

INVERSIONS OF STOCHASTIC PROCESSES FROM ERGODIC MEASURES OF NONLINEAR SDES

HONGYU LIU AND ZHIHUI LIU

ABSTRACT. We introduce and analyze a novel class of inverse problems for stochastic dynamics: Given the ergodic invariant measure of a stochastic process governed by a nonlinear stochastic ordinary or partial differential equation (SODE or SPDE), we investigate the unique identifiability of the underlying process—specifically, the recovery of its drift and diffusion terms. This stands in contrast to the classical problem of statistical inference from trajectory data. We establish unique identifiability results under several key scenarios, including cases with both multiplicative and additive noise, for both finite- and infinite-dimensional systems. Our analysis leverages the intrinsic structure of the governing equations and their quantitative relationship with the ergodic measure, thereby transforming the identifiability problem into a uniqueness issue for the solutions to the associated stationary Fokker-Planck equations. This approach reveals fundamental differences between drift and diffusion inversion problems and provides counterexamples where unique recovery fails. This work lays the theoretical foundation for a new research direction with significant potential for practical application.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic differential equations (SDEs), both SODEs and SPDEs, serve as fundamental mathematical models for phenomena across the sciences and engineering, from particle dynamics in physics to interest rate fluctuations in finance and pattern formation in biology. A profound feature of many such systems, particularly those with dissipative nonlinearities, is the existence and uniqueness of an *ergodic (invariant) measure*. This measure characterizes the long-time, statistical equilibrium of the system, describing the distribution of the state process after transients have decayed. In essence, while individual trajectories remain unpredictable, the probability law of the

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35R30; Secondary 60H15, 82C31.

Key words and phrases. inversions of stochastic processes, ergodic invariant measure, stochastic ordinary and partial differential equations, Fokker-Planck equation.

The work of H. Liu is supported by the Hong Kong RGC General Research Funds (projects 11311122, 11300821, and 11303125), the NSFC/RGC Joint Research Fund (project N-CityU101/21), the France-Hong Kong ANR/RGC Joint Research Grant, A-CityU203/19. The work of Z. Liu is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 12101296, Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation, No. 2024A1515012348, and Shenzhen Basic Research Special Project (Natural Science Foundation) Basic Research (General Project), Nos. JCYJ20220530112814033 and JCYJ20240813094919026.

process converges to this invariant measure, offering a powerful statistical description of the system's steady state.

The *forward problem*—understanding the properties of the invariant measure given the governing equations (i.e., the drift and diffusion coefficients)—has been a central theme in stochastic analysis for decades. A vast body of literature is devoted to proving the existence, uniqueness, and regularity of invariant measures, as well as quantifying the rate of convergence to equilibrium; see e.g. [2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16] and the references cited therein. In parallel, the field of statistical inference for SDEs is highly developed, where the central task is to estimate the unknown parameters of the drift and diffusion terms from *finite-time, noisy observational data* of the process trajectories; see e.g. [4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17] and the references cited therein.

In this paper, we address a fundamentally different and, to our knowledge, largely unexplored *inverse problem*. We posit a scenario where the *ergodic measure* itself is known, or can be reliably estimated, and we ask: Can one uniquely recover the underlying stochastic process—namely, its drift and diffusion terms—from this measure alone? We term this the *inversion of a stochastic process from its ergodic measure*.

This problem is motivated by several compelling considerations:

- (1) **A New Data Paradigm:** In many complex systems, especially those at a macroscopic or thermodynamic scale, one may have access to statistical equilibrium data (e.g., from long-time averages or ensemble measurements) without direct access to the complete dynamical trajectories. Our formulation directly utilizes this equilibrium information as the primary data for inversion.
- (2) **Theoretical Foundation:** Establishing identifiability—whether the map from the coefficients to the invariant measure is injective—is a prerequisite for any well-posed inverse problem. If two different drift-diffusion pairs can generate the same invariant measure, then any recovery attempt is inherently futile. Our work provides a rigorous foundation for this new class of problems.
- (3) **Potential for Robustness:** Ergodic measures are global, time-averaged objects. An inversion methodology based on them could potentially be more robust to model misspecification and high-frequency noise than methods relying on precise trajectory data.

Despite its natural motivation, this inverse problem presents significant challenges. The relationship between the coefficients of a nonlinear SDE and its invariant measure is highly implicit, governed by the so-called stationary Fokker-Planck equation. These are second-order elliptic equations in high or infinite dimensions, and the inversion is inherently ill-posed without suitable *a priori* assumptions.

The main contributions of this paper are the establishment of unique identifiability results for this novel inverse problem. We derive sufficient conditions under which the knowledge of the ergodic measure guarantees the unique recovery of the unknown drift and diffusion terms. Our analysis covers several key scenarios:

- (1) Drift inversion: Unique recovery is possible for one-dimensional SODEs with multiplicative noise (see Theorem 3.1), high-dimensional Langevin equations (i.e., with gradient drifts and additive noise in Theorem 3.3), and certain SPDEs with additive noise (see Theorem 4.1), but generally fails for high-dimensional SODEs without gradient structure, even in the additive noise case (we construct a counterexample in Theorem 3.2).
- (2) Diffusion inversion: Unique recovery is possible for any dimensional SODEs or certain SPDEs driven by additive noise (see Theorems 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1), but generally fails in the multiplicative noise case, even for one-dimensional SODEs (we construct a counterexample in Theorem 3.5), let alone SPDEs.

