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Abstract

We establish criteria for non-existence with positive probability of global weak solutions to a stochastic Keller–Segel model with spatially inhomogeneous, conservative noise on $\mathbb{R}^2$. By considering the evolution of both the centred and non-centred variance of weak solutions we obtain a criteria that relates the chemotactic sensitivity with the initial variance, regularity and intensity of the noise. Of particular note is the fact that in the situation of arbitrarily spatially uncorrelated noise our condition for blow-up agrees with that of a deterministic Keller–Segel model with increased viscosity.

1 Introduction

In this work, we present a criterion for non-existence of global solutions (that we will frequently refer to as finite time blow-up) to a stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) model of chemotaxis on $\mathbb{R}^2$. The model we consider,

\[
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u_t - \Delta u_t &= -\chi \nabla \cdot (u_t \nabla c_t) - \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\sigma_k \cdot \nabla u_t) \circ dW^k_t, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2, \\
-\Delta c_t &= u_t, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2, \\
|u|_{t=0} &= u_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2), & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2,
\end{aligned}
\]

is based on the parabolic-elliptic Patlak–Keller–Segel model of chemotaxis ($\gamma = 0$) with the addition of a stochastic transport term ($\gamma > 0$), where $\{W^k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a family of i.i.d. standard Brownian motions on a filtered probability space, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, satisfying the usual assumptions. We will give detailed assumptions on the vector fields $\sigma_k : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ below (see (H1)-(H3)), but for now simply stipulate that they are assumed to be divergence free and such that $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 1} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}; L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$.
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The noiseless model \((\gamma = 0)\) is a well known PDE system modelling chemotaxis: the collective movement of a population of cells (represented by its time-space density \(u\)) in the presence of an attractive chemical substance (represented by its time-space concentration \(c\)). The chemical sensitivity is encoded by the parameter \(\chi > 0\). The main particularity of the model is that solutions may become unbounded in finite time even though the total mass is preserved. This is the so-called blow-up in finite time and occurs depending on the spatial dimension of the problem and the size of parameters appearing in the model. Namely, in the case of \(d = 1\) solutions exist globally in time as shown by Bossy and Talay [4], while when \(d = 2\) blow-up in finite time occurs whenever \(\chi > 8\pi\), at \(t = \infty\) for \(\chi = 8\pi\) see Blanchet et al. [2] and global existence holds for \(\chi < 8\pi\); see the monograph by Perthame [26]. For \(d \geq 3\) the situation is more subtle and we refer to [26, Thm. 2.1 & Thm. 2.2] and the references therein.

Since the scenario described by the noiseless model often occurs within an external environment, it is natural to take into account additional environmental effects. In some cases, this can be done by coupling additional equations into the system, such as the Navier–Stokes equations of fluid mechanics [24, 30, 31]. However, for both modelling and analysis purposes it is also relevant to study the effect of random environments. These either model a rough, background, accumulated errors in measurement or emergent noise from micro-scale phenomena not explicitly considered.

The noise introduced in (1.1) is related to stochastic models of turbulence, [6, 8, 21, 23] and we refer to the monograph by Flandoli [14] for a broader overview of its relevance to SPDE models. Here we note that noise satisfying either our assumptions or closely related ones have been studied in a number of relevant settings. In the context of interacting particle systems, [7, 11, 13]; regularisation, stabilisation and enhanced mixing of general parabolic and transport PDE, [12, 17, 19], and with particular applications to the Keller–Segel and Navier–Stokes equations amongst others in [15, 16, 18]. We mention briefly that due to the conservative structure of the noise, (1.1) formally preserves the \(L^1\)-norm and sign of the initial data, hence one may view solutions to (1.1) as random probability measures.

The motivation of the present work is to understand the persistence of blow-up in the case of stochastic chemotactic models driven by conservative noise. Our main result is that finite time blow-up occurs with positive probability for solutions to (1.1) under the following condition relating \(\chi, \gamma, \sigma\) and the second moment of \(u_0\) \((V[u_0])\):

\[
\chi > [(1 + \gamma V[u_0] C_\sigma) \wedge (1 + \gamma)] 8\pi.
\]

Here \(C_\sigma\) indicates a type of Lipschitz norm of the vector fields \(\sigma\) and measures the spatial decorrelation of the noise (see (2.1) for a precise definition). In other words, under the above condition any solution to (1.1) ceases to exist with positive probability at a random time \(\tau\) on which we have an explicit deterministic upper bound \(T^* > 0\) (see Theorem 2.7). It is worth noting here that when \(\gamma = 0\), we recover the usual conditions for blow-up of the deterministic equation. On the one hand, we see that when \(C_\sigma\) increases, the condition becomes \(\chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi\). On the other hand, when \(C_\sigma\) is
arbitrarily small (which is the case for spatially homogeneous noise) one again recovers the deterministic criterion. However, when $V[u_0]C_\sigma < 1$, the condition also involves the initial variance. In that case, under increased spatial decorrelation of the noise, our result requires initial data that is correspondingly more spatially concentrated to ensure that the blow-up with positive probability occurs.

The study of blow-up of solutions to SPDEs is a large topic of which we only mention some examples. It was shown by Bonder and Groisman [3] that additive noise can eliminate global well-posedness for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations, while a similar statement has been shown for both additive and multiplicative noise in the case of stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equations by de Bouard and Debussche [9, 10]. In addition, non-uniqueness results for stochastic fluid equations has been studied by Hofmanová et al. [20], Romito [28].

In the case of SPDE models of chemotaxis the study of blow-up phenomena has begun to be considered and we mention here two very recent works, by Flandoli et al. [16] and Misiats et al. [25]. In [16] the authors show that under a particular choice of the vector fields, $\sigma$, a similar model to (1.1) on $\mathbb{T}^d$ for $d = 2, 3$ enjoys delayed blow-up with $1 - \varepsilon$ after choosing $\gamma$ and $\sigma$ w.r.t. $\chi$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. In [25] the authors study global well-posedness and blow-up of a conservative model similar to (1.1) with a constant family of vector fields $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma$ and a single common Brownian motion. Translating their parameters into ours, they establish global well-posedness of solutions to (1.1), with $\sigma_k(x) \equiv 1$ and for $\chi < 8\pi$, as well as finite time blow-up when $\chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi$.

The main contribution of this paper is the above mentioned blow-up criterion for an SPDE version of the Keller–Segel model in the case of a spatially inhomogeneous noise term. To the best of our knowledge, this is a new result. An interesting point is that, unlike the deterministic criterion, it relates the chemotactic sensitivity with the initial variance, regularity and intensity of the noise term. In addition, we close the gap in [25], as in the case of constant vector fields we show that finite time blow-up occurs for $\chi > 8\pi$ (see Remark 2.8).

**Notation**

- For $n \geq 1$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$ (resp. $p = \infty$) we write $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for the spaces of $p$ integrable (resp. essentially bounded) $\mathbb{R}^n$ valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we write $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for the inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces of order $\alpha$ - a full definition and some useful facts are given in Appendix A.
- For $k \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we write $C^k(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for the $k$ continuously differentiable maps and $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^n)$ for the $k$ continuously differentiable maps with $\alpha$ Hölder continuous $k^{th}$ derivatives.

When the context is clear we remove notation for the target space, simply writing $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2), H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$. We equip these spaces with the requisite norms writing $\| \cdot \|_{L^p}, \| \cdot \|_{H^\alpha}$ removing the domain as well when it will not cause confusion.

