

EFFECT OF RANDOM NOISE ON SOLUTIONS TO THE MODIFIED TWO-COMPONENT CAMASSA-HOLM SYSTEM ON \mathbb{T}^D

LEI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. This paper studies the high dimensional modified two-component Camassa-Holm (MCH2) system with random perturbation on the torus \mathbb{T}^d ($d \geq 1$). The MCH2 system reduces to the Euler-Poincaré equation without considering the averaged density, and to the two-component Euler-Poincaré system as the potential energy term weakens to L^2 norm in the Lagrangian. First, we establish the local well-posedness of strong pathwise solutions in the sense of Hadamard for the MCH2 system driven by general nonlinear multiplicative noise. Moreover, we prove that the data-to-solution map does not uniformly depend on the initial data, assuming that the noise coefficients can be controlled by the nonlocal terms of the system itself. Second, when the noise coefficients are in the form of polynomial, say $c|f|^\delta f$ with $c \neq 0$, we find that the random noises with sufficiently large intensity parameters $\delta_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta_2 \geq 1$ have a regularization effect on the t -variable, which improves the local strong pathwise solutions to be global-in-time ones. Note that the global existence problem with small intensity $0 \leq \delta_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq \delta_2 < 1$ remains to be an open problem. As a partial positive answer, we prove that, in the case of $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, the stochastic MCH2 system admits a unique global strong pathwise solution with high probability for sufficiently small initial data. Nevertheless, when $d = 1$, we show that the solutions will break in finite time for any small initial data satisfying a proper shape condition.

Date: January 8, 2022.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic MCH2 system; High dimension; Periodic solutions; Local and global solutions; Blow-up criteria.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Preliminaries	5
1.2. Assumptions and main results	8
1.3. Plan of the paper	16
2. Hadamard local well-posedness	16
2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3(2)	16
2.2. Regularization of SMCH2 system	21
2.3. Momentum estimates	22
2.4. Smooth strong solutions	29
2.5. Proof of Theorem 1.3(1)	42
3. Nonuniform dependence on initial data	57
3.1. Approximation solutions	57
3.2. Error estimate	64
3.3. Nonuniform continuity	71
4. Global existence and blow-up criteria	73
4.1. Proof of global result-I	73
4.2. Proof of global result-II	78
4.3. Blow-up phenomena	82
5. Appendix	88
6. Acknowledgement	89
References	89

1. INTRODUCTION

The Camassa-Holm (CH) equation, which models the unidirectional propagation of shallow water waves over a flat bottom [16, 61], or the propagation of axially symmetric waves in hyperelastic rods [26], has been studied extensively during past decades. The most remarkable features of CH equation are the the existence of peaked soliton solutions [16, 23, 32, 65] and the description of wave breaking phenomena [6, 7, 19–21], which can not be characterized by the integrable Korteweg-de Vries equation [37, 73]. Recently, Holm, N araigh and Tronci [55, 57] extend the CH equation to the modified two-component Camassa-Holm system (MCH2) so as to combine its integrability property with compressibility, or free-surface elevation dynamics in its shallow-water interpretation. The MCH2 system is defined as geodesic motion on the semidirect product Lie group with respect to a certain metric and is given as a set of Euler-Poincar e equations on the dual of the corresponding Lie algebra. Consider the following type of variational principle

$$\delta \int \mathcal{L}(u, \bar{\rho}) dt = 0,$$

with the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \bar{\rho}) = \frac{1}{2} \int u \cdot (1 - \alpha_1^2 \Delta) u dx + \frac{g}{2} \int (\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0) (1 - \alpha_2^2 \Delta) (\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0) dx,$$

where Δ denotes the d -dimensional Laplacian operator, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are two length scales and $g > 0$ is the downward constant acceleration of gravity in application to shallow water waves. By substituting the variational derivatives for Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(u, \bar{\rho})$ into the semidirect-product Euler-Poincaré equations (cf. [55, 57, 71]), the MCH2 system in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 1$ may be formulated in coordinates as

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t m = \underbrace{-u \cdot \nabla m}_{\text{convection}} - \underbrace{(\nabla u)^T \cdot m}_{\text{stretching}} - \underbrace{m(\operatorname{div} u)}_{\text{expansion}} - \underbrace{g\rho \nabla \bar{\rho}}_{\text{force}}, \\ \partial_t \rho = -\operatorname{div}(\rho u), \\ m = (1 - \alpha_1^2 \Delta) u, \\ \rho = (1 - \alpha_2^2 \Delta) (\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0). \end{cases}$$

In (1.1), the d -dimension vector field $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d)^T$ denotes the velocity of the fluid, the field m with the component $m_j = u_j - \Delta u_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$ represents the momentum, and the scalar functions ρ and $\bar{\rho}$ stand for the density and averaged density (or depth, in the shallow-water interpretation), respectively. For the stretching term in (1.1)₁, we denote $(\nabla u)^T \cdot m = \sum_j m_j \nabla u_j$, where \cdot^T is the transposition of \cdot . Without loss of generality, we shall always assume that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = g = 1$ in the following argument.

The MCH2 system (1.1) is closely related to two important models. The first one is the Euler-Poincaré (EP) equation, which can be obtained by taking $\rho \equiv 0$ in (1.1):

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t m + u \cdot \nabla m + (\nabla u)^T \cdot m + m(\operatorname{div} u) = 0, \\ m = (1 - \alpha^2 \Delta) u. \end{cases}$$

The system (1.2) was first considered by Holm, Marsden, and Ratiu as a framework for modeling and analyzing fluid dynamics [55, 56], particularly for nonlinear shallow water waves, geophysical fluids and turbulence modeling. The EP equation can be considered as an evolutionary equation for a geodesic motion on a diffeomorphism group [31, 59, 63, 86], and it has important applications in computational anatomy (cf. [59, 86]). The EP equation has many further interpretations beyond fluid applications. For instance, it is exactly the same as the averaged template matching equation for computer vision (cf. [51, 54, 58]). The rigorous analysis of the EP equation was initiated by Chae and Liu [17], in which the authors established a fairly complete well-posedness theory for both weak and strong solutions. In [66], Li, Yu and Zhai proved that for a large class of smooth initial data, the corresponding solution to the EP equation with $\alpha \neq 0$ blows up in finite time, which settles an open problem raised in [17]. The local well-posedness result is improved to Besov spaces by Yan and Yin [85]. The blow-up phenomena and ill-posedness problem for EP equation on torus \mathbb{T}^d are investigated by Luo and Yin [70]. Moreover, it is shown that the data-to-solution map for EP equation is not uniformly continuous in [67, 89]. Besides, Tang [79] considered the effect of random noise on the dynamic behavior of pathwise solutions to the EP equation.

When $d = 1$, Eq.(1.2) becomes the classical Camassa-Holm equation [16], which has been well studied since its derivation from the shallow water regime. We are not going to list all the literatures here, and just refer readers to the references provided in paragraph one and the references therein for details on theoretical analysis.

The other remarkable model concerned with (1.1) is the following two-component Euler-Poincaré (EP2) system:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t m + u \cdot \nabla m + (\nabla u)^T \cdot m + m(\operatorname{div} u) = -g\rho \nabla \rho, \\ \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\ m = (1 - \alpha^2 \Delta)u. \end{cases}$$

The EP2 system in one dimension (also called the two-component Camassa-Holm (CH2) system) was first introduced by Chen and Zhang [18] and Falqui [33], and later Constantin and Ivanov [22] gave a rigorous justification of the derivation in the context of shallow water regime. Holm, Náraigh and Tronci [57, 64]; see also Kohlmann [64] and Holm and Tronci [60], extended the CH2 system to the multi-dimensional case by considering the Hamilton's principle $\delta \int \mathcal{L}(u, \rho) dt = 0$ when the Lagrangian is taken to be the metric

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \rho) = \frac{1}{2} \int u \cdot (1 - \Delta)u dx + \frac{g}{2} \int (\rho - \rho_0)^2 dx.$$

Comparing (1.3) with (1.1), the modification will amount to strengthening the norm for $\bar{\rho}$ from L^2 to H^1 in the potential energy term in the last metric Lagrangian in Hamilton's principle for EP2 system. This main difference leads to the fact that, the CH2 system does not admit singular solutions in the density profile, while the MCH2 system admits peaked soliton solutions in both the velocity and average density. Moreover, the dynamic behavior of solutions to MCH2 system is quite different with those of CH2 system. After its derivation, the EP2 system (1.3) has been studied by several authors. For instance, in [30], Duan and Xiang investigated the Cauchy problem for EP2 system in Sobolev spaces by using the energy method. Later, Li and Yin [68] established the local well-posedness of EP2 system in nonhomogeneous Besov spaces. In terms of the abstract Cauchy-Kowalevski lemma, they also proved the existence of locally-in-time analytical solutions. In the case of $d = 1$, the CH2 system has also attracted much attention owing the fact that it has both solutions which blow up in finite time and solitary wave solutions interacting like solitons. To name a few, we would like to refer the readers to [40, 42–45] and the references therein for more PDEs theory.

To our best knowledge, few works are available for the Cauchy problem of MCH2 system in high dimensions besides [84], in which the author established the local existence of strong solutions in nonhomogeneous Besov spaces, and several blow-up criteria for strong solutions in Besov spaces are also provided. For other works related to the MCH2 system in one dimension, we refer to [41, 43, 46, 77] and the works therein for details. It is worth pointing out that, as far as we know, there seems no result concerning the existence of global solutions to the MCH2 system in high dimensions, which will be one of the main themes in present paper, and we shall achieve this goal from a probability point of view.

Indeed, taking into account the random environment surrounding the fluid, it is natural to consider the MCH2 system perturbed by random noises. The importance of incorporating stochastic effects in the modeling of complex systems has been recognized, and the dynamic behavior of fluid models perturbed by different kinds of noises has been widely studied in past decades. For instance, from a stochastic variational principle, Holm [53] derived explicitly some new stochastic fluid equations in the Stratonovich form or Itô form. To just mention a few, we refer to [1, 4, 13, 15, 28, 29, 48, 49, 69, 83, 88] for the PDEs theory on some stochastic fluid models, and also refer to recent works on stochastic shallow water wave equations [2, 24, 27, 72, 74–76, 78, 87]. More recently, the compressible fluid flows perturbed by stochastic forcing has been systematically studied by Breit, Feireisl and Hofmanová [8–10, 12]. Furthermore, it is worth pointing out that the appearance of stochastic perturbation in PDEs can lead to new phenomena. For instance, while uniqueness may fail for the deterministic transport equation, Flandoli et al. [36] proved that a multiplicative stochastic perturbation of Brownian type is enough to render the equation well-posed; see also [34]. In [14], Brzeźniak et al. proved that the 2D Navier-Stokes system driven by degenerate noise has a unique invariant measure and hence exhibits ergodic behavior in the sense that the time average of a solution is equal to the average over all possible initial data, which is quite different with the deterministic case.

The main purpose of this work is to investigate the effect of random noise on dynamic behavior of periodic solutions to the MCH2 system in high dimensions. Precisely, we are going to seek for probabilistically the local strong pathwise solution for the MCH2 system with general random noises, and more interestingly, look for sufficient conditions which lead to the existence of global solutions and the blow-up phenomena in finite time. The stochastically perturbed MCH2 (SMCH2) system on the torus $\mathbb{T}^d \triangleq (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^d$ considered in the paper can be formulated by

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} dm + (u \cdot \nabla m + (\nabla u)^T m + (\operatorname{div} u)m + \rho \nabla \bar{\rho}) dt = g_1(t, m) d\mathcal{W}_1, \\ d\rho + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = g_2(t, \rho) d\mathcal{W}_2, \\ m = (1 - \Delta)u, \\ \rho = (1 - \Delta)(\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0), \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

which is endowed with the initial conditions

$$(1.5) \quad m(0, x) = m_0(x), \quad \rho(0, x) = \rho_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Here, m_0 and n_0 are given random initial data in Sobolev spaces with suitable regularity. The driven stochastic processes \mathcal{W}_1 and \mathcal{W}_2 are independent cylindrical Wiener processes defined on some separable Hilbert spaces. The precise assumptions on the coefficients g_1 and g_2 as well as further details are given in Subsection 1.1.

1.1. Preliminaries.

1.1.1. *Deterministic background.* Denote by $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ the Schwartz space of all rapidly decreasing infinitely functions from \mathbb{T}^d to \mathbb{R}^n . The space of tempered distributions is denoted

by $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the usual square-integrable Lebesgue space on \mathbb{T}^d with the inner product and norm denoted by $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$, respectively. Define the complex trigonometric polynomials $e_{\mathbf{m}}(x) = \exp(i\mathbf{m} \cdot x)$, $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\bar{e}_{\mathbf{m}}$ denotes the complex conjugate. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of periodic functions can be characterized as $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{H^s}^2 \triangleq \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|\mathbf{m}|^2 + 1)^s a_{\mathbf{m}}^2[f] < \infty,$$

where $a_{\mathbf{m}}[f] = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} (f, \bar{e}_{\mathbf{m}})_{L^2}$ denotes the Fourier coefficients of f . The spaces $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ are separable Hilbert spaces endowed with the product

$$(f, g)_{H^s} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (|\mathbf{m}|^2 + 1)^s a_{\mathbf{m}}[f] \bar{a}_{\mathbf{m}}[g] = ((1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} f, (1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}} g)_{L^2}.$$

Consider a Schwartz function $j(x)$ such that $0 \leq \mathcal{F}j(\xi) \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{F}j(\xi) = 1$ for $\xi \in [-1, 1]^d$. For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the function defined by $j_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (j, \bar{e}_{\epsilon \mathbf{m}})_{L^2} e_{\mathbf{m}}$ is called the Friedrichs mollifier. For $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$, we define its regularization $J_\epsilon f$ as $J_\epsilon f(x) = j_\epsilon \star f(x) \equiv (f, j_\epsilon(x - \cdot))_{L^2}$. One can verify the following basic properties:

$$(1.6) \quad \|f - J_\epsilon f\|_{H^r} \approx o(\epsilon^{s-r}), \quad r \leq s,$$

$$(1.7) \quad \|J_\epsilon f\|_{H^r} \lesssim O(\epsilon^{s-r}) \|f\|_{H^s}, \quad r \geq s,$$

$$(1.8) \quad (J_\epsilon f, g)_{L^2} = (f, J_\epsilon g)_{L^2},$$

and

$$(1.9) \quad \|[J_\epsilon, g \cdot \nabla]f\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} \|f\|_{L^2},$$

for any $g \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (cf. [81]).

Since the solutions to SMCH2 system are not expected to be differentiable, we need to consider the fractional space-time Sobolev spaces: For $1 \leq q < \infty$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the space $L^q([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n))$ consists of all measurable functions $f : [0, T] \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|f\|_{L^q([0, T]; H^s)}^q = \int_0^T \|f(t)\|_{H^s}^q dt < \infty$. For any $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we define

$$W^{\theta, q}([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)) = \left\{ f \in L^q([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)); \right. \\ \left. \|f\|_{L^q([0, T]; H^s)}^q + \int_0^T \int_0^T \frac{\|f(t) - f(t')\|_{H^s}^q}{|t - t'|^{1+\theta q}} dt dt' < \infty \right\}.$$

To prove the existence of global strong pathwise solutions to the SMCH system, we shall utilize the Littlewood-Paley theory, and we refer the readers to [3] for more details. Let $\{\Delta_j\}_{j \geq -1}$ be the Littlewood-Paley blocks which are pseudo-differential operators defined by certain partition of unity. The nonhomogeneous Besov space $B_{2,r}^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined by

$$B_{2,r}^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n) \triangleq \left\{ u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^n); \|u\|_{B_{2,r}^s} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$\|u\|_{B_{2,r}^s} = \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{q \geq -1} 2^{rsq} \|\Delta_q u\|_{L^2}^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, & \text{if } r < \infty, \\ \sup_{q \geq -1} 2^{sq} \|\Delta_q u\|_{L^2}, & \text{if } r = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Since the unknown variable (u, γ) in (1.11) is \mathbb{R}^{d+1} -valued and defined on \mathbb{T}^d , in order to write the vector field in a single form, we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}^p(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) &\triangleq L^p(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^p(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}), \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty, \\ \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) &\triangleq H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{W}^{k,p}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \triangleq W^{k,p}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \times W^{k,p}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}), \quad k \geq 1, 1 \leq p \leq \infty.$$

Here for two Banach spaces \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , the Cartesian product space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is again a Banach spaces which is equipped with the Cartesian product norm $\|(u_1, u_2)\|_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} = \sqrt{\|u_1\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \|u_2\|_{\mathcal{Y}}^2}$, for any $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Moreover, if \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are Hilbert spaces, then $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is also a Hilbert space with the inner product

$$(u, v)_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} = (u_1, v_1)_{\mathcal{X}} + (u_2, v_2)_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad u = (u_1, u_2), \quad v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}.$$

For the sake of simplicity, when a function is defined on \mathbb{T}^d and take values in \mathbb{R}^n , where k, n are clear from the context, we shall omit the parentheses in notations of function spaces. For example, $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d+1}) = \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $\mathbb{W}^{k,p}(\mathbb{T}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) = \mathbb{W}^{k,p}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and so on.

1.1.2. *Stochastic setting.* To make sense of the stochastic forcing, let $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0})$ be a fixed complete filtration probability space, and $(\beta_j^i)_{j \geq 1}$, $i = 1, 2$ be mutually independent real-valued standard Wiener processes relative to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Let $(e_j^i)_{j \geq 1}$ be a complete orthonormal system in a separate Hilbert space \mathfrak{A}_i , then one can formally define the mutually independent cylindrical Wiener processes \mathcal{W}_i on \mathfrak{A}_i by

$$\mathcal{W}_i(t, \omega) = \sum_{j \geq 1} e_j^i \beta_j^i(t, \omega), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

To ensue the convergence of the last series, we introduce an auxiliary space

$$\mathfrak{A}_{0,i} \triangleq \left\{ u = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j^i e_j^i; \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(a_j^i)^2}{j^2} < \infty \right\} \supset \mathfrak{A}_i, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

which is endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{\mathfrak{A}_{0,i}}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(a_j^i)^2}{j^2}$, for any $u = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j^i e_j^i \in \mathfrak{A}_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Note that the canonical injection $\mathfrak{A}_i \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{0,i}$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, which implies that for any $T > 0$ $\mathcal{W}_i \in C([0, T]; \mathfrak{A}_{0,i})$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, $i = 1, 2$. Here we denote by $L_2(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z})$ the collection of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{Y} into another separable Hilbert space \mathcal{Z} with the norm

$$\|H\|_{L_2(\mathcal{Y}; \mathcal{Z})}^2 = \sum_{j \geq 1} \|H v_j\|_{\mathcal{Z}}^2 < \infty,$$

where $(v_j)_{j \geq 1}$ is a complete orthogonal basis in \mathcal{Y} .

Now let H be a \mathcal{Z} -valued predictable process in $L^2(\Omega; L^2_{loc}([0, \infty); L_2(\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{Z})))$. One can define the Itô-type stochastic integration

$$\int_0^t H(r) d\mathcal{W}_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} \int_0^t H(r) e_j^i d\beta_j^i(r), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

which is actually a continuous \mathcal{Z} -valued square integrable martingale. We also remark that the above definition of the stochastic integration does not depend on the choice of $\mathfrak{A}_{0,i}$ (cf. [25]). Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$ and $t > 0$, there exists a positive constant depending only on p such that the following Burkholder-Davis-Gundy (BDG) inequality holds [25]:

$$(1.10) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left\| \int_0^s H(r) d\mathcal{W}_i \right\|_X^p \right) \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \|H(r)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}_i, X)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In the following, we shall reformulate the SMCH2 system into a single form. To this purpose, we define the Cartesian products $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_1 \times \mathfrak{A}_2$ and the auxiliary space $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathfrak{A}_{0,1} \times \mathfrak{A}_{0,2}$, then the canonical injection $\mathfrak{A} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{A}_0$ is Hilbert-Schmidt, and $\mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2)^T$ defines a cylindrical Wiener process on \mathfrak{A} , which belongs to $C_{loc}([0, \infty); \mathfrak{A}_0)$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Moreover, as the noise coefficients for the rewritten SMCH2 system becomes a matrix-valued Hilbert-Schmidt operator, for instance,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

with $M_{ij} \in L_2(V_j; U_j)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, where V_j and U_j , $j = 1, 2$ are separable Hilbert spaces, we define the canonical norm

$$\|M\|_{L_2(V; U)}^2 \triangleq \sum_{i, j=1}^2 \|M_{ij}\|_{L_2(V_j; U_j)}^2,$$

where $V = V_1 \times V_2$ and $U = U_1 \times U_2$.

1.2. Assumptions and main results. To provide the main results for the SMCH2 system (1.4), let us first transform the system (1.11) into another two convenient forms. It follows from (1.4)₃ that $u = \Lambda^{-2}m$, and from (1.4)₄ that $\gamma \triangleq \bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0 = \Lambda^{-2}\rho$, where $\Lambda^s = (1 - \Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the Bessel potentials. By applying Λ^{-2} to the first two equations in (1.4), and using the similar calculations for the deterministic counterpart [84], the Cauchy problem (1.4)-(1.5) can be reformulated as

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} du + (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt = \Lambda^{-2}g_1(t, m) d\mathcal{W}_1, \\ d\gamma + (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)) dt = \Lambda^{-2}g_2(t, \rho) d\mathcal{W}_2, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 = \Lambda^{-2}m_0, \\ \gamma|_{t=0} = \gamma_0 = \Lambda^{-2}\rho_0, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.12) \quad \mathcal{L}_1(u) &= \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 I_d + \nabla u \nabla u + \nabla u (\nabla u)^T - (\nabla u)^T \nabla u - (\operatorname{div} u) \nabla u \right) \\
&\quad + \Lambda^{-2} ((\operatorname{div} u) u + u \cdot (\nabla u)^T), \\
\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma) &= \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 + |\nabla \gamma|^2) I_d - (\nabla \gamma)^T \nabla \gamma \right), \\
\mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma) &= \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} (\nabla \gamma \nabla u + (\nabla \gamma) \cdot \nabla u - (\operatorname{div} u) \nabla \gamma) + \Lambda^{-2} ((\operatorname{div} u) \gamma),
\end{aligned}$$

and I_d denotes the $d \times d$ unit matrix. The system (1.11) can be regarded as a nonlocal transport system perturbed by the nonlinear multiplicative noise.

For simplicity, we also rewrite the system (1.11) into a single form. Define

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \gamma_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{W} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \mathcal{W}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the bilinear functional

$$B(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 \\ u_1 \cdot \nabla \gamma_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y}_i = \begin{pmatrix} u_i \\ \gamma_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, we define for $m = \Lambda^2 u$, $\rho = \Lambda^2 \gamma$

$$F(\mathbf{y}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma) \\ \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma) \end{pmatrix}, \quad G(t, \mathbf{y}) = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m) & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda^{-2} g_2(t, \rho) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the Cauchy problem (1.11) can be understood in the following concise form:

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{cases} d\mathbf{y} + B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})dt + F(\mathbf{y})dt = G(t, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W}, \\ \mathbf{y}(\omega, 0, x) = \mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x), \end{cases} \quad t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Observing that due to the lack of free-divergence property for velocity field, i.e., $\operatorname{div} u = 0$, the cancelation property $(B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y})_{\mathbb{L}^2} = 0$, which holds for the Euler equations and Navier-Stokes equations, does not hold in the present case.

The following assumptions on the data of the problem will be valid throughout this paper:

Assumption 1.1. Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, we assume that

- (1) There exists two non-decreasing locally bounded continuous scalar functions $\mu_i, \chi_i : \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ with $\chi_i(0) = 0$ such that

$$\|g_i(t, f)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, H^{s-2})} \leq \mu_i(t) \chi_i(\|h\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|h\|_{H^s}), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $f = (1 - \Delta)h$.

- (2) There exists two non-decreasing locally bounded continuous scalar functions $\tilde{\mu}_2, \tilde{\chi}_2 : \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|g_i(t, f_1) - g_i(t, f_2)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, H^{s-2})} \\
&\leq \tilde{\mu}_i(t) \tilde{\chi}_i(\|h_1\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|h_2\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \|h_1 - h_2\|_{H^s}, \quad i = 1, 2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_j = (1 - \Delta)h_j$, $j = 1, 2$.

Remark. Note that the pseudo-differential operator $\Lambda^{-2} = (1 - \Delta)^{-1}$ is a S^{-2} multiplier (cf. Proposition 2.78 in [3]), so under the conditions provided in Assumption 1.1, it is easy to verify that the diffusion matrix $G(t, \mathbf{y})$ is also locally bounded and locally Lipschitz continuous, that is,

$$(1.14) \quad \|G(t, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} \leq \mu(t)\chi(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}),$$

and

$$(1.15) \quad \|G(t, \mathbf{y}) - G(t, \mathbf{z})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} \leq \tilde{\mu}(t)\tilde{\chi}(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s},$$

where $\mu \triangleq \max\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, $\chi \triangleq \max\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$, $\tilde{\mu} \triangleq \max\{\tilde{\mu}_1, \tilde{\mu}_2\}$ and $\tilde{\chi} \triangleq \max\{\tilde{\chi}_1, \tilde{\chi}_2\}$ are locally bounded nondecreasing continuous functions.

Now we give the strict definition of local-in-time or global-in-time maximal strong pathwise solution to the system (1.13) (or (1.11)).

Definition 1.2. Assume that $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, and the initial data $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable such that $\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) < \infty$.

- (1) A local strong pathwise solution of SMCH2 system (1.13) is a pair $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathfrak{t})$, where \mathfrak{t} is a \mathbb{P} -almost surely positive stopping time, i.e., $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} > 0\} = 1$, and $\mathbf{y}(\cdot)$ is a $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -valued \mathcal{F}_t -predictable processes satisfying

$$\mathbf{y}(\cdot \wedge \mathfrak{t}) \in L^2(\Omega, C([0, \infty), \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))),$$

and

$$\mathbf{y}(t \wedge \mathfrak{t}) + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}} B(\mathbf{y}(r), \mathbf{y}(r))dr + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}} F(\mathbf{y}(r))dr = \mathbf{y}_0 + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}} G(r, \mathbf{y}(r))d\mathcal{W}(r),$$

for all $t > 0$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

- (2) The strong pathwise solution $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ is said to be maximal, if $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} > 0\} = 1$ and there is a sequence of stopping times \mathfrak{t}_n increasingly tending to \mathfrak{t} as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t}_n)$ is a local strong pathwise solution such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_n]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} > n \quad \text{on the set } \{\mathfrak{t} < \infty\}.$$

In addition, if $\bar{\mathfrak{t}} = \infty$, then the solution is said to be global.

- (3) The strong pathwise solution is said to be pathwise unique (or indistinguishable), if for any given two local strong pathwise solutions $(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ and $(\mathbf{y}_2, \mathfrak{t}_2)$ related to the same probability space, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_0}(\mathbf{y}_1(t) = \mathbf{y}_2(t)), \forall t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_1 \wedge \mathfrak{t}_2]\} = 1,$$

with $\Omega_0 = \{\mathbf{y}_1(0) = \mathbf{y}_2(0)\}$.

Our first main result is concerned with the local well-posedness of strong pathwise solution to the SMCH2 system driven by nonlinear multiplicative noise.