Our technical approach is rooted in a detailed analysis of the stationary Fokker-Planck equations. We transform the problem of identifiability into the problem of uniqueness of solutions to certain PDEs. The proofs rely on a careful exploitation of the quantitative relationships between the coefficients and the density of the invariant measure.

To the best of our knowledge, this work represents a new direction in research on inverse problems for stochastic dynamics. The established identifiability results provide the theoretical bedrock upon which future computational and statistical recovery algorithms can be built. We envision many potential developments of practical significance, including applications to model validation, uncertainty quantification for systems in equilibrium, and the design of stochastic processes with desired statistical properties.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Some preliminaries are given in Section 2. In Section 3, we investigate the drift and diffusion inversion problem for nonlinear SODEs. These ideas are generalized in Section 4 to the infinite-dimensional case.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section will investigate the drift and diffusion inversion problems for nonlinear SODEs driven by an \mathbb{R}^m -valued Wiener process W on a complete filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ (with $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}(t))_{t \geq 0}$):

$$dX(t) = b(X(t))dt + \sigma(X(t))dW(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ belongs to the space $\mathcal{B}_b^{\text{loc}}$ of Borel measurable and locally bounded functions. Throughout, we denote by $|\cdot|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the Euclidean norm and inner product in \mathbb{R}^d or the Hilbert space in Section 4 if there is no confusion and by $\|\cdot\|$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$.

2.1. Fokker-Planck equation and Invariant measure. Let us recall the invariant measure of Eq. (2.1) and the connection to the Fokker-Planck equation.

Assume that Eq. (2.1) has a unique strong solution which is a homogeneous Markov process (under broad assumptions on the coefficients of Eq. (2.1); see Example 3.1).

Denote by P_t the associated Markov semigroup of Eq. (2.1) on \mathbb{R}^d , i.e.,

$$P_t f(x) := \mathbb{E}^x[f(X_t)], \quad t \geq 0, \quad f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the class of all bounded measurable functions on \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{E}^x is the expectation for the solution X_t of (4.1) with $X_0 = x$. A probability measure μ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called *invariant* for (the solution $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$) Eq. (2.1) if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P_t \phi(x) \mu(dx) = \mu(\phi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) \mu(dx), \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.3)$$

This is equivalent to $\mu(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P_t(x, A) \mu(dx)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\{P_t(x, \cdot)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote the transition probabilities of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ starting from $X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$; μ is also called a stationary distribution of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ or Eq. (2.1). An invariant (probability) measure μ of Eq. (2.1) is called *ergodic* if

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P_t \phi(x) = \mu(\phi) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu), \quad \forall \phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mu). \quad (2.4)$$

It is well-known that if $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ admits a unique invariant measure, then it is ergodic; in this case, we call it uniquely ergodic.

As b^i and D^{ij} , $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, are locally bounded, the transition probabilities μ_t of Eq. (2.1) at the time $t > 0$ satisfy the following parabolic Fokker–Planck equation (Fokker-Planck equation) for measures (in the sense of generalized functions; see, e.g., [1, Proposition 1.3.1]):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mu_t = L_{D,b} \mu_t := \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} [D^{ij} \mu_t] - \partial_{x_i} [b^i \mu_t], \quad t > 0.$$

Moreover, the invariant measure μ defined by (2.3) satisfies the following stationary Fokker-Planck equation for measures:

$$L_{D,b} \mu = \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} [D^{ij} \mu] - \partial_{x_i} [b^i \mu] = 0, \quad t > 0.$$

Let μ have a positive density p . Then the corresponding stationary Fokker-Planck equation for densities becomes

$$\partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} [D^{ij} p] - \partial_{x_i} [b^i p] = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

2.2. Measurement operator. Let $D := \sigma \sigma^\top$ be the diffusion tensor Eq. (2.1) with elements

$$D^{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{il} \sigma^{jl}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (2.6)$$

where we always assume that the summation is taken over all repeated indices. From Eq. (2.5) we observe that a pair of (b, D) (even with different $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ generating D through (2.6)) satisfies the same stationary Fokker-Planck equation (2.5) for densities.

Denote by \mathcal{A} the set of assumptions on $(b, D) \in \mathcal{B}_b^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{B}_b^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ with $D = \sigma \sigma^\top / 2$ being nondegenerate such that Eq. (2.1) has a unique strong solution

with a unique ergodic measure $\pi_{b,D} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{\text{probability measures on } \mathbb{R}^d\}$ having a positive density $p_{b,D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{\text{density functions on } \mathbb{R}^d\}$. We note that $p_{b,D}$ is λ -a.e. uniquely determined by $\pi_{b,D}$, where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure. It is clear \mathcal{A} is nonempty as this assumption is valid under broad conditions that include all the examples given in Sections 2 and 3; see, e.g., [1, Theorems 1.5.2, 3.1.2, and 6.3.1]. Then for each pair of $(b, D) \in \mathcal{A}$, we obtain a solution $\pi_{b,D} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with density $p_{b,D} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$ and we can define the measurement operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_{b,D} : \mathcal{A} &\longrightarrow p_{b,D}(\mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ (b, D) &\longmapsto p_{b,D} = T_{b,D}(b, D). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Our main aim is to find the inversion of b and/or D from the ergodic measure $\pi_{b,D}$ of Eq. (2.1).

