

Optimal rates for parameter estimation of stationary Gaussian processes

Khalifa Es-Sebaiy¹ and Frederi G. Viens²
Cadi Ayyad University and Purdue University

Abstract: We study rates of convergence in central limit theorems for partial sum of functionals of general stationary and non-stationary Gaussian sequences, using optimal tools from analysis on Wiener space. We apply our result to study drift parameter estimation problems for some stochastic differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motion with fixed-time-step observations.

Key words: Central limit theorem; Berry-Esséen; stationary Gaussian processes; Nourdin-Peccati analysis; parameter estimation; fractional Brownian motion.

1 Introduction

While statistical inference for Itô-type diffusions has a long history, statistical estimation for equations driven by fractional Brownian motion (fBm) is much more recent, partly because the development of stochastic calculus with respect to the fBm, which provides tools to study such models, is itself a recent and ongoing endeavor, and partly because these tools can themselves be unwieldy in comparison with the convenience and power of martingale methods and the Markov property which accompany Itô models. Our purpose in this article is to show how the analysis on Wiener space, particularly via tools recently developed to study the convergence-in-law properties in Wiener chaos, can be brought to bear on parameter estimation questions for fBm-driven models, and more generally for arbitrary stationary Gaussian models.

1.1 Context and general ideas

There are several approaches to estimating drift parameters in fBm-driven models, which have been developed over the course of the past 10 or 15 years. The approaches we mention below are related to the methods in this article.

- The MLE approach in [17], [27]. In general the techniques used to construct maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) for drift parameters are based on Girsanov transforms for fBm and depend on the properties of the deterministic fractional operators (determined by the Hurst parameter) related to the fBm. In general, the MLE is not easily computable. In particular, it relies on being able to compute stochastic integrals with respect to fBm. This is difficult or

¹National School of Applied Sciences - Marrakesh, Cadi Ayyad University, Marrakesh, Morocco. Email: k.essebaiy@uca.ma

²Dept. Statistics and Dept. Mathematics, Purdue University, 150 N. University St., West Lafayette, IN 47907-2067, USA. E-mail: viens@purdue.edu

hopeless for most models since approximating pathwise integrals w.r.t. fBm, when they exist, is challenging, while Skorohod-type integrals cannot be computed based on the data except in special cases. The work in [27] is the only one in which a strongly consistent discretization of the MLE was based on long-horizon asymptotics without also requiring an in-fill (small time step) condition, though it did not establish any asymptotic distribution.

- A least-squares (LS) approach was proposed in [14]. The study of the asymptotic properties of the estimator is based on certain criteria formulated in terms of the Malliavin calculus (see [24]). It should be noted that in [14], the full LS estimator relies on an unobservable Skorohod integral, and the authors proposed a modified version of this estimator which can be computed based on in-fill asymptotics; however, this modified estimator bears no immediate relation to an LS one (see [13] for examples of what constitutes a discretization of an LS estimator for fBm models, and for a comparison with MLE methods, which coincide with LS methods if and only if $H = 1/2$). In the ergodic case, the statistical inference for several fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (fOU) models via LS methods was recently developed in the papers [14], [1], [2], [13], [15], [6], [21]. The case of non-ergodic fOU process of the first kind and of the second kind can be found in [3], [11] and [12] respectively.

We bring new techniques to statistical inference for stochastic differential equations (SDEs) related to stationary Gaussian processes. Some of these ideas can be summarized as follows:

- Since the theory of inference for these fBm-driven SDEs is still near its inception, and most authors are concerned with linear problems, whose solutions are Gaussian, this Gaussian property should be exploited to its fullest extent, given the best tools currently available.
 - Therefore we choose to consider polynomial variations of these processes, which then necessarily live in Wiener chaos, whose properties are now well understood thanks to new Malliavin-calculus advances which were initiated by Nourdin and Peccati in 2008; in particular, we rely a general observation and their so-called optimal 4th moment theorem, in [22].
 - As a consequence, we are able to compute upper bounds in the total variation (TV) norm for the rate of normal convergence of our estimator. In particular, for the quadratic case, we prove a Berry-Esséen theorem (speed on the order of $1/\sqrt{n}$) for this TV norm which we show is sharp in some cases by finding a lower bound with the same speed. No authors as far as we know have ever provided such quantitative estimates of the speed of asymptotic normality for any drift estimators for any fBm-driven model, let alone shown that they are sharp.
- Rather than starting from the continuous-time setting of SDEs, and then attempt to discretize resulting LS estimators, as was done in many of the aforementioned works including our own [13], we work from discretely observed data from the continuous-time SDEs, and design estimators based on such Gaussian sequences. In fact, we show that one can develop estimators valid for any Gaussian sequence, with suitable conditions on the sequence's auto-correlation

function, and then apply them to fBm-driven SDEs of interest. In this way, we are able to provide estimators for many other models, while the models studied in [15], [1], [2], [13] become particular cases in our approach.

- Since our method relies on conditions which need only be checked intrinsically on the auto-correlation function, it can apply equally well to in-fill situations and increasing-horizon situations.
 - It turns out that, as an artefact of trying to discretize estimators based on continuous paths, prior works were never able to avoid an in-fill assumption on the data (and sometimes even required both in-fill and increasing-horizon assumptions). In this paper, we illustrate our methods by showing that in-fill assumptions are never needed for the examples we cover.
 - Essentially, as explained in more detail further below, if a Gaussian stochastic process has a memory correlation length which is bounded above by that of a fBm with Hurst parameter $H < 3/4$, then our polynomial variations estimator based on discrete data (fixed time step) is asymptotically normal as the number of observations n increases, with a TV speed as good as $1/\sqrt{n}$, as mentioned above.
- Finally, we provide a systematic study of how to go from stationary observations, to observations coming from a Gaussian process which may not be stationary, by implementing a fully quantitative strategy to control the contribution of the non-stationarity to the TV convergence speeds. In the examples we cover, which are those of recent interest in the literature, the non-stationarity term vanishes exponentially fast, which is more than enough for our generic condition to hold, but slower power convergences would yield the same results, for summable powers.

1.2 Summary of results

We summarize our paper's contents briefly in this section, including some heuristics for easier reading. Consider a centered stationary Gaussian process $Z = (Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with covariance (auto-correlation function)

$$r_Z(k) := \mathbf{E}[Z_0 Z_k] \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } r_Z(0) > 0.$$

Fix a polynomial function f_q of degree q where q is an even integer. To estimate the parameter $\lambda_{f_q}(Z) := \mathbf{E}[f_q(Z_0)]$, we use the “polynomial variation” estimator

$$Q_{f_q, n}(Z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_i),$$

which can be considered as a scalar version of a generalized method of moments. Some of the general results we prove are the following.

- $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$ is strongly consistent under a very weak decay condition on r_Z (Theorem 1), without requiring ergodicity.
- To avoid situations where the memory of Z is so long that $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$'s asymptotics are non-normal, we introduce the following assumption (condition (12)), which is a special case of the condition used by Breuer and Major in 1983 to establish normality of Hermite variations (see [24, Chapter 7]):

$$u_{f_2}(Z) := 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} r_Z(j)^2 < \infty,$$

with a similar definition for $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$, the limit of $\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$, which is then also finite.

- Under this condition, as an extension of our main TV convergence rate Theorem 4, we prove the following for the normalized (Corollary 5):

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{TV}(\sqrt{n}[Q_{f_q,n}(Z) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z)], \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \\ & \leq C_q(Z) \left(\sqrt[4]{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))} + \sqrt{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))} \right) + 2 \left| 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $U_{f_2,n}(Z) := Q_{f_2,n}(Z) - u_{f_2}(Z)$, which comes from the case $q = 2$, controls all cases of q nonetheless. Thus the total variation distance between the renormalized estimator and the normal law with asymptotic variance $u_{f_q}(Z)$ is bounded by the 4th root of the 4th cumulant in the quadratic case, and the relative distance of the estimator's variance to its limit.

- If further normalizing by $\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$, the last term above vanishes, though the unnormalized expression is the only one which can be computed in practice, since $\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$ depends on the parameter λ . Thus the speed of convergence of $\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$ is of major practical importance.
- There are explicit expressions for $\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))$ and $\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$ which can be expressed using r_Z , as explained in Section 3.4.1. Consequently, the above upper bound can be computed explicitly for many cases of r_Z . For instance (Corollary 6), if Z has a memory which is bounded above by that of fractional Gaussian noise with parameter $H < 5/8$, the above result yields

$$d_{TV}(\sqrt{n}[Q_{f_q,n}(Z) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z)], \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \leq 1/\sqrt[4]{n}.$$

- The case where $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$'s asymptotics are non-normal can be treated using other, less optimal, tools. For the sake of conciseness, we do not provide detailed arguments in this paper, instead stating results without proof in Remarks 7 and 16.
- In practice, it is common to encounter situations where observations are not stationary, for instance because their initial value is a point mass rather than the stationary law of a stochastic system. Thus, assuming that the observations come from $X_k = Z_k + Y_k$ where Z is as above

and Y is the deviation from a stationary process, we prove a convergence theorem under a generic assumption on Y which is easily verified in practice. If there exist $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that for every $p \geq p_0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|Q_{f_q,n}(Z + Y) - Q_{f_q,n}(Z)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma})$$

then for the Wasserstein distance (see Theorem 11 for details)

$$\begin{aligned} & d_W(Q_{f_q,n}(X) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z), \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \\ & \leq C n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} + C \sqrt[4]{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))} + C \left| 1 - \frac{\text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

- When $q = 2$, up to a constant, the estimator $Q_{f_2,n}(Z)$ is in the second chaos. In this case, sharper results are established.

- For instance, assuming $u_{f_2}(Z) < \infty$ and the following two conditions (see Theorem 12 for details):

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{f_2,n}(Z + Y) - Q_{f_2,n}(Z)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} & \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \\ |u_{f_2}(Z) - E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]| & \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then for the Wasserstein distance, assuming constants in the above assumptions are not too large,

$$\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W(\sqrt{n}[Q_{f_q,n}(X) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z)], \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

In this sense, we have established conditions under which our variation for a non-stationary and highly correlated sequence satisfies a quantitative Berry-Esséen-type theorem with optimal rate (recall that the classical Berry-Esséen theorem is for an i.i.d. sequence and is stated for the Kolmogorov distance, which is bounded above strictly by our Wasserstein distance).

- It is remarkable that this results holds for all Gaussian sequences with autocorrelation bounded above by that of fBm with $H < 2/3$ (whereas the best results for $q > 2$ show that one needs the stronger condition $H < 5/8$).
- Before moving to specific examples, we establish two improvements: a strategy for converting the above results into estimators for parameters which are buried in a functional form for $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$, and a method for improving rates of convergence by taking finite differences.

- If we are interested in a parameter θ which is related to λ via $\lambda_{f_q}(Z) = g^{-1}(\theta)$ where g is a diffeomorphism, so that $\check{\theta}_n := g(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$ is a strongly consistent estimator of θ , under the condition that $g''(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))$ has moments of sufficiently large order, then

$$d_W(\sqrt{n}(\check{\theta}_n - \theta), \mathcal{N}(0, g'(\lambda_{f_q}(Z))^2 \text{Var}(Q_{f_q,n}(Z))))$$

converges to 0 at the same speed as in (1). This is in Theorem 17.

- Finally, by considering $X_k^{(1)} = X_k - X_{k-1}$, it is well known that memory length is decreased by 2 power units in autocorrelation for all long-memory sequences with power decay; thus $Z_k^{(1)}$ becomes sufficiently short memory to allow us to apply the best convergence results above; in particular conditions such as “ $H < 5/8$ ” are automatically satisfied as soon as one takes a first-order finite difference. This is explained in Section 5. For instance in Theorem 20, we find

$$\frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W \left(Q_{f_2,n}(Z^{(1)}) - \lambda_{f_2,n}(Z^{(1)}), \mathcal{N} \left(0, u_{f_2}(Z^{(1)}) \right) \right) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Arguably, as long as one can compute $\lambda_{f_2,n}(Z^{(1)})$ and relate it to a parameter of interest, this improvement allows one to take advantage of the best rate of convergence, that of Berry-Esséen order. A study of one example of what it means to extract a parameter from $\lambda_{f_2,n}(Z^{(1)})$ is given in Section 6.3.3, for the fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

This bring us to the last sections in which we apply the above results to specific cases.

- *Application to fractional Ornstein Uhlenbeck models.* An Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $X = \{X_t, t \geq 0\}$ is the solution of the linear stochastic differential equation

$$X_0 = 0; \quad dX_t = -\theta X_t dt + dG_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

where G is a Gaussian process and $\theta > 0$ is an unknown parameter. The problem here is to estimate the parameter θ based on discrete equidistant observations (fixed time step, horizon tending to $+\infty$), and provide precise CLTs, which can be useful for hypothesis testing in practice via parametric inference.

- *Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model* (Section 6): the process G in (2) is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (0, 1)$. By assuming that $H > \frac{1}{2}$, [14] studied the least-squares estimator (LSE) $\hat{\theta}_t = \left(\int_0^t X_s \delta X_s \right) / \left(\int_0^t X_s^2 ds \right)$ of θ when the process X is continuously observed. In this paper, using our approach we construct a class of explicit estimators of θ when the process X is discretely observed. We study the asymptotic behavior of these estimators for any $H \in (0, 1)$ with Berry-Esséen-type theorems. We prove the consistency and prove that our estimators are asymptotically normal when $H \in (0, \frac{3}{4}]$. In the particular case when $q = 2$ and $f_2(x) = x^2$, [15] proved strong consistency of this discrete estimator and gave a Berry-Esséen-type result when $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4})$ but the proofs in [15] rely on a possibly flawed technique, since the passage from line -7 to -6 on page 434 is true if $H > \frac{3}{4}$, while one expects normal asymptotics only for the case $H \leq \frac{3}{4}$. Our work resolves the issue of θ estimation via least squares and their higher-order generalizations, by appealing to our new tools, avoiding the arguments in [15]. We present a number of results in this section, including Berry-Esséen estimates, optimal lower bounds thereof, an implementation the inversion of the quadratic variation estimator to access θ directly, and details of how to increase the rate of convergence via finite-differences.

- *Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process driven by fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process* (Section 7.1): here X is again given by (2) with drift parameter θ , and G is itself a fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with Hurst index $H \in (0, 1)$ and drift parameter $\rho > 0$. Here θ and ρ are considered as unknown parameters (with $\theta \neq \rho$), and we assume that only X is observed. This is the long-memory analogue of a continuous-time latent Markovian framework, in other words a partial observation, or partial information, question. This question was considered in [13] when $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4})$; therein, an estimator of (θ, ρ) was provided in the continuous and discrete cases, but relatively strong in-fill assumptions were needed, though the estimators still needed an increasing-horizon setting. In the present paper, we extend the result to $H \in (0, 1)$ and we propose a class of estimators with Berry-Esséen behavior, which dispenses with any in-fill assumption. A full set of results such as in Section 7.1 could also be derived, including optimal Berry-Esséen rates for the quadratic case in this two-dimensional setting; for the sake of conciseness, we omit stating all these improvements.
- *Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind* (Section 7.2): again with X as in (2), this process arises when G has the form $G_t = \int_0^t e^{-s} dB_{a_s}$ with $a_s = He^{\frac{s}{H}}$ and $B = \{B_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and where $\theta > 0$ is a unknown real parameter; notationally, to be consistent with previous work on this topic, we use the letter α instead of θ . The continuous and discrete cases, when $q = 2$ and $f_2(x) = x^2$, are studied in [1] and [2], though no speeds of convergence are provided, and in-fill assumptions are needed. In Section 7.2, we propose a class of estimators and we provide Berry-Esséen-type theorems of them with no in-fill assumption. The covariance structure of the process is such that our methods easily provide an optimal convergence rate for the estimator after inversion of the quadratic variation.

