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ABSTRACT. We consider the linear response theory and derive fluctuation-dissipation formulas for a class of non-autonomous dissipative stochastic differential equations with time-periodic coefficients in finite dimension. This time-periodic version of the linear response exploiting ‘non-equilibrium’ fluctuation-dissipation relationships provides a systematic way of studying the average response of a class of complex dynamical systems to perturbations of their time-dependent asymptotic dynamics, leading to improved predictions, sensitivity analysis and uncertainty quantification in such a setting. First, we establish sufficient conditions for existence of certain stable random time-periodic orbits generated by the underlying SDE. Ergodicity of time-periodic measures supported on the random periodic paths is subsequently discussed. Then, we derive fluctuation-dissipation relations associated with the linear response for such ergodic time-periodic measures. The results are formulated in an abstract setting but they apply to problems ranging from aspects of climate modelling, to molecular dynamics, neuroscience and neural networks.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In many scientific applications a systematic determination of a response of a complex nonlinear dynamical system to a time-dependent perturbation of its asymptotic state or parameters is of key importance; topical examples in high-dimensional, non-autonomous and/or stochastic settings include climate models (e.g., [1, 68, 69, 52, 22, 17]), statistical physics and non-equilibrium thermodynamics (e.g., [29, 11, 10, 62, 52]), and even neural networks (e.g., [18, 36, 21]). The sought response is usually quantified in terms of a change in an ‘observable’ expressed as a statistical/ensemble average of some functional defined on the trajectories of the dynamical system. The classical theory of linear response (e.g., [42, 68]) is concerned with capturing changes in observables to sufficiently small perturbations of the original dynamics close to statistical equilibrium. It turns out that in such a setting the response can be expressed, with some caveats, through formulae linking the external perturbations to spontaneous fluctuations and dissipation in the unperturbed dynamics (e.g., [41, 40]). The classical fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) is of fundamental importance in statistical physics (e.g., [28, 5, 46]), and it roughly states that for systems of identical particles in statistical equilibrium, the average response to small external perturbations can be calculated through the knowledge of suitable correlation functions of the unperturbed statistical system; see, for example, [30, 15] for some of the many applications of the FDT in the statistical physics setting.

The validity of the linear response and fluctuation-dissipation relationships for more general dynamical systems encountered, for example, in climate modelling (e.g., [68]) is an important topic which is particularly relevant for uncertainty quantification in reduced-order predictions and reduced-mode tuning (e.g., [52, 35, 17, 70]). One of the influential works by Leith [66] suggested that if the climate dynamics satisfied a suitable FDT, the climate response to small external forcing should be calculated by estimating suitable statistics in the unperturbed climate. Climate dynamics is modelled as a forced dissipative chaotic dynamical system which is arguably rather far from the statistical physics’ setting for FDT. Nevertheless, Leith’s conjecture stimulated a lot of activity in generating new theoretical formulations (e.g., [63]) and approximate algorithms for FDT that were applied to climate response (e.g., [1, 2, 3, 68, 69, 52, 22, 23, 24, 25]). However, despite numerous applications in both autonomous and non-autonomous settings, there is precious little rigorous evidence supporting the validity of the linear response and FDT in the non-autonomous setting beyond the formal derivation of FDT for time-dependent stochastic systems [69], and in [61] in the case of Langevin dynamics in a space-time periodic potential.

The goal here is to provide a rigorous justification of the linear response theory for a class of forced dissipative stochastic systems with time-periodic coefficients which induce time-periodic ergodic measures. Our objective is twofold:

(i) Establish sufficient conditions for existence of time-periodic measures and their ergodicity for a broad class of dissipative stochastic differential equations (SDE’s) in finite dimensions with time-periodic coefficients.

(ii) Consider the linear response of such systems in the ergodic time-periodic regime to small perturbations, and express the change in observables built on such measures via fluctuation-dissipation type relations.

The results derived in the sequel will concern SDE’s whose time-periodic ergodic measures are supported on certain random periodic solutions. In principle, the results discussed in the context
of the linear response apply to a wider class of SDE’s generating time-periodic measures; however, establishing conditions for the existence and ergodicity of such measures in a more general setting is not trivial and is beyond the scope of this work.

Finally, we remark that time-dependent invariant measures are arguably ubiquitous in many mathematical models. In particular, seasonal and diurnal cycles in climate models due to time-periodic forcing or retarded self-interactions in neural networks present some of the obvious candidates for the need to develop such a framework. It is worth stressing that rigorous formulation of the linear response and FDT for forced dissipative stochastic dynamical systems (inline with, e.g., [39, 68, 34, 37, 38]) is justified by contemporary approaches in reduced-order modelling and simulation of high-dimensional, multi-scale dynamical phenomena: comprehensive computer models for climate change modelling or molecular dynamics involve stochastic components (e.g., [37, 33, 38, 34, 91, 4, 48]) to mimic the effects of unresolved dynamics, while reduced-order or homogenized models typically involve stochastic noise terms (e.g., [20, 71, 32, 79, 16]. Here, similar to [53, 69], the presence of noise leads to improved regularity of the problem which simplifies key aspects of the problem compared to nonlinear dissipative deterministic systems (e.g., [43, 10, 11, 12, 26]). As a consequence, we are able to focus on systems that have other important features of realistic systems, namely a lack of ellipticity, non-compactness of state space, and a lack of global Lipschitz continuity of the coefficients. The results established below apply to a broad class of nonlinear functionals of state space which include common quantities of interest, such as the mean and variance of subsets of variables.

2. Setup and notation

Our framework relies on the theory of Markovian random dynamical systems (RDS), which provides a clear geometric link between stochastic analysis and dynamical systems. This link was established through the discovery (e.g., [8, 65]) that for sufficiently regular coefficients $b, \sigma$ the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t)dt + \sigma(t, X_t)dW^s_t, \quad X_s = x \in \mathcal{M},$$

(2.1)
generates a stochastic flow $\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : s, t \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}\}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ such that

$$X^s_t(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

for $\omega \in \Omega$ in a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We assume throughout that $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathcal{M} = S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, and $W^s_t$ an $m$-dimensional Brownian motion s.t. $W^s_s = 0$.

One of the key concepts relevant for the analysis of the long-time behaviour of RDS is the extension of the notion of ergodicity to the random setting (e.g., [8, 65]). These important results are established in the regime of (random) stationary measures and (random) stationary processes, mostly in the case when the source of time-dependence is due to the noise process (i.e., the coefficients $b, \sigma$ in (2.1) do not depend explicitly on time). Over the last decade significant progress has been made in the study of the long-time behaviour of SDEs generated by time-dependent vector fields (e.g., [49, 50, 51, 86, 87, 88, 90]). Based on the insight from the latter results, we shall study the ergodicity of SDEs with time-periodic coefficients in order to establish fluctuation-dissipation formulas through the linear response in the random periodic regime. Our strategy is to first prove the existence of unique time-periodic measure under some weak dissipative assumptions on the SDE via a version of Lyapunov second method.
and coupling. The standard Lyapunov second method is a well-known and powerful technique for the investigation of stability of solutions of nonlinear dynamical systems, as well as control systems, in finite and infinite dimensions. Extension of this method to RDS generated by SDE’s is essentially due to Hasminskii (e.g., [57]). Subsequent extensions include applications to SDEs with random switching (e.g., [74]) and to the case of nontrivial random stationary solutions and random attractors by Schmalfuss [84]. Importantly, this method involves the study of random invariant sets without the need for explicit knowledge of solutions of the underlying SDE, and it is based solely on the vector fields encoded in the drift and diffusion coefficients of the SDE even when the drift term is locally Lipschitz continuous. Importantly, Lyapunov second method is essentially due to Hasminskii (e.g., [57]). Subsequent extensions include applications to SDEs with random switching (e.g., [74]) and to the case of nontrivial random stationary solutions and random attractors by Schmalfuss [84]. Importantly, this method involves the study of random invariant sets without the need for explicit knowledge of solutions of the underlying SDE, and it is based solely on the vector fields encoded in the drift and diffusion coefficients of the SDE even when the drift term is locally Lipschitz continuous. Importantly, Lyapunov second method leads to a relatively simple argument enabling the proof of ergodicity of periodic measures in the narrow topology generated by the dual of the Markov evolution semigroup.

The rest of the article is organised as follows. In the remainder of this section, we fix notations which are frequently used in the sequel. In Section 3, we recall the notion of a stochastic process, and a Random Dynamical System (RDS) generated by SDE’s in finite dimensions, and we outline the notion of a random periodic process. In Section 4, we first prove the existence of stable random time-periodic solutions for a class of dissipative SDE’s with time-periodic coefficients and the associated time-periodic measures (§4.3); sufficient conditions for ergodicity of such measures are established in §4.3. Section 5 deals with the linear response theory in the above setting. First, we derive a finite-time linear response formula and fluctuation-dissipation relationships for periodic measures, followed by analogous results for ergodic periodic measures in the infinite-time horizon.

**Notation.** Let \((\mathcal{M}, d)\) be a complete separable metric space. Here, we consider either \(\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d\) or \(\mathcal{M} \subseteq S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\); modifications to closed smooth manifolds follow naturally (e.g., [65]).

- We fix the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) as the Wiener space, i.e., \(\Omega = \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^m)\), \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), is a linear subspace of continuous functions \(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^m)\) which are zero at \(s \in \mathbb{R}\). \(\mathcal{F}\) is the Borel \(\mathcal{G}\)-algebra on \(\Omega\) generated by open subsets in the compact-open topology defined via

\[
\varrho(\omega, \hat{\omega}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\|\omega - \hat{\omega}\|_n}{1 + \|\omega - \hat{\omega}\|_n}, \quad \|\omega - \hat{\omega}\|_n := \sup_{t \in [-n, n]} |\omega(t) - \hat{\omega}(t)|, \quad \omega, \hat{\omega} \in \Omega,
\]

with \(\cdot\) the Euclidean norm on \(\mathbb{R}^m\). Finally, \(\mathbb{P}\) is the Wiener measure on \(\mathcal{F}\).

- Given the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) and \(\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\), denote \(L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})\), \(p \geq 1\), as the space of \(\mathcal{G}\)-measurable random variables \(X : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d\) such that \(\mathbb{E}|X|^p := \int_{\Omega} |X(\omega)|^p \mathbb{P}(d\omega) < \infty\), and equipped with the norm \(\|X\|_p := (\mathbb{E}|X|^p)^{1/p}\).

- Given the (Borel) measurable space \((\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}))\), the space of bounded measurable functions on \(\mathcal{M}\) is denoted by

\[
\mathbb{M}_\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}) := \{f : \mathcal{M} \to \hat{\mathcal{M}}, \text{ measurable : } \|f\|_\infty < \infty\}, \quad \|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} |f(x)|,
\]

where \(\cdot\) is the Euclidean norm on \(\hat{\mathcal{M}}\).

- The space of bounded continuous functions on \(\mathcal{M}\) is

\[
\mathbb{C}_\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}) := \{f : \mathcal{M} \to \hat{\mathcal{M}}, \quad f \in \mathbb{M}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and continuous}\}.
\]

- The space of \(l\)-times continuously differentiable real-valued functions is denoted by

\[
\mathbb{C}^l(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}) := \{f \in \mathbb{C}(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}), \quad D^lf \text{ continuous}\}.
\]
The space $C^l_{\infty}(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}})$ contains those functions in $C^l(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}})$ which are bounded. Analogously, $C^{l,k}(\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}', \hat{\mathcal{M}})$ denotes the space of functions which are $l$-times continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{M}$, and $k$-times continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{M}'$.

The space of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions on $(\mathcal{M}, d)$ is denoted by

$$\text{Lip}_\infty(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}) := \{ f \in C_\infty(\mathcal{M}, \hat{\mathcal{M}}) : \| f \|_{BL} < \infty \},$$

$$\| f \|_{BL} := \max \{ \| f \|_\infty, \text{Lip}(f) \},$$

and $\text{Lip}(f) := \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(y) - f(z)|}{d(y, z)} : y \neq z \right\}$.

For $\mathcal{M} = \hat{\mathcal{M}}$, we simplify the notation and write $\mathcal{M}_\infty$, $C_\infty(\mathcal{M})$, $C^l(\mathcal{M})$, and $\text{Lip}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

$C^{l,\delta}(\mathcal{M})$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, is the space of functions $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$, whose $l$-th derivatives are $\delta$-Hölder continuous, and which is furnished with the countable family of semi-norms

$$\| f \|_{l,0,N} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{|f(x, x)|}{1 + |x|^2} + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq l} \sup_{x \in B_N} |D^\beta f(x)|,$$

$$\| f \|_{l,\delta,N} := \| f \|_{l,0,N} + \sum_{|\beta| = l} \sup_{x,y \in B_N, x \neq y} \frac{|D^\beta f(x) - D^\beta f(y)|}{|x - y|^\delta},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean norm and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the dot product on $\mathcal{M}$, and $B_N = \{ x \in \mathcal{M} : |x| \leq N \}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, is a closed ball in $\mathcal{M}$ with radius $N$, and

$$D^\beta f(x) := \frac{\partial |\beta| f}{(\partial x_1)^{\beta_1} \cdots (\partial x_d)^{\beta_d}}, \quad |\beta| := \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_n, \quad \beta_i \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \quad D^\beta = \mathbb{I},$$

denotes the Frechet derivative; see, e.g. [7] [65].

$C^{l,\delta}_b(\mathcal{M})$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, is the space of functions $f : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$, whose $l$-th derivatives are $\delta$-Hölder continuous with the norm

$$\| f \|_{l,0} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} |f(x)| + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq l} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{M}} |D^\beta f(x)|,$$

$$\| f \|_{l,\delta} := \| f \|_{l,0} + \sum_{|\beta| = l} \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}, x \neq y} \frac{|D^\beta f(x) - D^\beta f(y)|}{|x - y|^\delta},$$

Finally, we write $C^{l,0}_b \equiv C^l_b$, and $C^{l,0}_b \equiv C^l_b$.

3. Random periodic processes

In order to facilitate subsequent derivations, we recall definitions of Markovian RDS generated by SDEs (see, e.g. [64] [65] [8] [7]), random periodic processes (see, e.g. [49] [50] [51] [86] [87] [88] [90] and Markov evolutions generated by SDEs (see, e.g. [8] [44] [45] [65]). We also provide an intuitive example of a random periodic solution arising in the stochastic dynamics of periodically forced FitzHugh–Nagumo neural model.

Definition 3.1 (Stochastic flow [64] [65]). Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth manifold and, for any $s, t \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathcal{M}$, let $\phi(t, s, \omega, x) \in \mathcal{M}$ be a random field on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The two-parameter family $\{ \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : s, t \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \}$ is called a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms if there exists a null set $\mathcal{N} \subset \Omega$ such that for any $\omega \notin \mathcal{N}$, there exists a family of continuous maps $\{ \hat{\phi}(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : s, t \in \mathcal{I} \}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying
(i) \( \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) = \phi(t, u, \omega, \phi(u, s, \omega, \cdot)) \) holds for any \( s, t, u \in I \),

(ii) \( \phi(s, s, \omega, \cdot) = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{M}} \), for all \( s \in I \),

(iii) the map \( \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M} \) is a homeomorphism for any \( t, s \in I \).

The map \( \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) \) is a stochastic flow of \( C^k \)-diffeomorphisms, if it is a homeomorphism and \( \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \) is \( k \)-times continuously differentiable with respect to \( x \in \mathcal{M} \) for all \( s, t \in I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) and the derivatives are continuous in \( (s, t, x) \in I \times I \times \mathcal{M} \).

**Definition 3.2** (Filtration generated by a stochastic flow). Given a complete probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\), let \( \mathcal{F}_s^t \subset \mathcal{F} \) be the smallest \( \mathcal{G} \)-algebra on \( \Omega \) generated by \( \cap_{\varepsilon > 0} \mathcal{G} (\omega : \phi(u, v, \cdot) : s - \varepsilon \leq u, v \leq t + \varepsilon) \) and containing all null sets of \( \mathcal{F} \). The two-parameter filtration \( \{ \mathcal{F}_s^t : s \leq t \} \) is the filtration generated by the stochastic flow \( \{ \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : s, t \in I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \} \) and the associated filtered probability space is denoted by \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_s^t, \mathbb{P})\).

**Definition 3.3** (Markov transition kernel). Consider the stochastic flow \( \{ \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : t, s \in I ; t \geq s \} \) induced by the SDE \([2.1]\) for some fixed \( s \in I \). Given the measurable space \((\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}))\), the Markov transition probability kernel \( P(s, x; t, \cdot) \) induced by solutions of \([2.1]\) is defined by

\[
P(s, x; t, A) = \mathbb{P}(\{ \omega : \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \in A \}), \quad s, t \in I, \quad s \leq t, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}). \tag{3.1}
\]

**Definition 3.4** (Markov evolution and its dual). Given the stochastic flow and the Markov kernel associated with solutions of \([2.1]\), the Markov evolution \( \mathcal{P}_{s,t} : \mathbb{M}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathbb{M}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) is defined by

\[
\mathcal{P}_{s,t} \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi(z) P(s, x; t, dz) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\phi(t, s, \omega, x))], \quad s, t \in I, \quad s \leq t, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{3.2}
\]

For any probability measure \( \mu \) on \((\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}))\), the Markov dual \( \mathcal{P}_{s,t}^\ast \) is defined by

\[
(\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^\ast \mu)(B) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} P(s, y; t, B) \mu(dy), \quad s, t \in I, \quad s \leq t, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}). \tag{3.3}
\]

**Theorem 3.5** (Stochastic flows generated by global solutions of SDE’s). Suppose that the coefficients of the SDE \([2.1]\) are such that for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), \( b(t, \cdot) \in C^l(\mathcal{M}) \) and \( \sigma_j(t, \cdot) \in C^l(\mathcal{M}) \), \( l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 0 < \delta \leq 1 \), where \( \sigma_k \) denote columns of \( \sigma \). Then, there exist unique strong global solutions of \([2.1]\) which generate a stochastic flow of \( C^l \)-diffeomorphisms, \( \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M} \) such that

\[
\phi(t, s, \omega, x) := X_t^s(x), \quad t, s \in I = \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq s, \quad x \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \tag{3.4}
\]

which are adapted to the filtration \( \mathcal{F}_s^t \); e.g., [63] Theorems 4.7.2, 3.4.6] with slight modifications.

If the initial condition is given by a random variable \( X \) which is independent of \( \mathcal{F} \) and is such that \( \mathbb{E}[|X|^2] < \infty \), then \( \mathbb{E}[|X_t^s|^2] < \infty \) for \( t < \infty \) (e.g., [63] Theorem 5.2.1]). Stronger, dissipative growth conditions have to be imposed on the coefficients \( b, \sigma \) in \([2.1]\) to guarantee existence of the second and higher absolute moments of the solutions for all time (see, e.g., Appendix A).

**Definition 3.6** (Infinitesimal generator). Let \( V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R}^+) \) and \( t \to \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \) a solution of the SDE in \([2.1]\). Considering the evolution of \( V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x)) \) allows one to represent the infinitesimal generator (e.g., [63]) of solutions of \([2.1]\) through the second-order operator

\[
\mathcal{L}_t V(t, x) = \partial_t V(t, x) + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(t, x) \partial_{x_i} V(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_{ik}(t, x) \sigma_{jk}(t, x) \partial_{x_i x_j}^2 V(t, x),
\]

where \( b, \sigma \) are (sufficiently regular) drift and diffusion coefficients in the SDE \([2.1]\). Considering the evolution of \( V(t, \phi(t+s, s, \omega, x) - \phi(t+s, s, \omega, y)) \) yields the second-order differential operator
associated with the two-point motion (e.g., [65, Theorem 4.2.4]) which is given by
\[
\mathcal{L}_t^{(2)} V(t, x - y) = \partial_t V(t, x - y) + D_x V(t, x - y) (b(t, x) - b(t, y))
+ \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \left[ \sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y) \right]^T D_x^2 V(t, x - y) \left[ \sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y) \right] \right),
\]
where \( D_x V(\cdot, x - y) := (\partial_x V(\cdot, x - y))_{1 \leq i,j \leq d} \).