Theorem 1.3 (Local solutions). *Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, and \mathbf{y}_0 be a arbitrary \mathbb{H}^s -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable such that $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \infty$. Under the Assumption 1.1, we obtain the following conclusions:*

(1) *The system (1.13) admits a unique maximal local strong pathwise solutions $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. Moreover, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$, there is a sufficiently small $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, T, \mathbf{y}_0) > 0$ such that if*

$$\|\mathbf{y}_0 - \mathbf{z}_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)} < \delta,$$

then a stopping time $\mathfrak{t} \in (0, T]$ exists such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} \|\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{z}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

where \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{z} are strong pathwise solutions to the system (1.13) with respect to initial datum \mathbf{y}_0 and \mathbf{z}_0 , respectively.

(2) *The local solution $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ is also a $\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}$ -valued \mathcal{F}_t adapted process for all $t < \mathfrak{t}$, and the norm inflation of $\|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}$ and the norm inflation $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}$ has the following relationship:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} = \infty\}}\right) = 1.$$

Remark. We would like to make a few comments on Theorem 1.3:

1) **Difficulty and strategy:** The proof of Theorem 1.3(1) relies on looking at the SMCH2 system as a system of SDEs in Hilbert spaces due to the lack of cancellation condition, i.e., $\operatorname{div} u = 0$, and this can be achieved by mollifying the convection terms $u \cdot \nabla u$ and $u \cdot \nabla \gamma$ in (1.13). The main difficulty in carrying out this construction is the appearance of the norm $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}$ in L^2 moment estimates (cf. (2.12)), which prevent us from closing the a priori estimate for \mathbf{y}_ϵ in $L^2(\Omega; H^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$. The usual approach for overcoming this problem is to introduce the exiting times $\mathfrak{t}_\epsilon = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{\|\mathbf{y}_\epsilon(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} > r\}$ for $r > 0$. However, the current case is strongly different from the deterministic counterpart [84], due to the lack of the efficient method for estimating $\inf_{\epsilon > 0} \mathfrak{t}_\epsilon$ which may degenerate to zero. To overcome this difficulty, we shall introduce $W^{1,\infty}$ -truncation functions to the nonlinear terms in system (1.13) to obtain new approximations $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}$. The second difficulty arises from the loss of the compact embedding from $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{X})$ into $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{Y})$ even though $\mathcal{X} \subset \subset \mathcal{Y}$, and thus one can not directly extract a convergence subsequence of $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}$. Our method is first to prove the tightness of the measures $\{\mu_{R,\epsilon}\}$ induced by the approximations $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}$. Then we prove that the regularized SMCH2 system with truncation admits a smooth global martingale solution when $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$. After proving a pathwise uniqueness result for the SMCH2 system, one can prove by applying the Gyöngy-Krylov lemma and then taking the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ that the original system (1.13) has a local unique strong pathwise solution in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$. Thanks to the density embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset H^{s-3}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, it is successfully prove by a density-stability argument (cf. [38, 88]) that the SMCH2 system admits a local pathwise solution in the sharp case of $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$.

2) Note that the SMCH2 system (1.5) degenerates to the deterministic MCH2 system if we take $g_1(t, u) = g_2(t, \gamma) \equiv 0$. Theorem 1.3 improved the local well-posedness result

in high dimensions [84] and the results in one dimension [41, 46] to the stochastic setting. However, the existence and uniqueness result for SMCH2 system on the whole space \mathbb{R}^d is still unknown, where the main difficulty arises from the lack of compact embedding $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset H^t(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $s > t$, which leads to the fact that the crucial Lemma 2.5 below associated with the martingale method does not hold any more.

3) Theorem 1.3(2) provides a blow-up criteria of strong pathwise solution in Sobolev spaces, which implicitly tells us that although the Sobolev embedding implies $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq C\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}$, for $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, the \mathbb{H}^s -norm of the solution $\mathbf{y}(t)$ will not blow up before the $\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}$ -norm of $\mathbf{y}(t)$. Indeed, this characteristic also appears in the study for classic Camassa-Holm equations in one dimension (cf. [20, 21, 41]), which has been applied as a cornerstone to prove the wave breaking mechanism in finite time.

Our second goal is further to investigate the regularity of data-to-solution map for the SMCH2 system with suitable conditions on diffusion coefficients. To this end, inspired by [79], we shall utilize the following definition of stability of exiting time for the SMCH2 system: Let \mathbf{y} and $\{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are strong pathwise solutions to the SMCH2 system (1.13) with respect to the initial datum \mathbf{y}_0 and $\{\mathbf{y}_{0,n}\}_{n \geq 1}$ in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$, respectively.

For any $a > 0$, we say that the stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}}^a$ defined by

$$(1.16) \quad \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}}^a \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq a\}$$

is **stable**, if $\mathbb{P}\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{y}_{0,n} - \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = 0\} = 1$ implies $\mathbb{P}\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_n}^a = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}}^a\} = 1$ with

$$\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_n}^a \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}_n(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq a\}, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

The stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}}^a$ is said to be **strongly stable**, if for any $s' < s$, $\mathbb{P}\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{y}_{0,n} - \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s'}} = 0\} = 1$ still implies $\mathbb{P}\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_n}^a = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}}^a\} = 1$.

Assumption 1.4. For any $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, the operator $G(t, \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the conditions in Assumption 1.1. Moreover, there is a positive constant C such that

$$\|G(t, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} \leq C\|F(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s},$$

and

$$\|G(t, \mathbf{y}) - G(t, \mathbf{z})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{A}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} \leq C\|F(\mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{z})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s},$$

for any $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, where $F(\mathbf{y})$ is the nonlocal term defined in (1.13).

The second main result can now be stated by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (Nonuniform continuity). *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.3 and the Assumption 1.4, at least one of the following properties holds true:*

(1) *For some $a_0 \gg 1$, the exiting time $\mathfrak{t}_0^{a_0}$ defined by (1.16) for the zero solution to system (1.13) is not strongly stable.*

(2) *The data-to-solution map for system (1.13)*

$$L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)) \ni \mathbf{y}_0 \longmapsto \mathbf{y} \in L^1(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)))$$

is not uniformly continuous. To be specific, there exist two sequences of solutions $(\mathbf{y}_{i,n}, \mathfrak{t}_{i,n})_{n \geq 1}$, $i = 1, 2$ such that the following properties hold:

- For each $n \geq 1$, $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}_{i,n} > 0\} = 1$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{1,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} = \infty\right\} = 1.$$

- At time $t = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{y}_{1,n}(0) - \mathbf{y}_{2,n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = 0.$$

- Uniform boundedness:

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{i,n}]} \|\mathbf{y}_{i,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \lesssim 1, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

- For $t > 0$, we have

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{1,n} \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{2,n}]} \|\mathbf{y}_{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{2,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \gtrsim \|\sin(\cdot)\|_{C([0, T])}, \quad \forall T > 0.$$

Remark. The Assumption 1.4 provided a special structure on the diffusion coefficients, which implies that the solution map of the SMCH2 system is nonuniformly continuous. An interesting and difficult problem is to explore other general conditions which can also be used to establish the nonuniform continuity. Indeed, in view of the proof for Theorem 1.5, it is sufficient to find appropriate conditions on $G(t, \mathbf{y})$ (or on $g_1(t, m)$ and $g_2(t, \rho)$) such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|G(\varsigma, \mathbf{y}^{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{Q}; H^\sigma)} \ll n^{-\vartheta_s}, \quad \forall r > 0,$$

where $\mathbf{y}^{\kappa, n}$ is the explicit approximate solutions defined in (C1) or (C2) below, ϑ_s is the decaying index defined in Lemma 3.2, and the stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a$ denotes the first time that the solution $\mathbf{y}_{\kappa, n} = (u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})$ departure from the ball in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with radius a . This topic will be discussed in detail in our forthcoming works.

Since the deterministic MCH2 system and the SMCH2 system driven by general noise can only admits local solutions, motivated by [34, 36], it is interesting to ask whether the noises have a regularization effect on the local solutions to the system (1.13). The following theorem provides a positive answer. To highlight the nature of the problem, we shall consider the MCH2 system driven by 1-D standard Brownian motion $W(t)$.

Theorem 1.6 (Global result-I). *Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, and (u_0, γ_0) be a \mathbb{H}^s -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial random variable in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Assume that the parameters δ_i and c_i ,*

$i = 1, 2$ satisfy one of the following four conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \begin{cases} \delta_1 > \frac{1}{2}, & c_1 \neq 0, \\ \delta_2 > 1, & c_2 \neq 0, \end{cases} & (2) \quad & \begin{cases} \delta_1 > \frac{1}{2}, & c_1 \neq 0, \\ \delta_2 = 1, & |c_2| > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{4}}, \end{cases} \\
(3) \quad & \begin{cases} \delta_1 = \frac{1}{2}, & |c_1| > \sqrt{2}, \\ \delta_2 > 1, & c_2 \neq 0, \end{cases} & (4) \quad & \begin{cases} \delta_1 = \frac{1}{2}, & |c_1| > \sqrt{2}, \\ \delta_2 = 1, & |c_2| > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the corresponding local maximal strong solution $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ to the system

$$(1.17) \quad \begin{cases} du + (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt = c_1 \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} u dW, \\ d\gamma + (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)) dt = c_2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_2} \gamma dW, & t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad \gamma(0, x) = \gamma_0(x), \end{cases}$$

exists globally in time \mathbb{P} -almost surely, that is, $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} = \infty\} = 1$.

Remark. It is easy to verify that the diffusion coefficients in (1.17) satisfies the Assumption 1.1. Therefore, Theorem 1.3 implies that system (1.17) admits a unique local strong pathwise solution in the sense of Definition 1.2.

As far as we know, Theorem 1.6 seems to be the first result concerning the existence of global solutions for MCH2 system in high dimensions, which considerably improves the local-in-time well-posedness results in [41, 84], and it informs us that the polynomial-type random noises $c\|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta}u$ with proper intensity $\delta > 0$ have a regularization effect on the t -variable of solutions to the MCH2 system.

Problem: It will be of interest to study the existence of global solutions to the MCH2 system perturbed by polynomial type noises when the intensity belongs to the region: $0 \leq \delta_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 \leq \delta_2 < 1$ (maybe with some restrictive conditions on c_1 and c_2).

As is expected from the following two theorems, the influence of noises on the behavior of solutions to the Cauchy problem with small intensity will be more complicated. The next theorem provides a partial positive answer to problem.

Theorem 1.7 (Global result-II). *Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$ and $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that (u_0, γ_0) is a \mathbb{H}^s -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Let $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ be the corresponding maximal strong pathwise solution to the system*

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{cases} du + (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt = cudW, \\ d\gamma + (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)) dt = c\gamma dW, & t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad \gamma(0, x) = \gamma_0(x), \end{cases}$$

For any arbitrary parameters $R > 1$ and $\kappa \geq 2$, there exists a positive constant \tilde{C} , depending only on s and d , such that whenever

$$\|(u_0, \gamma_0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \frac{c^2}{2\tilde{C}R\kappa}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} = \infty\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{R^{\frac{\kappa-1}{2\kappa}}}.$$

In other words, the strong pathwise solution to the system (1.18) exists globally in time with high probability.

Remark. Theorem 1.7 provides a global existence result to the MCH2 system driven by a linear multiplicative noise for small initial data. Observing from $\|(u_0, \gamma_0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \frac{c^2}{2\tilde{C}R\kappa}$ and the lower bound $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} = \infty\} \geq 1 - R^{\frac{1-\kappa}{2\kappa}}$ that, for any fixed $c \neq 0$, the larger the parameter R (in other words, the smaller the norm size of initial data), the higher the probability that the global solution exists. Nevertheless, it is little known about the global well-posedness for the MCH2 system driven by linear multiplicative noise for large initial data. Comparing Theorem 1.7 with Theorem 1.6, it is interesting to observe that the nonlinear multiplicative noise has a better regularization effect than the linear multiplicative noise, in the sense that the conditions on initial data for the existence of global strong solutions are highly weakened.

Our final result gives a negative answer to the problem. Due to the technique reasons, the system will be restricted in one dimension, that is,

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{cases} du + (uu_x + \partial_x G \star (u^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 - \gamma_x^2))dt = cudW, \\ d\gamma + u\gamma_x + G \star ((u_x\gamma_x)_x + u_x\gamma) = c\gamma dW, \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \gamma|_{t=0} = \gamma_0, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

Here the sign \star denotes the spatial convolution, and $G(\cdot)$ is the associated Green's function of the operator $\Lambda^{-2} = (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1}$, which can be formulated explicitly by

$$\Lambda^{-2}f = G \star f, \quad G(x) = \frac{\cosh(x - 2\pi[\frac{x}{2\pi}] - \pi)}{2\sinh(\pi)}, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}).$$

The final result tells us that the linear multiplicative noise can not prevent the wave breaking phenomena (or equivalently blow-up phenomena) from happening.

Theorem 1.8 (Wave breaking). *Let $s > \frac{3}{2}$, $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ be the unique local maximal pathwise solution to system (1.19) with respect to a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial random variable (u_0, γ_0) in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}))$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. If there exists a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that*

$$(1.20) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ (\partial_x u_0)(x_0) < -\frac{c^2}{2\lambda} - \sqrt{\frac{c^4}{4\lambda^2} + \|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^1}^2} \right\} = 1.$$

Then the solution $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ will blow up in finite time. Moreover, the wave breaking phenomena occurs with the positive probability

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} u_x(t, x) = -\infty \right\} > 0.$$

Remark. Theorem 1.3 ensures that $u \in C([0, \mathfrak{t}); H^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, which combined with $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $s > \frac{3}{2}$ make sense of the quantity $\partial_x u(x_0)$ in (1.20). Comparing Theorem 1.8 with Theorem 1.7, one find that the effect of the structure of initial data (cf. (1.20)) on existence results is larger than that of linear multiplicative noise. For any sufficiently small initial data (u_0, γ_0) , although Theorem 1.7 (when $d = 1$) ensures the existence of global solutions, only one point property for the initial data will make the solution blow up in finite time. We also remark that the blow-up phenomena depends only on the property for the first component u .

1.3. Plan of the paper. Section 2 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. First, we establish the relationship between the exploring time of $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}$ and the exploring time of $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}$, which is also important in the proof of Theorem 1.8. Then by using the Gyöngy-Krylov lemma and the abstract Cauchy theorem, we establish the local well-posedness for the SMCH2 system in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$. In Section 3, we prove by constructing two sequence of approximation solutions that the data-to-solution map of the SMCH2 system is nonuniformly continuous. In Section 4, we first prove that the MCH2 system perturbed by polynomial-type noise admits a unique global strong solution in the regime $\delta_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta_2 \geq 1$. Then when $\delta = 0$, we show that the SMCH2 system with small initial data has a unique global-in-time solution with high probability. Finally, in the case of $d = 1$, we prove that, no matter how small the initial data is, if the initial data satisfies a shape condition (cf. (1.20)), then the solution of SMCH2 system will blow up in finite time with positive probability.

2. HADAMARD LOCAL WELL-POSEDNESS

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. To this end, we would like to first prove the second part Theorem 1.3(2), the proof of the existence and uniqueness of local strong solutions is long, which will be achieved in next several sections by using suitable approximate scheme.

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3(2).

Proof. The proof will be divided into three steps.

Step 1: We prove that, for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if \mathfrak{t}_1 and \mathfrak{t}_2 are stopping times defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{t}_1 &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{1,m}, \quad \text{where } \mathfrak{t}_{1,m} = \inf\{t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq m\}, \\ \mathfrak{t}_2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{2,n}, \quad \text{where } \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} = \inf\{t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \geq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathfrak{t}_1 = \mathfrak{t}_2$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Clearly, $\mathfrak{t}_{1,m}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}$ are both nondecreasing stopping times. Indeed, from the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, we infer that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq C\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}$. Then

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{1,m}]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq C \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{1,m}]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq ([C] + 1)m.$$

Hence, it follows from the definition of $\mathfrak{t}_{1,m}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}$ that $\mathfrak{t}_{1,m} \leq \mathfrak{t}_{2,([C]+1)m} \leq \mathfrak{t}_2$, for all $m \geq 1$, which implies that

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}_1 \leq \mathfrak{t}_2\} = 1.$$

Step 2: We prove the inverse inequality, i.e., $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}_1 \geq \mathfrak{t}_2\} = 1$, which combined with (2.1) leads to $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}_1 = \mathfrak{t}_2\} = 1$. To this end, we first **Claim** that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < \infty \right\} = 1, \quad \text{for all } n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

Since the strong solution $\mathbf{y}(t)$ is a \mathcal{F}_t -predictable process taking values in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the convection term $B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) = (u \cdot \nabla u, u \cdot \nabla \gamma)$ is just a \mathbb{H}^{s-1} -valued process, and the loss of one regularity prevents us applying the Itô's formula in Hilbert space to (1.13). We overcome this difficulty by regularizing the SMCH2 via the Fredriches mollifier J_ϵ , that is,

$$(2.3) \quad dJ_\epsilon \mathbf{y} + J_\epsilon B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})dt + J_\epsilon F(\mathbf{y})dt = J_\epsilon G(t, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W}.$$

Then Eq.(2.3) can be regarded as a system of SDEs in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. By applying the Itô's formula in Hilbert spaces (cf. Theorem 4.32 in [25]) to $\|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2$, we get

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &= \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 2 \int_0^t (J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon G(r, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W})_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon (B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + J_\epsilon F(\mathbf{y})))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dr + \int_0^t \|J_\epsilon G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

By using the BDG inequality and the Assumption 1.1, we have for any $k \geq 1$

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \left| \int_0^t (J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon G(r, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W})_{\mathbb{H}^s} \right| \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \|J_\epsilon G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C_R \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \mu^2(r) \chi^2(\|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})^2 dr \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C_R \chi^2(n) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \mu^2(r) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the boundedness of J_ϵ (1.7) and the definition of $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}$. Similarly, the fourth term on the R.H.S. of (2.4) can be estimated as

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \left| \int_0^t \|J_\epsilon G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{M}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \right| \leq C_{R\chi^2}(n) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \mu^2(t) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})^2 dt.$$

For the third term on the R.H.S. of (2.4), we get by using the symmetry property of J_ϵ (cf. (1.8)) that

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon F(\mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 u, [\Lambda^s, (u \cdot \nabla)]u)_{L^2} + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 u, (u \cdot \nabla) \Lambda^s u)_{L^2} \\ & \quad + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 \gamma, [\Lambda^s, (u \cdot \nabla)]\gamma)_{L^2} + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 \gamma, (u \cdot \nabla) \Lambda^s \gamma)_{L^2} \\ & \quad + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon (\mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)))_{L^2} + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma))_{L^2} \\ & \triangleq \sum_{i=1} A_{\epsilon, i}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first and third terms in (2.7), we need the following commutator estimate:

Lemma 2.1 ([62]). *Let $s > 0$, and $f, g \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, there holds*

$$\|[\Lambda^s, f \cdot \nabla]g\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^2}).$$

By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{\epsilon, 1} + A_{\epsilon, 3} &\leq \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 u\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^s, (u \cdot \nabla)]u\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon^2 \gamma\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^s, (u \cdot \nabla)]\gamma\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{H^s} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} \nabla u\|_{L^2}) \\ & \quad + C \|\gamma\|_{H^s} (\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} \nabla \gamma\|_{L^2}) \\ &\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + C (\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, integrating parts yields that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\epsilon, 2} + A_{\epsilon, 4} &= (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u, [J_\epsilon, (u \cdot \nabla)] \Lambda^s u)_{L^2} + (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma, [J_\epsilon, (u \cdot \nabla)] \Lambda^s \gamma)_{L^2} \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \operatorname{div} u (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u)^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \operatorname{div} u (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma)^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the Lemma 2.1 that

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} A_{\epsilon, 2} + A_{\epsilon, 4} &\leq \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2} \|[J_\epsilon, (u \cdot \nabla)] \Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{L^2} \|[J_\epsilon, (u \cdot \nabla)] \Lambda^s \gamma\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term involved in $A_{\epsilon, 5}$, we need

Lemma 2.2 ([39]). *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $p, p_i, q_i \in (1, \infty]$, $i = 1, 2$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{q_2},$$

Then for any $s > 0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|\Lambda^s(fg)\|_{L^p} \leq C (\|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|g\|_{L^{q_1}} + \|f\|_{L^{p_2}} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^{q_2}}).$$

Due to the facts that $\Lambda^{-2}\text{div}$ is a S^{-1} -multiplier, Λ^{-2} is a S^{-2} -multiplier and $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset H^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we get from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathcal{L}_1(u))_{L^2} \\
& \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 \mathbf{I}_d + \nabla u \nabla u + \nabla u (\nabla u)^T - (\nabla u)^T \nabla u - (\text{div} u) \nabla u \right\|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\| (\text{div} u) u + u \cdot (\nabla u)^T \right\|_{H^{s-2}} \right) \\
& \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\text{div} u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\text{div} u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\
& \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^s}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term involved in $A_{\epsilon,5}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma))_{L^2} & \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \left\| \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 + |\nabla \gamma|^2) \mathbf{I}_d - (\nabla \gamma)^T \nabla \gamma \right\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
& \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} (\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
& \leq C \|\gamma\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the last two estimates that

$$(2.10) \quad A_{\epsilon,5} \leq C (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}).$$

For $A_{\epsilon,6}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.11) \quad A_{\epsilon,6} & \leq C \|\gamma\|_{H^s} (\|\nabla \gamma \nabla u + (\nabla \gamma) \cdot \nabla u - (\text{div} u) \nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|(\text{div} u) \gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}) \\
& \leq C \|\gamma\|_{H^s} (\|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
& \quad + \|\text{div} u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{div} u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\text{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
& \leq C (\|\gamma\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the estimates (2.8)-(2.11) into (2.7), using the Hölder inequality and the definition of $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}$, the third term on the R.H.S. of (2.4) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.12) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \left| \int_0^t (\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, \Lambda^s J_\epsilon (B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + J_\epsilon F(\mathbf{y})))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dr \right| \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\gamma\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2) dr \\
& \leq C n \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby, we get from (2.4)-(2.6) and (2.12) that

$$(2.13) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(1 + \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) \leq 1 + 2\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C_R(\chi^2(n) + n) \\ \times \int_0^k (\mu^2(r) + 1) \mathbb{E} \left(1 + \sup_{r' \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge r]} \|\mathbf{y}(r')\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) dr.$$

Notice that the R.H.S. of (2.13) is independent of ϵ , and the convergence $J_\epsilon \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}$ holds strongly in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. After taking the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (2.13), we get by applying the Fatou lemma and the Gronwall inequality that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq (1 + 2\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) e^{C_R(\chi^2(n) + n) \int_0^k (\mu^2(r) + 1) dr},$$

which proves the Claim in (2.2). From (2.2) and the monotonicity of stopping times $\mathfrak{t}_{1,m}$, we deduce that for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k \leq \mathfrak{t}_1) &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} \{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k \leq \mathfrak{t}_{1,m}\} \right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{m \geq 1} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < m \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < \infty \right) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which means that all the sets $\{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k \leq \mathfrak{t}_1\}_{n, k \geq 1}$ have full measure. Therefore, we deduce from the nondecreasing property of $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}$ that

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{t}_2 \leq \mathfrak{t}_1) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \leq \mathfrak{t}_1 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \leq \mathfrak{t}_1\} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \{\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \wedge k \leq \mathfrak{t}_1\} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.1) and (2.14), we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{t}_2 = \mathfrak{t}_1) = 1.$$

Step 3: We verify that $\mathfrak{t}_1 = \mathfrak{t}_2 \triangleq \mathfrak{t}^*$ is actually the maximal existence time \mathfrak{t} of solution \mathbf{y} . Otherwise, we assume that $\mathfrak{t}^* < \mathfrak{t}$ on $\{\mathfrak{t} < \infty\}$. Then by the uniqueness of solution, the pair $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t}^*)$ is a local strong pathwise solution. Note that for a given $n > 0$, we may have $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} = 0) \neq 0$. However, for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists $n > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n}(\omega) > 0$. In terms of the fact of $\mathfrak{t}_{2,n} \nearrow \mathfrak{t}_2$, we deduce from the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset \mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and the continuity of $\mathbf{y}(t)$ on $\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}$ that, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n}]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \\ &\lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{2,n}]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \lesssim \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_2]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \approx \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}^*]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq C, \quad \text{on } \{\mathfrak{t} < \infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C independent of n . This is a contradiction, and we get from the uniqueness of solution that $\mathfrak{t}^* = \mathfrak{t}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Moreover, by using the definitions of \mathfrak{t}_1 and \mathfrak{t}_2 , we see that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = \infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\limsup_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} = \infty\}}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3(2) is now completed. \square

2.2. Regularization of SMCH2 system. For each $R > 0$, we introduce the scalar truncation function $\varpi_R(x) \triangleq \varpi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right)$, for all $x \geq 0$, with support in the interval $[0, 2R]$, where $\varpi : [0, \infty) \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a smooth decreasing function given by

$$\varpi(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq x \leq 1, \\ 0, & x > 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in [0, \infty)} |\varpi'(x)| \leq C < \infty.$$

For example, the function $\varpi(\cdot)$ can be obtained by mollifying the piecewise function $f(x) = 1$ when $0 \leq x \leq 1$; $f(x) = 0$ when $x > 1$. Then the truncated SMCH2 system can be formulated by:

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{cases} d\mathbf{y} + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})dt \\ \quad = \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\mathbf{y})dt + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})G(t, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W}, & t > 0, x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \\ \mathbf{y}(\omega, 0, x) = \mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x), & x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \end{cases}$$

Unlike the fluid models such as Euler equation and Navier-Stokes equation, the SMCH2 system do not possess the cancellation property, that is, $(B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y})_{L^2} = 0$. Hence the existence and uniqueness of global approximate solutions to (2.15) can not be guaranteed.

