arXiv:1711.09514v5 [stat.ML] 12 Nov 2019

Asymptotic Analysis via Stochastic Differential Equations of Gradient Descent Algorithms in Statistical and Computational Paradigms

Yazhen Wang
Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI 53706, USA. Email: yzwang@stat.wisc.edu

Abstract

This paper investigates asymptotic behaviors of gradient descent algorithms (particularly accelerated gradient descent and stochastic gradient descent) in the context of stochastic optimization arising in statistics and machine learning where objective functions are estimated from available data. We show that these algorithms can be computationally modeled by continuous-time ordinary or stochastic differential equations. We establish gradient flow central limit theorems to describe the limiting dynamic behaviors of these computational algorithms and the large-sample performances of the related statistical procedures, as the number of algorithm iterations and data size both go to infinity, where the gradient flow central limit theorems are governed by some linear ordinary or stochastic differential equations like time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. We illustrate that our study can provide a novel unified framework for a joint computational and statistical asymptotic analysis, where the computational asymptotic analysis studies dynamic behaviors of these algorithms with the time (or the number of iterations in the algorithms), the statistical asymptotic analysis investigates large sample behaviors of the statistical procedures (like estimators and classifiers) that the algorithms are applied to compute, and in fact the statistical procedures are equal to the limits of the random sequences generated from these iterative algorithms as the number of iterations goes to infinity. The joint analysis results based on the obtained gradient flow central limit theorems can identify four factors – learning rate, batch size, gradient covariance, and Hessian – to derive new theory regarding the local minima found by stochastic gradient descent for solving non-convex optimization problems.

Key words: Gradient flow central limit theorem; joint computational and statistical asymptotic analysis, weak convergence limit, mini-batch, optimization, ordinary or stochastic differential equation,

Running title: Computational & Statistical Analysis of Gradient Descent

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Motivation

Optimization plays an important role in scientific fields ranging from machine learning to physical sciences and statistics to engineering. It lies at the core of data science by providing a mathematical language for handling both computational algorithms and statistical inferences in data analysis. Numerous algorithms and methods have been proposed to solve optimization problems. Examples include Newton's method, gradient and subgradient descent, conjugate gradient methods, trust region methods, and interior point methods (see Polyak, 1987; Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004; Nocedal and Wright, 2006; Ruszczynski, 2006; Boyd et al., 2011; Shor, 2012; Goodfellow et al. (2016) for expositions). Practical problems arising in fields like statistics and machine learning usually involve optimization settings where the objective functions are empirically estimated from available data with the form of a sum of differentiable functions. We refer to such optimization problems with random objective functions as stochastic optimization. As data sets in practical problems grow rapidly in scale and complexity, methods such as stochastic gradient descent can scale to the enormous size of big data and have been very popular. There has been recent surging interest in and great research work on the theory and practice of gradient descent and its extensions and variants. For example, a number of recent papers were devoted to investigate stochastic gradient descent and its variants for solving complex optimization problems (Ali et al. (2019), Chen et al. (2016), Ge et al. (2015), Jin et al. (2017), Kawaguchi (2016), Keskar et al. (2017), Lee et al. (2016), Li et al. (2017b), Mandt et al. (2016), and Shallue et al. (2019)). In particular Su et al. (2016) derived the continuous-time limit of Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent as a second-order ordinary differential equation for studying the acceleration phenomenon and generalizing Nesterov's scheme. Wibisono et al. (2016) further developed a systematic approach based on continuous-time variations to understand the acceleration phenomenon and produce acceleration algorithms from continuous-time differential equations. In spite of compelling theoretical and numerical evidence on the value of the stochastic approximation idea and acceleration phenomenon, yet there remains some conceptual and theoretical mystery in the acceleration and stochastic approximation schemes.

1.2 Contributions

This paper establishes asymptotic theory for gradient descent, stochastic gradient descent, and accelerated gradient descent in the stochastic optimization setup. We derive continuous-time ordinary or stochastic differential equations to model the dynamic behaviors of these gradient descent algorithms and investigate their limiting algorithmic dynamics and large sample performances as the number of algorithm iterations and data size both go to infinity. Specifically for an optimization problem whose objective function is convex and deterministic, we consider a matched stochastic optimization problem whose random objective function is an empirical estimator of the deterministic objective

function based on available data. The solution of the stochastic optimization specifies a decision rule like an estimator or a classifier based on the sampled data in statistics and machine learning, while its corresponding deterministic optimization problem characterizes through its solution the true value of the parameter in the population model. In other words, the two connected optimization problems associate with the data sample and its corresponding population model where the data are sampled from, and the stochastic optimization is considered to be a sample version of the deterministic optimization corresponding to the population. These two types of optimization problems refer to the deterministic population and stochastic sample optimization problems. Consider random sequences that are generated from the gradient descent algorithms and their corresponding continuous-time ordinary or stochastic differential equations for the stochastic sample optimization setting. We show that the random sequences converge to the ordinary differential equations for the corresponding deterministic population optimization setup, and we derive their asymptotic distributions by some linear ordinary or stochastic differential equations such as time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. The asymptotic distributions are used to understand and quantify the limiting discrepancy between the random sequences generated from each algorithm for solving the corresponding sample and population optimization problems. In particular since the obtained asymptotic distributions characterize the limiting behavior of the normalized difference between the sample and population gradient (or Lagrangian) flows, the limiting distributions may be viewed as central limit theorems (CLT) for gradient (or Lagrangian) flows, and are then called the gradient (or Lagrangian) flow central limit theorems (GF-CLT or LF-CLT). Moreover, our analysis may offer a novel unified framework to carry out a joint asymptotic analysis for computational algorithms and statistical decision rules that the algorithms are applied to compute. As iterated computational methods, these gradient descent algorithms generate sequences that converge to the exact decision rule or the true parameter value for the corresponding optimization problems, when the number of the iterations goes to infinity. Thus, as time (corresponding to the number of iterations) goes to infinity, the continuous-time differential equations may have distributional limits corresponding to the large-sample distributions of statistical decision rules as the sample size goes to infinity. In other words, the asymptotic analysis can be done with both time and data size, where the time direction corresponds to the computational asymptotics on dynamic behaviors of the algorithms, and the data size direction associates with the statistical large-sample asymptotics on the statistical behaviors of decision rules such as estimators and classifiers. The continuous-time modeling and the GF-CLT based joint asymptotic analysis may reveal new facts and shed some light on the phenomenon that stochastic gradient descent algorithms can escape from saddle points and converge to good local minimizers for solving non-convex optimization problems in deep learning. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to establish the GF-CLT and LF-CLT, offer the unified framework for the joint computational and statistical asymptotic analysis, and establish a novel theory to identify four factors for influencing the local minima found by stochastic gradient descent in non-convex optimization.

There is a large literature on stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms in particular stochastic gradient descent in deep learning (see Chen et al. (2016), Dalalyan (2017), Fan et al. (2018), Ge et al. (2015), Jastrzębski et al. (2018), Jin et al. (2017), Kawaguchi (2016), Keskar et al. (2017), Kushner and Yin (2003), Lee et al. (2016), Li et al. (2016), Li et al. (2017a), Li et al. (2017b), Ma et al. (2019), Mandt et al. (2016), Shallue et al. (2019), Sirignano and Spiliopoulos (2017), Su et al. (2016), Wibisono et al. (2016)). Both continuous-time and discrete-time means are adopted by computational and statistical (as well as machine learning) communities. The work on the computational side focuses more on the dynamics and convergence of learning algorithms, while the statistics research emphasizes more on statistical inferences of learning rules. Our study combines both computational and statistical approaches to carry out a joint analysis on the learning algorithms and the learning rules, where the algorithms are used to compute the rules. In a nutshell, we analyze the learning algorithms in terms of both computational dynamic convergence behavior and statistical large sample performance. The developed GF-CLT based theory and the created joint analysis provide a description of dynamic convergence behaviors of the computational algorithms as well as the statistical large sample performances of the learning rules computed by the algorithms. The statistical behaviors of the associated learning rules can be derived from the GF-CLT at an infinite time horizon. On the computational side, it has implications for optimization phenomena observed in the discrete-time case as well as in practice. For example, the obtained GF-CLT uncovers that the gradient flow for the stochastic sample optimization can be decomposed into the gradient flow for the corresponding deterministic population optimization plus a random fluctuation term, where the random fluctuation depends on the learning rate and batch size only through their ratio and is governed by a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Using the joint analysis along with the algebraic Ricatti equation for characterizing the stationary covariance of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, we discover a novel theory about how the minima found by stochastic gradient descent are influenced by four factors: learning rate, batch size, gradient covariance, and Hessian. As a case in point, our general results cover the study under a special circumstance in Jastrzębski et al. (2018) that can identify only three of the four factors to influence the local minima found by stochastic gradient descent. Foster et al. (2019) showed that the complexity of a stochastic optimization can be decomposed into the complexity of its corresponding deterministic population optimization and the sample complexity, where the optimization complexity represents the minimal amount of effort required to find near-stationary points, and the sample complexity of an algorithm refers to the number of training-samples needed to learn a target function sufficient well. Our results indicate that finding near-stationary points for a stochastic sample optimization can be converted into finding near-stationary points for the corresponding deterministic population optimization plus some control on the random fluctuation term. As the random fluctuation has zero mean, the control can be achieved through bounding the variance of the time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process along with selecting a sufficiently small ratio of learning rate to batch size, which is often used to describe the sample complexity of the associated statistical learning problem

for the time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. This shows that our results are in agreement with Foster et al. (2019), and may point to some potential intrinsic connection between our approach and that in Foster et al. (2019). Furthermore, the continuous-time approach serves as a handy means as well as a beautiful framework to formulate stochastic dynamics and statistical procedures and derive their limiting behaviors and large sample performances. These are eventually used to establish limiting behaviors of their discrete counterparts.
In summary, we highlight our main contributions as follows:

- We establish a new asymptotic theory for the discrepancy between the sample and population gradient (or Lagrangian) flows. In particular the new limiting distributions for the normalized discrepancy are called the gradient (or Lagrangian) flow central limit theorems (GF-CLT or LF-CLT). See Sections 3.3 and 4.1-4.2.

- The obtained asymptotic theory provides a novel unified framework for a joint computational and statistical asymptotic analysis. Statistically the joint analysis can facilitate inferential analysis of a learning rule computed by gradient descent algorithms. Computationally the joint analysis enables us to understand and quantify a random fluctuation in and the related impact on the dynamic and convergence behavior of a gradient descent algorithm when being applied to solve a stochastic optimization problem. See Sections 3.4 and 4.3.

- Computationally we discover a novel theory that four factors – learning rate, batch size, gradient covariance, and Hessian – along with the associated identities are shown to influence the local minima found by stochastic gradient descent for solving a nonconvex optimization problem. It may also shed light on some intrinsic relationship among stochastic optimization, deterministic optimization, and statistical learning. See Section 4.4.

- Statistically we illustrate implications of our results for statistical analysis of stochastic gradient descent and inference of outputs from stochastic gradient descent. See Section 4.5.

- The continuous-time approach is employed to demonstrate that it can provide a handy means for deriving beautiful and deep results for stochastic dynamics of learning algorithms and statistical inference of learning rules.

1.3 Organization

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 introduces gradient descent, accelerated gradient descent, and their corresponding ordinary differential equations. Section 3 presents stochastic optimization and investigates asymptotic behaviors of the plain and accelerated gradient descent algorithms and their associated ordinary differential equations

(with random coefficients) when the sample size goes to infinity. We illustrate the unified framework to carry out a joint analysis on computational and statistical asymptotics, where computational asymptotics deals with dynamic behaviors of the gradient descent algorithms with time (or iteration), and statistical asymptotics studies large sample behaviors of statistical decision rules that the algorithms are applied to compute. Section 4 considers stochastic gradient descent algorithms for large scale data and derives stochastic differential equations to model these algorithms. We establish asymptotic theory for these algorithms and their associated stochastic differential equations, and describe a joint analysis on computational and statistical asymptotics. Section 5 features an example. All technical proofs are relegated in the appendix section.

We adopt the following notations and conventions. For the stochastic sample optimization problem considered in Sections 3 and 4, we add a superscript n to notations for the associated processes and sequences in Section 3 and indices m and/or $*$ to notations for the corresponding processes and sequences affiliated with mini-batches in Section 4, while notations without such subscripts or superscripts are for sequences and functions corresponding to the deterministic population optimization problem given in Section 2. Our basic proof ideas are as follows. Each algorithm generates a sequence for computing a learning rule, a step-wise empirical process is formed by the generated sequence, and a continuous process is obtained from the corresponding continuous-time differential equation. We derive asymptotic distributions by analyzing the differential equations, and we bound the differences between the empirical processes and their corresponding continuous processes by studying the optimization problems and utilizing the empirical process theory along with the related differential equations.

2 Ordinary differential equations for gradient descent algorithms

Consider the following minimization problem

$$\min_{\theta\in\Theta} g(\theta), \tag{2.1}$$

where the objective function $g(\theta)$ is defined on a parameter space $\Theta \subset I\!R^p$ and assumed to have L-Lipshitz continuous gradients. Iterative algorithms such as gradient descent methods are often employed to numerically compute the solution of the minimization problem. Starting with some initial values x_0, the plain gradient descent algorithm is iteratively defined by

$$x_k = x_{k-1} - \delta\nabla g(x_{k-1}), \tag{2.2}$$

where ∇ denotes gradient operator, and δ is a positive constant which is often called a step size or learning rate.

It is easy to model $\{x_k,\, k = 0, 1, \cdots\}$ by a smooth curve $X(t)$ with the Ansatz $x_k \approx X(k\delta)$ as follows. Define a step function $x_\delta(t) = x_k$ for $k\delta \le t < (k+1)\delta$, and as $\delta \to 0$, $x_\delta(t)$ approaches $X(t)$ satisfying

$$\dot{X}(t) + \nabla g(X(t)) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\dot{X}(t)$ denotes the derivative of $X(t)$, and initial value $X(0) = x_0$. In fact, $X(t)$ is a gradient flow associated with the objective function $g(\cdot)$ in the optimization problem (2.1). Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent scheme is a well-known algorithm that is much faster than the plain gradient descent algorithm. Starting with initial values x_0 and $y_0 = x_0$, Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm is iteratively defined by

$$x_k = y_{k-1} - \delta \nabla g(y_{k-1}), \qquad y_k = x_k + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x_k - x_{k-1}), \tag{2.4}$$

where δ is a positive constant. Using (2.4) we derive a recursive relationship between consecutive increments

$$\frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{\sqrt{\delta}} = \frac{k-1}{k+2}\frac{x_k - x_{k-1}}{\sqrt{\delta}} - \sqrt{\delta}\nabla g(y_k). \tag{2.5}$$

We model $\{x_k,\, k = 0, 1, \cdots\}$ by a smooth curve in a sense that x_k are its samples at discrete points, that is, we define a step function $x_\delta(t) = x_k$ for $k\sqrt{\delta} \le t < (k+1)\sqrt{\delta}$, and introduce the Ansatz $x_\delta(k\sqrt{\delta}) = x_k \approx X(k\sqrt{\delta})$ for some smooth function $X(t)$ defined for $t \geqslant 0$. Let $\sqrt{\delta}$ be the step size. For $t = k\sqrt{\delta}$, as $\delta \to 0$, we have $x_k = x_{t/\sqrt{\delta}} = X(t)$, $x_{k+1} = x_{(t+\sqrt{\delta})/\sqrt{\delta}} = X(t + \sqrt{\delta})$, and

$$y_k = X(t) + \frac{t/\sqrt{\delta} - 1}{t/\sqrt{\delta} + 2}[X(t) - X(t - \sqrt{\delta})] = X(t) + O(\sqrt{\delta}).$$

Applying the Taylor expansion and using L-Lipshitz continuous gradients we obtain

$$\frac{x_{k+1} - x_k}{\sqrt{\delta}} = \frac{X(t + \sqrt{\delta}) - X(t)}{\sqrt{\delta}} = \dot{X}(t) + \frac{1}{2}\ddot{X}(t)\sqrt{\delta} + o(\sqrt{\delta}),$$

$$\frac{x_k - x_{k-1}}{\sqrt{\delta}} = \frac{X(t) - X(t - \sqrt{\delta})}{\sqrt{\delta}} = \dot{X}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\ddot{X}(t)\sqrt{\delta} + o(\sqrt{\delta}),$$

$$\sqrt{\delta}\nabla g(y_k) = \sqrt{\delta}\nabla g(X(t)) + o(\sqrt{\delta}),$$

where $\ddot{X}(t)$ denotes the second derivative of $X(t)$. Substituting above results into the equation (2.5) and letting $\delta \to 0$ we obtain

$$\ddot{X}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}(t) + \nabla g(X(t)) = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

with the initial conditions $X(0) = x_0$ and $\dot{X}(0) = 0$. As the coefficient $3/t$ in the ordinary differential equation (2.6) is singular at $t = 0$, classical ordinary differential equation

theory is not applicable to establish the existence or uniqueness of the solution to the equation (2.6). The heuristic derivation of (2.6) is from Su et al. (2016) who has established that the equation (2.6) has a unique solution satisfying the initial conditions, and $x_\delta(t)$ converges to $X(t)$ uniformly on $[0, T]$ for any fixed $T > 0$. Note the step size difference between the plain and accelerated cases, where the step size is $\delta^{1/2}$ for Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent algorithm and δ for the plain gradient descent algorithm. Su et al. (2016) has shown that, because of the difference, the accelerated gradient descent algorithm moves much faster than the plain gradient descent algorithm along the curve $X(t)$. Wibisono et al. (2016) provided more elaborate explanation on the acceleration phenomenon and developed a systematic continuous-time variational scheme to generate a large class of continuous-time differential equations and produce a family of accelerated gradient algorithms. The variational scheme utilizes a first-order rescaled gradient flow and a second-order Lagrangian flow, which are generalizations of gradient flow. As we refer the solution $X(t)$ of the differential equation (2.3) to the gradient flow for the gradient descent algorithm (2.2), the solution $X(t)$ to the differential equation (2.6) is called the Lagrangian flow for the accelerated gradient descent algorithm (2.4).

3 Gradient descent for stochastic optimization

Let $\theta = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_p)^{'}$ be the parameter that we are interested in, and U be a relevant random element on a probability space with a given distribution Q. Consider an objective function $\ell(\theta; u)$ and its corresponding expectation $E[\ell(\theta; U)] = g(\theta)$. For example, in a statistical decision problem, we may take U to be a decision rule, $\ell(\theta; u)$ a loss function, and $g(\theta) = E[\ell(\theta; U)]$ its corresponding risk; in M-estimation, we may treat U as a sample observation and $\ell(\theta, u)$ a ρ-function; in nonparametric function estimation and machine learning, we may choose U an observation and $\ell(\theta; u)$ equal to a loss function plus some penalty. For these problems we need to consider the corresponding population minimization problem (2.1) for characterizing the true parameter value or its function as an estimand, but practically, because $g(\theta)$ is usually unavailable, we have to employ its empirical version and consider a stochastic optimization problem, described as follows:

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n), \tag{3.7}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; U_i)$, $\mathbf{U}_n = (U_1, \cdots, U_n)'$ is a sample, and we assume that $U_1, \cdots, U_n$ are i.i.d. and follow the distribution Q.

The minimization problem (2.1) characterizes the true value of the target estimand such as an estimation parameter in a statistical model and a classification parameter in a machine learning task. As the true objective function $g(\theta)$ is usually unknown in practice, we often solve the stochastic minimization problem (3.7) with observed data to obtain practically useful decision rules such as an M-estimator, a smoothing function estimator, and a machine learning classifier. The approach to obtaining practical procedures is based on the heuristic reasoning that as $n \to \infty$, the law of large number implies that $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$

eventually converges to $g(\theta)$ in probability, and thus the solution of (3.7) approaches that of the minimization problem (2.1).

3.1 Plain gradient descent algorithm

Applying the plain gradient descent scheme to the minimization problem (3.7) with initial value x_0^n, we obtain the following iterative algorithm to compute the solution of (3.7),

$$x_k^n = x_{k-1}^n - \delta \nabla \mathcal{L}^n(x_{k-1}^n; \mathbf{U}_n), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a step size or learning rate, and $\mathcal{L}^n$ is the objective function in the minimization problem (3.7).
Following the continuous curve approximation described in Section 2 we define a step function $x_\delta^n(t) = x_k^n$ for $k\delta \le t < (k+1)\delta$, and for each n, as $\delta \to 0$, $x_\delta^n(t)$ approaches a smooth curve $X^n(t)$, $t \ge 0$, given by

$$\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla \mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\nabla \mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \ell(X^n(t); U_i)$, gradient operator ∇ here is applied to $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ and $\ell(\theta; U_i)$ with respect to θ, and initial value $X^n(0) = x_0^n$. $X^n(t)$ is a gradient flow associated with $\mathcal{L}^n$ in the optimization problem (3.7).
As $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $X^n(t)$ are random, and our main interest is to study the distributional behaviors of the solution and algorithm, we may define a solution of the equation (3.9) in a weak sense that there exist a process $X_\dagger^n(t)$ and a random vector $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger = (U_1^\dagger, \cdots, U_n^\dagger)'$ defined on some probability space such that $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ is identically distributed as $\mathbf{U}_n$, $(\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger, X_\dagger^n(t))$ satisfies the equation (3.9), and $X_\dagger^n(t)$ is called a (weak) solution of the equation (3.9). Note that $X_\dagger^n(t)$ is not required to be defined on a fixed probability space with given random variables, instead we define $X_\dagger^n(t)$ on some probability space with some associated random variables $U_i^\dagger$ whose distributions are given by Q. The weak solution definition, which shares the same spirit as that for stochastic differential equations (see Ikeda and Watanabe (1981) and more in Section 4), will be very handy in facilitating our asymptotic analysis in this paper. For simplicity we drop index † and 'weak' when there is no confusion.

3.2 Accelerated gradient descent algorithm

Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent scheme can be used to solve the minimization problem (3.7). Starting with initial values x_0^n and $y_0^n = x_0^n$, we obtain the following iterative algorithm to compute the solution of the stochastic minimization problem (3.7),

$$x_k^n = y_{k-1}^n - \delta \nabla \mathcal{L}^n(y_{k-1}^n; \mathbf{U}_n), \qquad y_k^n = x_k^n + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x_k^n - x_{k-1}^n). \tag{3.10}$$

Using the continuous curve approach described in Section 2 we can define a step function $x_\delta^n(t) = x_k$ for $k\sqrt{\delta} \le t < (k+1)\sqrt{\delta}$, and for every n, as $\delta \to 0$, we approximate $x_\delta^n(t)$ by

a smooth curve $X^n(t)$, $t \geq 0$, governed by

$$\ddot{X}^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

where initial values $X^n(0) = x_0^n$ and $\dot{X}^n(0) = 0$, $\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla\ell(X^n(t); U_i)$, and gradient operator ∇ here is applied to $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ and $\ell(\theta; U_i)$ with respect to θ. $X^n(t)$ is a Lagrangian flow associated with $\mathcal{L}^n$ in the optimization problem (3.7).
Again we define a solution $X^n(t)$ of the equation (3.11) in the weak sense, i.e., that there exist a process $X^n(t)$ and a random vector $\mathbf{U}_n$ on some probability space so that the distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n$ is specified by Q, and $X^n(t)$ is a solution of the equation (3.11).

3.3 Asymptotic theory via ordinary differential equations

To make the equations (3.9) and (3.11) and their solutions to be well defined and study their asymptotics we need to impose the following conditions.

A0. Assume initial values satisfy $x_0^n - x_0 = o_P(n^{-1/2})$.

A1. $\ell(\theta; u)$ is continuously twice differentiable in θ; $\forall\ u \in R^p$, $\exists\ h_1(u)$, such that $\forall\ \theta^1, \theta^2 \in \Theta$, $\|\nabla\ell(\theta^1; u) - \nabla\ell(\theta^2; u)\| \leqslant h_1(u)\|\theta^1 - \theta^2\|$, where $h_1(U)$ and $\nabla\ell(\theta_0; U)$ for some fixed θ_0 have finite fourth moments.

A2. $E[\ell(\theta; U)] = g(\theta)$, $E[\nabla\ell(\theta; U)] = \nabla g(\theta)$, $E[\mathbb{H}\ell(\theta; U)] = \mathbb{H}g(\theta)$, on the parameter space Θ, $g(\cdot)$ is continuously twice differentiable and strongly convex, and $\nabla g(\cdot)$ is L-Lipschitz for some $L > 0$, where ∇ is the gradient operator (the first order partial derivatives), and $\mathbb{H}$ is the Hessian operator (the second order partial derivatives).

A3. Define cross auto-covariance $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}(\theta, \vartheta) = (\varsigma_{ij}(\theta, \vartheta))_{1\leq i,j\leq p}$, $\theta, \vartheta \in \Theta$, where $\mathrm{Cov}[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}\ell(\theta; U), \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta_j}\ell(\vartheta; U)] = \varsigma_{ij}(\theta, \vartheta)$ are assumed to be continuously differentiable, and L-Lipschitz. Let $\sigma_{ij}(\theta) = \mathrm{Cov}[\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}\ell(\theta; U), \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}\ell(\theta; U)] = \varsigma_{ij}(\theta, \theta)$, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta) = \mathrm{Var}[\nabla\ell(\theta; U)] = (\sigma_{ij}(\theta))_{1\leq i,j\leq p} = \boldsymbol{\varsigma}(\theta, \theta)$ be positive definite.

A4. $\sqrt{n}[\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) - \nabla g(\theta)] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^n [\nabla\ell(\theta; U_i) - \nabla g(\theta)]$ weakly converges to $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ uniformly over $\theta \in \Theta_X$, where $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ is a Gaussian process with mean zero and auto-covariance $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}(\theta, \vartheta)$ defined in A3, Θ_X is a bounded subset of Θ, and the interior of Θ_X contains the solutions $X(t)$ of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (2.6) connecting the initial value x_0 and the minimizer of $g(\theta)$.

Conditions A1-A2 are often used to make optimization problems and differential equations to be well defined, and match the stochastic sample optimization problem (3.7) to the deterministic population optimization problem (2.1). Conditions A3-A4 guarantee that the solution of (3.7) and its associated differential equations provide large sample approximations of those for (2.1). Condition A4 can be easily justified by empirical processes with common assumptions such as that $\nabla\ell(\theta; U)$, $\theta \in \Theta_X$, form a Donsker class (van der Vaart

and Wellner (2000)), since the solution curves $X(t)$ of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (2.6) are deterministic and bounded, and it is easy to select Θ_X.
For a given $T > 0$, denote by $C([0,T])$ the space of all continuous functions on $[0,T]$ with the uniform metric $\max\{|b_1(t) - b_2(t)| : t \in [0,T]\}$ between functions $b_1(t)$ and $b_2(t)$. For the solutions $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (3.9) [or (2.6) and (3.11)], respectively, we define $V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$. Then $X(t)$, $X^n(t)$ and $V^n(t)$ live on $C([0,T])$. Treating them as random elements in $C([0,T])$, in the following theorem we establish a weak convergence limit of $V^n(t)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under conditions A0-A4, as $n \to \infty$, $V^n(t)$ weakly converges to a Gaussian process $V(t)$, where $V(t)$ is the unique solution of the following linear differential equations*

$$\dot{V}(t) + [\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}g(X(t))]V(t) + \mathbf{Z}(X(t)) = 0, \;\; V(0) = 0, \tag{3.12}$$

for the plain gradient descent case, and

$$\ddot{V}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}(t) + [\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}g(X(t))]V(t) + \mathbf{Z}(X(t)) = 0, \;\; V(0) = \dot{V}(0) = 0, \tag{3.13}$$

for the accelerated gradient descent case, where the deterministic functions $X(t)$ in (3.12) and (3.13) are the solutions of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (2.6), respectively, $\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}$ is the Hessian operator, random coefficient $\mathbf{Z}(\cdot)$ is the Gaussian process given by Condition A4.
In particular if Gaussian process $\mathbf{Z}(\theta) = \sigma(\theta)\mathbf{Z}$, where random variable $\mathbf{Z} \sim N_p(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)$ is defined in Condition A3, then $V(t) = \Pi(t)\mathbf{Z}$ on $C([0,T])$, and the deterministic matrix $\Pi(t)$ is the unique solution of the following linear differential equations

$$\dot{\Pi}(t) + [\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}g(X(t))]\Pi(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) = 0, \;\; \Pi(0) = 0, \tag{3.14}$$

for the plain gradient descent case, and

$$\ddot{\Pi}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{\Pi}(t) + [\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}g(X(t))]\Pi(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) = 0, \;\; \Pi(0) = \dot{\Pi}(0) = 0, \tag{3.15}$$

for the accelerated gradient descent case, where $X(t)$ in (3.14) and (3.15) are the solutions of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (2.6), respectively, $\ddot{\boldsymbol{H}}$ is the Hessian operator, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\cdot)$ is defined in Condition A3.

Remark 3.1. *As discussed in Sections 2 and 3.1, for the gradient descent case $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ are gradient flows associated with the population optimization* (2.1) *and the sample optimization* (3.7)*, respectively, and thus refer to the corresponding population and sample gradient flows. As a consequence, the Gaussian limiting distribution of $V^n(t)$ describes the asymptotic distribution of the difference between the sample and population gradient flows, with a normalization factor $\sqrt{n}$. Hence, it is natural to view the Gaussian limiting distribution as the central limit theorem for the gradient flows, and we call it the gradient flow central limit theorem (GF-CLT). Similarly, for the accelerated case $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$*

are Lagrangian flows associated with the population optimization (2.1) *and the sample optimization* (3.7)*, respectively, and thus refer to the corresponding population and sample Lagrangian flows. The Gaussian limiting distribution for the normalized discrepancy between the sample and population Lagrangian flows can be naturally viewed as the central limit theorem for the Lagrangian flows, and we call it the Lagrangian flow central limit theorem (LF-CLT).*

Remark 3.2. *As we discussed early in Section 3, as* $n \to \infty$, $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; U_i)$ *converges to* $g(\theta)$ *in probability, and the solutions of the minimization problems (2.1) and (3.7) should be very close to each other. We may heuristically illustrate the derivation of Theorem 3.1 as follows. Central limit theorem may lead us to see that as* $n \to \infty$, $\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ *is asymptotically distributed as* $\nabla g(\theta) + n^{-1/2}\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$*. Then asymptotically the differential equations (3.9) and (3.11) are, respectively, equivalent to*

$$\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla g(X^n(t)) + n^{-1/2}\mathbf{Z}(X^n(t)) = 0, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\ddot{X}^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla g(X^n(t)) + n^{-1/2}\mathbf{Z}(X^n(t)) = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

Applying the perturbation method for solving ordinary differential equations, we write approximation solutions of the equations (3.16) and (3.17) as $X^n(t) \approx X(t) + n^{-1/2}V(t)$ *and substitute it into (3.16) and (3.17). With* $X(t)$ *satisfying the ordinary differential equations (2.3) or (2.6), using the Taylor expansion and ignoring higher order terms, we can easily obtain the equations (3.12) and (3.13) for the limit* $V(t)$ *of* $V_n(t)$ *in the two cases, respectively.*

The step function $x_\delta^n(t)$ is used to model x_k^n generated from the gradient descent algorithms (3.8) and (3.10). To study their weak convergence, we need to introduce the Skorokhod space, denoted by $D([0,T])$, of all cádlág functions on $[0,T]$, equipped with the Skorokhod metric (Billingsely (1999)). Then $x_\delta^n(t)$ lives on $D([0,T])$, and treating it as a random element in $D([0,T])$, we derive its weak convergence limit in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Under assumption A0-A4, as* $\delta \to 0$ *and* $n \to \infty$*, we have*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)| = O_P(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|),$$

where $x_\delta^n(t)$ *are the continuous-time step processes for discrete* x_k^n *generated from the algorithms (3.8) and (3.10), with continuous curves* $X^n(t)$ *defined by the ordinary differential equations (3.9) and (3.11), for the cases of plain and accelerated gradient descent algorithms, respectively. In particular, we may choose* (n,δ) *such that* $n\delta|\log\delta|^2 \to 0$ *as* $\delta \to 0$ *and* $n \to \infty$*, and then for the chosen* (n,δ)*,* $n^{1/2}[x_\delta^n(t) - X(t)]$ *weakly converges to* $V(t)$ *on* $D([0,T])$*, where* $X(t)$ *is the solution of the ordinary differential equations (2.3) or (2.6), and* $V(t)$ *is given by Theorem 3.1. That is,* $\sqrt{n}[x_\delta^n(t) - X(t)]$ *and* $\sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$ *share the same weak convergence limit.*

Remark 3.3. *There are two types of asymptotic analyses in the set up. One type is to employ continuous differential equations to model discrete sequences generated from the gradient descent algorithms, which is associated with δ treated as the step size between consecutive sequence points. Another type involves the use of random objective functions in stochastic optimization, which are estimated from sample data of size n. We refer the first and second types as computational and statistical asymptotics, respectively. The computational asymptotic analysis is that for each n, the ordinary differential equations (3.9) and (3.11)[or (3.16) and (3.17)] provide continuous solutions as the limits of discrete sequences generated from the algorithms (3.8) and (3.10), respectively, when δ is allowed to go to zero. Theorem 3.1 provides the statistical asymptotic analysis to describe the behavior difference between the sample gradient flow $X^n(t)$ and the population gradient flow $X(t)$, as the sample size n goes to infinity. Theorem 3.2 involves both types of asymptotics and shows that as $\delta \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$, $x^n_\delta(t) - X^n(t)$ is of order $\delta^{1/2}$. It is easy to choose (n, δ) so that $x^n_{\delta_n}(t) - X^n(t)$ is of order smaller than $n^{-1/2}$. Then $x^n_{\delta_n}(t)$ has the same asymptotic distribution $V(t)$ as $X^n(t)$.*

3.4 A framework to unify computational and statistical asymptotic analysis

The two types of asymptotics associated with δ and n seem to be quite different, with one for computational algorithms and one for statistical procedures. This section will elaborate further about these analyses and provide a framework to unify both viewpoints. Denote the solutions of the optimization problems (2.1) and (3.7) by $\check{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_n$, respectively. In the statistical set-up, $\check{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_n$ represent the true estimand and its associated estimator, respectively. Using the definitions of $\check{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_n$ and the Taylor expansion, we have $\nabla g(\check{\theta}) = 0$,

$$0 = \nabla \mathcal{L}^n(\hat{\theta}_n; \mathbf{U}_n) = \nabla \mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}; \mathbf{U}_n) + \mathbb{H}\mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}; \mathbf{U}_n)(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta}) + \text{reminder},$$

the law of large number implies that $\mathbb{H}\mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}; \mathbf{U}_n)$ converges in probability to $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ as $n \to \infty$, and Condition A4 indicates that

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}; \mathbf{U}_n) = \nabla g(\check{\theta}) + n^{-1/2}\mathbf{Z}(\check{\theta}) + \text{reminder} = n^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z} + \text{reminder},$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ stands for a standard normal random vector. Thus, $n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ is asymptotically distributed as $[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}$. On the other hand, the gradient descent algorithms generate sequences corresponding to $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$, which are expected to approach the solutions of the two optimization problems (2.1) and (3.7), respectively. Hence $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ must move towards $\check{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}_n$, respectively, and $V_n(t)$ and $V(t)$ are reaching their corresponding targets $n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ and $[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}$. Below we will provide a framework to connect $(X^n(t), X(t))$ with $(\hat{\theta}_n, \check{\theta})$ and $(V^n(t), V(t))$ with $\Big(n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta}), [\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}\Big)$. Since the time interval considered so far is $[0, T]$ for any arbitrary $T > 0$, we may extend the time interval to $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$, and consider $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$, the space of all continuous

functions on $\mathbb{R}_+$, equipped with a metric d for the topology of uniform convergence on compacta:

$$d(b_1, b_2) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-r} min \left\{ 1, \max_{0 \le s \le r} |b_1(s) - b_2(s)| \right\}.$$

The solutions $X(t)$, $X^n(t)$, $V(t)$ and $V^n(t)$ of the ordinary differential equations (2.3), (2.6), (3.9), (3.11)-(3.17) all live on $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and we can study their weak convergence on $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Similarly we may adopt the Skorokhod space $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$ equipped with the Skorokhod metric for the weak convergence study of $x_\delta^n(t)$ (see Billingsely (1999)). The following theorem establishes the weak convergence of these processes on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and studies their asymptotic behaviors as $t \to \infty$.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that the assumption A0-A4 are met, $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ is positive definite, all eigenvalues of $\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$ diverge as $t \to \infty$, $\mathbb{H}g(\theta_1)$ and $\mathbb{H}g(\theta_2)$ commute for any $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$, and $n\delta|\log\delta|^2 \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$. Then on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$, as $\delta \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$, $V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$ and $\sqrt{n}[x_\delta^n(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converge to $V(t)$, $t \in [0, +\infty)$.*
Furthermore, for the plain gradient descent case we have as $t \to \infty$ and $k \to \infty$,

(1) x_k, $x_\delta(t)$ and $X(t)$ converge to $\check{\theta}$, where x_k, $x_\delta(t)$ and $X(t)$ are defined in Section 2 (see the ordinary differential equations (2.2)-(2.4) and (2.6)).

(2) x_k^n, $x_\delta^n(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ converge to $\hat{\theta}_n$ in probability, and thus $V^n(t)$ converges to $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ in probability, where x_k^n, $x_\delta^n(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ are defined in the algorithms and equations (3.8)-(3.11).