**Definition 3.7** (Random Dynamical System (RDS) [8, 7]). Let \((\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}))\) be a measurable space and \((\theta_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}_I, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{I}\) be a measure-preserving flow of measurable maps of a complete probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\). A random dynamical system (RDS) over a metric dynamical system \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\theta_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}_I})\) is a mapping \( \Phi : \mathcal{I} \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M} \) such that
(a) \((t, \omega, x) \mapsto \Phi(t, \omega, x)\) is measurable,
(b) \( \Phi(0, \omega, \cdot) = I_{\mathcal{M}} \) for all \( \omega \in \Omega \),
(c) \( \Phi(t + s, \omega, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \theta_s \omega, \Phi(s, \omega, \cdot)) \) for all \( s, t, s + t \in \mathcal{I}, \omega \in \Omega \) (cocycle property),
(d) if \( \mathcal{M} \) is a topological space, then \( \Phi \) is continuous if \((t, x) \mapsto \Phi(t, \omega, x)\) is continuous,
(e) if \( \mathcal{M} \) is a \( \mathcal{C}^k \) manifold \( 1 \leq k \leq \infty \), then \( \Phi \) is smooth of class \( \mathcal{C}^k \), if \( \Phi(t, \omega, x) \) is \( k \)-times differentiable w.r.t. \( x \), and the derivatives are continuous w.r.t. \( t, \omega \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{M} \).

Consider the \((\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F})\)-measurable (base) flow \( \theta_t : \Omega \to \Omega, t \in \mathbb{R} \), with \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) the Wiener space. For RDS driven by the Brownian motion, the base flow is defined via
\[
W_t(\theta_s \omega) = W_{t+s}(\omega) - W_s(\omega) := W_t^s(\omega).
\]
It is well-known that the measurable flow \((\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) is \( \mathbb{P} \)-ergodic and that it defines a filtered metric dynamical system \( \theta := (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}, (\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}})\); see, e.g., [8, 7]. Moreover, assuming suitable regularity of the coefficients of autonomous SDEs together with appropriate adoption of two-sided stochastic calculus, the solutions of autonomous SDEs generate an RDS over \( \theta \) (e.g., [7, 17, 60, 65]). We will consider the non-autonomous dynamics of the SDE (2.1) with time-periodic coefficients as a suitable RDS on an extended space.

**3.1. Time-periodic setting.** We consider non-autonomous SDE’s (2.1) on \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d, d < \infty \), with time-periodic coefficients, i.e., \( b(t + \tau, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot), \sigma(t + \tau, \cdot) = \sigma(t, \cdot) \) for some \( 0 < \tau < \infty \), with locally Lipschitz, linear-growth coefficients s.t. \( b(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^{1, \delta} (\mathcal{M}), \sigma_k \in \mathcal{C}^{1, \delta} (\mathcal{M}), 0 \leq \delta < 1 \), for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). In such a case the stochastic flow \( \{ \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : t, s \in \mathbb{R}; t \geq s \} \) generated by (2.1) is a \( \mathcal{C}^1 \)-diffeomorphism and it satisfies
\[
\phi(t + \tau, s + \tau, \omega, \cdot) = \phi(t, s, \theta_{\tau} \omega, \cdot), \quad \mathbb{P} \text{-a.s.},
\]
which follows easily from the uniqueness of solutions of (2.1). The relationship in (3.7) plays a crucial role in constructing an RDS on \( \mathcal{M} = [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \) from solutions of (2.1) with time-periodic coefficients, and for the asserting existence and ergodicity of time-periodic measures which are supported on random time-periodic paths defined below.

**Definition 3.8** (Random periodic path of a stochastic flow [49, 60, 90]). A random periodic path of period \( 0 < \tau < \infty \) generated by a stochastic flow \( \phi : \Delta \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M} \) with \( \Delta := \{(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t \geq s\} \), is an \( \mathcal{F} \)-measurable function \( S : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathcal{M} \) such that
\[
S(s + \tau, \omega) = S(s, \theta_{\tau} \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(s + t, s, \omega, S(s, \omega)) = S(s + t, \omega), \quad \mathbb{P} \text{-a.s.,}
\]
for any \( t \in \mathbb{R}^+, s \in \mathbb{R} \).
Definition 3.9 (Random periodic path of RDS [51, 90]). A random periodic path of period \(0 < \tau < \infty\) generated by an RDS, \(\Phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}\), is an \(\mathcal{F}\)-measurable function \(S : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathcal{M}\) such that
\[
S(s + \tau, \omega) = S(s, \theta_{\tau} \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(t, \theta_{\tau}\omega, S(s, \omega)) = S(s + t, \omega), \quad (3.9)
\]
for any \(s \in \mathbb{R}\), \(t \in \mathbb{R}^+\), and for almost all \(\omega \in \Omega\).

Example 3.10. Let \(b : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d\), \(d \geq 2\), be a globally Lipschitz vector field, and let \(\{\Psi(t, \cdot) : t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}\) be a deterministic flow generated by the ODE
\[
\frac{dY_t}{dt} = b(Y_t). \quad (3.10)
\]
If \(u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^d\) is a periodic solution of the ODE \((3.10)\) of period \(0 < \tau < \infty\), i.e.,
\[
u(t, \omega) = \Psi(t, u(s)) = u(t + s), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+.
\]
Consider the stochastic process \(X_t(\omega) = u(t) + Z_t(\omega)\), where \(Z_t\) solves the following SDE
\[
dZ_t = b(t, Z_t)dt + \sigma(t, Z_t)dW_t, \quad (3.11)
\]
with time-periodic coefficients \(\tilde{b}(t, z) := b(u(t + z) - b(u(t))\) and \(\tilde{\sigma}(t, z) := \sigma(u(t + z))\). If \(\nu(t, \omega)\) is a random periodic solution of the SDE \((3.11)\), then \(S(t, \omega) = u(t) + \nu(t, \omega)\) is a random periodic solution of the autonomous SDE: \(dX_t = b(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t\).

Example 3.11 (Stochastic FitzHugh-Nagumo model with periodic current). Consider the following SDE on \(\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^2\)
\[
\frac{dx_t}{dt} = Ax_tdt + b(t, x_t)dt + \sigma(t)dW_t, \quad X_{t_0} = v = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (3.12)
\]
where
\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ a & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b(t, x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{3}x^3 + B_1 \sin(\tau t) \\ c \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2\beta - 1} + B_2 \cos(\tau t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]
with \(a < 1\), \(\beta > 0\), \(B_1, B_2, c \in \mathbb{R}\), \(0 < \tau < \infty\), and \(W_t = (W^1_t, 0)^T\), where \((W^1_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\) is a two-sided Wiener process on \(\mathbb{R}\). Let \(\phi(t, t_0, \omega, \dot{x})\) be the solution of \((3.12)\) represented implicitly via
\[
\phi(t, t_0, \omega, v) = e^{A(t-t_0)}v + \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{A(t-s)}b(s, \phi(s, t_0, \omega, v))ds + \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{A(t-s)}\sigma(s)dW_s(\omega),
\]
where \(\dot{x} \mapsto e^{A(t-t_0)}v\) is the solution of the linear ODE
\[
\frac{dy_t}{dt} = Ay_t, \quad Y_{t_0} = v \in \mathbb{R}^2; \quad Y_{t_0} = v \in \mathbb{R}^2.
\]
Now, consider the projections \(P^+ : \mathbb{R}^2 \to E^s, \ P^- : \mathbb{R}^2 \to E^u\), where the linear subspaces are
\[
E^s = \text{span}\{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : Av = -\lambda v\}, \quad E^u = \text{span}\{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : Av = \lambda v\}, \quad \lambda := \sqrt{1 - a}.
\]
The process \(S(t, \omega)\) defined by
\[
S(t, \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{A(t-s)}P^+b(s, S(s, \omega))ds - \int_{t}^{\infty} e^{A(t-s)}P^-b(s, S(s, \omega))ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{A(t-s)}P^+\sigma(s)dW_s(\omega) - \int_{t}^{\infty} e^{A(t-s)}P^-\sigma(s)dW_s(\omega),
\]
is a random \(2\pi/\tau\)-periodic solution of the flow generated by the SDE \((3.12)\); see, e.g., [50].
4. Time-periodic ergodic measures for a class of SDEs

In this section we consider a class of non-autonomous SDEs \(^{(2.1)}\) which generate stable random periodic paths. First, in §4.2 we prove the existence of a unique stable random periodic solution for SDE’s with dissipative, time-periodic coefficients, and we characterise time-periodic measures induced by such dynamics (Theorem 4.6). Conditions for ergodicity of these time-periodic measures are established in §4.3 (Theorem 4.10). We conclude with an example of periodically forced stochastic Lorenz model, which is then used in §5 to illustrate the utility of fluctuation-dissipation formulas for time-periodic measures when considering the linear response.

4.1. Preliminaries, definitions, and assumptions. Recall the following notions and results which will be needed in the sequel:

**Definition 4.1** (Time-periodic measure \([51]\)). A measure \(\mu_s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})\) induced by the stochastic flow \(\{\phi(t+s,s,\omega, \cdot): s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}\) is referred to as a time-periodic measure of period \(0 < \tau < \infty\) if for all \(B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M})\), the following hold

\[
\mu_{s+\tau} = \mu_s \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{s+t}(B) = \mathcal{P}_{s,s+\tau}^* \mu_s(B), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+.
\]

Furthermore, \(\mu_t\) is called a time-periodic measure with minimal (or fundamental) period \(\tau\), if \(\tau\) is the smallest strictly positive number such that \((4.1)\) holds.

**Remark 4.2.** Let \(S : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\) be a random periodic path \((3.8)\) of a stochastic flow \(\phi\) on the (Borel) measurable space \((\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}))\) and consider the probability measure \(\mu_s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})\) given by

\[
\mu_s(A) := (\mathbb{P} \circ S^{-1}(s, \cdot))(A) = \mathbb{P}(\{\omega : S(s,\omega) \in A\}), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{M}).
\]

Then, the measure \(\mu_s\) (supported on the random periodic path) is \(\tau\)-periodic since

\[
\mu_{s+\tau}(A) = \mathbb{P}(\{\omega : S(s+\tau,\omega) \in A\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{\omega : S(s,\theta_\tau\omega) \in A\})
= \mathbb{P}(\{\omega : S(s,\omega) \in A\}) = \mu_s(A).
\]

Thus, the law of a random periodic path \((3.8)\) of a stochastic flow \(\phi\) on \(\mathcal{M}\) satisfies Definition 4.1 and it induces a \(\tau\)-periodic measure on \(\mathcal{M}\).

In the remainder of this section, we will discuss the existence of random periodic paths induced by \((2.1)\) which will then lead to considering time-periodic measures supported on these paths. A useful way of dealing with ergodicity of time-periodic measures induced by the non-autonomous SDE \((2.1)\) on \(\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d\) with time-periodic coefficients of period \(0 < \tau < \infty\) is to lift the original to the extended space \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) so that the resulting ‘lifted’ SDE is autonomous. Such a representation of the original dynamics does not necessarily simplify the formulation of the problem but the flows of the lifted solutions generate a cocycle \([\mathcal{M}]\) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\), and the lifted random periodic paths \((3.8)\) of the stochastic flow induced by the non-autonomous SDE \((2.1)\) can be associated with random periodic paths \((3.9)\) of RDS generated by the lifted flow on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\).

To this end, we consider the extended process \(\tilde{X}_t = (s_t, X_t)\) satisfying the following SDE

\[
d\tilde{X}_t = \tilde{b}(\tilde{X}_t)dt + \tilde{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_t)d\tilde{W}_t^s, \quad \tilde{X}_s = (s,x) \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}} := \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

\(^1\)See Definition 3.7
where \( \tilde{b} : \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \to \tilde{\mathcal{M}}, \tilde{\sigma} : \tilde{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}^{\otimes (m+1)} \), or explicitly
\[
\begin{align*}
    d \left( \frac{s_t}{X_t} \right) &= \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 \\
    b(s_t, X_t) & \sigma(s_t, X_t) \end{array} \right) dt + \left( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\
    0 \end{array} \right) d\tilde{W}_t^s,
\end{align*}
\] (4.5)
where \( b(t, \cdot), \sigma(t, \cdot) \) are the \( \tau \)-periodic coefficients of the SDE (2.1), and \( \tilde{W}_t^s = (0, W_t^s) \), is the Brownian motion such that \( W_s^s = 0 \).

The Markov transition kernel (Definition 3.3) on \( \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \) associated with the dynamics of (4.4), takes the form (e.g., [57, 65])
\[
\tilde{P}(0, (s, x); t, A) := \mathbb{P}(\omega : (t + s, \phi(t + s, s, \theta_{-s} \omega, x)) \in \mathcal{J} \times A) = \mathbb{P}(s, x; t + s, B) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{J}), \quad \mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d),
\] (4.6)
where \( \phi(t + s, s, \omega, \cdot) \), \( t \geq 0 \) is the stochastic flow induced by the SDE (2.1) with time-periodic coefficients.

The RDS on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) (Definition 3.7) associated with the lifted SDE (4.4) is generated as follows for \( s \equiv (s \mod \tau) \):
\[
\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, (s, x)) := (t + s \mod \tau, \phi(t + s, s, \theta_{-s} \omega, x)), \quad s \in [0, \tau), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+.
\] (4.7)
The cocycle property of \( \tilde{\Phi} \) in (4.7) can be verified by recalling that \( t + s \mod \tau = t + s - k\tau \), where \( k = \left\lfloor \frac{t+s}{\tau} \right\rfloor \), and utilising (3.7); see also [51].

The Markov transition kernel \( \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t, \cdot) \), \( t \geq 0 \), \( \tilde{x} := (s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \), \( 0 < \tau < \infty \), induced by \( \tilde{\Phi} \) are given by (cf. Definition 3.3)
\[
\tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t, \tilde{A}) = \mathbb{P}(\omega : \tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \tilde{x}) \in \tilde{A})
= \mathbb{P}(\omega : (t + s \mod \tau, \phi(t + s, s, \theta_{-s} \omega, x)) \in \mathcal{J} \times A)
= \mathbb{P}(s, x; t + s, A) \delta_{(t+s \mod \tau)}(\mathcal{J}), \quad \tilde{A} = \mathcal{J} \times A \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).
\] (4.8)
The Markov evolution \( \tilde{P}(t)_{t \geq 0} \) (now, a Markov semigroup) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) and its dual \( \tilde{P}^*_t \)\( t \geq 0 \) induced by \( \tilde{\Phi} \) are given, respectively, by
\[
\tilde{P}_t \tilde{h}(\tilde{y}) = \int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{h}(\tilde{z}) \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{y}; t, d\tilde{z}), \quad \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{C}_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d),
\] (4.9)
\[
\tilde{P}_t^* \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = \int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{y}; t, \tilde{A}) \tilde{\mu}(d\tilde{y}), \quad \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
\] (4.10)

With the above definition at hand we have, in particular, that
\[
\tilde{\mu}_s(\tilde{A}) := \mathbb{P}\left( \{ \omega : (s \mod \tau, S(s, \omega)) \in \tilde{A} \} \right) = \mathbb{P}\left( \{ \omega : S(s, \omega) \in \tilde{A} \} \right) = \mu_s(\tilde{A}_s),
\]
for \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \tilde{A}_s = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : (s, x) \in \tilde{A} \} \). It is easy to verify that \( \tilde{\mu}_{s+s} = \tilde{\mu}_s \) and \( \tilde{P}^*_t \tilde{\mu}_s = \tilde{\mu}_{t+s} \) for any \( t \geq 0, \ s \in [0, \tau) \). This implies that \( \tilde{\mu}_s \) is a \( \tau \)-periodic measure for the lifted flow \( \{ \tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0 \} \) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) which is supported on the random periodic path (4.9) of the lifted SDE (4.5).

Existence of \( \tau \)-periodic measures associated with the dynamics of (2.1) is discussed in [4.2] and it requires the following assumption:

**Assumption 4.3.** Let \( V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+) \) s.t. \( V(t, 0) = 0 \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) satisfying the following:
Remark 4.4.

(ii) There exists \( \bar{\lambda} > 0 \) such that

\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t \lambda(u) du < -\bar{\lambda} < 0.
\]

(iii) For the one-point motion \( \phi(t, s, \omega, \xi) \), \( t, s \in \mathbb{R}, \ t \geq s \) induced by (2.1), and \( \xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^s, \mathbb{P}) \) there exists \( 0 < K < \infty \) independent of \( t, s \) such that

\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[V(t, \phi(t, s, \cdot, \xi) - \xi)] \leq K.
\]

**Remark 4.4.**

(a) Two important classes of coefficients satisfying Assumption 4.3, which yield global solutions of (2.1) are specified in Appendix A. In particular, we might take the dissipative condition

\[
\langle b(t, x), x \rangle \leq L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}|x|^2, \quad \|\sigma(t, x)\|_{HS}^2 \leq L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2),
\]

where \( L_{b_1}, L_{b_2}, L_\sigma \in C([0, \tau], \mathbb{R}^+) \) for \( |v| > R \) with the \( R \) the radius of an absorbing ball of the deterministic dynamics with \( \sigma \equiv 0 \). Here, \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) denotes dot product on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \| \cdot \|_{HS} \) denotes the Hilbert–Schmidt norm (aka Frobenius norm) defined by \( \|A\|_{HS}^2 = \text{trace}(AA^T) \).

Condition (4.13) is satisfied for (4.14) when

\[
\inf_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_1}(t) - 2^{p-1}L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{1}{2}(2^{p-1} + 1)\sigma(t)(p - 1) \right) > 0
\]

and it also leads to global existence of the \( p \)-th absolute moment of the law of the associated SDE; tighter bounds can be obtained for \( p = 2, 3 \) as shown in Appendix A. Condition (4.13) is reminiscent of the Hasminskii-type regularity condition \([57]\) for existence and uniqueness of global solutions of SDEs; sufficient conditions for verification of Hasminskii’s conditions require existence of real-valued functions \( L_b(\cdot), L_\sigma(\cdot) \in C([0, \tau]; \mathbb{R}^+) \) such that

\[
\langle b(t, x), x \rangle \leq L_b(t)(1 + |x|^2), \quad \|\sigma(t, x)\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \leq L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2).
\]

Coefficients satisfying (4.14) also satisfy (4.16), since for some \( L_b \in C([0, \tau], \mathbb{R}^+) \) we have

\[
L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}|x|^2 \leq L_b(1 + |x|^2).
\]

(b) Construction of the Lyapunov function \( V \) satisfying Assumption 4.3 is often not straightforward. However, one can construct a polynomial Lyapunov function growing at infinity like \( |x|^{2N}, \ N \in \mathbb{N} \), for a broad class of SDEs whose coefficients \( b(\cdot, x), \sigma(\cdot, x) \) are continuous, \( b(t, \cdot), \{\sigma_k(t, \cdot)\}_{1 \leq k \leq m} \in \mathcal{L}^{1,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d) \) and such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle b(t, x) - b(t, y), x - y \rangle & \leq -K_t|x - y|^2, \\
|\sigma_k(t, x) - \sigma_k(t, y)| & \leq L_t|x - y|; \ 1 \leq k \leq m, \\
\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}}(|b(t, 0)| + |\sigma_k(t, 0)|) & < \infty, \ 1 \leq k \leq m,
\end{align*}
\]
where \( \sigma_k \) denotes the \( k \)-th column of \( \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m} \), and

\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t \lambda(u)du < 0,
\]

(4.18)

with \( \lambda(t) = -K_t + \frac{(p-1)}{2} mL_t^2 \) for some \( p > 1 \). The function \( K_t \) is defined by

\[ K_t = \liminf_{R \to \infty} K_t(R), \]

where \( K_t : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a Borel function defined by

\[
K_t(R) = \inf \left\{ -\frac{b(t,x) - b(t,y), x - y}{|x - y|^2} : |x - y| = R \right\}.
\]

Many important classes of SDEs driven by Levy processes (including the Brownian motion) satisfy the dissipative conditions (4.17) - (4.18) (e.g., [59, 72]).

In order to study ergodicity of \( \tau \)-periodic measures induced by the RDS \( \{\Phi(t,\cdot,\cdot)\t \geq 0\} \) in (4.7), we will require variants of the following standard conditions (e.g., [54]) to be satisfied:

(i) Relative compactness property of the transition kernel.
(ii) Irreducibility of the transition kernel.
(iii) Strong Feller property of the Markov semigroup \( \{\hat{P}_t\}_{t \geq 0} \).

Thus, we will require the following in §4.3 in addition to Assumption 4.3.

**Assumption 4.5.** Denote the columns of \( \sigma \) by \( \sigma_k \), \( 1 \leq k \leq m \), and assume that that the following are satisfied for all \( t \in \mathcal{I} \):

(i) \( b(t,\cdot) \in \tilde{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( t \mapsto b(t,\cdot) \) is differentiable.

(ii) \( \sigma_k(t,\cdot) \in \tilde{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), D_x^\beta \sigma_k(t,\cdot) \in \tilde{C}^\infty_b(\mathbb{R}^d), t \mapsto \sigma_k(t,x) \) is differentiable, and

\[
|\partial_t D_x^\beta \sigma_k(t,x)| \leq C, \quad (t,x) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}^d.
\]

(4.19)

for every multi-index \( \beta \).

