WONG-ZAKAI APPROXIMATIONS WITH CONVERGENCE RATE FOR STOCHASTIC PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

TOSHIYUKI NAKAYAMA AND STEFAN TAPPE

Abstract. The goal of this paper is to prove a convergence rate for Wong-Zakai approximations of semilinear stochastic partial differential equations driven by a finite dimensional Brownian motion.

1. Introduction

Consider a semilinear stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) of the form
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dX(t)}{dt} &= (AX(t) + b(X(t)))dt + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_j(X(t))dB_j(t) \\
X(0) &= x_0
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
on a separable Hilbert space \((H, \| \cdot \|)\) driven by a finite dimensional Brownian motion \(B = (B_1, \ldots, B_r)\) for some positive integer \(r \in \mathbb{N}\).

A natural method in order to approximate the SPDE (1.1) by a sequence of partial differential equations (PDEs) is to use the so-called Wong-Zakai approximations. More precisely, on a fixed time interval \([0, T]\) we replace the Brownian motions \(B_j\) by their polygonal approximations \((B_j^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\) with step size \(T/m\). For each \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) the Wong-Zakai approximation \(\xi_m(\cdot) = \xi_m(\cdot, \omega) : [0, T] \to H\) is the mild solution to the deterministic PDE
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\dot{\xi}_m(t) &= A\xi_m(t) + b(\xi_m(t)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_j(\xi_m(t))\sigma_j(\xi_m(t)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sigma_j(\xi_m(t))B_j^m(t) \\
\xi_m(0) &= x_0
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
for each \(\omega \in \Omega\). Under appropriate regularity conditions, the Wong Zakai approximations \((\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}\) converge to the solution \(X\) of the SPDE (1.1). More precisely, for every \(p > 1\) we have the convergence
\begin{equation}
\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \xi_m(t) - X(t) \|^{2p} \right] = 0,
\end{equation}
see [19, Thm. 2.1].

Such a convergence result has first been proven, in the case of finite dimensional SDEs, by Wong and Zakai, see [31, 32]. Their approximation result has been generalized into several directions; namely, to the infinite dimensional case, e.g. in [1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23] and [25]–[29], with a view to support theorems, e.g. in [2, 3, 12, 13, 18, 19] (we also mention the related viability result from [20]).
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with a view to the theory of rough paths, e.g. in [9], for driving processes with jumps, e.g. in [17, 22], and with a driving fractional Brownian motion, e.g. in [24]. However, there are only very few reference dealing with convergence rates for the Wong-Zakai approximations. In [14] and [15] the authors consider the particular situation where the SPDE (1.1) is a second-order SPDE of parabolic type, and in [17] it is assumed that the generator $A$ appearing in (1.1) is compact and analytic.

Our goal in the present paper is to establish a convergence rate for (1.3) without imposing restrictions on the generator $A$ appearing in (1.1), that is, $A$ is allowed to be the infinitesimal generator of an arbitrary strongly continuous semigroup.

In order to present our main result, let us briefly outline the assumptions on the drift $b$:

1.1. Assumption. We suppose that the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. The drift $b$ is Lipschitz continuous and bounded.
2. We have $\sigma_j \in C^2_b(H)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$.

Here $C^2_b(H)$ denotes the space of all $\sigma \in C^2(H)$ such that $\sigma$, $D\sigma$ and $D^2\sigma$ are bounded. Then the volatilities $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r$ are Lipschitz continuous and bounded, and the mapping

$$\rho : H \to H, \quad \rho(x) := \sum_{j=1}^r D\sigma_j(x)\sigma_j(x)$$

(1.4)

appearing in the PDE (1.2) is Lipschitz continuous and bounded, too, which ensures existence and uniqueness of mild solutions to the SPDE (1.1) and the PDE (1.2).

Furthermore, we assume that the conditions stated above are also fulfilled when we consider the coefficients as mappings on the domain $D(A)$ of the generator with respect to the graph norm

$$\|x\|_{D(A)} = \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + \|Ax\|^2}, \quad x \in D(A).$$

(1.5)

More precisely:

1.2. Assumption. We suppose that the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. We have $b(D(A)) \subset D(A)$ and $\sigma_j(D(A)) \subset D(A)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$.
2. The drift $b|_{D(A)}$ is Lipschitz continuous and bounded with respect to the graph norm $\| \cdot \|_{D(A)}$.
3. We have $\sigma_j |_{D(A)} \in C^2_b(D(A))$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$ with respect to the graph norm $\| \cdot \|_{D(A)}$.

Then our main result reads as follows:

1.3. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are fulfilled, and let $T > 0$, $p > 1$ and $x_0 \in D(A)$ be arbitrary. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \xi_m(t) - X(t) \|^{2p} \right] \leq \frac{C}{m^{p-1}},$$

where $X$ denotes the mild solution to the SPDE (1.1) with $X(0) = x_0$, and the $(\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the mild solutions to the PDEs (1.2) with $\xi_m(0) = x_0$.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 will be a consequence of the following two results:

1. First, we will prove the stated convergence rate for the Euler-Maruyama approximations; see Theorem 3.1.
(2) Then, we will prove the stated convergence rate for the difference between the Euler-Maruyama approximations and the Wong-Zakai approximations; see Theorem 4.1.

For both steps, we will use and extend some results from [19].

The remainder of this text is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the mathematical framework and present some preliminary results. In Section 3 we provide the stated convergence rate for the Euler-Maruyama approximations, and in Section 4 we provide the stated convergence rate for the difference between the Euler-Maruyama approximations and the Wong-Zakai approximations.

2. General framework and notation

In this section, we introduce the mathematical framework and present some preliminary results. Let \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}, \mathbb{P})\) be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions. Let \(B^1, \ldots, B^r\) be independent standard Brownian motions for some positive integer \(r \in \mathbb{N}\). Let \(H\) be a separable Hilbert space and let \((S_t)_{t \geq 0}\) be a \(C_0\)-semigroup on \(H\) with infinitesimal generator \(A: \mathcal{D}(A) \subset H \to H\). Furthermore, let \(b: H \to H\) and \(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r: H \to H\) be measurable mappings.

2.1. Lemma. Suppose that \(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r \in C^2_b(H)\). Then the mapping \(\rho: H \to H\) defined in (1.4) is Lipschitz continuous and bounded.

