

ON THE LOCAL LINEARIZATION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STOCHASTIC WAVE EQUATION WITH A MULTIPLICATIVE SPACE-TIME WHITE NOISE FORCING

JINGYU HUANG, TADAHIRO OH, AND MAMORU OKAMOTO

ABSTRACT. In this note, we establish a bi-parameter linear localization of the one-dimensional stochastic wave equation with a multiplicative space-time white noise forcing.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following stochastic wave equation (SNLW) on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u - \partial_x^2 u = F(u)\xi & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \\ (u, \partial_t u)|_{t=0} = (u_0, u_1), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function and ξ denotes the (Gaussian) space-time white noise on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ whose space-time covariance is formally given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi(t_1, x_1)\xi(t_2, x_2)] = \delta(t_1 - t_2)\delta(x_1 - x_2). \quad (1.2)$$

The expression (1.2) is merely formal but we can make it rigorous by testing it against a test function.

Definition 1.1. A two-parameter white noise ξ on \mathbb{R}^2 is a family of centered Gaussian random variables $\{\xi(\varphi) : \varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi(\varphi)^2] = \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\xi(\varphi_1)\xi(\varphi_2)] = \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}.$$

In [17], Walsh studied the Ito solution theory for (1.1) and proved its well-posedness. See, for example, [17, p.323, Exercise 3.7] and [7, p.45], where the fundamental properties of solutions to (1.1) are stated (implicitly). For readers' convenience, we state and prove basic properties of solutions to (1.1) in Appendix A. Our main goal in this note is to study the local fluctuation property of solutions to (1.1).

Let us first consider the following stochastic heat equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \partial_x^2 u = F(u)\xi & (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}. \\ u|_{t=0} = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

It is well known that, under suitable assumptions on F and u_0 , the solution to (1.3) *locally linearizes*; namely by letting Z_{heat} denote the linear solution satisfying $\partial_t Z_{\text{heat}} - \partial_x^2 Z_{\text{heat}} = \xi$ with $Z_{\text{heat}}|_{t=0} = 0$, the solution u to (1.3) satisfies

$$u(t, x + \varepsilon) - u(t, x) = F(u(t, x))\{Z_{\text{heat}}(t, x + \varepsilon) - Z_{\text{heat}}(t, x)\} + R_\varepsilon(t, x), \quad (1.4)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R60, 35L05, 60H15.

Key words and phrases. local linearization; stochastic wave equation; multiplicative noise; null coordinates.

where, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the remainder term $R_\varepsilon(t, x)$ tends to 0 much faster than $Z_{\text{heat}}(t, x + \varepsilon) - Z_{\text{heat}}(t, x)$. See, for example, [11, 15, 8, 12]. The relation (1.4) states that, for fixed t , local fluctuations (in x) of the solution $u(t)$ are essentially given by those of $Z_{\text{heat}}(t)$. In other words, if we ignore precise regularity conditions, then (1.4) states that $u(t)$ is controlled by $Z_{\text{heat}}(t)$ in the sense of controlled paths due to Gubinelli [10]; see [9, Definition 4.6].

In [13], Khoshnevisan and the first author studied an analogous issue for SNLW (1.1). In particular, they showed that the solution to (1.1) with initial data $(u_0, u_1) \equiv (0, 1)$ does *not* locally linearize (for fixed t), which shows a sharp contrast to the case of the stochastic heat equation. In this note, we change our viewpoint and study the local linearization issue for SNLW (1.1) from a *bi-parameter* point of view.

