

An explicit scheme for stochastic Allen-Cahn equations with space-time white noise near the sharp interface limit

Yingsong Jiang, Chenxu Pang, Xiaojie Wang ^{*}

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hunan Research Center of the Basic Discipline for Analytical Mathematics, HNP-LAMA, Central South University, Changsha 410083, Hunan, China

Abstract

This article investigates time-discrete approximations of Allen-Cahn type stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) driven by space-time white noise near the sharp interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, where the small parameter ϵ is the diffuse interface thickness. We propose an explicit and easily implementable exponential integrator with a modified nonlinearity for the considered problem. Uniform-in-time and uniform-in- ϵ moment bounds of the scheme are established and the convergence in total variation distance of order $O(T \cdot \text{Poly}(\epsilon^{-1})\tau^\gamma)$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, is established, between the law of the numerical scheme and that of the SPDE over $[0, T]$. In contrast to the exponential dependence due to standard arguments, the obtained error bound depends on ϵ^{-1} and T polynomially. By incorporating carefully chosen method parameters, we only require a mild and ϵ -independent restriction on the time step-size τ , getting rid of the severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon^\sigma)$, $\sigma \geq 1$ in the literature. Also, a uniform-in-time error bound of order $O(\tau^\gamma)$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, is obtained for a fixed ϵ (e.g., $\epsilon = 1$), which improves the existing ones in the literature and matches the classical weak convergence rate in the globally Lipschitz setting. The error analysis is highly nontrivial due to the low regularity of the considered problem, the super-linear growth of the non-globally Lipschitz drift, the non-smooth observables inherent in the total variation metric and the presence of the small interface parameter $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. These difficulties are addressed by introducing a new strategy of nonlinearity modification and establishing refined regularity estimates for the associated Kolmogorov equation to an auxiliary process in the context of non-smooth test functions. Numerical experiments are included to demonstrate the theoretical convergence and the ability of interface-capturing for the proposed scheme.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we are interested in the following parabolic stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) in the Hilbert space $H := L^2(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R})$ driven by space-time white noise:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = -AX(t)dt + \epsilon^{-1}F(X(t))dt + dW(t), & t > 0, \\ X(0) = X_0. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

^{*}All authors contributed equally. This work was supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (12471394, 12071488, 12371417) and the Postdoctoral Fellowship Program of CPSF (GZB2025715).

E-mail addresses: x.j.wang7@csu.edu.cn (Corresponding author), yingsong@csu.edu.cn, c.x.pang@csu.edu.cn.

Here, $\mathcal{D} := (0, 1)$, the small parameter $\epsilon > 0$ is the diffuse interface thickness, $-A$ is the Laplacian operator with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, F is a nonlinear Nemytskii operator associated with a real-valued function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(u)(x) := f(u(x))$, $x \in \mathcal{D}$, and $\{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a cylindrical I -Wiener process (see Assumptions 2.1-2.3 below for details). The considered equation includes a stochastic Allen–Cahn equation as a special case, which describes random phase separation or interface motion under thermal fluctuations. As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the solution becomes nearly piecewise constant, taking values close to the stable equilibria ± 1 in two bulk regions separated by a diffusive interfacial layer of thickness $O(\epsilon)$ [36]. Such a limiting behavior is commonly referred to as the sharp-interface limit, and the stochastic Allen–Cahn dynamics formally converge to a stochastic mean curvature flow [23]. However, it is a challenge to numerically resolve the $O(\epsilon)$ -thick transition layer and to accurately capture such thin interfaces. In particular, extremely fine resolutions and high computational cost are required to effectively capture thin interfacial layers (see, e.g., [11, 13, 16–19, 35] and references therein).

For a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ (e.g. $\epsilon = 1$), the numerical analysis of the underlying model has been extensively examined in the literature (see e.g. [4, 7–9, 12, 16, 21, 25, 26, 29, 32–34], to just mention a few). On the contrary, the numerical analysis in the sharp-interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is much less studied. In this regime, standard convergence arguments yield error bounds with exponential dependence on ϵ^{-1} , which in turn would impose a severe restriction on the time-stepping step-size as ϵ tends to zero. A natural and interesting question thus emerges:

(Q). *Can one provide an error bound polynomially depending on ϵ^{-1} for a numerical approximation of SPDEs (1.1) near the sharp interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$?*

Recently, the authors of [13] and [14] gave a positive answer to this question. More accurately, the authors of [13] proposed a splitting method for (1.1), where the phase flow of a parameterized nonlinear ODE with the nonlinearity F should be exactly calculated. As the main focus of [13], the authors established weak convergence rates of the splitting scheme in the context of smooth test functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H)$, with error bounds polynomially depending on ϵ^{-1} obtained under a severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon)$ on the step-size. For SPDEs with trace-class noise, which is smoother than the space-time white one, the authors of [14] proposed a fully discrete tamed Euler scheme and derived error bounds polynomially depending on ϵ^{-1} , in a truncated L^1 -Wasserstein distance involving Lipschitz continuous test functions, under a even more severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon^\sigma)$, $\sigma > 1$.

In the present work we restrict ourselves to SPDEs (1.1) driven by space-time white noise and aim to obtain error bounds of new explicit schemes under total variation distance, which only polynomially depend on ϵ^{-1} and do not impose the severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon^\sigma)$, $\sigma \geq 1$ on the step-size. More precisely, we introduce the following time-stepping scheme:

$$X_{t_{m+1}}^\tau = E(\tau)X_{t_m}^\tau + \tau E(\tau)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X_{t_m}^\tau) + \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} E(t_{m+1} - s) \, dW(s), \quad X_0^\tau = X_0, \quad (1.2)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $F_\tau: L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H$, $q > 1$, is defined by

$$F_\tau(u)(x) := f_\tau(u(x)), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \text{with} \quad f_\tau(v) := \frac{f(v)}{\left(1 + \beta\tau^\theta|v|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}}\right)^\alpha}, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\beta, \theta > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{\theta})$ are method parameters and $2q - 1$ is the degree of polynomial growth of f . To the best of our knowledge, the time-stepping scheme is new, even for deterministic Allen–Cahn equations. Such a modification (1.3) results in a fully explicit and easily implementable

scheme, which simultaneously preserves the dissipativity of f (see Proposition 3.2) and thus helps us establish the uniform-in-time and uniform-in- ϵ moment bounds of the numerical solution, under the restriction $\tau = O(\beta^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\theta\alpha}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{1-\theta\alpha}})$ on the time step-size (Theorem 4.2). The convergence in total variation (TV) distance of order $O(t_m \cdot \text{Poly}(\beta) \cdot \text{Poly}(\epsilon^{-1}) \tau^\gamma)$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, is established, between the law of $X_{t_m}^\tau$ and $X(t_m)$, which depends on ϵ^{-1} and T polynomially (Theorem 6.4). Also, a uniform-in-time error bound of order $O(\tau^\gamma)$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, is obtained for a fixed $\epsilon = 1$ (Corollary 6.5). These findings improve the existing TV convergence rate of order $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ in [13] and match the classical weak convergence rate in the globally Lipschitz setting [3, 5]. Another interesting finding in numerical experiments is that, decreasing the degree α in the scheme seemingly improves the computational accuracy. In addition, numerical results indicate a good performance of the proposed scheme in interface-capturing.

Different from the splitting scheme proposed by [13], the new scheme (1.2)-(1.3) is easy to implement and more direct, as one does not need to exactly solve the phase flow of a nonlinear ODE with the nonlinearity F . Also, we highlight that, the tamed scheme here is computational cheaper than tamed schemes introduced in [14], where the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_\vartheta$ needs to be computed per every time-step. Indeed, by incorporating a flexible degree $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{\theta})$ (instead of a fixed degree $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 in the literature) and a method parameter β in the taming factor, we introduce a different taming strategy, which, through carefully choosing method parameters, can significantly relieve the required restriction $\tau = O(\beta^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\theta\alpha}} \epsilon^{\frac{1}{1-\theta\alpha}})$. More precisely, by taking $\beta^\alpha = \epsilon^{-1}$, we get an ϵ -independent restriction $\tau = O(1)$, while retaining an error bound with polynomial dependence on ϵ^{-1} (see Theorem 6.4 for details). This essentially overcomes the severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon^\sigma)$, $\sigma \geq 1$ in the literature [13, 14].

Distinct from weak convergence analysis with smooth test functions and other metrics like L^1 -Wasserstein distance, the TV distance involves non-smoothness in nature, which makes the corresponding analysis more challenging. In the globally Lipschitz setting, the author of [4] derived the TV convergence of an accelerated exponential Euler scheme for SPDEs driven by space-time white noise via the Kolmogorov equation. A crucial step for the analysis is to treat the TV error between law($X_{t_m}^\tau$) and law($X(t_m)$) as the weak error analysis in the setting of non-smooth test functions. However, the presence of ϵ^{-1} and the non-globally Lipschitz nonlinearities pose substantial difficulties for the construction of the scheme and its error analysis. To overcome them, we introduce the auxiliary process \mathbb{X}^δ defined by

$$\mathbb{X}^\delta(t) = E(t)\mathbb{X}_0^\delta + \int_0^t E(t-s)\epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s)) \, ds + \int_0^t E(t-s) \, dW(s), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

and decompose the weak error into the following two parts:

$$|\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t_m))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_m}^\tau)]| \leq \underbrace{|\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t_m))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t_m))]|}_{=: \text{Error}_1} + \underbrace{|\mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t_m))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_m}^\tau)]|}_{=: \text{Error}_2}, \quad (1.5)$$

where the non-smooth test functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$ with $\|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1$, according to the definition of the TV distance (2.3). Here the modification F_δ is defined analogously to (1.3) with particular choices of parameters α, β, θ and τ therein replaced by δ . As the modification F_δ is globally Lipschitz continuous (cf. Lemma 5.1), one can rely on the use of the Kolmogorov equation to estimate both error terms in (1.5). A major technical obstacle stems from the regularization estimates of the solution ν^δ to the associated Kolmogorov equations in the context of non-smooth test functions and

the sharp interface limit. A direct use of the Bismut-Elworthy-Li formula ensures a rough bound for $D\nu^\delta(t, x)$ being of order $O\left(\frac{\exp(\epsilon^{-1}t)}{t^{1/2}}\right)$ (see Lemma 5.3). Despite the exponential dependence on both t and ϵ^{-1} , the rough bound is enough for the first error term in (1.5), by noting the error $\text{Error}_1 = |\mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(0, X(t_m))] - \mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(t_m, X_0)]| = O(\exp(\epsilon^{-1}t_m)\sqrt{\delta})$ vanishes as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Using the rough bound of $D\nu^\delta(t, x)$ and based on more careful estimates with the ergodicity of (1.4), one can obtain improved regularization estimates of $D\nu^\delta$ with polynomial dependence on ϵ^{-1} (Proposition 5.5). The refined regularization estimates for $D\nu^\delta(t, x)$ thus leads us to good estimates of Error_2 in (1.5) with order $O(\text{Poly}(\epsilon^{-1})\tau^{\gamma\wedge\theta})$ (see Theorem 6.4).

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- A novel explicit and easily implementable time-stepping scheme is designed for SPDEs with non-globally Lipschitz nonlinearity and space-time white noise. The scheme is new, even for deterministic Allen-Cahn equations. Uniform-in-time and uniform-in- ϵ moment bounds of the scheme are established. As clarified before, by carefully choosing proper method parameters, the analysis of the newly proposed scheme relies on an ϵ -independent restriction on the time step-size τ , instead of the severe restriction $\tau = O(\epsilon^\sigma)$, $\sigma \geq 1$ in the literature.
- Total variation error bounds are established near the sharp interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ (Theorem 6.4) with a polynomial dependence on ϵ^{-1} and the time length t_m :

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) = O(t_m \cdot \text{Poly}(\epsilon^{-1})\tau^\gamma), \quad \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}). \quad (1.6)$$

This error bound admits a convergence rate of order γ for any $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, twice that of convergence in TV distance in [13, Theorem 5.6].

