basic Hilbert spaces: K and H. The first one is

$$K = \mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{1/2}) \times U = V \times U.$$

This is the usual space for the deterministic wave equation obtained when $B = 0$ (removing $\dot{W}(\tau)$ from the equation). This space is also denoted by $V \oplus U$. However even if $B = 0$ solutions to stochastic wave equations (1.2) do not evolve in K but in the larger space

$$H = U \times \mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{-1/2}) = U \times V'$$

(see Example 5.8 in [15]). Here V' is the dual space of V. On the other hand, as we mention before, the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup has a regularizing effect only along the directions of K (see Section 3).

The existence of a weak solution $X_\tau^{0,x} = \left(y(\tau), \frac{dy}{d\tau}(\tau)\right)$ to (1.2) for any initial condition $x = (x_0, x_1) \in H$, taking values in H and with continuous paths is well known if $B : [0,T] \times H \to U$ is Borel and bounded; see Section 2 for more details. It follows by the Girsanov theorem (cf. [15], [35], [32] and Remark 2.1) writing (1.2) as

$$dX_\tau^{0,x} = AX_\tau^{0,x} d\tau + GB(\tau, X_\tau^{0,x}) d\tau + G dW_\tau, \qquad \tau \in [0,T], \qquad X_0^{0,x} = x \in H, \tag{1.4}$$

where A is the generator of the wave group in H and $GdW_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ dW_\tau \end{pmatrix}$. To prove pathwise uniqueness we require that $B : [0,T] \times H \to U$ is Borel, bounded and α-Hölder continuous in the x-variable, $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$ (cf. Hypothesis 2).

Our strategy to show pathwise uniqueness requires first to investigate regularizing properties of the J-valued Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (R_t) (see Section 4). Here J can be any real separable Hilbert space. We have $R_\tau[\Phi](x) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X_\tau^{0,x})]$, $\tau \geq 0$, $\Phi \in B_b(H, J)$, where $X_\tau^{0,x}$ is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process solving (1.4) when $B = 0$. To prove the differentiability of $R_\tau[\Phi]$, along the directions of K, $\tau > 0$, we use sharp results on the behaviour of the minimal energy for the linear control system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{w}(t) = Aw(t) + Gu(t), \\ w(0) = h \in K, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

with controls $u \in L^2_{loc}(0, \infty; U)$ (see Theorem A.1, Section A.2 and the references mentioned in Appendix). We also need interpolation results involving Hölder functions along the directions of K (see in particular Lemma 4.4). We will also consider second directional derivatives of $R_\tau[\Phi]$; see in particular the estimate for

$$\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{a\in U, |a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_{Ga} \mathbb{E}[\, \langle \Phi(X_\tau^{0,\cdot}), f_m \rangle_J \,](x)|^2,$$

$x \in H$, $k \in K$, $\tau > 0$, given in Lemma 4.11 (here (f_m) denotes any basis of J). At the end of Section 4 we establish a regularity result for the following Kolmogorov integral equation:

$$u(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s,\cdot)\right](x)\, ds + \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\nabla^G u(s,\cdot) B(s,\cdot)\right](x)\, ds, \tag{1.6}$$

where the unknown function $u(t,x)$ takes values in K and $\nabla^G u(s,x)B(s,x) = \nabla_{GB(s,x)} u(s,x) \in K$, $(s,x) \in [0,T] \times H$. To this purpose we use the regularizing effects of R_τ when $J = K$ (see Theorem 4.13). In Remark 6.2 we will compare our Kolmogorov equation with the one used in [8] to study parabolic SPDEs .

In Section 5 we introduce backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs from now on) for the unknown pair of processes $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$, coupled with the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $\Xi^{t,x}$ starting from x at time t:

$$\begin{cases} d\Xi_\tau^{t,x} = A\Xi_\tau^{t,x} d\tau + G dW_\tau, \qquad \tau \in [t,T], \\ \Xi_t^{t,x} = x, \\ -dY_\tau^{t,x} = -AY_\tau^{t,x} d\tau + GB(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\, d\tau + Z_\tau^{t,x} B(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) d\tau - Z_\tau^{t,x}\, dW_\tau, \qquad \tau \in [t,T], \\ Y_T^{t,x} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

The process $Y^{t,x}$ takes values in K and $Z^{t,x}$ in the space $L_2(U,K)$ (cf. [27], [4] and [21]). We study first differentiability of $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ with respect to x assuming in addition that the coefficient B is regular. Such type of results, together with the identification of $Z^{t,x}$ with the directional derivative of $Y^{t,x}$, are known also in the infinite dimensional case when $Y^{t,x}$ is real, see [21]; here we extend these results to the case when $Y^{t,x}$ is Hilbert space valued (see Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.3). Then, using the results of Section 4 and an approximation argument, we are able to study regularity properties of solutions $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ together with the identification of $Z^{t,x}$ in the case of an Hölder continuous drift B (see Theorem 5.4 which holds under more general assumptions on B and also Lemma 5.5).

The results of Sections 4 and 5 allow to get in Section 6 the important identity

$$X_\tau^{0,x} = e^{\tau A}x + e^{\tau A}v(0,x) - v(\tau, X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}\nabla^G v(s, X_s^x)\, dW_s + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A} G dW_s, \tag{1.8}$$

which holds for any weak mild solution $(X_\tau^{0,x})$. Note that the irregular coefficient B is not present in (1.8). This identity involves a deterministic function v related to $Y^{t,x}$ (indeed $v(t,x) = Y_t^{t,x} \in K$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times H$; see (5.7)). Moreover v is "very regular" because it solves the Kolmogorov equation (1.6).

Identities like (1.8) are established in [19], [8], [9], [11], [42] by the so-called Itô-Tanaka trick which is a variant of the Zvonkin method used in [41] (see also our Remark 6.2 and [20]). Here we prove (1.8) by using the mild form of the BSDE, which, together with the group property of A, allows to remove the "bad term" B of the semilinear stochastic wave equation. We stress that in contrast with the previous papers which use the Itô-Tanaka trick here we have a function v which is regular only along the directions

of K (see Theorem 4.13). We can use the previous identity and prove pathwise uniqueness noting that (see (1.4))

$$X_\tau^{0,x_1} - X_\tau^{0,x_2} \in K, \quad \tau \in [0,T],$$

if $x_1, x_2 \in H$ and $x_1 - x_2 \in K$ (i.e., the difference of two solutions evolves in K but not the single solution; cf. (2.12)). Finally note that by Theorem 6.3, using an extension of the Yamada-Watanabe theorem (see [35] and [30]), one can obtain that (1.2) has a unique strong mild solution, for any $x \in H$.

Remark 1.1. Using a localization argument as in [10], the boundeness of B could be dispensed. In particular, one can prove strong well-posedness of (1.2), for any $x \in H$, under Hypothesis 1 and assuming that $B : [0,T] \times H \to U$ is continuous on $[0,T] \times H$ and growths at most linearly, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$; moreover, one requires that for any ball $S \subset H$ the function $B(t,\cdot) : S \to U$ is α-Hölder continuous, for some $\alpha > 2/3$, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$ (cf. (2.10)).

2 Notations and preliminary results

Given two real separable Hilbert spaces H and J we denote by $L(H,J)$ the space of bounded linear operators from H to J, endowed with the usual operator norm; $L_2(H,J)$ is the subspace of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators endowed with the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(H,J)}$. Let E be a Banach space. $B_b(H,E)$ is the space of all Borel and bounded functions from H into E endowed with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in H} |f(x)|_E$, $f \in B_b(H,E)$. $C_b(H,E)$ is its subspace consisting of all uniformly continuous and bounded functions from H into E. The space $C_b^1(H,E)$ is the space of all functions in $C_b(H,E)$ which are Fréchet differentiable on H with bounded and uniformly continuous Fréchet derivative $\nabla f : H \to L(H,E)$; it is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{C_b^1}$, $\|f\|_{C_b^1} = \|f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty$, $f \in C_b^1(H,E)$. We define, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, the space $C_b^\alpha(H,E)$ of all functions f in $C_b(H,E)$ such that

$$[f]_\alpha = \sup_{x',\, x\in H, x-x'\neq 0} |f(x) - f(x')|_E \, |x - x'|_H^{-\alpha} < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

It is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha = \|\cdot\|_\infty + [\cdot]_\alpha$.

By $C([0,T] \times H, E)$ we denote the space of continuous functions from the product space $[0,T] \times H$ into E. Moreover, $B_b([0,T] \times H, E)$ is the Banach space of bounded Borel measurable functions from $[0,T] \times H$ into E endowed with the sup norm.

Let U be a real separable Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_U$ and norm $|\cdot|_U$. To study (1.2) we assume that

Hypothesis 1. *$\Lambda : \mathscr{D}(\Lambda) \subset U \to U$ is a given positive self-adjoint operator and there exists Λ^{-1} which is a trace class operator from U into U.*

Recall that positivity of Λ means that there exists $m > 0$ such that $\langle \Lambda u, u \rangle_U \geq m|u|_U^2$, $u \in \mathscr{D}(\Lambda)$ (see, for instance, Section 3.3 in [40]). We also consider the Hilbert space $V = \mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{1/2})$ =Im$(\Lambda^{-1/2})$ endowed with the inner product

$$\langle h, k \rangle_V = \langle \Lambda^{1/2} h, \Lambda^{1/2} k \rangle_U, \quad h, k \in V$$

and its dual space V' which is again a Hilbert space. Note that $|\cdot|_{V'}$ is equivalent to $|\Lambda^{-1/2} \cdot|_U$. Moreover, V' can be identified with the completion of U with respect to the norm $|\Lambda^{-1/2} \cdot|_U$ (see Section 3.4 in [40]). V' is also denoted by $\mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{-1/2})$. We have $V \subset U \simeq U' \subset V'$ with continuous inclusions; Λ can be extended to an unbounded self-adjoint operator on V' with domain V, which we still denote by Λ:

$$\Lambda : V \to V'. \tag{2.2}$$

We consider the linear stochastic wave equation in a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a filtration $(\mathscr{F}_\tau)_{\tau\geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions. We have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d^2 y}{d\tau^2}(\tau) = -\Lambda y(\tau) + \dot{W}(\tau), \\ y(0) = x_0, \quad \frac{dy}{d\tau}(0) = x_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\{W(\tau) = W_\tau, \tau \geq 0\}$ is a cylindrical Wiener process in U with respect to the filtration $(\mathscr{F}_\tau)_{\tau\geq 0}$. The process W_t is formally given by "$W_t = \sum_{j\geq 1} \beta_j(t) e_j$" where $\beta_j(t)$ are independent real Wiener

processes and (e_j) denotes a basis in U (see [15] for more details). We introduce the reference Hilbert space for the solutions to (2.3):

$$H = U \times V'$$

endowed with the inner product $\langle x, y\rangle_H = \langle x_1, y_1\rangle_U + \langle x_2, y_2\rangle_{V'} = \langle x_1, y_1\rangle_U + \langle \Lambda^{-1/2}x_2, \Lambda^{-1/2}y_2\rangle_U$ and norm $|x|_H = (\langle x, x\rangle_H)^{1/2}$, $x, y \in H$. This space is also denoted by $U \oplus V'$.

In the sequel we will also denote $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H$ and $|\cdot|_H$ by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and $|\cdot|$. According to [15], the equation (2.3) is well-posed in H thanks to Hypothesis 1. On the other hand, (2.3) is not well-posed in the usual space K for the deterministic wave equation:

$$K = V \times U = \mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{1/2}) \times U \tag{2.4}$$

(i.e., solutions to (2.3) do not evolve in $K = V \times U$ even if $x_0 \in V$ and $x_1 \in U$; see Example 5.8 in [15]). Recall the inner product $\langle x, y\rangle_K = \langle x_1, y_1\rangle_V + \langle x_2, y_2\rangle_U$, $x, y \in K$. In H one considers the unbounded wave operator A which generates a unitary group e^{tA}:

$$\mathscr{D}(A) = V \times U, \qquad A\begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for every } \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in \mathscr{D}(A),$$

$$e^{tA}\begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\sqrt{\Lambda}t & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}\sin\sqrt{\Lambda}t \\ -\sqrt{\Lambda}\sin\sqrt{\Lambda}t & \cos\sqrt{\Lambda}t \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in H.$$

Let $G : U \to H$,

$$Gu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} u, \quad u \in U. \tag{2.5}$$

Notice that $e^{tA} : K \to K$ and $e^{tA} : H \to H$, and moreover since $(e^{tA})_t$ is a group of linear operators, then

$$e^{tA}(K) = K, \quad e^{tA}(H) = H, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.6}$$

Equation (2.3) can be rewritten in an abstract form as

$$\begin{cases} dX_\tau = AX_\tau d\tau + GdW_\tau, & \tau \in [0, T]. \\ X_0 = x \in H, \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

A solution to (2.7) is a particular Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. We study (2.3) in H since the operators

$$Q_\tau = \int_0^\tau e^{sA}GG^*e^{sA^*}ds, \quad \tau \geq 0, \tag{2.8}$$

are of trace class from H into H thanks to Hypothesis 1 (cf. Example 5.8 in [15]); here G^* denotes the adjoint operator of G in H. Thus the stochastic convolution (i.e., the solution to (2.7) when $x = 0$)

$$S_\tau = \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GdW_s \text{ is well defined in } H. \tag{2.9}$$

Its law at time τ is the Gaussian measure $\mathscr{N}(0, Q_\tau)$ with mean 0 and covariance operator Q_τ (cf. [15]). Note that we have

$$S_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} C_\tau \\ D_\tau \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where } C_\tau = \int_0^\tau \frac{\sin\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}(\tau - s)\right)}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}dW_s, \quad D_\tau = \int_0^\tau \cos\left(\sqrt{\Lambda}(\tau - s)\right)dW_s.$$

Moreover, since

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|e^{tA}G\|_{L_2(U,H)} < \infty, \quad T > 0,$$

we can apply Theorem 5.11 in [15] and deduce that the process (S_τ) has a continuous version with values in H. Concerning the semilinear stochastic equation (1.4), we assume that

Hypothesis 2. *$B : [0, T] \times H \to U$ is (Borel) measurable and bounded and moreover there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$|B(t, x + h) - B(t, x)|_U \leq C|h|_H^\alpha, \quad x, h \in H, \ t \in [0, T], \tag{2.10}$$

for some $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$. We also write that $B \in B_b([0, T]; C_b^\alpha(H, U))$ with $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$.

Let $x \in H$. Recall that a (weak) mild solution to (1.4) is a tuple $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t), \mathbb{P}, W, X)$, where $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ is a stochastic basis on which it is defined a cylindrical U-valued $\mathscr{F}_t$-Wiener process W and a continuous $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted H-valued process $X = (X_t) = (X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$X_t = e^{tA}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}GB\,(s, X_s)\,ds + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}GdW_s, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.11}$$

According to Chapter 1 in [35] (see also [30]) we say that strong existence holds for equation (1.4) if, for every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ on which there is defined an U-valued cylindrical $\mathscr{F}_t$-Wiener process W, for any initial condition $x \in H$, there exists an H-valued continuous $(\mathscr{F}_t)$-adapted process $X = (X_t) = (X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t), \mathbb{P}, W, X)$ is a weak mild solution. We also write $X_t^{0,x}$ or X_t^x instead of X_t. Similarly, we denote by $(X_\tau^{t,x})_{\tau\geq t}$ the solution to (1.4) starting from $x \in H$ at time $t \in [0,T]$. Note that if $a \in U$

$$Ga = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \end{pmatrix} \in K \quad \text{and} \quad e^{tA}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}\sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)\,a \\ \cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}t)a \end{pmatrix} \in K, \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence, since in Hypotheses 2 we assume that the drift B takes its values in U, then $\int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}GB\,(s, X_s)\,ds$ evolves in K : it is K- valued and the map $t \mapsto \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}GB\,(s, X_s)\,ds$ is continous due to the boundedness of B (indeed, let $T > 0$; for any ω, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $s \mapsto GB\,(s, X_s(\omega))$ is Borel and bounded from $[0,T]$ with values in K and so we can apply Lemma 3.1.5 in [7]).
Therefore even if in general a solution (X_t^x) does not evolve in K (cf. (2.9)) we know that when the initial conditions x_1 and x_2 are in H and verify

$$x_1 - x_2 \in K$$

then any couple of weak mild solutions $X_t^{x_1}$ and $X_t^{x_2}$ (starting at x_1 and x_2 respectively) verifies the property

$$(X_t^{x_1} - X_t^{x_2}) \text{ evolves in } K, \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{2.12}$$

Indeed

$$X_t^{x_1} - X_t^{x_2} = e^{tA}(x_1 - x_2) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}G\Big(B\,(s, X_s^{x_1}) - B\,(s, X_s^{x_2})\Big)\,ds, \quad t \in [0,T];$$

the stochastic integral has disappeared, and since $x_1 - x_2 \in K$, also $e^{tA}(x_1 - x_2) \in K$; the other term we have already discussed that belongs to K. Note that, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., the paths of $(X_t^{x_1} - X_t^{x_2})$ are continuous functions from $[0,T]$ with values in K. Property (2.12) will be important in the proof of our uniqueness result (see Section 6). Indeed recall that the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup regularizes only in the directions of K (see Section 4).

Remark 2.1. Thanks to the boundedness of B we can apply the Girsanov Theorem as in [32]. For the infinite dimensional Girsanov theorem we refer to Proposition 7.1 in [35] and Section 10.3 in [15]. The Girsanov theorem allows to prove Theorem 5 in [35] which states that there always exists a weak mild solution, starting from any $x \in H$ (Theorem 5 in [35] even shows weak existence for random initial conditions). Moreover uniqueness in law holds for (1.4). To deduce such results by Theorem 5 of [35] we note the following facts: as f in [35] we can consider our $GB : [0,T] \times H \to K \subset H$; our space H can be the space $U = X = X_1$ used in [35]; the space U_0 in [35] can be our U; finally as cylindrical Wiener process of Theorem 5 in [35] we can consider our W.

3 Examples

We present two classes of abstract semilinear stochastic wave equations that we can treat: the stochastic semilinear wave and plate equations. In Section 3.3 we also give a counterexample to uniqueness for deterministic semilinear wave equations with Hölder continuous coefficients.