In [17], Walsh studied the well-posedness issue of (1.1) by first switching to the null coordinates:

$$x_1 = \frac{x - t}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = \frac{x + t}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (1.5)$$

In the null coordinates, the Cauchy problem (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} v = -\frac{1}{2} F(v) \tilde{\xi} \\ v|_{x_1=x_2} = u_0(\sqrt{2} \cdot), \quad (\partial_{x_2} - \partial_{x_1})v|_{x_1=x_2} = \sqrt{2} u_1(\sqrt{2} \cdot), \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

where

$$v(x_1, x_2) = u\left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\xi}(x_1, x_2) = \xi\left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \quad (1.7)$$

with the latter interpreted in a suitable sense. Note that this change of coordinates is via an orthogonal transformation (which in particular preserves the L^2 -inner product on \mathbb{R}^2) and thus $\tilde{\xi}$ is also a two-parameter white noise in the sense of Definition 1.1.

By integrating in x_1 and x_2 , we can rewrite (1.6) as

$$v(\mathbf{x}) = V_0(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \int_{x_1}^{y_2} F(v(\mathbf{y})) \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2), \quad (1.8)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2)$, and

$$V_0(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(u_0(\sqrt{2}x_1) + u_0(\sqrt{2}x_2) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\sqrt{2}x_1}^{\sqrt{2}x_2} u_1(y) dy. \quad (1.9)$$

Under the Lipschitz assumption on F , one can then interpret the last term on the right-hand side of (1.8) as a two-parameter stochastic integral ([3, 4]) and prove well-posedness of (1.8) (and hence of the original SNLW (1.1)); see [17, 7].

In the following, we study the local linearization property of the solution v to (1.6) in the variable $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ in a bi-parameter manner. For this purpose, let us introduce some notations. Let \tilde{Z} be the linearization of v in (1.6); namely, \tilde{Z} is the solution to (1.6) with $F(v) \equiv 1$ and $(u_0, u_1) = (0, 0)$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} \tilde{Z} = -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\xi} \\ \tilde{Z}|_{x_1=x_2} = 0, \quad (\partial_{x_2} - \partial_{x_1})\tilde{Z}|_{x_1=x_2} = 0. \end{cases}$$

By a direction integration, we then have

$$\tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \int_{x_1}^{y_2} \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2) \quad (1.10)$$

which is to be interpreted as a two-parameter stochastic integral.

Given $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, define the difference operator $\delta_\varepsilon^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2$, by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} f(x_1, x_2) &= f(x_1 + \varepsilon, x_2) - f(x_1, x_2), \\ \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} f(x_1, x_2) &= f(x_1, x_2 + \varepsilon) - f(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1.11)$$

Then, from (1.11) and (1.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} v(\mathbf{x}) &= v(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2 + \varepsilon) - v(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2) - v(x_1, x_2 + \varepsilon) + v(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} V_0(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_2}^{x_2+\varepsilon} \int_{x_1}^{x_1 \pm \varepsilon} F(v(\mathbf{y})) \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1.12)$$

Similarly, from (1.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x}) &= \tilde{Z}(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2 + \varepsilon) - \tilde{Z}(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2) - \tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2 + \varepsilon) + \tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{x_2}^{x_2+\varepsilon} \int_{x_1}^{x_1 \pm \varepsilon} \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1.13)$$

Thus, from the Wiener isometry (see, for example, [14, (20) on p. 7]), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|^2] = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2, \quad (1.14)$$

which shows that the decay rate of $|\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|$ is $\sim |\varepsilon|$ on average. The following lemma shows that the decay rate (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of $|\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|$ is almost surely slower than $|\varepsilon|^{1+\kappa}$ for any $\kappa > 0$.

Lemma 1.2. *Fix $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, for any $\kappa > 0$, we have*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\varepsilon|^{1+\kappa}} = \infty, \quad (1.15)$$

almost surely.

Lemma 1.2 follows from a simple application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. We present the proof of Lemma 1.2 in the next section.

