

The averaging principle of stochastic functional partial differential equations with Hölder coefficients and infinite delay

Shuaishuai Lu^{a 1}, Xue Yang^{a 2}, Yong Li^{a,b,* 3}

^aCollege of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun 130012, P. R. China.

^bCenter for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, P. R. China.

Abstract

In this paper, we establish the averaging principle for stochastic functional partial differential equations (SFPDEs) characterized by Hölder coefficients and infinite delay. Firstly, we rigorously establish the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for a specific class of finite-dimensional systems characterized by Hölder continuous coefficients and infinite delay. We extend these results to their infinite-dimensional counterparts using the variational approach and Galerkin projection technique. Subsequently, we establish the averaging principle (the first Bogolyubov theorem) for SFPDEs with infinite delay, subject to conditions of linear growth and Hölder continuity. This is achieved through classical Khasminskii time discretization and reductio ad absurdum, illustrating the convergence of solutions from the original Cauchy problem to those of the averaged equation across the finite interval $[0, T]$. To illustrate our findings, we present two applications: stochastic generalized porous media equations and stochastic reaction-diffusion equations with Hölder coefficients.

keywords: Averaging principle; Hölder continuous coefficients; Stochastic functional partial differential equations; Infinite delay; Reductio ad absurdum

MSC codes: 70K65, 60H15, 34K50

1. Introduction

Random phenomena encompass both natural occurrences and man-made systems, spanning from financial market fluctuations to molecular motions in living organisms, all of which can be

*Corresponding author

¹E-mail address : luss23@mails.jlu.edu.cn

²E-mail address : xueyang@jlu.edu.cn

³E-mail address : liyong@jlu.edu.cn

mathematically described by stochastic differential equations. Traditional differential equation theory is rooted in deterministic assumptions; however, many real-world systems are influenced by external random disturbances. Therefore, the introduction of stochastic processes and stochastic differential equations becomes essential for accurately modeling and analyzing these systems. Practical applications of stochastic models, such as climate interactions [28, 38], financial fluctuations [16, 17] and geophysical fluid dynamics [19, 20], frequently exhibit significant oscillatory components. These high-frequency oscillations present challenges for direct analysis and simulation of the system's properties. Consequently, deriving simplified equations that effectively capture the long-term evolution of these systems is crucial. The key strategy involves applying the averaging principle, which “averaged out” highly oscillatory components under suitable conditions, thereby yielding an averaged system that is more manageable for analysis. This averaged system governs the evolution of the original complex system over extended time periods, enabling us to grasp its fundamental dynamics independently of high-frequency oscillations.

Consider the following SFPDEs with high-frequency oscillating variables and infinite delay on a separable Hilbert space U_1 :

$$du^\varepsilon(t) = [A(u^\varepsilon(t)) + f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon)]dt + g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon)dW(t), \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$du(t) = [A(u(t)) + f^*(u_t)]dt + g^*(u_t)dW(t), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and

$$f^*(\varphi) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(t, \varphi)dt, \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|g(t, \varphi) - g^*(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 dt = 0$$

uniformly with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $\varphi \in C((-\infty, 0], U_1)$. Let $W(t)$ denote a cylindrical Wiener processes on a separable Hilbert space U_2 and let $u_t = \{u_t(\theta)\} = u(t + \theta)(-\infty \leq \theta \leq 0)$ be the segment process or solution map of system. A natural question arises: does the solution of system (1.1) converge to that of (1.2) as the time scale ε tends to zero? This query emerges naturally from both physical and mathematical perspectives. The theory that addresses such problems is the aforementioned averaging principle.

The concept of the averaging principle originated with the development of for nonlinear oscillations of deterministic systems by Bogoliubov [3, 29], and its extension to stochastic differential equations was further advanced by Khasminskii [26]. The averaging principle for finite dimensional systems has been extensively studied in recent decades, building on the pioneering work of Khasminskii; see, for example, [1, 18, 22, 23, 27, 32–34, 43, 47]. For infinite-dimensional systems,

the averaging principle was introduced by Henry [24]. Subsequently, the corresponding averaging principle for infinite-dimensional systems has also undergone significant development. In [39], Maslowski et al. presented an averaging principle for stochastic evolution equations with small parameters using the semigroup method. Kuksin and Piatnitski [30] explored the the Whitham averaging method in damped-driven equations affected by random disturbances. Cerrai and Freidlin [9] demonstrated the averaging principle for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations where the diffusion coefficients and the rates of reactions have different order. The averaging principle for nonautonomous stochastic reaction-diffusion equations exhibiting slow-fast dynamics was addressed in [10]. Furthermore, Cheng and Liu [11] established the second Bogolyubov theorem and a global averaging principle for a specific class of SPDEs with monotone coefficients. For further exploration of this topic, please consult the following references [2, 4–7, 14, 21, 48].

Deriving the averaging principle requires imposing suitable regularity conditions on the coefficients of the system, with the crucial assumption of Lipschitz continuity. Lipschitz continuity ensures the well-posedness of the system’s solution and plays a significant role in establishing solution uniqueness and sensitivity to initial conditions. Additionally, it allows us to work within the framework of square-integrable functions, thereby simplifying the proof process for a priori bounds of solutions in both fast and slow systems. Furthermore, Lipschitz continuity enables the application of Gronwall’s lemma to establish the convergence of the original system to the averaged system. Despite its importance in studying the dynamic properties of stochastic systems, the Lipschitz continuity condition is often not satisfied in many significant stochastic models. For instance, the Cox-Ingersoll-Ross model and diffusion coefficients in the Ferrer branch diffusion exhibit only Hölder continuous, not Lipschitz continuous. This limitation restricts the applicability of the averaging principle in various relevant scenarios. Thus, the rigorous demand for Lipschitz continuity in coefficients proves overly limiting for numerous models. Consequently, there has been increasing interest in recent years in developing averaging principles tailored to stochastic models with coefficients that are not Lipschitz continuous. For example, Veretennikov [47] investigated the averaging principle of SDEs across slow and fast time scales. Specifically, the drift coefficients of the equations involving the slow variables must be bounded and measurable, while all other coefficients are assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous. In [8], Cerrai presented the averaging principle for a system of slow and fast reaction-diffusion equations featuring multiplicative noise and coefficients with polynomial growth. Sun et al. [46] established the averaging principle for slow-fast SPDEs with Hölder continuous drift coefficients. In [44], Röckner et al. studied the averaging principle for semi-linear slow-fast SPDEs featuring additive noise with reaction coefficients that are merely assumed to be Hölder continuous with respect to the fast variable. For systems similar to system (1.1) that involve high-frequency oscillating variables, Xu and Xu [52] investigated the averaging

principle of stochastic evolution equations under non-Lipschitz conditions, focusing on the perspective of mild solutions. Here, we observe that in this context, the non-Lipschitz condition is, in fact, still stronger than Hölder continuity, also see [40, 41, 45] for the diffusion approximations of SDEs with singular coefficients.

The current issue pertains to whether the aforementioned averaging principle can be established for a stochastic differential system with parameters showing high-frequency oscillations, assuming the diffusion and drift coefficients are Hölder continuous. There are limited studies on this question, and our article tackles and resolves this matter. We will explore the averaging principle under Hölder conditions within the framework of stochastic partial differential equations with infinite delay. However, we emphasize that the conclusions in the paper are also applicable to corresponding models with finite delay and without delay, with slight adjustments to the conditions. In fact, the derivation process often becomes more concise in these cases. The reason we have chosen to focus on system (1.1) for our study is twofold: it allows us to showcase our methodology effectively and is also widely applicable in various contexts. Since time delays are ubiquitous in everyday life, they play a crucial role in mathematical and physical models. The motivation arises from phenomena involving delayed transmission, such as high-speed fields in wind funnel experiments, species growth patterns, and the incubation periods in disease models. The theory of stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delays has been garnering increasing attention, as reflected in recent literature; for examples, see [25, 37, 49–51] and others.

Prior to demonstrating the averaging principle for system (1.1), our foremost concern is to ascertain if the system ensures strong well-posedness under coefficients that satisfy Hölder continuity conditions. The issue of well-posedness for solutions of stochastic systems under non-Lipschitz conditions is addressed in [12, 13, 15, 31, 50] and references therein. It is crucial to emphasize that the problem we are addressing has not been covered in the existing literature. In the recent work [35], we investigated the issue of strong solution well-posedness under Hölder conditions in the framework of McKean-Vlasov SPDEs. However, we found that for SFDEs with delays, the approach does not straightforwardly parallel the above system. Thus, for SFDEs characterized by Hölder continuous coefficients, we initially establish the existence and pathwise uniqueness of weak solutions for a class of finite-dimensional systems. Subsequently, we ensure the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions by applying the Yamada-Watanabe criterion. For further details, please refer to Theorem 3.1. In the framework of infinite-dimensional systems, we employ the Galerkin projection technique. This approach, augmented with insights from finite-dimensional analysis, facilitates the verification of existence and uniqueness for solutions, as discussed in Theorem 3.3. The most challenging aspect of the proof process lay in establishing the pathwise uniqueness of weak solutions. Under Lipschitz conditions, the influence of initial values on solutions can be evaluated using Gron-

wall's lemma. To break through this bottleneck, we try to propose a new framework and develop some method from stochastic analysis. Ultimately, we utilize a proof to arrive at Hölder case. For a detailed account, please refer to Step 2 of Theorem 3.1.

Subsequently, we will employ the classical Khasminskii time discretization to establish the averaging principle for systems (1.1) with Hölder continuity coefficients. Similarly, a significant challenge arises when the system involves coefficients with low regularity, rendering the Gronwall inequality inapplicable. Therefore, by employing a special function and employing reductio ad absurdum under suitable conditions, we establish the following conclusion:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 = 0,$$

for all $T > 0$ provided $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 = 0$, where $u^\varepsilon(s; \varphi^\varepsilon)$ is the solution of (1.1) with the initial value $u_0^\varepsilon = \varphi^\varepsilon$ and $u^*(s; \varphi^*)$ is the solution of (1.2) with the initial value $u_0^* = \varphi^*$. In fact, this is the first Bogolyubov theorem, and it should be mentioned that this is the first averaging principle result for nonlinear S(F)PDEs with Hölder continuous diffusion and drift coefficients.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the assumptions and state our main results. Section 3 rigorously establishes the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions for a class of finite-dimensional systems characterized by Hölder continuous drift and diffusion coefficients. Subsequently, employing Galerkin projection techniques and insights from finite-dimensional systems, we extend these results to demonstrate the existence and uniqueness of solutions for corresponding infinite-dimensional systems. In Section 4, we concentrate on proving the averaging principle under the condition that the drift and diffusion coefficients of system (1.1) satisfy Hölder continuity. Additionally, we establish the averaging principle for systems with both finite delay and delay-free systems under the Hölder continuity condition. In Section 5, we will give two examples to illustrate the applicability of our result.