3.1 Stochastic wave equations

We first deal with the semilinear stochastic wave equation as in Introduction, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\tau^2}y(\tau,\xi) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\xi^2}y(\tau,\xi) + b(\tau,\xi,y(\tau,\xi)) + \dot{W}(\tau,\xi), \\ y(\tau,0) = y(\tau,1) = 0, \\ y(0,\xi) = x_0(\xi), \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial\tau}(0,\xi) = x_1(\xi), \quad \tau\in[0,T],\ \xi\in[0,1]. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Comparing with (1.2), $\Lambda = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions, i.e., $\mathscr{D}(\Lambda) = H_0^1([0,1])\cap H^2([0,1])$. Note that Λ^{-1} is of trace class since eigenvalues of Λ are $\lambda_n = n^2$, $n\geq 1$. Thus Hypothesis 1 holds.

We still denote by Λ its extension on $H^{-1}([0,1])$ with domain

$$\mathscr{D}(\Lambda) = H_0^1([0,1]), \qquad \Lambda y = -\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial\xi^2}\in H^{-1}([0,1]), \quad \text{for every } y\in\mathscr{D}(\Lambda).$$

We consider $x_0\in U = L^2([0,1])$, $x_1\in H^{-1}([0,1])$.

Writing $X_\tau(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} y(\tau,\xi) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}y(\tau,\xi)\end{pmatrix}$, according to Section 2, the reference Hilbert space for the solution is $H = L^2([0,1])\times H^{-1}([0,1])$.

By considering $G: L^2([0,1])\longrightarrow H$, $Gu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I\end{pmatrix}u$ (cf. (2.5)) we can rewrite (3.1) in the abstract form (1.4) with $B(\tau,h) := b(\tau,\cdot,h_1(\cdot))$ and

$$GB(\tau,h)(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ b(\tau,\xi,h_1(\xi))\end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi\in[0,1],\ \tau\in[0,T],\ h=(h_1,h_2)\in H. \tag{3.2}$$

It is easy to check that the next assumptions on b imply the validity of Hypothesis 2 for B.

Hypothesis 3.1. *The function $b:[0,T]\times[0,1]\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is measurable and, for $\tau\in[0,T]$, a.e. $\xi\in[0,1]$, the map $b(\tau,\xi,\cdot):\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is continuous. There exists c_1 bounded and measurable on $[0,1]$, $\alpha\in(2/3,1)$, such that, for $\tau\in[0,T]$ and a.e. $\xi\in[0,1]$,*

$$|b(\tau,\xi,x) - b(\tau,\xi,y)| \leq c_1(\xi)|x-y|^\alpha,$$

x, $y\in\mathbb{R}$. Moreover $|b(\tau,\xi,x)|\leq c_2(\xi)$, for $\tau\in[0,T]$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and a.e. $\xi\in[0,1]$, with $c_2\in L^2([0,1])$.

3.2 Stochastic plate equations

Let $D\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded open domain with smooth boundary ∂D, which represents an elastic plate. We consider the following semilinear stochastic plate equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial\tau^2}(\tau,\xi) = -\triangle^2 y(\tau,\xi) + b(\tau,\xi,y(\tau,\xi)) + \dot{W}(\tau,\xi), \\ y(\tau,z) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial y}{\partial\nu}(\tau,z) = 0, \quad z\in\partial D, \\ y(0,\xi) = x_0(\xi), \quad \frac{\partial y}{\partial\tau}(0,\xi) = x_1(\xi), \quad \tau\in(0,T],\ \xi\in\overline{D}, \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

where $\triangle$ is the Laplacian in ξ, $\triangle^2 = \triangle(\triangle)$ is a fourth order operator, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}$ denotes the outward normal derivative on the boundary (we are considering the so-called clamped boundary conditions) and $\dot{W}(\tau,\xi)$ is a space-time white noise on $[0,T]\times D$. We remark that weak existence and uniqueness in law for non-linear stochastic plate equations with multiplicative noise have been established in [28].

Following Section III.8.4 in [2] we introduce $U = L^2(D)$ (the $L^2(D)$ space is defined with respect to the Lebesgue measure); the operator $\Lambda = \triangle^2$, with domain

$$\mathscr{D}(\Lambda) = H^4(D)\cap H_0^2(D)$$

is a positive self-adjoint operator ($H_0^2(D)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(D)$ in $H^2(D)$, see Definition 13.4.6 in [40]). One can prove that $\mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{1/2}) = H_0^2(D)$ (see page 172 in [2]). The topological dual of $H_0^2(D)$ will be

indicated by $H^{-2}(D)$. In order to check that Λ satisfies Hypothesis 1 we refer to [6]. Indeed a classical result by Courant (see page 460 of [6]) states that the eigenvalues λ_n of Λ have the asymptotic behaviour

$$\lambda_n \sim \frac{(4\pi n)^2}{f^2} \tag{3.4}$$

where f denotes the area of D (such behaviour depends on the size but not on the shape of the plate). It follows that Λ^{-1} is a trace class operator in $L^2(D)$. Proceeding as in Sections 2 and 3.1 we consider an extension of Λ to $H^{-2}(D)$ with domain $H_0^2(D)$.

The initial conditions of (3.3) are $x_0 \in L^2(D)$, $x_1 \in H^{-2}(D)$.

The reference Hilbert space for the solution $X_\tau(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} y(\tau,\xi) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau} y(\tau,\xi) \end{pmatrix}$ is $H = L^2(D) \times H^{-2}(D)$. By considering $G : L^2(D) \longrightarrow H$, $Gu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u \end{pmatrix}$ (cf. (2.5)) we rewrite (3.3) in the abstract form (1.4) with $B(\tau, h) := b(\tau, \cdot, h_1(\cdot))$, $h = (h_1, h_2) \in H$. The assumptions we impose on b to verify Hypothesis 2 and get well-posedness for (3.3) are similar to Hypothesis 3.1.

Hypothesis 3.2. *The function $b : [0,T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and, for $\tau \in [0,T]$ and a.e. $\xi \in D$, the map $b(\tau,\xi,\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. There exists c_1 bounded and measurable on D, $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$, such that, for $\tau \in [0,T]$ and for a.e. $\xi \in D$,*

$$|b(\tau,\xi,x) - b(\tau,\xi,y)| \le c_1(\xi)\,|x-y|^\alpha,$$

x, $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover $|b(\tau,\xi,x)| \le c_2(\xi)$, for $\tau \in [0,T]$ and a.e. $\xi \in D$, with $c_2 \in L^2(D)$.

3.3 A counterexample to well-posedness in the deterministic case

Let us consider the following semilinear deterministic wave equation for $\tau \in [0,T]$:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial \tau^2}(\tau,\xi) = \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial \xi^2}(\tau,\xi) + b(\xi, y(\tau,\xi)) \\ y(\tau,0) = y(\tau,\pi) = 0, \\ y(0,\xi) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial y}{\partial \tau}(0,\xi) = 0, \quad \xi \in [0,\pi]. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

with

$$b(\xi,y) = 56\sqrt[4]{\sin\xi\, y^3}\, I_{\{|y|<2T^8\}} + y\, I_{\{|y|<2T^8\}} + 56\sqrt[4]{8T^{24}\sin\xi}\, I_{\{|y|\ge 2T^8\}} + 2T^8\, I_{\{|y|\ge 2T^8\}},$$

where $\xi \in [0,\pi]$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$; I_A is the indicator function of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Notice that b, which is independent of τ satisfies Hypothesis 3.1. It turns out that $y(\tau,\xi) \equiv 0$ and $y(\tau,\xi) = \tau^8 \sin\xi$ are both solutions to equation (3.5).

4 The J-valued transition semigroup for the stochastic wave equation

Let J be a real separable Hilbert space. As in Section 2 we consider the Hilbert spaces

$$H = U \times V', \quad K = V \times U \subset H.$$

Moreover (e_j) is a basis in U such that $(e_j) \subset \mathscr{D}(\Lambda) \subset U$ and

$$\Lambda e_j = \lambda_j e_j, \quad \lambda_j > 0, \quad j \ge 1; \quad \sum_{j\ge 1} \lambda_j^{-1} < \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

We will prove some regularizing effects for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (R_t) related to stochastic wave equation (1.4) with $B = 0$ and acting on J-valued functions Φ. Recall that

$$R_\tau[\Phi](x) = R_\tau\Phi(x) = \mathbb{E}\Phi\left(X_\tau^{0,x}\right), \quad \Phi \in B_b(H,J), \quad x \in H, \ \tau \ge 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where X, defined by (2.11), is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (cf. [8]). Since X is time homogeneous, we have

$$R_{\tau-t}\left[\Phi\right](x) = \mathbb{E}\Phi\left(X_\tau^{t,x}\right), \quad \Phi \in B_b(H,J),$$

$\tau \geq t \geq 0$, $x \in H$. Similarly, we consider the usual Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (P_t) acting on scalar functions $\phi \in B_b(H)$:

$$P_\tau\left[\phi\right](x) = P_\tau\phi\,(x) = \mathbb{E}\phi\left(X_\tau^{0,x}\right), \quad \phi \in B_b(H), \quad \tau \geq 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Using also the results in Appendix, for $t > 0$, we show the differentiability of $R_t\Phi$ along the directions of K. Moreover, we prove that, for any $x \in H$, $k \in K$, $t > 0$,

$$\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\,\langle \Phi(\cdot), f_m\rangle_J\,](x)|^2$$

is finite (here (f_m) denotes any basis of J) and we provide a bound independent of x and k (see Lemma 4.11 and compare with Chapter 6 of [14] and Section 3 of [8]).

In order to study differentiability properties of $R_t[\Phi]$ for $t > 0$ we fix some basic definitions. If $F : H = U \times V' \to J$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $x \in H$ we denote by $\nabla F(x) \in L(H,J)$ its Gâteaux derivative at x and by $\nabla_h F(x) = \nabla F(x)h$ its directional derivative along the direction $h \in H$:

$$\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{F(x+sh)-F(x)}{s} = \nabla_h F(x), \quad x \in H,\, h \in H.$$

We say that $F : H \to J$ is differentiable along the subspace $K = V \times U \subset H$ if there exists at any $x \in H$ the directional derivative along any direction $k \in K$ (i.e., $\lim_{s\to 0} \frac{F(x+sk)-F(x)}{s} \in J$, for any $x \in H$, $k \in K$). We denote the directional derivative at x along the direction $k \in K$ as

$$\nabla_k F(x) \in J.$$

If in addition

$$k \mapsto \nabla_k F(x) \quad \text{belongs to } L(K,J)$$

we indicate such linear operator with $\nabla^K F(x)$. We say that F is K-differentiable on H if it is differentiable along the subspace K and there exists $\nabla^K F(x) \in L(K,J)$ for any $x \in H$ (if $J = \mathbb{R}$ then $\nabla^K F(x)$ can be identified with an element in K by the Riesz theorem).

Note that the concept of differentiability along subspaces arises naturally in the Malliavin Calculus (see also the related concept of Gross differentiability; we refer to [38] and the references therein).

Let $G : U \to H$, $Ga = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \end{pmatrix} \in K \subset H$, $a \in U$. If $F : H \to J$ is differentiable along the subspace $G(U)$ we set

$$\nabla_a^G F(x) = \nabla_{Ga} F(x) \in J, \quad a \in U,\, x \in H. \tag{4.4}$$

If in addition $a \mapsto \nabla_a^G F(x)$ belongs to $L(U,J)$ we denote such linear operator with $\nabla^G F(x)$. We say that F is G-differentiable on H if it is differentiable along the subspace $G(U)$ and there exists $\nabla^G F(x) \in L(U,J)$ for any $x \in H$.

Note that if $F : H \to J$ is K-differentiable on H then it is also G-differentiable on H and $\nabla^G F(x) = \nabla^K F(x)G \in L(U,J)$.

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, we introduce the space $C_K^\alpha(H,J)$ consisting of all functions F in $C_b(H,J)$ which are α-Hölder continuous along K, i.e., such that

$$[F]_{\alpha,K} = \sup_{x\in H=U\times V',\, k\in K, k\neq 0} \frac{|F(x+k)-F(x)|_J}{|k|_K^\alpha} < \infty. \tag{4.5}$$

It is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,K} = \|\cdot\|_\infty + [\cdot]_{\alpha,K}$.

4.1 Interpolation results involving K-differentiable functions

We first introduce a function space related to the K-differentiability. We say that $f \in C^1_K(H,J)$ if $f \in C_b(H,J)$, f is K-differentiable on H and $\nabla^K f : H \to L(K,J)$ is uniformly continuous and bounded. This is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{C^1_K(H,J)} = \|\nabla^K f\|_\infty + \|f\|_\infty, \quad f \in C^1_K(H,J),$$

setting $\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla^K f(x)|_J = \|\nabla^K f\|_\infty$. When $J = \mathbb{R}$ we set $C^1_K(H,\mathbb{R}) = C^1_K(H)$. Recall that for $f \in C^1_K(H)$ one has: $\nabla^K f : H \to K$ uniformly continuous and bounded.

Let us consider the following operator $Q : H \to H$,

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad Qh = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^{-1}h_1 \\ \Lambda^{-1}h_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h = (h_1,h_2) \in H = U \times V'. \tag{4.6}$$

Let (e_j) be the basis in U defined in (4.1). Then $(\sqrt{\lambda_j}e_j)$ is a basis of V' and $\{(e_j,0)\}_{j\geq 1} \cup \{(0,\sqrt{\lambda_j}e_j)\}_{j\geq 1}$ is a basis of H. It is not difficult to check that Q is a symmetric positive trace class operator and that

$$C^1_K(H) \text{ coincides with the space } C^1_Q(H) \text{ introduced in [5] with equivalence of norms.} \tag{4.7}$$

To this purpose we note that $Q^{1/2}H = K$. Then we consider conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) used in the definition of $C^1_Q(H)$ in Section 2.1 of [5]. Let $f \in C_b(H)$. Condition (i) says that there exist all the directional derivatives of f in the directions of $K = Q^{1/2}H$. Let $k = Q^{1/2}h$ with $h \in H$. The directional derivative in x along the direction k is denoted by

$$\nabla_k f(x) = \nabla_{Q^{1/2}h} f(x).$$

Condition (ii) says that for any $x \in H$, there exists $D_Q f(x) \in H$ such that

$$\nabla_{Q^{1/2}h} f(x) = \langle D_Q f(x), h\rangle_H.$$

If $k \in K$ then $k = Q^{1/2}h$ for a unique $h \in H$. We have $\langle D_Q f(x), h\rangle_H = \langle Q^{1/2}D_Q f(x), Q^{1/2}h\rangle_K = \langle Q^{1/2}D_Q f(x), k\rangle_K$. Thus condition (ii) is equivalent to say that $k \mapsto \nabla_k f(x)$ is linear and continuous from K into $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover such linear functional can be identified with $Q^{1/2}D_Q f(x)$. According to our previous notation we can write

$$\nabla^K f(x) = Q^{1/2}D_Q f(x), \quad x \in H.$$

Condition (iii) requires that the mapping: $x \mapsto D_Q f(x)$ is uniformly continuous and bounded from H into H. This is equivalent to say that the mapping: $x \mapsto Q^{1/2}D_Q f(x) = \nabla^K f(x)$ is uniformly continuous and bounded from H into K. This shows (4.7).

Similarly to [5] we define, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, the space $C^\alpha_K(H,J)$ of all functions f in $C_b(H,J)$ such that

$$[f]_{\alpha,K} = \sup_{k',\, k\in K, k-k'\neq 0} \frac{|f(k) - f(k')|_J}{|k-k'|^\alpha_K} < \infty. \tag{4.8}$$

It is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha,K} = \|\cdot\|_\infty + [\cdot]_{\alpha,K}$, where $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in H} |f(x)|_J$. Note that $C^\alpha_b(H,J) \subset C^\alpha_K(H,J)$ and in general the inclusion is strict (cf. Remark 4.3).

Remark 4.1. Condition (4.8) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{x\in H=U\times V',\, k\in K, k\neq 0} \frac{|f(x+k) - f(x)|_J}{|k|^\alpha_K} < \infty$$

(cf. (4.5)). Indeed if $x \in H$ and $k \in K$ there exists a sequence $(k_n) \subset K$ such that $k_n \to x$ in H. Then by (4.8) we find $|f(k_n + k) - f(k_n)|_J \leq C|k|^\alpha_K$. Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$ we obtain $|f(x+k) - f(x)|_J \leq C|k|^\alpha_K$.

The space $C_K^\alpha(H) = C_K^\alpha(H,\mathbb{R})$ coincides with the space $C_Q^\alpha(H)$ introduced in Section 2.2 in [5] as the space of all functions $f \in C_b(H)$ such that

$$[f]_{\alpha,Q} = \sup_{h',\, h\in H, h-h'\neq 0} |f(Q^{1/2}h) - f(Q^{1/2}h')| \cdot |h-h'|_H^{-\alpha} < \infty$$

with equivalence of norms. By [5] we now obtain the following useful interpolation result.

Lemma 4.2. *We have, for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, with equivalence of norms,*

$$(C_b(H), C_K^1(H))_{\alpha,\infty} = C_K^\alpha(H). \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. The result is proved in Proposition 2.1 in [5] in the form

$$(C_b(H), C_Q^1(H))_{\alpha,\infty} = C_Q^\alpha(H).$$

We only recall that $f \in X_\alpha = (C_b(H), C_K^1(H))_{\alpha,\infty}$ if $\|f\|_{X_\alpha} = \sup_{t\in(0,1]} t^{-\alpha} L(t,f) < \infty$ where $L(t,f) = \inf\{\|a\|_{C_b(H)} + t\|b\|_{C_K^1(H)},\ f = a+b,\ a \in C_b(H),\ b \in C_K^1(H)\}$ (see, for instance, Section 2.3 in [15]). □

Remark 4.3. Theorem 3.1 in [37] implies that $C_b^\alpha(H)$ (the space of real α-Hölder continuous and bounded functions defined on H) is strictly included in $C_Q^\alpha(H)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Indeed $C_b^\alpha(H)$ is contained in the interpolation space $\mathscr{D}_{\mathscr{A}}(\alpha/2,\infty)$ (see the notation in [37]) which by Theorem 3.1 is strictly included in $C_Q^\alpha(H)$.

When J is infinite dimensional it is an open problem to characterize both $\big(C_b(H,J), C_K^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty}$ and $\big(C_b(H,J), C_b^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty}$. However we can prove the following inclusion which will be important for the sequel (see in particular the proof of Lemma 4.9).

