

EXPONENTIAL MIXING AND LIMIT THEOREMS OF QUASI-PERIODICALLY FORCED 2D STOCHASTIC NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN THE HYPOELLIPTIC SETTING

RONGCHANG LIU AND KENING LU

ABSTRACT. We consider the incompressible 2D Navier-Stokes equations on the torus driven by a deterministic time quasi-periodic force and a noise that is white in time and extremely degenerate in Fourier space. We show that the asymptotic statistical behavior is characterized by a uniquely ergodic and exponentially mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure. The result is true for any value of the viscosity $\nu > 0$ and does not depend on the strength of the external forces, which in particular solves a conjecture made by Hairer and Mattingly [24].

By utilizing this quasi-periodic invariant measure, we are able to show the strong law of large numbers and central limit theorem for the continuous time inhomogeneous solution processes. Estimates of the corresponding rate of convergence are also obtained, which is the same as in the time homogeneous case for the strong law of large numbers, while the convergence rate in the central limit theorem depends on the Diophantine approximation property on the quasi-periodic frequency and the mixing rate of the quasi-periodic invariant measure. We also prove the existence of a stable quasi-periodic solution in the laminar case (when the viscosity is large).

The scheme of analyzing the statistical behavior of the time inhomogeneous solution process by the quasi-periodic invariant measure is new and could be extended to other inhomogeneous Markov processes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Description of results	2
1.2. Relation to existing works	6
2. Settings and main results	7
2.1. Well-posedness, quasi-periodic invariant measures and quasi-periodic solutions	7
2.2. Homogenization through skew product	10
2.3. Main results	11
3. Ergodicity and exponentially mixing	13
3.1. Contraction on $\mathcal{P}(H)$	13
3.2. Ergodicity and mixing	18
4. SLLN and CLT for time inhomogeneous solution process	23
4.1. The martingale approximation	25
4.2. The limit theorems	32
4.3. The rate of convergence in the limit theorems	38
5. Large viscosity implies a trivial quasi-periodic attractor	45
6. Appendix: Estimates of the solution	49
References	53

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 37D45, 37C40.

Key words and phrases. Navier-Stokes Equations, quasi-periodic invariant measure, unique ergodicity, mixing, limit theorems, rate of convergence, Diophantine condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the asymptotic statistical properties of time inhomogeneous solution process of the incompressible 2D Navier-Stokes equation driven by a deterministic time-dependent quasi-periodic force and a highly degenerate stochastic force. Besides its own interest in the theory of turbulence, the consideration of the system leads to an effective scheme of analyzing the statistical dynamics of time inhomogeneous Markov processes, which is known to be challenging in the literature. More specifically, there are three main ingredients of our work for this system:

(1) We extend the Harris-like theorem in the infinite dimensional hypoelliptic setting developed by Hairer and Mattingly [24] to the time quasi-periodic inhomogeneous case. Furthermore, by viewing the two-parameter Markov transition operator as a contractive deterministic non-autonomous dynamical system acting on the space of probability measures, we show that the non-autonomous system has a globally exponentially attracting quasi-periodic trajectory, serving as the uniquely ergodic and exponentially mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure, which describes the quasi-periodically statistical steady states of the system.

(2) The quasi-periodic invariant measure in (1) enables us to develop a martingale approximation scheme, to show the strong law of large numbers and central limit theorem for the time inhomogeneous solution process starting at every deterministic point and for Hölder observables weighted by a Lyapunov function. This particular type of martingale approximation as well as the limit theorems for the time inhomogeneous Markov solution process, are new in the literature. They reflect how the asymptotic statistical dynamics of the time inhomogeneous solution process is characterized by the quasi-periodic invariant measure.

(3) We also obtain an estimate on the rate of convergence in the limit theorems, which is apparently new in the time inhomogeneous regime. For the strong law of large numbers, the convergence rate is the same as in the time homogeneous case. While in the case of the central limit theorem, the convergence rate is related to the mixing rate of the quasi-periodic invariant measure and the convergence rate of the Birkhoff average of the irrational rotation flow with particular observable functions involving the quasi-periodic invariant measure. The later has a close connection with the Diophantine approximation property of the frequency. The result reveals how the statistical dynamics of a time inhomogeneous Markov process is affected by its time inhomogeneity.

We confine ourselves to the 2D Navier-Stokes system to simplify the presentation of the main ideas. However, the results can be applied to a class of time inhomogeneous Markov process generated by stochastic semilinear equations driven by an additional time dependent deterministic force for which the in-homogeneity can be modeled by a dynamical system (the Bebutov shift for example). In what follows we will briefly describe our results (Theorems A, B and C below) and compare them with the existing literature, while leave the technical preliminaries to the next section.

1.1. Description of results. Consider the incompressible 2D Navier-Stokes on the two dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^2 := \mathbb{R}^2/(2\pi)\mathbb{Z}^2$ in the vorticity form

$$dw(t, x) + B(\mathcal{K}w, w)(t, x)dt = \nu \Delta w(t, x)dt + f(t, x)dt + \sum_{i=1}^d g_i dW_i(t), \quad t > s, \quad w(s) = w_0,$$

where $w(t, x)$ is the vorticity field, and $\mathcal{K}w$ is the divergence free velocity field. The phase space is chosen as $H := \{w \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) : \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} w dx = 0\}$ whose norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. The deterministic force f is quasi-periodic in t in the sense that $f(t, x) = \Psi(\alpha t, x)$ for some $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$. Here the frequency $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^n$ are rationally independent. $W = (W_1, W_2, \dots, W_d)$ is a

two-sided \mathbb{R}^d -valued standard Wiener process over the sample space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ where \mathbf{P} is the Wiener measure, and $\{g_i\}$ are elements of H . Under appropriate spatial regularity conditions on the external forces (see the next section), the equation is well posed with a time inhomogeneous Markov solution process $w_{s,t}(w_0)$. It generates a two-parameter Markov transition operator $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}$ acting on the space of bounded measurable functions $B_b(H)$ as

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,t}\phi(w_0) = \mathbf{E}\phi(w_{s,t}(w_0)), \quad \forall \phi \in B_b(H), w_0 \in H.$$

It acts on the space of probability measures $\mathcal{P}(H)$ by duality

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*\mu(A) = \int_H \mathcal{P}_{s,t}\mathbb{I}_A(w)\mu(dw), \quad \text{for } \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H), A \in \mathfrak{B},$$

where \mathfrak{B} is the Borel σ -algebra of H and \mathbb{I}_A is the indicator function of A . For $\eta > 0$ small, recall the geodesic metric ρ weighted by a Lyapunov function introduced in [24]

$$(1.1) \quad \rho(w_1, w_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_0^1 e^{\eta\|\gamma(t)\|^2} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| dt, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in H,$$

where the infimum is taken over all differentiable path γ connecting $w_1, w_2 \in H$. We endow $\mathcal{P}(H)$ with the topology of weak convergence and denote by $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ the set of probability measures that have finite first moment with respect to the 1-Wasserstein metric induced from the metric ρ in H . A quasi-periodic invariant measure is a continuous quasi-periodic map with values in $\mathcal{P}(H)$ satisfying the following invariance condition

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*\mu_s = \mu_t, \quad s \leq t.$$

To state the main result, we recall a condition on the structure of the degenerate noise from [25]. Define the set A_∞ by setting $A_1 = \{g_l : 1 \leq l \leq d\}$, $A_{k+1} = A_k \cup \{\tilde{B}(h, g_l) : h \in A_k, g_l \in A_1\}$, and $A_\infty = \overline{\text{span}(\cup_{k \geq 1} A_k)}$, where $\tilde{B}(u, w) = -B(\mathcal{K}u, w) - B(\mathcal{K}w, u)$ is the symmetrized nonlinear term. These sets reflect the mechanism of the propagation of the extremely degenerate noise to the phase space that yields a smoothing effect of the dynamics.

Besides spatial regularity conditions on the external forces, the only remaining assumption for our main results is the Hörmander condition: $A_\infty = H$. In particular, the noise is allowed to be extremely degenerate to have $A_\infty = H$, for example it can be excited only through four directions [23].

Remark 1.1. *Note that our result does not rely on any condition on the viscosity $\nu > 0$, nor conditions on the strength of the external forces. In particular, we do not need the range condition as in [24] and our result in the case when f is time independent verifies a conjecture made by Hairer and Mattingly [24] (see Remark 1.3) that the spectral gap (as well as unique ergodicity and exponentially mixing) holds without restrictions on f other than it be sufficiently smooth.*

Unique ergodicity and mixing of the quasi-periodic invariant measure

One of the main ingredients of this paper is to provide a perspective to investigate the asymptotic statistical behaviors of the time inhomogeneous Markov solution process, by analyzing the dynamics of the non-autonomous system on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ induced by the action of the two parameter Markov transition operators $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$. It turns out that the asymptotic behavior of $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$ is characterized by a complete quasi-periodic trajectory in $\mathcal{P}(H)$. More specifically, we prove

Theorem A (Exponential Mixing). *There exists a unique quasi-periodic path $\{\mu_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ in $\mathcal{P}(H)$ satisfying the invariance condition (1.2), such that*

$$(1.3) \quad \rho(\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*\mu, \mu_t) \leq C e^{-\varpi(t-s)} \rho(\mu, \mu_s), \quad \forall s \leq t, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H),$$

where C, ϖ are positive constants.

Such a unique quasi-periodic path is called a uniquely ergodic and exponentially mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure. One of the classical methods to show the unique ergodicity and mixing in the homogeneous setting, which dates back to the early works of Doeblin [12] and Harris [21], is to show that the action of the Markov semigroup on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ is a contraction under an appropriate metric, whose unique fixed point gives the uniquely ergodic and mixing invariant measure. The Harris work was generalized to the hypoelliptic case for infinite dimensional systems by Hairer and Mattingly [24]. Our first result (1.3) can be regarded as an extension of their work to the time (quasi-periodically) inhomogeneous setting.

The proof of Theorem A will be given in section 3 by first proving $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$ is a contraction on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ and then using a fixed point argument to the induced action (through a pull-back procedure) on the space of quasi-periodic graphs $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$. Besides the Lyapunov structure and a particular type of irreducibility (in a form that is more uniform than the usual topological irreducibility), the proof of the contraction for $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$ requires a deep analysis of its gradient in the time inhomogeneous hypoelliptic setting, which was first developed in the time homogeneous case by Hairer and Mattingly in their celebrated works [23, 24, 25]. In addition, we prove the particular type of irreducibility here by combining the parabolic regularizing effect of the equation and the usual topological irreducibility, where the later is a consequence of the well known controllability results of Agrachev and Sarychev [1, 2].

Limit theorems in terms of the quasi-periodic invariant measure

In the time homogeneous setting, the strong law of large numbers and central limit theorem show that the asymptotic behavior of an observation along a Markov process can be characterized by the unique invariant measure. Suppose that we are given a homogeneous Markov process X_t with a unique invariant measure μ_* with a certain independence condition (mixing for example) and $\phi \in C(H, \mathbb{R})$ is an observable function with some regularity, say Hölder continuous. Then as $T \rightarrow \infty$, one has (see [28] for example) the strong law of large numbers

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \phi(X_t) dt \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \langle \mu_*, \phi \rangle,$$

and the central limit theorem

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(X_t) - \langle \mu_*, \phi \rangle \right) dt \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\langle \mu_*, \phi \rangle$ is the integral of ϕ with respect to μ_* , and a.s. denotes the almost sure convergence w.r.t. the Wiener measure \mathbf{P} , while \mathcal{D} represents the convergence in distribution and $N(0, \sigma^2)$ is the centered normal distribution with variance $\sigma^2 \geq 0$. The strong law of large numbers in the form (1.4) also bears the name of the ergodic theorem, which states that the time average of the observations converges to the ensemble average for almost every sample, regardless of the initial condition. And the central limit theorem measures the size of fluctuations around the ensemble average. We notice that the following form of the strong law of large numbers

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(X_t) - \langle \mu_*, \phi \rangle \right) dt \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$$

captures another role played by the invariant measure in the sense that, the average of observations centered by the invariant measure converges to the corresponding asymptotic mean. We will see

that the quasi-periodic invariant measure has the same feature, which is the key to extend the limit theorems to the time inhomogeneous setting.

The celebrated Dobrusion's theorem [11] is of particular importance in the time inhomogeneous case. It shows that for any discrete time inhomogeneous Markov chain X_k with a certain compatibility condition between the minimal ergodic coefficients, the observable functions ϕ_k and the variance, one has the convergence as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(1.7) \quad \frac{S_n - \mathbf{E}[S_n]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(S_n)}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1),$$

where $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(X_k)$ and $\text{Var}(S_n)$ is the variance. Although this theorem is quite general in its own right, it is not applicable to the Navier-Stokes equation in our context. Indeed, as mentioned in [24], the transition probabilities in infinite dimensional systems are likely to be mutually singular, especially in the case when the strong Feller property does not hold. Hence the non-degeneracy condition (characterized by the total variational metric) on the minimal ergodic coefficients in Dobrusion's theorem may not be satisfied. Besides, to apply the Dobrusion's theorem, one needs to compute the expectation and variance along each observation as indicated in (1.7).

Our second result shows how the uniquely ergodic and mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure μ_t enables us to give the limit theorems for the time inhomogeneous solution process. Indeed, in view of the role played by the invariant measure in the homogeneous case, and the fact that the ergodicity and mixing of the quasi-periodic invariant measure shows that the distribution of any solution is exponentially attracted by the quasi-periodic path in $\mathcal{P}(H)$, one may expect that the quasi-periodic invariant measure carries the information that one needs to center the observations appropriately to derive the limit theorems. In fact, we obtain the following limit theorems.

Theorem B (Limit Theorems). *For any Hölder continuous observable function ϕ , and any initial data $w_0 \in H$, the solution $w_{s,s+t}(w_0)$ of the Navier-Stokes system satisfies as $T \rightarrow \infty$ the strong law of large numbers*

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0,$$

and the central limit theorem

$$(1.9) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, \sigma^2).$$

Theorem B are proved in section 4 through a martingale approximation procedure and by applying martingale limit theorems. The idea of the martingale approximation was originally due to Gordin [20] and further developed by Knips and Varadhan [27]. In [35], a new proof of the Dobrusion's theorem was given by using similar ideas. While our approach here is different from that in [35], since we apply the martingale approximation to the associated homogenized Markov process on the extended phase space $H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, where \mathbb{T}^n is equipped with the irrational rotation flow with rotation frequency α from the quasi-periodic force (see subsection 2.2 below). It is worth to mention that this homogenized process is not mixing since the irrational rotation flow is never mixing. Hence the method of martingale approximation for uniformly mixing time homogeneous Markov processes [28] cannot be applied in a straightforward way. Fortunately, the exponentially mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure centers the observations in the limit theorems in an appropriate way that enables us to derive a martingale approximation.

Rate of convergence in the limit theorems

In the time homogeneous and essentially elliptic setting, the estimates of the rate of convergence of the limit theorems were obtained for the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation, which are close to be optimal [34]. Our third result shows that similar estimates hold in the inhomogeneous context. Namely, we will show the following convergence rate (which is the same as in the time homogeneous case) for the limit theorems:

Theorem C (Convergence Rates). *1. Convergence rate of the strong law of large numbers: for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an almost surely finite random time $T_{s,\varepsilon}$ such that for all $T \geq T_{s,\varepsilon}$,*

$$(1.10) \quad \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \right| \leq CT^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon},$$

2. Convergence rate of the central limit theorem:

$$(1.11) \quad \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\xi_\sigma(z) \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \leq z \right\} - \Phi_\sigma(z) \right| \right) \leq C_{\varepsilon_0} T^{-\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon_0},$$

where $\xi_\sigma \equiv 1$ for $\sigma > 0$, $\xi_0(z) = 1 \wedge |z|$, and $\Phi_\sigma(z)$ is the distribution function of the centered Gaussian distribution.

Here $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ is a constant depending on the mixing rate of the quasi-periodic invariant measure and the convergence rate for the Birkhoff ergodic sums of the irrational rotation for a particular observable function involving the quasi-periodic invariant measure.

Theorem C is proved in section 4. The general idea is to derive first the estimates for the approximating martingale and then pass to inequalities (1.10) and (1.11) by invoking the martingale approximation. In particular, estimate (1.11) is derived from a combination of several ideas from [34] with an important Berry-Esseen type result for martingales from [22]. We stress here that estimate (1.11) requires a detailed analysis on the Hölder regularity of a particular induced observable function (see Proposition 4.13) on the torus \mathbb{T}^n involving the quasi-periodic invariant measure. This is a main feature in our context that is different from the time homogeneous case. We will also see that the result from [22] enables us to show (1.11) for observable functions that are allowed to have exponential growth at infinity, while in the time homogeneous case [34] the estimate is valid for observable functions growing at infinity not faster than a polynomial. However, due to the interaction between the mixing of the solution process and the irrational rotation inherited from the quasi-periodic force, the convergence rate in our context cannot be arbitrarily close to the likely optimal rate usually obtained in the time homogeneous case. Indeed, from the proof, one can see that estimate (1.11) is a mixture of the convergence rate to the variance of the time inhomogeneous solution process, and the convergence rate of the Birkhoff sum for the irrational rotation with a particular observable function involving the quasi-periodic invariant measure that is related to the Diophantine approximation property of the frequency. The combination of the two rates prohibits the possibility of ε_0 being arbitrarily small. Besides, estimate (1.10) is obtained by combining the martingale approximation and the Borel-Cantelli lemma with an estimation on the convergence rate for the moments of the time average of the observations centered by the quasi-periodic invariant measure.

1.2. Relation to existing works.

(1) There is an extensive literature on the unique ergodicity and mixing of invariant measures for time homogeneous infinite dimensional systems. However, this literature is too vast a subject for us to review here. Hence we limit ourselves to topics on the time inhomogeneous setting. The

concept of quasi-periodic invariant measure with its ergodicity and mixing for stochastic 2D Navier-Stokes equation, is introduced in the present work. However, the quasi-periodic invariant measure for ordinary stochastic differential equations has been introduced in [17]. In fact, the probability measure valued path μ_t satisfying (1.2) has been studied by Dynkin in [14, 15] where it is called an entrance law. In this context, a quasi-periodic invariant measure is an entrance law that possesses additional dynamical structure inherited from the quasi-periodic force. The ergodicity and mixing for periodic invariant measures, were first investigated and proved in [10] for 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equations with nondegenerate noise. In the hypoelliptic (extremely degenerate noise) case, the ergodicity and mixing of the periodic invariant measure were proved in the author's recent work [30] under the condition of the Grashof number being small. Our first result here is a sequel of [30] with a deterministic force having multiple frequencies and does not place any condition on the viscosity $\nu > 0$ and the deterministic force other than some spatial regularity.

(2) The martingale limit theory has been widely studied as a generalization of the limit theory for the sum of independent random variables, see the monograph [22]. It becomes a powerful tool when studying the limit theorems of Markov processes, in the case that the Gordin's martingale approximation is available. This approach has been summarized in [28, 34] in the case of uniformly mixing time homogeneous Markov processes with applications to randomly forced PDE's including the 2D Navier-Stokes equation. As we mentioned above, the result in [28, 34] cannot be applied directly here due to the time in-homogeneity and non-mixing feature of the homogenized process.

(3) For discrete time inhomogeneous Markov chains, progress on limit theorems has been made over the decades, which is best summarized in [13]. However, the problem and method we consider here, are different from that in [13] where they mainly focus on the local limit theorems in the stationary regime for discrete time Markov chains and take a different perspective. Furthermore, despite the uniform boundedness condition on the observables, the uniform elliptic condition in [13] does not hold in our hypoelliptic setting so that the results cannot be applied. In fact, we are not aware of any existing results on limit theorems for continuous time inhomogeneous Markov processes, as well as applications to randomly forced PDE's both in elliptic and hypoelliptic settings.

2. SETTINGS AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Well-posedness, quasi-periodic invariant measures and quasi-periodic solutions. Let (M, d) be a metric space with metric d and $C_b(\mathbb{R}, M)$ the space of bounded continuous functions endowed with the uniform convergence topology generated by the following metric

$$\underline{d}(q_1, q_2) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} d(q_1(t), q_2(t)).$$

Definition 2.1 (Quasi-periodic functions). *A function $q \in C_b(\mathbb{R}, M)$ is quasi-periodic with frequency $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if there is $Q \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, M)$ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad q(t) = Q(\alpha t) = Q(\alpha_1 t, \alpha_2 t, \dots, \alpha_n t),$$

where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$ are rationally independent real numbers and $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n / (2\pi)\mathbb{Z}^n$ is the n -dimensional torus.

We also need the notion of a Diophantine condition on the frequency α as in [26].

Definition 2.2 (Diophantine condition). *A frequency $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}^n$ is said to satisfy a Diophantine condition if there exist $K > 0$ and $A > n$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \text{dist}(k \cdot \alpha, \mathbb{Z}) \geq \frac{K}{\|k\|^A},$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\|k\| \neq 0$, where $\|k\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |k_i|$, and $k \cdot \alpha = k_1 \alpha_1 + k_2 \alpha_2 + \cdots + k_n \alpha_n$.

Consider the Navier-Stokes equation on the two dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^2 driving by a deterministic quasi-periodic force and a degenerate stochastic force. In the vorticity form, it reads

$$(2.3) \quad dw(t, x) + B(\mathcal{K}w, w)(t, x)dt = \nu \Delta w(t, x)dt + f(t, x)dt + GdW(t), \quad t > s, \quad w(s) = w_0,$$

where $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $w(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the value of the scalar vorticity field, Δ is the Laplacian operator with periodic boundary conditions, $B(\mathcal{K}w, w) = (\mathcal{K}w) \cdot \nabla w$ is the nonlinear term and $\mathcal{K}w$ is the velocity that is recovered from w by the Biot-Savart integral operator \mathcal{K} . The deterministic initial condition w_0 lies in the state space of system (2.3), which is chosen as $H := \{w \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) : \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} w dx = 0\}$, where the norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$ and the inner product is $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We also define the interpolation spaces $H_s = \{w \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) : \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} w dx = 0\}$ and the corresponding norms $\|\cdot\|_s$ by $\|w\|_s = \|(-\Delta)^{s/2} w\|$. Here $W(t)$ is a standard d dimensional two-sided Brownian motion obtained as follows. Let $W^\pm(t)$ be two independent standard d dimensional Brownian motion, then define

$$W(t) := \begin{cases} W^+(t), & t \geq 0, \\ W^-(-t), & t < 0. \end{cases}$$

The sample space is denoted by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, where $\Omega = \{\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) : \omega(0) = 0\}$ endowed with the compact open topology, \mathcal{F} is the Borel σ -algebra and \mathbf{P} is the Wiener measure associated with the Brownian motion W . Denote by \mathcal{F}_t the filtration of σ -algebras generated by $W(t)$. The coefficient of the noise is a bounded linear operator $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow H_\infty := \bigcap_{s>0} H_s$, such that $Ge_i = g_i$, where $\{e_i\}$ is the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d and $g_i \in H_\infty$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Then the noise can be expressed as $GW(t) = \sum_{i=1}^d g_i W_i(t)$. Let $\mathcal{B}_0 := \sum_{i=1}^d \|g_i\|^2$ be the energy input from the noise.

