ON ERGODICITY OF SOME MARKOV PROCESSES

T. KOMOROWSKI, S. PESZAT, AND T. SZAREK

To the memory of Andrzej Lasota (1932–2006)

Abstract. We formulate a criterion for the existence, uniqueness of an invariant measure for a Markov process taking values in a Polish phase space. In addition, the weak* ergodicity, that is, the weak convergence of the ergodic averages of the laws of the process starting with any initial distribution, is established. The principal assumptions are: the lower bound of the ergodic averages of the transition probability function and its local uniform continuity. The latter is called the e-property. The general result is applied to solutions of some stochastic evolution equations in Hilbert spaces. As an example we consider an evolution equation whose solution describes the Lagrangian observations of the velocity field in the passive tracer model. The weak* mean ergodicity of the respective invariant measure is used to derive the law of large numbers for the trajectory of a tracer.

1. Introduction

The lower bound technique is a useful tool in the ergodic theory of Markov processes. It has been used by Doeblin, see [5], to show mixing of a Markov chain whose transition probabilities possess a uniform lower bound. A somewhat different approach, relying on the analysis of the operator dual to the transition probability, has been applied by A. Lasota and J. Yorke, see e.g. [19]. For example in [21] they show that the existence of a lower bound for the iterates of the Frobenius–Perron operator, that corresponds to a piecewise monotonic transformation of the unit interval, implies the existence of a stationary distribution for the deterministic Markov chain describing the iterates of the transformation. In fact, the invariant measure is then unique, in the class of measures that are absolutely continuous with respect to one dimensional Lebesgue measure, and statistically stable, i.e. the law of the chain, starting with any initial distribution that is absolutely continuous, converges to the invariant measure in the total variation metric. This technique has been extended to more general Markov chains, including those corresponding to iterated function systems, see e.g. [22]. However, most of the existing results are formulated for Markov chains taking values in some finite dimensional spaces, see e.g. [34] for a review of the topic.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60J25, 60H15; Secondary: 76N10.

Key words and phrases. Ergodicity of Markov families, invariant measures, stochastic evolution equations, passive tracer dynamics.

This work has been partly supported by Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education Grants N 20104531 (T.K.), PO3A03429 (S.P.), N201 0211 33 (T.S.). In addition, the authors acknowledge the support of EC FP6 Marie Curie ToK programme SPADE2, MTKD-CT-2004-014508 and Polish MNiSW SPB-M .

Generally speaking, the lower bound technique, we have in mind, consists in deriving ergodic properties of the Markov process from the fact that there exists a "small" set in the state space, e.g. it could be compact, such that the time averages of the mass of the process are concentrated over that set for all sufficiently large times. If this set is compact, one can conclude the existence of an invariant probability measure with not much difficulty.

The question of extending the lower bound technique to Markov processes taking values in Polish spaces that are not locally compact is quite a delicate matter. This situation typically occurs for processes that are solutions of stochastic partial differential equations. The value of the process is then usually an element of an infinite dimensional Hilbert, or Banach space. We stress here that for proving the existence of a stationary measure it is not enough then to ensure only the lower bound on the transition probability over some "thin" set. One can show, see the counterexample provided in [30], that even if the mass of the process, contained in any neighborhood of a given point, is separated from zero for all times, an invariant measure may fail to exist. In fact some general results concerning the existence of an invariant measure and its statistical stability for a discrete time Markov chain have been formulated in [30], see Theorems 3.1–3.3.

In the present paper we are concerned with the question of finding a criterion on the existence of a unique invariant, ergodic probability measure for a continuous time, Feller, Markov process $(Z(t))_{t\geq 0}$ taking values in a Polish space $\mathcal{X}$, see Theorems 1 and 2 below. Suppose that $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is its transition probability semigroup. In our first result, see Theorem 1, we show that there exists a unique, invariant probability measure for the process, provided that for any Lipschitz, bounded function ψ the family of functions $(P_t\psi)_{t\geq 0}$ is uniformly continuous at any point of $\mathcal{X}$ (we call this the e-property of the semigroup) and there exists $z\in\mathcal{X}$ such that for any $\delta>0$

$$\liminf_{T\to+\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_t\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x)\mathrm{d}t>0,\quad \forall\, x\in\mathcal{X}. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $B(z,\delta)$ denotes the ball in $\mathcal{X}$ centered at z with radius δ. Observe that, in contrast to the Doeblin condition, we do not require that the lower bound in (1.1) is uniform in the state variable x. If some conditions on uniformity over bounded sets are added, see (2.8) and (2.9) below, one can also conclude the stability of the ergodic averages corresponding to $(Z(t))_{t\geq 0}$, see Theorem 2. We call it, after [34], *the weak* mean ergodicity.*

This general result is applied to solutions of stochastic evolution equations in Hilbert spaces. We show in Theorem 3 the uniqueness and ergodicity of an invariant measure, provided that the transition semigroup has the e-property, the (deterministic) semi-dynamical system, corresponding to the equation without the noise, has an attractor, which admits a unique invariant measure. This is a natural generalization of the results known for the so-called dissipative systems see e.g. [4].

A different approach to prove the uniqueness of an invariant measure for a stochastic evolution equation is based on the strong Feller property of the transition semigroup (see [4], [26], [7], and [12]) or in a more refined version on *the asymptotic strong Feller property* (see [13], [14], [23]). In our Theorem 3 we do not require neither of these properties of the corresponding semigroup. Roughly speaking we assume: 1) the existence of a global compact attractor for the system without the noise (hypothesis (i)), 2) the existence of a Lyapunov function (hypothesis (ii)), 3) some form of stochastic stability of the system after the noise is added (hypothesis (iii)) and finally 4) the e-property, see Section 2. This allows us to show lower bounds for the transition probabilities and then use Theorems 1 and 2.

As an application of Theorem 3 we consider in Sections 5 - 6 the Lagrangian observation process corresponding to the passive tracer model $\dot{x}(t) = V(t, x(t))$, where $V(t,x)$ is a time-space stationary random, Gaussian and Markovian velocity field. One can show that when the field is sufficiently regular, see (2.16), the process $\mathcal{Z}(t) := V(t, x(t) + \cdot)$ is a solution of a certain evolution equation in a Hilbert space, see (5.5) below. With the help of the technique developed by Hairer and Mattingly [13] (see also [6] and [18]) we verify the assumptions of Theorem 3, when $V(t,x)$ is periodic in the x variable and satisfies a mixing hypothesis in the temporal variable, see (2.17). The latter reflects physically quite a natural assumption that the mixing time for the velocity field gets shorter on smaller spatial scales. As a consequence of the statistical stability property of the ergodic invariant measure for the Lagrangian velocity $(\mathcal{Z}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ we obtain the weak law of large numbers for the passive tracer model in a compressible environment, see Theorem 4. It generalizes the corresponding result that holds in the incompressible case, which can be easily concluded due to the fact that the invariant measure is known explicitly in that situation, see [29].

2. Main results

Let $(\mathcal{X}, \rho)$ be a Polish metric space. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ be the space of all Borel subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ and let $B_b(\mathcal{X})$ (resp. $C_b(\mathcal{X})$) be the Banach space of all bounded, measurable (resp. continuous) functions on $\mathcal{X}$ equipped with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. We denote by $\mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$ the space of all bounded Lipschitz continuous functions on $\mathcal{X}$. Denote by

$$\mathrm{Lip}\,(f) := \sup_{x\neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\rho(x,y)}$$

the smallest Lipschitz constant of f.

Let $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the transition semigroup of a Markov family $Z = ((Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0},\, x \in \mathcal{X})$ taking values in $\mathcal{X}$. Throughout this paper we shall assume that the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is *Feller*, i.e. $P_t(C_b(\mathcal{X})) \subset C_b(\mathcal{X})$. We shall also assume that the Markov family is stochastically continuous, which implies that: $\lim_{t\to 0+} P_t\psi(x) = \psi(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\psi \in C_b(\mathcal{X})$.

Definition 2.1. *We say that a transition semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has* the e-property *if the family of functions $(P_t\psi)_{t\geq 0}$ is equicontinuous at every point x of $\mathcal{X}$ for any bounded and Lipschitz continuous function ψ, i.e.*

$$\forall\, \psi \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X}),\, x \in \mathcal{X},\, \varepsilon > 0\, \exists\, \delta > 0\, \forall\, z \in B(x,\delta),\, t \geq 0 :\, |P_t\psi(x) - P_t\psi(z)| < \varepsilon.$$

Then, $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$ is called an e-process*.*

An e-process is an extension to a continuous time of the notion of an e-chain introduced in Section 6.4 of [24].

Given $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ we denote by $\mathcal{M}_1(B)$ the space of all probability Borel measures on B. For brevity we write $\mathcal{M}_1$ instead of $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{X})$. Let $(P_t^*)_{t\geq 0}$ be the dual semigroup defined on $\mathcal{M}_1$ by the formula $P_t^*\mu(B) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} P_t \mathbf{1}_B \mathrm{d}\mu$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$. Recall that $\mu_* \in \mathcal{M}_1$ is *invariant* for the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ (or the Markov family $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$) if $P_t^*\mu_* = \mu_*$ for all $t \geq 0$.

For a given $T > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$ define $Q^T\mu := T^{-1}\int_0^T P_s^*\mu \mathrm{d}s$. We write $Q^T(x,\cdot)$ in the particular case when $\mu = \delta_x$. Let

$$\mathcal{T} := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{X} \colon \text{the family of measures } \left(Q^T(x)\right)_{T\geq 0} \text{ is tight } \right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Denote by $B(z,\delta)$ the ball in $\mathcal{X}$ with center at z and radius δ and by w-lim the limit in the sense of weak convergence of measures. The proof of the following result is given in Section 3.2.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has the e-property and that there exists $z \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for every $\delta > 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(x, B(z,\delta)) > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Then the semigroup admits a unique invariant, probability measure μ_*. Moreover

$$\operatorname*{w-lim}_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T\nu = \mu_* \tag{2.3}$$

for any $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$ that is supported in $\mathcal{T}$.

Remark 1. We remark here that the set $\mathcal{T}$ may not be the entire space $\mathcal{X}$. This issue is investigated more closely in [32]. Among others it is shown there that if the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1, then the set $\mathcal{T}$ is closed. Below we present an elementary example of a semigroup satisfying the assumptions of the above theorem, for which $\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{X} = (-\infty,-1] \cup [1,+\infty)$, $T(x) := -(x+1)/2 - 1$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and let $P : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}) \to [0,1]$ be the transition function defined by the formula:

$$P(x,\cdot) = \begin{cases} (1-\exp(-1/x^2))\delta_{-x}(\cdot) + \exp(-1/x^2)\delta_{x+1}(\cdot), & \text{for } x \geq 1, \\ \\ \delta_{T(x)}(\cdot), & \text{for } x \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

Define the Markov operator $P : B_b(\mathcal{X}) \to B_b(\mathcal{X})$ corresponding to $P(\cdot,\cdot)$, i.e.

$$Pf(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y)P(x,\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \text{for } f \in B_b(\mathcal{X}).$$

Finally, let $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the semigroup given by the formula:

$$P_t f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-t}\frac{t^n}{n!}P^n f \qquad \text{for } t \geq 0. \tag{2.4}$$

It is obvious that the semigroup is Feller.

We check that $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1 and that $\mathcal{T} = (-\infty,-1]$. Let $z := -1$. Since for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\delta > 0$

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} P_t^*\delta_x(B(z,\delta)) \geq 1 - \exp(-1/x^2),$$

condition (2.2) is satisfied.

To prove the e–property it is enough to show that for any $f \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$

$$\lim_{y\to x}\sup_{n\ge 1}|P^n f(x) - P^n f(y)| = 0, \quad \forall\, x\in\mathcal{X}. \tag{2.5}$$

If $x \le -1$, then condition (2.5) obviously holds. Therefore we may assume that $x \ge 1$. Observe that

$$P^n f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^{n-1-k}(-x-k))G_k(x) + H_n(x)f(x+n), \quad n\ge 1$$

where $H_n(x) := \prod_{j=0}^{n-1}\exp(-(x+j)^{-2})$ and $G_k(x) := [1-\exp(-(x+k)^{-2})]H_k(x)$. Here we interpret $\prod_{j=0}^{-1}$ as equal to 1. After straightforward calculations, we obtain that for $1\le x\le y$.

$$|P^n f(x) - P^n f(y)| \le \mathrm{Lip}(f)(y-x) + \|f\|_\infty\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\int_x^y |G_k'(\xi)|\mathrm{d}\xi + \int_x^y |H_n'(\xi)|\mathrm{d}\xi\right).$$

Condition (2.5) follows from the fact that $\sum_{k=0}^{n-2}|G_k'(\xi)|$ and $H_n'(\xi)$ are uniformly convergent on $[1,+\infty)$.

Finally, it can be seen from (2.4) that for any $R>0$ and $x\ge 1$ we have

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} P_t^*\delta_x(B^c(0,R)) \ge \lim_{n\to+\infty} H_n(x) > 0,$$

which proves that $x\notin\mathcal{T}$.

Following [34], see p. 95, we introduce the concept of weak* mean ergodicity.

Definition 2.2. *A semigroup $(P_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is called* weak* mean ergodic*, if there exists a measure $\mu_*\in\mathcal{M}_1$ such that*

$$\operatorname*{w-lim}_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T\nu = \mu_*, \qquad \forall\,\nu\in\mathcal{M}_1. \tag{2.6}$$

Remark 2. In some important cases it is easy to show that $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}$. For example if $(Z^x(t))_{t\ge 0}$ is given by a stochastic evolution equation in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{X}$ then it is enough to show that there exist a compactly embedded space $\mathcal{V}\hookrightarrow\mathcal{X}$ and a locally bounded, measurable function $\Phi:[0,+\infty)\to[0,+\infty)$ that satisfies $\lim_{R\to+\infty}\Phi(R)=+\infty$ such that

$$\forall\, x\in\mathcal{X}\ \exists\, T_0\ge 0, \qquad \sup_{t\ge T_0}\mathbb{E}\,\Phi(\|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}) < \infty.$$

Clearly, if $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}$, then the assumptions of Theorem 1 guarantee the weak* mean ergodicity. In Theorem 2 below the weak* mean ergodicity is deduced from a version of (2.2) that holds uniformly on bounded sets.

