

(Deterministic) well-posedness theory

We consider the Benjamin-Bona-Mahony equation (BBM) on the torus \mathbb{T} :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \partial_{xxt} u + \partial_x u + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (u^2) = 0 \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0. \end{cases} \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+,$$

By factoring the time derivative, we write BBM as

$$\partial_t u + \varphi(\partial_x) u = -\frac{1}{2} \varphi(\partial_x) (u^2),$$

where $\varphi(\partial_x) := (1 - \partial_x^2)^{-1} \partial_x$, which yields the integral form:

$$u(t) = \underbrace{e^{t\varphi(\partial_x)} u_0}_{(\text{linear evolution})=: S(t)u_0} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t e^{(t-t')\varphi(\partial_x)} \varphi(\partial_x) (u^2(t')) dt'.$$

Well-posedness:

• Bona-Tzvetkov '07, Roumégoux '10: BBM is globally well-posed (GWP) in $H^s(\mathbb{T})$, for any $s \geq 0$

Ill-posedness:

• Panthee '11, Bona-Dai '16: BBM is ill-posed below $L^2(\mathbb{T})$, since the solution map

$$\Phi : u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T}) \mapsto u \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T})) \text{ for } s < 0,$$

experiences *norm-inflation at zero* ($u_0 = 0$, see Theorem 1)

▷ We extended this to norm inflation at *every* initial condition.

Theorem 1: Norm inflation at general initial data

Let $s < 0$ and $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a solution u_ε to BBM and $t_\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\|u_\varepsilon(0) - u_0\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T})} > \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

▷ Theorem 1 implies Φ is *discontinuous everywhere* in negative Sobolev spaces.

Almost sure well-posedness theory

Q: Does (a form of) well-posedness persist below $L^2(\mathbb{T})$?

Yes, if we consider randomised initial data:

$$u_0^\omega(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_n(\omega)}{\sqrt{1 + |n|^{2\alpha}}} e^{inx}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\{g_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of independent standard complex-valued Gaussian random variables such that $g_{-n} = \overline{g_n}$ and g_0 is real.

Regularity: $u_0^\omega \in H^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}) \setminus H^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, a.s.

▷ **Difficulty:** we consider $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ so that $u_0^\omega \notin L^2(\mathbb{T})$ almost surely

On the nonlinearity below L^2 :

We interpret the nonlinearity $\varphi(\partial_x)(u^2)$ via the frequency side as:

$$N(u) = \sum_{n \neq 0} i\varphi(n) e^{inx} \sum_{n=n_1+n_2} \widehat{u}(n_1) \widehat{u}(n_2) = \varphi(\partial_x) \left(u^2 - \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^2 dx \right)$$

- When $u \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$, $N(u) = \varphi(\partial_x)(u^2)$
- Quadratic derivative nonlinearity \implies no renormalisation (e.g. stochastic Burgers equation)

Why u_0^ω as initial data?

The random Fourier series u_0^ω is a typical element in the support of Gaussian measures μ_α on periodic distributions on \mathbb{T} :

$$d\mu_\alpha = Z_\alpha^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{T})}^2\right) du.$$

▷ **Q:** What are the transport properties of μ_α under the BBM flow?

BBM conserves the energy:

$$E(u(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \|u(t)\|_{H^1}^2 = E(u(0)).$$

Hence, BBM has a naturally associated Gibbs measure: $d\mu_1 = Z_1^{-1} \exp(-E(u)) du$.

- de Suzzoni '14: μ_1 is *invariant* under the BBM flow
- Tzvetkov '15: the pushforward measure $\Phi(t)_\# \mu_\alpha$ is *quasi-invariant* (mutually absolutely continuous) with respect to $\mu_\alpha = \Phi(0)_\# \mu_\alpha$ for integers $\alpha \geq 2$
- \implies solutions with data in $\text{supp } \mu_\alpha$ enjoy additional $W^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{T})$ -integrability (beyond deterministic methods)

Theorem 2: Almost sure local existence

Let $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$. Then, BBM is **almost surely locally well-posed** with respect to the random initial data u_0^ω .

Ideas of Theorem 2:

We construct solutions which have the form:

$$u = z + v,$$

where $z(t) := S(t)u_0^\omega$ is the random linear solution and we solve a fixed point argument for the 'residual part' v .

Key: v is almost surely smoother than z ,

$v \in C([0, T]; H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}))$ for $\sigma < 2\alpha$, because:

(i) randomisation leads to improved integrability: $z \in C([0, T]; W^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon, \infty}(\mathbb{T}))$ a.s.

(ii) *nonlinear smoothing under randomisation* of second Picard iterate:

$$\mathcal{N}(z) := \int_0^t e^{(t-t')\varphi(\partial_x)} \mathcal{N}(z(t')) dt \in C([0, T]; H^\sigma(\mathbb{T})) \text{ a.s.}$$

for any 2α , **provided** $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$.

- This expansion follows McKean '95, Bourgain '96 and Da Prato-Debussche '03.
- "Sharpness" of $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$: if $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{4}$, then $\mathcal{N}(z) \notin C([0, T]; \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T}))$ a.s.