- A uniform-in-time error bound is obtained for $\epsilon = 1$ (Corollary 6.5):

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) = O(\tau^\gamma), \quad \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}). \quad (1.7)$$

Such a uniform-in-time error bound extends the existing ones in the globally Lipschitz regime [3, 5] to a non-globally Lipschitz setting.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. The next section presents some preliminaries. The explicit time-stepping scheme is introduced in Section 3 and the uniform-in-time moment bound of the proposed scheme is proved in Section 4. In Section 5, an auxiliary process is introduced and the regularity estimates of its Kolmogorov equation are established. Then we show main convergence results in TV distance in Section 6. The numerical experiments are performed in Section 7 to verify the theoretic findings.

2 Settings and the considered SPDEs

2.1 Notation

Let \mathbb{N} be the set of all positive integers and denote $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Define $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$, $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. By $L^r(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R})$ ($L^r(\mathcal{D})$ or simply L^r) we denote the Banach space of

r -integrable functions, equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^r}$. In particular, let $H := L^2(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R})$ be the real, separable Hilbert space endowed with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and norm $\|\cdot\| := \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^{1/2}$. Moreover, we use $\mathcal{L}(H)$ to denote the Banach space of bounded linear operators on H , equipped with the operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}$. By $\mathcal{L}_2(H) \subset \mathcal{L}(H)$ (\mathcal{L}_2 for short), we denote the subspace consisting of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from H to H , which is also a separable Hilbert space, endowed with the scalar product $\langle \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)} := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \Gamma_1 \eta_n, \Gamma_2 \eta_n \rangle$ and the norm $\|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)} := (\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\Gamma \eta_n\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, independent of the choice of the orthogonal basis $\{\eta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of H . Also, we denote the Banach space consisting of continuous functions by $V := C(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{R})$, endowed with the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_V$. By $\mathbb{1}_S$ we denote the indicator function of the set S . We also clarify the notation for Fréchet derivatives: for a mapping $\phi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its first derivative $D\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(H, \mathbb{R})$ and second derivative $D^2\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(H, \mathcal{L}(H, \mathbb{R}))$ are defined by

$$D\phi(x).h := \langle D\phi(x), h \rangle \text{ and } D^2\phi(x).(h, k) := \langle D^2\phi(x).h, k \rangle, \quad \forall h, k \in H.$$

Throughout the paper, we denote C as a generic positive constant, which may change from line to line and whose dependence on parameters will be indicated in the notation $C(\cdot)$. Unless otherwise stated, all such constants are independent of ϵ and the step-size τ .

Next we recall the TV distance between two Borel probability distributions μ_1 and μ_2 on H , defined by

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H), \|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1} \left| \int \varphi(x) \mu_1(dx) - \int \varphi(x) \mu_2(dx) \right|, \quad (2.1)$$

where we denote the set of all bounded and measurable mappings from H to \mathbb{R} by $\mathcal{B}_b(H)$, and $\|\varphi\|_0 := \sup_{x \in H} |\varphi(x)|$. By $\mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$, we denote the set of bounded and continuous mappings from H to \mathbb{R} and by $\mathcal{C}_b^1(H)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$ consisting of all functions with bounded first order derivatives. Since every bounded, measurable function $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H)$ can be approximated pointwise by a sequence $(\varphi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$, where $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in H} |\varphi_k(x)| < \infty$ and $\varphi_k(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in H$, the TV distance between two Borel probability distributions μ_1 and μ_2 can be equivalently rewritten as (see, e.g., [4, 5]):

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H), \|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1} \left| \int \varphi(x) \mu_1(dx) - \int \varphi(x) \mu_2(dx) \right|. \quad (2.2)$$

Given an H -valued random variable X and a Borel probability measure μ on H , the TV distance between the law of X , denoted by $\text{law}(X)$, and μ is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X), \mu) &= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H), \|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] - \int \varphi(x) \mu(dx) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H), \|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] - \int \varphi(x) \mu(dx) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Main assumptions and the well-posedness of SPDEs

Throughout this paper, we focus on the following parabolic SPDEs in the Hilbert space H :

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = -AX(t)dt + \epsilon^{-1}F(X(t))dt + dW(t), & t > 0, \\ X(0) = X_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ is the diffuse interface thickness, and A , F , W , and X_0 are as specified below. To ensure the well-posedness of (2.4) and to facilitate our subsequent analysis, we impose the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 (Linear Operator A). *Let $\mathcal{D} := (0, 1)$ and let $H := L^2(\mathcal{D}; \mathbb{R})$. Let $-A: \text{Dom}(A) \subset H \rightarrow H$ be the Laplacian on \mathcal{D} with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, i.e., $-Au = \Delta u$, $u \in \text{Dom}(A) := H^2(\mathcal{D}) \cap H_0^1(\mathcal{D})$.*

Under this assumption, the operator A admits an eigensystem $\{\lambda_j, e_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in H satisfying $Ae_j = \lambda_j e_j$, with $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ being an increasing sequence such that $\lambda_j \sim j^2$. Further, it holds

$$\|A^{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)} < \infty, \quad \text{for any } \gamma < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.5)$$

In addition, $-A$ generates an analytic and contractive semi-group, denoted by $E(t) := e^{-At}$, $t \geq 0$. By means of the spectral decomposition, we define the fractional powers of A , i.e., A^ϑ for $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$ [24, Appendix B.2]. Denote the interpolation spaces by $\dot{H}^\vartheta := \text{Dom}(A^{\frac{\vartheta}{2}})$, $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}$, which are separable Hilbert spaces equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\vartheta := \langle A^{\frac{\vartheta}{2}} \cdot, A^{\frac{\vartheta}{2}} \cdot \rangle$ and the norm $\|\cdot\|_\vartheta := \|A^{\frac{\vartheta}{2}} \cdot\| = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\vartheta^{1/2}$. The following regularity properties are well-known (see e.g. [28]): for any $t > 0$, $\vartheta \geq 0$, $\varsigma \in [0, 1]$,

$$\|E(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \leq e^{-\lambda_1 t}, \quad \|A^\vartheta E(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \leq Ct^{-\vartheta}, \quad \|A^{-\varsigma}(I - E(t))\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \leq Ct^\varsigma. \quad (2.6)$$

As indicated by [2, (2.4)] and [31, (6.2)], for any $t > 0$,

$$\|E(t)x\|_V \leq C(1 \wedge t)^{-\frac{1}{4}}e^{-ct}\|x\|, \quad \forall x \in H, \quad \text{and} \quad \|E(t)x\|_V \leq \|x\|_V, \quad \forall x \in V. \quad (2.7)$$

Assumption 2.2 (Noise Process). *Let $\{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a cylindrical I -Wiener process with respect to a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}, \mathbb{P})$, represented by a formal series*

$$W(t) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\beta}_n(t) e_n, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\{\tilde{\beta}_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, t \geq 0$, is the sequence of independent real-valued standard Brownian motions adapted to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, and $\{e_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the complete orthonormal basis of H .

Assumption 2.3 (Nonlinearity). *Let $q > 1$ be any integer and let $F: L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H$ be a nonlinear Nemytskii operator given by*

$$F(u)(x) := f(u(x)), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (2.9)$$

where $f(v) = -c_f v^{2q-1} + f_0(v)$, $v \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c_f > 0$ and $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being twice differentiable. In particular, there exist constants $c_{f,0}, c_{f,1} > 0$ such that

$$|f_0(v)| \leq c_{f,0}(1 + |v|^{2q-2}), \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$|f'_0(v)| + |f''_0(v)| \leq c_{f,1}(1 + |v|^{2q-3}), \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.11)$$

By Assumption 2.3, one can find constants $L_f \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 > 0$ such that, for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f'(u) \leq L_f, \quad (2.12)$$

$$(u+v)f(u) \leq -c_0|u|^{2q} + c_1|v|^{2q} + c_2, \quad (2.13)$$

$$|f(u)| \leq c_3|u|^{2q-1} + c_4|u| + c_5. \quad (2.14)$$

A typical example fulfilling Assumption 2.3 is the cubic nonlinearity (i.e., the case $q = 2$) $f(u) := a_0 + a_1u + a_2u^2 + a_3u^3$ with $a_3 < 0, a_0, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Such SPDEs with cubic nonlinearity are commonly termed as stochastic Allen–Cahn equations ([7, 12, 16, 20]).

Assumption 2.4 (Initial value). *Let the initial value $X_0: \Omega \rightarrow H$ be an $\mathcal{F}_0/\mathcal{B}(H)$ -measurable random variable. For any $p \geq 1$ and for some $\varrho > \frac{1}{2}$, there exists a constant $C(\varrho, p) > 0$ depending on ϱ, p such that*

$$\|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\varrho)} \leq C(\varrho, p) < \infty. \quad (2.15)$$

The next lemma provides uniform-in-time regularity properties of the stochastic convolution (see, e.g., the proof of [13, Lemma 2.2]).

Lemma 2.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 be fulfilled. For any $p \in [2, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exist constants $C(p)$ and $C(p, \gamma)$ such that the stochastic convolution*

$$\mathcal{O}_t := \int_0^t E(t-s) dW(s), \quad t \geq 0 \quad (2.16)$$

obeys

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathcal{O}_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \leq C(p) < \infty, \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathcal{O}_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \leq C(p, \gamma) < \infty. \quad (2.17)$$

As a consequence, we obtain the well-posedness of the mild solution to SPDEs (2.4) as follows (see, e.g., [10, Chapter 6] and [13, Lemma 2.2]).

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose Assumptions 2.1–2.4 are satisfied. Then, the model (2.4) admits a unique mild solution $\{X(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ with continuous sample paths defined by*

$$X(t) = E(t)X_0 + \int_0^t E(t-s)\epsilon^{-1}F(X(s)) ds + \mathcal{O}_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.18)$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C(p, q) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|X(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \leq C(p, q)(1 + \|X_0\|_V). \quad (2.19)$$

Owing to the non-degeneracy of the I -Wiener process, the SPDE (2.18) admits the exponential convergence to the equilibrium (see, e.g., [13, Lemma 4.6]).

Proposition 2.7. *Let Assumptions 2.1–2.3 hold. By $X(t, x), t \geq 0$ we denote the unique solution of (2.18) that initiates at $x \in H$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of ϵ^{-1} such that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H)$, $t \geq 0$, and $x_1, x_2 \in V \cap \dot{H}^\gamma$, it holds*

$$|\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, x_1))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, x_2))]| \leq C\|\varphi\|_0 e^{-rt}, \quad (2.20)$$

where the rate $r := -\frac{1}{2}\log(1 - \vartheta)$ with $e^{-\tilde{C}\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}} \leq \vartheta \leq e^{-\tilde{c}\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}}$ for some $\tilde{C} \geq \tilde{c} \geq 0$.