- We write $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for the space of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and for $m \geq 1$, $\mathcal{P}_m(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for the space of probability measures with $m$ finite moments. By an abuse of notation
we write, for example, $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to indicate the space of probability measures with densities in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

- For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and when they are finite we define the following quantities:
  
  $$C[\mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x \, d\mu(x),$$
  
  $$V[\mu] := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x - C[\mu]|^2 \, d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 \, d\mu(x) - \frac{1}{2} C[\mu].$$

  Note that $V[\mu]$ is one half the usual variance, we define it in this way for computational ease.

- For $T > 0$, $X$ a Banach space and $p \in [1, \infty)$ (resp. $p = \infty$) we write $L^p_T X := L^p([0, T]; X)$ for the space of $p$-integrable (resp. essentially bounded) maps $f : [0, T] \to X$. Similarly we write $C_T X := C([0, T]; X)$ for the space of continuous maps $f : [0, T] \to X$, which we equip with the supremum norm $\|f\|_{C_T X} := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|f\|_X$.

- We write $\nabla$ for the usual gradient operator on Euclidean space while for $k \geq 2$, $\nabla^k$ denotes the matrix of $k$-fold derivatives and we write $\Delta := \nabla \cdot \nabla$ for the Laplace operator.

- If we write $a \lesssim b$ we mean that the inequality holds up to a constant which we do not keep track of. Otherwise we write $a \leq Cb$ for some $C > 0$ which is allowed to vary from line to line.

**Plan of the paper**  In Section 2 we give the precise assumptions on the noise term and formulate our main result. Then, in Section 3 we establish some important properties of weak solutions to (1.1) which are made use of in Section 4 where we prove our main theorem. Appendix A is devoted to a brief recap of the fractional Sobolev spaces on $\mathbb{R}^2$ along with some useful properties. Appendix B gives a sketch proof for the equivalence between (1.1) and a comparable Itô equation. Finally, in Appendix C, for the readers convenience, we provide a relatively detailed proof of local existence of weak solutions in the sense of Definition 2.3 below.

## 2 Main result

Throughout we fix a complete, filtered, probability space, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, satisfying the usual assumptions and carrying a family of i.i.d Brownian motions $\{W^k\}_{k \geq 1}$. Furthermore, we consider a family of vector fields $\sigma := \{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, satisfying the following assumptions.

(H1) For $k \geq 1$, $\sigma_k : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ are measurable and such that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|\sigma_k\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$.

(H2) For every $k \geq 1$, $\sigma_k \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\text{div} \, \sigma_k = 0$. 

(H3) Defining \( q : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2 \) by
\[
q_{ij}(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma^k_i(x) \sigma^k_j(y), \quad \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, d, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2;
\]

(a) The mapping \((x, y) \mapsto q(x, y) =: Q(x - y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2\) depends only on the difference \(x - y\).

(b) \(Q(0) = q(x, x) = \text{Id}\) for any \(x \in \mathbb{R}^2\).

(c) We have \(Q \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2)\) and \(\sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} |\nabla^2 Q(x - y)| < \infty\).

**Remark 2.1.** For \(\sigma\) satisfying Assumption (H3) it is possible to show that the quantity,
\[
C_{\sigma} := \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left|\sigma_k(x) - \sigma_k(y)\right|^2}{|x - y|^2}.
\]  

is finite. See [7, Rem. 4] for details. Note that due to (H3)-(b) one cannot re-scale \(\sigma\) so as to remove \(\gamma\) from (1.1).

**Remark 2.2.** It is important to note that one can instead specify the covariance matrix \(Q\) first. In fact, due to [22, Thm. 4.2.5] any matrix valued map \(Q : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^2\) satisfying the analogue of (2.1),
\[
\sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{q_{ii}(x, x) - 2q_{i}(x, y) + q_{ii}(y, y)}{|x - y|^2} < \infty
\]
can be expressed as a family of vector fields \(\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 1}\) satisfying (H1)-(H3). See [7, Ex. 5] for an example of a suitable \(Q\).

We now define our notion of weak solutions.

**Definition 2.3.** Let \(T > 0, \chi, \gamma > 0\). Then, given \(u_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)\), we say that an adapted \(C_T L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^2_T H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\) valued process \(u\) such that
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \|u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2_T H^1}^2 \right] < \infty
\]
is a weak solution to (1.1) on \([0,T]\) if for any \(t \in [0,T]\), \(\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\), \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.s. the following hold:
\[
\langle u_t, \phi \rangle = \langle u_0, \phi \rangle - \int_0^t \left( \langle \nabla u_s, \nabla \phi \rangle - \chi \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle \right) ds \\
- \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k u_s, \nabla \phi \rangle \circ dW^k_s,
\]
\[
-\langle c_t, \Delta \phi \rangle = \langle u_t, \phi \rangle.
\]
A process \((u_t)_{0 \leq t < \infty}\) is a global weak solution to (1.1) if it is a weak solution to (1.1) on \([0,T]\) for all \(T > 0\).
Note that we are able to specify weak solutions on a deterministic time interval due to the particular form of the noise, we refer to Appendix C for details and a proof of local well-posedness in the above sense. Applying the standard Itô-Stratonovich correction one can prove the following remark, a sketch is given in Appendix B.

Remark 2.4. Let $T > 0$ and let $u$ be a solution, in the sense of Definition 2.3, to (1.1) on $[0,T]$ then $u$ is also a solution to the following Itô equation: For every $\phi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $t \in [0,T]$, it holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

\[ \langle u_t, \phi \rangle = \langle u_0, \phi \rangle - \int_0^t ((1 + \gamma) \langle \nabla u_t, \nabla \phi \rangle - \chi \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle) \, ds \]
\[ - \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k u_s, \nabla \phi \rangle \, dW_s^k, \]
\[ -\langle c_t, \Delta \phi \rangle = \langle u_t, \phi \rangle. \] (2.3)

Remark 2.5. It follows from Definition 2.3 and the standard chain rule for the integral that for $u$ a weak, Stratonovich solution to (1.1) and $F \in C^3(L^2(\mathbb{R}^2); \mathbb{R})$,

\[ F[u_t] = F[u_0] + \int_0^t DF[u_s][\Delta u_s - \chi \nabla \cdot (u_s \nabla c_s)] \, ds \]
\[ + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t DF[u_s][\nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s)] \circ dW_s^k, \] (2.4)

where $DF[u_s][\varphi]$ denotes the Gateaux derivative of $F[u_s]$ in the direction $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Remark 2.6. Note that under assumption (H1), for any $T > 0$ and any weak solution on $[0,T]$, the stochastic integral is well defined as an element of $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)) \subset L^2(\Omega \times [0,T]; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2))$, since for any $t \in (0,T]$, we have

\[ E \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \| \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k(x)u_s(x)) \|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \right] = E \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \| \sigma_k(x) \nabla u_s(x) \|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \right] \]
\[ \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \| \sigma_k \|_{L^\infty}^2 E \left[ \int_0^t \| \nabla u_s \|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \right] < \infty. \]

We are ready to state our main result. It shows that under certain conditions, with positive probability, global weak solutions to (1.1) cannot exist.

**Theorem 2.7 (Blow-up in finite time).** Let $\chi, \gamma > 0$ and let $u_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $\int xu_0(x) \, dx = 0$. Assume $\sigma = \{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ satisfy (H1)-(H3). Then, under the condition

\[ \chi > [(1 + \gamma V[u_0]C_\sigma) \wedge (1 + \gamma)] 8\pi, \] (2.5)

there exists a deterministic $T^* > 0$ such that with positive probability any weak solution to (1.1) in the sense of Definition 2.3 must cease to exist for $t \geq T^*$. Furthermore, we have the explicit expression

\[ T^* = \frac{\log(8\pi - \chi) - \log(V[u_0]8\pi \gamma C_\sigma + 8\pi - \chi)}{2\gamma C_\sigma} \wedge \frac{2\pi V[u_0]}{\chi - (1 + \gamma)8\pi}. \] (2.6)
Remark 2.8. • If $V[u_0]C_\sigma > 1$, the condition (2.5) becomes $\chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi$. This has relevance to the setting of [16] in which a model similar to (1.1) is considered on $\mathbb{T}^d$ for $d = 2, 3$ where formally $C_\sigma$ can be taken arbitrarily large.