2. Preliminaries

The $(U_i, \|\cdot\|_{U_i})$, $i = 1, 2$ are separable Hilbert spaces with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{U_i}$. The space $(B, \|\cdot\|_B)$ is a reflexive Banach space and U_i^* , B^* denote the dual spaces of U_i , B , respectively. Let

$$B \subset U_1 \subset B^*,$$

where the embedding $B \subset U_1$ is continuous and dense. Thus, U_1^* is densely and continuously embedded in B^* . Denote the pairing between B^* and B by ${}_{B^*}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_B$, which implies that for all $u \in U_1$, $v \in B$,

$${}_{B^*}\langle u, v \rangle_B = \langle u, v \rangle_{U_1},$$

and (B, U_1, B^*) is called a Gelfand triple. The $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a certain complete probability space with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual condition and \mathbb{R}^n is the n -dimensional Euclidean space equipped with the norm $|\cdot|$. If K is a matrix or a vector, K' is its transpose. For a matrix K , the norm is expressed as $\|K\| = \sqrt{\text{trace}(KK')}$ and denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product of \mathbb{R}^n . For any $q \geq 1$ and the Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$, $C_b(\mathbb{R}, L^q(\mathbb{P}, X))$ to represent the set of all continuous and uniformly bounded stochastic processes from \mathbb{R} into $L^q(\mathbb{P}, X)$. If $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ is a real separable Hilbert spaces, for a given $h > 0$, we give the following definition of spaces C^h :

$$C_X^h = \left\{ \varphi \in C((-\infty, 0], X) : \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} e^{h\theta} \varphi(\theta) = x \in X \right\}.$$

The space C_X^h is a Banach space with norm $\|\varphi\|_h = \sup_{-\infty < \theta \leq 0} \|e^{h\theta} \varphi(\theta)\|_X$, and C_X^h has the following properties([51]):

- (1) For any $T > 0$, $x(\cdot) : (-\infty, T] \rightarrow X$ is continuous on $[0, T]$ and $x_0 = \{x(\cdot)\} : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow X$ is in C_X^h . Then for every $t \in [0, T]$,
 - (a) $x_t(\cdot) = \{x(t + \cdot)\} \in C_X^h$;
 - (b) $\|x(t)\|_X \leq \|x_t\|_h$.
- (2) x_t is a C_X^h -valued continuous function for any $t \in [0, T]$.
- (3) The space C_X^h is a complete space.

Let $\mathcal{B}(X)$ denote the σ -algebra generated by space X , $\mathcal{P}(X)$ be the family of all probability measures defined on $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Then we denote by \mathcal{P}_0 the set of probability measures on $(-\infty, 0]$, namely, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_0$, $\int_{-\infty}^0 \mu(d\theta) = 1$. For any $k > 0$, let us further define \mathcal{P}_k as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_k := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_0 : \mu^{(k)} := \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-k\theta} \mu(d\theta) < \infty \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}(X)$ be the family of all probability measures on $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ with the following metric

$$d_X(\mu, \nu) := \sup \left\{ \left| \int \Upsilon d\mu_1 - \int \Upsilon d\mu_2 \right| : \|\Upsilon\|_{BL} \leq 1 \right\},$$

where $\|\Upsilon\|_{BL} := \|\Upsilon\|_\infty + Lip(\Upsilon)$ and $\|\Upsilon\|_\infty = \sup_{\varphi \in X} \frac{|\Upsilon(\varphi)|}{(1+\|\varphi\|_X)^2}$, $Lip(\Upsilon) = \sup_{\varphi_1 \neq \varphi_2} \frac{|\Upsilon(\varphi_1) - \Upsilon(\varphi_2)|}{\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_X}$. Then it is not difficult to verify that the space $(\mathcal{P}(X), d_X)$ is a complete metric space.

Consider the following SFPDEs with infinite delay:

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(t, u(t)) + f(t, u_t)dt + g(t, u_t)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi \in C_{U_1}^h, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $W(t)$ be a cylindrical Wiener processes on a separable Hilbert space $(U_2, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{U_2})$ with respect to a complete filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and $u_t = \{u_t(\theta)\} = u(t + \theta)(-\infty \leq \theta \leq 0)$ is the segment process or solution map of system (2.1). The measurable maps:

$$A : \mathbb{R}^+ \times B \rightarrow B^*, \quad f : \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{U_1}^h \rightarrow U_1, \quad g : \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{U_1}^h \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)$ is the space of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from U_2 into U_1 .

3. Existence and uniqueness

The investigation into the existence and uniqueness of solutions to equation (2.1), characterized by Hölder continuous coefficients, presumes the initial value $\varphi \in C_{U_1}^h$ to be independent of $W(t)$. Initially, we postulate that the coefficients in (2.1) satisfy the following hypotheses:

(H1) (Continuity) For all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u, v \in B$, the map

$$\mathbb{R}^+ \times B \ni (t, u) \rightarrow_{B^*} \langle A(t, u), v \rangle_B$$

is continuous.

(H2) (Growth) For A , there exist constant $\alpha_1, M > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u \in B$ such that

$$\|A(t, u)\|_{B^*}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq \alpha_1 \|u\|_B^p + M,$$

and for the continuous functions f, g , there exist constant α_1 and M for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi \in C_{U_1}^h$ such that

$$\|f(t, \varphi)\|_{U_1} \vee \|g(t, \varphi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} \leq \alpha_1 \|\varphi\|_h + M.$$

(H3) (Coercivity) There exist constant $\alpha_1, M, p \geq 2$ and $\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u \in B$

$${}_{B^*} \langle A(t, u), u \rangle_B \leq -\alpha_1 \|u\|_B^p + \alpha_2 \|u\|_{U_1}^2 + M.$$

(H4) There exist constants $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$. The map A satisfies, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u, v \in B$

$${}_{2B^*} \langle A(t, u) - A(t, v), u - v \rangle_B \leq \alpha_1 \|u - v\|_{U_1}^{\beta+1},$$

and the functions f, g satisfy, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi, \phi \in C_{U_1}^h$ with $\|\varphi\|_h \vee \|\phi\|_h \leq M$,

$$\|f(t, \varphi) - f(t, \phi)\|_{U_1} \vee \|g(t, \varphi) - g(t, \phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} \leq L_M \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^\gamma.$$

(H5) For f and g , there exist constants α_1, α_2 and probability measures $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{(\gamma+1)h}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{2\gamma h}$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi, \phi \in C_{U_1}^h$

$$\langle f(t, \varphi) - f(t, \phi), \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \rangle_{U_1} \leq \alpha_2 [\|\varphi(0) - \phi(0)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta)],$$

$$\|g(t, \varphi) - g(t, \phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \leq \alpha_1 \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta).$$

In this paper, L_M denotes certain positive constants dependent on M . To prevent ambiguity, we maintain the assumption throughout that the constants $\alpha_1 > 0, M > 0$ and $\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which may vary from line to line.

Extensive research has focused on the properties of existence and uniqueness of solutions when the system coefficients satisfy Lipschitz continuity conditions. However, for coefficients with lower regularity, such as Hölder continuity alone, research on the topic is relatively scarce. We investigate the existence, uniqueness of solutions, and further asymptotic properties of equation (2.1) using the Galerkin-type approximation technique. For clarity, we initially analyze the following finite-dimensional system with Hölder continuous coefficients:

$$dx(t) = F(t, x_t)dt + G(t, x_t)dB(t), \quad (3.1)$$

where the initial data $x_0 = \varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$, $B(t)$ is an m -dimensional Wiener process and $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $G : \mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are two continuous maps. We assume that the coefficients in equation (3.1) satisfy the following hypotheses:

(h1) The functions F and G are continuous in (t, φ) and satisfy, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$

$$\langle F(t, \varphi), \varphi(0) \rangle \vee \|G(t, \varphi)\|^2 \leq \alpha_1 \|\varphi\|_h^2 + M.$$

(h2) The functions F, G satisfy, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi, \phi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$ with $\|\varphi\|_h \vee \|\phi\|_h \leq M$,

$$|F(t, \varphi) - F(t, \phi)| \vee \|G(t, \varphi) - G(t, \phi)\| \leq L_M \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^\gamma.$$

(h3) For F and G , there exist constants α_1, α_2 and probability measures $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{(\gamma+1)h}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{2\gamma h}$ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varphi, \phi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$

$$\langle F(t, \varphi) - F(t, \phi), \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \rangle \leq \alpha_2 [|\varphi(0) - \phi(0)|^{\gamma+1} + \int_{-\infty}^0 |\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta)],$$

$$\|G(t, \varphi) - G(t, \phi)\|^2 \leq \alpha_1 \int_{-\infty}^0 |\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)|^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta).$$

Theorem 3.1. Consider (3.1). Suppose that the assumptions **(h1)**–**(h3)** hold. Then the following statement holds: for any $\varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$, there exist a unique strong solution $x(t)$ and segment process x_t to (3.1) with $x_0 = \varphi$.

proof: Based on the preceding analysis, we divide the proof of Theorem 3.1 into the following two steps:

step 1: We choose a family of finite-dimensional projections $\{\Lambda_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ in $C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$ that satisfies the following property:

$$\Lambda_n \rightarrow I (n \rightarrow \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_n[\varphi(0)] = \varphi(0),$$

where I are the identity transformation on $C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$. Let

$$F^n(t, \varphi) = F(t, \Lambda_n(\varphi)), \quad G^n(t, \varphi) = G(t, \Lambda_n(\varphi)),$$

then we obtain:

(I) $F^n \rightarrow F, G^n \rightarrow G$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$;

(II) F^n, G^n satisfy the conditions **(h1)** and **(h2)**, that is, the coefficients are independent of n .

We then convolve the (F^n, G^n) with the finite-dimensional approximation δ -function to obtain the $(F^{n,\delta}, G^{n,\delta})$, hence it's not hard to get that the functions $F^{n,\delta}$ and $G^{n,\delta}$ satisfy

$$\left| F^{n,\delta}(t, \varphi) - F^{n,\delta}(t, \phi) \right| \vee \left\| G^{n,\delta}(t, \varphi) - G^{n,\delta}(t, \phi) \right\| \leq L_M \|\Lambda_n(\varphi) - \Lambda_n(\phi)\|_h,$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle F^{n,\delta}(t, \varphi) - F^{n,\delta}(t, \phi), \Lambda_n[\varphi(0)] - \Lambda_n[\phi(0)] \right\rangle \\ & \leq \alpha_2 [\|\Lambda_n[\varphi(0)] - \Lambda_n[\phi(0)]\|_h^2 + \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\Lambda_n[\varphi(\theta)] - \Lambda_n[\phi(\theta)]\|_h^2 \mu_1(d\theta)], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\| G^{n,\delta}(t, \varphi) - G^{n,\delta}(t, \phi) \right\|^2 \leq \alpha_1 \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\Lambda_n[\varphi(\theta)] - \Lambda_n[\phi(\theta)]\|_h^2 \mu_2(d\theta).$$

Then we further consider the following equation:

$$dx^n(t) = F^{n,\delta}(t, x_t^n)dt + G^{n,\delta}(t, x_t^n)dB(t), \tag{3.2}$$

where $n \geq 1$. Based on the previous analysis, it is established that (3.2) admits a unique strong solution $x^n(t)$ with the initial condition $x_0^n = \varphi$ (see [51], Theorem 3.2).