3 The proposed explicit time-stepping scheme

In this section, we aim to design an explicit time-stepping scheme to approximate the underlying problem (2.4) temporally. For a uniform step-size $\tau > 0$, we propose the following scheme:

$$X_{t_{m+1}}^\tau = E(\tau)X_{t_m}^\tau + \tau E(\tau)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X_{t_m}^\tau) + \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} E(t_{m+1} - s) \, dW(s), \quad X_0^\tau = X(0), \quad (3.1)$$

where we denote $t_m := m\tau$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Here, $F_\tau: L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H$ is the Nemytskii operator associated with the function $f_\tau: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$F_\tau(u)(x) := f_\tau(u(x)), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}, \quad f_\tau(v) := \frac{f(v)}{(1 + \beta\tau^\theta|v|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^\alpha}, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\beta, \theta > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{\theta})$. On different choices of method parameters, the proposed modifications f_τ of the nonlinearity reduce to several existing ones for stochastic ordinary differential equations (SODEs). For example, the modification f_τ with $\alpha = 1/2$ is similar to that in [27] and taking $\alpha = 1$ makes the modification f_τ similar to the tamed Euler method considered in [1, 30].

Throughout the paper, we put an additional condition on the time step-size τ , the diffuse interface thickness ϵ and the regularization parameters β, θ, α for f_τ (3.2) as follows:

$$2c_3^2\tau^{1-\theta\alpha} \leq c_0\beta^\alpha\epsilon, \quad (3.3)$$

where the parameters c_0, c_3 stem from (2.13)-(2.14). We mention that a similar condition like (3.3) was also required in [13, 14]. At first sight, such a restriction depending on the small parameter ϵ is rather strict. However, by carefully choosing proper method parameters, the severe restriction can be significantly relieved and only an ϵ -independent restriction is needed (see Remark 3.1 and Theorem 6.4 below).

Remark 3.1. *The restriction (3.3) illustrates how the step-size τ should be scaled with respect to ϵ and the regularization parameters α, β and the convergence rate θ . In particular, for β and θ fixed, the parameter α can be chosen flexibly to relax the constraint on τ in sharp-interface simulations. Notably, as implied by Theorem 6.4, by taking $\beta^\alpha = O(\epsilon^{-1})$, we just need an ϵ -independent restriction $2c_3^2\tau^{1-\theta\alpha} \leq c_0$ to promise error estimates still with a polynomial dependence on ϵ^{-1} .*

Under the condition (3.3), we have several key properties of the modified function f_τ .

Proposition 3.2. *Let Assumption 2.3 and condition (3.3) hold. For $\tau > 0$, the modified function f_τ (3.2) satisfies the following conditions: there exist constants $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2 > 0$ independent of β, θ, τ and ϵ^{-1} , such that for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$2(u + v)f_\tau(u) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}|f_\tau(u)|^2 \leq -\frac{c_0}{2(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}|u|^2 + \tilde{c}_1(1 + |v|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$|f_\tau(u)| \leq |f(u)|, \quad (3.5)$$

$$|f_\tau(u) - f(u)| \leq \alpha\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}}|f(u)|, \quad (3.6)$$

where c_0 is given by (2.13) and $\beta, \theta > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{\theta})$ come from (3.2).

Proof. By introducing

$$\Theta(x) := (1 + \beta\tau^\theta x)^{-\alpha}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (3.7)$$

we rewrite f_τ as

$$f_\tau(u) = f(u)\Theta(|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}}), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.8)$$

As $|\Theta(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \geq 0$, the assertion (3.5) follows immediately. Noting that $\Theta(0) = 1$ and

$$|\Theta'(x)| = \left| \frac{\alpha\beta\tau^\theta}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta x)^{\alpha+1}} \right| \leq \alpha\beta\tau^\theta, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (3.9)$$

we can infer

$$|f_\tau(u) - f(u)| = |f(u)| \cdot \left| \Theta(|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}}) - \Theta(0) \right| \leq \alpha\beta\tau^\theta |u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}} |f(u)| \quad (3.10)$$

and thus the assertion (3.6) is validated. Now it remains to verify (3.4), which requires more efforts. Using (2.13)-(2.14) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(u+v)f_\tau(u) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}|f_\tau(u)|^2 \\ &= \frac{2(u+v)f(u)}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^\alpha} + \frac{\tau\epsilon^{-1}|f(u)|^2}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\leq \frac{2(-c_0|u|^{2q} + c_1|v|^{2q} + c_2)}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^\alpha} + \frac{\tau\epsilon^{-1}(c_3|u|^{2q-1} + c_4|u| + c_5)^2}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{-2c_0|u|^{2q}(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^\alpha + \tau\epsilon^{-1}(c_3|u|^{2q-1} + c_4|u| + c_5)^2}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Note that $(1+x)^\alpha \geq 2^{\alpha-1}(1+x^\alpha)$, $x \geq 0$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ (see, e.g., [22, (3.16)]), while $(1+x)^\alpha \geq 1+x^\alpha$, $x \geq 0$ for $\alpha > 1$. Accordingly, for $\tilde{\alpha} := \min\{\alpha, 1\}$ it holds

$$(1+x)^\alpha \geq 2^{\tilde{\alpha}-1}(1+x^\alpha), \quad \text{for any } x \geq 0, \alpha > 0. \quad (3.12)$$

This together with the Young inequality, namely, $(c_3|u|^{2q-1} + c_4|u| + c_5)^2 \leq 2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_3^2|u|^{4q-2} + \hat{c}_5$ for some constant $\hat{c}_5 > 0$ depending on $(2^{\tilde{\alpha}} - 1)^{-1}$, further implies

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(u+v)f_\tau(u) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}|f_\tau(u)|^2 \\ &\leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{-2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_0|u|^{2q}(1+\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}|u|^{2q-2}) + 2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_3^2\tau\epsilon^{-1}|u|^{4q-2} + \hat{c}_5\tau\epsilon^{-1}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{\frac{\hat{c}_5c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{2c_3^2} + \frac{-2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_0|u|^{2q} - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_3\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}|u|^{4q-2}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\quad + \frac{-\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}|u|^{4q-2} + 2^{\tilde{\alpha}}c_3^2\tau\epsilon^{-1}|u|^{4q-2}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{\frac{\hat{c}_5c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{2c_3^2} + \left[\frac{-c_0|u|^{2q-2} - \frac{1}{2}c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}|u|^{4q-4}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}} \right] \cdot |u|^2}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta|u|^{\frac{2q-2}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where the last inequality follows from the condition (3.3) for $q > 1$, i.e., $2c_3^2\tau\epsilon^{-1} \leq c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}$.

To proceed further, we consider two cases: $|u| \leq 1$ and $|u| > 1$. For the former case $|u| \leq 1$, one easily derives from (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(u+v)f_\tau(u) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}|f_\tau(u)|^2 &\leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{\hat{c}_5c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{2c_3^2} \\ &\leq -\frac{c_0}{2(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}|u|^2 + 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{c_0}{2(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}} + \frac{\hat{c}_5c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{2c_3^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

as required. For the other case $|u| > 1$, we introduce an auxiliary function defined by

$$\Upsilon(x) := \frac{-c_0x - \frac{1}{2}c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}x^2}{(1 + \beta\tau^\theta x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{2\alpha}}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (3.15)$$

and therefore, the equation (3.13) is recast as

$$2(u+v)f_\tau(u) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}|f_\tau(u)|^2 \leq 2c_1|v|^{2q} + 2c_2 + \frac{\hat{c}_5c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{2c_3^2} + \Upsilon(|u|^{2q-2}) \cdot |u|^2. \quad (3.16)$$

Now it suffices to estimate the upper bound of Υ , for which we claim

$$\sup_{x \geq 1} \Upsilon(x) \leq \frac{-c_0}{2(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}. \quad (3.17)$$

To validate the claim (3.17), one derives

$$\Upsilon'(x) = \frac{-c_0 - c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}x + c_0\beta\tau^\theta x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{(1 + \beta\tau^\theta x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^{1+2\alpha}}. \quad (3.18)$$

For $\alpha \geq 1$, one sees

$$c_0\beta\tau^\theta x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq c_0(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})^\alpha) = c_0 + c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}x, \quad (3.19)$$

leading to $\Upsilon'(x) \leq 0$, and thus

$$\sup_{x \geq 1} \Upsilon(x) \leq \Upsilon(1) = \frac{-c_0 - \frac{1}{2}c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}} \leq \frac{-c_0}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}. \quad (3.20)$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, following a same way as in [22, (3.23)-(3.25) of Proposition 3.3], there exists $x^* > 0$ such that

$$\Upsilon'(x) \leq 0 \text{ for } x \in [0, x^*], \quad \Upsilon'(x) \geq 0 \text{ for } x \geq x^*. \quad (3.21)$$

Hence, $\sup_{x \geq 1} \Upsilon(x)$ is bounded by $\Upsilon(1) \vee \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Upsilon(x)$, i.e.,

$$\Upsilon(x) \leq \Upsilon(1) \vee \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Upsilon(x) = \frac{-c_0 - \frac{1}{2}c_0\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}}{(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}} \vee \frac{-c_0}{2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}} \leq \frac{-c_0}{2(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}, \quad (3.22)$$

as claimed. Inserting this bound into (3.16) thus completes the proof. \square

4 Uniform moment bounds of numerical approximations

The subsequent error analysis relies on uniform-in-time moment bounds for the proposed scheme. To get started, we recast the time-stepping recursion (3.1) as follows:

$$X_{t_m}^\tau = Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}, \quad \text{with} \quad Y_{t_m}^\tau := E(t_m)X_0^\tau + \tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} E(t_m - t_k)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X_{t_k}^\tau), \quad (4.1)$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $X_0^\tau = X_0$. Clearly, it follows from $Y_0^\tau = X_0$ that, for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$Y_{t_{m+1}}^\tau = E(\tau)Y_{t_m}^\tau + \tau E(\tau)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}). \quad (4.2)$$

Before proceeding further, we introduce a modified version of [22, Lemma 4.3], tailored for our analysis to refine the estimate (4.9) therein.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\rho \geq 1$ be any integer. Then for any $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \geq 0$ and $r, v > 0$, it holds that*

$$(\mathbb{A} + r\mathbb{B})^\rho \leq e^{(\rho-1)vr}\mathbb{A}^\rho + r\left(r^{\rho-1} + (1 + (\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-1})(1 + r^{\rho-1})e^{\rho-1}\right)\mathbb{B}^\rho. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. In a similar manner as (4.6)-(4.8) in [22, Lemma 4.3], it holds

$$(\mathbb{A} + r\mathbb{B})^\rho \leq \mathbb{A}^\rho + r^\rho\mathbb{B}^\rho + \frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}e^{\frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}}\mathbb{A}^\rho + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\rho-1} \frac{(\rho-1)!}{(j-1)!(\rho-j)!}r^j(\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-j}\right)\mathbb{B}^\rho, \quad (4.4)$$

where for the term $\sum_{j=1}^{\rho-1} \frac{(\rho-1)!}{(j-1)!(\rho-j)!}r^j(\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-j}$ we provide a slight modification of [22, (4.9)] such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\rho-1} \frac{(\rho-1)!}{(j-1)!(\rho-j)!}r^j(\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-j} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\rho-1} \frac{(\rho-1)^{j-1}}{(j-1)!}r^j(\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-j} \leq r(1 + (\frac{2}{v})^{\rho-1})(1 + r^{\rho-1})e^{\rho-1}. \quad (4.5)$$

The desired result then follows immediately by further employing that

$$\left(1 + \frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}e^{\frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}}\right)\mathbb{A}^\rho \leq \left(1 + \frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}\right)e^{\frac{(\rho-1)vr}{2}}\mathbb{A}^\rho \leq e^{(\rho-1)vr}\mathbb{A}^\rho. \quad (4.6)$$

□

The following theorem illustrates the uniform (in both time and ϵ) moment bounds of the numerical approximation X^τ .