• If $V[u_0]C_\sigma < 1$, it follows that blow-up occurs in finite time with positive probability for $\chi > (1 + \gamma V[u_0]C_\sigma)8\pi$. In particular, if one considers spatially homogeneous noise, as treated in [25], so that $\sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{l \geq 1} \sigma_k \sigma_l u_k u_l \circ dW^k_t$ is replaced by $\sigma \circ \nabla u_t \circ dW_t$, then we have $C_\sigma = 0$. Hence, the condition becomes $\chi > 8\pi$. This can in fact be seen more directly, since for $u$ a solution to (1.1) with spatially homogeneous noise, the function $v(t, x) := u(t, x - \sigma W_t)$ is a solution to the usual parabolic-elliptic Keller–Segel equation with viscosity equal to one.

Remark 2.9. It is possible to show that the definition of $T^*$ respects the ordering of $V[u_0]C_\sigma$ and 1. In particular, one finds

$$T^* = \begin{cases} \frac{\log(8\pi - \chi) - \log(V[u_0]8\pi C_\sigma + 8\pi - \chi)}{2V[u_0]C_\sigma}, & V[u_0]C_\sigma < 1, \\
\frac{2\pi V[u_0]}{\chi - (1 + \gamma)8\pi}, & V[u_0]C_\sigma > 1. \end{cases}$$

As mentioned before, in the PDE case blow-up occurs, for $\chi > 8\pi$, and weak solutions cannot exist beyond $T^* = \frac{2\pi V[u_0]}{\chi - 8\pi}$. It follows that in all parameter regions both the threshold for $\chi$ and definition of $T^*$ in Theorem 2.7 agree with the equivalent quantities in the limit $\gamma \to 0$.

We conclude this section with a brief outline of the method and organisation of the proof of Theorem 2.7 which is completed in Section 4. After establishing some preliminary results in Section 3 below, we split the proof of Theorem 2.7 into two parts, both of which lead to a contradiction. First, we demonstrate positive probability of finite time blow-up under the condition $\chi > (1 + \gamma V[u_0]C_\sigma)8\pi$. To do so we consider the evolution of the expectation of the centred variance, $\mathbb{E}[V[u_t]]$ in terms of a number of exact quantities and the second moment of the centre of mass, $\mathbb{E}[[C[u_t]]^2]$. Using Assumption (H3) we are able to obtain a lower bound on $\mathbb{E}[[C[u_t]]^2]$ which leads to an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[V[u_t]]$. By Grönwall arguments and calculating some explicit integrals we show that this upper bound is decreasing in time if $\chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi$. Hence, for $t \geq T^*$ we obtain a contradiction with Corollary 3.4 proved in Section 2. To prove positive probability of finite time blow-up under the condition $\chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi$ we use similar arguments but instead applied to the non-centred variance, $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx$, which we are able to bound in expectation directly by the quantity $V[u_0] + ((1 + \gamma) - \chi/(8\pi))t$. This allows us to conclude in a similar manner.

### 3 A Priori Properties of Weak Solutions

We observe that the parabolic-elliptic system (1.1) may be decoupled by writing $\nabla c$ explicitly in terms of $u$. To do so we recall that the elliptic operator $-\Delta$ has a Green’s function on $\mathbb{R}^2$, $K(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \ln(|x|)$. Thus, for $t > 0$, we may formally write

$$\nabla c_t(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{x - y}{|x - y|^2} u_t(y) \, dy. \quad (3.1)$$
The following lemma demonstrates that this expression is well defined Lebesgue almost everywhere.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $u$ a weak solution to (1.1) up to some $T > 0$. Then, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. there exists a $C > 0$ such that for a.e. $t \leq T$,

\[ \|c_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|u_t\|_{L^2}, \quad \|\nabla c_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|u_t\|_{H^1}. \]

**Proof.** These are a direct consequence of the Sobolev embeddings, Lemma A.3 and the regularising effect of Poisson’s equation. For the first, applying the embedding $C^{0,1-\frac{d}{4}} \subset L^\infty$, the bound (A.3) and finally the embedding $H^{-1+\frac{d}{4}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ we arrive at the chain of inequalities,

\[ \|c_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|c_t\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{d}{4}}} \leq \|c_t\|_{H^{1+\frac{d}{4}}} \lesssim \|u_t\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_t\|_{H^1}. \]

For the second, we also apply the embedding $C^{0,1-\frac{d}{4}} \subset L^\infty$, the regularising effect of Poisson’s equation, (A.3), and the effect of derivatives on Sobolev spaces, (A.2), followed by the embedding $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset H^\frac{d}{4}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

\[ \|\nabla c_t\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\nabla c_t\|_{C^{0,1-\frac{d}{4}}} \leq \|\nabla c_t\|_{H^{1+\frac{d}{4}}} \lesssim \|u_t\|_{H^{\frac{d}{4}}} \leq \|u_t\|_{H^1}, \]

which completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.2.** Exploiting symmetries of the kernels $K$, (3.1) and following [29], we can write the advection term of (2.2) in a different form that is useful for some arguments later. We note that,

\[ \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle = \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} u_s(x) \nabla_x K(x - y) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) u_s(y) \, dy \, dx. \quad (3.2) \]

Renaming the dummy variables in the double integral and applying Fubini’s theorem, we also have

\[ \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle = \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} u_s(y) \nabla_y K(y - x) \cdot \nabla \phi(y) u_s(x) \, dy \, dx. \quad (3.3) \]

Combining (3.2) and (3.3) gives

\[ \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} u_s(x) u_s(y) (\nabla_x K(x - y) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) + \nabla_y K(y - x) \cdot \nabla \phi(y)) \, dy \, dx. \]

Therefore, in view of (3.1) we may re-write $\langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle$ as

\[ \langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla \phi \rangle = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{(\nabla \phi(x) - \nabla \phi(y)) \cdot (x - y)}{|x - y|^2} u_s(x) u_s(y) \, dy \, dx \quad (3.4) \]

In order to prove our main result we will need to manipulate the zeroth, first and second moments of weak solutions. The following cut-off functions will be frequently
used. We define a family of radial, cut-off functions, indexed by \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) such that for some \( C > 0 \)

\[
\Psi_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{for } |x| < \varepsilon^{-1}, \\
0, & \text{for } |x| > 2\varepsilon^{-1}, 
\end{cases} \\
\|\nabla \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \|\nabla^2 \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon^2.
\] (3.5)

For any family of cut-off functions satisfying (3.5), it is straightforward to show that there exists a \( C > 0 \) such that

\[
\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla^2(x\Psi_\varepsilon(x))| \leq C, \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla^2(|x|^2\Psi_\varepsilon(x))| \leq C.
\] (3.6)

Note also that since \( \text{supp}(\nabla \Psi_\varepsilon) = \text{supp}(\Delta \Psi_\varepsilon) = B_{2\varepsilon^{-1}}(0) \setminus B_{\varepsilon^{-1}}(0) \), then

\[
\|\nabla \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Delta \Psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq C\varepsilon^{3/2}.
\] (3.7)

We start with sign and mass preservation.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let \( u \) a weak solution to (1.1) on \([0, T]\). If \( u_0 \geq 0 \) then \( \mathbb{P}\)-a.s.

i) \( u_t \) is non-negative for all \( t \in [0, T] \),

ii) \( \|u_t\|_{L^1} = \|u_0\|_{L^1} \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \).