Let us now turn to the local linearization property of solutions to SNLW (1.1). In [13], Khoshnevisan and the first author investigated the local linearization issue for SNLW (1.1) by studying local fluctuations (in x) of $u(t)$ for fixed t . While such an approach is suitable for the stochastic heat equation (1.3), it does not seem to be appropriate for the wave equation. We instead propose to study *bi-parameter* fluctuations of u with respect to the null coordinates $x_1 = \frac{x-t}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $x_2 = \frac{x+t}{\sqrt{2}}$. For this purpose, let us first state the local linearization result for SNLW (1.6) in the null coordinates. Given $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and (small) $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, define the

remainder terms $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^+(x_1, x_2)$ and $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^-(x_1, x_2)$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2) &= \delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)}\delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}v(x_1, x_2) - F(v(x_1, x_2))\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)}\delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}\tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2) \\ &= \{v(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2 + \varepsilon) - v(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2) - v(x_1, x_2 + \varepsilon) + v(x_1, x_2)\} \\ &\quad - F(v(x_1, x_2))\{\tilde{Z}(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2 + \varepsilon) - \tilde{Z}(x_1 \pm \varepsilon, x_2) \\ &\quad - \tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2 + \varepsilon) + \tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{1.16}$$

Theorem 1.3. *Given $u_0 \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $u_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, let v be the solution to SNLW (1.6) in the null coordinates and \tilde{Z} be as in (1.10). Then, given any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and finite $p \geq 2$, we have*

$$\|\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(p, x_1, x_2)\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}},\tag{1.17}$$

uniformly in small $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 1.3 establishes bi-parameter local linearization for the solution v to (1.6) in the following sense; the remainder term $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2)$ decays like $\sim \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ on average, and hence, in view of Lemma 1.2, $\tilde{R}_\varepsilon^\pm(x_1, x_2)$ tends to 0 much faster than $\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)}\delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}\tilde{Z}(x_1, x_2)$.

As an immediate corollary to Theorem 1.3 and (1.7), we obtain the following bi-parameter local linearization for the solution u to SNLW (1.1) in the original space-time coordinates.

Theorem 1.4. *Given $u_0 \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $u_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, let u be the solution to SNLW (1.1) and Z be the linear solution, satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 Z - \partial_x^2 Z = \xi \\ (Z, \partial_t Z)|_{t=0} = (0, 0). \end{cases}\tag{1.18}$$

Then, given any $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and finite $p \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}u(t, x) - F(u(t, x))\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}Z(t, x)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ + \|\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}u(t, x) - F(u(t, x))\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}Z(t, x)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C(p, t, x)\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in small $\varepsilon > 0$, where $\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}$ and $\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}f(t, x) &= f(t, x + 2\varepsilon) - f(t - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) - f(t + \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) + f(t, x), \\ \Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}f(t, x) &= f(t + 2\varepsilon, x) - f(t + \varepsilon, x - \varepsilon) - f(t + \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon) + f(t, x).\end{aligned}$$

We also have the following claim as a direct corollary to Lemma 1.2 and (1.7); given any $\kappa > 0$ and $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}Z(t, x)|}{|\varepsilon|^{1+\kappa}} = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}Z(t, x)|}{|\varepsilon|^{1+\kappa}} = \infty,\tag{1.19}$$

almost surely. Hence, from Theorem 1.4 and (1.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}u(t, x) &= F(u(t, x))\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)}Z(t, x) + R_\varepsilon^{(1)}(t, x), \\ \Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}u(t, x) &= F(u(t, x))\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)}Z(t, x) + R_\varepsilon^{(2)}(t, x),\end{aligned}$$

where the remainder term $R_\varepsilon^{(j)}(t, x)$ decays much faster than $\Delta_\varepsilon^{(j)}Z(t, x)$, $j = 1, 2$, thus establishing a bi-parameter local linearization for the solution u to SNLW (1.1) in the original space-time coordinates.

Remark 1.5. In Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, we established local linearizability of SNLW in a bi-parameter sense. Such a bi-parameter point of view is natural in studying the one-dimensional (stochastic) wave equation. See, for example, [16, 6, 2] and the references therein.