(3) The limiting distributions of $V(t)$ as $t \to \infty$ and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ as $n \to \infty$ are identical and given by a normal distribution with mean zero and variance $[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}$, where $V(t)$, defined in the ordinary differential equations (3.12) and (3.13), is the weak convergence limit of $V^n(t)$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 3.4. *Denote the limits of the processes in Theorem 3.3 as $t, k \to \infty$ by the corresponding processes with t and k replacing by ∞. Then Theorem 3.3 shows that for the plain gradient descent case, $x_\infty = x_\delta(\infty) = X(\infty) = \check{\theta}$, $x_\infty^n = x_\delta^n(\infty) = X^n(\infty) = \hat{\theta}_n$, $V^n(\infty) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(\infty) - X(\infty)] = \sqrt{n}[x_\delta^n(\infty) - X(\infty)] = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$, $V(\infty) = [\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}$, $V(t)$ weakly converges to $V(\infty)$ as $t \to \infty$, and $V^n(\infty)$ weakly converges to $V(\infty)$ as $n \to \infty$. In particular, as the process $V^n(t)$ is indexed by n and t, its limits are the same regardless the order of $n \to \infty$ and $t \to \infty$. Also as $\check{\theta} = X(\infty)$ is the minimizer of the convex function $g(\cdot)$, the positive definite assumption $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta}) = \mathbb{H}g(X(\infty)) > 0$ is very reasonable; since the limit $\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))$ of $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))$ as $t \to \infty$ has all positive eigenvalues, it is natural to expect that $\int_0^\infty \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$ has diverging eigenvalues. We conjecture that for the accelerated gradient descent case, similar asymptotic results might hold as $k, t \to \infty$.*

With the augmentation of $t = \infty$, we extend $[0, +\infty)$ further to $[0, +\infty]$, consider $X(t)$, $x_\delta(t)$, $X^n(t)$, $x^n_\delta(t)$, $V(t)$, and $V^n(t)$ on $t \in [0, \infty]$ and derive the limits of $V^n(t)$ and $\sqrt{n}[x^n_\delta(t) - X(t)]$ on $[0, \infty]$ by Theorem 3.3. As $\delta \to 0$ and $n \to \infty$, the limiting distributions of $V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$ and $\sqrt{n}[x^n_\delta(t) - X(t)]$ are $V(t)$ for $t \in [0, \infty]$, where $(V^n(t), V(t))$ describe the dynamic evolution of the gradient descent algorithms for $t \in [0, \infty)$ and the statistical distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ for $t = \infty$.
The joint asymptotic analysis provides a unified framework to describe distribution limits of $X^n(t)$ and $x^n_\delta(t)$ from both computation and statistical viewpoints as follows. For $t \in [0, \infty)$, $X(t)$ and $V(t)$ give the limiting behaviors of $X^n(t)$ and $x^n_\delta(t)$ corresponding to the computational algorithms, and $X(\infty)$ and $V(\infty)$ illustrate their limiting behaviors of the corresponding statistical decision rule $\hat{\theta}_n$ (or the exact solutions of the corresponding optimization problems (2.1) and (3.7) that the algorithms are designed to compute). We use the following simple example to explicitly illustrate the joint asymptotic analysis.

Example 1. Suppose that $U_i = (U_{1i}, U_{2i})'$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, are iid random vectors, where U_{1i} and U_{2i} are independent, and follow a normal distribution $N(\theta_1, \tau^2)$ with mean θ_1 and variance τ^2 and an exponential distribution with mean θ_2, respectively, and $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)'$. Define $\ell(\theta; U_i) = (U_i - \theta)'(U_i - \theta)/2$, and denote by $\check{\theta}$ the true value of the parameter θ in the model. Then $\mathcal{L}(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (U_i - \theta)'(U_i - \theta)/2$, $g(\theta) = E[\ell(\theta; U_i)] = [(\theta - \check{\theta})'(\theta - \check{\theta}) + \tau^2 + \check{\theta}_2^2]/2$, $\nabla g(\theta) = \theta - \check{\theta}$, $\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i) = \theta - U_i$, $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \theta - \bar{U}_n$, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta) = Var(U_1 - \theta) = \text{diag}(\tau^2, \check{\theta}_2^2)$, where $\bar{U}_n = (\bar{U}_{1n}, \bar{U}_{2n})'$ is the sample mean. It is easy to see that the corresponding minimization problems (2.1) and (3.7) have explicit solutions: $g(\theta)$ has the minimizer $\check{\theta}$, and $\mathcal{L}(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ has the minimizer $\hat{\theta}_n = \bar{U}_n$. For this example, the algorithms (2.2), (3.8), (2.4) and (3.10) yield recursive formulas $x_k = x_{k-1} + \delta(\check{\theta} - x_{k-1})$, and $x^n_k = x^n_{k-1} + \delta(\bar{U}_n - x^n_{k-1})$ for the plain gradient descent case; and $x_k = x_{k-1} + \delta(\check{\theta} - y_{k-1})$, $y_k = x_k + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x_k - x_{k-1})$, $x^n_k = x^n_{k-1} + \delta(\bar{U}_n - y^n_{k-1})$, $y^n_k = x^n_k + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x^n_k - x^n_{k-1})$ for the accelerated gradient descent case. While it may not be so obvious to explicitly describe the dynamic behaviors of these algorithms for the accelerated case, below we will clearly illustrate the behaviors of their corresponding ordinary differential equations through closed form expressions. First we consider the plain gradient descent case where closed form expressions are very simple. The ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (3.9) admit simple solutions

$$X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t))' = \check{\theta} + (x_0 - \check{\theta})e^{-t}, \;\; X^n(t) = (X^n_1(t), X^n_2(t))' = \bar{U}_n + (x^n_0 - \bar{U}_n)e^{-t},$$

$$V^n(t) = (V^n_1(t), V^n_2(t))' = \sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta})(1 - e^{-t}) + \sqrt{n}(x^n_0 - x_0)e^{-t}.$$

Note that $Z_1 = \sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_{1n} - \check{\theta}_1)/\tau \sim N(0, 1)$, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_{2n}/\check{\theta}_2 - 1)$ converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable Z_2, and Z_1 and Z_2 are independent. As in Theorem 3.1, let $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2)'$, $V(t) = \Pi(t)\mathbf{Z}$, where $\Pi(t) = -(1 - e^{-t})\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)$ is the matrix solution of the linear differential equation (3.14) in this case. Then for $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$V^n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau Z_1 \\ \check{\theta}_2 Z_2 \end{pmatrix}(1 - e^{-t}) + o_P(1) = V(t) + o_P(1),$$

which confirms that $V^n(t)$ converges to $V(t)$, as shown in Theorem 3.1. Furthermore, as $t \to \infty$, $X(t) \to \check{\theta} = X(\infty)$, $X^n(t) \to \hat{\theta}_n = \bar{U}_n = X^n(\infty)$, and $V^n(t) \to V^n(\infty) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta})$; as $n \to \infty$, $V^n(\infty) \to V(\infty) = \Pi(\infty)\mathbf{Z} = -(\tau Z_1, \check{\theta}_2 Z_2)'$, which gives the asymptotic distribution of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n = X^n(\infty)$. In summary, the behaviors of $X(t)$, $X^n(t)$, $V^n(t)$, and $V(t)$ over $[0, \infty]$ provide a complete description on the dynamic evolution of the gradient descent algorithms when applied to solve the stochastic sample optimization problem. For example, as functions of t, $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ can be used to describe how the sequences generated from the algorithms evolve along iterations; we may use the convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V^n(\infty)$ and $V(t)$ to $V(\infty)$, as $t \to \infty$, to illustrate how the generated sequences converge to the target optimization solutions (estimators); the convergence of $V^n(\infty)$ to $V(\infty)$ as $n \to \infty$ may be employed to characterize the asymptotic distributions of the target optimization solutions; and their relationship with n and t can be used to investigate the joint dynamic effect of data size and algorithm iterations on the computational and statistical errors in the sequences generated by the algorithms. The key signature in this case is the exponential decay factor e^{-t} that appears in all relationships. The joint asymptotic analysis with both n and t provides a unified picture for the statistical asymptotic analysis with $n \to \infty$ and the computational asymptotic analysis with $t \to \infty$. For the accelerated case, the solution $X(t)$ of the ordinary differential equation (2.6) admits an expression via the Bessel function,

$$X(t) = \check{\theta} + \frac{2(x_0 - \check{\theta})}{t} J_1(t),$$

where $x_0 = (x_{0,1}, x_{0,2})'$ is an initial value of $X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t))'$, and $J_1(u)$ is the Bessel function of the first kind of order one,

$$J_1(u) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^j}{(2j)!!(2j+2)!!} u^{2j+2},$$

with the following symptotic behaviors as $u \to 0$ and $u \to \infty$

$$J_1(u) \sim \frac{u}{2} \text{ as } u \to 0, \text{ and } J_1(u) \sim \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi u}} cos\left(u - \frac{3\pi}{4}\right) \text{ as } u \to \infty.$$

The ordinary differential equation (3.11) has the solution

$$X^n(t) = \bar{U}_n + \frac{2(x_0^n - \bar{U}_n)}{t} J_1(t), \;\; V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta}) \left[1 - \frac{2}{t} J_1(t)\right] + \sqrt{n}(x_0^n - x_0) \frac{2}{t} J_1(t),$$

As in Theorem 3.1, let $V(t) = \Pi(t)\mathbf{Z}$, where it is relatively simple to use the properties of the Bessel function $J_1(u)$ to verify that $\Pi(t) = -[1 - 2J_1(t)/t]\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)$ is the matrix solution of the linear differential equation (3.15) in this case. Then for $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$V^n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau Z_1 \\ \check{\theta}_2 Z_2 \end{pmatrix} \left[1 - \frac{2}{t} J_1(t)\right] + o_P(1) = V(t) + o_P(1).$$

The result matches the weak convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V(t)$ shown in Theorem 3.1, and as $t \to \infty$, $X(t) \to \check{\theta} = X(\infty)$, $X^n(t) \to \hat{\theta}_n = \bar{U}_n = X^n(\infty)$, and $V^n(t) \to V^n(\infty) = \sqrt{n}(\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta})$; as $n \to \infty$, $V^n(\infty) \to V(\infty) = \Pi(\infty)\mathbf{Z} = -(\tau Z_1, \check{\theta}_2 Z_2)'$, which indicates the asymptotic distribution of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n = X^n(\infty)$. Again the behaviors of $X(t)$, $X^n(t)$, $V^n(t)$, and $V(t)$ over $[0, \infty]$ describe the dynamic evolution of the accelerated gradient descent algorithm, such as how the sequences generated from the algorithm evolve along iterations (via $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ as functions of t), and converge to the target optimization solutions (via the convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V^n(\infty)$ and $V(t)$ to $V(\infty)$ as $t \to \infty$), as well as connect to the asymptotic distributions of the target optimization solutions (via the convergence of $V^n(\infty)$ to $V(\infty)$ as $n \to \infty$). We find that the polynomial decay factor $\frac{2}{t}J_1(t)$ appears in all relationships for the accelerated case, and the major difference for the two cases is exponential decay $1 - e^{-t}$ for the plain case vs polynomial decay $1 - \frac{2}{t}J_1(t)$ for the accelerated case.

Remark 3.5. *Solving problems with large-scale data often require some tradeoffs between statistical efficiency and computational efficiency, and thus we need to handle both statistical errors and computational errors. We illustrate the potential of the joint asymptotic analysis framework for the study of the two types of errors. Note that*

$$x_\delta^n(t) - \check{\theta} = x_\delta^n(t) - \hat{\theta}_n + \hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta},$$

where $x_\delta^n(t)$ (or x_k^n) are the values computed by the gradient descent algorithms for solving the stochastic sample optimization problem (3.7) based on sampled data, and $\check{\theta}$ is the exact solution of the deterministic population optimization problem (2.1) corresponding to the true value of θ, with $\hat{\theta}_n$ the exact solution of the optimization problem (3.7) corresponding to the estimator of θ. The total error $x_\delta^n(t) - \check{\theta}$ consists of computational error $x_\delta^n(t) - \hat{\theta}_n$ (of order t^{-1} or t^{-2}) and statistical error $\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta}$ (of order usually $n^{-1/2}$). Since $X(t)$ approaches the solution $\check{\theta}$ of the optimization problem (2.1), and in fact numerically $\check{\theta}$ can be only evaluated by $X(t)$ and its corresponding algorithms, using $X(t)$ as a proxy of $\check{\theta}$ we may treat $x_\delta^n(t) - X(t)$ as a surrogate of the total error, and find its asymptotic distribution $V(t)$ via differential equation useful for the analysis of the total error.

4 Stochastic gradient descent via stochastic differential equations for stochastic optimization

Solving the stochastic sample optimization problem (3.7) by the algorithms (3.8) and (3.10) requires evaluating the sum-gradient for all data, that is, it requires expensive evaluations of the gradients $\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i)$ from summand functions $\ell(\theta; U_i)$ with all data U_i, $i = 1, \cdots, n$. For big data problems, data are enormous, and such evaluation of the sums of gradients for all data becomes prohibitively expensive. To overcome the computational burden, stochastic gradient descent uses a so-called mini-batch of data to evaluate the corresponding subset of summand functions at each iteration. Each mini-batch is a

relatively small data set that is sampled from (i) the large training data set $\mathbf{U}_n$ or (ii) the underlying population distribution Q. For the case of subsampling from the original data set $\mathbf{U}_n$, it turns out that mini-batch subsampling in the stochastic gradient descent scheme is similar to the m out of n (with or without replacement) bootstraps for gradients (Bickel et al. (1997)). While bootstrap resampling is widely used to draw inferences in statistics, resampling used here in learning community is motivated purely from the computational purpose. Specifically, assume integer m is much smaller than n, and denote by $\mathbf{U}_m^* = (U_1^*, \cdots, U_m^*)'$ a mini-batch. For the case (ii), $\mathbf{U}_m^* = (U_1^*, \cdots, U_m^*)'$ is an i.i.d. sample taken from distribution Q. For case (i), $\mathbf{U}_m^* = (U_1^*, \cdots, U_m^*)'$ is a subsample taken from $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \cdots, U_n)'$, where $U_1^*, \cdots, U_m^*$ are randomly drawn with or without replacement from $U_1, \cdots, U_n$. For the case of with replacement, $U_1^*, \cdots, U_m^*$ are an i.i.d. sample taken from $\hat{Q}_n$, and $\hat{Q}_n$ is the empirical distribution of $U_1, \cdots, U_n$. In this paper we consider the case that mini-batches are sampled from the underlying distribution Q. Since mini-batch size m is negligible in comparison with data size n, the bootstrap sampling case (ii) can be handled via strong approximation (Csörgö and Mason (1989), Csörgö et al. (1999), Massart (1989), Rio (1993a, b)) by converting case (ii) into the essentially proven scenario of case (i) where mini-bataches are sampled from the underlying distribution Q.
The main computational idea in the stochastic gradient descent algorithm is to replace $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ in the algorithms (3.8) and (3.10) by a smaller sample version $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*)$ at each iteration, where

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ell(\theta; U_i^*).$$

4.1 Stochastic gradient descent

The stochastic gradient descent scheme replaces $\nabla \mathcal{L}^n(x_{k-1}^n; \mathbf{U}_n)$ in the algorithm (3.8) by a smaller sample version at each iteration to obtain the following recursive algorithm,

$$x_k^m = x_{k-1}^m - \delta \nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*), \tag{4.18}$$

where $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^* = (U_{1k}^*, \cdots, U_{mk}^*)'$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, are independent mini-batches.
We may naively follow the continuous curve approach described in Section 2 to approximate $\{x_k^m, k = 0, 1, \cdots\}$ by a smooth curve similar to the case in Section 3. However, unlike the scenario in Section 3, the algorithms (4.18) [and (4.26) for the accelerated case in Section 4.2 later] are designed for the computational purpose, they do not correspond to any optimization problem with a well-defined objective function like $g(\theta)$ in the optimization problem (2.1) or $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ in the optimization problem (3.7), since samples $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^*$ used in $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)$ change with iteration k. The analysis for stochastic gradient descent will be quite different from those studied in Section 3. Below we consider the stochastic gradient descent case, and may define a 'pseudo objective function'.
Define a mini-batch process $\mathbf{U}_m^*(t) = (U_1^*(t), \cdots, U_m^*(t))'$ and a step process $x_\delta^m(t)$, $t \geq 0$, for x_k^m in (4.18) as follows,

$$\mathbf{U}_m^*(t) = \mathbf{U}_{mk}^* \text{ and } x_\delta^m(t) = x_k^m \text{ for } k\delta \leq t < (k+1)\delta. \tag{4.19}$$

To facilitate the analysis we adopt a convention $x_\delta^m(t) = x_0^m$ for $t < 0$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_\delta^m(t-\delta); \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk})$ for $k\delta \le t < (k+1)\delta$. $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t))$ may be treated as a counterpart of $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$. As $m \to \infty$, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t))$ approaches $g(\theta)$ for each δ, and the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) can still solve the optimization problem (3.7) numerically. But as t evolves, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t))$ changes from iteration to iteration, and depends on δ as well as m, since mini-batches change as the algorithm iterates, and the number of the mini-batches involved is determined by the time t and the step size δ. There is no single bona fide objective function here, and the 'pseudo objective function' $\mathcal{L}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t))$ can't serve the role of genuine objective functions like $g(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$. The approach in Sections 2 and 3 can not be directly applied to obtain an ordinary differential equation like the equation (3.9). In fact as we will see below, for this case there exists no such analog ordinary differential equation. Instead we will derive asymptotic stochastic differential equations for the algorithm (4.18). The new asymptotic stochastic differential equations may be considered as a counterpart of the ordinary differential equation (3.16), which is an asymptotic version of the ordinary differential equation (3.9), but the key difference is that the asymptotic stochastic differential equations must depend on the step size δ as well as m to account for the mini-batch effect (see more details later after the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) regarding the associated random variability). Our derivation and stochastic differential equations rely on the asymptotic behavior of $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(\theta)$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$.
We need the following initial condition to guarantee the validity of our asymptotic analysis.

A5. Assume initial values satisfy $x_0^m - x_0 = o_P((\delta/m)^{1/2})$.

We describe the asymptotic behavior of $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t))$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Define a partial sum process*

$$H_\delta^m(t) = (m\delta)^{1/2} \sum_{t_k \le t} \left[\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_\delta^m(t_{k-1}); \mathbf{U}_m^*(t_k)) - \nabla g(x_\delta^m(t_{k-1})) \right], \ t \ge 0, \tag{4.20}$$

where $t_k = k\delta$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Under Conditions A1-A5, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, we have that on $D([0,T])$, $H_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}((X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)$, $t \in [0,T]$, where $\mathbf{B}$ is a p-dimensional standard Brownian motion, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)$ is defined in Condition A3, and $X(t)$ is the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.3).

Remark 4.1. *As we have discussed early, due to mini-batches used in the algorithm (4.18), there is no corresponding optimization problem with a well-defined objective function. As a result, we do not have any δ-free differential equation analog to the ordinary differential equation (3.16). In other words, here there is no analog continuous modeling to derive differential equations free of δ, obtained by letting $\delta \to 0$. This may be explained from Theorem 4.1 as follows. It is easy to see that $H_\delta^m(t)$ is a normalized partial sum process for $[T/\delta]$ random variables $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_\delta^m(t_{k-1}); \mathbf{U}_m^*(t_k))$ whose variances are of order m^{-1}, and*

the weak convergence theory for partial sum processes indicates that a normalized factor $(m\delta)^{1/2}$ *in the definition (4.20) is needed to obtain a weak convergence limit for* $H_\delta^m(t)$. *On the other hand, to obtain an analog to the* $\mathbf{Z}$ *term in the equation (3.16) we need to find some kind of continuous-time limit for* $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(\theta)$. *As* $\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)$ *is an empirical process for independent subsamples* $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^*$, $\nabla\mathcal{L}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(\theta)$ *may behave like a sort of discrete-time weighted white noise (in fact a martingale difference sequence). Therefore, a possible continuous-time limit for* $\nabla\mathcal{L}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(\theta)$ *is related to a continuous-time white noise, which is defined as the derivative* $\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ *of Brownian motion* $\mathbf{B}(t)$ *in the sense of the Dirac delta function (a generalized function). In the notation of Theorem 4.1, we may informally write* $H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du$ *in terms of white noise* $\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)$, *and* $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_\delta^m(t-\delta);\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))$ *corresponds to the derivative* $\dot{H}(t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ *of* $H(t)$. *While the factor* $\delta^{1/2}$ *on the right hand side of the definition (4.20) is needed to normalize a partial sum process with* $[T/\delta]$ *random variables for obtaining a weak convergence limit, from the white noise point of view, here we need a normalized factor* $\delta^{1/2}$ *to move from a discrete-time white noise to a continuous-time white noise. As a matter of fact, the weak convergence is very natural from the viewpoint of limit theorems for stochastic processes (Jacod and Shiryaev (2003), He et al. (1992)). Because of the white noise type stochastic variation due to different mini-batches used from iteration to iteration in the algorithm (4.18), the continuous modeling for stochastic gradient descent will be* δ*-dependent, which will be given below.*

Using the definitions of $x_\delta^m(t)$ in (4.19) and $H_\delta^m(t)$ in (4.20), we recast algorithm (4.18) as

$$x_\delta^m(t+\delta) - x_\delta^m(t) = -\nabla g(x_\delta^m(t))\delta - (\delta/m)^{1/2}\,[H_\delta^m(t+\delta) - H_\delta^m(t)].$$

Theorem 4.1 suggests an approximation of the step process $H_\delta^m(t)$ by the continuous process $H(t)$, and we approximate the step process $x_\delta^m(t)$ by a continuous process $X_\delta^m(t)$. Taking the step size δ as dt, $H_\delta^m(t+\delta) - H_\delta^m(t)$ as $dH(t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t)$, and $x_\delta^m(t+\delta) - x_\delta^m(t)$ as $dX_\delta^m(t)$, we tranform the above difference equation into the following stochastic differential equation

$$dX_\delta^m(t) = -\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))dt - (\delta/m)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t), \tag{4.21}$$

where $X(t)$ is the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.3), and $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a p-dimensional standard Brownian motion. The solution $X_\delta^m(t)$ of the stochastic differential equation (4.21) may be considered as a continuous approximation of x_k^m [or $x_\delta^m(t)$] generated from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) [or (4.19)]. Since $X_\delta^m(t)$ is expected to be close to $X(t)$, and the Brownian term in (4.21) is of higher order, we may replace $X(t)$ in (4.21) by $X_\delta^m(t)$ to better mimic the recursive relationship in (4.18). That is, we also consider the following stochastic differential equation

$$d\check{X}_\delta^m(t) = -\nabla g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))dt - (\delta/m)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))d\mathbf{B}(t). \tag{4.22}$$

As our interest is on their distributional behaviors, we consider solutions of the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) in the weak sense that for each fixed δ and m, there

exist versions of the continuous process $X_\delta^m(t)$ (or $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$) and Brownian motion $\mathbf{B}(t)$ on some probability space to satisfy the equation (4.21) (or (4.22)) (see Ikeda and Watanabe (1981)).

The stochastic Brownian terms in (4.21) and (4.22) are employed to account for the random fluctuations due to the use of min-batches for gradient estimation from iteration to iteration in the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18), where $m^{-1/2}$ and $\delta^{1/2}$ are statistical normalization factors with m for mini-batch size and $[T/\delta]$ for the total number of iterations considered in $[0,T]$ (as δ for the step size). At each iteration we resort to a mini-batch for gradient estimation, so the number of iterations in $[0,T]$ is equal to the number of mini-batches used in $[0,T]$, and the factor $\delta^{1/2}$ accounts for the effect due to the total number of mini-batches used in $[0,T]$, while $m^{-1/2}$ accounts for the effect of m observations in each mini-batch.

The theorem below derives the asymptotic distribution of $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$. Let $V_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ and $\check{V}_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[\check{X}_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$. Treating them as random elements in $C([0,T])$, we derive their weak convergence limit in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Under Conditions A1-A5, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, we have*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} |X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(m^{-1}\delta), \tag{4.23}$$

and both $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{V}_\delta^m(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, weakly converge to $V(t)$ which is a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process satisfying

$$dV(t) = -[\boldsymbol{I\!H} g(X(t))]V(t)dt - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t), \;\; V(0) = 0, \tag{4.24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{I\!H}$ is the Hessian operator, $\mathbf{B}$ is a p-dimensional standard Brownian motion, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)$ is defined in Condition A3, and $X(t)$ is the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.3).

Remark 4.2. *As $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ in the gradient descent case are viewed as the population and sample gradient flows in Remark 3.1 respectively, we may treat $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ as stochastic gradient flows in the stochastic gradient descent case, and regard the Gaussian limiting distribution of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{V}_\delta^m(t)$ as the central limit theorem for the stochastic gradient flows, which simply refers to the gradient flow central limit theorem (GF-CLT).*

Remark 4.3. *Theorem 4.2 shows that while $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ have the same weak convergence limit, they are an order of magnitude closer to each other than to $X(t)$. This may also be seen from the fact that the difference between the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) is at the high order Brownian term with $X_\delta^m(t)$ replaced by its limit $X(t)$. The linear stochastic differential equation (4.24) indicates that $V(t)$ has the following explicit expression for $t \in [0,T]$ under the condition that $\boldsymbol{I\!H} g(X(u))$ and $\boldsymbol{I\!H} g(X(v))$ commute for all $u \neq v$,*

$$V(t) = -\int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \boldsymbol{I\!H} g(X(v))dv\right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u). \tag{4.25}$$

The step process $x_\delta^m(t)$ defined in (4.19) is the empirical process for x_k^m generated from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18). Treating $x_\delta^m(t)$ as a random element in $D([0,T])$ we consider its asymptotic distribution in the follow theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Under assumption A1-A5, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, we have*

$$\sup_{t \le T} |x_\delta^m(t) - X_\delta^m(t)| = o_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}) + O_P(\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

where $x_\delta^m(t)$ and $X_\delta^m(t)$ are defined by the algorithm (4.19) and the stochastic differential equation (4.21), respectively. In particular if we choose (δ, m) such that $m\delta|\log\delta| \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, then for the chosen (δ, m), $(m/\delta)^{1/2}[x_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converges to $V(t)$, where $V(t)$ is governed by the stochastic differential equation (4.24).

Remark 4.4. *Theorem 4.3 indicates that sequences x_k^m generated from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) can be very close to the continuous curves $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ governed by the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22), respectively, and with proper choices of (δ, m) we can make the empirical process $x_\delta^m(t)$ for x_k^m to share the same weak convergence limit as the continuous curves $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$. The results allow us to study discrete algorithms by analyzing their corresponding continuous stochastic differential equations and their relatively simple weak limit.*

Remark 4.5. *We may consider stochastic gradient descent with momentum and/or diminishing learn rate and obtain the corresponding stochastic differential equations. For example, δ in (4.18) can be replaced by diminishing learning rate $\delta_k = \eta k^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and constant $\eta > 0$, and the same arguments lead us to stochastic differential equations like (4.21) and (4.22) with extra factor $(t+1)^{-\alpha}$. For the momentum case, we need to add an extra linear term in the drifts of $X_\delta^m(t)$ (or $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$). For example, we consider stochastic gradient descent with momentum,*

$$x_k^m = \gamma x_{k-1}^m - \delta\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*), \qquad \delta = \eta k^{-\alpha}, \;\; \gamma = 1 - \beta\eta,$$

and obtain the following stochastic differential equation,

$$dX_\delta^m(t) = -[\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))(t+1)^{-\alpha} + \beta X_\delta^m(t)]dt - (\eta/m)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))(t+1)^{-\alpha}d\mathbf{B}(t).$$

4.2 Accelerated stochastic gradient descent

We apply Nesterov's acceleration scheme to stochastic gradient descent by replacing $\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(y_{k-1}^n; \mathbf{U}_n)$ in the algorithm (3.10) with a subsampled version at each iteration as follows,

$$x_k^m = y_{k-1}^m - \delta\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(y_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*), \qquad y_k^m = x_k^m + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x_k^m - x_{k-1}^m), \tag{4.26}$$

where we use initial values x_0^m and $y_0^m = x_0^m$, and $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^* = (U_{1k}^*, \cdots, U_{mk}^*)'$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, are independent mini-batches.

The continuous modeling for the algorithm (4.26) is conceptually in parallel with the case for the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) in Section 4.1, but the tricky part is on the technical side that we face many mathematical difficulties in multiple steps related to singularity in the second order stochastic differential equations involved.
As we have illustrated the continuous modeling of x_k^m generated from the algorithm (4.18) in Section 4.1, it is easy to see that our derivation of stochastic differential equations relies on the asymptotic behavior of $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) - \nabla g(\theta)$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$. Similar to the cases in Sections 2 and 3.2, we define step processes

$$x_\delta^m(t) = x_k^m,\ \ y_\delta^m(t) = y_k^m,\ \ \mathbf{U}_m^*(t) = \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*,\ \ \text{for}\ \ k\sqrt{\delta} \le t < (k+1)\sqrt{\delta}, \tag{4.27}$$

and approximate $x_\delta^m(t)$ by a smooth curve $X_\delta^m(t)$ given by (4.35) below. Note the difference between the step sizes δ and $\delta^{1/2}$ for the plain and accelerated cases, respectively, as pointed out at the end of Section 2.

Theorem 4.4. *Define a partial sum process*

$$H_\delta^m(t) = (m^2\delta)^{1/4} \sum_{t_k \le t} \left[\nabla\hat{L}^m(y_\delta^m(t_{k-1});\mathbf{U}_m^*(t_k)) - \nabla g(y_\delta^m(t_{k-1}))\right],\ t \ge 0, \tag{4.28}$$

where $t_k = k\delta^{1/2}$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Under Conditions A1-A5, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, we have that on $D([0,T])$, $H_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}((X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)$, $t \in [0,T]$, where $\mathbf{B}$ is a p-dimensional standard Brownian motion, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)$ is defined in Condition A3, and $X(t)$ is the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.6).

Now we are ready to derive the second order stochastic differential equation corresponding to the algorithm (4.26). First, note that the second order ordinary differential equation (2.6) can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = Z(t)dt, \\ dZ(t) = -\left[\frac{3}{t}Z(t) + \nabla g(X(t))\right]dt, \end{cases} \tag{4.29}$$

where $Z(t) = \dot{X}(t)$; and the algorithm (2.4) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1} = x_k + \sqrt{\delta}\, z_k, \\ z_{k+1} = \left[1 - \frac{3}{k+3}\right] z_k - \sqrt{\delta}\,\nabla g\left(x_k + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k\right), \end{cases} \tag{4.30}$$

where $z_k = (x_{k+1} - x_k)/\sqrt{\delta}$, which can be recasted as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_{k+1}-x_k}{\sqrt{\delta}} = z_k, \\ \frac{z_{k+1}-z_k}{\sqrt{\delta}} = -\frac{3}{t_k+3\sqrt{\delta}} z_k - \nabla g\left(x_k + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k\right), \end{cases} \tag{4.31}$$

where we take $t_k = k\sqrt{\delta}$. We approximate (x_k, z_k) by continuous curves $(X(t), Z(t))$. Noting that as $\delta \to 0$, $3\sqrt{\delta} \to 0$ and $\frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k \to 0$ in (4.31), which are negligible relative

to t_k and x_k. We take step size $\sqrt{\delta}$ as dt and turn the discrete difference equation system (4.31) into the continuous differential equation system (4.29).
Second, we replace (x_k, z_k) in (4.30) by (x_k^m, z_k^m), where $z_k^m = (x_{k+1}^m - x_k^m)/\sqrt{\delta}$, and write the algorithm (4.26) in the following equivalent forms

$$\begin{cases} x_{k+1}^m = x_k^m + \sqrt{\delta}\, z_k^m, \\ z_{k+1}^m = \left[1 - \frac{3}{k+3}\right] z_k^m - \sqrt{\delta}\, \nabla g\left(x_k^m + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k^m\right) - \frac{\delta^{1/4}}{\sqrt{m}}[H_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) - H_\delta^m(t_k)], \end{cases} \tag{4.32}$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_{k+1}^m - x_k^m}{\sqrt{\delta}} = z_k^m, \\ \frac{z_{k+1}^m - z_k^m}{\sqrt{\delta}} = -\frac{3}{t_k + 3\sqrt{\delta}} z_k^m - \nabla g\left(x_k^m + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k^m\right) - \frac{\delta^{1/4}}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{H_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) - H_\delta^m(t_k)}{\sqrt{\delta}}, \end{cases} \tag{4.33}$$

where again $t_k = k\sqrt{\delta}$. Third, we approximate (x_k^m, z_k^m) by some continuous process $(X_\delta^m(t), Z_\delta^m(t))$. As Theorem 4.4 suggests to substitute $H_\delta^m(t)$ by $H(t)$, with $dH(t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t)$, dropping the negligible terms $3\sqrt{\delta}$ and $\frac{2k+3}{k+3}\sqrt{\delta}\, z_k^m$, and taking the step size $\sqrt{\delta}$ as dt we move from discrete difference equations (4.33) to the following stochastic differential equation system,

$$\begin{cases} dX_\delta^m(t) = Z_\delta^m(t)dt, \\ dZ_\delta^m(t) = -\left[\frac{3}{t} Z_\delta^m(t) + \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))\right] dt - \frac{\delta^{1/4}}{\sqrt{m}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) d\mathbf{B}(t), \end{cases} \tag{4.34}$$

which together with $\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) = Z_\delta^m(t)$ is equivalent to the following second order stochastic differential equation,

$$\ddot{X}_\delta^m(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) + \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) + (\delta/m^2)^{1/4} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0, \tag{4.35}$$

where initial conditions $X_\delta^m(0) = x_0^m$ and $\dot{X}_\delta^m(0) = 0$, $X(t)$ is defined by the ordinary differential equation (2.6), $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a p-dimensional Brownian motion, and $\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ is a white noise defined as the time derivative of $\mathbf{B}(t)$ in the sense of generalized functions (Hida and Si (2008)).
As we have discussed and demonstrated for the stochastic gradient descent case in Section 4.1, similar to the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) for the stochastic gradient descent algorithm, the second order stochastic differential equations (4.34) and (4.35) depend on δ and m through the stochastic Brownian terms. They are used to account for the random fluctuation due to the use of min-batches for gradient estimation from iteration to iteration in the algorithm (4.26), where $m^{-1/2}$ and $\delta^{1/4}$ are statistical normalization factors with m for the mini-batch size and $[T/\delta^{1/2}]$ for the total number of iterations considered in $[0, T]$ (as $\delta^{1/2}$ for the step size), or equivalently, the total number of mini-batches used in $[0, T]$.
The theorem below will show that the second order stochastic differential equation (4.35) has a unique solution. Here again we consider the solution in the weak sense that for

each fixed δ and m, there exist continuous process $X_\delta^m(t)$ and Brownian motion $\mathbf{B}(t)$ on some probability space to satisfy the equation (4.35). As in Section 4.1, the process $X_\delta^m(t)$ provides a continuous approximation of x_k^m given by the algorithm (4.26). As $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, the Brownian term in the equation (4.35) disappears, and $X_\delta^m(t)$ approaches $X(t)$ defined by the ordinary differential equation (2.6). Define $V_\delta^m(t) = (m^2/\delta)^{1/4}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$. Then $X(t)$, $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $V_\delta^m(t)$ live on $C([0,T])$. Treating them as random elements in $C([0,T])$, in the following theorem we derive a weak convergence limit of $V_\delta^m(t)$.

Theorem 4.5. *Under conditions A1-A5, the second order stochastic differential equation (4.35) has a unique solution in the weak sense, and as $\delta \to 0$, $m \to \infty$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to a Gaussian process $V(t)$ on $C([0,T])$, where $V(t)$ is the unique solution of the following linear second order stochastic differential equation,*

$$\ddot{V}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}(t) + [\nabla\nabla g(X(t))]V(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0, \tag{4.36}$$

where $\nabla\nabla$ is the Hessian operator, $X(t)$ is the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.6), $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)$ is defined in Condition A3, $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a p-dimensional standard Brownian motion, and initial conditions $V(0) = \dot{V}(0) = 0$.

Remark 4.6. *As $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ in the accelerated case are viewed as the population and sample Lagrangian flows in Remark 3.1 respectively, we may treat $X_\delta^m(t)$ as a stochastic Lagrangian flow in the accelerated stochastic gradient descent case, and regard the Gaussian limiting distribution of $V_\delta^m(t)$ as the central limit theorem for the stochastic Lagrangian flows, which we simply call the Lagrangian flow central limit theorem (LF-CLT).*

The step process $x_\delta^m(t)$ in the definition (4.27) is the empirical process for x_k^m generated from the algorithm (4.26). Treating $x_\delta^m(t)$ as a random element in $D([0,T])$ we consider its asymptotic distribution in the follow theorem.

Theorem 4.6. *(Due to Shang Wu) Assume that there exists $a \in (0, 1/2)$ such that $\delta m^{2/(1-2a)}$ is bounded below from zero. Then under assumption A1-A5, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, we have*

$$\sup_{t \le T} |x_\delta^m(t) - X_\delta^m(t)| = o_p(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}) + O_p(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|),$$

where $x_\delta^m(t)$ and $X_\delta^m(t)$ are given by the definition (4.27) and the stochastic differential equation (4.35), respectively. In particular if we choose (δ, m) to further satisfy that $m^{1/2}\delta^{1/4}|\log\delta| \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, then for the chosen (δ, m), $(m^2/\delta)^{1/4}[x_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converges to $V(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, where $V(t)$ is governed by the stochastic differential equation (4.36).