Remark 3. Of course, (2.6) implies uniqueness of invariant measure for $(P_t)_{t\ge 0}$. Moreover, for any stochastically continuous Feller semigroup $(P_t)_{t\ge 0}$ its weak* mean ergodicity implies also ergodicity of μ_*, i.e. that any Borel set B, which satisfies $P_t\mathbf{1}_B=\mathbf{1}_B$, μ_*-a.s. for all $t\ge 0$ has to be μ_*-trivial. This can be seen e.g. from part iv) of Theorem 3.2.4 of [4].

Remark 4. Note that condition (2.6) is equivalent with *every point of $\mathcal{X}$ being generic* in the sense of [10], i.e.

$$\text{w-}\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(x,\cdot)=\mu_*,\qquad \forall\, x\in\mathcal{X}. \tag{2.7}$$

Indeed, (2.6) obviously implies (2.7), since it suffices to take $\nu=\delta_x$, $x\in\mathcal{X}$. Conversely, assuming (2.7) we can write for any $\nu\in\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\psi\in C_b(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q_T\nu(\mathrm{d}x)=\lim_{T\uparrow\infty}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_s\psi(x)\mathrm{d}s\,\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{(2.7)}{=}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)\mu_*(\mathrm{d}x)$$

and (2.6) follows.

The proof of the following result is given in Section 3.3.

Theorem 2. *Let $(P_t)_{t\ge0}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1. Assume also that there exists $z\in X$ such that for every bounded set A and $\delta>0$ we have*

$$\inf_{x\in A}\liminf_{T\to+\infty}Q^T(x,B(z,\delta))>0. \tag{2.8}$$

Suppose furthermore that for every $\varepsilon>0$ and $x\in X$ there exists a bounded Borel set $D\subset X$ such that

$$\liminf_{T\to+\infty}Q^T(x,D)>1-\varepsilon. \tag{2.9}$$

Then: besides the existence of a unique invariant measure μ_* for $(P_t)_{t\ge0}$, the following are true:

*1) the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\ge0}$ is weak * mean ergodic,*
2) for any $\psi\in\mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mu\in\mathcal{M}_1$ the weak law of large numbers holds

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu\text{–}\lim_{T\to+\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T\psi(Z(t))\mathrm{d}t=\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\mathrm{d}\mu_*. \tag{2.10}$$

Here $(Z(t))_{t\ge0}$ is the Markov process that corresponds to the given semigroup, whose initial distribution is μ and whose path measure is $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. The convergence takes place in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ probability.

Using Theorems 1 and 2 we establish the weak* mean ergodicity for the family defined by the stochastic evolution equation

$$\mathrm{d}Z(t)=(AZ(t)+F(Z(t)))\,\mathrm{d}t+R\mathrm{d}W(t). \tag{2.11}$$

Here $\mathcal{X}$ is a real separable Hilbert space, A is the generator of a C_0-semigroup $S=(S(t))_{t\ge0}$ acting on $\mathcal{X}$, F maps (not necessarily continuously) $D(F)\subset\mathcal{X}$ into $\mathcal{X}$, R is a bounded linear operator from another Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{X}$, and $W=(W(t))_{t\ge0}$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on $\mathcal{H}$ defined over a certain filtered probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge0},\mathbb{P})$.

Let Z_0 be an $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable random variable. By a solution of (2.11) starting from Z_0 we mean a solution to the stochastic integral equation (the so called *mild solution*)

$$Z(t) = S(t)Z_0 + \int_0^t S(t-s)F(Z(s))\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t S(t-s)R\mathrm{d}W(s), \qquad t \geq 0,$$

see e.g. [3], where the stochastic integral appearing on the right hand side is understood in the sense of Itô. We suppose that for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there is a unique mild solution $Z^x = (Z_t^x)_{t\geq 0}$ of (2.11) starting from x, and that (2.11) defines in that way a Markov family. We assume that for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the process Z^x is stochastically continuous.

The corresponding transition semigroup is given by $P_t\psi(x) = \mathbb{E}\,\psi(Z^x(t))$, $\psi \in B_b(\mathcal{X})$, and we assume that it is Feller.

Definition 2.3. $\Phi\colon \mathcal{X} \to [0,+\infty)$ *is called a* Lyapunov function*, if it is measurable, bounded on bounded sets and* $\lim_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\uparrow\infty} \Phi(x) = \infty$.

We shall assume that the deterministic equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}Y(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = AY(t) + F(Y(t)), \qquad Y(0) = x \tag{2.12}$$

defines a continuous semi-dynamical system $(Y^x,\, x \in \mathcal{X})$, i.e. for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists a unique continuous solution to (2.12) that we denote by $Y^x = (Y^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$ and for a given t the mapping $x \mapsto Y^x(t)$ is measurable. Furthermore, we have $Y^{Y^x(t)}(s) = Y^x(t+s)$ for all $t, s \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 2.4. *A set* $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{X}$ *is called* a global attractor *for the semi-dynamical system if*

1) *it is invariant under the semi-dynamical system, i.e.* $Y^x(t) \in \mathcal{K}$ *for any* $x \in \mathcal{K}$ *and* $t \geq 0$.
2) *for any* $\varepsilon, R > 0$ *there exists* T *such that* $Y^x(t) \in \mathcal{K} + \varepsilon B(0,1)$ *for* $t \geq T$ *and* $\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R$.

Definition 2.5. *The family* $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ *is* stochastically stable *if*

$$\forall\, \varepsilon,\ R,\ t > 0\colon \qquad \inf_{x\in B(0,R)} \mathbb{P}\left(\|Z^x(t) - Y^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \varepsilon\right) > 0. \tag{2.13}$$

In Section 4 we derive from Theorems 1 and 2 the following result concerning ergodicity of Z.

Theorem 3. *Assume that:*

(i) *the semi-dynamical system* $(Y^x,\, x \in \mathcal{X})$ *defined by* (2.12) *has a compact, global attractor* $\mathcal{K}$.
(ii) $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$ *admits a Lyapunov function* Φ, *i.e.*

$$\forall\, x \in \mathcal{X}: \qquad \sup_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\Phi(Z^x(t)) < \infty,$$

(iii) *the family* $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$, $x\in\mathcal{X}$ *is stochastically stable and*

$$\bigcap_{x\in\mathcal{K}}\bigcup_{t\geq 0}\Gamma^t(x)\neq\emptyset, \tag{2.14}$$

where $\Gamma^t(x)=\operatorname{supp}P_t^*\delta_x$,

(iv) *its transition semigroup has the e-property.*

Then, $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$, $x\in\mathcal{X}$ *admits a unique invariant measure* μ_* *and is weak * mean ergodic. Moreover for any bounded, Lipschitz observable* ψ *the weak law of large numbers holds*

$$\mathbb{P}-\lim_{T\to+\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T\psi(Z^x(t))\mathrm{d}t=\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\mathrm{d}\mu_*.$$

Remark 5. Observe that condition (2.14) in Theorem 3 is trivially satisfied if $\mathcal{K}$ is a singleton. Also, this condition holds if the semi-dynamical system, obtained after removing the noise, admits a global attractor that is contained in the support of the transition probability function of the solutions of (2.11) corresponding to the starting point at the attractor (this situation occurs e.g. if the noise is non-degenerate).

Another situation when (2.14) can be guaranteed occurs if we assume (2.13) and uniqueness of invariant probability measures for $(Y^x,\,x\in\mathcal{X})$. From stochastic stability condition (2.13) it is clear that the support of such a measure is contained in any $\bigcup_{t\geq 0}\Gamma_t(x)$ for $x\in\mathcal{K}$. We do not know however whether there exists an example of a semi-dynamical system corresponding to (2.12) with a non single point attractor and such that it admits a unique invariant measure.

Remark 6. The e-property used in Theorem 3 can be understood as an intermediary between the strong dissipativity property of [4] and asymptotic strong Feller (see [13]). A trivial example of a transition probability semigroup that is neither dissipative (in the sense of [4]) nor is asymptotic strong Feller but satisfies the e-property is furnished by the dynamical system on a unite circle $\{z\in\mathbb{C}\colon |z|=1\}$ given by $\dot z=i\alpha z$, where $\alpha/(2\pi)$ is an irrational real. For more examples of Markov processes that have the e-property but are neither dissipative nor have the asymptotic strong Feller property see [20]. A careful analysis of the current proof shows that the e-property could be viewed as a consequence of some version of the asymptotic strong Feller concerning time averages of the transition operators. We shall investigate this point in more details in a forthcoming paper.

Our last result follows from an application of the above theorem and concerns the weak law of large numbers for the passive tracer in a compressible random flow. The trajectory of a particle is described then by the solution of an ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t}=V(t,\mathbf{x}(t)),\quad \mathbf{x}(0)=\mathbf{x}_0, \tag{2.15}$$

where $V(t,\xi)$, $(t,\xi)\in\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, is a d-dimensional random vector field. This is a simple model, used in statistical hydrodynamics, that describes transport of matter in a turbulent flow.

We assume that $V(t,\xi)$ is a mean zero, stationary, spatially periodic, Gaussian and Markov in time random field. Its covariance matrix

$$R_{i,j}(t-s,\xi-\eta) := \mathbb{E}\left[V_i(t,\xi)V_j(s,\eta)\right]$$

is given by its Fourier coefficients:

$$\widehat{R}_{i,j}(h,k) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}k\xi} R_{i,j}(h,\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi = \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(k)|h|}\mathcal{E}_{i,j}(k),\ i,j=1,\ldots,d,$$

$h \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Here $\mathbb{T}^d := [0,2\pi)^d$, the *energy spectrum* $\mathcal{E} := [\mathcal{E}_{i,j}]$ maps $\mathbb{Z}^d$ into the space $S_+(d)$ of all non-negative definite Hermitian matrices, and the *mixing rates* $\gamma\colon \mathbb{Z}^d \to (0,+\infty)$. Denote by $\mathrm{Tr}\,A$ the trace of a given $d\times d$ matrix A and by $\mathbb{P}$–lim the limit in probability. In Section 6, we show the following result.

Theorem 4. *Assume that:*

$$\exists\, m > d/2+1,\ \alpha\in(0,1)\colon \qquad |||\mathcal{E}|||^2 := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \gamma^{\alpha}(k)|k|^{2(m+1)}\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{E}(k) < \infty, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(k)t}|k|\mathrm{d}t < \infty. \tag{2.17}$$

Then, there exists a constant vector v_* such that

$$\mathbb{P}\text{–}\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}(t)}{t} = v_*.$$

Remark 7. We will show that $v_* = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}V(0,0)$, where the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_*}$ is calculated with respect to the path measure that corresponds to the Markov process starting with the initial distribution μ_*, which is invariant under Lagrangian observations of the velocity field, i.e. the vector field valued process $V(t,\mathbf{x}(t)+\cdot)$, $t\geq 0$. In the physics literature v_* is referred to as the *Stokes drift*. Since V is spatially stationary, the Stokes drift does not depend on the initial value $\mathbf{x}_0$.

Remark 8. Note that condition (2.17) holds if

$$\exists\, \varepsilon, K_0 > 0\, \forall\, k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*\colon \quad \gamma(k) \geq K_0|k|^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Indeed, it is clear that under this assumption

$$\int_1^\infty \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(k)t}|k|\mathrm{d}t < \infty.$$

On the other hand for $t\in(0,1]$ we obtain

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(k)t}|k| \leq \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} \exp\left\{-K_0|k|^{1+\varepsilon}t + \log|k|\right\} \leq \frac{C}{t^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}}$$

for some constant $C>0$. This, of course implies (2.17).

3. Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

3.1. **Some auxiliary results.** For the proof of the following lemma the reader is referred to [20], see the argument given on pp. 517–518.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $(\nu_n)\subset\mathcal{M}_1$ is not tight. Then, there exist an $\varepsilon>0$, a sequence of compact sets (K_i), and an increasing sequence of positive integers (n_i) satisfying*

$$\nu_{n_i}(K_i)\ge\varepsilon,\quad\forall\, i, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\min\{\rho(x,y)\colon x\in K_i, y\in K_j\}\ge\varepsilon,\qquad\forall\, i\neq j. \tag{3.2}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{T}$ is defined by (2.1).

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $(P_t)_{t\ge 0}$ has the e-property and admits an invariant probability measure μ_*. Then, $\operatorname{supp}\mu_*\subset\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Let μ_* be an invariant measure in question. Assume, contrary to our claim, that $\big(Q^T(x)\big)_{T\ge 0}$ is not tight for some $x\in\operatorname{supp}\mu_*$. Then, according to Lemma 1, there exist a strictly increasing sequence of positive numbers $T_i\uparrow\infty$, a positive number ε and a sequence of compact sets (K_i) such that

$$Q^{T_i}(x,K_i)\ge\varepsilon,\quad\forall\, i, \tag{3.3}$$

and (3.2) holds. We will derive the assertion from the claim that there exist sequences $(\tilde f_n)\subset\operatorname{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$, $(\nu_n)\subset\mathcal{M}_1$ and an increasing sequence of integers (m_n) such that $\operatorname{supp}\nu_n\subset B(x,1/n)$ for any n, and

$$\mathbf{1}_{K_{m_n}}\le\tilde f_n\le\mathbf{1}_{K^{\varepsilon/4}_{m_n}}\quad\text{and}\quad\operatorname{Lip}(\tilde f_n)\le 4/\varepsilon,\quad\forall\, n. \tag{3.4}$$

Here $A^\varepsilon:=\{x\in\mathcal{X}\colon\ \operatorname{dist}(x,A)<\varepsilon\}$, $\varepsilon>0$ denotes the ε-neighborhood of $A\subset\mathcal{X}$. Moreover,

$$P^*_t\nu_n\left(\bigcup_{i=n}^{\infty}K^{\varepsilon/4}_{m_i}\right)\le\varepsilon/4,\qquad\forall\, t\ge 0, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$|P_tf_n(x)-P_tf_n(y)|<\varepsilon/4,\qquad\forall\, t\ge 0,\forall\, y\in\operatorname{supp}\nu_n, \tag{3.6}$$

$f_1:=0$ and $f_n:=\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}\tilde f_i$, $n\ge 2$. Admitting for a moment the above claim we show how to finish the proof of the proposition. Observe first that (3.2) and condition (3.4) together imply that the series $f:=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\tilde f_i$ is uniformly convergent and $\|f\|_\infty=1$. Note also that for x,y such that $\rho(x,y)<\varepsilon/8$ we have $\tilde f_i(x)\neq 0$, or $\tilde f_i(y)\neq 0$ for at most one i. Therefore for such points $|f(x)-f(y)|<16\varepsilon^{-1}\rho(x,y)$. This, in particular implies that $f\in\operatorname{Lip}(\mathcal{X})$.