In conclusion, our methodology is developed for essentially any stationary Gaussian sequence, we can handle some non-stationarity under a weak assumption on the speed of relaxation to a stationary law, we provide Berry-Esséen rates for the normal asymptotics of our polynomial variation estimators, particularly in the quadratic case where the rates are often optimal, and we analyze some of the issues that can arise when inverting a polynomial variation to access a specific parameter. This is all achieved by relying on the sharpest estimates known to date, in the framework of Nourdin and Peccati, in Wiener chaos for total variation and Wasserstein convergence in law. Applications to drift estimation for long-memory models of current interest are provided.

Our article is structured as follows. Section 2 provides some basic elements of analysis on Wiener space which are helpful for some of the arguments we use. Section 3 provides the general theory of polynomial variation for general Gaussian sequences, covering the stationary case (Section 3.3, with examples in Section 3.4), non-stationary cases (Section 4), which include optimality in the quadratic case even under non-stationarity (Section 4.2) and a strategy of how to access a specific parameter other than the polynomial's variance (Section 4.3). Section 5 explains under what circumstances one can increase the rate of convergence to an optimal level by finite-differencing. Finally, three sets of examples based on fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck constructions are given in

Sections 6 and 7. Some of the technical results used in various proofs, including the proof of the basic Berry-Esséen theorem in the stationary case, are in the Appendix (Section 8).

2 Elements of analysis on Wiener space

Here we summarize a few essential facts from the analysis on Wiener space and the Malliavin calculus. Though these facts and notation are essential underpinnings of the tools and results of this paper, most of our results and arguments can be understood without knowledge of the elements in this section. The interested reader can find more details in [25, Chapter 1] and [24, Chapter 2].

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a standard Wiener space, its standard Wiener process W , where for a deterministic function $h \in L^2(\mathbf{R}_+) =: \mathcal{H}$, the Wiener integral $\int_{\mathbf{R}_+} h(s) dW(s)$ is also denoted by $W(h)$. The inner product $\int_{\mathbf{R}_+} f(s)g(s)ds$ will be denoted by $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. For every $q \geq 1$, let \mathcal{H}_q be the q th Wiener chaos of W , that is, the closed linear subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$ generated by the random variables $\{H_q(W(h)), h \in \mathcal{H}, \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}} = 1\}$ where H_q is the q th Hermite polynomial. The mapping $I_q(h^{\otimes q}) := q!H_q(W(h))$ provides a linear isometry between the symmetric tensor product $\mathcal{H}^{\odot q}$ (equipped with the modified norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\odot q}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q!}}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes q}}$) and \mathcal{H}_q . It also turns out that $I_q(h^{\otimes q})$ is the multiple Wiener integral of $h^{\otimes q}$ w.r.t. W . For every $f, g \in \mathcal{H}^{\odot q}$ the following product formula holds

$$E(I_q(f)I_q(g)) = q!\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\odot q}}.$$

For $h \in \mathcal{H}^{\otimes q}$, the multiple Wiener integrals $I_q(h)$, which exhaust the set \mathcal{H}_q , satisfy a hypercontractivity property (equivalence in \mathcal{H}_q of all L^p norms for all $p \geq 2$), which implies that for any $F \in \oplus_{l=1}^q \mathcal{H}_l$, we have

$$(E[|F|^p])^{1/p} \leq c_{p,q} (E[|F|^2])^{1/2} \quad \text{for any } p \geq 2. \quad (3)$$

Though we will not insist on their use in the main body of the paper, leaving associated technicalities to the proof of one of our main theorems in the appendix, the Malliavin derivative operator D on $L^2(\Omega)$ plays a fundamental role in evaluating distances between random variables therein. For any function $\Phi \in C^1(\mathbf{R})$ with bounded derivative, and any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we define the Malliavin derivative of the random variable $X := \Phi(W(h))$ to be consistent with the following chain rule:

$$DX : X \mapsto D_r X := \Phi'(W(h))h(r) \in L^2(\Omega \times \mathbf{R}_+).$$

A similar chain rule holds for multivariate Φ . One then extends D to the so-called Gross-Sobolev subset $\mathbf{D}^{1,2} \subsetneq L^2(\Omega)$ by closing D inside $L^2(\Omega)$ under the norm defined by

$$\|X\|_{1,2}^2 = \mathbf{E}[X^2] + \mathbf{E}\left[\int_{\mathbf{R}_+} |D_r X|^2 dr\right].$$

Now recall that, if X, Y are two real-valued random variables, then the total variation distance between the law of X and the law of Y is given by

$$d_{TV}(X, Y) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})} |P[X \in A] - P[Y \in A]|.$$

If X, Y are two real-valued integrable random variables, then the Wasserstein distance between the law of X and the law of Y is given by

$$d_W(X, Y) = \sup_{f \in Lip(1)} |Ef(X) - Ef(Y)|$$

where $Lip(1)$ indicates the collection of all Lipschitz functions with Lipschitz constant ≤ 1 . Let N denote the standard normal law. All Wiener chaos random variable are in the domain $\mathbf{D}^{1,2}$ of D , and are orthogonal in $L^2(\Omega)$. The so-called Wiener chaos expansion is the fact that any $X \in \mathbf{D}^{1,2}$ can be written as $X = \mathbf{E}X + \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} X_q$ where $X_q \in \mathcal{H}_q$. We define a linear operator L which is diagonalizable under the \mathcal{H}_q 's by saying that \mathcal{H}_q is the eigenspace of L with eigenvalue $-q$, i.e. for any $X \in \mathcal{H}_q$, $LX = -qX$. The kernel of L is the constants. The operator $-L^{-1}$ is the negative pseudo-inverse of L , so that for any $X \in \mathcal{H}_q$, $-L^{-1}X = q^{-1}X$. Since the variables we will be dealing with in this article are finite sums of elements of \mathcal{H}_q , the operator $-L^{-1}$ is easy to manipulate thereon.

Two key estimates linking total variation distance and the Malliavin calculus are the following.

- Let $X \in \mathbf{D}^{1,2}$ with $\mathbf{E}[X] = 0$. Then (see [22, Proposition 2.4]),

$$d_{TV}(X, N) \leq 2E|1 - \langle DX, -DL^{-1}X \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|.$$

- Let a sequence $X : X_n \in \mathcal{H}_q$, such that $\mathbf{E}X_n = 0$ and $Var[X_n] = 1$, and assume X_n converges to a normal law in distribution, which is equivalent to $\lim_n \mathbf{E}[X_n^4] = 3$ (this equivalence, proved originally in [26], is known as the *fourth moment theorem*). Then we have the following optimal estimate for $d_{TV}(X, N)$, known as the optimal 4th moment theorem, proved in [22]: there exist two constant $c, C > 0$ depending only on the sequence X but not on n , such that

$$c \max\{\mathbf{E}[X_n^4] - 3, |\mathbf{E}[X_n^3]|\} \leq d_{TV}(X, N) \leq C \max\{\mathbf{E}[X_n^4] - 3, |\mathbf{E}[X_n^3]|\}.$$

Given the importance of the centered 4th moment, also known as a 4th cumulant, of a standardized random variable, we will use the following special notation:

$$\kappa_4(X) := \mathbf{E}[X^4] - 3.$$

3 Parameter estimation for stationary Gaussian processes

3.1 Notation and basic question

Consider a centered stationary Gaussian process $Z = (Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with covariance

$$r_Z(k) := E(Z_0 Z_k) \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } r_Z(0) > 0.$$

For any centered Gaussian sequence Z indexed by \mathbb{Z} (stationary or not), it is always possible to represent the entirely family of Z_n 's jointly as Wiener integrals using a corresponding family of functions $f_n \in \mathcal{H}$ as

$$Z_n = I_1(f_n)$$

in the notation of Section 2. In all that follows, we will use this representation.

Fix a polynomial function f_q where q is an even integer such that f_q possesses the following decomposition

$$f_q(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k} H_{2k} \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) \quad (4)$$

where for every $k = 1, \dots, \frac{q}{2}$, $d_{f_q,2k} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $d_{f_q,q} = r_Z^{\frac{q}{2}}(0)$. Thus from Section 2, we can write for every $i \geq 0$

$$f_q(Z_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k} H_{2k} \left(\frac{Z_i}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k} I_{2k} \left(\varepsilon_i^{\otimes 2k} \right) \quad (5)$$

with $Z_i / \sqrt{r_Z(0)} = I_1(\varepsilon_i)$. Define the following partial sum

$$Q_{f_q,n}(Z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_i)$$

and

$$\lambda_{f_q}(Z) := E[f_q(Z_0)].$$

We expect that the polynomial variation $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$, as an empirical mean, should converge to $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$. Our aim in this section is to estimate the parameter $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$ and the speed of convergence of $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$ to it.

The “quadratic” case $q = 2$ is of special importance. In this case, the quadratic function f_2 will typically be taken as

$$f_2(x) = x^2 = r_Z(0) + r_Z(0) H_2 \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right), \quad (6)$$

and may also be taken as $H_2(x) = x^2 - 1$ when convenient. We will see in Theorem 4 that certain functionals related to the quadratic case control the estimator’s asymptotics no matter what q is. We will also provide an optimal treatment in the case $q = 2$ itself in Section 4.2.

3.2 Consistency

Theorem 1 *Suppose that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 0$*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} r_Z(j)^2 \leq n^{1-\varepsilon}. \quad (7)$$

Then $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$ is a consistent estimator of $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$, i.e. almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$Q_{f_q,n}(Z) \longrightarrow \lambda_{f_q}(Z). \quad (8)$$

Proof. It follows from (5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[(Q_{f_q, n}(Z) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z))^2 \right] &= E \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_j) - E f_q(Z_j) \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q, 2k}^2 \frac{(2k)!}{n^2} \sum_{i, j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{E(Z_i Z_j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q, 2k}^2 \frac{(2k)!}{n^2} \sum_{i, j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{r_Z(i-j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} = \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q, 2k}^2 \frac{(2k)!}{n} \left(1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (n-j) \left(\frac{r_Z(j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q, 2k}^2 \frac{(2k)!}{n} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{r_Z(j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j \left(\frac{r_Z(j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} \right). \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using (9), (7), (3) and Lemma 36 in the appendix, the convergence (8) is obtained. ■

Remark 2 *If Z is ergodic, the convergence (8) is immediate.*

3.3 Asymptotic distribution

Consider the following renormalized partial sum

$$U_{f_q, n}(Z) = \sqrt{n} (Q_{f_q, n}(Z) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z)) \tag{10}$$

Then, by (5) we can write

$$U_{f_q, n}(Z) = \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} I_{2k}(g_{2k, n}) \tag{11}$$

where

$$g_{2k, n} := d_{f_q, 2k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_i^{\otimes 2k}.$$

The following condition will play an important role in our analysis:

$$u_{f_2}(Z) := 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} r_Z(j)^2 < \infty. \tag{12}$$

Under this condition, we can pursue the analysis of expression further. Under (12), $r_Z(j)^2$ must converge to 0 as $|j| \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, under (12), for any k , $r_Z(j)^{2k}$ is dominated by $r_Z(j)^2$ for large $|j|$, and the last term in (9) can be estimated as follows. We first fix an $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and write for any $n \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j \cdot r_Z(j)^{2k} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{[\varepsilon n]-1} j \cdot r_Z(j)^{2k} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=[\varepsilon n]}^{n-1} j \cdot r_Z(j)^{2k} \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon n}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{[\varepsilon n]-1} r_Z(j)^{2k} + \frac{n}{n} \sum_{j=[\varepsilon n]}^n r_Z(j)^{2k} \leq \varepsilon u_{f_2}(Z) + \sum_{j=[\varepsilon n]}^{\infty} r_Z(j)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Condition (12), with ε fixed, one can choose n so large that $\sum_{j=[\varepsilon n]}^{\infty} r_Z(j)^2 < \varepsilon$. Thus the last term in (9) can be made arbitrarily small. This immediately implies the following useful result.

Lemma 3 *Under Condition (12), for every even $q \geq 2$,*

$$u_{f_q}(Z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z) \right] = \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k}^2 (2k)! \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{r_Z(j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} < \infty. \quad (13)$$

The following notation will be convenient.

$$F_{f_q,n}(Z) := \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z) \right]}}. \quad (14)$$

When the expansion (4) defining the polynomial f_q has more than one term, we establish the following general central limit theorem for $F_{f_q,n}(Z)$ with explicit speed of convergence in total variation.

Theorem 4 *Let f_q be the function defined in (4), and recall the stationary Gaussian process Z with covariance function r_Z on \mathbb{Z} , the partial sum $Q_{f_q,n}(Z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_i)$, its renormalized version $U_{f_q,n}(Z)$ defined in (10), and its standardized version $F_{f_q,n}(Z)$ in (14). Denote $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Then there exists a constant $C_q(Z)$ depending on q, f_q and $r_Z(0)$ such that*

$$d_{TV} (F_{f_q,n}(Z), N) \leq C_q(Z) \sqrt{\sqrt{\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))} + \kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))}.$$

Thus $F_{f_q,n}(Z)$ is asymptotically normal as soon as $\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) \rightarrow 0$. In addition, for large n ,

$$\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) = \frac{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}{\left(E \left[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z) \right] \right)^2} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\left(\sum_{|j| < n} |r_Z(j)|^{4/3} \right)^3}{n \left(E \left[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z) \right] \right)^2} \right).$$

Proof. See Appendix. ■

The upper bound in the previous theorem does not require normal convergence, and even when this convergence holds, it does not require that the variance $E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]$ be bounded. By Lemma 3, this boundedness holds if and only if Condition (12) holds.

In the next corollary, we look at two examples, one under Condition (12) and one when it fails but normality still holds. In the former case, we replace the normalization term $\sqrt{E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z) \right]}$ which is an unobservable sequence because it depends on the parameter-dependent sequence r_Z , by the constant $\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}$. While this constant also depends on the parameter $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$, it allows one to measure the total variation distance of the data-based estimator $U_{f_q,n}(Z)$ itself to the fixed law $\mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))$, consistent with common methodological practice. This change of normalization results in an additional term to reflect the speed of convergence of $\sqrt{E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z) \right]}$ to $\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}$.

Corollary 5 1) If $r_Y(k) \sim ck^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, then

$$E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z) \right] \sim 4c^2 d_{q,2}^2(Z) \log(n). \quad (15)$$

and the upper bound on $d_{TV} (F_{f_q,n}(Z), N)$ from Theorem 4 holds with

$$\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) = \mathcal{O}(\log^{-2}(n)). \quad (16)$$

2) Under Condition (12), i.e. if $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_Z(j)|^2 < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{TV} (U_{f_q,n}(Z), \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \\ & \leq C_q(Z) \sqrt{\sqrt{\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))} + \kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) + 2} \left| 1 - \frac{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\leq C_q(Z) \sqrt{\sqrt{\frac{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}{|u_{f_q}(Z)|^2}} + \frac{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}{|u_{f_q}(Z)|^2} + 2} \left| 1 - \frac{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right|. \quad (18)$$

3) Under the additional assumption that r_Z is asymptotically of constant sign and monotone, the expressions in (17) and (18) converges to 0.