Lemma 4.4. *For any real separable Hilbert space J we have*

$$C_b^\alpha(H,J) \subset \big(C_b(H,J), C_K^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty},\quad \alpha \in (0,1), \quad \textit{with a continous inclusion.} \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. We take into account Remark 2.3.1 in [15]. Let $f \in C_b^\alpha(H,J)$ and $t \in (0,1]$. We prove that there exists $a_t \in C_b(H,J)$ and $b_t \in C_K^1(H,J)$ such that $f = a_t + b_t$ and

$$\|a_t\|_{C_b(H,J)} + t\|b_t\|_{C_K^1(H,J)} \le c\|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)}\, t^\alpha \tag{4.11}$$

with $c > 0$ independent of t and f. This gives (4.10).

Let us consider the trace class operator $Q : H \to H$ given in (4.6). Recall that Q is injective and $Q^{1/2}(H) = K$. As in Chapter 3 of [15] we consider the heat semigroup (V_t) acting on functions in $C_b(H,J)$:

$$V_r g(x) = \int_H g(x+y)\mathscr{N}(0,rQ)(dy),\quad x \in H,\quad g \in C_b(H,J),\ r \ge 0.$$

For $t \in (0,T]$ we set

$$a_t = f - V_{t^2} f,\quad b_t = V_{t^2} f$$

and prove that (4.11) holds. Let us first consider a_t. It is easy to prove that $a_t \in C_b(H,J)$. Moreover, we have

$$|a_t(x)|_J \le \int_H |f(x+y) - f(x)|_J\, \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy) \le \|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)} \int_H |ty|_J^\alpha\, \mathscr{N}(0,Q)(dy) \le c_\alpha \|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)} t^\alpha.$$

To prove that $b_t \in C_K^1(H,J)$ we consider $k = Q^{1/2}h \in K$ with $h = Q^{-1/2}k \in H$. Arguing as in Theorem 3.3.3 in [15], using the Cameron-Martin theorem, one can prove that, for any $x \in H$, there exists the directional derivative

$$\nabla_k b_t(x) = \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{V_{t^2} f(x + sQ^{1/2}h) - V_{t^2} f(x)}{s}$$

$$= \frac{1}{t}\int_H f(x+y)\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, h\rangle \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy) = \frac{1}{t}\int_H f(x+y)\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, Q^{-1/2}k\rangle \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy).$$

It is not difficult to prove that $k \mapsto \nabla_k b_t(x)$ is linear and continuous from K into J. We note that

$$|\nabla_k b_t(x)|_J^2 \le \frac{1}{t^2}\|f\|_\infty^2 \int_H |\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, Q^{-1/2}k\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy) \le \frac{1}{t^2}\|f\|_\infty^2 |Q^{-1/2}k|^2 = \frac{|k|_K^2}{t^2}\|f\|_\infty^2.$$

Writing, for $k \in K$, $x, x' \in H$,

$$|\nabla_k b_t(x) - \nabla_k b_t(x')|_J^2 \le \frac{1}{t^2}\int_H |\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, Q^{-1/2}k\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy)$$
$$\cdot \int_H |f(x+y) - f(x'+y)|_J^2 \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy) \le \frac{|k|_K^2}{t^2}\|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)}^2 |x-x'|^{2\alpha}$$

(we have used that $|Q^{-1/2}k| = |k|_K$) we check easily that $\nabla^K b_t : H \to L(K,J)$ is uniformly continuous and bounded. Finally, since

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_H f(x)\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, h\rangle \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy) = 0,$$

we obtain by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $k \in K$, $x \in H$,

$$|\nabla_k b_t(x)|_J^2 = \Big|\frac{1}{t}\int_H \langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, Q^{-1/2}k\rangle\,[f(x+y) - f(x)]\mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy)\Big|_J^2$$
$$\le \|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)}^2 \frac{1}{t^2}\int_H |\langle (t^2Q)^{-1/2}y, Q^{-1/2}k\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,t^2Q)(dy)\cdot \int_H |ty|_J^{2\alpha}\mathscr{N}(0,Q)(dy)$$
$$\le c_\alpha \|f\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)}^2 t^{2\alpha-2}.$$

Collecting the previous estimates we get (4.11) □

4.2 Regularizing properties of the transition semigroup

We first collect some useful properties proved in Section A.2 by classical control theoretic arguments for the abstract wave equation.

Remark 4.5. For any $t > 0$, we have $e^{tA}(K) = Q_t^{1/2}(H) = K$ and $Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}$ belongs to $L(K,H)$. Let $T > 0$. There exists $c = c_T > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0,T]$ we have

$$|Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}k|_H \le \frac{c}{t^{3/2}}|k|_K, \quad k \in K = V \times U; \tag{4.12}$$
$$|Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}Ga|_H \le \frac{c}{t^{1/2}}|a|_U, \quad a \in U. \ \square \tag{4.13}$$

Let $\Phi \in B_b(H,J)$ and $x \in H$. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 6.2.2 of [14] (similar arguments are used in Section 9.4 of [15] and Section 3 of [8]) one can prove the existence of the directional derivative of $R_t[\Phi]$ along the directions of K:

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{R_t[\Phi](x+sk) - R_t[\Phi](x)}{s}$$
$$= \nabla_k R_t[\Phi](x) = \int_H \langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}y\rangle\,\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\,\mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy),\ k \in K,\ t > 0. \tag{4.14}$$

In the sequel we often write $\mu_t = \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)$ and $|\cdot|_H = |\cdot|$.

In the next result we will use (4.14) together with the estimates in Remark 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume Hypothesis 1 and let $R = (R_t)$ be the OU semigroup defined in (4.2). If $\Phi \in B_b(H,J)$ and $t > 0$ then $R_t\Phi$ is K-differentiable on H. The directional derivative $\nabla_k R_t[\Phi](x) \in J$ is given by (4.14), for $x \in H$. In particular $R_t[\Phi]$ is G-differentiable on H; further*

$$\nabla_a^G R_t[\Phi](x) = \int_H \langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{tA}Ga, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}y\rangle\,\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy), \quad a \in U. \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, for $t \in (0,T]$, we have

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k R_t[\Phi](x)|_J \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}\|\Phi\|_\infty |k|_K,\ k\in K; \tag{4.16}$$

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla^G_a R_t[\Phi](x)|_J \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}\|\Phi\|_\infty |Ga|_K = \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}\|\Phi\|_\infty |a|_U,\ a\in U. \tag{4.17}$$

If in addition $\Phi \in C_b(H,J)$ then $\nabla^K R_t[\Phi] \in C_b(H, L(K,J))$, $\nabla^G R_t[\Phi] \in C_b(H, L(U,J))$ for $t>0$.

Proof. Let us fix $t\in(0,T]$ and $x\in H$. The integral in (4.14) defines a linear operator in $L(K,J)$. Let

$$I_{t,x}k := \int_H \langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy),\quad k\in K.$$

We have the well-known estimate (cf. the proof of Theorem 6.2.2 in [15])

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{t,x}k|_J &\le \int_H |\langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \Phi(e^{tA}x+y)|_J \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy) \\ &\le \Big(\int_H |\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)|_J^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy)\Big)^{1/2} \cdot \Big(\int_H |\langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy)\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\le \|\Phi\|_\infty \Big(\int_H |\langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy)\Big)^{1/2} = \|\Phi\|_\infty |Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k|_H \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}\|\Phi\|_\infty |k|_K. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Similarly, we get (4.17) using (4.13) since

$$\int_H |\langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}Ga, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy) \le |Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}Ga|^2 \le \frac{c|a|_U^2}{t},\quad a\in U. \tag{4.19}$$

Computing the directional derivative as in (4.14) we obtain the differentiability of $R_t[\Phi]$ along the directions of K at x. We also obtain that $R_t[\Phi]$ is G-differentiable and K-differentiable on H.

If $\Phi \in C_b(H,J)$ we compute, for any $k\in K$, $|k|_K=1$, $z\in H$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|I_{t,x}k - I_{t,x+z}k|_J^2 \\ &\le \Big|\int_H \langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \left[\Phi(e^{tA}x+y) - \Phi(e^{tA}(x+z)+y)\right]\mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy)\Big|_J^2 \\ &\le \int_H |\langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA}k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle|^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy) \int_H |\Phi(e^{tA}x+y) - \Phi(e^{tA}x+e^{tA}z+y)|_J^2 \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy) \\ &\le \frac{c^2|k|_K^2}{t^3}\int_H \sup_{x\in H} |\Phi(e^{tA}x+y) - \Phi(e^{tA}x+e^{tA}z+y)|_J^2\, \mathscr{N}(0,Q_t)(dy) \end{aligned}$$

and so by the dominated convergence theorem we obtain easily

$$\lim_{z\to 0} \sup_{y\in H} \sup_{|k|_K=1} |I_{t,y}k - I_{t,y+z}k|_J = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

By (4.20) we deduce that $\nabla^K R_t[\Phi] \in C_b(H, L(K,J))$ and $\nabla^G R_t[\Phi] \in C_b(H, L(U,J))$. □

In a similar way we get

Lemma 4.7. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 let $t>0$. If $\Phi \in C_b(H,J)$ and $\xi\in U$ the mapping:*

$$x \mapsto \nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x)$$

with values in J is K-differentiable on H. The second order directional derivatives are

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x) = \int_H \big(\langle \Gamma_t k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \langle \Gamma_t G\xi, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle - \langle \Gamma_t k, \Gamma_t G\xi\rangle\big)\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\mu_t(dy), \tag{4.21}$$

for $x\in H, k\in K$, $\xi\in U$. Moreover, for each $x\in H$, $k\in K$, the map: $\xi \to \nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x)$ belongs to $L(U,J)$ and, for any $t\in(0,T]$,

$$\sup_{x\in H} \|\nabla_k \nabla^G_\cdot R_t[\Phi](x)\|_{L(U,J)} \le \frac{c_T|k|_K}{t^2}\|\Phi\|_\infty,\ k\in K. \tag{4.22}$$

$$\lim_{x\to 0}\sup_{y\in H}\|\nabla^K\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x+y)-\nabla\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](y)\|_{L(K,J)} \tag{4.23}$$
$$=\lim_{x\to 0}\sup_{y\in H}\sup_{|k|_K=1}|\nabla_k\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x+y)-\nabla_k\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](y)|_J=0,\ \ \xi\in U.$$

Proof. Let us fix $T>0$ and $t\in(0,T]$, $x\in H$. Let $\xi\in U$. First define $\Gamma_{t,x,k,\xi}$ as the integral in the right hand side of (4.21). Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 it is not difficult to show that

$$k\mapsto\Gamma_{t,x,k,\cdot} \tag{4.24}$$

is defined from K into $L(U,J)$. Using (4.12) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$|\Gamma_{t,x,k,\xi}|^2_J\le\Big|\int_H[\langle\Gamma_tk,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\langle\Gamma_tG\xi,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle-\langle\Gamma_tk,\Gamma_tG\xi\rangle]\,\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\,\mu_t(dy)\Big|^2_J \tag{4.25}$$
$$\le\int_H\big|\langle\Gamma_tk,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\langle\Gamma_tG\xi,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle-\langle\Gamma_tk,\Gamma_tG\xi\rangle\big|^2\mu_t(dy)\cdot\int_H|\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)|^2_J\,\mu_t(dy)$$
$$\le\frac{c|k|^2_K}{t^4}|\xi|^2_U\|\Phi\|^2_\infty.$$

Thus we have proved (4.22). Arguing as in Section 9.4 of [15] and Section 3 in [8] we find that

$$\lim_{s\to0}\frac{\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x+sk)-\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x)}{s}=\Gamma_{t,x,k,\xi},\ \ k\in K.$$

Moreover, for any $z\in H$, $\xi\in U$,

$$|\Gamma_{t,x,k,\xi}-\Gamma_{t,x+z,k,\xi}|^2_J$$
$$=\Big|\int_H\big(\langle\Gamma_tk,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\langle\Gamma_tG\xi,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle-\langle\Gamma_tk,\Gamma_tG\xi\rangle\big)\,[\Phi(e^{tA}x+e^{tA}z+y)-\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)]\mu_t(dy)\Big|^2_J$$
$$\le\frac{c|k|^2_K}{t^4}|\xi|^2_U\int_H|\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)-\Phi(e^{tA}x+e^{tA}z+y)|^2_J\mu_t(dy)$$

and so

$$\lim_{z\to0}\sup_{x\in H}\sup_{|k|_K=1}|\Gamma_{t,x,k,\xi}-\Gamma_{t,x+z,k,\xi}|^2_J=0. \tag{4.26}$$

This shows in particular that the mapping $x\mapsto\nabla^G_\xi R_t[\Phi](x)$ verifies (4.23). □

Now we improve the previous estimates in the case when Φ is Hölder continuous along the directions of K using Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $T>0$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 let $\Phi\in C^\alpha_K(H,J)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$, see (4.5). We have all the assertions of Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 and the following new estimates, for $t\in(0,T]$,*

$$\sup_{x\in H}|\nabla_kR_t[\Phi](x)|_J\ \le\frac{c}{t^{\frac32(1-\alpha)}}\|\Phi\|_{\alpha,K}|k|_K,\ k\in K; \tag{4.27}$$
$$\sup_{x\in H}\|\nabla_k\nabla^G_\cdot R_t[\Phi](x)\|_{L(U,J)}\le\frac{c}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}}\|\Phi\|_{\alpha,K}|k|_K,\ k\in K.$$

Proof. Let us fix $t\in(0,T]$, $k\in K$ and $\xi\in U$. Using the OU process X defined by (2.11) we can define the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (P_t) acting on scalar functions $\phi\in B_b(H)$ (see (4.3)).

For $h\in J$, we introduce the scalar function $\Phi_h(x)=\langle\Phi(x),h\rangle_J$, $x\in H$, which belongs to $C^\alpha_K(H)$ with $\|\Phi_h\|_{\alpha,K}\le\|\Phi\|_{\alpha,K}\,|h|_J$. We note arguing as in Section 3 of [8] that

$$\langle\nabla_kR_t[\Phi](x),h\rangle_J=\nabla_kP_t[\Phi_h](x),\ \ x\in H.$$

To prove the first estimate we consider the linear operators

$$\nabla_kP_t:C^1_K(H)\to C_b(H),\quad\nabla_kP_t:C_b(H)\to C_b(H).$$

These operators are well defined by Lemma 4.6. When $\phi \in C^1_K(H)$ we find that (recall that $e^{tA}k \in K$)

$$\nabla_k P_t[\phi](x) = \lim_{s\to 0} \int_H \frac{\phi(e^{tA}x + se^{tA}k + y) - \phi(e^{tA}x + y)}{s} \mu_t(dy) = \int_H \nabla_{e^{tA}k}\, \phi(e^{tA}x + y)\, \mu_t(dy)$$
$$= \int_H \langle \nabla^K \phi(e^{tA}x + y), e^{tA}k\rangle_K\, \mu_t(dy)$$

(by the Riesz theorem we identify $\nabla^K \phi(e^{tA}x + y)$ with an element in K). We get the estimate

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k P_t[\phi](x)| \le C\|\nabla^K \phi\|_\infty |k|_K, \quad \phi \in C^1_K(H). \tag{4.28}$$

On the other hand we have (cf. (4.16))

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k P_t[f](x)| \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}\|f\|_\infty |k|_K, \quad f \in C_b(H). \tag{4.29}$$

Interpolating between (4.28) and (4.29) (see Theorem A.1.1 in [15]) we obtain that, for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$,

$$\nabla_k P_t : (C_b(H), C^1_K(H))_{\alpha,\infty} \to C_b(H)$$

is linear and bounded; further

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k P_t[\psi](x)| \le \frac{\tilde c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}(1-\alpha)}}\|\psi\|_{(C_b(H),C^1_K(H))_{\alpha,\infty}} |k|_K, \quad \psi \in (C_b(H), C^1_K(H))_{\alpha,\infty}.$$

Now thanks to Lemma 4.2 we deduce

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k P_t[\psi](x)| \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}(1-\alpha)}}\|\psi\|_{\alpha,K}\, |k|_K, \quad \psi \in C^\alpha_K(H).$$

If we consider now $\psi = \Phi_h$, we have, for each $x \in H$, $h \in J$,

$$|\langle \nabla_k R_t[\Phi](x), h\rangle_J| = |\nabla_k P_t[\Phi_h](x)| \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}(1-\alpha)}}\|\Phi_h\|_{\alpha,K}\, |k|_K \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{3}{2}(1-\alpha)}}\|\Phi\|_{\alpha,K}\, |k|_K |h|_J.$$

By taking the supremum over $\{h \in J : |h|_J = 1\}$ we get the first estimate in (4.27).

To prove the second estimate we fix $t > 0$, $k \in K$, with $|k|_K = 1$, $\xi \in U$ with $|\xi|_U = 1$ and argue as before. We first introduce the following linear operators (cf. Lemma 4.7)

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t : C^1_K(H) \to C_b(H), \quad \nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t : C_b(H) \to C_b(H). \tag{4.30}$$

When $\phi \in C^1_K(H)$ we know that

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t[\phi](x) = \int_H \langle \Gamma_t G\xi, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \nabla_{e^{tA}k}\phi(e^{tA}x + y)\mu_t(dy). \tag{4.31}$$

Moreover, we have, with $\Gamma_t = Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}$,

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t[\phi](x)|^2 \le \int_H |\langle \Gamma_t G\xi, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle|^2\, |\nabla_{e^{tA}k}\phi(e^{tA}x + y)|^2\, \mu_t(dy)$$
$$\le \|\phi\|^2_{C^1_K}\, |Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}G\xi|^2_H \le \frac{c}{t}|\xi|^2_U \|\phi\|^2_{C^1_K} = \frac{c}{t}\|\phi\|^2_{C^1_K}. \tag{4.32}$$

On the other hand if $\phi \in C_b(H)$ then

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t[\phi](x) = \int_H \big(\langle \Gamma_t k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle\, \langle \Gamma_t G\xi, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle - \langle \Gamma_t k, \Gamma_t G\xi\rangle\big)\phi(e^{tA}x + y)\mu_t(dy),$$

$$\sup_{x\in H} |\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi P_t[\phi](x)|^2 \le C\|\phi\|^2_\infty\, |\Gamma_t k|^2_H\, |Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}G\xi|^2_H \le c\|\phi\|^2_\infty\, \frac{1}{t^3}|k|^2_K\, \frac{1}{t}|\xi|^2_U \le c\|\phi\|^2_\infty\, \frac{1}{t^4}. \tag{4.33}$$

Interpolating between (4.32) and (4.33) as we have done before we get

$$\sup_{x\in H}|\nabla_k(\nabla^G_\xi P_t[\psi])(x)| \le \frac{c}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}}\|\psi\|_{\alpha,K},\quad \psi\in C^\alpha_K(H). \tag{4.34}$$

Now for $x\in H$, $k\in K$, $\Phi\in C^\alpha_K(H,J)$, we compute

$$\|\nabla_k(\nabla^G R_t[\Phi])(x)\|^2_{L(U,J)} = \sup_{a\in U,\,|a|_U=1}|\nabla_k(\nabla^G_a R_t[\Phi])(x)|^2_J$$

$$= \sup_{|a|_U=1}\sup_{h\in J,\,|h|_J=1}|\langle\nabla_k(\nabla^G_a R_t[\Phi])(x),h\rangle_J|^2 = \sup_{|a|_U=1}\sup_{|h|_J=1}|\nabla_k(\nabla^G_a P_t[\Phi_h])(x)|^2$$

$$\le \frac{c\,|k|^2_K}{t^{4-3\alpha}}\sup_{|h|_J=1}\|\Phi_h\|^2_{\alpha,K} \le \frac{c\,|k|^2_K}{t^{4-3\alpha}}\,\|\Phi\|^2_{\alpha,K}.$$

The second estimate in (4.27) follows easily. □

The next result is crucial for our approach to get pathwise uniqueness (see in particular Theorem 4.13 and the proof of Theorem 6.3). We can only prove the result when $\Phi\in C^\alpha_b(H,J)$ using Lemma 4.4. We do not know if such result holds more generally when $\Phi\in C^\alpha_K(H,J)$.