Remark 1.6. (i) If f is a smooth function, we have

$$\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} f = \varepsilon^2(-\partial_t^2 + \partial_x^2)f + O(\varepsilon^3) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} f = \varepsilon^2(\partial_t^2 - \partial_x^2)f + O(\varepsilon^3).$$

Thus, if both the solution u to (1.1) and Z satisfying (1.18) were smooth (in both t and x), then we would formally have

$$\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} u - F(u)\Delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} Z = O(\varepsilon^3) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} u - F(u)\Delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} Z = O(\varepsilon^3).$$

The main point of Theorem 1.4 is to justify such heuristics when both u and Z are non-smooth functions.

(ii) As shown in [13], local linearization in x (for fixed t) fails for (1.1). By switching the role of t and x , we also see that local linearization in t (for fixed x) fails for (1.1).

One may also study local linearization properties in x_1 (for fixed x_2) of solutions to (1.6) in the null coordinates. Let $x_2 > x_1$. From (1.8) and (1.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} v(\mathbf{x}) - F(v(\mathbf{x}))\delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \delta_\varepsilon^{(j)} V_0(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_1+\varepsilon}^{x_2} \int_{x_1}^{x_2+\varepsilon} \{F(v(\mathbf{y})) - F(v(\mathbf{x}))\} \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_1}^{x_1+\varepsilon} \int_{x_1}^{y_2} \{F(v(\mathbf{y})) - F(v(\mathbf{x}))\} \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1.20)$$

On the other hand, from the Lipschitz continuity of F and (2.3), we have

$$|F(v(\mathbf{y})) - F(v(\mathbf{x}))|^2 \leq C(\omega)(|x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2|),$$

which is $O(1)$ in the domain of integration for the second term on the right-hand side of (1.20) since $|x_2 - y_2| \sim |x_2 - x_1| = O(1)$. Namely, the second term on the right-hand side of (1.20) does not decay faster than $\delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} \tilde{Z}$ in general, and hence local linearization in x_1 (for fixed x_2) fails for (1.6). By symmetry, we also see that local linearization in x_2 (for fixed x_1) fails for (1.6). This is the reason that we need to consider the second order difference in studying local linearization for SNLW.

2. PROOFS OF LEMMA 1.2 AND THEOREM 1.3

In this section, we present the proofs of Lemma 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. We first prove Lemma 1.2 on a lower bound of the decay rate of $|\delta_{\pm\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof of Lemma 1.2. We only consider $\delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})$ since the same proof applies to $\delta_{-\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})$.

Fix $\kappa > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Recalling from (1.13) and (1.14) that $\delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})$ is a mean-zero Gaussian random variable with variance $\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^2$, we have

$$P\left(|\delta_\varepsilon^{(1)} \delta_\varepsilon^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \leq M\varepsilon^{2+2\kappa}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{|z| \leq \sqrt{4M\varepsilon^{2\kappa}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} dz \leq \sqrt{\frac{8M}{\pi}} \varepsilon^\kappa \quad (2.1)$$

for any $M, \varepsilon > 0$, uniformly in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where we simply bounded $e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}$ by 1. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varepsilon_n = e^{-n}$ which tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, from (2.1), we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P\left(|\delta_{\varepsilon_n}^{(1)} \delta_{\varepsilon_n}^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|^2 \leq M \varepsilon_n^{2+2\kappa}\right) \leq C_M \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\kappa n} < \infty.$$

Hence, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, there exists an almost surely finite constant $N(\omega) > 0$ such that

$$|\delta_{\varepsilon_n}^{(1)} \delta_{\varepsilon_n}^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|^2 > M \varepsilon_n^{2+2\kappa}$$

for any $n \geq N(\omega)$. In particular, we obtain

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\delta_{\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_{\varepsilon}^{(2)} \tilde{Z}(\mathbf{x})|}{|\varepsilon|^{1+\kappa}} > \sqrt{M}, \quad (2.2)$$

almost surely. Since (2.2) holds for any (integer) $M \gg 1$, we conclude (1.15). \square

Next, we present the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We only consider $\tilde{R}_{\varepsilon}^{+}$ since the same proof applies to $\tilde{R}_{\varepsilon}^{-}$. As before, we use the short-hand notations $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2)$.