Later in Section 2 (see Remark 3.1), we will observe that given an ergodic measure $\pi_{b,D}$, generally one cannot simultaneously invert the drift b and diffusion tensor D . So we also consider the following measurable operators with a fixed drift or diffusion. For a fixed $D \in \mathcal{B}_b^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$, define

$$\begin{aligned} T_b : \mathcal{A}_b = \{b : (b, D) \in \mathcal{A}\} &\longrightarrow T_b(\mathcal{A}_b) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ b &\longmapsto p_{b,D} = T_b(b, D), \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

and for a fixed $b \in \mathcal{B}_b^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} T_D : \mathcal{A}_D = \{D : (b, D) \in \mathcal{A}\} &\longrightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_D) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ D &\longmapsto p_{b,D} = T_D(b, D). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

It is clear that T_b and T_D are well-defined and highly nonlinear.

By the definitions of \mathcal{A}_b and \mathcal{A}_D in (2.8) and (2.9), respectively, it is clear that $T_b : \mathcal{A}_b \rightarrow T_b(\mathcal{A}_b)$ and $T_D : \mathcal{A}_D \rightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_D)$ are surjective. Now a natural and central question is whether $T_b : \mathcal{A}_b \rightarrow T_b(\mathcal{A}_b)$ and $T_D : \mathcal{A}_D \rightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_D)$ are injective? If they are injective (and thus bijective), are their inverses, denoted by T_b^{-1} and T_D^{-1} , continuous?

Question 2.1. (1) For a fixed σ such that $(b_k, D) \in \mathcal{A}$ with $k = 1, 2$, whether $p_{b_1,D} = p_{b_2,D}$ induces $b_1 = b_2$ (equivalently, T_b^{-1} exists)? If so, is T_b^{-1} continuous in the sense that $\lim_{p_{b_1,D} \rightarrow p_{b_2,D}} T_b^{-1}(p_{b_1,D}) = T_b^{-1}(p_{b_2,D})$?

(2) For a fixed b such that $(b, D_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ with $k = 1, 2$, whether $p_{b,D_1} = p_{b,D_2}$ if and only if $D_1 = D_2$ (equivalently, T_D^{-1} exists)? If so, is T_D^{-1} continuous in the sense that $\lim_{p_{b,D_1} \rightarrow p_{b,D_2}} T_D^{-1}(p_{b,D_1}) = T_D^{-1}(p_{b,D_2})$?

3. DRIFT AND DIFFUSION INVERSION PROBLEM FOR SDES

In this section, we study the drift inversion problem and the diffusion inversion problem with both multiplicative and additive noise, for both one-dimensional and

high-dimensional SODEs. Meanwhile, we give several examples to indicate the ill-posedness of both the drift inversion problem for high-dimensional SODEs, even driven by additive noise, and the diffusion problem for SODEs driven by multiplicative noise, even in one dimension.

3.1. Drift inversion for SODEs. We have the following bijectivity of T_b in the one-dimensional case (i.e., $d = 1$) driven by $1 \leq m$ -dimensional Wiener process. In this case, the nondegenerate condition of D reduces to $|\sigma(x)| > 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For a fixed $D = D_k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$, assume that $(b_k, D_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{U_k(x)}}{D_k(x)} dx < \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

where $U_k \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ is any primitive of b_k/D , i.e., $U'_k = b_k/D$, $k = 1, 2$. Then $\pi_{b_1, D} = \pi_{b_2, D}$ if and only if $b_1 = b_2$, i.e., T_b is a bijective.

Proof. In the case of $d = 1$, the stationary Fokker-Planck equation (2.5) reduces to the following linear ODE with variable coefficients:

$$(Dp)'' - (bp)' = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Solving the above equation (3.2), we obtain its general solution

$$p(x) = \frac{C}{2D(x)} \int_{x_0}^x \exp\left(\int_y^x \frac{b}{D} dz\right) dy + \frac{D(x_0)p(x_0)}{D(x)} \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{b}{D} dz\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and any constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Here and after, we omit the integral variable to lighten the notation. The requirement $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) dx = 1$ implies that $C = 0$. Consequently, $\pi_{b, D}(dx) = p_{b, D}(x) dx$ with

$$p_{b, D}(x) = \frac{C}{D(x)} \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{b}{D} dy\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.3)$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C = D(x_0)p(x_0) > 0$ (satisfying $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) dx = 1$) is the unique invariant measures of Eq. (2.1), provided (3.1) holds.

Let U be any primitive of b/D . Then the solution of Eq. (2.5) is

$$p_{b, D}(x) = Ce^{-U(x_0)} \frac{e^{U(x)}}{D(x)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C = D(x_0)p(x_0) = e^{U(x_0)} (\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^U / D dx)^{-1} > 0$ (satisfying $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) dx = 1$). We can rewrite it as

$$p_{b, D}(x) = \frac{e^{U(x)}}{D(x)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^U}{D} dy \right)^{-1}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.4)$$

Now let $D_1 = D_2 = D$ and $\pi_{b_1,D} = \pi_{b_2,D}$, we have the existence of a constant C such that

$$\frac{e^{U_1(x)}}{D(x)} = C \cdot \frac{e^{U_2(x)}}{D(x)},$$

from which we obtain

$$U_1(x) - U_2(x) = C.$$

Differentiating on both sides, we obtain $b_1 = b_2$, and thereby prove the injectivity of T_b . \square

Remark 3.1. From the representation (3.4), even in the one-dimensional case, there exist many pairs $(b_k, D_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ that generalize the same ergodic measure, so that one can not invert both the drift and diffusion from a given ergodic measure simultaneously.