We fix an basis (f_m) of J and set $\Phi_m=\langle\Phi,f_m\rangle_J$. We will use the OU semigroup (P_t) given in (4.3).

Lemma 4.9. *Let $T>0$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 let $\Phi\in C^\alpha_b(H,J)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$. We have, for $t\in(0,T]$, $k\in K$,*

$$\Big(\sum_{m\ge1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla_k\nabla^G_a P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2\Big)^{1/2} \le \frac{C}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}}|k|_K\,\|\Phi\|_{C^\alpha_b(H,J)}. \tag{4.35}$$

where $C>0$ is independent of x,k,t, Φ and the basis (f_m) of J .

Proof. We recall that for $k\in K$, $a\in U$

$$\nabla_k\nabla^G_a P_t[\Phi_m](x) = \int_H\big(\langle\Gamma_t k,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\,\langle\Gamma_t Ga,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle - \langle\Gamma_t k,\Gamma_t Ga\rangle\big)\,\Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y)\,\mu_t(dy).$$

We fix $k\in K$. We have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (cf. (4.25)) for any $x\in H$, $m\ge1$,

$$\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla_k\nabla^G_a P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2$$

$$\le \sup_{|a|_U=1}\int_H\big|\big(\langle\Gamma_t k,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\,\langle\Gamma_t Ga,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle - \langle\Gamma_t k,\Gamma_t Ga\rangle\big)\big|^2\,\mu_t(dy)\cdot\int_H|\Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y)|^2\,\mu_t(dy)$$

$$\le \frac{c}{t^4}|k|^2_K\cdot\int_H|\Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y)|^2\,\mu_t(dy).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{m\ge1}\sup_{a\in U}\Big|\int_H\big(\langle\Gamma_t k,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle\,\langle\Gamma_t Ga,Q_t^{-\frac12}y\rangle - \langle\Gamma_t k,\Gamma_t Ga\rangle\big)\,\Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y)\,\mu_t(dy)\Big|^2$$

$$\le \frac{c}{t^4}|k|^2_K\sum_{m\ge1}\int_H|\Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y)|^2\,\mu_t(dy) = \frac{c}{t^4}|k|^2_K\int_H|\Phi(e^{tA}x+y)|^2_J\,\mu_t(dy).$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{m\ge1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla_k\nabla^G_a P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2 \le \frac{c}{t^4}|k|^2_K\,\|\Phi\|^2_\infty. \tag{4.36}$$

Now we fix also $x\in H$. For any $l\in J$ we define $\Phi_l:H\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi_l(y)=\langle\Phi(y),l\rangle_J,\quad l\in J.$$

We have $\Phi_m=\Phi_{f_m}$. We can consider the linear operator $T_{x,k}:C_b(H,J)\to L_2(J,U)$,

$$T_{x,k}(\Phi)(l)=\nabla_k\nabla^G_\cdot P_t[\Phi_l](x)\in U,\quad \Phi\in C_b(H,J),\ \ l\in J$$

(we identify U with $L(U,\mathbb{R})$). We have

$$|T_{x,k}(\Phi)(l)|_U^2 = \sup_{|a|_U=1} \Big| \int_H \big(\langle \Gamma_t k, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \langle \Gamma_t G a, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle - \langle \Gamma_t k, \Gamma_t G a\rangle\big) \langle \Phi(e^{tA}x+y), l\rangle_J \, \mu_t(dy)\Big|^2.$$

and

$$\|T_{x,k}(\Phi)\|_{L_2(J,U)}^2 = \sum_{m\geq 1} |T_{x,k}(\Phi)(f_m)|_U^2 = \sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2.$$

By the bound in (4.36) we deduce that $\|T_{x,k}(\Phi)\|_{L_2(J,U)}^2 \leq \frac{c}{t^4}|k|_K^2 \, \|\Phi\|_\infty^2$, where c is independent of $t>0$, $x\in H$, Φ and $k\in K$.

The linear operator: $T_{x,k} : C_b(H,J) \to L_2(J,U)$ is well defined and continuous; we have

$$\|T_{x,k}\|_{L(C_b(H,J),L_2(J,U))} \leq \frac{c}{t^2}|k|_K. \tag{4.37}$$

Now if $\Phi \in C_K^1(H,J)$ we find for $k\in K$, $a\in U$ (cf. (4.31))

$$\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x) = \int_H \langle \Gamma_t G a, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \, \langle \nabla^K \Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y), e^{tA}k\rangle_K \, \mu_t(dy).$$

We find (cf. (4.19))

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{a\in U, |a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{|a|_U=1} \int_H \big|\langle \Gamma_t G a, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle\big|^2 \, \mu_t(dy) \cdot \int_H |\langle \nabla^K \Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y), e^{tA}k\rangle_K|^2 \, \mu_t(dy) \\
&\leq \frac{c}{t} \cdot \int_H |\langle \nabla^K \Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y), e^{tA}k\rangle_K|^2 \, \mu_t(dy)
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{c}{t} \sum_{m\geq 1} \int_H |\langle \nabla^K \Phi_m(e^{tA}x+y), e^{tA}k\rangle_K|^2 \, \mu_t(dy) = \frac{c}{t} \int_H |\nabla^K \Phi(e^{tA}x+y)[e^{tA}k]|_J^2 \, \mu_t(dy).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $|\nabla^K \Phi(e^{tA}x+y)[e^{tA}k]|_J \leq \|\nabla^K \Phi(e^{tA}x+y)\|_{L(K,J)} \, |k|_K$, $t\geq 0$, it follows that

$$\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2 \leq \frac{c}{t}|k|_K^2 \, \|\Phi\|_{C_K^1(H,J)}^2. \tag{4.38}$$

Hence

$$\|T_{x,k}\|_{L(C_K^1(H,J),L_2(J,U))} \leq \frac{c}{t^{1/2}}|k|_K. \tag{4.39}$$

Interpolating, between (4.37) and (4.39) as in the proof of Lemma 4.8, for any $\Phi \in \big(C_b(H,J), C_K^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty}$, we get

$$\Big(\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2\Big)^{1/2} \leq \frac{c}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}}|k|_K \, \|\Phi\|_{\big(C_b(H,J),C_K^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty}}. \tag{4.40}$$

Now we consider any $\Phi \in C_b^\alpha(H,J) \subset \big(C_b(H,J), C_K^1(H,J)\big)_{\alpha,\infty}$ (see Lemma 4.4). We finally obtain

$$\Big(\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_m](x)|^2\Big)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}}|k|_K \, \|\Phi\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,J)}, \quad t\in(0,T].$$

□

Remark 4.10. We provide here an equivalent formulation of Lemma 4.9 when $J = K$ (this will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.13). Let $\Phi \in C_b^\alpha(H, K)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Let us fix $t \in (0,T]$, $x \in H$ and $k \in K$.

Recall the notation $\Phi_l = \langle \Phi, l\rangle_K$, $l \in K$. We know that the linear operator $\nabla_k \nabla^G R_t[\Phi](x)$ is well defined from K into U by the formula

$$l \mapsto \nabla_k \nabla^G P_t[\Phi_l](x)$$

(cf. Lemma 4.7; note that the operator $a \mapsto \nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\Phi_l](x)$ belongs to $L(U, \mathbb{R})$ and so it can be identified with an element of U). Assertion of Lemma 4.9 is equivalent to say that

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G R_t[\Phi](x) \in L_2(K, U) \text{ and} \tag{4.41}$$

$$\|\nabla_k \nabla^G R_t[\Phi](x)\|_{L_2(K,U)} = \Big(\sum_{m\geq 1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_t[\langle \Phi, f_m\rangle_K](x)|^2 \Big)^{1/2}$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{t^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} |k|_K \, \|\Phi\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,K)}, \quad t \in (0,T];$$

here (f_m) is a basis in K. Recall that the constant $C > 0$ is independent of x, k, t and Φ.

We will also use the following additional regularity result.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $T > 0$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.6 let $\Phi \in C_b^\alpha(H, J)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$. We have the following estimate, for $t \in (0,T]$, $x, y \in H$*

$$\|\nabla^G R_t[\Phi](x) - \nabla^G R_t[\Phi](x')\|_{L(U,J)} \leq \frac{c}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} |x - x'|^\alpha \|\Phi\|_\alpha \tag{4.42}$$

Proof. The assertion follows easily by the formula

$$\nabla_a^G R_t[\Phi](x) - \nabla_a^G R_t[\Phi](x') = \int_H \langle Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{tA} G a, Q_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} y\rangle \, [\Phi(e^{tA}x + y) - [\Phi(e^{tA}x' + y)] \mathcal{N}(0, Q_t)(dy),$$

$a \in U$, using that

$$|\Phi(e^{tA}x + y) - \Phi(e^{tA}x' + y)|_J \leq \|\Phi\|_\alpha |x - x'|^\alpha, \quad t \geq 0, \, y \in H.$$

□

In the sequel we will apply the previous regularity results when

$$J = K = V \times U. \tag{4.43}$$

Let $T > 0$. We consider the following integral equation which will be important in the sequel:

$$u(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} G B(s, \cdot) \right](x) \, ds + \int_t^T R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} \nabla^G u(s, \cdot) B(s, \cdot) \right](x) \, ds, \tag{4.44}$$

where $u(t,x)$ takes values in K and $\nabla^G u(s,x) B(s,x) = \nabla_{GB(s,x)} u(s,x) \in K$, $(s,x) \in [0,T] \times H$.

Using the previous lemmas, we will solve the equation in the Banach space E_0 consisting of all $u \in B_b([0,T] \times H, K)$ such that $u(t, \cdot)$ is K-differentiable on H, with $\nabla^K u \in B_b([0,T] \times H, L(K,K))$.

We also require that there exists $C = C_T > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in H$

$$\sup_{s\in[0,T]} |\nabla^G u(s,x) - \nabla^G u(s,y)|_{L(U,K)} \leq C |x - y|_H^\alpha, \tag{4.45}$$

where $\alpha \in (2/3, 1)$ is given in Hypothesis 2. Finally, to define E_0 we require that, for each $\xi \in U$, $t \in [0,T]$, the mapping:

$$x \mapsto \nabla_\xi^G u(t,x) \text{ is } K\text{-differentiable on } H \tag{4.46}$$

$$\text{with} \quad \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H} \; \sup_{|\xi|_U=1} \|\nabla^K \nabla_\xi^G u(t,x)\|_{L(K,K)} < \infty.$$

Let $\beta \geq 0$ to be fixed later. It is not difficult to prove that E_0 is a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{E_0,\beta} = \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H} e^{\beta t}|u(t,x)|_K + \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^K u(t,x)\|_{L(K,K)}$$

$$+ \sup_{t\in[0,T]} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G u(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,L(U,K))} + \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H} \sup_{|\xi|_U=1} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^K \nabla^G_\xi u(t,x)\|_{L(K,K)}. \tag{4.47}$$

Lemma 4.12. *Let Hypotheses 1 and 2 hold true. There exists a unique solution $u \in E_0$ to (4.44). Moreover, there exists a function $h(r) = h(r,\alpha) > 0$, $r \geq 0$, such that $h(r) \to 0$ as $r \to 0^+$ and if $S \in [0,T]$ verifies $h(T-S)\cdot(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha) \leq 1/4$, then*

$$\sup_{t\in[S,T],\, x\in H} \|\nabla^K u(t,x)\|_{L(K,K)} \leq 1/3. \tag{4.48}$$

Proof. We introduce the following operator $\mathscr{T}$ defined on E_0:

$$\mathscr{T}u(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}GB(s,\cdot)\right](x)\,ds + \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)\right](x)\,ds,$$

$u \in E_0$, $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times H$. In order to apply Lemmas 4.8 and 4.11 with $J = K$ we first check the Hölder regularity of the terms $GB(s,\cdot)$ and $\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)$.

Since, for any $x \in H$, $h \in H$, $s \in [0,T]$,

$$|GB(s,x) - GB(s,x+h)|_K = |B(s,x) - B(s,x+h)|_U \leq C|h|_H^\alpha$$

we get that $GB \in B_b([0,T]; C_b^\alpha(H,K))$, see the definition in Hypothesis (2). We need to prove that also

$$\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot) \quad \text{belongs to } B_b([0,T]; C_b^\alpha(H,K)). \tag{4.49}$$

We write for $x, y \in H$ with $|x-y|_H \leq 1$

$$[\nabla^G u(s,x)B(s,x) - \nabla^G u(s,y)B(s,x)] + \nabla^G u(s,y)[B(s,x) - B(s,y)].$$

We bound the second term with

$$|\nabla^G u(s,y)[B(s,x) - B(s,y)]|_K \leq \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G u(t,x)\|_{L(U,K)}\,|B(s,x) - B(s,y)|_U \leq C|x-y|_H^\alpha.$$

Moreover we have

$$\begin{aligned}|[\nabla^G u(s,x) - \nabla^G u(s,y)]B(s,x)|_K &\leq |B(s,x)|_U|\nabla^G u(s,x) - \nabla^G u(s,y)|_{L(K,U)}\\ &\leq \|B\|_\infty \sup_{t\in[0,T]} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G u(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,L(U,K))}\,|x-y|_H^\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 4.8 and 4.11, using that $\alpha > 2/3$, it is not difficult to prove that $\mathscr{T} : E_0 \to E_0$. Let us check that for a suitable value of β the map $\mathscr{T}$ is a strict contraction (see (4.47)). We have to consider $\|\mathscr{T}u_1 - \mathscr{T}u_2\|_{E_0,\beta}$, $u_1, u_2 \in E_0$; we only treat the term

$$\sup_{t,x}\sup_{|\xi|_U=1} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^K \nabla^G_\xi[\mathscr{T}u_1 - \mathscr{T}u_2](t,x)\|_{L(K,K)}.$$

Indeed the other terms of $\|\mathscr{T}u_1 - \mathscr{T}u_2\|_{E_0,\beta}$ can be estimated in a similar way. We have for any $k \in K$ with $|k|_K = 1$

$$e^{\beta t}|\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi[\mathscr{T}u_1(t,x) - \mathscr{T}u_2(t,x)]\,|_K$$

$$\leq \int_t^T e^{-\beta(s-t)}\left|\nabla_k \nabla^G_\xi R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\,e^{\beta s}\{\nabla^G u_1(s,\cdot) - \nabla^G u_2(s,\cdot)\}B(s,\cdot)\right](x)\right|_K ds$$

$$\leq \int_t^T \frac{ce^{-\beta(s-t)}}{(s-t)^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} ds \sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha\|u_1 - u_2\|_{E_0,\beta} \leq C_{\beta,T}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha\|u_1 - u_2\|_{E_0,\beta},$$

where $C_{\beta,T} > 0$ tends to 0 as $\beta \to +\infty$. Therefore taking the supremum over $k \in K$ with $|k|_K = 1$ we infer

$$e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^K \nabla_\xi^G [\mathscr{T}u_1(t,x) - \mathscr{T}u_2(t,x)]\|_{L(K,K)} \le C_{\beta,T} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha \|u_1 - u_2\|_{E_0,\beta}.$$

Choosing β large enough, we can apply the fixed point theorem and obtain that there exists a unique solution $u \in E_0$.

In order to prove (4.48), we first introduce $\|u\|_{E_0,0,S,T}$ which is defined as $\|u\|_{E_0,0}$ in (4.47) (with $\beta = 0$) but taking all the supremums over $[S,T] \times H$ instead of $[0,T] \times H$. We proceed as before:

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{E_0,0,S,T} &\le \sup_{t\in[S,T]} \int_t^T \frac{c}{(s-t)^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} ds \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{\alpha,K} \left(\|u_0\|_{E_0,0,S,T} + 1\right) \\ &\le h(T-S) \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha \left(\|u_0\|_{E_0,0,S,T} + 1\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $h(r) = \int_0^r \frac{c}{s^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} ds$; now (4.48) follows since we have $\frac{3}{4}\|u\|_{E_0,0,S,T} \le 1/4$. □

To prove the next result we will apply Lemma 4.9 (see also Remark 4.10). To this purpose we fix a basis (f_m) of K and set $u_m = \langle u, f_m\rangle_K$, where u is the solution given in Lemma 4.12.

Theorem 4.13. *Let Hypotheses 1 and 2 hold true. Then the unique solution $u \in E_0$ to (4.44) (see Lemma 4.12) verifies in addition*

$$\Big(\sum_{m\ge1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G u_m(t,x)|^2\Big)^{1/2} \le C|k|_K \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}, \qquad k \in K, \tag{4.50}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $x \in H, k \in K$, $t \in [0,T]$, u and the basis (f_m) in K.

Proof. First following the proof of Lemma 4.12 it is not difficult to prove that there exists $C_T > 0$ independent of u such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\nabla^G u(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,L(U,K))} \le C_T \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}. \tag{4.51}$$

Then we write $u = v + w$, where

$$v(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s,\cdot)\right](x)\, ds, \quad w(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)\right](x)\, ds.$$

We need to prove that (4.50) holds when u is replaced by v and w. We concentrate on w (the proof for v is similar). We define, for any $s \in [0,T]$, $x \in H$, $\Phi(s,x) = e^{-(s-t)A}\nabla^G u(s,x)B(s,x)$.