No improvement from *higher-order* expansions of u

Theorem 3: Almost sure global existence

Let $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$. Then, BBM is **almost surely globally well-posed** with respect to the random initial data u_0^ω .

Ideas of Theorem 3:

▷ **Goal:** Show for any $T > 0$, we have a bound

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C(T), \text{ for } t \leq T \text{ and } \sigma < 2\alpha. \quad (*)$$

▷ **Problem:** $E(v(t)) = +\infty$ a.s.!

Smooth out v : Use "I-method" of Colliander, Keel, Staffilani, Takaoka, Tao '02.

▷ **New goal:** Control growth of $E(I_N v) := \frac{1}{2} \|I_N v\|_{H^1}^2$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $I_N = \text{Id}$ on 'low frequencies' and is *smoothing* of order $1 - \sigma$ on 'high frequencies'.

Using the equation $I_N v$ solves:

$$\frac{d}{dt} E(I_N v) \sim \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}} (\partial_x I_N v) [(I_N v)^2 - I_N(v^2)]}_{(1)=\text{Commutator}} + \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}} (\partial_x I_N v) I_N v I_N z}_{(2)}$$

(1): I_N does not commute with products so (1) does not vanish:

$$(1) \lesssim N^{-\theta_1} E^{\frac{3}{2}}(I_N v) \text{ for some } \theta_1 > 0.$$

Hence, the ODE for $E(I_N v)$ *blows-up in finite time* $T^*(N)$.

(2): $z \notin L^2(\mathbb{T})$, so $I_N z \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ at a cost of a 'bad' growth in N :

$$(2) \lesssim \|I_N z\|_{L^2}^2 E(I_N v) \sim \phi_\alpha(N)^{\frac{1}{2}} E(I_N v),$$

where $\phi_\alpha(N) \sim \log N$ if $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and polynomial if $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$.

- Gronwall argument: $T^*(N) \sim \phi_\alpha(N)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log N$.
- Given $T > 0$, we **must** choose $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and then $N = N(T)$ so that $T^*(N) > T$, which yields (*).
- I-method for singular stochastic nonlinear wave equations: Gubinelli-Koch-Oh-Tolomeo '18 and Tolomeo '18.

Stability property of random solutions

▷ **Q:** Do our random solutions depend *continuously* on the random initial data?

Theorem 4: Approximation property of random solutions

Let $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]$, $s < \alpha - \frac{1}{2}$ and fix 'good' ω such that u^ω solves BBM with $u^\omega|_{t=0} = u_0^\omega$. Then,

(i) there are smooth (random) solutions $\{u_k^\omega\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to BBM such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k^\omega(0) - u_0^\omega\|_{H^s} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k^\omega - u^\omega\|_{C([0, k^{-1}]; H^s)} = \infty$$

(ii) the solutions $\{u_k^\omega\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ from **mollified** data $u_{0,k}^\omega = \rho_k * u_0^\omega$ satisfy

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{0,k}^\omega - u_0^\omega\|_{H^s} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k^\omega - u^\omega\|_{C([0, T]; H^s)} = 0$$

Furthermore, the limits are **independent** of the choice of mollifier ρ

▷ **Ans: No**, since (i) implies there is a 'bad' way to approximate. However, (ii) implies we have a 'good' approximation property **when** we *regularise by mollification*: the smooth approximating sequence converges *independently* of the choice of mollifier.

- Similar stability statements typical in (singular) stochastic PDEs, e.g. see Hairer '13, Gubinelli-Imkeller-Perkowski '15.

Extension: Non-Gaussian randomisation

We consider now the random initial data

$$u_0^{\omega, h}(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{h_n(\omega)}{\sqrt{1 + |n|^{2\alpha}}} e^{inx}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\{h_n(\omega)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a sequence of independent, mean-zero complex-valued *sub-Gaussian* random variables such that $h_{-n} = \overline{h_n}$ and h_0 is real.

Under an additional *non-degeneracy assumption* (as in Burq-Tzvetkov '08), the randomisation does *not* regularise: $u_0^{\omega, h} \in H^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}) \setminus H^{\alpha - \frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, a.s.

Theorem 5: Non-Gaussian existence theory

With respect to the random initial data $u_0^{\omega, h}$, BBM is (i) almost surely **locally well-posed**, when $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$, and (ii) almost surely **globally well-posed**, when $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$.

Main difficulty: Lack of the Gaussian specific tool, *The Wiener chaos estimate*:

"If $S_2(\omega) = \sum_{|n_1|, |n_2| \leq N} a(n_1, n_2) g_{n_1}(\omega) g_{n_2}(\omega)$, then for **any** $p \geq 2$,

$$\|S_2(\omega)\|_{L^p(\omega)} \lesssim_p \|S_2(\omega)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}."$$

- Need to estimate high-moments of $\mathcal{N}(z^h)$ 'by-hand':

Case-by-case analysis on $\mathbb{E}[h_{n_1}(\omega) h_{n_2}(\omega) \overline{h_{n_3}(\omega)} \overline{h_{n_4}(\omega)} h_{n_5}(\omega) \overline{h_{n_6}(\omega)} \overline{h_{n_7}(\omega)} h_{n_8}(\omega)]$