The following result shows that, different from the one-dimensional case, T_b is generally not injective for the high-dimensional SODEs, even in the additive noise case.

Theorem 3.2. *For a fixed $D = D_k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ with $d \geq 2$, assume that $(b_k, D_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy (3.1) with $U'_k = b_k/D$, $k = 1, 2$. Then $\pi_{b_1,D} = \pi_{b_2,D}$ if and only if there exists a continuously differentiable function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(b_1 - b_2)p = \nabla \times \psi$. In particular, there exist $b_1 \neq b_2$, together with a fixed $D \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, such that $\pi_{b_1,D} = \pi_{b_2,D}$, thus T_b is not injective.*

Proof. It follows from the stationary Fokker-Planck equation (2.5) for densities with $D_1 = D_2 = D$ that $\pi_{b_1,D} = \pi_{b_2,D}$ if and only if

$$\nabla \cdot [(b_1 - b_2)p] = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

When $d \geq 2$, by Helmholtz decomposition theorem (i.e., the space of vector fields can be decomposed into the range of the gradient and the kernel of the divergence), there exists a continuously differentiable function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(b_1 - b_2)p = \nabla \times \psi.$$

Finally, we construct different b_k 's so that $\pi_{b_1,D} = \pi_{b_2,D}$. Let $\pi_{b_1,D}(x) = p(dx)$ be the unique ergodic measure of Eq. (2.1) with coefficients $(b_1, D) \in \mathcal{A}$. We take a skew-symmetric constant matrix $J = (J^{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ (i.e., $J = -J^\top$) and

$$b_2 := b_1 - J \nabla \ln p.$$

Then, direct calculations yield that

$$\nabla \cdot (b_1 - b_2)p = \nabla \cdot [J(\nabla \ln p)p] = \nabla \cdot [J \nabla p] = J^{ij} \partial_{x_i} \partial_{x_j} p = 0,$$

by the skew-symmetry of J , provided p is twice-differentiable, which is valid for a broad range of assumptions.

To ensure the (well-posedness and) unique ergodicity of the above counterexample, for example, we consider the Langevin equation (3.6) with density (3.8) and $U \in$

$\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Suppose that $b_1(x) = \nabla U(x) = -\alpha x$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{\beta} \text{Id}_d$. It is clear that (b_1, σ_1) satisfy all the conditions of Example 3.1. By elementary calculations, we obtain that $b_2 := b_1 - J \nabla \ln p = b_1 - J b_1$ and the same $\sigma = \sqrt{\beta} \text{Id}_d$ (so that the nondegenerate condition (3.24) holds) satisfy all the conditions of Example 3.1, with possibly different constants L_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, 4$. Indeed, as σ is constant and J is a skew-symmetric constant matrix implying $\langle Jx, x \rangle = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\langle b_2(x) - b_2(y), x - y \rangle + \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\|^2 \\ &= 2\langle b_1(x) - b_1(y), x - y \rangle - 2\langle J(b_1(x) - b_1(y)), x - y \rangle \\ &= 2\langle b_1(x) - b_1(y), x - y \rangle \leq L_0|x - y|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (3.21) with the same constant L_0 . A similar idea yields (3.22) and (3.23) with the same constants L_1, L_2 and different L_4 with $q = 1$ (and $L_3 = 0$).

This indicates that $\pi_{b_1, D}(x) = p(dx)$ is also the unique ergodic measure of Eq. (2.1) with coefficients (b_2, D) , thus T_b is not injective. \square

From Theorem 3.2, it is known that T_b is generally not injective in the high-dimensional, multiplicative noise case; the following result shows that they are injective for the following d -dimensional Langevin equation driven by $m = d$ -dimensional Wiener process W :

$$dX(t) = \nabla U(X(t))dt + \sqrt{\beta}dW(t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a constant and $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel measurable. This corresponds to Eq. (2.1) with $b = \nabla U$ and $\sigma = \sqrt{\beta} \text{Id}_d$, where Id_d is the d -dimensional unit matrix, so that D given in (2.6) is the constant $\beta/2$ (or $D = \frac{1}{2}\beta \text{Id}_d$). Thus, the stationary Fokker-Planck equation (2.5) for densities reduces to

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \Delta p - \nabla \cdot [bp] = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

From now on, all the invariant measure $\pi_{b, D}$, invariant density $p_{b, D}$, and measurement operator $T_{b, D}$, are denoted by $\pi_{b, \beta}$, $p_{b, \beta}$, and $T_{b, \beta}$, respectively, in the Langevin equation case. By direct calculations, the following invariant density, called the Gibbs density, satisfies Eq. (3.7) (see also in, e.g., [1, Theorem 4.1.11]):

$$p_{b, \beta}(x) = e^{\frac{2U(x)}{\beta}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{2U(x)}{\beta}} dx \right)^{-1}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.8)$$

provided the following d -dimensional similar integrability condition as (3.1) holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{2U(x)}{\beta}} dx < \infty. \quad (3.9)$$

Therefore, $\pi_{b, \beta}(dx) = p_{b, \beta}(x)dx$, with $p_{b, \beta}$ given above, is the unique ergodic measure of the d -dimensional Langevin equation (3.8), provided (3.9) holds.