Proof. The estimate (15) is a direct consequence of (9). Also, by (15) and the second estimate of Theorem 4 we obtain (16). The result of point (1) is established.

Next, we prove the estimate (17). We first note that since the laws of $U_{f_q,n}(Z)$ and of N both have densities with respect to Lebesgue's measure, $d_{TV} (U_{f_q,n}(Z), \sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}N)$ is identical to $d_{TV} (U_{f_q,n}(Z)/\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}, N)$. Next, from [22, Proposition 2.4] (see bullet points in Section 2) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{TV} \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}}, N \right) \\ & \leq 2E \left| 1 - \left\langle D \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}}, -DL^{-1} \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left| 1 - \frac{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right| + 2 \frac{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}{u_{f_q}(Z)} E \left| 1 - \left\langle D \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, -DL^{-1} \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \end{aligned}$$

By the expression in (9), the ratio $E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]/u_{f_q}(Z)$ is in $(0, 1)$. Therefore the first estimate in point (2) follows by the main estimate in the proof of Theorem 4. The estimate (18) is an elementary consequence of the same fact that $E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)] < u_{f_q}(Z)$. Point (2) is thus fully established.

To prove the corollary's final claim in point (3), we first note that by Lemma 3, the term $\left|1 - E \left[U_{f_q, n}^2(Z) \right] / u_{f_q}(Z) \right|$ tends to 0. Thus we only need to show that under Condition (12) and the additional monotonicity assumption on r_Z , $\kappa_4(U_{f_2, n}(Z))$ also tends to 0. By the conclusion of Theorem 4 and the finiteness of $u_{f_2}(Z)$, we have

$$\kappa_4(U_{f_2, n}(Z)) = \mathcal{O} \left(n^{-1} \left(\sum_{|j| < n} |r_Z(j)|^{4/3} \right)^3 \right) =: K_4(n). \quad (19)$$

Next, we borrow from [20, Proposition 1] that, under the additional assumptions on r_Z in the last statement of the theorem, and using the finiteness of $u_{f_2}(Z)$,

$$K_4(n) = \mathcal{O} \left(n^{-1/3} \left(n^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{|j| < n} |r_Z(j)|^{3/2} \right)^2 \right)^{4/3} \right).$$

From Jensen's inequality and Lemma 3 we get

$$n^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{|j| < n} |r_Z(j)|^{3/2} \right)^2 \leq 4n^{3/2} \left(\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{|j| < n} |r_Z(j)|^2 \right)^{3/2} \leq \sqrt{2} u_{f_2}(Z) < \infty.$$

Thus by (19), $\kappa_4(U_{f_2, n}(Z)) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/3})$, which finishes the proof of the corollary. ■

The assumptions of Corollary 5 are very weak, given a memory length shorter than that of fractional Gaussian noise with Hurst parameter $H = 5/8$. We state this formally in the next Corollary, while leaving the question of how to rid oneself of the condition " $H < 5/8$ " to Section 5. In fact, the computations outlined in Section 5, which are based on the convergence speeds (20) and (21) identified in Section 3.4.1 which immediately follows, are sufficient to obtain this corollary, whose simple proof we thus omit. Note however that the corollary's result is not necessarily sharp; we will see in Section 4.2 that it is not sharp for $q = 2$.

Corollary 6 *Under the notation of Theorem 4, assume that for some $H < 5/8$,*

$$r_Z(k) \leq ck^{2H-2}.$$

Then Condition (12) holds and for some constant C depending only on q and $r_Z(0)$,

$$d_{TV}(U_{f_q, n}(Z), \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_q}(Z))) \leq Cn^{-1/4}.$$

Remark 7 *In most cases where Condition (12) fails, the series' divergence occurs so fast that $U_{f_q, n}(Z)$'s asymptotics are not normal. Under certain special circumstances, namely a slowly modulated $(2H - 2)$ -self-similarity assumption on r_Z , classical tools such as in [10] can be used to show that $U_{f_q, n}(Z)$ tends to a so-called (scaled) Rosenblatt law $G_\infty^{(H)}$. A now classical result of Davydov and Martinova [9] was revived in recent years in [5, 20] to estimate total-variation distances to $G_\infty^{(H)}$. This can be achieved in our context as well, though for the sake of conciseness, we omit this study, only stating two basic results here, whose proofs would proceed as in [20] and [5] respectively.*

1. Assume that for some $H \in (3/4, 1)$ and some $\beta > 0$, asymptotically

$$(1 + o(1)) \log^{-\beta}(|k|) |k|^{2H-2} \leq |r_Z(k)| / r_Z(0) \leq (1 + o(1)) \log^{\beta}(|k|) |k|^{2H-2},$$

then for some constant C depending on r and H ,

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Z)}{2 \sum_{|k|>n} r_Z(k)^2}, \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{4H-3}{2\Gamma(2-2H) \cos\left(\frac{(2-2H)\pi}{2}\right)}} G_{\infty}^{(H)} \right) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\log n}}.$$

2. If $\beta = 0$, then f_2 can be replaced above by f_q for any even q , and $3/4$ can be replaced by $1 - 1/(2q)$, and $\sqrt{\log n}$ by $n^{H-1+1/(2q)}$.

The law of $G_{\infty}^{(H)}$ can be represented under a standard white noise measure W on \mathbb{C} as

$$G_{\infty}^{(H)} = \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x+y)} \frac{e^{i(x+y)} - 1}{i(x+y)} |xy|^{1/2-H} W(dx) W(dy).$$

3.4 Examples

3.4.1 General considerations

For any degree- q polynomial f_q as given in (4), we saw that under the assumptions of Theorem 1 and Theorem 4, $Q_{f_q,n}(Z)$ serves as a consistent and asymptotically normal generalized method of moments estimator $\lambda_{f_q}(Z) := E[f_q(Z_0)]$, or indeed for any parameter which can be extracted from this quantity.

Condition (12) should be sought in order to invoke the explicit speed of convergence result of the second part of Corollary 5. This assumption is generic for any stationary process whose memory length is bounded above strictly by that of the so-called fractional Gaussian noise with Hurst parameter $H = 3/4$. The articles [20] and [22] can be consulted for precise statements of what this means in general scales and in the fractional Brownian scale. Section 5 can be consulted for a simple transformation of the data to ensure that Condition (12) holds for any long-memory stationary Gaussian sequence with an asymptotically power-law autocorrelation decay.

Under Condition (12), Part (2) of Corollary 5 shows that the speed of convergence in total variation is determined by the choice of q via the leading constant $C_q(Z)$ and the speed of convergence of the variance term $E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]$. Specifically, by Lemma 3, the term corresponding to this variance convergence, i.e. the last term in (18), is given by the tail expression

$$\frac{2}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k}^2(Z) (2k)! \sum_{|j|>n} \left(\frac{r_Z(j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k}. \quad (20)$$

The other term in (18), which corresponds to the core normal convergence from Theorem 4, asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{C_q(Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}} (\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z)))^{1/4}; \quad (21)$$

this has a speed which is determined by the fourth root of the estimator's fourth cumulant no matter what q is, and the leading constant $C_q(Z)$ can be computed via the explicit formulas (66), (67), and (68) in the proof of Theorem 4.

There may be a trade-off between choosing a large q to effect the size of the coefficients $d_{f_q,2k}^2$ and a small q to control the value of $C_q(Z)$. The constants in these expressions are sufficiently complex to make it difficult to discern a general rule on how to choose q , particularly since the speed of convergence of $E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]$ depends heavily on the entire sequence r_Z . But this can be determined on a case-by-case basis since all the constants can be computed explicitly, as the examples in the subsections that follow show.

Before working out those examples, we finish this section with an attempt to explain in qualitative terms where the trade-off may come from. For the sake of argument, let us compare the constants for $q = 2$ with those for a large q .

For $q = 2$, the constant $C_2(Z)$ is of moderate size: inspection of the proof of Theorem 4 shows that $C_2(Z) = 2\sqrt{2}r_Z(0)$, while the variance-convergence term in (20) easily computes to

$$\frac{2}{u_{f_2}(Z)} \sum_{|j|>n} r_Z(j)^2 = \frac{\sum_{|j|>n} r_Z(j)^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} r_Z(j)^2}.$$

One may choose a high-degree polynomial f_q such that the constant $d_{f_q,2}^2(Z)$ may be much smaller than $C_2(Z)$; in this case, the dominant term in (20), which is for $k = 1$, has the same behavior in terms of n as for $q = 2$, but would be minimized because of the presence of the small multiplicative factor $d_{f_q,2}^2(Z)$. If the other constants $d_{f_q,2k}^2(Z)$ for $k \geq 2$ were much larger, this would have little effect for large n since they would be multiplicative of the asymptotically negligible tails $\sum_{|j|>n} r_Z(j)^{2k}$ in (20). In other words, for large q , the speed of convergence in (20) can be controlled by choosing f_q with a small contribution to the term corresponding to H_2 in the Hermite polynomial decomposition (4). However, this must be traded off against the size of the constant $C_q(Z)$. All the terms in the expression $C_q(Z)$ are additive and grow quickly as q increases; the term of highest order is proportional to $q^{3/2}(2q-4)!$. Such rapid growth does not seem to be the case for $d_{f_q,2}^2(Z)$, as illustrated in the next two typical examples, where access to the variance parameter $E(Z_0^2) = r_Z(0)$ itself is essentially immediate.

3.4.2 Hermite variation

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be an even integer. Then the q th Hermite polynomial H_q can be written as in (4). Indeed, it follows from the fact that for q even, $H_q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} \frac{q!(-1)^k}{k!(q-2k)!2^k} x^{q-2k}$. Then we can write,

$$H_q(x) = EH_q(Z_0) + \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{H_q,2k}(Z) H_{2k}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}}\right)$$

where for any $k \in \{1, \dots, \frac{q}{2} - 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{H_q, q-2k}(Z) &= (-1)^k \left(r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}}(0) - r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}-1}(0) \right) a_{q-2}^q a_{q-4}^{q-2} \dots a_{q-2k}^{q-2k+2} \\
&+ (-1)^{k-1} \left(r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}}(0) - r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}-2}(0) \right) a_{q-4}^q a_{q-6}^{q-4} \dots a_{q-2k}^{q-2k+2} \\
&+ \dots \\
&+ (-1)^1 \left(r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}}(0) - r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}-k}(0) \right) a_{q-2k}^q
\end{aligned}$$

and $d_{H_q, q}(Z) = r_{\frac{q}{2}}^{\frac{q}{2}}(0)$, where for every p even, the constants

$$a_{p-2k}^p = \frac{p!(-1)^k}{k!(p-2k)!2^k} \quad k = 0, \dots, p/2$$

are the ones which satisfy

$$H_p(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{p/2} a_{p-2k}^p x^{p-2k}.$$

Consequently, the Hermite variation

$$Q_{H_q, n}(Z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} H_q(Z_k)$$

satisfies the results given in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. Moreover the parameter $\lambda_{H_q}(Z)$ has the following explicit expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{H_q}(Z) &= E[H_q(Z_0)] = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{q}{2}} \frac{q!(-1)^k}{k!(q-2k)!2^k} E\left(Z_0^{q-2k}\right) \\
&= \frac{q!}{2^{q/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{q}{2}} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!(\frac{q}{2}-k)!} [E(Z_0^2)]^{\frac{q}{2}-k} \\
&= \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})!2^{q/2}} (E(Z_0^2) - 1)^{q/2}. \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the results of the previous sections provide explicit means for computing total variation speeds of convergence in a generalized method of moments based on Hermite polynomials for estimating the variance parameter $E(Z_0^2) = r_Z(0)$. Because of the simple form of (22) as a function of $r_Z(0)$, for any sequence satisfying Condition (12), one can immediately test the hypothesis of whether $r_Z(0)$ equals a specific value σ^2 , using Corollary 5 to account precisely for the error term due to non-infinite sample size. Since the corollary provides the error in total variation distance, this error is uniform over σ^2 by definition.

3.4.3 Power variation

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ be an even integer. Let $c_{q,2k} = \frac{1}{(2k)!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x^q H_{2k}(x) dx$ be the coefficients of the monomial $\phi_q(x) := x^q$ expanded in the basis of Hermite polynomials :

$$x^q = \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} c_{q,2k} H_{2k}(x).$$

It is known that

$$c_{q,2k} = \frac{q!}{2^{q/2-k} (q/2 - k)! (2k)!}.$$

Thus, by relying directly on the results we just saw in the case of Hermite polynomials, the polynomial function ϕ_q can be written as in (4). As consequence, the power variation

$$Q_{\phi_q,n}(Z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (Z_i)^q.$$

satisfies the results given in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. In this case, the parameter $\lambda_{\phi_q}(Z)$ has the following explicit expression

$$\lambda_{\phi_q}(Z) = E[(Z_0)^q] = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})! 2^{q/2}} [E(Z_0^2)]^{q/2}. \quad (23)$$

4 Parameter estimation for non-stationary Gaussian process

In practice, it is often the case that the data comes from a sequence which has visibly not yet reached a stationary regime. This is a typical situation for the solution of a stochastic system which initiates from a point mass rather than the system's stationary distribution; we will see examples of this in Sections 6 and 7. The rate at which stationarity is reached heavily affects other rates of convergence, including the total variation speeds in the central limit theorem. To illustrate this phenomenon more broadly than in the two aforementioned sections, in this section we consider a general class of models which can be written as the sum of a stationary model and a non-stationary nuisance term which vanishes asymptotically.

4.1 General case

For a polynomial f_q of even degree q , and a random sequence X , recall the polynomial variation notation introduced in Section 3.1:

$$Q_{f_q,n}(X) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(X_i).$$

Let $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a centered stationary Gaussian process and let $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a process such that the following condition holds: there exist $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that for every $p \geq p_0$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|Q_{f_q,n}(Z + Y) - Q_{f_q,n}(Z)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma}). \quad (24)$$

Combining (24), Lemma 36 in the Appendix, and Theorem 1 we get the following result.

Theorem 8 *Assume that the conditions (24) and (7) hold. Then*

$$Q_{f_q,n}(Z + Y) \longrightarrow \lambda_{f_q}(Z)$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In Corollary 5, we handled a discrepancy at the level of deterministic normalizing constants, while retaining statements with the total variation distance. In this section, our discrepancy comes at a slightly higher price because it is stochastic. We use instead the Wasserstein distance d_W , in order to rely on the following elementary lemma whose proof is in the Appendix.

Lemma 9 *Let Y and Z be random variables defined on the same probability space. Then*

$$d_W(Y + Z, N) \leq d_W(Z, N) + \|Y\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Another lemma, proved for instance in [24, Theorem 5.1.3], relates the Wasserstein distance to a connection between Stein's method and the Malliavin calculus.

Lemma 10 *If F has mean 0, variance 1, and a square-integrable Malliavin derivative, then*

$$d_W(F, N) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} E[|1 - \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle|]$$

By combining these two lemmas (the second one applies because variables with finite chaos expansions are infinitely Malliavin-differentiable with finite moments of all orders) and the proof of Theorem 4, by (24) we immediately obtain the following upper bounds.