Remark 4.7. *As we mentioned before, similar to the stochastic gradient descent case, the continuous modeling depends on both δ and m, and Theorems 4.4-4.6 are in parallel with*

Theorems 4.1-4.3. However, for the accelerated case, the challenges are largely on the technical proofs. For example, we need to handle second order stochastic differential equations like (4.35) with singularity (similar to the singularity case for the ordinary differential equations (2.6) and (3.15)); it is hard to analyze the complex recursive relationship in the accelerated stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.26). Theorems 4.5-4.6 show that sequences x_k^m generated from the accelerated stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.26) may be very close to the continuous curve $X_\delta^m(t)$ governed by the stochastic differential equation (4.35), and proper choices of (δ, m) enable the empirical process $x_\delta^m(t)$ for x_k^m to have the same weak convergence limit as the continuous curve $X_\delta^m(t)$.

Remark 4.8. *The two conditions on (δ, m) are compatible. The bound condition indicates that for some generic constant C, $\delta^{a/2-1/4}m^{-1/2} < C$ or $\delta > Cm^{-2/(1-2a)}$, and the condition $m^{1/2}\delta^{1/4}|\log\delta| \to 0$ requires that δ should decrease faster than m^{-2}. For example, if we take $\delta = m^{-b}$ for any $b > 2$, then $\delta^{a/2-1/4}m^{-1/2} \leq 1$ holds for $1/2 > a > 1/2 - 1/b$, and $m^{1/2}\delta^{1/4}|\log\delta| = bm^{1/2-p/4}\log m \to 0$.*

Below we study the example considered in Section 3.4 under the stochastic gradient descent case.

Example 1(continue). We have already calculated $\nabla g(\theta) = \theta - \check{\theta}$, $\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(\theta) = I$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta) = \text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)$, $X(t) = \check{\theta} + (x_0 - \check{\theta})e^{-t}$. For the stochastic gradient descent case, solving the stochastic differential equation (4.21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
X_\delta^m(t) &= x_0^m e^{-t} + \check{\theta}(1 - e^{-t}) - \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}\int_0^t e^{u-t}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u) \\
&= \check{\theta} + (x_0^m - \check{\theta})e^{-t} - \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}\left(\tau\int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_1(u),\ \check{\theta}_2\int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_2(u)\right)' \\
&= X(t) + (x_0^m - x_0)e^{-t} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)\Lambda(t) \\
&= X(t) + (x_0^m - x_0)e^{-t} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}V(t), \qquad (4.37)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda(t) = -(\int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_1(u), \int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_2(u))$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process whose stationary distribution is a bivariate normal distribution with mean zero and variance equal to the half of identity matrix, and $V(t) = \text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)\Lambda(t)$ is the solution of the stochastic differential equation (4.24). It is easy to see that the weak convergence of $V_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ to $V(t)$. For the accelerated case, as we have seen, the solution of the ordinary differential equation (2.6) has the form

$$X(t) = \check{\theta} + \frac{2(x_0 - \check{\theta})}{t}J_1(t).$$

Below we will give solutions of the stochastic differential equations (4.35) and (4.36) in this case. First we consider the solution $V(t)$ of the stochastic differential equation (4.36).

It is easy to check that $tV(t)$ satisfies the inhomogeneous Bessel equation of the first order with constant term $t^3\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)$, and its solution can be expressed as follows,

$$V(t) = \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{J_1(t)}{t}\int_0^t \check{J}_1(u)u^2\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)d\mathbf{B}(u) - \frac{\pi}{2}\frac{\check{J}_1(t)}{t}\int_0^t J_1(u)u^2\text{diag}(\tau, \check{\theta}_2)d\mathbf{B}(u),$$

where $J_1(t)$ and $\check{J}_1(t)$ are the Bessel functions of the first and second kind of order one, respectively. Since in this case, ∇g is linear, $\mathbb{H}g = 1$, and the stochastic differential equations (4.35) and (4.36) differ by a shift $\check{\theta}$ and a scale $m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}$, we can easily find

$$\begin{aligned} X_\delta^m(t) &= \check{\theta} + \frac{2(x_0^m - \check{\theta})}{t}J_1(t) + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}V(t) \\ &= X(t) + \frac{2(x_0^m - x_0)}{t}J_1(t) + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}V(t). \end{aligned}$$

With the initial condition in A5, it is clear that $V_\delta^m(t) = (m^2/\delta)^{1/4}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converges to $V(t)$.

4.3 Joint computational and statistical asymptotic analysis for stochastic gradient descent

As we advocate a joint asymptotic analysis framework in Section 3.4, here $X(t)$, $X_\delta^m(t)$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $V(t)$ provide a joint asymptotic analysis for the dynamic behaviors of the algorithms (4.18) and (4.26), and the weak convergence results established in Theorems 4.1-4.6 can be used to demonstrate the corresponding weak convergence results in $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$. It is more complicated to consider the asymptotic analysis with $t \to \infty$ for the stochastic gradient descent case and extend the convergence results further from $[0, \infty)$ to $[0, \infty]$. As $t \to \infty$, Brownian motion $\mathbf{B}(t)$ behaves like $(2t\log\log t)^{1/2}$, and process $H(t)$ often diverges, however, there may exist meaningful distributional limits for processes $X_\delta^m(t)$, $x_\delta^m(t)$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $V(t)$. For the stochastic gradient descent case we establish the weak convergence of $V_\delta^m(t)$ to $V(t)$ on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and study their asymptotic behaviors as $t \to \infty$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that the assumptions A1-A5 are met, $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ is positive definite, all eigenvalues of $\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$ diverge as $t \to \infty$, $\mathbb{H}g(\theta_1)$ and $\mathbb{H}g(\theta_2)$ commute for any $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$, and assume $m^{1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2} \to 0$, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$. We obtain the following results.*
(i) As $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $V_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ and $(m/\delta)^{1/2}[x_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converge to $V(t)$ on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$.
(ii) The stochastic differential equation (4.24) admits a unique stationary distribution denoted by $V(\infty)$, where $V(\infty)$ follows a normal distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix $\Gamma(\infty)$ satisfying the algebraic Ricatti equation,

$$\Gamma(\infty)\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty)) + \mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))\Gamma(\infty) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty)). \tag{4.38}$$

(iii) Further assume that there exists a unique stationary distribution, denoted by $X_\delta^m(\infty)$, for the stochastic differential equation (4.21). Then as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $V_\delta^m(\infty) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(\infty) - X(\infty)]$ converges in distribution to $V(\infty)$.

Remark 4.9. *Similar to Theorem 3.3 and Remark 3.4, Theorem 4.7 indicates that for the stochastic gradient descent case, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $X_\delta^m(\infty)$ approaches $X(\infty) = \breve{\theta}$, $V_\delta^m(t) = \sqrt{m/\delta}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ converges to $V(t)$, $t \in [0, \infty]$, and $V(t)$ weakly converges to $V(\infty)$ as $t \to \infty$. Intuitively, $V(t)$ is a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with stationary distribution $V(\infty)$ as its limit when $t \to \infty$, and similarly the solution $X_\delta^m(t)$ of the stochastic differential equation (4.21) may admit a stationary distribution $X_\delta^m(\infty)$ as the limiting distribution of $X_\delta^m(t)$ when $t \to \infty$ (see Da Prato and Zabczyk (1996) and Gardiner (2009) for the existence of stationary distributions). Naturally $X_\delta^m(\infty)$ corresponds to $V(\infty)$. Mandt et al. (2017) essentially takes these results as its major model assumptions to establish that stochastic gradient descent can be treated as a statistical estimation procedure in the Bayesian framework.*

Note that stochastic gradient descent is designed for the pure computational purpose, and there is no corresponding objective function nor analog of minimizer $\hat{\theta}_n$ for the stochastic gradient descent algorithm, as mini-batches (and their corresponding gradient estimators) change along iterations. It is not clear whether we have known statistical estimation methods corresponding to the limits of $x_\delta^m(t)$ and $X_\delta^m(t)$ as $t \to \infty$. Below we provide an explicit illustration of the point through Example 1 considered in Sections 3.4 and 4.2.

Example 1(continue). First we evaluate

$$H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u) = \big(\tau B_1(t), \breve{\theta}_2 B_2(t)\big)',$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) = \text{diag}(\tau, \breve{\theta}_2)$, and $X(u) = \breve{\theta} + (x_0 - \breve{\theta})e^{-u}$. By the law of the iterated logarithm for Brownian motion, $H(t)$ diverges like $(t \log\log t)^{1/2}$ as $t \to \infty$. From (4.37) we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_\delta^m(t) &= X(t) + (x_0^m - x_0)e^{-t} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}\text{diag}(\tau, \breve{\theta}_2)\Lambda(t) \\ &= X(t) + (x_0^m - x_0)e^{-t} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{m}}V(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

$\Lambda(t) = -(\int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_1(u), \int_0^t e^{u-t}dB_2(u))$ is an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process whose stationary distribution is a bivariate normal distribution with mean zero and variance equal to the half of identity matrix, $V(t) = \text{diag}(\tau, \breve{\theta}_2)\Lambda(t)$, and $V_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}(x_0^m - x_0)e^{-t} + V(t)$. As $t \to \infty$, $\Lambda(t)$ approaches its stationary distribution given by $\mathbf{Z}/\sqrt{2}$, where $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2)'$, and Z_1 and Z_2 are independent standard normal random variables. Using the expression (4.39) we conclude that as $t \to \infty$, $X_\delta^m(t)$ converges in distribution to $X_\delta^m(\infty) = \breve{\theta} + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\text{diag}(\tau, \breve{\theta}_2)\mathbf{Z}/\sqrt{2}$. For the initial values satisfying Condition A5,

$x_0^m - x_0 = o((\delta/m)^{1/2})$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $V(t)$, and $V_\delta^m(\infty)$ weakly converges to $V(\infty) = (\tau Z_1, \check{\theta}_2 Z_2)/\sqrt{2}$.
On the other hand, the algorithm (4.18) gives

$$x_k^m = x_{k-1}^m + \delta(\bar{U}_{mk}^* - x_{k-1}^m), \;\; k = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

where $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^* = (U_{1k}^*, \cdots, U_{mk}^*)$, $k \geq 1$, are mini-batches, and $\bar{U}_{mk}^*$ is the sample mean of $U_{1k}^*, \cdots, U_{mk}^*$. In comparison with the recursive relationship $x_k^n = x_{k-1}^n + \delta(\bar{U}_n - x_{k-1}^n)$ for the stochastic sample optimization (3.7) based on all data, and $x_k = x_{k-1} + \delta(\check{\theta} - x_{k-1})$ for the deterministic population optimization (2.1), the differences are $\delta(\bar{U}_{mk}^* - \bar{U}_n)$ and $\delta(\bar{U}_{mk}^* - \check{\theta})$, respectively. In fact, for the stochastic gradient descent case, we rewrite the recursive relationship as $x_k^m = (1-\delta)x_{k-1}^m + \delta\bar{U}_{mk}^*$, and obtain

$$x_\delta^m(t) = x_0^m(1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]} + \delta \sum_{k\delta \leq t} (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]-k} \bar{U}_{mk}^*. \tag{4.40}$$

Similarly, we have

$$x_\delta^n(t) = x_0^n(1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]} + \bar{U}_n \delta \sum_{k\delta \leq t} (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]-k}, \;\; x_\delta(t) = x_0(1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]} + \check{\theta}\delta \sum_{k\delta \leq t} (1-\delta)^{[t\delta]-k}.$$

Letting $t \to \infty$, we get

$$x_\delta^n(\infty) = \bar{U}_n \delta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1-\delta)^{k-1} = \bar{U}_n, \;\; x_\delta(\infty) = \check{\theta},$$

$$x_\delta^m(\infty) = \delta \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (1-\delta)^j \bar{U}_{m,\ell-j}^* = \delta \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1-\delta)^{k-1} \bar{U}_{mk}^{**},$$

where sequence $\{\bar{U}_{mk}^{**}\}_k$ is defined as the reverse sequence of $\{\bar{U}_{mk}^*\}_k$. We can clearly see that $X(\infty) = x_\delta(\infty) = \check{\theta}$, $X^n(\infty) = x_\delta(\infty) = \hat{\theta}_n$, and $X_\delta^m(\infty)$ and $x_\delta^m(\infty)$ approach $\check{\theta}$ but do not correspond to any statistical estimation procedures like $\hat{\theta}_n$. For $t \in [0, \infty)$, when δ is small, and m is relatively large, $x_\delta^m(t)$ can be naturally approximated by its 'limit' $x_0^m e^{-t} + \check{\theta}(1-e^{-t}) - (\delta/m)^{1/2} \int_0^t e^{u-t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u)$, which is equal to $X_\delta^m(t)$, where the last term on the right hand side of (4.40) after centered at $\check{\theta}$ and normalized by $\delta^{1/2}$ weakly converges to $\int_0^t e^{u-t} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u)$. To compare these processes, we assume initial values $x_0^m = x_0^n = x_0$ for simplicity. Then

$$x_\delta^n(t) = x_\delta(t) + (\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta}) \left[1 - (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]}\right], \tag{4.41}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_\delta^m(t) &= x_\delta^n(t) + \delta \sum_{k\delta \leq t} (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]-k} (\bar{U}_{mk}^* - \bar{U}_n) \\ &= x_\delta(t) + (\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta}) \left[1 - (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]}\right] + \delta \sum_{k\delta \leq t} (1-\delta)^{[t/\delta]-k} (\bar{U}_{mk}^* - \bar{U}_n). \end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

The second and third terms on the right hand side of (4.42) account for, respectively, the variability due to statistical estimation and the random fluctuation due to the use of min-batches for gradient estimation from iteration to iteration in the stochastic gradient descent algorithm. Note that $\bar{U}_n - \check{\theta}$ and $\bar{U}^*_{mk} - \bar{U}_n$ are of orders $n^{-1/2}$ and $m^{-1/2}$, respectively. As $m/n \to 0$, we easily conclude that the second term on the right hand side of (4.42) is of order higher than the third term, where the the third term represents the cumulative min-batch-subsampling effect up to the $k = [t/\delta]$-th iteration, with the second term for the statistical estimation error. (4.41) and (4.42) show that as $m, n \to \infty$, $x^n_\delta(t)$ and $x^m_\delta(t)$ approach $\check{\theta}$, and on average both gradient descent and stochastic gradient descent algorithms stay on target, the difference is their random variabilities. Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 establish an order of $n^{-1/2}\mathbf{Z}$ for the random variability of the gradient descent algorithm using all data, while Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 indicate that for the stochastic gradient descent algorithm, the cumulative random fluctuation up to the $[t/\delta]$-iteration can be modeled by process $(\delta/m)^{1/2}V(t)$, where $V(t)$ given by the stochastic differential equation (4.24) (or its expression (4.25)) is a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process that may admit a stationary distribution with mean zero and variance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))/[2\boldsymbol{H}g(X(\infty))]$, factor $m^{-1/2}$ accounts for the effect of each mini-batch of size m, and factor $\delta^{1/2}$ represents the effect of the total number of mini-batches that is proportional to $1/\delta$. The normalized factor $(\delta/m)^{1/2}$ means that while each mini-batch of size m is not as efficient as full data sample of size n, but repetitive use of min-batch subsampling in stochastic gradient descent utilizes more data and improves its efficiency, with the improvement represented by $\delta^{1/2}$, where $1/\delta$ is proportional to the total number of min-batches up to the time t (or the t/δ-th iteration). In other words, repeatedly subsampling compensates the efficiency loss due to a mini-batch of small size at each iteration. Intuitively, it means that the stochastic gradient descent algorithm invokes different min-batches resulted some random fluctuation when moving from one iteration to another, and as the number of iterations increases, subsampling improves efficiency with factor $(\delta/m)^{1/2}$ instead of $m^{-1/2}$, to make up loss from $n^{-1/2}$ to $m^{-1/2}$, that is, updating with the use of many mini-batches can improve accuracy for the stochastic gradient descent algorithm.

4.4 Convergence analysis of stochastic gradient descent for non-convex optimization

Our asymptotic results may have implications for stochastic gradient descent used in non-convex optimization particularly in deep learning. Recent studies often suggest that stochastic gradient descent algorithms can escape from saddle points and find good local minima (Jastrzębski et al. (2018), Jin et al. (2017), Keskar et al. (2017), Lee et al. (2016), Shallue et al. (2019)). We will provide new rigorous analysis and heuristic intuition to shed some light on the phenomenon. First note that we can relax the convexity assumption on the objective function $g(\theta)$ for the deterministic population optimization (2.1) in Theorems 4.1-4.3, and thus Theorem 4.7 can be easily adopted to non-convex optimization with $\check{\theta}$ being a critical point of $g(\theta)$. Suppose that stochastic gradient descent processes converge

to the critical point $\check{\theta}$. Applying large deviation theory to the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) corresponding to the gradient descent algorithm, we obtain that as δ/m goes to zero, if the critical point is a saddle point of $g(\theta)$, the continuous processes generated from the stochastic differential equations can escape from the saddle point in a polynomial time (proportional to $(m/\delta)^{1/2}\log(m/\delta)$) (see Kifer (1981, theorems 2.1-2.3) and Li et al. (2017b, theorem 3.3)); while, if the critical point is a local minimizer of $g(\theta)$, the continuous processes will take an exponential time (proportional to $\exp\{c(m/\delta)^{1/2}\}$ for some generic constant c) to get out a neighborhood of the local minimizer (see Dembo and Zeitouni (2010, chapter 5) and Li et al. (2017b, theorem 3.2)). We may also explain the phenomenon from the limiting distribution point of view. Theorem 4.2 indicates that the continuous processes $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ generated from the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22) are asymptotically the same as the deterministic solution $X(t)$ of the ordinary differential equation (2.6) plus $(\delta/m)^{1/2}V(t)$, where $V(t)$ is the solution of the stochastic differential equation (4.24). The limiting process $V(t)$ is a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process given by the expression (4.25). We have the following theorem for the behaviors of $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))$ around the critical point $\check{\theta}$.

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose that the assumptions A1-A5 (except for the convexity of $g(\cdot)$) are met, and the gradient descent process $X(t)$ given by the ordinary differential equation (2.3) converges to a critical point $\check{\theta}$ of $g(\cdot)$. Then we have the following results,*

$$\begin{aligned} g(X_\delta^m(t)) &= g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\nabla g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + \frac{\delta}{2m}[V_\delta^m(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + o_P(\delta/m) \\ &= g(\check{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2}[X(t)-\check{\theta}+(\delta/m)^{1/2}V_\delta^m(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}+(\delta/m)^{1/2}V_\delta^m(t)] \\ &\quad + o_P\left(\delta/m + [X(t)-\check{\theta}]^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) &= \nabla g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + o_P((\delta/m)^{1/2}) \\ &= \mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}+(\delta/m)^{1/2}V_\delta^m(t)] + o_P\left((\delta/m)^{1/2} + |X(t)-\check{\theta}|\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

and the same equalities hold with X_δ^m replaced by $\check{X}_\delta^m$, where $X(t)$, $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ are the solutions of the differential equations (2.3), (4.21) and (4.22), respectively, $V_\delta^m(t) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$, and the equalities hold in the weak sense that we may consider $X_\delta^m(t)$, $V_\delta^m(t)$, and $V(t)$ on some common probability spaces through Skorokhod's representation.
If $\check{\theta} = X(\infty)$ is a local minimizer with positive definite $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$, then as $t \to \infty$, $V(t)$ has a limiting stationary distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix $\Gamma(\infty)$ satisfying the algebraic Ricatti equation (4.38), and

$$E[g(X_\delta^m(t))] = g(X(t)) + \frac{\delta}{4m}tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))] + o(\delta/m), \tag{4.45}$$

$$E[|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))|^2] = |\nabla g(X(t))|^2 + \frac{\delta}{2m}tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))] + o(\delta/m). \tag{4.46}$$

If $\check{\theta}$ is a saddle point, $V(t)$ diverges and thus does not have any limiting distribution.

Theorem 4.8 shows that as $X(t)$ gets close to the critical point $\check{\theta}$ within the range of order $(\delta/m)^{1/2}$, $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))$ are approximately quadratic. As Theorem 4.2 indicates that $V(t)$ is the limit of $V_\delta^m(t)$, we may replace $V_\delta^m(t)$ by $V(t)$ in the expansions of $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and find that $V(t)$ plays a key role in determining the behavior of the stochastic gradient descent algorithm. If the critical point $\check{\theta}$ is a saddle point of $g(\theta)$, $\mathbb{H}g(\cdot)$ is non-positive definite around the saddle point, and the time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $V(t)$ does not have any stationary distribution, and in fact, it diverges. Thus processes $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ have unstable behaviors around the saddle point and can make big moves, which leads them to escape from the saddle point. On the other hand, if the critical point $\check{\theta}$ is a local minimizer of $g(\theta)$, then $g(\cdot)$ may be approximately quadratic with positive definite $\mathbb{H}g(\cdot)$ around the local minimizer. Also $V(t)$ has a stationary distribution, and all the processes maintain stable stochastic behaviors. Moreover, the stochastic component $(\delta/m)^{1/2}V(t)$ plays a dominant role in determining the behaviors of $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))$ around the local minimizer. In fact, the equations (4.43)-(4.46) imply that $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))$ behave like

$$g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\nabla g(X(t))V(t) + \frac{\delta}{2m}[V(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t),$$

whose mean is asymptotically equal to

$$g(X(t)) + \frac{\delta}{4m}tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))],$$

and $\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $\nabla g(\check{X}_\delta^m(t))$ act similar to

$$\nabla g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t),$$

which has mean $\nabla g(X(t))$ and variance asymptotically equal to

$$\frac{\delta}{2m}tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))].$$

First note that the stochastic components in the equations (4.43)-(4.46) depend on the learning rate δ and the batch size m only through their ratio δ/m. Second, they are characterized by the local geometry of the objective function around the local minimizer, where the local geometric characteristics include the Hessian $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))$ and the gradient covariance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$. In particular utilizing the joint analysis along with the algebraic Ricatti equation (4.38) for the stationary covariance of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, we establish the equations (4.45)-(4.46) to specify how the minima found by stochastic gradient descent are influenced by four factors: the learning rate δ, batch size m, gradient covariance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})$, and Hessian $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$. These may have implications regarding the behavior of stochastic gradient descent for non-convex optimization. For example, (4.45)-(4.46) indicate that the ratio δ/m of learning rate to batch size is inversely proportional to $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})]$ for a given level of the expected loss at $\check{\theta}$ and $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]$ for a specific level

of the expected loss gradient at $\check{\theta}$. That is, for a larger δ/m, stochastic gradient descent tends to find a local minimum with smaller $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})]$ and $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]$. For a more sharp (or wide) local minimizer $\check{\theta}$, we have larger (or smaller) $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ as well as faster (or slower) changing gradient around $\check{\theta}$, which points to a tendency of larger (or smaller) $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})]$ and $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]$. The scenario analysis seems to indicate that for a higher ratio of learning rate to batch size, stochastic gradient descent tends to avoid sharp minima and lead towards more wide minima that typically generalize well.

A case in point is a special case studied in Jastrzębski et al. (2018) that identified three factors to influence the minimum found by stochastic gradient descent. We describe the special case as follows. Suppose that U has a pdf $f(u;\theta)$, and the loss function $\ell(\theta;u) = -\log f(u;\theta)$. Since we take the loss as a negative log likelihood, this is the MLE case, and the gradient covariance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta)$ corresponds to the negative Fisher information, which in turn is equal to $E[\mathbb{H}\ell(\theta;U)] = \mathbb{H}g(\theta)$. In this case, because the stochastic differential equation (4.24) has commutable diffusion coefficient $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))$ and drift $\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$, we have an explicit expression (4.25) for the time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $V(t)$, with the simple stationary distribution $N(0,\Gamma(\infty)) = N(0,\mathbf{I})/2$. With these explicit forms and $\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$, Jastrzębski et al. (2018, equation (9)) employed direct calculations for this specific example to essentially establish a special form of (4.45) with only three of the four factors about a relation between the ratio of learning rate to batch size and the width of the minimum found by stochastic gradient descent. However, their corresponding formula no longer holds for the general case. In fact, for this case, given $\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$ and the explicit expressions of $V(t)$ and its stationary distribution, our general results can easily recover the relation in Jastrzębski et al. (2018, equation (9)). Moreover, we conclude that smaller values for both $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})] = tr[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]$ and $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})] = tr[\{\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})\}^2]$ point to a wider minimum.

In Section 1.2 we have discussed Foster et al. (2019) regarding transforming the problem of finding near-stationary points for a stochastic optimization into finding near-stationary points for the corresponding deterministic optimization plus the related sample complexity. The equation (4.44) indicates that finding near-stationary points of $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ can be converted into making $|\nabla g(X(t))|$ small and controlling $(\delta/m)^{1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t)$. Making $|\nabla g(X(t))|$ small means finding a near-stationary point for the corresponding deterministic optimization. The equation (4.46) implies that the control of $(\delta/m)^{1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t)$ can be achieved through bounding its variance, namely, imposing a bound on $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]$ along with selecting a sufficiently small ratio δ/m of learning rate to batch size, where the variance $tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]$ is used to describe the sample complexity of the associated statistical learning problem for the time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. This indicates that our results are in line with Foster et al. (2019), and future study may reveal further intrinsic connection between our results and those in Foster et al. (2019). Also we again find that the behavior of stochastic gradient descent depends on the gradient covariance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$ and the Hessian $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))$ along with the ratio δ/m of learning rate to batch size.

Example 2. Consider the problem of orthogonal tensor decomposition (Ge et al. (2015)

and Li et al. (2016)). A 4-th order tensor $\Upsilon \in I\!R^{d^4}$ has an orthogonal tenor decomposition if it can be written as

$$\Upsilon = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{\otimes 4},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$'s are orthonormal vectors in $I\!R^d$ satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j\| = 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^\dagger \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k = 0$ for $j \neq k$, and the problem is to find tensor components $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$'s given such a tensor Υ. Since the tensor decomposition problem has inherent symmetry, that is, a tensor decomposition is unique only up to component permutation and sign-flips, the symmetry property makes the corresponding optimization problem multiple local minima and thus non-convex.
A formulation of orthogonal tensor decomposition as an optimization problem to find one component was proposed in Frieze et al. (1996) with the following objective function

$$\max_{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2=1} \Upsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Take $\Upsilon = E[U^{\otimes 4}]$ to be the 4-th order tensor whose (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)-th entry is $E(U_{i_1} U_{i_2} U_{i_3} U_{i_4})$, where U is a d-dimensional random vector with distribution Q. Assume $U = \mathbf{A}W$, where W is bounded, and has symmetric and i.i.d. components with unit variance, and $\mathbf{A}$ is an orthonormal matrix whose column vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_d$ form an orthonormal basis. Let ψ_k be the k-th moment of i.i.d. components of W, with $\psi_1 = 0$, $\psi_2 = 1$, and ψ_4 equal to its kurtosis. The optimization problem can be equivalently casted as the problem of finding components $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$'s into the solution to the following population optimization problem

$$\min -sign(\psi_4 - 3) E[(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger U)^4] = \min \sum_{j=1}^{d} -(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^\dagger \boldsymbol{\beta})^4 \quad \text{subject to } \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\| = 1.$$

It is well known that there is an unidentifiable tensor structure for $\psi_4 = 3$. For $\psi_4 \neq 3$, we may consider empirical objective function $\sum_{i=1}^n -sign(\psi_4 - 3)(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger U_i)^4$ based on available data $U_1, \cdots, U_n$, and study the corresponding stochastic optimization.
The objective function of the population optimization has the gradient and Hessian in the tangent space

$$sign(\psi_4 - 3) \nabla \Upsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = 4 \left([\beta_1^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_4^4] \beta_1, \cdots, [\beta_d^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_4^4] \beta_d \right),$$

$$sign(\psi_4 - 3) I\!H \Upsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = -12 \mathrm{diag}(\beta_1^2, \cdots, \beta_d^2) + 4 \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_4^4 \mathbf{I}_d.$$

Applying gradient descent and stochastic gradient descent algorithms for solving the population and stochastic optimization problems we obtain sequence x_k and x_k^m. As learning rate $\delta \to 0$, $x_{[t/\delta]}$ converges in probability to gradient flow $X(t)$ satisfying

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = 4 X_i \left(X_i^2 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} X_\ell^4 \right), \quad i = 1, \cdots, d,$$

and $(m/\delta)^{1/2}[x^m_{[t/\delta]} - X(t)]$ has a weak convergence limit $V(t)$ satisfying,

$$dV(t) = -\boldsymbol{\mu}(X(t))V(t)dt - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = -12\text{diag}(\beta_1^2, \cdots, \beta_d^2) + 4\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_4^4\mathbf{I}_d, \;\; \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = 16Cov([\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger\mathbf{W}]^3\mathbf{W}).$$

To better understand the complex gradient flow system and time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process limit, we derive explicit expressions for the case of $d = 2$ where $X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t))'$ has a closed-form solution

$$X_1^2(t) = 0.5 + 0.5[1 + c\exp(-4t)]^{-0.5}, \;\; X_2^2(t) = 1 - X_1^2(t),$$

with constant c depending on the initial value. In particular, if the initial vector$([X_1(0)]^2 < [X_2(0)]^2$ (resp. $([X_1(0)]^2 > [X_2(0)]^2)$, then $X_1(t)$ approaches 1 (resp. 0) as $t \to \infty$. Direct calculations lead to

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(u)/16 = E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^3\mathbf{W}\mathbf{W}^\dagger) - E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^3\mathbf{W})[E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^3\mathbf{W})]^\dagger,$$

where $E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^3\mathbf{W}) = (u_1^3\psi_4 + 3u_1u_2^2, u_2^3\psi_4 + 3u_1^2u_2)$,

$$E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^6W_1^2) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{6} C_\ell^6 u_1^\ell u_2^{6-\ell}\psi_{\ell+2}\psi_{6-\ell},$$

$$E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^6W_2^2) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{6} C_\ell^6 u_2^\ell u_1^{6-\ell}\psi_{\ell+2}\psi_{6-\ell},$$

$$E([u_1W_1 + u_2W_2]^6W_1W_2) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{6} C_\ell^6 u_1^\ell u_2^{6-\ell}\psi_{\ell+1}\psi_{6-\ell+1}.$$

We may simplify $\boldsymbol{\mu}(X(t))$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))$ further by approximating $X(t)$ with its limit w_*(some critical point). For example, if $X(t)$ approaches critical point $w_* = (1, 0)$ (saddle point), we may approximate $\boldsymbol{\mu}(X(t))$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))$ by $\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_*)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(w_*)$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_*) = -12\text{diag}(w_{*1}^2, w_{*2}^2) + 4\mathbf{I} = \text{diag}(-8, 4),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(w_*) = \text{diag}(\psi_8 - \psi_4^2, \psi_6),$$

and obtain an approximate stochastic differential equation for the weak convergence limit $V(t)$,

$$dV(t) = 4\left[-\text{diag}(-2, 1)V(t)dt - [\text{diag}(\psi_8 - \psi_4^2, \psi_6)]^{1/2}d\mathbf{B}_t\right].$$

On the other hand, if $X(t)$ approaches critical point $w_* = 2^{-1/2}(1, -1)$ (local minimizer), we have

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(w_*) = -12\text{diag}(w_{*1}^2, w_{*2}^2) + 4\mathbf{I}/d = -8I/d = -4\mathbf{I},$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(w_*) = \frac{1}{8}\begin{pmatrix} \psi_8 + 16\psi_6 + 15\psi_4^2 - 26\psi_3\psi_5 - (\psi_4+3)^2 & 30\psi_3\psi_5 - 12\psi_6 - 20\psi_4^2 + (\psi_4+3)^2 \\ 30\psi_3\psi_5 - 12\psi_6 - 20\psi_4^2 + (\psi_4+3)^2 & \psi_8 + 16\psi_6 + 15\psi_4^2 - 26\psi_3\psi_5 - (\psi_4+3)^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$dV(t) = -4V(t)dt - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(u_*)d\mathbf{B}_t.$$

It is easy to see from the stochastic differential equations that $V(t)$ has a stationary distribution for the local minimizer case, while $V(t)$ diverges for the saddle point case (in fact the first component of $V(t)$ has variance with exponential growth in t).

4.5 Statistical analysis of stochastic gradient descent for output inference

There is a great current interest in statistical analysis of stochastic gradient descent. Examples include statistical variability analysis and Bayesian inference (Chen et al. (2018), Li et al. (2018), Mandt et al. (2017), Toulis and Airoldi (2017)). Our results may have important implications on statistical analysis of stochastic gradient descent. For the case of stochastic gradient descent, Theorems 4.2-4.3 show that output sequence x_k^m generated from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) is asymptotically equivalent to the continuous processes $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ generated from the stochastic differential equations (4.21) and (4.22), respectively, and they both in turn are asymptotically the same as $(\delta/m)^{1/2}V(t)$ plus the deterministic solution $X(t)$ of the ordinary differential equation (2.3), where $V(t)$ is the solution of the stochastic differential equation (4.24). The limiting process $V(t)$ is a time-dependent Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, and its stationary distribution is a normal distribution given by Theorem 4.7 with mean zero and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$ specified in the algebraic Ricatti equation (4.38). This suggests that statistical inference based on x_k^m can be asymptotically equivalent to statistical inference based on discrete samples from $X(t) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}V(t)$. As $t \to \infty$, $X(t)$ converges to the true minimizer $X(\infty) = \check{\theta}$, $V(t)$ converges in distribution to $V(\infty)$, which follows its stationary distribution $N(0, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty))$. Thus inferences based on x_k^m can be asymptotically equivalent to inferences based on discrete samples from the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with stationary distribution $N(\check{\theta}, \delta\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)/m)$. Below we discuss two specific cases.