Theorem 4.2 (Uniform moment bounds of X^τ). *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.4 and condition (3.3) hold. For any $p \geq 1$ and any integer $\rho \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) > 0$ such that the numerical approximation $X_{t_m}^\tau, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ produced by (3.1) obeys*

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|X_{t_m}^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} \leq \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} + C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) \cdot (1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(2 - \frac{1}{2\rho})}). \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. Thanks to (4.1) and Lemma 2.5, it suffices to derive a priori estimates for $Y_{t_m}^\tau, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ in $L^{2\rho}$ -norm. Recall that for any $t \geq 0$ and integer $\rho \geq 1$, the semi-group operator $E(t) := e^{-At}, t \geq 0$ satisfies a contractive property: $\|E(t)u\|_{L^{2\rho}} \leq \|u\|_{L^{2\rho}}, u \in L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D})$ (see, e.g., [22, Proposition 4.2]). As a result, we deduce from (4.2) that

$$\|Y_{t_{m+1}}^\tau\|_{L^{2\rho}} = \|E(\tau)(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \tau\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}))\|_{L^{2\rho}} \leq \|Y_{t_m}^\tau + \tau\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m})\|_{L^{2\rho}}. \quad (4.8)$$

Bearing (3.4) in mind and denoting $\tilde{c}_0 := \frac{c_0}{4(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}$ for short, one acquires

$$\begin{aligned} & |Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}f_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m})(\cdot)|^2 \\ &= |Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2 + 2\tau\epsilon^{-1}Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)f_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot) + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)) + \tau^2\epsilon^{-2}|f_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot) + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot))|^2 \\ &\leq |Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2 + \tau\epsilon^{-1}\left(-2\tilde{c}_0|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot) + \mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^2 + \tilde{c}_1(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}\right) \\ &\leq (1 - \tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1})|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2 + 2\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}|\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^2 + \tau\epsilon^{-1}\left(\tilde{c}_1(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2 + \tau\epsilon^{-1}\left((2\tilde{c}_0 + \tilde{c}_1)(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where we further used the Young inequality

$$-4\tilde{c}_0Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot) \leq \tilde{c}_0|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2 + 4\tilde{c}_0|\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^2, \quad (4.10)$$

as well as the inequality $1 - y \leq e^{-y}$ for $y > 0$ and the fact that $|\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^2 \leq 1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}$ for $q > 1$. Therefore, by taking ρ -th power on both sides of (4.9) and applying Lemma 4.1 with $r = \tau\epsilon^{-1}$, $v = \tilde{c}_0$ and

$$\mathbb{A} = e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2, \quad \mathbb{B} = (2\tilde{c}_0 + \tilde{c}_1)(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}, \quad (4.11)$$

one further gets

$$\begin{aligned} & |Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot) + \tau\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(Y_{t_m}^\tau + \mathcal{O}_{t_m})(\cdot)|^{2\rho} \\ &\leq e^{(\rho-1)\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}\left(e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^2\right)^\rho \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau}{\epsilon}\left(\left(\frac{\tau}{\epsilon}\right)^{\rho-1} + (1 + (\frac{2}{\tilde{c}_0})^{\rho-1})(1 + (\frac{\tau}{\epsilon})^{\rho-1})e^{\rho-1}\right)\left((2\tilde{c}_0 + \tilde{c}_1)(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}\right)^\rho \\ &\leq e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}|Y_{t_m}^\tau(\cdot)|^{2\rho} + C\tau\epsilon^{-1}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4\rho-3)})(1 + |\mathcal{O}_{t_m}(\cdot)|^{2q\rho}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where we used the condition (3.3) that $\tau\epsilon^{-1} \leq \frac{c_0}{2c_3^2}\beta^\alpha\tau^{\theta\alpha}$ and recalled $\tilde{c}_0 = \frac{c_0}{4(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}$. By integrating the above inequality over \mathcal{D} and recalling (4.8), we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_{t_{m+1}}^\tau\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} &\leq e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}\|Y_{t_m}^\tau\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} + C\tau\epsilon^{-1}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4\rho-3)})(1 + \|\mathcal{O}_{t_m}\|_V^{2q\rho}) \\ &\leq e^{-(m+1)\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}\|Y_0^\tau\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} + C\tau\epsilon^{-1}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4\rho-3)})\sum_{k=0}^m e^{-(m-k)\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}\left(1 + \|\mathcal{O}_{t_k}\|_V^{2q\rho}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Furthermore, one notes that

$$\tau\epsilon^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^m e^{-(m-k)\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}} = \frac{\tau\epsilon^{-1}(1 - e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}(m+1)})}{1 - e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}} \leq \frac{\tau\epsilon^{-1}}{1 - e^{-\tilde{c}_0\tau\epsilon^{-1}}} \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_0} + \tau\epsilon^{-1} \leq C(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}), \quad (4.14)$$

where we employed the inequality that $\frac{y}{1-e^{-y}} \leq 1+y$ for all $y > 0$, and recalled again the condition (3.3) together with $\tilde{c}_0 = \frac{c_0}{4(1+\beta\tau^\theta)^{2\alpha}}$. Using the fact $Y_0^\tau = X_0$ and Lemma 2.5 then ensures for any $p \geq 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|Y_{t_m}^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} \leq \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} + C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) \cdot (1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(2-\frac{1}{2\rho})}). \quad (4.15)$$

This together with Lemma 2.5 implies

$$\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0} \|X_{t_m}^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} \leq \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D}))} + C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) \cdot (1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(2-\frac{1}{2\rho})}), \quad (4.16)$$

as required. \square

5 Regularity estimates of the Kolmogorov equation

The subsequent weak convergence analysis relies on the Kolmogorov equation associated with the stochastic dynamics. For the considered SPDEs (2.4), the drift grows superlinearly and thus violates Lipschitz continuity, which prevents a direct use of the Kolmogorov equation. To resolve this, we construct an auxiliary process whose drift is modified to be globally Lipschitz continuous, for which the corresponding Kolmogorov equation is well posed. This enables us to establish regularity estimates essential for the subsequent weak convergence analysis.

5.1 An auxiliary process and its uniform moment bound

Inspired by the proposed modification of F as described in (3.2), we introduce the following auxiliary process:

$$\mathbb{X}^\delta(t) = E(t)\mathbb{X}_0^\delta + \int_0^t E(t-s)\epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s)) \, ds + \int_0^t E(t-s) \, dW(s), \quad X_0^\delta \in H, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.1)$$

where $F_\delta: L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H$ is a nonlinear Nemytskii operator such that $F_\delta(u)(x) := f_\delta(u(x))$ with $f_\delta: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f_\delta(u) := \frac{f(u)}{1+\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2}}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.2)$$

where we let $\delta \in (0, 1]$ be sufficiently small. Moreover, for any $v, \psi \in L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D})$, we define

$$(F'_\delta(v)(\psi))(x) := f'_\delta(v(x))\psi(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.3)$$

Note that the modification (5.2) is a special case of (3.3) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$. In this particular setting, the counterpart of condition (3.3) reduces to $2c_3^2\sqrt{\delta} \leq c_0\epsilon$, which can be always satisfied as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ finally. Consequently, such a regularized nonlinearity f_δ (5.2) inherits similar properties to those established in Proposition 3.2 with fixed $\alpha = \beta = 1, \theta = \frac{1}{2}$ and τ therein replaced by δ .

The following lemma shows additional properties for the derivative f'_δ .

Lemma 5.1. *Let Assumption 2.3 hold with $q > 1$ and let f_δ be defined by (5.2). Then there exist constants \tilde{L}_f and \tilde{l}_f independent of δ such that*

$$\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} f'_\delta(u) \leq \tilde{L}_f, \quad (5.4)$$

$$|f'_\delta(u)| \leq \tilde{l}_f (1 + (|u|^{2q-2} \wedge \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}})). \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. Denote $\text{sgn}(u) := \mathbb{1}_{\{u \geq 0\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u < 0\}}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$. It is straightforward to deduce

$$f'_\delta(u) = \frac{f'(u)(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2}) - f(u)(2q-2)\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-3}\text{sgn}(u)}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2}. \quad (5.6)$$

Owing to Assumption 2.3, we have

$$f'(u) \leq -c_f(2q-1)|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3}), \quad |f(u)| \leq c_f|u|^{2q-1} + c_{f,0}(1 + |u|^{2q-2}), \quad (5.7)$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} f'_\delta(u) &\leq \frac{(-c_f(2q-1)|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3}))(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{(c_f|u|^{2q-1} + c_{f,0}(1 + |u|^{2q-2}))(2q-2)\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-3}}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2} \\ &= \frac{-c_f(2q-1)|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3})}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{-c_f\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{4q-4} + c_{f,1}\sqrt{\delta}(1 + |u|^{2q-3})|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,0}\sqrt{\delta}(1 + |u|^{2q-2})(2q-2)|u|^{2q-3}}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Before moving on, we know that for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ independent of δ while depending on $c_{f,1}, c_{f,0}, q$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} -c_f(2q-1)|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3}) &\leq C_1, \\ -c_f|u|^{4q-4} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3})|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,0}(1 + |u|^{2q-2})(2q-2)|u|^{2q-3} &\leq C_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Thus, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$f'_\delta(u) \leq \frac{C_1}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2} + \frac{C_2\sqrt{\delta}}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2} \leq C_1 + C_2, \quad (5.10)$$

as asserted. Moreover, Assumption 2.3 ensures

$$|f'(u)| \leq c_f(2q-1)|u|^{2q-2} + c_{f,1}(1 + |u|^{2q-3}), \quad (5.11)$$

which together with (5.6)-(5.7) implies for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|f'_\delta(u)| \leq \frac{C(1 + |u|^{2q-2} + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{4q-4})}{(1 + \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2})^2}. \quad (5.12)$$

Hence, it holds that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|f'_\delta(u)| \leq C(1 + |u|^{2q-2}) + \frac{C\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{4q-4}}{1+\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2}} \leq C(1 + |u|^{2q-2}), \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$|f'_\delta(u)| \leq C\left(1 + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{|u|^{2q-2}}{1+\sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2}}\right) \leq C(1 + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (5.14)$$

The desired result (5.5) then follows immediately. The proof is thus finished. \square

Since f_δ in (5.2) is a particular case of the modification f_τ in (3.2) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$, the coercivity-type property (3.4) still holds for f_δ under the condition $2c_3^2\sqrt{\delta} \leq c_0\epsilon$. Consequently, \mathbb{X}^δ admits the following uniform moment bounds.