Our main strategy involves initially establishing the existence of weak solutions for (3.1) through the construction of strong solutions $x^n(t)$ for (3.2). Subsequently, we proceed to prove the pathwise uniqueness of these weak solutions. Finally, by applying the Yamada-Watanabe theorem, we demonstrate the existence of a global strong solution for (3.1).

For any fixed $q \geq 2$, applying Itô formula to $|x^n(t)|^q$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} |x^n(t)|^q &= \|\varphi\|_h^q + \int_0^t \left[\frac{q(q-1)}{2} |x^n(s)|^{q-2} \left\| G^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) \right\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q |x^n(s)|^{q-2} \left\langle F^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n), x^n(s) \right\rangle \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t q |x^n(s)|^{q-2} (x^n(s))' G^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) dB(s). \end{aligned}$$

There exist constants L_q, M_q by Young's inequality and assumptions **(h1)**, such that

$$|x^n(t)|^q = \|\varphi\|_h^q + L_q \int_0^t (\|x_s^n\|_h^q + M_q) ds + L_q \int_0^t (\|x_s^n\|_{\mathcal{D}}^q + M_q) dB(s).$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_s^n\|_h &= \sup_{-\infty < \theta \leq 0} \left| e^{h\theta} x^n(s + \theta) \right| \\ &= \sup_{-\infty < r \leq s} \left| e^{h(r-s)} x^n(r) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{-\infty < r \leq 0} \left| e^{h(r-s)} x^n(r) \right| + \sup_{0 \leq r \leq s} \left| e^{h(r-s)} x^n(r) \right| \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_h + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} |x^n(r)|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

By Cauchy's inequality, Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x^n(t)|^{2q} &\leq L_q \|\varphi\|_h^{2q} + L_q \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \left(\sup_{r \in [0, s]} |x^n(r)|^q + M_q \right) ds \right]^2 \\ &\quad + L_q \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} \int_0^t (\|x_s^n\|_{\mathcal{D}}^q + M_q) dB(s) \right)^2 \\ &\leq L_q \|\varphi\|_h^{2q} + L_q \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(\sup_{r \in [0, s]} |x^n(r)|^{2q} + M_q \right) ds + L_q \int_0^t [\mathbb{E} \|x_s^n\|_h^{2q} + M_q] ds \\ &\leq L_q \|\varphi\|_h^{2q} + L_q \left[\int_0^t \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} |x^n(z)|^{2q} ds + M_q t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Gronwall inequality then gives

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x^n(t)|^{2q} \leq L_{q, M} (\|\varphi\|_h^{2q} + t + e^t) < \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

For any $t \in [0, T]$ and $T > 0$, we deduce from condition **(h1)** that $F^{n,\delta}$ and $G^{n,\delta}$ are bounded on every bounded subset Γ of $\mathbb{R}^+ \times C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$. Therefore, by **(h1)** and (3.4), there exists a constant L_T , independent of n , such that

$$\left| F^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) \right| \vee \left\| G^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) \right\| \leq L_T.$$

Hence for any $0 \leq z, t \leq T < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} |x^n(t) - x^n(z)|^{2q} \\ & \leq L_q \sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_z^t F^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) ds \right|^{2q} + L_q \mathbb{E} \sup_{n \geq 1} \left| \int_z^t G^{n,\delta}(s, x_s^n) dB(s) \right|^{2q} \\ & \leq L_{q,T} |t - z|^q. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

This implies that the family of laws of $x^n(t)$ is weakly compact. Moreover, property **(I)** allows us to establish that the weak limit point of $x^n(t)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ constitutes a weak solution to the system (3.1). This proof follows a standard approach; for detailed exposition, refer to **Appendix I** of [35].

step 2: In the following, we will present the pathwise uniqueness for (3.1). Suppose that two stochastic processes $x(t), y(t)$ satisfy the following form:

$$\begin{cases} x(t) = \varphi(0) + \int_0^t F(s, x_s) ds + \int_0^t G(s, x_s) dB(s), \\ x_0 = \varphi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} y(t) = \phi(0) + \int_0^t F(s, y_s) ds + \int_0^t G(s, y_s) dB(s), \\ y_0 = \phi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h. \end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality, let's assume $\|\varphi - \phi\|_h < 1$ and $\delta \in (\|\varphi - \phi\|_h, 1]$. Denote

$$\tau_M = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{|x(t)| \vee |y(t)| > M\}, \quad \tau_\delta = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{|x(t) - y(t)| > \delta\},$$

where $M > \|\varphi\|_h \vee \|\phi\|_h$. In fact, we claim that the following property holds:

$$\lim_{\|\varphi - \phi\|_h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

For the above property, we're going to apply the contradiction to prove that (3.6) is true. We assume that (3.6) does not hold, that is, there is a constant $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, so that when $\|\varphi - \phi\|_h \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \geq \varepsilon_0. \quad (3.7)$$

By Itô formula, Young inequality, Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and **(h3)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2) \\
&= |\varphi(0) - \phi(0)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} [\|G(s, x_s) - G(s, y_s)\|^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \langle F(s, x_s) - F(s, y_s), x(s) - y(s) \rangle] ds \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} \int_0^{z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} [x(s) - y(s)]'(G(s, x_s) - G(s, y_s)) dB(s)) \\
&\leq |\varphi(0) - \phi(0)|^2 + \alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta) ds \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} [|x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} + \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta)] ds \quad (3.8) \\
&\quad + 12 \mathbb{E}[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |(x(s) - y(s))'(G(t, x_s) - G(t, y_s))|^2 ds]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq |\varphi(0) - \phi(0)|^2 + 2\alpha_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta) ds \\
&\quad + 73\alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta) ds \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\varphi, \phi \in C_{\mathbb{R}^n}^h$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{2\gamma h}$, by the Fubini theorem and a substitution technique, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_i(d\theta) ds \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^{-s} |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_i(d\theta) ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-s}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \mu_i(d\theta) ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^{-s} e^{(\gamma+1)h(s+\theta)} |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} e^{-(\gamma+1)h(s+\theta)} \mu_i(d\theta) ds \quad (3.9) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{-(t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)}^0 \int_{-\theta}^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} ds \mu_i(d\theta) \\
&\leq \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1} \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-(\gamma+1)h(s+\theta)} \mu_i(d\theta) ds + \mathbb{E} \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} ds \mu_i(d\theta) \\
&\leq \frac{\|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1}}{(\gamma+1)h} \mu_i^{(\gamma h+h)} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\infty}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta) ds \\ & \leq \frac{\|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{2\gamma}}{2\gamma h} \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{2\gamma} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Substituting (3.9) and (3.10) into (3.8), by Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2 \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\ & \quad + 146\alpha_1 \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right)^\gamma ds \\ & \quad + 8\alpha_2 \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} ds \\ & := \Pi(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Let $\mathcal{G}(t) = \frac{t^{1-2\gamma}}{1-2\gamma}$. Then $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is a monotonically increasing function and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{G}(t) = -\infty$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}(t)$ satisfies $\mathcal{G}(t) > -\infty$ for any $t > 0$. Hence

$$\mathcal{G}(\varepsilon_0) < \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2) < \mathcal{G}(\Pi(t)), \quad (3.12)$$

then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(\Pi(t)) & = \mathcal{G}(\Pi(0)) + \int_0^t \mathcal{G}'(\Pi(s)) d\Pi(s) \\ & = \mathcal{G}(2 \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1}) \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Pi^\gamma(s)} \cdot \frac{146\alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} (|x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2)^\gamma}{\Pi^\gamma(s)} ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \frac{1}{\Pi^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}(s)} \cdot \frac{8\alpha_2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} (|x(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}}{\Pi^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}(s)} ds \\ & \leq \mathcal{G}(2 \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1}) \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \frac{146\alpha_1}{\Pi^\gamma(s)} + \frac{8\alpha_2}{\Pi^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}(s)} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

By (3.12) and (3.13), we have

$$\mathcal{G}(2 \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1}) \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0^{1-2\gamma}}{1-2\gamma} - \left[\frac{146\alpha_1}{\varepsilon_0^\gamma} + \frac{8\alpha_2}{\varepsilon_0^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}} \right] t,$$

which implies $\|\varphi - \phi\|_h \neq 0$. This contradicts the condition in (3.7). Therefore we use the technique of contradiction to show that (3.6) holds.

In addition, by (3.4), we obtain that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \tau_M = \infty \quad a.s.$$

Hence Fatou's lemma and (3.6) imply

$$\lim_{\|\varphi - \phi\|_h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) = 0.$$

Then by the definition of τ_δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(t \geq \tau_\delta) \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}(t < \tau_\delta) \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}(t \geq \tau_\delta) \delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (h1), (3.4) and (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z) - y(z)|^2 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z) - y(z)|^2 \chi_{\{t > \tau_\delta\}} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z) - y(z)|^2 \chi_{\{t \leq \tau_\delta\}} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z \wedge \tau_\delta) - y(z \wedge \tau_\delta)|^2 \right) \\ & = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that when $\|\varphi - \phi\|_h = 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{z \in [0, t]} |x(z) - y(z)|^2 = 0 \right) = 1.$$

That is, the pathwise uniqueness of weak solutions for system (3.1) is established. Then, applying the Yamada-Watanabe principle, we conclude the existence of a unique global strong solution for (3.1). This completes the proof. \square

Building upon Theorem 3.1, we will conduct a detailed analysis of the existence, uniqueness of the solution, and other properties of system (2.1) under condition (H1)–(H5). Next, we explore the properties of the solution to (2.1) using the Galerkin-type approximation technique. To facilitate this, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.2. ([36, 42]) We call a continuous $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted process $\{u(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a solution of the system (2.1), if $\{u(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ satisfying $u(t) \in \mathcal{L}^p([0, T] \times \Omega, B) \times \mathcal{L}^2([0, T] \times \Omega, U_1)$ and \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$\begin{cases} u(t) = \varphi(0) + \int_0^t [A(s, u(s)) + f(s, u_s)] ds + \int_0^t g(s, u_s) dW(s), & t \geq 0, \\ u(t) = \varphi(t), & t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.3. Consider (2.1). Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H5)** hold. Then the following statements hold:

- 1) For any $\varphi \in C_{U_1}^h$, there exist a unique solution $u(t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and segment process u_t to (2.1) with $u_0 = \varphi$;
- 2) The segment process u_t is a time homogeneous Markov process in $C_{U_1}^h$ and has the Feller property.

