

A LOCAL-IN-TIME THEORY FOR SINGULAR SDES WITH APPLICATIONS TO FLUID MODELS WITH TRANSPORT NOISE

DIEGO ALONSO-ORÁN, CHRISTIAN ROHDE, AND HAO TANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish a local theory, i.e., existence, uniqueness and blow-up criterion, for a general family of singular SDEs in some Hilbert space. The key requirement is an approximation property that allows us to embed the singular drift and diffusion mappings into a hierarchy of regular mappings that are invariant with respect to the Hilbert space and enjoy a cancellation property. Various nonlinear models in fluid dynamics with transport noise belong to this type of singular SDEs. With a cancellation estimate for generalized Lie derivative operators, we can construct such regular approximations for cases involving the Lie derivative operators, or more generally, differential operators of order one with suitable coefficients. In particular, we apply the abstract theory to achieve novel local-in-time results for the stochastic two-component Camassa–Holm (CH) system and for the stochastic Córdoba–Córdoba–Fontelos (CCF) model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Z} be three separable Hilbert spaces such that

$$\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{Z}. \quad (1.1)$$

We consider the initial value problem for a stochastic differential equation (SDE) with unknown process $X = X(t)$, $t \geq 0$, given by

$$dX = (b(t, X) + g(t, X)) dt + h(t, X) dW, \quad X(0) = X_0 \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (1.2)$$

In (1.2), W denotes a cylindrical Wiener process defined on some separable Hilbert space \mathbb{U} . The drift is given by the sum of the mappings $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ and $g : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$. The operator $h : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Y})$ stands for the diffusion coefficient with $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Y})$ being the space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from \mathbb{U} to \mathcal{Y} . We call (1.2) a *singular* initial value problem because g and h map \mathcal{X} to the larger spaces \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{Y} , i.e. they are not invariant in \mathcal{X} . We refer to Sections 2.1, 2.2 for the precise setting.

For the entirely regular case $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z}$, it is well-known that (local) Lipschitz conditions on $b(t, \cdot) + g(t, \cdot)$ and $h(t, \cdot)$ ensure that (1.2) admits unique (local) pathwise solution in \mathcal{X} . If additional monotonicity properties on the coefficients are imposed, then the Itô formula for Gelfand-triple Hilbert spaces can be exploited to assure global existence and continuity of solutions, cf. [42, 48, 46, 50] and the references therein. Notably this covers also the case when the Hilbert spaces form a Gelfand triple.

In this work, we focus on the singular case which appears in particular for ideal fluid models. Indeed, when we consider particular examples in Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{X} = H^s$, if $g(t, X)$ and $h(t, X)$ involve ∇X in a nonlinear way, or more generally, general Lie-type derivatives of X (see our examples (3.7) and (3.11) in the second part of the paper), then $g(t, X)$ and $h(t, X)$ can not be expected to be in $\mathcal{X} = H^s$, either. Likewise, the concept of monotonicity fails to apply as it relies on self-embedding drift and diffusion mappings. Working with the abstract framework in (1.2) entails another difficulty as compared to the regular or the Gelfand-triple case: the Itô formula is no longer available. To highlight the latter difficulty, let us recall the classical Itô formula for a Gelfand triplet $V \hookrightarrow H \hookrightarrow V^*$, where H is a separable Hilbert space with inner product (\cdot, \cdot) and H^* is its dual; V is a Banach space such that the embedding $V \hookrightarrow H$ is dense. Then the following result is classical, see [46, Theorem I.3.1] or [50, Theorem 4.2.5].

Date: January 23, 2022.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 60H15, 35Q35; Secondary: 60H17, 35A01.

Key words and phrases. Singular Stochastic differential equations; Stochastic fluid models; Transport noise; Generalized Lie derivative operators.

D. Alonso-Orán and H. Tang are supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. C. Rohde acknowledges support by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2075 - 39074001.

Assume that \mathbf{U} is a continuous V^* -valued stochastic process given by

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = \mathbf{U}(0) + \int_0^t \mathbf{g}(s) ds + \int_0^t \mathbf{G}(s) d\mathcal{W}(s), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $\mathbf{G} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; L_2(\mathbb{U}; H))$ and $\mathbf{g} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; V^*)$ are both progressively measurable and $\mathbf{U}(0) \in L^2(\Omega; H)$ is \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable. If $\mathbf{U} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; V)$, then \mathbf{U} is an H -valued continuous stochastic process and the Itô formula

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|_H^2 &= \|\mathbf{U}(0)\|_H^2 + 2 \int_0^t {}_{V^*}\langle \mathbf{g}(s), \mathbf{U}(s) \rangle_V ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\mathbf{G}(s) d\mathcal{W}, \mathbf{U}(s))_H + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{G}(s)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{U}; H)}^2 ds. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

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

Notice that (1.3) is applicable for $\mathbf{U}(0) \in H$, $\mathbf{U} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; V)$, $\mathbf{g} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; V^*)$ and $\mathbf{G} \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; L_2(\mathbb{U}; H))$. However, if \mathbf{G} is singular (not invariant in H), then $\mathbf{G} \in L_2(\mathbb{U}; H)$ is ambiguous. Besides, even though \mathbf{g} is allowed to be less regular, (1.3) requires $\mathbf{U}(t)$ to be more regular than $\mathbf{U}(0)$, i.e., $\mathbf{U} \in V \hookrightarrow H \ni \mathbf{U}(0)$. In many cases (for example, stochastic ideal fluid models), we do *not* know that this holds true. Hence, (1.3) is *not* applicable in singular cases, and then the time continuity of the solution *cannot* be obtained directly.

The first major goal of this paper is to establish a local-in-time theory for (1.2) generalizing classical results for e.g. the completely regular case $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z}$. The second goal of this work is to show that the abstract theory for (1.2) can be used to establish new results for ideal fluid systems with noise.

- (1) To achieve the first goal we fix in Section 2.2 the precise assumptions on the regular drift b and in particular on the singular drift g and diffusion h (see Assumption (A)). Then we provide our main results for (1.2), including the existence, uniqueness, time regularity, and a result characterizing the possible blow-up of pathwise solutions (see Theorem 2.1). The key requirements for the proof are the assumption on the existence of appropriate Lipschitz-continuous and monotone regularizations for the singular mappings. This allows us to exploit Itô-like formulas as above.
- (2) With the abstract framework at hand, for a large number of nonlinear SPDE models, we are able to construct such regular approximation schemes by using convolution operators and establishing a cancellation property for generalized Lie derivatives (cf. Lemma A.5). To set the stage, in Section 3, we consider two models governing ideal flows with particularly interesting stochastic perturbation, namely
 - the two-component Camassa-Holm (CH) system with transport noise [39], see (3.4) below,
 - a nonlinear transport equation with non-local velocity, referred to the Córdoba-Córdoba-Fontelos (CCF) model [19], with transport noise, see (3.10) below.

In both cases, we obtain a local-in-time theory in the sense of the abstract-framework Theorem 2.1. These results for both models are new up to our knowledge and can be found in Section 3.2. Finally, we will explain in Section 3.5 how our abstract framework and the regular approximation schemes can be applied to a broader class of fluid dynamics equations including the surface quasi-geostrophic (SQG) equation with transport noise.

2. AN ABSTRACT FRAMEWORK FOR A CLASS OF SINGULAR SDES

2.1. Notations and definitions. To begin with, we introduce some notations. We consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where \mathbb{P} is a probability measure on Ω and \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra. We endow the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with an increasing filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, which is a right-continuous filtration on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) such that $\{\mathcal{F}_0\}$ contains all the \mathbb{P} -negligible subsets. For some separable Hilbert space \mathbb{U} with a complete orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ the noise \mathcal{W} in (1.2) is a cylindrical Wiener process, i.e., it is defined by

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} W_k e_k \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad (2.1)$$

where $\{W_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a sequence of mutually independent standard 1-D Brownian motions. To guarantee the convergence of the above formal summation, we consider a larger separable Hilbert space \mathbb{U}_0 such that the canonical injection $\mathbb{U} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{U}_0$ is Hilbert-Schmidt. Therefore, for any $T > 0$, we have, cf. [25, 34, 43],

$$\mathcal{W} \in C([0, T], \mathbb{U}_0) \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Note that the choice of the auxiliary Hilbert spaces \mathbb{U} and \mathbb{U}_0 is not crucial for our analysis. Thus we let \mathbb{U} and \mathbb{U}_0 be arbitrary but fixed in the sequel.

For some time $t > 0$, the family $\sigma\{x_1(\tau), \dots, x_n(\tau)\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$ stands for the completion of the union σ -algebra generated by $(x_1(\tau), \dots, x_n(\tau))$ for $\tau \in [0, t]$. $\mathbb{E}Y$ stands for the mathematical expectation of a random variable Y with respect to \mathbb{P} . From now on $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ is called a stochastic basis.

For any Hilbert space \mathbb{H} the inner product is denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathbb{H}}$. Furthermore, the space $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})$ contains all Hilbert-Schmidt operators $Z : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ with finite norm $\|Z\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|Ze_k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2$. As in [11, Theorem 2.3.1], we see that for an \mathbb{H} -valued progressively measurable stochastic process Z with $Z \in L^2(\Omega; L_{\text{loc}}^2([0, \infty); \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})))$, one can define the Itô stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t Z \, d\mathcal{W} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t Ze_k \, dW_k.$$

Most notably for the analysis here, if $Z \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})$ and \mathcal{W} is given as above, we have the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy (BDG) inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \int_0^t Z \, d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^p \right) \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \|Z\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{H})}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad p \geq 1,$$

or in terms of the coefficients,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t Ze_k \, dW_k \right\|_{\mathbb{H}}^p \right) \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|Ze_k\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \, dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad p \geq 1.$$

Let \mathbb{X} be a separable Banach space. $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ denotes the Borel sets of \mathbb{X} and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ stands for the collection of Borel probability measures on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$. We denote $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathbb{X})$ the family of probability measures in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ with finite moment of order $r \in [1, \infty)$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_r(\mathbb{X}) = \{\mu : \int_{\mathbb{X}} \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}}^r \mu(dx) < \infty\}$. For two Banach spaces \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} , $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ means that \mathbb{X} is embedded continuously into \mathbb{Y} , and $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ means that the embedding is compact.

For some set E , $\mathbf{1}_E$ denotes the indicator function on E .

Next, let us make precise two different notions of solutions in the Hilbert space \mathcal{X} from (1.1) for the Cauchy problem (1.2).

Definition 2.1 (Martingale solutions). *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. A triple (\mathcal{S}, X, τ) is said to be a martingale solution to (1.2) if*

- (1) $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ is a stochastic basis and τ is a stopping time with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$;
- (2) $X(\cdot \wedge \tau) : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -progressively measurable process such that it is continuous in \mathcal{Z} , $\mu_0(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}\{X_0 \in \cdot\}$ for all $\cdot \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ and for every $t > 0$,

$$X(t \wedge \tau) - X_0 = \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (b(t', X(t')) + g(t', X(t'))) \, dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} h(t', X(t')) \, d\mathcal{W} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (2.2)$$

In (2.2), $\int_0^{\cdot} \{b(t', X(t')) + g(t', X(t'))\} \, dt'$ is the Bochner integral on \mathcal{Z} and $\int_0^{\cdot} h(t', X(t')) \, d\mathcal{W}$ is a continuous local martingale on \mathcal{Y} .

- (3) If $\tau = \infty$ $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$, then we say that the martingale solution is global.

The stronger concept of pathwise solutions is provided in

Definition 2.2 (Pathwise solutions). *Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis. Let X_0 be an \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable. A local pathwise solution to (1.2) is a pair (X, τ) , where τ is a stopping time satisfying $\mathbb{P}\{\tau > 0\} = 1$ and $X : \Omega \times [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -progressively measurable process satisfying (2.2) and $X(\cdot \wedge \tau) \in C([0, \infty); \mathcal{X})$ almost surely.*

It follows from Definition 2.1 that, if a martingale solution exists, then (2.2) implies that

$$\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} (b(t', X(t')) + g(t', X(t'))) \, dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} h(t', X(t')) \, d\mathcal{W} \quad (2.3)$$

takes values in \mathcal{X} , even though g and h are not invariant in \mathcal{X} . Moreover, Definition 2.2 implies that if a pathwise solution exists, then (2.3) is continuous in time in \mathcal{X} .

To study the possible blow-up of the solutions, we need the following concept of maximal solutions.

Definition 2.3 (Maximal solutions). *Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis. Let X_0 be an \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable. (X, τ^*) is called a maximal pathwise solution to (1.2) if there is an increasing sequence $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (X, τ_n) is a pathwise solution satisfying*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_n]} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \geq n \quad \text{a.e. on } \{\tau^* < \infty\}.$$

Particularly, if $\tau^ = \infty$ almost surely, then such a solution is called global.*

2.2. Assumptions and main results. To study the existence of martingale and pathwise solutions, we need the following assumptions on the three separable Hilbert spaces \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} , \mathcal{Z} from (1.1) and on the coefficients b , g and h in (1.2). Recall that $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a complete orthonormal basis of \mathbb{U} .

Assumption (A). *The Hilbert spaces satisfy the embedding relation $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ and the coefficients $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $g : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ and $h : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Y})$ are continuous in both variables. Let \mathcal{V} be a Banach space satisfying $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$.*

There are non-decreasing locally bounded functions $f(\cdot), k(\cdot), q(\cdot) \in C([0, +\infty); [0, +\infty))$ such that the following conditions hold true.

(A₁) *For all $(t, X) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\|b(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq k(t)f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}})\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (2.4)$$

and for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{X \neq Y\}} \frac{\|b(t, X) - b(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}}} \right\} \leq q(N)k(t). \quad (2.5)$$

Besides, for any bounded sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $X_\varepsilon \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{Z} ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b(t, X_\varepsilon) - b(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.6)$$

(A₂) *For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $N \geq 1$ there exist progressively measurable maps*

$$g_\varepsilon : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}, \quad h_\varepsilon : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})$$

and constants $C_{\varepsilon, N} > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$ the bounds

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1), \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \|g_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} + \|g(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} + \|h_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Y})} + \|h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Y})} \right\} \leq q(N)k(t), \quad (2.7)$$

$$\sup_{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \|g_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \|h_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})} \right\} \leq C_{\varepsilon, N}k(t), \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\sup_{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{X \neq Y\}} \left(\frac{\|g_\varepsilon(t, X) - g_\varepsilon(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}}} + \frac{\|h_\varepsilon(t, X) - h_\varepsilon(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}}{\|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}}} \right) \right\} \leq C_{\varepsilon, N}k(t) \quad (2.9)$$

hold. Moreover, for any bounded sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $X_\varepsilon \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{Z} and for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t | {}_{\mathcal{Z}} \langle g_\varepsilon(t, X_\varepsilon(t')) - g(t, X(t')), \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*} | \, dt' = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{Z}^* \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_\varepsilon(t, X_\varepsilon) - h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Z})} = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Here ${}_{\mathcal{Z}} \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^}$ denotes the dual pairing in \mathcal{Z} .*

(A₃) *Let g_ε and h_ε as in (A₂). For all $n \geq 1$ and $(t, X) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X}$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |(h_\varepsilon(t, X)e_i, X)_{\mathcal{X}}|^2 \leq k(t)f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}})\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4 \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$2(g_\varepsilon(t, X), X)_{\mathcal{X}} + \|h_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}^2 \leq k(t)f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}})\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2. \quad (2.13)$$

(A₄) For any $t \geq 0$ and $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\sup_{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{X \neq Y\}} \frac{\|b(t, X) - b(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}}{\|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{Z}}} + \right\} \leq q(N)k(t) \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\sup_{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{X \neq Y\}} \frac{2(g(t, X) - g(t, Y), X - Y)_{\mathcal{Z}} + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Z})}^2}{\|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2} \right\} \leq q(N)k(t). \quad (2.15)$$

(A₅) The embedding $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is dense, and there is a family of continuous linear operators $\{T_{\varepsilon} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ such that

$$\|T_{\varepsilon}X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|T_{\varepsilon}X - X\|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0 \quad (X \in \mathcal{X}) \quad (2.16)$$

and for all $t \geq 0$, $N \geq 1$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1), \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} 2(T_{\varepsilon}g(t, X), T_{\varepsilon}X)_{\mathcal{X}} + \|T_{\varepsilon}h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}^2 \leq q(N)k(t), \quad (2.17)$$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1), \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq N} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |(T_{\varepsilon}h(t, X)e_i, T_{\varepsilon}X)_{\mathcal{X}}|^2 \leq q(N)k(t) \quad (2.18)$$

hold.