**Proof.** By assumption, \( u_0 \geq 0 \). Let us define

\[
S[u_t] = \int u_t(x) u^-_t(x) \, dx = \|u^-_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\]

on \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \), where \( u^-_t = u_t 1_{\{u_t < 0\}} \). The computations below can be properly justified by first defining an \( H^1 \) approximation of the indicator function, obtaining uniform bounds in the approximation parameter using that \( u \in H^1 \) and then passing to the limit using dominated convergence. For ease of exposition we work directly with \( S[u_t] \) keeping these considerations in mind so that the following calculations should only be understood formally.

Applying (2.4) gives

\[
S[u_t] = S[u_0] + 2 \int_0^t \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla u_s(x) \cdot (\nabla c_s(x) u_s(x)) \, dx \, ds \\
+ \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} u_s(x) \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s(x)) \, dx \, dW^k_s.
\] (3.8)

Regarding the stochastic integral term, using that \( \nabla \cdot \sigma_k = 0 \), \( u_s|_{\partial\{u_s < 0\}} = 0 \) and integrating by parts, we have

\[
\int_{\{u_s < 0\}} u_s(x) \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s(x)) \, dx = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla \cdot (u^2_s(x) \sigma_k) \, dx = 0.
\]
Regarding the finite variation integral,
\[
\int_0^t \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla u_s(x) \cdot (-\nabla u_s(x) + \chi \nabla c_s(x) u_s(x)) \, dx \, ds \]
\[
= -\int_0^t \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |\nabla u_s(x)|^2 \, dx + \chi \int_0^t \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla u_s(x) \cdot u_s(x) \nabla c_s(x) \, dx,
\]
we apply Young’s inequality in the second term, to give
\[
\chi \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla u_s(x) \cdot u_s(x) \nabla c_s(x) \, dx \leq \frac{\chi}{2\varepsilon} \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |\nabla u_s(x)|^2 \, dx + \|\nabla c_s(x)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{\varepsilon \chi}{2} \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |u_s(x)|^2 \, dx.
\]
So choosing \(\varepsilon = \frac{\chi}{4}\) we have,
\[
-\int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |\nabla u_s(x)|^2 \, dx + \chi \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} \nabla u_s(x) \cdot u_s(x) \nabla c_s(x) \, dx
\]
\[
\leq -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |\nabla u_s(x)|^2 \, dx + \frac{\|\nabla c_s\|_{L^\infty}^2 \chi^2}{8} \int_{\{u_s < 0\}} |u_s(x)|^2 \, dx
\]
Putting all this together in (3.8) and using that \(\nabla u_s \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)\) for almost every \(s \in [0, T]\),
\[
S[u_t] \leq S[u_0] + \frac{\chi^2}{4} \int_0^t \|\nabla c_s\|_{L^\infty}^2 S[u_s] \, ds.
\]
So, having in mind Lemma 3.1 and applying Grönwall’s inequality,
\[
S[u_t] \leq S[u_0] \exp \left( \frac{\chi^2}{4} \int_0^T \|u_s\|_{H^1}^2 \, ds \right) = S[u_0] \exp \left( \frac{\chi^2}{4} \|u\|_{L^2_T H^1} \right)
\]
Hence, if \(S[u_0] = 0\), we have \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.s. \(S[u_t] = 0\) for all \(t \in [0, T]\) which shows the first claim.

To show the second claim, for \(\varepsilon \in (0, 1)\), we define \(M_\varepsilon[u_t] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx\), where the cut-off functions \(\Psi_\varepsilon\) are given in (3.5). Using the weak form of the equation and integrating by parts where necessary we see that
\[
M_\varepsilon[u_t] = M_\varepsilon[u_0] + (1 + \gamma) \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Delta \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, ds
-
\chi \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla \Psi_\varepsilon(x) \cdot \nabla c_s(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, ds \tag{3.9}
-
\sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla \Psi_\varepsilon(x) \cdot (u_s(x) \sigma_k(x)) \, dx \, dW_s^k.
\]
Applying Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the fact that the Itô integral disappears under the expectation and in view of (3.7), there exists a \(C > 0\) such that
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx \right] \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_0(x) \, dx
\]
\[
+ (1 + \gamma) C \varepsilon^{3/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2} \right] + \chi C \varepsilon^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla c\|_{L^2_T L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2} \right].
\]
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Applying Fatou’s lemma,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_t(x) \, dx \right] \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx \right] \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_0(x) \, dx.$$

Hence $$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_t(x) \, dx < \infty$$ \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.s. for every \(t \in (0, T]\). We may now apply dominated convergence to each term in (3.9). In particular, stochastic dominated convergence is used for the last term on the right hand side. Thus, to get the almost sure convergence all the limits should be taken up to the convenient subsequence resulting from the latter. Finally, noting that \(\Delta \Psi_\varepsilon\) and \(\nabla \Psi_\varepsilon\) converge to zero pointwise almost everywhere, we conclude

$$M[u_t] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_t(x) \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_0(x) \, dx.$$

In combination with the first statement of the lemma this proves the second claim. 

The following corollary to Proposition 3.3 will be crucial to obtaining our central contradiction in the proof of Theorem 2.7.

**Corollary 3.4.** Let \(T > 0\) and \(u\) be a weak solution to (1.1) on \([0, T]\). Then for any \(f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}\) such that \(f > 0\) Lebesgue almost everywhere and any \(t \in [0, T]\),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x) u_t(x) \, dx > 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

**Proof.** We first show that any weak solution must have positive support. Let us fix \(t \in [0, T]\) and \(\mathbb{P}\text{-a.a.} \omega \in \Omega\) and assume for a contradiction that, \(u_t(\omega)\) is supported on a set of zero measure. However, since \(\|u_t(\omega)\|_{L^1} = 1\), we find that,

$$1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_t(x, \omega)| \, dx \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_t(x, \omega)|^2 \, dx \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{\text{supp}(u_t(\omega))} 1 \right)^{1/2} = 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Since \(f\) is assumed to be strictly positive, Lebesgue almost surely, the conclusion follows.

In the following proposition, we derive the evolution for the center of mass and the variance of a weak solution to (1.1).

**Proposition 3.5.** Let us assume that \(u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)\) is such that, \(C[u_0] = 0\) and \(V[u_0] < \infty\). Then for any weak solution to (1.1) in the sense of Def. 2.3, \(\mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. for any} \ t \in [0, T]\),

$$C[u_t] = \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sigma_k(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, dW^k_s, \quad (3.10)$$

$$V[u_t] = V[u_0] + \left( 2(1 + \gamma) + \frac{\chi}{4\pi} \right) t - \frac{1}{2} |C[u_t]|^2$$

$$- \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_{0}^{t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x \cdot \sigma_k(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, dW^k_s \quad (3.11)$$
Remark 3.6. Note that if we consider the situation of chemotactic collapse, where formally $u_t = \delta_y$ for a process $Y_t \in \mathbb{R}^2$ then we find $V[u_t] = 0$ and using the assumed properties of the covariance matrix $Q$, $\mathbb{E}[C[u_t]] = 2\gamma t$.