We begin by applying the Galerkin projection technique to transform the system (2.1) into a finite-dimensional system. Let's assume we have orthonormal bases $\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \dots\} \subset B$ for U_1 and $\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, \dots\}$ for U_2 . Selecting the first k orthonormal bases from each set, we define the following operators:

$$\Theta_1^k : B^* \rightarrow U_1^k := \text{span}\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_k\}, \quad \Theta_2^k : U_2 \rightarrow U_2^k := \text{span}\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \dots, \varrho_k\}.$$

For any $u \in B^*$ and $k \geq 1$, we obtain $u^k = \Theta_1^k(u) = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle u, \eta_i \rangle_B \eta_i$ and $W^k(t) = \Theta_2^k[W(t)] = \sum_{i=1}^k \langle W(t), \varrho_i \rangle_{U_2} \varrho_i$. Based on the above approximation techniques, we will first analyze the finite-dimensional equation corresponding to system (2.1) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} du^k(t) = \Theta_1^k[(A(t, u(t)) + f(t, u_t))] dt + \Theta_1^k[g(t, u_t)] dW^k(t), \\ u_0^k = \varphi^k \in C_{U_1}^{h,k}, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$C_{U_1}^{h,k} = \left\{ \varphi \in C((-\infty, 0]; U_1^k) : \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} e^{h\theta} \varphi(\theta) = \mathcal{U} \in U_1^k \right\}.$$

Following Theorem 3.1, under assumptions **(H1)**, **(H3)**, **(H4)**, and **(H5)**, system (3.14) admits a unique continuous solution $u^k(t)$. Next, we proceed to prove Theorem 3.2. Similarly, the proof is conducted in the following apriori estimates.

Lemma 3.4. (Apriori estimates of the solutions $u^k(t)$) Suppose that **(H1)**, **(H2)** and

(H3) hold. Then there exists a constant $L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T}$, which is independent of k , such that for any $k \geq 1$ and $T \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T]} \left\| u_z^k \right\|_h^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\left\| (A(s, u^k(s))) \right\|_{B^*}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right. \\ & \left. + \left\| f(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + \left\| g(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 + \left\| u^k(s) \right\|_B^p \right] ds \\ & \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2). \end{aligned}$$

proof: By Itô's formula for (3.14), (H2) and (H3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| u^k(t) \right\|_{U_1}^2 &= \left\| \varphi^k \right\|_h^2 + \int_0^t [2_{B^*} \langle \Theta_1^k(A(s, u^k(s)), u^k(s)) \rangle_B \\ &+ 2 \langle \Theta_1^k(f(s, u_s^k), u^k(s)) \rangle_{U_1} + \left\| \Theta_1^k[g(s, u_s^k)] \Theta_2^k \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds \\ &+ 2 \int_0^t \langle u^k(s), \Theta_1^k[g(s, u_s^k)] dW^k(s) \rangle_{U_1} \tag{3.15} \\ &\leq \left\| \varphi^k \right\|_h^2 + \int_0^t [-\alpha_1 \left\| u^k(s) \right\|_B^p + 2\alpha_2 \left\| u^k(s) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + (2\alpha_1^2 + 2\alpha_1 + 1) \left\| u_s^k \right\|_h^2 + M] ds \\ &+ 2 \int_0^t \langle u^k(s), \Theta_1^k[g(s, u_s^k)] dW^k(s) \rangle_{U_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\left\| u_s^k \right\|_h \leq \|\varphi\|_h + \sup_{z \in [0, s]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}. \tag{3.16}$$

For arbitrary $N > 0$, let $\tau_N^k = \inf_{t \geq 0} \{ \left\| u^k(t) \right\|_{U_1} > N \}$. According to the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, Young's inequality and (3.16), for arbitrary fixed time T we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^k]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 \\ & \leq L_{\alpha_1, M, T} (1 + \left\| \varphi^k \right\|_h^2) + L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N^k} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 ds \\ & \quad + 6 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N^k} \left\| u^k(t) \right\|_{U_1}^2 \left\| \Theta_1^k[g(s, u_s^k)] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \tag{3.17} \\ & \leq L_{\alpha_1, M, T} (1 + \left\| \varphi^k \right\|_h^2) + L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sup_{z \in [0, s \wedge \tau_N^k]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^k]} \left\| u^k(t) \right\|_{U_1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Gronwall's lemma, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^k]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2), \tag{3.18}$$

further,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T \wedge \tau_N^k]} \left\| u_z^k \right\|_h^2 \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2).$$

In addition, by taking expectations on both sides of (3.15), we derive

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N^k} \left\| u^k(s) \right\|_B^p ds \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2), \quad (3.19)$$

and combining (H2), (H3), (3.18) and (3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N^k} \left[\left\| (A(s, u^k(s))) \right\|_{B^*}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} + \left\| f(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + \left\| g(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \right] ds \\ & \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, by the monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T]} \left\| u^k(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T]} \left\| u_z^k \right\|_h^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\left\| (A(s, u^k(s))) \right\|_{B^*}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right. \\ & \left. + \left\| f(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + \left\| g(s, u_s^k) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 + \left\| u^k(s) \right\|_B^p \right] ds \\ & \leq L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (1 + \|\varphi\|_h^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

□

Now we give the proof of Theorem 3.3.

proof of Theorem 3.3: Due to the the reflexivity of $\|\cdot\|_B^p$ and **Lemma 3.4**, we may assume that there exist common subsequences k_n such that for $n \rightarrow \infty$:

- (1) $u^{k_n}(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in $L^2([0, T] \times \Omega, U_1)$ and weakly in $L^p([0, T] \times \Omega, B)$;
- (2) $A(t, u^{k_n}(t)) \rightarrow A^*(t)$ weakly in $[L^p([0, T] \times \Omega, B)]^*$;
- (3) $f(t, u_t^{k_n}) \rightarrow f^*(t)$ weakly in $L^2([0, T] \times \Omega, U_1)$;
- (4) $g(t, u_t^{k_n}) \rightarrow g^*(t)$ weakly in $L^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1))$.

Then for any $v \in B$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [{}_{B^*} \langle u(s), v \rangle_B] ds &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [{}_{B^*} \langle u^{k_n}(s), v \rangle_B] ds \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [{}_{B^*} \langle \varphi^{k_n}(0), v \rangle_B + \int_0^s ({}_{B^*} \langle A(z, u^{k_n}(z)), v \rangle_B) dz \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^s \langle f(z, u_z^{k_n}), v \rangle_{U_1} dz + \int_0^s \langle v, g(z, u_z^{k_n}) dW(z) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
& = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [{}_{B^*} \langle \varphi(0), v \rangle_B + \int_0^s ({}_{B^*} \langle A^*(z), v \rangle_B) dz \\
& \quad + \int_0^s \langle f^*(z), v \rangle_{U_1} dz + \int_0^s \langle v, g^*(z) dW(z) \rangle_{U_1}] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{cases} u(t) = \varphi(0) + \int_0^t A^*(s) ds + \int_0^t f^*(s) ds + \int_0^t g^*(s) dW(s), & dt \times \mathbb{P} - \text{a.e.}, \\ u_0 = \varphi \in C_{U_1}^h. \end{cases} \quad (3.22)$$

In addition, given any given $\lambda \geq 0$ and

$$\psi(t) \in L^p((-\infty, T] \times \Omega, B) \cap L^2((-\infty, T] \times \Omega, U_1),$$

where let $\psi(\theta) = \varphi(\theta), \theta \in (-\infty, 0]$. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| u_t^{k_n} - \psi_t \right\|_h^2 \leq 1$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$.

For any fix $T > 0$, let

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, T]} \left\| u^{k_n}(z) - \psi(z) \right\|_{U_1}^2 = \varepsilon_T \geq 0, \quad (3.23)$$

then the Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda t} \left\| u^{k_n}(t) \right\|_{U_1}^2 - \|\varphi(0)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
& = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2{}_{B^*} \langle A(s, u^{k_n}(s)), u^{k_n}(s) \rangle_B + 2\langle f(s, u_s^{k_n}), u^{k_n}(s) \rangle_{U_1} \\
& \quad + \left\| g(s, u_s^{k_n}) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 - \lambda \left\| u^{k_n}(s) \right\|_{U_1}^2] ds \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2{}_{B^*} \langle A(s, u^{k_n}(s)) - A(s, \psi(s)), u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_B + \lambda \|\psi(s)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
& \quad + 2\langle f(s, u_s^{k_n}) - f(s, \psi_s), u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} + \left\| g(s, u_s^{k_n}) - g(s, \psi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \\
& \quad - \lambda \left\| u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s) \right\|_{U_1}^2 + 2{}_{B^*} \langle A(s, \psi(s)), u^{k_n}(s) \rangle_B + 2\langle f(s, \psi_s), u^{k_n}(s) \rangle_{U_1} \\
& \quad + 2{}_{B^*} \langle A(s, u^{k_n}(s)) - A(s, \psi(s)), \psi(s) \rangle_B + 2\langle f(s, u_s^{k_n}) - f(s, \psi_s), \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} \\
& \quad + 2\langle g(s, u_s^{k_n}), g(s, \psi_s) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} - \left\| g(s, \psi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 - 2\lambda \langle u^{k_n}(s), \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1}] ds,
\end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

where $\psi_s =: \{\psi(s + \theta), \theta \in (-\infty, 0]\}$. Then by (3.24) and **Lemma 3.4**, there exists a sufficiently large constant M_T such that $\mathbb{E} \|\psi(z)\|_{U_1}^2 \leq M_T$.

By **(H4)** and **(H5)**, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi(t) &:= \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2_{B^*} \langle A(s, u^{k_n}(s)) - A(s, \psi(s)), u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_B - \lambda \|u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \langle f(s, u_s^{k_n}) - f(s, \psi_s), u^{k_n}(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} + \|g(s, u_s^{k_n}) - g(s, \psi_s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, M, T} (\|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{\beta+1} + \|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{\gamma+1} + \|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{2\gamma}) \\
&\quad - \lambda \|u^{k_n}(z) - \psi(z)\|_{U_1}^2] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, we can claim that $\Xi(t) \leq 0$. The reasons are as follows:

(a) If $\varepsilon_T = 0$, which implies $u^{k_n}(s) = \psi(s)$ and $u_s^{k_n} = \psi_s$, i.e., $\Xi(t) = 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.e.;

(b) If $\varepsilon_T \in (0, 1]$, by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{\alpha+1} \vee \mathbb{E} \|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{\gamma+1} \vee \mathbb{E} \|u_s^{k_n} - \psi_s\|_h^{2\gamma} \leq 1.$$

Hence for λ sufficiently large, $\Pi(t) \leq 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.e.

