

# AN ADAPTIVE TIME-STEPPING FULL DISCRETIZATION FOR STOCHASTIC ALLEN–CAHN EQUATION

CHUCHU CHEN, TONGHE DANG, JIALIN HONG

ABSTRACT. It is known in [1] that a regular explicit Euler-type scheme with a uniform timestep, though computationally efficient, may diverge for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. To overcome the divergence, this paper proposes an adaptive time-stepping full discretization, whose spatial discretization is based on the spectral Galerkin method, and temporal direction is the adaptive exponential integrator scheme. It is proved that the expected number of timesteps is finite if the adaptive timestep function is bounded suitably. Based on the stability analysis in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ -norm of the numerical solution, it is shown that the strong convergence order of this adaptive time-stepping full discretization is the same as usual, i.e., order  $\beta$  in space and  $\frac{\beta}{2}$  in time under the correlation assumption  $\|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} < \infty, 0 < \beta \leq 1$  on the noise. Numerical experiments are presented to support the theoretical results.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Numerical approximations for stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) with globally Lipschitz coefficients have been studied in recent decades (see e.g., [8], [9], [10], [17], [19], [29], [31] and references therein). In contrast, numerical analysis of SPDEs with non-globally Lipschitz coefficients, for example the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation, has been considered (see e.g., [2], [4], [5], [11], [12], [15], [18], [21], [24], [25], [27], [30] and references therein) and is still not fully understood. It is pointed out in [1] that the explicit, the exponential and the linear-implicit Euler-type methods given by the uniform timestep fail to converge for SPDEs with superlinearly growing coefficients. Implicit methods like fully drift-implicit method (see [21]) can be strongly convergent in this setting, while their implementation requires solving an algebraic equation at each iteration step, which needs additional computational effort. These reasons have led to the research on the construction of explicit methods that ensure strong convergence under non-globally Lipschitz coefficients, see for instance [5] [30] and [2] [18] for the analysis of the tamed and truncated methods, respectively. The present work makes further contributions on the numerical study of an explicit, adaptive time-stepping full discretization for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation.

Let  $\mathcal{O} := [0, 1]$ , and  $H := L^2(\mathcal{O})$  endowed with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . In this paper, we mainly focus on the following stochastic Allen–Cahn equation driven by additive noise:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) + AX(t)dt = F(X(t))dt + dW(t), & t \in (0, T], \\ X(0) = X_0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $-A := \Delta : \text{Dom}(A) \subset H \rightarrow H$  is the Laplacian operator with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. The stochastic process  $\{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  is a generalized  $Q$ -Wiener process

---

*Key words and phrases.* Stochastic Allen–Cahn equation · Adaptive time-stepping · Full discretization · Strong convergence.

This work is funded by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11971470, No. 11871068, No. 12031020, No. 12022118), and by Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS.

on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ , whose precise assumptions are given in Assumption 2. The drift coefficient  $F$  is the Nemytskii operator satisfying Assumption 1. The stochastic Allen–Cahn equation (1) models the effect of thermal perturbations and simulates rare events in infinite-dimensional stochastic systems (see [3] [4]).

The adaptive time-stepping scheme, which adapts the timestep size at each iteration to control the numerical solution from instability, has been deeply studied for stochastic ordinary differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz drift; see e.g., [14], [20], [22], [23] and references therein. Numerically this adaptive scheme is simple to implement and the complexity is similar as that of an Euler scheme, which is a big advantage for high dimensional problems (see [22]). It is pointed out in [14] that such an adaptive scheme can lead to better computational performance for multi-level Monte–Carlo simulations. To our knowledge, there is few work on the study of the adaptive time-stepping scheme for SPDEs. The first attempt to apply the adaptive time-stepping scheme to the simulation of SPDEs is [6], where the strong convergence rate is proved under a polynomial bound on the Fréchet derivative of  $F$  (see [6, Assumption 2.4]). The aim of this paper is to propose an explicit, adaptive time-stepping full discretization for more general SPDEs, including the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation (1), and present the strong convergence analysis.

To be specific, the adaptive time-stepping full discretization for (1), whose spatial discretization is using the spectral Galerkin method, and temporal direction is based on the adaptive exponential integrator scheme, is an explicit numerical scheme with adaptive timesteps. The strong convergence order of this fully discrete scheme is carefully analyzed, which is the same as usual, i.e., order  $\beta$  in space and  $\frac{\beta}{2}$  in time under the correlation assumption  $\|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} < \infty, 0 < \beta \leq 1$  on the noise. It is worthwhile mentioning that proving the strong convergence order of the numerical scheme is challenging. One difficulty is that we should make sure that the adaptive timestep function will not go to zero so that the final time  $T$  can be attained in finite steps. To overcome this difficulty, we give suitable assumptions on the low bound for the adaptive timestep function. Generally, the adaptive timestep function is required to have a uniform low bound, but this can be weakened to an adaptive low bound characterized by  $H$ -norm of the numerical solution for the trace-class noise case. The expected number of timesteps can be obtained by the a priori estimate of the  $H$ -norm of the numerical solution, which is derived by the iterative form of the numerical scheme, combining the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy’s inequality and assumption on the upper bound for the adaptive timestep function. Another difficulty lies in deriving the a priori moment bound in  $E$ -norm ( $E := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ ) for the numerical approximation to SPDEs with super-linearly growing nonlinearity. With regard to this difficulty, we prove  $\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_t^N\|_E^p) < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Omega_t^c} \|X_t^N\|_E^p) < \infty$  respectively, where  $\Omega_t$  is an event depending on the timestep function and the numerical solution before time  $t$ . Meanwhile, the smoothing effect of the analytic semigroup, assumptions on the timestep function and regularity properties of the  $Q$ -Wiener process are fully utilized. The stability of the numerical solution in  $E$ -norm is finally obtained.

Furthermore, since the timestep function sometimes can not be ensured to satisfy the low bound, so we suggest to combine the adaptive and tamed exponential integrator schemes, i.e., when the low bound is invalid for the adaptive timestep function, we will take the tamed exponential integrator scheme instead. For instance, we investigate the adaptive-tamed exponential integrator schemes with the uniform low bound and the adaptive low bound for the adaptive timestep function, respectively. It can be shown that both of them are strongly convergent with order being the same as the adaptive time-stepping full discretization. Moreover, alternative choices of the adaptive timestep function are given in Section 4.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In the next section, some preliminaries are listed. In Section 3, we propose the adaptive time-stepping full discretization, and obtain the a priori estimates and strong convergence order of this full discretization. Section 4 is devoted to the numerical experiments, which verify our theoretical findings.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we give assumptions on  $A$ ,  $F$ ,  $W(t)$  and the initial datum, as well as the well-posedness of (1). In all of the article,  $C$  or  $C(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$  is a constant which may change from one line to another and depends only on its arguments.

Let  $H^s := H^s(\mathcal{O})$  be the usual Sobolev space. Then the domain of the operator  $A$  is  $\text{Dom}(A) := H^2 \cap H_0^1$ , and there is a sequence of real numbers  $\lambda_i = \pi^2 i^2, i \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and an orthonormal basis  $\{e_i(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(i\pi x), x \in (0, 1)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_+}$  such that  $Ae_i = \lambda_i e_i$ . It is known that  $A$  is positive, self-adjoint, densely defined operator on  $H$ , and  $-A$  generates the analytic semigroup  $\{S(t) := e^{-tA}, t \geq 0\}$  on  $H$ . Define the Hilbert space  $\dot{H}^\gamma := \text{Dom}(A^{\frac{\gamma}{2}})$ , equipped with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\gamma := \langle A^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot, A^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \cdot \rangle$  and the norm  $\|\cdot\|_\gamma := \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Denote  $E := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ .

It is well-known that there is a positive constant  $C$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^\gamma S(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} &\leq Ct^{-\gamma}, \quad t > 0, \gamma \geq 0, \\ \|A^{-\rho}(Id - S(t))\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} &\leq Ct^\rho, \quad t > 0, \rho \in [0, 1], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_s^t \|A^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} S(t-r)u\|^2 dr \leq C(t-s)^{1-\gamma} \|u\|^2, \quad u \in H, 0 \leq s \leq t, \gamma \in [0, 1].$$

**Assumption 1.** Let  $F : L^6(\mathcal{O}; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H$  be the Nemytskii operator defined by

$$F(X)(x) = f(X(x)) := a_3 X^3(x) + a_2 X^2(x) + a_1 X(x) + a_0, \quad a_3 < 0, x \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Assume that there exist constants  $L_0, L_1 \in (0, \infty)$  such that for  $X, Y \in E$ , we have

$$\langle X - Y, F(X) - F(Y) \rangle \leq L_0 \|X - Y\|^2, \quad (2)$$

$$\|F(X) - F(Y)\| \leq L_1 (1 + \|X\|_E^2 + \|Y\|_E^2) \|X - Y\|. \quad (3)$$

It can be verified that for  $X \in \dot{H}^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(X)\|_1^2 &= \|A^{\frac{1}{2}} F(X)\|^2 = \int_{\mathcal{O}} |(3a_3 X^2(x) + 2a_2 X(x) + a_1) X'(x)|^2 dx \\ &\leq C(\|X\|_E^4 + 1) \|X\|_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

We make the following assumption on the stochastic process  $\{W(t, \cdot)\}_{t \geq 0}$ .