Note that $\Phi \in B_b([0,T]; C_b^\alpha(H,K))$ (see the computations to verify (4.49)). By (4.51) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{s\in[0,T]} \|\Phi(s,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,K)} \le C_T \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)} \text{ with} \\ &w(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}[\Phi(s,\cdot)](x)\, ds, \quad t \in [0,T],\ x \in H.\end{aligned}$$

Let us fix $k \in K$ and $t \in [0,T)$; set $w_m = \langle w, f_m\rangle_K$. By Lemma 4.9 (see also Remark 4.10) we know that, for any $s \in (t,T]$, the linear operator $\nabla_k \nabla^G R_{s-t}[\Phi(s,\cdot)](x)$ is well defined from K into U by the formula $l \mapsto \nabla_k \nabla^G P_{s-t}[\langle \Phi(s,\cdot), l\rangle_K](x)$ and it is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_k \nabla^G R_{s-t}[\Phi(s,\cdot)](x)\|_{L_2(K,U)} &= \Big(\sum_{m\ge1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G P_{s-t}[\langle \Phi(s,\cdot), f_m\rangle_K](x)|^2\Big)^{1/2} \qquad (4.52)\\ \le \frac{C}{(s-t)^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} |k|_K \sup_{r\in[0,T]} \|\Phi(r,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,K)} &\le \frac{c|k|_K}{(s-t)^{\frac{4-3\alpha}{2}}} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}, \quad s > t.\end{aligned}$$

Note that also the linear operator $\nabla_k \nabla^G w(t,x)$ is well defined from K into U ($l \mapsto \nabla_k \nabla^G[\langle w(s,\cdot), l\rangle_K](x)$).

Moreover, we have, for any $x \in H$,

$$\nabla_k \nabla^G w(t,x) = \int_t^T \nabla_k \nabla^G R_{s-t}[\Phi(s,\cdot)](x) ds.$$

Using (4.52) we deduce that $\nabla_k \nabla^G w(t,x) \in L_2(K,U)$ and

$$\|\nabla_k \nabla^G w(t,x)\|_{L_2(K,U)} \le \int_t^T \|\nabla_k \nabla^G R_{s-t}[\Phi(s,\cdot)](x)\|_{L_2(K,U)} ds \le C_{\alpha,T} |k|_K \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|B(t,\cdot)\|_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)},$$

where $C_{\alpha,T} > 0$ is independent of $x \in H$, $t \in [0,T]$, B and $k \in K$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 4.14. If try to prove the previous theorem using Lemma 4.2 instead of Lemma 4.4 we could eventually obtain a bound for $\sum_{m\ge1} \sup_{|a|_U=1} |\nabla_k \nabla_a^G u_m(t,x)|^2$ by requiring that

$$\sum_{j\ge1} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|\langle B(t,\cdot), e_j\rangle_U\|^2_{C^\alpha_K(H)} < \infty.$$

However this condition is restrictive when it is applied to the examples of Section 3.

5 The related infinite dimensional forward-backward system

In a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$, let us consider the following forward-backward system (FBSDE)

$$\begin{cases} d\Xi_\tau^{t,x} = A\Xi_\tau^{t,x} d\tau + G dW_\tau, \quad \tau \in [t,T], \\ \Xi_t^{t,x} = x, \\ -dY_\tau^{t,x} = -AY_\tau^{t,x} + GB(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\, d\tau + Z_\tau^{t,x}\, B(\tau,\Xi_\tau^{t,x}) d\tau - Z_\tau^{t,x}\, dW_\tau, \qquad \tau \in [0,T], \\ Y_T^{t,x} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $t \in [0,T]$, $x \in H$, and the forward equation is the abstract formulation of the wave equation (2.3) given in (2.7) under Hypothesis 1; here $B : [0,T] \times H \to U$ is (Borel) measurable and satisfies

$$B(t,\cdot) \in C_b(H,U), \quad t \in [0,T], \quad \|B\|_\infty = \sup_{t\in[0,T]\times H} |B(t,x)|_U < \infty \tag{5.2}$$

(clearly, Hypothesis 2 implies (5.2)); G is defined by (2.5) and W is a cylindrical Wiener process in U.

We extend $\Xi^{t,x}$ to the whole $[0,T]$ by setting $\Xi_\tau^{t,x} = x$ for $0 \le \tau \le t$, in order to have $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ well defined on $[0,T]$. The precise meaning of the BSDE in (5.1) is given by its mild formulation: for $\tau \in [0,T]$

$$Y_\tau^{t,x} = \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} GB(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds + \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} Z_s^{t,x}\, B(s,\Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} Z_s^{t,x}\, dW_s, \tag{5.3}$$

$\mathbb{P}$-a.s. (cf. [27], [25] and the references therein). The solution of (5.3) will be a pair of processes $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ (see Proposition 5.1). Notice that in order to give sense to the BSDE in (5.1) as it is done in (5.3), we need that A is the generator of a C_0-group of bounded linear operators, so that $-A$ is the generator of a C_0-semigroup of bounded linear operators.

We also refer to this BSDE as BSDE in a Markovian framework, since the pair of processes $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ depends on the Markov process $\Xi^{t,x}$. We endow $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with the natural filtration $(\mathscr{F}_t^W)$ of W, augmented in the usual way with the family of $\mathbb{P}$-null sets of $\mathscr{F}$. All the concepts of measurability, e.g. predictability, are referred to this filtration.

Notice that the forward equation evolve in H as we have already discussed in Section 2, while the backward equation takes values in K, indeed the term $GB(\cdot,\cdot)$ take values in K, and we can give an explicit representation of the solution in terms of $GB(\cdot)$, see [27], Sections 2 and 3.

We denote by $L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega, C([0,T],K))$ the space of all predictable K-valued processes Y with continuous paths and such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\tau\in[0,T]} |Y_\tau|^2] = \|Y\|^2_{L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega,C([0,T],K))} < \infty.$$

The space $L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega, C([0,T],K))$ is a Banach space endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega,C([0,T],K))}$. On the other hand, $L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega\times[0,T],L_2(U,K))$ is the usual L^2-space of all predictable processes Z with values in $L_2(U,K)$. We also define the space $\mathscr{G}^{0,1}([0,T]\times H,K)$, as in [21] Section 2.2, as the subspace of $C([0,T]\times H,K)$ consisting of all functions f which are Gâteaux differentiable with respect to x and such that the map $\nabla_x f:[0,T]\times H\to L(H,K)$ is strongly continuous. Similarly one can define the space $\mathscr{G}^{0,1}([0,T]\times H,\mathbb{R})\subset C([0,T]\times H,\mathbb{R})$.

Following [27], it is immediate to get existence and pathwise uniqueness of a solution $(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x})$ to the Markovian BSDE (5.3). Moreover we can show regular dependence on the initial datum x of the solution to the forward equation in (5.1).

Proposition 5.1. *Assume Hypothesis 1 and let B be as in (5.2). Let $t\in[0,T]$ and $x\in H$. Consider the K-valued BSDE (5.3). Then there exists a unique solution $(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x})\in L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega,C([0,T],K))\times L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega\times[0,T],L_2(U,K))$. Moreover, the following estimates hold true:*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\sup_{\tau\in[0,T]}|Y^{t,x}_\tau|^2_K\big]+\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\|Z^{t,x}_\tau\|^2_{L_2(U,K)}d\tau\le C_T\|B\|_\infty. \tag{5.4}$$

In addition, the map: $(t,x)\mapsto Y^{t,x}_t$, $[0,T]\times H\to K$, is deterministic. If we further assume that

$$\text{the map: } x\mapsto B(\tau,x),\quad H\to U,\ \text{ is Gâteaux differentiable on } H,\ \text{for all } \tau\in[0,T], \tag{5.5}$$

then, for any $t\in[0,T]$, the map

$$x\mapsto(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x}),\quad H\to L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega,C([0,T],K))\times L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega\times[0,T],L_2(U,K)) \tag{5.6}$$

is Gâteaux differentiable on H. Moreover, assuming (5.5), the map: $(t,x)\mapsto Y^{t,x}_t$ belongs to $\mathscr{G}^{0,1}([0,T]\times H,K)$.

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of a solution come directly from Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.1 in [27], that we can apply since B is bounded. Estimate (5.4) follows from [24], Remark 4.5, estimate (4.19). Since the process $\Xi^{t,x}$ is $\mathscr{F}^W_{t,T}$-measurable (where $\mathscr{F}^W_{t,T}$ is the σ-algebra generated by W_r-W_t, $r\in[t,T]$, augmented with the $\mathbb{P}$-null sets), it turns out that $Y^{t,x}_t$ is measurable both with respect to $\mathscr{F}^W_{t,T}$ and $\mathscr{F}^W_t$; it follows that $Y^{t,x}_t$ is indeed deterministic.

When B is also differentiable with respect to x (see (5.5)) then the differentiability properties follow by [21], Propositions 4.8 and 5.2, which can be applied in the same way also when the BSDE is K-valued. □

Let $(Y^{t,x},Z^{t,x})$ be the solution of (5.1) assuming only Hypothesis 1 and (5.2). By the previous result we can define the deterministic function $v:[0,T]\times H\to K$,

$$v(t,x)=Y^{t,x}_t\in K,\quad (t,x)\in[0,T]\times H. \tag{5.7}$$

Assuming also the differentiability condition (5.5), the map defined in (5.6) is in particular continuous and it is standard to check the following useful identities: for any $0\le t\le s\le\tau\le T$,

$$Y^{t,x}_\tau=Y^{s,\Xi^{t,x}_s}_\tau,\quad Z^{t,x}_\tau=Z^{s,\Xi^{t,x}_s}_\tau,\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}. \tag{5.8}$$

The proof of (5.8) can be performed as for the real valued BSDEs (see [21], formula (5.3)), and it is related to the fact that the value of the processes $Y^{t,x}$ and $Z^{t,x}$ on the time interval $[s,T]$ is uniquely determined by the values of $\Xi^{t,x}$ on the same interval.

Moreover, if we assume differentiability of B (see (5.5)), we get in particular that, for $t\in[0,T]$, $v(t,\cdot):H\to K$ is Gâteaux differentiable on H, and, moreover, applying (5.8), we have:

$$v(\tau,\Xi^{t,x}_\tau)=Y^{t,x}_\tau,\quad \tau\in[t,T],\ \mathbb{P}-a.s.. \tag{5.9}$$

Now we want to prove that the derivative $\nabla^G v(\tau,\Xi^{t,x}_\tau)$ can be identified with $Z^{t,x}_\tau$ (see (4.4)). At first we prove such identification assuming that B is also differentiable (see (5.5)). Then in Theorem 5.4 we show that such identification holds true only assuming (5.2).

Remark 5.2. The next identification property with B differentiable (see (5.5)) is here presented for the markovian BSDE (5.3) related to the Ornstein Uhlenbeck wave process; it remains true for general linear Markovian BSDEs with differentiable coefficients and final datum which is related to a forward stochastic equation with additive noise, A generator of a strongly continuous semigroup, A instead of $-A$ in the backward equation, and Lipschitz continuous and Gâteaux differentiable drift.

Lemma 5.3. *Let v be defined in (5.7) and assume that all the hypotheses of Proposition 5.1, including the differentiability of B (see (5.5)) hold true. Let $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ be the solution of (5.3). Then, for any $\tau \in [0,T]$, a.e., we have, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,*

$$\nabla^G v(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) = Z_\tau^{t,x} \ \textit{in } L_2(U,K). \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. The result can be seen as an extension of Theorem 6.1 in [22] (see also Theorem 6.2 in [21]) to the case of a K-valued BSDE. Let $\xi \in U$ and consider the real Wiener process $(W_\tau^\xi)_{\tau\geq 0}$, where

$$W_\tau^\xi := \langle \xi, W_\tau \rangle_U.$$

Let $h \in K$. Using the group property if we set $\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x} = e^{-\tau A} Y_\tau^{t,x}$ we have, for $\tau \in [0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x} &= \int_\tau^T e^{-sA} GB(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds + \int_\tau^T e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x}\, B(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x}\, dW_s \\ &= \widetilde{Y}_0^{t,x} - \int_0^\tau e^{-sA} GB(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds - \int_0^\tau e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x}\, B(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds + \int_0^\tau e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x}\, dW_s\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x}, h\rangle = \langle \widetilde{Y}_0^{t,x}, h\rangle &- \int_0^\tau \langle e^{-sA} GB(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}), h\rangle\, ds - \int_0^\tau \langle e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x}\, B(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}), h\rangle\, ds \\ &+ \int_0^\tau \langle dW_s, (Z_s^{t,x})^* e^{-sA^*} h\rangle_U\end{aligned}$$

(A^* denotes the adjoint of A, $A^* = -A$). We study the joint quadratic variation between $\widetilde{Y}^{t,x}$ and W^ξ (see, for instance, page 638 in [22]). We find, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 17 of [9],

$$\langle \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}, W^\xi \rangle_\tau = \int_0^\tau \langle \xi, (Z_s^{t,x})^* e^{-sA^*} h\rangle_U\, ds = \int_0^\tau \langle e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x} \xi, h\rangle_K ds, \quad \tau \in [0,T],\ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{5.11}$$

Now we compute $\langle \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}, W^\xi \rangle_\tau$ in a different way, using (5.24).

Let us define $\widetilde{v}(t,x) = e^{-tA} v(t,x)$ so that we have $\widetilde{v}(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) = \widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x}$. Moreover, we introduce the real function

$$\widetilde{v}^h(\tau, x) = \langle \widetilde{v}(\tau, x), h\rangle = \langle v(\tau, x), e^{-\tau(A^* + \lambda I)} h\rangle, \quad \tau \in [0,T],\ x \in H.$$

By (5.7) we know that $\widetilde{v}^h \in \mathscr{G}^{0,1}([0,T] \times H, \mathbb{R})$. Hence we can argue as in Lemma 6.3 of [21] (see also Lemma 6.4 in [21]) and obtain that the real process

$$(\widetilde{v}^h(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}))_{\tau\in[0,T]} = (\langle \widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x}, h\rangle)_{\tau\in[0,T]}$$

admits joint quadratic variation with W^ξ given by

$$\langle \widetilde{v}^h(\cdot, \Xi^{t,x}), W^\xi \rangle_\tau = \int_0^\tau \nabla^G \widetilde{v}^h(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) \xi\, ds = \int_0^\tau \langle \nabla^G v(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) \xi, e^{-sA^*} h\rangle\, ds, \quad \tau \in [0,T].$$

Comparing this formula with (5.11) we discover that for $s \in [0,T]$, a.e., we have, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\langle e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x} \xi, h\rangle = \langle e^{-sA} \nabla^G v(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) \xi, h\rangle.$$

Thanks to the separability of K it follows that $e^{-sA} Z_s^{t,x} \xi = e^{-sA} \nabla^G v(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) \xi$, for $s \in [0,T]$, a.e., $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.. The assertion follows easily. □

We introduce now an approximation argument to smooth the coefficient B. We need such approximation in the proof of next theorem. Recall that for $s \in [0,T]$, $B(s,\cdot) : H \to U$, and

$$GB(s,\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ B(s,\cdot) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.12}$$

where B satisfies (5.2). To perform the approximations of B we follow [36]. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider a nonnegative function $\rho_k \in C_b^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^k\right)$ with compact support contained in the ball of radius $\frac{1}{k}$ and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \rho_k(x)\,dx = 1$. Let $Q_k : H \longrightarrow \langle g_1, ..., g_k\rangle$ be the orthogonal projection on the linear space Λ_k generated by $g_1, ..., g_k$, where $(g_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is a basis in H. We identify Λ_k with $\mathbb{R}^k$. For a bounded and continuous function $f : H \to U$ we set

$$f^k(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \rho_k\Big(y - Q_k x\Big) f\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k y_i g_i\Big) dy,$$

where for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $y_k = \langle y, g_k\rangle_H$. It turns out that $f^k \in C_b^\infty(H,U)$.
We will apply this approximation to $f = B(s,\cdot)$, $s \in [0,T]$. By (5.2) it follows that the sequence $(B^k(t,\cdot))$ is equi-uniformly continuous on H, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$, and $|B^k(t,x) - B(t,x)| \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$, for any $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times H$. Moreover, for $s \in [0,T]$, $B^n(s,\cdot)$ is Fréchet differentiable on H and

$$\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,T]\times H} \|\nabla B^n(s,x)\|_{L(H,U)} = c(n) \tag{5.13}$$

where $c(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. For any $n \geq 1$ let us consider the FBSDE (5.1) with B^n in the place of B where again the precise meaning of the BSDE is given by its mild formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\tau^{n,t,x} &= \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} GB^n(s,\Xi_s^{t,x})\,ds + \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} Z_s^{n,t,x}\, B^n(s,\Xi_s^{t,x})\,ds \\ &\quad - \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} Z_s^{n,t,x}\, dW_s. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

We know that the map in (5.6) is Gâteaux differentiable on H, since in the BSDE (5.14) the coefficients are regular. Let $\xi \in U$ and consider the BSDE satisfied by the pair of processes $(\nabla_{G\xi} Y^{n,t,x}, \nabla_{G\xi} Z^{n,t,x})$, which can be obtained by differentiating (5.14) arguing as in [21], Proposition 4.8, or following [25], Proposition 4.4:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{G\xi} Y_\tau^{n,t,x} &= \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} G\nabla B^n(s,\Xi_s^{t,x}) e^{(s-t)A} G\xi\,ds + \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} \nabla_{G\xi} Z_s^{n,t,x}\, B^n(s,\Xi_s^{t,x})\,ds \\ &\quad + \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} Z_s^{n,t,x}\, \nabla B^n(s,\Xi_s^{t,x}) e^{(s-t)A} G\xi\,ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A} \nabla_{G\xi} Z_s^{n,t,x}\, dW_s. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

By applying estimate (5.4) to (5.15), and since $\|\nabla B^n(s,\cdot)\|_{L(H,U)} \leq c(n)$, where $c(n)$ does not depend on s and x, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{\tau\in[0,T]} |\nabla_{G\xi} Y_\tau^{n,t,x}|^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \|\nabla_{G\xi} Z_\tau^{n,t,x}\|_{L_2(U,K)}^2 d\tau \leq c(n,T)^2\,|\xi|_U^2, \tag{5.16}$$

where $c(n,T) > 0$ is a constant that may blow up as $n \to \infty$, it depends on T and B but not on x and t. Recalling (5.7) we have

$$v^n(t,x) = Y_t^{n,t,x},$$

and we know that $v^n \in \mathscr{G}^{0,1}([0,T]\times H, K)$; by the previous computations we have, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T], x\in H} |\nabla_\xi^G v^n(t,x)| \leq c(n,T)|\xi|_U; \tag{5.17}$$