Consider the Bayesian treatment of stochastic gradient descent in Mandt et al. (2017). As described above, Theorems 4.2-4.3 and Theorem 4.7 imply that outputs from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18) are asymptotically equivalent to discrete samples from the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with stationary distribution $N(\check{\theta}, \delta\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)/m)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$ is given by the algebraic Ricatti equation (4.38). Applying the Bernstein-von Mises theorem to discrete samples from the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, we obtain that the posterior distribution is asymptotically equal to a normal distribution with mean and covariance equal to the MLE of $\check{\theta}$ and the Fisher information evaluated at the MLE, respectively. Since the stochastic gradient descent outputs are asymptotically equivalent to discrete samples from the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, the posterior distribution based on outputs from stochastic gradient descent is asymptotically the same as the posterior distribution for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model, and thus is asymptotically equal to the normal distribution. The obtained results can be employed to justify the essential inference assumptions

in Mandt et al. (2017) and Li et al. (2018) that stochastic gradient descent is a stationary Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, and the corresponding posterior distribution is Gaussian.
Another case is the average output from stochastic gradient descent. Denote by $\bar{x}_\delta^m$ the average of N outputs $x_{k_i}^m = x_\delta^m(t_{k_i})$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, from the stochastic gradient descent algorithm (4.18), where N may depend on m and δ, and $N \to \infty$ as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$. By Skorokhod's representation theorem and Theorems 4.2-4.3 we have that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, the average of $x_\delta^m(t)$ has the same asymptotic distribution as the average of $X_\delta^m(t)$, and the difference between

$$(m/\delta)^{1/2}\left[N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N X_\delta^m(t_{k_i}) - N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N X(t_{k_i})\right] \text{ and } N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N V(t_{k_i})$$

is negligible. Note that deterministic $N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^N X(t_{k_i})$ converges to $X(\infty) = \check{\theta}$, and that for large N the distribution of $N^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^N V(t_{k_i})$ can be approximated by a normal distribution with mean zero and covariance $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$, where with notations in Theorem 4.7 we set

$$A = \mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta}) = \mathbb{H}g(X(\infty)), \quad S = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty)). \tag{4.47}$$

This suggests that $(m/\delta)^{1/2}(\bar{x}_\delta^m - \check{\theta})$ has an asymptotic normal distribution with mean zero and covariance $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$, and we may use outputs from stochastic gradient descent to estimate $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$ and employ the associated Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process to justify the estimation approaches. See Chen et al. (2018) and Li et al. (2018) for the covariance estimation study of stochastic gradient descent.
Note the asymptotic covariance difference between $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$ and $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$ for stochastic gradient descent above and in the literature. For example, in Chen et al. (2018), Kushner and Yin (2003), Li et al. (2018), and Polyak and Juditsky (1992), the average output from stochastic gradient descent has asymptotic covariance $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$, while Mandt et al. (2017) and Theorem 4.7 indicate that the asymptotic covariance of the corresponding outputs is equal to the stationary covariance $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$ [defined in (4.38)] of the associated Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. We explain and reconcile the difference between the covariances $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$ as follows. On the one hand, although the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $V(t)$ approaches its normal stationary distribution with mean zero and covariance $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\infty)$, its re-scaled average $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{i=1}^N V(t_{k_i}) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\int_0^N V(s)ds$ has asymptotic covariance $A^{-1}SA^{-1}$. Indeed, without confusion we denote by $V(t)$ the stationary solution of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model $dV(t) = -AV(t)dt + S^{1/2}d\mathbf{B}_t$, and define its auto-covariance function $\zeta(s_1 - s_2) = E[V(s_1)(V(s_2))']$. Then the variance of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\int_0^N V(s)ds$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{N}\int_0^N\int_0^N E[V(s_1)(V(s_2))']ds_1ds_2 = \frac{1}{N}\int_0^N\int_0^N \zeta(s_1 - s_2)ds_1ds_2 \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\zeta(u)du + O(N^{-1}) = A^{-1}SA^{-1} + O(N^{-1}), \text{ as } N \to \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where A and S are given by the expressions (4.47), and the last equality is due to the facts that

$$\zeta(0) = Var(V(s)) = \int_0^\infty e^{-As} S e^{-As} ds = \Gamma(\infty) \text{ satisfying } \zeta(0)A + A\zeta(0) = S,$$
$$\zeta(s) = e^{-As}\zeta(0), \;\; \zeta(-s) = \zeta(0)e^{-As}, \;\; s \geq 0,$$
$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \zeta(u)du = A^{-1}\zeta(0) + \zeta(0)A^{-1} = A^{-1}[\zeta(0)A + A\zeta(0)]A^{-1} = A^{-1}SA^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, the stationary covariance $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\infty)$ is derived by treating the stochastic gradient descent recursive equation as an approximate VAR(1) model (see Polyak and Juditsky (1992)), where the VAR(1) model can be expressed as $V_k = \Psi V_{k-1} + e_k$, with $\Psi = I - \delta A$, and random errors e_k has covariance $Var(e_k) = \delta S$. The VAR(1) model can be approximated by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model $dV(t) = -AV(t)dt + S^{1/2}d\mathbf{B}_t$. From the VAR(1) equation and stationarity we obtain

$$Var(V_k) = \Psi Var(V_{k-1})\Psi + \delta S = (I - \delta A)Var(V_k)(I - \delta A) + \delta S$$
$$= Var(V_k) - \delta A Var(V_k) - \delta Var(V_k)A + \delta^2 A Var(V_k)A + \delta S,$$

Canceling out $Var(V_k)$, dividing by δ on both sides, and then letting $\delta \to 0$ we obtain

$$A\, Var(V_k) + Var(V_k)\, A = S,$$

which recovers the algebraic Ricatti equation (4.38) for the stationary covariance $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\infty)$ of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $V(t)$. In particular, for the one-dimensional case, the AR(1) variance has an expression $Var(e_k)/(1 - \Psi^2)$. Plugging $\Psi = I - \delta A$ and $Var(e_k) = \delta S$ into the variance formula we obtain

$$\frac{Var(e_k)}{1 - \Psi^2} = \frac{\delta S}{1 - (1 - \delta A)^2} = \frac{S}{2A} + O(\delta),$$

where the leading term $\frac{S}{2A}$ is the exact stationary variance of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

5 A numerical example

This section considers a simple example with some numerical study to illustrate the approximation of gradient descent algorithms by ordinary or stochastic differential equations.
Example 3. Consider the following simple linear regression model

$$U_{1i} = U_{2i}'\theta + \varepsilon_i, \;\; i = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{5.48}$$

where U_{1i} and U_{2i} are response and covariate, respectively, $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)'$ is the parameter, and random errors ε_i are i.i.d. normal random variables with mean zero and variance

τ^2. We consider both fixed and random designs. For the random design case, we assume that U_{2i} and ε_i are independent, and U_{2i} are i.i.d. mean zero bivariate normal random vectors. For the fixed design case, we set U_{2i} to be deterministic instead of bivariate normal random variables, where observations U_{1i} are not i.i.d, and we need to make some obvious modification.

First consider the fixed design case. Denote by $\check{\theta}$ the true value of the parameter θ in the regression model. Let $U_1 = (U_{11}, \cdots, U_{1n})'$, $U_2 = (U_{21}, \cdots, U_{2n})'$, and $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n)$. Assume that we have an orthogonal design so that $U_2'U_2/n$ is equal to the identity matrix. Then we may write regression model in a matrix form $U_1 = U_2\theta + \varepsilon$, and define $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = (U_1 - U_2\theta)'(U_1 - U_2\theta)/(2n)$, and $g(\theta) = E[\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)]$. Simple calculations show $g(\theta) = [(\theta - \check{\theta})'(\theta - \check{\theta}) + \tau^2]/2$, $\nabla g(\theta) = \theta - \check{\theta}$, $\nabla \mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = -U_2'(U_1 - U_2\theta)/n = \nabla g(\theta) - n^{-1/2}\tau \mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{Z} = n^{-1/2}U_2'\varepsilon/\tau$ follows a standard bivariate normal distribution.

It is easy to see that the deterministic population minimization problem (2.1) and the stochastic sample minimization problem (3.7) have explicit solutions in this case: $g(\theta)$ has the minimizer being the true parameter value $\check{\theta}$, and $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ has the minimizer equal to the least squares estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$.

The ordinary differential equations (3.9) and (3.16) [or (3.11) and (3.17)] are identical in this case, and as $n \to \infty$, their limits are given by the ordinary differential equations (2.3) and (2.6). Specially, the differential equations admit solutions with the following expressions

$$X^n(t) = (X_1^n(t), X_2^n(t))' = \frac{U_2'U_1}{n} + \left(x_0^n - \frac{U_2'U_1}{n}\right) e^{-t}, X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t))' = \check{\theta} + (x_0 - \check{\theta})e^{-t}$$

for the plain gradient descent case. For the accelerated case,

$$X^n(t) = \begin{pmatrix} X_1^n(t) \\ X_2^n(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\check{\theta} + n^{-1/2}\tau\mathbf{Z} + \frac{2(x_0^n - \check{\theta} - n^{-1/2}\tau\mathbf{Z})}{t} J_1(t)\right)_{i=1,2},$$

$$X(t) = \begin{pmatrix} X_1(t) \\ X_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\check{\theta} + \frac{2(x_0 - \check{\theta})}{t} J_1(t)\right)_{i=1,2},$$

where x_0^n and x_0 are initial values of $X^n(t)$ and $X(t)$, respectively, and $J_1(u)$ is the Bessel function of the first kind of order one. The results are identical to those for Example 1 given in Section 3.4. For both stochastic gradient descent and accelerated stochastic gradient descent cases, the situation is also the same as the part of Example 1 considered in Section 4.2 with explicit forms.

Now consider the random design case. Denote the covariance matrix of U_{2i} by $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = E[U_{2i}U_{2i}'] = (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$, let $\check{\theta}$ be the true value of the parameter θ in the regression model, and define $\ell(\theta; U_i) = (U_{1i} - U_{2i}'\theta)^2/2$. Then $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (U_{1i} - U_{2i}'\theta)^2/2$ is the half mean residual square error, $g(\theta) = E[\ell(\theta; U_i)] = \tau^2/2 + (\theta - \check{\theta})'\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta - \check{\theta})^2/2$, $\nabla g(\theta) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta - \check{\theta})$, $\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i) = U_{2i}(U_{2i}'\theta - U_{1i})$, and $\nabla \mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n U_{2i}(U_{2i}'\theta - U_{1i})$. Also from the regression model (5.48) we have

$$\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i) = U_{2i}U_{2i}'(\theta - \check{\theta}) - U_{2i}\,\varepsilon_i, \;\; E[\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i)] = \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta - \check{\theta}) = \nabla g(\theta),$$

$$\sigma(\theta) = Var[\nabla \ell(\theta; U_i)] = E[U_{21}U_{21}'(\theta - \check{\theta})(\theta - \check{\theta})'U_{21}U_{21}'] + \tau^2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\theta - \check{\theta})(\theta - \check{\theta})'\boldsymbol{\alpha}',$$

where we set $U_{21} = (H_1, H_2)'$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)' = \theta - \check{\theta}$, and compute $E(H_1^4) = 3\alpha_{11}^2$, $E(H_1^3 H_2) = 3\alpha_{11}\alpha_{12}$, $E(H_1^2 H_2^2) = \alpha_{11}\alpha_{22} + 2\alpha_{12}^2$, $E(H_1 H_2^3) = 3\alpha_{22}\alpha_{21}$, $E(H_2^4) = 3\alpha_{22}^2$, and $U_{21}U_{21}'(\theta - \check{\theta})(\theta - \check{\theta})'U_{21}U_{21}' =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_1^4\beta_1^2 + 2H_1^3 H_2\beta_1\beta_2 + H_1^2 H_2^2\beta_2^2 & H_1^3 H_2\beta_1^2 + 2H_1^2 H_2^2\beta_1\beta_2 + H_1 H_2^3\beta_2^2 \\ H_1^3 H_2\beta_1^2 + 2H_1^2 H_2^2\beta_1\beta_2 + H_1 H_2^3\beta_2^2 & H_1^2 H_2^2\beta_1^2 + 2H_1 H_2^3\beta_1\beta_2 + H_2^4\beta_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Again it is easy to see that the minimization problems corresponding to (2.1) and (3.7) have explicit solutions in this case: $g(\theta)$ has the minimizer being the true parameter value $\check{\theta}$, and $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ has the minimizer equal to the least squares estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$.

Take $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.02 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.005 \end{pmatrix}$, $\tau = 0.1$, and $\check{\theta} = (0, 0)'$. Then $g(\theta) = (0.02\theta_1^2 + 0.005\theta_2^2 + 0.1)/2$, and

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_{11}^2\theta_1^2 + \alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}\theta_2^2 + \tau^2\alpha_{11} & \alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}\theta_1\theta_2 \\ \alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}\theta_1\theta_2 & \alpha_{11}\alpha_{22}\theta_1^2 + 2\alpha_{22}\theta_2^2 + \tau^2\alpha_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Unlike the fixed design case, the random design case lacks explicit expressions for the processes corresponding to the accelerated (or stochastic) gradient descent algorithms and the ordinary (or stochastic) differential equations. We applied the gradient descent, accelerated gradient descent, and stochastic gradient descent algorithms and solved the corresponding ordinary or stochastic differential equations by the Euler scheme for various initial values and (m, n, δ). We conducted simulations to check the finite sample performance of the obtained gradient descent central limit theorem. Figure 1 illustrates sample paths of sequences generated from the accelerated gradient descent (based on all data) and stochastic gradient descent algorithms and their corresponding ordinary or stochastic differential equations. It also displays the comparison of the limiting distribution with the corresponding finite sample distribution of the scaled discrepancy between the sample and population gradient flows. As analytically demonstrated in the fixed design case, the numerical results show that the algorithms and the ordinary or stochastic differential equations can successfully find the solutions of the corresponding minimization problems. The sample paths generated by the algorithms and differential equations for solving the stochastic sample optimization problem are random sequences or curves distributed around the true targets for the corresponding deterministic population optimization, and the sample path for each algorithm is closely tracked by that for its corresponding differential equation. We found that the finite sample distributions of $V^n(t)$ and $V_\delta^m(t)$ can be well approximated by their corresponding limiting distributions provided by the obtained gradient descent central limit theorem.

Acknowledgements

The research of Yazhen Wang was supported in part by NSF grants DMS-1528375, DMS-1707605, and DMS-1913149. The authors thank action editor Ryan Tibshirani, an asso-




Figure 1: The scatter plot of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ and the plots of sample paths for accelerated and stochastic gradient descent algorithms and their corresponding ordinary or stochastic differential equations, where $\delta = 0.05$, $n = 1000$, $m = 200$, initial values $x_0 = x_0^n = x_0^m = (0.1, 0.1)'$, and $\tau = 1$. The top panels are sample paths of the gradient descent algorithms to compute $\hat{\theta}_n$, with the top left and right panels for the stochastic gradient descent case, and the accelerated gradient descent case based on all data, respectively. In both top panels, $\times$ denotes the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ which is the solution of the stochastic sample optimization (3.7), with $\circ$ for the true parameter value $\breve{\theta} = (0, 0)$ which is the solution of the deterministic population optimization (2.1); in the top left panel, color curves are different sample paths of stochastic gradient descent; and in the top right panel, color curves with $+$ and $\circ$ correspond to sample paths of the algorithm (3.10) and their corresponding differential equation (3.11), respectively, for accelerated gradient descent based on all data, with the black curve for sample paths of the algorithm (2.4) and the ordinary differential equation (2.6). The bottom left panel is the scatter plot of 500 simulated $\hat{\theta}_n$, and the bottom right panel is the marginal quantiles for $V(t)$ (the curve with $\bullet$) and the corresponding estimated quantiles for $V_\delta^m(t)$ (the curve with $\circ$) based on 500 repetitions.

ciate editor and three referees for helpful comments and suggestions which led to improvements of the paper.

REFERENCES

A. Ali, Z. Kolter, and R. Tibshirani. A continuous-time view of early stopping for least squares regression. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 2019.

L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Gradient Flows: In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures. Birkhäuser. Second edition. 2008.

Y. Arjevani, S. Shalev-Shwartz, and O. Shamir. On lower and upper bounds for smooth and strongly convex optimization problems. ArXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06833, 2015.

H. Attouch, J. Peypouquet, and P. Redont. On the fast convergence of an inertial gradient-like system with vanishing viscosity. ArXiv preprint arXiv:1507.04782, 2015.

P. Billingsley. Convergence of Probability Measures. Wiley, 2nd Edition. 1999.

P. J. Bickel, F. Götze, and W. R. van Zwet. Resampling fewer than n observations: Gains, loses, and remedies for loses. Statistica Sinica 7, 1-31. 1997.

S. Blanes, F. Casas, J. A. Oteo, and J. Ros. The Magnus expansion and some of its applications. Physics Reports 470, 151-238, 2009.

M. Bogdan, E. V. D. Berg, C. Sabatti, W. Su, and E. J. Candés. SLOPE adaptive variable selection via convex optimization. Annals of Applied Statistics, 9(3):1103-1140, 2015.

L. Bottou. Online learning and stochastic approximations. On-line learning in neural networks, 17(9):142, 1998.

S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. Convex Optimization. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 3(1):1-122, 2011.

A. A. Brown and M. C. Bartholomew-Biggs. Some effective methods for unconstrained optimization based on the solution of systems of ordinary differential equations. Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 62(2):211-224, 1989.

S. Bubeck, Y. T. Lee, and M. Singh. A geometric alternative to Nesterov's accelerated gradient descent. ArXiv preprint arXiv:1506.08187, 2015.

S. Bubeck and N. Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 5(1):1-122, 2012.

J. C. Butcher. Numerical Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations. John Wiley. 2008.

V. Chandrasekarana and M. I. Jordan. Computational and statistical tradeoffs via convex relaxation. PNAS 110, no. 13, E1181-E1190. 2012.

C. Chen, D. Carlson, Z. Gan, C. Li, and L. Carin. Bridging the gap between stochastic gradient MCMC and stochastic optimization. arXiv:1512.07962v3, 2016.

C. Chen, N. Ding, and L. Carin. On the convergence of stochastic gradient MCMC algorithms with high-order integrators. arXiv:1610.06665v1, 2016.

X. Chen, J. D. Lee, X. T. Tong, Y. Zhang. Statistical inference for model parameters in stochastic gradient descent. arXiv:1610.08637, 2018.

Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher. Probability Theory. Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales. Third edition. New York, Springer. 1997.

M. Csörgö, L. Horváth, and P. Kokoszka. Approximation for bootstrapped empirical processes. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 128, 2457-2464. 1999.

S. Csörgö, and D. M. Mason. Bootstrapping empirical functions. Ann. Statist. 17, 1447-1471. 1989.

G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. Ergodicity for Infinite Dimensional Systems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; 1996.

A. S. Dalalyan. Further and stronger analogy between sampling and optimization: Langevin Monte Carlo and gradient descent. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 65:1-12, 2017.

J. Fan, W. Gong, C. J. Li, and Q. Sun. Statistical sparse online regression: A diffusion approximation perspective. Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, PMLR 84, 1017-1026 (2018).

N. Flammarion and F. R. Bach. From averaging to acceleration, there is only a step-size. In Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Learning Theory (COLT), 2015.

D. J. Foster, A. Sekhari, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, K. Sridharan, B. Woodworth. The complexity of making the gradient small in stochastic convex optimization. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research 99, 1-27 (2019).

A. Frieze, M. Jerrum, and R. Kannan. Learning linear transformations. FOCS 1996.

C. W. Gardiner. Stochastic Methods: A Handbook for the Natural and Social Sciences. Springer, 4th edition. 2009.

R. Ge, F. Huang, C. Jin, and Y. Yuan. Escaping from saddle points - online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In COLT, 2015.

S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming. Mathematical Programming, 156(1):59-99, 2015.

I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville. Deep Learning. MIT press. 2016.

T. Hida and S. Si. Lectures on White Noise Functionals. World Scientific. 2008.

S. W. He, J. G. Wang, and J. A. Yan. Semimartingale Theory and Stochastic Calculus. Science Press and CRC Press. 1992.

C. Hu, J. T. Kwok, and W. Pan. Accelerated gradient methods for stochastic optimization and online learning. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 22, 2009.

N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes, Volume 24 (North-Holland Mathematical Library). 1981.

J. Jacod and A. Shiryaev. Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes. Springer, 2nd edition, 2003.

S. Jastrzębski, Z. Kenton, D. Arpit, N. Ballas, A. Fischer, Y. Bengio, and A. Storkey. Three factors influencing minima in SGD. arXiv:1711.04623v3. 2018.

S. Ji and J.Ye. An accelerated gradient method for trace norm minimization. In Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2009.

C. Jin, R. Ge, P. Netrapalli, S. M. Kakade, M. I. Jordan. How to escape saddle points efficiently. arXiv:1703.00887v1, 2017.

V. Jojic, S. Gould, and D. Koller. Accelerated dual decomposition for MAP inference. In Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2010.

A. Juditsky. Convex Optimization II: Algorithms. Lecture Notes, 2013.

A. Juditsky, A. Nemirovski, and C. Tauvel. Solving variational inequalities with stochastic mirror-prox algorithm. Stoch. Syst., 1(1):17-58, 2011.

K. Kawaguchi. Deep learning without poor local minima. In Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems, pages 586-594, 2016.

N. S. Keskar, D. Mudigere, J. Nocedal, M. Smelyanskiy, and P. T. P. Tang. On Large-Batch Training for Deep Learning: Generalization Gap and Sharp Minima.

arXiv:1609.04836v2, 2017.

Y. Kifer. The exit problem for small random perturbations of dynamical systems with a hyperbolic fixed point. Israel Journal of Mathematics 40, 74-96 (1981).

J. Kim and D. Pollard (1990). Cube root asymptotics. Ann. Statist.18, 191-219.

J. Komlós, P. Major, and G. Tusnády. An approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s and the sample DF. I. Z. Wahrschein. Verw. Gebiete 32, 111-131. 1975.

J. Komlós, P. Major, and G. Tusnády. An approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s and the sample DF. II. Z. Wahrschein. Verw. Gebiete 34, 33-58. 1976.

W. Krichene, A. Bayen, and P. Bartlett. Accelerated mirror descent in continuous and discrete time. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 29, 2015.

W. Krichene, S. Krichene, and A. Bayen. Efficient Bregman projections onto the simplex. In 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2015.

H. Kushner and G. Yin. Stochastic Approximation and Recursive Algorithms and Applications. Springer, 2003.

G. Lan. An optimal method for stochastic composite optimization. Mathematical Programming, 133(1-2):365-397, 2012.

G. Lan, Z. Lu, and R. Monteiro. Primal-dual first-order methods with $O(1/\epsilon)$ iteration-complexity for cone programming. Mathematical Programming, 126(1):1-29, 2011.

J. D. Lee, M. Simchowitz, M. I Jordan, and B. Recht. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers. In Conference on Learning Theory, pages 1246-1257, 2016.

L. Lessard, B. Recht, and A. Packard. Analysis and design of optimization algorithms via integral quadratic constraints. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 26(1):57-95, 2016.

T. Li, L. Liu, A. Kyrillidis, and C. Caramanis. Statistical Inference Using SGD. The Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18), 3571-3578, 2018.

C. J. Li, Z. Wang, H. Liu. Online ICA: Understanding global dynamics of nonconvex optimization via diffusion processes. 30th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2016), Barcelona, Spain.

C. J. Li, M. Wang, H. Liu, and T. Zhang. Diffusion approximations for online principal component estimation and global convergence. 31th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2017), Long Beach, CA, USA. 2017a.

C. J. Li, L. Li, J. Qian, J. Liu. Batch Size Matters: A Diffusion Approximation Framework

on Nonconvex Stochastic Gradient Descent. arXiv:1705.07562v2, 2017b.

H. Li and Z. Lin. Accelerated proximal gradient methods for nonconvex programming. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 28, 2015.

Q. Li, C. Tai, W. E. Stochastic modified equations and adaptive stochastic gradient algorithms. arXiv:1511.06251v3, 2015.

Y. A. Ma, N. S. Chatterji, X. Cheng, N. Flammarion, P. L. Bartlett, c, and M. I. Jordan Is there an analog of Nesterov acceleration for MCMC? arXiv:1902.00996v1. 2019.

S. Mandt, M. D. Hoffman, and D. M. Blei. A variational analysis of stochastic gradient algorithms. arXiv:1602.02666v1, 2016.

S. Mandt, M. D. Hoffman, and D. M. Blei. Stochastic gradient descent as approximate Bayesian inference. Journal of Machine Learning Research 18, 1-35, 2017.

P. Massart. Strong Approximation for Multivariate Empirical and Related Processes, Via KMT Constructions. Ann. Probab. 17, 266-291, 1989.

Q. Meng, W. Chen, J. Yu,T. Wang, Z. Ma, T. Liu. Asynchronous Accelerated Stochastic Gradient Descent. Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence ((IJCAI-16). 2016.

R. Monteiro, C. Ortiz, and B. Svaiter. An adaptive accelerated first-order method for convex optimization. Technical report, ISyE, Gatech, 2012.

A. Nemirovskii and D. Yudin. Problem Complexity and Method Efficiency in Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, 1983.

Y. Nesterov. A method of solving a convex programming problem with convergence rate $O(1/k^2)$. Soviet Mathematics Doklady, 27(2):372-376, 1983.

Y. Nesterov. Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course. Applied Optimization. Kluwer, 2004.

Y. Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. Mathematical Programming, 103(1):127-152, 2005.

Y. Nesterov. Accelerating the cubic regularization of Newton's method on convex problems. Mathematical Programming, 112(1):159-181, 2008.

Y. Nesterov. Gradient methods for minimizing composite functions. Mathematical Programming, 140(1):125-161, 2013.

Y. Nesterov and Boris T. Polyak. Cubic regularization of Newton's method and its global

performance. Mathematical Programming, 108(1):177-205, 2006.

J. Nocedal and S. Wright. Numerical Optimization. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

B. O'Donoghue and E. Candés. Adaptive restart for accelerated gradient schemes. Foundations of Computational Mathematics, 15(3):715-732, 2015.

B. O'Donoghue and E. J. Candés. Adaptive restart for accelerated gradient schemes. Found. Comput. Math., 2013.

D. Pollard. Empirical Processes: Theory and Applications. CMS. 1988.

B. T. Polyak. Introduction to optimization. Optimization Software New York, 1987.

B. T. Polyak and A. B. Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 30 (4): 838, 1992.

M. Raginsky and J. Bouvrie. Continuous-time stochastic mirror descent on a network: Variance reduction, consensus, convergence. In CDC 2012, pages 6793-6800, 2012.

A. Rakhlin, O. Shamir, and K. Sridharan. Making Gradient Descent Optimal for Strongly Convex Stochastic Optimization. arXiv:1109.5647v7, 2012.

E. Rio. Strong Approximation for Set-Indexed Partial Sum Processes Via KMT Constructions I. Ann. Probab. 21, 759-790 (1993a).

E. Rio. Strong Approximation for Set-Indexed Partial-Sum Processes, Via KMT Constructions II. Ann. Probab. 21, 1706-1727 (1993b).

R. T. Rockafellar. Convex Analysis. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, 1997. Reprint of the 1970 original.

S. Ruder. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. arXiv:1609.04747v1, 2016.

D. Ruppert. Efficient estimators from a slowly converging Robbins-Monro process. Technical report, 1988.

A. P. Ruszczyński. Nonlinear Optimization. Princeton University Press, 2006.

C. J. Shallue, J. Lee, J. Antognini, J. Sohl-Dickstein, R. Frostig, and G. E. Dahl. Measuring the effects of Data Parallelism on Neural Network Training. Journal of Machine Learning Research 20, 1-49 (2019).

N. Z. Shor. Minimization Methods for Non-Differentiable Functions. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

J. Sirignano and K. Spiliopoulos. Stochastic gradient descent in continuous time. arXiv:1611.05545v3, 2017.

J. Sirignano and K. Spiliopoulos. Stochastic gradient descent in continuous time: A central limit theorem. arXiv:1710.04273v2, 2017.

I. Sutskever, J. Martens, G. Dahl, and G. Hinton. On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 1139-1147, 2013.

W. Su, S. Boyd, and E. J. Candés. A differential equation for modeling Nesterov's accelerated gradient method: Theory and insights. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 27, 2014.

Weijie Su, Stephen Boyd, and Emmanuel J. Candés. A differential equation for modeling Nesterov's accelerated gradient method: Theory and Insights. Journal of Machine Learning Research 17, 1-43. 2016.

P. Tseng. On accelerated proximal gradient methods for convex-concave optimization. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 2008.

P. Tseng. Approximation accuracy, gradient methods, and error bound for structured convex optimization. Mathematical Programming, 125(2):263-295, 2010.

P. Toulis and E. M. Airoldi. Asymptotic and finite-sample properties of estimators based on stochastic gradients. Ann. Statist. 45(4), 1694-1727 (2017).

A. W. van der Vaart and J. Wellner. Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes With Applications to Statistics. Springer. 2000.

G. N. Watson. A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 1995. Reprint of the second (1944) edition.

A. Wibisono, A. Wilson, and M. Jordan. A variational perspective on accelerated methods in optimization. Proc Natl Acad Sci 113, E7351-E7358. 2016.

Z. A. Zhu. Katyusha: The first direct acceleration of stochastic gradient methods. Journal of Machine Learning Research 18, 1-51 (2018).

Z. Zhu, J. Wu, B. Yu, L. Wu, and J. Ma The anisotropic noise in stochastic gradient descent: Its behavior of escaping from sharp minima and regularization effects. Xiv:1803.00195v5, 2019.

6 Appendix: Proofs

Denote by C generic constant free of (δ, m, n) whose value may change from appearance to appearance. For simplicity we take initial values $x_0^n = x_0^m = x_0$. In appendix sections of theorem proofs, lemmas are established under the conditions and assumptions in corresponding theorems, and we often do not repeatedly list these conditions and assumptions in the lemmas. To track processes under different circumstances and facilitate long technical arguments we adopt the following notations and conventions.

It is often necessary to put processes and random variables on some common probability spaces. At such occasions, we often automatically change probability spaces and consider versions of the processes and the random variables on new probability spaces, without altering notations. Because of this convention and Skorokhod's representation theorem, we often switch between "convergence in probability" and "convergence in distribution." Also because of the convention, when no confusion occurs, we try to use the same notation for random variables or processes with identical distribution.

Convention 1. We reserve x's and y's for sequences generated from gradient descent algorithms and the corresponding empirical processes, X's for solutions of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) and stochastic differential equations (SDEs).

Convention 2. As described at the end of Section 1, for gradient descent algorithms to solve optimization (3.7), we add superscripts n and m to notations for the associated processes and sequences based on all data in Section 3 and based on mini-batches in Section 4, respectively, while notations without any superscript are for sequences and functions corresponding to the optimization (2.1).

Convention 3. We reserve V's for normalized solutions difference between differential equations associated with the optimization (2.1) and the optimization (3.7) under the cases for all data and mini-batches, while we reserve V without any superscript as their corresponding weak convergence limits.

Convention 4. As described at the end of Section 1, we add a superscript $*$ to notations U's associated with mini-batches and as in Convention 2, their corresponding process notations have a superscript m.

Convention 5. We denote by $|\Psi|$ the absolute value of scalar Ψ, the Euclidean norm of vector Ψ, or the spectral norm of matrix Ψ.

6.1 Proofs of Theorem 3.1

We show that the solution of the linear differential equations (3.12) and (3.13) are Gaussian, assuming the existence and uniqueness. For the equation (3.12) its solution has an expression $V(t) = \Pi_0(t) \int_0^t [\Pi_0(s)]^{-1} \mathbf{Z}(X(s))ds$, where $\Pi_0(t)$ is a p by p deterministic matrix constructed by the Magnus expansion for solving the homogeneous linear differential equation $\dot{V}(t) + [\mathbb{H}g(X(t))]V(t) = 0$ (see Blanes et al. (2009)). Thus the limiting distribution of $V^n(t)$ is Gaussian. For the equation (3.13) in the accelerated case we may convert the second-order homogeneous linear differential equation $\ddot{V}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}(t) + [\mathbb{H}g(X(t))]V(t) = 0$ into an equivalent first-order homogeneous linear differential equation system

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{V}(t) \\ \dot{\Xi}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) & -\frac{3}{t} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V(t) \\ \Xi(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Xi(t) = \dot{V}(t)$. Similar to the first order case, we apply the Magnus expansion to solve the first-order homogeneous linear differential equation system and then show that the solution of the differential equation (3.13) linearly depends on $Z(\cdot)$. Therefore, the limiting distribution of $V^n(t)$ is also Gaussian. As a matter of fact, the theorem shows that in the special case of $\mathbf{Z}(\theta) = \sigma(\theta)\mathbf{Z}$, we have $V(t) = \Pi(t)\mathbf{Z}$ to clearly indicates the Gaussian limiting distribution.

Now we are ready to provide detailed arguments for the accelerated case, as results for the plain case are relatively easier to show and will be established later. From now on for simplicity we provide proof arguments only for the case of $\mathbf{Z}(\theta) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)\mathbf{Z}$, as the proof for general $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ is essentially the same.

6.1.1 Differential equation derivation

With $\mathbf{U}_n = (U_1, \cdots, U_n)^\tau$, let $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = (R_1^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}), \cdots, R_p^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n))^\tau$, where

$$R_j^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} \ell(\theta; U_i) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j} g(\theta) \right], \qquad j = 1, \cdots, p.$$

Then

$$R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n) = \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \ell(\theta; U_i) - \nabla g(\theta) \right].$$

For the accelerated case, we can re-express ODE (3.11) as

$$\ddot{X}^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla g(X^n(t)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = 0. \tag{6.49}$$

By Lemma 6.5 below we obtain that $X^n(t)$ converges in probability to $X(t)$ uniformly over any finite interval. Thus, for large n, $X^n(t)$ falls into Θ_X, and Assumption A4 implies that as $n \to \infty$, $R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n) = O_P(1)$, and $n^{-1/2}R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n)| \to 0$. Hence, ODEs (3.11) and (6.49) both converge to ODE (2.6).

From Assumption A4 we have that $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ converges in distribution to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)\mathbf{Z}$ uniformly over $\theta \in \Theta_X$, and the generalization of Skorohod's representation theorem in Lemma 6.1 below shows that there exist $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ and $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger$ defined on some common probability spaces with $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger \sim N_p(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$ and $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ identically distributed as $\mathbf{U}_n$ such that as $n \to \infty$, $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n^\dagger) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\theta)\mathbf{Z}_\dagger = o(1)$ uniformly over $\theta \in \Theta_X$. Thus we have that the solution $X^n(t)$ of equations (3.11) is identically distributed as the solution $X_\dagger^n(t)$ of

$$\ddot{X}_\dagger^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}_\dagger^n(t) + \nabla g(X_\dagger^n(t)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}R^n(X_\dagger^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n^\dagger) = 0,$$

which in turn may be written as

$$\ddot{X}_\dagger^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}_\dagger^n(t) + \nabla g(X_\dagger^n(t)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X_\dagger^n(t))\mathbf{Z}_\dagger + o\left(n^{-1/2}\right) = 0. \tag{6.50}$$

In particular (6.50) is equivalent to (3.17) up to the order of $n^{-1/2}$, which implies that as $n \to \infty$, ODEs (3.11), (3.17), and (6.50) all converge to ODE (2.6), and $X_\dagger^n(t)$ almost surely converges to $X(t)$. Since the solutions of equations (3.11), (3.17) and (6.50) are defined in the distribution sense, when there is no confusion, with a little abuse of notations we may drop index † and write equation (6.50) as

$$\ddot{X}^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{X}^n(t) + \nabla g(X^n(t)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X^n(t))\mathbf{Z} + o\left(n^{-1/2}\right) = 0, \tag{6.51}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ is a Gaussian random vector with distribution $N_p(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$, and initial conditions $X^n(0) = x_0$ and $\dot{X}^n(0) = 0$.

The arguments for establishing Theorem 1 in Su et al. (2016) can be directly applied to establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution $X^n(t)$ to (6.49) for each n. We

can employ the same arguments with $\nabla g(\cdot)$ replaced by $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))\,\Pi(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))$ or $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))\,V(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\mathbf{Z}$ to show that linear differential equations (3.15) and (3.13) have unique solutions.

For the plain gradient descent case, Lemma 6.2 below shows that $X^n(t)$ converges to $X(t)$ uniformly over any finite interval. Similarly we can establish that ODE (3.9) is asymptotically equivalent to ODE (3.16), and the standard ODE theory shows that they have unique solutions.

Now we give a generalization of Skorohod's representation theorem. Assumption A4 indicates $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ converges in distribution to $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$, and Skorohod's representation theorem allows to realize $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ and $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ on some common probability spaces with almost sure convergence. The following lemma generalizes Skorohod's representation theorem to have a joint representation of $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ along with almost sure convergence for $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ and $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$.

Lemma 6.1. *There exist* $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ *and* $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$ *defined on some common probability spaces with* $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$ *and* $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ *identically distributed as* $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ *and* $\mathbf{U}_n$*, respectively, such that as* $n \to \infty$*,* $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n^\dagger) - \mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta) = o(1)$ *uniformly over* $\theta \in \Theta_X$*.*

Proof. Our proof argument follows the construction proof of Skorohod's representation theorem in Billingsley (1999, Theorem 6.7), with some delicate modifications involving joint distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ as well as its associated conditional distributions. Let Ψ_θ be the normal distribution of $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$. Assume random variables $\mathbf{U}_n$ are defined on probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Denote by $\Psi_{\theta,n}$ the joint distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$, and by $\Psi_{\theta,n,U}$ and $\Psi_{\theta,n,R}$ the marginal distributions of $\mathbf{U}_n$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$, respectively. Let $\Xi_0(\theta), \cdots, \Xi_k(\theta)$ be the partition of $\mathbb{R}^p$ (the support of normal distribution Ψ_θ) such that (i) $\Psi_\theta(\Xi_0(\theta)) < \epsilon$, (ii) the boundaries of $\Xi_0(\theta), \cdots, \Xi_k(\theta)$ have probability zero under Ψ_θ, and (iii) the diameters of $\Xi_1(\theta), \cdots, \Xi_k(\theta)$ are bounded by ϵ. Here we use notation $\Xi_i(\theta)$ to indicate the possible dependence of the partitions on θ. For $r = 1, 2, \cdots$, we take $\epsilon_r = 2^{-r}$ and obtain partition $\Xi_0^r(\theta), \cdots, \Xi_{k_r}^r(\theta)$. Assumption A4 indicates that $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n)$ converges in distribution to $\mathbf{Z}(\theta)$ uniformly over $\theta \in \Theta_X$, which implies that for each r there exists an integer n_r^* (free of θ) such that for $n \geq n_r^*$,

$$\Psi_{\theta,n,R}\left(\Xi_i^r(\theta)\right) \geq (1 - \epsilon_r)\Psi_\theta\left(\Xi_i^r(\theta)\right), \qquad i = 1, \cdots, k_r,\ \theta \in \Theta_X.$$

As in Billingsley (1999, Theorem 6.7), we can always find a probability space to support a random element with any given distribution, and by passing to the appropriate large or infinite product space we can show that there exists a probability space $(\Omega_\dagger, \mathcal{F}_\dagger, I\!P_\dagger)$ to support random variables ξ, $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$, $\check{\mathbf{U}}_n$, and $\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n$, $n, i \geq 1$, all independent of each other, with the following four properties.

(i) ξ follows a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$.

(ii) $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$ follows a normal distribution Ψ_θ, and $\check{\mathbf{U}}_n$ has distribution $\Psi_{\theta,n,U}$.