We assume that the deterministic force $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}, H_2)$ is quasi-periodic with frequency $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$. Then there is a function $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{T}^n; H_2)$ such that $f(t, x) = \Psi(\alpha t, x)$. The regularity condition imposed on f is to ensure the spatial regularity of the solution that is needed to show the asymptotic smoothing effect of the dynamics in subsection 3.1.

The existence and uniqueness of the solution to equation (2.3) is well known, see for example [3] and references therein. To be specific, we have the following

Proposition 2.3 (well-posedness [3]). *Assume $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}, H_2)$ and $g_i \in H_\infty$, $1 \leq i \leq d$. For any initial time $s \in \mathbb{R}$, every $T > s$ and $w_0 \in H$, equation (2.3) under the above conditions has a unique strong solution $w(t, \omega; s, w_0)$, adapted to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t , which generates a stochastic flow $\Phi(t, \omega; s, \cdot) : H \rightarrow H$ such that $\Phi(t, \omega; s, w_0) = w(t, \omega; s, w_0)$ for $s \leq t, w_0 \in H$ and*

$$w \in C([s, T]; H) \cap C((s, T]; H_3), \quad \mathbf{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

Here by a stochastic flow $\Phi(t, \omega; s, w_0)$, we mean that it is a modification of the solution of equation (2.3) satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) It is adapted to \mathcal{F}_t and for almost all ω , $\Phi(t, \omega; s, w_0)$ is continuous in (t, s, w_0) and $\Phi(s, \omega; s, w_0) = w_0$.
- (2) For almost all ω ,

$$\Phi(t + \tau, \omega; s, w_0) = \Phi(t + \tau, \omega; t, \Phi(t, \omega; s, w_0)),$$

for $s \leq t, \tau > 0$ and $w_0 \in H$.

Throughout this work, we will also use $w_{s,t}(\omega, w_0)$ or $\Phi_{s,t}(\omega, w_0)$ to represent the solution $w(t, \omega; s, w_0)$.

The solution to (2.3) generates a two parameter Markov transition operator $\mathcal{P}_{s,t} : B_b(H) \rightarrow B_b(H)$ defined by

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{P}_{s,t}\varphi(w_0) := \mathbf{E}[\varphi(w(t; s, w_0))], \quad \varphi \in B_b(H),$$

where $B_b(H)$ is the space of bounded Borel measurable functions on H with the supremum norm. We denote the transition probabilities as $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}(w, A) := \mathcal{P}_{s,t}\mathbb{I}_A(w)$ for $A \in \mathfrak{B}$, the Borel σ -algebra of H , where \mathbb{I}_A is the characteristic function of A . By duality, the transition operator $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$ acts on the space $\mathcal{P}(H)$ of probability measures on H by

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*\mu(A) = \int_H \mathcal{P}_{s,t}(w, A)\mu(dw), \quad \text{for } \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H), A \in \mathfrak{B}.$$

For $\eta > 0$ small, recall the metric ρ on H weighted by the Lyapunov function $e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$ as in (1.1),

$$(2.5) \quad \rho(w_1, w_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_0^1 e^{\eta\|\gamma(t)\|^2} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| dt, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in H,$$

where the infimum is taken over all differentiable path γ connecting w_1 and w_2 . This metric naturally induces a Wasserstein metric (allowed to take values in $[0, \infty]$) on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ by

$$(2.6) \quad \rho(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{H \times H} \rho(u, v)\mu(du dv),$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the set of couplings of $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(H)$. The subset

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{P}_1(H) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(H) : \rho(\mu, \delta_0) < \infty\}$$

is complete under the metric ρ [6, 36], where δ_0 is the Dirac measure at 0. For this Wasserstein metric, the following Monge-Kantorovich duality is well-known [6, 36],

$$(2.8) \quad \rho(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{\text{Lip}_\rho(\phi) \leq 1} \left| \int \phi(x)\mu_1(dx) - \int \phi(x)\mu_2(dx) \right|, \quad \forall \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_1(H),$$

where $\text{Lip}_\rho(\phi)$ is the Lipschitz constant of the function ϕ on H endowed with the metric ρ .

Definition 2.4 (Quasi-periodic invariant measures). *A quasi-periodic invariant measure of system (2.3) is a quasi-periodic function $\mu \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{P}(H))$ that is invariant under the Markov transition operators*

$$\int_H \mathcal{P}_{s,t}\varphi(w)\mu_s(dw) = \int_H \varphi(w)\mu_t(dw), \quad s \leq t, \quad \varphi \in B_b(H),$$

or equivalently

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*\mu_s = \mu_t, \quad s \leq t.$$

We also give the following definition of the random quasi-periodic solution in the path wise sense.

Definition 2.5 (Random quasi-periodic solutions). *A random quasi-periodic solution of system (2.3) is a progressively measurable stochastic process $w^*(t, \omega)$ defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ that satisfies the following property:*

- (1) (Invariance property) $\Phi(t, \omega; s, w^*(s, \omega)) = w^*(t, \omega)$, for almost all ω ;
- (2) (Quasi-periodicity) $w^*(t, \theta_{-t}\omega)$ is a quasi-periodic function for almost every sample ω . That is, there is a function $Q : \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega \rightarrow H$, where $Q(h, \omega)$ is continuous in $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$ and measurable in ω for each fixed h , such that for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$w^*(t, \theta_{-t}\omega) = Q(\alpha t, \omega), \quad \mathbf{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

Here $\theta : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ given by

$$(2.9) \quad \theta_t \omega(\cdot) := \omega(t + \cdot) - \omega(t)$$

is the Wiener shift.

2.2. Homogenization through skew product. To deal with the time inhomogeneity, we adopt a classical method that has been widely used in the study of non-autonomous problems arising from deterministic differential equations and dynamical systems. Let $\mathcal{H}(f)$ be the closure in $C_b(\mathbb{R}, H_2)$ of $\{f(\cdot + s) | s \in \mathbb{R}\}$, the set of time translations of f . The set $\mathcal{H}(f)$ is called the hull of f , which is compact since f is quasi-periodic. It is the minimal invariant set of the translation group $\{T(t)\}$ acting on $C_b(\mathbb{R}; H_2)$ by $(T(t)g)(s) = g(t + s)$, which is called the Bebutov shift flow. The Bebutov shift dynamics has the advantage of capturing the nonautonomy caused by the quasi-periodicity of f and the compactness of the hull $\mathcal{H}(f)$ allows us to apply tools from dynamical systems to analyze related problems. For each $g \in H(f)$, there is a unique solution $w_{s,t,g}(\omega, w_0)$ of (2.3) by replacing f with g , which is called the process corresponding to problem (2.3) with time symbol g [8]. The homogenization process associated with $\Phi_{s,t}(\omega, w_0)$ is then the homogeneous Markov process in the extended phase space $H \times \mathcal{H}(f)$ defined by $S(t, \omega, w_0, g) := (w_{0,t,h}(\omega, w_0), T(t)g)$.

In the quasi-periodic case, it turns out that $\mathcal{H}(f) = \{\Psi(\alpha t + h_0, x) | h_0 \in \mathbb{T}^n\}$ [8], where $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, H_2)$ is the function corresponding to f . Hence it is more convenient to work with \mathbb{T}^n instead of $\mathcal{H}(f)$. The irrational rotation flow $\beta_t h := h + \alpha t$ on torus corresponds to the Bebutov shift $T(t)$ on $\mathcal{H}(f)$ through the continuous map Ψ . Instead of working on $H \times \mathcal{H}(f)$, we will study the associate homogeneous Markov process $X_{s,t}(w_0, h_0)$ on $H \times \mathbb{T}^n$ given by the solution of the following equation

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{cases} dw(t, x) + B(Kw, w)(t, x)dt = \nu \Delta w(t, x)dt + \Psi(\beta_t, x)dt + GdW(t), \\ d\beta_t = \alpha dt, \\ w(s) = w_0, \beta_s = h_0. \end{cases}$$

Note that the solution $X_{s,t}(w_0, h_0) = (\Phi_{s,t,\beta_{-s}h_0}(w_0), \beta_{t-s}h_0)$ for $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, where $\Phi_{s,t,\beta_{-s}h_0}(w_0)$ is the solution to (2.3) by replacing $f(t, x) = \Psi(\alpha t, x)$ with $\Psi(\alpha t - \alpha s + h_0, x)$. We will use $w_{s,t,h}(w_0)$ to denote the solution of (2.3) with $f(t, x)$ replaced by $\Psi(\beta_t, x)$ with $\beta_t h = h + \alpha t$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_{s,t,h}\phi(w_0) = \mathbf{E}\phi(\Phi_{s,t,h}(w_0))$ be the transition operator corresponding to the time symbol h . In particular, $\mathcal{P}_{s,t,0} = \mathcal{P}_{s,t}$ as defined in (2.4). It follows from the uniqueness of solution that the following translation identity holds:

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{P}_{s+\tau,t+\tau,h} = \mathcal{P}_{s,t,\beta_\tau h}, \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}, h \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

For $\varphi \in B_b(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, the Markov transition operator associated with the homogenized process is given by

$$(2.12) \quad P_{s,t}\varphi(w_0, h_0) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(X_{s,t}) = \mathbf{E}\varphi(\Phi_{s,t,\beta_{-s}h_0}(w_0), \beta_{t-s}h_0) = \mathcal{P}_{s,t,\beta_{-s}h_0}\varphi(\cdot, \beta_{t-s}h_0)(w_0).$$

In view of the translation identity (2.11) and time homogeneity of $X_{s,t}$, we can assume the initial time of the homogenized process $s = 0$ for simplicity.

Notations. $\langle \mu, \phi \rangle$ represents the integration of a real valued function ϕ on H with respect to a given measure μ . Denote $\mathbf{E}[X, Y \geq Z] = \mathbf{E}X \mathbb{1}_{\{Y \geq Z\}}$ for given random variables X, Y, Z . Also $\text{Lip}_\rho(H)$ is the space of Lipschitz functions on H endowed with the metric ρ as in (2.5) and $\text{Lip}_\rho(\phi)$ is the Lipschitz constant for $\phi \in \text{Lip}_\rho(H)$. The constant C could be different from line to line, but we will emphasize its dependence on the parameters when necessary. X_t represents the solution $X_{s,t}$ of (2.10) with $s = 0$ and P_t means $P_{0,t}$. Given any functional φ of the process X_t , the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)}\varphi(X_t)$ means $\mathbf{E}\varphi(X_t(w, h))$, i.e. the expectation of the random variable $\varphi(X_t(w, h))$ with respect to the Wiener measure \mathbf{P} .

2.3. Main results. In this subsection, we formulate the main results of the present paper in details. We use the metric (2.6) on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ to measure the convergence to the quasi-periodic invariant measure. The reason for working with the Wasserstein metric is that the transition probabilities in infinite dimensional systems are likely to be mutually singular, especially when the strong Feller property does not hold [24]. Hence the convergence to the invariant measure often fails under the total variation metric and one would like to replace it by a weaker Wasserstein metric. Note that the metric ρ weighted by the Lyapunov function $V(w) = e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$ depends on the parameter $\eta > 0$.

The following Theorem 2.6-2.9 are our main results under the standing assumption:

$$(2.13) \quad f \in C_b(R, H_2) \text{ is quasi-periodic; } g_i \in H_\infty, \forall 1 \leq i \leq d; \text{ and } A_\infty = H.$$

The first result is the following unique ergodicity and exponentially mixing of the quasi-periodic invariant measure for (2.3) under the Wasserstein metric (2.6).

Theorem 2.6 (Ergodicity and mixing). *There is a unique quasi-periodic invariant measure μ_t for (2.3) given by a unique map $\Gamma \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}(H))$, i.e., $\mu_t = \Gamma_{\beta_t 0}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^* \mu_s = \mu_t$. Moreover, there exists $\eta_0 > 0$, such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, there are constants $C, \varpi > 0$, such that $\Gamma \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$ and*

$$(2.14) \quad \rho(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+t}^* \mu, \mu_{s+t}) \leq C e^{-\varpi t} \rho(\mu, \mu_s), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H),$$

where C, ϖ do not depend on s . Furthermore, $\Gamma \in C^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^n, (\mathcal{P}_1(H), \rho))$ if $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$, where $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$ with $r = 64c_0^6\eta^{-3}\nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ from estimate (6.3).

In an equivalent form that involves the transition operator acting on observables, we have for every $\phi \in C_\eta^1$,

$$(2.15) \quad \left\| \mathcal{P}_{s,s+t} \phi - \int_H \phi(w) \mu_{s+t}(dw) \right\|_\eta \leq C e^{-\varpi t} \|\phi\|_\eta.$$

Here

$$C_\eta^1 := \left\{ \phi \in C^1(H) : \|\phi\|_\eta := \sup_{w \in H} e^{-\eta\|w\|^2} (|\phi(w)| + \|\nabla\phi(w)\|) < \infty \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.6 will be proved in Section 3, by combining a fixed point argument with the following uniform contraction property proved in the same section.

Theorem 2.7. (Contraction on $\mathcal{P}(H)$) *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, there are positive constants C and ϖ such that*

$$(2.16) \quad \rho(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}^* \mu_1, \mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}^* \mu_2) \leq C e^{-\varpi t} \rho(\mu_1, \mu_2),$$

for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 0$, $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(H)$.

The second result is on the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) and the central limit theorem (CLT) for the solution process. The proof will be given in Section 4. To state the results, we first define the space of observable functions. For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, let $C_\eta^\gamma(H)$ be the space of Hölder continuous functions with finite norms weighted by the Lyapunov function $e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$,

$$(2.17) \quad C_\eta^\gamma(H) := \{ \phi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta} < \infty \},$$

where

$$\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta} := \sup_{w \in H} \frac{|\phi(w)|}{e^{\eta\|w\|^2}} + \sup_{0 < \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq 1} \frac{|\phi(w_1) - \phi(w_2)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma (e^{\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{\eta\|w_2\|^2})}.$$

Recall that $w_{s,s+t}(w_0)$ is the solution to (2.3) starting from $w_0 \in H$ at time $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 2.8. *There is a constant $\eta_0 > 0$, such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, $\phi \in C_\eta^\gamma(H)$ and $w_0 \in H$, we have*

1. *SLLN for the time inhomogeneous solution process:*

$$(2.18) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

2. *CLT for the time inhomogeneous solution process:*

$$(2.19) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $N(0, \sigma^2)$ a centered normal variable with variance σ^2 and \mathcal{D} represents the convergence in distribution. The variance

$$\sigma^2 = \sigma_\phi^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \right]^2,$$

where $\sigma_\phi \geq 0$ is independent of s .

The third result is an estimate of the rate of convergence in the limit theorems. The proof will be given in Section 4.

Theorem 2.9. *There is a constant $\eta_0 > 0$ such that the following estimates hold.*

1. *(Rate of convergence in SLLN) Let $\varepsilon > 0$, for every integer $p \geq 3$ satisfying $2^p > 1/\varepsilon$, every $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$, and every $\phi \in C_\eta^\gamma(H)$, $w_0 \in H$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there is an almost surely finite random time $T_0(\omega) \geq 1$, depending on $p, \varepsilon, \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, s, \|w_0\|$ such that for all $T > T_0$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \right| \leq CT^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant that does not depend on the above parameters. Moreover, for every $0 < \ell < \min\{2^p\varepsilon - 1, 2^{p-2} - 1\}$, there is a constant $C_p = C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}T_0^\ell \leq C_p e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w_0\|^2}.$$

2. *(Rate of convergence in CLT) Assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$ and the frequency α satisfies the Diophantine condition (2.2) with constant A and dimension n (of the torus). Let Φ_σ be the distribution function of $N(0, \sigma^2)$. Also let $\Lambda = \frac{\varpi}{5(2-\gamma)}$, $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_0 = \frac{\Lambda\zeta}{5(\Lambda+r)(2-\gamma)}$, where ϖ is the mixing rate from Theorem 2.6 and $r = 64c_0^6\eta^{-3}\nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is the constant from (6.3).*

(1). *For any integer $p \geq 2$, $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$, and $\phi \in C_\eta^\gamma(H)$ with $\sigma_\phi^2 > 0$, and $w_0 \in H$, there are constants $C_p = C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta}, \|w_0\|) > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that for all $T \geq T_0$,*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \leq z \right\} - \Phi_{\sigma_\phi}(z) \right| \leq C_p \left(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + T^{-\frac{2^{p-2}}{2^{p+1}}} + T^{-\frac{2^{p-1}\bar{\gamma}_0}{(2^{p+1})(A+n)}} \right),$$

(2). *For $\eta \in (0, 2^{-7}\eta_0]$ and $\phi \in C_\eta^\gamma(H)$ such that $\sigma_\phi^2 = 0$, and $w_0 \in H$, there is a constant $C = C(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta}, \|w_0\|) > 0$ such that for all $T \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} (|z| \wedge 1) \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \left(\phi(w_{s,s+t}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_{s+t}, \phi \rangle \right) dt \leq z \right\} - \Phi_0(z) \right| \leq C \left(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + T^{-\frac{\bar{\gamma}_0}{2(A+n)}} \right),$$

The following result shows that if the viscosity is large, then the dynamics of system (2.3) is actually trivial. Let c_0 be the constant from the Ladyzhenskaya's inequality

$$(2.20) \quad \|w\|_{L^4(\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \leq c_0 \|w\|_1 \|w\|.$$

And let $G = \sqrt{\|f\|_\infty^2/\nu^4 + \mathcal{B}_0/\nu^3}$ be the Grashof number for the whole system, where $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|f(t)\|$. The following theorem will be proved in Section 5. Note that we do not need the assumption $A_\infty = H$ here.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\bar{\eta} > 0$. Assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$. If*

$$(2.21) \quad Gc_0 \leq \sqrt{1/2}, \quad \text{and } \nu^3 > 8(n + \bar{\eta})c_0^2\mathcal{B}_0\gamma^{-1},$$

then there exists a random quasi-periodic solution $w^(t, \omega)$ of equation (2.3) in the sense of Definition 2.5, where the function $Q(h, \omega)$ associated with $w^*(t, \theta_{-t}\omega)$ has a continuous (with respect to h) modification that is η -Hölder continuous for all $0 < \eta < \frac{\bar{\eta}\gamma}{2(n+\bar{\eta})}$. Moreover, $w^*(t, \omega)$ exponentially attracts all other solutions both in forward and pullback times. The law of $w^*(t, \omega)$ gives the unique quasi-periodic invariant measure.*

Remark 2.1. *The quasi-periodic solution is obtained as the composition of a random field $Q : \mathbb{T}^n \times \Omega$ with the irrational rotation flow on the torus \mathbb{T}^n and the Wiener shift on Ω , i.e. $w^*(t, \omega) = Q(\beta_t 0, \theta_t \omega)$. In view of the quasi-periodicity in the Definition 2.5, one requires the random field Q to be almost surely continuous in \mathbb{T}^n component. The conditions imposed in Theorem 2.10 are used to find the desired continuous modification of the random field by applying the Kolmogorov continuity theorem. This is an essential feature in the multiple frequency setting that is different from the periodic case as in [30].*

3. ERGODICITY AND EXPONENTIALLY MIXING

In this section, we will prove Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.7.

3.1. Contraction on $\mathcal{P}(H)$. We first prove Theorem 2.7 in this subsection, namely, the “uniform fiber-wise” contraction property (2.16) of the transition operators $\{\mathcal{P}_{s,t,h}^*\}_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n}$ when acting on $\mathcal{P}(H)$. The result can be regarded as an extension of the Harris-like theorem for infinite dimensional systems first established by Hairer and Mattingly [24] in the time homogeneous setting. In [30], the result was extended to the time inhomogeneous case when the deterministic force is time periodic. In fact, the proof of Theorem 2.7 is a rework of the proof from [30] in a fiber-wise manner, as long as we prove the following three “uniform fiber-wise” estimates on the dynamics.

The first estimate is a Lyapunov structure that reveals the dissipation property of system (2.3) and gives the contraction of (2.16) at large scales.

Proposition 3.1 (The Lyapunov Structure). *Let $V(w) = \exp(\eta\|w\|^2)$, $\eta_0 > 0$ be the constant from (6.1) and $\alpha(t) = e^{-\nu t}$. For any $\kappa \geq 1$, and any $\eta \in (0, \frac{\eta_0}{2\kappa}]$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{E}V^\kappa(\Phi_{s,s+t,h}(w)) \leq CV^{\kappa\alpha(t)}(w),$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbf{E}\rho(0, w_{s,s+t,h}(w))^\kappa \leq CV^{2\kappa}(w),$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{E}V^\kappa(\Phi_{s,s+t,h}(w))(1 + \|\nabla\Phi_{s,s+t,h}(w)\xi\|) \leq CV^{\kappa\alpha(t)}(w)$$

for every $t \in [0, 1]$, $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $\xi \in H$ with $\|\xi\| = 1$.

Proof. Inequality (3.1) is a reformulation of (6.1). The estimate (3.2) follows from (6.1). Indeed, by the definition of ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\rho(0, w_{s,s+t,h}(w))^\kappa &\leq \mathbf{E}\|w_{s,s+t,h}(w)\|^\kappa V^\kappa(w_{s,s+t,h}(w)) \\ &\leq C\mathbf{E}V^{2\kappa}(w_{s,s+t,h}(w)) \leq C \exp(2\kappa\eta\|w\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

for $\eta \leq \frac{\eta_0}{2\kappa}$, where η_0 is from (6.1). Following the proof of (6.4) or as in [30], one can show that for any $\eta > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla\Phi_{s,s+t,h}(w)\xi\| \leq \exp\left(\nu\eta \int_s^{s+t} \|\Phi_{s,r,h}(w)\|_1^2 dr + Ct\right).$$

The estimate (3.3) then follows from (6.1) and (6.2). \square

The second is a gradient inequality that shows the asymptotic smoothing effect of the dynamics by the highly degenerate noise and the spatial Laplacian, which is applied, together with the Lyapunov structure, to show the contraction of (2.16) at small scales.

Proposition 3.2 (The gradient inequality). *There exists constant a $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $a > 0$ there exists constants $C = C(\eta, a) > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$(3.4) \quad \|\nabla\mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}\phi(w)\| \leq C \exp(p\eta\|w\|^2) \left(\sqrt{(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}|\phi|^2)(w)} + e^{-at} \sqrt{(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}\|\nabla\phi\|^2)(w)} \right)$$

for every Frechet differentiable function ϕ , every $w \in H, s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Here $C(\eta, a)$ does not depend on s, w, h and ϕ .