From (3.3) and (3.4)–(3.6) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}(x,\mathrm{d}y)f(y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}\nu_n(\mathrm{d}y)f(y) &\ge Q^{T_{m_n}}(x,K_{m_n})\\ + \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}(x,\mathrm{d}y)f_n(y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}\nu_n(\mathrm{d}y)f_n(y) &- Q^{T_{m_n}}\nu_n\left(\bigcup_{i=n}^{\infty} K_{m_i}^{\varepsilon/4}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By virtue of (3.3) the first term on the right hand side of (3.7) is greater than, or equal to ε. Combining the second and the third terms we obtain that their absolute value equals

$$\left|\frac{1}{T_{m_n}}\int_0^{T_{m_n}}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\left[P^s f_n(x) - P^s f_n(y)\right]\nu_n(\mathrm{d}y)\mathrm{d}s\right| \stackrel{(3.6)}{\le} \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

The fourth term is less than, or equal to $\varepsilon/4$ by virtue of (3.5). Summarizing we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}(x,\mathrm{d}y)f(y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} Q^{T_{m_n}}\nu_n(\mathrm{d}y)f(y)\\ &= \frac{1}{T_{m_n}}\int_0^{T_{m_n}}\mathrm{d}s\int_{\mathcal{X}}\left[P^s f(x) - P^s f(y)\right]\nu_n(\mathrm{d}y) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\end{aligned}$$

for every positive integer n. Hence, there must be a sequence (t_n, y_n) such that $t_n \in [0, T_{m_n}]$, $y_n \in \operatorname{supp}\nu_n \subset B(x, 1/n)$ for which $P_{t_n}f(x) - P_{t_n}f(y_n) > \varepsilon/2$, $n \ge 1$. This clearly contradicts equicontinuity of $(P_t f)_{t\ge 0}$ at x.

Proof of the claim. We conduct it by induction on n. Let $n = 1$. Since $x \in \operatorname{supp}\mu_*$, we have $\mu_*(B(x,\delta)) > 0$ for all $\delta > 0$. Define the probabiliy measure ν_1 by the formula

$$\nu_1(B) = \mu_*(B|B(x,1)) := \frac{\mu_*(B\cap B(x,1))}{\mu_*(B(x,1))}, \qquad B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}).$$

Since $\nu_1 \le \mu_*^{-1}(B(x,1))\mu_*$, from the fact that μ_* is invariant, it follows that the family $(P_t^*\nu_1)_{t\ge 0}$ is tight. Thus, there exists a compact set K such that

$$P_t^*\nu_1(K^c) \le \varepsilon/4, \qquad \forall\, t \ge 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Note however that $K \cap K_i^{\varepsilon/4} \ne \emptyset$ only for finitely many i-s. Otherwise, in light of (3.2), one could construct in K an infinite set of points separated from each other at distance at least $\varepsilon/2$, which contradicts its compactness. As a result, there exists an integer m_1 such that

$$P_t^*\nu_1\left(\bigcup_{i=m_1}^{\infty} K_i^{\varepsilon/4}\right) \le \varepsilon/4, \qquad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

Let $\tilde{f}_1$ be an arbitrary Lipschitz function satisfying $\mathbf{1}_{K_{m_1}} \le \tilde{f}_1 \le \mathbf{1}_{K_{m_1}^{\varepsilon/4}}$ and $\operatorname{Lip}(\tilde{f}_1) \le 4/\varepsilon$.

Assume now that for a given $n \ge 1$ we have already constructed $\tilde{f}_1, \ldots, \tilde{f}_n$, $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n$, $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ satisfying (3.4)-(3.6). Since $(P_t f_{n+1})_{t\ge 0}$ is equicontinuous we can choose $\delta < 1/(n+1)$ such that $|P_t f_{n+1}(x) - P_t f_{n+1}(y)| < \varepsilon/4$ for all $t \ge 0$ and $y \in B(x,\delta)$. Suppose furthermore that $\nu_{n+1} := \mu_*(\cdot|B(x,\delta))$. Since the measure is supported in $B(x,\delta)$ condition

(3.6) holds for f_{n+1}. Tightness of $(P_t^*\nu_{n+1})_{t\ge 0}$ can be argued in the same way as in case $n=1$. In consequence, one can find $m_{n+1}>m_n$ such that

$$P_t^*\nu_{n+1}\left(\bigcup_{i=m_{n+1}}^{\infty} K_i^{\varepsilon/4}\right)\le \varepsilon/4,\qquad \forall\, t\ge 0.$$

Finally, we let $\tilde f_{n+1}$ be an arbitrary continuous function satisfying (3.4). □

For given an integer $k\ge 1$ and times $t_1,\dots,t_k\ge 0$ and a measure $\mu\in\mathcal{M}_1$ we let $Q^{t_k,\dots,t_1}\mu := Q^{t_k}\dots Q^{t_1}\mu$. The following simple lemma will be useful for us in the sequel. In what follows $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ denotes the total variation norm.

Lemma 2. *For all $k\ge 1$ and $t_1,\dots,t_k>0$,*

$$\limsup_{T\to+\infty}\sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_1}\left\|Q^{T,t_k,\dots,t_1}\mu - Q^T\mu\right\|_{TV}=0. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. To simplify the notation we assume that $k=1$. The general case can be argued by the induction on the length of the sequence $t_1,\dots,t_k$ and is left to a reader. For any $T>0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{T,t_1}\mu - Q^T\mu &= (Tt_1)^{-1}\int_0^{t_1}\mathrm{d}r\left[\int_0^T P_{s+r}^*\mu\mathrm{d}s - \int_0^T P_s^*\mu\mathrm{d}s\right]\\ &= (Tt_1)^{-1}\int_0^{t_1}\mathrm{d}r\int_0^r (P_{s+T}^*\mu - P_s^*\mu)\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

The total variation norm of $Q^{T,t_1}\mu - Q^T\mu$ can be estimated therefore by t_1/T and (3.9) follows. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.** The existence of an invariant measure follows from Theorem 3.1 of [20]. We will show that for arbitrary $x_1,x_2\in\mathcal{T}$ and $\psi\in \mathrm{Lip}_b(X)$,

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x_1,\mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x_2,\mathrm{d}y)\right| = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

From this we can easily conclude (2.3) using e.g. Example 22, p. 74 of [28]. Indeed, for any ν as in the statement of the theorem

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\nu(\mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi\mathrm{d}\mu_*\\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\mu_*(\mathrm{d}x')\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x,\mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x',\mathrm{d}y)\right) \end{aligned}$$

and (2.3) follows directly from (3.10) and Proposition 1. The rest of the argument shall be devoted to the proof of (3.10).

Fix a sequence (η_n) of positive numbers monotonically decreasing to 0. Fix also arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$, $\psi\in\mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$, $x_1,x_2\in\mathcal{T}$. For these parameters we define $\Delta\subset\mathbb{R}$ in the following way: $\alpha \in \Delta$ if and only if $\alpha > 0$ and there exist a positive integer N, a sequence of times $(T_{\alpha,n})$ and sequences of measures $(\mu^n_{\alpha,i}), (\nu^n_{\alpha,i}) \subset \mathcal{M}_1$, $i = 1, 2$, such that for $n \geq N$,

$$T_{\alpha,n} \geq n, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\|Q^{T_{\alpha,n}}(x_i) - \mu^n_{\alpha,i}\|_{TV} < \eta_n, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mu^n_{\alpha,i} \geq \alpha \nu^n_{\alpha,i} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\limsup_{T\uparrow\infty} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(x) Q^T \nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}x) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(x) Q^T \nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}x) \right| < \varepsilon. \tag{3.14}$$

Our main tool is contained in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *For given $\varepsilon > 0$, (η_n), $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\psi \in \mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$ the set $\Delta \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, we have* $\sup \Delta = 1$.

Taking this lemma for granted we show how to finish the proof of (3.10). To that purpose let us choose an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists then $\alpha > 1 - \varepsilon$ that belongs to Δ. Thanks to (3.12) we can replace $Q^T(x_i, \cdot)$ appearing in (3.10) by $\mu^n_{\alpha,i}$ and the error made that way can be estimated for $T \geq T_{\alpha,n}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T(x_1, \mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T(x_2, \mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T(x_i, \mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^{T, T_{\alpha,n}}(x_i, \mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\qquad + \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T \mu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T \mu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\qquad + \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^{T, T_{\alpha,n}}(x_i, \mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T \mu^n_{\alpha,i}(\mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T(x_i, \mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^{T, T_{\alpha,n}}(x_i, \mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\qquad + \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T \mu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}y) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y) Q^T \mu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}y) \right| + 2\eta_n \|\psi\|_\infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

To deal with the second term on the utmost right hand side of (3.15) we use condition (3.13). We can replace then $\mu^n_{\alpha,i}$ by $\nu^n_{\alpha,i}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\mu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}y)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\mu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}y)\right|\\ &\stackrel{(3.13)}{\le}\alpha\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}y)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}y)\right|+\sum_{i=1}^{2}\|\psi\|_\infty(\mu^n_{\alpha,i}-\alpha\nu^n_{\alpha,i})(\mathcal{X})\\ &\le\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}y)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T\nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}y)\right|+2\varepsilon\|\psi\|_\infty.\end{aligned}\tag{3.16}$$

In the last inequality we have used the fact that $1-\alpha<\varepsilon$. Summarizing, from Lemma 2, (3.15), (3.16) and (3.14) we obtain that

$$\limsup_{T\uparrow\infty}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x_1,\mathrm{d}y)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(y)Q^T(x_2,\mathrm{d}y)\right|\le 2\eta_n\|\psi\|_\infty+2\varepsilon\|\psi\|_\infty+\varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon>0$ and n are arbitrarily chosen we conclude that (3.10) follows.

Proof of Lemma 3. First we show that $\Delta\neq\emptyset$. Let $z\in\mathcal{X}$ be such that for every $\delta>0$ and $x\in\mathcal{X}$ condition (2.2) is satisfied. Equicontinuity of $(P_t\psi)_{t\ge0}$ at $z\in\mathcal{X}$ implies the existence of $\sigma>0$ such that

$$|P_t\psi(z)-P_t\psi(y)|<\varepsilon/2\qquad\text{for } y\in B(z,\sigma)\text{ and } t\ge0.\tag{3.17}$$

By (2.2) there exist $\beta>0$ and $T_0>0$ such that

$$Q^T(x_i,B(z,\sigma))\ge\beta\qquad\forall\,T\ge T_0,\ i=1,2.\tag{3.18}$$

Set $\alpha:=\beta$ and $T_{\alpha,n}=n+T_0$ for $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu^n_{\alpha,i}:=Q^{T_{\alpha,n}}(x_i)$ and $\nu^n_{\alpha,i}(\cdot):=\mu^n_{\alpha,i}(\cdot|B(z,\sigma))$ for $i=1,2$ and $n\ge1$. Note that $\mu^n_{\alpha,i}(B(z,\sigma))>0$, thanks to (3.18). The measures $\nu^n_{\alpha,i}$, $i=1,2$ are supported in $B(z,\sigma)$ therefore for all $t\ge0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)P_t^*\nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)P_t^*\nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ &=\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}P_t\psi(x)\nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}P_t\psi(x)\nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ &\le\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\left[P_t\psi(x)-P_t\psi(z)\right]\nu^n_{\alpha,1}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|+\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\left[P_t\psi(x)-P_t\psi(z)\right]\nu^n_{\alpha,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\stackrel{(3.17)}{<}\varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

and hence (3.14) follows. Conditions (3.10)–(3.13) are also evidently satisfied. Thus $\Delta\neq\emptyset$.

Next we show that $\sup\Delta=1$. Suppose, contrary to our claim, that $\alpha_0:=\sup\Delta<1$. Thanks to the previous step we have $\alpha_0>0$. Let $(\alpha_n)\subset\Delta$ be such that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n=\alpha_0$. Set $T_n:=T_{\alpha_n,n}$, $\mu_{n,i}:=\mu^n_{\alpha_n,i}$, $\nu_{n,i}:=\nu^n_{\alpha_n,i}$ for $n\ge1$ and $i=1,2$. From conditions (3.12), (3.13) and the fact that the family $(Q^T(x_i))$ is tight for $i=1,2$, it follows that the sequences $(\mu_{n,i})$, $(\nu_{n,i})$; $i=1,2$, are also tight. Indeed, (3.12) clearly implies tightness of $(\mu_{n,i})$, $i=1,2$. In consequence, for any $\varrho>0$ there exists a compact set $K\subset\mathcal{X}$ such that

$\mu_{n,i}(\mathcal{X}\setminus K)<\varrho$ for all $n\ge 1$, $i=1,2$. Condition (3.13) in turn implies that for sufficiently large n we have

$$\nu_{n,i}(\mathcal{X}\setminus K)<\frac{2\mu_{n,i}(\mathcal{X}\setminus K)}{\alpha_0}<\frac{2\varrho}{\alpha_0}$$

and tightness of $(\nu_{n,i})$, $i=1,2$, follows. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that the sequences $(\mu_{n,i})$, $(\nu_{n,i})$; $i=1,2$, are weakly convergent. The sequences

$$\bar\mu_{n,i}:=\mu_{n,i}-\alpha_n\nu_{n,i},\quad n\ge 1, \tag{3.19}$$

are therefore also weakly convergent for $i=1,2$. Assumption that $\alpha_0<1$ implies that the respective limits are non-zero measures. We denote them by $\bar\mu_i$, $i=1,2$, correspondingly. Let $y_i\in\operatorname{supp}\bar\mu_i$, $i=1,2$. Analogously as in the previous step, we may pick $\sigma>0$ such that (3.17) is satisfied. By (2.2) we choose $T>0$ and $\gamma>0$ for which

$$Q^T(y_i,B(z,\sigma/2))\ge\gamma\quad\text{for } i=1,2. \tag{3.20}$$

Since the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\ge 0}$ is Feller we may find $r>0$ such that

$$Q^T(y,B(z,\sigma))\ge\gamma/2\quad\text{for } y\in B(y_i,r)\text{ and } i=1,2. \tag{3.21}$$