(ii) \( \text{Lie}(\sigma_1(t,\cdot),\ldots,\sigma_m(t,\cdot)) = \mathbb{R}^d \), where

\[
\text{Lie}(\sigma_1(t,x),\ldots,\sigma_m(t,x)) := \text{span}\{\sigma_i, [\sigma_i,\sigma_j], [\sigma_i,\{\sigma_j,\sigma_k\}], \ldots, 1 \leq i,j,k \leq m\},
\]

and \([F,G]\) is the Lie bracket between the vector fields \( F \) and \( G \) defined by

\[
[F,G](t,x) := D_xG(t,x)F(t,x) - D_xF(t,x)G(t,x).
\]

Equivalently, there exist \( N(x) \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( C_N(x) > 0 \) such that

\[
\inf_{s \leq t \leq s+T} \sum_{\ell=0}^N \sum_{V \in \Sigma_\ell} (y \cdot V(t,x))^2 \geq C_N, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,
\]

(4.20)

where \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \) and \( \Sigma_0 = \{\sigma_k : 1 \leq k \leq m\}, \Sigma_{\ell+1} = \{|\sigma_k,V| : 1 \leq k \leq m, V \in \Sigma_\ell\} \).

4.2. **Existence of \( \tau \)-periodic measure on stable random periodic paths.** Given the assumptions outlined in §4.1, we have the following result on the existence of a \( \tau \)-periodic measure (Definition 4.1) for the lifted SDE in (4.4).

**Theorem 4.6.** Consider the stochastic flow \( \{\phi(s,t,\cdot,\cdot) : s,t \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq s\} \) generated by the SDE in (2.1) with \( b(t,\cdot) \in \tilde{C}^{1,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), and the columns of \( \sigma \) such that \( \sigma(t,\cdot) \in \tilde{C}^{1,\delta}(\mathbb{R}^d), 0 \leq \delta \leq 1 \),

2 Markov semigroup \( \{P_t\}_{t \geq 0} \) on a complete separable metric space \( \mathcal{M} \) has strong Feller property if for \( \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathcal{M}), \) one has \( P_t \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathcal{M}), t > 0, \) i.e., \( P_t : C_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \to C_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \).
which are τ-periodic in time with $0 < \tau < \infty$. If Assumption 4.3 holds, then there exists a family $(\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of τ-periodic measures, $\tilde{\mu}_t \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, given by

$$
\tilde{\mu}_t(\tilde{A}) := \mathbb{P}\left( \omega : \tilde{S}(t, \omega) \in \tilde{A} \right), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}^{d},
$$

(4.21)

which are supported on a random periodic path $\tilde{S}$ of the Markovian RDS $\{\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0\}$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\tilde{\Phi}$ generated by (4.4).

Proof. First, for $\xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, we show that $\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \xi) : t \geq s\}$ converges to a random process $S(t, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ almost surely as $s \to -\infty$, and that $S(t, \omega)$ is bounded and independent of $\xi$. Next, we show that $t \mapsto S(t, \omega)$ is a unique stable random periodic path of period $0 < \tau < \infty$ for the stochastic flow $\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : s, t \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq s\}$. Finally, we conclude that the law of the random periodic path $\tilde{S}(t, \omega) = (t \mod \tau, S(t, \omega))$ generates a τ-periodic measure for the Markovian RDS generated by $\tilde{\Phi}$ on the cylinder $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Existence of random periodic path for the stochastic flow $\phi$. Set $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to be random variables on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$, s.t. $\xi, \eta \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$. Then, by Itô formula (e.g., Theorem 4.2.4 in [65] or Theorem 8.1 in [64]) and Assumption 4.3 we have

$$
dE \left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta)) \right] = E\left[ L^2 V(t, \phi(u, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta)) \right] dt
$$

$$
\leq \lambda(t) E\left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(u, s, \eta)) \right] dt,
$$

where $E\left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(u, s, \eta)) \right] := \int_t^s V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(u, s, \eta)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega)$. Thus, by the first part of (4.11) and Gronwall’s inequality, we arrive at

$$
E|\phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta)|^p \leq E\left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta)) \right] \leq E\left[ V(s, \xi - \eta) \right] \exp \left( \int_s^t \lambda(u) du \right),
$$

(4.22)

Finally, given the bound (4.22), for $r < s < t$, we have

$$
E|\phi(t, r, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \xi)|^p = E|\phi(t, s, \phi(s, r, \xi)) - \phi(t, s, \xi)|^p
$$

$$
\leq E\left[ V(s, \phi(s, r, \xi) - \xi) \right] \exp \left( \int_s^r \lambda(u) du \right),
$$

and, utilising the above with Assumption 4.3(iii), yields

$$
\lim_{r < s \to -\infty} \sup_{t-s \to \infty} E|\phi(t, r, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \xi)|^p = 0.
$$

(4.23)

For $\xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$, $1 < p < \infty$, the above bound combined with condition (4.13) of Assumption 4.3 implies that the $L^p$ limit of $\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \xi) : t \geq s\}$ exists as $s \to -\infty$. Note that this limit is independent of the initial condition $\xi$ by (4.13). We denote this limit by the random process $S: \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$, so that

$$
E|S(t) - \phi(t, s, \xi)|^p \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad s \to -\infty,
$$

for $\xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$, where $S(t) := S(t, \cdot)$. Then, by Chebyshev’s first inequality (aka Markov’s inequality; e.g., [8]), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$
\mathbb{P}(\omega \in \Omega : |S(t, \omega) - \phi(t, s, \omega, \xi)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-p} E|S(t) - \phi(t, s, \xi)|^p,
$$

(4.24)
which implies that the convergence is also in probability. Thus, there exists a subsequence \((s_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) in \(\mathbb{R}\) with \(s_k \to -\infty\) as \(k \to \infty\) such that

\[
S(t, \omega) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \phi(t, s_k, \omega, \xi), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}
\]

To simplify notation, we write

\[
S(t, \omega) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} \phi(t, s, \omega, \xi), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.} \tag{4.25}
\]

Note that for \(\xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^s_{-\infty}, \mathbb{P})\), (with norm \(\|\cdot\|_p := (\mathbb{E}[|\cdot|^p])^{1/p}\)) we have

\[
\|\phi(t, s, \xi)\|_p \leq \|\phi(t, s, \xi) - \xi\|_p + \|\xi\|_p \leq \left(\mathbb{E}[V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \xi)]\right)^{1/p} + \|\xi\|_p < \infty,
\]

by condition (4.13) of Assumption 4.3. Consequently, for any \(t \in \mathbb{R}\), we have

\[
\|S(t)\|_p \leq \limsup_{s \to -\infty} \|\phi(t, s, \xi)\|_p < \infty, \tag{4.26}
\]

implying that \(S(t, \omega)\) is bounded in \(L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^s_{-\infty}, \mathbb{P})\).

Next, we show that \(S(t, \omega)\) is a random periodic path of period \(0 < \tau < \infty\) for the flow \(\phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot)\) using its \(\tau\)-periodic property (see equation (3.7)); namely

\[
S(t + \tau, \omega) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} \phi(t + \tau, s, \omega, \xi) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} \phi(t + \tau, s - \tau + \tau, \omega, \xi) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} \phi(t, s - \tau, \theta_{\tau} \omega, \xi) = S(t, \theta_{\tau} \omega), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.,} \tag{4.27}
\]

and by the continuity of \((t, s, x) \mapsto \phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) and the flow property, we have

\[
\phi(t + s, s, \omega, S(s, \omega)) = \lim_{r \to -\infty} \phi(t + s, s, \omega, \phi(s, r, \omega, \xi)) = \lim_{r \to -\infty} \phi(t + s, r, \omega, \xi) = S(t + s, \omega), \quad (t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.} \tag{4.28}
\]

The equalities (4.27) and (4.28) imply that \(S(t, \omega)\) is a random periodic path (3.8) of period \(\tau > 0\) of the stochastic flow \(\{\phi(t + s, s, \omega, \cdot) : s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}\) on \(\mathbb{R}^d\).

**Uniqueness:** Let \(S_1(t, \omega)\) and \(S_2(t, \omega)\) be two random periodic paths for the flow \(\phi\), we know from (4.28) that for \(t, s \in \mathbb{R}\) with \(t \geq s\),

\[
S_1(t, \omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, S_1(s, \omega)), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.,}
\]

\[
S_2(t, \omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, S_2(s, \omega)), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}
\]

Then, for \(1 < p < \infty\), we have

\[
\|S_1(t) - S_2(t)\|_p^p = \|\phi(t, s, S_1(s)) - \phi(t, s, S_2(s))\|_p^p \leq \exp\left(-\lambda(t - s)\right) \mathbb{E}\left[V(s, S_1(s) - S_2(s))\right] \to 0, \quad s \to -\infty,
\]
Thus, $S(t, \omega) = S_2(t, \omega)$, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

Construction of $\tau$-periodic measure for the RDS $\tilde{\Phi}$: Let $\tilde{S}: \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined by

$$ \tilde{S}(s, \omega) = (s \mod \tau, S(s, \omega)). $$

Then

$$ \tilde{S}(s + \tau, \omega) = (s + \tau \mod \tau, S(s + \tau, \omega)) = (s \mod \tau, S(s, \theta_t \omega)), \quad (4.29) $$

and

$$ \tilde{\Phi}(t, \theta_t \omega, \tilde{S}(s, \omega)) = \tilde{\Phi}(t, \theta_s \omega, (s \mod \tau, S(s, \theta_t \omega))) $$

$$ = (t + s \mod \tau, \phi(t + s, \omega, S(s, \omega))) $$

$$ = (t + s \mod \tau, S(t + s, \omega)) $$

$$ = \tilde{S}(t + s, \omega), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+, \ s \in [0, \tau], \ \mathbb{P}$$.a.s. \quad (4.30)

The equalities (4.29)–(4.30) imply that $\tilde{S}(s, \omega)$ is a random periodic path of period $\tau$ of the RDS generated by $\tilde{\Phi}$ on the cylinder $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Finally, let $(\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, $\tilde{\mu}_t \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ be defined by

$$ \tilde{\mu}_t(\tilde{A}) = \mathbb{P}(\omega : \tilde{S}(t, \omega) \in \tilde{A}), \ t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). $$

It follows from (4.29)–(4.30) - see also [51], that $\tilde{\mu}_t$ is a $\tau$-periodic measure for the Markov semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in (4.9) induced by the RDS $\{\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0\}$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ in the sense of Definition 4.1 Furthermore, given that for any $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau])$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have

$$ \tilde{\mu}_t(\mathcal{J} \times A) = \delta_{(t \mod \tau)}(\mathcal{J}) \otimes \mathbb{P}(\omega : S(t, \omega) \in A) = \delta_{(t \mod \tau)}(\mathcal{J}) \otimes \mu_t(A), $$

one can check from (4.27)–(4.28), that $t \mapsto \mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a $\tau$-periodic measure for the Markov evolution $(\mathcal{P}_{s, t})_{t \geq s}$ in (3.2) induced by the flow $\{\phi(t + s, \omega, \cdot) : s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$. \hfill \Box

4.3. Ergodicity of $\tau$-periodic measures. Now, we turn to ergodicity of the family of $\tau$-periodic measures $(\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ generated by the Markovian RDS $\{\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0\}$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for $\tilde{\Phi}$ in (4.7) obtained from the lifted flow of solutions of the SDE (2.1) with time-periodic coefficients; existence of such periodic measures under appropriate assumptions was shown in Theorem 4.6

**Definition 4.7** (Ergodic periodic measure [51]). A family of $\tau$-periodic measures $(\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on the extended phase space $([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is said to be ergodic if

$$ \tilde{\mu} = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \tilde{\mu}_t dt, \quad (4.31) $$

is ergodic with respect to the Markov semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in (4.9).

One can check by the linearity of $\tilde{\mu}_s \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s^* \tilde{\mu}_s$, $s \in [0, \tau]$, and Fubini’s theorem that $\tilde{\mu}$ is an invariant measure for the Markov semigroup $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$ defined in (4.10). From the definition of the $\tau$-periodic measure $\tilde{\mu}_t$ in (4.21) induced by the RDS $\{\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0\}$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

\[\text{\footnotesize See Definition 4.1} \]
for any \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) that
\[
\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \tilde{\mu}_r(\tilde{A})dr = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \mathbb{P}\{\omega : \tilde{S}(r, \omega) \in \tilde{A}\}dr = \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^\tau \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{S}(r, \omega))dr \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{1}{\tau} m_1(\{r \in [0, \tau) : \tilde{S}(r, \omega) \in \tilde{A}\}) \right],
\]
where \( \tilde{S} \) is a random periodic path of (3.9) of an RDS generated by \( \Phi \) in (4.7), and \( m_1 \) is the Lebesgue measure on \( \mathbb{R} \). Moreover, given the invariance of \( \tilde{\mu} \) under the action of the Markov semigroup \((\tilde{\Phi}_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in (4.9) and by the \( \tau \)-periodicity of \( \tilde{\mu}_t \) (see Definition 4.1), one has for any \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and any \( u \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) that
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{1}{\tau} m(\{r \in [0, \tau) : \tilde{S}(r, \omega) \in \tilde{A}\}) \right] = (\tilde{\Phi}_u^* \tilde{\mu})(\tilde{A}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau (\tilde{\Phi}_u^* \tilde{\mu}_r)(\tilde{A})dr = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \tilde{\mu}_{u+r}(\tilde{A})dr = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{u+\tau} \tilde{\mu}_r(\tilde{A})dr = \mathbb{E}\left[ \frac{1}{\tau} m(\{r \in [u, u+\tau) : \tilde{S}(r, \omega) \in \tilde{A}\}) \right].
\]
This implies that the expected time spent by the random periodic path \( \tilde{r} \mapsto \tilde{S}(\tilde{r}, \omega) \) on a Borel set \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) over a time interval of exactly one period is independent of the starting point.

In this case, verification of ergodicity of periodic measures \( (\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \) on the extended phase space \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\). The invariant measure \( \tilde{\mu} \) in (4.31) is ergodic if and only if the following holds for any \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \):
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t + n\tau, \tilde{A}) - \tilde{\mu}_t(\tilde{A}) \right\} dt = \tilde{\mu}(d\tilde{x}) = 0. \tag{4.32}
\]

**Proof.** Recall from (e.g., [3]) that \( \tilde{\mu} \) is ergodic if \( \tilde{P}_t \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}} = \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}, \tilde{\mu} - \text{a.e.,} \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) implies that either \( \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = 0 \) or \( \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = 1 \). First, we assume that (4.32) holds for any \( \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) with \( \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t, \tilde{A}) = \tilde{P}_t \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{x}) = \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{x}) \). Then, it follows from (4.32) that
\[
\int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) \right| \tilde{\mu}(d\tilde{x}) = \int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{(k+1)\tau} \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t, \tilde{A})dt - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) \right| \tilde{\mu}(d\tilde{x}) = 0.
\]
This implies that \( \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}}(\tilde{x}) \) is a constant for \( \tilde{\mu} - \text{a.e.} \tilde{x} \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, either \( \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = 0 \) or \( \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}) = 1 \). Conversely, assume that \( \tilde{\mu} \) is ergodic, then
\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t, \tilde{A})dt = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}), \quad \text{in } L^2(\tilde{\mu}).
\]
Therefore,
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_0^\tau \tilde{P}(0, \tilde{x}; t + k\tau, \tilde{A})dt = \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{A}), \quad \text{in } L^2(\tilde{\mu}), \tag{4.33}
\]
and (4.32) follows from (4.33) and from the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality. \( \square \)
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The key for validation of the convergence of the Krylov–Bogolyubov scheme (4.32) in the present case, and thus verification of the ergodicity of periodic measures on \([0, \tau) \times \mathbb{R}^d\) by Proposition 4.8 lies in proving the strong Feller property of the Markov evolution \((\mathcal{P}_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in (3.2) (and, therefore, the strong Feller property of \((\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in (4.9)). Recall that the Markov evolution \((\mathcal{P}_t)_{t \geq 0}\) has strong Feller property (i.e., \(\mathcal{P}_t \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\) for any \(\varphi \in M_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\)) if and only if

(a) \((\mathcal{P}_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a Feller semigroup, i.e., \(\mathcal{P}_t : C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \to C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\), and

(b) For any \(\varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\) the family \((\mathcal{P}_t \varphi)_{t \geq 0}\) is equicontinuous.

The first condition follows from the existence of the stochastic flow (see, e.g., [65, 57]); we only derive the second item in Proposition 4.9 below.

**Proposition 4.9.** Suppose that Assumption 4.5 holds. Then, for any \(t \in [s, s + T]\), there exist \(0 < C_T < \infty\) such that, for any \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\) and \(\varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\), we have

\[
|\mathcal{P}_{t,s} \varphi(x) - \mathcal{P}_{t,s} \varphi(y)| \leq C_T \|\varphi\|_\infty |x - y|.
\]

**Proof.** See the proof of Theorem B.10 in Appendix B.2.

Given the above setting, we have the following main result of this section:

**Theorem 4.10.** Suppose Proposition 4.9 and Assumption 4.3 hold. Then, the family of \(\tau\)-periodic measures \((\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}\), \(\tilde{\mu}_t \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)\) in (4.21) is ergodic in the sense of Definition 4.7.

**Proof.** The proof is relatively long and we divide it into four steps.

**Step I:** First, we show that for a random periodic path \(S : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d\) of the stochastic flow \(\phi\) on \(\mathbb{R}^d\), and \(\eta \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{s-\infty}, \mathbb{P})\), \(1 < p < \infty\), there exists \(0 < \tilde{\mathcal{C}} < \infty\) such that

\[
\|\phi(s + n\tau, s, \eta) - S(s + n\tau)\|_p \leq \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u)du \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.
\]  

(4.34)

To see this, note that from the definition of the random periodic path (3.8) we have \(S(s + n\tau, \omega) = \phi(s + n\tau, s, \omega, S(s, \omega))\), \(\mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},\) so that

\[
\|\phi(s + n\tau, s, \eta) - S(s + n\tau)\|_p = \|\phi(s + n\tau, s, \eta) - \phi(s + n\tau, s, S(s))\|_p
\]

\[
\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ V(s, \eta - S(s)) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u)du \right)
\]

(4.35)

\[
= \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u)du \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},
\]

by Assumption 4.3(i)) and the fact that \(S(s) \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{s-\infty}, \mathbb{P})\), \(1 < p < \infty\), which was shown in the proof of Theorem 4.6.

**Step II:** We show that for \(1 < p < \infty\), there exists \(0 < \mathcal{C}_\tau < \infty\), such that for \(n \in \mathbb{N}\),

\[
\left| \mathcal{P}_{s+n\tau,s} \varphi(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) \mu_s(dy) \right| \leq \mathcal{C}_\tau \|\varphi\|_\infty \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u)du \right), \quad \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),\]

(4.36)

where \(\mu_s(A) = \mathbb{P}\{\omega : S(s, \omega) \in A\}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\).

To see this, we note that from the definition of the periodic measure \(\mu_s\), we have that

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{P}_{s+n\tau,s} \varphi(y) \mu_s(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) \mu_s(dy), \quad \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),
\]

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{P}_{s+n\tau,s} \varphi(y) \mu_s(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) \mu_s(dy), \quad \varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),
\]
Next, for \( \psi \in \text{Lip}_∞(ℝ^d) \), we have for \( 1 < p < ∞ \),
\[
\left| P_{s+nτ,s}ψ(x) - \int_{ℝ^d} ψ(y)μ_s(dy) \right| = \left| \int_{ℝ^d} \left( P_{s+nτ,s}ψ(x) - P_{s+nτ,s}ψ(y) \right)μ_s(dy) \right| ≤ \left\| ψ \right\|_{BL} \int_{ℝ^d} \left| E[φ(s + nτ, s, x) - φ(s + nτ, s, y)] \right|μ_s(dy) = \left\| ψ \right\|_{BL} \int_{ℝ^d} \left| E[φ(s + nτ, s, x) - φ(s + nτ, s, S(s))] \right|μ_s(dy) ≤ \left\| ψ \right\|_{BL} \left( E[|φ(s + nτ, s, x) - S(s)|^p] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} ≤ \tilde{c} \left\| ψ \right\|_{BL} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+nτ} λ(u)du \right),
\]
where we applied Hölder’s inequality and estimate (4.34) in the last two lines respectively.