Proof. Note that we have assumed $A_\infty = H$ and $\Psi \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, H_2)$. Hence for each $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, inequality (3.4) with a constant C depending on $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h)\|$ follows from Proposition 6.6 in [30] with the deterministic force $\Psi(\beta_t h)$. It employs an infinite dimensional Malliavin calculus and an infinite dimensional Hörmander type condition as in [23, 25] to investigate the propagation of the degenerate noise throughout the phase space H , combined with a Foias-Prodi's type estimate, which yields the asymptotic smoothing estimate of the transition operator as in (3.4). The constant C is actually independent of h since $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h)\| = \sup_{g \in \mathbb{T}^n} \|\Psi(g)\|$. \square

The last estimate is a particular form of irreducibility (slightly stronger than the usual topological irreducibility) that concerns the small positive probability of being contraction of the dynamics on the phase space. It deals with the contraction (2.16) at intermediate scales.

Proposition 3.3 (Irreducibility). *For any $R, \varepsilon, T > 0$, and $r \in (0, 1]$, there exists $a > 0$ so that*

$$(3.5) \quad \inf_{\|w_1\|, \|w_2\| \leq R} \sup_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_1}, \mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_2})} \Gamma \left\{ (w'_1, w'_2) \in H \times H : \rho_r(w'_1, w'_2) < \varepsilon \right\} \geq a,$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}, h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Here the metric ρ_r is given by

$$\rho_r(w_1, w_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_0^1 V^r(\gamma(t)) \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\| dt, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in H,$$

where the infimum is taken over all differentiable path γ in H connecting w_1 and w_2 .

For the reader's convenience, we give the proof of this proposition after the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. For each $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, it follows from Lemma 3.15-3.17 in [30] that Proposition 3.1-3.3 imply the corresponding contractions at different scales, which in turn implies the contraction (2.16) by following Theorem 2.2 in [30]. The constant C is independent of $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ since the estimates in Proposition 3.1-3.3 are independent of h . The proof is complete. \square

3.1.1. *Irreducibility: The Proof of Proposition 3.3.* This subsection is devoted to the proof the irreducibility in Proposition 3.3. It is based on the topological irreducibility (Lemma 3.4) which is a consequence of the celebrated controllability results of Agrachev and Sarychev [1, 2], and a parabolic regularizing property (Lemma 3.5) of the Navier-Stokes equations. We first state and prove the two lemmas and then give the proof of Proposition 3.3 at the end.

The first lemma states that uniformly for the initial positions in any given compact set, the system has a positive probability to enter into any neighborhood of a given position.

Lemma 3.4. *For any compact set $K \subset H$, any $\delta, T > 0$, and $v \in H$, there is $a_0 := a_0(K, \delta, T, v) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{w \in K, h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h}(w, B_\delta(v)) \geq a_0.$$

Proof. By the well known controllability argument of Agrachev and Sarychev [1, 2] (see also [19]) and the condition $A_\infty = H$, it follows that for each $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ the Navier-Stokes equation (2.3) with the deterministic force f replaced by $\Psi(\beta_t h)$ is approximately controllable in H . Hence it is topologically irreducible, i.e., for all $w, v \in H$, $\delta > 0, T > 0$ there is $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(w, v, \delta, T, h) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} \mathbb{I}_{B_{\delta/2}(v)}(w) = \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h}(w, B_{\delta/2}(v)) \geq \varepsilon.$$

Now let $0 \leq L_\delta \leq 1$ be a Lipschitz continuous function on H such that $L_\delta(w) = 1$ on $B_{\delta/2}(v)$ and $L_\delta(w) = 0$ outside of $B_\delta(v)$. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} \mathbb{I}_{B_\delta(v)}(w) \geq \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} L_\delta(w) \geq \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} \mathbb{I}_{B_{\delta/2}(v)}(w) \geq \varepsilon.$$

The Lipschitz continuity of L_δ and estimates (6.3) and (6.4) implies that the function

$$(w, h) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} L_\delta(w)$$

is continuous. Hence on the compact set $K \times \mathbb{T}^n$, it attains the infimum at some (w_0, h_0) , which implies

$$\inf_{(w,h) \in K \times \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} \mathbb{I}_{B_\delta(v)}(w) \geq \inf_{(w,h) \in K \times \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} L_\delta(w) = \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h_0} L_\delta(w_0) \geq \varepsilon(w_0, v, \delta, T, h_0).$$

The proof is then completed by taking $a_0 = \varepsilon(w_0, v, \delta, T, h_0)$. \square

The second lemma is a result of the parabolic regularizing effect, which states that any given bounded set has a positive probability to be mapped into a compact set by the solution map.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $R > 0, T > 0$, there are $R_1 := R_1(R, T) > 0$ and $a_1 := a_1(R, R_1, T) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{w \in B_R(0), h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h} \left(w, \overline{B}_{R_1}^{H_1}(0) \right) \geq a_1,$$

where $B_R(0)$ is the ball in H centered at 0 with radius R , and $\overline{B}_{R_1}^{H_1}(0)$ is the closed ball in H_1 centered at 0 with radius R_1 .

Proof. Let $w_{0,t,h}(w_0)$ be the solution of (2.3) with the deterministic force f replaced by $\Psi(\beta_t h)$. We eliminate the additive noise by subtracting from (2.3) the following auxiliary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

$$dV_t = \nu \Delta V_t dt + G dW_t, \quad V(0) = 0.$$

It is readily seen that the process $u_{t,h} := w_{0,t,h}(w_0) - V_t$ solves the equation

$$(3.6) \quad \partial_t u = \nu \Delta u - B(\mathcal{K}(u + V_t), u + V_t) + \Psi(\beta_t h), \quad u_{0,h} = w_0.$$

For $\delta > 0, T > 0$, consider the event that the d -dimensional Wiener process has small amplitude on a finite interval

$$(3.7) \quad \Omega_{\delta, T} = \{\omega \in \Omega : |W(\omega, t)| \leq \delta, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ denote the usual norm in \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists $a_1 = a_1(\delta, T)$ such that

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbf{P}(\Omega_{\delta, T}) \geq a_1 > 0.$$

By the properties of stochastic convolutions, one can show that the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process V_t has the following property on the event $\Omega_{\delta, T}$.

Lemma 3.6. [16] *For any $\delta > 0, T > 0$, there exists a positive deterministic constant $\varepsilon_{\delta, T}$ such that $\varepsilon_{\delta, T} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ for T fixed, and*

$$(3.9) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|V(t, \omega)\|_1 \leq \varepsilon_{\delta, T}, \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega_{\delta, T}.$$

Taking H inner product with $2u$ on both sides of (3.6) and applying standard estimates on the nonlinear term (see for example [23]), we have (we write u or u_t for $u_{t, h}$ for notational simplicity and denote $\|\Psi\|_\infty = \sup_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \|\Psi(h)\|$)

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \|u\|^2 &= \langle \nu \Delta u, 2u \rangle - \langle B(\mathcal{K}(u + V_t), u + V_t), 2u \rangle + \langle \Psi(\beta_t h), 2u \rangle \\ &\leq -2\nu \|u\|_1^2 - 2\langle B(\mathcal{K}V_t, V_t), u \rangle - 2\langle B(\mathcal{K}u, V_t), u \rangle + \frac{4}{\nu} \|\Psi\|_\infty^2 + \nu \|u\|^2 \\ &\leq -\nu \|u\|_1^2 + C\|V_t\|_1^2 \|u\| + C\|u\|^2 \|V_t\|_1 + \frac{4}{\nu} \|\Psi\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq C\|V_t\|_1^2 \|u_t\|^2 + C(\|V_t\|_1^4 + \|\Psi\|_\infty^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the Gronwall's inequality and Lemma 3.6 yields

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_t\|^2 &\leq \|w_0\|^2 \exp\left(C \int_0^t \|V_\tau\|_1^2 d\tau\right) + C \int_0^t (\|V_\tau\|_1^4 + \|\Psi\|_\infty^2) \exp\left(C \int_\tau^t \|V_r\|_1^2 dr\right) d\tau \\ &\leq C(\|w_0\|^2 + 1) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\delta, T}$, where the last constant $C = C(\varepsilon_{\delta, T}, T, \|\Psi\|_\infty, \nu)$. Using this estimate and integrating (3.10), we also have on $\Omega_{\delta, T}$,

$$(3.12) \quad \nu \int_0^T \|u_t\|_1^2 dt \leq \|w_0\|^2 + \int_0^T \left(C\|V_t\|_1^2 \|u_t\| + C\|u_t\|^2 \|V_t\|_1 + \frac{4}{\nu} \|\Psi\|_\infty^2 \right) dt \leq C(\|w_0\|^2 + 1)$$

with constant C only depending on $\varepsilon_{\delta, T}, T, \|\Psi\|_\infty, \nu$.

Differentiating $t\|u_t\|_1^2$ with respect to t and using (3.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(t\|u_t\|_1^2) &= \|u\|_1^2 + 2t\langle \partial_t u, -\Delta u \rangle \\ &= \|u\|_1^2 - 2t\nu \|u\|_2^2 + 2t \langle B(\mathcal{K}u, u) + B(\mathcal{K}V_t, V_t) + B(\mathcal{K}u, V_t) + B(\mathcal{K}V_t, u) - \Psi(\beta_t h), \Delta u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from standard estimates on the nonlinear term and interpolation inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle B(\mathcal{K}u, u), \Delta u \rangle| &\leq C\|u\| \|u\|_{\frac{3}{2}} \|u\|_2 \leq C\|u\| \|u\|^{\frac{1}{4}} \|u\|_{\frac{3}{2}}^{\frac{3}{4}} \|u\|_2 \\ &\leq C(\nu) \|u\|^{10} + \frac{\nu}{5} \|u\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle B(\mathcal{K}V_t, V_t), \Delta u \rangle| &\leq C\|V_t\|_1^2\|u\|_2 \leq C(\nu)\|V_t\|_1^4 + \frac{\nu}{5}\|u\|_2^2, \\
|\langle B(\mathcal{K}u, V_t), \Delta u \rangle| &\leq C\|V_t\|_1\|u\|_1\|u\|_2 \leq C(\nu)\|u\|_1^2\|V_t\|_1^2 + \frac{\nu}{5}\|u\|_2^2, \\
|\langle B(\mathcal{K}V_t, u), \Delta u \rangle| &\leq C\|V_t\|_1\|u\|_1\|u\|_2 \leq C(\nu)\|u\|_1^2\|V_t\|_1^2 + \frac{\nu}{5}\|u\|_2^2, \\
|\langle \Psi(\beta_t h), \Delta u \rangle| &\leq \|\Psi\|_\infty\|u\|_2 \leq C(\nu)\|\Psi\|_\infty^2 + \frac{\nu}{5}\|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\partial_t(t\|u_t\|_1^2) \leq \|u\|_1^2 + C(\nu)t(\|u\|^{10} + \|V_t\|_1^4 + \|u\|_1^2\|V_t\|_1^2 + \|\Psi\|_\infty^2)$$

Integrating this inequality from 0 to T , using Lemma 3.6 and estimates (3.11)-(3.12), one has

$$\|u_{T,h}\|_1^2 \leq C(1 + \|w_0\|^2)^5,$$

on $\Omega_{\delta,T}$, where C depends on $\varepsilon_{\delta,T}, T, \|\Psi\|_\infty, \nu$, but is independent of $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Hence on $\Omega_{\delta,T}$ we have

$$\|w_{0,T,h}(w_0)\|_1^2 \leq 2(\|u_{T,h}\|_1^2 + \|V_T\|_1^2) \leq C(1 + \|w_0\|^{10}),$$

which completes the proof by taking $R_1 = \sqrt{C(1 + R^{10})}$. \square

We are now in a position to give a proof of Proposition 3.3.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Fix any $v \in H$. For any $\delta, T > 0$, $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and $w \in B_R(0)$, we have by the Chapman-Kolmogorov relation, the translation identity (2.11) that

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,T,h}(w, B_\delta(v)) = \int_H \mathcal{P}_{\frac{T}{2},T,h}(y, B_\delta(v))\mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},h}(w, dy) = \int_H \mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},\beta_{\frac{T}{2}}h}(y, B_\delta(v))\mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},h}(w, dy).$$

It follows from Lemma 3.5 that there are $R_1 := R_1(R, T/2) > 0$, and $a_1 := a_1(R, R_1, T/2) > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{w \in B_R(0), h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T/2,h}(w, \overline{B}_{R_1}^{H_1}(0)) \geq a_1,$$

Combining this with Lemma 3.4 with $K = \overline{B}_{R_1}^{H_1}(0)$, we have the existence of $a_0 := a_0(K, \delta, T, v) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{w \in B_R(0), h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,T,h}(w, B_\delta(v)) &\geq \inf_{w \in B_R(0), h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \int_K \mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},\beta_{\frac{T}{2}}h}(y, B_\delta(v))\mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},h}(w, dy) \\
&\geq a_1 \inf_{y \in K, h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \mathcal{P}_{0,\frac{T}{2},h}(y, B_\delta(v)) \geq a_0 a_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the translation identity (2.11), one has

$$\mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}(w, B_\delta(v)) = \mathcal{P}_{0,T,\beta_s h}(w, B_\delta(v)) \geq a_0 a_1, \quad \forall w \in B_R(0), s \in \mathbb{R}, h \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Now for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we choose $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2V(\|\cdot\| + \varepsilon)}$, here $V(w) = e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$ for $w \in H$ is the Lyapunov function from Proposition 3.1. Then $\tilde{B}_\delta(v) := B_\delta(v) \times B_\delta(v) \subset \{(w'_1, w'_2) \in H \times H \mid \rho_r(w'_1, w'_2) < \varepsilon\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{w_1, w_2 \in B_R(0)} \sup_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_1}, \mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_2})} \Gamma \{(w'_1, w'_2) \in H \times H : \rho_r(w'_1, w'_2) < \varepsilon\} \\
&\geq \inf_{w_1, w_2 \in B_R(0)} \mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_1} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}^* \delta_{w_2}(\tilde{B}_\delta(v)) \\
&= \inf_{w_1, w_2 \in B_R(0)} \mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}(w_1, B_\delta(v))\mathcal{P}_{s,s+T,h}(w_2, B_\delta(v)) \geq (a_0 a_1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete with $a = (a_0 a_1)^2$. \square

3.2. Ergodicity and mixing. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.6 by applying a fixed point argument and the uniform contraction (2.16) proved in the previous subsection. The scheme is the same as that in [30], the difference is that the symbol space here is \mathbb{T}^n with $n \geq 1$, but in [30] the symbol space is a circle. The idea is to regard the two parameter family of Markov transition operators $\mathcal{P}_{s,t}^*$ as a non-autonomous dynamical system over the space of probability measures, whose associated pull back mapping is a contraction semigroup acting on an appropriate family of closed subsets of the space of “quasi-periodic graphs” $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$. And the fixed point of the semigroup gives the desired quasi-periodic invariant measure. Different from [30], we further show that this fixed point has a Hölder regularity if the function Ψ that generates the quasi-periodic force does, and prove the weak convergence of time averages of the transition probabilities to the unique invariant measure for the homogenized process. These results play important roles in the study of the limit theorems in the next section.

Note that Theorem 2.6 follows from the following Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.10 with $\mu_s = \Gamma_{\beta_s 0}$ by taking $h = \beta_s 0$ in (3.13) and (3.16), and applying the translation identity (2.11).

Theorem 3.7. *There is a unique map $\Gamma \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}(H))$, such that $\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \Gamma_h = \Gamma_{\beta_t h}$ for any $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Furthermore, there is a constant $\eta_0 > 0$, such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, there are constants $C, \varpi > 0$, such that $\Gamma \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$ and*

$$(3.13) \quad \rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \mu, \Gamma_{\beta_t h}) \leq C e^{-\varpi t} \rho(\mu, \Gamma_h), \quad t \geq 0, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(H), h \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where C, ϖ dose not depend on h . Also $\int_H \exp(2\kappa\eta\|w\|^2) \Gamma_h(dw) \leq C$ for all $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, where $\kappa \geq 2$ is the constant from Proposition 3.1.

Moreover, $\Gamma \in C^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^n, (\mathcal{P}_1(H), \rho))$ if $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$, where $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$ with $r = 64c_0^6\eta^{-3}\nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ from estimate (6.3).

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ is defined by (2.7). By Theorem 2.7, for any $t \geq 0$, $\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^*$ maps $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ to itself. Denote for convenience

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{P}_1(H) \times \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(H), \text{ by } \varphi(t, \mu, h) = \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \mu.$$

It follows from the translation identity (2.11) that φ has the cocycle property over the base dynamical system $(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}, \beta)$ since for all $\tau, t \geq 0$ and $h \in H(f)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(H)$,

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,t+\tau,h}^* \mu = \mathcal{P}_{t,t+\tau,h}^* \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \mu = \mathcal{P}_{0,\tau,\beta_t h}^* \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \mu.$$

Hence the pull-back map S^t induced from φ , is defined on the space of quasi-periodic graphs $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$, i.e.,

$$S^t(\gamma)(h) := \varphi(t, \gamma(\beta_{-t}h), \beta_{-t}h), \quad \gamma \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H)),$$

which satisfies the semigroup property $S^{t_1} S^{t_2} \gamma(h) = S^{t_1+t_2} \gamma(h)$. We would like to apply the fixed point theorem for S^t on $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$ endowed with the metric (which is complete since $(\mathcal{P}_1(H), \rho)$ is complete.)

$$p(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) := \max_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\gamma_1(h), \gamma_2(h)), \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H)).$$

However, the continuity of $\varphi(t, \mu, h)$ with respect to (μ, h) is unclear due to the Lyapunov structure of the solution of (2.3). Hence $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$ may not be invariant under the map S^t . Indeed as in [30], one can show from the estimate (6.1) and (6.3) that

$$(3.14) \quad \rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h_1}^* \mu, \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h_2}^* \mu) \leq C e^{rt} \int_H g(w) \mu(dw) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_1) - \Psi(\beta_t h_2)\|,$$

where $r = 64c_0^6\eta^{-3}\nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is from (6.3), $g(w) = V^{2\kappa}(w) = \exp(2\kappa\eta\|w\|^2)$, and the Lyapunov function $V(w) = e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$ along with κ, η are from Proposition 3.1. It is unclear if each $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(H)$ yields

$\int_H g(w)\mu(dw)$ finite, therefore we confine ourselves to those measures that make the integral finite to ensure the continuity. To be specific, consider the family of closed subsets of $\mathcal{P}_1(H)$ (see [30] for a proof of the closedness.)

$$\mathcal{P}_R := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(H) : \int_H g(w)\mu(dw) \leq R\}, \quad R > 0.$$

By the contraction property in Theorem 2.7, we have that for any $R > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_R$, φ is continuous in μ , uniformly with respect to h . And by inequality (3.14), it is continuous in h uniformly for μ . Hence φ is joint continuous in $(\mu, h) \in \mathcal{P}_R \times \mathbb{T}^n$. Then the fixed point argument will be applied on the complete subset $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_R)$. However the trade off for the continuity is the loss of the invariance of $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_R)$ under S^t uniformly for any $t \geq 0$. Indeed, it follows from Proposition 3.1 that for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_R$, and any $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_H \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}g(w)\mu(dw) &= \int_H \mathbf{E}g(\Phi_{0,t,h}(w))\mu(dw) \\ &\leq C \int_H g^{\alpha(t)}(w)\mu(dw) \leq C \left(\int_H g(w)\mu(dw) \right)^{\alpha(t)} \leq CR^{\alpha(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality in the penultimate step. One can check that it is impossible to choose a common $R > 0$ such that $CR^{\alpha(t)} \leq R$ for any $t \geq 0$ since $\alpha(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. However, note that for each fixed $t_0 > 0$, if we choose $R = R_{t_0} := C^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha(t_0)}}$ then $CR^{\alpha(t)} \leq CR^{\alpha(t_0)} = R_{t_0}$, which gives the invariance under S^t uniformly for $t \geq t_0$.