We overcome the difficulty by regularizing the convection term $B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y})$ and considering

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{cases} d\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})dt + \mathcal{G}_R(t, \mathbf{y})d\mathcal{W}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) = -\varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\mathbf{y}), \\ \mathcal{G}_R(t, \mathbf{y}) = \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})G(t, \mathbf{y}), \\ J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) = (J_\epsilon[(J_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla)J_\epsilon u], J_\epsilon[(J_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla)J_\epsilon \gamma])^T, \\ \mathbf{y}(\omega, 0) = \mathbf{y}_0(\omega), \end{cases}$$

where J_ϵ is the Fredriches mollifier defined in Subsection 1.1. By using Assumption 1.1, one can verify that the coefficients in (2.15)₁ are locally bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}_R(t, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{M}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} &\leq \chi(R)\mu(t)(1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}), \\ \|\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{M}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)} &\leq \left(\frac{C}{\epsilon} + 1\right)R\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}, \end{aligned}$$

for any $t \leq T$ and some constant $C > 0$, which indicates that (2.16) can be regarded as a system of SDEs in Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Moreover, by assumption 1.1, it is not difficult to

verify that

$$\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) : \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad \mathcal{G}_R(t, \mathbf{y}) : \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \mapsto L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$$

both are locally Lipchitz continuous functionals. Therefore, there exists a time $T_{R,\epsilon} > 0$ such that the SDEs (2.16) admits a local strong solution $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon} \in C([0, T_{R,\epsilon}]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. In a similar manner as we did in the proof of Theorem 1.3(2), one can show that if $T_{R,\epsilon} < \infty$, then $\limsup_{t \rightarrow T_{R,\epsilon}} \|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} = \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. However, the above blow-up phenomena will not happen in present case due to the appearance of the cut-off function $\varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})$, which means that, for each R and ϵ , the solutions $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}$ exists globally. We summarize the above discussion into the following lemma:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, and $R \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ are given parameters. Assume that \mathbf{y}_0 is a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$, and the conditions (A1)-(A2) hold. Then for any given $T > 0$, the SDEs (2.16) admits a unique strong solution $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon} \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely.*

2.3. Momentum estimates. In order to taking the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in suitable sense for approximation solutions $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}_{R \geq 1, 0 < \epsilon < 1}$, we shall first establish some a priori uniform estimates for approximate solutions for any given $R \geq 1$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$ and $R > 1$. Assume that the conditions Assumption 1.1 hold, and $\mathbf{y}_0 \in L^r(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable. For any $T > 0$, let $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}$ be the unique strong solution to (2.16). Then for any $p \geq 3$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})$, we have*

$$(2.17) \quad \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon} \in L^p(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))) \cap L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))) \\ \cap L^p(\Omega; C^\beta([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))), \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Moreover, there exists some positive constant C independent of ϵ such that

$$(2.18) \quad \sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \leq C, \\ \sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon} - \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \leq C.$$

Proof. Step 1 (L^2 -estimate): By applying the Bessel potential Λ^s to (2.16)₁ and then the Itô's formula to $\|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = (\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}, \Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon})_{L^2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.19) \quad \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &= \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 - 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot \Lambda^s J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) dx dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot F(\mathbf{y}) dx dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot \Lambda^s G(r, \mathbf{y}) dx dW \\
&= \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t) + I_4(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Here and in the proof of Lemma 2.4, we shall omit the subscripts R and ϵ of $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}$ for simplicity. For $I_1(t)$, by commutating the operator Λ^s with $J_\epsilon u$ and then integrating by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.20) \quad &\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot \Lambda^s J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon u \cdot ([\Lambda^s, J_\epsilon u] \cdot \nabla J_\epsilon u) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u|^2 \operatorname{div}(J_\epsilon u) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma \cdot ([\Lambda^s, J_\epsilon u] \cdot \nabla J_\epsilon \gamma) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma|^2 \operatorname{div}(J_\epsilon u) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 2.1 and the fact that $\|J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty}$ for any $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon u \cdot ([\Lambda^s, J_\epsilon u] \cdot \nabla J_\epsilon u) dx \\
&\leq \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^s, J_\epsilon u] \cdot \nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|u\|_{H^s} (\|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} \nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s}^2, \\
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u|^2 \operatorname{div}(J_\epsilon u) dx \leq \|\operatorname{div}(J_\epsilon u)\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the third and the fourth terms on the R.H.S. of (2.20) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma \cdot ([\Lambda^s, J_\epsilon u] \cdot \nabla J_\epsilon \gamma) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma|^2 \operatorname{div}(J_\epsilon u) dx \\
&\leq C (\|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2) \\
&\leq C (\|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the estimates into (2.20) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.21) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} |I_1(r)| &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot \Lambda^s J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) dx \right| dr \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) (\|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2) dr \\
&\leq CR \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For $I_2(t)$, by using Lemma 2.2 and the property $\|\Lambda^2 f\|_{H^{s-2}} \approx \|f\|_{H^s}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, one can estimate $\mathcal{L}_1(u)$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)$ and $\mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{L}_1(u)\|_{H^s} &\leq C \left\| \frac{1}{2} |\nabla u|^2 \mathbf{I}_d + \nabla u \nabla u + \nabla u (\nabla u)^T - (\nabla u)^T \nabla u - (\operatorname{div} u) \nabla u \right\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
&\quad + C \|(\operatorname{div} u) u + u \cdot (\nabla u)^T\|_{H^{s-2}} \\
&\leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) \|u\|_{H^s}, \\
\|\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)\|_{H^s} &\leq C \left\| \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^2 + |\nabla \gamma|^2) \mathbf{I}_d - (\nabla \gamma)^T \nabla \gamma \right\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
&\leq C (\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty}) \|\gamma\|_{H^s},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)\|_{H^s} &\leq C (\|\nabla \gamma \nabla u + (\nabla \gamma) \cdot \nabla u - (\operatorname{div} u) \nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|(\operatorname{div} u) \gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}) \\
&\leq C (\|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
&\quad + \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\operatorname{div} u\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
&\leq C (\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}),
\end{aligned}$$

which lead to the estimate for $I_2(t)$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.22) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} |I_2(r)| &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \|F(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} dr \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \leq CR \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

By condition (1), one can estimate $I_3(t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.23) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} |I_3(r)| &\leq \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{u}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr \\
&\leq C \chi^2(2R) \int_0^t \mu^2(r) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For $I_4(t)$, one can use the BDG inequality and (2.23) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.24) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} |I_4(r)| &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \sum_{k \geq 1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \Lambda^s \mathbf{y} \cdot \Lambda^s G_k(r, \mathbf{y}) dx \right)^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 \sum_{k \geq 1} \|\Lambda^s G_k(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \mu^2(r) \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \chi^2(2R) \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \int_0^t \mu^2(r) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \chi^2(2R) \int_0^t \mu^2(r) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking the supremum on both sides of (2.19), we deduce from the estimates (2.21)-(2.24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &\leq 1 + 2\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(r)) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r]} \|\mathbf{y}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) dr,
\end{aligned}$$

By applying the Gronwall inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq C e^{(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^T (1 + \mu^2(r)) dr} (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2),$$

for any $T > 0$, which combined with the continuity of $\mu(\cdot)$ yield that the approximations are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)))$.

Step 2 (L^p -estimate for $p > 2$): Applying the Itô's formula to $\|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p = (\|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2)^{\frac{p}{2}}$ and using the identity (2.19), one find

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.25) \quad \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p &= \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p - p \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} (\mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{H}^s} dr \\
&\quad + \frac{p}{2} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} \|G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \\
&\quad + \frac{p(p-2)}{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-4} (\mathbf{y}, G_k(\mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \\
&\quad + p \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} (\mathbf{y}, G_k(\mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{H}^s} d\beta_k \\
&= \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p + H_1(t) + H_2(t) + H_3(t) + H_4(t).
\end{aligned}$$

The term $H_1(t)$ can be treated as that in *Step 1* for $\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.26) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} |H_1(r)| &\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-1} \|J_\epsilon B(J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}, J_\epsilon \mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} dr \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} dr \\
&\leq CR \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For $H_2(t)$, it follows from the Assumption 1.1 and Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.27) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} |H_2(r)| &\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} \|G(r, \mathbf{y})\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} dr \\
&\leq C\chi^2(2R) \int_0^t \mu^2(r) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner,

$$(2.28) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} |H_3(r)| \leq C\chi^2(2R) \int_0^t \mu^2(r) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p) dr.$$

For the stochastic integral term $H_4(t)$, we get from (1.14) and the BDG inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.29) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} |H_4(r)| &= C\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} \left| \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^r \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} (\mathbf{y}, G_k(\mathbf{y}))_{\mathbb{H}^s} d\beta_k \right| \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{2p-2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \|G_k(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \mu^2(t) \varpi_R^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{2p-2} (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C\chi(2R) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0,t]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \mu^2(t) \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^{p-2} (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p + C\chi^2(2R) \int_0^t \mu^2(t) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, after taking supremum to (2.25) over the interval $[0, t]$ with respect to time variable, we deduce from the estimates (2.26)-(2.29) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p &\leq 2\|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p + C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(t))(1 + \mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p) dr \\ &\leq 2\|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p + C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(r)) dr \\ &\quad + C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(r)) \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r]} \|\mathbf{y}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p dr. \end{aligned}$$

An application of the Gronwall inequality to above inequality yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{y}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p &\leq e^{C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^T (1 + \mu^2(r)) dr} \left(2\|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^T (1 + \mu^2(\varsigma)) e^{-C(R + \chi^2(2R)) \int_0^\varsigma (1 + \mu^2(r)) dr} d\varsigma \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $T > 0$. As the function $\mu^2(t)$ is continuous and hence integrable on any finite interval $[0, T]$, there is a constant $C > 0$ independent of ϵ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p \leq C, \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which implies that $\{\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^p(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)))$.

Step 3 (Hölder regularity): Since we do not expect $\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon}$ to be differentiable in time in the stochastic setting, we have to lead ourselves to estimates on fractional time derivatives of order strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}$. Notice that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{F}_{R, \epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) dr \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \right. \\ (2.30) \quad &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Sobolev embedding $W^{1, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \hookrightarrow W^{\alpha, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ for all $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let us estimate the second and third terms on the R.H.S. of (2.30). First, we get by using the Minkowski inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{F}_{R, \epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) dr \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\mathcal{F}_{R, \epsilon}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^p dt + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{F}_{R, \epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) dr \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^p dt \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\mathcal{F}_{R, \epsilon}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^p dt. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the boundedness of the mollifier J_ϵ (cf. (1.12)) and the Moser-type estimate (cf. Lemma 2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|J_\epsilon[(J_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla)J_\epsilon u]\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|J_\epsilon[(J_\epsilon u \cdot \nabla)J_\epsilon \gamma]\|_{H^{s-1}} \\
& \leq C \left(\|J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|J_\epsilon u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\
& \leq C (\|u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{H^s}) \\
& \leq C (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty}) (\|u\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}} & \leq C (\|\mathcal{L}_1(u)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
& \leq C \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^s} + \|\nabla \gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\
& \leq C (\|u\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\gamma\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) (\|u\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma\|_{H^s}).
\end{aligned}$$

From the last two estimates, the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})$ and the uniform bound obtained in *Step 2*, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.31) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y}) dr \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p & \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \varpi_R^p(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}\|_{W^{1,\infty}}^p \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p dt \\
& \leq CR^p \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For the stochastic term in (2.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.32) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) dW \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p & \leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \Lambda^{-2} g_i(t, \mathbf{y}) dW_i \right\|_{W^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \varpi_R^p(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|g_i(t, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1;\mathbb{H}^{s-2})}^p dt \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \mu_i^p(t) \varpi_R^p(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \chi_i^p(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p) dt \\
& \leq C \sum_{i=1,2} \chi_i^p(2R) \int_0^T \mu_i^p(t) dt \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p \right) \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, it follows from (2.30)-(2.32) that

$$\sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{W^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \right) \leq C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of ϵ , which implies that the approximations $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^p(\Omega; W^{\alpha,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)))$, for any $T > 0$.

In addition, similar to the proof in *Step 2*, one can also derive $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [r,t]} \|\mathbf{y}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p \leq C$ for any $0 < r < t < T$, which together with the Hölder inequality and BDG inequality lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.33) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^p \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_r^t \|\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 d\varsigma \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_r^t \|\mathcal{G}_R(\varsigma, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^2 d\varsigma \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [r,t]} \left(\|\mathcal{F}_{R,\epsilon}(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \|\mathcal{G}_R(\varsigma, \mathbf{y})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{U}_1; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^2 \right) |t - r|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C |t - r|^{\frac{p}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of ϵ . Thanks to the Kolmogorov's continuity theorem (cf. Theorem 3.3 in [25]), the uniform estimate (2.33) implies that the approximation $\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}$ has a continuous modification in $C^\beta([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})$, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{C^\beta([0,T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \right) \leq C, \quad \forall \beta \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

for some positive constant C independent of ϵ . This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4. \square

2.4. Smooth strong solutions.

2.4.1. Existence of martingale solutions. With the uniform bounds in Lemma 2.4, we shall prove by the stochastic compactness method that the probability measures $\{\mathbb{P} \circ \mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}^{-1}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ induced by the approximations $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is weakly compact.

For any $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, $R > 1$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we consider the phase space

$$\mathcal{X}^s = \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s = C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}} = C([0, T]; \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_1),$$

On the given probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we define

$$\mu^{R,\epsilon} = \mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} \times \mu_{\mathcal{W}} \in \Pr(\mathcal{X}^s), \quad \text{where } \mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} = \mathbb{P} \circ (\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon})^{-1}, \quad \mu_{\mathcal{W}} = \mathbb{P} \circ \mathcal{W}^{-1},$$

where $\Pr(\mathcal{X}^s)$ is the collection of Borel probability measures on \mathcal{X}^s . Recalling that a collection $\mathcal{O} \subset \Pr(\mathcal{X}^s)$ is *tight* on \mathcal{X}^s if, for every $\gamma > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\gamma \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that, $\nu(K_\gamma) \geq 1 - \gamma$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{O}$. We have the following weak compact result.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$, $r > 2$, $R > 1$ and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, assume that the conditions (1.14)-(1.15) hold and consider any $\mu_0 \in \Pr(\mathcal{X}^{s-1})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{X}^{s-1}} |\mathbf{y}|^r \mu_0(d\mathbf{y})$, for some $r > 2$. Suppose that $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ are solutions to SDEs (2.16) with respect to the initial data \mathbf{y}_0 satisfying $\mu_0 = \mathbb{P} \circ \mathbf{y}_0^{-1}$. Then the sequence of probability measures $\{\mu^{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is tight on \mathcal{X}^{s-1} , and hence has a weakly convergent subsequence in $\Pr(\mathcal{X}^{s-1})$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that, for every $\eta > 0$, there exists a relatively compact set $K_\eta \in \mathcal{X}^{s-1}$ such that $\mu^{R,\epsilon}(K_\eta) \geq 1 - \eta$, for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Indeed, choosing a $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})$ such that $\alpha p > 1$. According to the Theorem 2.1 in [35], one find that both $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and $\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0, T; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ are compactly embedded in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Thereby, for any $L > 0$, the set

$$(2.34) \quad B(L) \triangleq \{\mathbf{y} : \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})} < L\} \cap \{\mathbf{y} : \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^s)} < L\}$$

is pre-compact in $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^{s-1}$. Define the balls

$$B_1(L) \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{y} : \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})} < L \right\},$$

$$B_2(L) \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{y} : \left\| \mathbf{y} - \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})} < L \right\}.$$

Simple calculation shows that $B_1(L) \cap B_2(L) \subseteq B(L)$. By (2.34), the uniform momentum estimates (2.18) and the Chebyshev inequality, we have

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} \left(\overline{B(L)}^c \right) &\leq \mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} \left(\left(\overline{B_1(L) \cap B_2(L)} \right)^c \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \mathbf{y} - \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})} \geq L \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})} \geq L \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{L^p} \mathbb{E} \left\| \int_0^\cdot \mathcal{G}_R(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W} \right\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}(0,T;\mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \leq \frac{C}{L^p}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C independent of ϵ . By choosing $L = L(\eta) > (C/\eta)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, one can derive from the estimate (2.35) that

$$\mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} \left(\overline{B(L)} \right) = 1 - \mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon} \left(\overline{B(L)}^c \right) > 1 - \frac{C}{L^p} > 1 - \eta, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \epsilon < 1,$$

which implies that the collection of probability measures $\{\mu_{\mathbf{y}}^{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is tight on $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^{s-1}$. Moreover, since the sequence $\{\mu_{\mathcal{W}}\}$ is constant, it is trivially weakly compact and hence tight. As a result, one may finally infer that the sequence $\{\mu^{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ is tight on \mathcal{X}^{s-1} . This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.5. \square

Based on the weak compactness result in Lemma 2.5, one can now start to prove the existence of global martingale solutions to the truncated SMCH2 system (2.15).

Lemma 2.6. *Let $s > \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$. The functional $F(\mathbf{y})$ defined in () satisfies*

$$(2.36) \quad \|F(\mathbf{y})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

$$(2.37) \quad \|F(\mathbf{y}_1) - F(\mathbf{y}_2)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq C(\|\mathbf{y}_1\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\mathbf{y}_2\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \|\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2\|_{\mathbb{H}^s},$$

for any $\mathbf{y}_1 = (u_1, \gamma_1)$, $\mathbf{y}_2 = (u_2, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

The proof of Lemma 2.6 is given in the Appendix. The following theorem ensures the existence of global martingale solutions to SDEs (2.16) in a new probability space.

Lemma 2.7. *Fix any $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$ and $R \geq 1$. Suppose that the conditions (1.14)-(1.15) hold, and $\mu_0 \in \text{Pr}(\mathcal{X}^{s-1})$ is a given initial distribution satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{X}^{s-1}} |\mathbf{y}|^r \mu_0(d\mathbf{y})$, for some $r > 2$. Then there exists a new stochastic basis $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \triangleq (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})$ and a $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -predictable process*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\cdot) : \Omega \mapsto C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \text{for any } T > 0,$$

such that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(0)^{-1} = \mathbb{P} \circ \mathbf{y}_0^{-1}$, and the following equation

$$(2.38) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t) &+ \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) d\tau \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(0) + \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) d\tau + \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) G(\tau, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}} \end{aligned}$$

holds $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely, for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Step 1 (Existence): Due to the weak compactness result in Lemma 2.5 and \mathcal{X}^{s-1} is a separable complete metric space, one infer from the Prokhorov theorem (cf. Theorem 2.3 in [25]) that there exists a probability measure $\mu^R \in \text{Pr}(\mathcal{X}^{s-1})$ and a subsequence of $\{\mu^{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$, still denoted by itself, such that

$$\mu^{R,\epsilon} \rightharpoonup \mu^R, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

It then follows from the Skorokhod representation theorem (cf. Theorem 2.6.1 in [10]) that there exist a new probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, on which defined a sequence of \mathcal{X}^{s-1} -valued random elements $\{(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\epsilon)\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1} = \{(\tilde{u}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\gamma}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{1,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{2,\epsilon})\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ converging almost surely in \mathcal{X}^{s-1} to an element $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}) = (\tilde{u}_R, \tilde{\gamma}_R, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_2)$, that is,

$$(2.39) \quad \tilde{u}_{R,\epsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{u}_R, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{R,\epsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{\gamma}_R, \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.},$$

and

$$(2.40) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{1,\epsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_1, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{2,\epsilon} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_2, \quad \text{in } C([0, T]; \mathfrak{U}_1), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$$

Notice that by Theorem 2.1.35 and Corollary 2.1.36 in [11], the random elements $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\epsilon$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ are both cylindrical Wiener processes relative to the filters $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon^t \triangleq \sigma\{(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\epsilon(\tau))\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$ and $\mathcal{F}^t \triangleq \sigma\{(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\tau), \tilde{\mathcal{W}}(\tau))\}_{\tau \in [0, t]}$, respectively.

In order to verify that the limitation $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ is a martingale solution to the truncated SMCH2 system (2.15), we first observe that, the uniform bounds in Lemma 2.4 hold true in the new probability $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. So we get by using the Fatou's lemma

$$(2.41) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s)}^p \right) + \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{\alpha,p}([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1})}^p \right) \leq C,$$

for any $T > 0$ and some positive constant C independent of ϵ .

Define the stochastic process

$$(2.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t) &\triangleq \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}(t) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}(0) \\ &+ \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) dr - \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) dr. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4 (under $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$) and the assumptions (1.14)-(1.15), it is easy to verify that $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t)$ is a $\mathbb{H}^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ -valued square integrable $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -martingale, and the associated quadratic variation process is given by

$$[\mathcal{E}_\epsilon](t) = \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})^* dr.$$

For any vector valued function $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and bounded continuous function ϕ on $C([0, s]; \mathbb{H}^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)) \times C([0, s]; \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_1)$ with $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, there hold

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t) - \mathcal{E}_\epsilon(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})|_{[0,s]} \right] = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left((\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 - (\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})^* \varphi\|_{\mathfrak{U}}^2 dr \right) \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})|_{[0,s]} \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Itô's product rule, we have

$$d \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) (\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \right) = (\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} d\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) d(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} + d\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) d(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}},$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}(t) = \sum_{k \geq 1} e_k \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t)$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on $\mathfrak{U} \times \mathfrak{U}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k = (\beta_k^1, \beta_k^2)^T$ denotes the two dimensional Brownian motion. Integrating the last identity on $[s, t]$ and then taking the expectation leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) (\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(s) (\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \int_s^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})^* \varphi, e_j)_{\mathfrak{U}} dr \right) \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathcal{W}})|_{[0,s]} \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.6, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.43) \quad & \left\| \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) - \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)dr \right\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \leq \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})\|F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) - F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}dr \\
& \quad + \int_0^t |\varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) - \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})|\|F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}dr \\
& \leq C \int_0^t \varpi_R(c\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s})\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}dr \\
& \quad + C \int_0^t \|\varpi'_R\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}dr \\
& \leq C \int_0^t \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}(r) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}dr \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality used the properties for the cut-off functions and the uniform bounds for $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ (cf. Lemma 2.4, (2.39) and (2.41)). Moreover, by using the Moser-type estimates (see Lemma 2.2) for $s - 1 > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, one get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.44) \quad & \|\varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) - \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \leq \|\varpi'_R\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \quad + \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(\|B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \\
& \leq \|\varpi'_R\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \\
& \quad + \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \\
& \leq C\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the \mathbb{P} -almost surely convergence result (2.39). From (2.43) and (2.44), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \left(\int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon})dr - \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)dr, \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \right| \\
& = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \left(\int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}) - \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)dr, \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \right| = 0.$$

Thereby, one can deduce from the definition of $\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t)$ that

$$(2.45) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t) - \mathcal{E}(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}| = 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t) - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(0) + \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) dr - \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) dr.$$

Now let us consider the convergence result related to high order momentum in (2.45). Indeed, since for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d) \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the process $(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}$ is a real valued martingale, so by using the assumption on $F(\cdot)$ and the BDG inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} |(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}|^p \\ & \leq C \sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\int_0^t \mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq C \chi^p(2R) \|\mu\|_{L^p}^p \left(1 + \sup_{0 < \epsilon < 1} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R,\epsilon}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^p \right) \\ & \leq C \chi^p(2R) \|\mu\|_{L^p}^p, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C independent of ϵ . This implies that the process $|(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}|^2$ is uniformly integrable. It then follows from the Vitali's convergence theorem (cf. pp.187 in [19]) that

$$(2.46) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |(\mathcal{E}_\epsilon(t) - \mathcal{E}(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}|^2 = 0.$$

Thanks to (2.46), one can take the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[(\mathcal{E}(t) - \mathcal{E}(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}) \Big|_{[0, s]} \right] = 0, \\ & \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left((\mathcal{E}(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 - (\mathcal{E}(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 - \int_0^t \varpi_R^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)^* \varphi\|_{\mathfrak{A}}^2 dr \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}) \Big|_{[0, s]} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(t) (\mathcal{E}(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_k(s) (\mathcal{E}(s), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} - \int_s^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (G(t, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R)^* \varphi, e_j)_{\mathfrak{A}} dr \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \cdot \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathcal{W}}) \Big|_{[0, s]} \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which indicates that the limit process $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is in fact an $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -adapted square integrable martingale taking values in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. As a result, one can apply the generalized martingale presentation theorem (cf. Proposition A.1 in [52]) to obtain

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \int_0^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) G(r, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R) d\tilde{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Meanwhile, there exists a new filtered probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, a cylindrical Wiener process $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ and an $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -adapted process

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R \in L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)),$$

such that $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ satisfies Eq.(2.38) $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely, and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(0)$ has the same distribution with $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(0) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_0$. In other words, we have proved the existence of a martingale solution to the truncated system (2.15). In addition, the solution $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\cdot)$ exists globally as $T > 0$ is arbitrary.

Step 2 (Regularity): We prove that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}$$

Indeed, it is shown in *Step 1* that $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ belongs to $L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)) \cap C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d))$, so by the continuous embedding $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we infer that the solution is weakly continuous in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (cf. Lemma II.5.9 in [5]), that is,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)_{\text{weak}}),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left| \sup_{\varphi \in \mathbb{H}^{-s}, \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-s}}=1} \lim_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^s, \mathbb{H}^{-s}} \right|^2 \\ (2.47) \quad &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \left(\sup_{\varphi \in \mathbb{H}^{-s}, \|\varphi\|_{\mathbb{H}^{-s}}=1} |(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t), \varphi)_{\mathbb{H}^s, \mathbb{H}^{-s}}|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\cdot)$ solves the truncated SMCH2 system (2.14) $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely, one can apply the Itô's formula to $\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2$. After utilizing the BDG inequality and the assumption (1.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2.48) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{r \in [\varsigma, t]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \int_{\varsigma}^t \varpi_R(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \\ &\quad + C \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \left(\int_{\varsigma}^t \mu^2(t) \varpi_R^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 (1 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \int_{\varsigma}^t \mu^2(t) \varpi_R^2(\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) (1 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thereby, it follows from (2.48) and the uniform bound for $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (cf. (2.41)) that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \sup_{r \in [\varsigma, t]} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C(|t - \varsigma| + |t - \varsigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

By taking the superior limit $t \rightarrow \varsigma^+$ in last inequality leads to

$$(2.49) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \left(\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C(|t - \varsigma| + |t - \varsigma|^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2.$$

Combining (2.47) and (2.48) yields that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2,$$

which implies

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^+} \tilde{\mathbb{E}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2.$$

In a similar manner, one can also prove that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \varsigma^-} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2$. Hence, the solution $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ is actually strongly continuous in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.7. \square

2.4.2. Pathwise uniqueness.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$, $R \geq 1$, and the conditions (1.14)-(1.15) hold. Suppose that $(\mathbf{y}_R^{(i)}, \mathcal{S})$, $\mathbf{y}_R^{(i)} = (u_i, \gamma_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, are two global solutions of (2.14) in the sense of Lemma 2.7, relative to the same stochastic basis $\mathcal{S} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. If $\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}(0) = \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}(0) = \mathbf{y}_0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely with $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^r < \infty$ for some $r > 2$, then the solutions $\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}$ are indistinguishable, that is,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}(t) = \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}(t), \forall t \geq 0 \right\} = 1.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{y}_0 \in L^r(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$, for every $T > 0$, we get from Lemma 2.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) \leq C < \infty,$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant depending only on \mathbf{y}_0 , R , T , μ and χ . Notice that the continuity in time is only ensured for \mathbb{H}^{s-1} -norm of $\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}$. In view of the choice of s , one may define the following collection of exiting times

$$\mathfrak{t}_K \triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 > K \right\}, \quad \forall K > 0.$$

Due to the Sobolev embedding $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and the uniformly boundedness of solutions, we have $\mathfrak{t}_K \rightarrow \infty$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely as $K \rightarrow \infty$.

Setting $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)} - \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}$ with the components $\mathbf{z} = (u, \gamma)^T = (u_1 - u_2, \gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^T$, and using definition of the bilinear property of $B(\cdot, \cdot)$, one deduce from the system (2.14) that

$$(2.50) \quad d\mathbf{z}(t) = (J_1(t) + J_2(t))dt + J_3(t)d\mathcal{W},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(t) &\triangleq \varpi_{1,2}(t)B(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}) + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(B(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) + B(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}, \mathbf{z})), \\ J_2(t) &\triangleq \varpi_{1,2}(t)F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) - F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)})), \\ J_3(t) &\triangleq \varpi_{1,2}(t)G(t, \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) + \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(G(t, \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) - G(t, \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)})), \end{aligned}$$

with $\varpi_{1,2}(t) \triangleq \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) - \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})$. In what follows, we shall derive some momentum estimates for $\mathbf{z}(t)$, which ensures the uniqueness of the solution.