Remark 3.7. The assumption that $C[u_0] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xu_0(x) \, dx = 0$ is purely cosmetic. Given a non-centred initial condition $\bar{u}_0$ with $C[\bar{u}_0] = c \neq 0$ one may redefine $C[\mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (x - c) \, d\mu(x)$ whose evolution along weak solutions to (1.1) will again be given by (3.10) and the rest of our analysis holds without further change.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Let $p \in \{1, 2\}$ and we use the convention that for $p = 2$, $x^p := |x|^2$. Since $x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x)$ is an $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ function we may apply (2.3) along with Remark 3.2 and integrate by parts where necessary to give that

$$\int x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx = \int x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_0(x) \, dx + (1 + \gamma) \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Delta(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x)) u_s(x) \, dx \, ds$$

$$+ \frac{\chi}{4\pi} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} \frac{\nabla(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) - y^p \Psi_\varepsilon(y)) \cdot (x - y)}{|x - y|^2} u_s(x) u_s(y) \, dy \, dx \, ds$$

$$- \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x)) \cdot \sigma_k(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, dW_s^k.$$  

From (3.6) it follows that uniformly across $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\Delta(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x))$ is bounded and $\nabla(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x))$ is Lipschitz continuous. Hence, using that $\|u_t\|_{L^1} = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ there exists a $C > 0$ such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1),$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx \right] \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_0(x) \, dx + (1 + \gamma) + \frac{\chi}{4\pi} tC.$$ 

Note that we may directly apply Lebesgue’s dominated convergence to the initial data term, since $|x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_0(x)| \leq |x^p u_0(x)|$ where the latter is assumed to be integrable. Now, let us for the moment take only $p = 2$. Applying Fatou’s lemma,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \right] \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x) \, dx \right]$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_0(x) \, dx + (1 + \gamma) + \frac{\chi}{4\pi} tC < \infty.$$ 

Hence $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx < \infty$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. From Proposition, 3.3 $u_t$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$, so we have the bound

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x| u_t(x) \, dx \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \right)^{1/2}.$$ 

It follows that for $p \in \{1, 2\}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x^p u_t(x) \, dx < \infty$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Since by definition we also have,

$$|x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) u_t(x)| \leq |x^p u_t(x)|,$$
Similarly as in Proposition 3.3, we may apply dominated convergence in each integral of (3.12). Using that for \( p \in \{1, 2\} \) and Lebesgue almost every \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \)

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Delta(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x)) = 0,
\]
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \nabla(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x) - y^p \Psi_\varepsilon(y)) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } p = 1, \\
x - y, & \text{if } p = 2,
\end{cases}
\]
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \nabla(x^p \Psi_\varepsilon(x)) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } p = 1, \\
2x, & \text{if } p = 2.
\end{cases}
\]

we directly find the claimed identities for \( C[u_t] \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \). To conclude therefore it only remains to note that

\[
V[u_t] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx - \frac{1}{2} |C[u_t]|^2.
\]

\( \square \)

4 Proof of Theorem 2.7

We are ready to prove our main result. Let \( u \) be a global weak solution to (1.1). We will prove that under the constraint (2.5) there exists a \( T^* > 0 \) such that for all \( t \geq T^* \) either of the quantities \( \mathbb{E}[V[u_t]] \) or \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \right] \) are no longer strictly positive. Either result is in contradiction with Corollary 3.4 and hence we establish finite time blow-up of weak solutions with positive probability. We begin by establishing blow-up under the criteria

\[
\chi > (1 + \gamma V[u_0] C_\sigma)
\]

(4.1)

It follows directly from (3.11) that,

\[
\mathbb{E} [V[u_t]] = V[u_0] + \left(2(1 + \gamma) + \frac{\chi}{4\pi} \right) t - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ |C[u_t]|^2 \right].
\]

(4.2)

Using (3.10) and Itô’s isometry,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ |C[u_t]|^2 \right] = 2\gamma \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int \sigma_k(x) u_s(x) \, dx \right|^2 \right] \, ds.
\]

(4.3)

From Remark 2.1,

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma_k(x) - \sigma_k(y)|^2 \leq C_\sigma |x - y|^2, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
As a direct consequence we have,

\[ C_{\sigma} |x - y|^2 \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma_k(x) - \sigma_k(y)|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\sigma_k(x)|^2 - 2\sigma_k(x) \cdot \sigma_k(y) + |\sigma_k(y)|^2 \]

\[ = 2\text{Tr}(Q(0)) - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x) \cdot \sigma_k(y) \]

\[ = 2d - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x) \cdot \sigma_k(y). \]

So that,

\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k(x) \cdot \sigma_k(y) \geq d - \frac{1}{2} C_{\sigma} |x - y|^2. \quad (4.4) \]

From (4.4) and the fact that \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_t(x) \, dx = 1 \, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. for all } t \in [0, T] \), we find

\[ \mathbb{E}[(C[u_t])^2] \geq 2d\gamma \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \iint |x - y|^2 u_s(x)u_s(y) \, dx \, dy \right] \, ds - C_{\sigma}\gamma \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \iint |x - y|^2 u_s(x)u_s(y) \, dx \, dy \right] \, ds \]

\[ = 2d\gamma t - C_{\sigma}\gamma \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \iint |x - y|^2 u_s(x)u_s(y) \, dx \, dy \right] \, ds. \]

The integrand in the second term can easily be rewritten as

\[ \iint |x - y|^2 u_s(x)u_s(y) \, dx \, dy = 4V[u_s]. \]

Thus, we establish the lower bound

\[ \mathbb{E}[(C[u_t])^2] \geq 2d\gamma t - 4\gamma C_{\sigma} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[V[u_s]] \, ds. \quad (4.5) \]

Therefore, taking expectations in (4.2) and using (4.5), we find

\[ \mathbb{E}[V[u_t]] \leq V[u_0] + \left(2 - \frac{\chi}{4\pi}\right)t + 2\gamma C_{\sigma} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[V[u_s]] \, ds. \]

Applying Grönwall,

\[ \mathbb{E}[V[u_t]] \leq V[u_0] + \left(2 - \frac{\chi}{4\pi}\right)t + 2\gamma C_{\sigma} \int_0^t \left(V[u_0] + \left(2 - \frac{\chi}{4\pi}\right)s\right) e^{(t-s)2\gamma C_{\sigma}} \, ds \]

Evaluating the exponential integrals,

\[ \mathbb{E}[V[u_t]] \leq \left(V[u_0] - \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\chi}{4\pi} - 2\right)\right) e^{2\gamma C_{\sigma} t} + \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{\sigma}} \left(\frac{\chi}{4\pi} - 2\right). \]

Which implies that if \( \chi > 8\pi \left(1 + \gamma C_{\sigma} V[u_0]\right) \) and \( t \geq T^* \), with

\[ T^* = \frac{1}{2\gamma C_{\sigma}} \left(\log(8\pi - \chi) - \log(V[u_0]8\pi\gamma C_{\sigma} + 8\pi - \chi)\right), \]
then
\[ \mathbb{E}[V[u_t]] \leq 0. \]
This is in contradiction with Corollary 3.4 which shows \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \) positivity of \( V[u_t] \) for \( u \) a weak solution to (1.1).

Showing positivity probability of blow-up under the criteria
\[ \chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi \] (4.6)
is considerably simpler. Since,
\[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx = V[u_t] + \frac{1}{2} C[u_t]^2 \]
it follows from Lemma 3.5 that \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \)
\[ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx = V[u_0] + \left(2(1 + \gamma) + \frac{\chi}{4\pi}\right) t - \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} x \cdot \sigma_k(x) u_s(x) \, dx \, dW_s^k \]
Therefore,
\[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \right] = V[u_0] + \left((1 + \gamma) - \frac{\chi}{8\pi}\right) t. \]
Hence, if \( \chi > (1 + \gamma)8\pi \) for any \( t \geq T^* := \frac{2\pi V[u_0]}{\chi - (1 + \gamma)8\pi} \),
\[ \int |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \leq 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \]
By Corollary 3.4, \( \int |x|^2 u_t(x) \, dx \) must also be strictly positive for any weak solution so we may conclude in the same manner as above.

This shows finite time blow-up with positive probability under the condition
\[ \chi > [(1 + \gamma V[u_0] C_\sigma) \lor (1 + \gamma)]8\pi. \]
The definition (2.6) of \( T^* \) follows from inspecting the proof.