Proof. By assumption, there exists a constant \(C > 0\) such that

\[
\max\{\|\sigma_j(x)\|, \|D\sigma_j(x)\|, \|D^2\sigma_j(x)\|\} \leq C \quad \text{for all } x \in H \text{ and } j = 1, \ldots, r.
\]

Therefore, for each \(x \in H\) we obtain

\[
\|\rho(x)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \|D\sigma_j(x)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \|D\sigma_j(x)\| \|\sigma_j(x)\| \leq rC^2,
\]

proving that \(\rho\) is bounded. Now, let \(x_1, x_2 \in H\) be arbitrary. Then we have

\[
\|\rho(x_1) - \rho(x_2)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^r \|D\sigma_j(x_1)\| \|\sigma_j(x_1) - \sigma_j(x_2)\| \leq 2rC^2\|x_1 - x_2\|,
\]

showing that \(\rho\) is Lipschitz continuous. \(\square\)

We fix a finite time horizon \(T > 0\), and define the quantities

\[
\delta_m := \frac{T}{m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},
\]

\[
[t]^-_m := k\delta_m, \quad k\delta_m \leq t < (k + 1)\delta_m, \quad k = 0, \ldots, m - 1,
\]

\[
[t]^+_m := (k + 1)\delta_m, \quad k\delta_m \leq t < (k + 1)\delta_m, \quad k = 0, \ldots, m - 1,
\]

and the real-valued processes \((B^j_m(t))_{t \in [0,T]}\) for \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(j = 1, \ldots, r\) as

\[
B^j_m(t) := B^j([t]^+_m) + \frac{t - [t]^-_m}{\delta_m} (B^j([t]^+_m) - B^j([t]^-_m)), \quad t \in [0,T].
\]

Note that for all \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) we have

\[
[t]^-_m \leq t < [t]^+_m, \quad t \in [0,T],
\]
and that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $j = 1 \ldots, r$ we have

$$\hat{B}_m(t) = \frac{B^j([t]_m^+)}{\delta_m} - B^j([t]_m^-), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

For what follows, we suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are fulfilled, and consider the SPDE

$$\begin{cases}
    dX(t) = (AX(t) + \hat{b}(X(t)))dt + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(X(t))dB^j(t) \\
    X(0) = x_0,
\end{cases}$$

where the mapping $\hat{b} : H \rightarrow H$ is given by $\hat{b} := b + \frac{\rho}{2}$ with $\rho : H \rightarrow H$ being defined in (1.4), and for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider the Wong-Zakai approximation $\xi_m(\cdot) = \xi_m(\cdot, \omega) : [0, T] \rightarrow H$ given by the PDE

$$\begin{cases}
    \dot{\xi}_m(t) = A\xi_m(t) + b(\xi_m(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\xi_m(t))\hat{B}_m(t) \\
    \xi_m(0) = x_0
\end{cases}$$

for each $\omega \in \Omega$.

2.2. Remark. From now on, we consider the SPDE (2.2) and the PDEs (2.3) instead of (1.1) and (1.2). For our purposes, this is more convenient, as then we are directly in the framework of [19, Sec. 2], and it does not mean a restriction by virtue of Lemma 2.1.

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the Euler-Maruyama approximation $Y_m$ inductively as follows. We set $Y_m(0) := x_0$, and, provided that $Y_m$ is defined on the interval $[0, k\delta_m]$ for some $k \in \{0, \ldots, m - 1\}$, we set

$$Y_m(t) := S_{t-k\delta_m}Y_m(k\delta_m) + \int_{k\delta_m}^t S_{t-s}\hat{b}(Y_m(k\delta_m))ds$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^r \int_{k\delta_m}^t S_{t-s}\sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))dB^j(s), \quad t \in [k\delta_m, (k+1)\delta_m].$$

Note that for $A = 0$ (that is $S_t = \text{Id}$ for each $t \geq 0$) the processes $(Y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ coincide with the well-known Euler-Maruyama approximations with step sizes $\delta_m$ for SDEs.

2.3. Remark. As pointed out in [4], the naive implementation

$$Y_m(t) := Y_m(k\delta_m) + \int_{k\delta_m}^t (AY_m(k\delta_m) + \hat{b}(Y_m(k\delta_m)))ds$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^r \int_{k\delta_m}^t \sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))dB^j(s), \quad t \in [k\delta_m, (k+1)\delta_m].$$

of the Euler-Maruyama method does not work, because it might immediately lead to some $Y_m(k\delta_m) \notin D(A)$. Even in our situation, where we have a well-defined strong solution (see Proposition 2.8 below), there is no reason why the discrete approximation (2.5) should always stay in $D(A)$.

2.4. Lemma. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$Y_m(t) = S_{t}x_0 + \int_{0}^t S_{t-s}\hat{b}(Y_m([s]_m^-))ds$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^r \int_{0}^t S_{t-s}\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^-))dB^j(s), \quad t \in [0, T].$$
Proof. We prove identity (2.6) inductively on each interval $[0, k\delta_m]$ for $k = 0, \ldots, m$. The identity (2.6) holds true for $k = 0$, because $Y_m(0) = x_0$. For the induction step $k \to k + 1$ note that for $t = k\delta_m$ identity (2.6) yields

$$Y_m(k\delta_m) = S_{k\delta_m}x_0 + \int_0^{k\delta_m} S_{k\delta_m-s} \hat{b}(Y_m([s]^-_m)) ds + \sum_{j=1}^r \int_0^{k\delta_m} S_{k\delta_m-s} \sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-_m)) dB^j(s).$$

(2.7)

Therefore, by (2.4) and (2.7), and noting that $[s]^-_m = k\delta_m$, $s \in [k\delta_m, (k+1)\delta_m)$, for each $t \in [k\delta_m, (k+1)\delta_m]$ we obtain

$$Y_m(t) = S_{t-k\delta_m} \left( S_{k\delta_m}x_0 + \int_0^{k\delta_m} S_{k\delta_m-s} \hat{b}(Y_m([s]^-_m)) ds + \sum_{j=1}^r \int_0^{k\delta_m} S_{k\delta_m-s} \sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-_m)) dB^j(s) \right) + \int_{k\delta_m}^t S_{t-s} \hat{b}(Y_m([s]^-_m)) ds + \sum_{j=1}^r \int_{k\delta_m}^t S_{t-s} \sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-_m)) dB^j(s),$$

proving (2.6).