We first recall the Hölder continuity of the solution v to (1.8). In particular, it follows from Proposition A.2 and (1.7) that, for any $L > 0$ and $2 \leq p < \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|v(\mathbf{x}) - v(\mathbf{y})|^p] \lesssim |x_1 - y_1|^{\frac{p}{2}} + |x_2 - y_2|^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad (2.3)$$

uniformly for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|x_1|, |x_2|, |y_1|, |y_2| \leq L$. By taking $p \gg 1$ and applying the Kolmogorov continuity criterion [1, Theorem 2.1], we see that v is α -Hölder continuous for any $\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$, almost surely.

From (1.16) with (1.12) and (1.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{\varepsilon}^{+}(x_1, x_2) &= \delta_{\varepsilon}^{(1)} \delta_{\varepsilon}^{(2)} V_0(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{x_2}^{x_2+\varepsilon} \int_{x_1}^{x_1+\varepsilon} \{F(v(\mathbf{y})) - F(v(\mathbf{x}))\} \tilde{\xi}(dy_1, dy_2) \\ &=: \text{I}(\mathbf{x}) + \text{II}(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where V_0 is as in (1.9). It is easy to see from (1.9) and (1.11) that

$$\text{I}(\mathbf{x}) = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Next, we estimate the term II in (2.4). To ensure adaptedness of the integrand, we first decompose the domain of integration (which is a square) into two triangular regions; see [5, p. 21] for a similar decomposition to recover adaptedness. For fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and small $\varepsilon > 0$, define the sets $D_1(\mathbf{x}), D_2(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{t,x}^2$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(\mathbf{x}) &:= \left\{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{-x_1 + x_2 - \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \leq t \leq \frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. -t + \sqrt{2}x_2 \leq x \leq t + \sqrt{2}x_1 + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon \right\}, \\ D_2(\mathbf{x}) &:= \left\{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}} \leq t \leq \frac{-x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. t + \sqrt{2}x_1 \leq x \leq -t + \sqrt{2}x_2 + \sqrt{2}\varepsilon \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Namely, $D_1^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})$ is the triangular region with vertices:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(\mathbf{x}) &:= \left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \\ P_2(\mathbf{x}) &:= \left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2 - \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \\ \text{and } P_3(\mathbf{x}) &:= \left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2 + 2\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

while $D_2^\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})$ is the triangular region with vertices:

$$P_1(\mathbf{x}), \quad P_3(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{and} \quad P_4(\mathbf{x}) := \left(\frac{-x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right),$$

By undoing the change of variables (1.7), we divide Π into three parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathbf{x}) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} + \int_{D_2(\mathbf{x})} \right) \{F(u(t, x)) - F(u(P_1(\mathbf{x})))\} \xi(dt, dx) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} \{F(u(t, x)) - F(u(P_2(\mathbf{x})))\} \xi(dt, dx) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \{F(u(P_2(\mathbf{x}))) - F(u(P_1(\mathbf{x})))\} \int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} \xi(dt, dx) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{D_2(\mathbf{x})} \{F(u(t, x)) - F(u(P_1(\mathbf{x})))\} \xi(dt, dx) \\ &=: \Pi_1(\mathbf{x}) + \Pi_2(\mathbf{x}) + \Pi_3(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

From the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality ([14, Theorem 5.27]), Minkowski's inequality, the Lipschitz continuity of F , and (2.3) with (2.6) and (1.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Pi_1(\mathbf{x})|^p] &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} |F(u(t, x)) - F(u(P_2(\mathbf{x})))|^2 dx dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} \mathbb{E}[|u(t, x) - u(P_2(\mathbf{x}))|^p]^{\frac{2}{p}} dx dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} \left(\left| t - \frac{-x_1 + x_2 - \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right| + \left| x - \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right| \right) dx dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= \left(2 \int_{\frac{-x_1 + x_2 - \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}}^{\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}} \int_{-t + \sqrt{2}x_2}^{\frac{x_1 + x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}} (t - x + \sqrt{2}(x_1 + \varepsilon)) dx dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= \left(3 \int_{\frac{-x_1 + x_2 - \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}}^{\frac{-x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}}} \left(t + \frac{x_1 - x_2 + \varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^2 dt \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}p}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