**Assumption 2.** Let  $\{W(t, \cdot)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  be a generalized  $Q$ -Wiener process on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ , which can be represented as

$$W(t, x) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Q^{\frac{1}{2}} e_n(x) \beta_n(t),$$

where  $\{\beta_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$  is a sequence of independent real valued standard Brownian motions. Assume that

$$\|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)} < \infty \quad (4)$$

for some  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ . In the case  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , we in addition assume that  $Q$  commutes with  $A$ .

There are two important cases included in (4): the trace-class noise case for  $\beta = 1$  and the space-time white noise case (i.e.  $Q = I$ ) for  $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Assumption 3.** *The initial datum  $X_0 \in L^{s_0}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta \cap E)$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and some  $s_0 \geq 2$  sufficiently large. In addition,  $X_0$  is  $\mathcal{F}_0/\mathcal{B}(H)$ -measurable.*

Based on the above assumptions, we can get the following regularity estimates of the mild solution.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Under Assumptions 1-3, the SPDE (1) has a unique mild solution given by*

$$X(t) = S(t)X_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)F(X(s)) ds + \int_0^t S(t-s) dW(s) \quad a.s.$$

For  $p \geq 2$ , there are positive constants  $C_0, C_1$  depending on  $p, T, a_i, i = 0, \dots, 3$  such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)} \leq C_0 \left(1 + \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)}\right), \quad (5)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} \leq C_1 \left(1 + \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} + \|X_0\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^3 + \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}\right). \quad (6)$$

Moreover, there is constant  $C_2 > 0$  depending on  $p, T, a_i, i = 0, \dots, 3$  such that for  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ ,

$$\|X(t) - X(s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C_2 \left(1 + \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} + \|X_0\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^3 + \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}\right) (t-s)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}. \quad (7)$$

The existence and uniqueness of the mild solution and the regularity estimate (5) can be found in [7, Proposition 6.2.2], based on the estimation

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left\| \int_0^t S(t-s) dW(s) \right\|_E^p \right) < \infty.$$

Other regularity estimates in Theorem 2.1 can be proved by similar arguments as in e.g., [30, Theorem 2.6]. We also refer to [5, Theorem 2.1] for more details.

### 3. ADAPTIVE FULL DISCRETIZATION

In this section, we introduce the adaptive time-stepping full discretization, and prove the stabilities of the numerical solution in  $E$ -norm and  $H^\beta$ -norm, respectively. This is the key point for the estimate of convergence order of this full discretization, which is the same as usual.

We consider the following adaptive time-stepping full discretization, whose spatial discretization is based on the spectral Galerkin method, and temporal direction is the adaptive exponential integrator scheme:

$$X_{t_{m+1}}^N = S^N(\tau_m) X_{t_m}^N + S^N(\tau_m) F^N(X_{t_m}^N) \tau_m + S^N(\tau_m) P^N \Delta W_m, \quad X_0^N = P^N X_0, \quad (8)$$

where  $\tau_m := \tau(X_{t_m}^N)$ ,  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $t_{m+1} = t_m + \tau_m$ ,  $S^N(t) := P^N S(t) = e^{-tA^N}$  with  $P^N$  being the spectral projection operator and  $A^N := P^N A$ , and the increment  $\Delta W_m := W(t_{m+1}) - W(t_m)$ . If the existing time span is longer than  $T$  after adding the last timestep, then we take a smaller timestep such that the existing time span just attains  $T$  after adding it. In the sequel, we will give some assumptions on the timestep function so that the numerical solution can attain  $T$  with finite timesteps.

The continuous version of (8) is given by

$$X_t^N = S^N(t)P^N X_0 + \int_0^t S^N(t - \lfloor s \rfloor)P^N F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) ds + \int_0^t S^N(t - \lfloor s \rfloor)P^N dW(s), \quad (9)$$

where  $\lfloor s \rfloor := \max\{t_m : t_m \leq s\}$ , i.e., the maximum grid point before time  $s$ . Denote  $m_s := \max\{m : t_m \leq s\}$ . Then  $\lfloor s \rfloor = t_{m_s}$ . In the following, we also use the notation  $\tau_{\lfloor s \rfloor} := \tau_{m_s}$ .

**3.1. A priori estimates for full discretization.** In this subsection, we present assumptions on the adaptive timestep function, and give the a priori estimates of the numerical solution, including the stabilities in  $E$ -norm and  $\dot{H}^\beta$ -norm, respectively.

We give the following assumption on the adaptive timestep function with the uniform low bound.

**Assumption 4.** *The adaptive timestep function  $\tau : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is continuous and satisfies that for  $X(\omega) \in H$ ,*

$$\tau(X(\omega))^{\frac{3}{4}} \|F(X(\omega))\| \leq L_2, \quad a.s., \quad (10)$$

$$\tau(X(\omega)) \geq \tau_{min}, \quad a.s. \quad (11)$$

with positive constants  $L_2, \tau_{min}$  independent of  $\omega$ .

For the trace-class noise case, i.e.,  $\beta = 1$  in Assumption 2, the adaptive timestep function in Assumption 4 can be weakened to the following one with the adaptive low bound.

**Assumption 5.** *The adaptive timestep function  $\tau : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is continuous and satisfies that for  $X(\omega) \in H$ ,*

$$\langle X(\omega), F(X(\omega)) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \tau(X(\omega)) \|F(X(\omega))\|^2 \leq \bar{L}_2 \|X(\omega)\|^2, \quad a.s., \quad (12)$$

$$\tau(X(\omega))^{\frac{3}{4}} \|F(X(\omega))\| \leq L_2(\omega), \quad a.s., \quad (13)$$

$$\tau(X(\omega)) \geq (\zeta \|X(\omega)\|^{q_0} + \xi)^{-1}, \quad a.s. \quad (14)$$

with positive constants  $\bar{L}_2, \zeta, \xi, q_0$  independent of  $\omega$ , and  $\|L_2(\cdot)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} < \infty$  for some  $p \geq 2$ .

The inequality (11) or (14) is used for bounding the expected number of timesteps. Since the timestep function  $\tau$  is determined by the numerical solution, so we need to make a modification when considering the convergence of the adaptive time-stepping full discretization. Here, we follow the idea in [14] and consider the timestep function  $\tau^\delta$  with  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ , and let  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . More precisely, for a given timestep function  $\tau$  which satisfies Assumption 4 or 5, we introduce the refined timestep function  $\tau^\delta$  in the following assumption. See also Section 4 for suitable examples of  $\tau^\delta$ .

**Assumption 6.** *The refined timestep function  $\tau^\delta$  satisfies that for  $X(\omega) \in H$ ,*

$$\delta \min\{T, \tau(X(\omega))\} \leq \tau^\delta(X(\omega)) \leq \min\{\delta T, \tau(X(\omega))\},$$

where  $\tau$  satisfies Assumption 4 or 5.

We remark that  $\tau^\delta$  also satisfies Assumption 4 or 5 if the right hand side of (11) or (14) is multiplied by  $\delta$ . In order to show the boundedness of the expected number of timesteps, we need the a priori estimate of the numerical solution in  $H$  for the trace-class noise case. This is natural since the adaptive low bound in (14) is characterized by the solution in  $H$ -norm.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $X_0 \in L^p(\Omega; H)$ ,  $p \geq 2$ . Under Assumption 2 with  $\beta = 1$  and Assumption 5 (12), we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|^p \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|^p), \quad (15)$$

where  $C > 0$  depends on  $p, T, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}, \bar{L}_2$ .