Indeed, it suffices to choose $\phi\in\mathrm{Lip}_b(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\sigma/2)}\le\phi\le\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\sigma)}$. From (3.20) we have $\int_{\mathcal{X}}\phi(x)Q^T(y_i,\mathrm{d}x)\ge\gamma$. Feller property implies that there exists $r>0$ such that for $y\in B(y_i,r)$ and $i=1,2$ we have

$$Q^T(y,B(z,\sigma))\ge\int_{\mathcal{X}}\phi(x)Q^T(y,\mathrm{d}x)\ge\frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

Set $s_0=\min\{\bar\mu_1(B(y_1,r)),\bar\mu_2(B(y_2,r))\}>0$. Using part (iv) of Theorem 2.1 p. 16 of [2] we may find $N\ge 1$ such that

$$\bar\mu_{n,i}(B(y_i,r))>\frac{s_0}{2}\quad\text{and}\quad\alpha_n+s_0\frac{\gamma}{4}>\alpha_0 \tag{3.22}$$

for $n\ge N$. We prove that $\alpha_0':=\alpha_0+s_0\gamma/8$ also belongs to Δ, which obviously leads to a contradiction with the hypothesis that $\alpha_0=\sup\Delta$. We construct sequences $(T_{\alpha_0',n})$, $(\mu^n_{\alpha_0',i})$ and $(\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i})$, $i=1,2$ that satisfy conditions (3.11)–(3.14) with α replaced by α_0'. Let $\hat\mu^i_n(\cdot):=\bar\mu_{n,i}(\cdot|B(y_i,r))$, $i=1,2$, be the measure $\bar\mu_{n,i}$ conditioned on the respective balls $B(y_i,r)$, $i=1,2$, i.e. if $\bar\mu_{n,i}(B(y_i,r))\ne 0$ we let

$$\hat\mu^i_n(\cdot):=\frac{\bar\mu_{n,i}(\cdot\cap B(y_i,r))}{\bar\mu_{n,i}(B(y_i,r))} \tag{3.23}$$

while if $\bar\mu_{n,i}(B(y_i,r))=0$ we just let $\hat\mu^i_n(\cdot):=\delta_{y_i}$. Let also $\tilde\mu^i_n(\cdot):=(Q^T\bar\mu_{n,i})(\cdot|B(z,\sigma))$. From the above definition it follows that

$$Q^T\mu_{n,i}\ge\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\tilde\mu^i_n+\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i} \tag{3.24}$$

for $n\ge N$ and $i=1,2$. Indeed, note that from (3.22) and (3.23) we have

$$\bar\mu_{n,i}(B)\ge\frac{s_0}{2}\,\hat\mu^i_n(B),\quad\forall\, B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \tag{3.25}$$

hence also

$$Q^T\bar\mu_{n,i}(B)\ge \frac{s_0}{2}\,Q^T\hat\mu^i_n(B),\quad \forall\, B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}). \tag{3.26}$$

On the other hand, by Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}Q^T\hat\mu^i_n(B(z,\sigma)) &= T^{-1}\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\sigma)}(x)P_s^*\hat\mu^i_n(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{d}s\\ &= T^{-1}\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{X}}P_s\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\sigma)}(x)\hat\mu^i_n(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{d}s=\int_{\mathcal{X}}Q^T(x,B(z,\sigma))\hat\mu^i_n(\mathrm{d}x)\\ &\overset{(3.23)}{=}\int_{B(y_i,r)}Q^T(x,B(z,\sigma))\hat\mu^i_n(\mathrm{d}x)\overset{(3.21)}{\ge}\frac{\gamma}{2},\end{aligned}$$

and consequently (3.26) implies that

$$Q^T\bar\mu_{n,i}(B(z,\sigma))\ge\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}. \tag{3.27}$$

Hence for any $B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\begin{aligned}Q^T\mu_{n,i}(B) &\overset{(3.19)}{=} Q^T\bar\mu_{n,i}(B)+\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i}(B)\ge Q^T\bar\mu_{n,i}(B\cap B(z,\sigma))+\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i}(B)\\ &\overset{(3.27)}{\ge}\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\,\tilde\mu_{n,i}(B)+\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i}(B),\end{aligned}$$

and (3.24) follows. At this point observe that thanks to (3.24) measures $Q^T\mu_{n,i}$ and $(s_0\gamma/4+\alpha_n)^{-1}[(s_0\gamma/4)\tilde\mu_{n,i}+\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i}]$ would satisfy (3.13), with α_0' in place of α, if we admited them as $\mu^n_{\alpha_0',i}$ and $\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i}$, respectively. Condition (3.12) needs not however hold in such case. To remedy this we average $Q^T\mu_{n,i}$ for long time using the operator Q^R corresponding to a sufficiently large $R>0$ and use Lemma 2. More precisely, since $\eta_n>\|Q^{T_n}(x_i)-\mu_{n,i}\|_{TV}$ (thus also $\eta_n>\|Q^{R,T,T_n}(x_i)-Q^{R,T}\mu_{n,i}\|_{TV}$ for any $R>0$) by Lemma 2 we can choose $R_n>T_n$ such that

$$\|Q^{R_n,T,T_n}(x_i)-Q^{R_n}(x_i)\|_{TV}<\eta_n-\|Q^{R_n,T,T_n}(x_i)-Q^{R_n,T}\mu_{n,i}\|_{TV}. \tag{3.28}$$

Let

$$T_{\alpha_0',n}:=R_n,\quad \mu^n_{\alpha_0',i}:=Q^{R_n}Q^T\mu_{n,i} \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i}:=\left(\alpha_n+\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\right)^{-1}Q^{R_n}\left(\alpha_nQ^T\nu_{n,i}+\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\tilde\mu_{n,i}\right) \tag{3.30}$$

for $i=1,2$, $n\ge1$. By virtue of (3.28) we immediately see that

$$\|Q^{T_{\alpha_0',n}}(x_i)-\mu^n_{\alpha_0',i}\|_{TV}<\eta_n,\quad\forall\, n\ge1.$$

Furthermore, from (3.24), positivity of Q^{R_n} and the definition of α_0' and measures $\mu^n_{\alpha_0',i}$ $\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i}$ we obtain that

$$\mu^n_{\alpha_0',i}\ge\alpha_0'\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i}\qquad\forall\, n\ge N,\ i=1,2,$$

when N is chosen sufficiently large. To verify (3.14) note that from (3.30) it follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu^n_{\alpha_0',1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu^n_{\alpha_0',2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\le\alpha_n\left(\alpha_n+\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\right)^{-1}\\ &\times\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n,T}\nu_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n,T}\nu_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ &+\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\left(\alpha_n+\frac{s_0\gamma}{4}\right)^{-1}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n}\tilde{\mu}_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)\mathrm{d}s-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n}\tilde{\mu}_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\end{aligned}\tag{3.31}$$

for all $S\ge 0$. Denote the integrals appearing in the first and the second terms on the right hand side of (3.31) by $I(S)$ and $II(S)$, respectively. Condition (3.14) shall follow if we could demonstrate that the upper limits, as $S\uparrow\infty$, of both of these terms are smaller than ε. To estimate $I(S)$ we use Lemma 2 and condition (3.14), that holds for $\nu_{n,i}$, $i=1,2$. We obtain then

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{S\uparrow\infty}I(S)\le&\limsup_{S\uparrow\infty}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n,T}\nu_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ &+\limsup_{S\uparrow\infty}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|\\ &+\limsup_{S\uparrow\infty}\left|\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^{S,R_n,T}\nu_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x)-\int_{\mathcal{X}}\psi(x)Q^S\nu_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x)\right|<\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\mu}^i_n\subset B(z,\sigma)$, $i=1,2$ we obtain from equicontinuity condition (3.17),

$$II(S)=\frac{1}{SR_n}\left|\int_0^S\int_0^{R_n}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_{\mathcal{X}}(P_{s_1+s_2}\psi(x)-P_{s_1+s_2}\psi(x'))ds_1ds_2\tilde{\mu}_{n,1}(\mathrm{d}x)\tilde{\mu}_{n,2}(\mathrm{d}x')\right|\le\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Hence (3.14) holds for $\nu^n_{\alpha_0',i}$, $i=1,2$ and function ψ. Summarizing, we have shown that $\alpha_0'\in\Delta$. However, we also have $\alpha_0'>\alpha_0=\sup\Delta$, which is clearly impossible. Therefore, we conclude that $\sup\Delta=1$. □

3.3. **Proof of Theorem 2.** Taking into account Theorem 1 the proof of the first part of the theorem will be completed as soon as we can show that $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{X}$. Note that condition (2.8) implies that $z\in\operatorname{supp}\mu_*$. Indeed, let B be a bounded set such that $\mu_*(B)>0$. We can write then for any $\delta>0$ and $T>0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_*(B(z,\delta))&=\int_{\mathcal{X}}Q^T(y,B(z,\delta))\mu_*(\mathrm{d}y)=\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\int_{\mathcal{X}}Q^T(y,B(z,\delta))\mu_*(\mathrm{d}y)\\ &\overset{\text{Fatou lem.}}{\ge}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(y,B(z,\delta))\mu_*(\mathrm{d}y)\\ &\overset{(2.8)}{\ge}\inf_{y\in B}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(y,B(z,\delta))\mu_*(B)>0.\end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 1 the above implies that $z\in\mathcal{T}$. Now, fix an arbitrary $x\in\mathcal{X}$. Let $\mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ be the family of all closed sets $C\subset\mathcal{X}$ which possess a finite ε-net, i.e. there exists a finite set, say $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ for which $C \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, \varepsilon)$. To prove that the family $(Q^T(x))$ is tight it suffices only to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(x, C_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{3.32}$$

for more details see e.g. pp. 517–518 of [20]. In light of Lemma 2 this condition follows if we could prove that for given $\varepsilon > 0$, $k \geq 1$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_k \geq 0$ one can find $T_\varepsilon > 0$ and $C_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ such that

$$Q^{T,t_1,\ldots,t_k}(x, C_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon, \qquad \forall\, T \geq T_\varepsilon. \tag{3.33}$$

Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $z \in \mathcal{T}$ we can find $C_{\varepsilon/2} \in \mathcal{C}_{\varepsilon/2}$ such that (3.32) holds with $\varepsilon/2$ in place of ε and $x = z$. Let $\tilde{C} := C_{\varepsilon/2}^{\varepsilon/2}$ be the $\varepsilon/2$-neighborhood of $C_{\varepsilon/2}$.

Lemma 4. *There exists $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\nu\in\mathcal{M}_1(B(z,\sigma))} \liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T\nu(\tilde{C}) > 1 - \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}. \tag{3.34}$$

In addition, if σ is as above then for any $k \geq 1$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_k \geq 0$ we can choose T_* such that

$$\inf_{\nu\in\mathcal{M}_1(B(z,\sigma))} Q^{T,t_1,\ldots,t_k}\nu(\tilde{C}) > 1 - \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}, \qquad \forall\, T \geq T_*. \tag{3.35}$$

Proof. The claim made in (3.34) follows if we can show that there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{T\to+\infty} Q^T(y, \tilde{C}) > 1 - \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}, \qquad \forall\, y \in B(z, \sigma). \tag{3.36}$$

To prove (3.36), suppose that ψ is a Lipschitz function such that $\mathbf{1}_{C_{\varepsilon/2}} \leq \psi \leq \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{C}}$. Since $(P_t\psi)_{t\geq 0}$ is equicontinuous at z we can find $\sigma > 0$ such that $|P_t\psi(y) - P_t\psi(z)| < \varepsilon/4$ for all $y \in B(z, \sigma)$. Then we have

$$Q^T(y, \tilde{C}) \geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y')Q^T(y, \mathrm{d}y') \geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y')Q^T(z, \mathrm{d}y') - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$$

and using (3.32) we conclude that

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(y, \tilde{C}) \geq \liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(z, C_{\varepsilon/2}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} > 1 - \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}. \tag{3.37}$$

Estimate (3.35) follows directly from (3.34) and Lemma 2. □

Let us go back to the proof of Theorem 2. Let $\sigma > 0$ be as in the above lemma and let $\gamma > 0$ denote the supremum of all sums $\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k$ such that there exist $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_1(B(z, \sigma))$ and

$$Q^{t_1^0,\ldots,t_{m_0}^0}(x) \geq \alpha_1 Q^{t_1^1,\ldots,t_{m_1}^1}\nu_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k Q^{t_1^k,\ldots,t_{m_k}^k}\nu_k \tag{3.38}$$

for some $t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0, \ldots, t_1^k, \ldots, t_{m_k}^k > 0$. In light of Lemma 4 to conclude (3.33) it is enough to show that $\gamma > 1 - \varepsilon/4$. Assume therefore that

$$\gamma \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \tag{3.39}$$

Let D be a bounded subset of X and $T_* > 0$ such that

$$Q^T(x, D) > 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{8}, \qquad \forall\, T \geq T_*, \tag{3.40}$$

and let

$$\alpha := \inf_{x \in D} \liminf_{T \uparrow \infty} Q^T(x, B(z, \sigma)) > 0. \tag{3.41}$$

Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k > 0$, $t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0, \ldots, t_1^k, \ldots, t_{m_k}^k > 0$ and $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_k \in \mathcal{M}_1(B(z, \sigma))$ be such that

$$Q^{t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0}(x) \geq \alpha_1 Q^{t_1^1, \ldots, t_{m_1}^1} \nu_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k Q^{t_1^k, \ldots, t_{m_k}^k} \nu_k$$

and

$$\gamma - (\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k) < \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{64}. \tag{3.42}$$

For a given $t \geq 0$ we let

$$\mu_t := Q^{t, t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0}(x) - \alpha_1 Q^{t, t_1^1, \ldots, t_{m_1}^1} \nu_1 - \ldots - \alpha_k Q^{t, t_1^k, \ldots, t_{m_k}^k} \nu_k.$$

Thanks to Lemma 2 we can choose $T_* > 0$ so that $\|Q^{t, t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0}(x) - Q^t(x)\|_{TV} < \varepsilon/16$ for $t \geq T_*$. Thus, from (3.40) we obtain that for such t,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t(D) &> Q^t(x, D) - \|Q^{t, t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0}(x) - Q^t(x)\|_{TV} - (\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} - \frac{\varepsilon}{16} - \gamma \overset{(3.39)}{\geq} \frac{\varepsilon}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

But this means that for $t \geq T_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{T \uparrow \infty} Q^T \mu_t(B(z, \sigma)) &\overset{\text{Fatou lem.}}{\geq} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \liminf_{T \uparrow \infty} Q^T(y, B(z, \sigma)) \mu_t(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &\geq \int_D \liminf_{T \uparrow \infty} Q^T(y, B(z, \sigma)) \mu_t(\mathrm{d}y) \overset{(3.41)}{\geq} \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{16}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $T_* > 0$ such that

$$Q^T \mu_t(B(z, \sigma)) > \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{32}, \qquad \forall\, t, T \geq T_*. \tag{3.43}$$

Let $\nu(\cdot) := (Q^T \mu_t)(\cdot | B(z, \sigma))$. Of course $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(B(z, \sigma))$. From (3.43) and the definitions of ν and μ_t we obtain however that for t, T as above

$$Q^{T, t, t_1^0, \ldots, t_{m_0}^0}(x) \geq \alpha_1 Q^{T, t, t_1^1, \ldots, t_{m_1}^1} \nu_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k Q^{T, t, t_1^k, \ldots, t_{m_k}^k} \nu_k + \frac{\alpha \varepsilon}{32} \nu.$$

Hence $\gamma \geq \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_k + \alpha\varepsilon/32$, which clearly contradicts (3.42).