Now for any fixed $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, the above analysis shows that the map $S^t : C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}}) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}})$ is well defined for $t \geq t_0$. It remains to show that it is a contraction. Indeed, by Theorem 2.7, one has

$$\begin{aligned} p(S^t \gamma_1, S^t \gamma_2) &= \max_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\varphi(t, \gamma_1(\beta_{-t}h), \beta_{-t}h), \varphi(t, \gamma_2(\beta_{-t}h), \beta_{-t}h)) \\ &= \max_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,t,\beta_{-t}h}^* \gamma_1(\beta_{-t}h), \mathcal{P}_{0,t,\beta_{-t}h}^* \gamma_2(\beta_{-t}h)) \\ &\leq Ce^{-\varpi t} \max_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\gamma_1(\beta_{-t}h), \gamma_2(\beta_{-t}h)) = Ce^{-\varpi t} p(\gamma_1, \gamma_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for large $T > t_0$, $p(S^T \gamma_1, S^T \gamma_2) \leq cp(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ for some $c \in (0, 1)$. Fix such a T , then S^T is a contraction over the complete metric space $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}})$, so there is a unique fixed point $\Gamma_{t_0} \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}})$ of S^T . Noting for any $t \geq t_0$, S^t maps $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}})$ to itself, hence

$$S^T(S^t \Gamma_{t_0}) = S^t(S^T \Gamma_{t_0}) = S^t(\Gamma_{t_0})$$

implies that $S^t(\Gamma_{t_0}) = \Gamma_{t_0}$ by the uniqueness of the fixed point, which shows that Γ_{t_0} is a fixed point of S^t for $t \geq t_0$. For $0 < t_1 \leq t_0$, one has $R_{t_1} \geq R_{t_0}$, so $\mathcal{P}_{R_{t_0}} \subset \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_1}}$. And for the same $T > 0$, S^T is a contraction on $C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_{R_{t_1}})$, which has a unique fixed point Γ_{t_1} . By the uniqueness, $\Gamma_{t_1} = \Gamma_{t_0}$, hence Γ_{t_0} is also a fixed point of S^t for $t \geq t_1$. Since t_1 is arbitrary, we see that $\Gamma := \Gamma_{t_0}$ is a fixed point of S^t for $t \geq 0$, that is, $\varphi(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h), \beta_{-t}h) = \Gamma(h)$ for all $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Replacing h with $\beta_t h$ we have $\varphi(t, \Gamma(h), h) = \Gamma(\beta_t h)$ which by definition is

$$\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \Gamma(h) = \Gamma(\beta_t h).$$

Hence the invariance follows, and the exponential mixing (3.13) then follows from the invariance and Theorem 2.7. Note that by replacing h with $\beta_s h$ in the invariance identity and using the translation identity (2.11), we have

$$(3.15) \quad \mathcal{P}_{s,s+t,h}^* \Gamma(\beta_s h) = \Gamma(\beta_{s+t} h), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0, h \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

To show the uniqueness of Γ , suppose that there is another $\tilde{\Gamma} \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}(H))$ that is invariant. Then $\tilde{\Gamma} \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$ by the Lyapunov structure (3.1). Indeed, for $R > 0$, let

$$g_R(w) = \begin{cases} e^{2k\eta\|w\|^2}, & \text{if } \|w\| \leq R, \\ e^{2k\eta R^2}, & \text{if } \|w\| \geq R. \end{cases}$$

Then by the invariance of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and estimate (3.1), we have for any $M, N > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_H g_R(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_h(dw) &= \int_H \mathcal{P}_{-N,0,h} g_R(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(dw) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\|w\| \leq M\}} \mathcal{P}_{-N,0,h} g_R(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(dw) + \int_{\{\|w\| \geq M\}} \mathcal{P}_{-N,0,h} g_R(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(dw) \\ &\leq \int_{\{\|w\| \leq M\}} \mathbf{E} g(w_{-N,0,h}(w)) \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(dw) + e^{2k\eta R^2} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(\{\|w\| \geq M\}) \\ &\leq C e^{2k\eta\alpha(N)M^2} + e^{2k\eta R^2} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(\{\|w\| \geq M\}). \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbb{T}^n is compact, and $\tilde{\Gamma} \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}(H))$, where $\mathcal{P}(H)$ is endowed with the topology of weak convergence, therefore $\{\tilde{\Gamma}_h\}_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n}$ is compact and hence tight by Prokhorov's theorem: for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a compact subset K_ε of H such that

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_h(H \setminus K_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Hence for any $R > 0$ and $\varepsilon = e^{-2k\eta R^2}$, there is a compact subset K_ε of H such that

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(H \setminus K_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon, \quad \forall N > 0.$$

Now we can choose M large enough such that $K_\varepsilon \subset \{\|w\| \leq M\}$ so that

$$e^{2k\eta R^2} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\beta_{-N}h}(\{\|w\| \geq M\}) \leq 1.$$

Since $\alpha(N) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we can choose N large such that $e^{2k\eta\alpha(N)M^2} \leq 1$ as well. Therefore we have

$$\int_H g_R(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_h(dw) \leq C, \quad \forall R > 0,$$

which, by the monotone convergence theorem, in turn implies that

$$\int_H g(w) \tilde{\Gamma}_h(dw) \leq C, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

and hence $\tilde{\Gamma} \in C(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathcal{P}_1(H))$. This ensures that

$$\sup_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\Gamma(h), \tilde{\Gamma}(h)) < \infty.$$

Now by the translation identity (2.11) and Theorem 2.7, we have for $h \in \mathbb{T}^n, t \geq s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Gamma(\beta_t h), \tilde{\Gamma}(\beta_t h)) &= \rho(\mathcal{P}_{s,t,h}^* \Gamma(\beta_s h), \mathcal{P}_{s,t,h}^* \tilde{\Gamma}(\beta_s h)) \\ &\leq C e^{-\varpi(t-s)} \rho(\Gamma(\beta_s h), \tilde{\Gamma}(\beta_s h)) \leq C \sup_{h \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho(\Gamma(h), \tilde{\Gamma}(h)) e^{-\varpi(t-s)}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $s \rightarrow -\infty$, it follows that $\Gamma(\beta_t h) = \tilde{\Gamma}(\beta_t h)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular this is true for $t = 0$ and any $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, hence $\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}$.

To show that $\Gamma \in C^\zeta(\mathbb{T}^n, (\mathcal{P}_1(H), \rho))$ if $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$, where $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$ with $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ from estimate (6.3), observing that for any $t \geq 0$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n$, by the invariance of Γ

and estimate (6.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho\left(\Gamma(h_1), \Gamma(h_2)\right) &= \rho\left(\varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_1), \beta_{-t}h_1\right), \varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_2), \beta_{-t}h_2\right)\right) \\
&\leq \rho\left(\varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_1), \beta_{-t}h_1\right), \varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_2), \beta_{-t}h_1\right)\right) + \rho\left(\varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_2), \beta_{-t}h_1\right), \varphi\left(t, \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_2), \beta_{-t}h_2\right)\right) \\
&\leq Ce^{rt} \int_H g(w)\Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_1)(dw) \|\Psi\|_\gamma |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma + Ce^{-\varpi t} \rho\left(\Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_1), \Gamma(\beta_{-t}h_2)\right) \\
&\leq Ce^{rt} R_{t_0} \|\Psi\|_\gamma |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma + Ce^{-\varpi t} \sup_{h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n} \rho\left(\Gamma(h_1), \Gamma(h_2)\right) \\
&\leq C(e^{rt}|h_1 - h_2|^\gamma + e^{-\varpi t}) \leq C|h_1 - h_2|^\zeta,
\end{aligned}$$

with $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$, by applying the following lemma.

Lemma 3.8. *For $D \geq 1, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 > 0, \gamma \in (0, 1], 0 < \delta \leq D$, one has*

$$e^{\Lambda_1 T} \delta^\gamma + e^{-\Lambda_2 T} \leq 2D^\gamma \delta^{\bar{\gamma}},$$

for $\bar{\gamma} = \frac{\Lambda_2}{\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2} \gamma$, by choosing $T = -\frac{\gamma}{\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2} \ln \delta$ for $\delta < 1$ and $T = 0$ for $\delta \geq 1$.

The proof is then complete. \square

We have the following two implications that express the mixing property in terms of the action of the transition operators on observables. Since the proof is the same as that in [30], we only state the results here and omit the proof.

Corollary 3.9. *There is a constant $\eta_0 > 0$, such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, there exist constants $C, \varpi > 0$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{s,t,h}\phi - \Gamma_{\beta_t h}(\phi)\|_{\rho,h,s} \leq Ce^{-\varpi(t-s)} \|\phi - \Gamma_{\beta_s h}(\phi)\|_{\rho,h,s},$$

for every Fréchet differentiable $\phi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $s \leq t$ and $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Here

$$\|\phi\|_{\rho,h,s} = \sup_{u \neq v} \frac{|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|}{\rho(u,v)} + |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_s h}, \phi \rangle|$$

Theorem 3.10. *There is a constant $\eta_0 > 0$, such that for every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, there exist constants $C, \varpi > 0$, such that for every $\phi \in C_\eta^1$ as in Theorem 2.6,*

$$(3.16) \quad \|\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}\phi - \int_H \phi(w)\Gamma_{\beta_t h}(dw)\|_\eta \leq Ce^{-\varpi t} \|\phi\|_\eta.$$

for any $h \in \mathbb{T}^n, t \geq 0$. In particular, the inequality (2.15) is obtained by replacing h with $\beta_s 0$ and using the translation identity (2.11), where $\mu_s := \Gamma_{\beta_s 0}$.

It turns out that Theorem 3.7 also implies the convergence of time averages of the transition probabilities, which is quite useful when applied to the proof of the limit theorems in the next subsection.

Proposition 3.11. *For any $(w_0, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following weak convergence of measures:*

1. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \delta_{w_0} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \Gamma_g \lambda(dg).$
2. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N P_{(j-1)K}^* \delta_{(w_0,h)} \rightarrow \Gamma_g(dw) \lambda(dg)$ and $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P_t^* \delta_{(w_0,h)} dt \rightarrow \Gamma_g(dw) \lambda(dg)$ as well.

Proof. For any $\phi \in \text{Lip}_\rho(H)$, we have by the Monge-Kantorovich duality (2.8), the invariance and mixing of the quasi-periodic invariant measure from Theorem 3.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \delta_{w_0} - \Gamma_{\beta_{(j-1)Kh}} \right), \phi \right\rangle \right| \\ & \leq \text{Lip}_\rho(\phi) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \delta_{w_0}, \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \Gamma_h) \leq C \text{Lip}_\rho(\phi) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-\varpi(j-1)K} \rho(\delta_0, \Gamma_h), \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem for the irrational rotation on \mathbb{T}^n , one has

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_{\beta_{(j-1)Kh}}, \phi \right\rangle \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \langle \Gamma_g, \phi \rangle \lambda(dg).$$

Hence the first claim of the lemma follows.

Now let $\phi \in \text{Lip}_{\rho,d}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, where H is equipped with the metric ρ and d is the usual distance in \mathbb{T}^n induced from \mathbb{R}^n . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{P}_{(j-1)K}^* \delta_{(w_0,h)}, \phi \right\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h} \phi(\cdot, \beta_{(j-1)Kh})(w_0) \\ & = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \delta_{w_0} - \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \Gamma_h, \phi(\cdot, \beta_{(j-1)Kh}) \right\rangle + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\langle \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \Gamma_h, \phi(\cdot, \beta_{(j-1)Kh}) \right\rangle \\ & := I + II, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term in the sum vanishes by the mixing of the quasi-periodic invariant measure since

$$|I| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Lip}_\rho \phi(\cdot, \sigma_{(j-1)Kh}) \rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \delta_{w_0}, \mathcal{P}_{0,(j-1)K,h}^* \Gamma_h) \leq \frac{C \text{Lip}_{\rho,d}(\phi)}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-\varpi(j-1)K} \rho(\delta_{w_0}, \Gamma_h) \rightarrow 0.$$

While the second term converges to the average of ϕ with respect to $\Gamma_h(dw)\lambda(dg)$ by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem for the irrational rotation β :

$$II = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\langle \Gamma_{\sigma_{(j-1)Kh}}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_{(j-1)Kh}) \right\rangle \rightarrow \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \phi(w, g) \Gamma_g(dw) \lambda(dg),$$

since the observable $g \in \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \langle \Gamma_g, \phi(\cdot, g) \rangle$ is continuous. The proof for the continuous time version is similar. \square

Remark 3.1. Usually the sequence of time averages of the transition probabilities always possesses a subsequence that converges to an invariant measure by the Krylov-Bogoliubov theorem, however it is not guaranteed that the whole sequence always converges to the invariant measure. While in the above lemma, even if it is the case that the homogenized Markov process is not mixing, we have the convergence of the time averages to the unique ergodic invariant measure. From the proof we see that this is a result of the mixing of the inhomogeneous Markov process along the H component, together with the unique ergodicity of the irrational rotation flow.

4. SLLN AND CLT FOR TIME INHOMOGENEOUS SOLUTION PROCESS

In this section, we establish the limit theorems as well as the corresponding convergence rates as given in Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.9 for the time inhomogeneous solution process of the Navier-Stokes equation (2.3). In fact, we will prove these results for more general class of observable functions that will be given below. The proof is based on a martingale approximation and the limit theorems from the martingale theory.

Due to the time inhomogeneity, it is not obvious to derive a martingale approximation for the inhomogeneous solution process. We also note that the homogenized process X_t is not mixing in the usual sense since $\mathbf{E}\phi(X_t) - \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \phi(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh)$ does not decay to 0, essentially because the irrational rotation on the torus is not mixing. Here $\Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh)$ is the unique invariant measure for X_t . Therefore the usual martingale approximation cannot be applied directly. Yet the exponentially mixing quasi-periodic invariant measure enables us to center the observation along the solution process in an appropriate way, which gives us a chance to have a martingale approximation. Indeed, by mixing (3.7), the transition probabilities are exponentially attracted by the quasi-periodic invariant measure, so the expectation of the observation $\phi(w_{0,t}(w_0))$ along the inhomogeneous process is attracted by the quasi-periodic path $\int_H \phi(w) \mu_t(dw)$. Hence $\phi(w_{0,t}(w_0)) - \int_H \phi(w) \mu_t(dw)$ forms a family of “asymptotically centered” random variables that is expected to have the asymptotic behavior described by the limit theorems. Note that if we let $\tilde{\phi}(w, h) = \phi(w) - \langle \phi, \Gamma_h \rangle$, then

$$\phi(w_{0,t}(w_0)) - \int_H \phi(w) \mu_t(dw) = \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, 0)),$$

which is the observation of the centered observable function along the homogenized process $X_t(w_0, 0)$. This indicates that the homogenized process is mixing when acting on the observables centered by the quasi-periodic invariant measure, which enables us to derive a martingale approximation.

Subsection 4.1 below is devoted to the study of this particular martingale approximation. Then the strong law of large numbers and the central limit theorem are direct conclusions of the corresponding theorems established in martingale theory, which merely requires the weak convergence of the average of the transition probabilities established in Proposition 3.11 and the bounds on the approximating martingale. The proof is presented in subsection 4.2. The rate of convergence for the limit theorems will be given in subsection 4.3, which requires more detailed analyses on regularity of observables and the convergence rate for the moments of the time average of the observations centered by the quasi-periodic invariant measure.

We now define the space of observable functions and state the main results of this section. For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, let $C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ be the space of Hölder continuous functions with finite norms weighted by the Lyapunov function $e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$,

$$(4.1) \quad C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) := \{ \phi \in C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) : \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} < \infty \},$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} := \sup_{(w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \frac{|\phi(w, h)|}{e^{\eta\|w\|^2}} + \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{T}^n \\ 0 < \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq 1}} \frac{|\phi(w_1, h) - \phi(w_2, h)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma (e^{\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{\eta\|w_2\|^2})}.$$

Let also $C_{\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ be the space of functions that are Hölder continuous on \mathbb{T}^n -component and uniformly on bounded subset of H

$$(4.3) \quad C_{\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) := \{ \phi \in C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) : \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n} < \infty \},$$

where

$$\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,\mathbb{T}^n} := \sup_{(w,h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \frac{|\phi(w,h)|}{e^{\eta\|w\|^2}} + \sup_{\substack{w \in H \\ 0 < \|h_1 - h_2\| \leq 1}} \frac{|\phi(w,h_1) - \phi(w,h_2)|}{e^{\eta\|w\|^2} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma}.$$

Recall that ρ is the geodesic distance on H weighted by $e^{\eta\|w\|^2}$ and therefore depends on η . Let

$$[\phi]_{\gamma,\eta,H_\rho} = \sup_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{T}^n \\ 0 < \rho(w_1, w_2) \leq 1}} \frac{|\phi(w_1, h) - \phi(w_2, h)|}{\rho(w_1, w_2)^\gamma},$$

be the Hölder semi-norm under the metric ρ , and set $C_{\eta,H_\rho}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ as the space of bounded Hölder continuous (with respect to the metric ρ on H) functions

$$(4.4) \quad C_{\eta,H_\rho}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) = \left\{ \phi \in C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) : \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H_\rho} := \sup_{(w,h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n} |\phi(w,h)| + [\phi]_{\gamma,\eta,H_\rho} < \infty \right\}.$$

Remark 4.1. *It is straightforward to verify that for $0 < \delta \leq \gamma$, the following inclusion holds:*

$$\{\phi \in C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) : [\phi]_{\gamma,\eta,H_\rho} < \infty\} \subset C_{2\eta,H}^\delta(H \times \mathbb{T}^n).$$

In the case when the deterministic force $f(t,x)$ vanishes and the noise is degenerate as in our work, the weak law of large numbers and central limit theorem were proved in [29] for Lipschitz observable functions ϕ with $[\phi]_{1,\eta,H_\rho} < \infty$. In view of the above inclusion and the fact that the following Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 are valid for $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, our limit theorems in the case when the deterministic force $f = 0$ can be considered as an improvement of those in [29].

For any $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, we set $\tilde{\phi}$ as the associated function obtained by normalizing ϕ with the quasi-periodic invariant measure,

$$(4.5) \quad \tilde{\phi}(w,h) = \phi(w,h) - \langle \Gamma_h, \phi(\cdot, h) \rangle.$$

It is clear that $\tilde{\phi} \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ as well. Note that $X_t(w_0, h_0) = (w_{0,t,h_0}(w_0), \beta_t h_0)$, hence

$$\tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) = \phi(w_{0,t,h_0}(w_0), \beta_t h_0) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_0}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_0) \rangle.$$

Recall from Theorem 3.7 that when $h_0 = 0$, $\Gamma_{\beta_t 0} = \mu_t$ is the unique quasi-periodic invariant measure of the Navier-Stokes system (2.3) with the deterministic force $f(t,x)$. And when ϕ is an observable function on H , we have $\tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, 0)) = \phi(w_{0,t,h_0}(w_0)) - \langle \mu_t, \phi \rangle$, which is the observation along the solution process normalized by the quasi-periodic invariant measure. In particular, Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.9 with $s = 0$ are obtained from the following Theorem 4.1-4.4 by taking the observable function $\phi \in C_\eta^\gamma(H) \subset C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ and $h_0 = 0$. For simplicity, we prove Theorem 4.1-4.4 for initial time $s = 0$, while the proof applies to $s \neq 0$ without any change. Therefore Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.9 hold for any initial time $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let η_0 be the constant from (6.1). The first result is the strong law of large numbers with its rate of convergence.

Theorem 4.1 (SLLN). *For any $\eta \in (0, 2^{-4}\eta_0]$, $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$(4.6) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) dt = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s..}$$

The second result is the central limit theorem.

Theorem 4.2 (CLT). For any $\eta \in (0, 2^{-6}\eta_0]$, $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, and $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, one has

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) dt \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $N(0, \sigma^2)$ is the standard normal random variable with variance σ^2 and \mathcal{D} represents the convergence in distribution. In fact

$$\sigma^2 = \sigma_\phi^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) dt \right)^2.$$

The third result of this section is an estimate of the rate of convergence for the strong law of large numbers.

Theorem 4.3. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, for every integer $p \geq 3$ satisfying $2^p > 1/\varepsilon$, every $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$, and every $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, there is an almost surely finite random time $T_0(\omega) \geq 1$, depending on $p, \varepsilon, \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, \|w_0\|, h_0$ such that for all $T > T_0$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(X_t(w_0, h_0)) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle \right) dt \right| \leq CT^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon},$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant that does not depend on the above parameters. Moreover, for every $0 < \ell < \min\{2^p \varepsilon - 1, 2^{p-2} - 1\}$, there is a constant $C_p = C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, \ell, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbf{E} T_0^\ell \leq C_p e^{2^{p+1}\eta \|w_0\|^2}.$$

The last result is on the convergence rate of the central limit theorem.

Theorem 4.4. Assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$ and the frequency α satisfies the Diophantine condition (2.2) with constant A and dimension n . Let $\Lambda = \frac{\varpi}{5(2-\gamma)}$, $\zeta = \frac{\varpi\gamma}{r+\varpi}$ and $\bar{\gamma}_0 = \frac{\Lambda\zeta}{5(\Lambda+r)(2-\gamma)}$, where ϖ is the mixing rate from Theorem 2.6 and $r = 64c_0^6\eta^{-3}\nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is the constant from (6.3).

1. For any integer $p \geq 2$, $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$, and $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ with $\sigma_\phi^2 > 0$, and $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, there are constants $C_p = C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n}, \|w_0\|) > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ such that for all $T \geq T_0$,

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) dt \leq z \right\} - \Phi_{\sigma_\phi}(z) \right| \leq C_p \left(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + T^{-\frac{2^p-2}{2^p+1}} + T^{-\frac{2^p-1\bar{\gamma}_0}{(2^p+1)(A+n)}} \right),$$

2. For $\eta \in (0, 2^{-7}\eta_0]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ such that $\sigma_\phi^2 = 0$, and $(w_0, h_0) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, there is a constant $C = C(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}, \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n}, \|w_0\|) > 0$ such that for all $T \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} (|z| \wedge 1) \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w_0, h_0)) dt \leq z \right\} - \Phi_0(z) \right| \leq C \left(T^{-\frac{1}{4}} + T^{-\frac{\bar{\gamma}_0}{2(A+n)}} \right)$$

4.1. The martingale approximation. We first give several properties of the spaces of observable functions defined above in the following Proposition 4.5. Then we prove a mixing result (as a consequence of Theorem 3.7) in terms of the observable functions in Theorem 4.6, which is crucial in deriving the martingale approximation. Proposition 4.7 gives the definition of the corrector and its properties that will be used to construct the martingale approximation as given in (4.14).

Proposition 4.5. Let η_0 be the constant from estimate (6.1), and c_0 be the constant from the Ladyzhenskaya's inequality (2.20). Then for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$, and any $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, P_t maps $C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ into $C_{2\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$; If we further assume that $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$, then P_t maps $C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ into $C_{2\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. It follows from (6.1) and (6.11) that for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |P_t \phi(w_1, h) - P_t \phi(w_2, h)| \\
&= |\mathbf{E} \phi(w_{0,t,h}(w_1), \beta_t h) - \mathbf{E} \phi(w_{0,t,h}(w_2), \beta_t h)| \leq \mathbf{E} |\phi(w_{0,t,h}(w_1), \beta_t h) - \phi(w_{0,t,h}(w_2), \beta_t h)| \\
&\leq \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \mathbf{E} \|w_{0,t,h}(w_1) - w_{0,t,h}(w_2)\|^\gamma \left(e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w_1)\|^2} + e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w_2)\|^2} \right) \\
&\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \left(\mathbf{E} \|w_{0,t,h}(w_1) - w_{0,t,h}(w_2)\|^2 \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(\mathbf{E} \left(e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w_1)\|^2} + e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w_2)\|^2} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma e^{\frac{\gamma r}{2} t} e^{\frac{\gamma}{2} \eta \|w_1\|^2} \left(e^{\eta \|w_1\|^2} + e^{\eta \|w_2\|^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is the constant from (6.4). Hence we have

$$(4.8) \quad |P_t \phi(w_1, h) - P_t \phi(w_2, h)| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma e^{\frac{\gamma r}{2} t} \left(e^{2\eta \|w_1\|^2} + e^{2\eta \|w_2\|^2} \right),$$

which shows that P_t maps $C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ into $C_{2\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$.

Now assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$ and let $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta,\mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& |P_t \phi(w, h_1) - P_t \phi(w, h_2)| = |\mathbf{E} \phi(w_{0,t,h_1}(w), \beta_t h_1) - \mathbf{E} \phi(w_{0,t,h_2}(w), \beta_t h_2)| \\
&\leq \mathbf{E} |\phi(w_{0,t,h_1}(w), \beta_t h_1) - \phi(w_{0,t,h_1}(w), \beta_t h_2)| + \mathbf{E} |\phi(w_{0,t,h_1}(w), \beta_t h_2) - \phi(w_{0,t,h_2}(w), \beta_t h_2)| \\
&\leq \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,\mathbb{T}^n} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma \mathbf{E} e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w)\|^2} + \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \mathbf{E} \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w) - w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^\gamma \left(e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w)\|^2} + e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6.1) and (6.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w) - w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^\gamma \left(e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w)\|^2} + e^{\eta \|w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^2} \right) \\
&\leq \left(\mathbf{E} \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w) - w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^2 \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(\mathbf{E} \left(e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h_1}(w)\|^2} + e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h_2}(w)\|^2} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C e^{\frac{\gamma r}{2} t} e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^\gamma |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(4.9) \quad |P_t \phi(w, h_1) - P_t \phi(w, h_2)| \leq C (\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,\mathbb{T}^n} + \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^\gamma) e^{\frac{\gamma r}{2} t} e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma,$$

which shows that P_t maps $C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta,\mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ into $C_{2\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2\eta,\mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. \square

The following theorem shows that the homogenized process is mixing over the family of observables normalized by the quasi-periodic invariant measure as in (4.5), although it is not mixing in the usual sense (by centering the observables with the unique ergodic invariant measure of the homogenized process).