*Proof.* By the contraction property of  $P^N$  and  $S(t)$  in  $H$ , i.e.,  $\|P^N u\| \leq \|u\|$ ,  $\|S(t)u\| \leq \|u\|$ , and using (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|X_{t_{m+1}}^N\|^2 \\ &= \|S(\tau_m)(X_{t_m}^N + F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m + P^N \Delta W_m)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{t_m}^N + F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m + P^N \Delta W_m\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{t_m}^N\|^2 + 2\tau_m \langle X_{t_m}^N, F(X_{t_m}^N) \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\tau_m \|F(X_{t_m}^N)\|^2 + 2\langle X_{t_m}^N + F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m, \Delta W_m \rangle + \|\Delta W_m\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{t_m}^N\|^2 + 2\tau_m \bar{L}_2 \|X_{t_m}^N\|^2 + 2\langle X_{t_m}^N + F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m, \Delta W_m \rangle + \|\Delta W_m\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^N\|^2 &= \|S(t - [t])(X_{[t]}^N + F^N(X_{[t]}^N)(t - [t]) + P^N(W(t) - W([t])))\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{[t]}^N + F^N(X_{[t]}^N)(t - [t]) + P^N(W(t) - W([t]))\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{[t]}^N\|^2 + 2(t - [t])\bar{L}_2 \|X_{[t]}^N\|^2 + 2\langle X_{[t]}^N + F^N(X_{[t]}^N)(t - [t]), W(t) - W([t]) \rangle \\ &\quad + \|W(t) - W([t])\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^N\|^2 &\leq \|P^N X_0\|^2 + 2\bar{L}_2 \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|X_{t_i}^N\|^2 \tau_i + \|X_{[t]}^N\|^2 (t - [t]) \right) + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \langle X_{t_i}^N + F^N(X_{t_i}^N)\tau_i, \Delta W_i \rangle \\ &\quad + 2 \left\langle X_{[t]}^N + F^N(X_{[t]}^N)(t - [t]), W(t) - W([t]) \right\rangle + \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|\Delta W_i\|^2 + \|W(t) - W([t])\|^2 \\ &\leq \|P^N X_0\|^2 + 2\bar{L}_2 \int_0^t \|X_{[s]}^N\|^2 ds + 2 \left| \int_0^t \langle X_{[s]}^N + F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s}, dW(s) \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|\Delta W_i\|^2 + \|W(t) - W([t])\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\frac{p}{2}$ th moment with  $p \geq 2$  and applying Burkholder–Davis–Gundy’s inequality (see e.g. [26, Lemma 2.4.2], [13, Section 6.4]) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|X_t^N\|^p &\leq C(p) \left[ \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|^p + \mathbb{E} \left( 2\bar{L}_2 \int_0^t \|X_{[s]}^N\|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left| 2 \int_0^t \langle X_{[s]}^N + F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s}, dW(s) \rangle \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|\Delta W_i\|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + \mathbb{E}\|W(t) - W([t])\|^p \right] \\ &\leq C(p, t, \bar{L}_2) \left[ \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|^p + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\|X_{[s]}^N\|^p ds + \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^t \left\| X_{[s]}^N + F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s} \right\|^2 \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{4}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|\Delta W_i\|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + \mathbb{E} \|W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)\|^p.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{[s]}^N + F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s}\|^2 &\leq \|X_{[s]}^N\|^2 + 2\tau_{m_s} \langle X_{[s]}^N, F(X_{[s]}^N) \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\tau_{m_s} \|F(X_{[s]}^N)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_{[s]}^N\|^2 + 2\tau_{m_s} \bar{L}_2 \|X_{[s]}^N\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \|\Delta W_i\|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} &= \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \tau_i \frac{\|\Delta W_i\|^2}{\tau_i} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \mathbb{E} \left( \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \tau_i \right)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \tau_i \frac{\|\Delta W_i\|^p}{\tau_i^{\frac{p}{2}}} \right) \\ &\leq T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_t-1} \tau_i \frac{\|\Delta W_i\|^p}{\tau_i^{\frac{p}{2}}} \right) \leq T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\|\Delta W_{m_s}\|^p}{\tau_{m_s}^{\frac{p}{2}}} ds \\ &= T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\|\Delta W_{m_s}\|^p}{\tau_{m_s}^{\frac{p}{2}}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{[s]} \right) \right) ds = T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left( \tau_{m_s}^{-\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} (\|\Delta W_{m_s}\|^p | \mathcal{F}_{[s]}) \right) ds \\ &\leq CT^{\frac{p}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality  $\left( \sum_i \tau_i u_i \right)^p \leq \left( \sum_i \tau_i \right)^{p-1} \sum_i \tau_i u_i^p$  and the property  $\mathbb{E} \left( \|W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)\|^p | \mathcal{F}_{[t]} \right) \leq C(p, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(t - \lfloor t \rfloor)^{\frac{p}{2}}$  (see [16, Section 1.4]). Therefore, combining the Hölder's inequality, we get for  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|X_t^N\|^p &\leq C(p, t, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}, \bar{L}_2) \left( 1 + \mathbb{E} \|X_0\|^p + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|X_{[s]}^N\|^p ds \right) \\ &\leq C(p, t, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}, \bar{L}_2) \left( 1 + \mathbb{E} \|X_0\|^p + \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \|X_u^N\|^p ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq t} \mathbb{E} \|X_r^N\|^p \leq C(p, t, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}, \bar{L}_2) \left( 1 + \mathbb{E} \|X_0\|^p + \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \|X_u^N\|^p ds \right).$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality leads to

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \|X_t^N\|^p \leq C(p, T, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}, \bar{L}_2) (1 + \mathbb{E} \|X_0\|^p). \quad (16)$$

To obtain (15), we need the following Burkholder–Davis–Gundy's inequality (see [13, Theorem 4.36]), for  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \langle X_{[s]}^N + F(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s}, dW(s) \rangle \right|^p \leq C(p) \left( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|X_{[s]}^N + F(X_{[s]}^N)\tau_{m_s}\|^2 \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Based on the above inequality and (16), the remaining proof of (15) can be showed. The proof is finished.  $\square$

Below we give the bound of the expected number of timesteps.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If one of the following conditions holds:*

(i) *Assumptions 2, 4 (11) and 6 hold simultaneously;*



(ii) Assumptions 2 with  $\beta = 1$ , 5 (12) (14), 6 and  $X_0 \in L^{q_0 p}(\Omega; H)$ ,  $q_0 p \geq 2$  hold simultaneously;

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{T,\delta}^p) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|^{q_0 p})\delta^{-p},$$

where  $M_{T,\delta}$  is the number of timesteps for a given timestep function  $\tau^\delta(x)$  with  $0 < \delta < 1$ , and  $C > 0$  may depend on  $p, T, \zeta, \xi, \bar{L}_2, \tau_{\min}, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$ .

*Proof.* Assumptions 2, 4 (11) and 6 give

$$M_{T,\delta} = \sum_{m=0}^{M_{T,\delta}-1} \frac{\tau_m^\delta}{\tau_m^\delta} \leq T \sup_{0 \leq t_m \leq T} \frac{1}{\tau^\delta(X_{t_m}^N)} \leq \delta^{-1} T (\tau_{\min}^{-1} + T^{-1}).$$

Assumptions 2 with  $\beta = 1$ , 5 (12) (14) and Assumption 6 yield

$$\begin{aligned} M_{T,\delta} &\leq T \sup_{0 \leq t_m \leq T} \frac{1}{\tau^\delta(X_{t_m}^N)} \leq \delta^{-1} T \sup_{0 \leq t_m \leq T} (\tau^{-1}(X_{t_m}^N) + T^{-1}) \\ &\leq \delta^{-1} T \sup_{0 \leq t_m \leq T} (\zeta \|X_{t_m}^N\|^{q_0} + \xi + T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By taking the  $p$ th moment, and combining Lemma 3.1, we get the desired result.  $\square$

We give the following lemma on the properties of the semigroup  $\{S(t), t \geq 0\}$ , which is important in the stability analysis of the numerical solution in  $E$ -norm.

**Lemma 3.3.** *We have*

(i) for  $\rho \geq 0$ ,  $t > 0$ ,

$$\|A^\rho P^N S(t)u\|_E \leq C(\rho)(t^{-\rho} + t^{-\rho-\frac{1}{2}})\|u\|;$$

(ii) for  $\rho \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $t > 0$ ,  $u \in \dot{H}_\rho$ ,

$$\|P^N S(t)u\|_E \leq C(\rho)t^{\frac{2\rho-1}{4}}\|u\|_\rho.$$

*Proof.* We only prove (i). For the proof of (ii), we refer to [30, Lemma 3.2].

Let  $u = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle u, e_i \rangle e_i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^\rho P^N S(t)u\|_E &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{O}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-\lambda_i t} \lambda_i^\rho \langle u, e_i \rangle e_i(x) \right| \leq \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-\lambda_i t} \lambda_i^\rho |\langle u, e_i \rangle| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^{2\rho} e^{-2\lambda_i t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N |\langle u, e_i \rangle|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (i^2 \pi^2)^{2\rho} e^{-2i^2 \pi^2 t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2} \pi^{2\rho} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 i t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we transform the variable  $i^2$  and still denote it by  $i$ . By the monotonicity of the function  $y^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 y t}$ , which takes the maximum value at the point  $\frac{\rho}{\pi^2 t}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 i t} &= \sum_{i=1}^{i_0} i^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 i t} + \sum_{i_0+1}^{\infty} i^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 i t} \leq \left(\frac{\rho}{\pi^2 t}\right)^{2\rho} e^{-2\rho} + \int_0^{\infty} y^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 y t} dy \\ &\leq \frac{C}{t^{2\rho}} + \frac{1}{t^{2\rho+1}} \int_0^{\infty} z^{2\rho} e^{-2\pi^2 z} dz \leq C \left( \frac{1}{t^{2\rho}} + \frac{1}{t^{2\rho+1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$



where  $i_0 := \lfloor \frac{\rho}{\pi^2 t} \rfloor$ . Applying the inequality  $(a+b)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq a^{\frac{1}{2}} + b^{\frac{1}{2}}$  leads to the desired result.  $\square$

In order to get the stability of the numerical solution in  $E$ -norm, we put an additional assumption on the initial datum.