First, by applying the operator Λ^{s-2} to Eq.(2.50) and then using the Ito's formula in $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, one find for any $t > 0$

$$(2.51) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z}(t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 &= 2 \sum_{i=1,2} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}(\tau), \Lambda^{s-2}J_i(\tau))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau + \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} \|J_3(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathbb{H}^{s-2})}^2 d\tau \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}(\tau), \Lambda^{s-2}J_3(\tau)d\mathcal{W})_{\mathbb{L}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For J_1 , by commuting the operator Λ^{s-2} with u_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.52) \quad & (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}\varpi_{1,2}(t)B(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\
& = \varpi_{1,2}(t)(\Lambda^{s-2}u, [\Lambda^{s-2}, u_2 \cdot \nabla]u_2)_{L^2} + \varpi_{1,2}(t)(\Lambda^{s-2}u, u_2 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{s-2}u_2)_{L^2} \\
& \quad + \varpi_{1,2}(t)(\Lambda^{s-2}\gamma, [\Lambda^{s-2}, u_2 \cdot \nabla]\gamma_2)_{L^2} + \varpi_{1,2}(t)(\Lambda^{s-2}\gamma, u_2 \cdot \nabla \Lambda^{s-2}\gamma_2)_{L^2} \\
& = J_{11} + J_{12} + J_{13} + J_{14}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the Cauchy-Schwartz estimate and the commutator estimate Lemma 2.1 lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_{11} + J_{13}| & \leq |\varpi_{1,2}(t)|(\|u\|_{H^{s-2}}\|[\Lambda^{s-2}, u_2 \cdot \nabla]u_2\|_{L^2} + \|\gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}\|[\Lambda^{s-2}, u_2 \cdot \nabla]\gamma_2\|_{L^2}) \\
& \leq C|\varpi_{1,2}(t)|(\|u\|_{H^{s-2}}\|\nabla u_2\|_{L^\infty}\|u_2\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}\|\nabla u_2\|_{L^\infty}\|\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-2}} \\
& \quad + \|\nabla \gamma_2\|_{L^\infty}\|u_2\|_{H^{s-2}}\|\gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}) \\
& \leq C\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)} - \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|\nabla \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \\
& \leq C\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the the embedding $\mathbb{H}^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and the mean value theorem for $\varpi_R(\cdot)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\varpi_{1,2}(t)| & = |\varpi'_R(\theta\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + (1-\theta)\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} - \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})| \\
& \leq C\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)} - \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$. In terms of the last inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_{12} + J_{14}| & \leq C\varpi_{1,2}(t)(\|u_2\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^{s-2}}\|u_2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u_2\|_{L^\infty}\|\gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}\|\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
& \leq C\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the estimates into (2.52), we get by the definition of the stopping times \mathfrak{t}_K that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.53) \quad & \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}\varpi_{1,2}(t)B(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau \\
& \leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}} + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}})\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \\
& \leq CK \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_K} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the commutator estimates, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}B(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}))_{\mathbb{L}^2}| &\leq |(\Lambda^{s-2}u, \Lambda^{s-2}(u \cdot \nabla u_1))_{L^2}| + |(\Lambda^{s-2}\gamma, \Lambda^{s-2}(u \cdot \nabla \gamma_1))_{L^2}| \\
&\leq C\|u\|_{H^{s-2}}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|u_1\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^{s-2}} \\
&\quad + \|u\|_{L^\infty}\|u_1\|_{H^{s-1}}) + C\|\gamma\|_{H^{s-2}}(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|u_1\|_{H^{s-2}} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla \gamma_1\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|u\|_{L^\infty}\|\gamma_1\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
&\leq C(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}\|\nabla \mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} + \|\nabla \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}) \\
&\leq C\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(2.54) \quad \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}B(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau \leq CK \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.$$

In a similar manner, we also have

$$\int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}\varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})B(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}, \mathbf{z}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau \leq C \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau,$$

which together with (2.53)-(2.54) yield that

$$(2.55) \quad \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}(\tau), \Lambda^{s-2}J_1(\tau))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau \leq C \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.$$

By applying the Lemma 2.6 with $s - 2 > \frac{d}{2} + 2$ and the mean value theorem for $\varpi_{1,2}(t)$, one can now estimate the term involving J_2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\Lambda^{s-2}\mathbf{z}, \Lambda^{s-2}J_2)_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\tau \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})(\mathbf{z}, F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) - F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}))_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} d\tau \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \varpi_{1,2}(\tau)(\mathbf{z}, F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}))_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} d\tau \right| \\
(2.56) \quad &\leq C \left(\int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}})\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}\|F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}) - F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} d\tau \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}\|F(\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)})\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} d\tau \right) \\
&\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}})\|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \\
&\leq C(K^2 + K) \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by conditions (1.14)-(1.15) and the BDG inequality, one can estimate the diffusion terms involved in J_3 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.57) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t]} \left| \int_0^{\tau \wedge t_K} (\Lambda^{s-2} \mathbf{z}(\tau), \Lambda^{s-2} J_3(\tau) d\mathcal{W})_{\mathbb{L}^2} \right| \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \mu^2(t) \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}^2 \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2) d\tau \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \tilde{\mu}^2(t) \tilde{\chi}^2(\|\mathbf{y}_R^{(1)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}} + \|\mathbf{y}_R^{(2)}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1, \infty}}) \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C(\tilde{\chi}^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (1+K)\chi^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}})) \\
& \quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tau \in [0, t \wedge t_K]} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\mu^2 + \tilde{\mu}^2)(t) \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t \wedge t_K]} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 \\
& \quad + C(\tilde{\chi}^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (1+K)\chi^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}})) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} (\mu^2 + \tilde{\mu}^2)(\tau) \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (2.57), there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.58) \quad & \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|J_3(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathfrak{H}_1, \mathbb{H}^{s-2})}^2 d\tau \\
& \leq C(\tilde{\chi}^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}}) + (1+K)\chi^2(CK^{\frac{1}{2}})) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

From the estimates (2.52)-(2.58), after taking the supremum on both sides of (2.51) and then taking the expected values, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\tau \in [0, t \wedge t_K]} \|\mathbf{z}(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 \leq C \int_0^{t \wedge t_K} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \tau \wedge t_K]} \|\mathbf{z}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 d\tau,$$

which combined with the Gronwall inequality yield that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge t_K]} \|\mathbf{z}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 = 0, \quad T > 0.$$

By taking the limit $K \rightarrow \infty$ in above equality, it follows from the monotone convergence theorem that $\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{z}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-2}}^2 = 0$ for any $T > 0$, which implies the uniqueness of solution. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. \square

2.4.3. Regularized pathwise solution. With the pathwise uniqueness and the existence of martingale solutions at hand, we could now establish the existence of local pathwise solutions in sufficient regular spaces, whose proof is based on the following result.

Lemma 2.9 (Gyöngy-Krylov lemma [47]). *Let X be a Polish space, and $\{Y_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ be a sequence of X -valued random elements. We define the collection of joint laws $\{\nu_{j,l}\}_{j,l \geq 1}$ of $\{Y_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ by*

$$\nu_{j,l}(E) = \mathbb{P}\{(Y_j, Y_l) \in E\}, \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(X \times X).$$

Then $\{Y_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ converges in probability if and only if for every subsequence $\{\nu_{j_k, l_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$, there exists a further subsequence which converges weakly to a probability measure ν such that

$$\nu(\{(u, v) \in X \times X : u = v\}) = 1.$$

The main result in this subsection can be stated as follows.

Lemma 2.10. *Fix $s > 4 + \frac{d}{2}$ and $d \geq 1$. Assume that the conditions in Assumption 1.1 hold, and $\mathbf{y}_0 = (u_0, \gamma_0) \in L^r(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ is a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial random variable for some $r > 2$. Then the Cauchy problem (2.15) has a unique local smooth maximal pathwise solution $\mathbf{y}_R = (u_R, \gamma_R)$ in the sense of Definition 1.2.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 2.10 will be divided into several steps.

Step 1 (Existence of global pathwise solution): Let $\{\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ be a sequence of strong solutions for the SDEs (2.16) in Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with respect to the stochastic basis \mathbb{S} fixed in advance.

Define a sequence of measures

$$\nu_{R, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}(E) = \mathbb{P}\{(\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon_1}, \mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon_2}) \in E\}, \quad \pi_{R, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}(E') = \mathbb{P}\{(\mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon_1}, \mathbf{y}_{R, \epsilon_2}, \mathcal{W}) \in E'\},$$

for any $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s)$, $E' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}})$, where $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s = C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}} = C([0, T]; \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_1)$.

With only minor modifications to the arguments in Lemma 2.5, one can easily prove that the collection $\{\pi_{R, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}\}_{0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 < 1}$ is tight and hence weakly compact. By using the Prokhorov theorem, there exist two subsequences of $\{\epsilon_1\}, \{\epsilon_2\}$, denoted by $\{\epsilon_{1, k}\}, \{\epsilon_{2, k}\}$ respectively, converging to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\pi_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}, \epsilon_{2, k}} \rightarrow \pi_R \quad \text{weakly in } \mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}}), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the Skorokhod's representing theorem that one can choose a new probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, on which a sequence of random elements $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{2, k}}, \tilde{W}_k)$ are defined such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{2, k}}, \tilde{W}_k)^{-1} = \pi_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}, \epsilon_{2, k}} \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

and

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{2, k}}, \tilde{W}_k) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp, \tilde{W}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{W}} \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp, \tilde{W})^{-1} = \pi_R.$$

Due to the last almost convergence result, one also have

$$\nu_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}, \epsilon_{2, k}} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{R, \epsilon_{1, k}})^{-1} \rightarrow \nu_R \quad \text{weakly in } \mathcal{P}_r(\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s \times \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{y}}^s), \quad k \rightarrow \infty,$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \circ (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp)^{-1} = \nu_R.$$

Following the argument at the beginning of Subsection 2.3, we infer that $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp$ are both global martingale solutions to SDEs (2.14) related to the stochastic basis $\tilde{\mathbb{S}} = (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$,

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma\{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(r), \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp(r), \widetilde{W}(r)\}_{r \leq t}$. Since $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R(0) = \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp(0)$, it follows from the pathwise uniqueness (cf. Lemma 2.8) again that

$$\nu_R\{(\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R, \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp) \in \mathcal{X}_y^s \times \mathcal{X}_y^s; \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R = \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_R^\sharp\} = 1.$$

Therefore, one can conclude from the Gyöngy-Krylov lemma that, the sequence $\{\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon}\}_{0 < \epsilon < 1}$ defined on the original probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ converges to an element \mathbf{y}_R almost surely, that is,

$$\mathbf{y}_{R,\epsilon} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}_R \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

in the strong topology of \mathcal{X}_y^s . This convergence combined with (2.38) imply that the limit \mathbf{y}_R is a global pathwise solution to the SMCH2 with cut-off function.

Step 2 (Construction of local pathwise solution): The goal will be achieved by decomposing the random initial data $\mathbf{y}_0 = (u_0, \gamma_0)$ and using the result in *Step 1*.

Case 1. Assume that the random initial data $\mathbf{y}_0(\omega) \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is bounded by some positive deterministic constant, i.e., there exists a real number $l > 0$ such that

$$(2.59) \quad \|\mathbf{y}_0(\omega)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq l, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Let $c > 0$ be the embedding constant from $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ into $\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, for all $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$. Then we get from (2.59) that

$$(2.60) \quad \|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq c\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq cl.$$

Considering the stopping times

$$\mathfrak{t}_m \triangleq \{t > 0; \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq m\}, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

If $m > cl$, then it follows from (2.60) that $\mathfrak{t}_m > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and hence

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_m]} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq m,$$

which implies that $\varpi_R(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) = 1$ for any $R \geq m$. As a result, the pair $(\mathbf{y}|_{[0, \mathfrak{t}_m]}, \mathfrak{t}_m)$ is a unique local pathwise solution to the SMCH2 system (2.5).

Case 2. For general data $\mathbf{y}_0 \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$, there holds $\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. In this case one can make the decomposition

$$\mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x) \mathbf{1}_{\{n-1 \leq \|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < n\}}(\omega) \triangleq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n}(\omega), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

For each $n \geq 1$, setting

$$\mathbf{y}_{0,n}(\omega, x) \triangleq \mathbf{y}_0(\omega, x) \mathbf{1}_{\{n-1 \leq \|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < n\}}(\omega).$$

It follows that $\Omega_n \cap \Omega_{n'} = \emptyset$ when $n \neq n'$, $\cup_{n \geq 1} \Omega_n$ is a set of full measure, and the sequence $\{\mathbf{y}_{0,n}(\omega)\} \in \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is uniformly bounded. By replacing the initial data \mathbf{y}_0 with $\mathbf{y}_{0,n}$ in the truncated system (2.14), one can concludes from *Step 1* that the system admits a unique global pathwise solution

$$\mathbf{y}_n(\cdot) \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \text{for any fixed } R > 0.$$

Thereby, by considering the stopping time \mathfrak{t}_m with $m > cn$, one get that the solution limited on $[0, \mathfrak{t}_m]$, denoted by $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n)$, provides a local pathwise solution to system (2.5) with initial data $\mathbf{y}_{0,n}$.

Now we define a stochastic process $\mathbf{y}(t)$ by piecing together these solutions, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{y}(\omega, t, x) \triangleq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n(\omega, t, x) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n}(\omega), \quad \mathfrak{t} \triangleq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n}(\omega).$$

As $\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) < \infty$, one infer from the uniform bound for $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n$ (cf. Lemma 2.2) that $\mathbf{y}(\cdot \wedge \mathfrak{t}) \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, \infty); \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)))$. Moreover, since $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n$ is a local solution to (2.5) with initial data $\mathbf{y}_{0,n}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}(r \wedge \mathfrak{t}) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n(r \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\mathbf{y}_{0,n} - \int_0^{r \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} B(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) dr - \int_0^{r \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} F(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) dr + \int_0^{r \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} G(r, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) d\mathcal{W} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\mathbf{y}_{0,n} - \int_0^{r \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} B(\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) dr - \int_0^{r \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} F(\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^{r \wedge \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_n} G(r, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_n} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_n) d\mathcal{W} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{y}_0 - \int_0^{r \wedge \mathfrak{t}} B(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) dr - \int_0^{r \wedge \mathfrak{t}} F(\mathbf{y}) dr + \int_0^{r \wedge \mathfrak{t}} G(r, \mathbf{y}) d\mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the pair $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ is a unique local pathwise solution to (1.5). By using a standard argument (cf. [38, 52]), we can extend the solution $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ to a maximal time of existence. The proof of Lemma 2.10 is now completed. \square

2.5. Proof of Theorem 1.3(1). In this subsection, we are going to prove the existence of local pathwise solutions to the SMCH2 system (1.13) in the sharp case of $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$.

To this end, we shall apply a stability density argument. Precisely, we consider the following SMCH2 system with regularized initial data:

$$(2.61) \quad \begin{cases} d\mathbf{y}_j + B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_j) dt + F(\mathbf{y}_j) dt = G(t, \mathbf{y}_j) d\mathcal{W}, \\ \mathbf{y}_j(0) = J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}^+, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_j = (u_j, \gamma_j)^T$, $J_{1/j}$ is the Friedrichs mollifier, and the nonlinear terms $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $F(\cdot)$ are defined as before.

By Lemma 2.8, for each $j \geq 1$, the Eq.(2.61) admits a unique local smooth strong solution $(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathfrak{t}_j)$ in the sense of Definition 1.2. In the following, we shall show that

$$\{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j \geq 1} \text{ is a Cauchy sequence in the strong topology of } C([0, \mathfrak{t}^*]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)),$$

for some $\mathfrak{t}^* > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. By means of the decomposition method as that in Lemma 2.8, one can first consider the uniformly bounded data, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{y}_0(\omega)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq M, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega,$$

for some deterministic $M > 0$ independent of j . The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the following several lemmas.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $T > 0$, $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$, and $(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathfrak{t}_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be a sequence of local strong pathwise solutions to the system (2.61) related to the random variables $(J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0)_{j \geq 1}$. For each $j, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, define the existing times*

$$\mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T \triangleq \mathfrak{t}_j^T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_k^T, \quad \mathfrak{t}_j^T \triangleq T \wedge \inf \{t > 0; \|\mathbf{y}_j(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \geq \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 3\}.$$

Then we have

$$(2.62) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0 - J_{1/k} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_j - u_k\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \right).$$

Proof. For each $j, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, denoting $\mathbf{y}_{j,k} = \mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k$ and $\mathbf{y}_{j,k} = (u_{j,k}, \gamma_{j,k})$, then it follows from (2.61) that $\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}$ satisfies the following system:

$$(2.63) \quad \begin{aligned} & d\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k} + \Lambda^s (B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{j,k}) + B(\mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \mathbf{y}_j)) dt + \Lambda^s (F(\mathbf{y}_j) - F(\mathbf{y}_k)) dt \\ & = \sum_{l \geq 1} \Lambda^s (G_l(t, \mathbf{y}_j) - G_l(t, \mathbf{y}_k)) d\beta_t^l, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(0) = J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0 - J_{1/k} \mathbf{y}_0$, $G_l(r, \cdot) = G(r, \cdot) e_l$ and $\{e_l\}$ is an orthogonal basis in \mathfrak{A} . Applying the Ito's formula to $\|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2$, one find

$$(2.64) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 &= \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 2 \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} (\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r), \Lambda^s (B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{j,k}) + B(\mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \mathbf{y}_j)))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dr \\ &+ 2 \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} (\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r), \Lambda^s (F(\mathbf{y}_j) - F(\mathbf{y}_k)))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dr \\ &+ \sum_{l \geq 1} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \|\Lambda^s (G_l(r, \mathbf{y}_j) - G_l(r, \mathbf{y}_k))\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 dr \\ &+ 2 \sum_{l \geq 1} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} (\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r), \Lambda^s (G_l(t, \mathbf{y}_j) - G_l(t, \mathbf{y}_k)))_{\mathbb{L}^2} d\beta_t^l \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + U_1(t) + U_2(t) + U_3(t) + U_4(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate the terms $U_i(t)$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in (2.64) one by one. For the term $B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{j,k})$ involved in $U_1(t)$, by using the Moser-type estimate and the fact of $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$,

for all $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.65) \quad & |(\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \Lambda^s B(\mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \mathbf{y}_j))_{\mathbb{L}^2}| \leq |(\Lambda^s u_{j,k}, \Lambda^s (u_{j,k} \cdot \nabla u_j))_{L^2}| + |(\Lambda^s \gamma_{j,k}, \Lambda^s (u_{j,k} \cdot \nabla \gamma_j))_{L^2}| \\
& \leq C \left(\|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \|u_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s} \|\nabla u_j\|_{H^s} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s} \|\nabla \gamma_j\|_{L^\infty} + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s} \|u_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \gamma_j\|_{H^s} \right) \\
& \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (\|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2) \\
& \quad + C \left((\|u_j\|_{H^s} + 1) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 (\|\gamma_j\|_{H^s}^2 + 1) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the term $B(\mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \mathbf{y}_j)$ involved in $U_1(t)$, by commutating the operator Λ^s with u_j and then integrating by parts, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \Lambda^s B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{j,k}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} &= (\Lambda^s u_{j,k}, [\Lambda^s, u_j \cdot \nabla] u_{j,k})_{L^2} - \frac{1}{2} (|\Lambda^s u_{j,k}|^2, \operatorname{div} u_j)_{L^2} \\
& \quad + (\Lambda^s \gamma_{j,k}, [\Lambda^s, u_j \cdot \nabla] \gamma_{j,k})_{L^2} - \frac{1}{2} (|\Lambda^s \gamma_{j,k}|^2, \operatorname{div} u_j)_{L^2} \\
& \triangleq D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the commutator estimate Lemma 2.1 for the first and third terms on the R.H.S., one get

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_1 + D_3| &\leq \|\Lambda^s u_{j,k}\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^s, u_j \cdot \nabla] u_{j,k}\|_{L^2} + \|\Lambda^s \gamma_{j,k}\|_{L^2} \|[\Lambda^s, u_j \cdot \nabla] \gamma_{j,k}\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s} (\|\Lambda^s u_j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} \nabla u_{j,k}\|_{L^2}) \\
& \quad + C \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s} (\|\Lambda^s u_j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \gamma_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{s-1} \nabla \gamma_{j,k}\|_{L^2}) \\
&\leq C \|u_j\|_{H^s} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The other terms can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_2 + D_4| &\leq C \|\operatorname{div} u_j\|_{L^\infty} (\|\Lambda^s u_{j,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Lambda^s \gamma_{j,k}\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&\leq C \|u_j\|_{H^s} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the estimates for $\{D_i\}_{i=1}^4$ together, we get

$$(\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}, \Lambda^s B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_{j,k}))_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq C \|u_j\|_{H^s} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2),$$

which combined with (2.65) and the definition of the stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T$ yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.66) \quad U_1(t) &\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \left(\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (\|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + 1) + \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 (\|\gamma_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_j\|_{H^s} + 1) \right) dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \left(\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) dr,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality used the boundedness of J_ϵ in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. For $U_2(t)$, it follows from the Lemma 2.6 and Young inequality that

$$(2.67) \quad \begin{aligned} U_2(t) &\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} (\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 1) \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} dr \\ &\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

For $U_4(t)$, by using the BDG inequality and condition (1.15), we get

$$(2.68) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} |U_4(r)| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \sum_{l \geq 1} (\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r), \Lambda^s (G_l(r, \mathbf{y}_j) - G_l(r, \mathbf{y}_k)))_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \tilde{\mu}^2(r) \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \tilde{\chi}^2(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|\mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \tilde{\mu}^2(r) \tilde{\chi}^2(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|\mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \tilde{\chi}^2(C(1 + M^2)) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \tilde{\mu}^2(r) \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used the facts that $\tilde{\chi}(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing, the Sobolev embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$ as well as the uniform bound

$$\sup_{j \geq 1} \|\mathbf{y}_j(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{j \geq 1} \|\mathbf{y}_j(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 2) \leq C(M^2 + 1),$$

for all $r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]$ with some constant $C > 0$ independent of j .

For $U_3(t)$, one can use the condition (1.15) to obtain

$$(2.69) \quad \begin{aligned} |U_3(t)| &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \tilde{\mu}^2(r) \tilde{\chi}^2(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|\mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr \\ &\leq C \tilde{\chi}^2(C(1 + M^2)) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T} \tilde{\mu}^2(r) \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

Setting

$$G(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2.$$

After plugging the estimates for U_i into (2.64), we get

$$\begin{aligned} G(t) &\leq \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) dr \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t (1 + \tilde{\mu}^2(r)) G(r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

An application of the Gronwall lemma to above inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \leq e^{C \int_0^T (1 + \tilde{\mu}^2(r)) dr} \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}_{j,k}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + C \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \right).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.11. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.11, we have*

$$(2.70) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j} u_0 - J_{1/k} u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) + \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|u_{j,k}(\varsigma)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 2.12 is based on a priori estimate for $\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2$. To this end, we get by applying the Ito's product law that

$$(2.71) \quad \begin{aligned} &d(\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 d\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 + d\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From the first component of the system (2.61), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k} &= -\Lambda^{s-1} (u_{j,k} \cdot \nabla u_j + u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}) dt - \Lambda^{s-1} (\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)) dt \\ &\quad - \Lambda^{s-1} (\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_j) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_k)) dt + \Lambda^{s-3} (g_1(t, m_j) - g_1(t, m_k)) dW_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Ito's formula again, one infer that

$$(2.72) \quad \begin{aligned} d\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 &= -2(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (u_{j,k} \cdot \nabla u_j + u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}))_{L^2} dt \\ &\quad - 2(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)))_{L^2} dt \\ &\quad - 2(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_j) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_k)))_{L^2} dt \\ &\quad + \|\Lambda^{s-3} (g_1(t, m_j) - g_1(t, m_k))\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}, L^2)}^2 dt \\ &\quad + 2(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-3} (g_1(t, m_j) - g_1(t, m_k)))_{L^2} dW_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^4 I_i(t) dt + I_5(t) dW_1. \end{aligned}$$

For $\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2$, we get by replacing s with $s+1$ in (2.63) throughout that

$$(2.73) \quad \begin{aligned} d\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 &= -2(\Lambda^{s+1}\mathbf{y}_j, \Lambda^{s+1}B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_j))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dt - 2(\Lambda^{s+1}\mathbf{y}_j, \Lambda^{s+1}F(\mathbf{y}_j))_{\mathbb{L}^2} dt \\ &\quad + \|G(t, \mathbf{y}_j)\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{H}^{s+1})}^2 dt + 2(\Lambda^{s+1}\mathbf{y}_j, \Lambda^{s+1}G(t, \mathbf{y}_j)d\mathcal{W})_{\mathbb{L}^2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 J_i(t)dt + J_4(t)d\mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

After plugging the identities (2.72)-(2.73) into (2.71), we get

$$(2.74) \quad \begin{aligned} d(\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 I_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_i(t) + \mathcal{K} \right) dt \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 I_5(t) dW_1 + \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_4(t) d\mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathcal{K} is the term arising from $d\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2$, and is given by

$$\mathcal{K} = 4 \sum_{q \geq 1} (\Lambda^{s+1}u_j, \Lambda^{s-1}g_1(t, u_j)e_q)_{L^2} (\Lambda^{s-1}u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-3}(g_1(t, u_j) - g_1(t, u_k))e_q)_{L^2},$$

where we used the fact that the Brown motion \mathcal{W}_1 is independent of \mathcal{W}_2 . It remains to estimate the terms on the R.H.S. of (2.74).

Estimate for I_1 . The discussion for term I_1 will be classified according to the spatial dimension $d \geq 1$.

Case of $d = 1$. In this case, the unknown is a scalar quantity, we observe from the identity $u_j \cdot \nabla u_j = u_j \partial_x u_j = \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (u_j^2)$ that

$$I_1(t) = \frac{1}{2} (\Lambda^{s-1}u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} \partial_x (u_{j,k}(u_j + u_k)))_{L^2}.$$

By commuting $\Lambda^{s-1} \partial_x$ with $u_j + u_k$, integrating by parts and using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{2} |(\Lambda^{s-1}u_{j,k}, [\Lambda^{s-1} \partial_x, u_j + u_k] u_{j,k})_{L^2}| + \frac{1}{2} |(\partial_x (u_j + u_k), (\Lambda^{s-1}u_{j,k})^2)_{L^2}| \\ &\leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|[\Lambda^{s-1} \partial_x, u_j + u_k] u_{j,k}\|_{L^2} + \|u_j + u_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\ &\leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (\|u_j + u_k\|_{H^s} + \|u_j + u_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \\ &\leq C (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_k\|_{H^s}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality used the following commutator estimates by Taylor (cf. Proposition 4.2 in [80]): If $s > \frac{3}{2}$ and $0 \leq \eta + 1 \leq s$, then for some $C > 0$

$$\|[\Lambda^\eta \partial_x, f]g\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{H^s} \|g\|_{H^\eta}, \quad \forall f \in H^s(\mathbb{T}), g \in H^\eta(\mathbb{T}),$$

and the last inequality used the Sobolev embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T})$ for $s > \frac{3}{2}$.