Proof of the weak law of large numbers. Recall that $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ is the path measure corresponding to μ - the initial distribution of $(Z(t))_{t\geq 0}$. Let $\mathbb{E}_\mu$ be the respective expectation and $d_* := \int \psi \mathrm{d}\mu_*$. It suffices only to show that

$$\lim_{T\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \psi(Z(t))\mathrm{d}t\right] = d_* \tag{3.44}$$

and

$$\lim_{T\to+\infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \psi(Z(t))\mathrm{d}t\right]^2 = d_*^2. \tag{3.45}$$

Equality (3.44) is an obvious consequence of weak * mean ergodicity. To show (3.45) observe that the expression under the limit equals

$$\frac{2}{T^2}\int_0^T\int_0^t \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P^s(\psi P_{t-s}\psi)\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}s = \frac{2}{T^2}\int_0^T (T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P_s(\psi\Psi_{T-s})\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s, \tag{3.46}$$

where

$$\Psi_t(x) := \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(y)Q^t(x,\mathrm{d}y) = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t P_s\psi(x)\mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.47}$$

The following lemma holds.

Lemma 5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and a compact set $K \subset X$ there exists $t_0 > 0$, such that*

$$\forall\, t \geq t_0 : \sup_{x\in K}\left|\Psi_t(x) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi \mathrm{d}\mu_*\right| < \varepsilon. \tag{3.48}$$

Proof. It suffices to only to show equicontinuity of $(\Psi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on any compact set K. The proof follows then from pointwise convergence of Ψ_t to d_*, as $t\to\infty$ and the Arzela–Ascoli theorem. The equicontinuity of the above family of functions is a direct consequence of the e-property and a simple covering argument. □

Suppose now that $\varepsilon > 0$. One can find a compact set K such that

$$\forall\, t \geq 0 : \quad Q^t\mu(K^c) < \varepsilon. \tag{3.49}$$

Then,

$$* \quad \left|\frac{2}{T^2}\int_0^T (T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P_s(\psi\Psi_{T-s})\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s - \frac{2d_*}{T^2}\int_0^T (T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P_s\psi\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s\right| \leq I + II,$$

where

$$I := \frac{2}{T^2}\int_0^T (T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P_s(\psi(\Psi_{T-s}-d_*)\mathbf{1}_K)\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s$$

and

$$II := \frac{2}{T^2}\int_0^T (T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} P_s(\psi(\Psi_{T-s}-d_*)\mathbf{1}_{K^c})\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s.$$

According to Lemma 5 we can find t_0 such that (3.48) holds with the compact set K and $\varepsilon\|\psi\|_\infty^{-1}$. We obtain then $|I|\le\varepsilon$. Note also that

$$|II|\le 2\|\psi\|_\infty(\|\psi\|_\infty+|d_*|)Q^T\mu(K^c)\overset{(3.49)}{<}2\varepsilon\|\psi\|_\infty(\|\psi\|_\infty+|d_*|).$$

The limit on the right hand side of (3.45) equals therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{T\to+\infty}\frac{2d_*}{T^2}\int_0^T(T-s)\left(\int_{\mathcal X}P_s\psi\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s\\ =&\lim_{T\to+\infty}\frac{2d_*}{T^2}\int_0^T\mathrm{d}s\int_0^s\left(\int_{\mathcal X}Q^{s'}\psi\mathrm{d}\mu\right)\mathrm{d}s'=d_*^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

4. Proof of Theorem 3

In what follows we are going to verify the assumptions of Theorem 2. First observe that (2.9) follows from (ii) and Chebyshev's inequality. The e-property implies equicontinuity of $(P_t\psi,\, t\ge 0)$ at any point for any bounded, Lipschitz function ψ. What remains to be shown therefore is condition (2.8). The rest of the proof is devoted to that purpose. It will be given in five steps.

Step I: We show that we can find a bounded Borel set B and a positive constant r^* such that

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,B)>\frac12,\qquad\forall\, x\in\mathcal{K}+r^*B(0,1). \tag{4.1}$$

To prove this observe, by (ii) and Chebyshev's inequality, that for every $y\in\mathcal K$ there exists a bounded Borel set B_y^0 such that $\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(y,B_y^0)>3/4$. Let B_y be a bounded, open set such that $B_y\supset B_y^0$ and let $\psi\in C_b(\mathcal X)$ be such that $\mathbf{1}_{B_y}\ge\psi\ge\mathbf{1}_{B_y^0}$. Since $(P_t\psi)_{t\ge0}$ is equicontinuous at y we can find $r_y>0$ such that $|P_t\psi(x)-P_t\psi(y)|<1/4$ for all $x\in B(y,r_y)$ and $t\ge0$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,B_y)&\ge\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac1T\int_0^T P_s\psi(x)\mathrm{d}s\\ &\ge\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac1T\int_0^T P_s\psi(y)\mathrm{d}s-\frac14\\ &\ge\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\ Q^T(y,B_y^0)-\frac14>\frac12.\end{aligned}$$

Since the attractor is compact we can find a finite covering $B(y_i,r_{y_i})$, $i=1,\dots,N$, of $\mathcal K$. The claim made in (4.1) holds therefore for $B:=\bigcup_{i=1}^N B_{y_i}$ and $r^*>0$ sufficiently small so that $\mathcal K+r^*B(0,1)\subset\bigcup_{i=1}^N B(y_i,r_{y_i})$.

Step II: Let $B\subset\mathcal X$ be such as in Step I. We prove that for every bounded Borel set $D\subset\mathcal X$ there exists a $\gamma>0$ such that

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,B)>\gamma,\qquad\forall\, x\in D. \tag{4.2}$$

From the fact that $\mathcal{K}$ is a global attractor for (2.12), for any $r>0$ and a bounded Borel set D there exists $L>0$ such that $Y^x(L)\in\mathcal{K}+\frac{r}{2}B(0,1)$ for all $x\in D$. By (2.13) we have

$$p(r,D):=\inf_{x\in D}\mathbb{P}\left(\|Z^x(L)-Y^x(L)\|_{\mathcal{X}}<r/2\right)>0.$$

We obtain therefore that

$$P_L\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}+rB(0,1)}(x)\ge p(r,D),\quad\forall\,x\in D. \tag{4.3}$$

Let $r^*>0$ be the constant given in Step I. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,B)&=\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_{s+L}\mathbf{1}_B(x)\mathrm{d}s\\
&=\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P^*_{s+L}\delta_x(B)\mathrm{d}s=\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{X}}P_s\mathbf{1}_B(z)P^*_L\delta_z(\mathrm{d}z)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\ge\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{K}+r^*B(0,1)}P_s\mathbf{1}_B(z)P^*_L\delta_x(\mathrm{d}z)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\overset{\text{Fubini \& Fatou}}{\ge}\int_{\mathcal{K}+r^*B(0,1)}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(z,B)P^*_L\delta_x(\mathrm{d}z)\overset{(4.1)}{\ge}\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}+r^*B(0,1)}(z)P^*_L\delta_x(\mathrm{d}z)\\
&=\frac{1}{2}P_L\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}+r^*B(0,1)}(x)\overset{(4.3)}{\ge}\gamma:=\frac{p(r^*,D)}{2},\qquad\forall\,x\in D.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Step III: We show here that for every bounded Borel set $D\subset\mathcal{X}$ and any radius $r>0$ there exists an $w>0$ such that

$$\inf_{x\in D}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,\mathcal{K}+rB(0,1))>w. \tag{4.5}$$

Fix therefore $D\subset\mathcal{X}$ and $r>0$. From Step II we know that there exist a bounded set $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ and a positive constant $\gamma>0$ such that (4.2) holds. By (2.13) we have, as in (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,\mathcal{K}+rB(0,1))&=\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T\int_{\mathcal{X}}P_L\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}+rB(0,1)}(z)P^*_s\delta_x(\mathrm{d}z)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\overset{\text{Fubini}}{\ge}\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\int_B P_L\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}+rB(0,1)}(z)Q^T(x,\mathrm{d}z).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

Using (4.3) we can further estimate the utmost right hand side of (4.6) from below by

$$p(r,D)\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}Q^T(x,B)\overset{(4.2)}{>}p(r,D)\gamma. \tag{4.7}$$

We obtain therefore (4.5) with $w=\gamma p(r,D)$.

Step IV: Choose $z\in\bigcap_{y\in\mathcal{K}}\bigcup_{t\ge0}\Gamma^t(y)\neq\emptyset$. We are going to show that for every $\delta>0$ there exist a finite set of positive numbers S and a positive constant $\tilde{r}$ satisfying

$$\inf_{x\in\mathcal{K}+\tilde{r}B(0,1)}\max_{s\in S}P_s\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x)>0. \tag{4.8}$$

Let $t_x > 0$ for $x \in \mathcal{K}$ be such that $z \in \operatorname{supp} P^*_{t_x}\delta_x$. By Feller property of $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ we may find for any $x \in \mathcal{K}$ a positive constant r_x such that

$$P^*_{t_x}\delta_y(B(z,\delta)) \geq P^*_{t_x}\delta_x(B(z,\delta))/2 \qquad \text{for } y \in B(x,r_x). \tag{4.9}$$

Since $\mathcal{K}$ is compact, we may choose $x_1,\ldots,x_p \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\mathcal{K} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^p B_i$, where $B_i = B(x_i, r_{x_i})$ for $i = 1,\ldots,p$. Choose $\tilde{r} > 0$ such that $\mathcal{K} + \tilde{r}B(0,1) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^p B_i$.

Step V: Fix a bounded, Borel subset $D \subset \mathcal{X}$, $z \in \bigcap_{y\in\mathcal{K}}\bigcup_{t\geq 0}\Gamma^t(y)$ and $\delta > 0$. Let a positive constant $\tilde{r}$ and a finite set S be such that (4.8) holds. Set

$$u := \inf_{x\in\mathcal{K}+\tilde{r}B(0,1))}\max_{s\in S} P_s\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x) > 0. \tag{4.10}$$

From Step III it follows that there exists $w > 0$ such that (4.5) holds for $r = \tilde{r}$.

Denote by $\# S$ the cardinality of S. We easily check that

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\sum_{q\in S}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_{q+s}\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x)\mathrm{d}s = \#S\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(x,B(z,\delta)), \qquad \forall\, x \in D. \tag{4.11}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{q\in S}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_{q+s}\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x)\mathrm{d}s &= \int_{\mathcal{X}}\sum_{q\in S}P_q\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(y)Q^T(x,\mathrm{d}y)\\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{K}+\tilde{r}B(0,1)}\sum_{q\in S}P_q\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(y)Q^T(x,\mathrm{d}y)\\ &\overset{(4.10)}{\geq} uQ^T(x,\mathcal{K}+\tilde{r}B(0,1)), \qquad \forall\, x \in D.\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Combining (4.5) with (4.12) we obtain

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty}\sum_{q\in S}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T P_{q+s}\mathbf{1}_{B(z,\delta)}(x)\mathrm{d}s > uw, \qquad \forall\, x \in D,$$

and finally, by (4.11),

$$\liminf_{T\uparrow\infty} Q^T(x,B(z,\delta)) > uw/\#S, \qquad \forall\, x \in D,$$

This shows that condition (2.8) is satisfied with $\alpha = uw/\#S$. $\square$

5. Ergodicity of the Lagrangian observation process

This section is a preparation for the proof of Theorem 4. Given an $r \geq 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{X}^r$ the Sobolev space which is the completion of

$$\left\{x \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)\colon\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} x(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi = 0, \quad \widehat{x}(k) \in \operatorname{Im}\mathcal{E}(k),\ \forall\, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d_*\right\}$$

with respect to the norm

$$\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{X}^r} := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*}|k|^{2r}|\widehat{x}(k)|^2,$$

where

$$\widehat{x}(k) := (2\pi)^{-d}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} x(\xi)e^{-i\xi\cdot k}\mathrm{d}\xi, \qquad k\in\mathbb{Z}^d,$$

are the Fourier coefficients of x. Note that $\mathcal{X}^u\subset\mathcal{X}^r$ if $u>r$.

Let A_r be an operator on $\mathcal{X}^r$ defined by

$$\widehat{A_r x}(k) := -\gamma(k)\widehat{x}(k), \qquad k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*, \tag{5.1}$$

with the domain

$$D(A_r) := \left\{ x\in\mathcal{X}^r\colon \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} |\gamma(k)|^2|k|^{2r}\left|\widehat{x}(k)\right|^2<\infty\right\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Since the operator is self-adjoint it generates a C_0-semigroup $(S_r(t))_{t\ge 0}$ on $\mathcal{X}^r$. Moreover, for $u>r$, A_u is the restriction of A_r and S_u is the restriction of S_r. From now on, we will omit the subscript r, when it causes no confusion, writing A and S instead of A_r and S_r.