**Assumption 7.** *The initial datum satisfies that for sufficiently large  $p_0 \geq 2$ ,*

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_+} \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega; E)} < \infty.$$

Based on the Sobolev embedding theorem, Assumption 7 is fulfilled if  $\|X_0\|_{L^{p_0}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} < \infty$  for  $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, or Assumptions 1, 2 with  $\beta = 1$ , 5, 6 and 7, we have for  $p \geq 2$ , there is some  $q := q(p, \beta) > 0$  for the former case and  $q := q(p, q_0)$  for the latter case satisfying  $q \leq \min\{s_0, p_0\}$ ,*

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}_+} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)} \leq C(1 + \|X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}), \quad (17)$$

where  $X_t^N$  is the numerical solution with timestep function  $\tau^\delta$  for some  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $C > 0$  may depend on  $p, T, \zeta, \xi, \bar{L}_2, L_2, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, define a sequence of non-increasing events as follows: for the case of  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,

$$\Omega_t := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_t(\omega)\}} (\tau_j^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{t_j}^N(\omega)\|_E \leq 1 \right\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

and for the case of  $\beta = 1$ ,

$$\Omega_t := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m_t(\omega)\}} (\tau_j^\delta)^{\frac{1}{6} - \epsilon} \|X_{t_j}^N(\omega)\|_E \leq 1 \right\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T$$

with some  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{6}$  small enough. It is clear that  $\chi_{\Omega_t} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ . Note that we can choose  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small, so that  $(\tau_0^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|P^N X_0\|_E \leq (\delta T)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|P^N X_0\|_E \leq 1$ , and hence  $\Omega_0 \neq \emptyset$ .

We claim that

$$\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_t^N\|_E^p) \leq C(p, T, \zeta, \xi, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_E^{q_1} + \mathbb{E}\|P^N X_0\|_E^{q_1})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Omega_t^c} \|X_t^N\|_E^p) \leq C(p, T, \zeta, \xi, \tau_{min}, \bar{L}_2, L_2, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \mathbb{E}\|X_0\|_E^{q_2} + \mathbb{E}\|P^N X_0\|_E^{q_2})$$

with  $q_1, q_2 > 0$  sufficiently large, whose proofs are given in *Step 1* and *Step 2*, respectively. In the sequel, when  $\beta = 1$ , we take the proof under Assumption 5 (14) as an example, since the case under Assumption 4 (11) can be proved similarly.

*Step 1:* Let  $Z_t^N := S^N(t)P^N X_0 + \int_0^t S^N(t-s)F^N(X_{[s]}^N)ds - \int_0^t S^N(t-s)F^N(X_s^N)ds + W_A^N(t)$ , where  $W_A^N(t) := \int_0^t S^N(t-s)dW(s)$ . Then  $X_t^N = \int_0^t S^N(t-s)F^N(X_s^N)ds + Z_t^N$ . Let

$$\bar{X}_t^N := X_t^N - Z_t^N. \quad (18)$$

It satisfies

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}_t^N = (-A^N \bar{X}_t^N + F^N(\bar{X}_t^N + Z_t^N))dt, & t \in (0, T], \\ \bar{X}_0^N = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\|\bar{X}_t^N\|_E \leq C(T)(1 + \|Z^N\|_{L^9(\mathcal{O} \times [0,t])}^9)$  (see [30, Lemma 4.2]). This implies

$$\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Omega_t} \|\bar{X}_t^N\|_E^p) \leq C(T, p) \left( 1 + \mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^t \|Z_s^N\|_E^{9p} ds \right) \right). \quad (19)$$

By the definition of  $Z_s^N$ , we have for  $0 \leq s \leq t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t} \|Z_s^N\|_E &\leq \|S^N(s)P^N X_0\|_E + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^s (S^N(s - \lfloor r \rfloor) - S^N(s - r))F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N)dr \right\|_E \\ &\quad + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^s S^N(s - r)(F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N) - F^N(X_r^N))dr \right\|_E + \|W_A^N(s)\|_E \\ &=: \|S^N(s)P^N X_0\|_E + I_0(s) + I_1(s) + \|W_A^N(s)\|_E. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since

$$X_r^N = S^N(r - \lfloor r \rfloor)X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N + \int_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^r S^N(r - \lfloor u \rfloor)F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)du + W_A^N(r) - S^N(r - \lfloor r \rfloor)W_A^N(\lfloor r \rfloor), \quad (21)$$

and by the boundedness of the semigroup in  $E$ , i.e.,  $\|S(t)u\|_E \leq \|u\|_E$  (see [28, Chapter 6]) and Lemma 3.3 (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N\|_E &\leq \chi_{\Omega_t} \left( \|X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\|_E + C \int_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^r (r - \lfloor u \rfloor)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)\|_E du + \|W_A^N(r)\|_E + \|W_A^N(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E \right) \\ &\leq \chi_{\Omega_t} C \left( 1 + \|X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\|_E + (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{3}{4}} \|X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\|_E^3 + \|W_A^N(r)\|_E + \|W_A^N(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from (21) we get for  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N - X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\| &\leq \|(S(r) - S(\lfloor r \rfloor))P^N X_0\| + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^r S(r - \lfloor u \rfloor)F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)du \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} S(\lfloor r \rfloor - \lfloor u \rfloor)F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)du \right\| + \|P^N(W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor))\| \\ &\leq (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|P^N X_0\|_\beta + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} S(\lfloor r \rfloor - \lfloor u \rfloor)(S(r - \lfloor r \rfloor) - \text{Id})F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)du \right\| \\ &\quad + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^r S(r - \lfloor u \rfloor)F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)du \right\| + \|P^N(W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor))\| \\ &\leq (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|X_0\|_\beta + \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} (\lfloor r \rfloor - \lfloor u \rfloor)^{-\beta} (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^\beta \|F^N(X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N)\| du \\ &\quad + \chi_{\Omega_t} \tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta \|F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N)\| + \|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N - X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\| &\leq (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|X_0\|_\beta + \chi_{\Omega_t} C \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} (\lfloor r \rfloor - \lfloor u \rfloor)^{-\beta} (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^\beta (1 + \|X_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^N\|_E^3) du \\ &\quad + \chi_{\Omega_t} C \tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta (1 + \|X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\|_E^3) + \|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\| \\ &\leq (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|X_0\|_\beta + C (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} (\lfloor r \rfloor - u)^{-\beta} (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} (\tau_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^\delta)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} ((\tau_{\lfloor u \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + 1) du \end{aligned}$$

$$+ C(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{1-\beta}((\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} + 1) + (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}},$$

according to definitions of  $F(X)$  and  $\Omega_t$ . Similarly, for  $\beta = 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N - X_{[r]}^N\| &\leq (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|P^N X_0\|_1 + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} A^{1-6\epsilon} S(\lfloor r \rfloor - \lfloor u \rfloor) A^{-1+6\epsilon} (S(r - \lfloor r \rfloor) - \text{Id}) F^N(X_{[u]}^N) du \right\| \\ &\quad + \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^r S(r - \lfloor u \rfloor) F^N(X_{[u]}^N) du \right\| + \|P^N(W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor))\| \\ &\leq (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|X_0\|_1 + C(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} \int_0^{\lfloor r \rfloor} (\lfloor r \rfloor - u)^{-1+6\epsilon} (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} (\tau_{[u]}^\delta)^{-\frac{1}{2}+3\epsilon} ((\tau_{[u]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} + 1) du \\ &\quad + C(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{6\epsilon} ((\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} + 1) + (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that for  $0 < \beta < 1$ , we have

$$\frac{\tau_{[r]}^\delta}{\tau_{[u]}^\delta} \leq \frac{\delta T}{\delta \min\{T, \tau_{[u]}\}} \leq T(T^{-1} + \tau_{min}^{-1}),$$

which implies

$$\chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N - X_{[r]}^N\| \leq C(T, \tau_{min})(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \left( 1 + \|X_0\|_\beta + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}} \right),$$

and for  $\beta = 1$ , we have

$$\frac{\tau_{[r]}^\delta}{\tau_{[u]}^\delta} \leq \frac{\delta T}{\delta \min_{0 \leq u \leq T} \{T, \tau_{[u]}\}} \leq T(T^{-1} + \zeta \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|^{q_0} + \xi),$$