The discussion for the cases of $d = 2$ and $d \geq 3$ is more involved, we first get from the Moser-type estimates that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.75) \quad \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 |I_1(t)| &\leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \left(\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_j\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}))_{L^2}| \right) \\
&\leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|u_j\|_{H^s} \\
&\quad + C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 |(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}))_{L^2}|.
\end{aligned}$$

The main difficulty comes from the second term on the R.H.S. of (2.75).

Case of $d = 2$. It is clear that $H^s(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ for $s > 2$. If $2 < s < 3$, then $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{1,q}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for some $q > 2$ such that $s - 2 = 1 - \frac{2}{q}$. Choosing $p > 2$ satisfying $1 = \frac{2}{p} + \frac{2}{q}$, then the following embedding holds:

$$H^s(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{s-1+\frac{2}{p},p}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{s-1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

By using Lemma 2.1 and integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}))_{L^2}| \\
&\leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|[\Lambda^{s-1}, u_k \cdot \nabla] u_{j,k}\|_{L^2} + \|\operatorname{div} u_k\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
&\leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|u_k\|_{W^{s-1,p}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{W^{1,q}} + \|u_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}) \\
&\leq C \|u_k\|_{H^s} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

If $s \geq 3$, then $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset C^1(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{1,q}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for all $q \in (2, \infty)$. The above inequality still remains to be true.

Case of $d \geq 3$. It follows from the Sobolev embeddings

$$H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{s-1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,d}(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

and the commutator estimates that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-1} (u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}))_{L^2}| \\
&\leq |(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, [\Lambda^{s-1}, u_k \cdot \nabla] u_{j,k})_{L^2}| + \frac{1}{2} |(|\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}|^2, \operatorname{div} u_k)_{L^2}| \\
&\leq C \left(\|u_k\|_{W^{s-1, \frac{2d}{d-2}}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{W^{1,d}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u_k\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\operatorname{div} u_k\|_{L^\infty} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right) \\
&\leq C \|u_k\|_{H^s} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, the term involving I_1 can be estimated by

$$(2.76) \quad \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 |I_1(t)| \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_k\|_{H^s}).$$

Estimate for I_2 . We get by using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$|I_2(t)| \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

To estimate $\|\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)\|_{H^{s-1}}$, one need the following Moser-type estimates (cf. Proposition 2.82 in [3]): For any $s_1 \leq \frac{d}{2} < s_2$ ($s_2 \geq \frac{d}{2}$ if $r = 1$), $s_1 + s_2 > 0$, then

$$\|fg\|_{B_{2,r}^{s_1}} \leq C\|f\|_{B_{2,r}^{s_1}}\|g\|_{B_{2,r}^{s_2}}.$$

We divide the discussion into two parts.

Case of $\frac{d}{2} + 1 < s \leq \frac{d}{2} + 2$. Since $s - 2 \leq \frac{d}{2} < s - 1$, and $(s - 2) + (s - 1) = 2s - 3 > 0$, it follows from the last Moser estimates that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ & \leq C \left\| (|\nabla u_1| + |\nabla u_2|)|\nabla u_{j,k}| \mathbf{I}_d + \nabla u_{j,k} \nabla u_j + \nabla u_k \nabla u_{j,k} + \nabla u_{j,k} \nabla u_j^T \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \nabla u_k \nabla u_{j,k}^T + \nabla u_{j,k}^T \nabla u_k + \nabla u_j^T \nabla u_{j,k} - \operatorname{div} u_{j,k} \nabla u_k - \operatorname{div} u_j \nabla u_{j,k} \right\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ & \quad + \left\| u_j \operatorname{div} u_{j,k} + u_{j,k} \operatorname{div} u_k + u_{j,k} \cdot \nabla u_j^T + u_k \cdot \nabla u_{j,k}^T \right\|_{H^{s-3}} \\ & \leq C \|\nabla u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} (\|\nabla u_j\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{H^{s-1}}) + C \|\nabla u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ & \quad \times (\|u_j\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|u_k\|_{H^{s-1}}) + C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|\nabla u_j\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{H^{s-2}}) \\ & \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_k\|_{H^s}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 |I_2(t)| \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_k\|_{H^s}).$$

Case of $s > \frac{d}{2} + 2$. In this case, the Sobolev spaces $H^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ are Banach algebras, and hence it follows from the embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset H^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s > t$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{L}_1(u_j) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_k)\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ & \leq C \|\nabla u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} (\|\nabla u_j\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{H^{s-2}}) + C \|\nabla u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} (\|u_j\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ & \quad + \|u_k\|_{H^{s-2}}) + C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} (\|\nabla u_j\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{H^{s-2}}) \\ & \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|u_j\|_{H^s} + \|u_k\|_{H^s}), \end{aligned}$$

which lead to the similar estimate.

Estimate for I_3 . There holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 I_3 & \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left(\|\gamma_{j,k}(\gamma_j + \gamma_k)\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|\nabla \gamma_{j,k}(|\nabla \gamma_j| + |\nabla \gamma_k|)\|_{H^{s-2}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\nabla \gamma_{j,k})^T \nabla \gamma_j\|_{H^{s-2}} + \|(\nabla \gamma_k)^T \nabla \gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-2}} \right) \\ & \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\gamma_{j,k}\|_{H^s} (\|\gamma_j\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_k\|_{H^s}) \\ & \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (\|\gamma_j\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma_k\|_{H^s}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Estimate for I_4 and I_5 . In terms of the assumption (A1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 I_4 & \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|g_1(t, m_j) - g_1(t, m_k)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}, H^{s-3})}^2 \\ & \leq C \tilde{\mu}_1^2(t) \tilde{\chi}_1^2 (\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|u_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using the BDG inequality and the Assumption 1.1, we have for any stopping time \mathfrak{t}

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.77) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} \left| \int_0^t \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 I_5(\varsigma) dW_1 \right| \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^4 \|\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Lambda^{s-3} (g_1(t, m_j) - g_1(t, m_k)) e_i\|_{L^2}^2 d\varsigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} (\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}) \right. \\
& \quad \times \left. \left(\int_0^{\mathfrak{t}} \tilde{\mu}_1^2(\varsigma) \tilde{\chi}_1^2 (\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|u_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 d\varsigma \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} (\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2) \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}} \tilde{\mu}_1^2(\varsigma) \tilde{\chi}_1^2 (\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|u_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}^2 d\varsigma.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate for J_1 . Using the definition of $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, commuting the operator Λ^{s+1} with u_j and then integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.78) \quad & \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_1 \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 |(\Lambda^{s+1} \mathbf{y}_j, \Lambda^{s+1} B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_j))_{\mathbb{L}^2}| \\
& \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left(|(\Lambda^{s+1} u_j, [\Lambda^{s+1}, u_j \cdot \nabla] u_j)_{\mathbb{L}^2}| + |(\operatorname{div} u_j, |\Lambda^{s+1} u_j|^2)_{L^2}| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + |(\Lambda^{s+1} \gamma_j, \Lambda^{s+1} (u_j \cdot \nabla \gamma_j))_{\mathbb{L}^2}| + |(\operatorname{div} u_j, |\Lambda^{s+1} \gamma_j|^2)_{L^2}| \right) \\
& \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left(\|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}} \|[\Lambda^{s+1}, u_j \cdot \nabla] u_j\|_{L^2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}} \|[\Lambda^{s+1}, u_j \cdot \nabla] \gamma_j\|_{L^2} + \|u_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|u_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \left(\|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}} (\|\Lambda^{s+1} u_j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s \nabla u_j\|_{L^2}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}} (\|\Lambda^{s+1} u_j\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \gamma_j\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u_j\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^s \nabla \gamma_j\|_{L^2}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|u_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 + \|u_j\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \|\gamma_j\|_{H^{s+1}}^2 \right) \\
& \leq C \|u_j\|_{H^s} \|\gamma_j\|_{H^s} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate for J_2 and J_3 . By using Lemma 2.6, the embedding $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset \mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ($s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$) as well as assumption (1.14), we have

$$\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_2 \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2,$$

and

$$\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_3 \leq \mu(t) \chi(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^s}^2 + \mu(t) \chi(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2.$$

Estimate for J_4 . By applying the BDG inequality and the assumption (1.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.79) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} \left| \int_0^t \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 J_4(t) d\mathcal{W} \right| \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} \int_0^t \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^4 (\Lambda^{s+1} \mathbf{y}_j, \Lambda^{s+1} G(t, \mathbf{y}_j) e_i)_{\mathbb{L}^2}^2 d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \int_0^t \mu^2(\zeta) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) d\zeta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \mu^2(\zeta) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 d\zeta \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \mu^2(\zeta) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 d\zeta.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate for \mathcal{K} . By using the Hölder inequality and the local Lipchitz property of $g_1(t, u_j)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{K}| & \leq C \left(\sum_{q \geq 1} |(\Lambda^{s+1} u_j, \Lambda^{s-1} g_1(t, u_j) e_q)_{L^2}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad \times \left(\sum_{q \geq 1} |(\Lambda^{s-1} u_{j,k}, \Lambda^{s-3} (g_1(t, u_j) - g_1(t, u_k)) e_q)_{L^2}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \|u_j\|_{H^{s+1}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|g_1(t, u_j)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}_1; H^{s-1})} \|g_1(t, u_j) - g_1(t, u_k)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}_1; H^{s-3})} \\
& \leq C \mu_1(t) \tilde{\mu}_1(t) \chi_1(\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \tilde{\chi}_1(\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|u_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \\
& \quad \times \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{H^{s+1}} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}} (1 + \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}) \|u_{j,k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}} \\
& \leq C \mu_1(t) \tilde{\mu}_1(t) \chi_1(\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \tilde{\chi}_1(\|u_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} + \|u_k\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \\
& \quad \times (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that from the definition of $\mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T$, there holds

$$\|\mathbf{y}_\lambda(t)\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_i(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq C(M^2 + 1), \quad \lambda \in \{j, k\}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T],$$

for some positive constant C independent of j and k . Using the nondecreasing property of $\chi_1(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_1(\cdot)$, after applying the BDG inequality and taking the supremum over $[0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]$,

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \\ & \leq C \mathbb{E} (\|u_{j,k}(0)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) + C \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(t) + \tilde{\mu}_1^2(t)) \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 dr \\ & \quad + C \int_0^t (1 + \mu^2(r) + \tilde{\mu}_1^2(r)) \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2 dr, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C independent of j and k . An application of the Gronwall inequality to above integral inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \leq C e^{\int_0^T (1 + \mu^2(r) + \tilde{\mu}_1^2(r)) dr} \left(1 + \int_0^T (1 + \mu^2(r) + \tilde{\mu}_1^2(r)) dr \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j} u_0 - J_{1/k} u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) + \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|u_{j,k}(\varsigma)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired inequality (2.70), and this completes the proof of Lemma 2.10. \square

Based on the last two lemmas, one can prove the following convergence results.

Lemma 2.13. *Under the same conditions of Lemma 2.9, we have*

$$(2.80) \quad \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = 0.$$

and

$$(2.81) \quad \limsup_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \sup_{j \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{r \in [0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + 3 \right\} = 0.$$

Proof. Observing that, for any $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $\{J_\epsilon u\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, so

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E} \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0 - J_{1/k} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = 0,$$

which implies that the first term on the R.H.S. of (2.62) converges to 0 as $j, k \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 2.11, it suffices to prove that

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{j,k}^T]} (\|u_{j,k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) = 0.$$

First, we get from the property of the mollifier J_ϵ that

$$\mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^4) \leq C j^4 \mathbb{E} (\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^4) \leq C j^4,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j} u_0 - J_{1/k} u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^4) & \leq 8 \mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j} u_0 - u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^4) + 8 \mathbb{E} (\|u_0 - J_{1/k} u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^4) \\ & = o\left(\frac{1}{j^4}\right) + o\left(\frac{1}{k^4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From the last two estimates, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E}(\|J_{1/j}u_0 - J_{1/k}u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \\
& \leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \left(\mathbb{E}\|J_{1/j}u_0 - J_{1/k}u_0\|_{H^{s-1}}^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E}\|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} j^2 \left(o(1/j^4) + o(1/k^4) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = C \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \left(\frac{o(1/j^4)}{1/j^4} + \frac{j^4 o(1/k^4)}{k^4 \cdot 1/k^4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Second, classical L^2 -estimate shows that $\|(\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{y}_k)(t)\|_{H^{s-1}}$ can be bounded by $C\|\mathbf{y}_j(0) - \mathbf{y}_k(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s-1}}$, where C is a positive constant independent of j and k . So we get

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, t_{j,k}^T]} \|(u_j - u_k)(\varsigma)\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \leq C \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{k \geq j} \mathbb{E}\|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_0 - J_{1/k}\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = 0.$$

Then the convergence (2.80) follows.

Now we prove (2.81). For each $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\omega > 0$, we use Ito's formula to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge t_j^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 & \leq \|\mathbf{y}_j(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \int_0^{\omega \wedge t_j^T} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} 2\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_j \cdot \Lambda^s B(\mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{y}_j) dx \right| dr \\
& \quad + \int_0^{\omega \wedge t_j^T} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} 2\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_j \cdot \Lambda^s F(\mathbf{y}_j) dx \right| dr \\
& \quad + \int_0^{\omega \wedge t_j^T} \|G(r, \mathbf{y}_j)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{u}_1, \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dr \\
& \quad + \sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge t_j^T]} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} 2\Lambda^s \mathbf{y}_j \cdot \Lambda^s G(r, \mathbf{y}_j) dx d\mathcal{W} \right| \\
& = \|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \int_0^{\omega \wedge t_j^T} (T_1 + T_2 + T_3) dr + \sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge t_j^T]} T_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby we have the following inclusion relationship

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \sup_{r \in [0, \omega \wedge t_j^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq \|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + 3 \right\} \\
& \subset \left\{ \int_0^{\omega \wedge t_j^T} (T_1 + T_2 + T_3) dr > \frac{3}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge t_j^T]} \left| \int_0^t T_4 d\mathcal{W} \right| > \frac{3}{2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the Chebyshev inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \int_0^{\omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T} (T_1 + T_2 + T_3) dr > \frac{3}{2} \right\} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{[0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} (|T_1| + |T_2| + |T_3|) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{[0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) (1 + \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) \right) \\
& \leq C(1 + M^2)(\omega \wedge T).
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} \left| \int_0^t T_4 d\mathcal{W} \right| > \frac{3}{2} \right\} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{\omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \|G(r, \mathbf{y}_j)\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}; \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 dt \right) \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} \left(\mu^2(t) \chi^2(\|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,\infty}}) \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 (1 + \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2) \right) \\
& \leq C(1 + M^4)(\omega \wedge T).
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{r \in [0, \omega \wedge \mathfrak{t}_j^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_j(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq \|J_{1/j} \mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + 3 \right\} \leq C(\omega \wedge T) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow 0.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.13. \square

Based on above lemmas, one can now prove the local well-posedness result of Theorem 1.3 in the sharp case $s > \frac{d}{2} + 1$, $d \geq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3(1). By Lemmas 2.11-2.13 and the uniform bound $\|\mathbf{y}_0\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < M$, one can conclude from the abstract Cauchy theorem (cf. Lemma 7.1 in [38]) that there exists a stopping time \mathfrak{t} with $\mathbb{P}\{0 < \mathfrak{t} \leq T\} = 1$ such that

$$\sup_{j \geq 1} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq CM + 3,$$

and

$$\mathbf{y}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{y} \quad \text{in } C([0, \mathfrak{t}]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)), \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Note that the approximate solutions $\{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ are continuous \mathcal{F}_t -adapted processes with values in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and hence \mathcal{F}_t -predictable ones. As the pointwise limits preserve the measurability, it then follows that the limit process \mathbf{y} is also \mathcal{F}_t -predictable. By using the decomposition method as that in Subsection 2.4, we infer that $(\mathbf{y}, \mathfrak{t})$ is a local pathwise solution in the sense of Definition 1.2. Finally, one can extend the local solution to the maximal solution by using a standard argument (cf. [21, 29]).

Now we prove that the solution map $\mathbf{y}_0 \mapsto \mathbf{y}$ is continuous from $L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ into $L^2(\Omega; C([0, \mathfrak{t}']; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)))$, for some $\mathfrak{t}' > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Assume that $\mathbf{y}_i(t)$ is solution to the SMCH2 system with respect to the data $\mathbf{y}_{0,i}$, $i = 1, 2$. Our aim is to find a $\delta > 0$ small enough and a stopping time \mathfrak{t}' such that whenever $\|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)} < \delta$, there holds

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}']} \|\mathbf{y}_1(t) - \mathbf{y}_2(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

To avoid the difficulty caused by the convection term $B(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$, similar to (2.61), let us consider the mollified initial data $\{J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_{0,i}\}_{j>1}$, and the corresponding solutions are denoted by $\{\mathbf{y}_{i,j}\}_{j>1}$, $i = 1, 2$. For any $T > 0$, we define

$$\mathfrak{t}_{i,j}^T \triangleq T \wedge \inf \{t > 0; \|\mathbf{y}_{i,j}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \geq \|J_{1/j}\mathbf{y}_{0,i}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 3\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

In view of the proof for the Lemmas 2.9-2.11, one can conclude again from the abstract Cauchy theorem that, there exists a subsequence $\{j_k\}$ of $\{j\}$ with $j_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, a sequence of stopping times $\{\bar{\mathfrak{t}}_{i,j_k}\}$ as well as a stopping time $\bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i$, such that

$$(2.82) \quad \mathfrak{t}_{i,j_k}^T \geq \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_{i,j_k} \text{ for each } k \geq 1, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_{i,j_k} = \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and

$$(2.83) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_{i,j_k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = 0, \quad \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_i(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \|\mathbf{y}_{0,i}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + 3, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, there exists $\Omega_{i,j_k} \uparrow \Omega$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$(2.84) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{i,j_k}} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_{i,j_k}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq \|\mathbf{y}_{0,i}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + 3, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Define $\Omega_{j_k} \triangleq \Omega_{1,j_k} \cap \Omega_{2,j_k}$. Clearly, $\Omega_{j_k} \uparrow \Omega$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. It then follows from (2.83) and (2.84) that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j_k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, which implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $k_0 > 0$ such that

$$(2.85) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j_k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{20}, \quad \forall k > k_0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

By (2.82), we get for all $k \geq 1$

$$(2.86) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_1 \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_2]} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{1,j_k}(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{2,j_k}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{1,j_k}^T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{2,j_k}^T]} \|\mathbf{y}_{1,j_k}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{2,j_k}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [\bar{\mathfrak{t}}_1 \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_2 \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_{1,j_k} \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_{2,j_k}, \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_1 \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_2]} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{1,j_k}(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_k}} \mathbf{y}_{2,j_k}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \\ & \triangleq \mathbb{I}_k + \mathbb{II}_k. \end{aligned}$$

For I_k , using a similar argument in Lemma 2.11 and 2.12, one can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_k &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \|J_{1/j_k} \mathbf{y}_{0,1} - J_{1/j_k} \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, \bar{t}_{1,j_k}^T \wedge \bar{t}_{2,j_k}^T]} (\|u_{1,j_k} - u_{2,j_k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|\mathbf{y}_{1,j_k}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{s \in [0, \bar{t}_{1,j_k}^T \wedge \bar{t}_{2,j_k}^T]} \|u_{1,j_k} - u_{2,j_k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \mathbb{E} \|J_{1/j_k} \mathbf{y}_{0,1} - J_{1/j_k} \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} (\|J_{1/j_k} u_{0,1} - J_{1/j_k} u_{0,2}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|J_{1/j_k} \mathbf{y}_{0,1}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{s+1}}^2) \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{t}_{1,j_k}^T \wedge \bar{t}_{2,j_k}^T]} \|u_{1,j_k} - u_{2,j_k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \frac{1}{j_k^2} \mathbb{E} \|u_{0,1} - u_{0,2}\|_{H^s}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the R.H.S. of last inequality, we refer back to the Eq.(2.72) and the estimates for I_i , $i = 1, \dots, 5$. Due to the continuity of the function $\tilde{\mu}$, the nondecreasing property of $\tilde{\chi}$ and the embedding from $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ into $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, one can deduce that $\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{t}_{1,j_k}^T \wedge \bar{t}_{2,j_k}^T]} \|u_{1,j_k} - u_{2,j_k}\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2$. Thereby the last inequality indicates that

$$(2.87) \quad I_k \leq C \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \frac{C}{j_k^2} \mathbb{E} \|u_{0,1} - u_{0,2}\|_{H^s}^2.$$

For Π_k , we get by using the convergence (2.82)

$$\Pi_k \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [\bar{t}_1 \wedge \bar{t}_2 \wedge \bar{t}_{1,j_k} \wedge \bar{t}_{2,j_k}, \bar{t}_1 \wedge \bar{t}_2]} (4\|\mathbf{y}_{0,1}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 4\|\mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + 72) \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that there exists a $k_1 > 0$ such that

$$\Pi_k < \frac{\epsilon}{20}, \quad \forall k > k_1.$$

For the fixed $k' = k_0 + k_1$, there holds

$$(2.88) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{t}_i]} \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{i,j_{k'}}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{20}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

$$\Pi_{k'} < \frac{\epsilon}{20}.$$

Moreover, if $\|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)} < \delta < \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon j_{k'}^2}{20C + 20C j_{k'}^2}}$, then we get from (2.87) that

$$I_{k'} \leq C \|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 + \frac{C}{j_{k'}^2} \|u_{0,1} - u_{0,2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{20}.$$

which combined with the estimate (2.88)₂ lead to

$$(2.89) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{t}_1 \wedge \bar{t}_2]} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{1,j_{k'}}(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{2,j_{k'}}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 < \frac{\epsilon}{10}.$$

Thereby, by choosing $\mathfrak{t}' = \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_1 \wedge \bar{\mathfrak{t}}_2$, if $\|\mathbf{y}_{0,1} - \mathbf{y}_{0,2}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s)} < \delta$ with $\delta > 0$ chosen as before, then we deduce from (2.88)₁ and (2.89) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}']} \|\mathbf{y}_1(t) - \mathbf{y}_2(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \\ & \leq 3 \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}']} \|\mathbf{y}_1(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{1,j_{k'}}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}']} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{1,j_{k'}}(t) - \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{2,j_{k'}}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}']} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{j_{k'}}} \mathbf{y}_{2,j_{k'}}(t) - \mathbf{y}_2(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}^2 \right) \\ & < 3 \left(\frac{\epsilon}{20} + \frac{\epsilon}{10} + \frac{\epsilon}{20} \right) < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is now completed. \square

3. NONUNIFORM DEPENDENCE ON INITIAL DATA

In this section, we shall prove that the solution map $\mathbf{y}_0 \mapsto \mathbf{y}$ defined by Theorem 1.3 is not uniformly continuous. Due to lack of zero divergence conditions and the complex structure of the system, it is difficult to find desired explicit solutions to the SMCH2 system. We overcome this problem by constructing free-divergence approximation solutions, where the original idea was introduced by Himonas and Misiolek (cf. [50]) for 3-D Euler equation.

3.1. Approximation solutions. Let $\kappa \in \{1, -1\}$, we shall choose approximate solutions $\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n} = (u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n})^T$ in the following form:

(C1) If $d \geq 1$ is even, we consider

$$u^{\kappa,n}(x, t) = \gamma^{\kappa,n}(x, t) \triangleq (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}, \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+,$$

with

$$\eta_i(x, t) \triangleq nx_{d+1-i} - \kappa t, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d.$$

(C2) If $d \geq 1$ is odd, we consider

$$u^{\kappa,n}(x, t) = \gamma^{\kappa,n}(x, t) \triangleq (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_1, \dots, \kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_{d-1}, 0), \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+,$$

with

$$\eta_i(x, t) \triangleq nx_{d-i} - \kappa t, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d-1.$$

Observing that, $\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}$ are free-divergence vector fields, that is,

$$\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n} = \operatorname{div} \gamma^{\kappa,n} = 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \kappa \in \{1, -1\}.$$

As the functions $\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}$ may not be exact solutions to the SMCH2 system (1.5), in order to investigate the distance between the approximate solutions and the exact solutions, we consider the error term $\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t) = (E_1^{\kappa,n}(t), E_2^{\kappa,n}(t))^T$ defined by

$$\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t) \triangleq \mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}(0) + \int_0^t B(\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}, \mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}) dr + \int_0^t F(\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}) dr - \int_0^t G(t, \mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}) dW.$$

The error can be written in the component form:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} E_1^{\kappa,n}(t) = u^{\kappa,n}(t) - u^{\kappa,n}(0) + \int_0^t F_1(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) dr - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m^{\kappa,n}) d\mathcal{W}_1, \\ E_2^{\kappa,n}(t) = \gamma^{\kappa,n}(t) - \gamma^{\kappa,n}(0) + \int_0^t F_2(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) dr - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_2(t, \rho^{\kappa,n}) d\mathcal{W}_2, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) &= u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n} + \mathcal{L}_1(u^{\kappa,n}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma^{\kappa,n}), \\ F_2(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) &= u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \gamma^{\kappa,n} + \mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}). \end{aligned}$$

and the bilinear term $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ as well as the nonlocal terms $F(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{L}_3(\cdot)$ are defined in Section 1. The following estimates for trigonometric functions cosine and sine are fundamental in the proof.