Theorem 4.6. *For any $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $\kappa \geq 2$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/\kappa]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ we have*

$$(4.10) \quad |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h)| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{\kappa \eta \|w\|^2} e^{-\Lambda t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, (w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where $\Lambda = \frac{\varpi}{5(2-\gamma)}$, the mixing rate ϖ is from Theorem 3.7, and C is a positive constant independent of (w, h) and η_0 is the constant from (6.1).

Proof. For any $R > 0$, let $\chi_R : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ satisfying $0 \leq \chi_R \leq 1$, with $\chi_R(w) = 1$ for $\|w\| \leq R$ and $\chi_R(w) = 0$ for $\|w\| \geq R + 1$. We can actually choose a χ_R such that $\|\chi_R\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \leq 2$. Assume without loss of generality that $\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} = 1$. Also denote by $\bar{\chi}_R = 1 - \chi_R$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h)| &= |P_t (\chi_R \phi + \bar{\chi}_R \phi)(w, h) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, (\chi_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) + (\bar{\chi}_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| \\
&\leq |P_t (\chi_R \phi)(w, h) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, (\chi_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| + |P_t (\bar{\chi}_R \phi)(w, h) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, (\bar{\chi}_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| \\
&:= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to show that $\chi_R\phi \in C_{\eta, H_\rho}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Indeed, since $\chi_R\phi$ vanishes outside of the ball $\|w\| \leq R+1$, in view of the definition (4.2), one has

$$(4.12) \quad \sup_{(w,h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n} |\chi_R(w)\phi(w,h)| \leq \sup_{\substack{(w,h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n \\ \|w\| \leq R+1}} |\phi(w,h)| \leq \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} e^{\eta(R+1)^2}.$$

Let

$$S = \{(w_1, w_2) \in H^2 : \|w_1\| \leq R+1, \|w_2\| \geq R+1, 0 < \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq 1\},$$

and

$$S_\rho = \{(w_1, w_2) \in H^2 : \|w_1\| \leq R+1, \|w_2\| \geq R+1, 0 < \rho(w_1, w_2) \leq 1\}.$$

It is clear that $S_\rho \subset S$ since $\|w_1 - w_2\| \leq \rho(w_1, w_2)$. It follows from $\chi_R(w_2) = 0$, $\|w_2\| \leq R+2$ and (4.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S_\rho} \frac{|\chi_R(w_1)\phi(w_1, h) - \chi_R(w_2)\phi(w_2, h)|}{\rho(w_1, w_2)^\gamma} &= \sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S_\rho} \frac{|\chi_R(w_1)\phi(w_1, h) - \chi_R(w_2)\phi(w_1, h)|}{\rho(w_1, w_2)^\gamma} \\ &\leq 2e^{\eta(R+1)^2} \sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S} \frac{|\chi_R(w_1) - \chi_R(w_2)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma} \\ &\leq 4e^{2\eta(R+2)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$S^R = \{(w_1, w_2) \in H^2 : \|w_1\|, \|w_2\| \leq R+1, 0 < \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq 1\},$$

and

$$S_\rho^R = \{(w_1, w_2) \in H^2 : \|w_1\|, \|w_2\| \leq R+1, 0 < \rho(w_1, w_2) \leq 1\}.$$

First note that for $\|w_1\|, \|w_2\| \leq R+1$,

$$|\chi_R(w_1)\phi(w_1, h) - \chi_R(w_2)\phi(w_2, h)| \leq 2e^{\eta(R+1)^2} (|\chi_R(w_1) - \chi_R(w_2)| + |\phi(w_1, h) - \phi(w_2, h)|)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S_\rho^R} \frac{|\chi_R(w_1)\phi(w_1, h) - \chi_R(w_2)\phi(w_2, h)|}{\rho(w_1, w_2)^\gamma} &\leq 2e^{\eta(R+1)^2} \left(\sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S^R} \frac{|\chi_R(w_1) - \chi_R(w_2)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma} + \sup_{(w_1, w_2) \in S^R} \frac{|\phi(w_1, h) - \phi(w_2, h)|}{\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma} \right) \\ &\leq 4e^{2\eta(R+2)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that $\chi_R\phi \in C_{\eta, H_\rho}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ and

$$\|\chi_R\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H_\rho} \leq C e^{2\eta(R+2)^2},$$

where C is a constant that does not depend on R .

It is known that the dual Hölder metric on $\mathcal{P}(H)$ is bounded by the Wasserstein metric (see Proposition 1.2.6 in [28] for example):

$$(4.13) \quad \sup_{\varphi \in C_b^\gamma(H), \|\varphi\|_\gamma \leq 1} |\langle \mu_1, \varphi \rangle - \langle \mu_2, \varphi \rangle| \leq 5(\rho(\mu_1, \mu_2))^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}}, \quad \forall \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(H),$$

where $C_b^\gamma(H)$ is the space of bounded γ -Hölder continuous functions on H endowed with the metric ρ , and

$$\|\varphi\|_\gamma = \sup_{w \in H} |\varphi(w)| + \sup_{0 < \rho(w_1, w_2) \leq 1} \frac{|\varphi(w_1) - \varphi(w_2)|}{\rho(w_1, w_2)^\gamma}.$$

Combining this fact with Theorem 3.7, it follows that the first term in (4.11) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= |P_t(\chi_R\phi)(w, h) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, (\chi_R\phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| \\
&= |\langle \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \delta_w, (\chi_R\phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle - \langle \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \Gamma_h, (\chi_R\phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| \\
&\leq 5 \|\chi_R\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H_\rho} (\rho(\mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \delta_w, \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h}^* \Gamma_h))^{\delta_0} \leq C e^{2\eta(R+2)^2} e^{-\delta_0 \varpi t} e^{\kappa \eta \|w\|^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{2-\gamma} \leq 1, \kappa \geq 2$ and ϖ are positive constants.

To estimate the second term in (4.11), observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
|P_t(\bar{\chi}_R\phi)(w, h)| &\leq \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)}(|\bar{\chi}_R\phi|)(X_t) \leq (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)}\bar{\chi}_R(X_t))^{1/2} (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)}|\phi(X_t)|^2)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\mathbf{P}(\|w_{0,t,h}(w)\| \geq R) \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbf{E} e^{2\eta\|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C e^{\eta\|w\|^2} e^{-\eta R^2} (\mathbf{E} e^{2\eta\|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2})^{1/2} \leq C e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} e^{-\eta R^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} = 1$ and the estimate (6.1) with a smaller η_0 (which is the one in (6.1) divided by 2).

In a similar fashion, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, (\bar{\chi}_R\phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle| &\leq \left(\int_H \bar{\chi}_R(w) \Gamma_{\beta_t h}(dw) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_H |\phi(w, \beta_t h)|^2 \Gamma_{\beta_t h}(dw) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\Gamma_{\beta_t h}(\|w\| \geq R) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_H e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} \Gamma_{\beta_t h}(dw) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C e^{-\eta R^2} \left(\int_H e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} \Gamma_{\beta_t h}(dw) \right)^{1/2} \leq C e^{-\eta R^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have the following estimate on (4.11),

$$|P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h)| \leq C e^{\kappa \eta \|w\|^2} (e^{4\eta R^2 - \delta_0 \varpi t} + e^{-\eta R^2}).$$

By choosing $R^2 = \frac{\delta_0 \varpi t}{5\eta}$, we obtain (4.10) with $\Lambda = \frac{\delta_0 \varpi}{5} = \frac{\varpi}{5(2-\gamma)}$. The proof is complete. \square

We now define the corrector that will be used in the martingale approximation procedure.

Proposition 4.7 (The corrector). *For $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, define*

$$\chi(w, h) := \int_0^\infty P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h) dt = \int_0^\infty \mathcal{P}_{0,t,h} \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h)(w) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle dt, \quad (w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n.$$

- (1). For $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$, $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, the corrector $\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ as long as $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, where $\gamma_0 = \frac{\Lambda \gamma}{\Lambda + r}$, with Λ from Theorem 4.6 and $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ is the constant from (4.8).
- (2). If we assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, then the associated corrector $\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\gamma_1}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, where $\gamma_1 = \frac{\Lambda \zeta}{5(\Lambda + r)(2-\gamma)}$ with Λ, r as above and ζ from Theorem 3.7. In particular, we have

$$\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n),$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_0 = \min\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1\} = \gamma_1$.

Proof. The function χ is well defined in view of Theorem 4.6. We begin with proving the first item. Let $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. It follows from Theorem 4.6 and inequality (4.8) that, for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi(w_1, h) - \chi(w_2, h)| &\leq \int_0^T |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w_1, h) - P_t \tilde{\phi}(w_2, h)| dt + \int_T^\infty |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w_1, h)| + |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w_2, h)| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^T |P_t \phi(w_1, h) - P_t \phi(w_2, h)| dt + C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{-\Lambda T} \left(e^{2\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{2\eta\|w_2\|^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \left(\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}T} + e^{-\Lambda T} \right) \left(e^{2\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{2\eta\|w_2\|^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \left(\|w_1 - w_2\|^\gamma e^{rT} + e^{-\Lambda T} \right) \left(e^{2\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{2\eta\|w_2\|^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where r is from inequality (4.8). In view of Lemma 3.8, we have for any $0 < \|w_1 - w_2\| \leq 1$,

$$|\chi(w_1, h) - \chi(w_2, h)| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} \left(e^{4\eta\|w_1\|^2} + e^{4\eta\|w_2\|^2} \right) \|w_1 - w_2\|^{\gamma_0},$$

with $\gamma_0 = \frac{\Lambda\gamma}{\Lambda+r}$. This also indicates that $\chi(w, h)$ is continuous in w uniformly for h . The continuity of $\chi(w, h)$ in h for fixed w follows from the fact that $\chi_T(w, h) := \int_0^T P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h) dt$ is continuous in h and $\chi_T(w, h) \rightarrow \chi(w, h)$ uniformly for h . Thus $\chi \in C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. It also follows from Theorem 4.6 that $|\chi(w, h)| \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{2\eta\|w\|^2}$. Hence $\chi \in C_{2\eta,H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$.

We now prove the second assertion. Let $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta,\mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ and assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi(w, h_1) - \chi(w, h_2)| &\leq \int_0^T |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h_1) - P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h_2)| dt + \int_T^\infty |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h_1)| + |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h_2)| dt \\ &:= I + II. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Theorem 4.6, the second term can be estimated as

$$II \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} e^{-\Lambda T}.$$

For the first term, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \int_0^T |P_t \phi(w, h_1) - P_t \phi(w, h_2)| dt + \int_0^T |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_1}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_2) \rangle| dt \\ &:= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the estimate (4.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq C (\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,\mathbb{T}^n} + \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^\gamma) e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma \int_0^T e^{\frac{r\gamma}{2}t} dt \\ &\leq C (\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,\mathbb{T}^n} + \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^\gamma) e^{2\eta\|w\|^2} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma e^{rT}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate I_2 , noting that as in the proof of Theorem 4.6, especially by (4.13) and Theorem 3.7 (ζ -Hölder continuity of Γ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &:= |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_1}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_1} - \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, \chi_R \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle| + |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_1}, (\bar{\chi}_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle| + |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, (\bar{\chi}_R \phi)(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle| \\ &\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{4\eta R^2} \|\Gamma\|_\zeta^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}} |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\zeta}{2-\gamma}} + C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} e^{-\eta R^2} \\ &\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} (\|\Gamma\|_\zeta^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}} + 1) \left(e^{4\eta R^2} |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\zeta}{2-\gamma}} + e^{-\eta R^2} \right) \\ &\leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H} (\|\Gamma\|_\zeta^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}} + 1) |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\zeta}{5(2-\gamma)}} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.8. Also note that by Theorem 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22} &:= |\langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) \rangle - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_2) \rangle| \\ &\leq \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}, |\phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_1) - \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h_2)| \rangle \\ &\leq \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma \int_H e^{\eta \|w\|^2} \Gamma_{\beta_t h_2}(dw) \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n} |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$I_2 \leq \int_0^T I_{21} + I_{22} dt \leq CT \left(\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} (\|\Gamma\|_{\zeta}^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}} + 1) + \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, \mathbb{T}^n} \right) |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\zeta}{5(2-\gamma)}}.$$

Therefore by Lemma 3.8 again,

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi(w, h_1) - \chi(w, h_2)| &\leq C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} \left(e^{rT} |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\zeta}{5(2-\gamma)}} + e^{-\Lambda T} \right) \\ &\leq C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} |h_1 - h_2|^{\gamma_1}. \end{aligned}$$

with $\gamma_1 = \frac{\Lambda \zeta}{5(\Lambda+r)(2-\gamma)}$. Hence $\chi \in C_{2\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\gamma_1}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. This completes the proof of this proposition. \square

We are now in a position to give the martingale approximation. For $T \geq 0$, let

$$(4.14) \quad \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt = \int_0^N \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt + \int_N^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt = M_N + R_{N,T},$$

where N is the integer part of T ,

$$M_N = \chi(X_N) - \chi(X_0) + \int_0^N \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt$$

is the Dynkin martingale (formally) and

$$R_{N,T} = -\chi(X_N) + \chi(X_0) + \int_N^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt$$

is the reminder term. Let $Z_N = M_N - M_{N-1}$ for $N \geq 1$ be the associated martingale difference. In what follows, we will show that M_N is indeed a martingale and $R_{N,T}$ is a negligible term that vanishes as $T \rightarrow \infty$. This will reduce the proof of Theorem 4.1-4.2 to the proof of the limit theorems for the associated martingale sequence M_N . Let $M_T = \chi(X_T) - \chi(X_0) + \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt$ for $T \geq 0$.

Lemma 4.8. $\{M_T\}_{T \geq 0}$ is a zero mean martingale w.r.t the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_T\}$.

Proof. The martingale property follows from the Markov property of the homogenized process X_t as follows.

$$\mathbf{E}[M_T | \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbf{E}[\chi(X_T) | \mathcal{F}_s] - \chi(X_0) + \int_0^s \mathbf{E}[\tilde{\phi}(X_u) | \mathcal{F}_s] du + \int_s^T \mathbf{E}[\tilde{\phi}(X_u) | \mathcal{F}_s] du.$$

Since X_u is \mathcal{F}_s measurable for $0 \leq u \leq s$, it follows that

$$\int_0^s \mathbf{E}[\tilde{\phi}(X_u) | \mathcal{F}_s] du = \int_0^s \tilde{\phi}(X_u) du.$$

Moreover, by the Markov property,

$$\int_s^T \mathbf{E}[\tilde{\phi}(X_u) | \mathcal{F}_s] du = \int_s^\infty P_{u-s} \tilde{\phi}(X_s) du - \int_T^\infty P_{u-T} (P_{T-s} \tilde{\phi})(X_s) du = \chi(X_s) - \mathbf{E}[\chi(X_T) | \mathcal{F}_s].$$

Hence $\mathbf{E}[M_T | \mathcal{F}_s] = M_s$.

It is zero mean since

$$\begin{aligned}
M_T &= \chi(X_T) - \chi(X_0) + \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \\
&= \int_T^\infty P_{t-T} \tilde{\phi}(X_T) dt - \int_0^\infty P_t \tilde{\phi}(X_0) dt + \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \\
&= \int_T^\infty \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} [\tilde{\phi}(X_t) | \mathcal{F}_T] dt - \int_0^\infty P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h) dt + \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} M_T = 0$. \square

The following lemma gives estimates on the even order moments of the martingale M_N and its associated martingale difference.

Lemma 4.9 (Bounds on the martingale). *For integer $p \geq 1$, $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, one has*

$$\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_T|^{2p} \leq C(T^{2-2^{-p}} + 1)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}, \quad \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |Z_N|^{2p} \leq Ce^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2},$$

for $T \geq 0$ and $N \geq 1$. Also with a larger constant C ,

$$P_t \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_T|^{2p} \leq C(T^{2-2^{-p}} + 1)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.7, we know that $\chi \in C_{2\eta,H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Hence $\chi^{2p} \in C_{2^{p+1}\eta,H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Besides, since $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, $|\tilde{\phi}|^{2p} \in C_{2^{p+1}\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. It follows from estimate (6.1) that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$, and any $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_T|^{2p} &\leq C \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |\chi(X_T)|^{2p} + |\chi(w, h)|^{2p} + T^{1-2^{-p}} \int_0^T \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |\tilde{\phi}(X_t)|^{2p} dt \right) \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbf{E} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w_{0,T,h}(w)\|^2} + e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2} + T^{1-2^{-p}} \int_0^T \mathbf{E} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2} dt \right) \\
&\leq C(T^{2-2^{-p}} + 1)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that for any $N \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |Z_N|^{2p} \leq Ce^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2},$$

where C does not depend on N, h . It follows from (6.1) that

$$P_t \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_T|^{2p} \leq C(T^{2-2^{-p}} + 1) \mathbf{E} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2} \leq C(T^{2-2^{-p}} + 1)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}.$$

\square

The following estimate on the remainder term shows that the proof of Theorem 4.1-4.2 can be reduced to the proof of the corresponding limit theorems for the associated martingale sequence.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $R_{N,T}$ be as in (4.14). Then for any initial condition $X_0 = (w, h)$, $\eta \in (0, 2^{-4}\eta_0]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$,*

$$(4.15) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} R_{N,T} = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof. Since N is the integer part of T , it suffices to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} R_{N,t} = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By Proposition 4.7, we have that

$$|\chi(X_N)| \leq C e^{2\eta \|w_{0,N,h}(w)\|^2}.$$

Since $\phi \in C_{\eta,H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, it also holds that

$$(4.16) \quad \sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} \left| \int_N^t \tilde{\phi}(X_s) ds \right| \leq C \sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2}.$$

It then follows from the Markov inequality, estimates (6.2) and (6.1) that for any $K > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2} > K \right) \leq C e^{2^4 \eta \|w\|^2} K^{-8}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} \left(|\chi(X_N)| + \chi(w, h) + \left| \int_N^t \tilde{\phi}(X_s) ds \right| \right) \geq N^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P} \left(C \sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} e^{2\eta \|w_{0,t,h}(w)\|^2} \geq N^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \leq C e^{2^4 \eta \|w\|^2} \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} N^{-2} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, there is an almost surely finite random integer time $N_0(\omega)$ such that for $N > N_0(\omega)$,

$$(4.17) \quad \sup_{N \leq t \leq N+1} R_{N,t} \leq N^{1/4},$$

which implies (4.15). \square

4.2. The limit theorems. Based on the martingale approximation given above, we will prove Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2 in this subsection by showing the limit results for the corresponding martingales. As remarked earlier, compared with the analysis in the next subsection on the rate of convergence, the proof of the limit theorems is quite straightforward that merely requires certain moment bounds as given in Lemma 4.9 and ergodicity properties given in Proposition 3.11. We first prove the strong law of large numbers, which is based on the following Kolmogorov's criterion for martingales.

Theorem 4.11 ([22, 28]). *Let $\{M_N\}_{N \geq 1}$ be a zero mean square integrable martingale and let $\{c_N\}$ be an increasing sequence going to ∞ such that*

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} c_N^{-2} \mathbf{E} Z_N^2 < \infty,$$

where $Z_N = M_N - M_{N-1}$ and $M_0 = 0$. Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} c_N^{-1} M_N \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. In view of the martingale approximation (4.14) and Theorem 4.10, to show (4.6), it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} M_N = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Lemma 4.9 with $p = 1$ ensures the condition of Theorem 4.11 with $c_N = N^{1/2+\varepsilon}$. Hence the desired convergence follows from Theorem 4.11. \square

The rest of this subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.2. We first prove the existence of the asymptotic variance.

Proposition 4.12 (The asymptotic variance). *For any $(w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$, $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/16]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, we have*

$$(4.18) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w, h)) dt \right)^2 = 2 \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \tilde{\phi}(w, h) \chi(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh) := \sigma_\phi^2.$$

Proof. By the Markov property of the homogenized process, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w, h)) dt \right)^2 &= \frac{2}{T} \mathbf{E} \int_0^T \int_s^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t(w, h)) \tilde{\phi}(X_s(w, h)) dt ds \\ &= \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \mathbf{E} \left[\tilde{\phi}(X_s(w, h)) \int_s^T \mathbf{E} \left[\tilde{\phi}(X_t(w, h)) | \mathcal{F}_s \right] dt \right] ds \\ &= \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} \int_0^{T-s} P_t \tilde{\phi} dt \right\rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the weak convergence in Proposition 3.11 and the definition of the corrector in Proposition 4.7, we expect that as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} \int_0^{T-s} P_t \tilde{\phi} dt \right\rangle ds - \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} \chi \right\rangle ds \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} (\chi - \chi_{T-s}) \right\rangle ds \right| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_{T-s} = \int_0^{T-s} P_t \tilde{\phi} dt$. Indeed, it follows from Theorem 4.6 with $\kappa = 2$ that

$$|\chi - \chi_{T-s}| \leq \int_{T-s}^\infty |P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h)| dt \leq C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} e^{-\Lambda(T-s)}.$$

Since $\tilde{\phi} \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, and $e^{2\eta \|\cdot\|^2} \in C_{4\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, it follows that $\tilde{\phi} e^{2\eta \|\cdot\|^2} \in C_{8\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Hence by estimate (6.1), we have for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/8]$, and any $s \geq 0$,

$$\left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, |\tilde{\phi}| e^{2\eta \|\cdot\|^2} \right\rangle \leq C \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, e^{8\eta \|\cdot\|^2} \right\rangle = C \mathbf{E} e^{8\eta \|w_{0, s, h}(w)\|^2} \leq C e^{8\eta \|w\|^2}.$$

Hence

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} (\chi - \chi_{T-s}) \right\rangle ds \right| \leq C e^{8\eta \|w\|^2} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T e^{-\Lambda(T-s)} ds \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies the limit (4.19).