(A₆) There is a family of continuous linear operators $\{Q_{\varepsilon} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ such that (2.16) with Q_{ε} replacing T_{ε} and

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |(Q_{\varepsilon}h(t, X)e_i, Q_{\varepsilon}X)_{\mathcal{X}}|^2 \leq k(t)f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}})\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\|Q_{\varepsilon}X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2, \quad (2.19)$$

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} 2(Q_{\varepsilon}g(t, X), Q_{\varepsilon}X)_{\mathcal{X}} + \|Q_{\varepsilon}h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}^2 \leq k(t)f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}})\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \quad (2.20)$$

hold true for $t \geq 0$.

Note that for the singular mappings the constants $C_{\varepsilon, N}$ in Assumption (A) are non-decreasing in N for ε fixed and explode for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ with N fixed. Then we can state our main results for the initial value problem (1.2).

Theorem 2.1. *Considering (1.2), we have the following results.*

- (i) Let Assumptions (A₁)-(A₃) hold. Then, for any $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$, (1.2) has a local martingale solution (S, X, τ) in the sense of Definition 2.1.
- (ii) Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis. If Assumptions (A₁)-(A₅) hold, then for any \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable $X_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{X})$, (1.2) has a local unique pathwise solution (X, τ) , in the sense of Definition 2.2 such that

$$X(\cdot \wedge \tau) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); \mathcal{X})). \quad (2.21)$$

- (iii) Let (X, τ^*) be the maximal solution to (1.2), in the sense of Definition 2.3, under (A₁)-(A₅). If additionally (A₆) holds true, then the blow-up occurs in \mathcal{X} as well as \mathcal{V} , i.e.

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|X\|_{\mathcal{V}} = \infty\}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (2.22)$$

Remark 2.1. We first remark that the singular terms g and h are in general not monotone in the sense of [49, 50]. So, the well-known approximation scheme under a Gelfand triple developed for quasi-linear SPDEs does not work for the present model. Motivated by [51], we will employ a regularization argument to overcome this difficulty. Let us give some explanations on Assumption (A) that makes precise the required regularization procedure.

- The condition (A₁) provides the local Lipschitz continuity for the regular drift coefficient $b(t, X)$ and bounds its growth. Assumption (A₂) requires the local Lipschitz continuity on the approximations g_{ε} and h_{ε} of the singular terms g and h , which together with (A₁) will ensure local-in-time existence for some approximate problem. In Section 3.1 we will show how to construct such approximations using mollifiers.

- **(A₃)** can be viewed as a renormalization type condition in the following sense. Formally speaking, even though g and h are not invariant with respect to \mathcal{X} (hence $(g(t, X), X)_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\|h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}$ may be infinite), we require that $(g(t, X), X)_{\mathcal{X}} + \|h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}$ can be controlled. In fact, **(A₃)** specifies this relationship for g_ε and h_ε such that $(g_\varepsilon(t, X), X)_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\|h_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}$ make sense.
- Since g and h are singular, we need **(A₄)** on the joint space \mathcal{Z} to guarantee pathwise uniqueness.
- As explained in the introduction, we can *not* use the Itô formula (1.3) to obtain the time continuity of the solution directly. This is why we need to assume **(A₅)** and **(A₆)** to establish time continuity and blow-up criterion, respectively. **(A₆)** is stronger than **(A₅)** because we need both, the validity of the Itô formula and the growth condition. However, the dense embedding $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is not necessary for deriving the blow-up criterion. Moreover, in applications, usually one can take $T_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon$.
- In view of Assumption **(A)**, it is worthwhile noticing that the regular drift b will *not* be used to control the singular terms, i.e. our result covers the case $b \equiv 0$, where both the drift and diffusion in (1.2) are singular. However, we assume that the problem (1.2) has a regular part to cover more ideal fluid models.

Remark 2.2. We remark that in [26], an abstract fluid model involving a Stokes operator (viscous term) and a regular noise coefficient is studied. Here, we are able to deal with ideal fluid models without viscosity and noise of transport type. Moreover, in [26], the martingale solution exists under the condition that the initial measure has finite moment of order $r > 8$ (See [26, Theorem 6.1]). In the present work, we only require $r = 2$, i.e., $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$ in **(i)** in Theorem 2.1.

Remark 2.3. We also remark that when the noise coefficient $h(t, X)$ is as regular as the solution X and the singularity of (1.2) only arises in g , namely $b : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $h : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})$ and $g : [0, \infty) \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, one can also obtain a local theory as in Theorem 2.1 even under weaker conditions as in Assumption **(A)**.

2.3. Proof of (i) in Theorem 2.1. For the sake of clarity, we split the proof into the following subsections.

2.3.1. Approximation scheme and uniform estimates. For $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$, we first fix a stochastic basis \mathcal{S} and a random variable X_0 such that the distribution law of X_0 is μ_0 . For any $R > 1$, we let $\chi_R(x) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ -function such that $\chi_R(x) = 1$ for $x \in [0, R]$ and $\chi_R(x) = 0$ for $x > 2R$. Then we consider a cut-off version of (1.2) given by

$$\begin{aligned} dX &= \chi_R^2(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) [b(t, X) + g(t, X)] dt + \chi_R(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) h(t, X) dW, \\ X(0) &= X_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

We have not posed any structural properties like monotonicity on the singular mappings g, h that ensure the existence of solutions for (2.23). Therefore we employ the regular approximations g_ε and h_ε from Assumption **(A)** which leads us to the regular approximative version

$$\begin{aligned} dX &= H_{1,\varepsilon}(t, X) dt + H_{2,\varepsilon}(t, X) dW, \\ H_{1,\varepsilon}(t, X) &= \chi_R^2(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (b(t, X) + g_\varepsilon(t, X)), \\ H_{2,\varepsilon}(t, X) &= \chi_R(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) h_\varepsilon(t, X), \\ X(0) &= X_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

For (2.24) we can obtain the following global existence result.

Lemma 2.1. *For $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{X})$, we fix a stochastic basis \mathcal{S} and a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable X_0 such that the distribution of X_0 is μ_0 . Let $R > 1$ be fixed.*

For each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the problem (2.24) has a global solution X_ε . Moreover, for any sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and for any $T > 0$, we have that

$$\nu_{\varepsilon_n}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}\{(X_{\varepsilon_n}, W) \in \cdot\} \quad (2.25)$$

defines a tight sequence in $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{U}_0))$.

Proof. From **(A₁)**, **(A₂)**, it is easy to see that for each $n \geq 1$, $H_{1,\varepsilon}(t, X)$ and $H_{2,\varepsilon}(t, X)$ are locally Lipschitz in $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, the growth of $\|H_{1,\varepsilon}(\cdot, X)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\|H_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}$ is controlled by the continuous function $k(t)$. Therefore, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a stopping time $\tau_\varepsilon^* > 0$ almost surely such that the problem (2.24) has a unique solution $X_\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \tau_\varepsilon^*]; \mathcal{X}))$, see [48] or [42, Theorem 5.1.1]. Next, we

prove that the solution is actually a global solution. Using the Itô formula in \mathcal{X} for the regular mappings $g_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} d\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &= 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \chi_R(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (h_\varepsilon(t, X_\varepsilon) e_k, X_\varepsilon)_{\mathcal{X}} dW_k + 2\chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (b(t, X_\varepsilon), X_\varepsilon)_{\mathcal{X}} dt \\ &\quad + 2\chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (g_\varepsilon(t, X_\varepsilon), X_\varepsilon)_{\mathcal{X}} dt + \chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|h_\varepsilon(t, X_\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}^2 dt \\ &=: \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_{1,k} dW_k + \sum_{i=2}^4 J_i dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

For any $T > 0$, we integrate (2.26), take a supremum for $t \in [0, T]$ and then use the BDG inequality, (A₁) and (A₃) to find a constant $C = C_R > 0$ depending on R such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 - \mathbb{E} \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_{1,k}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_0^T |J_2| dt + \int_0^T |J_3 + J_4| dt \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T k(t) \chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) f(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \int_0^T k(t) \chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) f(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \\ &\leq C_R \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \int_0^T k(t) \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_R \int_0^T k(t) \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C_R \int_0^T k(t) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Via Grönwall's inequality, we arrive at the ε -independent bound

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq C(R, X_0, T). \quad (2.27)$$

Since $T > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily, we see in particular that X_ε is a global solution for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, the bound (2.27) implies that the stopping times

$$\tau_N^\varepsilon := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}} \geq N\}, \quad N \geq 1, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \quad (2.28)$$

satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_N^\varepsilon < T) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}} \geq N \right) \leq \frac{C(R, X_0, T)}{N^2}. \quad (2.29)$$

Now we turn to prove the tightness result on the Borel measure in (2.25). For any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} (1 \wedge \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} (1 \wedge \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon < T\}} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} (1 \wedge \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\tau_N^\varepsilon < T\} + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} (1 \wedge \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C(R, X_0, T)}{N^2} + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \left(1 \wedge \|\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} X_\varepsilon(t_2) - \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

holds. Note that we used the ε -independent bound (2.29) for the last inequality. To estimate the expectation term in (2.30) we utilize the approximative problem (2.24) directly. We start with the drift term

$H_{1,\varepsilon}$. On account of (2.28), (A₁) and (A₂) and the BDG inequality, there are a non-decreasing, locally bounded function $a(\cdot) \in C([0, +\infty); [0, +\infty))$ and a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε such that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{1,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t')) dt' \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& \leq |t_2 - t_1| \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon]} \|H_{1,\varepsilon}(t, X_\varepsilon(t))\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& \leq C |t_2 - t_1| \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon]} (\chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) k(t) f(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \chi_R^2(\|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|g_\varepsilon(X_\varepsilon)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \\
& \leq C k(T) |t_2 - t_1| \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (f(CN)N + q(N)) \leq Ca(N)k(T)|t_2 - t_1|. \tag{2.31}
\end{aligned}$$

For the diffusion operator $H_{2,\varepsilon}$ and the stochastic integral, the bound (2.28), (A₂) and the BDG inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{2,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t')) dW \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \right) \tag{2.32} \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t_* \in [t_1, t_2]} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_*} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{2,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t')) dW \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{2,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t'))\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{Z})}^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C |t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon]} (q(N)k(t)) \\
& \leq Ca(N)k(T)|t_2 - t_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.33}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates (2.31), (2.32), for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} X_\varepsilon(t_2) - \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{1,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t')) dt' \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T \wedge \tau_N^\varepsilon], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_N^\varepsilon \geq T\}} H_{2,\varepsilon}(t', X_\varepsilon(t')) dW \right\|_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& \leq Ca(N)k(T)\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, returning to (2.30), the last estimate implies that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} (1 \wedge \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}) \leq \inf_{N \geq 1} \left\{ \frac{C(R, X_0, T)}{N^2} + Ca(N)k(T)\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.$$

Because $a(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \mathbb{E} \sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0.$$

Thus, we obtain that, for any $\delta > 0$, the limit

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{[t_1, t_2] \subset [0, T], t_2 - t_1 < \delta} \|X_\varepsilon(t_2) - X_\varepsilon(t_1)\|_{\mathcal{Z}} > \delta \right) = 0 \tag{2.34}$$

holds. Since $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, for each $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}(X_\varepsilon(t) \in \cdot)$ is tight in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$. This together with (2.34) means for any vanishing sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that (cf. [34, Theorem 3.17])

$$\mu_{\varepsilon_n}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}\{X_{\varepsilon_n} \in \cdot\}$$

is a tight sequence in $\mathcal{P}(C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}))$. On the other hand, since \mathcal{W} stays unchanged, ν_{ε_n} defined in (2.25) is also tight. \square

2.3.2. Stochastic compactness. On the basis of Lemma 2.1 and the weak stochastic compactness theory we can now characterize the convergence of the sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\}$ obtaining global-in-time results.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $R > 1$, $T > 0$. The sequence $\{\nu_{\varepsilon_n}\}$ defined in Lemma 2.1 has a weakly convergent subsequence, still denoted by $\{\nu_\varepsilon\}$, with limit measure ν . There is a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ on which there is a sequence of random variables $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon)$ and a pair $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})$ such that we have*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left\{(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon) \in \cdot\right\} = \nu_\varepsilon(\cdot), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left\{(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}) \in \cdot\right\} = \nu(\cdot), \quad (2.35)$$

and

$$\tilde{X}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{X} \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathbb{U}_0) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s. \quad (2.36)$$

Moreover, for $t \in [0, T]$, the following results hold.