Lemma 3.1 ([82]). *Let $\sigma, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\lambda \gg 1$, then*

$$\|\sin(\lambda x_1 - \alpha) \cos(\lambda x_2 - \alpha)\|_{H^\sigma} \cong \lambda^\sigma,$$

$$\|\sin(\lambda x_1 - \alpha)\|_{H^\sigma} = \|\cos(\lambda x_1 - \alpha)\|_{H^\sigma} \cong \lambda^\sigma.$$

Applying Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^\sigma}, \|\gamma^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^\sigma} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_i\|_{H^\sigma} \\ &\lesssim n^{-1} + n^{\sigma-s} \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \gg 1$ and $\frac{d}{2} < \sigma \leq s$. The following lemma provide an explicit decay estimate for the error term $\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t)$ in suitable Sobolev spaces.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$. For $\frac{d}{2} < \sigma < \min\{s - 1, 1 + \frac{d}{2}\}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s}, \quad n \gg 1,$$

where the damped exponential $\vartheta_s > 0$ is given by

$$\vartheta_s = \begin{cases} 2s - \sigma - 1, & \text{if } 1 + \frac{d}{2} < s \leq 3; \\ s - \sigma + 2, & \text{if } s > 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We first assume that $d \geq 1$ is even, i.e., the approximate solutions are defined in (C1). Direct calculation shows that

$$(3.3) \quad u^{\kappa,n}(t) - u^{\kappa,n}(0) = \int_0^t \partial_t u^{\kappa,n}(r) dr = \int_0^t (\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.$$

For the convection term $u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n} dr &= \int_0^t u^{\kappa,n} (\nabla u^{\kappa,n})^T dr \\
&= \int_0^t (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_1, \kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_2, \dots, \kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_d) \\
(3.4) \quad &* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & -n^{1-s} \sin \eta_d \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & -n^{1-s} \sin \eta_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ -n^{1-s} \sin \eta_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} dr \\
&= - \int_0^t (\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_i + n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$|\nabla u^{\kappa,n}|^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_i,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{1}{2} |\nabla u^{\kappa,n}|^2 \mathbf{I}_d \right) dr &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \left(\partial_{x_j} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_i \right) \right)_{1 \leq j \leq d} dr \\
(3.5) \quad &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by using the fact of $\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \left(\nabla u^{\kappa,n} (\nabla u^{\kappa,n} + (\nabla u^{\kappa,n})^T) - (\nabla u^{\kappa,n})^T \nabla u^{\kappa,n} - (\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n}) \nabla u^{\kappa,n} \right) dr \\
(3.6) \quad &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \begin{pmatrix} n^{2-2s} \mathcal{R}_1^{\kappa,n}(r) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & n^{2-2s} \mathcal{R}_2^{\kappa,n}(r) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & n^{2-2s} \mathcal{R}_d^{\kappa,n}(r) \end{pmatrix} dr \\
&= \int_0^t (\Lambda^{-2} \partial_{x_i} (n^{2-2s} \mathcal{R}_i^{\kappa,n}))_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr \\
&= \int_0^t (n^{3-2s} \Lambda^{-2} (-2 \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i} + \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}))_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr,
\end{aligned}$$

where the diagonal elements are given by

$$\mathcal{R}_i^{\kappa,n}(r) = \sin^2 \eta_i - \sin^2 \eta_{d+1-i} + \sin \eta_i \sin \eta_{d+1-i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d.$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} ((\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n}) u^{\kappa,n} + u^{\kappa,n} \cdot (\nabla u^{\kappa,n})^T) dr \\
(3.7) \quad &= - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i} + n^{1-2s} \cos \eta_{d+1-i} \sin \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For the terms involved in $\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma^{\kappa,n})$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} (|\gamma^{\kappa,n}|^2 + |\nabla \gamma^{\kappa,n}|^2) \mathbf{I}_d \mathrm{d}r \\
(3.8) \quad &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}^{\kappa,n}(r) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{D}^{\kappa,n}(r) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathcal{D}^{\kappa,n}(r) \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}r \\
&= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (\partial_{x_i} \mathcal{D}^{\kappa,n}(r))_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathrm{d}r \\
&= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (2(n^{3-2s} - n^{1-2s}) \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i} - 2\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathrm{d}r,
\end{aligned}$$

where the diagonal element is given by

$$\mathcal{D}^{\kappa,n}(r) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} (n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_i + (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_i)^2).$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} ((\nabla \gamma)^T \nabla \gamma) \mathrm{d}r \\
(3.9) \quad &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \begin{pmatrix} n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_d & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_{d-1} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & n^{2-2s} \sin^2 \eta_1 \end{pmatrix} \mathrm{d}r \\
&= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (2n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathrm{d}r.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the identities (3.3)-(3.9) together, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad E_1^{\kappa,n}(t) &= - \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathrm{d}r \\
&\quad + \int_0^t (\Lambda^{-2} S_i(r))_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathrm{d}r + \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m^{\kappa,n}) \mathrm{d}\mathcal{W}_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$S_i(r) \triangleq n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i} + 3(n^{3-2s} - n^{1-2s}) \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i} - 3\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i}.$$

For the terms involved in $\mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n})$, it follows from the fact of $\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n} = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.11) \quad \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) dr &= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} (\nabla \gamma^{\kappa,n} \nabla u^{\kappa,n} + (\nabla \gamma^{\kappa,n}) \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n}) dr \\
&= \int_0^t n^{2-2s} \Lambda^{-2} \operatorname{div} \begin{pmatrix} \sin \eta_1 \mathcal{T}_1^{\kappa,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \sin \eta_2 \mathcal{T}_2^{\kappa,n} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \sin \eta_d \mathcal{T}_d^{\kappa,n} \end{pmatrix} dr \\
&= \int_0^t n^{2-2s} \Lambda^{-2} (\partial_{x_i} (\sin \eta_i \mathcal{T}_i^{\kappa,n}))_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr \\
&= \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_i^{\kappa,n} = \sin \eta_{d+1-i} + \sin \eta_i$. Since $u^{\kappa,n} = \gamma^{\kappa,n}$, we also have

$$\gamma^{\kappa,n}(t) - \gamma^{\kappa,n}(0) + \int_0^t u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \gamma^{\kappa,n} dr = - \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr.$$

Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.12) \quad E_2^{\kappa,n}(t) &= - \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr + \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_2(t, m^{\kappa,n}) d\mathcal{W}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to get some momentum estimates for $\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t)$ in $\mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we shall first apply the Itô's formula to $\|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^s}^2$, and then use (3.12) and $E_1^{\kappa,n}(0) = 0$ to find

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.13) \quad \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 &= -2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma E_1^{\kappa,n}(r), \Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma E_1^{\kappa,n}(r), (\Lambda^{\sigma-2} S_i(r))_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; L^2)}^2 dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa,n}(r), \Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n}) d\mathcal{W}_1)_{L^2} \\
&= P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4.
\end{aligned}$$

For P_1 , we get by using Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
|P_1| &\leq C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\sigma E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{L^2} dr \\
&\leq C \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \int_0^t \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \|n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\
&\leq C n^{\sigma+1-2s} \int_0^t \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For P_2 , we get from the definition of S_i (cf. (3.10)) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|P_2| &\leq C \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \int_0^t \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \|S_i(r)\|_{H^{\sigma-2}} dr \\
&\leq C \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \int_0^t \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \left(\|n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^{\sigma-2}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|3(n^{3-2s} - n^{1-2s}) \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^{\sigma-2}} + \|3\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^{\sigma-2}} \right) dr \\
&\leq C(n^{\sigma+1-2s} + n^{\sigma-1-2s} + n^{\sigma-2-s}) \int_0^t \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For P_4 , by using the BDG inequality and the Assumption 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |P_4(t)| &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|\Lambda^\sigma E_1^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}; L^2)}^2 dr \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma} \left(\int_0^T \|g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\Lambda^{-2} g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}; H^\sigma)}^2 dr \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|F(\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n})\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, we also have

$$|P_3(t)| \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g_1(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s}.$$

Plugging the estimates for P_i into (3.13), we get by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa, n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 &\leq Cn^{\sigma+1-2s} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|E_1^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|g_1(r, m^{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \\ &\quad + C(n^{\sigma+1-2s} + n^{\sigma-1-2s} + n^{\sigma-2-s}) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|E_1^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\ &\leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r]} \|E_1^{\kappa, n}(\varsigma)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

An application of the Gronwall inequality to above inequality yields that

$$(3.14) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_1^{\kappa, n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s}.$$

In order to deal with the second component equation with respect to $\gamma^{\kappa, n}$, one can use Itô's formula to $\|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa, n}(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ to find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa, n}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |(\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa, n}(r), (\Lambda^\sigma \mathcal{P}_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{L^2}| dr \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(r, m^{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; L^2)}^2 dr \\ (3.15) \quad &\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa, n}(r), \Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(r, m^{\kappa, n}) dW_1)_{L^2} \right| \\ &\triangleq Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_i(r) = -n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i} + \Lambda^{-2}(n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$.

By means of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{L^2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|\Lambda^\sigma \mathcal{P}_i(r)\|_{L^2} dr \\ &\leq C \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|E_2^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \\ &\quad \times \left(\|n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^\sigma} + \|n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^{\sigma-2}} \right) dr \\ &\leq C(n^{\sigma+1-2s} + n^{\sigma-2+3-2s}) \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|E_2^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\ &\leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|E_2^{\kappa, n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

And by using the BDG inequality, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_2 + Q_3 &\leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g_2(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{L_2}^2 \int_0^T \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; L_2)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{L_2}^2 + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g_2(r, m^{\kappa,n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \\
&\leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{L_2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the last two estimates into (3.15) leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Lambda^\sigma E_2^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{L_2}^2 \leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s} + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \sup_{s \in [0, r]} \|E_2^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr,$$

which implies that

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|E_2^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s},$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on T . Thereby, we get from (3.14) and (3.16) that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\mathbf{E}^{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 \leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s},$$

which implies the desired inequality when $d \geq 1$ is even.

When $d \geq 1$ is odd, then the approximate solutions are now defined by (C2), and $d - 1$ is even. As the last component in $\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}$ has no effect on the estimates, one can establish the error estimate in a similar manner, and we shall omit the details here. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

3.2. Error estimate. Consider the following periodic initial boundary value problem:

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{cases} du + (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt = \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m) d\mathcal{W}_1, \\ d\gamma + (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)) dt = \Lambda^{-2} g_2(t, \rho) d\mathcal{W}_2, \\ u|_{t=0} = u^{\kappa,n}(0, x), \\ \gamma|_{t=0} = \gamma^{\kappa,n}(0, x), \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

where the vectors $u^{\kappa,n}$ and $\gamma^{\kappa,n}$ are defined in the last subsection. Precisely, the initial data is given by

$$u_{\kappa,n}(0, x) = \gamma_{\kappa,n}(0, x) = \begin{cases} (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d+1-i}))_{1 \leq i \leq d}, & \text{if } d \geq 1 \text{ is even;} \\ (\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d-i}), 0)_{1 \leq i \leq d-1}, & \text{if } d \geq 1 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 3.1, for any $n \geq 1$, $\kappa = \pm 1$, one can verify that the initial datum belongs to $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$. Thereby it follows from Theorem 1.3 that, for each $n \geq 1$, there exists a stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}$ such that the system (3.17) admits a unique strong pathwise

solution $(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n}, \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n})$. The following lemma tells us the specific rate of decay for the error between $(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n})$ and $(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n})$ in suitable Sobolev spaces.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, $d \geq 1$. For any $\kappa \in \{1, -1\}$, define the exiting time $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a$ by*

$$\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}}^a \triangleq \{t \geq 0; \|\mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \geq a\}, \quad \forall a \gg 1.$$

Then for $\frac{d}{2} < \sigma < \min\{s-1, 1 + \frac{d}{2}\}$ and any $t > 0$, we have

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}(r) - \mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 \leq Cn^{-2\vartheta_s}, \quad \forall n \gg 1,$$

and

$$(3.19) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}(r) - \mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-2\sigma}}^2 \leq Cn^{2s-2\sigma}, \quad \forall n \gg 1,$$

where the positive constant C depends only on σ and t , and the damped exponential ϑ_s is defined in Lemma 3.2.

Proof. For convenience, we denote

$$\varphi(t) = u^{\kappa,n}(t) - u_{\kappa,n}(t), \quad \psi(t) = \gamma^{\kappa,n}(t) - \gamma_{\kappa,n}(t), \quad \mathbf{v}(t) = (\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = \mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}(t).$$

Then $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$, and it follows from (3.1) and (3.17) that

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{\kappa,n}(t) = & \varphi(t) + \int_0^t (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi + \varphi \cdot \nabla u_{\kappa,n}) dr \\ & + \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_1(u^{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_{\kappa,n}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma^{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_{\kappa,n})) dr \\ & - \int_0^t (\Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m^{\kappa,n}) - \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m_{\kappa,n})) d\mathcal{W}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by applying the identities derived in Subsection 3.1 for the error $E_1^{\kappa,n}(t)$, the last equation can be written in the form of

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(t) = & - \int_0^t \left(u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi + \varphi \cdot \nabla u_{\kappa,n} - \mathcal{L}_1(u_{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_{\kappa,n}) \right) dr \\ & - \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_1(t, m_{\kappa,n}) d\mathcal{W}_1. \end{aligned}$$

For any $n \gg 1$ and $\kappa \in \{1, -1\}$, since

$$\|(u_{\kappa,n}(0), \gamma_{\kappa,n}(0))\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \lesssim 1 + n^{-1} \lesssim 1,$$

the stopping time $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. By applying the Ito's formula to $\|\varphi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2$ and utilizing the equation (3.20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.21) \quad \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 &= -2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi + \varphi \cdot \nabla u_{\kappa,n}))_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma \mathcal{L}_1(u_{\kappa,n}) + \Lambda^\sigma \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_{\kappa,n}))_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(t, m_{\kappa,n})\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{A}, L^2)}^2 dr \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(t, m_{\kappa,n}) dW_1)_{L^2} \\
&= V_1 + V_2 + V_3 + V_4 + V_5.
\end{aligned}$$

For V_1 , noting that $H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^d)$ ($\frac{d}{2} < \sigma \leq s-1$) are Banach algebra, it follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$|(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (\varphi \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n}))_{L^2}| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \|\varphi \cdot \nabla u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2,$$

where the last inequality have used the uniform bound (3.2) for $u^{\kappa,n}$ as $n \gg 1$. The estimate for the term $u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi$ involved in V_1 is complicated, which will be divided into two cases.

(I) If $d = 2$, then we choose $p > 0$ large enough such that $1 - \frac{2}{p} < \sigma - 1 = \sigma - \frac{d}{2}$. Let $q > 0$ be the dual number such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2}$, then the following embedding hold:

$$H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{1,p}(\mathbb{T}^2), \quad H^s(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{\sigma+\frac{2}{p},p}(\mathbb{T}^2) \subset W^{\sigma,p}(\mathbb{T}^2).$$

By means of the uniform bound (3.2) and the commutator estimate, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi))_{L^2}| &\leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \|[\Lambda^\sigma, u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla] \varphi\|_{L^2} + |(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \Lambda^\sigma \varphi)_{L^2}| \\
&\leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \left(\|\Lambda^\sigma u^{\kappa,n}\|_{L^p} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla u^{\kappa,n}\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^{\sigma-1} \nabla \varphi\|_{L^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\operatorname{div} u^{\kappa,n}\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^\sigma \varphi\|_{L^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} (\|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{W^{\sigma,p}} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,q}} + \|\nabla u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}) \\
&\leq C \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(II) If $d = 2k$ for $k \geq 2$, one can use the assumption $s-1 \geq \sigma > \frac{d}{2}$ and the Sobolev embedding theorem to find that

$$H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,d}(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset H^{\sigma+1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{\sigma, \frac{2d}{d-2}}(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

By applying Lemma 2.2 and the last embedding, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \varphi))_{L^2}| &\leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} (\|\Lambda^\sigma u^{\kappa,n}\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}} \|\nabla \varphi\|_{L^d} + \|\nabla u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}) \\
&\leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} (\|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{W^{\sigma, \frac{2d}{d-2}}} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,d}} + \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}) \\
&\leq C \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \lesssim \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to the discussions for **(I)** and **(II)**, the term V_1 can be estimated by

$$(3.22) \quad |V_1| \leq C \int_0^t \|u^{\kappa,n}(r)\|_{H^s} \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr \leq C \int_0^t \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr.$$

For V_2 , we first get from Lemma 2.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_2| &\leq C \int_0^t |(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (\mathcal{L}_1(u^{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_{\kappa,n}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma^{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_{\kappa,n})))_{L^2}| dr \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t |(\Lambda^\sigma \varphi, \Lambda^\sigma (\mathcal{L}_1(u^{\kappa,n}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma^{\kappa,n})))_{L^2}| dr \\
(3.23) \quad &\leq C \int_0^t (\|\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 dr \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \left\| \left(n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i} + \frac{3}{2} (n^{3-2s} - n^{1-2s}) \sin(2\eta_{d+1-i}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 3\kappa n^{-s} \sin \eta_{d+1-i} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\
&\leq C(1+a) \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^{\sigma-2}}^2 dr + C \int_0^t (n^{\sigma+1-2s} + n^{\sigma-1-2s} + n^{\sigma-2-s}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\
&\leq C n^{-\vartheta_s} + C(1+a) \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{\sigma-2}}^2 dr,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a]$, where we used the definitions of $\mathbf{v}(t)$ and the exiting time $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a$ in the second and third inequalities, respectively.

By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_3| &\leq 2 \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\sigma \varphi\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{L^2} dr \\
(3.24) \quad &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \|n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i}\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^t n^{\sigma+1-2s} \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma} dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For V_5 , we get by using the BDG inequality that

(3.25)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} |V_5(r)| &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|\Lambda^\sigma \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(r, m_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; L^2)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_1(r, m_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; L^2)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|g_1(r, m_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{X}; H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\varphi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, after taking the supremum on both sides of (3.21) over $[0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]$ for any $t > 0$ and then taking the expectation, we obtain from the estimates (3.22)-(3.25) that

$$(3.26) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(\varsigma)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr.$$

Next, we shall estimate the error $\psi(t)$ with respect to the second component.

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2^{\kappa, n}(t) = &\psi(t) + \int_0^t \left(u^{\kappa, n} \cdot \nabla \psi + \varphi \cdot \nabla \gamma_{\kappa, n} + \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n}) - \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n}) \right) dr \\
&- \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} (g_2(t, \rho^{\kappa, n}) - g_2(r, \rho_{\kappa, n})) dW_2
\end{aligned}$$

Using the formulation of the approximation solutions $\gamma^{\kappa, n}$, we have

$$E_2^{\kappa, n}(t) + \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa, n}, \gamma^{\kappa, n}) dr - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_2(t, \rho^{\kappa, n}) dW_2,$$

which combined with the last identity implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(t) = &-\int_0^t \left(u^{\kappa, n} \cdot \nabla \psi + \varphi \cdot \nabla \gamma_{\kappa, n} - \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n}) \right) dr \\
&- \int_0^t (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} dr - \int_0^t \Lambda^{-2} g_2(r, \rho_{\kappa, n}) dW_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying the Ito's formula to $\|\psi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.27) \quad \|\psi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 &= -2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \psi, \Lambda^\sigma (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \psi + \varphi \cdot \nabla \gamma_{\kappa,n} - \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n})))_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \psi, \Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{L^2} dr \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(t, \rho_{\kappa,n})\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{A}, L^2)}^2 dr \\
&\quad - 2 \int_0^t (\Lambda^\sigma \psi, \Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(r, \rho_{\kappa,n}))_{L^2} dW_2 \\
&= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4.
\end{aligned}$$

For T_1 , recalling the definition of $\mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a$, we first have for $r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a]$ that

$$\|\varphi \cdot \nabla \gamma_{\kappa,n}\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \|\nabla \gamma_{\kappa,n}\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} \|\gamma_{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \leq Ca \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma},$$

For the term $u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \psi$, by using the uniform bound (3.1), one can estimate it similar to (3.22) and obtain

$$\|u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \psi\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C \|u^{\kappa,n}\|_{H^s} \|\psi\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C \psi\|_{H^\sigma}.$$

For the term $\mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n})\|_{H^\sigma} &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n}) - \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n})\|_{H^\sigma} + \|\mathcal{L}_3(u^{\kappa,n}, \gamma^{\kappa,n})\|_{H^\sigma} \\
&\leq \|F(\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}) - F(\mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n})\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma} + \|\Lambda^{-2} (n^{3-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{H^\sigma} \\
&\leq C (\|\mathbf{y}^{\kappa,n}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\mathbf{y}_{\kappa,n}\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 + C n^{\sigma+1-2s} \\
&\leq C n^{-\vartheta_s} + C(1+a) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby, by using the the last three estimates and the Young inequality, for all $r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa,n}^a]$, one can estimate the terms involved in T_1 as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &\leq C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\sigma \psi\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\sigma (u^{\kappa,n} \cdot \nabla \psi + \varphi \cdot \nabla \gamma_{\kappa,n} - \mathcal{L}_3(u_{\kappa,n}, \gamma_{\kappa,n}))\|_{L^2} dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^t \|\psi\|_{H^\sigma} (a \|\varphi\|_{H^\sigma} + \|\psi\|_{H^\sigma} + C n^{-\vartheta_s} + (1+a) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}) dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \|\mathbf{v}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For T_2 , we get from the Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\leq C \int_0^t \|\Lambda^\sigma \psi\|_{L^2} \|\Lambda^\sigma (n^{1-2s} \sin \eta_i \cos \eta_{d+1-i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{L^2} dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \|\psi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For T_3 and T_4 , we get from the BDG inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} |(T_3 + T_4)(r)| &\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(t, \rho_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}, L^2)}^2 dr \\
&\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|\Lambda^\sigma \psi\|_{L^2}^2 \|\Lambda^{\sigma-2} g_2(r, \rho_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}, L^2)}^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\psi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 + C \int_0^{t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a} \|g_2(t, \rho_{\kappa, n})\|_{L_2(\mathfrak{A}, H^{\sigma-2})}^2 dr \\
&\leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\psi(r)\|_{H^\sigma}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $[0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]$ for any $t > 0$ and then taking the expectation, we deduce from the estimates for T_i and (3.27) that

$$(3.28) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\psi(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 dr.$$

Adding (3.26) and (3.28), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(t)\|_{H^\sigma}^2 \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s} + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 dr, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 \leq C n^{-2\vartheta_s}.$$

Since $2s - \sigma > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, it follows from the Theorem 1.3 that $(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})$ is a unique solution to the SMCH2 system (1.5) with initial data explicitly given by $(u^{\kappa, n}(0), \gamma^{\kappa, n}(0))$, one can taking the similar estimates as we provided in the proof of Lemma 2.6 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \\
&\leq C \|(u^{\kappa, n}, \gamma^{\kappa, n})(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{\varsigma \in [0, r \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})(\varsigma)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 dr,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.29) \quad \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 &\leq C \|(\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d+1-i}))_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{H^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \\
&\leq C(n^{-2} + n^{2s-2\sigma}) \leq C n^{2s-2\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby, we get by applying the Lemma 3.1 and (3.29) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|\mathbf{v}(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|(u^{\kappa, n}, \gamma^{\kappa, n})(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{r \in [0, t \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\kappa, n}^a]} \|(u_{\kappa, n}, \gamma_{\kappa, n})(r)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \\
& \leq C n^{2s-2\sigma} + C \|(\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos \eta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}\|_{H^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \\
& \leq C n^{2s-2\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if the dimension $d \geq 1$ is odd, one can also prove the similar estimates for φ and ψ as $d-1$ is even, we shall omit the details here. The proof of Lemma 3.3 is now completed. \square

3.3. Nonuniform continuity. Based on the previous lemmas, we could now prove that the solution map $S(t)$ is not uniformly continuous.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let us first prove Theorem 1.5 in even dimensions. Indeed, we shall verify that the solutions $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n} = (u_{\pm 1, n}, \gamma_{\pm 1, n})$ constructed by (3.17) satisfy the conclusions stated in Theorem 1.5.

(1) By Theorem 1.3, if $\mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, then the SMCH2 system (1.11) admits a unique zero solution $\mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, observing that the a_0 -exiting time (cf. (1.16)) for zero solution is infinity, i.e.,

$$(3.30) \quad \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{0}}^{a_0} = \inf \emptyset = \infty.$$

Recalling that $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n} = (u_{\pm 1, n}, \gamma_{\pm 1, n})$ is the unique pathwise solution to (3.17) with initial data $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}(0) = \mathbf{y}^{\pm 1, n}(0)$. On the one hand, in terms of the definition of $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}^{a_0}$ ($a_0 \gg 1$) and the uniform bound $\|\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} = \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1, n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \lesssim 1$, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}}^{a_0} > 0\} = 1$. On the other hand, an application of Lemma 3.1 implies that, for any $t < s$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.31) \quad & \|\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^t} = \|(u_{\pm 1, n}(0), \gamma_{\pm 1, n}(0))\|_{\mathbb{H}^t} \\
& \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|\kappa n^{-1} + n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d+1-i})\|_{H^t} \leq C(n^{-1} + n^{t-s}) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ in the strong topology of $\mathbb{H}^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for any $t < s$. Since we assume that the a_0 -exiting time $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{0}}^{a_0}$ ($a_0 \gg 1$) for zero solution to system (3.17) is strongly stable, then the convergence property (3.31) implies that $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}}^{a_0} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{0}}^{a_0}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thereby, we can conclude from (3.30) that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}}^{a_0} = \infty \right\} = 1.$$

This proves the first conclusion by taking $\mathfrak{t}_{1, n} = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{-1, n}}^{a_0}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{2, n} = \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{1, n}}^{a_0}$.

(2) By Lemma 3.1 and the definition of initial data $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1, n}(0)$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{y}_{1, n}(0) - \mathbf{y}_{-1, n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^t} = \|\mathbf{y}^{1, n}(0) - \mathbf{y}^{-1, n}(0)\|_{\mathbb{H}^t} \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \|2n^{-1}\|_{H^s} \lesssim n^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This proves second conclusion.

(3) By Theorem 1.3 and the definition of $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1,n}$, we see that $\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1,n} \in C([0, \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1,n}}^{a_0}]; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and $\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1,n}}^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}_{\pm 1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \leq a_0$. To prove the nonuniform continuity, we first use the triangle inequality to get

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\ & \geq \|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} - (\|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the R.H.S. of (3.32), denoting by $\mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0} \triangleq \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{1,n}}^{a_0} \wedge \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbf{y}_{-1,n}}^{a_0}$ for simplicity, we get by using Lemma 3.1 and the construction of the approximation solutions that

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\ & \gtrsim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \left(\|n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d+1-i} + t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - n^{-s} \cos(nx_{d+1-i} - t)\|_{H^s} - \|n^{-1}\|_{H^s} \right) \\ & \gtrsim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} n^{-s} \|\cos(nx_{d+1-i} + t) - \cos(nx_{d+1-i} - t)\|_{H^s} \\ & \gtrsim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} n^{-s} \|2 \sin(nx_{d+1-i}) \sin t\|_{H^s} \\ & \gtrsim \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} |\sin t| \gtrsim \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\sin t|. \end{aligned}$$

For the second and third terms on the R.H.S. of (3.32), by using the interpolation inequality between $\mathbb{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we get

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \left(\|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ & \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^\sigma}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \mathfrak{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{\pm 1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{\pm,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{2s-\sigma}}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ & \lesssim n^{-\frac{1}{2}(\vartheta_s - s + \sigma)} \\ & = \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}(s-1)}, & \text{if } 1 + \frac{d}{2} < s \leq 3; \\ n^{-1}, & \text{if } s > 3. \end{cases} \\ & \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.33) and (3.34), it follows from (3.32) and the Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.35) \quad & \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \bar{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}_{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \geq \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \bar{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \quad - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \bar{t}_n^{a_0}]} (\|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} + \|\mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}_{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s}) \\
& = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \bar{t}_n^{a_0}]} \|\mathbf{y}^{1,n}(t) - \mathbf{y}^{-1,n}(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} \\
& \gtrsim \|\sin(\cdot)\|_{C([0, T])}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the forth conclusion, which completes the proof of Theorem 1.5 for even dimensions. In the case of odd dimensions, we shall consider the approximation solutions defined by (C2), and repeat the previous procedure to verify the conclusions (1)-(3). The details will be omitted here for simplicity.