Let $\tau = t$ and let us take the expectation in (5.14); we get

$$Y_t^{n,t,x} = \mathbb{E}\int_t^T e^{-(s-t)A} G B^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T e^{-(s-t)A} Z_s^{n,t,x} B^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds, \quad t \in [0,T]\,,\ x \in H. \tag{5.18}$$

Applying Lemma 5.3, we can write (5.18) as

$$v^n(t,x) = \mathbb{E}\int_t^T e^{-(s-t)A} G B^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds + \mathbb{E}\int_t^T e^{-(s-t)A} \nabla^G v^n\left(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}\right) B^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})\, ds, \tag{5.19}$$

for $t \in [0,T]\,,\ x \in H$. Using the K-valued OU transition semigroup (R_t) defined in (4.2), we obtain

$$v^n(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A} G B^n(s,\cdot) + e^{-(s-t)A} \nabla^G v^n(s,\cdot)\, B^n(s,\cdot)\right](x)\, ds,\ t \in [0,T]\,,\ x \in H. \tag{5.20}$$

Now we want to show a convergence result of $Y_t^{n,t,x}$ to $Y_t^{t,x}$ and $Z^{n,t,x}$ to $Z^{t,x}$. The BSDE satisfied by $(Y^{n,t,x} - Y^{t,x}, Z^{n,t,x} - Z^{t,x})$ is

$$\begin{cases} -d\left(Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}\right) = -A\left(Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}\right)\, d\tau + \left(GB^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - GB(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right) d\tau \\ \quad + \left(Z_\tau^{n,t,x}\, B^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - Z_\tau^{t,x}\, B(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right) d\tau - \left(Z_\tau^{n,t,x} - Z_\tau^{t,x}\right)\, dW_\tau, \\ Y_T^{n,t,x} - Y_T^{t,x} = 0. \end{cases}$$

By adding and subtracting $Z_\tau^{t,x} B^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})$ this equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} -d\left(Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}\right) = -A\left(Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}\right)\, d\tau + \left(GB^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - GB(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right) d\tau \\ \quad - Z_\tau^{t,x}\left(B(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - B^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right) d\tau + \left(Z_\tau^{n,t,x} - Z_\tau^{t,x}\right) B^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\, d\tau - \left(Z_\tau^{n,t,x} - Z_\tau^{t,x}\right)\, dW_\tau, \\ Y_T^{n,t,x} - Y_T^{t,x} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.21}$$

Let $f_n(\tau) = \left(GB^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - GB(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right) - Z_\tau^{t,x}\left(B(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) - B^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x})\right)$. In the sequel we write $\|\cdot\|$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(U,K))}$ to simplify notation. Let us fix $t \in [0,T]$. By Remark 4.5, estimate (4.19) in [24], we know that there exists $M = M(A)$ such that, for any $\tau \in [0,T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}|^2 + \mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T \|Z_s^{n,t,x} - Z_s^{t,x}\|^2\, ds \le M(T-\tau)\mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T |f_n(s)|^2 ds. \tag{5.22}$$

Recall that the sequence (B^n) is uniformly bounded on $[0,T] \times H$ by $\|B\|_\infty$. Let $\eta > 0$ be small enough ($\eta M \|B\|_\infty \le 1/2$). If $\tau \in [T-\eta, T]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T \|Z_s^{n,t,x} - Z_s^{t,x}\|^2\, ds &\le M\eta\mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T |GB^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) - GB(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})|^2 ds \\ &+ M\eta\,\mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T \|Z_s^{t,x}\|^2\, |B(s, \Xi_s^{t,x}) - B^n(s, \Xi_s^{t,x})|_U^2\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Z^{t,x} \in L^2_{\mathscr{P}}(\Omega \times [0,T], L_2(U,K))$, by the pointwise convergence of $B^n(\tau,\cdot)$ to $B(\tau,\cdot)$ and the dominated convergence theorem we get

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_\tau^{n,t,x} - Y_\tau^{t,x}|^2 + \mathbb{E}\int_\tau^T \|Z_s^{n,t,x} - Z_s^{t,x}\|^2\, ds \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{5.23}$$

$\tau \in [T-\eta, T]$. Let now $\tau \in [(T-2\eta) \vee 0, T-\eta]$. We consider (5.21) on $[0, T-\eta]$ with the terminal condition $Y_{T-\eta}^{n,t,x} - Y_{T-\eta}^{t,x} = 0$. Arguing as before we obtain (5.23) when $\tau \in [(T-2\eta)\vee 0, T-\eta]$. Proceeding in this way we finally get (5.23) for any $\tau \in [0,T]$.

We mention two consequences of (5.23). The first one is obtained with $\tau = t$ and gives, setting $v^n(t,x) = Y_t^{n,t,x}$, $v^n(t,x) \to v(t,x)$ pointwise as $n \to \infty$ on $[0,T] \times H$. The second one is that, for $\tau \in [t,T]$, possibly passing to a subsequence, we can pass to the limit, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., in $v^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) = Y_\tau^{n,t,x}$ and get

$$v(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) = Y_\tau^{t,x}, \quad \tau \in [t,T],\ \mathbb{P} - a.s.. \tag{5.24}$$

Now we are ready to prove the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Assume Hypothesis 1 and that B satisfy (5.2). Let v be the function defined in (5.7).*

Then $v \in B_b([0,T]\times H, H)$ and, for any $t\in[0,T]$, $v(t,\cdot): H\to K$ is G-differentiable on H (see the definition after (4.4)). Moreover, for any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H$, the map: $\xi\mapsto \nabla_{G\xi}v(t,x)=\nabla^G_\xi v(t,x)\in L(U,K)$ and, for any $\xi\in U$, $\nabla^G_\xi v\in B_b([0,T]\times H,K)$ with $\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H}\|\nabla^G v(t,x)\|_{L(U,K)}<\infty$. Finally, for any $\tau\in[0,T]$, a.e., we have

$$\nabla^G v(\tau,\Xi^{t,x}_\tau)=Z^{t,x}_\tau,\quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}. \tag{5.25}$$

Proof. To prove the result we will pass to the limit as $n\to\infty$ in (5.20).

We first note that by estimate (5.23) $v^n(t,x)\to v(t,x)$ pointwise and so $v\in B_b([0,T]\times H,K)$.

Then we show that there exists $L:[0,T]\times H\to L(U,K)$ which is a bounded mapping, such that, for any $\xi\in U$, $L(t,x)\xi$ is measurable in $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H$, and $\nabla^G v^n(t,x)\to L(t,x)$ in $L(U,K)$ pointwise as $n\to\infty$ on $[0,T]\times H$.

In order to obtain the assertion we start to study the difference $v^n(t,x)-v^{n+p}(t,x)$, $n,p\geq 1$. In the sequel we set $\mathcal{N}(0,Q_t)=\mu_t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
v^n(t,x)-v^{n+p}(t,x)&=\int_t^T\int_H e^{-(s-t)A}\Big[\nabla^G v^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\\
&\quad-\nabla^G v^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\Big]\,\mu_{s-t}(dz)\,ds\\
&\quad+\int_t^T\int_H e^{-(s-t)A}\Big(GB^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)-GB^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\Big)\,\mu_{s-t}(dz).
\end{aligned}$$

Since v^n and v^{n+p} are Gâteaux differentiable in the space variable, by the smoothing properties of the transition semigroup (R_s), we can differentiate both sides and obtain for all $\xi\in U$ (cf. (4.14))

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^G_\xi v^n(t,x)-\nabla^G_\xi v^{n+p}(t,x)&=\int_t^T\int_H e^{-(s-t)A}\Big(GB^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)-GB^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\Big)\\
&\quad\Big\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2}e^{(s-t)A}G\xi,Q_{s-t}^{-1/2}z\Big\rangle\,\mu_{s-t}(dz)\,ds\\
&\quad+\int_t^T\int_H e^{-(s-t)A}\Big[\nabla^G v^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\\
&\quad-\nabla^G v^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\Big]\Big\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2}e^{(s-t)A}G\xi,Q_{s-t}^{-1/2}z\Big\rangle\,\mu_{s-t}(dz)\,ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now in order to apply the Cauchy criterion we note that by (4.17)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{p\geq1}\sup_{|\xi|_U=1}|\nabla^G_\xi v^n(t,x)-\nabla^G_\xi v^{n+p}(t,x)|\\
&\leq C\int_t^T(s-t)^{-\frac12}\left(\int_H\sup_{p\geq1}|GB^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)-GB^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)|^2\mu_{s-t}(dz)\right)^{\frac12}ds\\
&+C\int_t^T(s-t)^{-\frac12}\left(\int_H\sup_{p\geq1}|\nabla^G v^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^n(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\right.\\
&\left.-\nabla^G v^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)\,B^{n+p}(s,z+e^{(s-t)A}x)|^2\mu_{s-t}(dz)\right)^{\frac12}ds=I_n+II_n
\end{aligned}$$

(to simplify notation we drop the dependence of I_n and II_n from (t,x)). We can easily apply the dominated convergence theorem, and letting $n\to\infty$ we get $I_n\to0$. Concerning II_n, by adding and

subtracting $\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)B^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
II_n \le C \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H \sup_{p\ge 1} |\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\big[B^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) \\
- B^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\big]|^2 \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds \\
+ C \sup_{p\ge 1} \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H |\big(\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\big) \\
B^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)|^2 \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds = II_n^a + II_n^b.
\end{aligned}
$$

In order to estimate II_n^a we show that the sequence $\big(\nabla^G v^n\big)$ is equi-bounded from $[0,T]\times H$ with values in $L(U,K)$ (cf. (5.17)). We find, setting $\|\cdot\|_L = \|\cdot\|_{L(U,K)}$, with $\beta > 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G v^n(t,x)\|_L \\
& \le C\, e^{\beta t} \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H |B^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)|_U^2 \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds \\
& + Ce^{\beta t} \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H |\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)B^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)|^2 \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds \\
& \le\ Ce^{\beta t}\|B\|_\infty \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} ds + C\|B\|_\infty \int_t^T \frac{e^{-\beta(s-t)}}{(s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}} ds \ \cdot \sup_{t\in[0,T],\, y\in H} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G v^n(t,y)\|_L.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the sequence (B^n) is uniformly bounded, by taking the supremum over $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times H$ and β large enough we get on the left hand side we get

$$
\sup_{n\ge 1} \sup_{t\in[0,T], y\in H} \|\nabla^G v^n(t,y)\|_{L(U,K)} < \infty. \tag{5.26}
$$

Coming back to the estimate of II_n^a, we find

$$
II_n^a \le C_0 \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H \sup_{p\ge 1} |B^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - B^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)|_U^2 \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds,
$$

where C_0 is independent of t, x and n. By the dominated convergence theorem, using the pointwise convergence of the approximating sequence (B^n), we find that $II_n^a \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$.

Concerning II_n^b, since (B_n) and $(\nabla^G v^n)$ are equi-bounded we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |B^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)|_U^2 \, \|\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\|_{L(U,K)}^2 \\
& \le C_1 \|\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\|_{L(U,K)},
\end{aligned}
$$

where C_1 is independent of t, x and n, Next, by the Hölder inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
II_n^b & \le c' \sup_{p\ge 1} \int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Big(\int_H \|\ \nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\|_L \, \mu_{s-t}(dz)\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, ds \\
& \le c' \sup_{p\ge 1} \left(\int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{2}{3}} \, ds \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
& \cdot \left(\int_t^T \left(\int_H \|\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\|_L \, \mu_{s-t}(dz)\right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
& \le c' \sup_{p\ge 1} \left(\int_t^T \int_H \|\nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x)\|_L^2 \, \mu_{s-t}(dz)\, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
& = c' \sup_{p\ge 1} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_t^T \|Z_s^{n,t,x} - Z_s^{n+p,t,x}\|^2 \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \to 0
\end{aligned}
$$

as $n \to \infty$, for $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times H$, having applied (5.10) and estimate (5.23). Putting together these estimates we find

$$\sup_{p \geq 1} \|\nabla^G v^n(t,y) - \nabla^G v^{n+p}(t,y)\|_{L(U,K)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \quad (t,y) \in [0,T] \times H.$$

So we have proved that $\nabla^G v^n(t,x)$ converges as $n \to \infty$ in $L(U,K)$. We set

$$L(t,x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \nabla^G v^n(t,x).$$

Clearly, for any $\xi \in U$, $\nabla^G_\xi v^n \in B_b([0,T] \times H, K)$ and so $(t,x) \mapsto L(t,x)\xi \in B_b([0,T] \times H, K)$.

Recall that v^n satisfies (5.20), so, by passing to the limit in (5.20), by the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$v(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s,\cdot) + e^{-(s-t)A} L(s,\cdot) B(s,\cdot) \right](x) ds. \tag{5.27}$$

By differentiating (5.20) in the direction $G\xi$, we get for all $\xi \in U$

$$\nabla^G_\xi v^n(t,x) = \int_t^T \int_H e^{-(s-t)A} GB^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) \left\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} e^{(s-t)A} G\xi, Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} z \right\rangle \mu_{s-t}(dz)$$
$$+ \int_t^T \int_H e^{-(s-t)A} \nabla^G v^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) B^n(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) \left\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} e^{(s-t)A} G\xi, Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} z \right\rangle \mu_{s-t}(dz)\, ds.$$

By passing to the limit, we get

$$L(t,x)\xi = \int_t^T \int_H e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) \left\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} e^{(s-t)A} G\xi, Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} z \right\rangle \mu_{s-t}(dz)$$
$$+ \int_t^T \int_H e^{-(s-t)A} L(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) B(s, z + e^{(s-t)A}x) \left\langle Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} e^{(s-t)A} G\xi, Q_{s-t}^{-1/2} z \right\rangle \mu_{s-t}(dz)\, ds.$$

By considering (5.27) and taking into account the smoothing properties of the semigroup (R_t) (recall that, for any $s \in [0,T]$, $L(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot) \in B_b(H,K)$, and Lemma 4.6 and (5.2)), we can easily obtain the desired differentiability of $v(t,\cdot) : H \to K$ along the directions $G\xi$, $\xi \in U$.

Taking the directional derivative in (5.27) we get, for all $\xi \in U$,

$$\nabla^G_\xi v(t,x) = \int_t^T \nabla^G_\xi R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s,\cdot) + e^{-(s-t)A} L(s,\cdot) B(s,\cdot) \right](x) ds, \quad (t,x) \in [0,T] \times H,$$

and we finally deduce that $\nabla^G v(t,x) = L(t,x)$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times H$. By (5.23) we know that

$$Z^{n,t,x} \to Z^{t,x} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega \times [0,T]; L_2(U,K)).$$

Since, for any $n \geq 1$, $\tau \in [0,T]$, a.e., we have

$$\nabla^G v^n(\tau, \Xi_\tau^{t,x}) = Z_\tau^{n,t,x}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

we get easily that (5.25) holds. The proof is complete. □

5.1 Additional regularity for the function $v(t,x) = Y_t^{t,x}$

Here we prove additional regularity properties for the function $v(t,x)$ defined in (5.7). By the representation formula given in (5.3) using the OU semigroup (R_t) we know that

$$v(t,x) = \int_t^T R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} GB(s,\cdot) \right](x)\, ds + \int_t^T R_{s-t} \left[e^{-(s-t)A} \nabla^G v(s,\cdot) B(s,\cdot) \right](x)\, ds. \tag{5.28}$$

Hence v satisfies an integral equation like (4.44) which has been studied in Theorem 4.13.

Lemma 5.5. *Let Hypotheses 1 and 2 hold true. Then the function v defined in (5.7) coincides with the function u, unique solution of (4.44) given in Lemma 4.12 and Theorem 4.13.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.4 we know that that $v(t,x)$ belongs to $B_b([0,T]\times H,K)$ and, moreover, there exists $\nabla^G v:[0,T]\times H\to L(U,K)$ which is bounded and such that, for any $\xi\in U$, $\nabla^G_\xi v\in B_b([0,T]\times H,K)$.