Lemma 5.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.4 hold and let $\mathbb{X}^\delta(t)$, $t \geq 0$ be defined by (5.1). For any $p \geq 1$ and any integer $\rho \geq 1$, there exist constants $C(p, q, \rho)$ and $C(p, q)$ independent of δ such that*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} \leq \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} + C(p, q, \rho), \quad (5.15)$$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \leq \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C(p, q)\epsilon^{-1} \left(1 + \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1}\right). \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. Letting $\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t) := \mathbb{X}^\delta(t) - \mathcal{O}_t$, $t \geq 0$, one shows

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)}{\partial t} = -A\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t) + \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t) + \mathcal{O}_t), \quad t > 0, \quad \mathbb{Y}^\delta(0) = \mathbb{X}_0^\delta. \quad (5.17)$$

Applying integration by parts and Assumption 2.1, we deduce that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho}}{dt} &= 2\rho \int_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho-1} \frac{\partial \mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x)}{\partial t} dx \\ &= 2\rho \int_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho-1} \cdot (-A\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x) + \epsilon^{-1}f_\delta(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x) + \mathcal{O}_t(x))) dx \\ &= -2\rho \langle (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t))^{2\rho-1}, A\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\rho \int_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho-2} \cdot \epsilon^{-1}(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))f_\delta(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x) + \mathcal{O}_t(x)) dx \\ &\leq -2\rho(2\rho-1) \langle (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t))^{2\rho-2} \nabla(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)), \nabla(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \rho\epsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho-2} (-2\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x) + \mathcal{O}_t(x)|^2 + \tilde{c}_1(1 + |\mathcal{O}_t(x)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\sqrt{\delta}) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

where the last inequality follows from the coercivity estimate for f_δ under condition $2c_3^2\sqrt{\delta} \leq c_0\epsilon$:

$$2(u + v)f_\delta(u) \leq -2\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}|u|^2 + \tilde{c}_1(1 + |v|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2\sqrt{\delta}, \quad \text{for all } u, v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.19)$$

with $\tilde{c}_{0,\delta} := \frac{c_0}{4(1+\sqrt{\delta})^2}$. Since $\langle (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t))^{2\rho-2} \nabla(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)), \nabla(\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)) \rangle \geq 0$, one further utilizes the Young inequality

$$-4\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x)\mathcal{O}_t(x) \leq \tilde{c}_{0,\delta}|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x)|^2 + 4\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}|\mathcal{O}_t(x)|^2 \quad (5.20)$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho}}{dt} &\leq \rho\epsilon^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{D}} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho-2} \left(-\tilde{c}_{0,\delta} |\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x)|^2 + 2\tilde{c}_{0,\delta} |\mathcal{O}_t(x)|^2 + \tilde{c}_1 (1 + |\mathcal{O}_t(x)|^{2q}) + \tilde{c}_2 \sqrt{\delta} \right) dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathcal{D}} -\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}}{2} (\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)(x))^{2\rho} + C\epsilon^{-1} (1 + |\mathcal{O}_t(x)|^{2q\rho} + \delta^{\frac{\rho}{2}}) dx \\
&= -\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}}{2} \|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} + C\epsilon^{-1} \left(1 + \|\mathcal{O}_t\|_V^{2q\rho} + \delta^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

where the Young inequality was also employed to get the second inequality. Multiplying both sides of the above inequality by $e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{2}}$ implies

$$\frac{d(e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{2}} \|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho})}{dt} \leq C e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{2}} \epsilon^{-1} \left(1 + \|\mathcal{O}_t\|_V^{2q\rho} + \delta^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \right). \tag{5.22}$$

The Gronwall inequality then leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{2}} \|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} &\leq \|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(0)\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} + C\epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}s}{2}} \left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0} \|\mathcal{O}_s\|_V^{2q\rho} + \delta^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \right) ds \\
&= \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^{2\rho}}^{2\rho} + \frac{2C}{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}} \left(e^{\frac{\rho\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{2}} - 1 \right) \left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0} \|\mathcal{O}_s\|_V^{2q\rho} + \delta^{\frac{\rho}{2}} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{Y}^\delta(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} &\leq e^{\frac{-\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{4}} \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} + C(1 + \sqrt{\delta})^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0} \|\mathcal{O}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)}^q + \delta^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\
&\leq e^{\frac{-\tilde{c}_{0,\delta}\epsilon^{-1}t}{4}} \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} + C(p, q, \rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

where we recalled $\tilde{c}_{0,\delta} := \frac{c_0}{4(1+\sqrt{\delta})^2}$. This together with Lemma 2.5 immediately gives (5.15). Moreover, one uses (2.7) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \geq 0} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \left[\|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + \left\| \int_0^t E(t-s)\epsilon^{-1} F_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s)) ds \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + \|\mathcal{O}_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \right] \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C\epsilon^{-1} \sup_{t \geq 0} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s)\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} \right) ds + C(p) \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C(p, q) \epsilon^{-1} \left(1 + \|\mathbb{X}_0^\delta\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

where we used the fact that $\int_0^t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} ds$ is uniform-in-time bounded. The proof is thus finished. \square

5.2 The Kolmogorov equation and the regularity estimates

To carry out the weak error analysis, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$, let us introduce the functions $\nu^\delta(t, x)$ with $t \geq 0, x \in H$, defined by

$$\nu^\delta(t, x) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))], \tag{5.26}$$

where $\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x)$ solves (5.1) with initial value x . Since $F_\delta: H \rightarrow H$ is globally Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant depending on δ , as indicated by (5.5), it then follows from [6, Section 2] that ν^δ is the unique classical solution of the Kolmogorov equation satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \nu^\delta(t, x) = D\nu^\delta(t, x).(-Ax + \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(x)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} D^2\nu^\delta(t, x).(e_j, e_j), \\ \nu^\delta(0, \cdot) = \varphi(\cdot), \end{cases} \quad (5.27)$$

with $t \geq 0, x \in H$. In what follows, we first begin with a rather rough estimate for the derivatives of ν^δ , and later sharpen it to the desired estimate that reduces the dependence on ϵ^{-1} from exponential to polynomial order (as shown in Proposition 5.5).

Lemma 5.3. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.4, let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$ and $\nu^\delta(t, x)$ be given by (5.26). Then, for all $t > 0$ and $x, y \in H$,*

$$|D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| \leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0 \|y\|. \quad (5.28)$$

Proof. Recall that $\nu^\delta(0, \cdot) = \varphi(\cdot)$ with $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$. Then the Bismut-Elworthy-Li formula (see [10] for instance) yields

$$D\nu^\delta(t, x).y = t^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x)) \int_0^t \langle \xi_y^\delta(s, x), dW(s) \rangle \right], \quad (5.29)$$

with $\xi_y^\delta(t, x), t \geq 0$, given by

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_y^\delta(t, x) = -A\xi_y^\delta(t, x) dt + \epsilon^{-1}F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))\xi_y^\delta(t, x) dt, & t > 0, \\ \xi_y^\delta(0, x) = y. \end{cases} \quad (5.30)$$

In view of (5.3) and (5.4), we obtain

$$\langle F'_\delta(x)y, y \rangle \leq \tilde{L}_f \|y\|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in H. \quad (5.31)$$

Then it follows from Assumption 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\|\xi_y^\delta(t, x)\|^2}{dt} &= 2 \left\langle \frac{d\xi_y^\delta(t, x)}{dt}, \xi_y^\delta(t, x) \right\rangle \\ &= 2 \langle -A\xi_y^\delta(t, x), \xi_y^\delta(t, x) \rangle + 2\epsilon^{-1} \langle F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))\xi_y^\delta(t, x), \xi_y^\delta(t, x) \rangle \\ &\leq 2\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f \|\xi_y^\delta(t, x)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

The Gronwall inequality further yields

$$\|\xi_y^\delta(t, x)\| \leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t} \|y\|. \quad (5.33)$$

Using the Hölder inequality, the Itô isometry and (5.33) shows

$$\begin{aligned} |D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| &\leq t^{-1} \|\varphi\|_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \langle \xi_y^\delta(s, x), dW(s) \rangle \right| \right] \\ &\leq t^{-1} \|\varphi\|_0 \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_y^\delta(s, x)\|^2] ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0 \|y\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

for all $t > 0$ and all $x, y \in H$. The proof is thus completed. \square

Bearing the above lemma in mind, one obtains the following result that demonstrates the error between the original problem X and the auxiliary process \mathbb{X}^δ .

Proposition 5.4. *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.4, let $X(t, X_0), t \geq 0$ be the mild solution of the model (2.18) and $\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, X_0), t \geq 0$ be the auxiliary process defined by (5.1) with the initial value $\mathbb{X}_0^\delta = X_0$. Then for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_b(H)$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, X_0))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, X_0))] \right| \leq C\epsilon^{-1}e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t}t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_0\left(1 + \|X_0\|_V^{4q-3}\right)\sqrt{\delta}. \quad (5.35)$$

Proof. For brevity, we denote $X(s) := X(s, X_0)$, $s \in [0, t]$. Recalling $\nu^\delta(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))]$ and using Itô's formula, together with the associated Kolmogorov equation (5.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, X_0))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, X_0))] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(0, X(t))] - \mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(t, X_0)] \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t - \left(D\nu^\delta(t-s, X(s)) \cdot (-AX(s) + \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(X(s))) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} D^2\nu^\delta(t-s, X(s)) \cdot (e_j, e_j) \right) ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^t \left(D\nu^\delta(t-s, X(s)) \cdot (-AX(s) + \epsilon^{-1}F(X(s))) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} D^2\nu^\delta(t-s, X(s)) \cdot (e_j, e_j) \right) ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t D\nu^\delta(t-s, X(s)) \cdot (\epsilon^{-1}F(X(s)) - \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(X(s))) ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

Using Lemma 5.3 and the property $|f_\delta(u) - f(u)| \leq \sqrt{\delta}|u|^{2q-2}|f(u)|$ acquired similarly as in Proposition 3.2, one further deduces

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, X_0))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, X_0))] \right| \\ & \leq \epsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f(t-s)}(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|F(X(s)) - F_\delta(X(s))\| ds \right] \\ & \leq \sqrt{\delta}\epsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f(t-s)}(t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|X(s)\|_V^{2q-2}\|F(X(s))\| ds \right] \\ & \leq C\epsilon^{-1}e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t}t^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\varphi\|_0\left(1 + \|X_0\|_V^{4q-3}\right)\sqrt{\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where Assumption 2.3 and the bound (2.19) were utilized. The proof is completed. \square

Despite an exponential dependence on both t and ϵ^{-1} , such a rough estimate for $D\nu^\delta$ established in Lemma 5.3 is invoked only in the estimate for the error between X and \mathbb{X}^δ , which is $O(\sqrt{\delta})$ and thus vanishes as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In the next proposition, we derive a refined bound of $D\nu^\delta$ with a polynomial dependence on ϵ^{-1} .

Proposition 5.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.4 hold. Then for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$, $x, y \in H$, with $t > 0$, there exist positive constants $C(\vartheta, q), C(\tilde{L}_f, t, \epsilon^{-1})$ with $\vartheta \in [0, \frac{3}{4})$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
|D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| &\leq C(\vartheta, q)\|\varphi\|_0 e^{-rt}(1 + (t \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\vartheta}) \left(1 + \|x\|_{L^{4q-4}}^{2q-2}\right) \|A^{-\vartheta}y\| \\
&\quad + C(\tilde{L}_f, t, \epsilon^{-1})\|\varphi\|_0\|y\| \left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{8q-6}(\Omega; V)}^{4q-3}\right) \sqrt{\delta},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

where $r > 0$ comes from Proposition 2.7.

Proof. Below, we divide the proof into two parts: $t \in (0, 2\epsilon]$ and $t > 2\epsilon$.

- Part 1: $t \in (0, 2\epsilon]$.