Theorem 11 *Under hypothesis (24) and the assumptions of Theorem 4, for some constant C depending on the relation in (24),*

$$d_W\left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z + Y)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, N\right) \leq C \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} + \frac{C_q(Z) \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\sqrt{\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))} + \kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))}.$$

In addition, under Condition (12), i.e. if $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_Z(j)|^2 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_W\left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z + Y)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}}, N\right) &\leq C \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}} + \frac{C_q(Z) \sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\sqrt{\frac{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}{u_{f_q}(Z)^2}} + \frac{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}{u_{f_q}(Z)^2}} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{8}{\pi}} \left| 1 - \frac{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}{u_{f_q}(Z)} \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

4.2 Quadratic case

In this subsection we assume that $q = 2$. In this special case, consistent with the notation in (6), without loss of generality up to deterministic shifting and scaling, the only relevant polynomial of interest is $f_2(x) = x^2$. Thus the question introduced in Section 3.1 is to estimate the variance $r_Z(0) = \mathbf{E}[(Z_0)^2]$ where Z is our stationary Gaussian process. Using the notation introduced in that section, we thus have the following expression for our normalized partial sum

$$U_{f_2,n}(Z) = \frac{r_Z(0)}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} H_2 \left(\frac{Z_k}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) = I_2 \left(\frac{r_Z(0)}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k^{\otimes 2} \right),$$

where again ε_k is defined by $Z_k / \sqrt{r_Z(0)} = I_1(\varepsilon_k)$. Using the notation in Section 3.3, the standardized version of $U_{f_2,n}(Z)$ is thus

$$F_{f_2,n}(Z) = \frac{U_{f_2,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]}}.$$

Recall the 4th cumulant $\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) = E[F_{f_2,n}(Z)^4] - 3$, and define the third cumulant

$$\kappa_3(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) := E[F_{f_2,n}(Z)^3].$$

We will apply the sharp asymptotics established in [22] (see bullet points in Section 2), by which a sequence of variance-one random variables F_n in a fixed Wiener chaos which converges in law to the normal has total variation distance to the normal commensurate with the maximum of its third and fourth cumulant. We will also apply an explicit version of this theorem, due to [20], tailored to quadratic variations of stationary Gaussian processes. For positive-valued sequences a and b , we will use the commensurability notation

$$a_n \asymp b_n \iff 0 < c := \inf_n \frac{a_n}{b_n} \leq \sup_n \frac{a_n}{b_n} =: C < \infty$$

where the extrema may be over all positive integers, or all integers exceeding a value n_0 . Our first result is the following.

Proposition 12 (1) *With $f_2(x) = x^2$, assume that $\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) \rightarrow 0$. Then*

$$d_{TV}(F_{f_2,n}(Z), N) \asymp \max\{\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)), |\kappa_3(F_{f_2,n}(Z))|\}. \quad (26)$$

(2) *If r_Z is asymptotically of constant sign and monotone, then $\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $\kappa_3(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) \rightarrow 0$, and in this case,*

$$d_{TV}(F_{f_2,n}(Z), N) \asymp |\kappa_3(F_{f_2,n}(Z))| = |E((F_{f_2,n}(Z))^3)|, \quad (27)$$

and moreover,

$$|E((F_{f_2,n}(Z))^3)| \asymp \frac{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^{3/2}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^2\right)^{3/2} \sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. The result (26) in Point (1) is a direct consequence of the main result in [22] (see also [4]). The statements in point (2) come directly from [20, Theorem 3]. ■

The methods used to prove Corollary 5 and Theorem 11 immediately lead from the upper bound statements in Proposition 12 to the following corollary.

Corollary 13 *If the hypothesis (24) holds, under the assumptions in part (2) of Proposition 12, for some constant $C > 0$,*

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Z+Y)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]}}, N \right) \leq C \left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]}} + |E((F_{f_2,n}(Z))^3)| \right).$$

In addition, if Condition (12) holds, i.e. $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_Z(j)|^2 < \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Z+Y)}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}, N \right) \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}} + |E((F_{f_2,n}(Z))^3)| \right) + C \frac{\sum_{|j|>n} |r_Z(j)|^2}{u_{f_2}(Z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Unfortunately, these techniques say nothing about how to obtain lower bounds when one adds discrepancies corresponding to the speed of convergence of the series $\sum_j |r_Z(j)|^2$, and to a non-stationary term. We now investigate some slight strengthening of Conditions (12) and (24) which allow for such lower-bound statements, starting with some elementary considerations.

From (27) and the remainder of Point (2) in Proposition 12, there exists a constant $c_1(Z)$ depending only on the law of Z such that

$$c_1(Z) \frac{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^{3/2} \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^2 \right)^{3/2} \sqrt{n}} \leq d_{TV}(F_{f_2,n}(Z), N) \leq C_1(Z) \frac{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^{3/2} \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^2 \right)^{3/2} \sqrt{n}}. \quad (29)$$

Now assume merely that (12) holds: $\sum_j |r_Z(j)|^2$ converges. Thus, for some constant $c'_2(Z)$ depending only on the law of Z ,

$$d_{TV}(F_{f_2,n}(Z), N) \geq \frac{c'_2(Z)}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (30)$$

In cases where $\sum |r_Z(k)|^{3/2}$ diverges, we evidently get a larger lower bound than (30), which would make the rest of the analysis easier. To keep track of multiplicative constants as best we can, we define

$$L(Z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^{3/2} \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k|<n} |r_Z(k)|^2 \right)^{3/2}}, \quad (31)$$

which exists and is positive under condition (12), with the understanding that when $L(Z)$ is $+\infty$, one can and should replace it by an arbitrarily large constant for n large enough. We will not comment on the case of diverging L further. The interested reader can work out for herself how much better the final lower bound results would be in this case.

Thus in (30), we may take $c'_2(Z) = c_1(Z) L(Z)$ where $c_1(Z)$ is the lower bound constant from (27), i.e. as defined in (29). Finally, we relate (30) to the Wasserstein distance through the following lemma, proved in the appendix.

Lemma 14 *Lower bound statements in Proposition 12 hold for d_W with an additional factor 2.*

Thus, under Condition (12), by the previous development and Lemma 14, with

$$c_2(Z) := 2c_1(Z) L(Z), \quad (32)$$

we finally get

$$d_W(F_{f_2,n}(Z), N) \geq \frac{c_2(Z)}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (33)$$

and we are ready to state and prove our lower bound theorem in the quadratic case under a sharpening of condition (24) and a quantitative version of Condition (12).

Theorem 15 *Assume the following two conditions.*

- Let $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a process such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some finite constant $c_3 > 0$,

$$\|Q_{f_2,n}(Z + Y) - Q_{f_2,n}(Z)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{c_3 \sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}{n}. \quad (34)$$

- Condition (12) holds and for some finite constant $c_4 > 0$

$$|u_{f_2}(Z) - E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]| \leq \frac{2c_4 u_{f_2}(Z)}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (35)$$

With the positive constants $c_1(Z)$, $C_1(Z)$, and $L(Z)$ defined via (29), (31), and $c_2 = 2c_1(Z) L(Z)$ (32), which exist by Proposition 12, if $c_4 < c_2 - c_3$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $c_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)(c_3 + c_4) > 0$, there exists n_0 large enough that for all $n > n_0$,

$$\frac{c_1(Z) L(Z) - (1 + \varepsilon)(c_3 + c_4)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W\left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Y + Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}, N\right) \leq \frac{C_1(Z) L(Z) + c_3 + c_4}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. By using Lemma 9, the lower bound (33) implies

$$\frac{c_2}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W\left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Y + Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]}}, N\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]}} E[|U_{f_2,n}(Y + Z) - U_{f_2,n}(Z)|].$$

Then by assumption (34),

$$\frac{c_2}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Y+Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]}}, N \right) + \frac{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]}} \frac{c_3}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Now using the trivial consequence of Lemma 9 by which, for any random variable Z and constants a, b , $d_W(aZ, N) \leq d_W(bZ, N) + |a - b| \|Z\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{n}} &\leq d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Y+Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}, N \right) \\ &+ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]}} \right| E[|U_{f_2,n}(Z+Y)|] + \frac{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]}} \frac{c_3}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Regarding the middle term in the right-hand side above, we claim the following: for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for n large enough,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]}} \right| E[|U_{f_2,n}(Z+Y)|] \leq \frac{c_4(1+\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (37)$$

Let us prove this claim. To lighten the notation, we drop the subscripts. By assumption (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]}} \right| E[|U(Z+Y)|] \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{u(Z)}} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]}} \right| (E[|Q(Z) - \lambda(Z)|] + E[|Q(Z+Y) - Q(Z)|]) \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]}} \right| \left(\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]} + \frac{c_3\sqrt{u(Z)}}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $E[U(Z)^2]$ converges to $u(Z)$, and after some simple algebra, for n large enough we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]}} \right| E[|U(Z+Y)|] &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(Z)}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{E[U(Z)^2]}} \right| (1+\varepsilon) \sqrt{u(Z)} \\ &\leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2u(Z)} |u(Z) - E[U(Z)^2]|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (37) follows immediately from assumption (35). Combining (37) with (36), and again using the convergence of $E[U_{f_2,n}(Z)^2]$ to $u_{f_2}(Z)$, we finally obtain that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for n large enough

$$\frac{c_2}{\sqrt{n}} \leq d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(Y+Z)}{\sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z)}}, N \right) + \frac{(c_3 + c_4)(1+\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{n}},$$

Since, $c_4 + c_4 < c_2$, $\varepsilon > 0$ exists such that $c_2 - (1+\varepsilon)(c_3 + c_4) > 0$, which finishes the lower bound of the theorem.

The upper bound is easier to prove, and follows from the same estimates as for the lower bound. Details are omitted. ■

Remark 16 *The non-central limit theorem in Remark 7 part (1) also holds if Z is replaced by $Z+Y$ under assumption (24) if $\gamma > 1/2$; and similarly for part (2) if $\gamma > H - (q-1)/2q$. These results' proofs, which are omitted, follow the results in Remark 7 and from the tools in this section and those in [20] and [5].*

4.3 Towards a Berry-Esséen theorem for parameter estimators

In the previous two sections, we saw how to prove asymptotically normality for the empirical sums of the form $U_{f_q,n}(Z)$ (or $U_{f_q,n}(Y+Z)$ where Y is a non-stationary correction process), with convergence speed theorems in total variation and Wasserstein distances. These apply to parameter estimation if the quantity one is after is the expected value $\lambda_{f_q}(Z) := E[f_q(Z_0)]$. In this section we evaluate the same question if the parameter one seeks is implicit in $\lambda_{f_q}(Z)$.

Thus assume that one is looking for the unknown parameter $\theta > 0$ and that there is a homeomorphism g such that

$$\lambda_{f_q}(Z) = g^{-1}(\theta) := \theta^*.$$

As stated, so far, for a degree- q polynomial f_q we have studied the “estimator”

$$\hat{\theta}_n = Q_{f_q,n}(Z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_i).$$

We have proved the following in Section 3 (see for instance Theorems 1 and 4, Corollaries 5 and 6)
 $\widehat{\theta}_n \longrightarrow \theta^*$ almost surely and

$$d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta^*), \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \right) \leq \varphi(n)$$

where

$$U_{f_q,n}(Z) = \sqrt{n} (Q_{f_q,n}(Z) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z)) = \widehat{\theta}_n - \theta^*.$$

and where $\varphi(n)$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ at various speeds which can be determined thanks to the precise statements in Corollary 5, for instance $\varphi(n) = 1/\sqrt{n}$ in Corollary 6, which is the classical Berry-Esséen speed.

By using the relation between θ and λ , we naturally define the estimator of θ by

$$\check{\theta}_n := g(\widehat{\theta}_n).$$

This is a consistent estimator by Theorem 1 since g is continuous by assumption: $\check{\theta}_n \longrightarrow \theta$ almost surely. Now assume g is a diffeomorphism. By the mean-value theorem we can write

$$(\check{\theta}_n - \theta) = g'(\xi_n) (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta^*)$$

where ξ_n is a random variable which belongs to $[[\widehat{\theta}_n, \theta^*]]$. As a consequence

$$\begin{aligned} & d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\check{\theta}_n - \theta), \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \right) \\ & \leq d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\check{\theta}_n - \theta), \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \right) \\ & \quad + d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\widehat{\theta}_n - \theta^*), \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The last term above is controlled by $\varphi(n)$ as mentioned. Now assume that g is twice continuously differentiable. Then by the mean-value theorem again, for ζ_n some random variable which belongs

to $[\xi_n, \theta^*] \subset [\hat{\theta}_n, \theta^*]$, the other term above is controlled as

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\check{\theta}_n - \theta), \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} E \left| \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) (g'(\xi_n) - g'(\theta^*)) \right| \\
& = \frac{1}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} E \left| \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) g''(\zeta_n) (\xi_n - \theta^*) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} E \left| \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*)^2 g''(\zeta_n) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} \sqrt{n} \left[E \left((\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*)^{2p} \right) \right]^{1/p} \left[E \left(g''(\zeta_n)^{p'} \right) \right]^{1/p'}
\end{aligned}$$

where p and p' are conjugate reals greater than 1, i.e. $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. Moreover

$$\sqrt{n} \left[E \left((\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*)^{2p} \right) \right]^{1/p} \leq c_p \sqrt{n} E \left((\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*)^2 \right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Therefore the only question left to transfer the quantitative results of Section 3 to $\check{\theta}_n$ is whether one can prove, for instance, that $g''(\zeta_n)$ has a bounded moment of order greater than 1. We will see several examples in Section 6 where this is easy to check. More generally, we advocate checking this on a case-by-case basis when the function g can be identified. In the meantime, we summarize this discussion with the following general principle, which follows from the above discussion.

Theorem 17 *Consider the setup from Corollary 5, in which $\hat{\theta}_n = Q_{f_q,n}(Z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_q(Z_i)$ and $\theta^* = E[f_q(Z_0)]$, with $\varphi(n)$ an upper bound for the expression in (18) which converges to 0. Assume that there exists a twice-differentiable invertible function g and a value θ such that*

$$g^{-1}(\theta) := \theta^*.$$

If $g''(\hat{\theta}_n)$ has a moment of order greater than 1 which is bounded in n , the expression

$$\check{\theta}_n := g(\hat{\theta}_n)$$

is a strongly consistent and asymptotically normal estimator of θ and

$$d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} (\check{\theta}_n - \theta), \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \right) \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \varphi(n)$$

where $\varphi(n)$ is the speed of convergence in Corollary 5.

5 Improving the rate convergence

Consider our usual centered stationary Gaussian sequence Z with autocorrelation function r_Z , and define :

$$Z_k^{(0)} = Z_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

and for every $p \geq 1$

$$Z_k^{(p)} = Z_{k+1}^{(p-1)} - Z_k^{(p-1)}, k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

It is well known, and easily verified, that if $k \mapsto r_Z(k)$ decays like $k^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then the p th-order finite difference process $Z^{(p)}$ defined above is also a centered and stationary Gaussian sequence, with an autocorrelation function which decays like $k^{-\alpha-2p}$. On the other hand, the reader will easily check, or consult the computations in Section 6.5 of [4], which are also summarized in Proposition 4.2 part (3) in [22], and extended in [20] to cover the case at hand here, that as soon as $-\alpha - 2p < -3/4$, we have

$$\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^{(p)})) \leq c(Z) k^{-1}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some constant $c(Z)$ depending only on the law of Z . The condition $-\alpha - 2p < -3/4$ is satisfied for any $\alpha > 0$, as soon as the integer $p \geq 1$, evidently. For non-integer $p > 0$, we may define fractional finite-differences $Z^{(p)}$ using the standard formal power series expansion, in which case the condition on p becomes

$$p > 3/8 - \alpha. \tag{38}$$

Thus by applying Theorem 4 and part (3) of Corollary 5, we immediately conclude the following, which we state for integer p since the case of non-integer p is arguably of lesser practical use.