2.5. Remark. With the terminology from [7], the Euler-Maruyama approximations (2.6) are so-called accelerated exponential Euler approximations, whereas the so-called exponential Euler approximations would be given by

$$Y_m(t) = S_t x_0 + \int_0^t S_{t-s} \hat{b}(Y_m([s]^-_m)) ds + \sum_{j=1}^r \int_0^t S_{t-s} \sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-_m)) dB^j(s), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The domain $D(A)$ equipped with the graph norm (1.5) is a separable Hilbert space, too, and the restriction $(S_t|_{D(A)})_{t \geq 0}$ is a $C_0$-semigroup on $(D(A), \| \cdot \|_{D(A)})$ with infinitesimal generator $A$ on the domain $D(A^2)$.

2.6. Lemma. Let $\Phi : [0, T] \to D(A)$ be a function such that

$$\int_0^T \| \Phi(s) \|_{D(A)} ds < \infty.$$  

(2.8)

Then the following statements are true:

1. We have

$$\int_0^T \| \Phi(s) \| ds < \infty.$$  

(2.9)

2. For each $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\int_0^t \Phi(s) ds = (D(A) -) \int_0^t \Phi(s) ds.$$  

(2.10)

Proof. Relation (2.9) is an immediate consequence of (2.8). There is a sequence $(\Phi^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of simple functions $\Phi^n : [0, T] \to D(A)$ such that $\| \Phi - \Phi^n \|_{D(A)} \leq \| \Phi \|_{D(A)}$.
for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and we have $\|\Phi - \Phi^n\|_{D(A)} \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$. Let $t \in [0, T]$ be arbitrary. By Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\left\| (D(A)) \int_0^t \Phi(s)ds - (D(A)) \int_0^t \Phi^n(s)ds \right\|_{D(A)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$ 

We have $\|\Phi - \Phi^n\| \leq \|\Phi\|_{D(A)}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\|\Phi - \Phi^n\| \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$. Therefore, by Lebesgue’s dominated convergence theorem we also have

$$\left\| \int_0^t \Phi(s)ds - \int_0^t \Phi^n(s)ds \right\| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$ 

Noting that

$$\int_0^t \Phi^n(s)ds = (D(A)) \int_0^t \Phi^n(s)ds \quad \text{for each} \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

we arrive at (2.10).

2.7. Lemma. Let $\Psi$ be a $D(A)$-valued predictable process such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$\int_0^T \|\Psi(s)\|_{D(A)}^2 ds < \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Then the following statements are true:

1. We have

$$\int_0^T \|\Psi(s)\|^2 ds < \infty. \quad (2.12)$$

2. For each $t \in [0, T]$ and each $j = 1, \ldots, r$ we have

$$\int_0^t \Psi(s)dB^j(s) = (D(A)) \int_0^t \Psi(s)dB^j(s). \quad (2.13)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.6, and therefore omitted.

2.8. Proposition. For each $x_0 \in D(A)$ there exists a unique mild solution $X$ to the SPDE (2.2) on the state space $(D(A), \|\cdot\|_{D(A)})$, and it is a strong solution to the SPDE (2.2) on the state space $H$.

Proof. By a standard result (see, for example, [8, Thm. 7.4]), there is a unique mild solution $X$ to the SPDE (2.2) on the state space $(D(A), \|\cdot\|_{D(A)})$; that is, a continuous adapted process such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$X(t) = S_t x_0 + (D(A)) \int_0^t S_{t-s} \hat{b}(X(s))ds$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^r (D(A)) \int_0^t S_{t-s} \sigma_j(X(s))dB^j(s), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$ 

This implies that $X$ is also continuous in $H$, and by Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7 we obtain $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$X(t) = S_t x_0 + \int_0^t S_{t-s} \hat{b}(X(s))ds$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^r \int_0^t S_{t-s} \sigma_j(X(s))dB^j(s), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$
showing that $X$ is also a mild solution to the SPDE (2.2) on the state space $H$. Furthermore, since $X$ is continuous in $(\mathcal{D}(A), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)})$ we have $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely

$$
\int_0^t \|AX(s)\|ds \leq \int_0^t \|X(s)\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}ds < \infty \quad \text{for each } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.
$$

Therefore $X$ is also a strong solution to the SPDE (2.2) on the state space $H$. □

2.9. **Proposition.** For each $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a unique mild solution $\xi_m$ to the PDE (2.3) on the state space $(\mathcal{D}(A), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)})$, and it is a strong solution to the PDE (2.3) on the state space $H$.

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of Proposition 2.8, and therefore omitted. □

2.10. **Proposition.** For each $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $Y_m \in \mathcal{D}(A)$.

**Proof.** Noting that $Y_m(0) = x_0$ and (2.4), this is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7. □

2.11. **Lemma.** Let $\Psi$ be an $H$-valued predictable process, and let $p > 1$ be such that

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^T \|\Psi(s)\|^{2p}ds \right] < \infty.
$$

Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$ we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \left\| \int_0^t S_{t-s} \Psi(s)dB^j(s) \right\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^T \|\Psi(s)\|^{2p}ds \right].
$$

**Proof.** This follows, for example, from [11, Lemma 3.3]. □

2.12. **Lemma.** There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$ and all $x \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ we have

$$
\|S_{t_2}x - S_{t_1}x\| \leq C\|x\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}|t_2 - t_1|.
$$

**Proof.** According to [21, Thm. 2.2] there are constants $M \geq 1$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\|S_t\| \leq Me^{\omega t} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.
$$

Therefore, by [21, Thm. 2.4] we obtain

$$
\|S_{t_2}x - S_{t_1}x\| = \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} S_s Axds \right\| \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|S_s Ax\|ds
$$

$$
\leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|S_s\| \|Ax\|ds \leq Me^{\omega T}\|x\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}|t_2 - t_1|,
$$

proving (2.14) with $C = Me^{\omega T}$. □

3. **Convergence rate for the Euler-Maruyama approximations**

In this section, we prove the stated convergence rate for the Euler-Maruyama approximations. The general mathematical framework is that of Section 2.