Theorem 3.3. *For a fixed $\beta > 0$, assume that $(b, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying (3.9) for any primitive $U \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ of b . Then T_b is bijective and its inverse T_b^{-1} satisfy*

$$T_b^{-1}(p_{b,\beta})(=b) = \frac{\beta}{2} \nabla \ln p_{b,\beta}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$|T_b^{-1}(p_{b_1,\beta}) - T_b^{-1}(p_{b_2,\beta})| (=|b_1 - b_2|) = \frac{\beta}{2} |\nabla \ln p_{b_1,\beta} - \nabla \ln p_{b_2,\beta}|. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. It follows from the representation (3.8) that

$$\ln p(x) = \frac{2U(x)}{\beta} + C, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

from which we derive (3.10) and (3.11). \square

3.2. Diffusion inversion for SODEs. For the one-dimensional diffusion inversion problem, from the representation (3.4) of the density, i.e., the explicit solution of Eq. (2.5), we derive a gauge equivalence condition for σ such that T_D is injective. This particularly indicates that T_D is bijective in the case of additive noise. In contrast, it is not surjective, in the usual sense, for the multiplicative noise case.

Theorem 3.4. *For a fixed $b = b_k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$, assume that $(b_k, D_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying (3.1) for any primitive $U_k \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ of b/D_k , $k = 1, 2$. Then $\pi_{b,D_1} = \pi_{b,D_2}$ if and only if*

$$\frac{D_1(x)}{D_2(x)} = 1 + \frac{D_1(x_0) - D_2(x_0)}{D_2(x_0) \exp(\int_{x_0}^x b/D_2 dy)}, \quad \forall x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.12)$$

In particular, for the additive noise case, $\pi_{b,D_1} = \pi_{b,D_2}$ if and only if $D_1 = D_2$, i.e., T_D is a bijective.

Proof. Let $\pi_{b,D_1} = \pi_{b,D_2}$. By the representation (3.3) with any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have the existence of a positive constant $C = C(x_0)$ s.t.

$$D_1(x)^{-1} \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{b}{D_1} dy\right) = C D_2(x)^{-1} \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{b}{D_2} dy\right). \quad (3.13)$$

Denote by $f(x) := C D_2(x)^{-1} \exp(\int_{x_0}^x b/D_2 dy)$. It is equivalent to finding D_1 from

$$D_1(x)^{-1} \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x \frac{b}{D_1} dy\right) = f(x), \quad \lambda\text{-a.e.}$$

This equation can be rewritten as the following one-order linear ODE with variable coefficients by setting $g := D_1$:

$$g'(x) + \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)} g(x) = b(x). \quad (3.14)$$

By (3.13), it is known that the above linear equation, with

$$\frac{f'(x)}{f(x)} = \frac{b - D_2'}{D_2},$$

has a solution given by $g_1 = D_2$. Moreover, its general solution is

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= \int_{x_0}^x \exp\left(\int_y^x -\frac{f'}{f} dz\right) b(y) dy + g(x_0) \exp\left(\int_{x_0}^x -\frac{f'}{f} dz\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{f(x)} \int_{x_0}^x f b dy + g(x_0) \frac{f(x_0)}{f(x)} \\ &= D_2(x) \left(1 + \frac{g(x_0) - D_2(x_0)}{D_2(x_0) \exp(\int_{x_0}^x b/D_2 dy)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., (3.12) holds. This shows that $D_1 \equiv D_2$ if and only if $D_1(x_0) = D_2(x_0)$ for some point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

In the additive noise case, suppose that $D_1 \neq D_2$. From (3.12) we have

$$\exp\left(\frac{1}{D_2} \int_{x_0}^x b dy\right) \equiv \frac{D_1 - D_2}{(D_1/D_2 - 1)D_2} = 1, \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then we derive $b \equiv 0$, but this is impossible since, in this case, Eq. (2.1) is not uniquely ergodic. Therefore, $D_1 = D_2$, and thereby prove the bijectivity of T_D . \square

The following result shows that, different from the additive noise case, T_D is generally not injective for SODEs driven by multiplicative noise, even in one dimension.

Theorem 3.5. *There exist $D_1 \neq D_2$ which are not constant simultaneously, i.e., there do not exist constant vectors $(C_1, C_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $(D_1(x), D_2(x)) = (C_1, C_2)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, together with a fixed $b \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$, such that $\pi_{b, D_1} = \pi_{b, D_2}$, thus T_D is not injective.*

Proof. Let $d = 1$ and $(b, D_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfy (3.1) for some $U_2 \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ with $U_2 = b/D_2$. Based on (3.12), for the multiplicative noise case, if we choose, e.g., $x_0 = 0$ and $D_1(0) = D_2(0) + 1$, one can take another solution of Eq. (3.13) as

$$D_1(x) = D_2(x)(1 + Ce^{-U_2(x)}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.15)$$

with $C = [D_1(0)/D_2(0) - 1]e^{U_2(0)}$. As $D_2(0) > 0$, it is clear that $D_1(x) > D_2(x)$ so that $|D_1(x)| \neq |D_2(x)|$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