Let Q be a symmetric positive-definite bounded linear operator on

$$\left\{ x\in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d,\mathrm{d}\xi;\mathbb{R}^d)\colon \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} x(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi = 0\right\}$$

given by

$$\widehat{Qx}(k) := \gamma(k)\mathcal{E}(k)\widehat{x}(k), \qquad k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*.$$

Let m be the constant appearing in (2.16) and let $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}^m$ and $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{X}^{m+1}$. Note that by Sobolev embedding, see e.g. Theorem 7.10, p. 155 of [11], $\mathcal{X}\hookrightarrow C^1(\mathbb{T}^d,\mathbb{R}^d)$, and hence there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\|x\|_{C^1(\mathbb{T}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \forall\, x\in\mathcal{X}. \tag{5.3}$$

For any $t>0$ operator $S(t)$ is bounded from any $\mathcal{X}^r$ to $\mathcal{X}^{r+1}$. Its respective norm can be easily estimated by

$$\|S(t)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^r,\mathcal{X}^{r+1})} \le \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} |k|\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma(k)t}.$$

Let $e_k(x) := \mathrm{e}^{ik\cdot x}$, $k\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. The Hilbert–Schmitd norm of the operator $S(t)Q^{1/2}$, see Appendix C of [3], is given by

$$\|S(t)Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})} := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\|S(t)Q^{1/2}e_k\|^2_{\mathcal{V}} = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d}|k|^{2(m+1)}\gamma(k)e^{-2\gamma(k)t}\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{E}(k).$$

Taking into account assumptions (2.16) and (2.17) we easily obtain.

Lemma 6. (*i*) *For each $t>0$ the operator $Q^{1/2}S(t)$ is Hilbert–Schmidt from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{V}$, and there is $\beta\in(0,1)$ such that*

$$\int_0^\infty t^{-\beta}\|S(t)Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\mathrm{d}t<\infty.$$

(ii) For any $r \geq 0$ and $t > 0$ the operator $S(t)$ is bounded from $\mathcal{X}^r$ into $\mathcal{X}^{r+1}$ and

$$\int_0^\infty \|S(t)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^r,\mathcal{X}^{r+1})}\mathrm{d}t < \infty.$$

Let $W = (W(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a cylindrical Wiener process in $\mathcal{X}$ defined on a filtered probability space $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$. By Lemma 6 (i) and Theorem 5.9 p. 127 of [3], for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there is a unique, continuous in t, $\mathcal{X}$-valued process V^x solving, in the mild sense, the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck equation

$$\mathrm{d}V^x(t) = AV^x(t)\mathrm{d}t + Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(t), \quad V^x(0) = x. \tag{5.4}$$

Moreover, (5.4) defines a Markov family on $\mathcal{X}$, see Section 9.2. of ibid., and the law $\mathcal{L}(V(0,\cdot))$ of $V(0,\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is its unique invariant measure, see Theorem 11.7 of [3]. Note that, since $m > d/2+1$, for any fixed t the realization of $V^x(t,\xi)$ is Lipschitz in the ξ-variable. If the filtered probability space $\mathfrak{A}$ is sufficiently rich; that is, if there exists an $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable random variable with law $\mathcal{L}(V(0,\cdot))$, then the stationary solution to (5.4) can be found as a stochastic process over $\mathfrak{A}$. Its law on the space of trajectories $C([0,\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$, coincides with the laws of $(V(t,\cdot))_{t\geq 0}$.

5.1. **An evolution equation describing the environment process.** Since the realizations of $V^x(t,\cdot)$ are Lipschitz in the spatial variable, equation (2.15), with $V^x(t,\xi)$ in place of $V(t,\xi)$, has a unique solution $\mathbf{x}_x(t)$, $t \geq 0$, for given initial data $\mathbf{x}_0$. In fact with no loss of generality we may and shall assume that $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$. In what follows we shall also denote by $\mathbf{x}$ the solution of (2.15) corresponding to the stationary right hand side V. Let $\mathcal{Z}(s,\xi) := V(s,\xi+\mathbf{x}(s))$ be *the Lagrangian observation of the environment process*, or shortly *the observation process*. It is known, see [9] and [17], that $\mathcal{Z}(s,\cdot)$ solves the equations

$$\mathrm{d}\mathcal{Z}(t) = \left[A\mathcal{Z}(t) + B(\mathcal{Z}(t),\mathcal{Z}(t))\right]\mathrm{d}t + Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}\tilde{W}(t), \qquad \mathcal{Z}(0,\cdot) = V(0,\mathbf{x}(0)+\cdot), \tag{5.5}$$

where $\tilde{W}$ is a certain cylindrical Wiener process on the original probability space $\mathfrak{A}$ and

$$B(\psi,\phi)(\xi) := \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \psi_j(0)\frac{\partial\phi_1}{\partial\xi_j}(\xi),\ldots,\sum_{j=1}^d \psi_j(0)\frac{\partial\phi_d}{\partial\xi_j}(\xi)\right), \quad \psi,\phi\in\mathcal{X},\ \xi\in\mathbb{T}^d. \tag{5.6}$$

By (5.3), $B(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a continuous bilinear form acting from $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}$ into $\mathcal{X}^{m-1}$.

For a given an $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable square integrable in $\mathcal{X}$ random variable Z_0 and a cylindrical Wiener process W in $\mathcal{X}$ consider the SPDE:

$$\mathrm{d}Z(t) = \left[AZ(t) + B(Z(t),Z(t))\right]\mathrm{d}t + Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(t), \qquad Z(0) = Z_0. \tag{5.7}$$

Taking into account Lemma 6(ii), the local existence and uniqueness of a mild solution follow by a standard Banach fixed point argument. For a different type of argument based on Euler approximation scheme see also Section 4.2 of [9]. The global existence follows as well, see the proof of the moment estimates in Section 5.1.2 below.

Given $x \in \mathcal{X}$ let $Z^x(t)$ denote the value at $t \geq 0$ of a solution to (5.7) satisfying $Z^x(0,\xi) = x(\xi)$, $\xi \in \mathbb{T}^d$. Since the existence of a solution follows from the Banach fixed point argument, $Z = (Z^x,\, x \in \mathcal{X})$ is a stochastically continuous Markov family and its transition semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is Feller, for details see e.g. [3] or [27]. Note that

$$P_t\psi(x) := \mathbb{E}\,\psi(V^x(t, \mathbf{x}_x(t) + \cdot)).$$

The following result on ergodicity for the observation process, besides of its independent interest, will be crucial for the proof of Theorem 4.

Theorem 5. *Under assumptions* (2.16) *and* (2.17) *the transition semigroup* $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ *for the family* $Z = (Z^x,\, x \in \mathcal{X})$ *is mean** *weak ergodic.*

To prove the theorem above we verify the hypotheses of Theorem 3.

5.1.1. *Existence of a global attractor.* Note that $Y^0(t) \equiv 0$ is the global attractor for the semi-dynamical system $Y = (Y^x,\, x \in \mathcal{X})$ defined by the deterministic problem

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}Y^x(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = AY^x(t) + B(Y^x(t), Y^x(t)), \qquad Y^x(0) = x. \tag{5.8}$$

Clearly, this guarantees the uniqueness of an invariant measure ν_* for the corresponding semi-dynamical system, see Definition 2.4. Our claim follows from the exponential stability of Y^0, namely:

$$\forall\, x \in \mathcal{X},\, t > 0, \qquad \|Y^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma_* t}\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \tag{5.9}$$

where

$$\gamma_* = \inf_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^d_*} \gamma(k) \tag{5.10}$$

is strictly positive by (2.17). Indeed, differentiating $\|Y^x(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}$ over t we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|Y^x(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} = 2\langle AY^x(t), Y^x(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{d} Y^x(t,0)\left\langle \frac{\partial Y^x(t)}{\partial \xi_j}, Y^x(t)\right\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

The last term on the right hand side vanishes, while the first one can be estimated from above by $-2\gamma_*\|Y^x(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}$. Combining these observations with Gronwall's inequality we obtain (5.9).

5.1.2. *Moment estimates.* Let $B(0,R)$ be the ball in $\mathcal{X}$ with center at 0 and radius R. We will show that for any $R > 0$ and any integer $n \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{x\in B(0,R)}\ \sup_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\,\|Z^x(t)\|^{2n}_{\mathcal{X}} < \infty. \tag{5.11}$$

Recall that V^x is the solution to (5.4) satisfying $V^x(0) = x$. Let $\mathbf{x}_x = (\mathbf{x}_x(t),\, t \geq 0)$ solve the problem

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_x}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = V^x(t, \mathbf{x}_x(t)), \qquad \mathbf{x}_x(0) = 0. \tag{5.12}$$

We obtain then

$$\|Z^x(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla^m V^x(t, \mathbf{x}_x(t) + \xi)|^2\, \mathrm{d}\xi = \|V^x(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}. \tag{5.13}$$

Since V^x is Gaussian there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\,\|V^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{2n} \leq C_1 \left(\mathbb{E}\,\|V^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\right)^n.$$

Hence there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for $\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\|V^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{2n} &\leq C_2\left(1+R^{2n}\right)\left(\int_0^t \|S(t-s)Q^{1/2}\|_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X})}^2 \mathrm{d}s\right)^n \\ &\leq C_2\left(1+R^{2n}\right)\left(\int_0^\infty \|S(s)Q^{1/2}\|_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X})}^2 \mathrm{d}s\right)^n.\end{aligned}$$

Note that there is a constant C_3 such that

$$\int_0^\infty \|S(s)Q^{1/2}\|_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X})}^2 \mathrm{d}s \leq C_3\,|||\mathcal{E}|||^2 < \infty,$$

where $|||\mathcal{E}|||^2$ appears in (2.16) and (5.11) indeed follows.

5.1.3. *Stochastic stability.* We wish to show the following estimate:

$$\forall\,\varepsilon,\ R,\ T > 0, \qquad \inf_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R} \mathbb{P}\left(\|Z^x(T) - Y^x(T)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \varepsilon\right) > 0. \tag{5.14}$$

Write $R^x(t) := Z^x(t) - Y^x(t)$. Let also $M = (M(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be the stochastic convolution process

$$M(t) := \int_0^t S(t-s)Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s), \quad t \geq 0. \tag{5.15}$$

It is a centered, Gaussian, random element in the Banach space $C([0,T],\mathcal{X})$ whose norm we denote by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. From (5.13), we have

$$\|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R + \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$$

and hence

$$\|Z^x\|_\infty \leq R + \|M\|_\infty. \tag{5.16}$$

From the mild formulations for (5.7) and (5.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}R^x(t) = S(t-t_0)R^x(t_0) &+ \int_{t_0}^t S(t-s)\left[B(R^x(s),Z^x(s)) + B(Y^x(s),R^x(s))\right]\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ M(t) - S(t-t_0)M(t_0),\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \geq \tilde{t} \geq 0$. Thus, by the fact that $\|S(s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X})} \leq 1$, and that B is a continuous bilinear form acting from $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}^{m-1}$ there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all

$t \geq \tilde{t} \geq 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|R^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq \|R^x(\tilde{t})\|_{\mathcal{X}} + C\int_{\tilde{t}}^t \|S(t-s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^{m-1},\mathcal{X})}\|R^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\left(\|Z^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \|Y^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\right)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\qquad + \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \|M(t_0)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\\
&\leq C\left(\|Z^x\|_\infty + \|Y^x\|_\infty\right)\int_{\tilde{t}}^t \|S(t-s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^{m-1},\mathcal{X})}\|R^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\qquad + \|R^x(\tilde{t})\|_{\mathcal{X}} + 2\|M\|_\infty\\
&\leq C\left(\|Z^x\|_\infty + \|Y^x\|_\infty\right)\sup_{s\in[\tilde{t},t]}\|R^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\int_0^{t-\tilde{t}} \|S(s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^{m-1},\mathcal{X})}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\qquad + \|R^x(\tilde{t})\|_{\mathcal{X}} + 2\|M\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking into account (5.16), we have therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|R^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq C\left(R + \|M\|_\infty + \|Y^x\|_\infty\right)\sup_{s\in[\tilde{t},t]}\|R^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\int_0^{t-\tilde{t}} \|S(s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^{m-1},\mathcal{X})}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\qquad + \|R^x(\tilde{t})\|_{\mathcal{X}} + 2\|M\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
N(u) = \inf\left\{ l\in\mathbb{N}\colon \int_0^{T/l} \|S(s)\|_{L(\mathcal{X}^{m-1},\mathcal{X})}\mathrm{d}s \leq \left[2C\left(R + u + \|Y^x\|_\infty\right)\right]^{-1}\right\}.
$$

Note that $N\colon [0,\infty)\to\mathbb{N}$ is continuous, and if

$$
t_i = i\frac{T}{N(\|M\|_\infty)}, \qquad i = 1,\ldots,N(\|M\|_\infty),
$$

then

$$
\sup_{t\in[t_i,t_{i+1}]}\|R^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 4\|M\|_\infty + 2\|R^x(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \qquad i>0,
$$

and, taking into account that $R^x(0)=0$,

$$
\sup_{t\in[0,t_1]}\|R^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 4\|M\|_\infty.
$$

Therefore

$$
\|R^x(T)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 4\,\|M\|_\infty \sum_{j=0}^{N(\|M\|_\infty)-1} 2^j \leq 4\,\|M\|_\infty 2^{N(\|M\|_\infty)}. \tag{5.17}
$$

Now let $\delta>0$ be chosen so that $\delta 2^{N(\delta+2)} < \varepsilon$. The fact that M is a centered, Gaussian, random element in the Banach space $C([0,T],\mathcal{X})$ implies that its topological support is a closed linear subspace, see e.g. [33], Theorem 1, p. 61. Thus, in particular 0 belongs to the support of its law and

$$
\forall\,\delta>0\colon\quad q := \mathbb{P}\left(\|M\|_\infty < \delta\right) > 0. \tag{5.18}
$$

Using (5.17) and (5.18) we conclude therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\|R^x(T)\|_{\mathcal{X}} < \varepsilon) \geq q, \qquad \forall\, x \in B(0,R),$$

and (5.14) follows.