3.1. **Theorem.** Suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are fulfilled, and let $T > 0$, $p > 1$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ be arbitrary. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|Y_m(t) - X(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq \frac{C}{m^{p-1}},
$$

where $X$ denotes the mild solution to the SPDE (2.2) with $X(0) = x_0$, and the $(Y_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ denote Euler-Maruyama approximations given by $Y_m(0) = x_0$ and (2.4).
We will provide the proof of Theorem 3.1 at the end of this section. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we introduce the processes $\tilde{Y}_m$ and $\tilde{X}_m$ as
\[
\tilde{Y}_m(t) := S_{t-[|t|]_m} Y_m([|t|]_m), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+,
\]
\[
\tilde{X}_m(t) := S_{t-[|t|]_m} X([|t|]_m), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+.
\]
Then, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
\[
Y_m - X = (Y_m - \tilde{Y}_m) + (\tilde{Y}_m - \tilde{X}_m) + (\tilde{X}_m - X).
\]
In the upcoming proofs, we will denote by $C$ a suitable positive constant, possibly different from line to line, but only depending on $T$, $p$, $x_0$ and the parameters $(A, b, \sigma)$ of the SPDE (2.2).

3.2. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|Y_m(t) - \tilde{Y}_m(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C\delta_m^{-1}.
\]
Proof. We have
\[
Y_m(t) - \tilde{Y}_m(t) = \int_{[|t|]_m}^t S_{t-s} \dot{b}(Y_m([s]_m)) ds + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \int_{[|t|]_m}^t S_{t-s} \sigma_j Y_m([s]_m) dB_j(s).
\]
Since
\[
\left\| \int_{[|t|]_m}^t S_{t-s} \dot{b}(Y_m([s]_m)) ds \right\| \leq C\delta_m,
\]
applying [19, Lemma 2.4] completes the proof. \hfill \Box

3.3. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\tilde{X}_m(t) - X(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C\delta_m^{-1}.
\]
Proof. See [19, Lemma 2.5]. \hfill \Box

3.4. Lemma. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\tilde{Y}_m(t) - Y_m([|t|]_m)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C\delta_m^{2p}.
\]
Proof. Note that
\[
\tilde{Y}_m(t) - Y_m([|t|]_m) = (S_{t-[|t|]_m} - \text{Id}) Y_m([|t|]_m).
\]
Therefore, by Lemma 2.12 we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\tilde{Y}_m(t) - Y_m([|t|]_m)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C\delta_m^{2p} \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|Y_m([|t|]_m)\|^{2p}_{\mathcal{D}(A)} \right],
\]
which, by virtue of Lemma 2.11 – applied with the separable Hilbert space $(\mathcal{D}(A), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}(A)})$ – and Assumption 1.2 completes the proof. \hfill \Box

3.5. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $v \in [0,T]$ we have
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,v]} \|Y_m(t) - \tilde{X}_m(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C\left( \int_0^v \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,u]} \|Y_m(t) - X(t)\|^{2p} \right] du + \delta_m^{-1} \right).
\]
Proof. Note that
\[
\bar{Y}_m(t) - \bar{X}_m(t) = \int_0^t S_{t-s} (\bar{b}(Y_m(s)) - \bar{b}(X(s))) \, ds
+ \sum_{j=1}^r \int_0^t S_{t-s} (\sigma_j(Y_m(s)) - \sigma_j(X(s))) \, dB^j(s), \quad t \in [0,T].
\]
We have
\[
\mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \int_0^{[t]} S_{t-s} (\bar{b}(Y_m(s)) - \bar{b}(X(s))) \, ds \|^{2p}]
\leq C \int_0^v \mathbb{E}[\| Y_m(s) - X(s) \|^{2p}] \, ds.
\]
Furthermore, by Lemma 2.11 we have
\[
\mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \int_0^{[t]} S_{t-s} (\sigma_j(Y_m(s)) - \sigma_j(X(s))) \, dB^j(s) \|^{2p}]
\leq C \int_0^v \mathbb{E}[\| Y_m(s) - X(s) \|^{2p}] \, ds.
\]
Therefore, we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \bar{Y}_m(t) - \bar{X}_m(t) \|^{2p}]
\leq C (I_1(v) + I_2(v) + I_3(v)),
\]
where we have set
\[
I_1(v) := \int_0^v \mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \| Y_m(t) - \bar{Y}_m(t) \|^{2p}] \, du,
\]
\[
I_2(v) := \int_0^v \mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \| \bar{Y}_m(t) - Y_m(t) \|^{2p}] \, du,
\]
\[
I_3(v) := \int_0^v \mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \| Y_m(t) - X(t) \|^{2p}] \, du.
\]
Therefore, applying Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.4 completes the proof.

Now, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is an immediate consequence of the decomposition (3.1), Propositions 3.2, 3.3, 3.5 and Gronwall’s inequality.

4. Distance between the Euler-Maruyama approximations and the Wong-Zakai approximations

In this section, we prove the stated convergence rate for the difference between the Euler-Maruyama approximations and the Wong-Zakai approximations. The general mathematical framework is that of Section 2.

4.1. Theorem. Suppose that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are fulfilled, and let $T > 0$, $p > 1$ and $x_0 \in D(A)$ be arbitrary. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have
\[
\mathbb{E}
[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \xi_m(t) - Y_m(t) \|^{2p}]
\leq \frac{C}{m^{p-1}},
\]
where the $(\xi_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the mild solutions to the PDEs (2.3) with $\xi_m(0) = x_0$, and the $(Y_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the Euler-Maruyama approximations given by $Y_m(0) = x_0$ and (2.4).
We will provide the proof of Theorem 4.1 at the end of this section. For each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we introduce the processes \( \bar{\xi}_m \) and \( \bar{Y}_m \) as

\[
\bar{\xi}_m(t) := S_{t-[t]_m} \xi_m([t]_m^--), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+,
\]
\[
\bar{Y}_m(t) := S_{t-[t]_m} Y_m([t]_m^--), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\]

Then, for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we have

\[
(4.1) \quad \xi_m - Y_m = (\xi_m - \bar{\xi}_m) + (\bar{\xi}_m - \bar{Y}_m) + (\bar{Y}_m - Y_m).
\]

4.2. Proposition. There is a constant \( C > 0 \) such that for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in (0,T)} \| \xi_m - \bar{\xi}_m \|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta^{p-1}_m.
\]

Proof. See [19, Lemma 2.2].