Hence, for given any nonnegative function $\kappa \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows from (3.24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \kappa(t) [e^{-\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_{U_1}^2 - \|\varphi(0)\|_{U_1}^2] dt \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \kappa(t) \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2_{B^*} \langle A(s, \psi(s)), u(s) \rangle_B + 2 \langle f(s, \psi_s), u(s) \rangle_{U_1} \\
&\quad + 2_{B^*} \langle A^*(s) - A(s, \psi(s)), \psi(s) \rangle_B + 2 \langle f^*(s) - f(s, \psi_s), \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} \\
&\quad + 2 \langle g^*(s), g(s, \psi_s) \rangle_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} - \|g(s, \psi_s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \\
&\quad - 2\lambda \langle u(s), \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} + \lambda \| \psi(s) \|_{U_1}^2] ds dt. \tag{3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

By Itô's formula to $e^{-\lambda t} \|u(t)\|_{U_1}^2 - \|\varphi(0)\|_{U_1}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \kappa(t) \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2_{B^*} \langle A^*(s) - A(s, \psi(s)), u(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_B - \lambda \|u(s) - \psi(s)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \langle f^*(s) - f(s, \psi_s), u(s) - \psi(s) \rangle_{U_1} + \|g^*(s) - g(s, \psi_s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds dt \\
&\leq 0. \tag{3.26}
\end{aligned}$$

First, taking $\psi(t) = u(t)$ for $t \geq 0$ implies that $g^*(t) = g(t, u_t)$. In addition, let $\psi = u - \varepsilon \kappa^* y$ where $\kappa^* \in L^\infty((-\infty, T], \mathbb{R})$, $\kappa^*(\theta) = 0$ for $\theta \in (-\infty, 0]$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $y \in B$, then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \kappa(t) \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2_{B^*} \langle A^*(s) - A(s, u(s) - \varepsilon \kappa^*(s)y), \varepsilon \kappa^*(s)y \rangle_B$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2\langle f^*(s) - f(s, u_s - \varepsilon \kappa_s^* y), \varepsilon \kappa^*(s) y \rangle_{U_1} - \lambda \|\varepsilon \kappa^*(s) y\|_{U_1}^2] ds dt \\
& \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the converse follows by taking $\kappa^*(s) = -\kappa^*(s)$, and finally according to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \kappa(t) \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} [2_{B^*} \langle A^*(s) - A(s, u(s)), \kappa^*(s) y \rangle_B \\
& + 2\langle f^*(s) - f(s, u_s), \kappa^*(s) y \rangle_{U_1}] ds dt \\
& = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes $A^*(t) = A(t, u(t))$ and $f^*(t) = f(t, u_t)$, i.e., it suffices to prove that

$$A^* = A(\cdot, u(\cdot)), \quad f^* = f(\cdot, u(\cdot)), \quad g^* = g(\cdot, u(\cdot)), \quad dt \times \mathbb{P} - \text{a.e.}$$

By (3.22) and Definition 3.2, this completes the existence proof, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} u(t) = \varphi(0) + \int_0^t A(s, u(s)) ds + \int_0^t f(s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t g(s, u_s) dW(s), & dt \times \mathbb{P} - \text{a.e.}, \\ u_0 = \varphi \in C_{U_1}^h. \end{cases}$$

The uniqueness of (2.1) follows from the Itô formula, **(H4)**, **(H5)** and **step 2** of Theorem 3.1. In addition, the proof of the time homogeneity, the Markov and the Feller proper is again quite standard. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [35], we thus omit the details. This completes this proof of Theorem 3.3. \square

Remark 3.5. Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 address two distinct classes of stochastic functional differential equations: one involving infinite delay in finite dimensions, and the other in infinite dimensions. Our investigation centers on proving the existence and uniqueness of solutions under the condition that the coefficients exhibit low regularity, specifically adhering to Hölder continuity. Moreover, for finite delay, we demonstrate that analogous results can be achieved by setting $h = 0$ and adjusting the proof accordingly. This adjustment results in a more succinct derivation of the outcomes.

Fix $\tau \in (0, +\infty)$, which will be referred to as the delay and let $\mathcal{H} := C([-\tau, 0]; U_1)$ with the norm $\|\varphi\|_h = \sup_{-\tau \leq \theta \leq 0} \|\varphi(\theta)\|_{U_1}$ is regarded as a space of all continuous functions from $[-\tau, 0]$ into U_1 . Consider the following SFPDEs with finite delay

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(t, u(t)) + f(t, u_t)) dt + g(t, u_t) dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi \in \mathcal{H}, \end{cases} \tag{3.27}$$

where $u_t = u_t(\theta) =: \{u(t + \theta), \theta \in [-\tau, 0]\}$ and $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow U_1$, $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)$ are two continuous mappings. We denote by U_0 the set of probability measures on $[-\tau, 0]$, namely, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{U}_0$, $\int_{-\tau}^0 \nu(d\theta) = 1$. For system (3.27), to investigate the existence and uniqueness of solutions under the Hölder condition, it is necessary to adjust **(H5)** as described below:

(H5') For f and g , there be constant α_1, α_2 and $\nu \in \mathcal{U}_0$, such that for all $\varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\langle f(t, \varphi) - f(t, \phi), \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \rangle_{U_1} \leq \alpha_2 [\|\varphi(0) - \phi(0)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} + \int_{-\tau}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} \nu(d\theta)],$$

$$\|g(t, \varphi) - g(t, \phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \leq \alpha_1 \int_{-\tau}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} \nu(d\theta).$$

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)** and **(H5')** hold. Then (3.27) has a unique solution $u(t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and segment process u_t for any initial data with $u_0 = \varphi \in \mathcal{H}$.*

For the proof of Theorem 3.6, the critical steps involve modifying part one from (3.3) to

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_s^n\|_h &= \sup_{-\tau < \theta \leq 0} |x^n(s + \theta)| \\ &\leq \sup_{-\tau < r \leq s} |x^n(r)| \\ &\leq \sup_{-\tau < r \leq 0} |x^n(r)| + \sup_{0 \leq r \leq s} |x^n(r)| \\ &\leq \|\varphi\|_h + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} |x^n(r)|, \end{aligned}$$

and part two from (3.9) to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} \int_{-\tau}^0 |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} \nu(d\theta) ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_{-\tau}^0 \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s + \theta) - y(s + \theta)|^{\gamma+1} ds \nu(d\theta) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_{-\tau}^0 \int_{-\tau}^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} ds \nu(d\theta) \\ &\leq \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^{\gamma+1} + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_M \wedge \tau_\delta} |x(s) - y(s)|^{\gamma+1} ds. \end{aligned}$$

The remainder of the proof follows a procedure similar to the aforementioned proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3; thus, we omit these specific details.

For the following systems without time delay

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(t, u(t)) + f(t, u(t)))dt + g(t, u(t))dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0 \in U_1, \end{cases} \quad (3.28)$$

it is necessary to adjust **(H2)** and **(H4)** as described below:

(H2') (Growth) For A , there exist constant $\alpha_1, M > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u \in B$ such that

$$\|A(t, u)\|_{B^*}^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \leq \alpha_1 \|u\|_B^p + M,$$

and for the continuous functions f, g , there exist constant α_1 and M for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u \in U_1$ such that

$$\|f(t, u)\|_{U_1} \vee \|g(t, u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} \leq \alpha_1 \|u\|_{U_1} + M.$$

(H4') There exist constants $\beta \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that the map A satisfies, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u, v \in B$

$$2_{B^*} \langle A(t, u) - A(t, v), u - v \rangle_B \leq \alpha_1 \|u - v\|_{U_1}^{\beta+1},$$

and the functions f, g satisfy, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $u, v \in U_1$ with $\|u\|_{U_1} \vee \|v\|_{U_1} \leq M$,

$$\|f(t, u) - f(t, v)\|_{U_1} \vee \|g(t, u) - g(t, v)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)} \leq L_M \|u - v\|_{U_1}^\gamma.$$

Theorem 3.7. *Consider (3.28). Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**, **(H2')**, **(H3)** and **(H4')** hold. Then (3.28) has a unique solution $u(t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ for any initial data with $u(0) = u_0 \in U_1$.*

Similarly, the proof of Theorem 3.7 follows a procedure akin to the aforementioned proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3; therefore, we omit these particular details.

4. The averaging principle of SFPDEs with Hölder coefficients

Consider the following SFPDEs with infinite delay

$$\begin{cases} du^\varepsilon(t) = (A(u^\varepsilon(t)) + f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon)dt + g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^\varepsilon \in C_{U_1}^h, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Let $f^\varepsilon(t, \varphi) = f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, \varphi)$ and $g^\varepsilon(t, \varphi) = g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, \varphi)$, then (4.1) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} du^\varepsilon(t) = (A(u^\varepsilon(t)) + f^\varepsilon(t, u_t^\varepsilon)dt + g^\varepsilon(t, u_t^\varepsilon)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^\varepsilon \in C_{U_1}^h. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

In order to conduct a more thorough analysis of the averaging principle applied to systems (4.2) with Hölder coefficients, it is imperative to introduce the following assumption:

(H6) There exist functions Φ_1, Φ_2 and $f^* \in C(C_{U_1}^h, U_1), g^* \in C(C_{U_1}^h, \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1))$ such that for any $t \geq 0, r > 0$ and $\varphi \in C_{U_1}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r} \left\| \int_t^{t+r} [f(s, \varphi) - f^*(\varphi)] ds \right\|_{U_1} &\leq \Phi_1(r)(\|\varphi\|_h + M), \\ \frac{1}{r} \int_t^{t+r} \|g(s, \varphi) - g^*(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds &\leq \Phi_2(r)(\|\varphi\|_h^2 + M), \end{aligned}$$

where Φ_i is decreasing, positive bounded functions and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_i(r) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Now we consider the following averaged equation

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(u(t)) + f^*(u_t))dt + g^*(u_t)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^* \in C_{U_1}^h. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

Theorem 4.1. Consider (4.3). If A, f and g satisfy **(H1)–(H6)**, the following statement holds: for any $\varphi^* \in C_{U_1}^h$, there exist a unique solution $u^*(t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and segment process u_t^* to (4.3) with $u_0^* = \varphi^*$.

proof: By Theorem 3.2, we only need to verify that assumptions **(H3)–(H5)** hold for the coefficients f, g . Then under the assumption **(H6)** we have

$$\|f^*(\varphi)\|_{U_1} = \left\| \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_t^{t+r} f(s, \varphi) ds \right\|_{U_1} \leq \alpha_1 \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{R}} + M,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^*(\varphi) - f^*(\phi)\|_{U_1} &\leq \left\| f^*(\varphi) - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \varphi) ds \right\|_{U_1} + \left\| f^*(\phi) - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \phi) ds \right\|_{U_1} \\ &\quad + \left\| \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \varphi) ds - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \phi) ds \right\|_{U_1} \\ &\leq \Phi_1(r)(\|\varphi\|_h + M) + \Phi_1(r)(\|\phi\|_h + M) + L_M \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

and let $r \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain for all $\varphi, \phi \in C_{U_1}^h$ with $\|\varphi\|_h \vee \|\phi\|_h \leq M$,

$$\|f^*(\varphi) - f^*(\phi)\|_{U_1} \leq L_M \|\varphi - \phi\|_h^\gamma.$$

The case of g^* is similar.