Theorem 18 *Let q be an even positive integer. Assume that Z , r_Z , f_q , $U_{f_q,n}(Z)$ and $F_{f_q,n}(Z)$ are as in Theorem 4. Assume that $k^\alpha r_Z(k)$ converges to a constant for some $\alpha > 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then for every integer $p \geq 1$, there exists C depending on p, q and $r_{Z^{(p)}}(0)$ such that*

$$d_{TV} \left(F_{f_q,n}((Z^{(p)})), N \right) \leq C n^{-1/4}.$$

In particular, $Z^{(p)}$ satisfies condition (12) and $U_{f_q,n}((Z^{(p)}))$ is asymptotically normal.

For instance, if Z has autocorrelation asymptotics which are equivalent to those of a fractional Gaussian noise with Hurst parameter H , then $\alpha = 2 - 2H > 0$ and the above statements hold for all $H \in (0, 1)$.

To apply the remainder of Corollary 5, we note that, by the calculation in Section 3.4.1, under the assumption that $r_Z(k) \sim ck^{-\alpha}$, since $Z^{(p)}$ satisfies condition (12), the control on the variance discrepancy term given in (20) is of the same order as:

$$\sum_{|j|>n} r_{Z^{(p)}}(j)^2 \sim \sum_{|j|>n} j^{-2\alpha-4p} \asymp n^{-2\alpha-4p+1} = o(n^{-3}).$$

This is negligible compared to $n^{-1/4}$. Thus we immediately get the following by part (2) of Corollary 5.

Corollary 19 *Under the notation and conditions of Theorem 18, for some constant $c_{p,q}(Z)$ depending only on p, q , and the law of Z ,*

$$d_{TV}\left(U_{f_q,n}(Z^{(p)}), \mathcal{N}\left(0, u_{f_q}(Z^{(p)})\right)\right) \leq c_{p,q}(Z)n^{-1/4}.$$

This holds for instance if Z is as in the last statement in Theorem 18.

For the same reason as in the case of $p = 0$, there is no reason to believe that the speed $n^{-1/4}$ is sharp, but when $q = 2$, a sharp result can be established. The results of Section 4.2 imply the next sharp Berry-Esséen-type theorem.

Theorem 20 *Under all the assumptions of Theorem 18,*

$$d_W\left(U_{f_2,n}(Z^{(p)}), \mathcal{N}\left(0, u_{f_2}(Z^{(p)})\right)\right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. We briefly sketch the ideas in the proof. The details are bookkeeping given what has already been used to prove Corollary 5 and Theorem 15. The statement in Theorem 20 holds with U replaced by the normalized version F , by directly checking all the assumptions of Theorem 15; to get the result for U instead of F , an argument of the same type as in the proof of Corollary 5 suffices, which works just as we saw in the above justification of Corollary 19, because one easily shows that the variance discrepancy term (20) is still $o(n^{-3})$. ■

Remark 21 *Improving rates of convergence by using finite differences also works for the non-stationary processes of Section (4). The reason is simply that, since the process Y is a small perturbation of $Y+Z$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ under assumptions such as (24), these assumptions do not deteriorate under a finite difference of fixed order p , up to the possible inclusion of multiplicative constants depending only on p, q . All details are omitted for conciseness.*

6 Applications to Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes : the one-parameter case

6.1 Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process: general case

Consider an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $X = \{X_t, t \geq 0\}$ driven by a fractional Brownian motion $B^H = \{B_t^H, t \geq 0\}$ of Hurst index $H \in (0, 1)$. That is, X is the solution of the following linear

stochastic differential equation

$$X_0 = 0; \quad dX_t = -\theta X_t dt + dB_t^H, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (39)$$

whereas $\theta > 0$ is considered as unknown parameter. The solution X of (39) has the following explicit expression:

$$X_t = \int_0^t e^{-\theta(t-s)} dB_s^H. \quad (40)$$

Thus, we can write

$$X_t = Z_t^\theta - e^{-\theta t} Z_0^\theta \quad (41)$$

where

$$Z_t^\theta = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\theta(t-s)} dB_s^H. \quad (42)$$

Moreover, it is known that Z^θ is an ergodic stationary Gaussian process. It is the stationary solution of equation (39). We are thus in the setup of Section 4 with $Z = Z^\theta$ and $Y = -e^{-\theta t} Z_0^\theta$. Consequently, to apply the results of that section, we need only check that Condition 24 holds. It does, according to the following result.

Lemma 22 *Let X and Z^θ be the processes given in (39) and (42) respectively. Then for every $p \geq 1$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\left\| Q_{f_q,n}(X) - Q_{f_q,n}(Z^\theta) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).$$

Proof. By (41) and (4) we have

$$\left\| Q_{f_q,n}(X) - Q_{f_q,n}(Z^\theta) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k} \left\| H_{2k} \left(\frac{X_i}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) - H_{2k} \left(\frac{Z_i^\theta}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Combining this and the fact that

$$H_{2k} \left(\frac{X_i}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) - H_{2k} \left(\frac{Z_i^\theta}{\sqrt{r_Z(0)}} \right) = \sum_{l=0}^k \frac{(2k)!(-1)^l}{l!(2k-2l)!2^l} \sum_{j=1}^{2k-2l} \frac{(-1)^j \binom{2k-2l}{j} e^{-\theta i j}}{r_Z^{k-l}(0)} (Z_0^\theta)^j (Z_i^\theta)^{2k-2l-j}.$$

we deduce that there exist a constant $c(\theta, f_q)$ depending on f_q and θ such that

$$\left\| Q_{f_q,n}(X) - Q_{f_q,n}(Z^\theta) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq c(\theta, f_q) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^{-i\theta}.$$

Thus the lemma is obtained. ■

As a consequence, by using Z^θ ergodic, Lemma 22 and Theorem 8, we conclude that

$$Q_{f_q,n}(X) \longrightarrow \lambda_{f_q}(Z^\theta)$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by the Gaussian property of Z^θ and Lemma asymptotic 38 in the Appendix, we can write

$$\lambda_{f_q}(Z^\theta) := \mu_{f_q}(\theta)$$

where μ_{f_q} is a univariate function of θ determined by the polynomial f_q . Hence, in the case when the function μ_{f_q} is invertible, we obtain the following estimator for θ

$$\check{\theta}_{f_q,n} := \mu_{f_q}^{-1} [Q_{f_q,n}(X)] . \quad (43)$$

Proposition 23 *Assume $H \in (0, 1)$ and μ_{f_q} is a homomorphism. Let $\hat{\theta}_{f_q,n}$ be the estimator given in (43). Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, almost surely, $\hat{\theta}_{f_q,n} \rightarrow \theta$.*

These considerations allow us to state and prove the following strong consistency and asymptotic normality of $\check{\theta}_{f_q,n}$.

Proposition 24 *Denote $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Then*

- *If $H \in (0, \frac{5}{8})$, for any q ,*

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(X)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z^\theta)}}, N \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/4}}.$$

- *If $H \in (\frac{5}{8}, \frac{3}{4})$, for any q ,*

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(X)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z^\theta)}}, N \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{(4H-3)/2}}.$$

- *In particular, in both cases, assuming μ_{f_q} is a diffeomorphism,*

$$\sqrt{n} (\check{\theta}_{f_q,n} - \theta) \xrightarrow{law} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{u_{f_q}(Z^\theta)}{(\mu'_{f_q}(\theta))^2} \right).$$

- *If $H = \frac{3}{4}$,*

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(X)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z^\theta)]}}, N \right) \leq C \log^{-\frac{1}{4}}(n).$$

In particular,

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(n)}} (\check{\theta}_{f_q,n} - \theta) \xrightarrow{law} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{9d_{q,2}^2(Z)}{16\theta^4(\mu'_{f_q}(\theta))^2} \right).$$

Proof. In this proof, C represents a constant which may change from line to line. It was proved in [20] (also see [4]) that, with r_Z the covariance function of Z^θ ,

$$\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta)) \leq C \left(\sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^{4/3} \right)^3$$

while

$$E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z^\theta) \right] \leq C \sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^2$$

Then by Lemma 38, for all $H < 3/4$, we easily get $E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z^\theta) \right] \leq u_{f_q}(Z^\theta) < \infty$ and in particular

$$\left| 1 - \frac{E \left[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z^\theta) \right]}{u_{f_q}(Z^\theta)} \right| \leq C \sum_{|k| > n} |r_Z(k)|^2 \leq C n^{4H-3}. \quad (44)$$

Also by Lemma 38, for $H < 5/8$,

$$\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta)) \leq C n^{-1}$$

while for $H > 5/8$,

$$\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta)) \leq C n^{2(4H-3)}.$$

Then by Theorem 11 and by Lemma 22 which shows that $\gamma = 1$, we get

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z+Y)}{\sqrt{u_{f_q}(Z)}}, N \right) \leq C n^{-1/2} + \sqrt[4]{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta))} + C n^{4H-3}$$

depending on whether H is larger or smaller than $5/8$ we get the announced result, since $n^{-1/2}$ and $n^{(4H-3)/2}$ coming from dominate the term $\sqrt[4]{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta))}$ dominate the error terms n^{4H-3} and $n^{-1/2}$.

Now, by assumption, μ_{f_q} has a continuously differentiable derivative. Thus, by the mean value theorem, there exists a random variable $\xi_{f_q,n}$ between θ and $\hat{\theta}_{f_q,n}$ such that

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\mu_{f_q}(\hat{\theta}_{q,n}) - \mu_{f_q}(\theta) \right) = \mu'_{f_q}(\xi_{f_q,n}) \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{q,n} - \theta \right).$$

By the normal convergence in law of $\mu_{f_q}(\hat{\theta}_{q,n})$ to $\mu_{f_q}(\theta)$ and the almost-sure convergence of $\mu'_{f_q}(\xi_{f_q,n})$ to $\mu'_{f_q}(\theta)$, the theorem's final statement when $H < 3/4$ follows. The special case of $H = 3/4$ is treated similarly. ■

6.2 Examples and a Berry-Esséen theorem for drift estimators

In the two following examples, the function μ_{f_q} is an explicit diffeomorphism except at $\theta = 0$.

- Assume that $f_q = H_q$. Using (22) and Lemma 38, we have

$$\mu_{H_q}(\theta) = \lambda_{H_q}(Z^\theta) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})!2^{q/2}} (H\Gamma(2H)\theta^{-2H} - 1)^{q/2}.$$

In this case, the function μ is a diffeomorphism with bounded derivatives when the range is restricted to \mathbf{R}_+ . Since, by the previous strong consistency proposition, $Q_{f_q,n}(X)$ ends up in \mathbf{R}_+ almost surely, the estimator $\check{\theta}_{f_q,n}$ is asymptotically equivalent to the one in which the function $g = \mu_{f_q}^{-1}$ is restricted to \mathbf{R}_+ . This observation will be helpful below when applying the results of Section 4.3.

- Assume that $f_q = \phi_q$ with $\phi_q(x) = x^q$. From (23) and Lemma 38 we obtain

$$\mu_{\phi_q}(\theta) = \lambda_{\phi_q}(Z^\theta) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})!2^{q/2}} [H\Gamma(2H)\theta^{-2H}]^{q/2}.$$

The singularity of μ at $\theta = 0$ poses some technical problems when one tries to translate the consistency of $Q_{f_q,n}(X)$ into that of $\check{\theta}_{f_q,n}$ thanks to Section 4.3, which we investigate below.

We now show how the principle described in Section 4.3 can be used to estimate the speed of convergence for the estimator $\check{\theta}_{f_q,n}$ itself. To work in a specific situation, we look at the above two examples, assuming $q = 2$.

6.2.1 Berry-Esséen theorem for a Hermite-variations-based estimator for θ

In the notation of Section 4.3, using the convention of replacing $Q_{H_2,n}(Z)$ by $|Q_{H_2,n}(Z)|$, in the case of the Hermite polynomial H_2 we have

$$\mu_{H_2}(\theta) = \lambda_{H_2}(Z^\theta) = H\Gamma(2H) |\theta|^{-2H} - 1 = g^{-1}(\theta)$$

and thus

$$g(x) = g_{H_2}(x) := (H\Gamma(2H))^{-1/(2H)} (1 + |x|)^{-1/(2H)}, \quad (45)$$

and $g''(x)$ is proportional to $(1 + |x|)^{-1/(2H)-2}$. This function is bounded on \mathbf{R}_+ . Hence, according to Theorem 17, using the speed of convergence from Proposition 12, we obtain the following.

Proposition 25 *For the stationary fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Z^θ in (42), with $Q_{H_2,n}(Z^\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n Z^\theta(k)^2 - 1$ and g as in (45), we get*

$$d_W \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{g'(\theta^*) \sqrt{E[U_{H_2,n}^2(Z)]}} \left(g(Q_{H_2,n}(Z^\theta)) - \theta \right), \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \right) \leq C \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \varphi(n)$$

where $g(x) = (H\Gamma(2H))^{-1/(2H)} (1 + |x|)^{-1/(2H)}$ and $\theta^* = g^{-1}(\theta)$ and

$$\varphi(n) \asymp \frac{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |k|^{3H-3}\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |k|^{4H-4}\right)^{3/2} \sqrt{n}}.$$

In particular, for $H < 2/3$, $\varphi(n) \asymp 1/\sqrt{n}$.

Remark 26 Improvements to the above proposition which include the use of the asymptotic variance $u_{f_q}(Z^\theta)$ and the nonstationary fractional OU process X in (40) also hold. These are omitted here for the sake of conciseness; the reader will find these topics covered in Section 6.3 below.

6.2.2 Comments and strategy for θ estimators with singular variance function

For the power-2 function, in the notation of Section 4.3 we have

$$\mu_{\phi_2}(\theta) = \lambda_{\phi_2}(Z^\theta) = H\Gamma(2H)\theta^{-2H} = g^{-1}(\theta)$$

and thus $g''(x) = c_H x^{-1/(2H)-2}$ which has a singularity at 0 and thus is not bounded. A result can be obtained immediately from the above proposition since $g(Q_{\phi_2,n}(Z^\theta) - 1) = g(Q_{H_2,n}(Z^\theta))$ is the estimator studied in that proposition. However, for illustrative purposes, we finish this section by outlining a method for dealing with the singularity, since this works for any g such that g'' is asymptotically decreasing like a negative power, and any process that has an infinite Karhunen-Loève expansion.