(iii) For each $n_r^* \leq n < n_{r+1}^*$ and for each $\Xi_i^r(\theta)$ with non-zero probability under Ψ_θ, we take $\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger$ to be independent random variable on $(\Omega_\dagger, \mathcal{F}_\dagger, I\!P_\dagger)$ such that $\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger)$ jointly follow distribution $\Psi_{\theta,n}(\cdot|\Xi_i^r(\theta))$, which denotes the joint conditional distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n(\omega)$ and $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega))$ given $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)$ (the restriction of the joint distribution $\Psi_{\theta,n}$ on the set $\{\mathbf{u}, R^n(\theta; \mathbf{u}) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\}$). That is, for any Borel sets $A_1 \subset I\!R^m$ and $A_2 \subset I\!R^p$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&I\!P_\dagger\left[\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger(\omega_\dagger) \in A_1, R^n\left(\theta; \mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in A_2\right] \\
&= I\!P_\dagger\left[\check{\mathbf{U}}_n(\omega_\dagger) \in A_1, R^n\left(\theta; \check{\mathbf{U}}_n(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in A_2 \middle| R^n\left(\theta; \check{\mathbf{U}}_n(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] \\
&= I\!P\left[\mathbf{U}_n(\omega) \in A_1, R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)) \in A_2 \middle| R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] \\
&= \Psi_{\theta,n}(A_1 \times A_2 | \Xi_i^r(\theta)).
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking $A_1 = I\!R^m$ in above equality we obtain the marginal result for $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&I\!P_\dagger\left[R^n\left(\theta; \mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in A_2\right] = I\!P_\dagger\left[R^n\left(\theta; \check{\mathbf{U}}_n(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in A_2 \middle| R^n\left(\theta; \check{\mathbf{U}}_n(\omega_\dagger)\right) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] \\
&= I\!P\left[R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)) \in A_2 \middle| R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] = \Psi_{\theta,n,R}\left(A_2 | \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

(iv) For each $n_r^* \leq n < n_{r+1}^*$, the distribution of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_n$ is given by

$$
\nu_n(A) = \epsilon_r^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k_r} \Psi_{\theta,n}(A \times I\!R^p | \Xi_i^r(\theta)) \left[\Psi_{\theta,n,R}(\Xi_i^r(\theta)) - (1 - \epsilon_r)\Psi_\theta(\Xi_i^r(\theta))\right].
$$

Now we define $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ on $(\Omega_\dagger, \mathcal{F}_\dagger, I\!P_\dagger)$ as follows. For $n < n_1^*$, take $\mathbf{U}_{n,\dagger} = \check{\mathbf{U}}_n$. For each

$n_r^* \le n < n_{r+1}^*$, define

$$\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger = \sum_{i=0}^{k_r} \mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger 1\{\xi \le 1-\epsilon_r, \mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\} + \mathbf{\Lambda}_n 1\{\xi > 1-\epsilon_r\}.$$

We derive the distribution of $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$. For any Borel set $A_1 \subset I\!R^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} &I\!P_\dagger(\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger \in A_1) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_r} I\!P_\dagger\left[\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger \in A_1, \mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta), \xi \le 1-\epsilon_r\right] \\ &+I\!P_\dagger(\mathbf{\Lambda}_n \in A_1, \xi > 1-\epsilon_r) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (1-\epsilon_r)\sum_{i=0}^{k_r} I\!P_\dagger\left[\mathbf{U}_{n,i}^\dagger \in A_1\right] I\!P_\dagger\left[\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] + \epsilon_r \nu_n(A_1) \\ &= (1-\epsilon_r)\sum_{i=0}^{k_r} \Psi_{\theta,n}(A_1 \times I\!R^p | \Xi_i^r(\theta)) \Psi_\theta(\Xi_i^r(\theta)) + \epsilon_r \nu_n(A_1) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k_r} \Psi_{\theta,n}(A \times I\!R^p | \Xi_i^r(\theta)) \Psi_{\theta,n,R}(\Xi_i^r(\theta)) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k_r} I\!P\left[\mathbf{U}_n \in A_1, R^n\left(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n(\omega)\right) \in \Xi_i^r(\theta)\right] \\ &= I\!P[\mathbf{U}_n \in A_1] = \Psi_{\theta,n,U}(A_1), \end{aligned}$$

where the fifth equality is due to the definition of distribution ν_n (which is a reverse construction). That is, we have shown that $\mathbf{U}_n^\dagger$ is identically distributed as $\mathbf{U}_n$ for all n. Let $\Omega_{r,\dagger} = \{\xi \le 1-\epsilon_r, \mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta) \notin \Xi_0^r(\theta)\}$ and $\Omega_\dagger^* = \liminf_{r\to\infty} \Omega_{r,\dagger}$. Then $I\!P_\dagger(\Omega_{r,\dagger}^*) > 1-2\epsilon_r$, and an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma leads to $I\!P_\dagger(\Omega_\dagger^*) = 1$. For $n_r^* \le n < n_{r+1}^*$, on set $\Omega_{r,\dagger}$, $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n^\dagger)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$ fall into the same set $\Xi_i^r(\theta)$, whose diameter is less than ϵ_r. Thus, on $\Omega_\dagger^*$, $R^n(\theta; \mathbf{U}_n^\dagger)$ a.s. converges to $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger(\theta)$ uniformly over $\theta \in \Theta_X$.

6.1.2 Weak convergence and tightness

To prove the weak convergence of $V_n(t)$ to $V(t)$, we need to establish the usual finite-dimensional convergence plus uniform tightness (or stochastic equicontinuity) (see Kim

and Pollard (1990, Theorem 2.3), Pollard (1988) and Van der Vaart and Wellner (2000)). We establish finite-dimensional convergence below.

For the accelerated case, taking a difference between ODEs (2.6) and (6.50), we have

$$[\ddot{X}_\dagger^n(t) - \ddot{X}(t)] + \frac{3}{t}[\dot{X}_\dagger^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)] + \nabla[g(X_\dagger^n(t)) - g(X(t))] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X_\dagger^n(t))\mathbf{Z}_\dagger = o\left(n^{-1/2}\right).$$

Let $V_\dagger^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X_\dagger^n(t) - X(t)]$. As $n \to \infty$, $X_\dagger^n(t) \to_{a.s.} X(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X_\dagger^n(t)) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) + o(1)$, and $\nabla[g(X_\dagger^n(t)) - g(X(t))] = \nabla^2 g(X(t))[X_\dagger^n(t) - X(t)] + o(X_\dagger^n(t) - X(t))$, thus $V_\dagger^n(t)$ satisfies

$$\ddot{V}_\dagger^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}_\dagger^n(t) + \mathbb{H}g(X(t))V_\dagger^n(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\mathbf{Z}_\dagger = o(1).$$

As $n \to \infty$, $V_\dagger^n(t)$ almost surely converge to the unique solution $V_\dagger(t)$ of the following linear differential equation,

$$\ddot{V}_\dagger(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}_\dagger(t) + [\mathbb{H}g(X(t))]V_\dagger(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\mathbf{Z}_\dagger = 0,$$

where $X(t)$ is the solution of equation (2.6), random variable $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger \sim N_p(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$, and initial conditions $V_\dagger(0) = \dot{V}_\dagger(0) = 0$. As $V(t)$ and $V_\dagger(t)$ are governed by the equations with the same form but identically distributed random coefficients $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_\dagger$, we easily see that $V(t)$ and $V_\dagger(t)$ are identically distributed.

The almost sure convergence of $V_\dagger^n(t)$ to $V_\dagger(t)$ implies the joint convergence of $(V_\dagger^n(t_1), \cdots, V_\dagger^n(t_k))$ to $(V_\dagger(t_1), \cdots, V_\dagger(t_k))$ for any integer k and any $t_1, \cdots, t_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$. From the identical distributions of $X^n(t)$ with $X_\dagger^n(t)$, $V^n(t)$ with $V_\dagger^n(t)$, and $V(t)$ with $V_\dagger(t)$ we immediately conclude that $(V^n(t_1), \cdots, V^n(t_k))$ converges in distribution to $(V(t_1), \cdots, V(t_k))$. This establishes finite-dimensional distribution convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V(t)$.

For the plain gradient descent case, an application of the similar argument to ODEs (2.3) and (3.16) can establish finite-dimensional convergence.

Now we show tightness of $V_n(t)$. To establish the tightness of $V_n(t)$ on $[0, T]$, we need to

show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\eta > 0$, there exists a positive constant δ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left[\sup_{(t_1,t_2)\in\mathcal{T}(T,\delta)} |V_n(t_1) - V_n(t_2)| > \eta\right] < \varepsilon, \tag{6.52}$$

where $\mathcal{T}(T,\delta) = \{(t_1,t_2), t_1, t_2 \in I\!R_+, \max(t_1,t_2) \le T, |t_1 - t_2| < \delta\}$. The tightness of $V_n(t)$ on $I\!R_+$ requires above result for any $T < \infty$.
Note that as (6.52) requires only some probability evaluation, with the abuse of notations we have dropped index † and work on equation (6.51).

6.1.3 Weak convergence proof for the plain gradient descent case

Lemma 6.2. *For any given $T > 0$, we have*

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]} |X^n(t) - X(t)| = O_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. From ODEs (2.3) and (3.9) we have

$$\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t) = -[\nabla g(X^n(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))] - n^{-1/2} R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n),$$

and using assumption A1-A2 we obtain

$$|\nabla g(X^n(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))| \le L|X^n(t) - X(t)|,$$
$$n^{-1/2}|R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(t);\mathbf{U}_n)| \le \left(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + L\right)|X^n(t) - X(t)|.$$

Combining them together we arrive at

$$|X^n(t) - X(t)| \le n^{-1/2}\int_0^t |R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|ds + \left(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + 2L\right)\int_0^t |X^n(s) - X(s)|ds,$$

and an application of Gronwall's inequality leads to

$$|X^n(t) - X(t)| \leq n^{-1/2} \int_0^t |R^n(X(s); \mathbf{U}_n)| ds$$
$$+ n^{-1/2} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + 2L \right) \int_0^t e^{\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + 2L\right)u} du \int_0^u |R^n(X(s); \mathbf{U}_n)| ds,$$

which implies

$$\max_{t \in [0,T]} |X^n(t) - X(t)| \leq n^{-1/2} \int_0^T |R^n(X(s); \mathbf{U}_n)| ds$$
$$+ n^{-1/2} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + 2L \right) \int_0^T e^{\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) + 2L\right)u} du \int_0^u |R^n(X(s); \mathbf{U}_n)| ds.$$

Since assumptions A3 and A4 indicate $\sup_t |R^n(X(t); \mathbf{U}_n)| \sim \sup_t |\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\mathbf{Z}| = O_P(1)$, and $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)$ converges in probability to $E[h_1(U)] < \infty$, the above inequality shows $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |X^n(t) - X(t)| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$.

Lemma 6.3. *For any given $T > 0$, $V^n(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous on [0,T].*

Proof. Lemma 6.2 has shown $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |V^n(t)| = O_P(1)$. From ODEs (2.3) and (3.9) we have

$$\dot{V}^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)] = -\sqrt{n}[\nabla g(X^n(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))] - R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n),$$
$$|\dot{V}^n(t)| \leq \sqrt{n} |\nabla g(X^n(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))| + |R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n)|$$
$$\leq L\sqrt{n} |X^n(t)) - X(t)| + |R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n)|.$$

Lemma 6.2 shows that $\sqrt{n}|X^n(t)) - X(t)| = O_P(1)$, which indicates that for large n, $X^n(t)$ falls into Θ_X and assumption A4 in turn implies $|\sup_t R^n(X^n(t); \mathbf{U}_n)| \sim \sup_t |\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X^n(t))\mathbf{Z}| = O_P(1)$. Substituting these into the upper bound of $|\dot{V}^n(t)|$ we prove that $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |\dot{V}^n(t)| = O_P(1)$. Combining this with $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |V^n(t)| = O_P(1)$ shown in Lemma 6.2, we immediately establish the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 3.1 for the plain gradient descent case The same perturbation argument in Section 6.1.2 can be used to show finite-dimensional distribution convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V(t)$ for simple ODE (3.9) in the plain gradient descent case. With the tightness of $V^n(t)$ shown in Lemma 6.3 together with the finite distribution convergence

we immediately prove the weak convergence of $V^n(t)$ to $V(t)$ in the plain gradient descent case.

6.1.4 Weak Convergence proof for the accelerated case

We can use the same proof in Su et al. (2016, Theorem 1) to show that ODE (3.11) has a unique solution for each n and $\mathbf{U}_n$. While the proof arguments in Su et al. (2016, Theorem 1) mainly require local ODE properties such as those near a neighbor of zero, our weak convergence analysis needs to investigate global behaviors of processes generated from SDEs and ODEs with random coefficients. We will first extend and refine some local results for the global case and establish several preparatory lemmas for proving weak convergence in the theorem.

Given an interval $\mathcal{I} = [s,t]$ and a process $Y(t)$, define for $a \in (0,1]$,

$$M_a(s,t;Y) = M_a(\mathcal{I};Y) = \sup_{u\in[s,t]} \left| \frac{\dot{Y}(u) - \dot{Y}(s)}{(u-s)^a} \right|. \tag{6.53}$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.1 we take $a = 1$ and use $M_1(s,t;Y)$. We will need $M_a(s,t;Y)$ with $a < 1$ later in the proof of Theorems 4.5.

Lemma 6.4. *For $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ we have the following inequalities,*

$$M_1(s,t;X) \le \frac{1}{1-L(t-s)^2/6}\left[\left(\frac{3}{s}+\frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}(s)| + |\nabla g(X(s))|\right],$$

$$M_1(s,t;X^n) \le \frac{1}{1-[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L](t-s)^2/6}$$

$$\left[\left(\frac{3}{s}+\frac{[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L](t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}^n(s)| + |\nabla g(X^n(s))| + n^{-1/2}|R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|\right],$$

$$M_1(s,t;X^n - X) \le \frac{1}{1-[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L](t-s)^2/6}\Big\{(3/s + (t-s)[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L])|\dot{X}^n(s) - \dot{X}(s)|$$

$$+ [2\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+5L]|X^n(s) - X(s)| + n^{-1/2}|R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|$$

$$+n^{-1/2}\sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|\Big\},$$

when $s > 0$ and $t - s < \sqrt{6/[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]}$, $\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)$, and $h_1(\cdot)$ is given in

assumption A1. In particular for $s = 0$,

$$M_1(0,t;X) \le \frac{|\nabla g(x_0)|}{1 - Lt^2/6}, \quad M_1(0,t;X^n) \le \frac{|\nabla g(x_0)| + n^{-1/2}|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)|}{1 - [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) + 2L]t^2/6},$$

$$M_1(0,t;X^n - X) \le \frac{n^{-1/2}}{1 - [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) + 2L]t^2/6}$$

$$\left[|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)| + \sup_{u\in[0,t]} |R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)| \right].$$

Proof. Because of similarity, we provide proof arguments only for $M_1(s,t;X^n - X)$. As $V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$, $M_1(s,t;V^n) = \sqrt{n}M_1(s,t;X^n - X)$, and we will establish the inequality for $M_1(s,t;V^n)$. $V^n(t)$ satisfies the differential equation

$$\ddot{V}^n(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}^n(t) + \sqrt{n}\nabla[g(X^n(t)) - g(X(t))] + R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n) = 0. \tag{6.54}$$

Let

$$H(t;V^n) = \sqrt{n}\nabla[g(X^n(t)) - g(X(t))] + R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n),$$

and $J(s,t;H,V^n) = \int_s^t u^3[H(u;V^n) - H(s;V^n)]du$. Then

$$|H(t;V^n) - H(s;V^n)| \le \sqrt{n}|\nabla[g(X^n(t)) - g(X^n(s)) - g(X(t)) + g(X(s))]|$$
$$+ |R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 6.2, using assumptions A1-A2 we obtain

$$\sqrt{n}\,|\nabla[g(X^n(t)) - g(X^n(s)) - g(X(t)) + g(X(s))]|$$
$$\le L\sqrt{n}|X^n(t) - X(t)| + L\sqrt{n}|X^n(s) - X(s)|,$$
$$|R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)| \le |R^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(t);\mathbf{U}_n)|$$
$$+ |R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)| + |R^n(X(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|,$$
$$|R^n(X^n(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n)| \le [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) + L]\sqrt{n}|X^n(u) - X(u)|,$$
$$\sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)] = V^n(t) = \int_s^t [\dot{V}^n(u) - \dot{V}^n(s)]du + V^n(s) + (t-s)\dot{V}^n(s).$$

Putting together these results we get

$$|H(t;V^n)-H(s;V^n)| \le [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]\left[\int_s^t |\dot{V}^n(u)-\dot{V}^n(s)|du + 2|V^n(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}^n(s)|\right]$$
$$+ |R^n(X(t);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_s^t |\dot{V}^n(u)-\dot{V}^n(s)|du \le \int_s^t (u-s)\frac{|\dot{V}^n(u)-\dot{V}^n(s)|}{u-s}du \le \int_s^t (u-s)M_1(s,t;V^n)du$$
$$= \frac{M_1(s,t;V^n)(t-s)^2}{2},$$
$$\int_s^t M_1(s,u;V^n)u^3(u-s)^2du/2 \le M_1(s,t;V^n)t^3(t-s)^3/6.$$

Substituting above inequalities into the upper bound for $|H(u;V^n)-H(s;V^n)|$ and the definition of $J(s,t;H,V^n)$ we conclude

$$|J(s,t;H,V^n)| \le [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]\left\{M_1(s,t;V^n)t^3(t-s)^3/6 + [2|V^n(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}^n(s)|]t^3(t-s)\right\}$$
$$+ t^3(t-s)\sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|.$$

ODE (6.54) is equivalent to

$$\frac{t^3\dot{V}^n(t)}{dt} = -t^3H(t;V^n), \text{which implies}$$
$$t^3\dot{V}^n(t) - s^3\dot{V}^n(s) = -\int_s^t u^3H(u;V^n)du = -\frac{t^4-s^4}{4}H(s;V^n) - J(s,t;H,V^n),$$
$$\frac{\dot{V}^n(t)-\dot{V}^n(s)}{t-s} = -\frac{t^3-s^3}{t^3(t-s)}\dot{V}^n(s) - \frac{t^4-s^4}{4t^3(t-s)}H(s;V^n) - \frac{J(s,t;H,V^n)}{t^3(t-s)},$$

and using the upper bound of $|J(s,t;H,V^n)|$ and algebraic manipulation we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{|\dot{V}^n(t)-\dot{V}^n(s)|}{t-s} \le \frac{t^3-s^3}{t^3(t-s)}|\dot{V}^n(s)| + \frac{t^4-s^4}{4t^3(t-s)}|H(s;V^n)| + \frac{|J(s,t;H,V^n)|}{t^3(t-s)} \\
&\le \frac{t^2+st+s^2}{t^3}|\dot{V}^n(s)| + \frac{(t^2+s^2)(t+s)}{4t^3}|H(s;V^n)| \\
&+ [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]\left[M_1(s,t;V^n)\frac{(t-s)^2}{6} + 2|V^n(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}^n(s)|\right] \\
&+ \sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|.
\end{aligned}$$

As above inequality holds for any $t > s$, we may replace t by v, take the maximum over $v \in [s,t]$, and use the definition of $M_1(s,t;V^n)$ (which is increasing in t) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_1(s,t;V^n) \le \frac{3}{s}|\dot{V}^n(s)| + |H(s;V^n)| + [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]M_1(s,t;V^n)\frac{(t-s)^2}{6} \\
&+ [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L][2|V^n(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}^n(s)|] + \sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|, \\
&\le \frac{3}{s}|\dot{V}^n(s)| + L|V^n(s)| + |R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)| + [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]M_1(t,s;V^n)\frac{(t-s)^2}{6} \\
&+ [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L][2|V^n(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}^n(s)|] + \sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|,
\end{aligned}$$

and solving for $M_1(s,t;V^n)$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_1(s,t;V^n) \le \frac{1}{1-[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L](t-s)^2/6}\Big\{(3/s + (t-s)[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L])|\dot{V}^n(s)| \\
&+[2\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+5L]|V^n(s)| + |R^n(X^n(s);\mathbf{U}_n)| + \sup_{u\in[s,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(X(s);\mathbf{U}_n)|\Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

when $s > 0$ and $t - s < \sqrt{6/[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]}$. If $s = 0$, we replace the coefficient $3/s$ by $1/t$ in above inequality, and $V^n(0) = \dot{V}^n(0) = 0$, $X^n(0) = X(0) = x_0$. Then

$$M_1(0,t;V^n) \le \frac{1}{1-[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]t^2/6}\left[|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)| + \sup_{u\in[0,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n) - R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)|\right],$$

which in particular implies that

$$\sup_{t\le\sqrt{3/[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]}} \frac{|\dot{X}^n(t)-\dot{X}(t)|}{t} \le 2n^{-1/2}\left[2|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)| + \sup_{u\in[0,t]}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n)|\right] \to 0,$$

that is, $\dot{X}^n(t)\to\dot{X}(t)$ uniformly over $\left[0,\sqrt{3/[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+2L]}\right]$.

Lemma 6.5. *For any given $T>0$, we have*

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|X^n(t)-X(t)| = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \quad \max_{t\in[0,T]}|V^n(t)| = O_P(1),$$

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot{X}^n(t)-\dot{X}(t)| = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \quad \max_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot{V}^n(t)| = O_P(1).$$

Proof. As $V^n(t)=\sqrt{n}[X^n(t)-X(t)]$, we need to establish the results for $X^n(t)-X(t)$ only. Since as $n\to\infty$, $\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)\to E(h_1(U))$. Divide the interval $[0,T]$ into $N=\left[T\sqrt{[E(h_1(U))+2L]/3}\right]+1$ number of subintervals with length close to $\sqrt{3/[E(h_1(U))+2L]}$ (except for the last one), and denote them by $\mathcal{I}_i=[s_{i-1},s_i]$, $i=1,\cdots,N$ (with $s_0=0$, $s_N=T$, $\mathcal{I}_1=[0,s_1]$, $\mathcal{I}_N=[s_{N-1},T]$). First for $t\in\mathcal{I}_1$, from Lemma 6.4 we have

$$|\dot{X}^n(t)-\dot{X}(t)| \le |\mathcal{I}_1|M_1(\mathcal{I}_1;X^n-X) \le Cn^{-1/2}\left[|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)|+|R^n(X(s_1);\mathbf{U}_n)|\right],$$

$$|X^n(t)-X(t)| \le \int_{\mathcal{I}_1}|\dot{X}^n(u)-\dot{X}(u)|du \le Cn^{-1/2}\left[|R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)|+|R^n(X(s_1);\mathbf{U}_n)|\right].$$

Assumption A4 implies that $R^n(x_0;\mathbf{U}_n)=O_P(1)$, and $R^n(X(s_1);\mathbf{U}_n)=O_P(1)$, and thus the upper bounds of $\dot{X}^n(t)-\dot{X}(t)$ and $X^n(t)-X(t)$ over $t\in\mathcal{I}_1$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$.
For $t\in\mathcal{I}_i$, $i=2,\cdots,N$, from Lemma 6.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\dot{X}^n(t)-\dot{X}(t)-\dot{X}^n(s_{i-1})+\dot{X}(s_{i-1})| \le |\mathcal{I}_i|M_1(\mathcal{I}_i;X^n-X)\\
&\le C\left[[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+C_1]|\dot{X}^n(s_{i-1})-\dot{X}(s_{i-1})|+[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n)+C_2]|X^n(s_{i-1})-X(s_{i-1})|\right]\\
&+Cn^{-1/2}\left\{|R^n(X^n(s_{i-1});\mathbf{U}_n)|+2\sup_{u\ge0}|R^n(X(u);\mathbf{U}_n)|\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|X^n(t) - X(t)| \le |X^n(s_{i-1}) - X(s_{i-1})| + |\mathcal{I}_i||\dot{X}^n(s_{i-1}) - \dot{X}(s_{i-1})| \\
&+ \int_{\mathcal{I}_i} |\dot{X}^n(u) - \dot{X}(u) - \dot{X}^n(s_{i-1}) + \dot{X}(s_{i-1})| du \\
&\le C \left[[\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) + C_1] |\dot{X}^n(s_{i-1}) - \dot{X}(s_{i-1})| + [\zeta(\mathbf{U}_n) + C_2] |X^n(s_{i-1}) - X(s_{i-1})| \right] \\
&+ C n^{-1/2} \left\{ |R^n(X^n(s_{i-1}); \mathbf{U}_n)| + 2 \sup_{u \ge 0} |R^n(X(u); \mathbf{U}_n)| \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We will use above two inequalities to prove by induction that the upper bounds of $X^n(t) - X(t)$ and $\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)$ on $[0, T]$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$, and the upper bounds of $X^n(t) - X(t)$ and $\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)$ on $[0, T]$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$, Assume that the upper bounds of $X^n(t) - X(t)$ and $\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{I}_j$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$. Note that N is free of n, by induction we have shown that the upper bounds of $X^n(t) - X(t)$ and $\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)$ over $t \le s_{i-1}$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$ in particular $X^n(s_{i-1}) \to X(s_{i-1})$ in probability, and thus assumption A4 indicates that $R^n(X^n(s_{i-1}); \mathbf{U}_n) = O_P(1)$, and $\sup_{u \ge 0} |R^n(X(u); \mathbf{U}_n)| = O_P(1)$. Above two inequalities immediately show that their upper bounds on $\mathcal{I}_i$ are also $O_P(n^{-1/2})$. Hence, we establish that the bounds of $X^n(t) - X(t)$ and $\dot{X}^n(t) - \dot{X}(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^{N} \mathcal{I}_j = [0, T]$ are $O_P(n^{-1/2})$.

Lemma 6.6. *$V^n(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous on $[0, T]$.*

Proof. Lemma 6.5 shows that $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |V^n(t)| = O_P(1)$ and $\max_{t \in [0,T]} |\dot{V}^n(t)| = O_P(1)$, which implies that $V^n(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous on $[0, T]$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1 Lemma 6.6 together with the finite distribution convergence immediately lead to that as $n \to \infty$, $V^n(t)$ weakly converges to $V(t)$.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

6.2.1 Proof for the plain gradient descent case

Lemma 6.7. *For the case of plain gradient descent algorithm, we have*

$$
\max_{t \in [0,T]} |x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)| = O_P(\delta), \quad \max_{k \le T\delta^{-1}} |x_k^n - X^n(k\delta)| = O_P(\delta),
$$

where $\{x_k^n\}$ is generated from algorithm (3.8), with $x_\delta^n(t)$ its continuous-time step process, and $X^n(t)$ is the solution of ODE (3.9).

Proof. Algorithm (3.8) is the Euler scheme for solving ODE (3.9), and we will apply the standard ODE theory to obtain the global approximation error for the Euler scheme. First by assumption A1 we have that $\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(\theta;\mathbf{U}_n)$ is Lipschtiz in θ with Lipschitz constant $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)$, which converges in probability to $E[h_1(U)] < \infty$. On the other hand, taking derivative on both sides of ODE (3.9), we obtain

$$\ddot{X}^n(t) = -\mathbb{H}\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n)\dot{X}^n(t) = \mathbb{H}\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n)\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n).$$

Using Lemma 6.2, we conclude that for large n, $X^n(t)$ falls into Θ_X, and thus assumption A4 indicates that $\sup_t|\nabla^\kappa\mathcal{L}^n(X^n(t);\mathbf{U}_n)| \sim \sup_t|\nabla^\kappa g(X^n(t)) + n^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k(X^n(t))\mathbf{Z}_\kappa| = O_P(1)$, where $\mathbf{Z}_\kappa$ are standard normal random variables. Combining these results together we get $\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\ddot{X}^n(t)| = O_P(1)$. An application of the standard ODE theory for the global approximation error of the Euler scheme (Butcher (2008)) leads to

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)| \le \delta\left(\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)\right)^{-1}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\ddot{X}^n(t)|\left[\exp\left(\frac{T}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i)\right) - 1\right]$$
$$= O_P(\delta).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Lemma 6.7 establishes the first order result for $x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)$, and the weak convergence result is the consequence of the order result and Theorem 3.1.

6.2.2 Proof for the accelerated gradient descent case

Note that (x_k, y_k) and (x_k^n, y_k^n) are generated from accelerated gradient descent algorithms (2.4) and (3.10), respectively, and $X(t)$ and $X^n(t)$ are respective solutions of ODEs (2.6) and (3.11).

Lemma 6.8. *For fixed $T > 0$, as $\delta \to 0$, we have*

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}}\left|x_k - X(k\delta^{1/2})\right| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|), \tag{6.55}$$

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}}\left|z_k - \dot{X}(k\delta^{1/2})\right| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|), \tag{6.56}$$

where sequence x_k is generated from algorithm (2.4), $X(t)$ is the solution of the corresponding ODE (2.6), and $z_k = (x_{k+1} - x_k)/\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is given in (4.31).

Proof. We rewrite (2.4) as

$$x_{k+2} = y_{k+1} - \delta\nabla g(y_{k+1}), \;\; y_{k+1} = x_{k+1} + \frac{k}{k+3}(x_{k+1} - x_k) = x_k + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} z_k,$$

and obtain

$$z_{k+1} = \left(1 - \frac{3}{k+3}\right) z_k - \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla g\left(x_k + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} z_k\right). \tag{6.57}$$

Denote by y^* the critical point of $g(\cdot)$. Then

$$|\nabla g(y_k)| = |\nabla g(y_k) - \nabla g(y^*)| \leq L|y_k - y^*| \leq C_1,$$

where C_1 is some constant, and

$$|z_0| = |x_1 - x_0|/\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} = \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\nabla g(x_0)| \leq C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{6.58}$$

$$|z_k| \leq \frac{k-1}{k+2}|z_{k-1}| + C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (k+1)C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{6.59}$$

To compare x_k and $X(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and derive their difference, we first need to find the relationship between $X(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $X((k+1)\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and between $\dot{X}(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $\dot{X}((k+1)\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$. As in (4.29), we let $Z = \dot{X}$, and ODE (2.6) is equivalent to

$$\dot{X} = Z, \;\; \dot{Z} = -\frac{3}{t}Z - \nabla g(X).$$

Then with convention $t_k = k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have for $k \geq 1$,

$$X(t_{k+1}) = X(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} Z(u)du = X(t_k) + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} Z(t_k) + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [Z(u) - Z(t_k)]du, \tag{6.60}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z(t_{k+1}) &= Z(t_k) - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{3}{u} Z(u)du - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \nabla g(X(u))du \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{3}{k}\right) Z(t_k) - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\frac{3}{u}Z(u) - \frac{3}{t_k}Z(t_k)\right] du - \\ &\quad \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla g(X(t_k)) - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [\nabla g(X(u)) - \nabla g(X(t_k))]du. \end{aligned} \tag{6.61}$$

Lemma 6.4 shows that on $(0,T]$, $|\dot{X}(t)|/t$ is bounded, $|Z(t)| \le Ct$, and $|\dot{Z}(t)| = |\ddot{X}(t)| \le C$ for some constant C. Then we easily derive bounds for the following integrals appeared on the right hand sides of (6.60) and (6.61),

$$\left| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [Z(u) - Z(t_k)] du \right| = O(\delta),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\frac{3}{u} Z(u) - \frac{3}{t_k} Z(t_k) \right] du \right| &\le \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left| \frac{3}{u} [Z(u) - Z(t_k)] \right| du \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left| \left(\frac{3}{u} - \frac{3}{t_k} \right) Z(t_k) \right| du \\ &\le \frac{C\delta}{t_k} + \frac{3(t_{k+1} - t_k)^2}{t_k t_{k+1}} C t_k = O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\left| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [\nabla g(X(u)) - \nabla g(X(t_k))] du \right| \le L \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |X(u) - X(t_k)| du = O(\delta).$$

Plugging these integrals bounds into (6.60) and (6.61) we conclude

$$X(t_{k+1}) = X(t_k) + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} Z(t_k) + O(\delta),$$

$$Z(t_{k+1}) = \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right) Z(t_k) - \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \nabla g(X(t_k)) + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}) + O(\delta).$$

Let $a_k = |x_k - X(t_k)|, b_k = |z_k - Z(t_k)|$, and $S_k = b_0 + b_1 + ... + b_k$. Using the definition of z_k and (6.57)-(6.59), we have

$$a_0 = 0, \;\; a_{k+1} \le a_k + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} b_k + O(\delta),$$

$$a_k \le \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} S_{k-1} + O(k\delta), \tag{6.62}$$

$$b_0 = |z_0| \le C_1 \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \;\; b_1 = |z_1 - Z(t_1)| = O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_{k+1} &\leq \left(1-\frac{3}{k+3}\right) b_k + \frac{9}{k(k+3)}|Z(t_k)| + \\
&\quad L\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| x_k + \frac{2k+3}{k+3}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} z_k - X(t_k) \right| + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}) + O(\delta) \\
&\leq b_k + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}) + L\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} a_k + 2L\delta(k+1)C_1\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}) + O(\delta) \\
&\leq b_k + L\delta S_{k-1} + L\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} O(k\delta) + O(\delta) + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1}) \\
&\leq b_k + L\delta S_{k-1} + O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1}) \qquad (6.63)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since for $1 \leq k \leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} = O(1), O(\delta) = O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-1})$, $k^{-1} \leq 2(k+1)^{-1}$. Also with $b_1 = O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})$, we can see that (6.63) holds for $k = 0$. Therefore, there exists some constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$b_{k+1} \leq b_k + L\delta S_{k-1} + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1}.$$

Define a new sequence b'_k from b_k as follows. Let $b'_0 = b_0$, $b'_{k+1} = b'_k + L\delta S'_{k-1} + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1}$, where $S'_k = b'_0 + b'_1 + ... + b'_k$. Then we can easily prove by induction that $b_k \leq b'_k$. Indeed, if $b_j \leq b'_j$ for $j = 0, 1, ..., k$, then $S_{k-1} \leq S'_{k-1}$,

$$b_{k+1} \leq b_k + L\delta S_{k-1} + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1} \leq b'_k + L\delta S'_{k-1} + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1} = b'_{k+1}.$$

On the other hand, as $L\delta S'_{k-1} + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1} > 0$, $\{b'_k\}$ is an increasing sequence. Thus, $S'_{k-1} \leq kb'_k$, and

$$b'_{k+1} \leq b'_k + L\delta k b'_k + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1}.$$

Again define another sequence b^*_k from b'_k as follows. Let $b^*_0 = b'_0$, $b^*_{k+1} = b^*_k + L\delta k b^*_k + C_2\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}(k+1)^{-1}$. The same induction argument can prove that $b'_k \leq b^*_k$. The recursive definition of b^*_k easily leads to the following expression,

$$b^*_k = \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(C_1 \prod_{j=1}^{k-1}(1 + L\delta j) + C_2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} i^{-1} \prod_{j=i}^{k-1}(1 + L\delta j) \right),$$

and hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1} &\leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} \leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} b'_{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} \leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} b^*_{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} \\
&\leq C\left(\prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1}(1+L\delta j) + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} i^{-1} \prod_{j=i}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1}(1+L\delta j)\right) \\
&\leq C\left(\prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1}(1+L\delta T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} i^{-1} \prod_{j=i}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1}(1+L\delta T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\leq Ce^{LT^2}\left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor} i^{-1}\right) \leq C\log(T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = O(|\log\delta|).
$$

Finally using above inequality and (6.62) we arrive at

$$
\max_{k\leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}}\left|x_k - X(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\right| \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} S_{\lfloor T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\rfloor-1} + O(T\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}) = O(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|),
$$

which proves (6.55). It is easy to see that the left hand side of (6.56) is bounded by $b^*_{[T\delta^{-1/2}]}$, which is of order $\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|$.

Lemma 6.9.

$$
\max_{t\in[0,T]}|x^n_\delta(t) - X^n(t)| = O_p(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|),
$$

where $x^n_\delta(t)$ is the continuous-time step processes for discrete sequence x^n_k generated from algorithm (3.10), and $X^n(t)$ is the continuous-time solution of the corresponding ODE (3.11).

Proof. The objective function associated with (10) and (11) is $\nabla\mathcal{L}^n(\theta;\mathbf{U}_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \nabla\ell(\theta;U_i)$, which has Lipschitz constant $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) = O_p(1)$. Then for any $\epsilon>0$, there exists some constant $L_0>0$ such that for all n, $P\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) > L_0\right) < \epsilon$. For each n, on the event $\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h_1(U_i) \leq L_0\}$, Lemma 6.8 shows that there exists con-

stant M (which depends on L_0 only and is free of n) such that

$$\max_{k\leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}}\left|x_k^n - X^n(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\right| \leq M\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|.$$

As a result we have that

$$P\left(\max_{k\leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}}\left|x_k^n - X^n(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\right| > M\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|\right) \leq P\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_1(U_i) > L\right) < \epsilon$$

holds for each n, that is

$$\max_{k\leq T\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}}\left|x_k^n - X^n(k\delta^{\frac{1}{2}})\right| = O_p(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|).$$

Lemma 6.4 indicates $\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot{X}^n(t)| = O_p(1)$, and hence

$$\sup_{s,t\in[0,T],t-s\leq\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}}|X^n(t) - X^n(s)| \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot{X}^n(t)| = O_p(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Finally for any t we can find k such that $t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}$, and show

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)| \leq \max_{t\in[0,T]}\{|x_k^n - X^n(t_k)| + |X^n(t_k) - X^n(t)|\} = O_p(\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}|\log\delta|).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Lemma 6.9 establishes the order result for $x_\delta^n(t) - X^n(t)$, and the weak convergence result is the consequence of the order result and Theorem 3.1.