By Proposition 4.7, $\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Hence $|\tilde{\phi} \chi|^2 \in C_{8\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Then by estimate (6.1), for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/8]$,

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, |\tilde{\phi} \chi|^2 \right\rangle ds \leq C \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbf{E} e^{8\eta \|w_{0, s, h}(w)\|^2} ds < \infty.$$

Combining this moment bound with the weak convergence in Proposition 3.11, we obtain the desired convergence

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T \left\langle P_s^* \delta_{(w, h)}, \tilde{\phi} \chi \right\rangle ds = 2 \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \tilde{\phi}(w, h) \chi(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh),$$

which combined with (4.19) implies the desired (4.18). \square

The following proposition gives further properties related to the asymptotic variance. In particular, the Hölder regularity of for the particular observable function F as below, plays an important role when estimating the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem.

Proposition 4.13. For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, $\eta \in (0, 2^{-5}\eta_0]$, $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, and $X_0 = (w, h)$, let

$$Y(w, h) = \mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} M_1^2 = \mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} \left(\chi(X_1) - \chi(X_0) + \int_0^1 \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right)^2.$$

Assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$. Then $Y \in C_{2^5\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2^5\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Furthermore, the function

$$F(h) := \int_H Y(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) = \langle \Gamma_h, Y(\cdot, h) \rangle$$

is in $C^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$. Here $\bar{\gamma}_0$ is taken from Proposition 4.7. We also have

$$(4.20) \quad \sigma^2 = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} F(h) \lambda(dh) = \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} Y(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh).$$

Proof. It follows from the Markov property that

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} Y(w, h) = & \chi^2(w, h) + P_1 \chi^2(w, h) - 2\chi(w, h) P_1 \chi(w, h) + 2 \int_0^1 P_t(\tilde{\phi} P_{1-t} \chi)(w, h) dt \\ & - 2\chi(w, h) \int_0^1 P_t \tilde{\phi}(w, h) dt + 2 \int_0^1 \int_0^t P_\tau(\tilde{\phi} P_{t-\tau} \tilde{\phi})(w, h) d\tau dt. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.7 we know that $\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Hence for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$,

$$\chi^2 \in C_{4\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n).$$

Since $\bar{\gamma}_0 < \gamma$, it follows from Proposition 4.5 that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-3}\eta_0]$, one has

$$P_1 \chi \in C_{4\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n),$$

and for $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\tilde{\phi} P_{1-t} \chi, \chi P_1 \chi, P_1 \chi^2 \in C_{2^3\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2^3\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n).$$

It then follows from (4.8) and (4.9) that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-4}\eta_0]$,

$$\int_0^1 P_t(\tilde{\phi} P_{1-t} \chi)(w, h) dt \in C_{2^4\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2^4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n).$$

In a similar way, one can deduce that the remaining two integrals in (4.21) also belongs to the same function space. This shows that $Y \in C_{2^4\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n) \cap C_{2^4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |F(h_1) - F(h_2)| & \leq |\langle \Gamma_{h_1}, Y(\cdot, h_1) \rangle - \langle \Gamma_{h_2}, Y(\cdot, h_1) \rangle| + |\langle \Gamma_{h_2}, Y(\cdot, h_1) \rangle - \langle \Gamma_{h_2}, Y(\cdot, h_2) \rangle| \\ & := I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

And using the same functions $\chi_R, \bar{\chi}_R$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.6, together with the Hölder continuity of Γ_h and the fact (4.13), we have for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-5}\eta_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 & \leq |\langle \Gamma_{h_1} - \Gamma_{h_2}, (\chi_R Y)(\cdot, h_1) \rangle| + |\langle \Gamma_{h_1} - \Gamma_{h_2}, (\bar{\chi}_R Y)(\cdot, h_1) \rangle| \\ & \leq C \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, H} e^{2^6\eta R^2} (\rho(\Gamma_{h_1}, \Gamma_{h_2}))^{\frac{1}{2-\bar{\gamma}_0}} + C \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, H} e^{-2^4\eta R^2} \\ & \leq C \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, H} \left(e^{2^6\eta R^2} |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\gamma}{2-\bar{\gamma}_0}} + e^{-2^4\eta R^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the uniform integrability $\int_H e^{2^5\eta \|w\|^2} \Gamma_h(dw) \leq C$ in the second inequality, which is a consequence of Theorem 3.7 by taking $\kappa = 2^4$. It then follows from Lemma 3.8 that

$$I_1 \leq C \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, H} |h_1 - h_2|^{\frac{\gamma}{5(2-\bar{\gamma}_0)}}.$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \langle \Gamma_{h_2}, |Y(\cdot, h_1) - Y(\cdot, h_2)| \rangle \\ &\leq \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n} |h_1 - h_2|^{\bar{\gamma}_0} \int_H e^{2^4\eta\|w\|^2} \Gamma_{h_2}(dw) \leq C \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n} |h_1 - h_2|^{\bar{\gamma}_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{\gamma}_0 \leq \frac{\gamma}{5(2-\bar{\gamma}_0)}$, we deduce that

$$|F(h_1) - F(h_2)| \leq C (\|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, \mathbb{T}^n} + \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^4\eta, H}) |h_1 - h_2|^{\bar{\gamma}_0}, \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Hence $F \in C^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$.

Equation (4.20) follows from the invariance property of the invariant measure $\Gamma_h(dw)\lambda(dh)$ and the decomposition (4.21). Indeed, letting $m(dw, dh) = \Gamma_h(dw)\lambda(dh)$ and $\chi_t = \int_0^t P_\tau \tilde{\phi} d\tau$, then by the invariance of m under P_t , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \int_0^t \langle m, P_\tau (\tilde{\phi} P_{t-\tau} \tilde{\phi}) \rangle d\tau dt &= \int_0^1 \int_0^t \langle m, \tilde{\phi} P_\tau \tilde{\phi} \rangle d\tau dt = \int_0^1 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi_t \rangle dt \\ \int_0^1 \langle m, P_t (\tilde{\phi} P_{1-t} \chi) \rangle dt &= \int_0^1 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} P_t \chi \rangle dt = \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi \rangle - \int_0^1 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi_t \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $P_t \chi = \chi - \chi_t$. Hence from (4.21) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} Y(w, h) dt \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh) &= \langle m, Y \rangle \\ &= 2 \langle m, \chi^2 \rangle - 2 \langle m, \chi P_1 \chi \rangle + 2 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi \rangle - 2 \int_0^1 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi_t \rangle dt - 2 \langle m, \chi \chi_1 \rangle + 2 \int_0^1 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi_t \rangle dt \\ &= 2 \langle m, \chi^2 \rangle - 2 \langle m, \chi(\chi - \chi_1) \rangle + 2 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi \rangle - 2 \langle m, \chi \chi_1 \rangle \\ &= 2 \langle m, \tilde{\phi} \chi \rangle = \sigma^2 \end{aligned}$$

as in (4.18). The proof is complete. \square

We now proceed to prove the central limit theorem in Theorem 4.2. This is done by utilizing the following martingale central limit theorem to the approximating martingale M_N in (4.14). It is notable that the theorem only requires a weak form of law of large numbers for the martingale difference and Lindeberg type negligible conditions. Basically these conditions can be derived from the ergodic properties of the homogenized process as in Proposition 3.11 and certain moment bounds on the martingale from Lemma 4.9. Although Theorem 4.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.4 that will be proved in the next subsection, we supply the proof for Theorem 4.2 below since it does not require a deep analysis of the convergence of the conditioned martingale difference to the asymptotic variance.

Theorem 4.14 ([29]). *Assume the martingale M_N , its quadratic variation $[M]_N$ and the associated martingale difference $Z_N = M_N - M_{N-1}$ (with $M_0 = 0$) satisfy the following*

1. (The Lindeberg type conditions) For every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \left[Z_{j+1}^2, |Z_{j+1}| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{N} \right] = 0,$$

$$(4.23) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell K} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j=(m-1)K}^{mK-1} \mathbf{E} \left[1 + Z_{j+1}^2, |M_j - M_{(m-1)K}| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{\ell K} \right] = 0.$$

2. (Law of large numbers for the conditioned martingale difference) There exists $\sigma \geq 0$ such that

$$(4.24) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{E} \left[[M]_{mK} - [M]_{(m-1)K} \mid \mathfrak{F}_{(m-1)K} \right] - \sigma^2 \right| = 0,$$

with uniformly square integrable condition $\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{E} Z_n^2 < +\infty$.

Then one has

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}[M]_N}{N} = \sigma^2,$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} e^{i\theta M_N / \sqrt{N}} = e^{-\sigma^2 \theta^2 / 2}, \quad \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Before proving Theorem 4.2 by verifying the conditions of the above Theorem 4.14, we recall a useful lemma.

Lemma 4.15. [29] *If $\{\mu_N\}_{N \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{P}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ converges to μ weakly, $\{F_N\}_{N \geq 1} \subset C(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ converges to 0 uniformly on compact sets and there is $\eta > 0$ such that $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mu_N, |F_N|^{1+\eta} \rangle < \infty$, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mu_N, F_N \rangle = 0$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We first prove the The Lindeberg type conditions. From the Markov property of the homogenized process, the left hand side of (4.22) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E} \left[Z_j^2; |Z_j| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{N} \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle P_{j-1}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, G_N \rangle,$$

where $G_N(u, g) = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} [M_1^2; |M_1| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{N}]$ for $(u, g) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$. By the Markov inequality and Lemma 4.9, one has for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-3}\eta_0]$,

$$G_N \leq (\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_1|^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P} \left(|M_1| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_1|^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_1|^4}{\varepsilon^4 N^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \varepsilon^{-2} N^{-1} e^{2^4 \eta \|w\|^2}.$$

Hence $G_N \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on any compact set. Also by Lemma 4.9, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle P_{j-1}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, G_N^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N P_{j-1} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_1|^4 \leq C e^{2^4 \eta \|w\|^2},$$

where C is independent of N . Therefore

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle P_{j-1}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, G_N^2 \rangle < \infty.$$

The first Lindeberg condition (4.22) then follows from Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 4.15.

Again by the Markov property we can rewrite the left hand side formula in the limit of (4.23) as

$$\frac{1}{\ell K} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j=(m-1)K}^{mK-1} \mathbf{E} \left[1 + Z_{j+1}^2, |M_j - M_{(m-1)K}| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{\ell K} \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} \left\langle \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, F_{\ell,j} \right\rangle,$$

where $F_{\ell,j}(u, g) = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} \left[1 + Z_{j+1}^2, |M_j| \geq \varepsilon\sqrt{\ell K} \right]$. It follows from the Markov inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\ell,j}(u, g) &\leq \left(\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} (1 + Z_{j+1}^2)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{P} \left(|M_j|(u, g) \geq \varepsilon\sqrt{\ell K} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} (1 + Z_{j+1}^2)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\left(\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_j|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left(\varepsilon\sqrt{\ell K} \right)^2} \\ &\leq C(\varepsilon) \frac{1 + \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_{j+1}|^4 + \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} |M_j|^4}{\ell K} \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 4.9, we know that for any $R > 0$, and $0 \leq j \leq K$, there is a constant C independent of ℓ such that

$$\sup_{(u,g) \in B_R(0) \times \mathbb{T}^n} F_{\ell,j}(u, g) \leq \frac{C}{(\ell K)^{1/2}}.$$

Hence $F_{\ell,j} \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on bounded (in particular compact) sets. Again by Lemma 4.9,

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, F_{\ell,j}^2 \right\rangle \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} (|M_j|^4 + |M_{j+1}|^4) \right) \leq C(K, w).$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, F_{\ell,j}^2 \right\rangle < \infty.$$

It then follows from Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 4.15 that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, F_{\ell,j} \right\rangle = 0, \quad j = 0, \dots, K-1,$$

which completes the proof of (4.23).

Now we proceed to show the law of large numbers for the conditioned martingale difference as in (4.24). The finiteness of $\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} Z_n^2$ follows from Lemma 4.9. By the Markov property, we have

$$(4.25) \quad \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{K} \mathbf{E} [[M]_{mK} - [M]_{(m-1)K} | \mathcal{F}_{(m-1)K}] - \sigma^2 \right| = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \left\langle P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, |H_K| \right\rangle,$$

where

$$H_K(u, g) = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} \left[\frac{1}{K} [M]_K - \sigma^2 \right] = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} \left[\frac{1}{K} M_K^2 - \sigma^2 \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} P_j Y_0(u, g),$$

with $Y_0(u, g) = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} [M]_1 - \sigma^2 = \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} M_1^2 - \sigma^2$. In view of the decomposition (4.21) for $\mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} M_1^2$ and Proposition 4.5, together with Proposition 4.7, we see that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-4}\eta_0]$, $Y_0 \in C_{2^4\eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ where $\bar{\gamma}_0$ is as in Proposition 4.7. Note that we do not require the Hölder continuity of Ψ here. Also by Lemma 4.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \left\langle P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, |H_K|^2 \right\rangle &\leq C(\sigma, K) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} M_K^4 \right) \\ &\leq C(\sigma, K, w), \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of ℓ . Hence

$$\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \left\langle P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, |H_K|^2 \right\rangle < \infty.$$

Now since $\frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}$ converges weakly to $\Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg)$ by Proposition 3.11, it follows that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \left\langle P_{(m-1)K}^* \delta_{(w,h)}, |H_K| \right\rangle = \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} |H_K(u, g)| \Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg).$$

Since the homogenized process is unique ergodic with invariant measure $\Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg)$, it follows from the Birkhoff ergodic theorem for stationary ergodic process, that for an appropriate initial condition X_0 with law $\Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} |H_K(u, g)| \Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg) &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} P_j Y_0(X_0) \right| = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=0}^{K-1} Y_0(X_j(X_0)) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} Y_0(u, g) \Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg) \right| = 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} Y_0(u, g) \Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg) = 0$, i.e., $\sigma^2 = \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} \mathbf{E}_{(u,g)} M_1^2 \Gamma_g(du)\lambda(dg)$, which follows from (4.20). This completes the proof of (4.24). Hence the central limit theorem (4.7) follows from Theorem 4.14, the martingale approximation (4.14) and Theorem (4.10). \square

4.3. The rate of convergence in the limit theorems. The aim of this subsection is to show the desired rate of convergence in the limit theorems as in Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4. The proofs are given in subsection 4.3.1 and subsection 4.3.2 respectively. We begin with a result that gives a convergence rate for the moments of the time average of the observations centered by the quasi-periodic invariant measure. It will be useful when estimating the rate of convergence of the conditioned martingale difference to the variance.

Proposition 4.16. *For any integer $p \geq 1$, $\eta \in (0, \frac{\eta_0}{4p}]$, $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $\phi \in C_{\eta, H}^\gamma(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$, we have*

$$(4.26) \quad \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\phi(X_{k-1}) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1}h}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_{k-1}h) \rangle \right) \right|^{2p} \leq C_p e^{4p\eta\|w\|^2} \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p N^{-p},$$

for all $N \geq 1$, $(w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$. The same result also holds if we replace the summation by integration:

$$(4.27) \quad \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(\phi(X_t) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle \right) dt \right|^{2p} \leq C_p e^{4p\eta\|w\|^2} \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p T^{-p},$$

for any $T \geq 1$ and $(w, h) \in H \times \mathbb{T}^n$.

To show this proposition, we give a lemma first.

Lemma 4.17. *For any real numbers $\{x_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ and any integer $m \geq 1, p \geq 1$, let $S_m = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i$. Then one has*

$$|S_m|^{2p} = \left| \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right|^{2p} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m f_{2p-2,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i) x_i x_j,$$

where

$$f_{2p-2,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i) := \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} (k+1) S_{i-1}^k S_i^{2p-2-k}, & \text{when } j = i, \\ 2p \sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} S_{i-1}^k S_i^{2p-2-k}, & \text{when } j > i. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By the multinomial formula, one has for $j = i$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2p-2,i}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i) &= \sum_{k_1+k_2+\dots+k_i=2p-2} \frac{(2p)!}{k_1!k_2!\dots k_{i-1}!(k_i+2)!} x_1^{k_1} x_2^{k_2} \dots x_i^{k_i} \\ &= \sum_{k_i=0}^{2p-2} C_{2p}^{k_i+2} S_{i-1}^{2p-2-k_i} x_i^{k_i} \\ &= x_i^{-2} \left(S_i^{2p} - S_{i-1}^{2p} - 2p S_{i-1}^{2p-1} x_i \right) \\ &= x_i^{-2} \left(S_i \left(S_i^{2p-1} - S_{i-1}^{2p-1} \right) - (2p-1) S_{i-1}^{2p-1} x_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} (k+1) S_{i-1}^k S_i^{2p-2-k}. \end{aligned}$$

And similarly for $j > i$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2p-2,j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i) &= \sum_{k_1+k_2+\dots+k_i=2p-2} \frac{(2p)!}{k_1!k_2!\dots k_{i-1}!(k_i+1)!} x_1^{k_1} x_2^{k_2} \dots x_i^{k_i} \\ &= 2p \sum_{k_i=0}^{2p-2} C_{2p-1}^{k_i+1} S_{i-1}^{2p-2-k_i} x_i^{k_i} \\ &= 2p x_i^{-1} \left(S_i^{2p-1} - S_{i-1}^{2p-1} \right) \\ &= 2p \sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} S_{i-1}^k S_i^{2p-2-k}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.16. Recall that $\tilde{\phi}(w, h) = \phi(w, h) - \langle \Gamma_h, \phi(\cdot, h) \rangle$, then the summands in inequality (4.26) is $\xi_k := \tilde{\phi}(X_{k-1})$. Let

$$S_m = \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i, \quad s_N = \sup_{1 \leq m \leq N} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |S_m|^{2p}.$$

Let $g(\xi_i, \xi_j) = \xi_i \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} [\xi_j | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$ and $g_p(w, h) = (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |g(\xi_i, \xi_j)|^p)^{1/p}$. It follows from Lemma 4.17 and the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |S_m|^{2p} &= \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m f_{2p-2,j}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_i) \xi_i \xi_j \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left[f_{2p-2,j}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_i) \xi_i \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} [\xi_j | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |f_{2p-2,j}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{i-1}, \xi_i)|^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} g_p(w, h) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m 2p \left((2p-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left(|S_{i-1}|^k |S_i|^{2p-2-k} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} g_p(w, h) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m 2p(2p-1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{2p-2} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left(\frac{k}{2p-2} |S_{i-1}|^{2p-2} + \frac{2p-2-k}{2p-2} |S_i|^{2p-2} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} g_p(w, h) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=i}^m 2p(2p-1) \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} [|S_{i-1}|^{2p} + |S_i|^{2p}] \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} g_p(w, h).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum for $1 \leq m \leq N$, one has

$$s_N \leq 4p(2p-1) s_N^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i}^N (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |g(\xi_i, \xi_j)|^p)^{1/p}.$$

Hence by letting $C_p = (4p(2p-1))^p$,

$$s_N \leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=i}^N (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |g(\xi_i, \xi_j)|^p)^{1/p} \right)^p.$$

Note that by Theorem 4.6 with $\kappa = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |g(\xi_i, \xi_j)|^p &= \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \tilde{\phi}(X_{i-1}) \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left[\tilde{\phi}(X_{j-1}) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right] \right|^p \\
&\leq \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \tilde{\phi}(X_{i-1}) P_{j-i} \tilde{\phi}(X_{i-1}) \right|^p \\
&\leq C^p \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p e^{-p\Lambda(j-i)} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} e^{4p\eta \|w_{0,i-1,h}(w)\|^2} \\
&\leq C^p \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p e^{-p\Lambda(j-i)} e^{4p\eta \|w\|^2},
\end{aligned}$$

for $\eta \in (0, \frac{\eta_0}{4p}]$ by estimate (6.1). Therefore

$$s_N \leq CC_p \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p e^{4p\eta \|w\|^2} N^p,$$

where $C > 0$ does not depend on p . Dividing both sides of the above inequality by N^{2p} completes the proof of the first estimate (4.26) in Proposition 4.16.

The second inequality follows from the same argument (see also [34] for the case in the time homogeneous setting). Let $\xi(t) = \phi(X_t) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_t h}, \phi(\cdot, \beta_t h) \rangle$, $I_r = \int_0^r \xi(t) dt$ and $\mathcal{I}_T = \sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |I_r|^{2p}$. We

first note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_r^{2p} &= \int_{[0,r]^{2p}} \xi(t_1)\xi(t_2)\cdots\xi(t_{2p})dt_1dt_2\cdots dt_{2p} \\ &= (2p)! \int_{0\leq t_1\leq t_2\leq\cdots\leq t_{2p}\leq r} \xi(t_1)\xi(t_2)\cdots\xi(t_{2p})dt_1dt_2\cdots dt_{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

For $r_1 \leq r_2$, denote $\varphi(r_1, r_2) = \xi(r_1)\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)}[\xi(r_2)|\mathcal{F}_{r_1}]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |I_r|^{2p} &= (2p)! \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \int_{0\leq t_1\leq t_2\leq\cdots\leq t_{2p}\leq r} \xi(t_1)\xi(t_2)\cdots\xi(t_{2p-2})\varphi(t_{2p-1}, t_{2p})dt_1dt_2\cdots dt_{2p} \\ &= (2p)! \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left(\int_0^r \int_0^{t_{2p}} \varphi(t_{2p-1}, t_{2p}) \left(\int_{0\leq t_1\leq\cdots\leq t_{2p-1}} \xi(t_1)\cdots\xi(t_{2p-2})dt_1\cdots dt_{2p-1} \right) dt_{2p-1}dt_{2p} \right) \\ &\leq 2p(2p-1) \int_0^r \int_0^{t_{2p}} (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |\varphi(t_{2p-1}, t_{2p})|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |I_{t_{2p-1}}|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} dt_{2p-1}dt_{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum w.r.t r over $[0, T]$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_T \leq 2p(2p-1) (\mathcal{I}_T)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \int_0^T \int_0^{t_2} (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |\varphi(t_1, t_2)|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} dt_1dt_2.$$

Like in the proof of (4.26), one has for $\eta \in (0, \frac{\eta_0}{4p})$,

$$(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |\varphi(t_1, t_2)|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H} e^{-\Lambda(t_2-t_1)} e^{4\eta\|w\|^2}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{I}_T \leq C_p \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^p T^p e^{4p\eta\|w\|^2}$$

and the inequality (4.27) follows by dividing both sides with T^{2p} . \square

4.3.1. *The rate of convergence in SLLN.* The convergence rate of SLLN is a consequence of (4.27), the error estimate in Lemma 4.10 and the Borel-Cantelli lemma. We now give the details.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $E_N = \{\omega \in \Omega : |\frac{1}{N}M_N| > N^{-(1/2-\varepsilon)}\}$. From Proposition 4.7, we know that for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0/2]$, $\chi \in C_{2\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Thus $\chi^{2p} \in C_{2^{p+1}\eta, H}^{\gamma_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$. Hence from estimate (4.27) and (6.1) and Markov's inequality, we have for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-(p+1)}\eta_0]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(E_N) &\leq N^{2p(-1/2-\varepsilon)} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} M_N^{2p} \\ &\leq C_p N^{2p(-1/2-\varepsilon)} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left(\chi(X_N)^{2p} + \chi(w, h)^{2p} + \left(\int_0^N \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right)^{2p} \right) \\ &\leq C_p N^{2p(-1/2-\varepsilon)} \left(\|\chi\|_{\gamma_0, 2^{p+1}\eta, H} \mathbf{E} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w_0, N, h(w)\|^2} + \|\chi\|_{\gamma_0, 2^{p+1}\eta, H} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2} + e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2} \|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}^{2p-1} N^{2p-1} \right) \\ &\leq C_p (\|\phi\|_{\gamma, \eta, H}) N^{-2p\varepsilon} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, and every integer p such that $2^p\varepsilon > 1$,

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(E_N) < \infty.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, there is an almost surely finite random time $N_1(\omega)$, such that for all $N > N_1(\omega)$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{N}M_N \right| \leq N^{-(1/2-\varepsilon)}.$$

Note that for $\ell > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}N_1^\ell &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(N_1 = k)k^\ell \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(E_k)k^\ell \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H})k^{\ell-2p\varepsilon}e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2} \\ &\leq C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H}, \ell, \varepsilon)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2} \end{aligned}$$

as long as $\ell < 2^p\varepsilon - 1$. In a similar fashion we can estimate the moments of the random time $N_0(\omega)$ in (4.17). Let $\ell > 0$, then for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1}\eta_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}N_0^\ell &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(N_0 = k)k^\ell \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{k \leq t \leq k+1} R_{k,t} > k^{1/4}\right)k^\ell \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}\left(\sup_{k \leq t \leq k+1} R_{k,t}^{2p}\right)k^{\ell-2p-2} \\ &\leq C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H}) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}\sup_{k \leq t \leq k+1} \exp(2^{p+1}\eta\|w_{0,t,h}\|^2)k^{\ell-2p-2} \\ &\leq C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H}) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}k^{\ell-2p-2} = C_p(\|\phi\|_{\gamma,\eta,H}, \ell)e^{2^{p+1}\eta\|w\|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\ell < 2^{p-2} - 1$. The conclusion of Theorem 4.3 then follows from the above estimates, the martingale approximation (4.14) and Lemma 4.10. \square

4.3.2. *The rate of convergence in CLT.* We recall a Berry-Esseen type estimate for martingales from [22], which will be used in the proof of the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem.