A similar calculation yields that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Pi_3(\mathbf{x})|^p] \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}p}. \quad (2.8)$$

From Hölder's inequality, the Lipschitz continuity of F , and (2.3) with (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Pi_2(\mathbf{x})|^p] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[|u(P_2(\mathbf{x})) - u(P_1(\mathbf{x}))|^{2p}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\int_{D_1(\mathbf{x})} \xi(dt, dx)\right|^{2p}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \cdot \varepsilon^p = \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}p}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Therefore, the desired bound (1.17) follows from (2.4), (2.5), (2.7), (2.8), and (2.9). \square

APPENDIX A. ON THE CAUCHY PROBLEM FOR THE STOCHASTIC WAVE EQUATION

In this appendix, we go over basic properties of solutions to (1.1). Our presentation follows closely that in Section 6 of [14] on the stochastic heat equation. In the remaining part of this note, we restrict our attention to positive times (i.e. $t \geq 0$) for simplicity of the presentation.

Let G be the fundamental solution for the wave equation defined by

$$G(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| < t\}}(t, x). \quad (A.1)$$

Then, the Duhamel formulation (= mild formulation) of (1.1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x) &= \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x - y) u_0(y) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x - y) u_1(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y) F(u(s, y)) \xi(dy ds). \end{aligned} \quad (A.2)$$

Given $T > 0$ and finite $p \geq 2$, set

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_{T,p}} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \|u(t, x)\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \quad (A.3)$$

Then, for $T > 0$, we define a solution space \mathcal{X} by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X} &= \left\{ u \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}, \text{ predictable :} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \|u\|_{\mathcal{X}_{T,p}} < \infty \text{ for any } T > 0 \text{ and finite } p \geq 2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (A.4)$$

Then, we have the following well-posedness result.

Proposition A.1. *Let $u_0 \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $u_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$. Suppose that F is Lipschitz continuous. Then, there exists a unique global-in-time solution u to (A.2), belonging to the class \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. First, we prove uniqueness. Let u_1 and u_2 be solutions to (A.2), belonging to the class \mathcal{X} defined in (A.4). By letting $w = u_1 - u_2$, we have

$$w(t, x) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y) \{F(u_1(s, y)) - F(u_2(s, y))\} \xi(dy ds).$$

Then, by the Ito isometry and the Lipschitz continuity of F , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|w(t, x)|^2] &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y)^2 \mathbb{E}[|F(u_1(s, y)) - F(u_2(s, y))|^2] dy ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y)^2 \mathbb{E}[|w(s, y)|^2] dy ds. \end{aligned} \quad (A.5)$$

By setting

$$H(t) = \|w\|_{\mathcal{X}_{t,2}}^2 = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[|w(s, x)|^2],$$

where the $\mathcal{X}_{t,2}$ -norm is as in (A.3), it follows from (A.1) and (A.5) that

$$H(t) \lesssim \int_0^t (t-s)H(s)ds.$$

Since $H(0) = 0$, Gronwall's inequality yields that $H(t) = 0$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This proves uniqueness of a solution.