Now, let \( ϕ \in C_∞(ℝ^d) \) be given. Setting \( ψ = P_{s+nτ,s+nτ; s+nτ}ϕ = P_{s+nτ,s}ϕ \) in (4.37) and using the invariance of \( μ_s \) under the Markov evolution \( (P_{s+nτ,s})_{n∈ℕ} \), we obtain by Markov property and Proposition 4.9 that
\[
\left| P_{s+nτ+nτ,s+nτ}ϕ(x) - \int_{ℝ^d} P_{s+nτ,s}ϕ(y)μ_s(dy) \right| = \left| \int_{ℝ^d} \left( P_{s+nτ+nτ,s+nτ}ϕ(x) - P_{s+nτ+nτ,s+nτ}ϕ(y) \right)Mu_s(dy) \right| ≤ \tilde{c} \left\| P_{s+nτ+nτ,s+nτ}ϕ \right\|_{BL} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+nτ} λ(u)du \right) = \tilde{c} \left\| P_{s+nτ,s}ϕ \right\|_{BL} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+nτ} λ(u)du \right) ≤ C_τ \left\| ϕ \right\|_{∞} \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+nτ} λ(u)du \right),
\]
where \( C_τ = C_τ \tilde{c} \), and \( C_τ \) is a constant appearing in Proposition 4.9.

Step III: Let \( A ⊂ ℝ^d \) be a closed set, take \( ϕ = 1_A \), and consider the sequence \( (ϕ_m)_{m∈ℕ} \) of functions defined by
\[
ϕ_m(x) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } x ∈ A, \\
1 - 2^m d(x, A), & \text{if } d(x, A) ≤ 2^{-m}, \\
0, & \text{if } d(x, A) ≥ 2^{-m},
\end{cases}
\]
where \( d(x, A) = \inf\{|x - y| : y ∈ A\}, x ∈ ℝ^d \). Then
\[
ϕ_m(x) → ϕ(x), \text{ as } m → ∞, \text{ for all } x ∈ ℝ^d.
\]
Next, for \( s ∈ [0, τ) \), we have
\[
P_{s+nτ,s}ϕ_m(x) → P_{s+nτ,s}ϕ(x) = P_{s+nτ,s}1_A(x),
\]
which implies that \( P(s, s + nτ, A) = P_{s+nτ,s}1_A ∈ C_0(ℝ^d) \) and, since \( μ_s \) is invariant under \( (P_{s+nτ,s})_{n∈ℕ} \), (4.38) leads to
\[
|P(s, x; s + nτ, A) - μ_s(A)| ≤ C_τ \exp \left( \frac{1}{pq} \int_s^{s+nτ} λ(u)du \right).
\]
By the covering lemma (e.g., [6]), the inequality (4.39) holds for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \), thus for \( \mathcal{J} \subset [0, \tau] \), we have
\[
\int_{\mathcal{J}} |P(s, x; s + n\tau, A) - \mu_s(A)| ds \leq \int_0^\tau |P(s, x; s + n\tau, A) - \mu_s(A)| ds
\]

\[
\leq \mathcal{E}_\tau \int_0^\tau \exp \left( \frac{1}{p} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u) du \right) ds
\]

\[
= \mathcal{E}_\tau \int_0^\tau \exp \left( \frac{1}{pn^\tau} \int_s^{s+n\tau} \lambda(u) du \right)^{n^\tau} ds.
\]

Now, we use the Chapmann–Kolmogorov equation for the transition probability to obtain
\[
\left| \int_{\mathcal{J}} \left[ P(s, x; t+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right] dt \right| = \left| \left[ \int_{\mathcal{J}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P(t, y; t+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right] P(s, x; t, dy) dt \right|
\]

\[
\leq \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}_\tau \exp \left( \frac{1}{pn^\tau} \int_t^{t+n^\tau} \lambda(u) du \right)^{n^\tau} P(s, x; t, dy) dt
\]

\[
= \mathcal{E}_\tau \int_0^\tau \exp \left( \frac{1}{pn^\tau} \int_t^{t+n\tau} \lambda(u) du \right)^{n^\tau} dt.
\]

By condition (4.12) of Assumption 4.3, there exists \( 0 < \beta < 1 \), \( 0 < K < \infty \), such that
\[
\left| \int_{\mathcal{J}} \left[ P(s, x; t+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right] dt \right| \leq \int_{\mathcal{J}} \left| P(s, x; t+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right| dt \leq K\beta^{n\tau}.
\]

It then follows that
\[
\frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathcal{J}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right\} dt \mu_s(dx) ds \leq \frac{K}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \beta^{n\tau} \to 0. \quad (4.40)
\]

Step IV: In this step, with the help of Step III, we show the convergence of Krylov-Bogolyubov scheme for periodic measures \( (\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \in [0, \tau]} \) on the cylinder \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\). For any \( \mathcal{J} \times A \in \mathcal{B}([0, \tau]) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) we have
\[
\int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tilde{P}(0, (s, x); t+n\tau, \mathcal{J} \times A) - \tilde{\mu}_t(\mathcal{J} \times A) \right| dt \mu(ds dx)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\tau \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tilde{P}(0, (s, x); t+n\tau, \mathcal{J} \times A) - \tilde{\mu}_t(\mathcal{J} \times A) \right) dt \mu_s(dx) ds
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\tau \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t+s+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \delta_{(t+s \mod \tau)}(\mathcal{J}) dt \mu_s(dx) ds
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\tau-s}^\tau \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t+s+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{J}) dt \mu_s(dx) ds
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^{\tau-s} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t+s+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \delta_{(t+s-r)}(\mathcal{J}) dt \mu_s(dx) ds
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\tau-s}^\tau \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t+s+n\tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{J}) dt
\]
\[ + \int_{-s}^{0} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} P(s, x; t + n \tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{F}) dt \left| \mu_s(dx) ds \right. \]
\[ = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} \left\| \mathcal{F} \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t + n \tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \right) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{F}) dt \right\| \mu_s(dx) ds \]
\[ \leq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} \left\| \mathcal{F} \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} P(s, x; t + n \tau, A) - \mu_t(A) \right) \right) dt \right\| \mu_s(dx) ds \]
\[ + \frac{1}{N \tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( P(s, x; t + s, A) - P(s, x; t + s + N \tau, A) \right) \delta_{(t+s)}(\mathcal{F}) dt \left| \mu_s(dx) ds \right. \]
\[ \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square \]

**Example 4.11** (Stochastic Lorenz model with periodic forcing). Consider a modified Lorenz system (e.g., [32]) given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= -ax + ay, \\
\dot{y} &= -bx + yz, \\
\dot{z} &= -bz + xy - b(r + a),
\end{align*}
\]

with parameters \(a, b, r > 0\). We set \(v = (v_1, v_2, v_3) = (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3\), and consider the periodically and stochastically perturbed version of (4.41) in the form

\[ dv_t = b(t, v_t)dt + \sigma(v_t)dW_t = \left[ - Av_t - G(v_t) + F(t) \right] dt + \sigma(v_t)dW_t, \quad v_s = v_0, \quad (4.42) \]

where

\[ A = \begin{bmatrix}
a & -a & 0 \\
a & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & b
\end{bmatrix}, \quad G(v) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
v_1v_3 \\
-v_1v_2
\end{bmatrix}, \quad F(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
f + \gamma \sin \left( \frac{2\pi}{\tau} t \right) \\
0 \\
-b(r + a)
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma(v) = \tilde{\sigma} = \begin{bmatrix}
v_1 & 0 & 0 \\
v_2 & 0 & 0 \\
v_3 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \]

with \(|\gamma| \leq |f| < \infty\) and \(\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^3\) finite, \(0 < \tau < \infty\), and \(W_t = (W_t^1, W_t^2, W_t^3)\) an independent Wiener process on \(\mathbb{R}^3\). It is well-known that for \(\tilde{\sigma} = 0\) the system (4.42) has an absorbing ball for all values of the parameters, since for \(V(t, v) = |v|^2\) we have

\[ \frac{1}{2} \frac{dV}{dt} = \langle b(v), v \rangle = -a \left( v_1 - \frac{F_t}{2a} \right)^2 - v_2^2 - b \left( v_3 + \frac{r + a}{2} \right)^2 + ab(r + a)^2 + \frac{F_t^2}{4a}, \]

where we skip the explicit time dependence and \(F_t = f + \gamma \sin \left( \frac{2\pi}{\tau} t \right)\). Note that the drift and diffusion coefficients, \(b, \sigma\), in (4.42) are smooth and satisfy the growth conditions (4.14) outlined in Remark 4.17(a); since for \(0 < \alpha_1, \alpha_3 < \infty\), and \(\hat{F}_1 = \sup_{[0, \tau]} |F_1(t)|\) we have

\[ \langle b(v), v \rangle \leq -a \left( 1 - \frac{\hat{F}_1}{4a\alpha_1} \right) v_1^2 - v_2^2 - b \left( 1 - \frac{r + a}{4\alpha_3} \right) v_3^2 + \hat{F}_1 \alpha_1 + b(r + a)\alpha_3, \]

where we used the fact that \(|x| \leq \alpha + \frac{1}{4\alpha} |x|^2\) for \(\alpha > 0\). Thus, we have

\[ \langle b(v), v \rangle \leq L_{b_1} - L_{b_2} |v|^2, \quad \|\sigma(v)\|^2_{hs} \leq L_\sigma \left( 1 + |v|^2 \right), \quad (4.43) \]
where
\[ L_{b_1} = \alpha_1 \bar{F}_1 + \alpha_3 b(r + a), \quad L_{b_2} = \min \left( 1, a \left( 1 - \frac{\bar{F}_1}{4 \alpha_1} \right), b \left( 1 - \frac{r + a}{4 \alpha_3} \right) \right), \quad L_\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}, \] (4.44)
with \( \alpha_1, \alpha_3 \) sufficiently large so that \( L_{b_2} > 0 \). Thus, (4.42) has global strong solutions and it generates a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms on \( \mathbb{R}^3 \).

Next, note that the linear part in (4.42) satisfies
\[ \langle Av, v \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \geq \beta |v|^2, \quad \beta = \min \{1, a, b\}, \]
and the nonlinear term \( G(v) = B(v, v) \) is given by a bilinear map \( B(v, w) = (0, v_1 w_3, -v_1 w_2) \), \( v, w \in \mathbb{R}^3 \), which satisfies
\[
\begin{align*}
&\langle B(v, w), w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle (0, v_1 w_3, -v_1 w_2), (w_1, w_2, w_3) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = 0, \\
&\langle B(v, w), v \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = \langle (0, v_1 w_3, -v_1 w_2), (u_1, u_2, u_3) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} = -\langle B(v, u), w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}.
\end{align*}
\] (4.45)
Consider \( V(t, v) = |v|^p \) for some \( 1 < p < \infty \), so that
\[ \partial_v V(t, v) = p v|v|^{p-2}, \quad \partial_{vv} V(t, v) = p(p-2)v|v|^{p-4} + \delta_{ij} p|v|^{p-2}. \]
Based on (4.45), we have
\[ \langle G(v) - G(w), v - w \rangle = \langle B(v - w, v) - B(v - w, w) \rangle \leq |v - w|^2 |v|, \] (4.46)
so that
\[ \mathcal{L}^{(2)} V(t, v - w) = p\langle -Av + Aw - G(v) + G(w), v - w \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} |v - w|^{p-2} \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \left[ (v_i - w_i)(\sigma_i(v) - \sigma_i(w))(\sigma_j(v) - \sigma_j(w))(v_i - w_j)p(p-2)|v - w|^{p-4} \right. \]
\[ \left. + \delta_{ij} p(\sigma_i(v) - \sigma_i(w))(\sigma_j(v) - \sigma_j(w)) |v - w|^{p-2} \right] \]
\[ \leq p|v||v - w|^p - p\beta |v - w|^p + \frac{3}{2} \delta^2 p(p-1)|v - w|^p, \] (4.47)
where \( \mathcal{L}^{(2)} \) is the two-point generator associated with (4.42). Next, choose \( p \) such that for \( v, w \in L^{p+1}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t^g, \mathbb{P}) \) and \( 0 < E|v - w|^p \). Then, from Jensen’s inequality we have
\[ 0 < E|v - w|^p \leq (E|v - w|^{p+1})^{p/(p+1)} < \infty, \] (4.48)
while the Hölder inequality leads to
\[ E[|v||v - w|^p] = \| |v||v - w|^p \|_1 \leq \|v\|_{p+1}(E|v - w|^{p+1})^{p/(p+1)}. \] (4.49)
The bounds (4.48) and (4.49) imply that there exists a constant \( 1 \leq C_p < \infty \) such that
\[ (E|v - w|^{p+1})^{p/(p+1)} = C_p E|v - w|^p. \] (4.50)
Combining (4.50), (4.49), and (4.47) leads to
\[ E[\mathcal{L}^{(2)} V(t, v - w)] \leq -\lambda_p E[V(t, v - w)], \]
\[ \text{where } \lambda_p := (E[|X|^p])^{1/p}. \]
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\[ \phi(t, 0, \omega, \xi) - \phi(t, 0, \omega, \eta) \]

\[ \phi(2\pi n, 0, \omega, \xi), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \ n \gg 1 \]

**Figure 1.** Illustration of some aspects of the dynamics of the stochastic Lorenz model with time-periodic forcing (4.42) with flow of solutions \( \{\phi(t, 0, \omega, \cdot), \ t \geq 0\} \) in two different regimes. The top row corresponds to the regime in which the time-periodic measure exists and is supported on stable random periodic orbits of (4.42); the top-right inset shows a finite sample from this measure on a Poincare section (i.e., on the subspace \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) of \( \mathcal{M} = [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \)). The top-left inset illustrates the relationship in (4.52) in the case when \( \lim_{t \to \infty} \lambda_p(t) < 0 \) and random periodic orbits exist (see text and Theorem 4.6); colours denote path-wise evolution of \( |\phi(t, 0, \omega, \xi) - \phi(t, 0, \omega, \eta)| \) for fixed \( \xi, \eta \), and the dotted black line denotes \( \mathbb{E}[|\phi(t, 0, \cdot, \xi) - \phi(t, 0, \cdot, \eta)|] \). The bottom row illustrates a regime where \( \lim_{t \to \infty} |\phi(t, 0, \omega, \xi) - \phi(t, 0, \omega, \eta)| > 0 \) and existence of random periodic orbits and periodic measures cannot be guaranteed. Parameters in (4.42) are: \( a = 10, b = 8/3, r = 28, \tau = 2\pi, \gamma = 0/9, \hat{\sigma} = 0.2, \) and \( f = 120 \) (top row), \( f = 23 \) (bottom row).

where \( \lambda_p = p(\beta - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}(p - 1) - C_p\|v\|_{p+1}) \). Now, for \( v_t = \phi(t, s, \omega, \xi), w_t = \phi(t, s, \omega, \eta) \) solving (4.42), we have from the above

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}^{(2)}V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta))\right] \leq -\lambda_p(t, s) \mathbb{E}\left[V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta))\right],
\]

so that combining Itô’s lemma

\[
d\mathbb{E}\left[V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta))\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}^{(2)}V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta))\right],
\]

with (4.51) we obtain

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[V(t, \phi(t, s, \xi) - \phi(t, s, \eta))\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[V(s, \xi - \eta)\right] \exp\left(-\int_s^t \lambda_p(r, s)dr\right),
\]

(4.52)

Thus, in order for Assumption 4.3(ii) to hold, it is sufficient to require that

\[
\beta - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}(p - 1) - \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t C_p(u, s)\|\phi(u, s, \xi)\|_{p+1}du > 0.
\]
Finally, we choose \( V(t, v) = |v|^2 \) and note that (see (A.15)-(A.16) in Appendix A)
\[
\lim_{(t-s) \to \infty} \|\phi(t, s, \xi)\|_3 = \left( \frac{27}{4} \right)^{1/3} \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right)^{1/2},
\]
and algebraic manipulations lead to
\[
\beta - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma} - \hat{C} \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right)^{1/2} > 0, \quad \hat{C} = \left( \frac{27}{4} \right)^{1/3} \lim_{(t-s) \to \infty} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t C_2(u, s) du,
\]
where \( L_{b_1}, L_{b_2}, \) and \( L_\sigma \) for the system (4.42) are given in (4.44).

Therefore, by Theorem 4.6, we conclude that the time-periodically forced stochastic Lorenz equation (4.42) admits a family of periodic measures \( \{\mu_t : t \in [0, \tau]\} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \) supported on stable periodic solutions of (4.42) lifted to \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^3\) and \( \sigma \neq 0 \), Assumption 4.5 holds in addition to Assumption 4.3 and Theorem 4.10 implies existence of ergodic \( \tau \)-periodic measures \( \hat{\mu}_t = \delta_{t \mod \tau} \otimes \mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \) in the sense of Definition 4.7. Numerical illustration of the convergence in (4.52) is provided in Figure 1 alongside a sample from the density of the ergodic measure supported on the attractor containing stable random periodic orbits.

5. Linear response in the random periodic regime

In this section we derive linear response formulas and fluctuation-dissipation type results for time-periodically forced SDE’s in the same class as those possessing time-periodic measures supported on random periodic solutions (§4.2), or with ergodic time-periodic measures discussed in §4.3, under additional assumptions. First, we derive a linear response formula for perturbing ‘equilibrium’ dynamics associated with \( \tau \)-periodic ergodic measures. Then, we consider the linear response for perturbing equilibrium dynamics associated with \( \tau \)-periodic measure under stronger conditions, assuming that the perturbed dynamics has also \( \tau \)-periodic ergodic measures; such a setup can be realised, under appropriate assumptions, when the amplitude of time-periodic coefficients is modulated. We conclude with an example of periodically forced stochastic Lorenz model used earlier in Example 4.11 and discuss some further details in §5.3. In principle, the results discussed in this section apply to a wider class of SDE’s generating time-periodic measures under less stringent conditions than those in Assumption 4.3, however, establishing conditions for the existence and ergodicity of such measures in a more general setting is not trivial and is beyond the scope of this work.

5.1. Setup and assumptions. Consider the following parameterised SDE on \( \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^d \)
\[
dX_t^\alpha = \hat{b}(t, \alpha(t), X_t^\alpha) dt + \hat{\sigma}(t, \alpha(t), X_t^\alpha) dW_t, \quad X_0^\alpha = x, \ x \sim \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d),
\]
where \( t \mapsto \hat{b}(t, 0, \cdot) = b(t, \cdot), \ t \mapsto \hat{\sigma}(t, 0, \cdot) = \sigma(t, \cdot), \ t \in \mathcal{T} := [0, T] \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \) are \( \tau \)-periodic and coincide with the coefficients in (2.1), and \( \alpha(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathbb{R}) \) will be assumed sufficiently small in the sequel. Similar to §4, we consider the Wiener probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}), \mathcal{F} := C_0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m), \mathcal{B} \) Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra on \( \Omega, \) with the probability measure \( \mathbb{P} \) on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) induced by an \( m \)-dimensional Wiener process \( W_t \). Furthermore, we assume that there exists a proper interval \( \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) containing \( \alpha = 0 \) such that, for \( \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \) the coefficients \( \hat{b}(t, \alpha, \cdot), \hat{\sigma}(t, \alpha, \cdot) \) are sufficiently regular for (5.1) to have global solutions on \( \mathcal{T} \) which induce a flow of diffeomorphisms on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) (cf. Theorem 3.5), i.e.,
\[
X_t^\alpha(\omega) = \phi^\alpha(t, 0, \omega, x) \ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.
\]
The flow \( \{\phi^\alpha(t,0,\omega,\cdot) : t \in \mathcal{I}\} \) induced by (5.1) has a one-point generator
\[
\mathcal{L}_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \hat{b}_i(t,\alpha(t),x)\partial_{x_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \hat{a}_{ij}(t,\alpha(t),x)\partial_{x_ix_j}, \quad \hat{a} := \hat{\sigma}\hat{a}^T. \tag{5.2}
\]

As in the previous sections, we lift the SDE (5.1) to \( \mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}^d \) to obtain dynamics in the form
\[
dX^\alpha_t = \hat{b}(\alpha(t),X^\alpha_t)dt + \hat{\sigma}(\alpha(t),X^\alpha_t)dW_t, \quad X^\alpha_0 = \tilde{x}, \quad \tilde{x} \sim \tilde{\mu}_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}^d), \tag{5.3}
\]
where \( \tilde{x} = (s,x) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \tilde{\mu}_0 = \mu_0 \otimes \delta_0(s) \), \( \hat{W}_t = (0,W_t)^T \) with \( W_t \) and
\[
\hat{b}(\alpha,(s,x)) = (1,\hat{b}(s,\alpha,x))^T, \quad \hat{\sigma}(\alpha,(s,x)) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\sigma}(s,\alpha,x) \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Note that one can take \( \tilde{\mu}_0 \) to be the \( \tau \)-periodic measure of the ‘unperturbed’ dynamics in (4.4), assuming such a measure exists (i.e., if conditions of Theorem 4.6 are satisfied).