6.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Using Assumption A4 and the standard empirical process argument (van der Vaart and Wellner (2000)) we can show that $\hat{\theta}_n$ is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent. Define $\vartheta = n^{1/2}(\theta - \breve{\theta})$. We apply

Taylor expansion to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}^n(\theta, \mathbf{U}_n) = \mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}, \mathbf{U}_n) + \nabla\mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}, \mathbf{U}_n)(\theta - \check{\theta}) + (\theta - \check{\theta})'\mathbb{H}\mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}, \mathbf{U}_n)(\theta - \check{\theta})/2 \\
&+ o_P(n^{-1/2}) \\
&= \mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}, \mathbf{U}_n) + n^{-1/2}[\nabla g(\check{\theta}) + n^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}]\vartheta + n^{-1}\vartheta'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})\vartheta/2 + o_P(n^{-1}) \\
&= \mathcal{L}^n(\check{\theta}, \mathbf{U}_n) + n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}\vartheta + n^{-1}\vartheta'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})\vartheta/2 + o_P(n^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}$ stands for the standard normal random vector, the second equality is due to Assumptions 2 and 4, and the Skorokhod representation, and the law of large number, and the third equality is from $\nabla g(\check{\theta}) = 0$. As $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the minimizer of $\mathcal{L}^n(\theta, \mathbf{U}_n)$, $\hat{\vartheta}_n = n^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_n - \check{\theta})$ asymptotically minimizes $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}\vartheta + \vartheta'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})\vartheta/2$ over ϑ, and thus has an asymptotic distribution $[\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{\theta})\mathbf{Z}$. Note that $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is a subspace of $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and because of the metrics used in $C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$, the weak convergence of these process on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is determined by their weak convergence on $D([0,T])$ for all integers T only (see Billingsely (1999) and Jacod and Shiryaev (2002)). Treating $X(t)$, $X^n(t)$, $V(t)$, $V^n(t)$, and $x^n_\delta(t)$ as random elements in $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$, since the weak convergence results established in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 hold for $X^n(t)$ and $x^n_\delta(t)$ on $D([0,T])$ for any $T > 0$, thus we may conclude from these established weak convergence results that $V^n(t) = \sqrt{n}[X^n(t) - X(t)]$ and $\sqrt{n}[x^n_\delta(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converge to $V(t)$ on $D(\mathbb{R}_+)$.

On the other hand, it is known that as $k \to \infty$, x_k generated from algorithms (2.2) and (2.4) converge to the solution $\check{\theta}$ of (2.1) with speed of $(\delta k)^{-1}$ and $(\sqrt{\delta}k)^{-2}$, respectively, while as $t \to \infty$, their corresponding continuous curves $X(t)$ as the solutions of ODEs (2.3) and (2.6) approach $\check{\theta}$ with speed of t^{-1} and t^{-2}, respectively (see Nesterov (1983) and Su et al. (2016)). Similarly for fixed n, as $k, t \to \infty$, x^n_k and $x^n_\delta(t)$ from algorithms (3.8) and (3.10) and $X^n(t)$ from ODEs (3.9) and (3.11) approach the solution $\hat{\theta}_n$ of (3.7). For the weak limit $V(t)$ governed by (3.14) or (3.12), as $t \to \infty$, both ODEs lead to $[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]V(\infty) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\mathbf{Z} = 0$, or equivalently, $V(\infty) = [\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\mathbf{Z}$.

In fact, the solutions of (3.14) and (3.12) admit simple explicit expressions, for example,

$$V(t) = \int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))ds\mathbf{Z}, \tag{6.64}$$

$$\forall \epsilon > 0,\ \exists t_0 > 0 \text{ such that } \forall s > t_0, \left|[\mathbb{H}g(X(s))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s)) - [\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\right| < \epsilon,$$

$$\int_{t_0}^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))ds = \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\mathbb{H}g(X(s))$$

$$\left\{[\mathbb{H}g(X(s))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s)) - [\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\right\}ds$$

$$+ \int_{t_0}^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty)). \tag{6.65}$$

Since the assumptions indicate that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))$ and $\mathbb{H}g(X(s))$ are bounded continuous on $[0, t_0]$, $\int_0^{t_0} |\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))|ds$ is finite, and $\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du$ has finite eigenvalues. We immediately conclude that the eigenvalues of $\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$ are no less than the eigenvalues of $\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$ minus the maximum eigenvalue of $\int_0^{t_0} \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds$, and thus diverge as $t \to \infty$. Therefore, we can obtain

$$\left|\int_0^{t_0} \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))ds\right| \leq \left|\exp\left[-\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\right| \int_0^{t_0} |\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))|ds \to 0,$$

$$\int_{t_0}^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds = 1 - \exp\left[-\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds\right] \to 1,$$

$$\int_{t_0}^t \left|\exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\mathbb{H}g(X(s))\right| \left|[\mathbb{H}g(X(s))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))\right.$$

$$\left. -[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\right| ds$$

$$\leq \epsilon - \epsilon\left|\exp\left[-\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(s))ds\right]\right| \leq \epsilon,$$

which goes to zero, as we let $\epsilon \to 0$. Combining these results with (6.64) and (6.65) we conclude that as $t \to \infty$,

$$\int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_s^t \mathbb{H}g(X(u))du\right]\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(s))ds \to [\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty)),$$

and $V(t)$ converges in distribution to $[\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))\mathbf{Z}$.

6.4 Proofs of Theorems 4.1-4.3

Theorem 4.1 is proved by Lemma 6.10, with Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 shown in Lemma 6.18, where both lemmas are established in this section below.
Denote by $\hat{Q}^*_{mk}$ the empirical distribution of mini-batch $U^*_{1k}, \cdots, U^*_{mk}$. Then

$$\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) = \int \nabla\ell(\theta; u)\hat{Q}^*_{mk}(du),$$

$$\int \nabla\ell(\theta; u)Q(du) = E[\nabla\ell(\theta; U)] = \nabla g(\theta).$$

Let $R^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_m(t)) = (R^m_1(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_m(t)), \cdots, R^m_p(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_m(t)))'$, where

$$R^m_j(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_m(t)) = \sqrt{m}\left[\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}\ell(\theta; U^*_i(t)) - \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}g(\theta)\right], \ \ j = 1, \cdots, p.$$

We have

$$m^{-1/2}R^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_m(t)) = \int \nabla\ell(\theta; u)\hat{Q}^*_{mk}(du) - \int \nabla\ell(\theta; u)Q(du),$$
$$\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{k-1}; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) = \nabla g(x^m_{k-1}) + m^{-1/2}R^m(x^m_{k-1}; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk}).$$

It is easy to see that $R^m(x^m_{k-1}; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk})$, $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$, are martingale differences, and $H^m_\delta(t)$ is a martingale. We may use martingale theory (He et al. (1992), Jacod and Shiryaev (2003)) to establish weak convergence of $H^m_\delta(t)$ to stochastic integral $H(t)$. Below we will use a more direct approach to prove the weak convergence and obtain further convergence rate results.

Lemma 6.10. *As $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $H^m_\delta(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)$, $t \in [0, T]$.*

Proof. Let

$$\check{H}_\delta^m(t) = (m\delta)^{1/2} \sum_{t_k \le t} \left[\nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(X(t_{k-1}); \mathbf{U}_m^*(t_k)) - \nabla g(X(t_{k-1}) \right]$$
$$= (m\delta)^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{[t/\delta]} \left[\int \nabla \ell(X((k-1)\delta); u) \hat{Q}_{mk}^*(du) \right.$$
$$\left. - \int \nabla \ell(X((k-1)\delta); u) Q(du) \right].$$

Note that

$$E\left[\int \nabla \ell(\theta; u) \hat{Q}_{mk}^*(du) \right] = \int \nabla \ell(\theta; u) Q(du),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta) = mVar\left[\int \nabla \ell(\theta; u) \hat{Q}_{mk}^*(du) \right] = \int [\nabla \ell(\theta; u)]^2 Q(du)$$
$$- \left[\int \nabla \ell(\theta; u) Q(du) \right]^2,$$

which are the mean and variance of $\nabla \ell(\theta; U)$, respectively. Since $\mathbf{U}_{mk}^*$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, [T/\delta]$, are independent, then $\check{H}_\delta^m(t)$ is a normalized partial sum process for independent random variables and weakly converges to $\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u)$. Indeed, its finite-dimensional distribution convergence can be easily established through Lyapunov Central Limit Theorem with assumptions A3-A4 and Lemma 6.14 below, and its tightness can be shown by the fact that for $r \le s \le t$,

$$E\left\{ \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(t) - \check{H}_\delta^m(s) \right|^2 \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(s) - \check{H}_\delta^m(r) \right|^2 \right\} \le [\Upsilon(t) - \Upsilon(r)]^2, \tag{6.66}$$

where $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ is a continuous non-decreasing function on $[0, T]$ (Billingsley (1999, equation (13.14) & theorem 13.5)). To establish (6.66), we have that, because of independence,

$$E\left\{ \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(t) - \check{H}_\delta^m(s) \right|^2 \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(s) - \check{H}_\delta^m(r) \right|^2 \right\} = E\left\{ \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(t) - \check{H}_\delta^m(s) \right|^2 \right\} E\left\{ \left| \check{H}_\delta^m(s) - \check{H}_\delta^m(r) \right|^2 \right\}$$
$$= \delta^2 \sum_{s < k\delta \le t} tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X((k-1)\delta))] \sum_{r < k\delta \le s} tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X((k-1)\delta))]$$
$$\sim \int_s^t tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))] du \int_r^s tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))] du.$$

Since $X(t)$ is a deterministic bounded continuous curve, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta)$ is a continuous positive definite matrix,

$$\int_s^t tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))]du \int_r^s tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))]du \leq \left[\int_r^t tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))]du\right]^2 \equiv [\Upsilon(t) - \Upsilon(r)]^2.$$

We have shown that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $\check{H}_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t)$. By Central Limit Theorem for stochastic processes (Jacod and Shiryaev 2003, Theorem 3.11 of Ch. VIII), we obtain that quadratic variation $[\check{H}_\delta^m, \check{H}_\delta^m]_t$ converges in probability to $[H, H]_t$ for $t \in [0, T]$.

The Lipschitz of $\nabla\ell(\theta; u, Q)$ in θ implies the Lipschitz of $\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*, Q)$ (which is proved at the beginning of the proof of Lemma 6.11 below), and Lemma 6.12 below indicates that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $x_k^m - X(k\delta)$ converges to zero in probability (with order $\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}$) uniformly over $1 \leq k \leq T/\delta$. These two results together with the Lipschitz of $\nabla g(\theta)$ immediately show that

$$\max_{t \leq T} \left|[\check{H}_\delta^m, \check{H}_\delta^m]_t - [H_\delta^m, H_\delta^m]_t\right| = O_P\left((m\delta)\ \delta^{-1}[\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}]\right) = o_P(1),$$

and hence quadratic variation $[H_\delta^m, H_\delta^m]_t$ also converges in probability to $[H, H]_t$ for $t \in [0, T]$. An application of Central Limit Theorem for stochastic processes (Jacod and Shiryaev 2003, Theorem 3.11 of Ch. VIII) leads to that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $H_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t)$, that is, $\check{H}_\delta^m(t)$ and $H_\delta^m(t)$ share the same weak convergence limit $H(t)$.

Lemma 6.11. *We have*

$$\max_{k \leq T/\delta} |x_k^m - x_k| = O_P(m^{-1/2}),$$

where x_k and x_k^m are defined by (2.2) and (4.18), respectively.

Proof. Let $\zeta(\mathbf{U}_{mk}^*) = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m h_1(U_{ik}^*)$, which converges in probability to $E[h_1(U)]$ as

$m \to \infty$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) - \nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\vartheta;\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})| \le \zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|\theta-\vartheta|, \;\; |\boldsymbol{H}\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta;\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})| \le \zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}),\\
&|\check{\theta} - x^m_k| \le |\check{\theta} - x^m_{k-1}| + \delta|\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) - \nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\check{\theta};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})| + \delta|\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\check{\theta};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|\\
&\le (1+\delta\zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}))|\check{\theta} - x^m_{k-1}| + \delta|\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\check{\theta};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|\\
&\le \Big(1+\delta E[h_1(U)] + O_P(\delta m^{-1/2})\Big)^k\\
&+ \Big(1+\delta E[h_1(U)] + O_P(\delta m^{-1/2})\Big)^k \delta\sum_{j=1}^{k}[|\nabla g(\check{\theta})| + m^{-1/2}|R^m(\check{\theta};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})|]\\
&\le e^{TE[h_1(U)]}[1 + |\nabla g(\check{\theta})| + O_P(m^{-1/2})] = e^{TE[h_1(U)]}[1+O_P(m^{-1/2})],
\end{aligned}
$$

namely, x^m_k are bounded uniformly over $k \le T/\delta$. On the other hand, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&x^m_k - x_k = x^m_{k-1} - x_{k-1} - \delta[\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) - \nabla g(x_{k-1})]\\
&= x^m_{k-1} - x_{k-1} - \delta[\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) - \nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})] - \delta m^{-1/2}R^m(x_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})\\
&= (x^m_{k-1} - x_{k-1})[1 - \delta\boldsymbol{H}\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{\xi,k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})] - \delta m^{-1/2}R^m(x_{k-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})\\
&= -\delta m^{-1/2}\sum_{j=1}^{k}[1 - \delta\boldsymbol{H}\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{\xi,j-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})]^j R^m(x_{j-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj}),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $x^m_{\xi,j-1}$ is between x_{j-1} and x^m_{j-1}. Using $\zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mj}) \to E[h_1(U)]$ and assumption A4 we obtain for $j,k \le T/\delta$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|[1 - \delta\boldsymbol{H}\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x^m_{\xi,j-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})]^j| \le [1+\delta\zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})]^{T/\delta} \le e^{TE[h_1(U)]}[1+O_P(m^{-1/2})],\\
&R^m(x_{j-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj}) \sim \boldsymbol{\sigma}(x_{j-1})\mathbf{Z} = O_P(1),\\
&|x^m_k - x_k| \le \delta m^{-1/2}\sum_{j=1}^{k}|1+\delta\zeta(\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})]^{T/\delta}|R^m(x_{j-1};\mathbf{U}^*_{mj})| = O_P(k\delta m^{-1/2}) = O_P(m^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 6.12.

$$\max_{k\le T/\delta}|X(k\delta) - x^m_k| = O_P(\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}),$$

where $X(t)$ and x^m_k are defined by (2.3) and (4.18), respectively.

Proof. For $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$,

$$\int \nabla \ell(x_{k-1}^m; u) \hat{Q}_{mk}^*(du) - \int \nabla \ell(x_{k-1}^m; u) Q(du)$$

are martingale differences with conditional mean zero and conditional variance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(x_{k-1}^m)/m$. Since x_k in (2.2) is the Euler approximation of solution $X(t)$ of ODE (2.3), the standard ODE theory shows

$$\max_{k \le T/\delta} |x_k - X(k\delta)| = O(\delta). \tag{6.67}$$

By Lemma 6.11 we have that with probability tending to one, $x_{k-1}^m, k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$, fall inside a neighborhood of solution curve of ODE (2.3), and thus the maximum of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(x_{k-1}^m)$, $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$, is bounded. Applying Burkholder's inequality (Chow and Teicher (1997), He et al. (1992), Jacod and Shiryaev (2003)) we obtain

$$\max_{1 \le k \le T/\delta} \left| \sqrt{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \left[\int \nabla \ell(x_{\ell-1}^m; u) \hat{Q}_{m\ell}^*(du) - \int \nabla \ell(x_{\ell-1}^m; u) Q(du) \right] \right| = O_P(\delta^{-1/2}),$$

that is,

$$\max_{k \le T/\delta} \left| m^{-1/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} R^m(x_{\ell-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{m\ell}^*) \right| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{-1/2}).$$

Therefore, for $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^m &= x_0 - \delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \nabla g(x_{\ell-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} R^m(x_{\ell-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{m\ell}^*) \\ &= x_0 - \delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \nabla g(x_{\ell-1}^m) - O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

and with the same initial value x_0, comparing the expressions for x_k and x_k^m we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^m - x_k &= x_{k-1}^m - x_{k-1} - \delta[\nabla g(x_{k-1}^m) - \nabla g(x_{k-1})] - \delta m^{-1/2} R^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*) \\ &= \delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} [\nabla g(x_{\ell-1}) - \nabla g(x_{\ell-1}^m)] - \delta m^{-1/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} R^m(x_{\ell-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{m\ell}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Using the L-Lipschitz assumption on $\nabla g(\cdot)$ we conclude for $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$,

$$|x_k^m - x_k| \le L\delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} |x_{\ell-1}^m - x_{\ell-1}| + \delta m^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} R^m(x_{\ell-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{m\ell}^*) \right|$$
$$\le LT \max_{1\le\ell\le k} |x_{\ell-1}^m - x_{\ell-1}| + \delta m^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} R^m(x_{\ell-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{m\ell}^*) \right|.$$

Finally we can easily show by induction that

$$\max_{k\le T/\delta} |x_k^m - x_k| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}).$$

The lemma is a consequence of above result and (6.67).
The following lemma refines the order regarding $m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}$ in Lemma 6.12.

Lemma 6.13. *We have*

$$\max_{k\le T/\delta} |x_k^m - X_\delta^m(k\delta)| = o_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}) + O_P(\delta + \delta m^{-1/2} |\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

$$\max_{t\le T} |x_\delta^m(t) - X_\delta^m(t)| = o_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}) + O_P(\delta |\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

where $X_\delta^m(t)$ is given by (4.21), and x_k^m and $x_\delta^m(t)$ are defined by (4.18) and (4.19), respectively.

Proof. With weak convergence of $H_\delta^m(t)$ to $H(t)$ in Lemma 6.10, by Skohorod's representation we may realize $H_\delta^m(t)$ and $H(t)$ on some common probability spaces such that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, under the metric in $D([0,T])$, $H_\delta^m(t) - H(t)$ is $o_P(1)$. We may use arguments based on Lemma 6.37 (in Section 6.7) and stochastic equi-continuity to establish the convergence of $H_\delta^m(t) - H(t)$ under the maximum norm. Here we adopt a direct approach. Consider linear interpolation $\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t)$ between the values of $H_\delta^m(k\delta)$, $k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$, which satisfies

$$\max_{t\le T} |\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t) - H_\delta^m(t)| \le \delta^{1/2} \max_{k\le T/\delta} |R^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|.$$

By assumptions A1-A2, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|[\nabla \ell(x_{k-1}^m; U_{ik}^*) - \nabla g(x_{k-1}^m)] - [\nabla \ell(X((k-1)\delta); U_{ik}^*) - \nabla g(X((k-1)\delta))]| \\
&\leq [h_1(U_{ik}^*) + L]|x_{k-1}^m - X((k-1)\delta)|,
\end{aligned}
$$

and then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|R^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*) \leq |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)| \\
&+ m^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} [h_1(U_{ik}^*) + L]|x_{k-1}^m - X((k-1)\delta)|, \\
&\max_{t \leq T} |\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t) - H_\delta^m(t)| \leq \delta^{1/2} \max_{k \leq T/\delta} |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)| \\
&+ \delta^{1/2} \max_{k \leq T/\delta} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_1(U_{ik}^*) + L \right\} m^{1/2} \max_{k \leq T/\delta} |x_{k-1}^m - X((k-1)\delta)|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 6.12 implies $m^{1/2} \max_{k \leq T/\delta} |x_{k-1}^m - X((k-1)\delta)| = m^{1/2} O_P(\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}) = O_P(m^{1/2}\delta + \delta^{1/2}) = o_P(1)$, and by Lemma 6.14 below we derive that $\max_{t \leq T} |\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t) - H_\delta^m(t)| = o_P(\delta^{1/4} |\log \delta|)$. Thus, $\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $H(t)$ in $D([0,T])$. As both $\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t)$ and $H(t)$ live in $C([0,T])$, the weak convergence of $\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t)$ to $H(t)$ holds in $C([0,T])$. Again by Skohorod's representation we may realize $\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t)$ and $H(t)$ on some common probability spaces such that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $\max_{t \leq T} |\tilde{H}_\delta^m(t) - H(t)| = o_P(1)$, and hence $\max_{t \leq T} |H_\delta^m(t) - H(t)| = o_P(1)$.
Note that for $1 \leq k \leq T/\delta$,

$$
\delta \nabla \hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_{k-1}^m; \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*) = \delta \nabla g(x_{k-1}^m) + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}[H_\delta^m(k\delta) - H_\delta^m((k-1)\delta)],
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_k^m - x_{k-1}^m &= -\delta \nabla g(x^m(t_{k-1})) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}[H_\delta^m(k\delta) - H_\delta^m((k-1)\delta)], \\
x_k^m &= x_0 - \delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \nabla g(x_{\ell-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2} H_\delta^m(k\delta) \\
&= x_0 - \delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \nabla g(x_{\ell-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2} H(k\delta) + o_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Define $\check{x}_0^m = x_0$, and

$$\check{x}_k^m - \check{x}_{k-1}^m = -\delta \nabla g(\check{x}_{k-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}[H(k\delta) - H((k-1)\delta)]. \tag{6.68}$$

Then the situation is the same as in the last proof part of Lemma 6.12, and the same argument can be used to derive a recursive expression for $x_k^m - \check{x}_k^m$ and prove by induction that

$$\max_{k \le T/\delta} |x_k^m - \check{x}_k^m| = o_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}).$$

The lemma is a consequence of above result and Lemma 6.15 below.

Lemma 6.14.

$$\sup E\{|R^m(X(t); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|^4 : t \in [0,T], k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta\} < \infty,$$

$$\delta^{1/2} \max_{k \le T/\delta} \left\{ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_1(U_{ik}^*) - E[h_1(U)] \right\} = O_P(\delta^{1/4} |\log \delta|),$$

$$\delta^{1/2} \max_{k \le T/\delta} |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)| = O_P(\delta^{1/4} |\log \delta|).$$

Proof. Direct calculations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\delta^{1/2} \max_{k \le T/\delta} |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)| > \delta^{1/4} |\log \delta| \right) \\ & = 1 - \prod_{k \le T/\delta} P\left(\delta^{1/4} |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)| \le |\log \delta| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \le 1 - \prod_{k \le T/\delta} \left[1 - \delta E\left\{ |R^m(X((k-1)\delta); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|^4 \right\} / |\log \delta|^4 \right] \\ & \le 1 - \exp\left[-2T\tau / |\log \delta|^4 \right] \sim 2T\tau / |\log \delta|^4 \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Chebyshev's inequality, $\log(1-u) \ge -2u$ for $0 < u < 0.75$, and $\tau = \sup_{t,k} E\{|R^m(X(t); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|^4\} \equiv \sup E\{|R^m(X(t); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|^4 : t \in [0,T], k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta\}$ whose finiteness will be shown below. Indeed, it is enough to show that each component of $R^m(X(t); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)$ has finite fourth moment uniformly over $t \in [0,T], k = 1, \cdots, T/\delta$, and

thus we need to prove it only in the one dimensional case with gradient equal to the partial derivative. With this simple set-up we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|R^m(X(t);\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|^4 = m^{-2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m}\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}\right]^4 \\
&= m^{-2}\sum_{i\neq j}\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{jk}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2 \\
&+ m^{-2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^4 + \text{odd power terms}, \\
&E\{|R^m(X(t);\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|^4\} = m^{-2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^4] \\
&+ m^{-2}\sum_{i\neq j}E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2]E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{jk}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2] \\
&\leq \{E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2]\}^2 + E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^4]/m \\
&\leq \{E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2]\}^2 + E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^4]/m,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we use the fact that all odd power terms have mean zero factor $\nabla\ell(X(t);U^*_{ik}) - \nabla g(X(t))$, and thus their expectations are equal to zero. By assumption A1, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t,k}E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^2] \leq 2\sup_{t\geq 0}\left\{|X(t)-x_0|^2\right\}E[h_1^2(U)] \\
&+ 2E[\{\nabla\ell(x_0,U)\}^2] + 2\sup_{t\geq 0}\{[\nabla g(X(t))]^2\},
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t,k}E[\{\nabla\ell(X(t);U_{1k}) - \nabla g(X(t))\}^4] \leq 64\sup_{t\geq 0}\left\{|X(t)-x_0|^4\right\}E[h_1^4(U)] \\
&+ 64E[\{\nabla\ell(x_0,U)\}^4] + 8\sup_{t\geq 0}\{[\nabla g(X(t))]^4\},
\end{aligned}
$$

which are finite because $X(t)$ is deterministic and bounded. Thus $\tau = \sup_{t,k}E\{|R^m(X(t);\mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|^4\}$ is finite.

Similarly as $h_1(U)$ has the fourth moment, we have

$$E\left\{\left|m^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\{h_1(U_{ik}^*)-E[h_1(U_{ik}^*)]\}\right|^4\right\} \le [Var(h_1(U))]^2 + E\left[\{h_1(U)-E[h_1(U)]\}^4\right] \equiv \tau_1,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\delta^{1/2}\max_{k\le T/\delta}\left|m^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{m}h_1(U_{ik}^*)-E[h_1(U_{ik}^*)]\right| > \delta^{1/4}|\log\delta|\right)\\
&\le 1-\prod_{k\le T/\delta}\left[1-\delta E\left\{\left|m^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{m}h_1(U_{ik}^*)-E[h_1(U_{ik}^*)]\right|^4\right\}/|\log\delta|^4\right]\\
&\le 1-\exp\left[-2T\tau_1/|\log\delta|^4\right] \sim 2T\tau_1/|\log\delta|^4 \to 0, \text{ as } \delta\to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which together with $E[h_1(U_{ik}^*)] = E[h_1(U)]$ imply $\delta^{1/2}\max_{k\le T/\delta}\{\sum_{i=1}^{m}h_1(U_{ik}^*)\}/m = \delta^{1/2}E[h_1(U)] + O_P(\delta^{1/4}|\log\delta|)$.

Lemma 6.15.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{t\in[0,T]}|\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(k\delta)| = O_P(\delta+\delta m^{-1/2}|\log\delta|^{1/2}),\\
&\max_{0\le t-s\le\delta}|X_\delta^m(t)-X_\delta^m(s)| = O_P(\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\check{x}_k^m$ and $X_\delta^m(t)$ are defined by (6.68) and (4.21), respectively.

Proof. By (4.21) we have

$$|X_\delta^m(t)-X_\delta^m(s)| \le \int_s^t|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))|du + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left|\int_s^t\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|$$

$$= O_P(\delta+m^{-1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

where we use the fact that uniformly over $0\le t-s\le\delta$,

$$\int_s^t|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))|du = O_P(\delta),\quad \int_s^t\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u) = O_P(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

and the order for the Brownian term is derived by law of the iterated logarithm for Brow-

nian motion.

Note that $\check{x}_k^m$ are the Euler approximation of SDE (4.21). The first result follows from the standard argument for the Euler approximation. Let $D(k) = |\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(k\delta)|$. As $\check{x}_0^m = X_\delta^m(0) = x_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\check{x}_1^m - X_\delta^m(\delta) = \int_0^\delta \nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))du - \delta\nabla g(x_0), \\
&D(1) = |\check{x}_1^m - X_\delta^m(\delta)| = |\int_0^\delta [\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u)) - \nabla g(x_0)]du| \\
&\leq C\delta \max_{0\leq u\leq\delta} |X_\delta^m(u) - x_0| = O_P(\delta^2 + m^{-1/2}\delta^2|\log\delta|^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that for $u \in [0, \delta]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|X_\delta^m(u) - x_0| \leq \int_0^u |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(v))|dv + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left|\int_0^u \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(v))d\mathbf{B}(v)\right| \\
&= O_P(\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the general k, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
D(k) &= \left|\int_0^{k\delta} \nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))du - \delta\sum_{\ell=1}^k \nabla g(\check{x}_{\ell-1}^m)\right| \\
&\leq D(k-1) + \left|\int_{(k-1)\delta}^{k\delta} \nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))du - \delta\nabla g(\check{x}_{k-1}^m)\right|,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(k-1)\delta}^{k\delta} \nabla g(X_\delta^m(u))du - \delta\nabla g(\check{x}_{k-1}^m) = \int_{(k-1)\delta}^{k\delta} [\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u)) - \nabla g(X_\delta^m((k-1)\delta))]du \\
&+ \delta[\nabla g(X((k-1)\delta)) - \nabla g(\check{x}_{k-1}^m)], \\
&|\nabla g(X((k-1)\delta)) - \nabla g(\check{x}_{k-1}^m)| \leq C|X((k-1)\delta) - \check{x}_{k-1}^m| = CD(k-1), \\
&|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u)) - \nabla g(X_\delta^m((k-1)\delta))| = |\boldsymbol{H}g(X_\delta^m(u_*))[X_\delta^m(u) - X_\delta^m((k-1)\delta)]| \\
&\leq C\int_{(k-1)\delta}^u |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(v))|dv + Cm^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left|\int_{(k-1)\delta}^u \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(v))d\mathbf{B}(v)\right| \\
&= O_P(\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$D(k) \le D(k-1) + C\delta D(k-1) + O_P(\delta^2 + m^{-1/2}\delta^2|\log\delta|^{1/2}),$$

which shows that for $k \le T/\delta$,

$$D(k) \le (1+C\delta)^{k-1}D(1) + O_P(k\delta^2 + km^{-1/2}\delta^2|\log\delta|^{1/2}) = O_P(\delta + m^{-1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2}).$$

Lemma 6.16.

$$\max_{t\le T}|X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| \le Cm^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\max_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}),$$

where $X(t)$ and $X_\delta^m(t)$ are defined by (2.3) and (4.21), respectively.

Proof. With the same initial value for $X(t)$ and X_δ^m, from (2.3) and (4.21) we have

$$\begin{aligned}|X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| &\le \int_0^t |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u)) - \nabla g(X(u))|du + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| \\ &\le C\int_0^t |X_\delta^m(u) - X(u)|du + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Gronwall inequality we get

$$|X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| \le m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\left[\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| + C\int_0^t e^{C(t-s)}\left|\int_0^s \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|ds\right],$$

which implies

$$\max_{t\le T}|X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| \le Cm^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\max_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}),$$

where the last equality is due to Burkholder's inequality.

Lemma 6.17.

$$\max_{t\le T}|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(m^{-1}\delta).$$

where $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{X}_\delta^m(t)$ are the solutions of (4.21) and (4.22), respectively.

Proof. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)| \le \int_0^t |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(u)) - \nabla g(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))| du \\
&+ m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2} \left| \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))] d\mathbf{B}(u) \right| \\
&\le C \int_0^t |X_\delta^m(u) - X(u)| du + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2} \left| \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))] d\mathbf{B}(u) \right|. \\
&E[|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)|^2] \le C \int_0^t E[|X_\delta^m(u) - \check{X}_\delta^m(u)|^2] du \\
&+ 2m^{-1}\delta E \left[\left| \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))] d\mathbf{B}(u) \right|^2 \right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C \int_0^t E[|X_\delta^m(u) - \check{X}_\delta^m(u)|^2] du + 2m^{-1}\delta \int_0^t E[|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))|^2] du \\
&\le C \int_0^t E[|X_\delta^m(u) - \check{X}_\delta^m(u)|^2] du + C_1 m^{-1}\delta \int_0^t E[|X(u) - X_\delta^m(u)|^2] du \\
&+ C_1 m^{-1}\delta \int_0^t E[|X_\delta^m(u) - \check{X}_\delta^m(u)|^2] du,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is due to

$$
|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\check{X}_\delta^m(u))| \le C|X(u) - \check{X}_\delta^m(u)| \le C|X(u) - X_\delta^m(t)| + C|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)|.
$$

The Gronwall inequality leads to

$$
E[|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)|^2] \le C m^{-1}\delta \max_{s \le t} E[|X(s) - X_\delta^m(s)|^2].
$$

Using Lemma 6.16 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\max_{s \le t} E[|X(s) - X_\delta^m(s)|^2] \le C m^{-1}\delta E \left[\max_{s \le t} \left| \int_0^s \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u) \right|^2 \right] \\
&\le C m^{-1}\delta E \left[\int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]^2 du \right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is from Burkholder's inequality. Hence

$$E[|X_\delta^m(t) - \check{X}_\delta^m(t)|^2] \le Cm^{-2}\delta^2 E\left[\int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]^2 du\right],$$

and we can adopt the same argument to establish it for t as a bounded stopping time. Finally we prove the lemma by applying Lenglart's inequality for semi-martingale with $\eta_i = D_i m^{-1}\delta$ for some positive constants D_i,

$$P\left(\max_{s\le t}|X(s) - X_\delta^m(s)| > \eta_1\right) \le \frac{Cm^{-2}\delta^2 \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]^2 du}{\eta_1^2}$$
$$+ P\left(Cm^{-2}\delta^2 \int_0^t [\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]^2 du > \eta_2^2\right) \to 0, \text{ as } D_i \to \infty.$$

Lemma 6.18. *As $\delta \to 0$, and $m, n \to \infty$, we have $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\check{V}_\delta^m(t)$ both weakly converge to $V(t)$. Moreover, if $m(n\delta)^{1/2} \to 0$, and $m^{1/2}\delta|\log\delta|^{1/2} \to 0$, $(m/\delta)^{1/2}[x_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converges to $V(t)$.*

Proof. As the solutions of (4.21) and (4.22) have difference of order $m^{-1}\delta$, they have the same asymptotic distribution, and we can easily establish the result for $\check{V}_\delta^m(t)$ by that for $V_\delta^m(t)$ and Lemma 6.13.
Let consider the easier one for $X_\delta^m(t)$. From (4.21) and (2.3), we have

$$d[X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)] = -[\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t) - \nabla g(X(t))]dt - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))d\mathbf{B}(t),$$

and for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$X_\delta^m(t) - X(t) = -\int_0^t [\boldsymbol{I}\boldsymbol{H}g(X_\xi)][X_\delta^m(u) - X(u)]du - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/2}\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u),$$

where X_ξ is between $X(u)$ and $X_\delta^m(u)$ and thus Lemma 6.16 shows that uniformly over $[0, T]$,

$$|X_\xi - X(u)| \le |X_\delta^m(u) - X(u)| = O_P(m^{-1/2}\delta).$$

Then

$$V_\delta^m(t) = -\int_0^t [\boldsymbol{I}\boldsymbol{H}g(X_\xi)]V_\delta^m(u)du - \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u). \tag{6.69}$$

First as $\delta \to 0$, $m, n \to \infty$, equation (6.69) converges to (4.24).

We need to show stochastic equicontinuity for $V_\delta^m(t)$. From (6.69) we obtain

$$|V_\delta^m(t)| \le C\int_0^t |V_\delta^m(u)|du + \left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|,$$

and by the Gronwall inequality we have

$$\max_{t\le T}|V_\delta^m(t)| \le C\max_{t\le T}\left|\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|,$$

that is $V_\delta^m(t)$ is bounded in probability uniformly over $[0,T]$. Again (6.69) indicates that for any $s,t\in[0,T]$, and $t\in[s,s+\gamma]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_\delta^m(t) - V_\delta^m(s) &= -\int_s^t [\boldsymbol{H}g(X_\xi)]V_\delta^m(u)du - \int_s^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u),\\
|V_\delta^m(t) - V_\delta^m(s)| &\le C\int_s^t |V_\delta^m(u)|du + \left|\int_s^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|\\
&\le C\int_s^t |V_\delta^m(u) - V_\delta^m(s)|du + C(t-s)|V_\delta^n(s)| + \left|\int_s^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Again applying the Gronwall inequality we obtain uniformly for $t\in[s,s+\gamma]$,

$$|V_\delta^m(t) - V_\delta^m(s)| \le C\gamma|V_\delta^n(s)| + C\max_{s\le t\le s+\gamma}\left|\int_s^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| = O_P(\gamma+\gamma^{1/2}|\log\gamma|^{1/2}),$$

which proves stochastic equicontinuity for $V_\delta^n(t)$.

6.5 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Theorem 4.4 can be proved by the same proof argument of Theorem 4.1 except for changing step size from δ to $\delta^{1/2}$.

6.6 Proof of Theorems 4.5

6.6.1 The unique solution of the second order SDEs

In this section we will prove Lemma 6.25 blow that the second order SDEs (4.35) (with fixed (δ,m)) and (4.36) have unique (weak) solutions in the distributional sense.
Due to the similarity we provide proof arguments for (4.36) only. Consider the 2nd order

SDE (4.36) with initial conditions $V(0) = c$ and $\dot{V}(0) = 0$, where $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion, $\dot{V}(t)$ and $\ddot{V}(t)$ are the first and second derivatives of $V(t)$, respectively, $\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = \frac{dB(t)}{dt}$ is a white noise in a sense that for any smooth function $h(t)$ with compact support,

$$\int h(t)\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t)dt = \int h(t)dB(t),$$

where the right hand side is Itô integral.
The second order SDE (4.36) is equivalent to

$$Y(t) = V(t) + \frac{t}{2}\dot{V}(t), \;\; \dot{Y}(t) = -\frac{t}{2}[\nabla g(X(t))]V(t) - \frac{t}{2}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t), \tag{6.70}$$

where $V(0) = c, \dot{V}(0) = 0$, and $Y(0) = V(0) = c$. Denote by $V_\eta(t)$ the solution of the smoothed second order SDE

$$\ddot{V}_\eta(t) + \frac{3}{t \vee \eta}\dot{V}_\eta(t) + [\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0, \tag{6.71}$$

with initial conditions $V_\eta(0) = c$ and $\dot{V}_\eta(0) = 0$.
We need notation $M_a(s,t;Y)$ defined in (6.53). In the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, we have employed $M_a(s,t;Y)$ with $a = 1$, as curves and processes are solutions of ODE and thus differentiable. For this part of proofs we need to handle Brownian motion and SDEs, and the related processes have less than 1/2-derivatives, so we fix $a \in (0, 1/2)$ and consider $M_a(s,t;Y)$ with $a < 1/2$.