We have the identity

\[
(4.2) \quad \bar{\xi}_m(t) - \bar{Y}_m(t) = S_{t-[t]_m} (\xi_m([t]_m^-) - Y_m([t]_m^-)),
\]

and hence

\[
(4.3) \quad \sigma_j(\xi_m(t)) = \gamma_{m,1}^j(t) + \sum_{l=1}^r \gamma_{m,2}^{j,l}(t) + \gamma_{m,3}^j(t), \quad t \in [0,T],
\]

where the quantity \( \gamma_{m,1}^j(t) \) is given by

\[
\gamma_{m,1}^j(t) := \sigma_j(\bar{\xi}_m(t)),
\]

the quantities \( \gamma_{m,2}^{j,l}(t) \) for \( l = 1, \ldots, r \) are given by

\[
\gamma_{m,2}^{j,l}(t) := D\sigma_j(\bar{\xi}_m(t)) \int_{[t]_m^-}^t S_{u-[u]_m} \sigma_l(\bar{\xi}_m(u)) \dot{B}_m^l(u) du,
\]

Fix an arbitrary \( j \in \{1, \ldots, r\} \). By equation (2.6) in [19], for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we have
and the quantity \( \gamma_{m,3}^{j}(t) \) is given by
\[
\gamma_{m,3}^{j}(t) := D\sigma_j(\tilde{\xi}_m(t)) \int_{[t]\m}^{t} S_{t-u} b(\xi_m(u)) du \\
+ \sum_{l=1}^{r} D\sigma_j(\tilde{\xi}_m(t)) \int_{[t]\m}^{t} S_{t-u} \left( \int_{0}^{1} D\sigma_l(\bar{\xi}_m(u)) du \right) B^l_{m}(u) du \\
+ v(\xi_m(u) - \bar{\xi}_m(u))(\xi_m(u) - \xi_m(u)) du \big) \hat{B}_{m}(u) du \\
+ \int_{0}^{1} \left( \int_{0}^{v_1} D^2\sigma_j(\tilde{\xi}_m(t) + v_2(\xi_m(t) - \bar{\xi}_m(t))) \\
(\xi_m(t) - \bar{\xi}_m(t), \xi_m(t) - \bar{\xi}_m(t)) du_2 \right) dv_1.
\]

We introduce the quantity \( \zeta_{m,1}^{j}(t) \) as
\[
\zeta_{m,1}^{j}(t) := \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-u} \gamma_{m,3}^{j}(s) \hat{B}_{m}(s) ds,
\]
the quantity \( \zeta_{m,2}^{j}(t) \) as
\[
\zeta_{m,2}^{j}(t) := \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} \gamma_{m,1}^{j}(s) \hat{B}_{m}(s) ds - \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} \sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^{-}))) dB^{j}(s),
\]
the quantities \( \zeta_{m,3}^{j,l}(t) \) for \( l = 1, \ldots, r \) as
\[
\zeta_{m,3}^{j,l}(t) := \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} \gamma_{m,2}^{j,l}(s) \hat{B}_{m}(s) ds \\
- \frac{1}{\delta_{m}} \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\tilde{\xi}_m(s)) \left( \int_{[s]_m}^{s} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(\xi_m(u)) du \right) ds,
\]
and
\[
\zeta_{m,4}^{j,l}(t) := \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} \gamma_{m,2}^{j,l}(s) \hat{B}_{m}(s) ds \quad \text{for} \quad l \neq j,
\]
the quantity \( \zeta_{m,4}(t) \) as
\[
\zeta_{m,4}(t) := \frac{1}{\delta_{m}} \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\tilde{\xi}_m(s)) \left( \int_{[s]_m}^{s} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(\xi_m(u)) du \right) ds \\
- \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^{-})) \sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^{-})) ds,
\]
and the quantity \( \zeta_{m,5}(t) \) as
\[
\zeta_{m,5}(t) := \int_{0}^{[t]\m} S_{t-s} \left( b(\xi_m(s)) - b(Y_m([s]_m^{-})) \right) ds.
\]
Then we obtain
\[
\tilde{\xi}_m(t) - \tilde{Y}_m(t) = S_{t-[t]\m} \\
(\sum_{j=1}^{r} \zeta_{m,1}^{j}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \zeta_{m,2}^{j}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{l=1}^{r} \zeta_{m,3}^{j,l}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \zeta_{m,4}^{j}(t) + \zeta_{m,5}(t)).
\]
4.3. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \zeta_{m,1}^j(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \delta_m^2.$$

Proof. This follows from [19, Lemma 2.6]. \hfill \Box

4.4. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $v \in [0,T]$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \zeta_{m,2}^j(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \left( \int_0^v \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,u]} \| \xi_m(t) - Y_m(t) \|^2 \right] du + \delta_m^{2p} \right).$$

Proof. An analogous calculation as in the proof of [19, Lemma 2.9] shows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \zeta_{m,2}^j(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \mathbb{E}\left[ \int_0^v \| \tilde{Y}_m^j(u) \|^2 du \right], \quad v \in [0,T],$$

where

$$\tilde{Y}_m^j(u) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_{[u-\delta_m]}^{[u+\delta_m]} S_{[u^+]} v^j \sigma_j(\xi_m(v^j)) dv^j - S_{[u^+]} \sigma_j(Y_m([u^+]_m)).$$

Now, we have

$$\tilde{Y}_m^j(u) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_{[u-\delta_m]}^{[u+\delta_m]} S_{[u^+]} v^j \sigma_j(S_{[u^-]} \xi_m([u^-]_m)) - \sigma_j(S_{[u^-]} Y_m([u^-]_m))) dv^j$$

and hence, we obtain

$$\tilde{Y}_m^j(u) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_{[u-\delta_m]}^{[u+\delta_m]} S_{[u^+]} v^j \sigma_j(S_{[u^-]} \xi_m([u^-]_m)) dv^j$$