- (i) $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon$ is a cylindrical Wiener process with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^\varepsilon = \sigma\left\{\tilde{X}_\varepsilon(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon(\tau)\right\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$.
- (ii) $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ is a cylindrical Wiener process with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\left\{\tilde{X}(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}(\tau)\right\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$.
- (iii) On $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^\varepsilon\}_{t \geq 0})$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$ we have

$$\tilde{X}_\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{X}_\varepsilon(0) = \int_0^t \chi_R^2(\|\tilde{X}_\varepsilon\|_\nu) \left[b(t', \tilde{X}_\varepsilon) + g_\varepsilon(t', \tilde{X}_\varepsilon) \right] dt' + \int_0^t \chi_R(\|\tilde{X}_\varepsilon\|_\nu) h_\varepsilon(t', \tilde{X}_\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon. \quad (2.37)$$

Proof. The existence of the sequence $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon)$ satisfying (2.36) is a consequence of Lemma 2.1 and Theorems A.6 and A.7. Besides, [11, Theorem 2.1.35 and Corollary 2.1.36] imply that $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ are cylindrical Wiener processes relative to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^\varepsilon = \sigma\left\{\tilde{X}_\varepsilon(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon(\tau)\right\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\left\{\tilde{X}(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}(\tau)\right\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$, respectively. As in [9, page 282] or [11, Theorem 2.9.1] one can find that $(\tilde{X}_\varepsilon, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon)$ relative to $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t^\varepsilon\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies (2.37) $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$ \square

2.3.3. Concluding the proof of (i) in Theorem 2.1. To begin with, we notice that the embedding $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is continuous, which means there exist continuous maps $\pi_m : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $m \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\pi_m x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\pi_m x\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad x \in \mathcal{Z},$$

where $\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} := \infty$ if $x \notin \mathcal{X}$. This, together with (2.27), (2.35) and Fatou's lemma, yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\pi_m \tilde{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\pi_m \tilde{X}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < C(R, X_0, T). \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

Using (2.36), (2.38), $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, (A₂) and Lemma A.8 (up to further subsequence) in (2.37), we obtain that

$$\int_0^t \chi_R(\|\tilde{X}_\varepsilon\|_\nu) h_\varepsilon(t, \tilde{X}_\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \chi_R(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) h(t, \tilde{X}) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}} \text{ in } L^2(0, T; \mathcal{Z}) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$$

As before, it follows from (2.36), (2.38), $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$ and (A₂) that for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{Z}^*$,

$$\int_0^t \chi_R^2(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) \left\langle b(s, \tilde{X}_\varepsilon(s)) - b(s, \tilde{X}(s)) + g_\varepsilon(s, \tilde{X}_\varepsilon(s)) - g(s, \tilde{X}(s)), \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*} ds \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0, \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$$

Therefore we derive that for all $\phi \in \mathcal{Z}^*$ and $dt \otimes \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \tilde{X}(t), \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*} - \left\langle \tilde{X}(0), \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*} \\ &= \int_0^t \chi_R^2(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) \left\langle b(s, \tilde{X}(s)) + g(s, \tilde{X}_\varepsilon(s)), \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*} ds + \left\langle \int_0^t \chi_R(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) h(t, \tilde{X}) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}}, \phi \right\rangle_{\mathcal{Z}^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (2.38), (A₁) and (A₂), we see that $t \mapsto \int_0^t \chi_R(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) h(t', \tilde{X}(t')) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ is a local continuous martingale on $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{Z}$, and that $t \mapsto \int_0^t \chi_R^2(\|\tilde{X}\|_\nu) \left[b(t', \tilde{X}(t')) + g(t', \tilde{X}(t')) \right] dt'$ is a continuous process on \mathcal{Z} as well.

Hence, we obtain that \tilde{X} is a global martingale solution to (2.23). Moreover, (2.36) and (2.38) imply that $\tilde{X} \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega}; L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{X}) \cap C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}))$ holds. Define

$$\tilde{\tau} = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \|\tilde{X}(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}} > R \right\},$$

then we see that $(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \tilde{X}, \tilde{\tau})$ is a local martingale solution to (1.2), where $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})$ with $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t \geq 0} = \sigma \left\{ \tilde{X}(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}(\tau) \right\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$. We have finished the proof.

2.4. Proof of (ii) in Theorem 2.1. To obtain a pathwise solution to (1.2), we will use (i) in Theorem 2.1 and the Gyöngy-Krylov Lemma, cf. Lemma A.9. The proof can naturally be broken down into several subsections.

2.4.1. Pathwise uniqueness of the cut-off problem. We first state the following result which indicates that for $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -initial values, the solution map is time locally Lipschitz in the less regular space \mathcal{Z} .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis and let (A₄) hold. Let $M > 0$ be a constant. Assume that X_0 and Y_0 are two \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variables satisfying $\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \|Y_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < M$ almost surely.*

Let (\mathcal{S}, X, τ_1) and (\mathcal{S}, Y, τ_2) be two local pathwise solutions to (1.2) such that $X(0) = X_0, Y(0) = Y_0$ almost surely, and $X(\cdot \wedge \tau_1), Y(\cdot \wedge \tau_2) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); \mathcal{X}))$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Then, for any $T > 0$, there exists a constant $C(M, T) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|X(t) - Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \leq C(M, T) \mathbb{E} \|X_0 - Y_0\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2. \quad (2.39)$$

In (2.39) we used

$$\tau_X^T := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} > M + 2\} \wedge T, \quad \tau_Y^T := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} > M + 2\} \wedge T, \quad (2.40)$$

and $\tau_{X,Y}^T = \tau_X^T \wedge \tau_Y^T$.

Proof. Let $Z = X - Y$. Then Z satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} d\|Z\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 &= 2([h(t, X) - h(t, Y)] d\mathcal{W}, Z)_{\mathcal{Z}} + 2(b(t, X) - b(t, Y), Z)_{\mathcal{Z}} dt \\ &\quad + 2(g(t, X) - g(t, Y), Z)_{\mathcal{Z}} dt + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Z})}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

By (A₁), (A₄), Itô's formula (which holds true on the entire space \mathcal{Z}), and the BDG inequality, we find for some $C > 0$ depending on b, g, h the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|Z(t)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 - \mathbb{E} \|Z(0)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_{X,Y}^T} \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{Z})}^2 \|Z\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_{X,Y}^T} q(M+2) k(t) \|Z(t)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 dt \\ &\leq C q(M+2) \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|Z\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \cdot \int_0^{\tau_{X,Y}^T} k^2(t) \|Z\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C q(M+2) \int_0^T k(t) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|Z(t')\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|Z\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 + C(M, T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, \tau_{X,Y}^T]} \|Z(t')\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

If we apply Grönwall's inequality to the estimate above, we get (2.39). \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis and let (A₄) hold. Let X_0 be an \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E} \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < \infty$. If $(\mathcal{S}, X_1, \tau_1)$ and $(\mathcal{S}, X_2, \tau_2)$ are two local pathwise solutions to (1.2) satisfying $X_i(\cdot \wedge \tau_i) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); \mathcal{X}))$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\mathbb{P}\{X_1(0) = X_2(0) = X_0\} = 1$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_1 = X_2, \forall t \in [0, \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]\} = 1.$$

Proof. We first assume that $\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < M$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for some deterministic $M > 0$. For any $K > 2M$ and $T > 0$, we define

$$\tau_K^T := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|X_1(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \|X_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} > K\} \wedge T.$$

Then one can repeat all steps in the proof of (2.39) by using τ_K^T instead of $\tau_{X,Y}^T$ to find

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_K^T]} \|X_1(t) - X_2(t)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 \leq C(K, T) \mathbb{E} \|X_1(0) - X_2(0)\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 = 0.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \tau_K^T \geq \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 \wedge T\} = 1. \quad (2.41)$$

Sending $K \rightarrow \infty$, using the monotone convergence theorem and (2.41) with noticing $T > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain the desired result for X_0 being almost surely bounded.

It remains to remove this restriction. Motivated by [35, 36], for general \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial data such that $\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < \infty$ holds, we define $\Omega_k = \{k-1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k\}$, $k \geq 1$. Then we see that $\Omega_k \cap \Omega_{k'} = \emptyset$ for $k \neq k'$, and $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \Omega_k$ is a set of full measure. Consider

$$X_0(\omega) = \sum_{k \geq 1} X_0(\omega, x) \mathbf{1}_{k-1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k} =: \sum_{k \geq 1} X_{0,k}(\omega) \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1(t \wedge \tau_1) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X(0) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} b(t', X_1) dt' + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} g(t', X_1) dt' + \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_1} h(t, X_1) dW \\ &= \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} b(t', X_1) dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} g(t', X_1) dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} h(t', X_1) dW. \end{aligned}$$

Due to $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} F(t, X_1) = F(t, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k^c} F(t, \mathbf{0})$ for $F \in \{b, g, h\}$, and (A₁), (A₂) we get $\|b(t, \mathbf{0})\|_{\mathcal{X}}$, $\|g(t, \mathbf{0})\|_{\mathcal{Z}}$, $\|h(t, \mathbf{0})\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{V})} < \infty$. Then we can proceed with

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1(t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1) - X_{0,k} \\ &= \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} b(t', \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1) dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} g(t', \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1) dt' + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1} h(t', \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1) dW \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \end{aligned}$$

which means that $(\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1)$ is a solution to (1.2) with initial data $X_{0,k}$. Similarly, $(\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_2, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_2)$ is also a solution to (1.2) with initial data $X_{0,k}$. Altogether we obtain $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_1 = \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_2$ on $[0, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_1 \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_2]$ almost surely. Because $X_i = \sum_{k \geq 1} X_i \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}$ and $\tau_i = \sum_{k \geq 1} \tau_i \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k}$ almost surely for $i = 1, 2$, $\Omega_k \cap \Omega_{k'} = \emptyset$ for $k \neq k'$ and $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \Omega_k$ is a set of full measure, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_1 = X_2 \forall t \in [0, \tau_1 \wedge \tau_2]\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \Omega_k\} = 1,$$

which completes the proof. \square

For the cut-off problem (2.23), we also have pathwise uniqueness. Indeed, since $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, the additional terms coming from the cut-off function $\chi_R(\cdot)$ can be handled by the mean value theorem as

$$|\chi_R(\|X_1\|_{\mathcal{V}}) - \chi_R(\|X_2\|_{\mathcal{V}})| \leq C\|X_1 - X_2\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq C\|X_1 - X_2\|_{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

Then one can modify the proof of Lemma 2.4 in a straightforward way to get

Lemma 2.5. *Let $T > 0$ and $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis. Let (A₄) hold and let X_0 be an \mathcal{X} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < \infty$.*

If (\mathcal{S}, X_1, T) and (\mathcal{S}, X_2, T) are two solutions, on the same basis \mathcal{S} , of (2.23) such that $\mathbb{P}\{X_1(0) = X_2(0) = X_0\} = 1$ and $X_i \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathcal{X}))$ for $i = 1, 2$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_1 = X_2 \forall t \in [0, T]\} = 1.$$

2.4.2. Pathwise solution to the cut-off problem. Now we prove the existence and uniqueness of a pathwise solution to (2.23). To be more precise, we are going to show the following result.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a fixed stochastic basis. Let $X_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{X})$ be an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable.*

If Assumptions (A₁)-(A₅) hold, then (2.23) has a unique global pathwise solution X which satisfies for any $T > 0$

$$X \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathcal{X})). \quad (2.42)$$

Proof. Uniqueness is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.5. The proof of the other assertions is divided into two steps.

Step 1: Existence. Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be given and let X_ε be the global pathwise solution to (2.24). We define sequences of measures $\nu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}$ and $\mu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}$ as

$$\nu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}\{(X_{\varepsilon(1)}, X_{\varepsilon(2)}) \in \cdot\} \text{ on } C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}),$$

and

$$\mu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}\{(X_{\varepsilon(1)}, X_{\varepsilon(2)}, \mathcal{W}) \in \cdot\} \text{ on } C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{U}_0).$$

Let $\left\{\nu_{\varepsilon_k(1), \varepsilon_k(2)}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an arbitrary subsequence of $\left\{\nu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\varepsilon_k^{(1)}, \varepsilon_k^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. With minor modifications in the proof of Lemma 2.1, the tightness of $\left\{\nu_{\varepsilon_k(1), \varepsilon_k(2)}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be obtained. Similar to Lemma 2.2, one can find a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ on which there is a sequence of random variables $(X_{\varepsilon_k(1)}, \overline{X_{\varepsilon_k(2)}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_k)$ and a random variable $(\underline{X}, \overline{X}, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}})$ such that

$$\left(X_{\varepsilon_k(1)}, \overline{X_{\varepsilon_k(2)}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_k\right) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} (\underline{X}, \overline{X}, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}) \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathbb{U}_0) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}} - a.s.$$

Then, $\nu_{\varepsilon(1), \varepsilon(2)}$ converges weakly to a measure ν on $C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z})$ defined by

$$\nu(\cdot) = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\{(\underline{X}, \overline{X}) \in \cdot\}.$$

Going along the lines as in Section 2.3.3, we see that both $(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \underline{X}, T)$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \overline{X}, T)$ are martingale solutions to (2.23) such that $\underline{X}, \overline{X} \in L^2(\tilde{\Omega}; L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{X}) \cap C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}))$. Moreover, since $X_\varepsilon(0) \equiv X_0$ for all n , we have that $\underline{X}(0) = \overline{X}(0)$ almost surely in $\tilde{\Omega}$. Then we use Lemma 2.5 to see

$$\nu(\{(\underline{X}, \overline{X}) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \times C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}), \underline{X} = \overline{X}\}) = 1.$$

Lemma A.9 implies that the original sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\}$ defined on the initial probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ has a subsequence (still labeled in the same way) satisfying

$$X_\varepsilon \rightarrow X \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}) \quad (2.43)$$

for some X in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z})$. Similar to (2.38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\pi_m X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\pi_m X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|X_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < C(R, X_0, T). \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

Therefore $X \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{X}) \cap C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}))$. Since for each n , X_ε is $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ progressive measurable, so is X . Using (2.43) and the embedding $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, we obtain a global pathwise solution to (2.23).

Step 2: Time continuity. As $X \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{X}) \cap C([0, T]; \mathcal{Z}))$, now we only need to prove that $X(t)$ is continuous in \mathcal{X} . Since $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is dense, we see that X is weakly continuous in \mathcal{X} (cf. [56, page 263, Lemma 1.4]). It suffices to prove the continuity of $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. The difficulty here is that the problem (1.2) is singular, i.e., $g(t, X)$ is only a \mathcal{Z} -valued process and $h(t, X)$ is only an $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{V})$ -valued process, hence the products $(g(t, X), X)_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $(h(t, X)e_i, X)_{\mathcal{X}}$ might not exist and the classical Itô formula in the Hilbert space \mathcal{X} (see [25, Theorem 4.32] or [34, Theorem 2.10]) can not be used directly here. At this point the regularization operator T_ε from (A.5) is invoked to consider the Itô formula for $\|T_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$ instead. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\|T_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &= 2\chi_R(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (T_\varepsilon h(t, X) d\mathcal{W}, T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}} + 2\chi_R^2(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (T_\varepsilon b(t, X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}} dt \\ &\quad + 2\chi_R^2(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) (T_\varepsilon g(t, X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}} dt + \chi_R^2(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|T_\varepsilon h(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X})}^2 dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

By (2.44),

$$\tau_N = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}} > N\} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (2.46)$$

Thus, we only need to prove the continuity up to time $\tau_N \wedge T$ for each $N \geq 1$. Using (A₅), (A₁) and the bound $\chi_R(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \leq 1$, we have for $[t_2, t_1] \subset [0, T]$ with $t_1 - t_2 < 1$ the estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\|T_\varepsilon X(t_1 \wedge \tau_N)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 - \|T_\varepsilon X(t_2 \wedge \tau_N)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right)^4 \right] \leq C(N, T) |t_1 - t_2|^2.$$

Using Fatou's lemma, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\|X(t_1 \wedge \tau_N)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 - \|X(t_2 \wedge \tau_N)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right)^4 \right] \leq C(N, T) |t_1 - t_2|^2,$$

which together with Kolmogorov's continuity theorem ensures the continuity of $t \mapsto \|X(t \wedge \tau_N)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

With Lemma 2.6 at hand, we are in the position to finish the proof of (ii) in Theorem 2.1.