**Appendix**

**A Sobolev Spaces on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)**

We include some useful definitions and lemmas concerning inhomogeneous Sobolev spaces on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \).

**Definition A.1.** Let \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \). The Sobolev space \( H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2) \) consists of the tempered distributions \( u \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^2) \) such that \( \hat{u} \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and
\[ \|u\|_{H^\alpha}^2 := \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}((1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\alpha/2}\hat{u})\|_{L^2}, \]
where $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ denotes the inverse Fourier transform. We note that $H^\alpha$ is a Hilbert space with inner product,
\[
\langle u, v \rangle_{H^\alpha} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^\alpha \hat{u}(\xi) \hat{v}(\xi) \, d\xi.
\]
When $\alpha = 1$ we have $\langle u, v \rangle_{H^1} = \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2} + \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{L^2}$. It follows from the definition that for $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1$,
\[
H^{\alpha_1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow H^{\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R}^2).
\tag{A.1}
\]
Furthermore the following facts can be shown using the identification $H^\alpha = B^\alpha_{2,2}$ and arguing on each Littlewood–Paley block; there exists a $C > 0$ such that for any $u \in H^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,
\[
\|\nabla u\|_{H^{\alpha-1}} \leq C\|u\|_{H^\alpha},
\tag{A.2}
\]
\[
\|(-\Delta)^{-1}u\|_{H^{\alpha+2}} \leq C\|u\|_{H^\alpha}.
\tag{A.3}
\]
where $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ denotes the solution map of Poisson’s equation $-\Delta g = u$. We refer to [1] for relevant definitions and details.

Finally, we recall the following interpolation and embedding results.

**Lemma A.2** ([1, Prop.1.52]). For $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_1$,
\[
\|u\|_{H^\alpha} \leq \|u\|_{H^{\alpha_0}}^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{H^{\alpha_1}}^\theta, \quad \alpha = (1 - \theta)\alpha_0 + \theta\alpha_1.
\tag{A.4}
\]

**Lemma A.3** ([1, Thm. 1.66]). For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the space $H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ embeds continuously into

- the Lebesgue space $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$, if $0 < \alpha < d/2$ and $2 \leq p \leq \frac{2d}{d - 2\alpha}$;

- the Hölder space $C^{k,\rho}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, if $\alpha \geq \frac{d}{2} + k + \rho$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

## B  Stratonovich to Itô correction

We briefly detail the necessary calculations to justify Remark 2.4. We refer to [7, Sec. 2.2], [15, Sec. 2] and [18, Sec. 2.3] for similar arguments. All equalities below should be interpreted in the weak sense.

**Lemma B.1.** Let $T > 0$, $u \in C_T L^2 \cap L^\infty_T H^1$ be a weak, Stratonovich solution to (1.1), with $\sigma$ satisfying Assumptions (H1)-(H3). Then $u$ also solves the Itô SPDE,
\[
\begin{cases}
\d u_t = ((1 + \gamma)\Delta u_t + \chi \nabla \cdot (u_t \nabla c_t)) \, dt - \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_t) \, dW^k_t, \\
-\Delta c_t = u_t, \\
|_{t=0}^u = u_0.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** Repeating the caveat that all equalities should be understood after testing against suitable test functions, for all $k \geq 1$,
\[
\int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s) \circ dW^k_s = \int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s) \, dW^k_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k \d[u, W^k]_s),
\]
where the process $s \mapsto (u, W^k)_s$ denotes the quadratic covariation between $u$ and $W$. Using (1.1) we find

$$[u, W^k]_s = \sqrt{2\gamma} \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s),$$

so that we have,

$$\sqrt{2\gamma} \int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s) \circ dW^k_s = \sqrt{2\gamma} \int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s) dW^k_s - \gamma \int_0^t \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u_s)) ds.$$

Summing over $k \geq 1$ and applying the Leibniz rule, we see that,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k(x) \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k(x) u_s(x))) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i \partial_j (Q^{ij}(0) u_s(x)) - \nabla \cdot \left( \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \nabla \sigma_k(x) \cdot \sigma_k(x) \right) u_s(x) \right),$$

where, $Q^{ij}(0) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma^i_k(x) \sigma^j_k(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\nabla \sigma_k \cdot \sigma_k$ is the vector field with components,

$$\nabla \sigma_k \cdot \sigma_k = \sum_{j=1}^d (\partial_j \sigma^i_k) \sigma^j_k.$$

Applying the Leibniz rule once more, for $j = 1, \ldots, d$, we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^d (\partial_j \sigma^i_k(x)) \sigma^j_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j Q^{ij}(x, x) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma^i_k(x) \nabla \cdot \sigma_k(x).$$

By Assumptions (H2) and (H3) we have that $\nabla \cdot \sigma_k = 0$ and $Q^{ij}(x, x) = \delta_{ij}$ from which it follows that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\nabla \sigma_k \cdot \sigma_k)^i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, d$ and that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i \partial_j (Q^{ij}(x, x) u_s(x)) = \Delta u_s,$$

which completes the proof. \qed

\section{Local Existence}

In this section we give a sketched proof of local existence for (1.1). The method of proof is well known and can be found in a general format in [27]. In the case of (1.1) a similar proof of local existence was exhibited in [16, Prop. 3.6]. For the readers convenience we supply here a lighter version adapted to our particular setting.

\textbf{Theorem C.1.} Let $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then there exists a $T \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cap \{+\infty\}$, such that a unique, weak solution exists to (1.1) on $[0, T]$ in the sense of Definition 2.3. Furthermore, either,

$$T = +\infty, \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T} \|u_t\|_{L^2} = \infty.$$

We begin with a local a priori bound on solutions to (1.1).
Lemma C.2. Let \( u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \). Then there exists a \( \bar{T} = \bar{T}(\|u_0\|_{L^2}) > 0 \) and a \( C > 0 \), such that for any weak solution \( u \) to (1.1) on \([0, \bar{T}]\),

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, \bar{T}]} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{T}} \|u_t\|_{H^1}^2 \, dt < C, \quad \mathbb{P} \text{- a.s..} \tag{C.1}
\]

Remark C.3. Since the constant on the right hand side of (C.1) is non-random it follows immediately that \( \|u\|_{L_p^\infty L^2}^\infty + \|u\|_{L_p^{2, H^1}}^\infty \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \) for any \( p \geq 1 \).

Proof of Lemma C.2. By assumption \( u_t \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \) and it satisfies (2.2). In particular the Stratonovich integral is well-defined for \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega \). Applying (2.4) to the functional \( F[u_t] := \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \), we have the identity,

\[
\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 = \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_0^t \|\nabla u_s\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds + \chi \int_0^t \langle \nabla u_s, u_s \nabla c_s \cdot \nabla u_s \rangle \, ds
\]

\[
- \sqrt{2}\gamma \sum_{k=1}^\infty \langle u_s \sigma_k, \nabla u_s \rangle \circ dW^k_t.
\]

Regarding the non-linear term, integrating by parts and using the equation satisfied by \( c \), we have

\[
|\langle u_s \nabla c_s, \nabla u_s \rangle| = \frac{1}{2} |\langle \nabla c_s, \nabla (u^2_s) \rangle| = \frac{1}{2} \|u_s\|_{L^3}^3.
\]

Then using the Sobolev embedding \( H^{d/6}(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset L^3(\mathbb{R}^2) \), the ordering of fractional Sobolev spaces, real interpolation as given by Lemma A.2 and Young’s inequality, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
\|u_s\|_{L^3}^3 \leq \|u_s\|_{H^{1/2}}^3 \leq \|u_s\|_{H^1}^{3/2} \|u_s\|_{L^2}^{3/2} \leq \frac{3}{4\varepsilon} \|u_s\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \|u_s\|_{L^2}^6 \leq \frac{3}{4\varepsilon} \|\nabla u_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3}{4\varepsilon} \|u_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \|u_s\|_{L^2}^6.
\]