which implies

$$\chi_{\Omega_t} \|X_r^N - X_{[r]}^N\| \leq C(T, \xi, \zeta)(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} \left( 1 + \|X_0\|_1 + \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|^{q_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon} + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.3 (ii), we have for  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(s) &\leq \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \|F(X_r^N) - F(X_{[r]}^N)\| dr \\ &\leq C \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 + \|X_r^N\|_E^2 + \|X_{[r]}^N\|_E^2) \|X_r^N - X_{[r]}^N\| dr \\ &\leq C(T, \tau_{min}) \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left( 1 + \|X_{[r]}^N\|_E^2 + (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{3}{2}} \|X_{[r]}^N\|_E^6 + \|W_A(r)\|_E^2 + \|W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E^2 \right) \times \\ &\quad (\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \left( 1 + \|X_0\|_\beta + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}} \right) dr \\ &\leq C(T, \tau_{min}) \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 + \|W_A(r)\|_E^2 + \|W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E^2) \times \\ &\quad \left( 1 + \|X_0\|_\beta + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{[r]}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}} \right) dr. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I_1(s)\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega)} &\leq C(T, \tau_{min}) \left\| \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (1 + \|W_A(r)\|_E^2 + \|W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E^2) \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left(1 + \|X_0\|_\beta + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}}\right) dr \right\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega)} \\
&\leq C(T, \tau_{min}) \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left\| 1 + \|W_A(r)\|_E^2 + \|W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|_E^2 \right\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega)} \times \\
&\quad \left\| 1 + \|X_0\|_\beta + \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}} \right\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega)} dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|}{(\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}} \right)^{18p} = \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{\|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|^{18p}}{(\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2} \times 18p}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\lfloor r \rfloor} \right) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left( (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{-\frac{\beta}{2} \times 18p} \mathbb{E} \left( \|W_A(r) - W_A(\lfloor r \rfloor)\|^{18p} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\lfloor r \rfloor} \right) \right) \leq C(p, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}),
\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|I_1(s)\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega)} \leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}).$$

Similarly, for  $\beta = 1$ , we also obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|I_1(s)\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega)} \leq C(p, T, \zeta, \xi, \|Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^1)} + \|X_0\|_{L^{9p q_0}(\Omega; H)}).$$

For the term  $I_0$ , by applying Lemma 3.3 (i) with  $\rho = \frac{\beta}{2}$ , we get for  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0(s) &= \chi_{\Omega_t} \left\| \int_0^s A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} S^N(s-r) A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (S^N(r - \lfloor r \rfloor) - \text{Id}) F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N) dr \right\|_E \\
&\leq C \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^s \left( (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} + (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \right) (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N)\| dr \\
&\leq C \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^s \left( (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} + (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \right) (\tau_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} (1 + \|X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N\|_E^3) dr \\
&\leq C \int_0^s \left( (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} + (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \right) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

For  $\beta = 1$ , we get the similar result by taking  $\rho = \frac{1}{2} - 3\epsilon$ . Therefore, for  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|I_0(s)\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega)} \leq C(p, T).$$

Hence, combining (20), we obtain for  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_t} \int_0^t \|Z_s^N\|_E^{9p} ds \right) = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_t} \|Z_s^N\|_E^{9p} \right) ds \\
&\leq \int_0^T C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; E)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{9p}) ds \\
&\leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; E)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{9p}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then (19) can be estimated as

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|\bar{X}_t^N\|_E^p\right) \leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; E)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{9p}). \quad (22)$$

Note

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|Z_t^N\|_E^p\right) \leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)}^p + \|X_0\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^p). \quad (23)$$

Therefore, (18), (22) and (23) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|X_t^N\|_E^p\right) &\leq C(p)\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|\bar{X}_t^N\|_E^p\right) + C(p)\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|Z_t^N\|_E^p\right) \\ &\leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; E)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{9p}). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\beta = 1$ , similar arguments imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t}\|X_t^N\|_E^p\right) \leq C(p, T, \zeta, \xi, \|Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)})(1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; E)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{9p}(\Omega; H)}^{9p} + \|X_0\|_{L^{18p}(\Omega; \dot{H}^1)}^{9p}).$$

*Step 2:* We only show the proof of  $0 < \beta < 1$  because the proof of  $\beta = 1$  is the same as that of  $0 < \beta < 1$ . Note that for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\Omega_t^c = \Omega_{t_{m_t-1}}^c \cup \left( \Omega_{t_{m_t-1}} \cap \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : (\tau_{m_t}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[t]}^N(\omega)\|_E > 1 \right\} \right).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_t^c}(\omega) &= \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_t-1}}^c}(\omega) + \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_t-1}}}(\omega) \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_{m_t}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[t]}^N\|_E > 1\}}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{m_t(\omega)} \chi_{\Omega_{t_{j-1}}}(\omega) \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_j^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{t_j}^N\|_E > 1\}}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\chi_{\Omega_{t_{-1}}} := 1$ . Then for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t^c}\|X_t^N\|_E^p\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{m_t} \|X_{t_j}^N\|_E^p \cdot \chi_{\Omega_{t_{j-1}}} \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_j^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{t_j}^N\|_E > 1\}}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{m_t} \left(\chi_{\Omega_{t_{j-1}}} \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_j^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{t_j}^N\|_E > 1\}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{\tau_j^\delta}{\tau_j^\delta} \|X_{t_j}^N\|_E^p\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t_j \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_j^\delta}\right) \int_0^t \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1\}} ds \|X_t^N\|_E^p\right) \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t_j \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_j^\delta}\right)^3\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^t \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1\}} ds\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\mathbb{E} \|X_t^N\|_E^{3p}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the proof of Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t_j \leq T} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_j^\delta}\right)^3\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq C(T, \tau_{min})\delta^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot \chi_{\{(\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1\}}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\omega \in \Omega_{t_{m_s-1}} : (\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left( \omega \in \Omega : \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot (\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1 \right).$$

By applying the Chebyshev's inequality and Hölder's inequality, and combining Assumption 6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left( \omega \in \Omega : \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot (\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E > 1 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \cdot (\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{\frac{\beta}{6}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E \right)^{\frac{18(p+1)}{\beta}} \\ & \leq \left( \mathbb{E}(\tau_{m_s}^\delta)^{6(p+1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E^{\frac{36(p+1)}{\beta}} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}^{\frac{q}{2}} + \|X_0\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{\frac{q}{2}}) \delta^{3(p+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we have use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E^{\frac{36(p+1)}{\beta}} \right) \leq C(p, T, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}^q + \|X_0\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^q) \quad (26)$$

with  $q = 3 \times 9 \times \frac{36(p+1)}{\beta}$ . The proof of (26) is a combination of

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \|X_{[s]}^N\|_E &= \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} \|S^N(\tau_{m_s-1})(X_{t_{m_s-1}}^N + F^N(X_{t_{m_s-1}}^N)\tau_{m_s-1} + P^N \Delta W_{m_s-1})\|_E \\ &\leq C \chi_{\Omega_{t_{m_s-1}}} (\|X_{t_{m_s-1}}^N\|_E + \|X_{t_{m_s-1}}^N\|_E^3 + 1 + \|P^N \Delta W_{m_s-1}\|_E) \end{aligned}$$

and the result of *Step 1*. It remains to estimate  $(\mathbb{E}\|X_t^N\|_E^{3p})^{\frac{1}{3}}$ . For  $0 \leq t_{m+1} \leq T$  and the fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{t_{m+1}}^N\|_E &\leq \|S(\tau_m^\delta)X_{t_m}^N\|_E + \|S(\tau_m^\delta)F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m^\delta\|_E + \|S(\tau_m^\delta)\Delta W_m\|_E \\ &\leq \|X_{t_m}^N\|_E + C(\tau_m^\delta)^{\frac{3}{4}}\|F(X_{t_m}^N)\| + \|W_A(t_{m+1})\|_E + \|W_A(t_m)\|_E \\ &\leq \|P^N X_0\|_E + C \sum_{i=0}^m \left( (\tau_i^\delta)^{\frac{3}{4}}\|F(X_{t_i}^N)\| + \|W_A(t_{i+1})\|_E + \|W_A(t_i)\|_E \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\|X_t^N\|_E \leq \|X_{[t]}^N\|_E + C(t - [t])^{\frac{3}{4}}\|F(X_{[t]}^N)\| + \|W_A(t)\|_E + \|W_A([t])\|_E.$$