2.4.3. *Concluding the proof of (ii) in Theorem 2.1.* Similar to Lemma 2.4, for $X_0(\omega, x) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{X})$, we let

$$\Omega_k = \{k - 1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k\}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 < \infty$, we have $1 = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \mathbb{P} - a.s.$, which means that

$$X_0(\omega) = \sum_{k \geq 1} X_0(\omega, x) \mathbf{1}_{k-1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k} := \sum_{k \geq 1} X_{0,k}(\omega) \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

On account of Lemma 2.6, we let $X_{k,R}$ be the global pathwise solution to the cut-off problem (2.23) with initial value $X_{0,k}$ and cut-off function $\chi_R(\cdot)$. Define

$$\tau_{k,R} = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \sup_{t' \in [0, t]} \|X_{k,R}(t')\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 > \|X_{0,k}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + 2 \right\}. \quad (2.47)$$

Since $X_{k,R}$ is continuous in time (cf. Lemma 2.6), for any $R > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_{k,R} > 0, \forall k \geq 1\} = 1$. Now we let $R = R_k$ be discrete and then denote $(X_k, \tau_k) = (X_{k,R_k}, \tau_{k,R_k})$. If $R_k^2 > k^2 + 2$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_k > 0, \forall k \geq 1\} = 1$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\{\|X_k\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 \leq \|X_k\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq \|X_{0,k}\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + 2 < R_k^2, \forall t \in [0, \tau_k], \forall k \geq 1\} = 1,$$

which means

$$\mathbb{P}\{\chi_{R_k}(\|X_k\|_{\mathcal{V}}) = 1, \forall t \in [0, \tau_k], \forall k \geq 1\} = 1.$$

Therefore (X_k, τ_k) is the pathwise solution to (1.2) with initial value $X_{0,k}$. As has been shown in Lemma 2.4, $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_k$ also solves (1.2) with initial value $X_{0,k}$ on $[0, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_k]$. Then uniqueness means $X_k = \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_k$ on $[0, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_k] \mathbb{P} - a.s.$ Therefore we infer from $\mathbb{P}\{\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \Omega_k\} = 1$ that the pair

$$\left(X = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} X_k, \quad \tau = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k} \tau_k \right)$$

is a pathwise solution to (1.2) corresponding to the initial condition X_0 . Since for each k , X_k is continuous in time (cf. Lemma 2.6), so is X . Then we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} \|X\|_{H^s}^2 = \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{k-1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_k]} \|X_k\|_{H^s}^2 \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{k-1 \leq \|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}} < k} (\|X_{0,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + 2) \leq 2\|X_0\|_{H^s}^2 + 4.$$

Taking expectation gives rise to (2.21) and we have finished the proof of (ii) in Theorem 2.1.

2.5. **Proof of (iii) in Theorem 2.1.** To complete the proof of Theorem 2.1, it suffices to prove the blow-up criterion (2.22) when additionally (A₆) holds true. To show it, we define

$$\tau_{1,m} := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \geq m\}, \quad \tau_{2,l} := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \geq l\}, \quad m, l \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Denote $\tau_1 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{1,m}$ and $\tau_2 = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{2,l}$. Then, (2.22) is just a direct consequence of the statement

$$\tau_1 = \tau_2 \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (2.48)$$

Hence it suffices to prove (2.48). Because $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, it is obvious that $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \mathbb{P} - a.s.$ Therefore, the proof reduces further to checking only $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \mathbb{P} - a.s.$ We first notice that for all $M, l \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \infty \right\} = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < m \right\} \subset \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M \leq \tau_{1,m}\}.$$

Because

$$\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M \leq \tau_{1,m}\} \subset \{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M \leq \tau_1\},$$

as long as

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \infty \right) = 1, \quad \forall M, l \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.49)$$

we have $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{2,l} \wedge M \leq \tau_1) = 1$ for all $M, l \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_2 \leq \tau_1) = \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau_{2,l} \leq \tau_1\} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{M, l \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M \leq \tau_1\} \right) = 1.$$

As a result, it remains to prove (2.49). However, as mentioned before, we can not directly apply the Itô formula to $\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$ to get control of $\mathbb{E}\|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$. As in (2.45), but now with Q_ε , we use Itô formula for $\|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$, apply the BDG inequality, (A₁) and (A₆) to find constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 = C_2(l) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 - \mathbb{E}\|Q_\varepsilon X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ & \leq C_1 \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M} k(t) f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M} k(t) f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \\ & \leq C_2 \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \int_0^{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M} k(t) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_{2,l} \wedge M} k(t) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C_2 \int_0^M k(t) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{2,l}]} \|X(t')\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (A₆), yields

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|Q_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C_2 \int_0^M k(t) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{2,l}]} \|X(t')\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt.$$

Since the right hand side of the inequality above does not depend on ε , and since Q_ε satisfies (2.16), we can send $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to find

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C_2 \int_0^M k(t) \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{2,l}]} \|X(t')\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 dt.$$

Then Grönwall's inequality shows that for each $l, M \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_{2,l} \wedge M]} \|X(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \exp \left\{ C_2 \int_0^M k(t) dt \right\} < \infty,$$

which gives (2.49). We conclude the proof of (iii) in Theorem 2.1.

3. APPLICATIONS TO NONLINEAR IDEAL FLUID MODELS WITH TRANSPORT NOISE

3.1. Stochastic advection by Lie transport in fluid dynamics. Starting with the pioneering works [29, 31] for linear scalar transport equations, many achievements have been made in recent years for stochastic fluid equations with noise of *transport type*. Transport-type noise refers to noise depending linearly on the gradient of the solution. In [38], stochastic equations governing the dynamics of some ideal fluid regimes have been derived by employing a novel variational principle for stochastic Lagrangian particle dynamics. Later, the same stochastic evolution equations were rediscovered in [21] using a multi-scale decomposition of the deterministic Lagrangian flow map into a slow large-scale mean, and a rapidly fluctuating small-scale map. In [38], the extension of geometric mechanics to include stochasticity in nonlinear fluid theories was accomplished by using Hamilton's variational principle. This extension motivates us to

study stochastic Lagrangian fluid trajectories, denoted as $X_t(x, t)$, arising from the stochastic Eulerian vector field with a noise in the Stratonovich sense, i.e.,

$$dX_t(x, t) := u(x, t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^M \xi_k(x) \circ dW_k. \quad (3.1)$$

In (3.1) $u(x, t)$ means the drift velocity, $\{W_k = W_k(t)\}_{k=1,2,\dots,M}$ is a family of standard 1-D independent Brownian motions, and M can be determined via the amount of variance required from a principal component analysis, or via empirical orthogonal function analysis.

Deriving continuum-scale equations taking into account noise as in (3.1) is known as the Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport (SALT) approach, see [20] and the references therein. The SALT approach combines stochasticity in the velocity of the fluid material loop in Kelvin's circulation theorem with ensemble forecasting and meets the important challenge of incorporating stochastic parameterisation at the fundamental level, see for example [10, 47, 57].

Many subsequent investigations of the properties of the equations of fluid dynamics with the SALT modification have appeared in the literature recently. For example, local existence in Sobolev spaces and a Beale-Kato-Majda type blow-up criterion were derived in [22, 32] for the incompressible 3-D SALT Euler equations. For the 2-D version, global existence of solutions has been shown in [23]. In [2], the authors provide a local existence result for the incompressible 2-D SALT Boussinesq equations. For a simpler but still nonlinear equation as the SALT Burgers equation, we refer to [3, 30].

3.1.1. *The two-component CH system with transport noise.* The Camassa-Holm (CH) equation

$$u_t - u_{xxt} + 3uu_x = 2u_x u_{xx} + uu_{xxx} \quad (3.2)$$

was proposed independently by Fokas and Fuchssteiner in [33] and by Camassa and Holm in [14]. In [33], it was proposed to consider some completely integrable generalizations of the Korteweg-de-Vries equation with bi-Hamiltonian structures, and in [14], it was derived to describe the unidirectional propagation of shallow water waves over a flat bottom. Solutions of equation (3.2) exhibit the wave-breaking phenomenon, i.e., smooth global existence may fail [16, 17]. Global conservative solutions to the CH equation (3.2) were obtained in [12, 40]. Different stochastic versions of the CH equation have been studied including additive noise [15] and multiplicative noise [1, 52, 53, 54]. Following the approach in [38], the corresponding stochastic version of the CH equation with transport noise was introduced in [8, 24]. Transforming the equation into a partial differential equation with random coefficients, the well-posedness of the stochastic CH equation with some special transport noise has been studied in [1]. We can extend this result to a far more complex system: the stochastic two-component CH system which has been derived in [39], i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} dm + (m\partial_x + \partial_x m) d\chi_t + \eta\partial_x \eta dt = 0, \\ d\eta + (\eta d\chi_t)_x = 0, \\ m = u - u_{xx}. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

In (3.3) u is the fluid velocity and η denotes the depth of the flow. As in (3.1), the noise structure in (3.3) is

$$d\chi_t = u(t, x) dt + \sum_{k=1}^M \xi_k(x) \circ dW_k.$$

The functions ξ_1, \dots, ξ_M represent spatial velocity-velocity correlations up to order M .

Note that the system (3.3) reduces to the scalar CH equation from [1] if we put η to be zero. Here we consider $M = \infty$ and rewrite (3.3) as

$$\begin{cases} dm + [(mu)_x + \eta\eta_x] dt + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} m \circ dW_k = 0, \\ d\eta + (\eta u)_x dt + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta \circ dW_k = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

The differential operator \mathcal{L}_{ξ} is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} = \partial_x \xi_k + \xi_k \partial_x. \quad (3.5)$$

We use the notation \mathcal{L}_{ξ_k} since it coincides with the Lie derivative operator acting on one-forms. However, our analysis is valid for general linear differential operators with suitable coefficients. Calculating the cross-variation term in the general transformation formula

$$\int_0^t f \circ dW = \int_0^t f dW + \frac{1}{2} \langle f, W \rangle_t,$$

we obtain the corresponding Itô formulation of (3.4), given by

$$\begin{cases} dm + [(mu)_x + \eta\eta_x] dt - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 m dt = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} m dW_k, \\ d\eta + (\eta u)_x dt - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta dt = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta dW_k. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2$ in (3.6) is the second-order operator

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f = \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}(\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f) = \xi_k^2 \partial_{xx}^2 f + 3\xi_k \partial_x \xi_k \partial_x f + (\xi_k \partial_{xx}^2 \xi_k + (\partial_x \xi_k)^2) f.$$

In this paper, we will consider (3.6) on the periodic torus $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ in terms of the unknowns (u, η) . Therefore, for any real number s , we define $D^s = (I - \Delta)^{s/2}$ as $\widehat{D^s f}(k) = (1 + |k|^2)^{s/2} \widehat{f}(k)$. Then we apply $(1 - \partial_{xx}^2)^{-1} = D^{-2}$ to (3.6) and consider for (u, η) the nonlocal Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} du + \left[uu_x + \partial_x D^{-2} \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 + u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u \right] dt = - D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u dW_k, \\ d\eta + (u\eta_x + \eta u_x) dt - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta dt = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta dW_k, \\ (u(0), \eta(0)) = (u_0, \eta_0). \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Here we remark that in (3.7), $f = D^{-2}g = (I - \partial_{xx}^2)^{-1}g$ means $f = \mathcal{G} \star g$, where \mathcal{G} is the Green function of the Helmholtz operator $(I - \partial_{xx}^2)$ and \star stands for the convolution. The local theory for (3.7) is stated in Theorem 3.1 below.

3.1.2. The CCF model with transport noise. As the second application of the abstract framework, we will consider a stochastic transport equation with non-local velocity on the periodic torus \mathbb{T} . In the deterministic case, it reads

$$\theta_t + (\mathcal{H}\theta)\theta_x = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

where \mathcal{H} is the periodic Hilbert transform defined by

$$(\mathcal{H}f)(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{p.v.} \int_0^{2\pi} f(t) \cot\left(\frac{x-t}{2}\right) dt. \quad (3.9)$$

Equation (3.8) was proposed by Córdoba, Córdoba and Fontelos in [19] to consider advective transport with non-local velocity. It is deeply connected to the 2-D SQG equation and hence with the 3-D Euler equations (cf. [6] and the references therein). Notice that, if we replace the non-local Hilbert transform by the identity operator we recover the classical Burgers equation. In [19], the breakdown of classical solutions to (3.8) for a generic class of smooth initial data was discovered.

To the best of our knowledge, the stochastic counterpart of the CCF model (3.8) has not been studied yet. In this paper, we will consider the stochastic CCF model with transport noise, i.e.,

$$d\theta + (\mathcal{H}\theta)\partial_x \theta dt + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta \circ dW_k = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\{W_k = W_k(t)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of standard 1-D independent Brownian motions and \mathcal{L}_{ξ_k} is given as in (3.5). Using the corresponding Itô formulation, we are led to the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} d\theta + (\mathcal{H}\theta)\partial_x \theta dt - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \theta dt = - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta dW_k, \\ \theta(0) = \theta_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

A local theory for (3.11) is stated in Theorem 3.2 below.

3.2. Notations, assumptions and main results. To state the main results for (3.7) and (3.11), we introduce some function spaces. For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$ we denote by $L^p(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ the standard Lebesgue space of measurable p -integrable \mathbb{R} -valued functions with domain $\mathbb{T}^d = (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^d$ and by $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ the space of essentially bounded functions. Particularly, $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is equipped with the inner product $(f, g)_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f \cdot \bar{g} dx$, where \bar{g} denotes the complex conjugate of g . The Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform of $f(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})$ are defined by $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) e^{-ix \cdot \xi} dx$ and $f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widehat{f}(k) e^{ix \cdot k}$, respectively. Recalling that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\widehat{D^s f}(k) = (1 + |k|^2)^{s/2} \widehat{f}(k)$, we define the Sobolev space H^s on \mathbb{T}^d with values in \mathbb{R} as

$$H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}) := \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}) : \|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\widehat{D^s f}(k)|^2 < +\infty \right\}.$$

For $u = (u_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} : \mathbb{T}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)}^2 := \sum_{j=1}^n \|u_j\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R})}^2$. For the sake of simplicity, we omit the parentheses in the above notations from now on if there is no ambiguity. Similarly, for two spaces H^{s_1} and H^{s_2} ($s_1, s_2 > 0$) and $(f, g) \in H^{s_1} \times H^{s_2}$, we define $\|(f, g)\|_{H^{s_1} \times H^{s_2}}^2 := \|f\|_{H^{s_1}}^2 + \|g\|_{H^{s_2}}^2$. The commutator for two operators P, Q is denoted by $[P, Q] := PQ - QP$. The space of linear operators from \mathbb{U} to some separable Hilbert space \mathbb{X} is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X})$.

To obtain a local theory for (3.7) and (3.11), we have to impose natural regularity assumptions on $\{\xi_k(x)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to give a reasonable meaning to the stochastic integral and to show certain estimates. For this reason, we make the following assumption:

Assumption (B). $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} < \infty$ for any $s \geq 0$.

Remark 3.1. It follows from Assumption (B) that there is a $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in H^{s+2}$ with $s > \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f\|_{H^s} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{s+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f\|_{H^s} \leq C \|f\|_{H^{s+2}}.$$

Besides, we do not require that $\{\xi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthogonal system.