Finally, the generator of the lifted one-point motion is given by \( \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\alpha = \partial_s + \mathcal{L}_\alpha \), and the diffeomorphism \( \tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}^\alpha(t,\omega,\tilde{x}) \in [0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \), is defined analogously to that in (5.7); namely, take \( s \equiv (s \mod \tau) \) and set
\[
\tilde{\Phi}^\alpha(t,\omega,(s,x)) := (t+s \mod \tau, \phi^\alpha(t+s,s,\theta_{-s}\omega,x)), \quad s \in [0,\tau], t \in \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{5.4}
\]

By construction (or by a simple calculation; see e.g., [69]), one can check that if \( \mu_\alpha^\tau \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) is a solution of the forward Kolmogorov equation with the operator \( \mathcal{L}_\alpha^\tau \), then \( \tilde{\mu}_0 = \mu_\alpha^\tau \otimes \delta_{t+s \mod \tau} \) solves the lifted equation on \( [0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \hat{\mathcal{L}}_\alpha^\tau \). However, in contrast to (4.7), \( \tilde{\Phi}^\alpha \) does not necessarily generate a cocycle, unless \( \phi^\alpha \) is induced by the solutions of (5.1) with \( \hat{b}(t,\alpha(t),x), \hat{\sigma}(t,\alpha(t),x), \tau \)-time-periodic (e.g., for \( \alpha = 0 \)) when the results of [44] hold under appropriate assumptions.

In the sequel, we impose the following conditions which reduce to Assumption 4.3 when \( \alpha = 0 \):

**Assumption 5.1.** Let \( V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^+) \) such that \( V(t,0) = 0 \) for all \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), and the coefficients \( \hat{b}(t,\alpha,x), \hat{\sigma}(t,\alpha,x) \) in (5.1) be such that for an interval \( \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) containing \( \alpha = 0 \) the following hold:

(i) There exist functions \( \lambda_\alpha \in L^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}) \) with \( \mathcal{A} \ni \alpha \mapsto \lambda_\alpha(t) \) bounded for \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), and a constant \( 1 \leq C < \infty \) such that for all \( x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and some \( 1 < p < \infty \) we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ |x|^p \leq V(t,x) \leq C|x|^p, \\
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_\alpha^{(2)}V(t,x-y)] \leq \lambda_\alpha(t)\mathbb{E}[V(t,x-y)]. \tag{5.5}
\end{align*}
\]
where
\[
\mathcal{L}_\alpha^{(2)}V(t,x-y) = \partial_t V(t,x-y) + D_x V(t,x-y) b_\alpha(t,x,y)
+ \frac{1}{2} \text{trace} \left( \sigma_\alpha(t,x,y)^T D_x^2 V(t,x-y) \sigma_\alpha(t,x,y)^T \right),
\]
with \( b_\alpha(t,x,y) := \hat{b}(t,\alpha,x) - \hat{b}(t,\alpha,y), \sigma_\alpha(t,x,y) := \hat{\sigma}(t,\alpha,x) - \hat{\sigma}(t,\alpha,y). \)

(ii) There exists \( \tilde{\lambda} > 0 \) such that
\[
\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t \lambda_\alpha(u)du \right\} < -\tilde{\lambda} < 0, \tag{5.6}
\]
(iii) Given the one-point motion \( \phi^\alpha(t, s, \omega, \xi), \ s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \ t \geq s, \) and \( \xi \in L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}), \) there exists \( 0 < K_\alpha < \infty \) independent of \( s, t \) such that

\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \mathbb{E} [V(t, \phi^\alpha(t, s, \omega, \xi)) - \xi] < K_\alpha. \tag{5.7}
\]

In addition to Assumption [5.1] we impose the following regularity conditions, which will facilitate verification of the non-degeneracy condition required to assert the strong Feller property of the flows induced by [5.1] in the last theorem of this section which is concerned with the linear response when both the unperturbed and perturbed measures \( \tau \)-periodic and ergodic.

**Assumption 5.2.** Denote the columns of \( \tilde{\sigma} \) by \( \tilde{\sigma}_k, 1 \leq k \leq m, \) and assume that the following conditions are satisfied for all \( t \in \mathcal{I}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \) with \( \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) a proper interval containing \( \alpha = 0:\)

(i) \( D^\alpha_n \tilde{b}(t, \alpha, \cdot) \in \tilde{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \ n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \) and \( t \mapsto \tilde{b}(t, \cdot, \cdot) \) is differentiable on \( \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \)

(ii) \( D^\alpha_n \tilde{\sigma}_k(t, \alpha, \cdot) \in \tilde{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \ n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \) and \( t \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}_k(t, \cdot, \cdot) \) is differentiable on \( \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \) and

\[ |\partial_t \partial^\alpha_n \tilde{\sigma}_k(t, \alpha, x)| \leq C < \infty, \ (t, \alpha, x) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \ 1 \leq k \leq m. \]

for any multi-index \( \beta. \)

(ii) The Hörmander Lie bracket condition holds for \( t \in \mathcal{I}, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \) i.e.,

\[ \dim(\text{span Lie} \{ \tilde{\sigma}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m \})(t, \alpha, x) = d. \]

Equivalently, there exists \( N(\alpha, x) = N \in \mathbb{N}, \ C_N(\alpha, x) = C_N > 0 \) such that for all \( \eta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \)

\[ \inf_{t \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{t=0}^N \sum_{Z \in \Sigma_t} (\eta \cdot Z)^2(t, \alpha, x) \geq C_N, \]

where \( \Sigma_0 = \{ \tilde{\sigma}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m \}, \) \( \Sigma_{t+1} = [\{ \tilde{\sigma}_k, Z : 1 \leq k \leq m, \ Z \in \Sigma_t \}. \) Here, \( [F, G](t, \alpha, x) \) is the Lie bracket between the vector fields \( F \) and \( G \) defined by

\[ [F, G](t, \alpha, x) := D_x G(t, \alpha, x) F(t, \alpha, x) - D_x F(t, \alpha, x) G(t, \alpha, x). \]

With the above assumptions, we derive fluctuation-dissipation formulas in the context of linear response for SDEs in the random periodic regime. We start with the definition of a response function which might be interpreted as describing a change of statistical averages w.r.t. the invariant measure associated with the ‘unperturbed’ regime \( (\alpha = 0) \) of the dynamics in [5.3].

**Definition 5.3** (Linear Response Function). Consider a family of statistical observables

\[ \mathbb{P}_\varphi^\alpha(t, \alpha) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\tilde{\Phi}^\alpha(t, \omega, \tilde{x}))] \tilde{\mu}_0(d \tilde{x}) = \langle \mathbb{P}_t^\alpha \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_0 \rangle, \ \varphi \in C_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \tag{5.8}\]

where the Markov semigroup \( \{ \mathbb{P}_t^\alpha \}_{t \geq 0} \) induced by \( \tilde{\Phi}^\alpha \) is are defined in [4.9], the expectation is w.r.t. the law of \( \tilde{\Phi}^\alpha, \) and \( \tilde{\mu}_0 \) is the measure on the initial condition in [5.3]. If there exists a locally integrable function \( \mathcal{R}_\varphi^\alpha \) such that the functional derivative of \( \mathbb{P}_\varphi^\alpha(\cdot, \alpha) \) satisfies

\[ \langle \delta \mathbb{P}_\varphi^\alpha(t, \alpha) |_{\alpha = 0}, \vartheta \rangle = \int_0^t \mathcal{R}_\varphi^\alpha(t - r, \vartheta)dr, \ \vartheta \in C_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \ \vartheta(0) = 0, \]

we say that \( \mathcal{R}_\varphi^\alpha \) is a linear response function due to perturbations of the statistical observable \( \mathbb{P}_\varphi^\alpha. \)

In other words, \( \mathcal{R}_\varphi^\alpha \) can be defined if the functional \( \mathbb{P}_\varphi^\alpha(\cdot, \alpha) \) is Gateaux differentiable at \( \alpha = 0 \)
in the direction of \( \vartheta \in C^\infty_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}) \), and the Gateaux derivative is linear and continuous, i.e.,
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(\cdot, \varepsilon \vartheta)\bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} = \left. \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(\cdot, \alpha)}{\delta \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0} \vartheta,
\]
where the limit in \( \varepsilon \) exists for \( \vartheta \in C^\infty_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}) \), \( \vartheta(0) = 0 \).

The formula (5.9) can be interpreted as a change of the observable to the perturbation in the ‘direction’ of \( \vartheta(t) \). For example, formally, one can take \( \vartheta(t) = \delta_u(t) := \delta(u - t), u \geq 0 \) (i.e., the perturbation is understood in the sense of distributions) so that
\[
\mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t-r, r) = \int_0^t \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t-r, r) \delta_u(r) dr = \left. \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t, \alpha)}{\delta \alpha} \right|_{\alpha=0} \delta_u(t)
\]
\[
= \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t, \varepsilon \delta_u)\right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t, \varepsilon \delta_u) - \mathcal{F}_{\varphi}^{\hat{P}_0}(t, 0) \right]
\]
\[
= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} E[\varphi(\hat{\Phi}^\delta_u(t, \omega, \tilde{x}))] - E[\varphi(\hat{\Phi}(t, \omega, \tilde{x}))] \right] \tilde{\mu}_0(d\tilde{x}).
\]

We start with the following standard and preparatory results.

**Lemma 5.4.** Suppose the coefficients \( \hat{b}(t, \alpha, x) \) and \( \hat{\sigma}(t, \alpha, x) \) in the SDE (5.1) are such that Assumptions 5.1-5.2 are satisfied. Then, for any \( \varphi \in C^\infty_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( 0 \leq r \leq t \leq T \), the function \( v(r, \tilde{x}) := \mathcal{P}^\alpha_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \) with \( \tilde{x} := (s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \), and \( \mathcal{P}^\alpha_t \) defined in (4.9), is the unique bounded classical solution of the backward Kolmogorov equation with the terminal condition
\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_r v(r, \tilde{x}) = -\hat{L}_\alpha v(r, \tilde{x}), & 0 \leq r < t \leq T, \\
v(t, \tilde{x}) = \varphi(\tilde{x}).
\end{cases}
\]
Moreover, for any \( 0 \leq l \leq 3 \), there exists a constant \( K = K(T, \tau, \alpha) > 0 \) such that
\[
\|\mathcal{P}^\alpha_{t-r} \varphi\|_{l, \infty} \leq K \|\varphi\|_{l, \infty}, \quad \varphi \in C^l([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 \leq r < t \leq T,
\]
where \( \|\varphi\|_{l, \infty} = \|\varphi\|_{\infty} + \sum_{1 \leq |\beta| \leq l} \|D^\beta \varphi\|_{\infty} \).

**Proof.** See (e.g., [67, 85]). \( \square \)

**Definition 5.5** (\( \alpha \)-linearised generator). Given the infinitesimal generator \( \hat{L}_\alpha = \partial_s + \mathcal{L}_\alpha \) with \( \mathcal{L}_\alpha \) defined in (5.2), the \( \alpha \)-linearised generator is defined by
\[
\hat{V}_{\varphi}(\tilde{x}) = G(\tilde{x})D_x \varphi(\tilde{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}\left( R(\tilde{x})D^2_x \varphi(\tilde{x}) \right), \quad \tilde{x} = (s, x), \quad \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d),
\]
where
\[
G(\tilde{x}) = \partial_t \hat{b}(s, \alpha, x)|_{\alpha=0}, \quad R(\tilde{x}) := \sigma(s, x)H^T(s, x) + \sigma(s, x)H(s, x),
\]
with \( H \) a matrix field with components \( H_{ik}(s, x) = \partial_i \hat{\sigma}_{ik}(s, \alpha, x)|_{\alpha=0}, 1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq d \). The \( L^2(\tilde{x}) \) dual of \( \hat{V} \) is given by
\[
\hat{V}^* \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) = -D_x \left( G(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}\left( D^2_x R(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) \right), \quad \tilde{x} = (s, x), \quad \tilde{\rho} \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
\]

**Proposition 5.6.** Suppose that \( \hat{b}(t, \alpha, x) \) and \( \hat{\sigma}(t, \alpha, x) \) in (5.1) satisfy Assumption 5.2(i)-(ii), and that the measure on the initial conditions of the solution of \( \tilde{X}_{t-r}, 0 \leq r \leq t \leq T \) of (5.1)
with $\alpha = 0$ has all absolute moments finite. Let $g_{t,\alpha} : [0,t] \times [0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$
g_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{x}) = \tilde{V} \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}), \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \phi \in C^2_{\infty}([0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

(5.14)

Then, there exists a constant $C = C(T, \tau, \alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|g_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{X}_r)| \leq C\|\phi\|_{2,\infty}.$$  

(5.15)

**Proof.** For $(s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, one can obtain directly from (5.12) that

$$g_a(r, \tilde{x}) = \tilde{V} \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) = G(\tilde{x}) D_x \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( R(\tilde{x}) D^2_x \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) \right).$$

The regularity and growth conditions on $\hat{t}$, $\hat{r}$ in Assumption 5.2 ensure the existence of global solutions $\tilde{X}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. If the moments of the initial condition are finite, then a standard calculation utilising Itô’s lemma guarantees existence of finite moments and for $T < \infty$ (cf. Theorem 3.3 and derivations similar to those in Appendix A.2). Thus, there exists a constant $L = L(T, \tau, \alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|g_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{X}_r)| \leq L \sup_{0 \leq r \leq t \leq T} \|\tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi\|_{2,\infty}.$$  

(5.16)

By the second part of Lemma 5.4 there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq t \leq T} \|\tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi\|_{2,\infty} \leq K \|\phi\|_{2,\infty}.$$  

(5.17)

so that combining (5.16) and (5.17) leads to (5.15). For $T \to \infty$, additional constraints on the growth conditions on $\hat{b}$ may have to be imposed (see, Remark 4.4 and Appendix A) to guarantee existence of at most fourth absolute moments. Given Assumption 5.2 higher-order coefficients including $\partial^n \hat{b}$, $\partial^n \hat{r}$ can be treated analogously since the growth conditions remain unchanged. \qed

**Lemma 5.7.** Suppose conditions of Proposition 5.6 and condition (5.7) of Assumption 5.1 hold. Then for any $\phi \in C^2_{\infty}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $0 \leq r \leq t \leq T$, when $\|\alpha\|_{\infty}$ is sufficiently small, we have

$$\tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) = \int_r^t \tilde{P}_{s-r}^\alpha (\tilde{L}_\alpha - \tilde{L}) \tilde{P}_{s-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) ds.$$  

(5.18)

**Proof.** For $\tilde{x} := (s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|\alpha\|_{\infty}$ sufficiently small, $u(r, \tilde{x}) = \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{P}_{t-r}^\alpha \phi(\tilde{x})$ is a bounded classical solution of

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_r u(r, \tilde{x}) = -\tilde{L} u(r, \tilde{x}) - \alpha(r) \hat{g}_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{x}), \\
u(t, \tilde{x}) = 0,
\end{cases}$$

where $\hat{g}_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{x}) = g_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ with $g_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{x})$ defined in (5.14). Next, set $\alpha = 0$ in (5.3) and consider $X_r(\omega) = \tilde{X}(r, \omega, \cdot)$ which coincides with solutions of (4.4). Then, we have by Itô’s formula

$$du(r, \tilde{X}_r) = \left[ \partial_r u(r, \tilde{X}_r) + \tilde{L} u(r, \tilde{X}_r) \right] dr + D_x u(r, \tilde{X}_r)^T \tilde{\sigma}(r, \tilde{X}_r) d\tilde{W}_r$$

$$= -\alpha(r) \hat{g}_{t,\alpha}(r, \tilde{X}_r) dr + D_x u(r, \tilde{X}_r)^T \tilde{\sigma}(r, \tilde{X}_r) d\tilde{W}_r.$$  

If $|\tilde{x}| < R$ and $r < \varsigma < t \leq T$, we have

$$u(r, \tilde{x}) = \mathbb{E}[u(\varsigma \wedge T_R, \tilde{X}_{\varsigma \wedge T_R}) | \tilde{X}_{\varsigma \wedge T_R} = \tilde{x}] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_r^\varsigma \alpha(\zeta) \hat{g}_{t,\alpha}(\zeta, \tilde{X}_\zeta) d\zeta \bigg| \tilde{X}_{\varsigma \wedge T_R} = \tilde{x} \right].$$

where $T_R = \inf\{r \in [0, t] : |\tilde{X}_r| = R\}$ is the hitting time of the sphere \( \{ \tilde{x} \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d : |\tilde{x}| = R\} \) by $\tilde{X}_r$. Since $\tilde{X}_r$ is non-explosive (Assumption 5.3(iii)) and $u \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, t] \times [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have
\[
\lim_{\zeta \to t} \lim_{R \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u(\zeta \land T_R, \tilde{X}_{\zeta \land T_R})|\tilde{X}_t = \tilde{x}\right] = \lim_{\zeta \to t} \mathbb{E}\left[u(\zeta, \tilde{X}_{\zeta})|\tilde{X}_t = \tilde{x}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[u(t, \tilde{X}_t)\right] = 0.
\]
It follows from Proposition 5.6 that by the dominated convergence theorem, we arrive at
\[
u(r, \tilde{x}) = \int_r^t \mathbb{E}\left[\mu(\zeta)\frac{d}{d\zeta}(\tilde{X}_\zeta)\right] d\zeta
= \int_r^t \tilde{P}_{t-r}(\tilde{L}_r - \tilde{L})(\tilde{X}_{t-r}) d\zeta.
\]

5.2. Linear response and fluctuation-dissipation formulas for time-periodic measures.
Here, we derive a general expression for the linear response function characterising the change in an observable to small perturbations for dynamics in the random periodic regime which induces time-periodic ergodic measures (see §4). This is followed by deriving more tractable representation of the response function in terms of fluctuation-dissipation type formulas which allow to express the change in observables through statistical characteristics of the unperturbed dynamics.

**Proposition 5.8 (Linear response).** Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 are satisfied so that the family of Markov semigroups \( \{\tilde{P}_t^\alpha : (t, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times A\} \) induced by the SDE \( \tilde{X}^\alpha \) admit \( \tau \)-periodic measures \( (\tilde{\mu}_t)_{t \geq 0} \) at \( \alpha = 0 \) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \) such that \( \tilde{\mu}_t(d\tilde{x}) = \tilde{\mu}_t(\tilde{x})d\tilde{x} \). Given the observable \( F^\alpha_{t,0}(t, \alpha) = \langle \tilde{P}_t^\alpha \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_0 \rangle \) in (5.8), we have for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( \vartheta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}) \),
\[
\langle \frac{\delta F^\alpha_{t,0}(t, \alpha)}{\delta \alpha} \big|_{\alpha = 0}, \vartheta \rangle = \int_0^t \tilde{R}_{\varphi}^0(t-r, \vartheta) d\vartheta dr,
\]
with the linear response function given by
\[
\tilde{R}_{\varphi}^0(t-r, \vartheta) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi (\tilde{V}^\vartheta (\tilde{x})) d\tilde{x}, \tag{5.19}
\]
where \( \tilde{V}^\vartheta \) is defined in (5.13).

**Proof.** First, we show that for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( \vartheta \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}) \) and \( 0 \leq r \leq t \),
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\varepsilon \vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{P}_{t} \varphi(\tilde{x})\right] = \int_0^t \vartheta(r) \tilde{P}_{t} (\vartheta \tilde{L}) \tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) dr,
\]
with \( \vartheta \) defined in (5.12). To this end, it follows from Lemma 5.7 that for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, \[
\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\varepsilon \vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{P}_{t} \varphi(\tilde{x})\right] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \vartheta(r) \tilde{P}_{t} (\vartheta \tilde{L}) \tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) dr = \int_0^t \vartheta(r) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_\varepsilon(r, \tilde{X}_r)] dr,
\]
where \( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_\varepsilon(r, \tilde{x})] = \mathbb{E}[\vartheta \tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) + O(\varepsilon)] \) is bounded and \( \tilde{X}_r(\omega) = \tilde{X}_r(\vartheta, \cdot, \cdot) \).