We consider the difference

$$u(t,x)-v(t,x)=\int_t^T R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\big(\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)-\nabla^G v(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)\big)\right](x)\,ds \tag{5.29}$$

and take the ∇^G-derivative:

$$\|\nabla^G u(t,x)-\nabla^G v(t,x)\|_{L(U,K)}=\Big\|\int_t^T \nabla^G R_{s-t}\left[e^{-(s-t)A}\big(\nabla^G u(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)-\nabla^G v(s,\cdot)B(s,\cdot)\big)\right](x)\,ds\Big\|_L,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_L=\|\cdot\|_{L(U,K)}$. Since, $\nabla^G u(\cdot)B(\cdot)$ and $\nabla^G v(\cdot)B(\cdot)$ both belong to $B_b([0,T]\times H,K)$ we can apply Lemma 4.6 and obtain, for $\beta>0$, $t\in[0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x\in H} e^{\beta t}\|\nabla^G u(t,x)-\nabla^G v(t,x)\|_L\\
&\le C\|B\|_\infty\int_t^T\frac{e^{-\beta(s-t)}}{(s-t)^{\frac12}}ds\cdot\sup_{x\in H,s\in[0,T]} e^{\beta s}\|\nabla^G u(s,x)-\nabla^G v(s,x)\|_L\\
&\le C_{\beta,T}\sup_{x\in H,s\in[0,T]} e^{\beta s}\|\nabla^G u(s,x)-\nabla^G v(s,x)\|_L,\quad t\in[0,T],
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\beta,T}\to 0$ as $\beta\to\infty$. By choosing β large enough, we get $\sup_{x\in H,s\in[0,T]}\|\nabla^G u(s,x)-\nabla^G v(s,x)\|_L=0$. So by (5.29) we get that u and v coincide. □

6 Strong uniqueness for the wave equation

In this section we show how to remove the "bad" term B of equation (1.4), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} dX^x_\tau=AX^x_\tau d\tau+GB(t,X^x_\tau)d\tau+GdW_\tau, & \tau\in[0,T],\\ X^x_0=x,\end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

and get the main pathwise uniqueness result. Let $x\in H$. We consider a (weak) mild solution $(X^{t,x}_\tau)=(X^{t,x}_\tau)_{\tau\in[0,T]}$ as in (2.11):

$$X^{t,x}_\tau=e^{(\tau-t)A}x+\int_t^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GB(s,X_s)ds+\int_t^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GdW_s,\ \tau\in[t,T],\ \ X^{t,x}_\tau=x,\ \ \tau\le t. \tag{6.2}$$

This in particular is a continuous H-valued process defined and adapted on a stochastic basis $(\Omega,\mathscr{F},(\mathscr{F}_t),\mathbb{P})$, on which it is defined a cylindrical U-valued $\mathscr{F}_t$-Wiener process W. Let us consider the FBSDE

$$\begin{cases} dX^{t,x}_\tau=AX^{t,x}_\tau d\tau+GB(\tau,X^{t,x}_\tau)d\tau+GdW_\tau, & \tau\in[t,T],\\ X^{t,x}_\tau=x, & \tau\in[0,t],\\ -d\widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_\tau=-A\widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_\tau d\tau+GB(\tau,X^{t,x}_\tau)\,d\tau-\widetilde{Z}^{t,x}_\tau\,dW_\tau, & \tau\in[0,T],\\ \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_T=0.\end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

The precise meaning of the BSDE in equation (6.3) is given by its mild formulation

$$\widetilde{Y}^{t,x}_\tau=\int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A}GB(s,X^{t,x}_s)\,ds-\int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A}\widetilde{Z}^{t,x}_s dW_s,\quad \tau\in[0,T]. \tag{6.4}$$

Let us set

$$\widetilde{W}_\tau=W_\tau+\int_0^\tau B(s,X^{t,x}_s)ds,\ \ \tau\in[0,T].$$

By the Girsanov theorem, see e.g. [15] and [35], there exists a probability measure $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ such that on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$ the process $(\widetilde{W}_\tau)$ is a cylindrical Wiener process in U up to time T. In the stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, (\mathscr{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$ the FBSDE (6.3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} dX_\tau^{t,x} = AX_\tau^{t,x}d\tau + Gd\widetilde{W}_\tau, \quad \tau\in[t,T], \\ X_\tau^{t,x} = x, \quad \tau\in[0,t], \\ -d\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x} = -A\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x}\,d\tau + GB(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x})\,d\tau + \widetilde{Z}_\tau^{t,x}B(\tau,X_\tau^{t,x})d\tau - \widetilde{Z}_\tau^{t,x}\,d\widetilde{W}_\tau, \quad \tau\in[0,T], \\ \widetilde{Y}_T^{t,x} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{6.5}$$

$$\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x} = \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A}GB(s,X_s^{t,x})\,ds + \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A}\widetilde{Z}_s^{t,x}\,B(s,X_s^{t,x})\,ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-(s-\tau)A}Z_s^{t,x}\,d\widetilde{W}_s, \tag{6.6}$$

$\tau\in[0,T]$. By the strong uniquenes for equation (2.7), $X^{t,x}$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process starting from x at t which is $\mathscr{F}_{t,T}^{\widetilde{W}}$-measurable (where $\mathscr{F}_{t,T}^{\widetilde{W}}$ is the completed σ-algebra generated by $\widetilde{W}_r - \widetilde{W}_t$, $r\in[t,T]$). The law of $(X^{t,x}, \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}, \widetilde{Z}^{t,x})$ depends only on the coefficients of the FBSDE (6.5) and does not depend on the probability space on which it is defined the cylindrical Wiener process. Thus the law of $(X^{t,x}, \widetilde{Y}^{t,x}, \widetilde{Z}^{t,x})$ coincides with the one of $(\Xi^{t,x}, Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x})$ solution of the FBSDE (5.1).

Moreover $Y_t^{t,x}$ and $\widetilde{Y}_t^{t,x}$ are both deterministic and so they define a unique function $v(t,x)$ given in (5.7). Moreover, we have, for any $\tau\in[0,T]$,

$$\widetilde{Y}_\tau^{t,x} = v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}), \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s.; \quad \text{for any } \tau\in[0,T] \text{ a.e., } \widetilde{Z}_\tau^{t,x} = \nabla^G v(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}), \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s. \tag{6.7}$$

(cf. (5.24) and (5.25)). In order to prove strong existence of a mild solution to equation (6.1), we will rewrite in a different way (6.2), removing the term $\int_t^\tau e^{(t-s)A}GB(s,X_s)ds$ by means of the BSDE in (6.6); when $t=0$ we denote, for brevity, by $(\widetilde{Y}^x, \widetilde{Z}^x)$ the process $(\widetilde{Y}^{0,x}, \widetilde{Z}^{0,x})$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Hypotheses 1 and 2 hold true. Then a (weak) mild solution $X^x = (X_\tau^x)$ of (6.2) starting at $t=0$ satisfies, for any $\tau\in[0,T]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,*

$$\begin{aligned} X_\tau^x &= e^{\tau A}x + e^{\tau A}v(0,x) - v(\tau, X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GdW_s \\ &= e^{\tau A}x + e^{\tau A}v(0,x) - v(\tau,X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}\nabla^G v(s,X_s^x)\,dW_s + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GdW_s \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Proof. Let us fix $\tau\in[0,T]$. Writing (6.4) for $t=0$ and $\tau=0$ we find, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} v(0,x) = \widetilde{Y}_0^x &= \int_0^T e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_0^T e^{-sA}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s \\ &= \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s + \int_\tau^T e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-sA}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

In (6.4) with $t=0$ we apply to both sides the bounded linear operator $e^{-\tau A}$, we get

$$e^{-\tau A}\widetilde{Y}_\tau^x = \int_\tau^T e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_\tau^T e^{-sA}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s, \quad \tau\in[0,T].s \tag{6.10}$$

Using (6.7) we obtain, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} v(0,x) &= e^{-\tau A}\widetilde{Y}_\tau^x + \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}\widetilde{Z}_s^x\,dW_s \\ &= e^{-\tau A}v(\tau,X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds - \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}\nabla^G v(s,X_s^x)\,dW_s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

In particular from (6.11) we get

$$\int_0^\tau e^{-sA}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds = v(0,x) - e^{-\tau A}v(\tau,X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{-sA}\nabla^G v(s,X_s^x)\,dW_s \tag{6.12}$$

and by applying the bounded linear operator $e^{\tau A}$ to both sides we deduce that, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GB(s,X_s^x)\,ds = e^{\tau A}v(0,x) - v(\tau,X_\tau^x) + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}\nabla^G v(s,X_s^x)\,dW_s. \tag{6.13}$$

Since $X_\tau^x - e^{\tau A}x - \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GdW_s = \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}GB(s,X_s)ds$ we get (6.8). □

Remark 6.2. Notice that formula (6.8) does not coincide with formula (7) in [8], which is obtained by the so-called Itô-Tanaka trick. In fact our function v (see 5.7) and the function U used in the paper [8] are different, and we can see this by comparing (5.28) in the present paper with the mild formula (16) in [8]. Following the procedure in [8], one should consider $U : [0,T] \times H \to H$ represented by the real functions $U_n := \langle U, e_n\rangle : [0,T] \times H \to \mathbb{R}$, where $(e_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a basis in H, and U_n is the solution to the linear Kolmogorov equation

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial U_n(t,x)}{\partial t} + \mathscr{L}_t[U_n(t,\cdot)](x) = -GB_n(t,x),\ x \in H,\ \ t \in [0,T], \\ U_n(T,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.14}$$

where $\mathscr{L}_t[f](x) = \frac{1}{2}Tr(\ GG^*\ \nabla^2 f(x)) + \langle Ax, \nabla f(x)\rangle + \langle GB(t,x), \nabla f(x)\rangle$; one can solve (6.14) with techniques similar to the ones used also in [23]. On the other hand, from (5.28) we formally see that v is a K-valued solution of the following equation which contains the operator A:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v(t,x)}{\partial t} + \mathscr{L}_t[v(t,\cdot)](x) = Av(t,x) - GB(t,x),\ x \in H,\ \ t \in [0,T], \\ v(T,x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.15}$$

Theorem 6.3. *Let Hypotheses 1 and 2 hold true. Then for equation (1.4) pathwise uniqueness holds (starting from any initial condition $x \in H$).*

Moreover, there exists $c_T > 0$ such that if $X_\tau^{x_1}$ and $X_\tau^{x_2}$ are two (weak) mild solutions starting from x_1 and $x_2 \in H$ at $t = 0$ (defined on the same stochastic basis) such that $x_1 - x_2 \in K$ then $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $X_\tau^{x_1} - X_\tau^{x_2} \in K$ for any $\tau \in [0,T]$ and

$$\sup_{\tau\in[0,T]} \mathbb{E}|X_\tau^{x_1} - X_\tau^{x_2}|_K^2 \leq c_T|x_1 - x_2|_K^2. \tag{6.16}$$

Proof. We prove (6.16) which implies the pathwise uniqueness starting from any $x \in H$. Indeed if $x_1 = x_2 = x$ then (6.16) implies that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $X_\tau^{x_1} = X_\tau^{x_2}$, $\tau \in [0,T]$.

Let us fix $x_1, x_2 \in H$ with $x_1 - x_2 \in K$ and consider two (weak) mild solutions X^1 and X^2 defined on the same stochastic basis, with respect to the same cylindrical Wiener process and starting respectively from x_1 and x_2 at time $t = 0$. Notice that

$$X_\tau^1 - X_\tau^2 = e^{\tau A}(x_1 - x_2) + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}\Big(GB(s,X_s^1) - GB(X_s^2)\Big)\,ds,$$

and both $e^{\tau A}(x_1 - x_2)$ and the integral take their values in K. Indeed $x_1 - x_2 \in K$, $GB(s,\cdot) \in K$ and $e^{rA} : K \to K$ (cf. (2.12)).

Let $T_0 \in (0,T]$ be such that $h(T_0)\cdot(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|_\alpha) \leq 1/4$ (see (4.48)).

We consider the FBSDE (5.1) with $T = T_0$ and we denote its solution again $(\widetilde{Y}^x, \widetilde{Z}^x)$. We find the function $v^{(0)} : [0,T_0] \times H \to K$ according to (5.7) with $T = T_0$. By (6.8) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} X_\tau^1 - X_\tau^2 &= e^{\tau A}(x_1 - x_2) + e^{\tau A}[v^{(0)}(0,x_1) - v^{(0)}(0,x_2)] \\ &-[v^{(0)}(\tau,X_\tau^1) - v^{(0)}(\tau,X_\tau^2)] + \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\widetilde{Z}_s^{x_1} - \widetilde{Z}_s^{x_2}]\,dW_s,\ \ \tau \in [0,T_0], \end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

where $\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\widetilde{Z}_s^{x_1} - \widetilde{Z}_s^{x_2}]\,dW_s = \int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1) - \nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)]\,dW_s$.

By the regularity properties of $v^{(0)}$, see Theorem 4.13, Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 5.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &|e^{\tau A}(x_1 - x_2)|_K + |e^{\tau A}[v^{(0)}(0,x_1) - v^{(0)}(0,x_2)]|_K + |v^{(0)}(\tau,X_\tau^1) - v^{(0)}(\tau,X_\tau^2)|_K \\ &\leq C|x_1 - x_2|_K + \frac{1}{3}|X_\tau^1 - X_\tau^2|_K, \quad \tau \in [0,T_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the stochastic integral, we have (see [13] page 57 or [15], Section 4.3)

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)]\,dW_s\Big|_K^2 \tag{6.18}$$
$$\leq \mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)\|^2_{L_2(U,K)}ds.$$

It the sequel we will prove that $\mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)\|^2_{L_2(U,K)}ds$ is finite and we will provide a bound for it.

Let us consider a basis (e_k) in U; by the regularity properties of $v^{(0)}$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau \|\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)\|^2_{L_2(U,K)}ds=\sum_{j\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau |\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)|^2_K ds.$$

Now, using a basis (f_m) in K, we write, for any $s\in[0,\tau]$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\sum_{j\geq 1}|\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)|^2_K=\sum_{j\geq 1}\sum_{m\geq 1}\langle\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2),f_m\rangle^2_K$$
$$=\sum_{m\geq 1}\sum_{j\geq 1}\langle\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2),f_m\rangle^2_K=\sum_{m\geq 1}\sum_{j\geq 1}[\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^2)]^2$$
$$=\sum_{m\geq 1}|\nabla^G v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^2)|^2_U,$$

using $v^{(0)}_m=\langle v^{(0)},f_m\rangle_K$ and noting that $\nabla^G v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1)\in L(U,\mathbb{R})$ can be identified by the Riesz theorem with a unique element in U. We have obtained

$$\sum_{j\geq 1}\int_0^\tau |\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)|^2_K ds=\int_0^\tau\sum_{m\geq 1}|\nabla^G v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^2)|^2_U ds$$
$$=\int_0^\tau\sum_{m\geq 1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^2)|^2 ds.$$

Hence we have, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\sum_{j\geq 1}\int_0^\tau |\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)|^2_K ds$$
$$=\sum_{m\geq 1}\int_0^\tau\sup_{|a|_U=1}\Big|\int_0^1\nabla^K\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1+r(X_s^2-X_s^1))\,[X_s^2-X_s^1]dr\Big|^2 ds$$
$$=\int_0^\tau\sum_{m\geq 1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}\Big|\int_0^1\nabla_{[X_s^2-X_s^1]}\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1+r(X_s^2-X_s^1))\,dr\Big|^2 ds.$$

Moreover, we find, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., $r\in[0,1]$, $s\in[0,\tau]$,

$$\sum_{m\geq 1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}\Big|\int_0^1\nabla_{[X_s^2-X_s^1]}\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1+r(X_s^2-X_s^1))\,dr\Big|^2 \tag{6.19}$$
$$\leq\int_0^1\sum_{m\geq 1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla_{[X_s^2-X_s^1]}\nabla^G_a v^{(0)}_m(s,X_s^1+r(X_s^2-X_s^1))|^2\,dr$$
$$\leq C_T|X_s^2-X_s^1|^2_K\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|^2_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}.$$

In the last inequality we have used Theorem 4.13 with $u=v^{(0)}$ and $k=X_s^2-X_s^1$.

Coming back to (6.18) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)]\,dW_s\Big|_K^2$$
$$\le \sum_{j\ge 1}\mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau |\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G_{e_j} v^{(0)}(s,X_s^2)|_K^2 ds$$
$$\le \mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau ds\int_0^1 \sum_{m\ge 1}\sup_{|a|_U=1}|\nabla_{[X_s^2-X_s^1]}\nabla^G_a v_m^{(0)}(s,X_s^1+r(X_s^2-X_s^1))|^2\,dr$$
$$\le C_T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|^2_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}\,\mathbb{E}\int_0^\tau |X_s^2-X_s^1|_K^2 ds.$$

Starting from (6.17) and using the previous estimates, we can apply the Gronwall lemma and obtain

$$\sup_{\tau\in[0,T_0]}\mathbb{E}|X_\tau^{x_1}-X_\tau^{x_2}|_K^2\le c_T|x_1-x_2|_K^2. \tag{6.20}$$

If $T_0<T$ we consider the FBSDE (5.1) with terminal time $(2T_0)\wedge T$. We find $v^{(1)}:[0,(2T_0)\wedge T]\times H\to K$ according to (5.28) with T replaced by $(2T_0)\wedge T$. By (6.8) we obtain in particular

$$X_\tau^1-X_\tau^2=e^{\tau A}(x_1-x_2)+e^{\tau A}[v^{(1)}(0,x_1)-v^{(1)}(0,x_2)]$$
$$-[v^{(1)}(\tau,X_\tau^1)-v^{(1)}(\tau,X_\tau^2)]+\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\nabla^G v^{(1)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(1)}(s,X_s^2)]\,dW_s,\quad \tau\in[T_0,(2T_0)\wedge T].$$

Arguing as before, we get, for $\tau\in[T_0,(2T_0)\wedge T]$,

$$|e^{\tau A}(x_1-x_2)|_K+|e^{\tau A}[v^{(1)}(0,x_1)-v^{(1)}(0,x_2)]|_K+|v^{(1)}(\tau,X_\tau^1)-v^{(1)}(\tau,X_\tau^2)|_K$$
$$\le C_T|x_1-x_2|_K+\frac{1}{3}|X_\tau^1-X_\tau^2|_K$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\int_0^\tau e^{(\tau-s)A}[\nabla^G v^{(1)}(s,X_s^1)-\nabla^G v^{(1)}(s,X_s^2)]\,dW_s\Big|_K^2$$
$$\le C_T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|^2_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}\int_0^\tau \mathbb{E}|X_s^1-X_s^2|_K^2 ds$$
$$=C_T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|^2_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}\Big(\int_0^{T_0}\mathbb{E}|X_s^1-X_s^2|_K^2 ds+\int_{T_0}^\tau \mathbb{E}|X_s^1-X_s^2|_K^2 ds\Big)$$
$$\le C_T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|B(t,\cdot)\|^2_{C_b^\alpha(H,U)}\Big(c_T T_0\,|x_1-x_2|_K^2+\int_{T_0}^\tau \mathbb{E}|X_s^1-X_s^2|_K^2 ds\Big).$$

We have obtained, for $\tau\in[T_0,(2T_0)\wedge T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_\tau^1-X_\tau^2|_K^2\le C_T'|x_1-x_2|_K^2+C_T'\int_{T_0}^\tau \mathbb{E}|X_s^1-X_s^2|_K^2 ds.$$

By the Gronwall lemma we find $\sup_{\tau\in[T_0,(2T_0)\wedge T]}\mathbb{E}|X_\tau^{x_1}-X_\tau^{x_2}|_K^2\le c_T|x_1-x_2|_K^2$. Proceeding in this way, in finite steps, we get (6.16). □

A Appendix: an estimate on the minimal control energy for the controlled wave equation

A.1 The control system in K

Recall that we are considering a positive self-adjoint operator Λ on a real separable Hilbert space U, i.e., $\Lambda:\mathscr{D}(\Lambda)\subset U\to U$. Moreover $\Lambda^{-1}:U\to U$ is of trace class. The classical Hilbert space for the abstract wave equation is

$$K=\mathscr{D}(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}})\times U=V\times U$$

endowed with the inner product $\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ z_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y_2 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle_K = \left\langle \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} y_1, \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} y_2 \right\rangle_U + \langle z_1, z_2 \rangle_U$. This space is also denoted by $V \oplus U$. We also introduce

$$\mathscr{D}(A) = \mathscr{D}(\Lambda) \times \mathscr{D}\left(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\right), \qquad A \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for every } \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in \mathscr{D}(A) \tag{A.1}$$

(cf. [29]). The operator A is the generator of the unitary group e^{tA} on K

$$e^{tA} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\sqrt{\Lambda}t & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}} \sin\sqrt{\Lambda}t \\ -\sqrt{\Lambda}\sin\sqrt{\Lambda}t & \cos\sqrt{S}t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For the study of stochastic wave equations we also need to consider the larger space

$$H = U \times V',$$

where V' is the dual space of V. We can extend A on H:

$$\mathscr{D}(A) = K = V \times U, \qquad A \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for every } \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in \mathscr{D}(A), \tag{A.2}$$

and similarly we can extend $e^{tA} : H \to H$, $t \geq 0$. The control system on K we consider is the following one

$$\begin{cases} \dot{w}(t) = Aw(t) + Gu(t), \\ w(0) = h \in K, \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

where $u \in L^2_{loc}(0, \infty; U)$; $G : U \to K$; for any $a \in U$, $Ga = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \end{pmatrix}$. The solution of (A.3) is given by

$$w(t) = e^{tA}h + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} Gu(s) ds$$

and takes value in K; in particular, for any $T > 0$, $w \in C([0,T]; K)$ by Lemma 3.1.5 in [7] .