Theorem 4.18 (Theorem 3.10 of [22]). *Let $M_N = \sum_{j=1}^N Z_j$ be a zero mean martingale and $\sigma_k^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E}Z_j^2$. If $q > \frac{1}{2}$, and*

$$(4.28) \quad \max_{j \leq N} \frac{1}{\sigma_N^{4q}} \mathbf{E}|Z_j|^{4q} \leq \frac{M}{N^{2q}},$$

for a constant $M > 0$. Then there exists a constant C depending only on M and q such that whenever

$$(4.29) \quad N^{-q} + \mathbf{E}\left|\frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E}[Z_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] - 1\right|^{2q} \leq 1,$$

one has

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{M_N}{\sigma_N} \leq z\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \leq C \left(N^{-q} + \mathbf{E}\left|\frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E}[Z_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] - 1\right|^{2q} \right)^{1/(4q+1)},$$

where $\Phi(z)$ is the distribution function of the standard normal distribution.

We are now in a position to give an estimate of the convergence rate in the central limit theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Recall from (4.20) that the asymptotic variance

$$\sigma^2 = \int_{H \times \mathbb{T}^n} Y(w, h) \Gamma_h(dw) \lambda(dh) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \langle \Gamma_h, Y(\cdot, h) \rangle \lambda(dh).$$

Since $Y \in C_{2^5 \eta, H}^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(H \times \mathbb{T}^n)$ by Proposition 4.13, thus Proposition 4.16 implies that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-7} p^{-1} \eta_0]$, and $N \geq 1$,

$$(4.30) \quad \mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(Y(X_{k-1}) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle \right) \right|^{2p} \leq C_p e^{2^7 p \eta \|w\|^2} \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^5 \eta, H}^p N^{-p}.$$

In addition, since $F = \langle \Gamma_h, Y(\cdot, h) \rangle \in C^{\bar{\gamma}_0}(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$ by Proposition 4.13, it follows from Theorem 3 in [26] that for $N \geq 1$,

$$(4.31) \quad \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle - \sigma^2 \right| \leq C \|F\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0} N^{-\frac{\bar{\gamma}_0}{A+n}},$$

where A is the constant from the Diophantine condition (2.2) and n is the dimension of the torus. Therefore, by the Markov property, inequality (4.30) with $p = 1$, and inequality (4.31), it follows that for $\eta \in (0, 2^{-7} \eta_0]$, and $N \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{N} \sigma_N^2 - \sigma^2 \right| = \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} Z_k^2 - \sigma^2 \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} [\mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} [Z_k^2 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]] - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle \right) \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle - \sigma^2 \right| \\ & \leq \mathbf{E}_{(w, h)} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(Y(X_{k-1}) - \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle \right) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \langle \Gamma_{\beta_{k-1} h}, Y(\cdot, \beta_{k-1} h) \rangle - \sigma^2 \right| \\ (4.32) \quad & \leq C e^{2^6 \eta \|w\|^2} \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^5 \eta, H}^{1/2} N^{-1/2} + C \|F\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0} N^{-\frac{\bar{\gamma}_0}{A+n}}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\frac{1}{N} \sigma_N^2$ converges to σ^2 . To estimate the convergence rate for the central limit theorem of the approximating martingale sequence, we first deal with the case when $\sigma^2 > 0$. Set $q = 2^{p-2}$ for integer $p \geq 2$ in Theorem 4.18 and choose $N_1 > 0$ such that for all $N \geq N_1$, inequality (4.29) is satisfied and $\frac{1}{N} \sigma_N^2 \in [\sigma^2/2, 3\sigma^2/2]$. It then follows from Lemma (4.9) that the condition (4.28) holds for $p \geq 2$ and $\eta \in (0, 2^{-p-1} \eta_0]$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} [Z_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] - 1 \right|^{2^{p-1}} \\
& \leq C_p \left(\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N (Y(X_{k-1}) - F(\beta_{k-1}h)) \right|^{2^{p-1}} + \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{k=1}^N F(\beta_{k-1}h) - 1 \right|^{2^{p-1}} \right) \\
& \leq C_p \left(e^{2^{p+5}\eta\|w\|^2} \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^5\eta, H}^{2^{p-2}} N^{-2^{p-2}} + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N F(\beta_{k-1}h) - \sigma^2 \right|^{2^{p-1}} + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sigma_N^2 - \sigma^2 \right|^{2^{p-1}} \right) \\
& \leq C_p \left(e^{2^{p+5}\eta\|w\|^2} \|Y\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0, 2^5\eta, H}^{2^{p-2}} N^{-2^{p-2}} + \|F\|_{\bar{\gamma}_0}^{2^{p-1}} N^{-\frac{2^{p-1}\bar{\gamma}_0}{A+n}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Theorem 4.18 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{M_N}{\sigma_N} \leq z \right) - \Phi(z) \right| & \leq C \left(N^{-2^{p-2}} + \mathbf{E} \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{E} [Z_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] - 1 \right|^{2^{p-1}} \right)^{1/(2^{p+1})} \\
& \leq C e^{2^5\eta\|w\|^2} \left(N^{-\frac{2^{p-2}}{2^{p+1}}} + N^{-\frac{2^{p-1}\bar{\gamma}_0}{(2^{p+1})(A+n)}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}} \leq z \right) - \Phi_\sigma(z) \right| & \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}} \leq z \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sigma_N} z \right) \right| + \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sigma_N} z \right) - \Phi_\sigma(z) \right| \\
& \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{M_N}{\sigma_N} \leq z \right) - \Phi(z) \right| + C \left| \frac{\sigma_N}{\sqrt{N}} - \sigma \right| \\
& \leq C e^{2^5\eta\|w\|^2} \left(N^{-\frac{2^{p-2}}{2^{p+1}}} + N^{-\frac{2^{p-1}\bar{\gamma}_0}{(2^{p+1})(A+n)}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

When $\sigma = 0$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(|z| \wedge 1) \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}} \leq z \right) - \Phi_0(z) \right| & \leq (|z| \wedge 1) \left| \mathbf{P} \left(\left| \frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}} \right| \geq |z| \right) \right| \\
& \leq (|z| \wedge 1) |z|^{-1} N^{-1/2} \mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_N| \leq N^{-1/2} (\mathbf{E}_{(w,h)} |M_N|^2)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N Z_k^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
& \leq C e^{2^5\eta\|w\|^2} \left(N^{-1/4} + N^{-\frac{\bar{\gamma}_0}{2(A+n)}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by estimate (4.32).

To pass the estimates to continuous times, we apply the following lemma from [34].

Lemma 4.19. *Let R_1, R_2 be real random variables. Then for any $\sigma \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_1, z)| \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_2, z)| + \mathbf{P}(|R_1 - R_2| > \varepsilon) + c_\sigma \varepsilon,$$

where c_σ is a constant depending only on σ and $\Delta_\sigma(R, z)$ for random variable R is defined as

$$\Delta_\sigma(R, z) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{P}(R \leq z) - \Phi_\sigma(z), & \sigma > 0, \\ (|z| \wedge 1) (\mathbf{P}(R \leq z) - \Phi_0(z)), & \sigma = 0. \end{cases}$$

Recall that N is the integer part of T in the martingale approximation (4.14). It follows from the approximation that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt - \frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \left| \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right| + \frac{R_{N,T}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

The expectation of the remainder term $R_{N,T}$ obtained in the proof of Lemma 4.10 together with the Markov inequality yields

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\frac{R_{N,T}}{\sqrt{N}} > \varepsilon/2 \right) \leq C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} N^{-4} \varepsilon^{-8}.$$

It follows from (4.27) with $p = 1$ that

$$\mathbf{E} \left| \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right| \leq \left(\mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq T^{\frac{1}{2}} C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2}.$$

Now applying Lemma 4.19 with $R_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt$ and $R_2 = \frac{M_N}{\sqrt{N}}$, and the Markov inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_1, z)| &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_2, z)| + \mathbf{P}(|R_1 - R_2| > \varepsilon) + c_\sigma \varepsilon \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_2, z)| + 2\varepsilon^{-1} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{E} \left| T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \tilde{\phi}(X_t) dt \right| + C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} N^{-4} \varepsilon^{-8} + c_\sigma \varepsilon \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\Delta_\sigma(R_2, z)| + C e^{2\eta \|w\|^2} N^{-\frac{1}{4}} \end{aligned}$$

by taking $\varepsilon = N^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. □

5. LARGE VISCOSITY IMPLIES A TRIVIAL QUASI-PERIODIC ATTRACTOR

In this section, we will show the existence of a unique stable quasi-periodic solution of (2.3) when the viscosity is large as in Theorem 2.10. Recall that $G = \sqrt{\|f\|_\infty^2 / \nu^4 + \mathcal{B}_0 / \nu^3}$, and c_0 is the constant from (2.20). Let $\delta_0 = \nu - c_0^2 \nu^{-2} (\|f\|_\infty^2 \nu^{-1} + \mathcal{B}_0)$. Then $\delta_0 > 0$ is equivalent to $G < 1/c_0$. Fix a lattice $\mathbb{Z}_\varkappa = \{\varkappa m : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ where $\varkappa > 0$ is a real number. For each $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, denote by (2.3) _{h} the Navier-Stokes equation (2.3) with $f(t, x) = \Psi(\beta_t 0, x)$ replaced by $\Psi(\beta_t h, x)$. Let $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa$ and

$$w_{N,h}(t, \omega) = w(n_1 + N, t, h, \omega, 0), \quad N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa^-, t \geq n_1$$

be the sequence of solutions of (2.3) _{h} . In exactly the same way as in [31, 30], one can show the following

Theorem 5.1. *Assume $\delta_0 > 0$ and let $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$. Then for each $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ there is a full measure subset $\Omega_{h,\varkappa}$ of Ω such that:*

1. *There is a complete random trajectory $w^*(\cdot, h, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \rightarrow H$, which is a strong solution of (2.3) _{h} . For each $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{h,\varkappa}$, $w^*(\cdot, h, \omega)$ is the limit of $\{w_{N,h}(\cdot, \omega)\}_{N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa^-}$ in $C([n_1, \infty), H)$ equipped with the supremum norm.*
2. *For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist positive random times $n^*(s, \delta, h)$ and $n_*(s, \delta, h)$ having all moments finite such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{w_0 \in B_r(w^*(s, h, \omega))} \|w(s, t, h, \omega, w_0) - w^*(t, h, \omega)\|^2 &\leq r^2 e^{-\delta(t-s)}, \\ \sup_{w_0 \in B_r(w^*(\tau, h, \omega))} \|w(\tau, s, h, \omega, w_0) - w^*(s, h, \omega)\|^2 &\leq r^2 e^{-\delta(s-\tau)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $r > 0$, $t > s + n^*$ and $\tau < s - n^*$. Here $B_r(w)$ is the ball centered at w with radius r in H with the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

The following proposition shows that there is a continuous modification of the random field $w^*(0, h, \omega)$, which is proved by applying the Kolmogorov continuity theorem. The desired quasi-periodic solution will be constructed from this random field.

Proposition 5.2. *Assume $\Psi \in C^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^n, H)$, $Gc_0 \leq \sqrt{1/2}$. For any $p \geq 1$, if*

$$(5.1) \quad \nu^3 > 8pc_0^2\mathcal{B}_0,$$

then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbb{E}\|w^*(0, h_1, \cdot) - w^*(0, h_2, \cdot)\|^{2p} \leq C|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma}, \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

In particular, for any $\bar{\eta} > 0$, if condition (5.1) holds for $p = \frac{n+\bar{\eta}}{\gamma}$, then the random field $w^*(0, h, \omega)$ has a continuous (with respect to h) modification, which is η -Hölder continuous for all $0 < \eta < \frac{\bar{\eta}\gamma}{2(n+\bar{\eta})}$.

Proof. For $N \in \mathbb{Z}_z^-$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n$, let $\mathcal{R}_r = w_{N,r,h_1}(0) - w_{N,r,h_2}(0)$. To show (5.2), we first prove that the same inequality holds for \mathcal{R}_0 and then letting $N \rightarrow -\infty$. Let $\delta > 0$ be a constant whose value will be determined later. Since $w_{N,r,h_i}(0)$ is the solution to (2.3) _{h_i} starting from initial position $0 \in H$ at initial time $s = N$, it follows that (see also the proof of (6.3))

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r \|\mathcal{R}_r\|^2 &= \langle \nu \Delta \mathcal{R}_r, 2\mathcal{R}_r \rangle - \langle B(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{R}_r, w_{N,r,h_1}(0)), 2\mathcal{R}_r \rangle + \langle \Psi(\beta_r h_1) - \Psi(\beta_r h_2), 2\mathcal{R}_r \rangle \\ &\leq -2\nu \|\mathcal{R}_r\|_1^2 + 2c_0 \|\mathcal{R}_r\| \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1 \|\mathcal{R}_r\|_1 + 2\|\Psi(\beta_r h_1) - \Psi(\beta_r h_2)\| \|\mathcal{R}_r\| \\ &\leq -2\nu \|\mathcal{R}_r\|_1^2 + c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|\mathcal{R}_r\|^2 \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 + \nu \|\mathcal{R}_r\|_1^2 + 4\delta^{-1} \|\Psi\|_\gamma |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma + \frac{\delta}{4} \|\mathcal{R}_r\|^2 \\ &\leq -(\nu - \delta/4) \|\mathcal{R}_r\|^2 + c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|\mathcal{R}_r\|^2 \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 + 4\delta^{-1} \|\Psi\|_\gamma |h_1 - h_2|^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

By the Gronwall's inequality and Hölder's inequality, and noting that $\mathcal{R}_N = 0$, we have for $p, q > 0$ with $1/p + 1/q = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_0\|^{2p} &\leq 4^p \delta^{-p} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^p |h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \left(\int_N^0 \exp \left(\int_z^0 - \left(\nu - \frac{\delta}{4} \right) + c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 dr \right) dz \right)^p \\ &\leq 4^p \delta^{-p} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^p |h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \left(\int_N^0 e^{q \int_z^0 -\frac{\delta}{4} dr} dz \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_N^0 e^{p \int_z^0 -(\nu - \frac{\delta}{2}) + c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 dr} dz \\ (5.3) \quad &\leq 4^{2p-1} q^{-\frac{p}{q}} \delta^{-2p+1} \|\Psi\|_\gamma^p |h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \int_N^0 e^{p \int_z^0 -(\nu - \frac{\delta}{2}) + c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 dr} dz. \end{aligned}$$

We would like to have a bound on the expectation of $\exp \left(\int_z^0 pc_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 dr \right)$. It follows from Ito's formula that for $N \leq z \leq t \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{N,t,h_1}\|^2 + \nu \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \mathcal{B}_0(t-z) \\ &= \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 + 2 \int_z^t \langle w_{N,r,h_1}, GdW(r) \rangle - \nu \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr + 2 \int_z^t \langle w_{N,r,h_1}, \Psi(\beta_r h_1) \rangle dr \\ &\leq \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 + 2 \int_z^t \langle w_{N,r,h_1}, GdW(r) \rangle + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} (t-z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} \right) (t-z) \leq M(z, t),$$

where $M(z, t) := \frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 + \frac{2(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \int_z^t \langle w_{N,r,h_1}, GdW(r) \rangle$ is a continuous square integrable martingale whose quadratic variation $[M](z, t)$ satisfies

$$[M](z, t) = \frac{4(1+\varepsilon)^2 p^2 c_0^4}{\nu^4} \int_z^t \sum_{k=1}^d \langle w_{N,r,h_1}, g_k \rangle^2 dr \leq \frac{4(1+\varepsilon)^2 p^2 c_0^4 \mathcal{B}_0}{\nu^4} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr.$$

As a consequence, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} \right) (t-z) &\leq M(z, t) - \frac{\varepsilon pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr \\ &\leq M(z, t) - \frac{\varepsilon \nu^3}{4(1+\varepsilon)^2 pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0} [M](z, t). \end{aligned}$$

Let $b = \frac{\varepsilon \nu^3}{2(1+\varepsilon)^2 pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0}$. It then follows from the exponential supermartingale inequality that for $K \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq z} \exp \left(\frac{pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} \right) (t-z) \right) \geq e^K \middle| \mathcal{F}_z \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq z} \left(\frac{pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} \right) (t-z) \right) \geq K \middle| \mathcal{F}_z \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq z} \left(M(z, t) - \frac{b}{2} [M](z, t) \right) \geq K \middle| \mathcal{F}_z \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq z} \exp \left(bM(z, t) - \frac{b^2}{2} [M](z, t) \right) \geq e^{bK} \middle| \mathcal{F}_z \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 \right) e^{-bK}. \end{aligned}$$

If $b = \frac{\varepsilon \nu^3}{2(1+\varepsilon)^2 pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0} > 1$, then the same argument as we derive (6.7) implies that

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \geq z} \exp \left(\frac{pc_0^2}{\nu} \int_z^t \|w_{N,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr - \frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu} \right) (t-z) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \exp \left(\frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 \right) \frac{4}{1-2^{1-b}}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the expectation on the right, we note that the solution w_{N,r,h_1} starts from 0, so (6.6) implies that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 - \frac{C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} > \frac{K}{\alpha} \right) \leq e^{-K},$$

where $\alpha = \frac{(1-a)\nu}{2\mathcal{B}_0}$, $C(f, \mathcal{B}_0) = \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{2a} + \mathcal{B}_0$ and $a \in (0, 1)$. Therefore

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\exp \left(\frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 - \frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu^3} \right) > e^{\frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2 K}{\alpha \nu^2}} \right) \leq e^{-K},$$

Again by the same argument as in (6.7) with $c = \frac{\alpha \nu^2}{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}$, one has

$$(5.5) \quad \mathbf{E} \exp \left(\frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \|w_{N,z,h_1}\|^2 - \frac{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu^3} \right) \leq \frac{4}{1-2^{1-c}},$$

provided that $c = \frac{\alpha \nu^2}{(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2} = \frac{(1-a)\nu^3}{2(\varepsilon+1)pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0} > 1$. We take $a = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}$, which yields $b = c$.

Now it follows from (5.3)-(5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{R}_0\|^{2p} &\leq 4^{2p-1}q^{-\frac{p}{q}}\delta^{-2p+1}\|\Psi\|_\gamma^p|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \int_N^0 e^{p(\nu-\frac{\delta}{2})z} \mathbf{E}e^{p \int_z^0 c_0^2 \nu^{-1} \|w_{N,r,h_1}(0)\|_1^2 dr} dz \\
&\leq C(\delta, \varepsilon)|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \int_N^0 e^{p(\nu-\frac{\delta}{2})z} e^{-\frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu}\right)z} dz \\
(5.6) \quad &= C(\delta, \varepsilon)|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma} \int_N^0 e^{pz \left(\nu-\frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{(1+\varepsilon)c_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu}\right)\right)} dz
\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\delta, \varepsilon) = \left(\frac{1}{1-2^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)^2 4^{2p+1}q^{-\frac{p}{q}}\delta^{-2p+1}\|\Psi\|_\gamma^p \exp\left(\frac{(1+\varepsilon)pc_0^2 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu^3}\right)$. Since $\delta_0 = \nu - \frac{c_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu}\right) > 0$, one has

$$\delta_\varepsilon := \nu - \frac{(1+\varepsilon)c_0^2}{\nu^2} \left(\mathcal{B}_0 + \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{\nu}\right) > 0, \quad \text{as long as } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 := (Gc_0)^{-2} - 1.$$

Keeping in mind that we need to ensure inequalities (5.4) and (5.5) hold, which amounts to show the existence of $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ such that $c = \frac{\varepsilon\nu^3}{2(1+\varepsilon)^2 pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0} > 1$. This can be achieved if we let $(Gc_0)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (thus $\varepsilon_0 \geq 1$), and

$$\frac{2pc_0^2 \mathcal{B}_0}{\nu^3} < \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)} \frac{\varepsilon}{(1+\varepsilon)^2} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Therefore, under the conditions given in Proposition 5.2, there is an $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, such that $\delta_{\bar{\varepsilon}} > 0$. And by choosing $\delta = \delta_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$, we have from (5.6) that

$$\mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{R}_0\|^{2p} \leq C|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma}, \quad \text{with } C = \frac{2C(\delta_{\bar{\varepsilon}}, \bar{\varepsilon})}{p\delta_{\bar{\varepsilon}}}.$$

By Theorem 5.1, we know that for $i = 1, 2$, as $N \rightarrow -\infty$, $w_{N,r,h_i}(0)$ converges to $w^*(0, h_i, \omega)$ almost surely. Hence it follows from Fatou's lemma that

$$(5.7) \quad \mathbf{E}\|w^*(0, h_1, \cdot) - w^*(0, h_2, \cdot)\|^{2p} \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{R}_0\|^{2p} \leq C|h_1 - h_2|^{p\gamma}.$$

Since the dimension of the torus is n , by taking $p = \frac{n+\bar{\eta}}{\gamma}$ for any $\bar{\eta} > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\|w^*(0, h_1, \cdot) - w^*(0, h_2, \cdot)\|_{\frac{2(n+\bar{\eta})}{\gamma}} \leq C|h_1 - h_2|^{n+\bar{\eta}}, \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Hence by Kolmogorov's continuity test, the random field $w^*(0, h, \omega)$ has a continuous modification. Moreover, with probability one, the modification is η -Hölder continuous for all $0 < \eta < \frac{\bar{\eta}\gamma}{2(n+\bar{\eta})}$. \square

Note that for $h = 0 \in \mathbb{T}^n$, the associated equation (2.3)₀ is actually (2.3). We will show that the complete trajectory $w^*(t, 0, \omega)$ given in Theorem 5.1 is a quasi-periodic solution in the sense of Definition 2.5.