By Proposition 5.6 and the dominated convergence theorem, we have
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{P}_{t-r}^{\varepsilon \vartheta} \varphi(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{P}_{t} \varphi(\tilde{x})\right] = \int_0^t \vartheta(r) \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \tilde{g}_\varepsilon(r, \tilde{X}_r)\right] dr = \int_0^t \vartheta(r) \mathbb{E}[\vartheta \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{X}_r)] dr.
\]

Using Fubini’s theorem, we have
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon} \varphi - \hat{P}_{t} \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_{0} \rangle = \int_{0}^{t} \vartheta(r) \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} \tilde{P}_{r} \left( V \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \right) \tilde{\mu}_{0}(d\tilde{x}) dr
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{t} \vartheta(r) \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} V \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \left( \tilde{P}_{r}^{*} \tilde{\mu}_{0} \right)(d\tilde{x}) dr
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{t} \vartheta(r) \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} V \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \hat{\mu}_{r}(d\tilde{x}) dr.
\]

By the Hörmander Lie bracket condition in Assumption 5.2 there exists \( 0 < \rho_{\tau} \in C_{\alpha}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}) \cap L^{1}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}) \) such that \( (\tilde{P}_{r}^{*} \tilde{\mu}_{0})(d\tilde{x}) = \hat{\mu}_{r}(d\tilde{x}) = \rho_{\tau}(d\tilde{x}) \). Thus,
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon} \varphi - \hat{P}_{t} \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_{0} \rangle = \int_{0}^{t} \vartheta(r) \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} V \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \rho_{\tau}(d\tilde{x}) dr
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{t} \left( \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \rho_{\tau}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} \right) \vartheta(r) dr.
\]

Finally, by the definition of the response functional \( \mathcal{R}_{\varphi} \) we have for \( \vartheta \in C_{\alpha}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{+}, \mathbb{R}) \), that
\[
\int_{0}^{t} \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^{\tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon}} (t-r, \tau) \vartheta(r) dr = \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{P}_{t} \tilde{P}_{0}^{\varepsilon}}{\delta \alpha} \right)_{\alpha=0}^{\vartheta}
\]
\[
= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[ \tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon}(t, \vartheta) - \tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon}(t, 0) \right]
\]
\[
= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\langle \tilde{P}_{t}^{\varepsilon} \varphi - \hat{P}_{t} \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_{0} \right\rangle
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{t} \left( \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}} \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \rho_{\tau}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} \right) \vartheta(r) dr.
\]

Given the general framework for the linear response in the time-periodic regime, we now derive a set of more tractable representations of the response function (5.19) via formulas exploiting the asymptotic statistical properties of the unperturbed dynamics; in line with terminology inherited from statistical physics, these are termed ‘fluctuation-dissipation’ formulas. The first set of results in Theorem 5.10 shadows and formalises formulas derived in [69], while the results in Theorem 5.12 concern the linear response in situations when perturbations do not destroy (in an appropriate sense) the periodicity of the unperturbed asymptotic dynamics.

**Definition 5.9** (Correlation function). Given the stochastic flow \( \hat{\Phi}(t, \omega, \cdot) \) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^{d}\), and \( \varphi, \psi \in C_{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\infty}) \), the correlation of the random variables \( \varphi(\hat{\Phi}(t, \cdot, \cdot)) \) and \( \psi(\hat{\Phi}(t, \cdot, \cdot)) \) for \( 0 \leq r \leq t \) is given by
\[
\mathbb{E}(\varphi(\hat{\Phi}(t, \cdot, \cdot)) \psi(\hat{\Phi}(r, \cdot, \cdot))) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{r} \left( \psi \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t-r} \varphi \right),
\]
where the equality above follows from the Markov property of the RDS \( \Phi \) in [4.7]. The correlation function based on \( \varphi, \psi \in C_{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{\infty}) \) and \( \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^{\infty}) \) is defined as
\[
K_{\varphi, \psi}^{\tilde{\mu}}(t-r, r) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{\infty}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{r} \left( \psi \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t-r} \varphi \right) d\tilde{\mu}, \quad 0 \leq r \leq t.
\]

**Theorem 5.10** (FDT I). Let Assumption 5.1 be satisfied for \( \alpha = 0 \), and Assumption 5.2 be satisfied for \( \alpha \in \mathcal{A} \). Then, the following hold:
(i) There exists a family \( \tilde{\mu}_t \) of \( \tau \)-periodic measures, \( \tilde{\mu}_t \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \), and a uniquely ergodic measure, \( \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \), generated by a stochastic flow of diffeomorphisms \( \Phi(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0 \) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\) solving the SDE \((5.3)\) at \( \alpha = 0 \).

(ii) For any \( \varphi \in C^2_{\infty}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( 0 \leq r \leq t \), the response function in \((5.19)\) is given by

\[
\mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^\mu(t - r, r) = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}^\mu(t - r, r) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}, \quad \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{V}^* \tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{x}) / \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}),
\]

where \( \tilde{\mu}_r(d\tilde{x}) = \tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} \), \( \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}^\mu \) is defined in \((5.21)\), and \( \tilde{V}^* \) is defined in \((5.13)\).

(iii) The linear response to perturbations of the ergodic measure \( \tilde{\mu} \) is given by

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\varphi}(t - r) = \tilde{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}, \quad \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{V}^* \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) / \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}),
\]

where \( \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\varphi}(t - r) := \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^\mu(t - r, 0) \) and \( \tilde{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r) := \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}^\mu(t - r, r) \).

**Proof.** Part (i) is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.10.

For Part (ii), we have from the representation of the response functional \( \mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^\mu \) in \((5.19)\) together with the operator \( \tilde{V}^* \) in \((5.13)\) that, for \( 0 \leq r \leq t \) and \( \varphi \in C^2_{\infty}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \), the following holds

\[
\mathcal{R}_{\varphi}^\mu(t - r, r) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{P}_r \mathbb{V}(\tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x})) d\tilde{x} - \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\varphi}(t - r) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r, r) + \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}.
\]

As regards Part (iii), notice that due to the fact that \( \tilde{P}_r \tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\mu} \) for any \( u \in [0, \tau] \), we have

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\varphi}(t - r) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{P}_r \mathbb{V}(\tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi) d\tilde{x} = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r, r) + \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r, r)\mu_0(d\tilde{x}) = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathbb{B}}(t - r, r),
\]

and the desired result can be derived by following analogous derivations to those above. \( \square \)

**Remark 5.11.**

(i) Theorem 5.10 implies that for a diffusion process \( \{\Phi(t, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq 0\} \) in \((4.7)\) induced by the lifted SDE \((4.4)\) on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\), the change in the value of an observable \( \langle \tilde{P}_t \varphi, \tilde{\mu}_0 \rangle \) based on \( \varphi \in C^2_{\infty}([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) to a small, sufficiently regular perturbation can be represented by the correlation function of \( \varphi \) and \( \mathbb{B} = \hat{V}_{\tilde{\mu}}^* \) utilising the unperturbed dynamics/fluctuations.

The operator \( \hat{V} \) defined in \((5.12)\) does not depend on time due to the \( \tau \)-periodicity of the coefficients of \((5.1)\) at \( \alpha = 0 \) and the skew-product formulation on \([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d\).

(ii) The response function \((5.23)\) is amenable to practical approximations since, by ergodicity

\[
\mathcal{R}_{\varphi}(u) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(\tilde{P}_t \Phi(u, \cdot, \tilde{x})) \right] \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} = \lim_{\xi \to \infty} \frac{1}{\xi} \int_0^\xi \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{B}(\tilde{x}) \varphi(\tilde{P}_t \Phi(u + \xi, \omega, \tilde{x})) \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}.
\]
(iii) The conjugate observable $\mathbb{B}_r$ in (5.19) of Theorem 5.10 is unique almost everywhere. To see this, suppose that there exists $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_r \in L^1(\tilde{\mu}_r)$ such that

$$K_{\tilde{\varphi}, \mathbb{B}_r}(t-r, r) = K_{\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_r}(t-r, r), \quad \varphi \in C^2_c([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 \leq r < t.$$  

This implies that

$$\langle \tilde{P}_{t-r} \tilde{\varphi}, \mathbb{B}_r - \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_r \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}_r} = 0, \quad \varphi \in C^2_c([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 \leq r < t.$$ 

Given that $\varphi \in C^2([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is bounded, taking limit as $t \to r$ in the above and applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\langle \varphi, \mathbb{B}_r - \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_r \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}_r} = 0.$$ 

By arbitrariness of $\varphi$, $\mathbb{B}_r = \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_r - \tilde{\mu}_r$ almost everywhere.

Throughout the remaining part of this section, we shall assume that $t \mapsto \tilde{b}(t, \alpha, x), \tilde{\sigma}(t, \alpha, x)$ are $\tau$-periodic for all $(\alpha, x) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, under Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2, the family of measures $\{\tilde{\mu}_t^\alpha : t \geq 0, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is $\tau$-periodic (analogously to (4.24)) and, as a consequence, the time-averaged (invariant) measures $\tilde{\mu}^\alpha$ satisfy the stationary PDE

$$\int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{L}_\alpha \varphi(x) \tilde{\mu}^\alpha(dx) = 0, \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \varphi \in D(\tilde{L}) \cap C^2([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad (5.24)$$

where $\tilde{L}_\alpha$ is the generator of the lifted process $\{\tilde{\Phi}^\alpha(t, \omega) : t \geq 0, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and the domain $D(\tilde{L})$ is defined by

$$D(\tilde{L}_\alpha) := H^1([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tilde{\mu}^\alpha) = \left\{ \varphi : [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} : \varphi(0, \cdot) = \varphi(\tau, \cdot) \text{ and} \right.$$  

$$\int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(s, x)|^2 \tilde{\mu}^\alpha(dsdx) + \int_{[0,\tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} |D_\alpha \varphi(s, x)|^2 \tilde{\mu}^\alpha(dsdx) < \infty \right\}.$$

**Theorem 5.12** (FDT II). Let Assumptions 5.1, 5.2 be satisfied for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a proper interval in $\mathbb{R}$ containing $0$. Then, the following hold:

(i) For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $\{\tilde{\mu}_t^\alpha : t \geq 0\}$ is a family of $\tau$-periodic measures induced by the one-point motion $\tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}^\alpha(t, \omega, \tilde{x})$ with the uniquely ergodic measure $\tilde{\mu}^\alpha$ satisfying (5.24).

(ii) The map $\alpha \mapsto \tilde{\rho}^\alpha(dx) = \tilde{\rho}^\alpha(dx)dx \tilde{x}$ is weakly differentiable at $\alpha = 0$ for all $\tilde{x} \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and the linear response $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ in (5.23) and (5.19) associated with perturbations of the ergodic measure $\tilde{\mu}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(t-r) := \mathcal{R}_\alpha(t-r, 0) = \partial_\alpha K_{\varphi, \tilde{\mathbb{B}}}(t-r, r), \quad t \geq r, \quad (5.25)$$

for $\varphi \in D(\tilde{L}) \cap C^2([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, with the correlation function $K_{\varphi, \tilde{\mathbb{B}}}$ in (5.21) evaluated at the conjugate observable $\tilde{\mathbb{B}} \in C^\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ given by

$$\tilde{\mathbb{B}}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{x})}{\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x})}, \quad s.t. \quad \langle \eta, \varphi \rangle := \langle \partial_\alpha \tilde{\rho}^\alpha, \varphi \rangle |_{\alpha=0}. \quad (5.26)$$

with $\partial_\alpha \tilde{\rho}^\alpha$ understood in the weak sense.

**Proof.** Part (i) is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.10 given the fact that Assumptions 5.1, 5.2 hold for $\alpha$ in a proper interval.
For Part (ii), we proceed as at the beginning of the the proof of Theorem 5.8, except that due to Part (i), both the unperturbed and the perturbed measures are \( \tau \)-periodic, and we have for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small so that \( \varepsilon \theta \in A \), that for \( t \in [0, \tau] \) there exists \( 0 < C_{\varepsilon, \tau} < \infty \) such that

\[
\langle \varphi, \bar{\mu}_{t+\varepsilon} \rangle - \langle \varphi, \bar{\mu}_t \rangle = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \left( \bar{P}_{t+\varepsilon} \varphi(x) - \bar{P}_t \varphi(x) \right) \tilde{\mu}_0(dx)
\]

\[
= \int_0^t \varepsilon \vartheta(r) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\theta}_e (r, \tilde{X}_t)]
\]

\[
\leq \varepsilon \tau \| \vartheta \|_{C_{\varepsilon, \tau}}, \quad \vartheta \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{A}), \quad \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)
\]  

(5.27)

Averaging both sides over \( t \in [0, \tau] \) we have

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \langle \varphi, \bar{\mu}_{t+\varepsilon} - \bar{\mu} \rangle dt < \infty, \quad \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)
\]

(5.28)

for any \( \vartheta \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathbb{R}) \) and ; thus, \( \bar{\mu}^\alpha \) is weakly differentiable at \( \alpha = 0 \), and \( \langle \frac{\delta \bar{\mu}_t^{(t, \alpha)}}{\delta \alpha} |_{\alpha=0}, \vartheta \rangle \) holds in the sense of (5.9) for all \( \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \). Next, by the Hörmander Lie bracket condition in Assumption 5.2 we have \( \bar{\mu}^\alpha (d\bar{x}) = \bar{\rho}^\alpha (\bar{x})d\bar{x} \) so that

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \langle \varphi, \bar{\rho}^{\varepsilon} - \bar{\rho} \rangle < \infty, \quad \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)
\]

(5.29)

for any \( \vartheta \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathbb{R}) \) which implies that \( \bar{\rho}^\alpha \) is weakly differentiable at \( \alpha = 0 \).

Furthermore, (5.24) yields

\[
\langle \bar{\rho}^\alpha, \bar{L}_\alpha \varphi \rangle = 0, \quad \alpha \in A, \quad \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
\]

(5.30)

Differentiating (5.30) with respect to the parameter \( \alpha \) (in the weak sense), we obtain

\[
\langle \partial_\alpha \bar{\rho}^\alpha, -\bar{L}_\alpha \varphi \rangle |_{\alpha=0} = \langle \bar{V}^* \bar{\rho}, \varphi \rangle = \langle \bar{V} \varphi, \bar{\rho} \rangle.
\]

(5.31)

We use the strong Feller property of the Markov semigroup \( (\bar{P}_t)_{t \geq 0} \) and condition (5.6) in Assumption 5.1 to obtain that \( (\bar{P}_t)_{t \geq 0} \) is a semigroup of contraction and, in particular,

\[
(-\bar{L})^{-1} \varphi = \int_0^\infty \bar{P}_t \varphi dt \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
\]

Finally, set \( \langle \eta, -\bar{L} \varphi \rangle := \langle \partial_\alpha \bar{\rho}^\alpha, -\bar{L} \varphi \rangle |_{\alpha=0} \), and note that for \( \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) equation (5.1) can be written as

\[
\langle \eta, \varphi \rangle = \langle \bar{V}^* \bar{\rho}, (-\bar{L})^{-1} \varphi \rangle = \int_0^\infty \langle \bar{V}^* \bar{\rho}, \bar{P}_t \varphi \rangle dt = \int_0^\infty \langle \bar{P}_t^* (V^* \bar{\rho}), \varphi \rangle dt.
\]

For the second part of the claim, we use the fact that for any \( \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \),

\[
K_{\varphi, \mathbb{W}}(t - r, r) = \langle \bar{P}_{t-r} \left( \mathbb{W} \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi \right), \bar{\rho} \rangle = \langle \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \mathbb{W} \bar{\rho} \rangle = \langle \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \eta \rangle,
\]

where \( \mathbb{W} \) is given in (5.26). Recall that if \( \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \), then \( \bar{P}_t \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \) for \( t \geq 0 \); thus

\[
\partial_r K_{\varphi, \mathbb{W}}(t - r, r) = \partial_r (-\bar{L}) \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \eta \rangle = (-\bar{L}) \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \eta \rangle.
\]

Since \( \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \) for \( t \geq r \), we have by (5.31) that for \( \varphi \in D(\bar{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \),

\[
\partial_r K_{\varphi, \mathbb{W}}(t - r, r) = \langle -\bar{L} \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \eta \rangle = \langle \bar{V} \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi, \bar{\rho} \rangle
\]

\[
= \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} \langle \bar{V} \bar{P}_{t-r} \varphi(x), \bar{\rho}(dx) \rangle = \bar{R}_\hat{\rho}(t - r, 0).
\]

\( \square \)
Remark 5.13. (i) In contrast to the conjugate observable $\mathbb{B}$ in (5.23) of Theorem 5.10, the observable $\mathbb{W}$ in Theorem 5.12 is not unique. To see this, assume that there exists $\tilde{\mathbb{W}} \in L^1(\tilde{\mu})$ on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\partial_u K^\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_{\varphi, \tilde{\mathbb{W}}}(t-r, r) = \partial_u K^\mathbb{W}_{\varphi, \mathbb{W}}(t-r, r), \quad \varphi \in C_\infty_c([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 \leq r < t.$$ 

This implies that

$$\frac{d}{du} \langle \tilde{\mathbb{W}}_{-r} \varphi, \mathbb{W} - \tilde{\mathbb{W}} \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}}, \quad \varphi \in C_\infty_c([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad 0 \leq u < t.$$ 

Since $C_\infty^c([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{D}(\hat{L})$, it follows by the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\langle \hat{L} \varphi, \mathbb{W} - \tilde{\mathbb{W}} \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} = 0.$$ 

Since $\mathbb{W} - \tilde{\mathbb{W}} \in L^1(\tilde{\mu})$, it follows that $\mathbb{W} - \tilde{\mathbb{W}}$ is constant almost everywhere. Hence, there are infinite number of conjugate observables satisfying Theorem 5.12 and the uniqueness of $\mathbb{W}$ breaks down.

(ii) Consider a function $S^\alpha : [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$S^\alpha(\tilde{x}) = -\log \tilde{\rho}^\alpha(\tilde{x}).$$

The entropy of the invariant density $\tilde{\rho}^\alpha$ is a functional $H(\tilde{\rho}^\alpha)$ defined by

$$H(\tilde{\rho}^\alpha) = \int_{[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d} S^\alpha(\tilde{x}) \tilde{\rho}^\alpha(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}.$$ 

If $\tilde{\rho}^\alpha$ is differentiable in the classical sense, then $\eta = \partial_\alpha \tilde{\rho}^\alpha|_{\alpha=0}$ almost everywhere and

$$\mathbb{W}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{\partial_\alpha \tilde{\rho}^\alpha(\tilde{x})|_{\alpha=0}}{\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x})} = -\partial_\alpha S^\alpha(x)|_{\alpha=0}.$$

In this case, the FDT II formula (Theorem 5.12) shows that for a random periodic process on $[0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the response of an observable to a small perturbation can be expressed as the correlation of this observable with one that is conjugate to the perturbation with respect to the entropy functional (cf. [19]).

Example 5.14 (Stochastic Lorenz model with periodic forcing). We return to the time periodic forcing stochastic Lorenz model (4.42). For $\varphi \in C_\infty^c(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, the corresponding one-point generator $L$ is defined as

$$L \varphi(t, v) = \partial_t \varphi(t, v) + [-Av - G(v)] \cdot \partial_v \varphi(t, v) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma(v) \sigma^T(v) \cdot \partial^2_{vv} \varphi(t, v) + \partial_u K^\mathbb{W}_{\varphi, \mathbb{W}}(t-r, r),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \partial_t \varphi(t, v) + [-ax + ay + F + \gamma \sin(wt)] \partial_x \varphi(t, v) + [-ax - y - xz] \partial_y \varphi(t, v) \\
&\quad + [bz + xy + br + ab] \partial_z \varphi(t, v) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left[ x^2 \partial^2_{xx} \varphi(t, v) + y^2 \partial^2_{yy} \varphi(t, v) + z^2 \partial^2_{zz} \varphi(t, v) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Also, the periodically forced Lorenz equation satisfies the Hörmander condition in Assumption 5.2 on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$, so that the periodic measure $\mu_t$ has smooth density $\rho_t$ respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$ for all $t \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}]$.