According to Theorem 17, we are asking whether for some $p' > 1$,

$$\sup_n E \left[\left| \hat{\theta}_n \right|^{-p'/(2H)-2p'} \right] < \infty.$$

This condition is not entirely trivial, and can fail in some simple pathologically degenerate cases such as if Z is constant, since then $\hat{\theta}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n Z(k)^2 = Z(0)^2$ is a chi-squared variable with one degree of freedom, which has no moments of negative order less than $-1/2$. This pathology does not occur for the fOU process, though the argument is slightly involved, since the limit law of the renormalized $\hat{\theta}_n$ is normal, which does not have higher negative moments either. We decompose

$$E \left[g''(\hat{\theta}_n) \right] = E \left[g''(\hat{\theta}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\hat{\theta}_n < 1/\sqrt{n}} \right] + E \left[g''(\hat{\theta}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\hat{\theta}_n \geq 1/\sqrt{n}} \right].$$

By the asymptotic normality of $(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \sqrt{n}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[g''(\hat{\theta}_n) \mathbf{1}_{|\hat{\theta}_n| \geq 1/\sqrt{n}} \right] &\sim \int_{-\sqrt{n}\theta^*+1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{z}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta^* \right|^{-p'(2+1/(2H))} e^{-z^2/2} dz \\ &= \int_{-\sqrt{n}\theta^*+1}^{-\sqrt{n}\theta^*/2} \left| \frac{z}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta^* \right|^{-p'(2+1/(2H))} e^{-z^2/2} dz + \int_{-\sqrt{n}\theta^*/2}^{\infty} \left| \frac{z}{\sqrt{n}} + \theta^* \right|^{-p'(2+1/(2H))} e^{-z^2/2} dz \\ &\leq cst e^{-n\theta^*/8} n^{p'(2+1/(2H))} + (\theta^*/2)^{-p'(2+1/(2H))} \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded for all n .

For the second piece, the normal approximation would not yield a finite bound, thus we must return to the original expression of $\hat{\theta}_n$ as a 2nd chaos variable. It is known (see [19, page 522]) that $Z^\theta(k)$ has a Kahunen-Loève expansion $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_m} e_m(k) W_m$ (where the W_m are i.i.d. standard normal, and the e_m are orthonormal in $L^2([0, n])$) such that $\lambda_m \sim cm^{2H-2}$. Thus, the expansion of Z^θ contains infinitely many independent terms. One also knows (see [24, Section 2.7.4]) that $\hat{\theta}_n$, like any variable in the second chaos, can be expanded as $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mu_m W_m^2$ where the μ_m are summable. One can check that the infinity of distinct terms in the expansion of Z^y implies that for any fixed n , the expansion of $\hat{\theta}_n$ also contains infinitely many terms, and that the coefficients are positive. Therefore, for any fixed m_0 , there exists a positive constant c_{m_0} such that $\hat{\theta}_n \geq c_{m_0} \sum_{m=0}^{m_0} W_m^2 =: S_{m_0}$, which is a random variable with χ^2 distribution with m_0 degrees of freedom. Hence the density of S at the origin is of the order $z^{(m_0-1)/2}$, which means it has a negative moment of order $-p'(2 + 1/(2H))$ as soon as $m_0 > p'(2 + 1/(2H)) - 1$. From this it follows that $E \left[g''(\hat{\theta}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\hat{\theta}_n < 1/\sqrt{n}} \right]$ is bounded. Thus g and $\hat{\theta}$ comply with the conditions of Theorem 17. In fact, since p' can be taken arbitrarily close to 1, we only need to be able to choose $m_0 > 1 + 1/(2H)$. For instance, if $H > 1/2$, this means that for Theorem 17 to work with $q = 2$, one only needs to show that the second-chaos series decomposition of $\hat{\theta}_n$ contains 2 independent terms. This covers all Gaussian processes except for the trivial case of the constant process.

6.3 Optimal Berry-Esséen theorem in the quadratic case

As in the previous sections, the convergence speed for general q has no reason to be optimal. We illustrate this by studying the case $q = 2$, where we can improve the rate convergence thanks to the optimal rates obtained in Section 4.2, and even obtain optimal two-sided bounds when $H < 5/8$. Note that the results in this section deal with the fully realistic scenario where observations come from the non-stationary process X in (40) and there is no reference to normalizing constants other than finite asymptotic variances.

6.3.1 Setting up the rates of convergence

First assume that $H \leq 3/4$. We find that $\kappa_3(F_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta)) \rightarrow 0$ and more precisely (see [20]) that

$$\left| E \left((F_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta))^3 \right) \right| \asymp \frac{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^{3/2} \right)^2}{\left(\sum_{|k| < n} |r_Z(k)|^2 \right)^{3/2} \sqrt{n}} \leq C \times \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 < H < \frac{2}{3} \\ \log^2(n) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } H = \frac{2}{3} \\ n^{6H - \frac{9}{2}}, & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} < H < \frac{3}{4} \\ \log^{-3/2}(n), & \text{if } H = \frac{3}{4}. \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

By using Corollary 13, we see that we must compare the rates therein to the rates obtained in (46). By (44) the rate which controls the convergence of the variances is n^{4H-3} . This can be dominated by $1/\sqrt{n}$ if and only if $n < 5/8$. For $H \in [2/3, 3/4]$, n^{4H-3} dominates the rates in (46). The rate

which controls the non-stationarity term is always of order $1/\sqrt{n}$ because of Lemma 22, which is always the lowest-order term. Hence the improved rates in (46) only come into play when $H < 5/8$ when normalizing by the asymptotic variance. In other words, we have the following two estimates, where the second one avoids the use of non-empirical statistics.

Proposition 27 *If $H \in (0, \frac{3}{4}]$,*

$$d_W \left(\frac{U_{f_2,n}(X)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z^\theta)]}}, N \right) \leq C \times \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 < H < \frac{2}{3} \\ \log^2(n)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } H = \frac{2}{3} \\ n^{6H-\frac{9}{2}}, & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} < H < \frac{3}{4} \\ \log^{-3/2}(n), & \text{if } H = \frac{3}{4} \end{cases}$$

and

$$d_W \left(U_{f_2,n}(X), \sqrt{u_{f_2}(Z^\theta)}N \right) \leq C \times \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } 0 < H < \frac{5}{8} \\ n^{4H-3}, & \text{if } \frac{5}{8} \leq H < \frac{3}{4}. \end{cases}$$

Next we show how to obtain optimal rates of convergence in the Wasserstein distance when $H < 5/8$. This result is important methodologically speaking because, thanks to the strategy in Section 5, it is essentially always possible to transform one's long-memory time series into one which satisfies $H < 5/8$, by using a finite-difference transformation.

6.3.2 Applying the optimal theorem

To apply Theorem 15 we must check that conditions (34) and (35) are met. We just saw that this is the case when $H < 5/8$. However, we must also check that the corresponding constants c_3 and c_4 are sufficiently small. Since $H < 5/8$, by (44), the constant c_4 can be made arbitrarily small for n large enough. It remains to show that c_3 can be chosen small. A direct application of Lemma 22 is insufficient for this purpose. Therefore, we must modify our estimator slightly, by discarding some of the first terms. We thus fix an integer $i_0 > 0$ and define

$$\tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}(X) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=i_0}^{i_0+n-1} f_2(X_i). \quad (47)$$

It is easy to check that this is still a consistent and asymptotically normal estimator of $r_Z(0)$. By the proof of Lemma 22, we see that

$$\left\| \tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}(X) - \tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}(Z^\theta) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq c(\theta, f_2) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=i_0}^{i_0+n-1} e^{-i\theta} \leq c(\theta, f_2) \frac{1}{n} e^{-i_0\theta}. \quad (48)$$

Since $\theta > 0$, we can make the last expression above as small as we want by choosing i_0 sufficiently large. Thus Theorem 15 applies, and we have the following optimal Berry-Esséen theorem for the variance estimator $\tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}(X)$, which, as we saw in Section 6.1, gives access to estimators for θ .

Proposition 28 *If $H \in (0, \frac{5}{8})$, then there exists an integer $i_0 > 0$ such that the quadratic variation $\tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}$ defined in (47) satisfies*

$$d_W \left(\sqrt{n} \left[\tilde{Q}_{f_2,n}(X) - r_Z(0) \right], \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_2}(Z^\theta)) \right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Moreover, with g as in (45), we have

$$d_W \left(\sqrt{n} \left(g \left(\tilde{Q}_{H_2,n}(X) \right) - \theta \right), \mathcal{N}(0, g'(\theta^*)^2 u_{H_2}(Z^\theta)) \right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Proof. The first result follows from the considerations immediately above. The second follows from Theorem 17 exactly as did the result in Proposition 25; we omit the details. ■

6.3.3 Comments on higher-order finite-differenced data

Given the claim that one can always reduce a time series to one with $H < 5/8$, one ought to check that, in the case of the fOU process, the parameter θ remains explicitly accessible after the finite-difference transformation. We first leave it to the reader to check that for fOU with any $H < 1$, and any positive real d , the fractional finite-differenced process $D^d Z^\theta$ has an auto-correlation function which decays like $k^{2H-2d-2}$, so that the memory length parameter $H' = H - d$ satisfies the condition $H' < 5/8$ as soon as $d > 3/8$. Certainly, one may thus always consider the first-order difference process

$$X_k^{(1)} = X_{k+1} - X_k$$

as suggested in Section 5, and one can write $X^{(1)} = Z^{(1),\theta} + Y$ and the reader may check that an estimate such as (48) still holds, so that the proposition above holds for $X^{(1)}$ for any $H < 1$.

For the quadratic Hermite variation, it remains only to investigate the form of the variance parameter $\lambda_{\phi_2}(Z^{(1),\theta}) = r_{Z^{(1),\theta}}(0)$ to which $\tilde{Q}_{\phi_2,n}(X^{(1)})$ converges. The computation is tedious and presumably known. We find that the variance of $Z^{(1),\theta}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} r_{Z^{(1),\theta}}(0) &= \frac{e^\theta}{2 + e^{-2\theta}} r_{Z^\theta}(0) \\ &= \frac{e^\theta}{2 + e^{-2\theta}} H\Gamma(2H) |\theta|^{-2H}. \end{aligned}$$

By considering the Hermite quadratic variation instead, as we did in Section 6.2, one avoids the singularity at the origin in this function, obtaining that the function to be inverted to transform $\tilde{Q}_{H_2,n}(X^{(1)})$ into an estimator of θ is simply

$$\mu_{H_2,Z^{(1)}}(\theta) := \frac{e^\theta}{2 + e^{-2\theta}} \left(H\Gamma(2H) |\theta|^{-2H} - 1 \right). \quad (49)$$

One is confronted in $\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}$ with a function which has a single negative global minimum at θ_{\min} , and tends to $+\infty$ at 0 and at $+\infty$. Thus in practice, when working with this first finite difference, additional information is needed to find out on which side of θ_{\min} the parameter θ would be located. On each of the two intervals $(0, \theta_{\min}]$ and $[\theta_{\min}, +\infty)$ where $\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}$ is a diffeomorphism, despite the transcendental nature of this function of θ , it is a simple matter of inverting it numerically to access an asymptotically normal estimator for θ for any $H \in (0, 1)$. It is immediate that $\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}$ behaves like $|\theta|^{-2H}$ near 0, and like an exponential near $+\infty$. Using Theorem 17 to prove a Berry-Esséen speed of convergence for the θ estimator $\left(\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}\right)^{-1} \left(\tilde{Q}_{\phi_2, n}(X^{(1)})\right)$, one follows the argument leading to Proposition 25, to obtain this $n^{-1/2}$ speed in Wasserstein distance. The moment condition of Theorem 17 is automatically satisfied in the case $\theta < \theta_{\min}$ because the second derivative of $\left(\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}\right)^{-1}$ is bounded in that case. In the case $\theta > \theta_{\min}$ the function $\left(\left(\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}\right)^{-1}\right)''$ has logarithmic growth at $+\infty$; the moment condition in Theorem 17 is then also satisfied since chaos variables have moments of all orders, and certainly thus logarithmic ones. All further details are omitted. Summarizing, as in Proposition 28, we obtain the following.

Proposition 29 *Let $\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}$ be as in (49), θ_{\min} be that function's global minimizer, and assume either $\theta < \theta_{\min}$ or $\theta > \theta_{\min}$. Let $\theta^* := \mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}(\theta)$ and $g := \left(\mu_{H_2, Z^{(1)}}\right)^{-1}$ and*

$$\tilde{Q}_{f_2, n}(X^{(1)}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=i_0}^{i_0+n-1} H_2(X_i - X_{i-1}).$$

Then for any $H \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\lim \sqrt{n} \left(\tilde{Q}_{H_2, n}(X^{(1)}) - \theta^* \right) =: u_{H_2}(Z^{(1)}) < \infty$$

and there exists an integer $i_0 > 0$ such that $g\left(\tilde{Q}_{H_2, n}(X^{(1)})\right)$ is a strongly consistent estimator of θ and

$$d_W \left(\sqrt{n} \left(g \left(\tilde{Q}_{H_2, n}(X^{(1)}) \right) - \theta \right), \mathcal{N}(0, g'(\theta^*)^2 u_{H_2}(Z^{(1)})) \right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

7 Application to Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes : multi-parameter examples

In the previous section, we provided a full study of univariate parameter estimation for a fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, including all details of how to apply our general theory. In this final section of our article, we give two more examples of applications of our methods. For the sake of conciseness, we focus on the results, providing only a minimal amount of computations and proofs, since these are all modeled on the arguments in Section 6.

7.1 OU driven by fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

In this section we assume that $X = \{X_t, t \geq 0\}$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process driven by a fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $V = \{V_t, t \geq 0\}$. This is given by the following linear stochastic differential equations

$$\begin{cases} X_0 = 0; & dX_t = -\theta X_t dt + dV_t, & t \geq 0 \\ V_0 = 0; & dV_t = -\rho V_t dt + dB_t^H, & t \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

where $B^H = \{B_t^H, t \geq 0\}$ is a fractional Brownian motion of Hurst index $H \in (0, 1)$, whereas $\theta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ are two unknown parameters such that $\theta \neq \rho$.

Using the notation (42), the explicit solution to this linear system, noted for instance in [13], implies the following decomposition of X_t :

$$X_t = \frac{\rho}{\rho - \theta} X_t^\rho + \frac{\theta}{\theta - \rho} X_t^\theta. \quad (51)$$

On the other hand, we can also write the system (50) as follows

$$dX_t = -(\theta + \rho) X_t dt - \rho \theta \Sigma_t dt + dB_t^H. \quad (52)$$

where for $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\Sigma_t = \int_0^t X_s ds = \frac{V_t - X_t}{\theta} = \frac{X_t^\theta - X_t^\rho}{\rho - \theta} \quad (53)$$

We also have

$$X_t^\theta = Z_t^\theta - e^{-\theta t} Z_0^\theta \quad (54)$$

where

$$Z_t^\theta = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\theta(t-s)} dB_s^H. \quad (55)$$

Moreover, the process $(Z_t^\theta, Z_t^{\theta'})$ is an ergodic stationary Gaussian process. As consequence

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= \frac{\rho}{\rho - \theta} Z_t^\rho + \frac{\theta}{\theta - \rho} Z_t^\theta - \left(\frac{\rho e^{-\rho t}}{\rho - \theta} Z_0^\rho + \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t}}{\theta - \rho} Z_0^\theta \right) \\ &:= Z_t^{\theta, \rho} - \left(\frac{\rho e^{-\rho t}}{\rho - \theta} Z_0^\rho + \frac{\theta e^{-\theta t}}{\theta - \rho} Z_0^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t &= \frac{Z_t^\theta - Z_t^\rho}{\rho - \theta} - \frac{e^{-\theta t} Z_0^\theta - e^{-\rho t} Z_0^\rho}{\rho - \theta} \\ &:= \Sigma_t^{\theta, \rho} - \frac{e^{-\theta t} Z_0^\theta - e^{-\rho t} Z_0^\rho}{\rho - \theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Moreover, $Z^{\theta, \rho}$ and $\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}$ are ergodic stationary Gaussian processes.