The main results for (3.7) and (3.11) are the following:

Theorem 3.1. Let $s > \frac{11}{2}$ and $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a stochastic basis fixed in advance. Let Assumption (B) hold. If $(u_0, \eta_0) \in L^2(\Omega; H^s \times H^{s-1})$ is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable, then (3.7) has a local unique pathwise solution $((u, \eta), \tau)$ such that

$$(u, \eta)(\cdot \wedge \tau) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); H^s \times H^{s-1})). \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, the maximal solution $((u, \eta), \tau^*)$ to (3.7) satisfies

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|(u, \eta)(t)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|(u, \eta)(t)\|_{W^{1, \infty} \times W^{1, \infty}} = \infty\}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Theorem 3.2. Let $s > \frac{7}{2}$ and $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a stochastic basis fixed in advance. Let Assumption (B) hold. If $\theta_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^s)$ is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable, then (3.11) has a local unique pathwise solution (θ, τ) such that

$$\theta(\cdot \wedge \tau) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); H^s)). \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, the maximal solution (θ, τ^*) to (3.11) satisfies

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\mathcal{H}\theta_x)(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty\}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \quad (3.14)$$

Remark 3.2. We require $s > 11/2$ in Theorem 3.1. This is because, if $(u, \eta) \in H^s \times H^{s-1}$, then $(-\frac{1}{2}D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u, -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta) \in H^{s-2} \times H^{s-3}$. As one can see $|(u u_x, u)_{H^s}| + |(u \eta_x, \eta)_{H^{s-1}}| \lesssim \|(u, \eta)\|_{W^{1, \infty} \times W^{1, \infty}} \|(u, \eta)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}}^2$. To apply Theorem 2.1 to (3.7) with $\mathcal{X} = H^s \times H^{s-1}$, we have to verify (2.15) with using Lemma A.5. Therefore $s - 4 > \frac{3}{2}$, which means $s > 11/2$. Similarly, $s > 7/2$ is needed in Theorem 3.2.

As mentioned before, the scalar stochastic CH equation with transport noise has been analyzed in [1] with a completely different approach. The authors obtain the local existence of pathwise solutions in a less regular space but without a blow-up criterion. We note that our approach can be also applied to this equation to give local existence, uniqueness and the blow-up criterion.

Remark 3.3. Notice that in the deterministic case, one can use the estimate

$$\|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (1 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \log(e + \|\theta_x\|_{H^1}) + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}) \quad (3.15)$$

to improve the blow-up criterion (3.14) into (cf. [27])

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty \iff \limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty.$$

To achieve this in the stochastic setting, we have an essential difficulty in closing the H^s -estimate. That is, one has to split the expectation $\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\theta\|_{H^s}^2$. If we use (3.15), so far we have not known how to close the estimate for $\mathbb{E}\|\theta\|_{H^s}^2$, where $\mathbb{E}[(1 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \log(e + \|\theta_x\|_{H^1}) + \|\theta_x\|_{L^2}) \|\theta\|_{H^s}]$ is involved.

3.3. The stochastic two-component CH system: Proof of Theorem 3.1. Now we consider (3.7) on the periodic torus \mathbb{T} , and we will apply the abstract framework developed in Section 2 to obtain Theorem 3.1. To put (3.7) into the abstract framework, we define

$$X = (u, \eta), \quad G(u, \eta) = \partial_x D^{-2} \left(\frac{1}{2} u^2 + u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \eta^2 \right),$$

and we set

$$\begin{aligned} b(t, X) &= b(X) = (-G(u, \eta), -\eta u_x), \\ g(t, X) &= g(X) = \left(-uu_x + \frac{1}{2} D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u, -u\eta_x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta \right), \\ h^k(t, X) &= h^k(X) = (-D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, -\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Now we recall that \mathbb{U} is a fixed separable Hilbert space and $\{e_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a complete orthonormal basis of \mathbb{U} such that the cylindrical Wiener process \mathcal{W} is defined as in (2.1). Then we define $h(X) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{U}; H^s \times H^{s-1})$ such that

$$h(X)(e_k) = h^k(X) = (-D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, -\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.17)$$

Altogether we can rewrite the problem (3.7) as

$$\begin{cases} dX = (b(X) + g(X)) dt + h(X) d\mathcal{W}, \\ X(0) = X_0 = (u_0, \eta_0). \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

In order to prove Theorem 3.1 by applying Theorem 2.1, we need to check that Assumption (A) is satisfied. To ease notation, we define

$$\mathcal{X}^s = H^s \times H^{s-1} \quad (3.19)$$

and make the following choice for the spaces $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathcal{V}$,

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^s, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}^{s-1}, \quad \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}^{s-2}, \quad \mathcal{V} = W^{1,\infty} \times W^{1,\infty}. \quad (3.20)$$

3.3.1. Estimates on nonlinear terms. In this preparatory part, some basic Sobolev estimates to deal with b, g, h from (3.16), (3.17) are introduced.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $s > 5/2$. Then b is regular in \mathcal{X} and for $X = (u, \eta) \in \mathcal{X}^s$, $Y = (v, \rho) \in \mathcal{X}^s$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|b(X)\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} &\lesssim \|X\|_{\mathcal{V}} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}, \\ \|b(X) - b(Y)\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} &\lesssim (\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}) \|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\partial_x(1 - \partial_{xx}^2)^{-1}$ is a bounded map from H^s to H^{s+1} , the first estimate follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \|b(X)\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 &= \|G(u, \eta)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|u_x \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u^2 + u_x^2 + \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u_x\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^2 \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|(u, \eta)\|_{W^{1,\infty} \times L^\infty}^2 \|(u, \eta)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that H^{s-1} is an algebra, we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|b(X) - b(Y)\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|G(u, \eta) - G(v, \rho)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|u_x \eta - v_x \rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|u^2 - v^2 + u_x^2 - v_x^2 + \eta^2 - \rho^2\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u_x(\eta - \rho) + \rho(u_x - v_x)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \\
& \lesssim \|u + v\|_{H^s}^2 \|u - v\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta + \rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\eta - \rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\eta - \rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|u - v\|_{H^s}^2 \\
& \lesssim (\|(u, \eta)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}}^2 + \|(v, \rho)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}}^2) \|(u - v, \eta - \rho)\|_{H^s \times H^{s-1}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second estimate. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let Assumption (B) hold true and $s > 7/2$. If $X = (u, \eta) \in \mathcal{X}^s$, then $g : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$ and $h : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})$ obey*

$$\|g(X)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} \lesssim 1 + \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2$$

and

$$\|h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})} \lesssim \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}.$$

Proof. Using $H^{s-3} \hookrightarrow L^\infty$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g(X)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}}^2 &= \left\| -uu_x + \frac{1}{2} D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u \right\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \left\| -u\eta_x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta \right\|_{H^{s-3}}^2 \\
&\lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}^4 + \|D^2 u\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \\
&\lesssim \left(1 + \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the first estimate. Similarly, from the definition of h in (3.17), and the definition of \mathcal{L}_ξ in (3.5), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|h(X)e_k\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-1}}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\|D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \right) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u\|_{H^{s-3}}^2 + \|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \right) \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives the second estimate. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $s > \frac{11}{2}$, $X = (u, \eta) \in \mathcal{X}^s$ and $Y = (v, \rho) \in \mathcal{X}^s$. Then we have*

$$2(g(t, X) - g(t, Y), X - Y)_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-2})}^2 \lesssim (1 + \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2) \|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}}^2.$$

Proof. Recalling (3.16) and (3.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(g(X) - g(Y), X - Y)_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-2})}^2 \\
&= 2(vv_x - uu_x, u - v)_{H^{s-2}} + 2(v\rho_x - u\eta_x, \eta - \rho)_{H^{s-3}} \\
&+ \left(D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2(u - v), u - v \right)_{H^{s-2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2(u - v), D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2(u - v))_{H^{s-2}} \\
&+ \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 (\eta - \rho), \eta - \rho \right)_{H^{s-3}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} (\eta - \rho), \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} (\eta - \rho))_{H^{s-3}} \\
&=: \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Because $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, we can use Lemma A.4 and integration by parts to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\lesssim |(D^{s-2}v(u-v)_x, D^{s-2}(u-v))_{L^2}| + |(D^{s-2}(u-v)u_x, D^{s-2}(u-v))_{L^2}| \\
&\lesssim \|[D^{s-2}, v](u-v)_x\|_{L^2} \|u-v\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u-v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \\
&\lesssim (\|v\|_{H^s} + \|u\|_{H^s}) \|u-v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\lesssim |(D^{s-3}v(\eta-\rho)_x, D^{s-3}(\eta-\rho))_{L^2}| + |(D^{s-3}(u-v)\eta_x, D^{s-3}(\eta-\rho))_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim \|[D^{s-3}, v](\eta-\rho)_x\|_{L^2} \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}} + \|\eta_x\|_{H^{s-3}} \|u-v\|_{H^{s-3}} \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}} \\ &\lesssim \|v\|_{H^s} \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|u-v\|_{H^{s-3}}^2 + \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| + |I_2| &\lesssim \left(\|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|v\|_{H^s} + \|u\|_{H^s} \right) \|u-v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 + (1 + \|v\|_{H^s}) \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}}^2 \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2) \|X-Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $D^{s-2}D^{-2} = D^{s-4}$. Since $s-4 > 3/2$, we can invoke Lemma A.5 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 + I_4 &= \left(D^{s-4} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2(u-v), D^{s-4} D^2(u-v) \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-4} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2(u-v), D^{s-4} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2(u-v))_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|D^2(u-v)\|_{H^{s-4}}^2 \lesssim \|u-v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 + I_6 &= \left(D^{s-3} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 (\eta-\rho), D^{s-3}(\eta-\rho) \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} (\eta-\rho), D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} (\eta-\rho))_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\eta-\rho\|_{H^{s-3}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting the above estimates, we obtain the desired result. \square

3.3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. Now we will prove that all the requirements in Assumption (A) hold true. We first fix regular mappings g_ε and h_ε using the mollification operators from (A.1) and (A.2) in the Appendix A by

$$g_\varepsilon(X) = \left(-J_\varepsilon[J_\varepsilon u J_\varepsilon u_x] + \frac{1}{2} J_\varepsilon^3 D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 J_\varepsilon u, -J_\varepsilon[J_\varepsilon u J_\varepsilon \eta_x] + \frac{1}{2} J_\varepsilon^3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon \eta \right). \quad (3.21)$$

Let

$$h_\varepsilon^k(X) = (-J_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, -J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta). \quad (3.22)$$

Similar to (3.17), here we define $h_\varepsilon(X) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)$ such that

$$h_\varepsilon(X)(e_k) = h_\varepsilon^k(X), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.23)$$

We choose functions $k(\cdot) \equiv 1$, $f(\cdot) = C(1 + \cdot)$, $q(\cdot) = C(1 + \cdot^5)$ for some $C > 1$ large enough depending only on b, g, h . Finally we let $T_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon = \tilde{J}_\varepsilon$, where \tilde{J}_ε is given in (A.2).

Let $s > 11/2$. Obviously, $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$. Then Lemma 3.1 shows $b : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^s$, and Lemma 3.2 implies $g : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$ and $h : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})$. Hence the stochastic integral in (3.18) is a well defined \mathcal{X}^{s-1} -valued local martingale. It is straightforward to verify that all of them are continuous in $X \in \mathcal{X}^s$.

Checking (A₁): Lemma 3.1 implies (A₁).

Checking (A₂): By the construction of $g_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ and $h_\varepsilon(\cdot)$, (A.4), Lemma 3.2 and Assumption (B), it is easy to check that (A₂) is satisfied.

Checking (A₃): We first verify (2.12). By (3.22) and (A.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (h_\varepsilon^k(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}} &= (-J_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, u)_{H^s} + (-J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, \eta)_{H^{s-1}} \\ &= -(D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, J_\varepsilon u)_{H^s} - (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, J_\varepsilon \eta)_{H^{s-1}} \\ &= -(D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^{s-2} D^2 J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2} - (D^{s-1} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $v = D^2 J_\varepsilon u$. From the definition of the operator \mathcal{L}_ξ in (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} v, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} &= (D^{s-2} (v \partial_x \xi_k), D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} + (D^{s-2} (\partial_x v \xi_k), D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} \\ &= ([D^{s-2}, v] \partial_x \xi_k, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} + (v D^{s-2} \partial_x \xi_k, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} \\ &\quad + ([D^{s-2}, \xi_k] \partial_x v, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} + (\xi_k D^{s-2} \partial_x v, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.4, $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$ and integration by parts, we arrive at

$$([D^{s-2}, v] \partial_x \xi_k, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} + (v D^{s-2} \partial_x \xi_k, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s-1}}$$

and

$$([D^{s-2}, \xi_k] \partial_x v, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} + (\xi_k D^{s-2} \partial_x v, D^{s-2} v)_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s-2}}.$$

Combining the above estimates and using (A.7), we have that

$$(D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^{s-2} D^2 J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2} \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{H^s}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^s}.$$

Similarly,

$$(D^{s-1} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2} \lesssim \|J_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \leq \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\xi_k\|_{H^s}.$$

Therefore, by using (3.22), (3.23), Assumption (B) and (A.7), we conclude that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(h_\varepsilon(X) \xi_k, X)_{\mathcal{X}}|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(h_\varepsilon^k(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}}|^2 \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\xi_k\|_{H^s}^2 (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2)^2 \leq C \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4,$$

which yields (2.12).

Now we prove (2.13). For all $X = (u, \eta) \in \mathcal{X}^s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(g_\varepsilon(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|h_\varepsilon(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \\ &= -2(J_\varepsilon[J_\varepsilon u J_\varepsilon u_x], u)_{H^s} - 2(J_\varepsilon[J_\varepsilon u J_\varepsilon \eta_x], \eta)_{H^{s-1}} \\ &+ \left(D^s J_\varepsilon^3 D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^s u \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s J_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^s J_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2} \\ &+ \left(D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon^3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} \eta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2} \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^6 E_i. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (A.5), (A.7), Lemma A.4 and integration by parts that

$$|E_1| = 2 |([D^s, J_\varepsilon u] J_\varepsilon u_x, D^s J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2} + (J_\varepsilon u D^s J_\varepsilon u_x, D^s J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2}| \lesssim \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s}^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |E_2| &= 2 |([D^{s-1}, J_\varepsilon u] J_\varepsilon \eta_x, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2} + (J_\varepsilon u D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \eta_x, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim (\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\eta_x\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2). \end{aligned}$$

By (A.5), (A.6) and the fact that $D^{s-2} = D^s D^{-2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E_3 + E_4 \\ &= \left(D^{s-2} J_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^{s-2} J_\varepsilon D^2 J_\varepsilon u \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-2} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u, D^{s-2} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 J_\varepsilon u)_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{P} = D^{s-2} J_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{s-2}$ (cf. Lemma A.1), we apply Lemma A.5 to arrive at

$$E_3 + E_4 \lesssim \|D^2 J_\varepsilon u\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \leq C \|u\|_{H^s}^2,$$

where we have used (A.7) in the last inequality. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_5 + E_6 \\ &= \left(D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon \eta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta, D^{s-1} J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|J_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \leq C \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates, we arrive at

$$2(g_\varepsilon(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|h_\varepsilon(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \lesssim (1 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\eta_x\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2) \leq f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2,$$

which implies (2.13) with $k(t) \equiv 1$.