Now, consider the perturbed equation

$$dv^\alpha_t = [-Av^\alpha_t - G(v^\alpha_t) + f(t) + \alpha F(v^\alpha_t) \theta(t)] dt + \sigma(v^\alpha_t) dW_t, \quad t \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}].$$

(5.32)
Periodic measures, random periodic orbits, and the linear response for a class of SDEs

\( \vartheta \in C^\infty_\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^l) \), and \( F \in C^1_\infty(\mathbb{R}^3; \mathbb{R}^3) \), \( l \geq 2 \), such that for \( L_F \geq 0 \), the following holds

\[
\langle F(u) - F(v), u - v \rangle \leq -L_F|u - v|^2.
\]

(5.33)

Thus, for suitable observables \( \varphi, \psi \in C_\infty([0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \), our results assert the following:

(i) In the stable random periodic regime, the response function \( R_\varphi(t - r, r) \) for the observable \( \varphi \) to the perturbation \( F(v) \vartheta(t) \) is given by (Theorem 5.10)

\[
R_\varphi(t - r, r) = -\int_{[0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{P}_{t-r} \varphi(\tilde{v}) \partial_v(F(v)\tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{v})) d\tilde{v} = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, B}(t - r, r),
\]

where \( B_r(\tilde{v}) = -\frac{\partial_v(F(v)\tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{v}))}{\tilde{\rho}_r(\tilde{v})} \), \( \tilde{v} = (s, v) \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \) and \( \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \psi}(t - r, r) \) is the correlation of the random variables \( \varphi(\tilde{v}_t) \) and \( \psi(\tilde{v}_r) \). Following Remark 5.11(ii), the response to perturbations of the ergodic measure with density \( \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) \) can be expressed as

\[
\mathcal{R}_\varphi(u) = \int_{[0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^d} B(\tilde{x}) E[\varphi(\Phi(u, \cdot, \tilde{x}))] \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x} \to \lim_{\xi \to \infty} \frac{1}{\xi} \int_{[0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^d} B(\tilde{x}) E[\tilde{\Phi}(u + \xi, \tilde{x})] \tilde{\rho}(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{x}.
\]

where \( \tilde{\Phi} \) is the lifted flow of solutions of the system (4.42). This formula is amenable to further analytical and numerical approximations (see [69] for a number of algorithms aimed at practical approximations).

(ii) In the case when the perturbed measures are also \( \tau \)-periodic (Theorem 5.12), we have

\[
\mathcal{R}_\varphi(t - r, 0) = \frac{\tau}{2\pi} \int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{\tau}} \mathcal{R}_\varphi(t - r, r) dr = \partial_t \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathcal{W}}(t - r, r) = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, B}(t - r, r),
\]

where the conjugate observables \( \mathcal{W} \) and \( B \) are defined as

\[
\mathcal{W}(\tilde{v}) = \frac{\eta(\tilde{v})}{\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{v})}, \quad \text{and} \quad B(\tilde{v}) = -\frac{\partial_v(F(v)\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{v}))}{\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{v})}
\]

with \( \langle \eta, \varphi \rangle = -\int_0^{\frac{2\pi}{\tau}} \langle \tilde{P}_t \tilde{\varphi}(F(v)\tilde{\rho}(\tilde{v})) \rangle \varphi dt \), and \( \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \frac{2\pi}{\tau}] \times \mathbb{R}^3) \) s.t. \( \varphi(0, v) = \varphi(\frac{2\pi}{\tau}, v) \).

5.3. Further comments on the linear response in the random periodic regime. The results derived for the linear response function via the fluctuation-dissipation formulas in the case when both the unperturbed and the perturbed measures were \( \tau \)-periodic lead to the following summary:

\[
R_\varphi(t, 0) = \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, B}(t, 0) = \partial_u \mathcal{K}_{\varphi, \mathcal{W}}(t - u, u) \big|_{u=0}
\]

(5.34)

for \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) and \( 0 \leq t \leq \tau \). Thus, a natural question arises as to the relationship between the two conjugate observables \( \mathcal{W} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \); we consider this issue in a less formal fashion below.

Given the relationship in (5.31), we have

\[
\langle \mathcal{W}, -\mathcal{L} \varphi \rangle = \langle \tilde{\rho} \mathcal{W}, -\mathcal{L} \varphi \rangle = \langle \eta, -\mathcal{L} \varphi \rangle = \langle \mathcal{V}^* \tilde{\rho}, \varphi \rangle = \left\langle \frac{\mathcal{V}^* \tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}}, \varphi \right\rangle = \langle \mathcal{B}, \varphi \rangle \tilde{\mu},
\]

for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}) \cap C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \), and one obtains

\[
\mathcal{B} = -\mathcal{L}^\dagger \mathcal{W},
\]
where $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ is the $L^2(\bar{\mu})$ dual of the generator $\mathcal{L}$ of the one-point motion $\tilde{x} \mapsto \tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega, x)$, $t \geq 0$. The operator $\mathcal{L}^\dagger$ can be written as $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^*$, the $L^2(d\tilde{x})$ dual of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ plus some additional terms as follows:

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger \psi = \mathcal{L}^* \psi + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_i}(\psi \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{x_j} \log \tilde{\rho}), \quad \psi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
$$

(5.35)

To see this, elementary calculation shows that

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\varphi \tilde{\rho}) = \tilde{\rho} \mathcal{L} \varphi + \varphi \mathcal{L} \tilde{\rho} + \sum_{i,j=1}^d \tilde{a}_{ij} \partial_{x_i} \log \tilde{\rho} \partial_{x_j} \varphi, \quad \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
$$

Let $\tilde{b} = \tilde{a} \cdot \nabla \log \tilde{\rho}$, and integrate both sides with respect to $d\tilde{x}$ to obtain

$$
\langle \psi, \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} = \langle \psi, \mathcal{L} \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\rho}} - \langle \psi, \tilde{b} \cdot \nabla \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}}, \quad \psi, \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d).
$$

The duality of $\mathcal{L}$ in $L^2(d\tilde{x})$ and the divergence theorem, yield

$$
\langle \mathcal{L}^\dagger \psi, \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^* \psi, \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} + \langle \mathcal{L}^* \varphi, 1 \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} + \langle \nabla(\psi \tilde{a} \nabla \log \tilde{\rho}), \varphi \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}},
$$

for $\psi, \varphi \in C^2_\infty([0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is invariant with respect to $\{\tilde{P}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ one has

$$
\langle \mathcal{L}^* \varphi, 1 \rangle_{\tilde{\mu}} = \langle \mathcal{L}^* \varphi, \tilde{\mu} \rangle = 0,
$$

leading to the equality (5.35).

On the other hand, it is well-known (e.g., [58, 78]) that under some mild conditions on the coefficients of the SDE (4.4), or (5.3) when $\alpha = 0$, that the time-reversed process $\tilde{\Phi}^\dagger = \{\tilde{\Phi}(-t, \omega) : t \geq 0\}$ of the diffusion process $\tilde{\Phi} = \{\tilde{\Phi}(t, \omega) : t \geq 0\}$ is also a diffusion process with a new drift $(1, b^\dagger)$, where $b^\dagger = -b + \nabla a + a \nabla \log \tilde{\rho}$ and $a^\dagger = a$. In our case, the regularity of the coefficients $b, \sigma$, together with Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 when $\alpha = 0$ are sufficient. In fact, the generator of the time-reversed process is exactly $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger$, and it can be written as

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger = -\partial_s + \sum_{i=1}^d \left( - b_i + \sum_{j=1}^d (\partial_{x_j} a_{ij} + a_{ij} \partial_{x_j} \log \tilde{\rho}) \right) \partial_{x_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} \partial_{x_i x_j}^2.
$$

Finally, we note that from Nelson’s formulation of stochastic mechanics (e.g., [80]), the mean backward velocity of an observable $\varphi$ is another observable $A\varphi$ defined by

$$
A\varphi(\tilde{x}) = \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(\tilde{\Phi}(t+h)) - \varphi(\tilde{\Phi}(t)) \mid \tilde{\Phi}(t) = \tilde{x} \right].
$$

Moreover, the above can be written as (e.g., [58, 19]),

$$
A\varphi = -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger \varphi,
$$

so that, in particular, we have

$$
AW = -\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^\dagger W = B.
$$

Therefore, the conjugate observable in FDT I (Theorem 5.10) is exactly the mean backward velocity of that in FDT II (Theorem 5.12); this gives a connection between the two FDT formulae.

**Appendix A. Growth conditions and existence of absolute moments**

Here, we provide explicit examples of two classes of time-periodic coefficients in the SDE (2.1) which satisfy Assumption 4.3.
Lemma A.1. Let \( \{ \phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq s \} \) be a stochastic flow generated by the SDE (2.1) and let \( V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a Lyapunov satisfying the first part of condition (1.11) with some \( m > 1 \). Assume that the following growth conditions hold on the coefficients of (2.1)

\[
(b(t, x), x) \leq L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}(t)|x|^2, \quad \|\sigma(t, x)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2); \quad (A.1)
\]

Suppose further that there exist bounded \( L_{b_1}(), L_{b_2}(), L_\sigma() \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^+) \) such that

\[
\inf_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_1}(t) - \frac{m}{2} L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{m}{2} - 1 \right) L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right) > 0.
\]

Then, for \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \), there exist global solutions of (2.1) such that for the stochastic flow \( \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \) induced by the solutions of (2.1) we have

\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x)] < \infty,
\]

in Assumption 4.3(iii) with some \( p \geq 1 \).

Proof. It can be established (in a similar way to that in [65, Theorem 3.4.6]) that the growth conditions (A.1) lead to existence and uniqueness of global solutions of

\[
dX_{t}^{s,x} = b(t, X_{t}^{s,x})dt + \sigma(t, X_{t}^{s,x})dW_t, \quad X_{s}^{s,x} = x, \quad (A.2)
\]

inducing the flow \( X_{t}^{s,x}(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \). In order to prove the main part of the Lemma, first consider \( g(x) = |x|^m, \ m \geq 2 \); then

\[
\mathcal{L}_t|x|^m = m|x|^{m-2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} b_i(t, x)x_i + \frac{1}{2} m|x|^{m-4} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \left\{ |x|^2 \delta_{ij} + (m - 2)|x| x_j \right\} (\sigma \sigma^T)_{ij}(t, x, x)
\]

\[
\leq m|x|^{m-2}(L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}(t)|x|^2) + \frac{1}{2} L_\sigma(t)m(m - 1)(1 + |x|^2)|x|^{m-2}
\]

\[
= m \left( L_{b_1}(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right) |x|^{m-2} - m \left( L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{1}{2} L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right) |x|^m. \quad (A.3)
\]

Next, since \( |x|^{m-2} \leq (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{m}{2} - 1} \leq (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{m}{2}} \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1(1 + |x|^m) \), we get

\[
\mathcal{L}_t|x|^m \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1 m \left( L_{b_1}(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right)
\]

\[
- p \left( L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{m}{2} - 1 L_{b_1} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{m}{2} - 1 \right) L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right) |x|^m,
\]

which can be written as

\[
\mathcal{L}_t|x|^m \leq a_m - b_m|x|^m, \quad (A.4)
\]

with coefficients

\[
a_m = m \left( \frac{m}{2} - 1 \right) \inf_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_1}(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right), \quad (A.5)
\]

\[
b_m = m \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{m}{2} - 1 L_{b_1} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{m}{2} - 1 \right) L_\sigma(t)(m - 1) \right). \quad (A.6)
\]

It turns out that sharper bounds can be obtained for \( m = 2, 3 \); these are derived at the end of this section.

Next, for \( X_{t}^{s,x}(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x) \) satisfying (A.2) and \( g(x) = |x|^m, \ m \geq 2 \), Ito’s Lemma and the bound (A.4), or (A.9), or (A.12) lead to

\[
d\mathbb{E}[|X_{t}^{s,x}|^m] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_t|X_{t}^{s,x}|^m] dt \leq (a_m - b_m \mathbb{E}[|X_{t}^{s,x}|^m]) dt. \quad (A.7)
\]
Therefore, based on the differential form of Gronwall’s inequality, (A.7) yields
\[ E|X_t^{s,x}|^m \leq e^{-b_m(t-s)} E|x|^m + \frac{a_m}{b_m} \left(1 - e^{-b_m(t-s)}\right). \]  
(A.8)

Consequently, for \( m \geq 2 \), and \( L_{b_1}, L_{b_2}, L_\sigma \) such that \( b_m > 0 \) in (A.6), (A.11) or (A.14)
\[ 0 \leq \lim_{(t-s) \to \infty} E|\phi(t, s, x)|^m \leq \frac{a_m}{b_m} < \infty. \]
For \( 1 \leq m < 2 \) we use Hölder’s inequality and obtain
\[ E[|X_t^{s,x}|^m] \leq \left(E[|X_t^{s,x}|^{2m}]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \]
Thus, analogous derivations to those in (A.3) onwards can be carried out for \( m' = 2m \geq 2 \), with \( 1 \leq m < 2 \).

Finally, note that for \( Y_t^{s,x}(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x \) we obtain
\[ dY_t^{s,x} = b(t, Y_t^{s,x} + x)dt + \sigma(t, Y_t^{s,x} + x)dW_t, \quad Y_t^{s,x} = 0, \]
so that analogous calculations in conjunction with Assumption (4.3) and \( m = pk, k \geq 1 \) lead to
\[ E[V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x)]^k \leq CE[|\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x|^{pk}] \leq C \frac{a_{pk}}{b_{pk}} \left(1 - e^{-b_{pk}(t-s)}\right). \]
Consequently, for \( p \geq 1 \) and \( 0 < L_{b_1}, L_{b_2}, L_\sigma < \infty \) such that \( b_{pk} > 0 \)
\[ 0 \leq \lim_{s \to -\infty} \sup_{t \leq s} E[V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x)] < \infty, \]
\[ 0 \leq \lim_{t \to \infty} \sup_{t \leq s} E[V(\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x)] < \infty. \]

Note also that for \( m = 2, 3 \) tighter bounds can be easily obtained from (A.3). For \( m = 2 \), in a similiar way to (A.3), we have
\[ L_t|x|^2 \leq 2(L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}(t)|x|^2) + L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2) \]
\[ = 2\left(L_{b_1}(t) + \frac{1}{2}L_\sigma(t)\right) - 2\left(L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{1}{2}L_\sigma(t)\right)|x|^2 = \tilde{a}_2 - \tilde{b}_2|x|^3, \]
(A.9)
where
\[ \tilde{a}_2 = 2 \inf_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left(L_{b_1}(t) + \frac{1}{2}L_\sigma(t)\right), \]
(A.10)
\[ \tilde{b}_2 = 2 \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left(L_{b_2}(t) - \frac{1}{2}L_\sigma(t)\right). \]
(A.11)

For \( m = 3 \) we have
\[ L_t|x|^3 \leq 3|x|(L_{b_1}(t) - L_{b_2}(t)|x|^2) + 3|x|L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2) \]
\[ = 3\left(L_{b_1}(t) + L_\sigma(t)\right)|x| - 3\left(L_{b_2}(t) - L_\sigma(t)\right)|x|^3 \]
\[ \leq 3\left(L_{b_1}(t) + L_\sigma(t)\right) - 3\left(L_{b_2}(t) - L_\sigma(t) - \frac{4}{2\tau\sigma^2}(L_{b_1}(t) + L_\sigma(t))\right)|x|^3 \]
\[ = \tilde{a}_3 - \tilde{b}_3|x|^3, \]  
(A.12)
with
\[
\tilde{a}_3 = 3\alpha \inf_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_1}(t) + L_\sigma(t) \right),
\]
(\ref{A.13})
\[
\tilde{b}_3 = 3 \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \left( L_{b_2}(t) - L_\sigma(t) - \frac{4}{27\alpha^2} (L_{b_1}(t) + L_\sigma(t)) \right),
\]
(\ref{A.14})
where we used the fact that \(|x| \leq \alpha + \frac{4}{27\alpha^2}|x|^3, \alpha > 0|.

It is worth noting that, for \(L_{b_2} > L_\sigma\), the upper bound on the asymptotic moment \(\mathbb{E}[\phi(t, s, x)]^m\) for \(m = 3\) is optimised for \(\alpha^2 = \frac{9}{2} \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right)^{3/2}\) so that
\[
\min_{\alpha > 0} \frac{\tilde{a}_3}{\tilde{b}_3} = \frac{27}{4} \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right)^{3/2}.
\]
(\ref{A.15})
Moreover,
\[
\frac{\tilde{a}_2}{\tilde{b}_2} \leq \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right) \leq \left( \min_{\alpha > 0} \frac{\tilde{a}_3}{\tilde{b}_3} \right)^{2/3} = \left( \frac{27}{4} \right)^{2/3} \left( \frac{L_{b_1} + L_\sigma}{L_{b_2} - L_\sigma} \right);\]
(\ref{A.16})
this fact merely reflects the Jensen’s inequality for the second and third absolute moments, i.e., \(\mathbb{E}|X_t^{x,\epsilon}|^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}|X_t^{x,\epsilon}|)^2\), but it is useful in Example 4.11, since it implies that, based on (A.8),
\[
C \limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\phi(t, s, x)]^2 = \limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} (\mathbb{E}[\phi(t, s, x)]^3)^{2/3}, \quad 0 < C < \infty.
\]

Lemma A.2. Let \(\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot) : t \geq s\}\) be a stochastic flow generated by the SDE (2.1) and let \(V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^+)\) be a Lyapunov satisfying the first part of condition (4.11). Suppose further that there exist \(L_b(\cdot), L_\sigma(\cdot), c(\cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}^+)\) such that
\[
(b(t, x), x) \leq L_b(t)(1 + |x|^2), \quad \|\sigma(t, x)\|_{\text{lip}}^2 \leq L_\sigma(t)(1 + |x|^2),
\]
(\ref{A.17})
and
\[
0 < \limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \exp \left( \int_s^t C(u, p)du \right) < \infty,
\]
(\ref{A.18})
where \(C(t, p) = L_b(t) + \frac{1}{2}(p - 1)L_\sigma(t)\), for some \(1 < p < \infty\). Then, for \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\), we have
\[
\limsup_{(t-s) \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[V(t, \phi(t, s, x) - x)] < \infty.
\]

Proof. First, we suppose that \(p \geq 2\) and set \(g(x) = 1 + |x|^2\) and \(\varphi(x) = g(x)^{\frac{2}{p}}\); then
\[
\mathcal{L}_t \varphi(x) = pg(x)^{\frac{2}{p}-1} \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(t, x)x_i + \frac{1}{2} pg(x)^{\frac{2}{p}-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \left\{ g(x)\delta_{ij} + (p - 2)x_i x_j \right\} (\sigma \sigma^T)_{ij}(t, x, x).
\]
By the Growth conditions (\ref{A.17}) on the coefficients \(b, \sigma\), we obtain
\[
\mathcal{L}_t \varphi(x) \leq p C(t, p) \varphi(x),
\]
where \(C(t, p) = L_b(t) + c(t) + \frac{1}{2}(p - 1)L_\sigma(t)\). Next, let \(Y_{t,s}^x(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x\), it follows that \(Y_{t,s}^x(x)\) solves the following SDE
\[
dY_{t,s}^x = b(t, Y_{t,s}^x + x)dt + \sigma(t, Y_{t,s}^x + x)dW_t, \quad Y_{s,s}^x = 0.
\]
By Itô’s formula, we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(Y_{t,s}^x) \right] = \varphi(0) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_u \varphi(Y_{u,s}^x) du \right]
\]
\[
\leq \varphi(0) + p \int_s^t C(u, p) \mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(Y_{u,s}^x) \right] du.
\]
By Gronwall’s inequality, we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \varphi(Y_{t,s}^x) \right] \leq \varphi(0) \exp \left( p \int_s^t C(u, p) du \right).
\]
But \( Y_{t,s}^x(\omega) = \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x, \varphi(x) = g(x)^{\frac{p}{2}} = (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \) and \( \varphi(0) = 1 \), thus,
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ (1 + |\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \leq \exp \left( p \int_s^t C(u, p) du \right).
\]
Next, note for \( p \geq 2 \), \( |x|^p \leq (1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \) and by the assumption that \( V(t, x) \leq C|x|^p \), we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x) \right] \leq \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E} \left[ (1 + |\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \mathcal{C} \exp \left( p \int_s^t C(u, p) du \right).
\]
Since \( C(\cdot, p) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R}) \) such that \( \lim \sup_{s \to -\infty} \exp \left( \int_s^t C(u, p) du \right) < \infty \), then for \( p \geq 2 \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x) \right] \leq \mathcal{C} \lim \sup_{s \to -\infty} \exp \left( p \int_s^t C(u, p) du \right) < \infty. \tag{A.19}
\]
The case where \( 1 \leq p < 2 \), we use Hölder’s inequality, namely
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ V(t, \phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x) \right] \leq \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x|^p \right] \leq \mathcal{C} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |\phi(t, s, \omega, x) - x|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]
and the rest follows, since in this case \( 2p \geq 2 \).

**APPENDIX B. STRONG FELLER PROPERTY FOR FLOWS IN NON-AUTONOMOUS DYNAMICS.**

In order to prove Theorem 4.9, which is a generalisation of standard results to non-autonomous SDE’s and discussed in Appendix B.2, we first outline some basic notions from Malliavin calculus.