Now, assume that the processes X and Σ are observed equidistantly in time with the step size $\Delta_n = 1$. We will construct estimators for (θ, ρ) . By using the ergodicity of $Z^{\theta, \rho}$ and $\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}$, Lemma 22 and (8), we conclude that

$$(Q_{f_q, n}(X), Q_{f_q, n}(\Sigma)) \longrightarrow (\lambda_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}), \lambda_{f_q}(\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}))$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Moreover, by the Gaussian property of $Z^{\theta, \rho}$ and $\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}$, and the expressions $\eta_X(\theta, \rho)$ and $\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho)$ for the variances of $Z^{\theta, \rho}$ and $\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}$ which are given respectively in (71) and (72) after Lemma 39 in the Appendix, we can write

$$(\lambda_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}), \lambda_{f_q}(\Sigma^{\theta, \rho})) = \delta_{f_q}(\theta, \rho)$$

where δ_{f_q} is a function which can be expressed via $\eta_X(\theta, \rho)$ and $\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho)$. Hence, in the case when the function δ_{f_q} is invertible, we obtain the following estimator for θ

$$(\hat{\theta}_{f_q, n}, \hat{\rho}_{f_q, n}) := \delta_{f_q}^{-1} [(Q_{f_q, n}(X), Q_{f_q, n}(\Sigma))]. \quad (58)$$

Proposition 30 Assume $H \in (0, 1)$ and δ_{f_q} is a homomorphism. Let $(\hat{\theta}_{f_q, n}, \hat{\rho}_{f_q, n})$ be the estimator given in (58). Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$(\hat{\theta}_{f_q, n}, \hat{\rho}_{f_q, n}) \longrightarrow (\theta, \rho) \quad (59)$$

almost surely.

Examples. In the two following examples, the function δ_{f_q} is invertible and explicit, based on the expressions for $\eta_X(\theta, \rho)$ and $\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho)$ given respectively in (71) and (72) in the Appendix.

- Suppose that $f_q = H_q$. Using (22), (71) and (72), we have

$$\delta_{H_q}(\theta, \rho) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})! 2^{q/2}} \left((\eta_X(\theta, \rho) - 1)^{q/2}, (\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho) - 1)^{q/2} \right).$$

- Suppose that $f_q = \phi_q$ with $\phi_q(x) = x^q$. From (23), (71) and (72) we obtain

$$\delta_{\phi_q}(\theta, \rho) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})! 2^{q/2}} \left((\eta_X(\theta, \rho))^{q/2}, (\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho))^{q/2} \right).$$

Theorem 31 Let $H \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$. Define

$$\Gamma_{f_q}(\theta, \rho) = \begin{pmatrix} u_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}) & u_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}, \Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) \\ u_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}, \Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) & u_{f_q}(\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (60)$$

where

$$u_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}, \Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) = \sum_{k=0}^{q/2} d_{f_q, 2k}^2 (2k)! \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^*} \left(\frac{E(Z_0^{\theta, \rho} \Sigma_j^{\theta, \rho})}{\sqrt{r_{Z^{\theta, \rho}}(0) r_{\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}}(0)}} \right)^{2k}.$$

Then

$$d_W((U_{f_q,n}(X), U_{f_q,n}(\Sigma)); \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma_{f_q}(\theta, \rho))) \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/4}} \quad (61)$$

Hence, for any $H \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$,

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{f_q,n} - \theta, \hat{\rho}_{f_q,n} - \rho \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N} \left(0, J_{\delta_{f_q}^{-1}}(\eta_X(\theta, \rho), \eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho)) \Gamma_{f_q}(\theta, \rho) J_{\delta_{f_q}^{-1}}^T(\eta_X(\theta, \rho), \eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho)) \right) \quad (62)$$

where $J_{\delta_{f_q}^{-1}}$ is the Jacobian matrix of $\delta_{f_q}^{-1}$.

Proof. Combining (56), (57), Lemma 39 and Theorem 11, we obtain (61). Applying Taylor's formula we can write

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_{q,n} - \theta, \hat{\rho}_{q,n} - \rho \right) = J_{\delta_{f_q}^{-1}}^T \left(\lambda_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}), \lambda_{f_q}(\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) \right) (U_{f_q,n}(X), U_{f_q,n}(\Sigma)) + d_n$$

where d_n converges in distribution to zero, because

$$\|d_n\| \leq C\sqrt{n} \left\| \left(Q_{f_q,n}(X) - \lambda_{f_q}(Z^{\theta, \rho}), Q_{f_q,n}(\Sigma) - \lambda_{f_q}(\Sigma^{\theta, \rho}) \right) \right\|^2 \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by using (61). Thus the 2-d random vector in the left-hand side of (62) is the sum of a term converging in law to 0 and another converging almost surely to 0; thus it converges in law to 0, establishing (62). ■

Example: Here we assume that $f_q = \phi_q$ and $q = 2$, and we can recompute the expression for the function $\delta_{\phi_2} : (0, +\infty)^2 \mapsto (0, +\infty)^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\phi_2}(x, y) &= (\eta_X(x, y), \eta_\Sigma(x, y)) \\ &= H\Gamma(2H) \times \begin{cases} \frac{1}{y^2 - x^2} (y^{2-2H} - x^{2-2H}, x^{-2H} - y^{-2H}) & \text{if } x \neq y \\ ((1-H)x^{-2H}, Hx^{-2H-2}) & \text{if } y = x. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Since for every $(x, y) \in (0, +\infty)^2$ with $x \neq y$ the Jacobian of δ_{ϕ_2} computes as

$$J_{\delta_{\phi_2}}(x, y) = \Gamma(2H + 1) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(1-H)x^{1-2H}(x^2 - y^2) - x(x^{2-2H} - y^{2-2H})}{\frac{Hx^{-2H-1}(x^2 - y^2) + x(x^{-2H} - y^{-2H})}{(x^2 - y^2)^2}} & \frac{(1-H)y^{1-2H}(y^2 - x^2) - y(y^{2-2H} - x^{2-2H})}{\frac{Hy^{-2H-1}(y^2 - x^2) + y(y^{-2H} - x^{-2H})}{(x^2 - y^2)^2}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which is non-zero on in $(0, +\infty)^2$. So δ_{ϕ_2} is a diffeomorphism in $(0, +\infty)^2$ and its inverse $\delta_{\phi_2}^{-1}$ has a Jacobian

$$J_{\delta_{\phi_2}^{-1}}(a, b) = \frac{\Gamma(2H + 1)}{\det J_{F_2}(x, y)} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{Hy^{-2H-1}(y^2 - x^2) + y(y^{-2H} - x^{-2H})}{\frac{Hx^{-2H-1}(x^2 - y^2) + x(x^{-2H} - y^{-2H})}{(x^2 - y^2)^2}} & -\frac{(1-H)y^{1-2H}(y^2 - x^2) - y(y^{2-2H} - x^{2-2H})}{\frac{(x^2 - y^2)^2}{(1-H)x^{1-2H}(x^2 - y^2) - x(x^{2-2H} - y^{2-2H})}} \end{pmatrix};$$

where $(x, y) = \delta_{\phi_2}^{-1}(a, b)$. Thus the asymptotic covariance matrix in (62) is explicit. Moreover, similarly to the results obtained in Section 6, we can prove the following, all details being omitted.

Proposition 32 *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbf{R}^2$. Under the assumptions and notation of Theorem 31,*

- *if $H \in (0, \frac{5}{8})$,*

$$d_W \left(\alpha U_{\phi_2, n}(X) + \beta U_{\phi_2, n}(\Sigma); \mathcal{N} \left(0, (\alpha, \beta) \Gamma_{\phi_2}(\theta, \rho) (\alpha, \beta)^{Tr} \right) \right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

- *if $H \in (\frac{5}{8}, \frac{3}{4})$,*

$$d_W \left(\alpha U_{\phi_2, n}(X) + \beta U_{\phi_2, n}(\Sigma); \mathcal{N} \left(0, (\alpha, \beta) \Gamma_{\phi_2}(\theta, \rho) (\alpha, \beta)^{Tr} \right) \right) \leq \frac{C}{n^{4H-3}}.$$

7.2 Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind

The last example we consider is the so-called fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind, defined via the stochastic differential equation

$$S_0 = 0, \text{ and } dS_t = -\alpha S_t dt + dY_t^{(1)}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (63)$$

where $Y_t^{(1)} = \int_0^t e^{-s} dB_{a_s}$ with $a_s = He^{\frac{s}{H}}$ and $B = \{B_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, and where $\alpha > 0$ is the unknown real parameter which we would like to estimate. The equation (63) admits an explicit solution

$$S_t = e^{-\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{\alpha s} dY_s^{(1)} = e^{-\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{(\alpha-1)s} dB_{a_s} = H^{(1-\alpha)H} e^{-\alpha t} \int_{a_0}^{a_t} r^{(\alpha-1)H} dB_r.$$

Hence we can also write

$$S_t = S_t^\alpha - e^{-\alpha t} S_0^\alpha$$

where

$$S_t^\alpha = e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{(\alpha-1)s} dB_{a_s} = H^{(1-\alpha)H} e^{-\alpha t} \int_0^{a_t} r^{(\alpha-1)H} d\tilde{B}_r,$$

where the second equality holds by bijective change of variable, where \tilde{B} has the same law as B . Using a similar argument to that in Lemma 22 we have for every $p \geq 1$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|Q_{f_q, n}(S) - Q_{f_q, n}(S^\alpha)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}). \quad (64)$$

As consequence, by using S^α ergodic and (64) we conclude that, almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$Q_{f_q, n}(S) \longrightarrow \lambda_{f_q}(S^\alpha).$$

Moreover, by the Gaussian property of U^α and (74) we can write

$$\lambda_{f_q}(S^\alpha) := \nu_{f_q}(\alpha)$$

where ν_{f_q} is a function. Hence, in the case when the function ν_{f_q} is a homeomorphism, we obtain the following strongly consistent estimator for α

$$\hat{\alpha}_{f_q, n} := \nu_{f_q}^{-1} [Q_{f_q, n}(S)]. \quad (65)$$

Proposition 33 Assume $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and ν_{f_q} is a homeomorphism. Let $\hat{\alpha}_{f_q, n}$ be the estimator given in (65). Then, almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\hat{\alpha}_{f_q, n} \rightarrow \alpha.$$

Examples. In the two following examples, the function ν_{f_q} is homeomorphic and explicit.

- Suppose that $f_q = H_q$. Using (22) and (74), we have

$$\nu_{H_q}(\alpha) = \lambda_{H_q}(S^\alpha) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})!2^{q/2}} \left(\frac{(2H-1)H^{2H}}{\alpha} \beta(1-H+\alpha H, 2H-1) - 1 \right)^{q/2}.$$

- Suppose that $f_q = \phi_q$ with $\phi_q(x) = x^q$. From (23) and (74) we obtain $\nu_{\phi_q}(\alpha) = \lambda_{\phi_q}(S^\alpha) = \frac{q!}{(\frac{q}{2})!2^{q/2}} \left[\frac{(2H-1)H^{2H}}{\alpha} \beta(1-H+\alpha H, 2H-1) \right]^{q/2}$.
- The reader will check that in both cases above, the function $\alpha \mapsto \nu(\alpha)$ is monotone (decreasing) and convex from \mathbf{R}_+ to \mathbf{R}_+ , and that the moment condition of Theorem 17 on $(\nu^{-1})''$ is satisfied.

Now, we study the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\alpha}_{f_q, n}$. By (75) which is established in Lemma 40 in the Appendix, we have for every $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r_{S^\alpha}(j)|^2 < \infty$ and $\kappa_4(U_{f_q, n}(S^\alpha)) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$. Thus, applying (25) we deduce the following result.

Proposition 34 Suppose that $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\alpha > 0$. Then

$$d_W \left(u_{f_q}(S^\alpha)^{-1/2} U_{f_q, n}(S), N \right) \leq C n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$$

In particular,

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\alpha}_{f_q, n} - \alpha) \xrightarrow{\text{law}} \mathcal{N} \left(0, u_{f_q}(S^\alpha) \left(\left(\nu_{f_q}^{-1} \right)'(\alpha) \right)^{-2} \right).$$

Quadratic case. In this case we can improve the rate convergence of $\hat{\alpha}_{f_2, n}$. By using Theorem 15, the estimates $\kappa_4(U_{f_2, n}(S^\alpha)) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$ and $|E((F_{f_2, n}(S^\alpha))^3)| = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$, and invoking the properties of u_{f_2} described in the examples (bullet points) above to invoke Theorem 17, we get the following.

Proposition 35 Let $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then

$$d_W \left(u_{f_2}(S^\alpha)^{-1/2} U_{f_2, n}(S), N \right) \asymp \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

and

$$d_W \left(\sqrt{n} (\hat{\alpha}_{f_2, n} - \alpha), \mathcal{N}(0, u_{f_2}(S^\alpha) \left(\left(\nu_{f_2}^{-1} \right)'(\alpha) \right)^{-2}) \right) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

8 Appendix

The following result is a well-known direct consequence of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma (see e.g. [18]).

Lemma 36 *Let $\gamma > 0$ and $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover let $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of random variables. If for every $p \geq p_0$ there exists a constant $c_p > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|Z_n\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq c_p \cdot n^{-\gamma},$$

then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a random variable η_ε such that

$$|Z_n| \leq \eta_\varepsilon \cdot n^{-\gamma+\varepsilon} \quad \text{almost surely}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}|\eta_\varepsilon|^p < \infty$ for all $p \geq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 4. Since $\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, by [22, Proposition 2.4] we have

$$d_{TV} \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, N \right) \leq 2E \left| 1 - \left\langle D \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, -DL^{-1} \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|.$$

On the other hand, exploiting the fact that

$$E \left[E \left[(I_{2k}(g_{2k,n}))^2 \right] - \langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), -DL^{-1} I_{2k}(g_{2k,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] = 0$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left| 1 - \left\langle D \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, -DL^{-1} \frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{q/2} \sqrt{\text{Var}((2k)^{-1} \|DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)} + \sum_{1 \leq k \neq l \leq q/2} (2l)^{-1} E |\langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), DI_{2l}(g_{2l,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by [23, Lemma 3.1] we have

$$\text{Var}((2k)^{-1} \|DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) = (2k)^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} j^2 j!^2 \binom{2k}{j}^4 (4k-2j)! \|g_{2k,n} \tilde{\otimes}_j g_{2k,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 4k-2j}}^2,$$

and for $k < l$

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[((2l)^{-1} \langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), DI_{2l}(f_{2l,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})^2 \right] \leq (2k)! \binom{2l-1}{2k-1}^2 (2l-2k)! E \left[(I_{2k}(g_{2k,n}))^2 \right] \|g_{2k,n} \otimes_{2l-2k} g_{2k,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 4k}} \\ & + 2k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} (l-1)!^2 \binom{2k-1}{j-1}^2 \binom{2l-1}{j-1}^2 (2k+2l-2j)! \left(\|g_{2k,n} \otimes_{2k-j} g_{2k,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2j}}^2 + \|g_{2k,n} \otimes_{2l-j} g_{2k,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2j}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this together with