Let $(P_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$ be the Markov semigroup associated with \mathbb{X}^δ in (5.1), so that $P_t^\delta\varphi(x) = \nu^\delta(t, x)$. Denote $\|\varphi\|_1 := \sup_{x \in H} \sup_{h \in H, \|h\| \leq 1} |D\varphi(x).h|$ for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(H)$. As a direct consequence of Lemma 5.3, for any $t > 0$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$, one knows $P_t^\delta\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(H) \subset \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$ and

$$\|P_t^\delta\varphi\|_1 \leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0. \tag{5.39}$$

Furthermore, the Markov property of \mathbb{X}^δ (5.1) implies, for all $t > 0$ and $x \in H$,

$$\nu^\delta(t, x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\nu^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, \mathbb{X}^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right) \right) \right] = P_{\frac{t}{2}}^\delta \nu^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, \cdot \right) \left(\mathbb{X}^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right) \right), \tag{5.40}$$

By (5.39) and Lemma 5.3, one notes that both functions $\nu^\delta(t, \cdot)$ and $\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, \cdot)$ are continuously differentiable for $t > 0$, implying that $\nu^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, \mathbb{X}^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right) \right)$ is also continuously differentiable. As a result, using the chain rule to (5.40) gives

$$D \left(\nu^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, \mathbb{X}^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right) \right) \right) y = D\nu^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, \mathbb{X}^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right) \right) \xi_y^\delta \left(\frac{t}{2}, x \right), \quad \forall x, y \in H, \tag{5.41}$$

where ξ_y^δ solves the variational equation (5.30), leading to

$$|D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| \leq \|P_{\frac{t}{2}}^\delta\varphi\|_1 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_y^\delta(\frac{t}{2}, x)\|] \leq \sqrt{2} e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f t} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0 \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_y^\delta(\frac{t}{2}, x)\|]. \tag{5.42}$$

By denoting

$$\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x) := \xi_y^\delta(t, x) - E(t)y, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{5.43}$$

and utilizing (5.30), one has

$$d\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x) = (-A + \epsilon^{-1}F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x)))\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x) dt + \epsilon^{-1}F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))E(t)y dt. \tag{5.44}$$

As a result,

$$\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x) = \int_0^t \Gamma(t, s) \epsilon^{-1}F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x))E(s)y ds, \tag{5.45}$$

where $\Gamma(t, s)$ is the evolution operator associated with the linear equation

$$\frac{\partial \Gamma(t, s)u}{\partial t} = (-A + \epsilon^{-1}F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x)))\Gamma(t, s)u, \quad \Gamma(s, s)u = u \in H. \tag{5.46}$$

Clearly, following a similar way as in (5.32)-(5.33), one can deduce

$$\|\Gamma(t, s)y\| \leq e^{\epsilon^{-1}\tilde{L}_f(t-s)}\|y\|. \tag{5.47}$$

Therefore, one then shows that for any $\vartheta \in [0, \frac{3}{4})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x)\| &= \left\| \int_0^t \Gamma(t, s) \epsilon^{-1} F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)) E(s) y \, ds \right\| \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{L}_f(t-s)} \|F'_\delta(\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x))\| \|E(s)y\|_V \, ds \\ &\leq C\epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t (1 + \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{4q-4}}^{2q-2}) e^{\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{L}_f(t-s)} (s \wedge 1)^{-\frac{1}{4}-\vartheta} e^{-cs} \, ds \|A^{-\vartheta}y\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.48)$$

where we also used (2.6), (2.7) and (5.5). Combining (5.43) and (5.48) yields, for $t \leq 2\epsilon$ and $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_y^\delta(t, x)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} &\leq \|E(t)y\| + \|\tilde{\xi}_y^\delta(t, x)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \\ &\leq C(\vartheta) e^{2\tilde{L}_f} (1 + t^{-\vartheta}) \left(1 + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{2q-2}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2} \right) \|A^{-\vartheta}y\|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.49)$$

Hence it follows from (5.42) and (5.49) that for $t \leq 2\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} |D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| &\leq C(\vartheta) (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\vartheta}) \|\varphi\|_0 \left(1 + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{2q-2}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2} \right) \|A^{-\vartheta}y\| \\ &\leq C(\vartheta) e^{2r\epsilon} e^{-rt} (1 + t^{-\frac{1}{2}-\vartheta}) \|\varphi\|_0 \left(1 + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{2q-2}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2} \right) \|A^{-\vartheta}y\|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

as asserted.

• Part 2: $t > 2\epsilon$.

Denote $\nu(t, x) := \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t, x))]$, $t \geq 0, x \in H$, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$. The Markov property (see, e.g., [10]) ensures that $\nu(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\nu(t-\epsilon, X(\epsilon, x))]$ for $t > \epsilon$. By Proposition 2.7, there exists a unique invariant measure μ_X for (2.18) (see, e.g., [15]), and it holds that

$$\left| \nu(t-\epsilon, x) - \int \varphi \, d\mu_X \right| \leq C e^{-r(t-\epsilon)} \|\varphi\|_0. \quad (5.51)$$

Denote $\phi(x) := \nu^\delta(t-\epsilon, x) - \int \varphi \, d\mu_X$, and $\nu_\phi^\delta(t, x) := \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))]$. Using Proposition 2.7 and Proposition 5.4 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(x)| &\leq |\nu^\delta(t-\epsilon, x) - \nu(t-\epsilon, x)| + \left| \nu(t-\epsilon, x) - \int \varphi \, d\mu_X \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t-\epsilon, x))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t-\epsilon, x))] \right| + C e^{-r(t-\epsilon)} \|\varphi\|_0 \\ &\leq C\epsilon^{-1} e^{\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{L}_f(t-\epsilon)} (t-\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0 (1 + \|x\|_V^{4q-3}) \sqrt{\delta} + C e^{-r(t-\epsilon)} \|\varphi\|_0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

Note that $\nu^\delta(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\phi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x))] + \int \varphi \, d\mu_X$. Combining (5.29) with (5.33), (5.52), and following a similar argument as used in Lemma 5.3 shows

$$\begin{aligned} |D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| &= |D\nu_\phi^\delta(\epsilon, x).y| \\ &= \left| \epsilon^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\phi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x)) \int_0^\epsilon \langle \xi_y^\delta(s, x), dW(s) \rangle \right] \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-1} (\mathbb{E}[|\phi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x))|^2])^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^\epsilon \mathbb{E}[|\xi_y^\delta(s, x)|^2] \, ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{\tilde{L}_f} \|y\| \left(\epsilon^{-1} e^{\epsilon^{-1} \tilde{L}_f(t-\epsilon)} (t-\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\varphi\|_0 (1 + \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x)\|_{L^{8q-6}(\Omega; V)}^{4q-3}) \sqrt{\delta} + C e^{-r(t-\epsilon)} \|\varphi\|_0 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

for $t > \epsilon$. Consequently, for all $t > \epsilon$,

$$\|D\nu^\delta(t, x)\| \leq Ce^{-rt}\|\varphi\|_0\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C(\tilde{L}_f, t, \epsilon^{-1})\|\varphi\|_0\left(1 + \|\mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x)\|_{L^{8q-6}(\Omega; V)}^{4q-3}\right)\sqrt{\delta}. \quad (5.54)$$

In view of (5.33), (5.41) and (5.49), one obtains for all $t > 2\epsilon$, i.e., $t - \epsilon > \epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |D\nu^\delta(t, x).y| \\ & \leq \|D\nu^\delta(t - \epsilon, \mathbb{X}^\delta(\epsilon, x))\|_{L^2(\Omega; H)}\|\xi_y^\delta(\epsilon, x)\|_{L^2(\Omega; H)} \\ & \leq \left(Ce^{-rt}\|\varphi\|_0\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C(\tilde{L}_f, t, \epsilon^{-1})\|\varphi\|_0\left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0}\|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{8q-6}(\Omega; V)}^{4q-3}\right)\sqrt{\delta}\right)\|\xi_y^\delta(\epsilon, x)\|_{L^2(\Omega; H)} \\ & \leq C(\vartheta)e^{-rt}\|\varphi\|_0\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\vartheta}\left(1 + \sup_{s \in [0, \epsilon]}\|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{4q-4}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2}\right)\|A^{-\vartheta}y\| \\ & \quad + C(\tilde{L}_f, t, \epsilon^{-1})\|\varphi\|_0\left(1 + \sup_{s \geq 0}\|\mathbb{X}^\delta(s, x)\|_{L^{8q-6}(\Omega; V)}^{4q-3}\right)\|y\|\sqrt{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.55)$$

Combining (5.50) and (5.55) together, one employs Lemma 5.2 and obtains the desired result. \square

6 Convergence analysis

This section is devoted to the error analysis of the proposed explicit discretization scheme. Error bounds measured under the TV distance are established for a near sharp interface limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, with only polynomial dependence on the interface parameter ϵ (see Theorem 6.4). The uniform-in-time error bound is also provided in Corollary 6.5 for $\epsilon = 1$ fixed.

For the purpose of the convergence analysis, we introduce a continuous version of the time-stepping schemes (3.1), defined by

$$X^\tau(t) = E(t)X_0^\tau + \int_0^t E(t - \lfloor s \rfloor_\tau)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor s \rfloor_\tau))\,ds + \mathcal{O}_t, \quad X_0^\tau = X(0), \quad (6.1)$$

where $t \geq 0$, and $\lfloor s \rfloor_\tau := t_k$ for $s \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and \mathcal{O}_t is given in Lemma 2.5. Moreover, we note the process (6.1) satisfies $X^\tau(t) = X_{t_k}^\tau$ for $t = t_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and

$$dX^\tau(t) = -AX^\tau(t)\,dt + E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X_{\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau}^\tau)\,dt + dW(t), \quad t > 0. \quad (6.2)$$

We now present uniform-in-time moment bounds for the process (6.1) in $L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D})$, V , and \dot{H}^γ norms, which will be used in the subsequent convergence analysis.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.4 and condition (3.3) hold. Let $X^\tau(t)$, $t \geq 0$ be defined by (6.1). For any $p \geq 1$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ and any integer $\rho \geq 1$, there exist positive constants $C(p, \rho, q, \alpha)$, $C(p, q, \alpha)$ and $C(p, q, \alpha, \gamma)$ independent of τ, β such that*

$$\|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} \leq C(\beta\tau^\theta)^\alpha\|X_0\|_{L^{p(2q-1)}(\Omega; L^{2\rho(2q-1)})}^{2q-1} + C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) \cdot \left(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4q-1-\frac{1}{2\rho})}\right), \quad (6.3)$$

$$\|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t}\|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C(p, q, \alpha)\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}}\left(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^\alpha\|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha}\right), \quad (6.4)$$

$$\|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t}\|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + C(p, q, \alpha, \gamma)\epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}\left(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^\alpha\|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha}\right). \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. We split the proof into three steps.

Step 1: $L^{2\rho}$ -estimate.

Note that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$X^\tau(t) = E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) + (t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) \epsilon^{-1} F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)) + \int_{\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau}^t E(t-s) dW(s). \quad (6.6)$$

By the contractivity $\|E(t)u\|_{L^{2\rho}} \leq \|u\|_{L^{2\rho}}$, $u \in L^{2\rho}(\mathcal{D})$, $t \geq 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.5, Theorem 4.2 and condition (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} &\leq \|X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^p(\Omega; L^{2\rho})} + \tau \epsilon^{-1} \|X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^{p(2q-1)}(\Omega; L^{2\rho(2q-1)})}^{2q-1} + C(p) \\ &\leq C \beta^\alpha \tau^{\theta\alpha} \|X_0\|_{L^{p(2q-1)}(\Omega; L^{2\rho(2q-1)})}^{2q-1} + C(p, \rho, q, \alpha) \cdot (1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{(4q-1-\frac{1}{2\rho})\alpha}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Step 2: V -estimate.

First, one rewrites (6.2) as: for $t > 0$,

$$dX^\tau(t) = -(A + \epsilon^{-1} I) X^\tau(t) dt + \epsilon^{-1} [E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)) + X^\tau(t)] dt + dW(t). \quad (6.8)$$

In view of the property (2.7), we then arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} &\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|E(t)X_0^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} \epsilon^{-1} E(t - \lfloor s \rfloor_\tau) F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor s \rfloor_\tau)) ds \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} E(t-s) \epsilon^{-1} X^\tau(s) ds \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} E(t-s) dW(s) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \\ &\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|X_0^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X^\tau(\lfloor r \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} \right) ds \\ &\quad + C \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X^\tau(r)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \right) ds + C \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathcal{O}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} \\ &\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|X_0^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C(p) \\ &\quad + C(p, q, \alpha) \epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^\alpha \|X_0^\tau\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha} \right) ds \\ &\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; V)} + C(p, q, \alpha) \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^\alpha \|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha} \right) + C(p), \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

where we also used the fact $\epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (1 \wedge (t-s))^{-\frac{1}{4}} ds \leq C \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}}$.