Hence, by induction and Assumption 4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^N\|_E &\leq \|P^N X_0\|_E + C \sum_{i=0}^{m_t} \left( (\tau_i^\delta)^{\frac{3}{4}}\|F(X_{t_i}^N)\| + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|W_A(t)\|_E \right) \\ &\leq \|P^N X_0\|_E + CM_{T, \delta}(\omega) \left( L_2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|W_A(t)\|_E \right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)} &\leq \|P^N X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)} + C\|M_{T, \delta}\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \times \left( \|L_2\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} + \left\| \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|W_A(t)\|_E \right\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\leq C(p, T, L_2, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; E)} + \|M_{T, \delta}\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|X_t^N\|_E^{3p} \leq C(p, T, L_2, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^{3p} + \|M_{T, \delta}\|_{L^{6p}(\Omega)}^{3p})$$

$$\leq C(p, T, L_2, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^{3p} + \delta^{-3p}). \quad (27)$$

Combining (24) (25) and (27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\chi_{\Omega_t^c} \|X_t^N\|_E^p\right) &\leq C\delta^{-1} (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}^{\frac{q}{6}} + \|X_0\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^{\frac{q}{6}}) \delta^{p+1} \times \\ &\quad (1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^p + \delta^{-p}) \\ &\leq C(1 + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}^q + \|X_0\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^q) \end{aligned}$$

with  $C > 0$  depending on  $p, T, L_2, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$ . Therefore, combining *Step 1*, we get for some large  $q := q(p, \beta) > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}(\|X_t^N\|_E^p) \leq C(p, T, L_2, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^{2q}(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}^q + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}^q).$$

The proof is finished.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Under conditions in Theorem 3.4, there are constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  depending on  $p, T, \zeta, \xi, \bar{L}_2, L_2, \tau_{min}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$ , such that for  $p \geq 2, 0 < \beta \leq 1$ , we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} \leq C_1 (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E \cap \dot{H}^\beta)} + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}), \quad (28)$$

and

$$\|X_t^N - X_s^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C_2 (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E \cap \dot{H}^\beta)} + \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}) (t - s)^{\frac{\beta}{2}},$$

where  $q$  is defined as in Theorem 3.4.

*Proof.* Combining Theorem 3.4 and

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)} \leq C(1 + \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}) + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|X_s^N\|_{L^{3p}(\Omega; E)}^3 + \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)},$$

the proof of (28) can be finished. The proof of the remaining part is similar to that of (7) in Theorem 2.1 and is omitted.  $\square$

**3.2. Convergence for full discretization.** In this subsection, we give the convergence order for the adaptive time-stepping full discretization (8), based on the stability analyses proved in Section 3.1. Moreover, we introduce two schemes (30) and (31) when the low bound in Assumption 4 (11) or Assumption 5 (14) is invalid, and present their convergence orders.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let conditions in Theorem 3.4 hold. For the numerical solution  $X_t^N$  of the full discretization (8), there is some positive constant  $C$ , depending on  $p, T, \zeta, \xi, \tau_{min}, L_0, \bar{L}_2, L_2, \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}, \|X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$  with some large  $q$  defined as in Theorem 3.4, such that for  $p \geq 2, 0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C(N^{-\beta} + \delta^{\frac{\beta}{2}}).$$

*Proof.* We split the error into two parts, i.e.,

$$\|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq \|X(t) - P^N X(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} + \|P^N X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)}.$$

It suffices to estimate the term  $\|P^N X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)}$ . We introduce the auxiliary process in the following way:

$$dY_t^N = -A^N Y_t^N dt + S^N(t - [t]) F^N(X_{[t]}^N) dt + P^N dW(t), \quad Y_0^N = P^N X_0.$$



Then we need to estimate  $\|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}$  and  $\|Y_t^N - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}$  respectively. For the term  $\|Y_t^N - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}$ , when  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy’s inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Y_t^N - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}^p &= \left\| \int_0^t S^N(t-s)(\text{Id} - S^N(s - \lfloor s \rfloor))dW(s) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}^p \\
&\leq C(p) \left( \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|S^N(t-s)(\text{Id} - S^N(s - \lfloor s \rfloor))Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&= C(p) \left( \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \|A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}(\text{Id} - S^N(s - \lfloor s \rfloor))A^{\frac{1}{2}}S^N(t-s)A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq C(p) \left( \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [(s - \lfloor s \rfloor)^\beta] \|A^{\frac{1}{2}}S^N(t-s)A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq C(p) \left( \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \delta^{\frac{\beta p}{2}} \leq C(p, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}) \delta^{\frac{\beta p}{2}}. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

For the term  $\|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega;H)}$ , by Itô’s formula and Assumption 1 (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|^2 \\
&= 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, -A^N(P^N X(s) - Y_s^N) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, P^N(F(X(s))) - S^N(s - \lfloor s \rfloor)P^N F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) \rangle ds \\
&\leq 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(P^N X(s)) - F(Y_s^N) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(X(s)) - F(P^N X(s)) + F(Y_s^N) - S^N(s - \lfloor s \rfloor)P^N F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) \rangle ds \\
&\leq 2L_0 \int_0^t \|P^N X(s) - Y_s^N\|^2 ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(X(s)) - F(P^N X(s)) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(Y_s^N) - F(X_s^N) \rangle ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(X_s^N) - F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) - S(s - \lfloor s \rfloor)F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) \rangle ds \\
&\leq (2L_0 + 3) \int_0^t \|P^N X(s) - Y_s^N\|^2 ds + \int_0^t \|F(X(s)) - F(P^N X(s))\|^2 ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \|F(Y_s^N) - F(X_s^N)\|^2 ds + \int_0^t \|F(X_s^N) - F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N)\|^2 ds + 2J_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_1 := \int_0^t \langle P^N X(s) - Y_s^N, (\text{Id} - S(s - \lfloor s \rfloor))F(X_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^N) \rangle ds.$$

By the mild form of  $P^N X(s)$  and  $Y_s^N$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P^N X(s) - Y_s^N &= \int_0^s (S(s-r)F^N(X(r)) - S(s - \lfloor r \rfloor)F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N))dr \\
&= \int_0^s S(s-r)(F^N(X(r)) - F^N(X_r^N))dr + \int_0^s S(s-r)(F^N(X_r^N) - F^N(X_{\lfloor r \rfloor}^N))dr
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \int_0^s (S(s-r) - S(s - [r])) F^N(X_{[r]}^N) dr.$$

Hence, we split the term  $J_1$  into three parts, denoted by  $J_{11}, J_{12}, J_{13}$ .

For the term  $J_{11}$ ,  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{11} &= \int_0^t \left\langle \int_0^s A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} S(s-r) (F^N(X(r)) - F^N(X_r^N)) dr, A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (\text{Id} - S(s - [s])) F(X_{[s]}^N) \right\rangle ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \|X(r) - X_r^N\|^2 dr ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (1 + \|X(r)\|_E^4 + \|X_r^N\|_E^4) (s - [s])^\beta \|F(X_{[s]}^N)\|^2 dr ds \\ &\leq C(t) \int_0^t \|X(s) - X_s^N\|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (1 + \|X(r)\|_E^4 + \|X_r^N\|_E^4) (s - [s])^\beta (\|X_{[s]}^N\|_E^6 + 1) dr ds \\ &\leq C(t) \int_0^t \|P^N X(s) - Y_s^N\|^2 ds + C(t) \int_0^t \|Y_s^N - X_s^N\|^2 ds + C(t) \int_0^t \|X(s) - P^N X(s)\|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (1 + \|X(r)\|_E^4 + \|X_r^N\|_E^4) (s - [s])^\beta (\|X_{[s]}^N\|_E^6 + 1) dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second step we transform the integral domain.

For the term  $J_{12}$ ,  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{12} &= \int_0^t \left\langle \int_0^s A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} S(s-r) (F^N(X_r^N) - F^N(X_{[r]}^N)) dr, A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (\text{Id} - S^N(s - [s])) F(X_{[s]}^N) \right\rangle ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (1 + \|X_r^N\|_E^4 + \|X_{[r]}^N\|_E^4) \|X_r^N - X_{[r]}^N\|^2 dr ds \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (s - [s])^\beta \|F(X_{[s]}^N)\|^2 dr ds. \end{aligned}$$