Next, we prove existence. Define a sequence $\{u^{(n)}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ by setting

$$u^{(0)}(t, x) = \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x-y)u_0(y)dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x-y)u_1(y)dy$$

and

$$u^{(n)}(t, x) = u^{(0)}(t, x) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t-s, x-y)F(u^{(n-1)}(s, y))\xi(dyds) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $d_n = u^{(n)} - u^{(n-1)}$ satisfies

$$d_n(t, x) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t-s, x-y)\{F(u^{(n-1)}(s, y)) - F(u^{(n-2)}(s, y))\}\xi(dyds).$$

Let $T > 0$ and $2 \leq p < \infty$. Then, from the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, Hölder's inequality, and the Lipschitz continuity of F , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|d_n(t, x)|^p] \\ & \lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t-s, x-y)^2 |F(u^{(n-1)}(s, y)) - F(u^{(n-2)}(s, y))|^2 dyds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t-s, x-y)^{\frac{p}{p-2}} dyds\right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t-s, x-y)^{\frac{p}{2}} |d_{n-1}(s, y)|^p dyds\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Hence, by defining H_n by

$$H_n(t) = \|d_n\|_{\mathcal{X}_{t,p}}^p = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[|d_n(s, x)|^p],$$

where the $\mathcal{X}_{t,p}$ -norm is as in (A.3), it follows from (A.1) and (A.7) that there exists a constant $C = C(T, p) > 0$ such that

$$H_n(t) \leq C \int_0^t H_{n-1}(s)ds$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. Then, a Gronwall-type argument (see Lemma 6.5 in [14], for example) yields

$$H_n(t) \leq H_1(T) \frac{(Ct)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T]$. By summing over $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that, given any $T > 0$ and finite $p \geq 2$, there exists $C_0(T, p) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n(t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C_0(T, p) < \infty$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. This implies that $u^{(n)}$ converges to some limit, denoted by u , with respect to the $\mathcal{X}_{T,p}$ -norm for each $T > 0$ and finite $p \geq 2$. In particular, u is the limit of $u^{(n)}$ in

$L^1([0, T] \times [-R, R] \times \Omega)$ for any $T, R > 0$. In view of the predictability of $u^{(n)}$, we conclude that the limit u is also predictable. As a result, the limit u belongs to the class \mathcal{X} defined in (A.4). Furthermore, from (A.6), we conclude that the limit u almost surely satisfies (A.2) for any $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$. \square

Proposition A.2. *Let $T, L > 0$, and $2 \leq p < \infty$, and let u be the solution to (A.2) constructed in Proposition A.1. Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|u(t, x) - u(t', x')|^p] \lesssim |t - t'|^{\frac{p}{2}} + |x - x'|^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

for any $t, t' \in [0, T]$ and $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|x|, |x'| \leq L$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\text{lin}}(t, x) &:= \partial_t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x - y) u_0(y) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t, x - y) u_1(y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \{u_0(x + t) - u_0(x - t)\} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{x-t}^{x+t} u_1(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $u_0 \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $u_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$|u_{\text{lin}}(t, x) - u_{\text{lin}}(t', x')|^p \lesssim |t - t'|^p + |x - x'|^p \lesssim |t - t'|^{\frac{p}{2}} + |x - x'|^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

for any $t, t' \in [0, T]$ and $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|x - x'| \leq L$.

Next, we consider the third term on the right-hand side of (A.2) which we denote by $U(t, x)$:

$$U(t, x) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y) F(u(s, y)) \xi(dy ds).$$

For $0 \leq t' \leq t \leq T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U(t, x) - U(t', x') &= \int_{t'}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(t - s, x - y) F(u(s, y)) \xi(dy ds) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{G(t - s, x - y) - G(t' - s, x - y)\} F(u(s, y)) \xi(dy ds) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{G(t' - s, x - y) - G(t' - s, x' - y)\} F(u(s, y)) \xi(dy ds) \\ &=: \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $2 \leq p < \infty$. From the Lipschitz continuity of F and the fact that $u \in \mathcal{X}$ (see (A.3) and (A.4)) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \|F(u(s, y))\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \|u(s, y)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + F(0) < \infty. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Then, from the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, Minkowski’s inequality, and (A.8) with (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{I}|^p] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^{t'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |G(t' - s, x - y) - G(t' - s, x' - y)|^2 |F(u(s, y))|^2 dy ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_0^{t'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |G(t' - s, x - y) - G(t' - s, x' - y)|^2 \mathbb{E}[|F(u(s, y))|^p]^{\frac{2}{p}} dy ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\int_0^{t'} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |G(t' - s, x - y) - G(t' - s, x' - y)|^2 dy ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\lesssim |x - x'|^{\frac{p}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar computations yield