For the assumption **(H5)**, we have for any $\varphi, \phi \in C_{U_1}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle f^*(\varphi) - f^*(\phi), \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \rangle_{U_1} \\ &\leq \left\langle f^*(\varphi) - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \varphi) ds, \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \right\rangle_{U_1} - \left\langle f^*(\phi) - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \phi) ds, \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \right\rangle_{U_1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left\langle \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \varphi) ds - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r f(s, \phi) ds, \varphi(0) - \phi(0) \right\rangle_{U_1} \\
& \leq \Phi_1(r) (\|\varphi\|_h + \|\phi\|_h + M) \|\varphi - \phi\|_h + \alpha_2 [\|\varphi(0) - \phi(0)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta)],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|g^*(\varphi) - g^*(\phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \\
& = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r \|g^*(\varphi) - g^*(\phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
& \leq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r [\|g^*(\varphi) - g(t, \varphi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 + \|g^*(\phi) - g(t, \phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 \\
& \quad + \|g(t, \varphi) - g(t, \phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds \\
& \leq \Phi_1(r) (\|\varphi\|_h + \|\phi\|_h + M) + \alpha_1 \int_{-\infty}^0 \|\varphi(\theta) - \phi(\theta)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} \mu_2(d\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, let $r \rightarrow \infty$, then the coefficients f, g satisfy assumption **(H5)**. This completes the proof.

□

For any given function Ψ , define a piecewise function $\hat{\Psi}$ such that

$$\hat{\Psi}(t) = \begin{cases} \Psi(t) & t < 0, \\ \Psi(0) & t \in [0, d), \\ \dots & \dots \\ \Psi(kd) & t \in [kd, (k+1)d), \\ \dots & \dots \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and d be a fixed constant. To delve deeper into the long-term asymptotic behavior of systems (4.2) and (4.3), it is imperative to introduce the ensuing lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *If A, f and g satisfy **(H1)–(H6)**, the following statements hold: for any $T > 0$ and $\varphi^\varepsilon, \varphi^* \in C_{U_1}^h$,*

(1)

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s; \varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s; \varphi^\varepsilon)\|_{U_1}^2 ds \leq L_T (\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^*(s; \varphi^*) - \hat{u}^*(s; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 ds \leq L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}};$$

(2)

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}_s^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon)\|_h^2 ds \leq L_T (\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^*(\varphi^*) - \hat{u}_s^*(\varphi^*)\|_h^2 ds \leq L_T(\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $u^\varepsilon(s; \varphi^\varepsilon)$ ($u_s^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon)$) is the solution(the solution map) of (4.2) with the initial value $u_0^\varepsilon = \varphi^\varepsilon$ and $u^*(s; \varphi^*)$ ($u_s^*(\varphi^*)$) is the solution(the solution map) of (4.3) with the initial value $u_0^* = \varphi^*$.

proof of (1): Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.4 in [11], the above results can be obtained by (H1)–(H6), (3.21), Itô formula, Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Young's inequality.

proof of (2): By (4.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}_s^\varepsilon(\varphi^\varepsilon)\|_h^2 ds \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sup_{\theta \in (-\infty, 0]} e^{2h\theta} \|u^\varepsilon(s + \theta; \varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s + \theta; \varphi^\varepsilon)\|_{U_1}^2 ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in (-\infty, 0]} \int_\theta^{T+\theta} \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon)\|_{U_1}^2 dz \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\theta \in (-\infty, 0]} \int_\theta^0 \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon)\|_{U_1}^2 dz + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon)\|_{U_1}^2 dz \\ &\leq L_T(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

It follows from the same steps as (4.5) that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^*(\varphi^*) - \hat{u}_s^*(\varphi^*)\|_h^2 ds \leq L_T(\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)d^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

Now we establish the following the averaging principle of SFPDEs with infinite delay and Hölder coefficients.

Theorem 4.3. Consider (4.2) and (4.3). Suppose that the assumptions (H1)–(H6) hold. For any initial values $\varphi^\varepsilon, \varphi^* \in C_{U_1}^h$ and $T > 0$, assume further that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 = 0$. Then we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

proof: Applying Itô formula formula to $u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)$, by (H3), Young inequality and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \|\varphi^\varepsilon(0) - \varphi^*(0)\|_{U_1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left\{ \int_0^t [2B^* \langle A(u^\varepsilon(s)) - A(u^*(s)), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_B \right. \\
&\quad + 2 \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} + \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \int_0^t \langle u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s), [g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)] dW(s) \rangle_{U_1} \right\} \\
&\leq \|\varphi^\varepsilon(0) - \varphi^*(0)\|_{U_1}^2 + \int_0^T [2\alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\beta+1} ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t 2 \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} + 73 \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 &\leq 2 \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [4\alpha_1 \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\beta+1} \\
&\quad + 146 \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2] ds ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t 4 \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

For the drift coefficient,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&:= \mathfrak{f}_1 + \mathfrak{f}_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

By **(H5)** and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_1 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq \alpha_2 [\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^0 \|u^\varepsilon(s+\theta) - u^*(s+\theta)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} \mu_1(d\theta) ds] \\
&\leq \alpha_2 [2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} ds + \frac{\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1}}{(\gamma+1)h} \mu_1^{(\gamma h+h)}].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

For \mathfrak{f}_2 ,

$$\mathfrak{f}_2 = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^*(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&:= \mathfrak{f}_2^1 + \mathfrak{f}_2^2 + \mathfrak{f}_2^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

By **(H3)**, (3.21), (4.4), Hölder's inequality and Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_2^1 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [\|f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*)\|_{U_1} + \|f^*(u_s^*)\|_{U_1}] \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T 2\alpha_1 (\|u_s^*\|_{U_1}^2 + M) ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{U_1}^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq L_{T, \alpha_1, M} (\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Similarly, for \mathfrak{f}_2^3 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_2^3 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^*(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq L_{T, \alpha_1, M} (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Next, the key problem is to estimate \mathfrak{f}_2^2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_2^2 &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*) - f^*(\hat{u}_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^*(\hat{u}_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&:= \mathfrak{f}_2^{2,1} + \mathfrak{f}_2^{2,2} + \mathfrak{f}_2^{2,3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

By **(H4)**, (3.21), (4.4), Hölder's inequality, Jensen's inequality, Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,1} = \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - f^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*)\|_{U_1} \|\hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s)\|_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq L_T \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^* - \hat{u}_s^*\|_h^\gamma \|\hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s)\|_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq L_T (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^* - \hat{u}_s^*\|_h^2 ds)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|\hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\frac{2}{2-\gamma}} ds \right)^{\frac{2-\gamma}{2}} \\
&\leq L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{\gamma}{4}} \left(\int_0^T [\mathbb{E} \|\hat{u}^\varepsilon(s)\|_{U_1}^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\hat{u}^*(s)\|_{U_1}^2]^{\frac{1}{2-\gamma}} ds \right)^{\frac{2-\gamma}{2}} \\
&\leq L_{T,\gamma} (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{\gamma}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Similarly, for $\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,3}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^*(\hat{u}_s^*) - f^*(u_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq L_{T,\gamma} (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d^{\frac{\gamma}{4}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

In the following step, we will use the time discretization technique to deal with $\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,2}$. Let $[t]$ denote the integer part of t , then note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*) - f^*(\hat{u}_s^*), \hat{u}^\varepsilon(s) - \hat{u}^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{t}{d}]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*), u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + \int_{[\frac{t}{d}]d}^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_{[t/d]d}^*) - f^*(u_{[t/d]d}^*), u^\varepsilon([t/d]d) - u^*([t/d]d) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{t}{d}]-1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|f^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*)\|_{U_1} \|u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd)\|_{U_1} ds \\
&\quad + L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d \\
&\leq \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{T}{d}]-1} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} f^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*) ds \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} u^\varepsilon(nd) - u^*(nd) ds \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d \\
&\leq \frac{T}{d} \max_{0 \leq n \leq [T/d]-1, n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} f^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*) ds \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot L_T (\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) \\
&\quad + L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + 1) d,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$\left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} f^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*) ds \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} f\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}, u_{nd}^*\right) - f^*(u_{nd}^*) ds \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \varepsilon \left(\left\| \mathbb{E} \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} f(z, u_{nd}^*) - f^*(u_{nd}^*) dz \right\|_{U_1}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq d\Phi_1\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right)(\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Substituting (4.17) into (4.16) gives

$$\mathfrak{f}_2^{2,2} \leq L_T(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)(\Phi_1\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) + d). \tag{4.18}$$

Hence substituting (4.9)-(4.17) into (4.8) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \langle f^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - f^*(u_s^*), u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s) \rangle_{U_1} ds \\
&\leq 2\alpha_2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} ds + \frac{\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + L_T(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)(\Phi_1\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) + d + d^{\frac{7}{4}} + d^{\frac{1}{4}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

For the diffusion coefficient,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&:= \mathfrak{g}_1 + \mathfrak{g}_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

By (H5) and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_1 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq \alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_{-\infty}^0 \|u^\varepsilon(s + \theta) - u^*(s + \theta)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} \mu_1(d\theta) ds \\
&\leq \alpha_1 \left[\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} ds + \frac{\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma}}{2\gamma h} \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_2 &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*) - g^*(\hat{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^*(\hat{u}_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
& := \mathfrak{g}_2^{2,1} + \mathfrak{g}_2^{2,2} + \mathfrak{g}_2^{2,3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by **(H4)**, (3.21), Hölder's inequality, Jensen's inequality and Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_2^{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^*) - g^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq L_T \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^* - \hat{u}_s^*\|_h^{2\gamma} ds \\
&\leq L_T (\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u_s^* - \hat{u}_s^*\|_h^2 ds)^\gamma \\
&\leq L_T (1 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2) d^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Similarly, for $\mathfrak{g}_2^{2,3}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_2^{2,3} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^*(\hat{u}_s^*) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq L_T (1 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2) d^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Then, we will use the time discretization technique to deal with $\mathfrak{g}_2^{2,2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_2^{2,2} &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, \hat{u}_s^*) - g^*(\hat{u}_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&= \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor - 1} \int_{nd}^{(n+1)d} \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_{nd}^*) - g^*(u_{nd}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor d}^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor d}^*) - g^*(u_{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor d}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \\
&\leq \varepsilon \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor - 1} \mathbb{E} \int_{\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}}^{\frac{(n+1)d}{\varepsilon}} \|g(z, u_{nd}^*) - g^*(u_{nd}^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 dz \\
&\quad + L_{\alpha_1, M} (1 + \mathbb{E} \int_{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor d}^T \|u_{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor d}^*\|_h^2) ds \\
&\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor \frac{T}{d} \rfloor - 1} d \Phi_2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) + L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) d \\
&\leq L_T (\|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) [d + \Phi_2\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right)].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