**B.1. Malliavin calculus estimates.** Establishing the strong Feller property of Markov evolutions \((\mathcal{P}_{t,s})_{t \geq s}\) in our setting requires some estimates rooted in Malliavin calculus. We recall the main concepts and results on the Wiener space \( \Omega \); see (e.g., [53, 54, 73, 78, 81, 89]) for a comprehensive treatment. To this end, consider the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} = L^2([s, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \) equipped with the inner product
\[
\langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_s^\infty \eta_1(t) \cdot \eta_2(t) dt.
\]
For a Hilbert space \( E \) and a real number \( p \geq 1 \), we denote by \( L^p(\Omega; E) \) the space of \( E \)-valued random variable \( \xi \) such that \( \mathbb{E}(||\xi||_E^p) := \int_\Omega ||\xi||_E^p d\mathbb{P} < \infty \). Also, we set \( L^{\infty-}(\Omega; E) := \bigcap_{p<\infty} L^p(\Omega; E) \).
Following the approach due to Malliavin (e.g., [73, 81]), we introduce a derivative operator \( \mathcal{D} \) for a random variable \( G \) on the space \( L^{\infty-}(\Omega; E) \). We say that \( G \in \mathcal{D}^{1,\infty}(E) \) if there exists
\( \mathcal{D}G \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathcal{H} \otimes E) \) such that for any \( \eta \in \mathcal{H} \),
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{G(\omega + \varepsilon \int_x^n \eta(t)dt) - G(\omega)}{\varepsilon} - \langle \mathcal{D}G, \eta \rangle \mathcal{H} \right\|_E^p \right] = 0,
\]
holds for every \( p \geq 1 \). In this case, one defines the Malliavin derivative of \( G \) in the direction of \( \eta \in \mathcal{H} \) by \( \mathcal{D}^nG := \langle \mathcal{D}G, \eta \rangle \mathcal{H} \). For any \( p \geq 1 \), we define the Sobolev space \( \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(E) \) as the completion of \( \mathbb{D}^{1,\infty}(E) \) under the norm
\[
\|G\|_{1,p,E} = \left( \mathbb{E}[\|G\|^p_E] \right)^{1/p} + \left( \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}G\|^p_{\mathcal{H} \otimes E}] \right)^{1/p}.
\]

We define the \( k \)-th Malliavin derivative by \( \mathcal{D}^kG = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{D}^{k-1}G) \), which is a random variable with values in \( \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes E \). For any integer \( k \geq 1 \), the Sobolev space \( \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(E) \) is the completion of \( \mathbb{D}^{k,\infty}(E) \) under the norm
\[
\|G\|_{k,p,E} = \|G\|_{k-1,p,E} + \|\mathcal{D}^kG\|_{1,p,\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes E}.
\]

It turns out that \( \mathcal{D} \) is a closed operator from \( L^p(\Omega; E) \) to \( L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H} \otimes E) \). The adjoint \( \delta \) of the operator \( \mathcal{D} \) called the divergence operator is continuous from \( \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathcal{H} \otimes E) \) to \( L^p(\Omega; E) \) for any \( p > 1 \), with the duality relationship given as
\[
\mathbb{E}(\langle \mathcal{D}G, u \rangle \mathcal{H} \otimes E) = \mathbb{E}(\langle G, \delta(u) \rangle E),
\]
for any \( G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathcal{H} \otimes E) \) and \( u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,q}(\mathcal{H} \otimes E) \), with \( p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1 \).

Throughout the remaining part of this section we assume the following notation:
- \( C \) is a generic constant which may depend on \( T \), the exponent \( p > 1 \), the initial point \( x \) and fixed element \( \eta \) of the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} = L^2([s, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \).
- \( (H_n) \) denotes a class of coefficients \( b, \sigma \), \( 1 \leq k \leq m \), where \( \sigma_k \) are columns of \( \sigma \), such that \( b(t, \cdot) \in \tilde{C}^N, \sigma_k(t, \cdot) \in \tilde{C}_b^N(\mathbb{R}^d) \).

**Proposition B.1.** Suppose the coefficients \( b, \sigma \) of the SDE (2.7) are in the class \( (H_2) \). Then, for any \( t \geq s \), we have \( \phi(t, s) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \) and the Malliavin derivative \( \mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s) \) of \( \phi(t, s) \) in the direction of \( \eta = (\eta^1, \eta^2, \cdots, \eta^m) \in \mathcal{H} \) is the unique solution of the following affine SDE
\[
\begin{cases}
d\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s) = D_xb(t, \phi(t, s))\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s)dt + \sum_{k=1}^m D_x\sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s))\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s)dW^k_t \\
+ \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s))\eta^k(t)dt, & t > s,
\end{cases}
\]
\( \mathcal{D}^n\phi(s, s) = 0. \)

**Corollary B.2** (Chain rule, cf. [11]). Suppose that condition \( (H_2) \) holds true. Then, for any \( \eta \in \mathcal{H}, p \geq 2 \) and for any \( \varphi \in C^2_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \), we have
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{\varphi(\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s)) - \varphi(\phi(t, s))}{\varepsilon} - D_x\varphi(\phi(t, s))\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s) \right|^p \right] = 0,
\]
where \( \varphi(\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s)), t \geq s, \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) is the solution of the following perturbed SDE
\[
\begin{cases}
d\varphi(\mathcal{D}^n\phi(t, s)) = b(t, \phi(t, s))dt + \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s))dW^k_t + \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s))\eta^k(t)dt, \\
\phi(\mathcal{D}^n\phi(s, s)) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\end{cases}
\]
Moreover, \( \varphi(\phi(t, s)) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}) \) and \( \mathcal{D}\varphi(\phi(t, s)) = D_x\varphi(\phi(t, s))\mathcal{D}\phi(t, s) \).
Definition B.3 (Mean square gradient). Let $G(x) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a measurable function for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in F$. We say that the mean square gradient of $G(x)$ with respect to $x$ exists if there is a linear map $A(x) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{|G(x + \varepsilon v) - G(x) - A(x)v|}{\varepsilon} \right]^2 = 0.
$$

We denote the mean square gradient matrix $A(x)$ by $D_x G(x)$.

Theorem B.4 (e.g., [63, 73, 81]). Assume the condition $(H_2)$ holds true. Let $\phi(t, s, \omega, x)$, $t \geq s$ be the solution of the SDE (2.1). Then, the mean square gradient of $\phi(t, s, \omega, x)$ with respect to $x$ exists. If we define $J_{t,s} = D_x \phi(t, s, x)$, then

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{dJ_{t,s}}{dt} &= D_x b(t, \phi(t, s, x))J_{t,s} + \sum_{k=1}^{m} D_x \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s, x))J_{t,s}dW^k_t, \quad t \geq s, \\
J_{s,s} &= I,
\end{align*}
$$

(B.2)

where $I$ is a $d \times d$ identity matrix. Moreover, the inverse $J_{t,s}^{-1}$ of $J_{t,s}$ exists and satisfy the variational SDE

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{dJ_{t,s}^{-1}}{dt} &= -J_{t,s}^{-1} \left( D_x b(t, \phi(t, s, x)) - \sum_{k=1}^{m} D_x \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s, x))D_x \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s, x)) \right) dt \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{m} J_{t,s}^{-1} D_x \sigma_k(t, \phi(t, s, x))dW^k_t, \\
J_{s,s}^{-1} &= I.
\end{align*}
$$

(B.3)

We shall refer to the mean square gradient $J_{t,s} = D_x \phi(t, s, x)$ as derivative flow of $\phi(t, s, x)$. Next, we provide crucial $L^p$ bound for the derivative flow $J_{t,s}$ and that of its inverse $J_{t,s}^{-1}$.

Lemma B.5. Suppose the condition $(H_2)$ holds. Then for any $p \geq 2$, there exists a positive constant $C = C(T, p)$ such that

$$
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \leq u \leq s + \tau} |J_{t,u}|^p \right) \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \leq u \leq s + \tau} |J_{t,u}^{-1}|^p \right) \leq C.
$$

(B.4)

Now, let $D_\ell \phi(t, s)$ be the solution of the following SDE:

$$
\begin{align*}
D_\ell \phi(t, s) &= \sigma(u, \phi(u, s)) + \int_{u}^{t} D_x b(\ell, \phi(\ell, u))D_\ell \phi(\ell, u)d\ell \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \int_{u}^{t} D_x \sigma_k(\ell, \phi(\ell, u))D_\ell \phi(\ell, u)dW^k_\ell, \quad \text{for } t \geq u, \\
D_\ell \phi_{t,s} &= 0, \quad \text{for } s \leq t < u.
\end{align*}
$$

(B.5)

Ccomparing the variational SDEs (B.2) and (B.5), then by variation of parameters formula, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
D_u \phi(t, s) &= J_{t,u} \sigma(\phi(t, s)), \quad s \leq u \leq t \leq s + T, \\
D_u \phi(t, s) &= 0, \quad u > t.
\end{align*}
$$

Next, we recall a result on the Malliavin differentiability of the derivative flow $J_{t,s}$, $t \geq s$. To this end, let’s denote by $D^\ell_u$ the Malliavin derivative with respect to the $\ell$-th component of the Brownian motion $W$ at time $u$. 

Lemma B.6. Suppose that the condition \((H_3)\) holds. Then for all \(s \leq t \leq s + T\), \(J_{t,s} \in \mathbb{D}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)\) and for any \(p \geq 2\), there exists a positive constant \(C = C(T, p, x)\), such that for all \(j = 1, \cdots, m\) and \(u \in [s, s + T]\),

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{s \leq t \leq s + T} |\mathcal{D}_u J_{t,s}|^p \right] \leq C.
\]

Moreover, for any \(t \leq s + T\), \(X(t, s) \in \mathbb{D}^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) and for any \(p \geq 2\), there exists a positive constant \(C = C(T, p, x)\) such that for all \(j, l = 1, \cdots, m\) and \(\varsigma, u \leq t\)

\[
\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{D}_u^j(D^l(J_t(s)))|^p \leq C.
\]

Remark B.7. If \((H_\infty)\) holds true, then \(\phi(t, s) \in \mathbb{D}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) and \(J_{t,s} \in \mathbb{D}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)\).

Denote by \((D\phi(t, s))^T\) the transpose of the Malliavin derivative \(D\phi(t, s)\). From the relationship \(D_u \phi(t, s) = J_{t,u} \sigma(u, \phi(u, s))\), we have \((D_u \phi(t, s))^T = \sigma(u, \phi(u, s))^T J_{t,u}^T\).

Definition B.8 (Malliavin covariance, cf. [63, 51]). The Malliavin covariance \(M_{t,s}\) of the random vector \(\phi(t, s)\) is defined by

\[
M_{t,s} = \langle D\phi(t, s), (D\phi(t, s))^T \rangle_H = \int_s^t J_{t,\ell} \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s)) \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s))^T J_{t,\ell}^T d\ell
\]

\[
= J_{t,s} \left[ \int_s^t J_{\ell,s}^{-1} \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s)) \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s))^T (J_{\ell,s}^{-1})^T d\ell \right] J_{t,s}^T
\]

where \(C_{t,s}\) is defined by

\[
C_{t,s} = \int_s^t J_{\ell,s}^{-1} \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s)) \sigma(\ell, \phi(\ell, s))^T (J_{\ell,s}^{-1})^T d\ell
\]

is the so-called reduced Malliavin covariance of \(\phi(t, s)\).

We conclude this section by elucidating the invertibility of the Malliavin covariance almost surely and its integrability of all negative orders.

Proposition B.9 (e.g., [63, 51, 89]). Suppose Assumptions 4.5 holds. Then, for every \(t > s\), the Malliavin covariance matrix \(M_{t,s}\) of the random vector \(\phi(t, s)\) is invertible \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.s., and \(\mathbb{E} \left[ \det(M_{t,u}) \right] < \infty\), for every \(t, u \in [s, s + T]\), \(T > 0\), and \(p > 1\). Moreover, the law of \(\phi(t, s)\) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \(\mathbb{R}^d\) and the probability density is smooth.

B.2. Strong Feller property for non-autonomous dynamics. A Markov evolution \((\mathcal{P}_{t,s})_{t \geq s}\) induced by a stochastic \(\{\phi(t, s, \omega, \cdot)\}_{s,t \in \mathbb{R}}\) has strong Feller property (i.e., \(\mathcal{P}_{t,s}\phi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\) for any \(\phi \in M_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\)) if and only if

(a) \((\mathcal{P}_{t,s})_{t \geq t}\) is a Feller semigroup, i.e., \(\mathcal{P}_{t,s} : C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \to C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\), and

(b) For any \(\phi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\) the family \((\mathcal{P}_{t,s}\phi)_{t \geq s}\) is equicontinuous.

The first condition follows from the existence of the stochastic flow (see, e.g., [63, 57]); here, we are concerned with flows associated with solutions of the non-autonomous SDE (2.1). Thus, shall only derive the second item.

Intuitively, the strong Feller property states that for sufficiently close initial data \(x, y\) and any realisation \(\omega\) of the past driving noise, one can construct a coupling between two solutions
First, we find a control satisfying (B.6). To this end, for any \(\omega\), one has \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x) = \phi(t, s, \omega, y)\), for \(t > s\) (e.g., [54, 56]). One way of achieving such a coupling (e.g., [54, 55]) is via a change of measure on the driving process for one of the two solutions such that the noises \(W_t^x\) and \(W_t^y\) driving the solutions \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) and \(\phi(t, s, \omega, y)\), are related by

\[
dW_t^x = dW_t^y + \eta_t^{x,y} dt,
\]

where \(\eta_t^{x,y}\) is a control process that steers the solution \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) towards the solution \(\phi(t, s, \omega, y)\). If one sets \(y = x + \varepsilon \eta\) and looks for a control of the form \(\eta_t^{x,y} = \varepsilon \eta\), then in the limit as \(\varepsilon \to 0\), the scheme will induce a deformation onto the solution \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) at time \(t\) in the form of Malliavin derivative of \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) at \(\omega \in \Omega\) in the direction of \(\eta \in \mathcal{H}\), \(\mathcal{H} = L^2([s, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)\), i.e.,

\[
\langle D\phi(t, s, \omega, x), \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = D\eta^y(t, s, \omega, x).
\]

On the other hand, the effect of the perturbation of initial condition by \(v\) is given by the directional derivative of the solution \(\phi(t, s, \omega, x)\) at \(x\) along \(v\), i.e.,

\[
D_x \phi(t, s, \omega, x) v = J_{s,t}(\omega, x) v.
\]

That said, in order to establish the strong Feller property, one has to find a control \(\eta^v\) (e.g., [54, 56]) such that

\[
\langle D\phi(t, s, \omega, x), \eta^v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = J_{s,t}(\omega, x) v, \quad (B.6)
\]

where for brevity of notation we skip the explicit dependence on \(\omega\) and \(x\).

**Theorem B.10.** Suppose that Assumption [8, 9] hold true. Then for any \(t \in [s, s + T]\), there exist \(C_T > 0\) such that, for any \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d\) and \(\varphi \in C_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\), we have

\[
|\mathcal{P}_{t,s} \varphi(x) - \mathcal{P}_{t,s} \varphi(y)| \leq C_T \|\varphi\|_\infty |x - y|.
\]

**Proof.** First, we find a control satisfying \([B.6]\). To this end, for any \(v \in \mathbb{R}^d\) with \(|v| = 1\), let \(\eta^v = (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v\), then,

\[
\langle D\phi(t, s), \eta^v \rangle = \langle D\phi(t, s), (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = J_{t,s} v.
\]

Next, we show that \(\eta^v \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathcal{H})\) for any \(p \geq 2\). In fact, by chain rule of differentiation,

\[
D^k \eta^v = (D^k(D\phi(t, s))^T) M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v + (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} (D^k J_{t,s} v) + (D\phi(t, s))^T (D^k M_{t,s}^{-1}) J_{t,s} v
\]

\[
= (D^k(D\phi(t, s))^T) M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v + (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} (D^k J_{t,s} v) - (D\phi(t, s))^T M_{t,s}^{-1} ([D^k(D\phi(t, s)), (D\phi(t, s))^T]_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle D\phi(t, s), D^k(D\phi(t, s))^T \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) M_{t,s}^{-1} J_{t,s} v.
\]

By Lemmas [B.3, B.6] and Proposition [B.9], we arrive at

\[
E\|\eta^v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p + E\|D\eta^v\|_{\mathcal{H}^{1,p}}^p \leq E\|\eta^v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p + \sum_{k=1}^m E \left[ \int_s^t \|D^k \eta^v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^p d\zeta \right] < \infty. \quad (B.7)
\]
Recalling that \( \eta_{t,s}^v = \sigma(\zeta, X(\zeta, s))^T J_t \zeta M^{-1}_{t,s} J_t \zeta^* v \). Then, for \( \varphi \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \), we have
\[
D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi)(x) v = E \left[ D_x(\varphi(t, s, x)) v \right] = E \left[ D_x(\varphi(t, s, x)) J_{t,s}(\cdot, x) v \right] 
\]
\[
= E \left[ (D_x\varphi(t, s, x)) D X_t^{x,s}(\omega), \eta^v \right] = E \left[ (D \varphi(t, s, x)), \eta^v \right] = E \left[ (D \varphi(t, s, x)), \theta^v \right] 
\]
\[
= E \left[ \varphi(t, s, x) \right] \int_s^t \sigma(\zeta, \varphi(\zeta, s))^T J_t \zeta M^{-1}_{t,s} J_t \zeta^* v * dW_\zeta \right] 
\]
\[
= E \left[ \varphi(t, s, x) \right] \int_s^t \eta_{t,s}^v * dW_\zeta \right] , \quad (B.8) 
\]
where in the first and second lines, we applied chain rule for mean square gradient and Malliavin derivative, respectively, and third line is Malliavin integration by parts formula (e.g., [81]) and, the stochastic integral in the fourth or fifth line is interpreted in the sense of Skorokhod, i.e.,
\[
\int_s^t \eta_{t,s}^v * dW_\zeta \right] is the divergence of the process \{\eta_{t,s}^v|_{[s,t]}(\zeta) : \zeta \geq s\} (see equation (B.1)).

Next, since \( C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \) is dense in \( C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \), we have \( (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( \varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) so that
\[
\begin{align}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{t,s} \varphi_n(x) &= P_{t,s} \varphi(x), \\
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi_n)(x)v &= E \left[ \varphi(t, s, x) \right] \int_s^t \eta_{t,s}^v * dW_\zeta \right] . \quad (B.9)
\end{align}
\]
On the other hand, by Proposition B.9, there exists a function \( 0 < p_{t,s} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that \( P\{\omega : \varphi(t, s, \omega, x) \in dy\} = P(s, t; dy) = p_{t,s}(x, y)dy \). This implies that
\[
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi_n)(x)v = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_n(y) D_x p_{t,s}(x, y)vdy 
\]
\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) D_x p_{t,s}(x, y)vdy = D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi)(x)v . \quad (B.10)
\]
Comparing (B.9) and (B.10), we have that (B.8) holds for all \( \varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \).

Next, the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality yields
\[
|D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi)(x)v| \leq \sqrt{(P_{t,s} \varphi^2)(x)} \left( E \left[ \int_s^t \eta_{t,s}^v * dW_\zeta \right] ^2 \right) \right)^{1/2} , \quad \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) . \quad (B.11)
\]
By generalised Itô isometry (cf. [81]), we have
\[
E \left[ \int_s^t \eta_{t,s}^v * dW_\zeta \right] ^2 = E \left( \int_s^t |\eta_{t,s}^v|^2 ds \right) + E \left( \int_s^t \int_s^t (D_\xi \eta_{t,s}^v, D_\zeta \eta_{t,s}^v) R^d \otimes R^d d\xi d\zeta \right) 
\]
\[
\leq E \left( \int_s^t |\eta_{t,s}^v|^2 ds \right) + E \left( \int_s^t \int_s^t ||D_\xi \eta_{t,s}^v||^2 R^d \otimes R^d d\xi d\zeta \right) 
\]
\[
= E||\eta^v||^2_2 + \sum_{k=1}^m E \left( \int_s^t ||D_\xi \eta^v||^2_2 d\xi \right) .
\]
Then, by the inequality (B.7) and (B.11), there exists \( C_T > 0 \) such that
\[
|D_x(P_{t,s} \varphi)(x)v| \leq C_T ||\varphi||_\infty |v|, \quad x, v \in \mathbb{R}^d , \quad \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) . \quad (B.12)
\]
Finally, let $z_t = \ell x + (1 - \ell)y$, $\ell \in [0, 1]$ and set $v = x - y$. Then, by the mean value theorem and inequality (B.12), we have

$$|P_{t,s}\varphi(x) - P_{t,s}\varphi(y)| \leq \int_0^1 |D_x(P_{t,s}\varphi)(z_t)v| d\ell \leq C_T ||\varphi||_{\infty} |x - y|.$$ 
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