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is now completed. \square

4. GLOBAL EXISTENCE AND BLOW-UP CRITERIA

4.1. Proof of global result-I. In this subsection, we shall prove that the polynomial-type multiplicative noise with suitable index of growth have a regularization effect on t -variable of solutions to the MCH2 system.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Under the assumptions stated in Theorem 1.6, we conclude from the Theorem 1.3 that the system (1.13) admits a local strong pathwise solution (u, γ, \bar{t}) in the sense of Definition 1.2. To finish the proof of Theorem 1.6, it is sufficient to prove that $\bar{t} = \infty$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

By applying the differential operator Λ^s and Friedrichs mollifier J_ϵ to the first equation in (1.17), then the resulted system can be regarded SDEs in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, i.e.,

$$d\Lambda^s J_\epsilon u = -J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt + c_1 \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon u dW,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.1) \quad d\|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 &= -2(J_\epsilon \Lambda^s u, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)))_{L^2} dt \\
&\quad + c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^2 dt + 2c_1 \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^2 dW.
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of (4.1) and applying the Ito's formula to $\ln(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2) \quad & d \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\
&= -\frac{2(J_\epsilon \Lambda^s u, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)))_{L^2}}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dt - \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^4}{(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dt \\
&\quad + \frac{c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dt + \frac{2c_1 \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dW.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the commutator estimates, the Sobolev embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, and the similar procedure as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.4, we have

$$(4.3) \quad |(J_\epsilon \Lambda^s u, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)))_{L^2}| \leq C(\|u\|_{H^s}^3 + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2).$$

Integrating both sides of (4.2) on the interval $[0, t]$ and then taking the expectation, we derive from (4.3) and $\|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^s}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-1} (\|u\|_{H^s}^3 + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2) dr \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^4}{(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dr + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|J_\epsilon u\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\|u\|_{H^s}^3 + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr - C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dr \\ & \quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+2}}{e + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of ϵ . Thereby, by using Fatou's lemma and the dominated convergence theorem, the last inequality implies that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) & \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \ln(1 + \|J_\epsilon u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) - C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dr \\ & \quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\|u\|_{H^s}^3 + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 + c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+2}}{e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we apply the operators Λ^s and J_ϵ to the second equation in (1.17) and obtain

$$d\Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma = -J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)) dt + c_2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_2} \Lambda^s J_\epsilon \gamma dW.$$

An application of the Ito's formula to $\|J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ yields that

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma\|_{L^2}^2 & = \|J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma_0\|_{L^2}^2 - 2 \int_0^t (J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)))_{L^2} dr \\ & \quad + c_2^2 \int_0^t \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2} \|J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^s}^2 dr + 2c_2 \int_0^t \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_2} \|J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^s}^2 dW. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Itô's formula again to $\ln(e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)$, it follows from (4.5) and the uniform bound for J_ϵ in $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) - \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) \\ & = -2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{(J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)))_{L^2}}{e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr + \int_0^t \frac{c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2} \|J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr \\ & \quad - \int_0^t \frac{2c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2} \|J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^s}^4}{(e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dr + \int_0^t \frac{2c_2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_2} \|J_\epsilon \gamma\|_{H^s}^2}{e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dW. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4, one can verify that

$$|(J_\epsilon \Lambda^s \gamma, J_\epsilon \Lambda^s (u \cdot \nabla \gamma + \mathcal{L}_3(u, \gamma)))_{L^2}| \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2.$$

By plugging the last estimate into (4.6) and using Fatou's Lemma and dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) &\leq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|J_\epsilon \gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 + c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+2}}{e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2} dr \\ &\quad - C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{2c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{(e + \|\gamma(r)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Adding (4.4) and (4.7) and then rearranging the terms, we arrive at

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(\frac{\|u\|_{H^s}^3 + \|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 + c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+2}}{e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2} - \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\|u\|_{H^s} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 + c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+2}}{e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2} - \frac{2c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} \right) dr \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2\|u\|_{H^s} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{e}} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 + c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} + c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2c_1^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} - \frac{2c_2^2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^2} \right) dr. \end{aligned}$$

To get a better understanding of the estimates on the R.H.S. of (4.8), we have the following observation:

(I) For $\delta_1 > \frac{1}{2}$, $c_1 \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\delta_1}(x) &\triangleq 2x + c_1^2 x^{2\delta_1} - \frac{2c_1^2 x^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e+x^2)^2} + \frac{c_1^2 x^{2\delta_1+4}}{(e+x^2)^2 \ln(e+x^2)} \\ &= x^{2\delta_1} \left(\frac{2}{x^{2\delta_1-1}} + c_1^2 - \frac{2c_1^2}{(1+\frac{e}{x^2})^2} + \frac{c_1^2}{(1+\frac{e}{x^2})^2 \ln(e+x^2)} \right) \\ &\rightarrow -\infty, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, direct calculation shows that $f_{\delta_1}(x) > 0$, for all $x \in (0, \sqrt{\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}-1}})$. Therefore, by using the facts of $f_{\delta_1}(0) = 0$ and the continuity of $f_{\delta_1}(\cdot)$ on $[0, \infty)$, one can find an upper bound $d'_1 > 0$ such that $f_{\delta_1}(x) \leq d'_1$, for all $x \in [0, \infty)$.

(II) For $\delta_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $|c_1| > \sqrt{2}$, due to

$$f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \triangleq 2x + c_1^2 x - \frac{2c_1^2 x^5}{(e+x^2)^2} + \frac{c_1^2 x^5}{(e+x^2)^2 \ln(e+x^2)} \sim (2-c_1^2)x \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

we also have $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) = -\infty$. Note that the function $f_{\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}^+ , and $f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) > 0$ for any $x \in (0, 1)$. A positive constant d'_1 exists such that $f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) \leq d'_1$, for all $x \in [0, \infty)$. As a consequence, we have in both cases

$$f_{\delta_1}(x) \leq d'_1 + d'_2 \triangleq d_1, \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

One can also consider the function

$$g_{\delta_2}(y) \triangleq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{e}} y^2 + c_2^2 y^{2\delta_2} - \frac{2c_2^2 y^{2\delta_2+4}}{(e+y^2)^2} + \frac{c_2^2 y^{2\delta_2+4}}{(e+y^2)^2 \ln(e+y^2)}, \quad y \in [0, \infty).$$

Direct calculation shows that

(I)' If $\delta_2 > 1$, $c_2 \neq 0$, then we have

$$g_{\delta_2}(y) \sim -c_2^2 y^{2\delta_2} \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

(II)' If $\delta_2 = 1$, $|c_2| > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}}$, then we have

$$g_{\delta_2}(y) \sim \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{e}} - c_2^2 \right) y^2 \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover, $g_{\delta_2}(0) = 0$, $g_{\delta_2}(\cdot)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}^+ , and $g_{\delta_2}(x) > 0$ for any $x \in (0, 1)$. There must be a positive constant d_2 such that $g_{\delta_2}(x) \leq d_2$, for all $x \in [0, \infty)$.

Applying above facts on functions f_{δ_1} and g_{δ_2} to the R.H.S. of (4.8), note that if the parameters δ_i and c_i , $i = 1, 2$ satisfy one of the conditions provided in Theorem 1.6, one can deduce by using the identities (4.2) and (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) - \int_0^t 2c_1 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-1} \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dW \right| \\ & + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) - \int_0^t (e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-1} 2c_2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_2} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^2 dW \right| \\ (4.9) \quad & + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left(\frac{(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} c_1^2 \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{\ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} + \frac{(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} c_2^2 \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{\ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} \right) dt \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t f(\|u(r)\|_{H^s}) dr \\ & \quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t g(\|\gamma(r)\|_{H^s}) dr \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C(d_1 + d_2)T. \end{aligned}$$

Using the BDG inequality and the Fatou's Lemma, we have for any $T > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.10) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t 2c_1 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-1} \|u\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dW \right| \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T 4c_1^2 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \int_0^T \frac{4c_1^2 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1} \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^4 dt}{\ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{4c_1^2 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{\ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t 2c_2 (e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-1} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{\delta_1} \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dW \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{4c_2^2 (e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{\ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by using the inequality $1 + \ln(e + a + b) \leq \ln(e + a) + \ln(e + b)$, $a, b \geq 0$, it follows from the estimates (4.9)-(4.11) that for any $T > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.12) \quad & \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left(\ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2) + \ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \mathbb{E} \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) + C(d_1 + d_2)T \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left(\frac{4c_1^2 (e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|u\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_1+4}}{\ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} + \frac{4c_2^2 (e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{-2} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}^{2\delta_2+4}}{\ln(e + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)} \right) dt \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\ln(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2) + \ln(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2) \right) + C(d_1 + d_2)T.
\end{aligned}$$

Define the stopping time

$$\mathfrak{t} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{t}_m, \quad \mathfrak{t}_m = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0; (\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq m \right\}.$$

Notice that $\mathfrak{t}_m \nearrow \mathfrak{t}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\mathfrak{t} < T\} & \subset \{\mathfrak{t}_m < T\} \subset \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (\|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \geq m^2 \right\} \\
& \subset \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \geq \ln(e + m^2) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By applying the Chebyshev inequality to above events and then using the uniform estimate (4.12), we get for any $T > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq \mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} < T\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2) \geq \ln(e + m^2)\right\} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \ln(e + \|u(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}^2)}{\ln(e + m^2)} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \ln[(e + \|u_0\|_{H^s}^2)(e + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}^2)] + (d_1 + d_2)T}{\ln(e + m^2)} \\
&\rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} < T\} = 0$ for any $T > 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} = \infty\} = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} \{\mathfrak{t} < k\}\right) \geq 1 - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} \mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} < k\} = 1.$$

By means of Theorem 1.3 and the similar proof in Theorem 1.3(2), we find that the stopping time \mathfrak{t} is actually the maximal existence time $\bar{\mathfrak{t}}$ of the strong pathwise solution to the SMCH2 system in the sense of Definition of 1.2. As a consequence, the local strong pathwise solution $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ is actually a global-in-time one.

The proof of Theorem 1.6 is now completed. \square

4.2. Proof of global result-II. In order to prove Theorem 1.7, we shall first transform (1.18) into a system of random PDEs (note that $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$ in present case). Define

$$(4.13) \quad \mu(t) = e^{\frac{1}{2}c^2 t - cW(t)}, \quad \tilde{u}(\omega, t, x) = \mu(t)u(\omega, t, x), \quad \tilde{\gamma}(\omega, t, x) = \mu(t)\gamma(\omega, t, x).$$

In terms of (1.18)₁, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
d\tilde{u} &= \mu du + u d\mu + \mu d\mu \\
&= \mu(cudW - (u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt) + u(c^2 \mu dt - c\mu dW) - c^2 \mu u dt \\
&= -\mu(u \cdot \nabla u + \mathcal{L}_1(u) + \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma)) dt \\
&= -(\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner, one can also deduce from (1.18)₂ that

$$d\tilde{\gamma} = -(\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})) dt.$$

Therefore, the system (1.18) can be reformulated as

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u} + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma}) = 0, \\ \partial_t \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \mathcal{L}_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0, & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \\ \tilde{u}|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \tilde{\gamma}|_{t=0} = \gamma_0, \end{cases}$$

where the nonlocal terms $\mathcal{L}_1(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{L}_2(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{L}_3(\cdot, \cdot)$ are defined as before. Given a \mathcal{F}_0 -adapted initial data $(u_0, \gamma_0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$, Theorem 1.3 indicates that the system (1.18) admits

a unique local maximal pathwise solution $(u, \gamma) \in C([0, \bar{t}), \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}) \cap C^1([0, \bar{t}), \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. According to the transformation (4.13), one find that the pair $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})$ satisfies the random system (4.14), which ensures the existence of a unique local strong solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma}) \in C([0, \bar{t}), \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}) \cap C^1([0, \bar{t}), \mathbb{H}^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Applying the Littlewood-Paley block Δ_j to Eq.(4.14)₁, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \Delta_j \tilde{u} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \Delta_j \tilde{u} \\ &= \mu^{-1} (\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \Delta_j \tilde{u} - \Delta_j (\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u})) - \mu^{-1} (\Delta_j \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \Delta_j \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides of above equation by $\Delta_j \tilde{u}$ and integrating on \mathbb{T} , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (4.15) \quad & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} (\operatorname{div} \tilde{u}, |\Delta_j \tilde{u}|^2)_{L^2} + \mu^{-1} \left((\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \Delta_j \tilde{u} - \Delta_j (\tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u})), \Delta_j \tilde{u} \right)_{L^2} \\ & \quad - \mu^{-1} (\Delta_j \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \Delta_j \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma}), \Delta_j \tilde{u})_{L^2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \|\operatorname{div} \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C \mu^{-1} c_j 2^{-js} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \\ & \quad + \mu^{-1} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \Delta_j \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Lie bracket $[A, B] = AB - BA$, and the following commutator estimate (cf. [3]) to the second term on the R.H.S. of (4.15).

$$\|[\Delta_j, \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla] \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \leq C c_j 2^{-js} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s}, \quad \|\{c_j\}_{j \geq -1}\|_{l^2} = 1.$$

So we get from (4.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.16) \quad & \frac{d}{dt} 2^{js} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} 2^{js} \|\Delta_j \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} + C \mu^{-1} c_j \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \\ & \quad + \mu^{-1} 2^{js} \|\Delta_j \mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \Delta_j \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})\|_{L^2}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the l^2 -norm on both sides of (4.16) with respect to j leads to

$$(4.17) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \leq C \mu^{-1} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} + \mu^{-1} \|\mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})\|_{B_{2,2}^s}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Next, by applying the blocks Δ_j to Eq.(4.14)₂ yields

$$\partial_t \Delta_j \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla \Delta_j \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} [\Delta_j, \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla] \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \Delta_j \mathcal{L}_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.$$

Multiplying the both sides of last equation by $\Delta_j \tilde{\gamma}$, integrating the resulted inequality on \mathbb{T} and applying the commutator estimate (cf. Lemma 2.100 in [3])

$$\|\{2^{js} \|[\Delta_j, \tilde{u} \cdot \nabla] \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^2}\}_{j \geq -1}\|_{l^2} \leq C (\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} + \|\nabla \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^{s-1}}).$$

After taking the l^2 -norm $j \geq -1$ and simplifying the terms, we get

$$(4.18) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \leq C \mu^{-1} (\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} + \|\nabla \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty} \|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s}) + \mu^{-1} \|\mathcal{L}_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})\|_{B_{2,2}^s}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Since the operator $(I - \Delta)^{-1} \operatorname{div}$, $(I - \Delta)^{-1}$ are S^{-1} multipliers, by using the similar method as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.4, we get

$$(4.19) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_1(\tilde{u}) + \mathcal{L}_2(\tilde{\gamma})\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \leq C(\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty})\|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} + C(\|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty})\|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{B_{2,2}^s},$$

and

$$(4.20) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_3(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})\|_{B_{2,2}^s} \leq C(\|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^\infty})\|\tilde{u}\|_{B_{2,2}^s} + C\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty}\|\tilde{\gamma}\|_{B_{2,2}^s}.$$

By (4.17)-(4.20) and the equivalence $B_{2,2}^s(\mathbb{T}) \approx H^s(\mathbb{T})$, we deduce that

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}(\|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\tilde{\gamma}(t)\|_{H^s}) \\ & \leq C_1 \mu^{-1}(\|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\tilde{\gamma}(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}})(\|\tilde{u}(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\tilde{\gamma}(t)\|_{H^s}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant C_1 depending only on s and d .

Introducing

$$\phi(t) \triangleq e^{-\frac{c^2}{2}t} \tilde{u}(t) = e^{-cW(t)} u(t), \quad \varphi(t) \triangleq e^{-\frac{c^2}{2}t} \tilde{\gamma}(t) = e^{-cW(t)} \gamma(t).$$

As $\mu(t) = e^{\frac{c^2}{2}t - cW(t)}$, it then follows from (4.21) that

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}(\|\phi(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^s}) + \frac{c^2}{2}(\|\phi(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^s}) \\ & \leq C_1 e^{tW(t)}(\|\phi(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}})(\|\phi(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^s}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

For any $\kappa \geq 2$, define the stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathfrak{t}} & \triangleq \inf_{t \geq 0} \left\{ e^{tW(t)}(\|\phi(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \geq \frac{c^2}{2\kappa C_1} \right\} \\ & = \inf_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \|u(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\gamma(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \geq \frac{c^2}{2\kappa C_1} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As $s > 1 + \frac{d}{2}$, there is a Sobolev embedding constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|u_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\gamma_0\|_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq C_2(\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}) \leq \frac{c^2}{4R\kappa C_1},$$

where we used the assumption $\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s} \leq \frac{c^2}{4R\kappa C_1 C_2}$, $R > 1$. From the definition of $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$, we find that $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. Moreover, (4.22) indicates

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|\phi(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^s}) + \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa} \right) (\|\phi(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\varphi(t)\|_{H^s}) \leq 0,$$

for all $t \in [0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}})$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and so \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s} & \leq e^{cW(t) - (\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t} (\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}) \\ & \leq e^{cW(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t} (\|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s}), \quad \forall t \in [0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}). \end{aligned}$$

Define the stopping time

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) \triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0; e^{cW(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t} \geq R \right\}, \quad \forall R > 1.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) > 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and we get from (4.23) and the conditions on initial data that

$$\|u(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \frac{c^2}{4R\kappa C_1 C_2} R e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t} \leq \frac{c^2}{4\kappa C_1 C_2}, \quad \forall t \in [0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}} \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)].$$

According to the definition of $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$, the above bound shows that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) = \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R).$$

Therefore, we have on $[0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)]$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)]} (\|u(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}} + \|\gamma(t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}}) \leq C_2 \sup_{t \in [0, \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)]} (\|u(t)\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma(t)\|_{H^s}) \leq \frac{c^2}{4\kappa C_1},$$

which implies that $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}} \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)$. Observing from last estimate that the maximal pathwise solution $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ of (4.14) is global in time on the set $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) = \infty\}$, that is, on the set where $\Theta(t) \triangleq e^{cW(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{c^2}{2} - \frac{c^2}{2\kappa})t}$ always stay below R . To make sense the existence of global solution, one have to estimate the probability $\mathbb{P}\{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) = \infty\}$.

First, we have on $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) = \infty\}$

$$0 < \Theta(t) \leq R, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Note that $\Theta(t)$ is a geometric Brownian motion satisfying

$$d\Theta(t) = \left(\frac{c^2}{4} + \frac{c^2}{4\kappa} \right) \Theta(t) dt + c\Theta(t) dW(t).$$

Applying the Ito's formula to $\Theta^\lambda(t)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} d\Theta^\lambda(t) &= \lambda\Theta^{\lambda-1}(t)d\Theta(t) + \frac{\lambda(\lambda-1)}{2}\Theta^{\lambda-2}(t)d\Theta(t)d\Theta(t) \\ (4.24) \quad &= \left[\left(\frac{c^2}{4} + \frac{c^2}{4\kappa} \right) \lambda + \frac{c^2\lambda(\lambda-1)}{2} \right] \Theta^\lambda(t) dt + c\lambda\Theta^\lambda(t) dW(t). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating (4.24) up to $t \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)$ and taking the expectation value, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Theta^\lambda(t \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)) \right] = 1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)} \left[\left(\frac{c^2}{4} + \frac{c^2}{4\kappa} \right) \lambda + \frac{c^2\lambda(\lambda-1)}{2} \right] \Theta^\lambda(t) dt.$$

Choosing $\lambda = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}$ in last identity, it follows that

$$(4.25) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\Theta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}(t \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)) \right] = 1, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Using the continuity of the measures and the fact that $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) \leq \mathfrak{t}$ is increasing in R , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} = \infty\} &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) = \infty\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left\{\bigcap_n (\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) > n)\right\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R) > n\} \\
&\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\Theta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}(n \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)) < R^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}\} \\
&\geq 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\Theta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}(n \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R)) \geq R^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}\} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{1}{R^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\Theta^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}(n \wedge \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}(R))\right] \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{R^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality used the Chebyshev inequality, and the final limit used the identity (4.25) with $t = n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.7. \square

4.3. Blow-up phenomena. In this subsection, we prove that, if $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$ and $d = 1$, then the strong pathwise solutions to the SMCH2 system will blow up in finite time with some shape condition on initial data. In present case, the system (4.14) reduces to the following one dimensional random PDEs:

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star (\tilde{u}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{u}_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\gamma}^2 - \tilde{\gamma}_x^2) = 0, \\ \partial_t \tilde{\gamma} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{\gamma}_x + \mu^{-1} G \star ((\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x)_x + \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}) = 0, \\ \tilde{u}|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \tilde{\gamma}|_{t=0} = \gamma_0, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

The following lemma tells us that the solutions to (4.26) are H^1 -conserved.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $0 \neq c \in \mathbb{R}$, and (u_0, γ_0) is a \mathbb{H}^s -valued \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial data in $L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^d))$. Let $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ be the maximum local strong solution to the system (). Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
E(t) &\triangleq \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\tilde{u}^2(t) + (\partial_x \tilde{u})^2(t) + \tilde{\gamma}^2(t) + (\partial_x \tilde{\gamma})^2(t)) \, dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}} (u_0^2 + (\partial_x u_0)^2 + \gamma_0^2 + (\partial_x \gamma_0)^2) \, dx = E(0), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$. Moreover, we have for all $t \geq 0$

$$\|u(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\gamma(t)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \|\gamma_0\|_{H^1}^2), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Remark. Note that, by Sobolev embedding theorem, the L^∞ -bound in Lemma 4.1 only holds for $d = 1$, even though the H^1 -conservation also holds for $d \geq 1$. This limitation prevent us from extending the Theorem 1.8 to high dimensions (cf. (4.34) below).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. By using a density argument, it is sufficient to prove Lemma 4.1 in the case of $s > 3$. Differentiating the equation in (4.26) with respect to x and using the identity $\partial_x^2 G \star h = G \star h - h$ for all $h \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$, we get

$$\partial_t \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_{xx} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x^2 + \mu^{-1} G \star f = \mu^{-1} f, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and

$$\partial_t \tilde{\gamma}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{\gamma}_{xx} + \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star g = 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where $f = (\tilde{u}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{u}_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\gamma}^2 - \tilde{\gamma}_x^2)$ and $g = (\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x)_x + \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}$. Using previous equations and integrating by parts on \mathbb{T} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} E(t) &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\tilde{u} \partial_t \tilde{u} + \tilde{u}_x \partial_t \tilde{u}_x + \tilde{\gamma} \partial_t \tilde{\gamma} + \tilde{\gamma}_x \partial_t \tilde{\gamma}_x) dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\tilde{u} (-\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_x - \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star f) + \tilde{u}_x (-\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_{xx} - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x^2 - \mu^{-1} G \star f + \mu^{-1} f) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{\gamma} (-\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{\gamma}_x - \mu^{-1} G \star g) + \tilde{\gamma}_x (-\mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{\gamma}_{xx} - \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star g) \right) dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(-\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \partial_x G \star f - \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x^3 - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x G \star f + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x f \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}^2 - \mu^{-1} \tilde{\gamma} G \star g - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x^2 - \mu^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}_x \partial_x G \star g \right) dx \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}^2 + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x f - \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x^2 - \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x^3 - \mu^{-1} \tilde{\gamma} g \right) dx = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired identity. The L^∞ -estimate follows from the embedding $H^1(\mathbb{T}) \subset L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, and this completes the proof of Lemma 4.1. \square

Considering the random characteristic flow

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d\Phi(\omega, t, x)}{dt} = \mu^{-1}(t) \tilde{u}(\omega, t, \Phi(t, x)), & t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \\ \Phi(\omega, 0, x) = x, \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $s \geq 3$, and $(u_0, \gamma_0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}^s(\mathbb{T}))$ be a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial data. Assume that $(u, \gamma, \mathfrak{t})$ is the associated local pathwise solution of (4.26). Then*

- *Eq.(4.27) has a unique solution $\Phi \in C^1([0, \mathfrak{t}] \times \mathbb{T})$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely. For a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, the map $\Phi(\omega, t, \cdot) : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is an increasing diffeomorphism of \mathbb{T} , and*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\Phi_x(\omega, t, x) > 0, \forall (t, x) \in [0, \mathfrak{t}] \times \mathbb{T}\} = 1,$$

Moreover, for all $(t, x) \in [0, \mathfrak{t}] \times \mathbb{T}$,

$$\tilde{\rho}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \Phi_x(\omega, t, x) = \rho_0(x), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

- *If there exists a $M > 0$ such that $u_x(t, x) \geq -M$ for all $(t, x) \in [0, \mathfrak{t}] \times \mathbb{T}$, then*

$$\|\tilde{\rho}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{Mt} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty},$$

for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}]$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

Proof. For fixed $x \in \mathbb{T}$, Eq.(4.27) is a random ODE. For a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, the generator $\mu^{-1}\tilde{u}$ is bounded and Lipschitz continuous in x . Then one can conclude from the classical theory for ODEs that Eq.(4.27) has a unique solution $\Phi(\omega, t, x) \in C^1([0, \tau) \times \mathbb{T})$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely.

Differentiating (4.27) with respect to x , we get for a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$(4.28) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d\Phi_x(\omega, t, x)}{dt} = \mu^{-1}(\omega, t)u_x(\omega, t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\Phi_x(\omega, t, x), \\ \Phi_x(\omega, 0, x) = 1, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d,$$

which implies that

$$\Phi_x(\omega, t, x) = e^{\int_0^t \mu^{-1}(\omega, s)u_x(\omega, s, \Phi(\omega, s, x))ds} > 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence, the function $\Phi(\omega, t, x)$ is an increasing diffeomorphism of \mathbb{T} before blow-up \mathbb{P} -almost surely. For a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, we get from (4.26), (4.28) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}(\tilde{\rho}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\Phi_x(\omega, t, x)) \\ &= (\partial_t \tilde{\rho})(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\Phi_x(\omega, t, x) + \tilde{\rho}_x(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\Phi_x(\omega, t, x)\Phi_t(\omega, t, x) \\ & \quad + \tilde{\rho}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\Phi_{xt}(\omega, t, x) \\ &= \left(-\mu^{-1}(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{u})_x(\omega, t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) + \mu^{-1}\tilde{\rho}_x(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\tilde{u}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mu^{-1}\tilde{\rho}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))\tilde{u}_x(\omega, t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \right)\Phi_x(\omega, t, x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating above equation leads to the desired identity. By using the iterated logarithm $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(t)}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}} = 1$, we get

$$\sup_{t>0} \mu^{-1}(\omega, t) = \sup_{t>0} e^{cW(t) - \frac{c^2}{2}t} \leq C < \infty, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Thereby,

$$\|\tilde{\rho}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} = \|\tilde{\rho}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, \cdot))\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{-\int_0^t \mu^{-1}(\omega, r)u_x(\omega, r, \Phi(r, x))dr} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{Mt} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

Based on above lemmas, we can now give the proof of the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The proof of Theorem 1.8 will be divided into several steps.

Step 1: We show that for any $s > \frac{3}{2}$

$$(4.29) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} u_x(t, x) = -\infty\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty\}}\right) = 1,$$

which combined with Theorem 1.3(1) yield that the singularities of the solutions can occur only in the form of wave breaking.