Step 3: \dot{H}^γ -estimate.

The argument is similar to **Step 2**, except that we use $\|E(t)x\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma} \leq C t^{-\gamma/2} e^{-ct} \|x\|$, $t > 0$, $x \in$

H , which follows from (2.6), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} &\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|E(t)X_0^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} \epsilon^{-1} E(t - \lfloor s \rfloor_\tau) F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor s \rfloor_\tau)) \, ds \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \\
&\quad + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} E(t-s) \epsilon^{-1} X^\tau(s) \, ds \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + \left\| \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} E(t-s) \, dW(s) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \\
&\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|X_0^\tau\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + C\epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(1 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X^\tau(\lfloor r \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} \right) \, ds \\
&\quad + C\epsilon^{-1} \int_0^t e^{-\epsilon^{-1}(t-s)} (t-s)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(1 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|X^\tau(r)\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \right) \, ds + C \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|\mathcal{O}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \\
&\leq e^{-\epsilon^{-1}t} \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + C(p, q, \alpha, \gamma) \epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^\alpha \|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha} \right) + C(p, \gamma),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

The proof is thus completed. \square

Next we present its Hölder regularity property in negative Sobolev spaces as follows.

Lemma 6.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1-2.4 and the condition (3.3) hold. Let $X^\tau(t), t \geq 0$ be defined by (6.1). Then for any $p \in [2, \infty)$, $\eta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ and $t > 0$ there exists a constant $C(X_0, \alpha, p, q, \eta, \gamma) > 0$ independent of τ and β such that*

$$\|X^\tau(t) - X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^{-\eta})} \leq C(X_0, \alpha, p, q, \eta, \gamma) \epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} \tau^{\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} (1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{(4q-\frac{3}{2})\alpha}). \tag{6.11}$$

Proof. Note that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&X^\tau(t) - X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) \\
&= (E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) - I) X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) + (t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) \epsilon^{-1} F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)) + \int_{\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau}^t E(t-s) \, dW(s).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

It is clear from [32, (4.57)] that

$$\left\| \int_{\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau}^t E(t-s) \, dW(s) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^{-\eta})} \leq C \tau^{\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}}. \tag{6.13}$$

Moreover, using the property (2.6) and Proposition 6.1 ensures

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) - I) X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^{-\eta})} \\
&\leq \|A^{-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}}(E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) - I)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \|X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \\
&\leq C\epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \tau^{\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} (1 + \|X_0\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^\gamma)} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^\alpha \|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4q-\frac{3}{2})}).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Armed with condition (3.3), one further employs Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 4.2 to show

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) E(t - \lfloor t \rfloor_\tau) \epsilon^{-1} F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau))\|_{L^p(\Omega; \dot{H}^{-\eta})} \\
&\leq \left\| \tau^{\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} (\tau\epsilon^{-1})^{1-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} F_\tau(X^\tau(\lfloor t \rfloor_\tau)) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; H)} \\
&\leq C\tau^{\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} \epsilon^{-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2}} (1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(1-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2})} \|X_0\|_{L^{(2q-1)p}(\Omega; L^{4q-2})}^{2q-1} + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(4q-\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\gamma+\eta}{2})}).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

The desired result then follows immediately from Assumption 2.4. \square

The subsequent lemma reveals the commutativity properties of the nonlinearity, which is a straightforward extension of [32, Lemma 4.9] for $q = 2$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let the nonlinear operator $F: L^{4q-2}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H$, $q > 1$ satisfy Assumption 2.3. Then for any $\varsigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\eta > \frac{1}{2}$, and $u, v \in V \cap \dot{H}^\varsigma$, there exists a constant $C(\varsigma, \eta, q) > 0$ depending on ς, η, q , such that*

$$\|F'(u)v\|_{-\eta} \leq C(\varsigma, \eta, q) \left(1 + \max\{\|u\|_V, \|u\|_\varsigma\}^{2q-2}\right) \|v\|_{-\varsigma}. \quad (6.16)$$

Equipped with the above preparations, we are now in a position to establish the convergence rate of the proposed time-stepping scheme in TV distance.

Theorem 6.4 (Convergence rate of the time-stepping scheme). *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.4, let $X(t), t \geq 0$ be the mild solution of (2.18) and $X_{t_m}^\tau, m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the time-stepping scheme defined by (3.1) with condition (3.3) fulfilled. Then for any $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a positive constant $C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha)$ independent of τ, ϵ and β such that*

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) \leq C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha) \beta \left(1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{\kappa_0}\right) \min\{\exp(\epsilon^{-2}), 1 + t_m\} \epsilon^{-\frac{q+3+2\gamma}{2}} \tau^{\gamma \wedge \theta}, \quad (6.17)$$

where $\kappa_0 := \max\{(4q-4) + \alpha(8q^2 - 6q - 1), \alpha(16q^2 - 17q + 3)\}$. In particular, by taking $\beta^\alpha = \epsilon^{-1}$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ and thus replacing the strict condition (3.3) with the ϵ -independent restriction $2c_3^2 \tau^{1-\theta\alpha} \leq c_0$, one obtains

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) \leq C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha) (1 + t_m) \epsilon^{-\frac{q+3+2\gamma}{2} - \frac{1+\kappa_0}{\alpha}} \tau^\gamma. \quad (6.18)$$

Proof. From (2.2), the convergence in TV distance is equivalent to establishing the following weak error bound: for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H)$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(H), \|\varphi\|_0 \leq 1} |\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_m}^\tau)] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t_m))]|. \quad (6.19)$$

To begin with, we introduce an auxiliary process \mathbb{X}^δ with parameter $\delta > 0$ defined by (5.1) and make a decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_m}^\tau)] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t_m))]| \\ & \leq |\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_{t_m}^\tau)] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t_m))]| + |\mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t_m))] - \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(t_m))]| \\ & =: I_1^{(\delta)} + I_2^{(\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

Since \mathbb{X}^δ serves as an approximation of X , we have $I_2^{(\delta)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ owing to Proposition 5.4. Therefore, it remains to estimate $I_1^{(\delta)}$ uniformly in δ . By the telescoping argument, we rewrite the term $I_1^{(\delta)}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^{(\delta)} &= |\mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(0, X_{t_m}^\tau)] - \mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(t_m, X_0)]| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(t_m - t_{k+1}, X^\tau(t_{k+1}))] - \mathbb{E}[\nu^\delta(t_m - t_k, X^\tau(t_k))]}_{=: I_1^{(\delta, k)}} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Recalling $\nu^\delta(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\mathbb{X}^\delta(t, x))]$ and the associated Kolmogorov equation and using the Itô formula yield, for $I_1^{(\delta, k)}, k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1^{(\delta, k)} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} - \left(D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot (-AX^\tau(t) + \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(X^\tau(t))) \right. \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} D^2\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot (e_j, e_j) \left. \right) dt \\
&\quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(-AX^\tau(t) + E(t - t_k)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(t_k)) \right) dt \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} D^2\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot (e_j, e_j) dt \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(E(t - t_k)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(t_k)) - \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(X^\tau(t)) \right) dt \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

Next we decompose the term $I_1^{(\delta, k)}$ into four parts as

$$I_1^{(\delta, k)} = I_{1,1}^{(\delta, k)} + I_{1,2}^{(\delta, k)} + I_{1,3}^{(\delta, k)} + I_{1,4}^{(\delta, k)},$$

where we denote

$$I_{1,1}^{(\delta, k)} := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(E(t - t_k)\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(t_k)) - \epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(t_k)) \right) dt \right], \tag{6.23}$$

$$I_{1,2}^{(\delta, k)} := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(\epsilon^{-1}F_\tau(X^\tau(t_k)) - \epsilon^{-1}F(X^\tau(t_k)) \right) dt \right], \tag{6.24}$$

$$I_{1,3}^{(\delta, k)} := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(\epsilon^{-1}F(X^\tau(t_k)) - \epsilon^{-1}F(X^\tau(t)) \right) dt \right], \tag{6.25}$$

$$I_{1,4}^{(\delta, k)} := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} D\nu^\delta(t_m - t, X^\tau(t)) \cdot \left(\epsilon^{-1}F(X^\tau(t)) - \epsilon^{-1}F_\delta(X^\tau(t)) \right) dt \right]. \tag{6.26}$$

We first estimate the term $I_{1,1}^{(\delta, k)}$. Using Proposition 5.5 together with Proposition 6.1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |I_{1,1}^{(\delta, k)}| &\leq C(q, \gamma) \epsilon^{-1} \|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \gamma} \right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \\
&\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^{4q-4}}^{2q-2} \right) \|A^{-\gamma}(E(t - t_k) - I)F_\tau(X_{t_k}^\tau)\| \right] dt \\
&\leq C(q, \gamma) \tau^\gamma \epsilon^{-1} \|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \gamma} \right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(1 + \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^{4q-4}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2} \right) \|F_\tau(X_{t_k}^\tau)\|_{L^2(\Omega; H)} dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q, \alpha, \gamma) \tau^\gamma \epsilon^{-1} (1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{\alpha(8q^2 - 6q - 1)}) \|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \gamma} \right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

where the property (2.6), Proposition 3.2 and Assumption 2.3 were also utilized. In a similar manner, we derive for the term $I_{1,2}^{(\delta,k)}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |I_{1,2}^{(\delta,k)}| &\leq C(q)\epsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \\
&\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^{4q-4}}^{2q-2}\right) \|F_\tau(X_{t_k}^\tau) - F(X_{t_k}^\tau)\| \right] dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q)\epsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(1 + \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^{4q-4}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2}\right) \|F_\tau(X_{t_k}^\tau) - F(X_{t_k}^\tau)\|_{L^2(\Omega; H)} dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q, \alpha)\beta\tau^\theta\epsilon^{-1}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{(4q-4)+\alpha(8q^2-6q-1)})\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

Similarly, for the term $I_{1,3}^{(\delta,k)}$, one further utilizes the property (6.16) and the Taylor formula, together with Lemma 6.2, to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |I_{1,3}^{(\delta,k)}| &\leq C(q)\epsilon^{-1}\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{8}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(1 + \|X^\tau(t)\|_{L^{4q-4}(\Omega; L^{4q-4})}^{2q-2}\right) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|F(X_{t_k}^\tau) - F(X^\tau(t))\|_{-\frac{3}{4}}^2 \right]\right)^{1/2} dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q, \gamma)\epsilon^{-1}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(8q^2-10q+\frac{3}{2})})\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{7}{8}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} dt \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \|X_{t_k}^\tau\|_V^{4q-4} + \|X_{t_k}^\tau\|_\gamma^{4q-4} + \|X^\tau(t)\|_V^{4q-4} + \|X^\tau(t)\|_\gamma^{4q-4}\right) \|X_{t_k}^\tau - X^\tau(t)\|_{-\gamma}^2 \right]\right)^{1/2} dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q, \alpha)\epsilon^{-1-\frac{q-1}{2}}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(16q^2-21q+\frac{9}{2})})\|\varphi\|_0 \\
&\quad \cdot \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{7}{8}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} \|X_{t_k}^\tau - X^\tau(t)\|_{L^4(\Omega; \dot{H}^{-\gamma})} dt \\
&\leq C(X_0, q, \alpha)\tau^\gamma\epsilon^{-\frac{q+1+2\gamma}{2}}(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\alpha(16q^2-17q+3)})\|\varphi\|_0 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\frac{7}{8}}\right) e^{-r(t_m - t)} dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

For the term $I_{1,4}^{(\delta,k)}$, following same steps as (6.28) and noting F_δ satisfies a similar property as (3.6), one gets $I_{1,4}^{(\delta,k)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. As a result, one gathers the above estimates to get

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |I_1^{(\delta,k)}| \leq C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha)\epsilon^{-\frac{q+1+2\gamma}{2}}\beta(1 + (\beta\tau^\theta)^{\kappa_0})\|\varphi\|_0\tau^{\gamma\wedge\theta} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (1 + ((t_m - t) \wedge \epsilon)^{-\kappa_1}) e^{-r(t_m - t)} dt, \tag{6.30}$$

where $\kappa_0 = \max\{(4q-4)+\alpha(8q^2-6q-1), \alpha(16q^2-17q+3)\}$ and $\kappa_1 = \max\{\frac{7}{8}, \frac{1}{2}+\gamma\}$. Summing over k and noting the fact that $r^{-1} = O(\exp(\epsilon^{-2}))$ (see Proposition 2.7) lead to the desired result. \square

In the typical case $q = 2$, Theorem 6.4 shows that the proposed explicit scheme achieves a polynomial dependence of order at most three on ϵ^{-1} , which coincides with the cubic scaling with

ϵ^{-1} identified in [13] for the weak convergence analysis with smooth test functions. Moreover, the error bound has a linear dependence with respect to the terminal time t_m , which can be regarded as a trade-off between the interface singularity and temporal accumulation.