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[(I_{2k}(g_{2k,n}))^2 \right] &= \frac{(2k)!d_{f_q,2k}^2}{n} \sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{r_Z(i-j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k} \\
&\leq \frac{(2k)!d_{f_q,2k}^2}{n} \sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{r_Z(i-j)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^2 = \frac{(2k)!d_{f_q,2k}^2}{2r_Z^2(0)} E(U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)).
\end{aligned}$$

and the fact that for every $1 \leq s \leq 2k-1$ with $k \in \{1, \dots, q/2\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|g_{2k,n} \otimes_s g_{2k,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 4k-2s}}^2 \\
&\leq d_{f_q,2k}^4(Z) n^{-2} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4=1}^n \left(\frac{r_Z(k_1-k_2)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^s \left(\frac{r_Z(k_3-k_4)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^s \left(\frac{r_Z(k_1-k_3)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k-s} \left(\frac{r_Z(k_2-k_4)}{r_Z(0)} \right)^{2k-s} \\
&\leq d_{f_q,2k}^4(Z) n^{-2} r_Z(0)^{-4} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4=1}^n r_Z(k_1-k_2) r_Z(k_3-k_4) r_Z(k_1-k_3) r_Z(k_2-k_4) \\
&= d_{f_q,2k}^4(Z) \kappa_4(U_{2,n}(Z))
\end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{q/2} \sqrt{\text{Var} \left((2k)^{-1} \|DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)} \leq C_{1,q}(Z) \sqrt{\kappa_4(U_{2,n}(Y))}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{1 \leq k \neq l \leq q/2} (2l)^{-1} E |\langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), DI_{2l}(f_{2l,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}| \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq q/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{l}\right) (2l)^{-1} E |\langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), DI_{2l}(f_{2l,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}| \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq q/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{l}\right) \left(E \left[((2l)^{-1} \langle DI_{2k}(g_{2k,n}), DI_{2l}(f_{2l,n}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq C_{2,q}(Z) \sqrt{E \left[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z) \right] \sqrt{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z)) + \kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{1,q}(Z) = \sum_{k=1}^{q/2} d_{f_q,2k}^2(Z) (2k)^{-1} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} j^2 j!^2 \binom{2k}{j}^4 (4k-2j)!}, \quad (66)$$

and

$$C_{2,q}(Z) = \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq q/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{l}\right) \left(\max \left(((2k)!)^2 \binom{2l-1}{2k-1}^2 (2l-2k)! \frac{d_{f_q,2k}^4}{2r_Z^2(0)}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. 2k^2(d_{f_q,2k}^4 + d_{f_q,2l}^4) \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} (l-1)!^2 \binom{2k-1}{j-1}^2 \binom{2l-1}{j-1}^2 (2k+2l-2j)! \right) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (67)$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV} \left(\frac{U_{f_q,n}(Z)}{\sqrt{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]}}, N \right) &\leq \frac{C_q(Z)}{E[U_{f_q,n}^2(Z)]} \sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)] \sqrt{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z)) + \kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}} \\ &\leq \frac{C_q(Z)}{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)]} \sqrt{E[U_{f_2,n}^2(Z)] \sqrt{\kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z)) + \kappa_4(U_{f_2,n}(Z))}} \\ &= C_q(Z) \sqrt{\sqrt{\kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z)) + \kappa_4(F_{f_2,n}(Z))}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_q(Z) = 2 \max(C_{1,q}(Z), C_{2,q}(Z)). \quad (68)$$

Thus the first estimate of the theorem is obtained. The upper bound of the second estimate is proved in [4, Proposition 6.4]. ■

Proof of Lemma 9. By definition of the Wasserstein distance,

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(Y + Z, N) &= \sup_h |E[h(Y + Z) - h(Z)] + E[h(Z)] - E[h(N)]| \\ &\leq \sup_h |E[h(Y + Z) - h(Z)]| + \sup_h |E[h(Z)] - E[h(N)]| \\ &\leq E[|Y|] + d_W(Z, N) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that h is 1-Lipshitz. ■

Proof of Lemma 14. An inspection of the proof of the main lower bound result in [22] shows that their lower bound on $d_{TV}(F_n, N)$ is in fact a lower bound on

$$\frac{1}{2} \max \{ |E(\cos F_n) - E(\cos N)|; |E(\sin F_n) - E(\sin N)| \}.$$

Since \sin and \cos are 1-Lipshitz functions, by definition of d_W , this expression is also a lower bound on $\frac{1}{2}d_W(F_n, N)$. This proves the lemma. ■

Lemma 37 Let $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $m, m' > 0$ and $-\infty \leq a < b \leq c < d < \infty$. Then

$$E \left(\int_a^b e^{ms} dB^H(s) \int_c^d e^{m't} dB^H(t) \right) = H(2H-1) \int_a^b ds e^{ms} \int_c^d dt e^{m't} (t-s)^{2H-2}$$

Proof. We use the same argument as in the proof of [8, Lemma 2.1]. ■

Lemma 38 Let $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $m, m' > 0$ and let Z^θ be the process defined in (42). Then,

$$r_{Z^\theta}(0) = H\Gamma(2H)\theta^{-2H}$$

and for large $|t|$

$$r_{Z^\theta}(t) \sim \frac{H(2H-1)}{\theta^2}|t|^{2H-2}.$$

Proof. see [8, Theorem 2.3] or Lemma 39. ■

Lemma 39 Let $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $m, m' > 0$ and let Z^m be the process defined in (55). Then,

$$E \left[Z_0^m Z_0^{m'} \right] = \frac{H\Gamma(2H)}{m+m'} \left(m^{1-2H} + (m')^{1-2H} \right) \quad (69)$$

and for large $|t|$

$$E \left[Z_0^m Z_t^{m'} \right] \sim \frac{H(2H-1)}{mm'} |t|^{2H-2}. \quad (70)$$

This implies that for $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$

$$\eta_X(\theta, \rho) := E \left[\left(Z_0^{\theta, \rho} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{H\Gamma(2H)}{\rho^2 - \theta^2} [\rho^{2-2H} - \theta^{2-2H}], \quad (71)$$

$$\eta_\Sigma(\theta, \rho) := E \left[\left(\Sigma_0^{\theta, \rho} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{H\Gamma(2H)}{\rho^2 - \theta^2} [\theta^{-2H} - \rho^{-2H}], \quad (72)$$

and for every $t > 0$

$$E \left[\left(Z_t^{\theta, \rho} \Sigma_t^{\theta, \rho} \right) \right] = E \left[\left(Z_0^{\theta, \rho} \Sigma_0^{\theta, \rho} \right) \right] = 0. \quad (73)$$

Proof. By using [8, Proposition A.1], we can write

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[Z_0^m Z_0^{m'} \right] &= mm' \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{mu} e^{m'v} E \left(B_u^H B_v^H \right) dudv \\ &= \frac{mm'}{2} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{mu} e^{m'v} (u^{2H} + v^{2H} - |v-u|^{2H}) dudv \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(2H+1)}{2(m+m')} \left(m^{1-2H} + (m')^{1-2H} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the estimate (69) is proved. Now, let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(Z_0^m Z_t^{m'} \right) &= e^{-m't} E \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{mu} dB_u^H \int_{-\infty}^t e^{m'v} dB_v^H \right) \\ &= e^{-m't} E \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{mu} dB_u^H \int_{-\infty}^{\varepsilon t} e^{m'v} dB_v^H \right) + e^{-m't} E \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{mu} dB_u^H \int_{\varepsilon t}^t e^{m'v} dB_v^H \right) \\ &:= A + B \end{aligned}$$

where, using [8, Proposition A.1] it is easy to see that $|A| = O(e^{-m't})$. On the other hand, by Lemma 37 and integration by parts and linear changes of variables

$$\begin{aligned}
B &= H(2H-1)e^{-m't} \int_{-\infty}^0 du e^{mu} \int_{\varepsilon t}^t dv e^{m'v} (v-u)^{2H-2} \\
&= \frac{H(2H-1)}{m+m'} \left(\int_t^\infty e^{-m(z-t)} z^{2H-2} dz + \int_{\varepsilon t}^t e^{-m'(t-z)} z^{2H-2} dz + e^{-m't(1-\varepsilon)} \int_{\varepsilon t}^\infty e^{-m(z-\varepsilon t)} z^{2H-2} dz \right) \\
&= \frac{H(2H-1)}{(m+m')} \left(\frac{t^{2H-2}}{m} + \frac{2H-2}{m} \int_t^\infty e^{-m(z-t)} z^{2H-3} dz + \frac{t^{2H-2}}{m'} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{(\varepsilon t)^{2H-2}}{m'} e^{-m'(1-\varepsilon)t} - \frac{2H-2}{m'} \int_{\varepsilon t}^t e^{-m'(t-z)} z^{2H-3} dz + e^{-m't(1-\varepsilon)} \int_{\varepsilon t}^\infty e^{-m(z-\varepsilon t)} z^{2H-2} dz \right) \\
&= \frac{H(2H-1)}{mm'} t^{2H-2} + o(t^{2H-2}),
\end{aligned}$$

the last inequality coming from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_t^\infty e^{-m(z-t)} z^{2H-3} dz &\leq t^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-my} dy \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \\
t^{2-2H} \int_{\varepsilon t}^t e^{-m'(t-z)} z^{2H-3} dz &\leq \varepsilon^{2H-3} t^{-1} \int_{\varepsilon t}^t e^{-m'(t-z)} dz \\
&= \varepsilon^{2H-3} t^{-1} \int_0^{(1-\varepsilon)t} e^{-m'y} dy \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$t^{2-2H} e^{-m't(1-\varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

So, we conclude that the estimate (70) is obtained. ■

Lemma 40 *Let $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then,*

$$E \left[(S_0^\alpha)^2 \right] = \frac{(2H-1)H^{2H}}{\alpha} \beta(1-H+\alpha H, 2H-1). \quad (74)$$

and for large $|t|$

$$r_{S^\alpha}(t) = E[S_0^\alpha S_t^\alpha] = O\left(e^{-\min\{\alpha, \frac{1-H}{H}\}t}\right). \quad (75)$$

Proof. We prove the first point (74). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[(S_0^\alpha)^2 \right] &= H(2H-1)H^{2(1-\alpha)H} \int_0^{a_0} dy y^{(\alpha-1)H} \int_0^{a_0} dx x^{(\alpha-1)H} |x-y|^{2H-2} \\
&= 2H(2H-1)H^{2(1-\alpha)H} \int_0^{a_0} dy y^{(\alpha-1)H} \int_0^y dx x^{(\alpha-1)H} (y-x)^{2H-2} \\
&= 2H(2H-1)H^{2(1-\alpha)H} \int_0^{a_0} dy y^{2\alpha H-1} \int_0^1 dz z^{(\alpha-1)H} (1-z)^{2H-2} \\
&= \frac{(2H-1)H^{2H}}{\alpha} \beta(1-H+\alpha H, 2H-1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (74) is obtained. For the point (75) see [16]. ■

References

- [1] Azmoodeh, E. and Morlanes, G. I. (2013). Drift parameter estimation for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind. *Statistics*. DOI: 10.1080/02331888.2013.863888.
- [2] Azmoodeh, E. and Viitasaari, L. (2015). Parameter estimation based on discrete observations of fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind. *Statist. Infer. Stoch. Proc.* **18**, no. 3, 205-227.
- [3] Belfadli, R., Es-Sebaiy, K. and Ouknine, Y. (2011). Parameter Estimation for Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Processes: Non-Ergodic Case. *Frontiers in Science and Engineering (An International Journal Edited by Hassan II Academy of Science and Technology)*. **1**, no. 1, 1-16.
- [4] Biermé, H., Bonami, A., Nourdin, I. and Peccati, G. (2012). Optimal Berry-Esséen rates on the Wiener space: the barrier of third and fourth cumulants. *ALEA* **9**, no. 2, 473-500.
- [5] Breton, J.C. and Nourdin, I. (2008). Error bounds on the non-normal approximation of Hermite power variations of fractional Brownian motion. *Electron. Comm. Probab.* **13**, 482-493.
- [6] Brouste, A. and Iacus, S. M. (2012). Parameter estimation for the discretely observed fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and the Yuima R package. *Comput. Stat.* **28**, no. 4, 1529-1547.
- [7] Cénac, P. and Es-Sebaiy, K. (2015). Almost sure central limit theorems for random ratios and applications to LSE for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **35**, no. 2, 285-300.
- [8] Cheridito, P., Kawaguchi, H. and Maejima, M. (2003). Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, *Electr. J. Probab.* **8**, 1-14.
- [9] Davydov, Y.A. and Martynova, G. V. (1987). Limit behavior of multiple stochastic integral. *Statistics and control of random process*. Preila, Nauka, Moscow, 55-57 (in Russian).
- [10] Dobrushin, R. L. and Major, P. (1979). Non-central limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of Gaussian fields. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, **50**, 27-52.
- [11] El Machkouri, M., Es-Sebaiy, K. and Ouknine, Y. (2015). Least squares estimator for non-ergodic OrnsteinUhlenbeck processes driven by Gaussian processes. *Journal of the Korean Statistical Society*, DOI: 10.1016/j.jkss.2015.12.001 (In press).
- [12] El Onsy, B., Es-Sebaiy, K. and Tudor, C. (2014). Statistical analysis of the non-ergodic fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the second kind. *Preprint*.
- [13] El Onsy, B., Es-Sebaiy, K. and Viens, F. (2014). Parameter Estimation for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck driven by fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. Preprint, in revision for *Stochastics*.

- [14] Hu, Y. and Nualart, D. (2010). Parameter estimation for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **80**, 1030-1038.
- [15] Hu, Y. and Song, J. (2013). Parameter estimation for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes with discrete observations. *F. Viens et al (eds), Malliavin Calculus and Stochastic Analysis: A Festschrift in Honor of David Nualart*, 427-442, Springer.
- [16] Kaarakka, T. and Salminen, P. (2011). On fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Processes. *Communications on stochastic analysis* **5**, No. 1, 121-133.
- [17] Kleptsyna, M. and Le Breton, A. (2002). Statistical analysis of the fractional Ornstein- Uhlenbeck type process. *Statist. Infer. Stoch. Proc.* **5**, 229-241.
- [18] Kloeden, P. and Neuenkirch, A. (2007). The pathwise convergence of approximation schemes for stochastic differential equations. *LMS J. Comp. Math.* **10**, 235-253.
- [19] Luschgy, H. and Pagès, G. (2002). Functional quantization of Gaussian processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **196** (2), 486-531.
- [20] Neufcourt, L. and Viens, F. (2014). A third-moment theorem and precise asymptotics for variations of stationary Gaussian sequences. In press in *ALEA*; preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.00365>
- [21] Neuenkirch, A. and Tindel, S. (2014). A least square-type procedure for parameter estimation in stochastic differential equations with additive fractional noise. *Statist. Infer. Stoch. Proc.* **17**, no. 1, 99-120.
- [22] Nourdin, I. and Peccati, G. (2015). The optimal fourth moment theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143**, 3123-3133.
- [23] Nourdin, I., Peccati, G. and Podolskij, M. (2013). Quantitative Breuer-Major Theorems. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **121**, no. 4, 793-812.
- [24] Nourdin, I. and Peccati, G. (2012). Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus : from Stein's method to universality. *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 192. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*.
- [25] Nualart, D. (2006). The Malliavin calculus and related topics. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*.
- [26] Nualart, D. and Peccati, G. (2005). Central limit theorems for sequences of multiple stochastic integrals. *Ann. Probab.* **33**, no. 1, 177-193.
- [27] Tudor, C. and Viens, F. (2007). Statistical aspects of the fractional stochastic calculus. *Ann. Statist.* **35**, no. 3, 1183-1212.