Therefore, and by Lemma 2.12 and Assumption 1.2 we obtain

$$\| \tilde{Y}_m^j(u) \| \leq C \| \xi_m([u^-]_m) - Y_m([u^-]_m) \|$$

By Lemma 2.11 – applied with the separable Hilbert space $(D(A), \| \cdot \|_{D(A)})$ – and Assumption 1.2 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,v]} \| \zeta_{m,2}^j(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \int_0^v \mathbb{E}\left[ \| \tilde{Y}_m^j(u) \|^2 \right] du$$

$$\leq C \int_0^v \left( \mathbb{E}\left[ \| \xi_m([u^-]_m) - Y_m([u^-]_m) \|^2 \right] + \delta_m^{2p} \mathbb{E}\left[ \| Y_m([u^-]_m) \|^2_{D(A)} \right] + 1 \right) du$$

$$\leq C \left( \int_0^v \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,u]} \| \xi_m(t) - Y_m(t) \|^2 \right] du + \delta_m^{2p} \right),$$
finishing the proof.

4.5. Lemma. Let $X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ be a normally distributed random variable with variance $\sigma^2 > 0$. Then, for each positive real number $q > 0$ we have

$$
E \left[ |X|^{2q} \right] = 2^q \frac{\Gamma(q + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})} \sigma^{2q}.
$$

Proof. We have $X = \sigma Y$ with a random variable $Y \sim N(0, 1)$. Therefore, we have $Y^2 \sim \chi^2$, and by [30, Sec. 7.8.1] we obtain

$$
E \left[ |X|^{2q} \right] = E \left[ |\sigma Y|^{2q} \right] = \sigma^{2q} E \left[ (Y^2)^q \right] = 2^q \frac{\Gamma(q + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})} \sigma^{2q},
$$

completing the proof.

4.6. Corollary. Let $q > 0$ be a positive real number. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
E \left[ |B^j((k+1)\delta_m) - B^j(k\delta_m)|^{2q} \right] \leq C \delta_m^q.
$$

Proof. Since $B^j((k+1)\delta_m) - B^j(k\delta_m) \sim N(0, \delta_m)$ for each $k = 0, \ldots, m-1$, this is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.5.

The proof of the following auxiliary result is similar to that of Lemma 2.2 in [19].

4.7. Lemma. Let $q > 0$ be a positive real number. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\dot{B}^j_m(t)|^{2q} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{-(q+1)}.
$$

Proof. By taking into account (2.1), by Corollary 4.6 we obtain

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\dot{B}^j_m(t)|^{2q} \right] = \frac{1}{\delta_m^{2q}} E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |B^j([t]_m^+) - B^j([t]_m^-)|^{2q} \right]
$$

$$
\leq \frac{1}{\delta_m^q} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} E \left[ |B^j((k+1)\delta_m) - B^j(k\delta_m)|^{2q} \right] \leq \frac{C}{\delta_m^{2q}} m^{\frac{q}{2}} \delta_m^q = C \delta_m^{-(q+1)},
$$

completing the proof.

4.8. Corollary. Let $q > 0$ be a positive real number. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_m(t)\|^{2q} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{-(q+1)}.
$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 4.7.

The following results contributes to [19, Lemma 2.11], where it was shown that merely under Assumption 1.1 (that is, without imposing Assumption 1.2) for each $\alpha \in \left(\frac{4}{9}, \frac{2}{3}\right)$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\zeta_{m,3}(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{p(1-2\alpha)}.
$$

4.9. Proposition. For each $\kappa \in (0, p)$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $l \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\zeta_{m,3}^l(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{\kappa}.
$$
Proof. Let
\[ I_m(t) := \delta_m^{-2} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\xi_m(s)) \int_{[s]_m}^t S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m(u)) du K_m(s) ds, \]
where
\[ K_m(s) := \begin{cases} (B^j([s]_m^2) - B^j([s]_m^2))^2 - \delta_m, & \text{if } j = l, \\ (B^j([s]_m^2) - B^j([s]_m^2))(B^l([s]_m^2) - B^l([s]_m^2)), & \text{if } j \neq l. \end{cases} \]
Then we have \( \epsilon_{m,3}(t) = I_m(t) \), and hence, it has to be shown that
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m(t) \|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^n. \]
Note that
\[ I_m(t) = \delta_m^{-2}(I_m^1(t) + I_m^2(t) + I_m^3(t)), \]
where the quantity \( I_m^1(t) \) is defined as
\[ I_m^1(t) := \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\xi_m(s)) \int_{[s]_m}^t S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m(u)) - \sigma_j(\xi_m([u]_m)) du K_m(s) ds, \]
the quantity \( I_m^2(t) \) is defined as
\[ I_m^2(t) := \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} (D\sigma_j(\xi_m(s)) - D\sigma_j(\xi_m([s]_m^-))) \int_{[s]_m}^t S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m([u]_m^-)) du K_m(s) ds, \]
and the quantity \( I_m^3(t) \) is defined as
\[ I_m^3(t) := \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\xi_m([s]_m^-)) \int_{[s]_m}^t S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m([u]_m^-)) du K_m(s) ds. \]
Next, we define
\[ \bar{K}_m(k) := \begin{cases} (B^j((k + 1)\delta_m) - B^j(k\delta_m))^2 - \delta_m, & \text{if } j = l, \\ (B^j((k + 1)\delta_m) - B^j(k\delta_m))(B^l((k + 1)\delta_m) - B^l(k\delta_m)), & \text{if } j \neq l, \end{cases} \]
and we choose constants \( \pi, \theta \in (1, \infty) \) such that
\[ p - \frac{1}{\pi} > \kappa \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\theta} = 1. \]
Noting that \( B^j \) and \( B^l \) are independent for \( j \neq l \), by Corollary 4.6 (applied with \( q = 2p\theta \) in case \( j = l \), and applied twice with \( q = p\theta \) in case \( j \neq l \)) we have
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \bar{K}_m(k)^{2p\theta} \right]^{1/\theta} \leq C \delta_m^{2p} \quad \text{for all } k = 0, \ldots, m - 1. \]
Now, we set
\[ U_m(t) := \sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \| (S_u - \text{Id}) \xi_m(t) \|. \]
By Lemma 2.12, for each $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$U_m(t)^{2\rho} = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \| (S_u - \text{Id}) \xi_m(t) \|^{2\rho} \leq C \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \delta_m} u^{2\rho} \| \xi_m(t) \|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2\rho} \leq C \delta_m^{2\rho} \| \xi_m(t) \|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2\rho}.$$ 