Checking (A₄): It is clear that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^s$ is dense in $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$. Since $s - 2 > \frac{5}{2}$, inequality (2.14) follows directly from Lemma 3.1. Applying Lemma 3.3 yields (2.15).

Checking (A₅): Recall that $\tilde{J}_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon^2 \Delta)^{-1}$. Due to (A.7) and $T_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon = \tilde{J}_\varepsilon$, (A₅) is a direct consequence of (A₆), which will be checked below.

Checking (A₆): It is easy to prove (2.16) and we omit the details here. Then we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(T_\varepsilon g(X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|T_\varepsilon h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \\ &= -2(T_\varepsilon[uu_x], T_\varepsilon u)_{H^s} - 2(T_\varepsilon[u\eta_x], T_\varepsilon \eta)_{H^{s-1}} \\ &+ \left(D^s T_\varepsilon D^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u, D^s T_\varepsilon u \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s T_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, D^s T_\varepsilon D^{-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u)_{L^2} \\ &+ \left(D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta)_{L^2} = \sum_{i=1}^6 R_i. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1| &= 2 |(D^s T_\varepsilon[uu_x], D^s T_\varepsilon u)_{L^2}| \\ &\leq 2 |([D^s, u]u_x, D^s T_\varepsilon^2 u)_{L^2} + ([T_\varepsilon, u]D^s u_x, D^s T_\varepsilon u)_{L^2} + (uD^s T_\varepsilon u_x, D^s T_\varepsilon u)_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} \|T_\varepsilon u\|_{H^s} + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|T_\varepsilon u\|_{H^s}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemmas A.3 and A.4, integration by parts, embedding $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, (A.6) and (A.7). Similarly, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_2| &= 2 |(D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon[u\eta_x], D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2}| \\ &= 2 |([D^{s-1}, u]\eta_x, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon^2 \eta)_{L^2} + ([T_\varepsilon, u]D^{s-1} \eta_x, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2} + (uD^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta_x, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta)_{L^2}| \\ &\leq C (\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\eta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} \|T_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}) + C \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|T_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^s}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\eta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} \|T_\varepsilon \eta\|_{H^{s-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.5 yields

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 + R_4 &= \left(D^{s-2} T_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 D^2 u, D^{s-2} T_\varepsilon D^2 u \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-D^{s-2} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, -D^{s-2} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u)_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|D^2 u\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \leq \|u\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$R_5 + R_6 = \left(D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \eta, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \eta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta, D^{s-1} T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta)_{L^2} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2.$$

Gathering together the above estimates and noticing (A.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(T_\varepsilon g(X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|T_\varepsilon h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\eta_x\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2) \leq f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which gives (2.20). We are just left to show (2.19) to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.1. To this end, we recall (3.16) and consider

$$\begin{aligned} -(T_\varepsilon h_k(X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} &= (T_\varepsilon D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, T_\varepsilon D^s u)_{L^2} + (T_\varepsilon D^{s-1} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta, T_\varepsilon D^{s-1} \eta)_{L^2} \\ &= (\mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} D^2 u, \mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P}_2 \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \eta, \mathcal{P}_2 \eta)_{L^2} \\ &= (\mathcal{T}_1 D^2 u, \mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u, \mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u)_{L^2} \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{T}_2 \eta, \mathcal{P}_2 \eta)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \mathcal{P}_2 \eta, \mathcal{P}_2 \eta)_{L^2} \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^4 J_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_1 := T_\varepsilon D^{s-2} \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{s-2}$, $\mathcal{P}_2 := T_\varepsilon D^{s-1} \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{s-1}$ (cf. Lemma A.1), and $\mathcal{T}_1 = [\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}]$, $\mathcal{T}_2 = [\mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}]$. Using integration by parts, (3.5) and (A.5), we have that

$$|J_2| + |J_4| \lesssim \|\partial_x \xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \left(\|\mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathcal{P}_2 \eta\|_{L^2}^2 \right) \lesssim \|\partial_x \xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|T_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2.$$

Using (A.6) and (A.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 &= (\mathcal{T}_2\eta, \mathcal{P}_2\eta)_{L^2} \\
&= (D^{s-1}\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon^2\eta)_{L^2} - (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta)_{L^2} \\
&= (D^{s-1}\xi_k\partial_x\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon^2\eta)_{L^2} + (D^{s-1}\eta\partial_x\xi_k, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon^2\eta)_{L^2} - (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta)_{L^2} \\
&= ([D^{s-1}, \xi_k]\partial_x\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon^2\eta)_{L^2} + (T_\varepsilon\xi_k D^{s-1}\partial_x\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta)_{L^2} \\
&\quad + (D^{s-1}\eta\partial_x\xi_k, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon^2\eta)_{L^2} - (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta)_{L^2} \\
&=: \sum_{i=1}^4 K_i.
\end{aligned}$$

On account of $H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$ and integration by parts, it holds that

$$|K_3| \lesssim \|\eta\partial_x\xi_k\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}},$$

and

$$|K_4| \lesssim \|\partial_x\xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \lesssim \|\partial_x\xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Then we apply Lemma A.4 to K_1 to find

$$|K_1| \lesssim \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

For K_2 , we use Lemma A.3 and integration by parts to derive

$$|K_2| \lesssim |(T_\varepsilon, \xi_k)\partial_x D^{s-1}\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta| + |(\xi_k\partial_x D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta, D^{s-1}T_\varepsilon\eta)| \lesssim \|\partial_x\xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$|J_3| = |(\mathcal{T}_2\eta, \mathcal{P}_2\eta)_{L^2}| \lesssim \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|\eta\|_{H^{s-1}} \|T_\varepsilon\eta\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

The form $J_4 = (\mathcal{T}_1 D^2 u, \mathcal{P}_1 D^2 u)_{L^2}$ can be handled in the same way using $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$. Hence we have

$$|J_3| = |(\mathcal{T}_1 f, \mathcal{P}_1 f)_{L^2}| \lesssim \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|f\|_{H^{s-2}} \|T_\varepsilon f\|_{H^{s-2}} \lesssim \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|u\|_{H^s} \|T_\varepsilon u\|_{H^s}.$$

Now we summarize the above estimates, and use (3.17) and Assumption (B) to arrive at

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(T_\varepsilon h(X)e_k, T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s}|^2 \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\xi_k\|_{H^s}^2 \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 \|T_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 \leq C \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 \|T_\varepsilon X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2. \quad (3.24)$$

Hence we obtain inequality (2.19) and complete the proof.

3.4. Stochastic CCF model: Proof of Theorem 3.2. In this section we will apply Theorem 2.1 to (3.11) with $x \in \mathbb{T}$ to obtain Theorem 3.2. To that purpose, we set $X = \theta$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
b(t, X) &= b(X) = 0, \\
g(t, X) &= g(X) = -(\mathcal{H}\theta)\partial_x\theta + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \theta, \\
h^k(t, X) &= h^k(X) = -\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

As in (3.17), we define $h(X) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{U}; H^s)$ such that

$$h(X)(e_k) = h^k(X), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.26)$$

With the above notations, we reformulate (3.11) in the abstract form, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} dX = (b(X) + g(X)) dt + h(X) dW, \\ X(0) = \theta_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.27)$$

To prove Theorem 3.2, we would like to invoke Theorem 2.1 to this setting. To do that, we just need to check the Assumption (A). Now we let $r \in (3/2, s-2)$, and then let

$$\mathcal{X}^s = H^s \text{ and } \mathcal{V} = H^r. \quad (3.28)$$

3.4.1. *Estimates on nonlinear terms.* Analogously to Section 3.3.1 we will need the following auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *Let Assumption (B) hold true and $s > 5/2$. If $X = \theta \in \mathcal{X}^s$, then $g : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$ and $h : \mathcal{X}^s \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})$ such that*

$$\|g(X)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} \lesssim 1 + \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2,$$

and

$$\|h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})} \lesssim \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}.$$

Proof. Using $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, the continuity of the Hilbert transform for $s \geq 0$ and Remark 3.1, one can prove the above estimates directly. We omit the details for exposition clearness. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $X = \theta \in \mathcal{X}^s$ and $Y = \rho \in \mathcal{X}^s$. Then we have that for $s > 7/2$,*

$$2(g(t, X) - g(t, Y), X - Y)_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-2})}^2 \lesssim (1 + \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2 + \|Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2) \|X - Y\|_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}}^2.$$

Proof. Recalling (3.25) and (3.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(g(X) - g(Y), X - Y)_{\mathcal{X}^{s-2}} + \|h(t, X) - h(t, Y)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-2})}^2 \\ &= 2((\mathcal{H}\rho)\rho_x - (\mathcal{H}\theta)\theta_x, \theta - \rho)_{H^{s-2}} + \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2(\theta - \rho), \theta - \rho \right)_{H^{s-2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}(\theta - \rho), \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}(\theta - \rho))_{H^{s-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $H^{s-2} \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, we use Remark 3.1, Lemma A.4, the continuity of the Hilbert transform and integration by parts to bound the first term as

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{H}\rho)\rho_x - (\mathcal{H}\theta)\theta_x, \theta - \rho)_{H^{s-2}} \\ & \lesssim |(D^{s-2}(\mathcal{H}\rho)(\theta - \rho)_x, D^{s-2}(\theta - \rho))_{L^2}| + |(D^{s-2}(\mathcal{H}(\theta - \rho))\theta_x, D^{s-2}(\theta - \rho))_{L^2}| \\ & \lesssim \|[D^{s-2}, \mathcal{H}\rho](\theta - \rho)_x\|_{L^2} \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\partial_x \mathcal{H}\rho\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \\ & \quad + \|[D^{s-2}, \mathcal{H}(\theta - \rho)]\theta_x\|_{L^2} \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\partial_x \mathcal{H}(\theta - \rho)\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}}^2 \\ & \lesssim (\|\rho\|_{H^s} + \|\theta\|_{H^s}) \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last two terms can be bounded by invoking Lemma A.5 to obtain

$$\left(D^{s-2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2(\theta - \rho), D^{s-2}(\theta - \rho) \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}(\theta - \rho), D^{s-2} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}(\theta - \rho))_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta - \rho\|_{H^{s-2}}^2.$$

Collecting the above estimates, we obtain the desired result. \square

3.4.2. *Proof of Theorem 3.2.* To avoid unnecessary repetition, we just sketch the main points of the proof since it is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1. Recalling (A.1), we define

$$g_\varepsilon(X) = -J_\varepsilon[(\mathcal{H}J_\varepsilon\theta) \partial_x J_\varepsilon\theta] + \frac{1}{2} J_\varepsilon^3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon\theta. \quad (3.29)$$

Let

$$h_\varepsilon^k(X) = -J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon\theta. \quad (3.30)$$

Similar to (3.17), we define $h_\varepsilon(X) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)$ such that

$$h_\varepsilon(X)(e_k) = h_\varepsilon^k(X), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.31)$$

We now prove that all the estimates in Assumption (A) hold true for

- $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^s$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}^{s-1}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$, where \mathcal{X}^s and \mathcal{V} are given in (3.28),
- b, g, h, g_ε and h_ε are given in (3.25), (3.29), (3.30) and (3.31), respectively,
- $k(\cdot) \equiv 1$, $f(\cdot) = C(1 + \cdot)$, $q(\cdot) = C(1 + \cdot)^5$ for some $C > 1$ large enough,
- $T_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon = \tilde{J}_\varepsilon$, where \tilde{J}_ε is given in (A.2).

Let $s > 7/2$. Obviously, $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, Lemma 3.4 implies $g : \mathcal{X}^s \mapsto \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$ and $h : \mathcal{X}^s \mapsto \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^{s-1})$. Hence the stochastic integral in (3.27) is a well defined \mathcal{X}^{s-1} -valued local martingale. It is easy to check that g and h are continuous in $X \in \mathcal{X}^s$.

Checking (A₁): Trivial, since $b(t, X) \equiv 0$.

Checking (A₂): By the construction of $g_\varepsilon(X)$ and $h_\varepsilon(X)$, (A.4), Lemma 3.4 and Assumption (B), (A₂) is verified.

Checking (A₃): Since (3.30) enjoys similar estimates as we established for (3.22), the first part (2.12) can be proved as before. Therefore, we just need to show (2.13). For all $X = \theta \in \mathcal{X}^s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(g_\varepsilon(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|h_\varepsilon(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 &= -2(D^s J_\varepsilon [\mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta \partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta], D^s \theta)_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \left(D^s J_\varepsilon^3 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon \theta, D^s \theta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \theta, D^s J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2} \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 E_i. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma A.5 with $\mathcal{P} = D^s J_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$ (cf. Lemma A.1), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 + E_3 &= \left(D^s J_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 J_\varepsilon \theta, D^s J_\varepsilon J_\varepsilon \theta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \theta, D^s J_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} J_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 \leq C \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first term, we notice that $H^r \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, then we use Lemma A.4, integration by parts, (A.7) and (A.8) to find

$$\begin{aligned} |E_1| &= 2 |(\mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta \partial_x J_\varepsilon D^s \theta, D^s J_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2} + 2 ([D^s, \mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta] \partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta, D^s J_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{H} \partial_x \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|D^s J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \| [D^s, \mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta] \partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta \|_{L^2} \|D^s J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{H} \partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|D^s J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_x \mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|D^{s-1} \partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^2} + \|D^s \mathcal{H} J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^2} \|\partial_x J_\varepsilon \theta\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \|\mathcal{H} \partial_x \theta\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimates, we arrive at

$$2(g_\varepsilon(X), X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|h_\varepsilon(t, X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \lesssim (1 + \|\mathcal{H} \partial_x \theta\|_{L^\infty}) \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 \leq f(\|X\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}^s}^2,$$

which implies (2.13).

Checking (A₄): The dense embedding $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^s \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$ and (2.14) is clear. Applying Lemma 3.5, we infer (2.15).

Checking (A₅): As before, this is a direct consequence of (A₆), which will be shown next.