Proposition 5.3. *The process $w^*(t, 0, \omega)$ is a quasi-periodic solution of (2.3).*

Proof. The invariance property in Definition 2.5 follows from the stochastic flow property and Theorem 5.1. Note that for any $\tau \geq 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
w^*(s + \tau, 0, \omega) &= \lim_{\substack{N \rightarrow \infty \\ N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa}} w(n_1 - N, s + \tau, 0, \omega, 0) \\
&= \lim_{\substack{N \rightarrow \infty \\ N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa}} \Phi(s + \tau, \omega; s, w(n_1 - N, s, 0, \omega, 0)) \\
&= \Phi(s + \tau, \omega; s, \lim_{\substack{N \rightarrow \infty \\ N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa}} w(n_1 - N, s, 0, \omega, 0)) = \Phi(s + \tau, \omega; s, w^*(s, 0, \omega)), \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}
\end{aligned}$$

For $t \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w^*(t, 0, \omega) &= \lim_{\substack{N \rightarrow \infty \\ N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa}} w(n_1 - N, t, 0, \omega, 0) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{N \rightarrow \infty \\ N \in \mathbb{Z}_\varkappa}} w(n_1 - N - t, 0, \beta_t 0, \theta_t \omega, 0) = w^*(0, \beta_t 0, \theta_t \omega), \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for each $\varkappa \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a subset $\Omega_\varkappa \subset \Omega$ of full measure such that

$$w^*(\varkappa, 0, \omega) = w^*(0, \beta_\varkappa 0, \theta_\varkappa \omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_\varkappa.$$

Therefore for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$w^*(t, 0, \theta_{-t} \omega) = w^*(0, \beta_t 0, \omega), \quad \mathbf{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By Proposition 5.2, we can choose a continuous version of $w^*(0, h, \omega)$ such that $w^*(t, 0, \theta_{-t} \omega)$ is a random quasi-periodic function in the sense of Definition 2.5. This completes the proof. \square

6. APPENDIX: ESTIMATES OF THE SOLUTION

Several estimates about the solution $w_{s,t,h}(w_0)$ of the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation (2.3) with time symbol $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ are collected in the following Lemma 6.1. Note that for any $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h)\| = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t 0)\| = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|f(t)\| := \|f\|_\infty,$$

therefore the constant C in bounds on the solution does not depend on h .

Lemma 6.1. *Let $a \in (0, 1)$, $c \in (1, \infty)$, $\eta_0 = \frac{(1-a)\nu}{2c\mathcal{B}_0}$ and $C(f, \mathcal{B}_0) = \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{a\nu} + \mathcal{B}_0$. For solutions of the Navier-Stokes equation (2.3), we have*

(1) *For every $t > s$, $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, we have*

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbf{E} \exp\left(\eta \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2\right) \leq C \exp\left(\eta e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2\right),$$

$$\text{where } C = \frac{4}{1-2^{1-c}} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right).$$

(2) *The following inequality*

$$(6.2) \quad \mathbf{E} \exp\left(\eta \sup_{t \geq \tau} \left(\|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 + \nu \int_\tau^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr - C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)(t - \tau)\right)\right) \leq C \exp\left(\eta e^{-\nu(\tau-s)} \|w_0\|^2\right)$$

$$\text{holds for every } \tau \geq s \text{ and } \eta \in (0, \eta_0], \text{ where } C = \frac{16}{(1-2^{1-c})^2} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right).$$

(3) *For any $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, with $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ and $\bar{C} = \frac{16(r\nu)^{-1}}{(1-2^{1-c})^2} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right)$, we have*

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbf{E} \|w_{s,t,h_1} - w_{s,t,h_2}\|^2 \leq C e^{r(t-s)} \exp(\eta \|w_0\|^2) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_1) - \Psi(\beta_t h_2)\|^2,$$

for every $t \geq s$, where for $i = 1, 2$, w_{s,t,h_i} is the solution to equation (2.3) with $f = \Psi(\beta_t 0)$ replaced by $\Psi(\beta_t h_i)$ and with initial condition (s, w_0) .

(4) *For any $h \in \mathbb{T}^n$, and every $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, we have*

$$(6.4) \quad \mathbf{E} \|w_{s,s+t,h}(w_1) - w_{s,s+t,h}(w_2)\|^2 \leq C \|w_1 - w_2\|^2 e^{\eta \|w_1\|^2 + r(t-s)},$$

for every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$. Here $C = 64(1 - 2^{1-c})^{-3/2} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right)$ and $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

Proof. (1) Applying Ito's formula to the functional $F(t, w) = e^{\nu(t-s)} \|w\|^2$ and noting the fact that $\langle B(\mathcal{K}w, w), w \rangle = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\nu(t-s)} \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 &= -\|w_0\|^2 - 2\nu \int_s^t e^{\nu(r-s)} \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr + 2 \int_s^t e^{\nu(r-s)} \left\langle w_{s,r,h}, \sum_{k=1}^d g_k dW_k(r) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \nu \int_s^t e^{\nu(r-s)} \|w_{s,r,h}\|^2 dr + 2 \int_s^t e^{\nu(r-s)} \langle w_{s,r,h}, \Psi(\beta_r h) \rangle dr + \frac{e^{\nu(t-s)} - 1}{\nu} \mathcal{B}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Given $0 < a < 1$, let $C(f, \mathcal{B}_0) = \frac{\|f\|_\infty^2}{a\nu} + \mathcal{B}_0$. By the inequality $\|w\|_1^2 \geq \|w\|^2$ and Young's product inequality, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} \\ \leq -(1-a)\nu \int_s^t e^{-\nu(t-r)} \|w_{s,r,h}\|^2 dr + 2 \int_s^t e^{\nu(r-s)} \left\langle w_{s,r,h}, \sum_{k=1}^d g_k dW_k(r) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $M_t = 2 \int_s^t \left\langle w_{s,r,h}, \sum_{k=1}^d g_k dW_k(r) \right\rangle$ whose quadratic variation is

$$[M]_t = 4 \int_s^t \sum_{k=1}^d \langle w_{s,r,h}, g_k \rangle^2 dr.$$

Observe that

$$(6.5) \quad -(1-a)\nu \|w\|^2 \leq -\frac{(1-a)\nu}{\mathcal{B}_0} \sum_{k=1}^d \langle w, g_k \rangle^2 = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d 4 \langle w, g_k \rangle^2$$

where $\alpha = \frac{(1-a)\nu}{2\mathcal{B}_0}$. Hence

$$\|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} \leq \int_s^t e^{-\nu(t-r)} dM_r - \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_s^t e^{-\nu(t-r)} d[M]_r.$$

Then Lemma A.1 from [32] implies that

$$(6.6) \quad \mathbf{P} \left(\|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} > \frac{K}{\alpha} \right) \leq e^{-K},$$

which is, for any $c > 1$ and with $\eta_0 = \frac{\alpha}{c}$, equivalent to

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\exp \left(\eta_0 \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - \eta_0 e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} \right) > e^{\frac{K}{c}} \right) \leq e^{-K}.$$

Now if a random variable X satisfies $\mathbf{P}(X \geq C) \leq \frac{1}{C^c}$ for every $C \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}X &= \int_{\Omega} X d\mathbf{P} \leq \int_{\{0 \leq X \leq 1\}} X d\mathbf{P} + \int_{\{X \geq 1\}} X d\mathbf{P} \leq 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\{2^n \leq X \leq 2^{n+1}\}} X d\mathbf{P} \\ (6.7) \quad &\leq 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n+1} \frac{1}{2^{cn}} \leq \frac{4}{1 - 2^{1-c}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \exp \left(\eta \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - \eta e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{\eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} \right) \\ \leq \left(\mathbf{E} \exp \left(\eta_0 \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 - \eta_0 e^{-\nu(t-s)} \|w_0\|^2 - \frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu} \right) \right)^{\eta/\eta_0} \leq \frac{4}{1 - 2^{1-c}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we arrive at (6.1) with $C = \frac{4}{1-2^{1-c}} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right)$ and $\eta_0 = \frac{\alpha}{c} = \frac{(1-a)\nu}{2c\mathcal{B}_0}$.
(2) Again apply Ito's formula, for any $\eta > 0$, $s \leq \tau < t$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 + \eta\nu \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr - \eta\mathcal{B}_0(t - \tau) \\
&= \eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, GdW(r) \rangle - \eta\nu \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, \Psi(\beta_r h) \rangle dr \\
(6.8) \quad & \leq \eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, GdW(r) \rangle - \eta\nu(1-a) \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr + \frac{\eta}{a\nu} \|f\|_{\infty}^2 (t - \tau)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \eta \|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 + \eta\nu \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr - \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)(t - \tau) \\
& \leq \eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, GdW(r) \rangle - \eta\nu(1-a) \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr \\
(6.9) \quad & \leq \eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, GdW(r) \rangle - \frac{\eta\alpha}{2} \int_{\tau}^t \sum_{k=1}^d 4 \langle w_{s,r,h}, g_k \rangle^2 dr
\end{aligned}$$

Again the last inequality is obtained by choosing $\alpha = \frac{(1-a)\nu}{2\mathcal{B}_0}$ as in (6.5). Setting $M(\tau, t) = \eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 + 2\eta \int_{\tau}^t \langle w_{s,r,h}, GdW(r) \rangle$, then the right hand side of inequality (6.9) is $M(\tau, t) - \frac{\alpha}{2\eta} [M](\tau, t)$, where $[M](\tau, t)$ is the quadratic variation of the continuous L^2 -martingale M . Hence by the exponential supermartingale inequality, it follows that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq \tau} \left(M(\tau, t) - \frac{\alpha}{2\eta} [M](\tau, t) \right) \geq K \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau} \right) \leq \exp \left(\eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 - \frac{\alpha K}{\eta} \right)$$

for all $\tau \geq s$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.10) \quad \mathbf{P} \left(\eta \sup_{t \geq \tau} \left(\|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 + \nu \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr - C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)(t - \tau) \right) \geq K \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau} \right) \\
\leq \exp \left(\eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 - \frac{\alpha K}{\eta} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of (6.9) and (6.7), we deduce that

$$\mathbf{E} \exp \left(\frac{\alpha}{c} \sup_{t \geq \tau} \left(\|w_{s,t,h}\|^2 + \nu \int_{\tau}^t \|w_{s,r,h}\|_1^2 dr - C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)(t - \tau) \right) \right) \leq \frac{4}{1 - 2^{1-c}} \mathbf{E} \exp \left(\eta \|w_{s,\tau,h}\|^2 \right)$$

The conclusion follows from (6.1) by taking $\eta_0 = \frac{\alpha}{c}$.

(3) Let $\mathcal{R}_t = w_{s,t,h_1} - w_{s,t,h_2}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \mathcal{R}_t &= \nu \Delta \mathcal{R}_t + B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h_2}, w_{s,t,h_2}) - B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h_1}, w_{s,t,h_1}) + \Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1) \\
&= \nu \Delta \mathcal{R}_t + B(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{R}_t, \mathcal{R}_t) - B(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{R}_t, w_{s,t,h_1}) - B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h_1}, \mathcal{R}_t) + \Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore from the inequality $|\langle B(\mathcal{K}u, v), w \rangle| \leq c_0 \|u\| \|v\|_1 \|w\|_{1/2}$ and the interpolation inequality $\|w\|_{1/2}^2 \leq \varepsilon \|w\|_1^2 + \varepsilon^{-2} \|w\|^2$ for $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \|\mathcal{R}_t\|^2 &= \langle \nu \Delta \mathcal{R}_t, 2\mathcal{R}_t \rangle - \langle B(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{R}_t, w_{s,t,h_1}), 2\mathcal{R}_t \rangle + \langle \Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1), 2\mathcal{R}_t \rangle \\
&\leq -2\nu \|\mathcal{R}_t\|_1^2 + 2c_0 \|\mathcal{R}_t\| \|w_{s,t,h_1}\|_1 \|\mathcal{R}_t\|_{1/2} + 2 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\| \|\mathcal{R}_t\| \\
&\leq -2\nu \|\mathcal{R}_t\|_1^2 + \frac{4c_0^2}{\eta\nu} \|\mathcal{R}_t\|_1^2 + \eta\nu \|w_{s,t,h_1}\|_1^2 \|\mathcal{R}_t\|^2 + \nu \|\mathcal{R}_t\|_1^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\|^2 \\
&\leq (C(\eta, \nu) + \eta\nu \|w_{s,t,h_1}\|_1^2) \|\mathcal{R}_t\|^2 + \frac{1}{\nu} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\eta, \nu) = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5}$. By Gronwall's inequality, and estimate (6.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \|\mathcal{R}_t\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\nu} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\|^2 \int_s^t \exp(C(\eta, \nu)(t - \tau)) \mathbf{E} \left[\exp \left(\int_\tau^t \eta\nu \|w_{s,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dr \right) \right] d\tau \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\nu} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\|^2 \int_s^t \exp(r(t - \tau)) \exp(\eta e^{-\nu(\tau-s)} \|w_0\|^2) d\tau \\
&\leq \bar{C} e^{r(t-s)} \exp(\eta \|w_0\|^2) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Psi(\beta_t h_2) - \Psi(\beta_t h_1)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

with $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$ and $\bar{C} = \frac{16(r\nu)^{-1}}{(1-2^{1-c})^2} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right)$.

- (4) We now compare solutions that start from different initial position. Let $w_0, \tilde{w}_0 \in H$, and $\mathbf{e}_t = w_{s,t,h}(w_0) - \tilde{w}_{s,t,h}(\tilde{w}_0)$, where $w_{s,t,h}(w_0), \tilde{w}_{s,t,h}(\tilde{w}_0)$ are the solutions starting from w_0, \tilde{w}_0 . In view of equation (2.3) with symbol h , we see that \mathbf{e}_t solves the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \mathbf{e}_t &= \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_t - B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h}, w_{s,t,h}) + B(\mathcal{K}\tilde{w}_{s,t,h}, \tilde{w}_{s,t,h}) \\
&= \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_t - B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h}, w_{s,t,h}) + B(\mathcal{K}(w_{s,t,h} - \mathbf{e}_t), w_{s,t,h} - \mathbf{e}_t) \\
&= \nu \Delta \mathbf{e}_t - B(\mathcal{K}w_{s,t,h}, \mathbf{e}_t) + B(\mathcal{K}\mathbf{e}_t, w_{s,t,h}) + B(\mathcal{K}\mathbf{e}_t, \mathbf{e}_t).
\end{aligned}$$

From the fact $\langle B(\mathcal{K}w, v), v \rangle = 0$ and the basic estimates of the nonlinear term as in the proof of (6.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 &= 2\langle \mathbf{e}_t, \partial_t \mathbf{e}_t \rangle = -2\nu \|\mathbf{e}_t\|_1^2 + 2\langle B(\mathcal{K}\mathbf{e}_t, w_{s,t,h}), \mathbf{e}_t \rangle \\
&\leq -2\nu \|\mathbf{e}_t\|_1^2 + 2c_0 \|\mathbf{e}_t\| \|w_{s,t,h}\|_1 \|\mathbf{e}_t\|_{1/2} \\
&\leq (C(\eta, \nu) + \eta\nu \|w_{s,t,h_1}\|_1^2) \|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $C(\eta, \nu) = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5}$. Hence by Gronwall's inequality,

$$\|\mathbf{e}_t\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{e}_s\|^2 \exp \left(C(\eta, \nu)(t - s) + \eta\nu \int_s^t \|w_{s,r,h_1}\|_1^2 dt \right).$$

From the estimate (6.2), we have

$$(6.11) \quad \mathbf{E} \|w_{s,t,h}(w_0) - \tilde{w}_{s,t,h}(\tilde{w}_0)\|^2 \leq C \|w_0 - \tilde{w}_0\|^2 e^{\eta \|w_0\|^2 + r(t-s)},$$

where $C = \frac{16}{(1-2^{1-c})^2} \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0 C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)}{\nu}\right)$ and $r = 64c_0^6 \eta^{-3} \nu^{-5} + \eta C(f, \mathcal{B}_0)$.

□

REFERENCES

- [1] Agrachev, A. A., Sarychev, A. V.: Navier–Stokes equations: controllability by means of low modes forcing. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 7(1), 108–152 (2005)
- [2] Agrachev, A. A., Sarychev, A. V.: Controllability of 2D Euler and Navier-Stokes equations by degenerate forcing. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 265(3), 673–697 (2006)
- [3] Bakhtin, Y., Mattingly, J.C.: Malliavin calculus for infinite-dimensional systems with additive noise. *J. Funct. Anal.* 249(2), 307–353 (2007)
- [4] Crauel, H., Debussche, A., Flandoli, F.: Random attractors. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*. 9(2), 307–341 (1997)
- [5] Cheban, D., Schmalfuss, B.: Invariant manifolds, global attractors, almost automorphic and almost periodic solutions of non-autonomous differential equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 340(1), 374–393 (2008)
- [6] Chen, M.: *From Markov chains to non-equilibrium particle systems*. World Scientific (2004)
- [7] Constantin, P., Foias, P.: *Navier-Stokes Equations*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1988)
- [8] Chepyzhov, V.V., Vishik, M.I.: *Attractors for Equations of Mathematical Physics*, volume 49 of AMS Colloquium Publications. AMS (2002)
- [9] Chepyzhov, V.V., Vishik, M.I.: Non-autonomous 2D Navier–Stokes system with a simple global attractor and some averaging problems. *El. J. ESAIM: COCV*, 8, 467–487 (2002)
- [10] Da Prato, G., Debussche, A.: 2D stochastic Navier–Stokes equations with a time-periodic forcing term. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*. 20(2), 301–335 (2008)
- [11] Dobrushin, R.: Central limit theorems for non-stationary Markov chains I,II. *Theory of Probab. and its Appl.* 1,65-80& 329-383 (1956)
- [12] Doeblin, W.: Sur les propriétés asymptotiques de mouvement régis par certains types de chaînes simples. *Bull. Math. Soc. Roum. Sci.* 39(1), 57–115 (1937)
- [13] Dolgopyat, D., Sarig, O.: Local limit theorems for inhomogeneous Markov chains. (2021)
- [14] Dynkin, E.B.: *Markov processes*, volume 121 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg (1965)
- [15] Dynkin, E.B.: Entrance and exit spaces for a Markov process, volume 2 of *Actes du Congrès International des Mathématiciens*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris (1971)
- [16] Da Prato, G., Zabczyk, J.: *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, volume 152 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2014)
- [17] Feng, C., Qu, B., Zhao, H. Random quasi-periodic paths and quasi-periodic measures of stochastic differential equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 286, 119–163 (2021)
- [18] Frisch, U.: *Turbulence: The Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995)
- [19] Glatt-Holtz, N. E., Herzog, D. P., Mattingly, J. C.: Scaling and saturation in infinite-dimensional control problems with applications to stochastic partial differential equations. *Annals of PDE*, 4(2), 1–103 (2018)
- [20] Gordin, M. I.: The central limit theorem for stationary processes. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*. 188(4), 739–741 (1969)
- [21] Harris, T. E.: The existence of stationary measures for certain Markov processes, Volume 2 of *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, Univ. California Press, Berkeley. 113–124 (1956)
- [22] Hall, P., Heyde, C. C.: *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic press. (2014)
- [23] Hairer, M., Mattingly, J.C.: Ergodicity of the 2D Navier–Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 164 (3), 993–1032 (2006)
- [24] Hairer, M., Mattingly, J.C.: Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier–Stokes equations. *Annal. Probab.* 36(6), 2050–2091 (2008)
- [25] Hairer, M., Mattingly, J.C.: A theory of hypoellipticity and unique ergodicity for semilinear stochastic PDEs. *Electron. J. Probab.* 16(23), 658–738 (2011)
- [26] Klein S., Liu X., Melo A.: Uniform convergence rate for Birkhoff means of certain uniquely ergodic toral maps. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*. 1–26 (2019).
- [27] Kipnis, C.; Varadhan, S.R.S.: Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusions. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 104(1), 1–19 (1986)
- [28] Kuksin, S., Shirikyan, A.: *Mathematics of Two-Dimensional Turbulence*, Volum 194 of *Cambridge Tracts in Math.* Cambridge University Press (2012)
- [29] Komorowski, T., Walczuk, A.: Central limit theorem for Markov processes with spectral gap in the Wasserstein metric. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 122(5), 2155–2184 (2012)
- [30] Liu, R., Lu, K.: Statistical Properties of 2D Stochastic Navier-Stokes Equations with Time-Periodic Forcing and Degenerate Stochastic Forcing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.00598*, 2021.
- [31] Mattingly, J. C.: *The stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equations: energy estimates and phase space contraction*. Ph.D.thesis, Princeton University (1998)

- [32] Mattingly, J.C.: The dissipative scale of the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation: regularization and analyticity. *J. Statist. Phys.* 108(5-6), 1157–1179 (2002)
- [33] Punshon-Smith, S., Bedrossian, J.: Chaos in stochastic 2d Galerkin-Navier-Stokes. arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13748. (2021)
- [34] Shirikyan, A.: Law of large numbers and central limit theorem for randomly forced PDE's. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 134 (2), 215–247 (2006)
- [35] Sethuraman, S., Varadhan, S.: A martingale proof of Dobrushin's theorem for non-homogeneous Markov chains. *Electronic Journal of Probability.* 10, 1221-1235 (2005)
- [36] Villani, C.: *Optimal Transport, Old and New*, Volume 338 of Springer Science and Business Media (2008)

(Rongchang Liu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, PROVO, UTAH 84602, USA
Email address, R. Liu: `rongchang@mathematics.byu.edu`

(Kening Lu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, PROVO, UTAH 84602, USA
Email address, k. Lu: `klu@math.byu.edu`