It remains to ensure the unique ergodicity of the above counterexample; for example, we choose

$$b(x) = -\frac{2x}{1+x^2}, \quad \sigma_2(x) = \sqrt{2}, \quad D_2(x) = 1, \quad U_2(x) = -\ln(1+x^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then by (3.15) we get

$$D_1(x) = 2 + x^2, \quad \sigma_1(x) = \sqrt{2(2+x^2)}, \quad U_1(x) = \ln \frac{2+x^2}{1+x^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Elementary calculations show

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} b'(x) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{-2(1+2x^2)}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} = -2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\sigma'_1(x)| = \frac{\sqrt{2}|x|}{\sqrt{2+x^2}} = \sqrt{2}, \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\sigma'_2(x)| = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

thereby indicate that (b, σ_1) and (b, σ_1) satisfy all the conditions in Example 3.1.

Moreover, one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{U_2(x)}}{D_2(x)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{U_1(x)}}{D_1(x)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{1+x^2} dx = \pi < \infty.$$

thereby shows the integrability condition (3.1) for these two pairs. \square

From Theorem 3.5, it is known that T_D (denoted by T_β from now on) is generally not injective in the multiplicative noise case; the following result shows that they are injective for the d -dimensional Langevin equation (3.6).

Theorem 3.6. *For a fixed $\beta > 0$, assume that $(b_k, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying (3.9) for any primitive $U_k \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ of b_k , $k = 1, 2$. Then T_β is bijective and its inverse T_β^{-1} satisfies*

$$T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta})(= \beta) \equiv \frac{2b^i}{\partial_{x_i} \ln p_{b,\beta}}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\frac{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta_1})}{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta_2})} \left(= \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \right) \equiv \frac{\partial_{x_i} \ln p_{b,\beta_2}}{\partial_{x_i} \ln p_{b,\beta_1}}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. The representation (3.8) yields that

$$U(x) = \frac{\beta}{2} \ln p(x) + C.$$

from which we derive (3.16) and (3.17). \square

Remark 3.2. In the case $m \geq d > 1$, if $\sqrt{\beta}$ in the Langevin equation (3.6) is replaced by a constant matrix $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij})_{d \times m}$, then the drift and diffusion inversion problem becomes more complicated. We point out that the case $m > d > 1$ for Eq. (2.1) with $b = \nabla U$ and $\sigma = (\beta \text{Id}_d \ \mathbf{0}_{d \times (m-d)})$ reduces to Eq. (3.6) which was analyzed in Theorems 3.3 and 3.6. The general case remains unknown.

For the high-dimensional Eq. (2.1) driven by additive noise but without the gradient drift, the Fokker-Planck equation (2.5) with $D^{ij} = \delta_{ij}\beta/2$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, reduces to

$$\frac{1}{2}\beta\Delta p - \nabla \cdot [bp] = 0. \quad (3.18)$$

Unlike the gradient case, the explicit closed form of the invariant density is not available. We derive the injectivity of T_β (and a different representation from (3.16) for its inverse) in the following result, applying the properties of harmonic functions; we note that T_b is generally not injective in high dimensions by Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that $(b_k, \beta_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\beta_k > 0$, $k = 1, 2$. Then $\pi_{b, \beta_1} = \pi_{b, \beta_2}$ if and only if $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, i.e., T_β is bijective. Moreover, T_β^{-1} satisfies*

$$T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b, \beta})(= \beta) \equiv \frac{\nabla \cdot [bp]}{\Delta p}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (3.19)$$

$$\frac{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b, \beta_1})}{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b, \beta_2})} \left(= \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \right) \equiv \frac{\nabla \cdot [bp_1]}{\Delta p_1} / \frac{\nabla \cdot [bp_2]}{\Delta p_2}, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Let $p_{b, \beta_1} = p_{b, \beta_2}$ with two constants β_1 and β_2 . Then Eq. (3.18) yields that $\beta_1 - \beta_2$ satisfies

$$(\beta_1 - \beta_2)\Delta p = 0.$$

Suppose that $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$, then $\Delta p = 0$ with $p > 0$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(x) dx = 1$. Consequently, p is a positive harmonic function in \mathbb{R}^d and thus constant. Indeed, due to the average property of any harmonic function, we have

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{B_R(x)} \int_{B_R(x)} p(y) dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $B_R(\cdot)$ is a ball with radius $R > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. As p is positive,

$$p(x) \leq \frac{1}{B_R(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(y) dy = \frac{1}{B_R(x)}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

Now taking $R \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$p(x) \leq \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{B_R(x)} = 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

from which we obtain $p(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction of $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(x) dx = 1$. This shows that $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ and the injectivity of T_β .

The same analysis, in combination with Eq. (2.5), implies (3.19) and (3.20). \square

We end this section by giving an example about the coefficients of Eq. (2.1) such that all the counterexamples given in Section 3 hold.