Checking (A₆): Following the same way as we proved (3.24), we have that for some $C > 1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |(T_\varepsilon h(\theta) \xi_k, T_\varepsilon \theta)_{H^s}|^2 \leq C \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (3.32)$$

Hence (2.19) holds. Now we just need to prove (2.20). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} 2(T_\varepsilon g(X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|T_\varepsilon h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 &= -2(T_\varepsilon [\mathcal{H} \theta \theta_x], T_\varepsilon \theta)_{H^s} + \left(D^s T_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \theta, D^s T_\varepsilon \theta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta, D^s T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta)_{L^2} \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^3 R_i. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.4, (A.8), (A.9), integration by parts, Lemma A.3, and (A.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1| &\leq 2 |([D^s, \mathcal{H} \theta] \theta_x, D^s T_\varepsilon^2 \theta)_{L^2} + ([T_\varepsilon, \mathcal{H} \theta] D^s \theta_x, D^s T_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{H} \theta D^s T_\varepsilon \theta_x, D^s T_\varepsilon \theta)_{L^2}| \\ &\leq C \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 + C \|\mathcal{H} \theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 \lesssim (\|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathcal{H} \theta_x\|_{L^\infty}) \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma (A.5) with $\mathcal{P} = D^s T_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$ (cf. Lemma A.1), we have that

$$R_2 + R_3 = \left(D^s T_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 \theta, D^s T_\varepsilon \theta \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (D^s T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta, D^s T_\varepsilon \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \theta)_{L^2} \lesssim \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2.$$

Combining the above estimates, we find some $C > 1$ such that,

$$2(T_\varepsilon g(X), T_\varepsilon X)_{\mathcal{X}^s} + \|T_\varepsilon h(X)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathcal{X}^s)}^2 \leq C(1 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty})\|\theta\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (3.33)$$

Due to $\mathcal{V} = H^r \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$ and (A.9), (2.20) holds true. Therefore, we can apply Theorem 2.1 to obtain the existence, uniqueness of pathwise solutions, together with the blow-up criterion

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^r} = \infty\}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.,$$

where $r \in (3/2, s-2)$ is arbitrary. Now we only need to improve the above blow-up criterion to (3.14). To this end, we proceed as in the proof of (2.22) (cf. (2.48)). For $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\sigma_{1,m} = \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s} \geq m\}, \quad \sigma_{2,l} = \inf \{t \geq 0 : \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \geq l\},$$

where $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Denote $\sigma_1 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{1,m}$ and $\sigma_2 = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{2,l}$. Now we fix a $r \in (3/2, s-2)$. Then

$$\|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\theta(t)\|_{H^r} \lesssim \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s}.$$

From this, it is obvious that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ To prove $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$, we need to prove $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2$ $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ In the same way as we prove (2.48), we only need to prove

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s} < \infty \right\} = 1 \quad \forall N, l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.34)$$

It follows from (3.32) and (3.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 - \mathbb{E} \|T_\varepsilon \theta_0\|_{H^s}^2 \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{\sigma_{2,l} \wedge N} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\sigma_{2,l} \wedge N} (1 + \|\theta_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathcal{H}\theta_x\|_{L^\infty}) \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 dt \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 \int_0^{\sigma_{2,l} \wedge N} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_l \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\sigma_{2,l} \wedge N} \|\theta\|_{H^s}^2 dt \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 + C_l \int_0^M \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t \wedge \sigma_{2,l}]} \|\theta(t')\|_{H^s}^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_l = C(1+l)$ for some $C > 1$ large enough. Therefore we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|T_\varepsilon \theta\|_{H^s}^2 - 2\mathbb{E} \|T_\varepsilon \theta_0\|_{H^s}^2 \leq C_l \int_0^M \mathbb{E} \sup_{t' \in [0, t \wedge \sigma_{2,l}]} \|\theta(t')\|_{H^s}^2 dt.$$

Hence one can send $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then use Grönwall's inequality to derive that for each $l, N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \sigma_{2,l} \wedge N]} \|\theta(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \|\theta_0\|_{H^s}^2 \exp(C_l N) < \infty,$$

which is (3.34). Hence we obtain (3.14) and finish the proof.

3.5. Further examples. Actually, the abstract framework for (1.2) can be applied to show the local existence theory to a broader class of fluid dynamics equations. For instance, consider the SALT surface quasi-geostrophic (SQG) equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta \, dt + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\xi_k \cdot \nabla \theta) \circ dW_k = 0, & x \in \mathbb{T}^2, \\ u = \mathcal{R}^\perp \theta, \end{cases} \quad (3.35)$$

where \mathcal{R} is the Riesz transform in \mathbb{T}^2 , and $\{W_t^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of standard 1-D independent Brownian motions. The deterministic version of (3.35) reduces to the SQG equation describing the dynamics of sharp fronts between masses of hot and cold air (cf. [18]). The SQG equations have been studied intensively, and we cannot survey the vast research literature here. However, the stochastic version with transport noise as in (3.35) has not been studied yet as far as we know.

To apply Theorem 2.1 to (3.35) to get a local theory, we introduce some notations. For any real number s , $\Lambda^s = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ are defined by $\widehat{\Lambda^s f}(k) = |k|^s \widehat{f}(k)$. Then we let

$$\mathcal{X}^s = H^s \cap \left\{ f : \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} f \, dx = 0 \right\}. \quad (3.36)$$

We notice that with the mean-zero condition, \mathcal{X}^s is Hilbert space for $s > 0$ with inner product $(f, g)_{\mathcal{X}^s} = (\Lambda^s f, \Lambda^s g)_{L^2}$ and homogeneous Sobolev norm $\|f\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} = \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^2}$. However, it can be shown that if $f \in \mathcal{X}^s$ for $s > 0$, then, cf. [7],

$$\|f\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s}. \quad (3.37)$$

Assumption (C). For all $s > 1$, $\{\xi_k(x) : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset H^s \cap \{f \in H^1 : \nabla \cdot f = 0\}$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} < \infty$.

Then we have the following local results for (3.35):

Theorem 3.3. Let $s > 4$, $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ be a stochastic basis fixed in advance and \mathcal{X}^s be given in (3.36). Let Assumption (C) hold true. If $\theta_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{X}^s)$ is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable, then (3.35) has a local unique pathwise solution θ starting from θ_0 such that

$$\theta(\cdot \wedge \tau) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); \mathcal{X}^s)).$$

Moreover, the maximal solution (θ, τ^*) to (3.35) satisfies

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}^s} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \tau^*} \|\theta_x(t)\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\mathcal{R}\theta_x)(t)\|_{L^\infty} = \infty\}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Proof. We only give a very quick sketch. The approximation of (3.35) can be constructed as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. We only notice that if Assumption (C) is verified and θ_0 has mean-zero, then the approximate solution θ_ε has also mean-zero. Recalling that \mathbb{U} is fixed in advance to define (2.1), we take $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^s$, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}^{s-1}$, $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X}^{s-2}$, $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{X}^r$ with $2 < r < s - 2$ and $T_\varepsilon = Q_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon$. One can basically go along the lines as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 with using the Λ^s -version of Lemma A.4 (see also in [44, 45]) to estimate the nonlinear term. For the noise term, after writing it into the Itô form, one can use Lemma A.5 and (3.37) to estimate the corresponding two terms. For the sake of brevity, we omit the details. \square

Remark 3.4. If the relation $u = \mathcal{R}^\perp \theta$ in (3.35) is replaced by $u = \mathcal{R}^\perp \Lambda^\alpha u$ with $\alpha \in [-1, 0]$, (3.35) becomes a SALT 2-D Euler- α model in vorticity form, which interpolates with the SALT 2-D Euler equations [23] ($\alpha = -1$) and the SALT SQG equations ($\alpha = 0$). If $u = \mathcal{R}^\perp \mathcal{R}_1 \theta$ in (3.35), then (3.35) is the SALT incompressible porous medium equation, where θ is now explained as the density of the incompressible fluid moving through a homogeneous porous domain. For the deterministic incompressible porous medium equation, we refer to [13]. Both of them with SALT noise $\sum_{k=1}^\infty (\xi_k \cdot \nabla \theta) \circ dW_k$ have not been studied. Similar to Theorem 3.1, our general framework (ii) is also applicable to them.

Remark 3.5. It is worthwhile remarking that, a new framework called Lagrangian-Averaged Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport (LA SALT) has been developed for a class of stochastic partial differential equations in [4, 28]. For LA SALT the velocity field is randomly transported by white-noise vector fields as well as by its own average over realizations of this noise. For the even more general distribution-path dependent case of transport type equations, we refer to [51]. Generally speaking, the distribution of the solution is a global object on the path space, and it does not exist for explosive stochastic processes whose paths are killed at the life time. For a local theory of distribution dependent SDEs/SPDEs, we have to either consider the non-explosive setting or modify the “distribution” by a local notion (for example, conditional distribution given by solution does not blow up at present time). Here, we focus our attention to the abstract framework for SPDEs with SALT noise. The general case with LA SALT is left as future work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D. Alonso-Orán is deeply indebted to Antonio Córdoba for his helpful conversations about the theory of pseudo-differential operators. H. Tang benefited greatly from many insightful discussions with Professor Feng-Yu Wang.

APPENDIX A. AUXILIARY RESULTS

In this appendix we formulate and prove some estimates employed in the proofs above. We start from mollifiers which can preserve periodicity. Let $j = j(x)$ be a Schwartz function such that $0 \leq \widehat{j}(\xi) \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\widehat{j}(\xi) = 1$ for any $|\xi| \leq 1$. Define for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ the mollifier

$$J_\varepsilon g(x) := (j_\varepsilon \star g)(x), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $j_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widehat{j}(\varepsilon k) e^{ix \cdot k}$. The following operator \tilde{J}_ε is also fundamental for the approximation and defined by

$$\tilde{J}_\varepsilon g(x) := (1 - \varepsilon^2 \Delta)^{-1} g(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + \varepsilon^2 |k|^2)^{-1} \widehat{g}(k) e^{ix \cdot k}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For any $u, v \in H^s$, J_ε and \tilde{J}_ε satisfy, cf. [53, 54],

$$\|u - J_\varepsilon u\|_{H^r} \sim o(\varepsilon^{s-r}), \quad r \leq s, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\|J_\varepsilon u\|_{H^r} \lesssim \varepsilon^{s-r} \|u\|_{H^s}, \quad r > s, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$[D^s, J_\varepsilon] = [D^s, \tilde{J}_\varepsilon] = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$(J_\varepsilon u, v)_{L^2} = (u, J_\varepsilon v)_{L^2}, \quad (\tilde{J}_\varepsilon u, v)_{L^2} = (u, \tilde{J}_\varepsilon v)_{L^2}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and

$$\|J_\varepsilon u\|_{H^s}, \|\tilde{J}_\varepsilon u\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{H^s}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

From the definition of the Hilbert transform \mathcal{H} in (3.9), we have

$$[D^s, \mathcal{H}] = [\partial_x, \mathcal{H}] = [J_\varepsilon, \mathcal{H}] = 0, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and for any $s \geq 0$,

$$\|\mathcal{H}u\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

A pseudo-differential operator $P(x, D)$ on the periodic torus \mathbb{T}^d is an operator given by

$$p(x, D)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} a(x, k) e^{ix \cdot k} \widehat{f}(k), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $P(x, D)$ belongs to a certain class and $a(x, k)$ is called the symbol of $P(x, D)$. For $\rho, \delta \in [0, 1]$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the Hörmander class of symbols $S_{\rho, \delta}^m$ to be the set of all symbols $a : \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $a(\cdot, k) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$, there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$|\Delta_k^\alpha \partial_x^\beta a(x, k)| \leq C \langle k \rangle^{s - \rho|\alpha| + \delta|\beta|},$$

where $\langle k \rangle = (1 + k^2)^{1/2}$ and for $g : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\Delta_k^\alpha g(k) := \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^d, \gamma \leq \alpha} (-1)^{|\alpha - \gamma|} \binom{\alpha}{\gamma} g(k + \gamma)$$

is the finite difference operator of order α with step size one in each of the coordinates of the frequency variable k . In such a case we say the associated operator $p(x, D)$ defined by (A.10) belongs to the class $\text{OPS}_{\rho, \delta}^s$. Then J_ε and \tilde{J}_ε also satisfy

Lemma A.1 ([41, 55]). *Let $J_\varepsilon, \tilde{J}_\varepsilon$ be defined as in (A.1) and (A.2), then the following properties hold true*

- (1) $J_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{-\infty}$, $\tilde{J}_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{-2}$ for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$;
- (2) $\{J_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1}$ and $\{\tilde{J}_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1}$ are bounded subsets of $\text{OPS}_{1,0}^0$;
- (3) If $p(x, D) \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$, then $p(x, D)J_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{-\infty}$, $p(x, D)\tilde{J}_\varepsilon \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^{-\infty}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$;
- (4) If $p(x, D) \in \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$, then $\{p(x, D)J_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1} \subset \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$ and $\{p(x, D)\tilde{J}_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon < 1} \subset \text{OPS}_{1,0}^s$ are bounded.

We also recall the following commutator estimates for two pseudo-differential operators.

Lemma A.2 ([41, 55]). *Let $\mathcal{P} \in \text{OPS}_{\rho, \delta}^p$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \text{OPS}_{\rho, \delta}^q$ with $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq \delta < \rho \leq 1$ then*

$$[\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{T}] \in \text{OPS}_{\rho, \delta}^{p+q-(\rho-\delta)}.$$

Lemma A.3 ([54, 51]). Let $d \geq 1$ and $f, g : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $g \in W^{1,\infty}$ and $f \in L^2$. Then for some $C > 0$,

$$\left\| \left[\tilde{J}_\varepsilon, (g \cdot \nabla) \right] f \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Now we recall some useful estimates.

Lemma A.4 ([44, 45]). If $f, g \in H^s \cap W^{1,\infty}$ with $s > 0$, then for $p, p_i \in (1, \infty)$ with $i = 2, 3$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{p_3} + \frac{1}{p_4}$, we have

$$\| [D^s, f] g \|_{L^p} \leq C (\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|D^{s-1} g\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|D^s f\|_{L^{p_3}} \|g\|_{L^{p_4}}),$$

and

$$\| D^s(fg) \|_{L^p} \leq C (\|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|D^s g\|_{L^{p_2}} + \|D^s f\|_{L^{p_3}} \|g\|_{L^{p_4}}).$$

Lemma A.5. Let $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, $f \in H^{s+2}$ be a scalar function, ξ_k be a d -D vector and $\mathcal{P} \in OPS_{1,0}^s$. Define

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f = \xi_k \cdot \nabla f + (\operatorname{div} \xi_k) f.$$

If Assumption (B) holds, then we have

$$\left(\mathcal{P} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f, \mathcal{P} f \right)_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f, \mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f)_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Proof. The essential part of the desired estimate lies in the following result in [2]: Let \mathcal{Q} be a first-order linear operator with smooth coefficients and $\mathcal{P} \in OPS_{1,0}^s$. Then $f \in H^s$ with $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ we have that

$$(\mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q}^2 f, \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q} f, \mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q} f)_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s}^2.$$

In particular, if we choose $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}$ we have that:

$$(\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f, \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f, \mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f)_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^s}^2. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Since we want to calculate this estimate for $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2$, we need to precise the constant of the right hand side of (A.12). To this end, mimicking the proof of [2] we can rewrite the left hand side of (A.12) as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f, \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f, \mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f)_{L^2} &= (R_2 f, \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + (R_1 f, R_1 f)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P} f, E R_1 f)_{L^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{P} f, R_0 \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{P} f, E^2 \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} + (R_1 f, E \mathcal{P} f)_{L^2} \\ &=: \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $E = \operatorname{div} \xi_k \in OPS_{1,0}^0$, $R_0 = [\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}, E] \in OPS_{1,0}^1$, $R_1 = [\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}]$ and $R_2 = [R_1, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}]$. By Lemma A.2, we have

$$R_1, R_2, [R_1, \partial_x] \in OPS_{1,0}^s.$$

To derive (A.11) we will invoke the following commutator estimates (see [55, (3.6.1) and (3.6.2)]):

- If $P \in OPS_{1,0}^s$, $s > 0$, then there is a $C > 0$ such that

$$\|P(gu) - gPu\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|g\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|g\|_{H^s} \|u\|_{L^\infty}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

- If $P \in OPS_{1,0}^1$, then there is a $C > 0$ such that

$$\|P(gu) - gPu\|_{L^2} \leq C \|g\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^{s-1}}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