In conclusion, by (4.21)-(4.25), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|g^\varepsilon(s, u_s^\varepsilon) - g^*(u_s^*)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \alpha_1 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} ds + \frac{\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{2\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} \\
&\quad + L_T(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) [\Phi_2(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Substituting (4.16)-(4.26) into (4.7) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
&\leq 2 \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{(\gamma+1)} \\
&\quad + 4\alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\beta+1} ds + 146\alpha_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{2\gamma} ds \\
&\quad + 8\alpha_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|u^\varepsilon(s) - u^*(s)\|_{U_1}^{\gamma+1} ds + L_T(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) [\Phi_1(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + \Phi_2(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) + d + d^{\frac{1}{4}} + d^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + d^{\frac{\gamma}{4}}].
\end{aligned}$$

Let $d = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then by Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 \\
&\leq 2 \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1 \mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2 \mu_1^{(\gamma h + h)}}{(\gamma + 1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + 4\alpha_1 \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z) - u^*(z)\|_{U_1}^2)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}} ds + 8\alpha_2 \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z) - u^*(z)\|_{U_1}^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}} ds \\
&\quad + 146\alpha_1 \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0, s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z) - u^*(z)\|_{U_1}^2)^\gamma ds + L(T)(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1) [\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{\gamma}{8}}] \\
&:= \Gamma(T).
\end{aligned}$$

To facilitate subsequent proof, at this juncture, we regard $L(T)$ as a function with respect to T . In fact, from the preceding proof, it can be deduced that $L(T)$ is continuous and $L(0) \leq M$. Therefore, we're going to apply reductio ad absurdum to prove that (4.6) is true. We assume that (4.6) does not hold, that is, there is a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$, so that when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 \geq \epsilon_0.$$

Hence, for any fixed $T > 0$,

$$\mathcal{G}(\epsilon_0) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2) \leq \mathcal{G}(\Gamma(T)), \tag{4.27}$$

further

$$\mathcal{G}(\Gamma(T)) = \mathcal{G}(\Gamma(0)) + \int_0^T \mathcal{G}'(\Gamma(s)) d\Gamma(s)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathcal{G}(2\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1\mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2\mu_1^{(\gamma h+h)}}{(\gamma+1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + M(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}] \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\Gamma^{\frac{4\gamma-\beta-1}{2}}(s)} \cdot \frac{4\alpha_1(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0,s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(z; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}}{\Gamma^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}}(s)} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\Gamma^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}(s)} \cdot \frac{8\alpha_2(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0,s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(z; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}}{\Gamma^{\frac{\gamma+1}{2}}(s)} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\Gamma^\gamma(s)} \cdot \frac{146\alpha_1(\mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in [0,s]} \|u^\varepsilon(z; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(z; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2)^\gamma}{\Gamma^\gamma(s)} ds \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \frac{L'(s)(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}]}{\Gamma^{2\gamma}(s)} ds \tag{4.28} \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}(2\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1\mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2\mu_1^{(\gamma h+h)}}{(\gamma+1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + M(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}] + \int_0^T [\frac{4\alpha_1}{\Gamma^{\frac{4\gamma-\beta-1}{2}}(s)} + \frac{8\alpha_2}{\Gamma^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}(s)} \\
&\quad + \frac{146\alpha_1}{\Gamma^\gamma(s)}] ds + \int_0^T \frac{L'(s)(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}]}{\epsilon_0^{2\gamma}} ds \\
&\leq \mathcal{G}(2\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1\mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2\mu_1^{(\gamma h+h)}}{(\gamma+1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + M(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}] + \frac{4\alpha_1 T}{\epsilon_0^{\frac{4\gamma-\beta-1}{2}}} + \frac{8\alpha_2 T}{\epsilon_0^{\frac{3\gamma-1}{2}}} \\
&\quad + \frac{146\alpha_1 T}{\epsilon_0^\gamma} + \frac{(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}]}{\epsilon_0^{2\gamma}} (L(T) - L(0)).
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.27) and (4.28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{G}(2\|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 + \frac{73\alpha_1\mu_2^{(2\gamma h)}}{\gamma h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{2\gamma} + \frac{4\alpha_2\mu_1^{(\gamma h+h)}}{(\gamma+1)h} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^{\gamma+1} \\
&\quad + M(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1)[\Phi_1(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \Phi_2(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{8}}] \\
&\geq \frac{\epsilon_0^{1-2\gamma}}{1-2\gamma} - L_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \epsilon_0, \beta, \gamma, T}(\|\varphi^\varepsilon\|_h^2 + \|\varphi^*\|_h^2 + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by the condition of $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 = 0$ and the property of functions $\mathcal{G}, \Phi_1, \Phi_2$. Therefore we use the technique of contradiction to show that (4.6) holds. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.4. Likewise, we emphasize that the methods and conclusions in the paper are also applicable to corresponding models with finite delay and without delay, with slight adjustments to the conditions.

Consider the following SFPDEs with finite delay

$$\begin{cases} du^\varepsilon(t) = (A(u^\varepsilon(t)) + f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon))dt + g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u_t^\varepsilon)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}, \end{cases} \quad (4.29)$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

(H6') There exist functions Φ_1, Φ_2 and $f^* \in C(\mathcal{H}, U_1)$, $g^* \in C(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1))$ such that for any $t \geq 0$, $r > 0$ and $\varphi \in C_{U_1}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r} \left\| \int_t^{t+r} [f(s, \varphi) - f^*(\varphi)] ds \right\|_{U_1} &\leq \Phi_1(r)(\|\varphi\|_h + M), \\ \frac{1}{r} \int_t^{t+r} \|g(s, \varphi) - g^*(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds &\leq \Phi_2(r)(\|\varphi\|_h^2 + M). \end{aligned}$$

For the following averaged equation

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(u(t)) + f^*(u_t))dt + g^*(u_t)dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^* \in \mathcal{H}, \end{cases} \quad (4.30)$$

we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.5. Consider (4.29) and (4.30). Suppose that the assumptions **(H1)**–**(H4)** and **(H5')**–**(H6')** hold. For any initial values $\varphi^\varepsilon, \varphi^* \in \mathcal{H}$ and $T > 0$, assume further that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 = 0.$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{U_1}^2 = 0,$$

where $u^\varepsilon(s; \varphi^\varepsilon)$ is the solution of (4.29) and $u^*(s; \varphi^*)$ is the solution of (4.30).

For the following SPDEs:

$$\begin{cases} du^\varepsilon(t) = (A(u^\varepsilon(t)) + f(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(t)))dt + g(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}, u^\varepsilon(t))dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0^\varepsilon \in U_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.31)$$

let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

(H7) There exist functions Φ_1, Φ_2 and $f^* \in C(U_1, U_1), g^* \in C(U_1, \mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1))$ such that for any $t \geq 0, r > 0$ and $u \in U_1$,

$$\frac{1}{r} \left\| \int_t^{t+r} [f(s, u) - f^*(u)] ds \right\|_{U_1} \leq \Phi_1(r)(\|u\|_{U_1} + M),$$

$$\frac{1}{r} \int_t^{t+r} \|g(s, u) - g^*(u)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U_2, U_1)}^2 ds \leq \Phi_2(r)(\|u\|_{U_1}^2 + M).$$

For the following averaged equation

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = (A(u(t)) + f^*(u(t)))dt + g^*(u(t))dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0^* \in U_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.6. *Consider (4.29) and (4.30). Suppose that the assumptions (H1), (H2'), (H3), (H4') and (H7) hold. For any initial values $u_0^\varepsilon, u_0^* \in U_1$ and $T > 0$, assume further that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{U_1}^2 = 0$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{U_1}^2 = 0,$$

where $u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon)$ is the solution of (4.31) and $u^*(t; u_0^*)$ is the solution of (4.32).

The proof of Theorem 4.5 and 4.6 follows a procedure akin to the aforementioned proofs of Theorems 4.3; therefore, we omit these particular details.

5. Applications

This section aims to substantiate the validity of our principal findings by applying them to stochastic generalized porous media equations and stochastic reaction diffusion equations. It is notable that our focus in this illustration primarily centers on the additive and multiplicative noise. Consider $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n \in \mathbb{N})$ as an open bounded subset, with $-\Delta$ governed by Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Consider the stochastic generalized porous media equation:

$$\begin{cases} du = [\Delta(|u|^{q-2} + u) + \xi_1(\frac{t}{\varepsilon})f(u)]dt + \xi_2(\frac{t}{\varepsilon})g(u)dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0^\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,2}(D), \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and W is a standard real-valued Wiener process and $q > 2$. We require both functions ξ_1 and ξ_2 to be positively bounded, meaning there exists a constant M such that $|\xi_i(t)| \leq M$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $i = 1, 2$.

Assume that f and g satisfy **(H2')** and **(H4')**, then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let u^* be the unique stationary solution of the following averaged equation:*

$$\begin{cases} du = [\Delta(|u|^{q-2} + u) + \xi_1^* f(u)] dt + \xi_2^* g(u) dW(t), \\ u(0) = u_0^* \in W_0^{1,2}(D), \end{cases}$$

where $\xi_i^* = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \xi_i(s) ds$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $i = 1, 2$. Then assume further that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0^*\|_{W_0^{1,2}}^2 = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; u_0^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; u_0^*)\|_{W_0^{1,2}}^2 = 0,$$

for any $T > 0$.

proof Let $B = L^q(D)$, $U_1 = W_0^{1,2}(D)$ and

$$v^* \langle A(u), v \rangle_V := - \int_D u(x) |u(x)|^{q-2} v(x) dx - a \int_D u(x) v(x) dx,$$

for $u, v \in B$, which implies that $B \subset U_1 = U_1^* \subset B^*$. Then, according to Theorem 6.3 in Reference [11], the operator $A(u) = \Delta(|u|^{q-2} + u)$ satisfies conditions **(H1)**, **(H2')** and **(H3)** with Hölder exponent $\beta = 1$ (In fact, at this point, the operator A satisfies the monotonicity condition). Therefore, according to Theorem 4.6, we can derive the the first Bogolyubov theorem.

For the specific form of the diffusion and drift coefficients, for example, let

$$f(u) = \sin \sqrt{|u|}, \quad g(u) = \cos \sqrt{|u|},$$

for any $u \in U_1$. Then it is easy to check that f and g satisfy the Assumption **(H4')** with Hölder exponent $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$.

For the stochastic reaction diffusion equations with infinite delay:

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\Delta u - u |u|^{q-2} + \xi_1(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}) f(u_t)] dt + g dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^\varepsilon \in C_{L^2}^h(D), \end{cases}$$

let W is a one-dimensional two-sided cylindrical Q -Wiener process with $Q = I$ on $B = H_0^{1,2}(D) \cap L^q(D)$ and $g \in \mathcal{L}(B, L^2(D))$. Assume that f satisfies **(H2)**, **(H4)** and **(H5)**, then we have the

following theorem.