Lemma 6.19.

$$|\nabla g(X(t))| \le |\nabla g(X(s))| + L(t-s)|\dot{X}(s)| + LM_a(s,t;X)(t-s)^{1+a}/(1+a),$$
$$|\nabla g(X(t))V_\eta(t) - \nabla g(X(s))V_\eta(s)| \le L|V_\eta(s)|(t-s)|\dot{X}(s)| + |\nabla g(X(t))|(t-s)|\dot{V}_\eta(s)|$$
$$+ [L|V_\eta(s)|M_a(s,t;X) + |\nabla g(X(t))|M_a(s,t;V_\eta)](t-s)^{1+a}/(1+a).$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by the following direct calculation,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla g(X(t))V_\eta(t) - \nabla g(X(s))V_\eta(s)| \le |\nabla g(X(t))||V_\eta(t) - V_\eta(s)| \\
&+ |\nabla g(X(t)) - \nabla g(X(s))||V_\eta(s)| \\
&\le |\nabla g(X(t))||V_\eta(t) - V_\eta(s)| + L|V_\eta(s)||X(t) - X(s)| \\
&\le L|V_\eta(s)|| \int_s^t [\dot X(v) - \dot X(s)]dv + (t-s)\dot X(s)| \\
&+ |\nabla g(X(t))|| \int_s^t [\dot V_\eta(v) - \dot V_\eta(s)]dv + (t-s)\dot V_\eta(s)| \\
&\le L|V_\eta(s)|(t-s)|\dot X(s)| + |\nabla g(X(t))|(t-s)|\dot V_\eta(s)| \\
&+ L|V_\eta(s)|| \int_s^t (v-s)^a \frac{\dot X(v) - \dot X(s)}{(v-s)^a} dv| + |\nabla g(X(t))|| \int_s^t (v-s)^a \frac{\dot V_\eta(v) - \dot V_\eta(s)}{(v-s)^a} dv| \\
&\le L|V_\eta(s)|(t-s)|\dot X(s)| + |\nabla g(X(t))|(t-s)|\dot V_\eta(s)| \\
&+ [L|V_\eta(s)|M_a(s,t;X) + |\nabla g(X(t))|M_a(s,t;V_\eta)(t-s)^{1+a}/(1+a), \\
&|\nabla g(X(t))| \le |\nabla g(X(s))| + L|X(t) - X(s)| \\
&\le |\nabla g(X(s))| + L(t-s)|\dot X(s)| + LM_a(s,t;X)](t-s)^{1+a}/(1+a).
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 6.20. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$, $1 - |\nabla g(X(0))|\eta^2/[(1+a)(2+a)] - LM_a(0,\eta;X)\eta^{3+a}/[(1+a)^2(3+2a)]$ is bounded below from zero. Then we have for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$,*

$$
M_a(0,\eta;V_\eta) \le \frac{1}{1 - |\nabla g(X(0))|\eta^2/[(1+a)(2+a)] - LM_a(0,\eta;X)\eta^{3+a}/[(1+a)^2(3+2a)]}
$$

$$
\left[|\nabla g(X(0))V_\eta(0)|\eta^{1-a} + \frac{L|V_\eta(0)|M_a(0,\eta;X)\eta^2}{(1+a)(2+a)} + \max_{t\in(0,\eta]} \left| \frac{1}{t^a} e^{-3t/\eta} \int_0^t e^{3u/\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u) \right| \right].
$$

Proof. Since $\nabla g(X(0))$ and $M_a(0,\eta;X)$ for each η are deterministic and finite, and $M_a(0,\eta;X)$ is continuous and increasing in η, we easily show that $|\nabla g(X(0))|\eta^2/[(1+a)(2+a)] + LM_a(0,\eta;X)\eta^{3+a}/[(1+a)^2(3+2a)]$ approaches zero as $\eta \to 0$, which leads to

the existence of η_0. Lemma 6.19 indicates

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla g(X(u))V_\eta(u) - \nabla g(X(0))V_\eta(0)| \\
&\le [L|V_\eta(0)|M_a(0,u;X) + |\nabla g(X(u))|M_a(0,u;V_\eta)]u^{1+a}/(1+a), \\
&|\nabla g(X(u))| \le |\nabla g(X(0))| + LM_a(0,u;X)u^{1+a}/(1+a).
\end{aligned}
$$

For $t \in (0,\eta]$, V_η satisfies

$$
\ddot{V}_\eta(t) + \frac{3}{\eta}\dot{V}_\eta(t) + [\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0,
$$

which is equivalent to

$$
\left[\dot{V}_\eta(t)e^{3t/\eta}\right]' = -e^{3t/\eta}[\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) - e^{3t/\eta}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t),
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_\eta(t)e^{3t/\eta} &= -\int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}[\nabla g(X(u))]V_\eta(u)]du - \int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \\
&= -\nabla g(X(0))V_\eta(0)\int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}du - \int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}[\nabla g(X(u))V_\eta(u) - \nabla g(X(0))V_\eta(0)]du \\
&- \int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus for $t \in (0,\eta]$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{\dot{V}_\eta(t)}{t^a}\right| &\le \frac{1}{t^a}e^{-3t/\eta}|[\nabla g(X(0))]V_\eta(0)|\int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}du + \frac{1}{t^a}e^{-3t/\eta}\left|\int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| \\
&+ \frac{1}{(1+a)t^a}e^{-3t/\eta}\int_0^t [L|V_\eta(0)|M_a(0,u;X) + |\nabla g(X(u))|M_a(0,u;V_\eta)]u^{1+a}e^{3u/\eta}du,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le t^{1-a}|\nabla g(X(0))V_\eta(0)| + \frac{[L|V_\eta(0)|M_a(0,t;X) + |\nabla g(X(0))|M_a(0,t,V_\eta)]\eta^2}{(1+a)(2+a)} \\
&+ \frac{LM_a(0,t;X)M_a(0,t,V_\eta)\eta^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)} + \frac{1}{t^a}e^{-3t/\eta}\left|\int_0^t e^{3u/\eta}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the maximum over $t \in (0,\eta]$ on both sides of above inequality, and using the definition of $M_a(0,t;\cdot)$ (which is increasing in t), we can easily prove the lemma through

the simple algebra manipulation (which is also employed in the proof of Lemma 6.4).

Lemma 6.21. *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $\eta < t < \eta + \eta_0$, $1 - \frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}|\nabla g(X(\eta))| - \frac{LM_a(\eta,t;X)(t-\eta)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}$ is bounded below from zero. Then we have for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ and $\eta < t < \eta + \eta_0$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&M_a(\eta, t; V_\eta)\left[1 - \frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}|\nabla g(X(\eta))| - \frac{LM_a(\eta,t;X)(t-\eta)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}\right] \\
&\le C_1 M_a(0, \eta; V_\eta) + C_2|\nabla g(X(\eta))V_\eta(\eta)| \\
&+ \frac{(t-\eta)^{2-a}}{2}[L(|V_\eta(\eta)|+1)|\dot{X}(\eta)| + |\nabla g(X(\eta)|] + \frac{(t-\eta)^3}{(1+a)(3+a)}L|\dot{V}_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X) \\
&+ \frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}L|V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X) + \max_{t_0\in(\eta,t]}\left|\frac{1}{t_0^3(t_0-\eta)^a}\int_\eta^{t_0} u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Since $\nabla g(X(\eta))$ and $M_a(\eta, t; X)$ are deterministic and continuous in η, their maximum over η in a neighborhood of 0 is finite. As $t - \eta \to 0$, $\frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}|\nabla g(X(\eta))| + \frac{LM_a(\eta,t;X)(t-\eta)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}$ approaches zero, and thus the existence of η_0 is obvious. For $t > \eta$, V_η satisfies

$$
\ddot{V}_\eta(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}_\eta(t) + [\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0,
$$

which is equivalent to

$$
\left[t^3\dot{V}_\eta(t)\right]' = -t^3[\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) - t^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t),
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&t^3\dot{V}_\eta(t) = \eta^3\dot{V}_\eta(\eta) - \int_\eta^t u^3[\nabla g(X(u))]V_\eta(u)du - \int_\eta^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \\
&= \eta^3\dot{V}_\eta(\eta) - \int_\eta^t u^3[\nabla g(X(u))V_\eta(u) - \nabla g(X(\eta))V_\eta(\eta)]du - \int_\eta^t u^3[\nabla g(X(\eta))]V_\eta(\eta)du \\
&- \int_\eta^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{|\dot V_\eta(t)-\dot V_\eta(\eta)|}{(t-\eta)^a}\le \frac{(t^3-\eta^3)\eta^a}{t^3(t-\eta)^a}\frac{|\dot V_\eta(\eta)|}{\eta^a}+\frac{t^4-\eta^4}{4t^3(t-\eta)^a}|\nabla g(X(\eta))V_\eta(\eta)|\\
&+\frac{1}{t^3(t-\eta)^a}\int_\eta^t [L|V_\eta(\eta)|(u-\eta)|\dot X(\eta)|+|\nabla g(X(u)|(u-\eta)|\dot V_\eta(\eta)|]u^3du\\
&+\frac{1}{(1+a)t^3(t-\eta)^a}\int_\eta^t [L|V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,u;X)+|\nabla g(X(u))|M_a(\eta,u;V_\eta)]u^3(u-\eta)^{1+a}du\\
&+\frac{1}{t^3(t-\eta)^a}\left|\int_\eta^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\\
&\le \frac{(t^3-\eta^3)\eta^a}{t^3(t-\eta)^a}M_a(0,\eta;V_\eta)+\frac{t^4-\eta^4}{4t^3(t-\eta)^a}|\nabla g(X(\eta))V_\eta(\eta)|\\
&+\frac{(t-\eta)^{2-a}}{2}[L(|V_\eta(\eta)|+1)|\dot X(\eta)|+|\nabla g(X(\eta)|]+\frac{(t-\eta)^3}{(1+a)(3+a)}L|\dot V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X)\\
&+\frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}[L|V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X)+|\nabla g(X(\eta))|M_a(\eta,t;V_\eta)]\\
&+\frac{LM_a(\eta,t;X)M_a(\eta,t,V_\eta)(t-\eta)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}+\frac{1}{t^3(t-\eta)^a}\left|\int_\eta^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 6.20, replacing t by u in above inequality, taking the maximum over $u\in(\eta,t]$ on both sides, and using the definition of $M_a(\eta,t;\cdot)$ (which is increasing in t), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_a(\eta,t;V_\eta)\le C_1M_a(0,\eta;V_\eta)+C_2|\nabla g(X(\eta))V_\eta(\eta)|\\
&+\frac{(t-\eta)^{2-a}}{2}[L(|V_\eta(\eta)|+1)|\dot X(\eta)|+|\nabla g(X(\eta)|]+\frac{(t-\eta)^3}{(1+a)(3+a)}L|\dot V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X)\\
&+\frac{(t-\eta)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}[L|V_\eta(\eta)|M_a(\eta,t;X)+|\nabla g(X(\eta))|M_a(\eta,t;V_\eta)]\\
&+\frac{LM_a(\eta,t;X)M_a(\eta,t;V_\eta)(t-\eta)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}+\max_{t_0\in(\eta,t]}\left|\frac{1}{t_0^3(t_0-\eta)^a}\int_\eta^{t_0}u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the lemma.

Lemma 6.22. *There exists $\eta_0>0$ such that for $\eta\in(0,\eta_0]$ and $\eta<s<t<\eta+s\le T$, $1-\frac{(t-s)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}|\nabla g(X(s))|-\frac{LM_a(s,t;X)(t-s)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}$ is bounded below from zero. Then we have*

for $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$ *and* $\eta < s < t < \eta + s$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&M_a(s,t;V_\eta)\left[1 - \frac{(t-s)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}|\nabla g(X(s))| - \frac{LM_a(s,t;X)(t-s)^{3+a}}{(1+a)^2(3+2a)}\right] \\
&\le C_1 M_a(0,s;V_\eta) + C_2|\nabla g(X(s))V_\eta(s)| \\
&+ \frac{(t-s)^{2-a}}{2}[L(|V_\eta(s)|+1)|\dot{X}(s)| + |\nabla g(X(s)|] + \frac{(t-s)^3}{(1+a)(3+a)}L|\dot{V}_\eta(s)|M_a(s,t;X) \\
&+ \frac{(t-s)^2}{(1+a)(2+a)}L|V_\eta(s)|M_a(s,t;X) + \max_{t_0\in(s,t]}\left|\frac{1}{t_0^3(t_0-s)^a}\int_s^{t_0} u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Note that for $s, t > \eta$, V_η satisfies

$$
\left[t^3\dot{V}_\eta(t)\right]' = -t^3[\nabla g(X(t))]V_\eta(t) - t^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t),
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&t^3\dot{V}_\eta(t) = s^3\dot{V}_\eta(s) - \int_s^t u^3[\nabla g(X(u))]V_\eta(u)du - \int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \\
&= s^3\dot{V}_\eta(s) - \int_s^t u^3[\nabla g(X(u))V_\eta(u) - \nabla g(X(s))V_\eta(s)]du - \int_s^t u^3[\nabla g(X(s))]V_\eta(s)du \\
&- \int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we work on $\frac{|\dot{V}_\eta(t)-\dot{V}_\eta(s)|}{(t-s)^a}$. The rest of the proof argument is the same as in the proof of Lemma 6.21 with η replaced by s.

Lemma 6.23. *We have*

$$
P\left(\max_{v\in(s,t]}\left|\frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\int_s^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right| < \infty \text{ for all } 0 < s < t\right) = 1.
$$

Proof. We need to show that Gaussian process $\int_s^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)$ has the a-th derivative.

Indeed, we have

$$\frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\int_s^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d[\mathbf{B}(u)-\mathbf{B}(s)] = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(v))\frac{[\mathbf{B}(v)-\mathbf{B}(s)]}{(v-s)^a}$$
$$-\frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\int_s^v \frac{d[u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]}{du}[\mathbf{B}(u)-\mathbf{B}(s)]du$$
$$=\frac{[\mathbf{B}(v)-\mathbf{B}(s)]}{(v-s)^a}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(v)) - \frac{1}{v^3}\int_s^v \frac{d[u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]}{du}\frac{(u-s)^a}{(v-s)^a}\frac{\mathbf{B}(u)-\mathbf{B}(s)}{(u-s)^a}du,$$

which is a.s. finite, due to the facts that $0 < (u-s)^a/(v-s)^a \leq 1$, $X(\cdot)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\cdot)$ are continuously differentiable and Lipschitz, and Brownian motion has a well-known property that for all $u > s > 0$, $\sup_{s<u}\frac{|\mathbf{B}(u)-\mathbf{B}(s)|}{(u-s)^a}$ is a.s. finite.

Lemma 6.24. *For any given $T > 0$, $V_\eta(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous and stochastically bounded on $[0,T]$ uniformly over η.*

Proof. Take η_* to be the smallest η_0 defined in Lemmas 6.20 -6.22. Divide the interval $[0,T]$ into $N = [T/\eta_* + 1]$ number of subintervals with length almost equal to η_* (except for the last one), and denote by $\mathcal{I}_i = [s_{i-1}, s_i]$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$ (with $s_0 = 0$, $s_N = T$, $\mathcal{I}_1 = [0, T/N]$, $1/N < \eta_*/T$, $\mathcal{I}_N = [s_{N-1}, T]$). First for $t \in \mathcal{I}_1$, we have

$$|\dot{V}_\eta(t)| \leq |\mathcal{I}_1|^a M_a(\mathcal{I}_1; V_\eta), \;\; |V_\eta(t)| \leq |V_\eta(0)| + \int_{\mathcal{I}_1}|\dot{V}_\eta(u)|du,$$

and the upper bounds on $\dot{V}_\eta(t)$ and $V_\eta(t)$ over $\mathcal{I}_1$ are a.s. finite uniformly over η, which implies that $V_\eta(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous and stochastically bounded over $\mathcal{I}_1$. For $t \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $i = 2, \cdots, N$, we have

$$|\dot{V}_\eta(t) - \dot{V}_\eta(s_{i-1})| \leq |\mathcal{I}_i|^a M_a(\mathcal{I}_i; V_\eta),$$

and

$$|V_\eta(t)| \leq |V_\eta(s_{i-1})| + |\mathcal{I}_i||\dot{V}_\eta(s_{i-1})| + \int_{\mathcal{I}_i}|\dot{V}_\eta(u) - \dot{V}_\eta(s_{i-1})|du.$$

Note that N is free of η. We will use above two inequalities to prove by induction that the upper bounds of $V_\eta(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\eta(t)$ on $[0,T]$ are a.s. finite uniformly over η. Assume that

the upper bounds of $V_\eta(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\eta(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^{i-1}\mathcal{I}_j$ are a.s. finite uniformly over η. Above two inequalities immediately show that their upper bounds on $\mathcal{I}_i$ are also a.s. finite uniformly over η. This implies that the uniform finite bounds of $V_\eta(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\eta(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^{N}\mathcal{I}_j = [0,T]$, and thus $V_\eta(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous and stochastically bounded on $[0,T]$.

Lemma 6.25. *For fixed (δ, m), the second order SDEs (4.35) and (4.36) have unique solutions in the distributional sense.*

Proof. Due to the similarity we provide proof arguments for (4.36) only. Take a decreasing sequence of η as follows: η_k, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$, are decreasing, and as $k \to \infty$, $\eta_k \to 0$. Lemma 6.24 implies that $\{V_{\eta_k}(t), k = 1, 2, \ldots, \}$ is tight and thus there exists a subsequence that has a weak limit process $V_\dagger(t)$. We will show that $V_\dagger(t)$ satisfies (4.36). Without loss of generality, we may assume $V_{\eta_k}(t)$ weakly converges to $V_\dagger(t)$, and using SKorohod's representation theorem we may further assume that $V_{\eta_k}(t)$ converges to $V_\dagger(t)$ a.s. $V_{\eta_k}(t)$ obey the initial condition $V_{\eta_k}(0) = \dot{V}_{\eta_k}(0) = 0$, thus $V_\dagger(0) = 0$, and

$$\frac{|V_\dagger(t) - V_\dagger(0)|}{t} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{|V_{\eta_k}(t) - V_{\eta_k}(0)|}{t} = \lim_{k\to\infty} |\dot{V}_{\eta_k}(\xi_k)| \le \limsup_{k\to\infty} [t^a M_a(0, t, V_{\eta_k})].$$

Since $M_a(0, t, V_{\eta_k})$ is a.s. finite uniformly over η_k, taking $t \to 0$ we obtain $\dot{V}_\dagger(0) = 0$. For $t > \eta_k$, the second order SDE (6.71) is equivalent to the following smoothed stochastic differential equation system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{\eta_k}(t) &= \frac{2}{t} Y_{\eta_k}(t) - \frac{2}{t} V_{\eta_k}(t) \\ \dot{Y}_{\eta_k}(t) &= -\frac{t}{2} [\nabla g(X(t))] V_{\eta_k}(t) - \frac{t}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) \dot{\mathbf{B}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Its inherited initial conditions are $V_{\eta_k}(0) = Y_{\eta_k}(0) = c$ and $\dot{V}_{\eta_k}(0) = 0$. The right hand side of the second equation in above system implies that as $k \to \infty$, $Y_{\eta_k}(t)$ converges to $Y(t)$ defined by

$$\dot{Y}(t) = -\frac{t}{2} [\nabla g(X(t))] V_\dagger(t) - \frac{t}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t)) \dot{\mathbf{B}}(t), \;\; Y(0) = c,$$

which in turn shows that $\dot{V}_{\eta_k}(t)$ converges to $\dot{V}_*(t)$ given by

$$\dot{V}_*(t) = \frac{2}{t} Y(t) - \frac{2}{t} V_\dagger(t).$$

Since $V_{\eta_k}(t)$ converges to $V_\dagger(t)$, $\dot{V}_*(t) = \dot{V}_\dagger(t)$. Thus $V_\dagger(t)$ satisfies

$$\dot{V}_\dagger(t) = \frac{2}{t}\, Y(t) - \frac{2}{t}\, V_\dagger(t),$$

which impies $V_\dagger(t)$ obeys

$$\ddot{V}_\dagger(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{V}_\dagger(t) + [\nabla g(X(t))]V_\dagger(t) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t) = 0.$$

Suppose that the equation has two solutions $(V(t), \mathbf{B}(t))$ and $(V_*(t), \mathbf{B}_*(t))$. Then we may realize both solutions on some common probability space such that $\mathbf{B}(t) = \mathbf{B}_*(t)$. Then $U(t) = V(t) - V_*(t)$ obey

$$\ddot{U}(t) + \frac{3}{t}\dot{U}(t) + [\nabla g(X(t))]U(t) = 0, \qquad U(0) = \dot{U}(0) = 0,$$

which has a unique solution zero, as it is a second order ODE similar to ODEs (2.6) and (3.15). Thus $V(t) = V_*(t)$, that is, the two solutions have an identical distribution, which proves the unique solution.

6.6.2 Weak convergence of $V_\delta^m(t)$

Lemma 6.26. *For $X(t)$, $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $V_\delta^m(t)$ we have the following inequalities,*

$$M_1(s,t;X) \le \frac{1}{1 - L(t-s)^2/6}\left[\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}(s)| + |\nabla g(X(s))|\right], \text{ if } t - s < \sqrt{\frac{3}{L}},$$

$$M_a(s,t;X_\delta^m) \le \frac{1}{1 - L(t-s)^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]}\left[(t-s)^{1-a}\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}_\delta^m(s)|\right.$$
$$\left. + (t-s)^{1-a}|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(s))| + \max_{v\in(s,t]} \frac{\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2}}{4v^3(v-s)^a}\left|\int_s^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|\right],$$

$$M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) \le \frac{1}{1 - L(t-s)^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]}$$
$$\left[(t-s)^{1-a}\left\{2L|V_\delta^m(s)| + [3/s + L(t-s)]|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|\right\}\right.$$
$$\left. + \max_{v\in(s,t]} \frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\left|\int_s^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\right],$$

when $s > 0$ *and* $t - s < \sqrt{(a+1)(a+2)/(2L)}$. *In particular, for* $s = 0$ *we have*

$$M_1(0,t;X) \le \frac{|\nabla g(x_0)|}{1 - Lt^2/6},$$

$$M_a(0,t;X_\delta^m) \le \frac{t^{1-a}|\nabla g(x_0)| + \max_{v\in(s,t]} \frac{\delta^{1/4}(mT)^{-1/2}}{4v^{3+a}} \left|\int_0^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u)\right|}{1 - Lt^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]},$$

$$M_a(0,t;V_\delta^m) \le \frac{1}{1 - Lt^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]} \max_{v\in(0,t]} \left[\frac{1}{v^{3+a}} \left|\int_0^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) \dot{\mathbf{B}}(u) du\right|\right].$$

Proof. Because of similarity, we provide proof arguments only for $M_1(s,t;V_\delta^m$. Let $H(t;V_\delta^m) = \delta^{-1/4} m^{1/2}[\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) - \nabla g(X(t))]$, and $J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m) = \int_s^t u^3[H(u;V_\delta^m) - H(s;V_\delta^m)]du$. Then

$$|H(t;V_\delta^m)| \le L\delta^{-1/4} m^{1/2} |X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| = L|V_\delta^m(t)|,$$
$$|H(t;V_\delta^m) - H(s;V_\delta^m)| = \delta^{-1/4} m^{1/2} |\nabla[g(X_\delta^m(t)) - g(X_\delta^m(s)) - g(X(t)) + g(X(s))]|$$
$$\le L\delta^{-1/4} m^{1/2} |X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| + L\delta^{-1/4} m^{1/2} |X_\delta^m(s) - X(s)| = L|V^n(t)| + L|V_\delta^m(s)|,$$
$$V_\delta^m(t) = \int_s^t \dot{V}_\delta^m(u) du + V_\delta^m(s) = \int_s^t [\dot{V}_\delta^m(u) - \dot{V}^n(s)] du + V_\delta^m(s) + (t-s)\dot{V}^n(s),$$

$$|H(t;V_\delta^m) - H(s;V_\delta^m)| \le L \int_s^t |\dot{V}_\delta^m(u) - \dot{V}_\delta^m(s)| du + L[2|V_\delta^m(s)| + |(t-s)\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|],$$
$$\int_s^t |\dot{V}_\delta^m(u) - \dot{V}_\delta^m(s)| du \le \int_s^t (u-s)^a \frac{|\dot{V}_\delta^m(u) - \dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|}{(u-s)^a} du \le \int_s^t (u-s)^a M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) du$$
$$= \frac{M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m)(t-s)^{a+1}}{a+1},$$
$$\frac{L}{a+1} \int_s^t M_a(s,u;V_\delta^m) u^3 (u-s)^{a+1} du \le \frac{L M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) t^3 (t-s)^{a+2}}{(a+1)(a+2)},$$
$$|J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m)| \le \frac{Lt^3(t-s)^{a+2}}{(a+1)(a+2)} M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) + L[2|V_\delta^m(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|]t^3(t-s).$$

The SDE (4.35) is equivalent to

$$\frac{t^3\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)}{dt} = -t^3 H(t;V_\delta^m) - t^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(t), \text{ which implies}$$
$$t^3\dot{V}_\delta^m(t) - s^3\dot{V}_\delta^m(s) = -\int_s^t u^3 H(u;V_\delta^m)du - \int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du$$
$$= -\frac{t^4-s^4}{4}H(s;V_\delta^m) - J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m) - \int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du,$$
$$\frac{\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)-\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)}{t-s} = -\frac{t^3-s^3}{t^3(t-s)}\dot{V}_\delta^m(s) - \frac{t^4-s^4}{4t^3(t-s)}H(s;V_\delta^m) - \frac{J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m)}{t^3(t-s)}$$
$$-\frac{1}{t^3(t-s)}\int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du,$$

and using the upper bounds of $H(s;V_\delta^m)$ and $J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m)$ and algebraic manipulations we get

$$\frac{|\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)-\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|}{t-s} \le \frac{t^3-s^3}{t^3(t-s)}|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)| + \frac{t^4-s^4}{4t^3(t-s)}|H(s;V_\delta^m)| + \frac{|J(s,t;H,V_\delta^m)|}{t^3(t-s)}$$
$$+\frac{1}{t^3(t-s)}\left|\int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|$$
$$\le \frac{t^2+st+s^2}{t^3}|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)| + \frac{(t^2+s^2)(t+s)}{2t^3}L|V_\delta^m(s)| + M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m)\frac{L(t-s)^{a+1}}{(a+1)(a+2)}$$
$$+L[2|V_\delta^m(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|] + \frac{1}{t^3(t-s)}\left|\int_s^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|.$$

As above inequality holds for any $s<t$, an application of the definition of $M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m)$ leads to

$$M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) \le (t-s)^{1-a}\left\{\frac{3}{s}|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)| + L[4|V_\delta^m(s)| + (t-s)|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s)|]\right\}$$
$$+M_a(t,s;V_\delta^m)\frac{L(t-s)^2}{(a+1)(a+2)} + \max_{v\in(s,t]}\frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\left|\int_s^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|,$$

and solving for $M_a(s,t:V_\delta^m)$ to obtain

$$M_a(s,t;V_\delta^m) \le \frac{1}{1-L(t-s)^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]} \Big[(t-s)^{1-a}\Big\{4L|V_\delta^m(s)| + [3/s + L(t-s)]|\dot V_\delta^m(s)|\Big\} + \max_{v\in(s,t]} \frac{1}{v^3(v-s)^a}\left|\int_s^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\Big],$$

when $s>0$ and $t-s<\sqrt{(a+1)(a+2)/(2L)}$. If $s=0$, we replace the coefficient $3/s$ by $1/t$ in above inequality, and $V_\delta^m(0)=\dot V_\delta^m(0)=0$, $X_\delta^m(0)=X(0)=x_0$. Then

$$M_a(0,t;V_\delta^m) \le \frac{1}{1-Lt^2/[(a+1)(a+2)]} \max_{v\in(0,t]}\left[\frac{1}{v^{3+a}}\left|\int_0^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\right],$$

which proves the lemma.

Lemma 6.27. *For any given $T>0$, we have*

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|V_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(1), \quad \max_{t\in[0,T]}|X_\delta^m(t)-X(t)| = O_P(\delta^{1/4}m^{-1/2}),$$

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot V_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(1), \quad \max_{t\in[0,T]}|\dot X_\delta^m(t)-\dot X(t)| = O_P(\delta^{1/4}m^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. As $V_\delta^m(t)=\delta^{-1/4}m^{1/2}[X_\delta^m(t)-X(t)]$, we need to establish the results for $V_\delta^m(t)$ only. Divide interval $[0,T]$ into $N=\left[T\sqrt{2L/\{(a+1)(a+2)\}}\right]+1$ number of subintervals with length $\sqrt{(a+1)(a+2)/(2L)}$ (except for the last one) and denote by $\mathcal{I}_i=[s_{i-1},s_i]$, $i=1,\cdots,N$ (with $s_0=0$, $s_N=T$, $\mathcal{I}_1=[0,\sqrt{3/L}]$, $\mathcal{I}_N=[s_{N-1},T]$). First for $t\in\mathcal{I}_1$, from Lemma 6.26 we have

$$|\dot V_\delta^m(t)| \le |\mathcal{I}_1|^a M_a(\mathcal{I}_1;V_\delta^m) \le C\max_{v\in(0,s_1]}\left[\frac{1}{v^{3+a}}\left|\int_0^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\right],$$

$$|V_\delta^m(t)| \le |V_\delta^m(0)| + \int_{\mathcal{I}_1}|\dot V_\delta^m(u)|du \le C\max_{v\in(0,s_1]}\left[\frac{1}{v^{3+a}}\left|\int_0^v u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du\right|\right].$$

The the upper bounds of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\dot V_\delta^m(t)$ on $\mathcal{I}_1$ are a.s. finite uniformly over (δ,m).

For $t \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $i = 2, \cdots, N$, from Lemma 6.26 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\dot{V}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| \le |\mathcal{I}_i|^a M_a(\mathcal{I}_i, V_\delta^m) \le C\left[4L|V_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + (3/s_1 + Ls_1)|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})|\right] \\
&+ C \max_{v\in(s_{i-1},s_i]} \frac{1}{v^3(v-s_{i-1})^a} \left| \int_{s_{i-1}}^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \right|, \\
&|V_\delta^m(t)| \le |V_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + |\mathcal{I}_i||\dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + \int_{\mathcal{I}_i} |\dot{V}_\delta^m(u) - \dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})|du \\
&\le |V_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + \sqrt{3/L}|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + C\left[4L|V_\delta^m(s_{i-1})| + (3/s_1 + Ls_1)|\dot{V}_\delta^m(s_{i-1})|\right] \\
&+ C \max_{v\in(s_{i-1},s_i]} \frac{1}{v^3(v-s_{i-1})^a} \left| \int_{s_{i-1}}^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

We will use above two inequalities to prove by induction that the upper bounds of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)$ on $[0,T]$ are a.s. finite uniformly over (m,δ). Assume that the upper bounds of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^{i-1}\mathcal{I}_j$ are a.s. finite uniformly over (m,δ). Note that $\max_{v\in(s_{i-1},s_i]} \frac{1}{v^3(v-s_{i-1})^a} \left| \int_{s_{i-1}}^v u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))\dot{\mathbf{B}}(u)du \right|$ is a.s. finite, and N is free of (m,δ). Above two inequalities immediately show that the upper bounds of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)$ on $\mathcal{I}_i$ are also a.s. finite uniformly over (m,δ). This implies that the uniform finite bounds of $V_\delta^m(t)$ and $\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)$ on $\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}_j = [0,T]$.

Lemma 6.28. *For any given $T > 0$, as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous on $[0,T]$.*

Proof. Lemma 6.27 proves that $\max_{t\in[0,T]} |V_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(1)$ and $\max_{t\in[0,T]} |\dot{V}_\delta^m(t)| = O_P(1)$, which implies that $V_\delta^m(t)$ is stochastically equicontinuous on $[0,T]$.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Lemma 6.25 shows the unique solutions of SDEs. (4.36) is a linear SDE, and its constant term linearly depends on $\mathbf{B}(t)$, thus its solution $V(t)$ is Gaussian. As in Section 6.1.2, we can easily establish finite distribution convergence for $V_\delta^m(t)$. Lemma 6.28 together with the finite distribution convergence immediately lead to that as $\delta \to 0$ and $m \to \infty$, $V_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $V(t)$.

6.7 Proof of Theorem 4.6

Recall that sequences $\{x_k, y_k\}$ and $\{x_k^m, y_k^m\}$ are, respectively, defined by algorithms (2.4) and (4.26), with initial values $x_0^m = y_0^m = x_0$, and $X_\delta^m(t)$ and $X(t)$ are the solutions of ODE (2.6) and SDE (4.35), respectively.

We discretize SDE (4.34), which is equivalent to (4.35), to define a new sequence as follows. Let $\{\check{x}_k^m, \check{y}_k^m\}$ be the sequence, with initial values $\check{x}_0^m = \check{y}_0^m = x_0$, generated by

$$\check{x}_k^m = \check{y}_{k-1}^m - \delta\nabla g(\check{y}_{k-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}[H(t_k) - H(t_{k-1})], \check{y}_k^m = \check{x}_k^m + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(\check{x}_k^m - \check{x}_{k-1}^m), \quad (6.72)$$

where $H(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u)$ and $t_k = k\delta^{1/2}$.
We rewrite algorithm (4.26) to generate $\{x_k^m, y_k^m\}$ as follows,

$$x_k^m = y_{k-1}^m - \delta\nabla g(y_{k-1}^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}[H_\delta^m(t_k) - H_\delta^m(t_{k-1})], y_k^m = x_k^m + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(x_k^m - x_{k-1}^m). \quad (6.73)$$

Note that (6.72) and (6.73) share the same recursive structure with only difference between $H_\delta^m(t)$ and $H(t)$. Our proof approach is to (i) Lemma 6.34 below shows that $\{x_k^m, y_k^m\}$ and $\{\check{x}_k^m, \check{y}_k^m\}$ can be realized on some probability spaces within small order distance; (ii) Lemma 6.38 below derives an order bound for discretization error $\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(t_k)$; (iii) the theorem is proved by combining two lemmas in (i) and (ii).

Lemma 6.29.

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |x_k - X(t_k)| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|), \quad \max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |z_k - \dot{X}(t_k)| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|),$$

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |y_k - x_k| = O(\delta^{1/2}).$$

Proof. As $X(t)$ is the solution of ODE (2.6), it has been shown that $X(t)$, $\dot{X}(t)$ and $\nabla g(X(t))$ are uniformly bounded on $[0,T]$, and Lemma 6.4 further indicates that $\dot{X}(t)$ is Lipschitz. Let $Z(t) = \dot{X}(t)$. With deterministic sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}$ given by algorithm (2.4), we define $z_0 = 0$, $z_k = (x_k - x_{k-1})/\delta^{1/2}$. Lemma 6.8 has shown that

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |x_k - X(t_k)| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|), \quad \max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |z_k - Z(t_k)| = O(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|),$$

and $y_k - x_k = \frac{3k+4}{k+3}\delta^{1/2}z_k$, which implies that

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |y_k - x_k| \le 3\delta^{1/2}\left(\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |z_k - Z(t_k)| + \max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |Z(t_k)|\right) = O(\delta^{1/2}).$$

As in the proofs of Theorems 4.1-4.3, we use notations $R^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) =$

$(R_1^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)), \cdots, R_p^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)))'$, where

$$R_j^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}_m^*(t)) = \sqrt{m}\left[\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}\ell(\theta; U_i^*(t)) - \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j}g(\theta)\right], \quad j = 1, \cdots, p.$$

Lemma 6.30.

$$\max_{k \le T\delta^{-1/2}} E[|R^m(X(t_{k-1}); \mathbf{U}_{mk}^*)|^4] \le C.$$

Proof. For simplicity we write $R_i = R^m(X(t_i); \mathbf{U}_{m(i+1)}^*)$, and $\mathrm{r}_q = \nabla\ell(X(t_i); U_{q(i+1)}^*) - \nabla g(X(t_i))$. Then $R_i = m^{-1/2}\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}_q$. Since $X(t)$ is deterministic, and U_{qk}^*, $q = 1, 2, \cdots, m$, are independent, we have that $\mathrm{r}_1, \mathrm{r}_2, \ldots, \mathrm{r}_m$ are independent with mean 0, and

$$|\mathrm{r}_q| \le h_1(U_{q(i+1)}^*)|X(t_i) - \theta_0| + |\nabla\ell(\theta_0; U_{q(i+1)}^*)| + |\nabla g(X(t_i))|,$$

$$E|\mathrm{r}_q|^2 \le 3 \cdot (E[h_1^2(U)]|X(t_i) - \theta_0|^2 + E|\nabla\ell(\theta_0; U)|^2 + |\nabla g(X(t_i))|^2),$$

$$E|\mathrm{r}_q|^4 \le 27 \cdot (E[h_1^4(U)]|X(t_i) - \theta_0|^4 + E|\nabla\ell(\theta_0; U)|^4 + |\nabla g(X(t_i))|^4).$$

Note that $\sup_t |X(t) - \theta_0|$ and $\sup_t |\nabla g(X(t))|$ are bounded, and Assumption A1 implies that $E|\mathrm{r}_q|^2$ and $E|\mathrm{r}_q|^4$ are uniformly bounded. Therefore we obtain

$$E|R_i|^2 = m^{-1}E\left|\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}_q\right|^2 = m^{-1}\sum_{q=1}^{m}E|\mathrm{r}_q|^2 \le C,$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E|R_i|^4 &= m^{-2}E\left|\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}_q\right|^4 \\
&= m^{-2}E\left[\left(\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}'_q\right)\left(\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}_q\right)\left(\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}'_q\right)\left(\sum_{q=1}^{m}\mathrm{r}_q\right)\right] \\
&= m^{-2}E\left[\sum_{q=1}^{m}|\mathrm{r}_q|^4+\sum_{p<q}(4(\mathrm{r}'_p\mathrm{r}_q)^2+2|\mathrm{r}_p|^2|\mathrm{r}_q|^2)\right] \\
&\le m^{-2}\left[\sum_{q=1}^{m}E|\mathrm{r}_q|^4+\sum_{p<q}6E|\mathrm{r}_p|^2E|\mathrm{r}_q|^2\right] \\
&\le m^{-2}(mC+3m^2C^2)\le C+3C^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the inequality $(\mathrm{r}'_p\mathrm{r}_q)^2 \le |\mathrm{r}_p|^2|\mathrm{r}_q|^2$. That is, we have shown that $E(|R_i|^2)$ and $E(|R_i|^4)$ are uniformly bounded.