Let $t > 0$ and define the operator $\mathscr{L}_t$, $\mathscr{L}_t u := \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} Gu(s)\, ds$, acting from $L^2(0,t;U)$ with values in $K \subset H$. We know that

$$\widetilde{Q}_t^{1/2}(K) = Im\mathscr{L}_t = \mathscr{L}_t(L^2(0,t;U)) \tag{A.4}$$

(see, for instance, page 253 in [43]). We are considering $\widetilde{Q}_t : K \to K$:

$$\widetilde{Q}_t = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_U \end{pmatrix} e^{(t-s)A^*} ds$$

which is different from $Q_t : H \to H$ considered in (2.8):

$$Q_t = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix} e^{(t-s)A^*} ds.$$

Moreover, it is known that the controlled abstract wave equation (A.3) is exactly controllable in K (see [12] or page 367 in [2]).

Hence $\widetilde{Q}_t^{1/2}(K) = Im\mathscr{L}_t = K$. In particular the control system is null controllable in K (i.e., for any $h \in K$, $t > 0$, there exists a control function $u : [0,t] \to U$ such that the corresponding solution w verifies $w(t) = 0$). We can define $\mathscr{E}_C(t,h)$ as the infimum of

$$\left(\int_0^t |u(r)|_U^2 dr \right)^{1/2}$$

over all controls $u \in L^2(0,t;U)$ driving the solution w from h to 0 in time t. By Theorem 15.3 in [43] it follows that

$$\mathscr{E}_C(t,h) = |\widetilde{Q}_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} h|_K, \quad h \in K. \tag{A.5}$$

We are interested in the behaviour of $|\widetilde{Q}_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} h|_K$ as $t \to 0^+$ (for related results we refer to [39] and [1]). The first estimate in the next result is known. We provide a self-contained proof using special control functions as in [39] (see also Chapter 1 in [43]). Recall that $k = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix} \in K$ with $v \in V$ and $a \in U$.

Theorem A.1. *Let $T_0 > 0$. (i) There exists a positive constant $C_{T_0} > 0$ such that, for any $v \in V$, we have*

$$\left| \widetilde{Q}_T^{-1/2} e^{TA} \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right|_K \leq \frac{C_{T_0} |v|_V}{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \quad T \in (0, T_0], \tag{A.6}$$

(ii) There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that, for any $a \in U$, setting $Ga = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \end{pmatrix}$

$$|\widetilde{Q}_T^{-1/2} e^{TA} Ga|_K \leq \frac{C|a|_U}{T^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \ \ T > 0. \tag{A.7}$$

The previous estimates imply that there exists $C_{T_0} > 0$ such that

$$|\widetilde{Q}_T^{-1/2} e^{TA}|_{L(K,K)} \leq C_{T_0}\, T^{-3/2}, \quad T \in (0, T_0]. \tag{A.8}$$

Proof. (i) Let $v \in V$ and $T > 0$. We consider $f(t) = t^2(T-t)^2$ and

$$\phi(t) = \frac{f(t)}{\int_0^T f(s) ds}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Note that $\phi(0) = \phi(T)$, $\int_0^T \phi(s) ds = 1$ and there exists $C > 0$ (independent of $T > 0$) such that $|\phi(t)| \leq \frac{C}{T}$ and $|\phi'(t)| \leq \frac{C}{T^2}$, $t \in [0, T]$. Let $\psi : [0, T] \to K$,

$$\psi(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(t) \\ \psi_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = -\phi(t)\, e^{tA} k = -\begin{pmatrix} \phi(t) \cos(\sqrt{\Lambda} t) v \\ -\phi(t) \sqrt{\Lambda} \sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\, t)\, v \end{pmatrix}, \ \ t \in [0, T].$$

Using also the derivative ψ_1' we introduce the control

$$u(t) = \psi_2(t) + \psi_1'(t) \in U, \ \ t \in [0, T]. \tag{A.9}$$

We show that it transfers k to 0 at time T. We have

$$\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} G u(s) ds = \int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi_2(s) \end{pmatrix} ds + \int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} G \psi_1'(s) ds.$$

Since $G\psi_1'(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi_1'(s) \end{pmatrix}$ is continuous from $[0, T]$ with values in K, integrating by parts we get

$$\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} G \psi_1'(s) = \int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} AG \psi_1(s) ds = \int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -\Lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi_1(s) \end{pmatrix} ds$$

$$= \int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_1(s) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} ds.$$

Hence we find

$$\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A} G u(s) ds = -\int_0^T \phi(s) e^{(T-s)A} e^{sA} k \, ds = -e^{TA} k.$$

Now we compute the energy of the control u: $\int_0^T |u(s)|_U^2 ds$. Note that

$$\int_0^T |\psi_2(t)|_U^2 dt = \int_0^T \phi(t)^2 \, |\sqrt{\Lambda} \sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\, t)\, v|_U^2 dt \leq \frac{c\, |v|_V^2}{T};$$

$$\int_0^T |\psi_1'(t)|_U^2 dt = \int_0^T \Big| -\phi(t) \sqrt{\Lambda} \sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\, t) v \, - \, \phi'(s) \, \cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\, t) v \Big|_U^2 dt$$

$$\leq c\Big(\frac{|v|_V^2}{T}+\int_0^T\Big|\phi'(t)\cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)v\Big|_U^2dt\Big)\leq\frac{c_{T_0}\,|v|_V^2}{T^3},$$

where c_{T_0} is independent of T and v. Collecting the previous estimates we obtain

$$|\widetilde{Q}_T^{-1/2}e^{TA}k|_K\leq\Big(\int_0^T|u(s)|_U^2ds\Big)^{1/2}\leq\frac{C_{T_0}\,|v|_V}{\sqrt{T^3}},\ \ T\in(0,T_0].$$

(ii) Let us fix $T>0$ and $k=\begin{pmatrix}0\\a\end{pmatrix}$ with $a\in U$. Consider $\phi(t)$ as before. Define

$$\psi(t)=\begin{pmatrix}\psi_1(t)\\\psi_2(t)\end{pmatrix}=-\phi(t)\,e^{tA}k=-\begin{pmatrix}\phi(t)\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}\sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)\,a\\\phi(t)\cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)a\end{pmatrix},\ \ t\in[0,T].$$

Using also the derivative ψ_1' we introduce as in the first part of the proof the control $u(t)=\psi_2(t)+\psi_1'(t)\in U$, $t\in[0,T]$. It transfers k to 0 at time T since

$$\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A}G\psi_1'(s)ds=\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A}AG\psi_1(s)ds=\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A}\begin{pmatrix}0&I\\-\Lambda&0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0\\\psi_1(s)\end{pmatrix}ds$$
$$=\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A}\begin{pmatrix}\psi_1(s)\\0\end{pmatrix}ds$$

and

$$\int_0^T e^{(T-s)A}Gu(s)ds=-\int_0^T\phi(s)e^{(T-s)A}e^{sA}k\,ds=-e^{TA}k.$$

We compute the energy of the control u: $\int_0^T|u(s)|_U^2ds$. First note that

$$\int_0^T|\psi_2(t)|_U^2dt=\int_0^T\phi^2(t)\,|\cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)a|_U^2dt\leq\frac{c\,|a|_U^2}{T}.$$

On the other hand we get

$$\int_0^T|\psi_1'(t)|_U^2dt=\int_0^T\Big|\phi(t)\cos(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)a+\phi'(t)\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}\sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)\,a\Big|_U^2dt$$
$$\leq c\Big(\frac{|a|_U^2}{T}+|a|_U^2\int_0^T\Big|\phi'(t)t\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t}\sin(\sqrt{\Lambda}\,t)\Big|_U^2dt\Big)\leq\frac{c'|a|_U^2}{T},$$

where c' is independent of T and a. Collecting the previous estimates we obtain

$$|\widetilde{Q}_T^{-1/2}e^{TA}Ga|_K\leq\Big(\int_0^T|u(s)|_U^2ds\Big)^{1/2}\leq\frac{C\,|a|_U}{\sqrt{T}},\ \ T>0.\ \square$$

A.2 The control system in H

Here we consider the previous control system (A.3) in H, i.e., we take the initial condition $h\in H$. The control function u still belongs to $L^2_{loc}(0,\infty;U)$ with $G:U\to K\subset H$. Let $t>0$. We still have

$$Q_t^{1/2}(H)=Im\mathscr{L}_t=\mathscr{L}_t(L^2(0,t;U))\tag{A.10}$$

where $\mathscr{L}_t$ is the same operator considered in (A.4) but we have to consider Q_t instead of $\widetilde{Q}_t$.

It follows that $Q_t^{1/2}(H)=K$. Moreover, any $k\in K$ we define $\mathscr{E}_C\,(t,k)$ as we have done for the control system in K. By Theorem 15.3 in [43] it follows that

$$\mathscr{E}_C\,(t,k)=|Q_t^{-1/2}e^{tA}k|_H\tag{A.11}$$

for any $k \in K$. By (A.5) and (A.10) we infer that

$$|\widetilde{Q}_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} k|_K = |Q_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} k|_H, \quad k \in K,\ t > 0. \tag{A.12}$$

It follows that $Q_t^{-1/2} e^{tA}$ belongs to $L(K, H)$ and, applying Theorem A.1, for any $T > 0$, there exists $c = c_T > 0$ such that for any $t \in (0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} k|_H &\le \frac{c}{t^{3/2}} |k|_K, \quad k \in K = V \times U; \\ |Q_t^{-1/2} e^{tA} G a|_H &\le \frac{c}{t^{1/2}} |a|_U, \quad a \in U. \end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

Remark A.2. We stress that the previous control system (A.3) when considered in H is not null controllable in H at any time $t > 0$. This follows by the group property of (e^{tA}), the fact that $e^{tA}(K) = K$ and noting that $Q_t^{1/2}(H) = K$, $t > 0$.

The lack of null controllability can also be deduced by applying the argument in page 180 of [13]. Indeed $G : U \to H$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator because

$$\sum_{k \ge 1} |G e_k|_H^2 = \sum_{k \ge 1} \left| \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e_k \end{pmatrix} \right|_H^2 = \sum_{k \ge 1} |\Lambda^{-1/2} e_k|_U^2 < \infty.$$

Hence if $h \in H$ in general we cannot transfer h to 0 at time $t > 0$ by a control $u \in L^2(0, t; U)$. We could transfer h to 0 by a control $u \in L^2(0, t; V')$ but then we should change G with $\tilde{G} : V' \to H$, $\tilde{G} v' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v' \end{pmatrix}$ (recall that G is given in (1.4)).

References

[1] G. Avalos and I. Lasiecka, Optimal blowup rates for the minimal energy null control of the strongly damped abstract wave equation. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 2 (2003), no. 3, 601-616.

[2] A. Bensoussan, G. Da Prato, M. C. Delfour and S. K. Mitter, Representation and control of infinite-dimensional systems. Second edition, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2007.

[3] Z. Brzeźniak, M. Ondreját, J. Seidler, Invariant measures for stochastic nonlinear beam and wave equations. J. Differential Equations 260 (2016), 4157-4179.

[4] R. Buckdahn, S. Peng, Stationary backward stochastic differential equations and associated partial differential equations, Prob. Theory Rel. Fields 115 (1999), 383-399.

[5] P. Cannarsa, G. Da Prato, Infinite-dimensional elliptic equations with Holder-continuous coefficients, Adv. Differ. Equ. 1 (1996) 425-452.

[6] R. Courant and D. Hilbert, Methods of Mathematical Physics. Vol. I, Interscience Publishers, New York, 1953.

[7] R.F. Curtain, H.J. Zwart, An introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Linear Systems Theory, Texts in Applied Mathematics 21, Springer Verlag, New York, 1995.

[8] G. Da Prato, F. Flandoli, Pathwise uniqueness for a class of SDEs in Hilbert spaces and applications. J. Funct. Anal. 259 (2010), no. 1, 243–267.

[9] G. Da Prato, F. Flandoli, E. Priola, M. Röckner, Strong uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Hilbert spaces perturbed by a bounded measurable drift. Ann. Probab. 41 (2013), 3306-3344.

[10] G. Da Prato, F. Flandoli, E. Priola, M. Röckner, Strong uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations with unbounded measurable drift term. J. Theoret. Probab. 28 (2015) 1571–1600.

[11] G. Da Prato, F. Flandoli, M. Röckner, A. Veretennikov, Strong uniqueness for SDEs in Hilbert spaces with non-regular drift, Ann. Probab. 44 (2016), no. 3, 1985-2023.

[12] G. Da Prato, A. J. Pritchard and J. Zabczyk, On minimum energy problems, Control Theory Center Report No. 156, Warwick University, England.

[13] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, 229, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[14] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, Second order partial differential equations in Hilbert spaces. London Mathematical Society Note Series, 293, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[15] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk, Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions. Second edition. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 152. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

[16] A. Debussche, Y. Tsustumi, 1D quintic nonlinear equation with white noise dispersion, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliqués, 96 (2011) 363-376.

[17] F. Delarue, F. Flandoli, D. Vincenzi, Noise prevents collaps of Vlasov-Poisson point charges, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 67 (2014) 1700–1736.

[18] E. Fedrizzi and F. Flandoli, Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations, J. Funct. Anal. 264, (2013), pp 1329-1354.

[19] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, E. Priola, Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation, Invent. Math. 180 (2010), no. 1, 1-53.

[20] F. Flandoli, Random perturbation of PDEs and fluid dynamic models, Saint Flour Summer School Lectures, Lecture Notes in Math. 2015, Springer, Berlin.

[21] M. Fuhrman, G. Tessitore, Nonlinear Kolmogorov equations in infinite dimensional spaces: the backward stochastic differential equations approach and applications to optimal control. Ann. Probab. 30 (2002), no. 3, 1397–1465.

[22] M. Fuhrman and G. Tessitore, (2004), Infinite horizon backward stochastic differential equations and elliptic equations in Hilbert spaces. Ann. Probab. 32, no. 1B, 607–660.

[23] F. Gozzi, Regularity of solutions of second order Hamilton-Jacobi equations in Hilbert spaces and applications to a control problem, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 20 (1995) no.5-6, 775-826.

[24] G. Guatteri, G. Tessitore, On the backward stochastic Riccati equation in infinite dimensions. SIAM J. Control Optim. 44 (2005), no. 1, 159-194.

[25] G. Guatteri, On a Class of Forward-Backward Stochastic Differential Systems in Infinite Dimensions. J. of Appl. Math. and Stoc. Anal., (2007), Article ID 42640, 33 pages.

[26] I. Gyöngy. E. Pardoux, On the regularization effect of space-time white noise on quasi-linear parabolic partial differential equations, Probability Theory and Related Fields 97 (1993) 211-229

[27] Y. Hu, S. Peng, Adapted solution of a backward semilinear stochastic evolution equation, Stochastic Anal. Appl., 9, (1991), no. 4, 445-459.

[28] J. U. Kim, On a Stochastic Plate Equation, Appl. Math. Optim., 44, (2001) 33-48.

[29] W. Krabs, W, On time-minimal distributed control of vibrating systems governed by an abstract wave equation. Appl. Math. Optim. 13 (1985), no. 2, 137-149.

[30] W. Liu and M. Röckner, Stochastic Partial Differential Equations: An Introduction, Universitext Springer 2015.

[31] F. Masiero, Semilinear Kolmogorov equations and applications to stochastic optimal control, Appl. Math. Optim., 51 (2005), pp. 201–250.

[32] F. Masiero, Regularizing properties for transition semigroups and semilinear parabolic equations in Banach spaces. Electron. J. Probab. 12 (2007), no. 13, 387–419.

[33] F. Masiero, E. Priola, Well-posedness of semilinear stochastic wave equations with Hl̈der continuous coefficients. J. Differential Equations 263 (2017), no. 3, 1773-1812.

[34] L. Mytnik, E. Neuman, Pathwise uniqueness for the stochastic heat equation with Hölder continuous drift and noise coefficients. Stochastic Process. Appl. 125 (2015), no. 9, 3355-3372.

[35] M. Ondreját, Uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Banach spaces. Dissertationes Math. (Rozprawy Mat.) 426 (2004).

[36] S. Peszat and J. Zabczyk, Strong Feller property and irreducibility for diffusions on Hilbert spaces, Ann. Probab. 23 (1995), no. 1, 157–172.

[37] E. Priola, L. Zambotti, New optimal regularity results for infinite-dimensional elliptic equations. Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8) 3 (2000), no. 2, 411-429.

[38] I. Shigekawa, Stochastic Analysis. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2004.

[39] R. Triggiani, Constructive steering control functions for linear systems and abstract rank conditions, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications 1992, Vol. 74, Issue 2, pp 347-367.

[40] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss, Observation and Control for Operator Semigroups, Birkhauser-Verlag, Basel, 2009.

[41] A. J. Veretennikov, Strong solutions and explicit formulas for solutions of stochastic integral equations, Mat. Sb., (N.S.) 111 (153) (3) (1980), 434-452.

[42] F. Y. Wang, X. Zhang, Degenerate SDEs in Hilbert spaces with rough drifts. Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 18 (2015), 25 pp.

[43] J. Zabczyk, Mathematical control theory-an introduction. Second edition. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser/Springer, 2020.