Therefore, by Corollary 4.8 – applied with $q = p\rho$ and the separable Hilbert space $(\mathcal{D}(A), \| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{D}(A)})$ – and Assumption 1.2 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} U_m(k\delta_m)^{2\rho} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} U_m(t)^{2\rho} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{2\rho} \mathbb{E} \left[ \| \xi_m(t) \|_{\mathcal{D}(A)}^{2\rho} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{2\rho} \delta_m^{-(p\rho+1)} = C \delta_m^{p\rho-1}.$$

Now we have

$$\| I_m^1(t) \| \leq C \int_0^T \int_{[s, \min]_{\mathcal{D}(A)}} \| (S_u - \text{Id}) \xi_m([s]) \| du \| K_m(s) \| ds \leq C \int_0^T (s - \min_{\mathcal{D}(A)}) U_m([s]) | K_m(s) | ds = C \delta_m^{p} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} U_m(k\delta_m) | \tilde{K}_m(k) |.$$ 

Hence we obtain

$$\| I_m^1(t) \|^{2p} \leq C \left( \delta_m^{p} \right)^{2p} m^{2p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} U_m(k\delta_m)^{2p} | \tilde{K}_m(k) |^{2p} \leq C \left( \delta_m^{p} \right)^{2p} m^{2p} \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} U_m(k\delta_m)^{2p} | \tilde{K}_m(k) |^{2p}.$$ 

By Hölder’s inequality we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m^1(t) \|^{2p} \right] \leq C \left( \delta_m^{p} \right)^{2p} m^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} U_m(k\delta_m)^{2p} \right]^{1/\rho} \left[ | \tilde{K}_m(k) |^{2p} \right]^{1/\rho} \leq C \delta_m^{4p} \delta_m^{2p-\frac{1}{\rho}} \delta_m^{2p} \leq C \delta_m^{4p} g_m.$$ 

Now we have

$$\| I_m^2(t) \| \leq C \int_0^T \| (S_u - \text{Id}) \xi_m([s]) \| | (s - \min_{\mathcal{D}(A)}) | | K_m(s) | ds \leq C \int_0^T U_m([s]) | (s - \min_{\mathcal{D}(A)}) | | K_m(s) | ds.$$ 

So by the same argument as above, we also have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m^2(t) \|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{4p} g_m.$$ 

Next we have

$$I_m^3(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\delta_m^{-1}|n|^{-1}} \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} S_{t-u} D \sigma_j(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) \int_{k\delta_m}^{s} S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) du | K_m(s) | ds.$$ 

Let us consider the process $M_m = (M_m^n)_{n=0,1,...,m}$ defined by

$$M_m^n := \sum_{k=0}^{n^{-1}} \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} S_{t-u} D \sigma_j(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) \int_{k\delta_m}^{s} S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) du | K_m(s) | ds.$$
for $n = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ with $M_n^n = 0$. Then $M$ is a martingale, because $E[K_m(s)] = 0$ for all $s \in [0, T]$ and $\xi_m(k\delta_m)$, and $K_m(k)$ are independent for all $k = 0, \ldots, m - 1$. Furthermore, by the Lemma 2.10 in the paper [19], we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m^2(t) \|^2 \right] = E \left[ \max_{1 \leq n \leq m} \| M_n^m(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C_p E \left[ \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \| M_{k+1}^m - M_k^m \|^2 \right)^p \right]
$$

where

$$
E \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\| \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) \right\|^2 \right] = \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} S_{s-u} \sigma_l(\xi_m(k\delta_m)) dK_m(s) ds \left\| \right\|^2 \right] \right]^2 p
$$

and hence

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left\| \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} (s-k\delta_m) |K_m(s)| ds \right\|^2 \right)^{p/2}
$$

$$
= C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \| \tilde{K}_m(k) \|^2 \right)^{p/2} \leq C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \| \tilde{K}_m(k) \|^2 \right)^{p/2} m^{p/2} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} E \left[ \left\| \tilde{K}_m(k) \right\|^2 \right]
$$

Combining above results, we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| I_m(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \delta_m^{2p} (\delta_m^2 \delta_m^2 + \delta_m^{2p}) = C (\delta_m^p + \delta_m^p) \leq C \delta_m^p,
$$

completing the proof. \hfill \Box

4.10. Proposition. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $v \in [0, T]$ we have

$$
E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, v]} \| \zeta_{m,4}(t) \|^2 \right] \leq C \left( \int_0^v E \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, u]} \| \zeta_m(t) - Y_m(t) \|^2 \right] du + \delta_m^{2p} \right).
$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [19, Lemma 2.12]. Note that

$$
\zeta_{m,4}(t) = I_{m,1}^j(t) + I_{m,2}^j(t) + I_{m,3}^j(t) + I_{m,4}^j(t),
$$

where the quantity $I_{m,1}^j(t)$ is given by

$$
I_{m,1}^j(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\xi_m(s)) \left( \int_{[s]_m} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(\xi_m(u)) du \right) ds
$$

$$
- \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(s)) \left( \int_{[s]_m} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(u)) du \right) ds,
$$

the quantity $I_{m,2}^j(t)$ is given by

$$
I_{m,2}^j(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(s)) \left( \int_{[s]_m} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(u)) du \right) ds
$$

$$
- \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) \left( \int_{[s]_m} S_{s-u} \sigma_j(Y_m([u]_m)) du \right) ds,
$$

and
the quantity $I_{m,3}^j(t)$ is given by

$$I_{m,3}^j(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) \left( \int_s^\delta S_{s-u} \sigma_j(Y_m([u]_m)) du \right) ds$$

$$- \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} (s-[s]_m) S_{t-[s]_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) ds,$$

and the quantity $I_{m,4}^j(t)$ is given by

$$I_{m,4}^j(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} (s-[s]_m) S_{t-[s]_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) ds$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]^-)) ds.$$