Theorem 5.2. *Let u^* be the unique stationary solution of the following averaged equation:*

$$\begin{cases} du(t) = [\Delta u - u|u|^{q-2} + \xi_1^* f(u_t)]dt + g dW(t), \\ u_0 = \varphi^* \in C_{L^2(D)}^h. \end{cases}$$

Then assume further that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \|\varphi^\varepsilon - \varphi^*\|_h^2 = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u^\varepsilon(t; \varphi^\varepsilon) - u^*(t; \varphi^*)\|_{L^2}^2 = 0,$$

for any $T > 0$.

proof Let $B = H_0^{1,2}(D) \cap L^q(D)$, $U_1 = L^2(D)$ and according to Theorem 6.1 in [11], the operator $A(u) = \Delta u - u|u|^{q-2}$ satisfies conditions **(H1)**, **(H2)** and **(H3)** with Hölder exponent $\beta = 1$. Therefore, according to Theorem 4.3, we can derive the aforementioned conclusion.

For the specific form of f , for example, let

$$f(\varphi) = \cos \sqrt{|\varphi(0)|} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \sqrt{|\varphi(\theta)|} \mu(d\theta),$$

for any $\varphi \in C_{L^2(D)}^h$, where $\mu(d\theta) = 2he^{2h\theta} d\theta$. Then it is easy to check that f satisfies the Assumption **(H2)**, **(H4)** and **(H5)** with Hölder exponent $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$.

Acknowledgments

The first author (S. Lu) supported by Graduate Innovation Fund of Jilin University. The second author (X. Yang) was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12071175, 12371191). The third author (Y. Li) was supported by National Basic Research Program of China (2013CB834100), National Natural Science Foundation of China (12071175, 11171132 and 11571065) and Natural Science Foundation of Jilin Province (20200201253JC).

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

References

References

- [1] Victor Bakhtin and Yuri Kifer. Diffusion approximation for slow motion in fully coupled averaging. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 129(2):157–181, 2004.

- [2] Jianhai Bao, George Yin, and Chenggui Yuan. Two-time-scale stochastic partial differential equations driven by α -stable noises: averaging principles. *Bernoulli*, 23(1):645–669, 2017.
- [3] N. N. Bogoliubov and Y. A. Mitropolsky. *Asymptotic methods in the theory of non-linear oscillations*. International Monographs on Advanced Mathematics and Physics. Hindustan Publishing Corp., Delhi, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, Inc., New York, russian edition, 1961.
- [4] Charles-Edouard Bréhier. Strong and weak orders in averaging for SPDEs. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 122(7):2553–2593, 2012.
- [5] Charles-Edouard Bréhier. Orders of convergence in the averaging principle for SPDEs: the case of a stochastically forced slow component. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(6):3325–3368, 2020.
- [6] Sandra Cerrai. Asymptotic behavior of systems of stochastic partial differential equations with multiplicative noise. In *Stochastic partial differential equations and applications—VII*, volume 245 of *Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math.*, pages 61–75. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2006.
- [7] Sandra Cerrai. A Khasminskii type averaging principle for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 19(3):899–948, 2009.
- [8] Sandra Cerrai. Averaging principle for systems of reaction-diffusion equations with polynomial nonlinearities perturbed by multiplicative noise. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(6):2482–2518, 2011.
- [9] Sandra Cerrai and Mark Freidlin. Averaging principle for a class of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 144(1-2):137–177, 2009.
- [10] Sandra Cerrai and Alessandra Lunardi. Averaging principle for nonautonomous slow-fast systems of stochastic reaction-diffusion equations: the almost periodic case. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 49(4):2843–2884, 2017.
- [11] Mengyu Cheng and Zhenxin Liu. The second Bogolyubov theorem and global averaging principle for SPDEs with monotone coefficients. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 55(2):1100–1144, 2023.
- [12] G. Da Prato and F. Flandoli. Pathwise uniqueness for a class of SDE in Hilbert spaces and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 259(1):243–267, 2010.
- [13] G. Da Prato, F. Flandoli, E. Priola, and M. Röckner. Strong uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Hilbert spaces perturbed by a bounded measurable drift. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(5):3306–3344, 2013.
- [14] Zhao Dong, Xiaobin Sun, Hui Xiao, and Jianliang Zhai. Averaging principle for one dimensional stochastic Burgers equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 265(10):4749–4797, 2018.
- [15] Shizhan Fang and Tusheng Zhang. A study of a class of stochastic differential equations with non-Lipschitzian coefficients. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 132(3):356–390, 2005.
- [16] Jin Feng, Martin Forde, and Jean-Pierre Fouque. Short-maturity asymptotics for a fast mean-reverting Heston stochastic volatility model. *SIAM J. Financial Math.*, 1(1):126–141, 2010.
- [17] Jin Feng, Jean-Pierre Fouque, and Rohini Kumar. Small-time asymptotics for fast mean-reverting stochastic volatility models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(4):1541–1575, 2012.
- [18] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. Long-time behavior of weakly coupled oscillators. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 123(6):1311–1337, 2006.
- [19] Hongjun Gao and Jinqiao Duan. Dynamics of quasi-geostrophic fluid motion with rapidly oscillating Coriolis force. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 4(1):127–138, 2003.
- [20] Hongjun Gao and Jinqiao Duan. Averaging principle for quasi-geostrophic motion under rapidly oscillating forcing. *Appl. Math. Mech. (English Ed.)*, 26(1):108–120, 2005.
- [21] Peng Gao. Averaging principle for complex Ginzburg-Landau equation perturbed by mixing random forces. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 53(1):32–61, 2021.
- [22] Ivan I. Gonzales-Gargate and Paulo R. Ruffino. An averaging principle for diffusions in foliated spaces. *Ann.*

- Probab.*, 44(1):567–588, 2016.
- [23] Martin Hairer and Xue-Mei Li. Averaging dynamics driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(4):1826–1860, 2020.
- [24] Daniel Henry. *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, volume 840 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981.
- [25] Yangzi Hu, Fuke Wu, and Chengming Huang. Robustness of exponential stability of a class of stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delay. *Automatica J. IFAC*, 45(11):2577–2584, 2009.
- [26] R. Z. Khasminskii. On the principle of averaging the Itô’s stochastic differential equations. *Kybernetika (Prague)*, 4:260–279, 1968.
- [27] R. Z. Khasminskii and G. Yin. On averaging principles: an asymptotic expansion approach. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 35(6):1534–1560, 2004.
- [28] Yuri Kifer. Averaging and climate models. In *Stochastic climate models (Chorin, 1999)*, volume 49 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 171–188. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.
- [29] N. Kryloff and N. Bogoliuboff. *Introduction to Non-Linear Mechanics*, volume No. 11 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1943.
- [30] Sergei B. Kuksin and Andrey L. Piatnitski. Khasminskii-Whitham averaging for randomly perturbed KdV equation. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 89(4):400–428, 2008.
- [31] Alexei Kulik and Michael Scheutzow. Well-posedness, stability and sensitivities for stochastic delay equations: a generalized coupling approach. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(6):3041–3076, 2020.
- [32] Xue-Mei Li. An averaging principle for a completely integrable stochastic Hamiltonian system. *Nonlinearity*, 21(4):803–822, 2008.
- [33] Xue-Mei Li and Julian Sieber. Slow-fast systems with fractional environment and dynamics. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 32(5):3964–4003, 2022.
- [34] Wei Liu, Michael Röckner, Xiaobin Sun, and Yingchao Xie. Averaging principle for slow-fast stochastic differential equations with time dependent locally Lipschitz coefficients. *J. Differential Equations*, 268(6):2910–2948, 2020.
- [35] Shuaishuai Lu, Yang Xue, and Li Yong. McKean-vlasov SPDEs with Hölder continuous coefficients: existence, uniqueness, ergodicity, exponential mixing and limit theorems. arXiv:2405.06223, 2024.
- [36] Shuaishuai Lu and Xue Yang. Poisson stable solutions and solution maps for stochastic functional differential equations. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, 127:Paper No. 107533, 23, 2023.
- [37] Shuaishuai Lu and Xue Yang. Poisson stable solutions for stochastic functional evolution equations with infinite delay. *J. Differential Equations*, 375:374–414, 2023.
- [38] Andrew J. Majda, Ilya Timofeyev, and Eric Vanden Eijnden. A mathematical framework for stochastic climate models. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54(8):891–974, 2001.
- [39] Bohdan Maslowski, Jan Seidler, and Ivo Vrkoč. An averaging principle for stochastic evolution equations. II. *Math. Bohem.*, 116(2):191–224, 1991.
- [40] E. Pardoux and A. Yu. Veretennikov. On the Poisson equation and diffusion approximation. I. *Ann. Probab.*, 29(3):1061–1085, 2001.
- [41] E. Pardoux and A. Yu. Veretennikov. On the Poisson equation and diffusion approximation. III. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(3):1111–1133, 2005.
- [42] Claudia Prévôt and Michael Röckner. *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 1905 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [43] Michael Röckner and Longjie Xie. Averaging principle and normal deviations for multiscale stochastic systems.

- Comm. Math. Phys.*, 383(3):1889–1937, 2021.
- [44] Michael Röckner, Longjie Xie, and Li Yang. Asymptotic behavior of multiscale stochastic partial differential equations with Hölder coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 285(9):Paper No. 110103, 50, 2023.
 - [45] Yangyang Shi and Hongjun Gao. Weak and strong averaging principle for a stochastic coupled fast-slow atmosphere-ocean model with non-Lipschitz Lévy noise. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 218:Paper No. 112794, 34, 2022.
 - [46] Xiaobin Sun, Longjie Xie, and Yingchao Xie. Averaging principle for slow-fast stochastic partial differential equations with Hölder continuous coefficients. *J. Differential Equations*, 270:476–504, 2021.
 - [47] A. Yu. Veretennikov. On an averaging principle for systems of stochastic differential equations. *Mat. Sb.*, 181(2):256–268, 1990.
 - [48] W. Wang and A. J. Roberts. Average and deviation for slow-fast stochastic partial differential equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 253(5):1265–1286, 2012.
 - [49] Ya Wang, Fuke Wu, and George Yin. Limit theorems of additive functionals for regime-switching diffusions with infinite delay. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 167:Paper No. 104215, 28, 2024.
 - [50] Ya Wang, Fuke Wu, George Yin, and Chao Zhu. Stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delay under non-Lipschitz coefficients: existence and uniqueness, Markov property, ergodicity, and asymptotic log-Harnack inequality. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 149:1–38, 2022.
 - [51] Fuke Wu, George Yin, and Hongwei Mei. Stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delay: existence and uniqueness of solutions, solution maps, Markov properties, and ergodicity. *J. Differential Equations*, 262(3):1226–1252, 2017.
 - [52] Wenjing Xu and Wei Xu. An averaging principle for the time-dependent abstract stochastic evolution equations with infinite delay and Wiener process. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 178(5):1126–1141, 2020.