For I_1 , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\leq \|R_2 f\|_{L^2} \|\mathcal{P} f\|_{L^2} \leq \|[R_1, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}] f\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{H^s} \\ &= (\|[R_1, \xi_k \cdot \nabla] f\|_{L^2} + \|[R_1, \operatorname{div} \xi_k] f\|_{L^2}) \|f\|_{H^s} \\ &= (\|[R_1, \xi_k \cdot \nabla] f\|_{L^2} + \|\xi_k \cdot [R_1, \nabla] f\|_{L^2} + \|[R_1, \operatorname{div} \xi_k] f\|_{L^2}) \|f\|_{H^s} \\ &= (I_{1,1} + I_{1,2} + I_{1,3}) \|f\|_{H^s} \end{aligned}$$

Applying (A.13) with $P = R_1$, $g = \xi_k$, $u = \nabla f$, and using $H^s \hookrightarrow W^{1,\infty}$, we arrive at

$$|I_{1,1}| \leq \|\xi_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\nabla f\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

For the second term, we have

$$|I_{1,2}| = \|\xi_k \cdot [R_1, \nabla] f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|[R_1, \nabla] f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\xi_k\|_{H^s} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

Applying (A.13) with $P = R_1$, $g = \operatorname{div} \xi_k$ and $u = f$ yields

$$|I_{1,3}| \leq \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|f\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{H^s} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

Hence, we have show that

$$|I_1| \leq C \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}} \|f\|_{H^s}^2.$$

Repeat the above procedure as we estimate $\|R_2 f\|_{L^2} = \|[R_1, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}]f\|_{L^2}$ with replacing R_1 by \mathcal{P} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\leq \|R_1 f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}\|_{L^2}^2 = (\|\mathcal{P}, \xi_k \cdot \nabla\|_{L^2} + \|\mathcal{P}, \operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^2})^2 \\ &= (\|\mathcal{P}, \xi_k \cdot \nabla\|_{L^2} + \|\xi_k \cdot [\mathcal{P}, \nabla]f\|_{L^2} + \|\mathcal{P}, \operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^2})^2 \\ &\leq \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 \|f\|_{H^s}^2, \end{aligned}$$

For the third term, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $E = \operatorname{div} \xi_k \in \operatorname{OPS}_{1,0}^1$ gives rise to

$$|I_3| = (\mathcal{P}f, ER_1 f)_{L^2} \leq \|\mathcal{P}f\|_{L^2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k R_1 f\|_{L^2} \leq \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{H^s}^2.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_5 + I_6| &= \left| \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{P}f, E^2 \mathcal{P}f)_{L^2} + (R_1 f, E \mathcal{P}f)_{L^2} \right| \\ &\leq C \left(\|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\mathcal{P}f\|_{L^2}^2 + \|R_1 f\|_{L^2} \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathcal{P}f\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^\infty} + \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right) \|f\|_{H^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_4 , we notice that $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} \in \operatorname{OPS}_{1,0}^1$. Hence it follows from (A.14) with $P = \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}$, $g = \operatorname{div} \xi_k$ and $u = \mathcal{P}f$ that

$$|I_4| \leq C \|\mathcal{P}f\|_{L^2} \|\mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}, \operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{L^2} \|\mathcal{P}f\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{H^s} \|\operatorname{div} \xi_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|f\|_{H^{s-1}} \leq C \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}} \|f\|_{H^s}^2.$$

Gathering all the above estimates implies that for some $C > 0$,

$$(\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k}^2 f, \mathcal{P}f)_{L^2} + (\mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f, \mathcal{P} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_k} f)_{L^2} \leq C \left(\|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\xi_k\|_{H^{s+1}} \right) \|f\|_{H^s}^2.$$

Using Assumption (B) to the above estimates, we obtain (A.11). \square

We conclude this appendix with some useful tools in stochastic analysis.

Lemma A.6 (Prokhorov Theorem, [25]). *Let \mathbb{X} be a complete and separable metric space. A sequence of measures $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ is tight if and only if it is relatively compact, i.e., there is a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ converging to a probability measure μ weakly.*

Lemma A.7 (Skorokhod Theorem, [25]). *Let \mathbb{X} be a complete and separable metric space. For an arbitrary sequence $\{\mu_n\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $\{\mu_n\}$ is tight on $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}))$, there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ converging weakly to a probability measure μ , and a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with \mathbb{X} -valued Borel measurable random variables x_n and x , such that μ_n is the distribution of x_n , μ is the distribution of x , and $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} x$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

Lemma A.8 ([11, 26]). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space and \mathbb{X} be a separable Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{S}_n = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{W}_n)$ be a sequence of stochastic bases such that for each $n \geq 1$, \mathcal{W}_n is cylindrical Brownian motion (over \mathbb{U} with the canonical embedding $\mathbb{U} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{U}_0$ being Hilbert-Schmidt) with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}_{t \geq 0}$. Let G_n be an \mathcal{F}_t^n predictable process ranging in $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X})$. Finally consider $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{W})$ and $G \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X}))$, which is \mathcal{F}_t predictable. Suppose that in probability we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{W} \text{ in } C([0, T]; \mathbb{U}_0) \text{ and } G_n \rightarrow G \text{ in } L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{U}; \mathbb{X})).$$

Then

$$\int_0^\cdot G_n d\mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot G d\mathcal{W} \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; \mathbb{X}) \text{ in probability.}$$

Lemma A.9 (Gyöngy-Krylov Lemma, [37]). *Let \mathbb{X} be a Polish space equipped with the Borel sigma-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$. Let $\{Y_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{X} -valued random variables. Let*

$$\mu_{j,l}(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(Y_j \times Y_l \in \cdot) \quad \forall \cdot \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}).$$

Then $\{Y_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ converges in probability if and only if for every subsequence of $\{\mu_{j_k, l_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$, there exists a further subsequence which weakly converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X})$ satisfying

$$\mu(\{(u, v) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}, u = v\}) = 1.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Albeverio, Z. Brzeźniak, and A. Daletskii. Stochastic Camassa-Holm equation with convection type noise. [arXiv:1911.07077](#), 2019.
- [2] D. Alonso-Orán and A. Bethencourt de León. On the well-posedness of stochastic Boussinesq equations with transport noise. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 30(1):175–224, 2020.
- [3] D. Alonso-Orán, A. Bethencourt de León, and S. Takao. The Burgers’ equation with stochastic transport: shock formation, local and global existence of smooth solutions. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 26(6):Paper No. 57, 33, 2019.
- [4] D. Alonso-Orán, A. Bethencourt de León, D. D. Holm and S. Takao. Modelling the Climate and Weather of a 2-D Lagrangian-Averaged Euler–Boussinesq Equation with Transport Noise. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 179, 1267–1303, 2020.
- [5] G. R. Baker, X. Li, and A. C. Morlet Analytic structure of 1D-transport equations with nonlocal fluxes *Physica D*, 91: 349–375, 1996.
- [6] H. Bae and R. Granero-Belinchón. Global existence for some transport equations with nonlocal velocity. *Adv. Math.*, 269:197–219, 2015.
- [7] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin and R. Danchin Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, vol. 343, Springer, Heidelberg 2011.
- [8] T. Bendall, C. Cotter and D. D. Holm Perspectives on the Formation of Peakons in the Stochastic Camassa-Holm Equation [arXiv:1910.03018v](#), 2019.
- [9] A. Bensoussan. Stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 38(3):267–304, 1995.
- [10] J. Berner, T. Jung, and T. N. Palmer. Systematic model error: The impact of increased horizontal resolution versus improved stochastic and deterministic parameterizations. *Journal of Climate*, 25(14):4946–4962, 2012.
- [11] D. Breit, E. Feireisl, and M. Hofmanová. *Stochastically forced compressible fluid flows*, volume 3 of *De Gruyter Series in Applied and Numerical Mathematics*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018.
- [12] A. Bressan and A. Constantin. Global conservative solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 183(2):215–239, 2007.
- [13] A. Castro, D. Córdoba, F. Gancedo and R. Orive. Incompressible flow in porous media with fractional diffusion, *Nonlinearity*, 22 (8), 1791–1815, 2009.
- [14] R. Camassa and D. D. Holm. An integrable shallow water equation with peaked solitons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 71(11):1661–1664, 1993.
- [15] Y. Chen, H. Gao, and B. Guo. Well-posedness for stochastic Camassa-Holm equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 253(8):2353–2379, 2012.
- [16] A. Constantin and J. Escher Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations. *Acta Math.*, 181(2):229–243, 1998.
- [17] A. Constantin and J. Escher Well-posedness, global existence, and blowup phenomena for a periodic quasi-linear hyperbolic equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 51(5):475–504, 1998.
- [18] P. Constantin, A. Majda and E. Tabak. Formation of strong fronts in the 2-D quasi-geostrophic thermal active scalar *Nonlinearity*, 7, 1495–1533, 1994.
- [19] A. Córdoba, D. Córdoba, and M. A. Fontelos. Formation of singularities for a transport equation with nonlocal velocity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 162(3):1377–1389, 2005.
- [20] C. Cotter, D. Crisan, D. D. Holm, W. Pan and I. Shevchenko. A Particle Filter for Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport (SALT): A case study for the damped and forced incompressible 2-D Euler equation [arXiv:1907.11884 \[stat.AP\]](#), 2019.
- [21] C. Cotter, G. Gottwald and D. D. Holm. Stochastic partial differential fluid equations as a diffusive limit of deterministic lagrangian multi-time dynamics. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 473(2205):20170388, 2017.
- [22] D. Crisan, F. Flandoli, and D. D. Holm. Solution Properties of a 3D Stochastic Euler Fluid Equation. *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 29(3):813–870, 2019.
- [23] D. Crisan and O. Lang. Well-posedness for a stochastic 2-D Euler equation with transport noise [arXiv:1907.00451](#), 2019.
- [24] D. Crisan and D. Holm. Wave breaking for the stochastic Camassa-Holm equation, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 376, pp. 138–143, 2018.
- [25] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 152 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2014.
- [26] A. Debussche, N. E. Glatt-Holtz, and R. Temam. Local martingale and pathwise solutions for an abstract fluids model. *Phys. D*, 240(14–15):1123–1144, 2011.
- [27] H. Dong. Well-posedness for a transport equation with nonlocal velocity. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 255(11):3070–3097, 2008.
- [28] T. Drivas, D. D. Holm and J. M. Leahy, Lagrangian Averaged Stochastic Advection by Lie Transport for Fluids. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 179, 1304–1342, 2020.
- [29] E. Fedrizzi and F. Flandoli. Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(6):1329–1354, 2013.
- [30] F. Flandoli. *Random perturbation of PDEs and fluid dynamic models*, volume 2015 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. Lectures from the 40th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2010, École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. [Saint-Flour Probability Summer School].
- [31] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola. Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Invent. Math.*, 180(1):1–53, 2010.
- [32] F. Flandoli and D. Luo. Euler-Lagrangian approach to 3-D stochastic Euler equations. *J. Geom. Mech.*, 11 (2):153–165, 2019.

- [33] B. Fuchssteiner and A. S. Fokas. Symplectic structures, their Bäcklund transformations and hereditary symmetries. *Phys. D*, 4(1):47–66, 1981/82.
- [34] L. Gawarecki and V. Mandrekar. *Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensions with applications to stochastic partial differential equations*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [35] N. Glatt-Holtz and M. Ziane. Strong pathwise solutions of the stochastic Navier-Stokes system. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 14(5-6):567–600, 2009.
- [36] N. E. Glatt-Holtz and V. C. Vicol. Local and global existence of smooth solutions for the stochastic Euler equations with multiplicative noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(1):80–145, 2014.
- [37] I. Gyöngy and N. Krylov. Existence of strong solutions for Itô’s stochastic equations via approximations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 105(2):143–158, 1996.
- [38] D. D. Holm. Variational principles for stochastic fluid dynamics. *Proc. A.*, 471(2176):20140963, 19, 2015.
- [39] D. D. Holm and E. Luesink. Stochastic wave-current interaction in thermal shallow water dynamics. [arXiv:1910.10627](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10627), 2019.
- [40] H. Holden and X. Raynaud. Raynaud. Global conservative solutions of the Camassa-Holm equation—a Lagrangian point of view. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(10-12):1511–1549, 2007.
- [41] L. Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. III*, volume 274 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985. Pseudodifferential operators.
- [42] G. Kallianpur and J. Xiong. Stochastic differential equations in infinite-dimensional spaces. 26:vi+342, 1995. Expanded version of the lectures delivered as part of the 1993 Barrett Lectures at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, March 25–27, 1993. With a foreword by Balram S. Rajput and Jan Rosinski.
- [43] A. Karczewska. Stochastic integral with respect to cylindrical Wiener process. *Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Sect. A*, 52(2):79–93, 1998.
- [44] T. Kato and G. Ponce. Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 41(7):891–907, 1988.
- [45] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Well-posedness of the initial value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 4(2):323–347, 1991.
- [46] N. V. Krylov and B. L. Rozovskiĭ. Stochastic evolution equations. In *Current problems in mathematics, Vol. 14 (Russian)*, pages 71–147, 256. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Informatsii, Moscow, 1979.
- [47] D. Leslie and G. Quarini. The application of turbulence theory to the formulation of subgrid modelling procedures *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 91: 65–91, 1979.
- [48] G. Leha and G. Ritter. On solutions to stochastic differential equations with discontinuous drift in Hilbert space. *Math. Ann.*, 270(1):109–123, 1985.
- [49] E. Pardoux. Sur des équations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques monotones. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 275:A101–A103, 1972.
- [50] C. Prévôt and M. Röckner. *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 1905 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [51] P. Ren, H. Tang, and F.-Y. Wang. Distribution-path dependent nonlinear SPDEs with application to stochastic transport type equations. [arXiv:2007.09188](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.09188), 2020.
- [52] C. Rohde and H. Tang. On a stochastic Camassa-Holm type equation with higher order nonlinearities. *J Dyn Diff Equat*, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10884-020-09872-1>.
- [53] H. Tang. On the pathwise solutions to the Camassa-Holm equation with multiplicative noise. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 50(1):1322–1366, 2018.
- [54] H. Tang. Noise effects on dependence on initial data and blow-up for stochastic Euler–Poincaré equations. [arXiv:2002.08719](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08719), 2020.
- [55] M. E. Taylor. *Pseudodifferential operators and nonlinear PDE*, volume 100 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1991.
- [56] R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and numerical analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 2.
- [57] M. Zidikheri and J. Frederiksen. Stochastic subgrid-scale modelling for non-equilibrium geophysical flows *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 368: 145–160, 2010.

INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, D-53115 BONN, GERMANY
 Email address: alonso@iam.uni-bonn.de

INSTITUT FÜR ANGEWANDTE ANALYSIS UND NUMERISCHE SIMULATION, UNIVERSITÄT STUTTGART, PFAFFENWALDRING 57, 70569 STUTTGART, GERMANY
 Email address: christian.rohde@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

INSTITUT FÜR ANGEWANDTE ANALYSIS UND NUMERISCHE SIMULATION, UNIVERSITÄT STUTTGART, PFAFFENWALDRING 57, 70569 STUTTGART, GERMANY
 Email address: hao.tang@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de