Regarding the stochastic integral, using the divergence free assumption on the \( \sigma_k \)’s it follows that,

\[
|\langle u_s \sigma_k, \nabla u_s \rangle| = \frac{1}{2} |\langle \sigma_k, \nabla (u^2_s) \rangle| = \frac{1}{2} |\langle 1, \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u^2_s) \rangle| = 0.
\]

So, choosing \( \varepsilon = \chi \), we find that \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \)

\[
\|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{5}{8} \int_0^t \|\nabla u_s\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds + \frac{3}{8} \int_0^t \|u_s\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds + \frac{\chi^2}{8} \int_0^t \|u_s\|_{L^2}^6 \, ds. \tag{C.3}
\]

That is \( t \mapsto \|u_t\|_{L^2} \) satisfies the non-linear, locally Lipschitz, differential inequality,

\[
\frac{d}{dt}\|u_t\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{3}{8} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\chi^2}{8} \|u_t\|_{L^2}^3, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}
\]

By standard ODE theory and recalling that \( u_0 \) is non-random, there exists a strictly positive, but possibly finite time \( \bar{T}(\|u_0\|_{L^2}) \) and a deterministic constant \( C > 0 \), such that,

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, \bar{T}]} \|u_t\|_{L^2} \leq C, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}
\]

In combination with (C.3) this completes the proof of (C.1).
Definition C.4. We say that a mapping \( A : H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \to H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) is **locally coercive**, **locally monotone** and **hemi-continuous** if the following hold:

**Locally coercive:** there exists an \( \alpha > 0 \) such that for any \( R > 0 \) there exists a \( \lambda > 0 \) such that for any \( u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) with \( \|u\|_{H^1} \leq R \),

\[
2\langle A(u), u \rangle + \alpha \|u\|^2_{H^1} \leq \lambda \|u\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{C.4}
\]

**Locally monotone:** for any \( R > 0 \) there exists a \( \lambda > 0 \) such that for all \( u, w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) with \( \|u\|_{H^1} \vee \|w\|_{H^1} \leq R \),

\[
2\langle A(u) - A(w), u - w \rangle \leq \lambda \|u - w\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{C.5}
\]

**Hemi-continuous:** for any \( u, w, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) the mapping,

\[
\mathbb{R} \ni \theta \mapsto \langle A(u + \theta w), v \rangle \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{C.6}
\]

is continuous.

**Lemma C.5.** The operator \( A : H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \to H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) given by the mapping,

\[
A(u) := \Delta u - \chi \nabla \cdot (u \nabla c),
\]

is **locally coercive**, **locally monotone** and **hemi-continuous**.

**Proof. Local Coercivity:** Approximating \( u \) by smooth compactly supported functions it follows that,

\[
\langle A(u), u \rangle = -\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \chi \langle u \nabla c, \nabla u \rangle.
\]

By Hölder’s inequality, Young’s inequality and Lemma 3.1, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
|\langle u \nabla c, \nabla u \rangle| \leq \|u\|_{L^2} \|\nabla c\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|u\|^2_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|^2_{H^1}.
\]

So that under the assumption that \( \|u\|_{H^1} \leq R \) and choosing \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, there exist \( \alpha, \lambda(R) > 0 \) such that

\[
2\|A(u), u\| \leq -\alpha \|u\|^2_{H^1} + \lambda \|u\|^2_{L^2}.
\]

**Local Monotonicity:** By similar arguments it follows that

\[
\langle A(u) - A(w), u - w \rangle = -\|\nabla (u - w)\|^2_{L^2} + \|u \nabla c_u - w \nabla c_w, \nabla (u - w)\|
\leq -\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \|\nabla (u - w)\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|u \nabla c_u - w \nabla c_w\|^2_{L^2}.
\]

with \( -\Delta c_u = u \) and \( -\Delta c_w = w \). Applying the triangle inequality followed by Hölder’s inequality,

\[
\|u \nabla c_u - w \nabla c_w\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla c_u\|_{L^\infty} \|u - w\|_{L^2} + \|w\|_{L^4} \|\nabla c_{u-w}\|_{L^4}.
\]
Using Lemma 3.1 and the local bound \( \|u\|_{H^1} \vee \|w\|_{H^1} \leq R \) the first term gives can be controlled by the bound

\[
\| \nabla c_u \|_{L^\infty} \| u - w \|_{L^2} \leq \| u \|_{H^1} \| u - w \|_{L^2} \leq R \| u - w \|_{L^2}.
\]

On the other hand, using the Sobolev embeddings, ordering of fractional Sobolev spaces and Lemma 3.1, it follows that,

\[
\| w \|_{L^4} \| \nabla c_{u-w} \|_{L^4} \leq \| w \|_{H^{4/4}} \| \nabla c_{u-w} \|_{H^{4/4}} \leq \| w \|_{H^1} \| u - w \|_{H^{4/4-1}} \leq R \| u - w \|_{L^2}.
\]

So after choosing \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, local monotonicity follows. 

Hemi-continuity: Letting \( u, v, w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R} \), we have

\[
|\langle A(u + \theta w) - A(u), v \rangle| \leq \theta |\langle \nabla w, \nabla v \rangle| + \chi |\langle (u + \theta w) \nabla c_{u+\theta w} - u \nabla c_u, \nabla v \rangle|.
\]

The first term directly converges to 0 as \( \theta \to 0 \). For the second term, after applying Hölder’s inequality we see that we are required to control

\[
\| (u + \theta w) \nabla c_{u+\theta w} - u \nabla c_u \|_{L^2} \leq \theta (\| u \nabla c_w \|_{L^2}^2 + \| w \nabla c_u \|_{L^2}^2) + \theta^2 \| w \nabla c_w \|_{L^2}^2,
\]

which again directly converges to 0 as \( \theta \to 0 \).

\[\square\]

Lemma C.6. For \( \sigma := \{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 1} \) satisfying (H1) and divergence free, the mapping,

\[
H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \ni u \mapsto \sum_{k \geq 1} \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k u) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2),
\]

is linear and strongly continuous.

Proof. Linearity is clear. Let \( u, w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \), using the divergence free property of the \( \sigma_k \),

\[
\left\| \sum_{k \geq 1} \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k (u-w)) \right\|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \| \sigma_k \cdot \nabla (u-w) \|_{L^2} \leq \| \sigma \|_{\ell^2 L^\infty} \| u-w \|_{H^1}.
\]

\[\square\]

Proof of Theorem C.1. The strategy of proof is to first define a finite dimensional approximation to (1.1) using a Galerkin projection, we project the solution and the non-linear term to a finite dimensional subspace of \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \). Using Lemma C.5 and the linearity of the noise term it follows that this finite dimensional system has a global solution and using the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma C.2, there is a non-trivial interval \([0, T]\) on which we have uniform control on this solution. By Banach–Alaoglu we can extract a convergent subsequence, whose limit, \( u \), will be our putative solution to (1.1). By linearity the noise term converges so it will remain to show that \( A \) converges along this subsequence to \( A(u) \) and that \( u \) is a solution in the sense of Definition 2.3. Finally we prove that weak solutions in the sense of Definition 2.3 are unique.