5.1.4. *E-property of the transition semigroup.* It suffices only to show that for any $\psi \in C_b^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $R > 0$ there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\sup_{t\geq 0} \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R} \|DP_t\psi(x)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq C\|\psi\|_{C_b^1(\mathcal{X})}. \tag{5.19}$$

Here $D\phi$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of a given function $\phi \in C_b^1(\mathcal{X})$. Indeed, let $\rho_n \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be supported in the ball of radius $1/n$, centered at 0 and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_n(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi = 1$. Suppose that (e_n) is an orthonormal base in $\mathcal{X}$ and Q_n is the orthonormal projection onto $\mathrm{span}\{e_1,\ldots,e_n\}$. Define

$$\psi_n(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_n(Q_nx-\xi)\psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i e_i\right)\mathrm{d}\xi, \quad x\in\mathcal{X}.$$

One can deduce (see part 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.2, pp. 164–165 in [26]) that for any $\psi \in \mathrm{Lip}\,(\mathcal{X})$ the sequence (ψ_n) satisfies $(\psi_n) \subset C_b^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\psi_n(x) = \psi(x)$ pointwise. In addition $\|\psi_n\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\sup_z \|D\psi_n(z)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \mathrm{Lip}(\psi)$. Let $R > 0$ be arbitrary and $x, y \in B(0,R)$. We can write

$$|P_t\psi(x) - P_t\psi(y)| = \lim_{n\to\infty} |P_t\psi_n(x) - P_t\psi_n(y)| \leq \sup_{\|z\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R} \|DP_t\psi_n(z)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\|x-y\|_{\mathcal{X}}$$

$$\stackrel{(5.19)}{\leq} C\|\psi_n\|_{C_b^1(\mathcal{X})}\|x-y\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq C[\|\psi\|_\infty + \mathrm{Lip}(\psi)]\|x-y\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

This shows equicontinuity of $(P_t\psi)_{t\geq 0}$ for an arbitrary Lipschitz function ψ in the neighborhood of any x and the e-property follows.

To prove (5.19) we adopt the method from [13]. First note that $DP_t\psi(x)[v]$, the value of $DP_t\psi(x)$ at $v \in \mathcal{X}$, is equal to $\mathbb{E}\,\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[U(t)]\}$ where $U(t) := \partial Z^x(t)[v]$ and

$$\partial Z^x(t)[v] := \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left(Z^{x+\varepsilon v}(t) - Z^x(t)\right),$$

the limit is in $L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P};\mathcal{X})$. The process $U = (U(t),\, t\geq 0)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies the linear evolution equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}U(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= AU(t) + B(Z^x(t),U(t)) + B(U(t),Z^x(t)),\\ U(0) &= v. \end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Suppose that H is a certain Hilbert space and $\Phi\colon \mathcal{X} \to H$ a Borel measurable function. Given an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-adapted process $g\colon [0,\infty)\times\Omega \to \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \|g_s\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}\mathrm{d}s < \infty$ for each $t \geq 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{D}_g\Phi(Z^x(t))$ the Malliavin derivative of $\Phi(Z^x(t))$ in the direction of g; that is the $L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P};H)$-limit, if exists, of

$$\mathcal{D}_g\Phi(Z^x(t)) := \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\left[\Phi(Z^x_{\varepsilon g}(t)) - \Phi(Z^x(t))\right],$$

where $Z_g^x(t)$, $t\ge 0$, solves the equation

$$\mathrm{d}Z_g^x(t)=\left[AZ_g^x(t)+B(Z_g^x(t),Z_g^x(t))\right]\mathrm{d}t+Q^{1/2}\left(\mathrm{d}W(t)+g_t\mathrm{d}t\right),\qquad Z_g^x(0)=x.$$

In particular, one can easily show that when $H=\mathcal{X}$ and $\Phi=I$, where I is the identity operator, the Malliavin derivative of $Z^x(t)$ exists and the process $D(t):=\mathcal{D}_gZ^x(t)$, $t\ge 0$, solves the linear equation

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\mathrm{d}D}{\mathrm{d}t}(t)=AD(t)+B(Z^x(t),D(t))+B(D(t),Z^x(t))+Q^{1/2}g(t),\\ &D(0)=0.\end{aligned}\tag{5.21}$$

The following two facts about the Malliavin derivative shall be crucial for us in the sequel. Directly from the definition of the Malliavin derivative we conclude *the chain rule:* suppose that $\Phi\in C_b^1(\mathcal{X};H)$ then

$$\mathcal{D}_g\Phi(Z^x(t))=D\Phi(Z^x(t))[D(t)].\tag{5.22}$$

In addition, the *integration by parts formula* holds, see Lemma 1.2.1, p. 25 of [25]. Suppose that $\Phi\in C_b^1(\mathcal{X})$ then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}_g\Phi(Z^x(t))]=\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(Z^x(t))\int_0^t\langle g(s),Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}\right].\tag{5.23}$$

We also have the following.

Proposition 2. *For any given $v,x\in\mathcal{X}$: $\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le 1$, $\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le R$ one can find an $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-adapted $\mathcal{X}$-valued process $g_t=g_t(v,x)$ that satisfies*

$$\sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le R}\int_0^\infty\mathbb{E}\,\|Q^{1/2}g_s\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\mathrm{d}s<\infty,\tag{5.24}$$

$$\sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le R}\ \sup_{t\ge 0}\mathbb{E}\,\|DZ^x(t)[v]-\mathcal{D}_gZ^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}<\infty.\tag{5.25}$$

We prove this proposition shortly. First, however let us demonstrate now how to use it to finish the argument for the e-property. Let $\omega_t(x):=\mathcal{D}_gZ^x(t)$ and $\rho_t(v,x):=DZ^x(t)[v]-\mathcal{D}_gZ^x(t)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}DP_t\psi(x)[v]&=\mathbb{E}\left\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[\omega_t(x)]\right\}+\mathbb{E}\left\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[\rho_t(v,x)]\right\}\\ &=\mathbb{E}\left\{\mathcal{D}_g\psi(Z^x(t))\right\}+\mathbb{E}\left\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[\rho_t(v,x)]\right\}\\ &\overset{(5.23)}{=}\mathbb{E}\left\{\psi(Z^\xi(t))\int_0^t\langle g(s),Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}\right\}+\mathbb{E}\left\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[\rho_t(v,x)]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left\{\psi(Z^x(t))\int_0^t\langle g(s),Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}\right\}\right|\le\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}\left(\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty\|Q^{1/2}g(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\mathrm{d}s\right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$|\mathbb{E}\,\{D\psi(Z^x(t))[\rho_t(v,x)]\}| \le \|\psi\|_{C_b^1(\mathcal{X})}\mathbb{E}\,\|\rho_t(v,x)\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Hence, by (5.24) and (5.25), we conclude the desired estimate (5.19) with

$$C = \left(\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty \|Q^{1/2}g(s)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\mathrm{d}s\right)^{1/2} + \sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le R}\ \sup_{t\ge 0}\mathbb{E}\,\|DZ^x(t)[v]-\mathcal{D}_g Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

Therefore the e-process property will be shown if we could prove Proposition 2.

5.1.5. *Proof of Proposition 2.* Let us denote by $\Pi_{\ge N}$ the orthogonal projection onto span $\left\{z\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k\xi}\colon |k|\ge N,\ z\in \operatorname{Im}\mathcal{E}(k)\right\}$ and let $\Pi_{<N} := I-\Pi_{\ge N} = \Pi_{\ge N}^{\perp}$. Write

$$A_N := \Pi_{\ge N}A,\quad Q_N := \Pi_{\ge N}Q,\quad A_N^{\perp} := \Pi_{<N}A,\quad Q_N^{\perp} := \Pi_{<N}Q.$$

Given an integer N, let $\zeta^N(v,x)(t)$ be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\zeta^N}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) &= A_N\zeta^N(t) + \Pi_{\ge N}\left(B(Z^x(t),\zeta^N(t)) + B(\zeta^N(t),Z^x(t))\right)\\ &\qquad -\frac{1}{2}\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(t)\|\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1},\\ \zeta^N(0) &= v.\end{aligned}\tag{5.26}$$

We adopt the convention that

$$\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N\|\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1} := 0 \qquad \text{if}\quad \Pi_{<N}\zeta^N = 0.\tag{5.27}$$

Let

$$g := Q^{-1/2}f,\tag{5.28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}f(t) &:= A_N^{\perp}\zeta^N(v,x)(t) + \Pi_{<N}\left[B(Z^x(t),\zeta^N(v,x)(t)) + B(\zeta^N(v,x)(t),Z^x(t))\right]\\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1}\end{aligned}\tag{5.29}$$

and N will be specified later. Note that f takes values in a finite dimensional spaces, where Q is invertible by the definition of the space $\mathcal{X}$. Recall $\rho_t(v,x) := DZ^x(t)[v]-\mathcal{D}_gZ^x(t)$. We have divided the proof into a sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 7. *We have*

$$\rho_t(v,x) = \zeta^N(v,x)(t), \qquad \forall\, t\ge 0.\tag{5.30}$$

Proof. Adding $f(t)$ to both sides of (5.26) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\zeta^N(v,x)}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) + f(t) &= A\zeta^N(v,x)(t) + B(Z^x(t),\zeta^N(v,x)(t))\\ &\qquad + B(\zeta^N(v,x)(t),Z^x(t)),\\ \zeta^N(v,x)(0) &= v.\end{aligned}\tag{5.31}$$

Recall that $DZ^x(t)[v]$ and $\mathcal{D}_g Z^x(t)$ obey equations (5.20) and (5.21), respectively. Hence $\rho_t := \rho_t(v,x)$ satisfies

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = A\rho_t + B(Z^x(t),\rho_t) + B(\rho_t, Z^x(t)) - Q^{1/2}g(t),$$
$$\rho_0 = v.$$

Since, $f(t) = Q^{1/2}g_t$ we conclude that ρ_t and $\zeta^N(v,x)(t)$ solve the same linear evolution equation with the same initial value. Thus the assertion of the lemma follows. □

Lemma 8. *For each $N \geq 1$ we have $\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 2$.*

Proof. Applying $\Pi_{<N}$ to both sides of (5.26) we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\|\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^{-1}\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t),$$
$$\zeta^N(v,x)(0) = v. \tag{5.32}$$

Multiplying both sides of (5.32) by $\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)$ we obtain that $z(t) := \|\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2$ satisfies

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{z(t)}. \tag{5.33}$$

Since $\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 1$, $z(0) \in (0,1]$ and the desired conclusion holds from elementary properties of the solution of ordinary differential equation (5.33). □

Lemma 9. *For any $R > 0$ the following hold:*
(i) For any N,

$$\sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R}\ \sup_{t\in[0,2]} \mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4 < \infty. \tag{5.34}$$

(ii) There exists an $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R} \int_0^\infty \left(\mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4\right)^{1/2} \mathrm{d}t < \infty \tag{5.35}$$

and

$$\sup_{\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq 1}\ \sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\leq R}\ \sup_{t\geq 0} \mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4 < \infty. \tag{5.36}$$

Since the proof of the lemma is quite lengthy and technical we postpone its presentation till the next section. We can now finish however the proof of Proposition 2.

First of all assume that f is given by (5.29) with an arbitrary $N \geq N_0$, where N_0 appears in the formulation of Lemma 9. By Lemma 7, $\rho_t(v,x) = \zeta^N(v,x)(t)$. Of course (5.36) implies (5.25). We show (5.24). As a consequence of Lemma 8 we have $\Pi_N\zeta^N(v,x)(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 2$. The definition of the form $B(\cdot,\cdot)$, see (5.6), and the fact that the partial derivatives commute with the projection operator $\Pi_{<N}$ together imply that

$$\Pi_{<N}\, B(Z^x(t), \zeta^N(v,x)(t)) = B(Z^x(t), \Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)).$$

As a consequence of Lemma 8 and convention (5.27) we conclude from (5.29) that

$$f(t) = \Pi_{<N} B(\zeta^N(v,x)(t), Z^x(t)) = B(\zeta^N(v,x)(t), \Pi_{<N} Z^x(t)), \qquad \forall\, t \geq 2.$$

By (5.3), for $t \geq 2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq C\, \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|\Pi_{<N} Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}^{m+1}} \\ &\leq CN\, \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|\Pi_{<N} Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \\ &\leq CN\, \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \int_2^\infty \|Q^{1/2} g_t(v,x)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \mathrm{d}t &= \mathbb{E} \int_2^\infty \|f(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq C^2 N^2 \sup_{t\geq 2} \left(\mathbb{E}\, \|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4\right)^{1/2} \int_2^\infty \left(\mathbb{E}\, \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^4\right)^{1/2} \mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (5.11) and (5.35), we obtain

$$\sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R, \|v\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \int_2^\infty \|Q^{1/2} g_t(v,x)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \mathrm{d}t < \infty.$$

Clearly, by Lemma 9(i), and (5.11),

$$\sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R, \|v\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^2 \|Q^{1/2} g_t(v,x)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \mathrm{d}t < \infty,$$

and the proof of (5.24) is completed.

5.1.6. *Proof of Lemma* 9. Recall that, for any r, A is a self-adjoint operator when considered on the space $\mathcal{X}^r$, and that

$$\langle A\psi, \psi\rangle_{\mathcal{X}^r} \leq -\gamma_* \|\psi\|_{\mathcal{X}^r}^2, \qquad \psi \in D(A), \tag{5.37}$$

where $\gamma_* > 0$ was defined in (5.10). Recall that V^x is the solution to the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck equation (5.4) starting from x and that $\mathbf{x}_x$ is the respective solution to (5.12). The laws of the processes $(Z^x(t))_{t\geq 0}$ and $(V^x(t, \cdot + \mathbf{x}_x(t)))_{t\geq 0}$ are the same. Thanks to this and the fact that $\|V^x(t, \cdot + \mathbf{x}_x(t))\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \|V^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ we obtain that for each $N \geq 1$ and $r \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}\left((\|\Pi_{\geq N} V^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}^r})_{t\geq 0} \right) = \mathcal{L}\left((\|\Pi_{\geq N} Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}^r})_{t\geq 0} \right), \tag{5.38}$$

where, as we recall, $\mathcal{L}$ stands for the law of the respective process.

In order to show the first part of the lemma note that from (5.26), upon scalar multiplication (in $\mathcal{X}$) of both sides by $\zeta^N(v,x)(t)$ and use of (5.37),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\leq -\gamma_* \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \\ &\quad + |\zeta^N(v,x)(t,0)| \|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}} + \frac{1}{2} \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, as we recall, $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{X}^{m+1}$. Taking into account (5.3) and the rough estimate $a/2 \le 1 + a^2$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \le (1-\gamma_*)\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\,\|Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}} + 1.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality and (5.38) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\le \left(\|v\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + t\right)\exp\left\{2(1-\gamma_*)t + 2C\int_0^t \|Z^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s\right\}\\ &\le (1+t)\exp\left\{2(1-\gamma_*)t + C\int_0^t \|V^x(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s\right\}\\ &\le (1+t)\exp\left\{2(1-\gamma_*)t + C\int_0^t \left(\|S(s)x\|_{\mathcal{V}} + \|M(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right)\mathrm{d}s\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $M = V^0$ is given by (5.15). By Lemma 6(ii),

$$\sup_{\|x\|_{\mathcal{X}}\le 1}\int_0^\infty \|S(s)x\|_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

Thus the proof of the first part of the lemma will be completed as soon as we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}\,\exp\left\{C\int_0^2 \|M(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s\right\} < \infty. \tag{5.39}$$

By Lemma 6, M is a Gaussian element in $C([0,2],\mathcal{V})$. Therefore (5.39) is a direct consequence of the Fernique theorem (see e.g. [3]).