Example 3.1. Assume that b and σ in Eq. (2.1) satisfy the following coupled conditions of monotone, coercive, and polynomial growth for some positive constants L_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ and q , and for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$2\langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle + \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\|^2 \leq L_0|x - y|^2, \quad (3.21)$$

$$2\langle b(x), x \rangle + \|\sigma(x)\|^2 \leq L_1 - L_2|x|^2, \quad (3.22)$$

$$|b(x)| \leq L_3 + L_4|x|^q, \quad (3.23)$$

$$D(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is positive definite for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.24)$$

The above conditions, in particular, include polynomial drift (with a negative leading coefficient) and diffusion functions with $2a_{2k+1} + c_{k+1}^2 < 0$:

$$b(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{2k+1} a_i x^i, \quad \sigma(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} c_j x^j, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $a_i, c_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2k+1$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+1$. It is known that under these conditions, Eq. (2.1) is uniquely ergodic (see, e.g., [12]).

4. DRIFT AND DIFFUSION INVERSION FOR SPDES DRIVEN BY ADDITIVE NOISE

In this section, we apply the method developed in Section 3 to an infinite-dimensional SDE or its equivalent SPDE form. The infinite-dimensional case is considerably more complicated than the previous finite-dimensional case, partly due to the absence of exact analogs of Lebesgue measure.

For simplicity, we consider the following second-order parabolic SPDE driven by additive noise under the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on the separable Hilbert state space $H = \{u \in L^2(0, 1) : u(0) = u(1) = 0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} dX(t, \xi) &= \Delta X(t, \xi) + U'(X(t, \xi))dt + \sqrt{\beta}dW(t, \xi), \quad (t, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, 1); \\ X(0, \xi) &= X_0(\xi), \quad \xi \in (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Here, $X_0 \in H$, $\beta > 0$ is a constant, and $\{W(t, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} B_t^i e^i(\cdot), t \geq 0\}$ is a cylindrical Wiener process on H with $\{e^i\}_{i \geq 1}$ and $\{B^i\}_{i \geq 1}$ being an orthonormal basis of H and a sequence of independent one-dimensional Brownian motions, respectively; the temporal derivative of W in the sense of distribution is the so-called (space-time) white noise.

Though there is no Lebesgue measure in H , we choose the reference measure to be the centered Gaussian measure μ_0 on H with covariance operator $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ (which is of trace-class). Indeed, it is clear that $-\Delta$ has discrete spectrum with positive eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i = (k\pi)^2\}_{i \geq 1}$ listed in the increasing order counting multiplicities satisfying $\text{Tr}(-\Delta) := \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i = 1/6 < \infty$.

Denote by \mathcal{A} again the set of assumptions on (b, β) such that Eq. (2.1) has a unique mild (which is probabilistically strong) solution with a unique ergodic measure $\pi_{b, \beta} \in \mathcal{P}(H) := \{\text{probability measures on } H\}$ having a positive density $p_{b, \beta}$ with respect to μ_0 on H . We note that $p_{b, \beta}$ is μ_0 -a.e. uniquely determined by $\pi_{b, \beta}$. It is clear \mathcal{A} is nonempty as this assumption is valid under broad conditions that include all the examples given in Section 4; see, e.g., [10].

For each pair of $(b, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}$, we obtain a solution $\pi_{b, \beta} \in \mathcal{P}(H)$ with density $p_{b, \beta} \in \mathcal{D}(H) := \{\text{density functions on } H \text{ with respect to } \mu_0\}$ and we can define the measurement operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_\beta : \mathcal{A}_\beta &= \{b : (b, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}\} \longrightarrow T_\beta(\mathcal{A}_\beta) \subset \mathcal{D}(H) \\ b &\longmapsto p_{b, \beta} = T_\beta(b, \beta), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

for a fixed β , and

$$\begin{aligned} T_D : \mathcal{A}_D &= \{D : (b, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}\} \longrightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_D) \subset \mathcal{D}(H) \\ D &\longmapsto p_{b,\beta} = T_D(b, \beta), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

for a fixed b . By the definitions of \mathcal{A}_β and \mathcal{A}_D in (4.2) and (4.3), respectively, it is clear that $T_\beta : \mathcal{A}_\beta \rightarrow T_\beta(\mathcal{A}_\beta)$ and $T_D : \mathcal{A}_D \rightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_\beta)$ are surjective and usually nonlinear. Our main aim is to determine whether $T_\beta : \mathcal{A}_\beta \rightarrow T_\beta(\mathcal{A}_\beta)$ and $T_D : \mathcal{A}_D \rightarrow T_D(\mathcal{A}_\beta)$ are injective, and, if they are injective (and thus bijective), determine the representation of their inverses, denoted by T_β^{-1} and T_D^{-1} , as in the finite-dimensional cases studied in Theorems 3.3 and 3.7.

It is not difficult to show that the Gibbs measure

$$\mu(dx) := Z_U^{-1} e^{\frac{2U(x)}{\beta}} \mu_0(dx), \quad x \in H, \quad (4.4)$$

is the unique invariant measure, in the sense of (2.3) and (2.4), where H there and (2.2) is replaced by H , of Eq. (4.1) in H provided

$$Z_U := \mu_0(e^{\frac{2U(x)}{\beta}}) < \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

The following result is a generalization of the finite-dimensional cases studied in Theorems 3.3 and 3.7, which shows the bijectivity of T_b and T_β and the representations of their inverses.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that $(b_k, \beta_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ with constants $\beta_k > 0$ satisfy (4.5) for any primitive $U_k \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ of b_k , $k = 1, 2$.*

(1) T_b is bijective and its inverse T_b^{-1} satisfies μ_0 -a.e.