For \( N \geq 1 \), let \( H_N \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) denote the finite dimensional subspace spanned by the basis vectors \( \{e_k\}_{|k| \leq N} \) and \( \Pi_N : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \to H_N \) be an orthogonal projection such
that \(\|\Pi^N f\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^2}\). Then we consider the finite dimensional system of Stratonovich SDEs,

\[
du_{N;t} = \left(\Delta u_{N;t} + \chi \nabla \cdot \left(\Pi_N(u_{N;t} \nabla c_{N;t})\right)\right) dt + \sqrt{2\gamma} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Pi_N(\sigma_k \nabla u_{N;t}) \circ dW_t^k
\]

\(u_{N:0} = \Pi_N u_0\).

It follows from [27, Thm. 3.1.1] and Lemma C.5 that a unique, global solution exists for all \(N \geq 1\). Furthermore, for each \(N \geq 1\), \(u^N\) is a smooth solution to a truncated version of (1.1) with smooth initial data. It is readily shown that

\[
\langle \nabla u_N, \Pi_N(u_N \nabla c_N) \rangle = \langle \nabla u_N, u_N, \nabla c_N \rangle.
\]

Hence, using the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma C.2, there exists a \(\bar{T} \in (0, \infty)\) depending only on \(\|u^N_0\|_{L^2} \leq \|u_0\|_{L^2}\) such that

\[
\sup_{N \geq 1} \mathrm{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, \bar{T}]} \|u^N_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^{\bar{T}} \|u^N_t\|_{H^1}^2 \, dt \right] < \infty.
\]

We can therefore apply the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, [5, Thm. 3.16 & Thm. 3.17], to see that there exist sub-sequences \(\{u^k\}_{k \geq 1}\), \(\{A(u^k)\}_{k \geq 1}\), a \(u \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))\) and a \(\xi \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2))\) such that

\[
u^k \rightharpoonup u \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))
\]

\[A(u^k) \rightharpoonup \xi \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2)).\]

It follows from the first and Lemma C.6 that the stochastic integrals converge so it remains to show that \(\xi = A(u)\). From the local monotonicity of \(A\), for any \(t \in (0, \bar{T}]\), \(v \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))\) and \(N \geq 1\)

\[
\mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle A(u^N_s) - A(v_s), u^N_s - v_s \rangle \, ds \right] \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \|u^N_s - v_s\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \right].
\]

(C.8)

Using the identity,

\[
\mathrm{E} \left[ \|u^N_t\|_{L^2}^2 - \|u^N_0\|_{L^2}^2 \right] = \mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle A(u^N_s), u^N_s \rangle \, ds \right],
\]

which can be proved directly using the chain rule for Stratonovich integrals and the arguments of Lemma C.2, it is straightforward to show the inequality,

\[
\mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle \xi_s, u_s \rangle \, ds \right] \leq \liminf_{N \to \infty} \mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle A(u^N_s), u^N_s \rangle \, ds \right].
\]

It follows, applying (C.8) in the final inequality, that for any \(v \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, \bar{T}]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))\),

\[
\mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle \xi_s - A(v_s), u_s - v_s \rangle \, ds \right] \leq \liminf_{N \to \infty} \mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle A(u^N_s) - A(v_s), u^N_s - v_s \rangle \, ds \right]
\]

\[\leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \liminf_{N \to \infty} \mathrm{E} \left[ \int_0^t \|u^N_s - v_s\|_{L^2}^2 \, ds \right]
\]
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Now, choosing \( v = u - \theta w \) for some \( \theta > 0 \) and \( w \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)) \), gives that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle \xi_s - A(u_s - \theta w_s), w_s \rangle \, ds \right] \leq \theta \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \|w_s\|_{H^1}^2 \, ds \right].
\]

So applying (C.6) and taking \( \theta \to 0 \) we finally find that,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \langle \xi_s - A(u_s), w_s \rangle \, ds \right] \leq 0,
\]

for all \( w \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)) \) from which it follows that \( \xi = A(u_s) \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)) \).

It follows that \( u \in L^2(\Omega; L^\infty([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))) \cap L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)) \) and satisfies (2.2). We now show that in fact, \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, u \in L^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))) \). To see this we recall that since \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) is a Hilbert space, if \( u_{t_k} \rightharpoonup u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \), and \( \|u_{t_k}\|_{L^2} \to \|u\|_{L^2} \in \mathbb{R} \) one has

\[
\|u_{t_k} - u\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle u_{t_k} - u, u_{t_k} - u \rangle = \|u_{t_k}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\langle u_{t_k}, u \rangle + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \to 0.
\]

From (C.2) it follows that given a sequence \( t_k \to t \), \( \|u_{t_k}\|_{L^2} \to \|u_t\|_{L^2} \). So it suffices to show that \( u_{t_k} \rightharpoonup u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \). Let \( h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) be arbitrary, \( \{h_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \) be a sequence converging to \( h \) strongly in \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and \( \varepsilon > 0, n_\varepsilon \geq 1 \) be large enough such that,

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_t\|_{L^2}\|h - h_n\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_\varepsilon.
\]

Therefore we have

\[
|\langle u_t, h \rangle - \langle u_{t_k}, h \rangle| \leq |\langle u_t, h - h_n \rangle| + |\langle u_t - u_{t_k}, h_n \rangle| + |\langle u_{t_k}, h - h_n \rangle| \\
\leq \varepsilon + \|u_t - u_{t_k}\|_{H^{-1}}\|h_n\|_{H^1}.
\]

By definition, for any weak solution \( u_{t_k} \to u \) strongly in \( H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \) and so conclude

\[
\limsup_{n \geq n_\varepsilon}|\langle u_t, h \rangle - \langle u_{t_k}, h \rangle| \leq \varepsilon.
\]

Since \( \varepsilon > 0 \) was arbitrary we may conclude \( u_{t_k} \to u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \) strongly. Furthermore, inspecting the proof we see that the modulus of continuity is deterministic and hence \( u \in L^p(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))) \) for any \( p \geq 1 \).

**Uniqueness:** The final step is to show uniqueness of local, weak solutions. Let \( u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), \bar{T}(u_0) > 0 \) be as in Lemma C.2 and \( u, v \) be weak solutions on an \([0, \bar{T}]\) such that \( u|_{t=0} = v|_{t=0} = u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \). Due to Lemma C.2 there exists an \( R > 0 \) such that,

\[
(\|u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2_T H^1}^2) \vee (\|v\|_{L^\infty_T L^2}^2 + \|v\|_{L^2_T H^1}^2) \leq R, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}
\]
Hence, writing the equation satisfied by \( u - v \) in Stratonovich form, applying (2.4) with 
\[ F[u - v] = \|u - v\|^2 \] and using local monotonicity of \( A \), we immediately obtain, for 
any \( t \in [0, T] \), \( P \)-a.s.
\[
\|u_t - v_t\|^2_{L^2} \leq \lambda \int_0^t \|u_s - v_s\|^2_{L^2} ds + \sum_{k \geq 1} \int_0^t \langle \sigma_k \nabla (u_s - v_s), u_s - v_s \rangle dW^k_s. \quad (C.10)
\]
Again using the divergence free property of the \( \sigma_k \)'s we see that for any \( k \geq 1 \), \( P \)-a.s.
\[
\langle \sigma_k \nabla (u_s - v_s), u_s - v_s \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \sigma_k, \nabla (u_s - v_s)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle 1, \nabla \cdot (\sigma_k (u_s - v_s)^2) \rangle = 0. \quad (C.11)
\]
Hence, we may apply Grönwall’s inequality in (C.10) to conclude that \( \|u_t - v_t\|_{L^2} = 0 \), 
\( P \)-a.s. for all \( t \in [0, T] \). Using the same ideas as in the proof of Lemma C.2 one can also 
show that \( \|\nabla (u_t - v_t)\|_{L^2} = 0 \), \( P \)-a.s. for all \( t \in [0, T] \) which completes the proof. \( \square \)
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