The Sobolev embedding theorem implies $\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} u_x(t, x) = -\infty\} \subseteq \{\lim_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty\}$. Conversely, we will prove

$$A \triangleq \left\{ \lim_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \|\mathbf{y}(t)\|_{H^s} = \infty \right\}^C \supseteq B \triangleq \left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} u_x(t, x) = -\infty \right\}^C.$$

Notice that the event B happens if and only if there exists a positive constant $M = M(\omega) > 0$ such that $\tilde{u}_x(t, x) \geq -M$, for all $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{T}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$\|\tilde{\rho}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{Mt} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \text{on } B.$$

In order to prove $B \subseteq A$, we shall utilize another equivalent form of the system (4.26):

$$(4.30) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{m} + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{m}_x + 2\mu^{-1} \tilde{m} \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\rho}_x = 0, \\ \partial_t \tilde{\rho} + \mu^{-1} (\tilde{\rho} \tilde{u})_x = 0, \\ \tilde{\rho} = (1 - \partial_x^2) (\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0) \\ \tilde{m}|_{t=0} = (1 - \partial_x^2) u_0, \quad \tilde{\rho}|_{t=0} = (1 - \partial_x^2) \gamma_0, \end{cases} \quad t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d.$$

where $\tilde{m} = (1 - \partial_x^2) \tilde{u}$, $\tilde{\rho} = (1 - \partial_x^2) \tilde{\gamma}$. Multiplying (4.30)₁ by \tilde{m} and integrating on \mathbb{T} , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{m}^2 dx &= - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{m} (\mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{m}_x + 2\mu^{-1} \tilde{m} \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\rho}_x) dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{3}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{m}^2 \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{m} \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\rho}_x \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same procedure to Eq.(4.30)₂, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{\rho}^2 dx = - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\rho}^2 dx.$$

Thereby we arrive at

$$(4.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\tilde{m}^2 + \tilde{\rho}^2) dx &= - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{3}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{m}^2 \tilde{u}_x + \mu^{-1} \tilde{m} \tilde{\rho} \tilde{\rho}_x \right) dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\rho}^2 dx \\ &\leq \frac{3M}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\mu^{-1} \tilde{m}^2 + \mu^{-1} \tilde{\rho}^2) dx + \|\bar{\rho}_x\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mu^{-1} \tilde{m} \tilde{\rho} dx, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, it follows from the formulation (4.30)₃ that

$$\|\bar{\rho}_x\|_{L^\infty} = \|(\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_0)_x\|_{L^\infty} = \|(1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \partial_x \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^\infty} = \|\tilde{\gamma}_x(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Moreover, by using the identity $\partial_x G \star f = G \star f - f$, the equation for $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ (cf. proof of Lemma 4.1), the H^1 -conservation law as well as the fact that Φ is an increasing diffeomorphism of \mathbb{T} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d\tilde{\gamma}_x(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x))}{dt} \right| &= \left| \tilde{\gamma}_{xt}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) + \mu^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}_{xx}(t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) u(\omega, t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| [\mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x + \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star ((\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x)_x + \tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma})](t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| [\mu^{-1} G \star (\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x) + \mu^{-1} \partial_x G \star (\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma})](t, \Phi(\omega, t, x)) \right| \\ &\leq \mu^{-1} (\|G\|_{L^\infty} + \|G_x\|_{L^\infty}) (\|\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}_x\|_{L^1} + \|\tilde{u}_x \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^1}) \\ &\leq CE^2(0), \quad \text{on } B, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(4.32) \quad \|\tilde{\gamma}_x(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty} = \|\tilde{\gamma}_x(t, \Phi(\omega, t, \cdot))\|_{L^\infty} \leq CE^2(0)t + \|\gamma_{0,x}\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \text{on } B.$$

Thereby, we get from (4.31)-(4.32) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\tilde{m}^2 + \tilde{\rho}^2) dx \leq C(E^2(0)t + \|\gamma_{0,x}\|_{L^\infty} + M) \int_{\mathbb{T}} (\tilde{m}^2 + \tilde{\rho}^2) dx, \quad \text{on } B.$$

An application of the Gronwall inequality yields that the solution $\|(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})(t)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} < \infty$ on B , for any $t > 0$, which shows that $B \subseteq A$. Hence, $A = B$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. This proves (4.29).

Step 2: Define the quantity

$$H(\omega, t) \triangleq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \tilde{u}_x(\omega, t, x).$$

Theorem 1.3 implies that the first component of the solution $\tilde{u} \in C^1([0, \mathfrak{t}); H^2(\mathbb{T}))$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely for $s > 3$, it follows from Constantin's theorem (cf. Theorem 2.1 in [20]) that, for almost $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a point $\xi(\omega, t) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H(\omega, t) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \tilde{u}_x(\omega, t, x) = \tilde{u}_x(\omega, t, \xi(\omega, t)), \quad \tilde{u}_{xx}(\omega, t, \xi(\omega, t)) = 0.$$

Moreover, the function $H(\omega, t)$ is absolutely continuous in t \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and

$$(4.33) \quad \frac{d}{dt} H(\omega, t) = \tilde{u}_{xt}(\omega, t, \xi(\omega, t)), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Thanks to the facts of

$$\mu^{-1}(t) > 0, \quad G \star f(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{if } f \geq 0,$$

we get from (4.33) and the estimate $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|f\|_{H^1}$ that

$$(4.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} H(t) &= (\mu^{-1} f - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u} \tilde{u}_{xx} - \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}_x^2 - \mu^{-1} G \star f)(t, \xi(t)) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} H^2(t) + \mu^{-1} \tilde{u}^2(t, \xi(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}^2(t, \xi(t)) + \mu^{-1} G \star (\tilde{\gamma}_x^2)(t, \xi(t)) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} H^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \|\tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{4} \mu^{-1} \|\tilde{\gamma}(t, \cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} \|\tilde{\gamma}_x(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} H^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{-1} E(0), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t})$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely. From the assumption $H(0) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} (\partial_x u)(x) \leq (\partial_x u)(x_0) \leq -\sqrt{E(0)}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, one can deduce that

$$(4.35) \quad H(t) \leq -\sqrt{E(0)}, \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Otherwise, we define

$$\mathfrak{t}' \triangleq \inf \left\{ t \geq 0; H(\omega, t) > -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{E(0)} \right\} \wedge \mathfrak{t}.$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t}' > 0\} = 1$. By (4.33), there is an event $\Omega' \in \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega') = 1$ such that $H(\omega', t)$ is absolutely continuous for all $\omega' \in \Omega'$. If $\mathfrak{t}' = \mathfrak{t}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely does not hold, then there must be a subset $\Omega'' \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega'') > 0$ such that $0 < \mathfrak{t}'(\omega'') < \mathfrak{t}(\omega'')$ for all $\omega'' \in \Omega''$.

For any $\omega''' \in \Omega' \cap \Omega''$, we get from the continuity of $H(t)$ that $H(\omega''', \mathfrak{t}'(\omega''')) = -\sqrt{E(0)}$. However, in view of (4.34), we get by using again the continuity of $H(t)$ that

$$\frac{d}{dt}H(\omega''', t) < 0, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}'(\omega''')],$$

which implies

$$H(\omega''', \mathfrak{t}'(\omega''')) < -\sqrt{E(0)}.$$

This is a contradiction, so $\mathfrak{t}' = \mathfrak{t}$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and (4.35) holds.

Since $H(t) < H(0) < -\sqrt{E(0)} < 0$ for all $t \in [0, \mathfrak{t})$, we have

$$0 < \frac{H(0)}{H(t)} < 1, \quad 0 < \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} < 1, \quad \forall t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

It then follows from (4.34) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{H(t)} &= \frac{1}{H^2(t)} \frac{d}{dt} H(t) \leq -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1} + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1} \frac{E(0)}{H^2(t)} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1} + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1} \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \frac{H^2(0)}{H^2(t)} \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2}\mu^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right), \quad \forall t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the last inequality leads to

$$(4.36) \quad -\frac{1}{H(0)} \geq \frac{1}{H(t)} - \frac{1}{H(0)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right) \int_0^t e^{cW(r) - \frac{1}{2}c^2r} dr, \quad \forall t \in [0, \mathfrak{t}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

For any given $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $c \neq 0$, define

$$\Omega_\lambda \triangleq \left\{ \omega; e^{cW(t) - \frac{3}{8}c^2t} \geq \lambda e^{-\frac{3}{8}c^2t} \text{ for all } t \right\}.$$

It follows from (4.36) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{H(0)} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right) \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}} e^{cW(r) - \frac{3}{8}c^2r} e^{-\frac{1}{8}c^2r} dr \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right) \int_0^{\mathfrak{t}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}c^2r} dr \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{c^2} (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}c^2\mathfrak{t}}) \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right), \quad \text{on } \Omega_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\mathfrak{t}(\omega) = \infty$ on some subset $\Omega'_\lambda \subset \Omega_\lambda$ with positive probability, we deduce from the last inequality that

$$(4.37) \quad \frac{1}{H(0)} + \frac{\lambda}{c^2} \left(1 - \frac{E(0)}{H^2(0)} \right) \leq 0, \quad \text{on } \Omega'_\lambda.$$

Notice that

$$\varsigma_1 = \frac{-c^2 + \sqrt{c^4 + 4\lambda^2 E(0)}}{2\lambda} > 0, \quad \varsigma_2 = \frac{-c^2 - \sqrt{c^4 + 4\lambda^2 E(0)}}{2\lambda} < 0,$$

are two real roots to the quadratic equation $\lambda x^2 + c^2 x - \lambda E(0) = 0$. Hence if $H(0) \leq (\partial_x u_0)(x_0) < \varsigma_2$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely, then $\lambda H^2(0) + c^2 H(0) - \lambda E(0) > 0$ on Ω'_λ , which contradicts to (4.37), and this shows that $\mathfrak{t}(\omega) < \infty$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega_\lambda$, i.e., $\Omega_\lambda \subseteq \{\mathfrak{t} < \infty\}$. Thereby, we get from $\Omega_\lambda \supset \{e^{cW(t)} \geq \lambda \text{ for all } t\}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathfrak{t} < \infty\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{e^{cW(t)} \geq \lambda \text{ for all } t\} > 0,$$

which combined with (4.29) yield that the solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\gamma})$ breaks in finite time with positive probability. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.8. \square

5. APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 2.8. We only prove the estimate (2.38), and the proof of (2.36) is similar. It follows from the definition of $F(\mathbf{y})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(\mathbf{y}_1) - F(\mathbf{y}_2)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} &\leq \|\mathcal{L}_1(u_1) - \mathcal{L}_1(u_2)\|_{H^s} + \|\mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_1) - \mathcal{L}_2(\gamma_2)\|_{H^s} \\ (5.1) \quad &\quad + \|\mathcal{L}_3(u_1, \gamma_1) - \mathcal{L}_3(u_2, \gamma_2)\|_{H^s} \\ &\triangleq A_1 + A_2 + A_3. \end{aligned}$$

For A_1 , by using the Moser-type estimate (cf. Lemma 2.2), and the embedding $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow H^{s-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $s-1 > \frac{d}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{2} (|\nabla u_1|^2 - |\nabla u_2|^2) \mathbf{I}_d + \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \nabla u_1 + \nabla u_2 \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \right. \\ &\quad + \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \nabla u_1^T + \nabla u_2 \nabla(u_1 - u_2)^T + \nabla(u_2 - u_1)^T \nabla u_2 \\ &\quad - \nabla u_1^T \nabla(u_2 - u_1) + \operatorname{div}(u_2 - u_1) \nabla u_2 + (\operatorname{div} u_1) \nabla(u_2 - u_1) \Big\|_{H^{s-1}} \\ &\quad + \|(\operatorname{div} u_1 - \operatorname{div} u_2) u_1 + (\operatorname{div} u_2)(u_1 - u_2) \\ &\quad + (u_1 - u_2) \cdot \nabla u_1^T + u_2 \cdot \nabla(u_1 - u_2)^T\|_{H^{s-2}} \\ (5.2) \quad &\leq C \left(\|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{L^\infty} (\|\nabla u_1\|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\ &\quad + \|\nabla u_2\|_{H^{s-1}}) + \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} (\|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u_2\|_{L^\infty}) \\ &\quad + \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} \|u_1\|_{L^\infty} + \|u_1\|_{H^s} \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + (\|\nabla u_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla u_2\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\infty} + (\|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla u_2\|_{L^\infty}) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\ &\leq C (\|\nabla u_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla u_2\|_{H^{s-1}}) \|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^s}. \end{aligned}$$

For A_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.3) \quad A_2 &\leq C \left(\|(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \| |\nabla\gamma_1|^2 - |\nabla\gamma_2|^2 \|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|(\nabla\gamma_1)^T \nabla\gamma_1 - (\nabla\gamma_2)^T \nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\|\gamma_1 + \gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\gamma_1 + \gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\
&\quad + \|\nabla\gamma_1 + \nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla\gamma_1 + \nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla\gamma_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla\gamma_1\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad \left. + \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla\gamma_1 - \nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \right) \\
&\leq C(\|\gamma_1\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_2\|_{H^s})\|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{H^s}.
\end{aligned}$$

For A_3 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.4) \quad A_3 &\leq C \left(\|\nabla\gamma_1 \nabla u_1 - \nabla\gamma_2 \nabla u_2 + (\nabla\gamma_1) \cdot \nabla u_1 - (\nabla\gamma_2) \cdot \nabla u_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|(\operatorname{div} u_2) \nabla\gamma_2 - (\operatorname{div} u_1) \nabla\gamma_1\|_{H^{s-2}} \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\|\nabla(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u_1\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla u_1\|_{L^\infty} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \|\nabla\gamma_2\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\nabla\gamma_2\|_{H^{s-1}} \|\nabla(u_1 - u_2)\|_{L^\infty} \right) \\
&\leq C(\|u_1\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_2\|_{H^s})(\|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{H^s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the estimates (5.2)-(5.4) into (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F(\mathbf{y}_1) - F(\mathbf{y}_2)\|_{\mathbb{H}^s} &\leq C(\|u_1\|_{H^s} + \|u_2\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_1\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_2\|_{H^s}) \\
&\quad \times (\|u_1 - u_2\|_{H^s} + \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\|_{H^s}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired inequality. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8. \square

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is deeply indebted to Prof. Darryl D. Holm for sharing insights in background of the modified two-component Camassa-Holm system. We also owe our gratitude to Prof. Hao Tang for helpful comments on the first version of this manuscript. This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Projects # 11701198), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Projects # 5003011025).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alonso-Orán and A. Bethencourt de León, *On the well-posedness of stochastic boussinesq equations with transport noise*, Journal of Nonlinear Science **30** (2020), no. 1, 175–224.
- [2] D. Alonso-Orán, C. Rohde, and H. Tang, *A local-in-time theory for singular sdes with applications to fluid models with transport noise*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09972 (2020).
- [3] H. Bahouri, J.-Y. Chemin, and R. Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Vol. 343, Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.

- [4] L.A. Bianchi and F. Flandoli, *Stochastic navier-stokes equations and related models*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00491 (2020).
- [5] F. Boyer and P. Fabrie, *Mathematical tools for the study of the incompressible navier-stokes equations and related models*, Vol. 183, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [6] L. Brandolese, *Local-in-space criteria for blowup in shallow water and dispersive rod equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **330** (2014), no. 1, 401–414.
- [7] L. Brandolese and M. Cortez, *On permanent and breaking waves in hyperelastic rods and rings*, Journal of Functional Analysis **266** (2014), no. 12, 6954–6987.
- [8] D. Breit, E. Feireisl, and M. Hofmanová, *Incompressible limit for compressible fluids with stochastic forcing*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **222** (2016), no. 2, 895–926.
- [9] ———, *Compressible fluids driven by stochastic forcing: The relative energy inequality and applications*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **350** (2017), no. 2, 443–473.
- [10] ———, *Local strong solutions to the stochastic compressible navier–stokes system*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **43** (2018), no. 2, 313–345.
- [11] ———, *Stochastically forced compressible fluid flows*, De Gruyter, 2018.
- [12] D. Breit, E. Feireisl, M. Hofmanová, and B. Masłowski, *Stationary solutions to the compressible navier–stokes system driven by stochastic forces*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **174** (2019), no. 3, 981–1032.
- [13] Z. Brzeźniak, G. Dhariwal, and Q.T. Le Gia, *Stochastic navier–stokes equations on a thin spherical domain*, Applied Mathematics & Optimization (2020), 1–65.
- [14] Z. Brzeźniak, E. Hausenblas, and J. Zhu, *2d stochastic navier–stokes equations driven by jump noise*, Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications **79** (2013), 122–139.
- [15] Z. Brzeźniak, E. Motyl, M. Ondřejat, et al., *Invariant measure for the stochastic navier–stokes equations in unbounded 2d domains*, The Annals of Probability **45** (2017), no. 5, 3145–3201.
- [16] R. Camassa and D.D. Holm, *An integrable shallow water equation with peaked solitons*, Physical Review Letters **71** (1993), no. 11, 1661.
- [17] D. Chae and J. Liu, *Blow-up, zero α limit and the liouville type theorem for the euler–poincaré equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **314** (2012), no. 3, 671–687.
- [18] M. Chen and Y. Zhang, *A two-component generalization of the camassa–holm equation and its solutions*, Letters in Mathematical Physics **75** (2006), no. 1, 1–15.
- [19] A. Constantin, *On the blow-up of solutions of a periodic shallow water equation*, Journal of Nonlinear Science **10** (2000), no. 3, 391–399.
- [20] A. Constantin and J. Escher, *Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations*, Acta Mathematica **181** (1998), no. 2, 229–243.
- [21] ———, *On the blow-up rate and the blow-up set of breaking waves for a shallow water equation*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **233** (2000), no. 1, 75–91.
- [22] A. Constantin and R. Ivanov, *On an integrable two-component camassa–holm shallow water system*, Physics Letters A **372** (2008), no. 48, 7129–7132.
- [23] A. Constantin and W.A. Strauss, *Stability of peakons*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **53** (2000), no. 5, 603–610.
- [24] D. Crisan and D.D. Holm, *Wave breaking for the stochastic camassa–holm equation*, Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena **376** (2018), 138–143.
- [25] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [26] H-H. Dai, *Model equations for nonlinear dispersive waves in a compressible mooney–rivlin rod*, Acta Mechanica **127** (1998), no. 1, 193–207.
- [27] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche, *On the stochastic korteweg–de vries equation*, Journal of Functional Analysis **154** (1998), no. 1, 215–251.

- [28] Z. Dong, J. Xiong, J. Zhai, and T. Zhang, *A moderate deviation principle for 2-d stochastic navier–stokes equations driven by multiplicative lévy noises*, Journal of Functional Analysis **272** (2017), no. 1, 227–254.
- [29] L. Du and T. Zhang, *Local and global existence of pathwise solution for the stochastic boussinesq equations with multiplicative noises*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **130** (2020), no. 3, 1545–1567.
- [30] R. Duan and Z. Xiang, *On the cauchy problem for the two-component euler–poincare equations*, Journal of Functional Analysis **267** (2014), no. 8, 2698–2730.
- [31] D. Ebin and J. Marsden, *Groups of diffeomorphisms and the motion of an incompressible fluid*, Annals of Mathematics (1970), 102–163.
- [32] K. El Dika and L. Molinet, *Stability of multipeakons*, Annales de l’ihp analyse non linéaire, 2009, pp. 1517–1532.
- [33] G. Falqui, *On a camassa–holm type equation with two dependent variables*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **39** (2005), no. 2, 327.
- [34] E. Fedrizzi and F. Flandoli, *Noise prevents singularities in linear transport equations*, Journal of Functional Analysis **264** (2013), no. 6, 1329–1354.
- [35] F. Flandoli and D. Gatarek, *Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic navier–stokes equations*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **102** (1995), no. 3, 367–391.
- [36] F. Flandoli, M. Gubinelli, and E. Priola, *Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation*, Inventiones mathematicae **180** (2010), no. 1, 1–53.
- [37] C. Gardner, J. Greene, M. Kruskal, and R. Miura, *Method for solving the korteweg–devries equation*, Physical review letters **19** (1967), no. 19, 1095.
- [38] N.E. Glatt-Holtz, V.C. Vicol, et al., *Local and global existence of smooth solutions for the stochastic euler equations with multiplicative noise*, The Annals of Probability **42** (2014), no. 1, 80–145.
- [39] L. Grafakos and S. Oh, *The kato–ponce inequality*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **39** (2014), no. 6, 1128–1157.
- [40] K. Grunert, H. Holden, and X. Raynaud, *Global solutions for the two-component camassa–holm system*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **37** (2012), no. 12, 2245–2271.
- [41] C. Guan, K.H. Karlsen, and Z. Yin, *Well-posedness and blow-up phenomena for a modified two-component camassa–holm equation*, Contemp. Math **526** (2010), 199–220.
- [42] C. Guan and Z. Yin, *Global existence and blow-up phenomena for an integrable two-component camassa–holm shallow water system*, Journal of Differential Equations **248** (2010), no. 8, 2003–2014.
- [43] ———, *Global weak solutions for a two-component camassa–holm shallow water system*, Journal of Functional Analysis **260** (2011), no. 4, 1132–1154.
- [44] G. Gui and Y. Liu, *On the global existence and wave-breaking criteria for the two-component camassa–holm system*, Journal of Functional Analysis **258** (2010), no. 12, 4251–4278.
- [45] ———, *On the cauchy problem for the two-component camassa–holm system*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **268** (2011), no. 1-2, 45–66.
- [46] Z. Guo and M. Zhu, *Wave breaking for a modified two-component camassa–holm system*, Journal of Differential Equations **252** (2012), no. 3, 2759–2770.
- [47] I. Gyöngy and N. Krylov, *Existence of strong solutions for itô’s stochastic equations via approximations*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **105** (1996), no. 2, 143–158.
- [48] M. Hairer and J.C. Mattingly, *Ergodicity of the 2d navier–stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing*, Annals of Mathematics (2006), 993–1032.
- [49] ———, *Spectral gaps in wasserstein distances and the 2d stochastic navier–stokes equations*, Annals of Probability **36** (2008), no. 6, 2050–2091.
- [50] A.A. Himonas and G. Misiolek, *Non-uniform dependence on initial data of solutions to the euler equations of hydrodynamics*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **296** (2010), no. 1, 285–301.

- [51] A. Hirani, J. Marsden, and J. Arvo, *Averaged template matching equations*, International workshop on energy minimization methods in computer vision and pattern recognition, 2001, pp. 528–543.
- [52] M. Hofmanová, *Degenerate parabolic stochastic partial differential equations*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **123** (2013), no. 12, 4294–4336.
- [53] D.D. Holm, *Variational principles for stochastic fluid dynamics*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **471** (2015), no. 2176, 20140963.
- [54] D.D. Holm and J. Marsden, *Momentum maps and measure-valued solutions (peakons, filaments, and sheets) for the epdiff equation*, The breadth of symplectic and poisson geometry, 2005, pp. 203–235.
- [55] D.D. Holm, J. Marsden, and T. Ratiu, *The euler–poincaré equations and semidirect products with applications to continuum theories*, Advances in Mathematics **137** (1998), no. 1, 1–81.
- [56] ———, *Euler–poincaré models of ideal fluids with nonlinear dispersion*, Physical Review Letters **80** (1998), no. 19, 4173.
- [57] D.D. Holm, L. Náraigh, and C. Tronci, *Singular solutions of a modified two-component camassa-holm equation*, Physical Review E **79** (2009), no. 1, 016601.
- [58] D.D. Holm, J. Ratnanather, A. Trouvé, and L. Younes, *Soliton dynamics in computational anatomy*, NeuroImage **23** (2004), S170–S178.
- [59] D.D. Holm, T. Schmah, and C. Stoica, *Geometric mechanics and symmetry: from finite to infinite dimensions*, Vol. 12, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [60] D.D. Holm and C. Tronci, *Geodesic flows on semidirect-product lie groups: geometry of singular measure-valued solutions*, Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **465** (2009), no. 2102, 457–476.
- [61] R.S. Johnson, *Camassa-Holm, Korteweg-de Vries and related models for water waves*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics **455** (2002), 63–82.
- [62] T. Kato and G. Ponce, *Commutator estimates and the euler and navier-stokes equations*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **41** (1988), no. 7, 891–907.
- [63] B. Khesin and R. Wendt, *The geometry of infinite-dimensional groups*, Vol. 51, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [64] M. Kohlmann, *A note on multi-dimensional camassa-holm-type systems on the torus*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **45** (2012), no. 12, 125205.
- [65] J. Lenells, *Stability of periodic peakons.*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2004** (2004), no. 10.
- [66] D. Li, X. Yu, and Z. Zhai, *On the euler–poincare equation with non-zero dispersion*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **210** (2013), no. 3, 955–974.
- [67] J. Li, L. Dai, and W. Zhu, *Non-uniform continuous dependence on initial data of solutions to the euler-poincaré system*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **60** (2019), no. 11, 111510.
- [68] J. Li and Z. Yin, *Well-posedness and analytic solutions of the two-component euler–poincaré system*, Monatshefte für Mathematik **183** (2017), no. 3, 509–537.
- [69] D. Luo, *Convergence of stochastic 2d inviscid boussinesq equations with transport noise to a deterministic viscous system*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.01434 (2020).
- [70] W. Luo and Z. Yin, *Blow-up phenomena, ill-posedness and peakon solutions for the periodic euler-poincaré equations*, Journal of Differential Equations **268** (2020), no. 4, 1307–1325.
- [71] J. Marsden and T. Ratiu, *Introduction to mechanics and symmetry: a basic exposition of classical mechanical systems*, Vol. 17, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [72] Y. Miao, C. Rohde, and H. Tang, *Well-posedness for a stochastic camassa-holm type equation with higher order nonlinearities*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08607 (2021).
- [73] J. Miles, *The korteweg-de vries equation: a historical essay*, Journal of fluid mechanics **106** (1981), 131–147.

- [74] P. Ren, H. Tang, and F.-Y. Wang, *Distribution-path dependent nonlinear spdes with application to stochastic transport type equations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09188 (2020).
- [75] C. Rohde and H. Tang, *On a stochastic camassa–holm type equation with higher order nonlinearities*, *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations* (2020), 1–30.
- [76] ———, *On the stochastic dullin–gottwald–holm equation: global existence and wave-breaking phenomena*, *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications NoDEA* **28** (2021), no. 1, 1–34.
- [77] W. Tan and Z. Yin, *Global periodic conservative solutions of a periodic modified two-component camassa–holm equation*, *Journal of Functional Analysis* **261** (2011), no. 5, 1204–1226.
- [78] H. Tang, *On the pathwise solutions to the camassa–holm equation with multiplicative noise*, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **50** (2018), no. 1, 1322–1366.
- [79] ———, *Noise effects on dependence on initial data and blow-up for stochastic euler–poincaré equations*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08719 (2020).
- [80] M. Taylor, *Commutator estimates*, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **131** (2003), no. 5, 1501–1507.
- [81] R. Temam, *On the euler equations of incompressible perfect fluids*, *Journal of Functional Analysis* **20** (1975), 32–43.
- [82] A.R. Visram, *Asymptotic limit analysis for numerical models of atmospheric frontogenesis*, Ph.D. Thesis, 2014.
- [83] B. Wang, *Weak pullback attractors for stochastic navier–stokes equations with nonlinear diffusion terms*, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **147** (2019), no. 4, 1627–1638.
- [84] K. Yan, *On the modified multi-component camassa–holm system in higher dimensions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.00671 (2016).
- [85] K. Yan and Z. Yin, *On the initial value problem for higher dimensional camassa–holm equations*, *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems* **35** (2015), no. 3, 1327.
- [86] L. Younes, *Shapes and diffeomorphisms*, Vol. 171, Springer, 2010.
- [87] L. Zhang, *Local and global pathwise solutions for a stochastically perturbed nonlinear dispersive pde*, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **130** (2020), no. 10, 6319–6363.
- [88] L. Zhang, Y. Shi, C. Hu, W. Wang, and B. Liu, *The influence of stochastic forcing on strong solutions to the incompressible slice model in 2d bounded domain*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00913 (2020).
- [89] Y. Zhao, M. Yang, and Y. Li, *Non-uniform dependence for the periodic higher dimensional camassa–holm equations*, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **461** (2018), no. 1, 59–73.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HUBEI KEY LABORATORY OF ENGINEERING MODELING AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, HUAZHONG UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WUHAN 430074, HUBEI, P.R. CHINA.

Email address: lei_zhang@hust.edu.cn