$$T_b^{-1}(p_{b,\beta})(= b) = \frac{\beta}{2} \nabla \ln p_{b,\beta}(x), \quad (4.6)$$

$$T_b^{-1}(p_{b_1,\beta}) - T_b^{-1}(p_{b_2,\beta})(= b_1 - b_2) = \frac{\beta}{2} [\nabla \ln p_{b_1,\beta}(x) - \nabla \ln p_{b_2,\beta}(x)]. \quad (4.7)$$

(2) T_β is bijective and its inverse T_β^{-1} satisfies μ_0 -a.e.

$$T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta_1})(= \beta) = \frac{2\langle e_k, b(x) \rangle}{D_{e_k} \ln p(x)}, \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\frac{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta_1})}{T_\beta^{-1}(p_{b,\beta_2})} (= \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2}) \equiv \frac{D_{e_k} \ln p_{b,\beta_2}}{D_{e_k} \ln p_{b,\beta_1}} \quad \forall k \geq 1, \quad (4.9)$$

where D_{e_k} is the directional derivative with respect to e_k

Proof. It follows from the representation (4.4) that

$$\ln p(x) = \frac{2U(x)}{\beta} + C,$$

from which we derive (4.6) and (4.7).

Taking the directional derivative D_{e_k} with respect to e_k in the above identity, we have

$$D_{e_k} \ln p(x(\xi)) = \frac{2D_{e_k} U(x(\xi))}{\beta} = \frac{2\langle e_k, b(x) \rangle}{\beta}.$$

and conclude (4.8) and (4.9). \square

We end this section by giving an example about the coefficients of Eq. (4.1) such that all the assumptions given in Section 4 hold.

Example 4.1. Assume that there exist constants $K_1, K_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $K_3 > \lambda_1$, $K_4, K_5 > 0$, and $q \geq 1$ such that for any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$[b(\xi) - b(\eta)](\xi - \eta) \leq (K_1 + \lambda_1)|\xi - \eta|^2, \quad (4.10)$$

$$b(\xi)\xi \leq K_2 - (K_3 - \lambda_1)|\xi|^2, \quad (4.11)$$

$$|b(\xi)| \leq K_4 + K_5|\xi|^q. \quad (4.12)$$

Under these conditions, the assumption (4.5) holds, and Eq. (4.1) has a unique mild solution which is uniquely ergodic in H with respect to the invariant measure given in (4.4); see, e.g., [10, 16] for ergodic analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. I. Bogachev, N. V. Krylov, M. Röckner, and S. V. Shaposhnikov. *Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equations*, volume 207 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [2] O. Butkovsky and M. Scheutzow. Couplings via comparison principle and exponential ergodicity of SPDEs in the hypoelliptic setting. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 379(3):1001–1034, 2020.
- [3] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [4] F. Dou and W. Du. Determination of the solution of a stochastic parabolic equation by the terminal value. *Inverse Problems*, 38(7):Paper No. 075010, 24, 2022.
- [5] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Ergodicity of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations with degenerate stochastic forcing. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(3):993–1032, 2006.
- [6] J. Li, H. Liu, and S. Ma. Determining a random Schrödinger operator: both potential and source are random. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 381(2):527–556, 2021.
- [7] P. Li and X. Wang. Inverse scattering for the biharmonic wave equation with a random potential. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 56(2):1959–1995, 2024.
- [8] Z. Liao and Q. Lü. On inverse problems for mean field games with common noise via Carleman estimate. *Inverse Problems*, 41(4):Paper No. 045009, 21, 2025.
- [9] H. Liu and S. Ma. Inverse problem for a random Schrödinger equation with unknown source and potential. *Math. Z.*, 304(2):Paper No. 28, 31, 2023.
- [10] Z. Liu. Harnack inequalities and ergodicity of stochastic reaction-diffusion equation in L^p . *Stochastics*, 97(5):612–634, 2025.
- [11] Z. Liu. Numerical ergodicity and uniform estimate of monotone SPDEs driven by multiplicative noise. *J. Comput. Math.*, 44(1):84–102, 2026.
- [12] Z. Liu and Z. Liu. Numerical unique ergodicity of monotone SDEs driven by nondegenerate multiplicative noise. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 103(3):Paper No. 87, 21, 2025.

- [13] Z. Liu, A. Stuart, and Y. Wang. Second order ensemble Langevin method for sampling and inverse problems. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 23(5):1299–1317, 2025.
- [14] Q. Lü and Y. Wang. An inverse source problem for semilinear stochastic hyperbolic equations. *Inverse Problems*, 41(11):Paper No. 115014, 2025.
- [15] J. C. Mattingly, A. M. Stuart, and D. J. Higham. Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 101(2):185–232, 2002.
- [16] F. Wang. Convergence in Wasserstein distance for empirical measures of semilinear SPDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(1):70–84, 2023.
- [17] F. Werner and B. Hofmann. Convergence analysis of (statistical) inverse problems under conditional stability estimates. *Inverse Problems*, 36(1):015004, 23, 2020.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CITY UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, KOWLOON, HONG KONG SAR, P.R. CHINA

Email address: hongyliu@cityu.edu.hk, hongyu.liuip@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, SHENZHEN 518055, P.R. CHINA

Email address: liuzh3@sustech.edu.cn, liuzhihui@lsec.cc.ac.cn