For the term  $J_{13}$ , when  $0 < \beta < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{13} &= \int_0^t \left\langle \int_0^s A^\beta S(s-r) A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (\text{Id} - S(r - [r])) F^N(X_{[r]}^N) dr, A^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} (\text{Id} - S^N(s - [s])) F(X_{[s]}^N) \right\rangle ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\beta} (r - [r])^\beta \|F(X_{[r]}^N)\|^2 dr ds + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s-r)^{-\beta} (s - [s])^\beta \|F(X_{[s]}^N)\|^2 dr ds, \end{aligned}$$

and when  $\beta = 1$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_{13} &= \int_0^t \left\langle \int_0^s S(s-r) A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\text{Id} - S(r - [r])) A^{\frac{1}{2}} F^N(X_{[r]}^N) dr, A^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\text{Id} - S^N(s - [s])) A^{\frac{1}{2}} F(X_{[s]}^N) \right\rangle ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_0^s (r - [r]) \|A^{\frac{1}{2}} F(X_{[r]}^N)\|^2 dr ds + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s - [s]) \|A^{\frac{1}{2}} F(X_{[s]}^N)\|^2 dr ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \int_0^s (r - [r]) (\|X_{[r]}^N\|_E^4 + 1) \|X_{[r]}^N\|_{H^1}^2 dr ds + C \int_0^t \int_0^s (s - [s]) (\|X_{[s]}^N\|_E^4 + 1) \|X_{[s]}^N\|_{H^1}^2 dr ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining terms  $J_{1i}, i = 1, 2, 3$ , Hölder's continuity of  $X_t^N$ , (29), Theorem 3.4, Corollary 3.5, and taking  $L^p(\Omega)$ -norm, we get for  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\| \|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|^2 \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(L_0) \int_0^t \| \|P^N X(s) - Y_s^N\|^2 \|_{L^p(\Omega)} ds + \bar{C}(N^{-2\beta} + \delta^\beta),$$

where  $\bar{C}$  depends on  $p, T, \tau_{min}, L_2, \|P^N X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; E)}, \|X_0\|_{L^q(\Omega; \dot{H}^\beta)}, \|A^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)}$  with some large  $q > 0$ . Applying Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega; H)} \leq C(\bar{C}, L_0)(N^{-\beta} + \delta^{\frac{\beta}{2}}), \quad p \geq 1.$$

To sum up, we get for  $p \geq 2$ ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C(\bar{C}, L_0)(N^{-\beta} + \delta^{\frac{\beta}{2}}).$$

The proof is finished.  $\square$

The combination of Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.2 leads to the following result.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Under conditions in Theorem 3.6, we have for  $p \geq 2, 0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C(N^{-\beta} + (\mathbb{E}M_{T,\delta})^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}),$$

where  $C > 0$  is defined as that in Theorem 3.6.

Since we can not ensure that a timestep function satisfies the low bound in Assumption 4 (11) or Assumption 5 (14), so if they are invalid, we take  $\tau_{min}$  as the uniform timestep of another scheme to ensure that a simulation over the interval  $[0, T]$  can be completed in a finite number of time steps. More precisely, following the idea in [20], if  $\tau_m < \tau_{min}$  or  $\tau_m < (\zeta \|X_{t_m}^N\|^{q_0} + \xi)^{-1}$  at time  $t_m$ , then we apply a single step of the tamed exponential integrator scheme over a timestep of length  $\tau = \tau_{min}$ , rather than (8). Therefore, the adaptive-tamed exponential integrator scheme with the uniform low bound for the adaptive timestep function (ATEU) in this paper is:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t_{m+1}}^N &= (S^N(\tau_m)X_{t_m}^N + S^N(\tau_m)F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m + S^N(\tau_m)\Delta W_m)\chi_{\{\tau_m \geq \tau_{min}\}} \\ &+ \left( S^N(\tau)X_{t_m}^N + S^N(\tau) \frac{F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau}{1 + \|F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\|\tau} + S^N(\tau)\Delta W_m \right) \chi_{\{\tau_m < \tau_{min}\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

For the trace-class noise case, we can also introduce the following adaptive-tamed exponential integrator scheme with the adaptive low bound for the adaptive timestep function (ATEA):

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t_{m+1}}^N &= (S^N(\tau_m)X_{t_m}^N + S^N(\tau_m)F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau_m + S^N(\tau_m)\Delta W_m)\chi_{\{\tau_m \geq (\zeta \|X_{t_m}^N\|^{q_0} + \xi)^{-1}\}} \\ &+ \left( S^N(\tau)X_{t_m}^N + S^N(\tau) \frac{F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\tau}{1 + \|F^N(X_{t_m}^N)\|\tau} + S^N(\tau)\Delta W_m \right) \chi_{\{\tau_m < (\zeta \|X_{t_m}^N\|^{q_0} + \xi)^{-1}\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since the tamed exponential integrator scheme is convergent with order being the same as that of (8), so combining Theorem 3.6, we get the following convergence result.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Under conditions in Theorem 3.6, there is some  $C > 0$ , depending on parameters that are the same as those in Theorem 3.6, such that for  $p \geq 2, 0 < \beta \leq 1$ ,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq C(N^{-\beta} + \delta^{\frac{\beta}{2}}),$$

where  $X_t^N$  is the numerical solution of the scheme (30) or (31).

*Proof.* We only take (30) as an example. We can write the continuous version of (30) into a compact integral form by defining a new timestep function denoted by  $\tau_{new}$  with

$$\tau_{new} := \begin{cases} \tau_m, & \text{for } \tau_m \geq \tau_{min}, \\ \tau_{min}, & \text{for } \tau_m < \tau_{min}. \end{cases}$$

To be specific,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^N &= S^N(t)P^N X_0 + \int_0^t S^N(t-s) \left( F^N(X_{[s]}^N) \chi_{\{\tau_{[s]} \geq \tau_{min}\}} + \frac{F^N(X_{[s]}^N)}{1 + \|F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\| \tau_{min}} \chi_{\{\tau_{[s]} < \tau_{min}\}} \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t S^N(t-s) P^N dW(s). \end{aligned}$$

By introducing an auxiliary process,

$$Y_t^N = S^N(t)P^N X_0 + \int_0^t S^N(t-s) F^N(X(s)) ds + \int_0^t S^N(t-s) P^N dW(s),$$

the error can be divided into the following terms,

$$\|X(t) - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \leq \|X(t) - P^N X(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} + \|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} + \|Y_t^N - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)}.$$

The term  $\|P^N X(t) - Y_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)}$  can be estimated based on (29). It remains to analyze the term  $\|Y_t^N - X_t^N\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)}$ . By Ito's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_t^N - Y_t^N\|^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^N - Y_s^N, -A^N(X_s^N - Y_s^N) \rangle ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle X_s^N - Y_s^N, S^N(s-s) F^N(X_{[s]}^N) - F^N(X(s)) \rangle \chi_{\{\tau_{[s]} \geq \tau_{min}\}} ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \left\langle X_s^N - Y_s^N, S^N(s-s) \frac{F^N(X_{[s]}^N)}{1 + \|F^N(X_{[s]}^N)\| \tau_{min}} - F^N(X(s)) \right\rangle \chi_{\{\tau_{[s]} < \tau_{min}\}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the numerical solution of the adaptive exponential integrator scheme is stable in  $E$ -norm under condition  $\tau_{[s]} \geq \tau_{min}, 0 \leq s \leq t$ , and so is the exponential tamed integrator scheme with the uniform timestep. The remaining proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.6 and [30, Theorem 4.12] and hence can be omitted. The proof is finished.  $\square$

#### 4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we first give some alternative choices of the adaptive timestep function, then present numerical experiments to test the previous theoretical findings.

Consider the following stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with the generalized Q-Wiener process,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + u - u^3 + \dot{W}(t, x), & t \in (0, 1], x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0, x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(\pi x), & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(t, 0) = u(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

For the trace-class noise case, we choose  $Q$  such that  $Qe_i = \frac{1}{i^2}e_i, i \geq 1$ . Noting that  $tr(Q) < \infty$ , Assumption 2 holds for  $\beta = 1$ . For the space-time white noise case, i.e.,  $Q = I$ , Assumption 2 holds for  $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . For the trace-class noise case, the three methods tested are

the tamed exponential integrator scheme (TE), ATEU and ATEA. For the space-time white noise case, the two schemes tested are TE and ATEU.

Set  $\tau_{min} = 0.2$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ ,  $q_0 = 1$ . For the trace-class noise case, we choose the following three types of adaptive timestep functions:

*type 1:*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{au1}^\delta(X) &= \min \left\{ \delta T, \left( \frac{\|X\|}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \right\}, \\ \tau_{aa1}^\delta(X) &= \min \left\{ \delta T, \frac{2\|X\|_{L^4}^4}{\|X\|_{L^6}^6 + \phi}, \left( \frac{\|X\|}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \right\},\end{aligned}$$

*type 2:*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{au2}^\delta(X) &= \delta \left( \frac{\|X\|}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}, \\ \tau_{aa2}^\delta(X) &= \delta \min \left\{ \frac{2\|X\|_{L^4}^4}{\|X\|_{L^6}^6 + \phi}, \left( \frac{\|X\|}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \right\},\end{aligned}$$

*type 3:*

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{au3}^\delta(X) &= \delta \left( \frac{1}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}, \\ \tau_{aa3}^\delta(X) &= \delta \min \left\{ \frac{\|X\|^2}{\|X\|_{L^6}^6 + \phi}, \left( \frac{1}{\|F(X)\| + \phi} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \right\},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta = 2^{-l}$ ,  $l = 2, \dots, 7$ ,  $\phi = 1$ , and the indexes  $au, aa$  mean the adaptive timestep functions are chose to be with the uniform low bound and the adaptive low bound, respectively. In *type 1* and *type 2*, we let  $L_2(\omega) = X(\omega)$  with  $X$  being the exact solution or numerical solution, and  $\bar{L}_2 = \frac{3}{2}$ . In *type 3*, we let  $L_2 = 1$ ,  $\bar{L}_2 = 2$  independent of  $\omega$ . The *type 1* and *type 2* timestep functions are the upper bound and the lower bound of the timestep function in Assumption 6, respectively.