As a direct consequence of Theorem 6.4, we get a uniform-in-time TV convergence rate for fixed $\epsilon = 1$, extending the existing ones in the globally Lipschitz regime [3, 5] to a non-globally Lipschitz setting.

Corollary 6.5 (Uniform-in-time convergence rate for fixed $\epsilon = 1$). *Let all assumptions in Theorem 6.4 hold and let $\epsilon = 1$ be fixed. let $X(t), t \geq 0$ be the mild solution of (2.18) and $X_{t_m}^\tau, m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the time-stepping scheme defined by (3.1) with $\theta \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Then for any $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$, there exists a positive constant $C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha)$ independent of τ, β and t_m , such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\text{law}(X_{t_m}^\tau), \text{law}(X(t_m))) \leq C(X_0, q, \gamma, \alpha) \beta (1 + (\beta \tau^\theta)^{\kappa_0}) \tau^\gamma, \quad (6.31)$$

where $\kappa_0 = \max\{(4q - 4) + \alpha(8q^2 - 6q - 1), \alpha(16q^2 - 17q + 3)\}$.

7 Numerical experiments

In this section, we perform some numerical experiments to verify the theoretical results in the previous sections. Consider the following one-dimensional stochastic Allen-Cahn equation driven by the space-time white noise:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x) = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t, x) + \epsilon^{-1}u(t, x) - \epsilon^{-1}u^3(t, x) + \dot{W}(t), & t \in (0, 1], \quad x \in (0, 1), \\ u(0, x) = \sin(\pi x), & x \in (0, 1), \\ u(t, 0) = u(t, 1) = 0, & t \in (0, 1], \end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

where we set $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the cylindrical Wiener process as defined in Assumption 2.2. To perform numerical experiments on a computer, we do the spatial discretization using the spectral Galerkin method ($N = 2^6$) and the temporal discretization using the proposed time-stepping scheme (3.1).

In what follows, we simulate the weak convergence at the endpoint $T = 1$, where we choose a typical scheme with parameters $\theta = \frac{1}{2}, \alpha = 1, \beta = 5$. The test function φ is chosen as a step function as follows:

$$\varphi(X) = \begin{cases} \sin(a), & \text{if } \|X\| \in [a, a + 0.1), \\ \sin(a + 0.1), & \text{if } \|X\| \in [a + 0.1, a + 0.2), \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \sin(a + 0.9), & \text{if } \|X\| \in [a + 0.9, a + 1), \end{cases} \quad (7.2)$$

where $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$ are any integers. Meanwhile, we approximate the expectations appearing in weak errors by computing the average of over 1000 samples and identify the “exact” solution with the numerical one produced by the implicit Euler method with sufficiently small step-size ($M_{\text{exact}} = 2^{14}$). Using five different step-sizes with $M = T\tau^{-1} = 2^i, i = 8, \dots, 12$, we plot weak errors in Fig.1(a) on a log-log scale. A comparison with the other three reference lines indicates that the convergence rate is close to $\frac{1}{2}$, matching well the theoretical result. We also list errors in Table 1

for schemes with different choices of α . An interesting observation is that, decreasing the degree α seemingly improves the computational accuracy for the same step-size. Additionally, we test the parameter choice with $\beta^\alpha = \epsilon^{-1}$, where we take $\alpha = 1$ and thus $\beta = 100$. We compute the errors with various step-sizes ($M = T\tau^{-1} = 2^i, i = 5, \dots, 9$). As shown in Fig.1(b), the convergence rate also agrees with the theoretical one.




Figure 1: Weak convergence rates of explicit time-stepping schemes

Table 1: Errors of numerical schemes with different α

	$\alpha = 1$	$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$	$\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$	$\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$
$\tau = 2^{-8}$	0.5982	0.4184	0.3791	0.3626
$\tau = 2^{-9}$	0.3533	0.2347	0.2030	0.1896
$\tau = 2^{-10}$	0.2131	0.1283	0.1080	0.0993
$\tau = 2^{-11}$	0.1319	0.0765	0.0622	0.0567
$\tau = 2^{-12}$	0.0853	0.0477	0.0364	0.0340

Finally, we conduct numerical experiments to illustrate the interface-capturing performance of the proposed time-stepping scheme. Setting $\alpha = 1, \beta = 5, \theta = \frac{1}{2}$ and using a fixed time step-size $\tau = 2^{-10}$, we investigate profiles of interface for the model (7.1) with two different values of the interface width, i.e., $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\epsilon = 0.001$. Via approximating the expectation with the average of 1000 samples, the expected values of numerical solutions at various time are depicted in Fig.2 ($\epsilon = 0.01$ for the left picture and $\epsilon = 0.001$ for the right one). We observe that the profiles of interface can be well captured.

References

[1] L. Angeli, D. Crisan, and M. Ottobre. Uniform in time convergence of numerical schemes for stochastic differential equations via strong exponential stability: Euler methods, split-step and tamed schemes. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 59(4):2207–2251, 2025.




Figure 2: Interface-capturing of the explicit time-stepping scheme

- [2] C.-E. Bréhier. Approximation of the invariant distribution for a class of ergodic SPDEs using an explicit tamed exponential Euler scheme. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 56(1):151–175, 2022.
- [3] C.-E. Bréhier. Analysis of a modified regularity-preserving Euler scheme for parabolic semilinear SPDEs: Total Variation error bounds for the numerical approximation of the invariant distribution. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, page 1–76, 2024.
- [4] C.-E. Bréhier. Total variation error bounds for the accelerated exponential Euler scheme approximation of parabolic semilinear SPDEs. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 62(3):1171–1190, 2024.
- [5] C.-E. Bréhier. Total variation error bounds for the approximation of the invariant distribution of parabolic semilinear SPDEs using the standard Euler scheme. *Potential Analysis*, 62(1):101–136, 2025.
- [6] C.-E. Bréhier and A. Debussche. Kolmogorov equations and weak order analysis for SPDEs with nonlinear diffusion coefficient. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 119:193–254, 2018.
- [7] C.-E. Bréhier and L. Goudenège. Weak convergence rates of splitting schemes for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *BIT*, 60(3):543–582, 2020.
- [8] C.-E. Bréhier, A. B. Laurent, A. Debussche, and G. Vilmart. Preconditioning for the high-order sampling of the invariant distribution of parabolic semilinear SPDEs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.17714*, 2025.
- [9] M. Cai, S. Gan, and X. Wang. Weak convergence rates for an explicit full-discretization of stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with additive noise. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 86:1–30, 2021.

[10] S. Cerrai. *Second Order PDE's in Finite and Infinite Dimension: A Probabilistic Approach*. Springer, 2001.

[11] Q. Cheng, C. Liu, and J. Shen. A new interface capturing method for Allen-Cahn type equations based on a flow dynamic approach in Lagrangian coordinates, I. One-dimensional case. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 419:109509, 2020.

[12] J. Cui, J. Hong, and L. Sun. Weak convergence and invariant measure of a full discretization for parabolic SPDEs with non-globally Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 134:55–93, 2021.

[13] J. Cui and L. Sun. Weak approximation for stochastic Reaction-diffusion equation near sharp interface limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08241v2*, 2024.

[14] J. Cui and F.-Y. Wang. Improving numerical error bounds near sharp interface limit for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12604*, 2024.

[15] G. Da Prato. *An Introduction to Infinite-Dimensional Analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[16] X. Feng, Y. Li, and Y. Zhang. Finite element methods for the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with gradient-type multiplicative noise. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 55(1):194–216, 2017.

[17] T. Funaki. Singular limit for stochastic reaction-diffusion equation and generation of random interfaces. *Acta Mathematica Sinica*, 15(3):407–438, 1999.

[18] M. Hairer, M. Ryser, and H. Weber. Triviality of the 2D stochastic Allen-Cahn equation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 17(39):1–14, 2012.

[19] M. Hairer and H. Weber. Large deviations for white-noise driven, nonlinear stochastic PDEs in two and three dimensions. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 24, pages 55–92, 2015.

[20] C. Huang and J. Shen. Stability and convergence analysis of a fully discrete semi-implicit scheme for stochastic Allen–Cahn equations with multiplicative noise. *Mathematics of Computation*, 92(344):2685–2713, 2023.

[21] A. Jentzen and P. Pušnik. Strong convergence rates for an explicit numerical approximation method for stochastic evolution equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous nonlinearities. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 40(2):1005–1050, 04 2019.

[22] Y. Jiang and X. Wang. Uniform-in-time weak error estimates of explicit full-discretization schemes for SPDEs with non-globally Lipschitz coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21364*, 2025.

[23] K. Kawasaki and T. Ohta. Kinetic drumhead model of interface. i. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 67(1):147–163, 1982.

- [24] R. Kruse. *Strong and Weak Approximation of Semilinear Stochastic Evolution Equations*. Springer, 2014.
- [25] Z. Liu and J. Shen. Geometric ergodicity and optimal error estimates for a class of novel tamed schemes to super-linear stochastic PDEs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.19117*, 2025.
- [26] A. K. Majee and A. Prohl. Optimal strong rates of convergence for a space-time discretization of the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with multiplicative noise. *Computational Methods in Applied Mathematics*, 18(2):297–311, 2018.
- [27] A. Neufeld and Y. Zhang. Non-asymptotic convergence bounds for modified tamed unadjusted Langevin algorithm in non-convex setting. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 543(1):128892, 2025.
- [28] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, 1983.
- [29] R. Qi and X. Wang. Optimal error estimates of Galerkin finite element methods for stochastic Allen–Cahn equation with additive noise. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 80:1171–1194, 2019.
- [30] S. Sabanis. Euler approximations with varying coefficients: the case of superlinearly growing diffusion coefficients. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 26(4):2083–2105, 2016.
- [31] V. Thomée. *Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Parabolic Problems*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [32] X. Wang. An efficient explicit full-discrete scheme for strong approximation of stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(10):6271–6299, 2020.
- [33] X. Wang and R. Qi. A note on an accelerated exponential Euler method for parabolic SPDEs with additive noise. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 46:31–37, 2015.
- [34] Y. Wang and W. Cao. Approximation of the invariant measure for stochastic Allen–Cahn equation via an explicit fully discrete scheme. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00953*, 2024.
- [35] H. Weber. On the short time asymptotic of the stochastic Allen–Cahn equation. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 46(4):965–975, 2010.
- [36] J. Zhang and Q. Du. Numerical studies of discrete approximations to the Allen–Cahn equation in the sharp interface limit. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 31(4):3042–3063, 2009.