We have

$$\|I_{m,1}^j(t)\| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\bar{\xi}_m(s))$$

$$\left( \int_s^\delta S_{s-u}(\bar{\sigma}_m(u)) - \sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(u)) du \right) ds$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s}(D\sigma_j(\bar{\xi}_m(s)) - D\sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(s)))$$

$$\left( \int_s^\delta S_{s-u} \sigma_j(Y_m(u)) du \right) ds.$$

and hence

$$\|I_{m,1}^j(t)\| \leq C \left[ \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} \left( \int_s^\delta \|\bar{\xi}_m(u) - \bar{Y}_m(u)\| du \right) ds \right.$$

$$+ \int_0^{[t]_m} \|\bar{\xi}_m(s) - \bar{Y}_m(s)\| ds \right]$$

$$\leq C \int_0^{[t]_m} \|\xi_m([s]_m) - Y_m([s]_m)\| ds \leq C \int_0^{[t]_m} \sup_{t\in[0,u]} \|\xi_m(t) - Y_m(t)\| du.$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq v \leq T$. Therefore, we get

$$E \left[ \sup_{t\in[0,v]} \|I_{m,1}^j(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \int_0^v E \left[ \sup_{t\in[0,u]} \|\xi_m(t) - Y_m(t)\|^{2p} \right] du.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\|I_{m,2}^j(t)\| = \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(s))$$

$$\left( \int_s^\delta S_{s-u}(\bar{\sigma}_m(u)) - \sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m([u]_m)) du \right) ds$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s}(D\sigma_j(\bar{Y}_m(s)) - D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)))$$

$$\left( \int_s^\delta S_{s-u} \sigma_j(Y_m([u]_m)) du \right) ds.$$
and hence

\[ \|I_{m,2}(t)\| \leq C \left[ \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} \left( \int_{[s]_m}^s \|(S_{u-[u]_m} - \text{Id})Y_m([u]_m)^{-1})\| du \right) ds \\
+ \int_0^{|t|_m} \|(S_{s-[s]_m} - \text{Id})Y_m([s]_m)\| ds \right] \]

\[ \leq C \int_0^{|t|_m} \sup_{[s]_m \leq u \leq s} \|(S_{u-[u]_m} - \text{Id})Y_m([u]_m)\| ds. \]

Therefore, by Lemma 2.12 we obtain

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|I_{m,2}(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|(S_{t-}([t]_m) - \text{Id})Y_m([t]_m)\|^{2p} \right] \]

\[ \leq C \delta_m^{2p} \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|Y_m([t]_m)\|^{2p} \right]. \]

Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 2.11 – applied with the separable Hilbert space \((\mathcal{D}(A), \| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{D}(A)})\) – and Assumption 1.2 we obtain

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|I_{m,2}(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{2p}. \]

Furthermore, we have

\[ \|I_{m,3}(t)\| \leq \frac{1}{\delta_m} \left\| \int_0^{|t|_m} S_{t-s} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) \right\|
\]

\[ \left( \int_{[s]_m}^s (S_{s-u} - \text{Id})\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) du \right) ds \]

\[ + \frac{1}{\delta_m} \left\| \int_0^{|t|_m} (s-[s]_m)(S_{t-s} - S_{t-[s]_m}) D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m)) ds \right\|, \]

and hence

\[ \|I_{m,3}(t)\| \leq C \left[ \frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{|t|_m} \left( \int_{[s]_m}^s \|(S_{u-[u]_m} - \text{Id})\sigma_j(Y_m([u]_m))\| du \right) ds \\
+ \int_0^{|t|_m} \|(S_{t-s} - S_{t-[s]_m})D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m))\| ds \right]. \]

Therefore, by Lemma 2.12 and Assumption 1.2, we obtain

\[ \mathbb{E}\left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|I_{m,3}(t)\|^{2p} \right] \leq C \delta_m^{2p}. \]
Moreover, we have

\[
\frac{1}{\delta_m} \int_0^{[t]_m} \left(s - [s]_m^m\right) S_{t-[s]_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))ds
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\delta_m} \sum_{k=0}^{\delta_m-1} \int_{k\delta_m}^{(k+1)\delta_m} \left(s - k\delta_m\right) S_{t-k\delta_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))\sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))ds
\]

\[
= \frac{\delta_m}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\delta_m-1} S_{t-k\delta_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))\sigma_j(Y_m(k\delta_m))
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-[s]_m} D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))ds.
\]

Therefore, we have

\[
I_{m,4}^j(t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{[t]_m} (S_{t-[s]_m} - S_{t-s}) D\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))\sigma_j(Y_m([s]_m^m))ds.
\]

Consequently, by Lemma 2.12 and Assumption 1.2, we obtain

\[
E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|I_{m,4}(t)\|^2p\right] \leq C\delta_m^{2p},
\]

completing the proof. \(\square\)

4.11. Proposition. There is a constant \(C > 0\) such that for each \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) and each \(v \in [0,T]\) we have

\[
E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \|\zeta_{m,5}(t)\|^2p\right] \leq C\left(\int_0^v E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \|\xi_m(t) - Y_m(t)\|^2p\right]du + \delta_m^{p-1}\right).
\]

Proof. Since \(b\) is Lipschitz continuous, we obtain

\[
E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \|\zeta_{m,5}(t)\|^2p\right] = E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,v]} \left\|\int_0^{[t]_m} S_{t-s} (b(\xi_m(s)) - b(Y_m([s]_m)))ds\right\|^2p\right]
\]

\[
\leq C \int_0^v E[\|\xi_m(s) - Y_m([s]_m)\|^2p]ds \leq C(I_1(v) + I_2(v) + I_3(v)),
\]

where

\[
I_1(v) = \int_0^v E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \|\xi_m(s) - Y_m(t)\|^2p\right]du,
\]

\[
I_2(v) = \int_0^v E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \|Y_m(t) - \tilde{Y}_m(t)\|^2p\right]du,
\]

\[
I_3(v) = \int_0^v E\left[\sup_{t \in [0,u]} \|\tilde{Y}_m(t) - Y_m([t]_m)\|^2p\right]du.
\]

Therefore, applying Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.4 completes the proof. \(\square\)

Now, the proof of Theorem 4.1 is an immediate consequence of the decompositions (4.1), (4.4), Propositions 3.2, 4.2, Propositions 4.3–4.11 and Gronwall’s inequality.
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