To prove the second part of the lemma observe first that for any $N \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle \Pi_{\ge N} B(Z^x(t), \zeta^N(v,x)(t)), \zeta^N(v,x)(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}\\ &= \langle B(Z^x(t), \Pi_{\ge N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)), \Pi_{\ge N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\rangle_{\mathcal{X}}\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides of (5.26) by $\zeta^N(v,x)(t)$ and remembering that $\Pi_{<N}\zeta^N(v,x)(t) = 0$ for $t \ge 2$ we obtain that for those times

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 &\le -\gamma_*\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + |\zeta^N(v,x)(t,0)|\|\Pi_{\ge N}Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}\\ &\overset{(5.3)}{\le} -\gamma_*\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C\|\Pi_{\ge N}Z^x(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2\\ &\le -\gamma_*\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + C\left(\|\Pi_{\ge N}S(t)x\|_{\mathcal{V}}^2 + \|\Pi_{\ge N}Z^0(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right)\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$h(z) = \frac{z^2}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_*^{-1}|z|^2}}, \qquad z \ge 0.$$

Note that there is a constant $\tilde{C}$ such that

$$Cz\zeta^2 \leq \frac{\gamma_*}{2}\zeta^2 + \frac{\tilde{C}}{4}\, h(z)\zeta^2, \qquad z \geq 0,\ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore

$$C\|\Pi_{\geq N} Z^0(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \frac{\gamma_*}{2}\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} + \frac{\tilde{C}}{4}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} h(\|\Pi_{\geq N} Z^0(t)\|_{\mathcal{V}}).$$

Using Gronwall's inequality we obtain for $t \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}}\\ &\leq \|\zeta^N(v,x)(2)\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} \exp\left\{-\gamma_*(t-2) + L\,\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} + \frac{\tilde{C}}{2}\int_2^t h\left(\|\Pi_{\geq N} Z^0(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right) \mathrm{d}s\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

where $L := 2C\int_2^\infty \|S(t)\|_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\mathrm{d}t$. We have therefore, by virtue of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(t)\|^4_{\mathcal{X}}\\ &\quad\leq \mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(2)\|^4_{\mathcal{X}}\mathbb{E}\,\exp\left\{-2\gamma_*(t-2) + 2L\,\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{X}} + \tilde{C}\int_2^t h\left(\|\Pi_{\geq N} Z^0(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right) \mathrm{d}s\right\}\\ &\quad\overset{(5.38)}{=} \mathbb{E}\,\|\zeta^N(v,x)(2)\|^4_{\mathcal{X}}\mathbb{E}\,\exp\left\{-2\gamma_*(t-2) + 2L\,\|x\|^2_{\mathcal{V}} + \tilde{C}\int_2^t h\left(\|\Pi_{\geq N} M(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right) \mathrm{d}s\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where M is given by (5.15). Write

$$\Psi_N(t) := \exp\left\{\tilde{C}\int_0^t h\left(\|\Pi_{\geq N} M(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right) \mathrm{d}s\right\}.$$

The proof of part (ii) of the lemma will be completed as soon as we can show that there is an N_0 such that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\, \mathrm{e}^{-4\gamma_*(t-2)}\mathbb{E}\,\Psi_N(t) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_2^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-2\gamma_* t}\left(\mathbb{E}\,\Psi_N(t)\right)^{1/2}\mathrm{d}t < \infty.$$

To do this it is enough to show that

$$\forall\,\kappa > 0,\ \exists\, N(\kappa) \geq 1: \qquad \sup_{t\geq 0} \mathrm{e}^{-\kappa t}\,\mathbb{E}\,\Psi_N(t) < \infty, \qquad \forall\, N \geq N(\kappa). \tag{5.40}$$

To do this note that for any $N_1 > N$, $M_{N,N_1}(t) := \Pi_{<N_1}\Pi_{\geq N} M(t)$ is a strong solution to the equation

$$\mathrm{d}M_{N,N_1}(t) = A_N M_{N,N_1}(t)\mathrm{d}t + \Pi_{<M}\Pi_{\geq N} Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(t).$$

Therefore we can use the Itô formula to $M_{N,N_1}(t)$ and function

$$H(x) = \left(1 + \|(-A_N)^{-1/2}x\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{1/2}.$$

As a result we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(t)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{1/2}\\
&=1-\int_0^t \|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad+\frac12\int_0^t \|H''((-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s))\Pi_{<N_1}\Pi_{\ge N}Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad+\int_0^t \left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}\left\langle(-A_N)^{-1}M_{N,N_1}(s),\Pi_{<N_1}\Pi_{\ge N}Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s)\right\rangle_{\mathcal{V}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account spectral gap property of A we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}\\
&\ge \|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\left(1+\gamma_*^{-1}\|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}=h\left(\|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\tilde C\int_0^t h\left(\|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right)\mathrm{d}s\le \tilde C+\mathcal{M}_{N,N_1}(t)+\mathcal{R}_{N,N_1}(t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{N,N_1}(t)&=\tilde C\int_0^t\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}\\
&\times\left\langle(-A_N)^{-1}M_{N,N_1}(s),\Pi_{<N_1}\Pi_{\ge N}Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(s)\right\rangle_{\mathcal{V}}\\
&-\frac{\tilde C^2}{2}\int_0^t(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1}\|Q^{1/2}(-A_N)^{-1}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{N,N_1}(t)&=\frac{\tilde C}{2}\int_0^t\|H''((-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s))\Pi_{<N_1}\Pi_{\ge N}Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad+\frac{\tilde C^2}{2}\int_0^t(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}})^{-1}\|Q^{1/2}(-A_N)^{-1}M_{N,N_1}(s)\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
H''(x)&=\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}x\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-1/2}(-A_N)^{-1}\\
&\quad-\left(1+\|(-A_N)^{-1/2}x\|^2_{\mathcal{V}}\right)^{-3/2}(-A_N)^{-1}x\otimes(-A_N)^{-1}x,
\end{aligned}$$

there is a constant C_1 such that for all N, N_1, and t,

$$\mathcal{R}_{N,N_1}(t)\le tC_1\left(\|(-A_N)^{-1}\|^4_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\|Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}+\|(-A_N)^{-1}Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\right)$$

for all $N_1>N$. Let $\kappa>0$. We can choose sufficiently large N_0 so that for $N\ge N_0$,

$$C_1\left(\|(-A_N)^{-1}\|^4_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\|Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}+\|(-A_N)^{-1}Q^{1/2}\|^2_{L_{(HS)}(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{V})}\right)\le\kappa.$$

Since $(\exp\{\mathcal{M}_{N_0,N_1}(t)\})$ is a martingale we have shown therefore that for $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \exp\left\{h\left(\|M_{N,N_1}(s)\|_{\mathcal{V}}\right)\mathrm{d}s\right\} \leq \exp\left\{\tilde{C} + \kappa t\right\}.$$

Letting $N_1 \to \infty$ we obtain (5.40).

6. Proof of Theorem 4

With no loss of generality we shall assume that the initial position of the tracer $\mathbf{x}_0 = 0$. By definition

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \int_0^t V(s, \mathbf{x}(s))\mathrm{d}s = \int_0^t \mathcal{Z}(s, 0)\mathrm{d}s,$$

where $\mathcal{Z}(t, x) = V(t, \mathbf{x}(t) + x)$ is the observation process. Recall that $\mathcal{Z}(t)$ is a stationary solution to (5.5). Obviously uniqueness and the law of a stationary solution do not depend on the particular choice of the Wiener process. Therefore

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}(t)}{t}\right) = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \tilde{Z}(s, 0)\mathrm{d}s\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}}{\mathrm{d}t}(t)\right) = \mathcal{L}\left(\tilde{Z}(t, 0)\right),$$

where as before $\mathcal{L}(X)$ stands for the law of a random element X, and $\tilde{Z}$ is by Theorem 5, a unique (in law) stationary solution of the equation

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{Z}(t) = \left[A\tilde{Z}(t) + B(\tilde{Z}(t), \tilde{Z}(t))\right]\mathrm{d}t + Q^{1/2}\mathrm{d}W(t).$$

Let $F\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by $F(x) = x(0)$. The proof of the first part of the theorem will be completed as soon as we can show that the limit (in probability)

$$\mathbb{P}\text{–}\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \tilde{Z}(s, 0)\mathrm{d}s$$

exists and is equal to $\int_{\mathcal{X}} F(x)\mu_*(\mathrm{d}x)$, where μ_* is the unique invariant measure for the Markov family Z defined by (5.7). Since the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfies the e-property and is weak$*$ mean ergodic, part 2) of Theorem 2 implies that for any bounded Lipschitz continuous function ψ,

$$\mathbb{P}\text{–}\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \psi(\tilde{Z}(s))\mathrm{d}s = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \psi(x)\mu_*(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Since $\mathcal{X}$ is embedded into the space of bounded continuous functions, F is Lipschitz. Then the theorem follows by an easy truncation argument.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to express their gratitude to an anonymous referee for thorough reading of the manuscript and valuable remarks. We also would like to express our thanks to Z. Brzeźniak for many enlightening discussions on the subject of the article.

References

[1] Bass, R., *Probability Techniques in Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1995.

[2] Billingsley, P., *Convergence of Probability Measures*, 2-nd ed. Wiley & Sons, New York 1999.

[3] Da Prato, G. and Zabczyk, J., *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.

[4] Da Prato, G. and Zabczyk, J., *Ergodicity for Infinite Dimensional Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996.

[5] Doeblin, W., *Éléments d'une théorie générale des chaines simples constantes de Markov*, Ann. Ecole Norm. **57** (1940), 61–111.

[6] E, W. and Mattingly, J. C., *Ergodicity for the Navier-Stokes equation with degenerate random forcing: finite-dimensional approximation,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54** (2001), 1386–1402.

[7] Eckmann, J.-P. and Hairer, M., *Uniqueness of the invariant measure for a stochastic PDE driven by degenerate noise*, Comm. Math. Phys. **219** (2001), 523–565.

[8] Fannjiang, A. and Komorowski, T., *Turbulent diffusion in Markovian flows*, Ann. Appl. Prob. **9** (1999), 591–610.

[9] Fannjiang, A., Komorowski, T., and Peszat, S., *Lagrangian dynamics for a passive tracer in a class of Gaussian Markovian flows*, Stoch. Proc. Appl. **97** (2002), 171–198.

[10] Furstenberg, H., *Strict ergodicity and transformation of the torus*, Amer. J. Math. **83** (1961), 573–601.

[11] Gilbarg, D. and Trudinger N. S., *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1983.

[12] Hairer, M., *Exponential mixing properties of stochastic PDEs through asymptotic coupling*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **124** (2002), 345–380.

[13] Hairer, M. and Mattingly, J., *Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing*, Ann. of Math. **164** (2006), 993–1032.

[14] Hairer, M. and Mattingly, J., *Spectral gaps in Wasserstein distances and the 2D stochastic Navier–Stokes equations*, Ann. Probab. **36** (2008), 2050–2091.

[15] Ikeda, N. and Watanabe, S., *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, North-Holland, Groningen, Amsterdam 1981.

[16] Janson, S., *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. Vol. 129, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997.

[17] Komorowski, T. and Peszat, S., *Transport of a passive tracer by an irregular velocity field*, J. Statist. Phys. **115** (2004), 1383–1410.

[18] Kuksin, S and Shirikyan, A., *Ergodicity for the randomly forced 2D Navier-Stokes equations*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **4** (2001), 147–195.

[19] Lasota, A. and Mackey, M., *Probabilistic Properties of Deterministic Systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1985.

[20] Lasota, A. and Szarek, T., *Lower bound technique in the theory of a stochastric differential equation*, J. Differential Equations **231** (2006), 513–533.

[21] Lasota, A. and Yorke, J. A., *On the existence of invariant measures for piecewise monotonic transformations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **186** (1973), 481–488.

[22] Lasota, A. and Yorke, J. A., *Lower bound technique for Markov operators and iterated function systems*, Random Comput. Dynam. **2** (1994), 41–77.

[23] Mattingly, J. C., *Exponential convergence for the stochastically forced Navier–Stokes equations and other partially dissipative dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **230** (2002), 421–462.

[24] Meyn, S.P. and Tweedie, R. L., *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1993.

[25] Nualart, D., *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1995.

[26] Peszat, S. and Zabczyk, J., *Strong Feller property and irreducibility for diffusions on Hilbert spaces*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), 157–172.

[27] Peszat, S. and Zabczyk, J., *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations with Lévy Noise (an Evolution Equation Approach)*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007.

[28] Pollard, D., *Convergence of Stochastic Processes*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York 1984.

[29] Port, S. C. and Stone, C., *Random measures and their application to motion in an incompressible fluid*, J. Appl. Prob. **13** (1976), 499–506.

[30] Szarek, T., *Feller processes on nonlocally spaces*, Ann. Probab. **34** (2006), 1849–1863.

[31] Szarek, T., *The uniqueness of invariant measures for Markov operators*, Studia Math. **189** (2008), 225–233.

[32] Szarek, T., Ślęczka M., and Urbański M., *On stability of velocity vectors for some passive tracer models*, submitted for publication.

[33] Vakhania, N. V., *The topological support of Gaussian measure in Banach space*, Nagoya Math. J. **57** (1975), 59–63.

[34] Zaharopol, R., *Invariant Probabilities of Markov-Feller Operators and their Supports*, Birkhäuser, Basel 2005.

Institute of Mathematics, UMCS, Pl. M. Curie-Skłodowskiej 1, 20-031 Lublin, Poland, and, Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Śniadeckich, 8, 00-956, Warsaw, Poland

E-mail address: komorow@hektor.umcs.edu.pl

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Św. Tomasza 30/7, 31-027 Kraków, Poland

E-mail address: napeszat@cyf-kr.edu.pl

Institute of Mathematics, University of Gdańsk, Wita Stwosza 57, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland

E-mail address: szarek@intertele.pl