For the space-time white noise case, we choose the following three types of adaptive timestep functions:

*type 4:*

$$\tau_{au4}^\delta(X) = \min \left\{ \delta T, \left( \frac{1}{\|F(X)\| + 1} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \right\},$$

*type 5:*

$$\tau_{au5}^\delta(X) = \delta \left( \frac{1}{\|F(X)\| + 1} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}},$$

*type 6:*

$$\tau_{au6}^\delta(X) = \delta \left( \frac{1}{\|F(X)\| + 3} \right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

In this case, *type 4* and *type 5,6* timestep functions are the upper bound and the lower bound of the timestep function in Assumption 6, respectively.

In the following, error bounds are measured in root-mean-square (RMS) sense at the end point  $T = 1$ , caused by spatio-temporal discretization, and the expectations are approximated by computing averages over 100 samples. The infinite dimensional Hilbert space  $L^2((0, 1); \mathbb{R})$  is approximated through the finite dimensional subspace spanned by the first  $2^{10}$  eigenfunctions of the Laplacian, i.e., in the spectral Galerkin method, we take  $N = 2^{10}$ . The exact solution is approximated by the same method with a timestep which is 3 times smaller.

**4.1. Trace-class noise.** We show the experiment results for the trace-class noise case in this subsection. The comparisons of the three schemes are presented in Figure 1, where the left three subfigures are about the RMS error against the average number of timesteps, and the right ones are about the RMS error against the CPU time. As for ATEA, we take  $\xi = 10$  for three types of timestep functions. In Figure 1, the blue, red and black solid lines represent TE, ATEA and ATEU, separately. The black dotted line is the reference line of order  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We observe from Figure 1 (a)(c)(e) that the convergence orders of these three schemes are  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Moreover, ATEU seems to have the best performance among the three schemes.

As stated in (30) and (31), ATEU and ATEA are adaptive schemes with the uniform low bound and the adaptive low bound, respectively. We could also compare their behaviors in Figure 1 (b)(d)(f). It seems that ATEA costs more CPU time than ATEU. This can be explained by Figure 2, which shows that ATEA uses many small timesteps, and this may influence the efficiency of the scheme. As for *type 3*, the timesteps for ATEU are too large, it may influence the accuracy of the scheme.




FIGURE 1. RMS error for numerical methods with trace-class noise






FIGURE 2. Timestep function for numerical methods with trass-class noise ( $\delta = 2^{-7}$ )

4.2. **Space-time white noise.** For space-time white noise case, Figure 3 shows the comparison of RMS error against the number of timesteps and CPU time with different types of timestep functions. The blue and red solid lines represent TE and ATEU respectively, and the black dotted line is the reference line of order  $\frac{1}{4}$ . It can be gained from Figure 3 (a)(c)(e) that the convergence orders of the two schemes are  $\frac{1}{4}$ . ATEU performs better than TE for the three types of timestep functions. This can be explained by the fact that ATEU uses less timesteps and less CPU time.

Finally, we show the timestep functions and norms of  $F(X_{t_i}^N)$  for numerical solution  $X_{t_i}^N$  in the left and right subfigures in Figure 4, respectively. The blue and red solid lines represent ATEU and TE respectively.







FIGURE 3. RMS error for numerical methods with space-time white noise




(a) timestep type 4




(b) timestep type 4




(c) timestep type 5



(d) timestep type 5



(e) timestep type 6



(f) timestep type 6

FIGURE 4. Left: timestep function; Right:  $\|F(X_{t_i}^N)\|$  of different types of timestep functions

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Beccari, M. Hutzenthaler, A. Jentzen, R. Kurniawan, F. Lindner, and D. Salimova. Strong and weak divergence of exponential and linear-implicit Euler approximations for stochastic partial differential equations with superlinearly growing nonlinearities. *arXiv: 1903.06066*.
- [2] S. Becker and A. Jentzen. Strong convergence rates for nonlinearity-truncated Euler-type approximations of stochastic Ginzburg–Landau equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(1):28–69, 2019.
- [3] C. Bréhier, J. Cui, and J. Hong. Strong convergence rates of semidiscrete splitting approximations for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 39(4):2096–2134, 2019.
- [4] C. Bréhier and L. Goudenège. Analysis of some splitting schemes for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 24(8):4169–4190, 2019.
- [5] M. Cai, S. Gan, and X. Wang. Weak convergence rates for an explicit full-discretization of stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with additive noise. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 86(3):Paper No. 34, 30, 2021.
- [6] S. Campbell and G. Lord. Adaptive time-stepping for stochastic partial differential equations with non-Lipschitz drift. *arXiv: 1812.09036*.
- [7] S. Cerrai. *Second order PDE’s in finite and infinite dimension*, volume 1762 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. A probabilistic approach.
- [8] C. Chen, J. Hong, and L. Ji. Mean-square convergence of a semidiscrete scheme for stochastic Maxwell equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 57(2):728–750, 2019.
- [9] C. Chen, J. Hong, and L. Ji. Runge–Kutta semidiscretizations for stochastic Maxwell equations with additive noise. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 57(2):702–727, 2019.
- [10] D. Cohen, J. Cui, J. Hong, and L. Sun. Exponential integrators for stochastic Maxwell’s equations driven by Itô noise. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 410:109382, 21, 2020.
- [11] J. Cui and J. Hong. Strong and weak convergence rates of a spatial approximation for stochastic partial differential equation with one-sided Lipschitz coefficient. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 57(4):1815–1841, 2019.
- [12] J. Cui, J. Hong, and L. Sun. Weak convergence and invariant measure of a full discretization for parabolic SPDEs with non-globally Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 134:55–93, 2021.
- [13] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [14] W. Fang and M. Giles. Adaptive Euler–Maruyama method for SDEs with nonglobally Lipschitz drift. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(2):526–560, 2020.
- [15] X. Feng, Y. Li, and Y. Zhang. Finite element methods for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with gradient-type multiplicative noise. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 55(1):194–216, 2017.
- [16] Ī. Ī. Gihman and A. V. Skorohod. *Stochastic differential equations*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 72. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the Russian by Kenneth Wickwire.
- [17] I. Gyöngy. Approximations of stochastic partial differential equations. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and applications (Trento, 2002)*, volume 227 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 287–307. Dekker, New York, 2002.
- [18] A. Jentzen and P. Pušnik. Strong convergence rates for an explicit numerical approximation method for stochastic evolution equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous nonlinearities. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 40(2):1005–1050, 2020.
- [19] M. Kamrani. Convergence of a numerical scheme for SPDEs with correlated noise and global Lipschitz coefficients. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 39(11):2993–3004, 2016.
- [20] C. Kelly and G. Lord. Adaptive time-stepping strategies for nonlinear stochastic systems. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 38(3):1523–1549, 2018.
- [21] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and F. Lindgren. On the discretisation in time of the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *Math. Nachr.*, 291(5-6):966–995, 2018.
- [22] H. Lamba. An adaptive timestepping algorithm for stochastic differential equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 161(2):417–430, 2003.
- [23] V. Lemaire. An adaptive scheme for the approximation of dissipative systems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 117(10):1491–1518, 2007.
- [24] Z. Liu and Z. Qiao. Strong approximation of monotone stochastic partial differential equations driven by white noise. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 40(2):1074–1093, 2020.
- [25] A. Majee and A. Prohl. Optimal strong rates of convergence for a space-time discretization of the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with multiplicative noise. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, 18(2):297–311, 2018.

- [26] C. Prévôt and M. Röckner. *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 1905 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [27] R. Qi and X. Wang. Optimal error estimates of Galerkin finite element methods for stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with additive noise. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 80(2):1171–1194, 2019.
- [28] V. Thomée. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*, volume 25 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.
- [29] J. Walsh. Finite element methods for parabolic stochastic PDE’s. *Potential Anal.*, 23(1):1–43, 2005.
- [30] X. Wang. An efficient explicit full-discrete scheme for strong approximation of stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(10):6271–6299, 2020.
- [31] X. Wang and R. Qi. A note on an accelerated exponential Euler method for parabolic SPDEs with additive noise. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 46:31–37, 2015.

LSEC, ICMSEC, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, CHINA, AND SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100049, CHINA

*Email address:* `chenchuchu@lsec.cc.ac.cn`; `dangth@lsec.cc.ac.cn`; `hjl@lsec.cc.ac.cn`