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{I}|^p] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{II}|^p] \lesssim |t - t'|^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition A.2. \square

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank an anonymous referee for the helpful comments which have improved the presentation of the paper. T.O. was supported by the European Research Council (grant no. 864138 “SingStochDispDyn”). M.O. was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant numbers JP23K03182 and JP23H01079.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Baldi, *Stochastic calculus*, An introduction through theory and exercises. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2017. xiv+627 pp.
- [2] B. Bringmann, J. Lührmann, G. Staffilani, *The wave maps equation and Brownian paths*, Comm. Math. Phys. 405 (2024), no. 3, Paper No. 60, 115 pp.
- [3] R. Cairoli, *Sur une équation différentielle stochastique*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 274 (1972), A1739–A1742.
- [4] R. Cairoli, J. Walsh, *Stochastic integrals in the plane*, Acta Math. 134 (1975), 111–183.
- [5] L. Chen, J. Huang, D. Khoshnevisan, K. Kim, *Dense blowup for parabolic SPDEs*, Electron. J. Probab. 24 (2019), Paper No. 118, 33 pp.
- [6] K. Chouk, M. Gubinelli, *Rough sheets*, arXiv:1406.7748 [math.PR].
- [7] R.C. Dalang, *The stochastic wave equation*, A minicourse on stochastic partial differential equations, 39–71, Lecture Notes in Math., 1962, Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [8] M. Foondun, D. Khoshnevisan, P. Mahboubi, *Analysis of the gradient of the solution to a stochastic heat equation via fractional Brownian motion*, Stoch. Partial Differ. Equ. Anal. Comput. 3 (2015), no. 2, 133–158.
- [9] P. Friz, M. Hairer, *A course on rough paths. With an introduction to regularity structures*. Second edition. Universitext. Springer, Cham, [2020], ©2020. xvi+346 pp.
- [10] M. Gubinelli, *Controlling rough paths*, J. Funct. Anal. 216 (2004), no. 1, 86–140.
- [11] M. Hairer, *A theory of regularity structures*, Invent. Math. 198 (2014), no. 2, 269–504.
- [12] M. Hairer, É. Pardoux, *A Wong–Zakai theorem for stochastic PDEs*, J. Math. Soc. Japan 67 (2015), no. 4, 1551–1604.
- [13] J. Huang, D. Khoshnevisan, *Delocalization of a (1 + 1)-dimensional stochastic wave equation*, arXiv:1610.07727 [math.PR].
- [14] D. Khoshnevisan, *A primer on stochastic partial differential equations*, A minicourse on stochastic partial differential equations, 1–38, Lecture Notes in Math., 1962, Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [15] D. Khoshnevisan, J. Swanson, Y. Xiao, L. Zhang, *Weak existence of a solution to a differential equation driven by a very rough fBm*, arXiv:1309.3613 [math.PR].
- [16] L. Quer-Sardanyons, S. Tindel, *The 1-d stochastic wave equation driven by a fractional Brownian sheet*, Stochastic Process. Appl. 117 (2007), no. 10, 1448–1472.

- [17] J. Walsh, *An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations*, École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV–1984, 265–439, Lecture Notes in Math., 1180, Springer, Berlin, 1986.

JINGYU HUANG, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, WATSON BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM, B15 2TT, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: `j.huang.4@bham.ac.uk`

TADAHIRO OH, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, AND THE MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, JAMES CLERK MAXWELL BUILDING, THE KING'S BUILDINGS, PETER GUTHRIE TAIT ROAD, EDINBURGH, EH9 3FD, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: `hiro.oh@ed.ac.uk`

MAMORU OKAMOTO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, TOYONAKA, OSAKA, 560-0043, JAPAN

Email address: `okamoto@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`