Lemma 6.31.

$$
\max_{t\in[0,T]} E[|G^m_\delta(t)-\check{G}^m_\delta(t)|^2] \le C\max_{k\le k_T} E[|y^m_k - X(t_k)|^2],
$$

where $G^m_\delta(t)$ and $\check{G}^m_\delta(t)$ are defined in (6.77) and (6.79) below, respectively.

Proof. Define filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(y^m_\delta(s), \mathbf{U}^*_m(s); s\le t)$, where $y^m_\delta(t)$ and $\mathbf{U}^*_m(t)$ are given by (4.27). Then for $i>j$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E\{(R^m(y^m_i;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)})-R^m(X(t_i);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}))'(R^m(y^m_j;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)})-R^m(X(t_j);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)})\} \\
=&E\{E[(R^m(y^m_i;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)})-R^m(X(t_i);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}))'(R^m(y^m_j;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)})-R^m(X(t_j);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)}))|\mathcal{F}_{t_j}]\} \\
=&E\{(R^m(y^m_i;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)})-R^m(X(t_i);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}))'E[R^m(y^m_j;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)})-R^m(X(t_j);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(j+1)})|\mathcal{F}_{t_j}]\} \\
=&0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $r_{qi} = \nabla\ell(y^m_i;U^*_{q(i+1)})-\nabla g(y^m_i)-(\nabla\ell(X(t_i);U^*_{q(i+1)})-\nabla g(X(t_i))$. We have

$$
D_i \triangleq R^m(y^m_i;\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)})-R^m(X(t_i);\mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}) = m^{-1/2}\sum_{q=1}^{m} r_{qi},
$$

and for $q \neq s$,

$$E(r'_{qi}r_{si}) = E(E(r'_{qi}r_{si}|\mathcal{F}_{t_i})) = E(E(r'_{qi}|\mathcal{F}_{t_i})E(r_{si}|\mathcal{F}_{t_i})) = 0.$$

On the other hand, we get $|r_{qi}| \leq (h_1(U_{q(i+1)}) + L)|y_i^m - X(t_i)|$,

$$E(|r_{qi}|^2) \leq E(E[(h_1(U_{q(i+1)}) + L)^2|y_i^m - X(t_i)|^2|\mathcal{F}_{t_i}]) \leq C \cdot E|y_i^m - X(t_i)|^2,$$

and thus

$$E|D_i|^2 \leq C \cdot E|y_i^m - X(t_i)|^2.$$

Direct calculations show that for $t_{k+1} \leq t < t_{k+2}$,

$$E|G_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(t)|^2 = \frac{\delta^{1/2}}{c_k^2} E\left|\sum_{i=1}^k c_i D_i\right|^2 = \frac{\delta^{1/2}}{c_k^2}\sum_{i=1}^k c_i^2 E|D_i|^2$$
$$\leq k\delta^{1/2} C \cdot \max_{1\leq i\leq k} E|y_i^m - X(t_i)|^2 \leq C \cdot \max_{1\leq i\leq k} E|y_i^m - X(t_i)|^2,$$

and therefore

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]} E|G_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(t)|^2 \leq C \cdot \max_{k\leq k_T} E|y_k^m - X(t_k)|^2.$$

Lemma 6.32.

$$\max_{k\leq T\delta^{-1/2}} E[|y_k^m - y_k|^4] = O(m^{-2}), \quad \max_{k\leq T\delta^{-1/2}} E[|y_k^m - X(t_k)|^4] = O(m^{-2} + \delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|).$$

Proof. The second result can be easily established from the first one and Lemma 6.29. We will prove the first result.
Recall $d_0 = 0$, $d_k = x_k - x_{k-1}$, $d_0^m = 0$, $d_k^m = x_k^m - x_{k-1}^m$, $a_k = |x_k - x_k^m|$, $b_k = |d_k - d_k^m|$. We have $a_0 = 0$, $b_0 = 0$,

$$a_k \leq |x_{k-1} - x_{k-1}^m| + |d_k - d_k^m| = a_{k-1} + b_k \leq S_k,$$

where $S_k = b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_k$. Also we obtain

$$d_{k+1} = \frac{k-1}{k+2} d_k - \delta\nabla g(y_k),$$

$$d_{k+1}^m = \frac{k-1}{k+2} d_k^m - \delta \nabla g(y_k^m) - \delta m^{-1/2} R^m(y_k^m; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(k+1)}),$$

$$|y_k^m - y_k| \le a_k + b_k.$$

Since $\max_{k \le k_T} |y_k - X(t_k)| = O(\delta^{1/2} |\log \delta|)$, we have $\max_{k \le k_T} |y_k| = O(1)$, and as in Lemma 6.30, $\max_{k \le T\delta^{-1/2}} E[|R^m(y_k; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(k+1)})|^4] = O(1)$. For simplicity we let $R_k = |R^m(y_k; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(k+1)})|$. Recall

$$\begin{aligned}
|R^m(y_k^m; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(k+1)})| \le & R_k + m^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^m [h_1(U^*_{i(k+1)}) + L] |y_k^m - y_k| \\
\le & R_k + m^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m [h_1(U^*_{i(k+1)}) - E(h_1(U))] \right| \cdot |y_k^m - y_k| \\
& + m^{1/2} (E(h_1(U)) + L) \cdot |y_k^m - y_k|.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $h_k = m^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m [h_1(U^*_{i(k+1)}) - E(h_1(U))] \right|$. Then

$$\max_{k \le T\delta^{-1/2}} E[h_k^4] = O(1),$$

$$b_{k+1} \le b_k + L\delta(a_k + b_k) + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k + (\delta m^{-1/2} h_k + C\delta)(a_k + b_k),$$

and using $a_k + b_k \le 2S_k$, we obtain

$$b_{k+1} \le b_k + C\delta(1 + m^{-1/2} h_k) S_k + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k.$$

Define sequence b'_k satisfying $b'_0 = 0$,

$$b'_{k+1} = b'_k + C\delta(1 + m^{-1/2} h_k) S'_k + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k.$$

Then $b_k \le b'_k$, b'_k is non-decreasing, and since $k\delta^{1/2} \le T$,

$$b'_{k+1} \le b'_k + C\delta(1 + m^{-1/2} h_k) k b'_k + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k \le (1 + C\delta^{1/2})(1 + C\delta^{1/2} m^{-1/2} h_k) b'_k + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k.$$

Define another sequence b^*_k satisfying $b^*_0 = 0$,

$$b^*_{k+1} = (1 + C\delta^{1/2})(1 + C\delta^{1/2} m^{-1/2} h_k) b^*_k + \delta m^{-1/2} R_k.$$

Then $b'_k \le b^*_k$, and

$$b^*_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\{ (1+C\delta^{1/2})^{k-i-1} \left[\prod_{j=i+1}^{k-1} (1+C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2}h_j) \right] \delta m^{-1/2} R_i \right\}$$
$$\le C\delta m^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left\{ \left[\prod_{j=i+1}^{k-1} (1+C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2}h_j) \right] R_i \right\}.$$

Since for $r = C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2} < 1$,

$$E(1+rh_j)^4 \le 1 + 4rEh_j + 6rEh_j^2 + 4rEh_j^3 + rEh_j^4 \le 1 + Cr,$$

and $R_i, h_{i+1}, \ldots, h_{k-1}$ are independent, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{k\le k_T} Ea_k^4 &\le E(k_T b^*_{k_T})^4 \\
&\le C\delta^2 m^{-2} k_T^3 \sum_{i=0}^{k_T-1} E \left\{ \left[\prod_{j=i+1}^{k_T-1} (1+C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2}h_j) \right] R_i \right\}^4 \\
&\le C\delta^{1/2} m^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^{k_T-1} \left\{ \left[\prod_{j=i+1}^{k_T-1} E(1+C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2}h_j)^4 \right] ER_i^4 \right\} \\
&\le C\delta^{1/2} m^{-2} k_T (C(1+C\delta^{1/2}m^{-1/2})^{k_T}) \\
&= O(m^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude

$$\max_{k\le k_T} E[|y_k^m - y_k|^4] \le \max_{k\le k_T} E[(a_k+b_k)^4] \le C \max_{k\le k_T} E[a_k^4 + b_k^4] = O(m^{-2}).$$

Lemma 6.33.

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} E[|R^m(y^m_{k-1}; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk})|^4] \le C.$$

Proof. Define filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(y^m_\delta(s), \mathbf{U}^*_m(s); s \le t)$, where $y^m_\delta(t)$ and $\mathbf{U}^*_m(t)$ are given by (4.27). For simplicity we write $R^m_k = R^m(y^m_k; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(k+1)})$, and $r_{qk} = \nabla\ell(y^m_k, U^*_{q(k+1)}) - \nabla g(y^m_k)$. Then given $\mathcal{F}_{t_k}$, $r_{1k}, \ldots, r_{qk}$ are conditionally independent with conditional mean

0,

$$R_k^m = m^{-1/2} \sum_{q=1}^{m} r_{qk},$$

$$E|r_{qk}|^4 \le C \left(E[|h_1(U^*_{q(k+1)})|^4 |y_k^m - \theta_0|^4] + E|y_k^m - \theta_0|^4 + E|\nabla \ell(\theta_0, U^*_{q(k+1)})|^4 + |\nabla g(\theta_0)|^4 \right),$$

which is bounded uniformly over $1 \le k \le k_T$, since $E[|y_k^m - \theta_0|^4] \le E[|y_k^m - y_k|^4] + |y_k - \theta_0|^4] \le C$ (implied by Lemmas 6.29 and 6.32), and

$$E[|h_1(U^*_{q(k+1)})|^4 |y_k^m - \theta_0|^4] = E[E[|h_1(U^*_{q(k+1)})|^4 |y_k^m - \theta_0|^4 | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}]] = E(|h_1(U)|^4) E[|y_k^m - \theta_0|^4] \le C.$$

Finally, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} E|R_k^m|^4 &= m^{-2} E \left[E \left[\left(\sum_{q=1}^m r'_{qk} \right) \left(\sum_{q=1}^m r_{qk} \right) \left(\sum_{q=1}^m r'_{qk} \right) \left(\sum_{q=1}^m r_{qk} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_k} \right] \right] \\ &\le m^{-2} \left(\sum_{q=1}^m E|r_{qk}|^4 + 6 \sum_{p<q} (E|r_{pk}|^4 \cdot E|r_{qk}|^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\le C. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.34. *There exist simultaneous realizations* $\{\tilde{x}_k^m, \tilde{y}_k^m\}$, $\{\tilde{\check{x}}_k^m, \tilde{\check{y}}_k^m\}$, $\tilde{H}(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(u)$, *and standard Brownian motion* $\tilde{B}$ *on some common probability spaces, such that sequence* $\{\tilde{x}_k^m, \tilde{y}_k^m, k \le T/\delta^{1/2}\}$ *have the same distribution as* $\{x_k^m, y_k^m, k \le T/\delta^{1/2}\}$, *sequence* $\{\tilde{\check{x}}_k^m, \tilde{\check{y}}_k^m, k \le T/\delta^{1/2}\}$ *are generated from* $\tilde{H}(t)$ *the same way as* $\{\check{x}_k^m, \check{y}_k^m, k \le T/\delta^{1/2}\}$ *generated from* $H(t)$ *according to (6.72), and as* $\delta \to 0, m \to \infty$,

$$\max_{k \le T/\delta^{1/2}} |\tilde{x}_k^m - \tilde{\check{x}}_k^m| = o_p(m^{-1/2} \delta^{1/4}) \tag{6.74}$$

Proof. For $k \ge 1$, let $\check{d}_k^m = \check{x}_{k+1}^m - \check{x}_k^m$,

$$\check{d}_0^m = -\delta \nabla g(x_0) - m^{-1/2} \delta^{3/4} (H(t_1) - H(t_0)),$$

and rewrite (6.72) as

$$\check{x}^m_{k+1} = \check{x}^m_k + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(\check{x}^m_k - \check{x}^m_{k-1}) - \delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_k) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{d}^m_k &= \frac{k-1}{k+2}\check{d}^m_{k-1} - \delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_k) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)) \\
&= \frac{k-1}{k+2}\left(\frac{k-2}{k+1}\check{d}^m_{k-2} - \delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_{k-1}) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_k) - H(t_{k-1}))\right) \\
&\quad -\delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_k) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)) \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{k-1}{k+2}\cdot\frac{k-2}{k+1}\cdot\cdots\cdot\frac{i}{i+3}\right)(\delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_i) + m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_{i+1}) - H(t_i))) \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{(i+2)(i+1)i}{(k+2)(k+1)k}(\delta\nabla g(\check{y}^m_i) + m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}(H(t_{i+1}) - H(t_i))). \qquad (6.75)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, let $d^m_k = x^m_{k+1} - x^m_k$,

$$d^m_0 = -\delta\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_0; \mathbf{U}^*_{m1}) = -\delta\nabla g(x_0) - \delta(\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(x_0; \mathbf{U}^*_{m1}) - \nabla g(x_0)),$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d^m_k &= -\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{(i+2)(i+1)i}{(k+2)(k+1)k}\delta\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(y^m_i; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}) \qquad (6.76) \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{(i+2)(i+1)i}{(k+2)(k+1)k}\left(\delta\nabla g(y^m_i) + \delta\left(\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(y^m_i; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}) - \nabla g(y^m_i)\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Set $c_i = (i+2)(i+1)i$,

$$R^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) = m^{1/2}\left(\nabla\hat{\mathcal{L}}^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk}) - \nabla g(\theta)\right),$$

and define càdlàg processes $G_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta(t)$ as follows,

$$G_\delta^m(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le t < t_1 \\ \delta^{1/4} R^m(x_0; \mathbf{U}^*_{m1}), & t_1 \le t < t_2 \\ \delta^{1/4} \dfrac{1}{c_k} \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R^m(y_i^m; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}), & t_{k+1} \le t < t_{k+2} \end{cases} \tag{6.77}$$

$$G_\delta(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le t < t_1 \\ H(t_1) - H(t_0), & t_1 \le t < t_2 \\ \dfrac{1}{c_k} \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i (H(t_{i+1}) - H(t_i)), & t_{k+1} \le t < t_{k+2} \end{cases} \tag{6.78}$$

By Assumption A4, $R^m(\theta; \mathbf{U}^*_{mk})$ weakly converges to $N(0, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta))$ uniformly over θ as $m \to \infty$. Note that $H(t_{i+1}) - H(t_i)$ follows $N(0, \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))du)$, and $\mathrm{Var}(\delta^{1/4} R^m(y_i^m; \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}))$ is approximately equal to $\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))du$. According to Lemma 6.35 below, there exist $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $\tilde{H}(t) = \displaystyle\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(u)$ on some common probability spaces such that $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta^m(t)$ are identically distributed, $\tilde{G}_\delta(t)$ is generated by $\tilde{H}(t)$ the same way as $G_\delta(t)$ by $H(t)$ via scheme (6.78), and as $\delta \to 0, m \to \infty$,

$$\max_{t \le T} |\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t) - \tilde{G}_\delta(t)| = o_p(1).$$

Using $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ we define associated sequences $\{\tilde{R}_k\}$ and $\{\tilde{x}_k^m, \tilde{y}_k^m\}$ as follows,

$$\tilde{R}_0 = \delta^{-1/4} \tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_1), \tilde{x}_0^m = \tilde{y}_0^m = x_0,$$

$$\tilde{x}_k^m = \tilde{y}_{k-1}^m - \delta \nabla g(\tilde{y}_{k-1}^m) - \delta m^{-1/2} \tilde{R}_{k-1},\ \tilde{y}_k^m = \tilde{x}_k^m + \frac{k-1}{k+2}(\tilde{x}_k^m - \tilde{x}_{k-1}^m),$$

$$\tilde{R}_k = \delta^{-1/4} \tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) - \frac{1}{c_k} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i \tilde{R}_i.$$

Since $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_1), ..., \tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_k)$ have the same distribution as $G_\delta^m(t_1), ...G_\delta^m(t_k)$, we easily con-

clude that $\{\tilde{x}_k^m, \tilde{y}_k^m\}$ are identically distributed as $\{x_k^m, y_k^m\}$, and $\tilde{d}_k^m = \tilde{x}_{k+1}^m - \tilde{x}_k^m$ satisfies

$$\tilde{d}_0^m = -\delta \nabla g(x_0) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_1),\ \tilde{d}_k^m = -\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{c_i}{c_k}\delta \nabla g(\tilde{y}_i^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t_{k+1}).$$

Similarly, we define $\{\tilde{\tilde{x}}_k^m, \tilde{\tilde{y}}_k^m\}$ by $\tilde{G}_\delta(t)$, and set $\tilde{\tilde{d}}_k^m = \tilde{\tilde{x}}_{k+1}^m - \tilde{\tilde{x}}_k^m$, so that

$$\tilde{\tilde{d}}_0^m = -\delta \nabla g(x_0) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}\tilde{G}_\delta(t_1), \tilde{\tilde{d}}_k^m = -\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{c_i}{c_k}\delta \nabla g(\tilde{\tilde{y}}_i^m) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4}\tilde{G}_\delta(t_{k+1}).$$

Let $a_k = |\tilde{x}_k^m - \tilde{\tilde{x}}_k^m|, b_k = |\tilde{d}_k^m - \tilde{\tilde{d}}_k^m|$, $S_k = b_0 + \cdots + b_k$, and $\mathcal{Y} = m^{-1/2}\delta^{3/4} \max_{t \le T} |\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t) - \tilde{G}_\delta(t)|$. Then we have $b_0 \le \mathcal{Y}$,

$$a_k = |\tilde{x}_{k-1}^m + \tilde{d}_{k-1}^m - \tilde{\tilde{x}}_{k-1}^m - \tilde{\tilde{d}}_{k-1}^m| \le a_{k-1} + b_{k-1} \le b_0 + b_1 + \cdots + b_{k-1} = S_{k-1},$$

$$|\tilde{y}_k^m - \tilde{\tilde{y}}_k^m| = \left| \tilde{x}_k^m + \frac{k-1}{k+2}\tilde{d}_{k-1} - \tilde{\tilde{x}}_k^m - \frac{k-1}{k+2}\tilde{\tilde{d}}_{k-1} \right| \le a_k + b_{k-1} \le S_{k-1} + b_{k-1},$$

$$b_k \le L\delta \sum_{i=1}^{k} |\tilde{y}_i^m - \tilde{\tilde{y}}_i^m| + \mathcal{Y} \le L\delta \sum_{i=1}^{k} (S_{i-1} + b_{i-1}) + \mathcal{Y} \le 2L\delta k S_{k-1} + \mathcal{Y} \le C\delta^{1/2} S_{k-1} + \mathcal{Y}.$$

Let $b_0^* = \mathcal{Y}, b_k^* = C\delta^{1/2} S_{k-1}^* + \mathcal{Y}$, where $S_k^* = b_0^* + \ldots + b_k^*$. Then by induction we easily conclude

$$b_0 \le b_0^*, b_k \le C\delta^{1/2} S_{k-1} + \mathcal{Y} \le C\delta^{1/2} S_{k-1}^* + \mathcal{Y} = b_k^*, S_k \le S_k^*.$$

Since $b_{k+1}^* = C\delta^{1/2} S_k^* + \mathcal{Y}$ leads to $b_{k+1}^* - b_k^* = C\delta^{1/2} b_k^*$ for all $k \ge 0$, we immediately obtain geometric sequence $b_k^* = (1 + C\delta^{1/2})^k \mathcal{Y}$ and find its sum S_k^*. Finally,

$$\max_{k \le T/\delta^{1/2}} |\tilde{x}_k^m - \tilde{\tilde{x}}_k^m| \le S_{\lfloor T/\delta^{1/2} \rfloor - 1} \le S^*_{\lfloor T/\delta^{1/2} \rfloor - 1} \le T/\delta^{1/2}(1 + C\delta^{1/2})^{T/\delta^{1/2}} \mathcal{Y}$$

$$\le C\mathcal{Y}/\delta^{1/2} = o_p(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}).$$

Lemma 6.35. *Given that $G_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta(t)$ are defined by (6.77) and (6.78), respectively, we can show that there exist $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $\tilde{H}(t) = \int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(u)$ on some common probability spaces, such that $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta^m(t)$ are identically distributed, $\tilde{G}_\delta(t)$ are generated*

by $\tilde{H}(t)$ the same way as $G_\delta(t)$ by $H(t)$ via scheme (6.78), and as $\delta \to 0, m \to \infty$,

$$\max_{t \le T} |\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t) - \tilde{G}_\delta(t)| = o_p(1).$$

Proof. Define càdlàg processes $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$

$$\check{G}_\delta^m(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \le t < t_1 \\ \delta^{1/4} R^m(x_0; \mathbf{U}^*_{m1}), & t_1 \le t < t_2 \\ \delta^{1/4} \dfrac{1}{c_k} \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R^m(X(t_i); \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}), & t_{k+1} \le t < t_{k+2} \end{cases} \tag{6.79}$$

Note that the only change in (6.79) is to replace y_i^m in (6.77) by $X(t_i)$. Define $G(t) = \dfrac{1}{t^3} \displaystyle\int_0^t u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathrm{B}(u)$. We will prove that $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $G(t)$. Set $\mathcal{C}_i^\delta = \delta^{3/2} c_i = t_i t_{i+1} t_{i+2}$, and for any fixed $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_l \le T$, let $k_j^\delta = \max(0, \lfloor \tau_j / \delta^{1/2} \rfloor - 1)$. Then $\mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_j^\delta} = \delta^{3/2} k_j^\delta (k_j^\delta + 1)(k_j^\delta + 2) \to \tau_j^3$, as $\delta \to 0$. Using the definition of $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$ we have

$$\check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_j) = \delta^{1/4} \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_j^\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_j^\delta} \mathcal{C}_i^\delta R^m(X(t_i); \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}),$$

$$\mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_{j+1}^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_{j+1}) - \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_j^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_j) = \delta^{1/4} \sum_{i=k_j^\delta+1}^{k_{j+1}^\delta} \mathcal{C}_i^\delta R^m(X(t_i); \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)}).$$

The right hand side of above equation is the sum of independent random variables, by Assumption A4, as $m \to \infty, \delta \to 0$, $\mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_{j+1}^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_{j+1}) - \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_j^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_j)$ converges in distribution to a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\displaystyle\int_{\tau_j}^{\tau_{j+1}} u^6 \sigma^2(X(u)) du$. Because of independence between consecutive differences, we can easily arrive at that

$$\left(\mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_1^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_1), \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_2^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_2) - \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_1^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_1), \ldots, \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_l^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_l) - \mathcal{C}^\delta_{k_{l-1}^\delta} \check{G}_\delta^m(\tau_{l-1}) \right)$$

converges in distribution to

$$\left(\tau_1^3 G(\tau_1), \tau_2^3 G(\tau_2) - \tau_1^3 G(\tau_1), \ldots, \tau_l^3 G(\tau_l) - \tau_{l-1}^3(\tau_{l-1})\right),$$

which immediately shows that $\left(\mathcal{C}^{\delta}_{k_1^\delta}\check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_1), \mathcal{C}^{\delta}_{k_2^\delta}\check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_2), \ldots, \mathcal{C}^{\delta}_{k_l^\delta}\check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_l)\right)$ converges in distribution to $\left(\tau_1^3 G(\tau_1), \tau_2^3 G(\tau_2), \ldots, \tau_l^3 G(\tau_l)\right)$. Since $\mathcal{C}^{\delta}_{k_j^\delta} \to \tau_j^3$ as $\delta \to 0$, we conclude that $\left(\check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_1), \check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_2), \ldots, \check{G}^m_\delta(\tau_l)\right)$ converges in distribution to $(G(\tau_1), G(\tau_2), \ldots, G(\tau_l))$. That is, we prove the finite-dimensional distribution convergence of $\check{G}^m_\delta(t)$.
We will establish the tightness of $\check{G}^m_\delta(t)$ by proving that for any $0 \le r \le s \le t \le T$,

$$E\{|\check{G}^m_\delta(t) - \check{G}^m_\delta(s)|^2 |\check{G}^m_\delta(s) - \check{G}^m_\delta(r)|^2\} \le C(t-r)^2. \tag{6.80}$$

To simplify some notation we let $R_i = R^m(X(t_i); \mathbf{U}^*_{m(i+1)})$. First we will show that for any fixed $1 \le j < k < l$,

$$E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \le C(l-j)^2, \tag{6.81}$$

where C is a generic constant free of the choice of (j,k,l).
Lemma 6.30 implies that $E(|R_i|^2)$ and $E(|R_i|^4)$ are uniformly bounded over $1 \le i \le T\delta^{-1/2}$. Since $R_0, R_1, R_2, \ldots$ are independent with mean 0, we have

$$E\left|\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i^2 E|R_i|^2 \le Ckc_k^2,$$

$$E\left|\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^4 \le \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i^4 E|R_i|^4 + \sum_{i<j} 6c_i^2 c_j^2 E|R_i|^2 E|R_j|^2 \le Ck^2 c_k^4,$$

where we remind the convention that C denotes any generic constant free of (δ, m, n) and (i,j,k,l), and its value may change from appearance to appearance.
Let

$$D_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i, D_2 = \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} c_i R_i, D_3 = \sum_{i=k+1}^{l} c_i R_i.$$

Then D_1, D_2, D_3 are independent, and similarly we can show

$$E|D_2|^2 \le C(k-j)c_k^2, E|D_2|^4 \le C(k-j)^2 c_k^4,$$

$$E|D_3|^2 \le C(l-k)c_l^2, E|D_3|^4 \le C(l-k)^2 c_l^4,$$

$$\frac{(c_k-c_j)^2}{c_k^2} \le \frac{c_k-c_j}{c_k} = 1 - \frac{j(j+1)(j+2)}{k(k+1)(k+2)} \le 1 - \frac{j^3}{k^3} \le 3\left(\frac{k-j}{k}\right).$$

Therefore we establish (6.81) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \\
= \;& E\left\{\left|\frac{D_1+D_2}{c_k} - \frac{D_1}{c_j}\right|^2 \left|\frac{D_1+D_2+D_3}{c_l} - \frac{D_1+D_2}{c_k}\right|^2\right\} \\
= \;& E\left\{\left|\frac{D_2}{c_k} - \frac{c_k-c_j}{c_k c_j}D_1\right|^2 \left|\frac{D_3}{c_l} - \frac{c_l-c_k}{c_l c_k}(D_1+D_2)\right|^2\right\} \\
\le \;& C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{c_k^2} + \frac{(c_k-c_j)^2}{c_k^2 c_j^2}|D_1|^2\right)\left(\frac{|D_3|^2}{c_l^2} + \frac{(c_l-c_k)^2}{c_l^2 c_k^2}(|D_1|^2+|D_2|^2)\right)\right\} \\
\le \;& 9C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{c_k^2} + \frac{k-j}{kc_j^2}|D_1|^2\right)\left(\frac{|D_3|^2}{c_l^2} + \frac{l-k}{lc_k^2}(|D_1|^2+|D_2|^2)\right)\right\} \\
\le \;& C\left(\frac{(k-j)c_k^2(l-k)c_l^2}{c_k^2 c_l^2} + \frac{(k-j)c_k^2(l-k)jc_j^2}{c_k^2 l c_k^2} + \frac{(l-k)(k-j)^2 c_k^4}{lc_k^4}\right) \\
& + C\left(\frac{(k-j)jc_j^2(l-k)c_l^2}{kc_j^2 c_l^2} + \frac{(k-j)(l-k)j^2c_j^4}{kc_j^2 l c_k^2} + \frac{(k-j)jc_j^2(l-k)(k-j)c_k^2}{kc_j^2 l c_k^2}\right) \\
\le \;& C(l-j)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Second we will prove

$$E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \le Ck^2. \tag{6.82}$$

Indeed, similar direct calculations lead to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \\
= \;& E\left\{\left|\frac{D_1+D_2}{c_k} - \frac{D_1}{c_j}\right|^2 \left|\frac{D_1}{c_j}\right|^2\right\} \\
\le \;& C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{c_k^2} + \frac{(c_k-c_j)^2}{c_k^2 c_j^2}|D_1|^2\right)\frac{|D_1|^2}{c_j^2}\right\} \\
\le \;& C\left(\frac{(k-j)c_k^2 j c_j^2}{c_k^2 c_j^2} + \frac{j^2 c_j^4}{c_j^4}\right) \\
\le \;& Ck^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Third, for any $0 \le r \le s \le t \le T$, we may choose j, k, l such that $t_{j+1} \le r < t_{j+2}, t_{k+1} \le s < t_{k+2}, t_{l+1} \le t < t_{l+2}$. If $j = k$ or $k = l$, then $r = s$ or $s = t$, and (6.80) is obvious. Assume $j < k < l$, and we prove (6.80) for each scenario. If $j = -1$ and $k = 0$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{|\check{G}_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(s)|^2 |\check{G}_\delta^m(s) - \check{G}_\delta^m(r)|^2\right\} \\
= \;& \delta E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - R_0\right|^2 |R_0|^2\right\} \\
\le \;& C\delta l^2 = C(t_{l+1} - t_1)^2 \le C(t-r)^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $j = -1$ and $k \ge 1$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{|\check{G}_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(s)|^2 |\check{G}_\delta^m(s) - \check{G}_\delta^m(r)|^2\right\} \\
= \;& \delta E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \\
\le \;& C\delta l^2 = C(t_{l+1} - t_1)^2 \le C(t-r)^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $j = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left\{|\check{G}_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(s)|^2 |\check{G}_\delta^m(s) - \check{G}_\delta^m(r)|^2\right\} \\ = \;& \delta E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - R_0\right|^2\right\} \\ \leq \;& C\delta l^2 \leq 4C(t_{l+1} - t_2)^2 \leq 4C(t-r)^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $j \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left\{|\check{G}_\delta^m(t) - \check{G}_\delta^m(s)|^2 |\check{G}_\delta^m(s) - \check{G}_\delta^m(r)|^2\right\} \\ = \;& \delta E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \\ \leq \;& C\delta(l-j)^2 \leq 4C(t_{l+1} - t_{j+2})^2 \leq 4C(t-r)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now with the established finite-dimensional distribution convergence and tightness for $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$, we conclude that $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$ weakly converges to $G(t)$.

Note that the only difference between $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta^m(t)$ is y_i^m and $X(t_i)$ used in $R^m(\cdot; \mathbf{U}_{mi}^*)$. By Lemmas 6.31 and 6.32 we immediately show that the finite-dimensional distribution convergence of $G_\delta^m(t)$ to $G(t)$.

The same argument for deriving tightness of $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$ can be used to establish tightness of $G_\delta^m(t)$ by proving that for any $0 \leq r \leq s \leq t \leq T$,

$$E\{|G_\delta^m(t) - G_\delta^m(s)|^2 |G_\delta^m(s) - G_\delta^m(r)|^2\} \leq C(t-r)^2. \tag{6.83}$$

Again for simplicity we let $R_k = R^m(y_k^m; \mathbf{U}_{m(k+1)}^*)$, and we will show that for any fixed $1 \leq j < k < l$,

$$E\left\{\left|\frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_j}\sum_{i=1}^{j} c_i R_i\right|^2 \left|\frac{1}{c_l}\sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i R_i - \frac{1}{c_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i\right|^2\right\} \leq C(l-j)^2. \tag{6.84}$$

Indeed, recall $c_i = i(i+1)(i+2)$, and define $S_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i R_i^m$. Then there exists a constant $C_1 = \gamma^2 C$, $\gamma > 1$, such that $E|S_k|^4 \leq C_1 k^2 c_k^4$, which we will prove by induction. Lemma

6.33 implies it holds for $k = 1$. Assume it holds for $k-1$, then using Lemma 6.33 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E|S_k|^4 =& E\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i (R_i^m)'\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i R_i^m\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i (R_i^m)'\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^k c_i R_i^m\right)\right] \\
\leq& E|S_{k-1}|^4 + c_k^4 E|R_k^m|^4 + 4\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i c_k^3 E(|R_i^m|\cdot|R_k^m|^3) + 6c_k^2 E(|S_{k-1}|^2|R_k^m|^2) \\
&+ 4\sum_{i,j,l<k} c_i c_j c_l c_k E((R_i^m)' R_j^m (R_l^m)' R_k^m) \\
\leq& C_1(k-1)^2 c_k^4 + c_k^4 C + 4(k-1)c_k^4 C + 6c_k^2\sqrt{C_1}(k-1)c_k^2\sqrt{C} \\
\leq& c_k^4(C_1(k-1)^2 + (4+6\gamma)Ck) \\
\leq& c_k^4(C_1(k-1)^2 + \gamma^2 Ck) \\
\leq& C_1 k^2 c_k^4,
\end{aligned}$$

where we may take $\gamma = 7$ so that $4 + 6\gamma < \gamma^2$, and we have employed Cauchy-Schwarz inequality multiple times. Also in above derivation we use the facts that

$$E(|R_i^m|\cdot|R_k^m|^3) \leq (E|R_i^m|^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \cdot (E|R_k^m|^4)^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq C,$$

$$E(|S_{k-1}|^2|R_k^m|^2) \leq \sqrt{E|S_{k-1}|^4 \cdot E|R_k^m|^4} \leq \sqrt{C_1}(k-1)c_k^2\sqrt{C}$$

and the zero conditional mean for $i, j, l < k$,

$$E((R_i^m)' R_j^m (R_l^m)' R_k^m) = E[E[(R_i^m)' R_j^m (R_l^m)' R_k^m | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}]] = E[(R_i^m)' R_j^m (R_l^m)' E[R_k^m | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}]] = 0.$$

Note that all we used in proving $E|S_k|^4 \leq C_1 k^2 c_k^4$ are the above zero conditional mean and $E|R_k^m|^4 \leq C$ implied by Lemma 6.33. Applying the argument to $S_k - S_j$ we obtain that $E|S_k - S_j|^4 \leq C_1(k-j)^2 c_k^4$. Since

$$\frac{(c_k - c_j)^2}{c_k^2} \leq \frac{c_k - c_j}{c_k} = 1 - \frac{j(j+1)(j+2)}{k(k+1)(k+2)} \leq 1 - \frac{j^3}{k^3} \leq 3\left(\frac{k-j}{k}\right),$$

direct calculations show

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left|\frac{S_k}{c_k}-\frac{S_j}{c_j}\right|^4 &= E\left|\frac{S_k-S_j}{c_k}-\frac{c_k-c_j}{c_jc_k}S_j\right|^4 \\
&\le 8\left(\frac{E|S_k-S_j|^4}{c_k^4}+\frac{E|S_j|^4(c_k-c_j)^4}{c_j^4c_k^4}\right) \\
&\le 8\left(C_1(k-j)^2+\frac{9C_1j^2(k-j)^2}{k^2}\right) \\
&\le C_2(k-j)^2
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence we conclude for $j<k<l$,

$$
E\left[\left|\frac{S_l}{c_l}-\frac{S_k}{c_k}\right|^2\left|\frac{S_k}{c_k}-\frac{S_j}{c_j}\right|^2\right] \le \left(E\left|\frac{S_l}{c_l}-\frac{S_k}{c_k}\right|^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(E\left|\frac{S_k}{c_k}-\frac{S_j}{c_j}\right|^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C_2(l-j)^2,
$$

which proves (6.84). The rest arguemnts for establishing (6.83) are easy and pretty much the same as for establishing (6.80).

The finite-dimensional distribution convergence and (6.83) show $G_\delta^m(t)$ has the same weak convergence limit $G(t)$ as $\check{G}_\delta^m(t)$.

Skorohod's representation theorem shows that there exist $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $\tilde{G}(t)$ on some common probability spaces, such that $\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)$ and $G_\delta^m(t)$ are identically distributed, $\tilde{G}(t)$ and $G(t)$ are identically distributed, and as $\delta\to 0$, $m\to\infty$, under the metric d in $D[0,T]$,

$$
d(\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t),\tilde{G}(t)) = o_p(1).
$$

By Lemma 6.37 below we obtain that if we further prove the tightness of $\tilde{G}(t)$, then above $o_p(1)$ result under the metric in $D[0,T]$ can be strengthen to the maximum norm, that is,

$$
\max_{t\le T}|\tilde{G}_\delta^m(t)-\tilde{G}(t)| = o_p(1). \tag{6.85}
$$

We need to establish the tightness of $\tilde{G}(t)$. Because $G(t)$ and $\tilde{G}(t)$ are identically distributed, if we show that for any $0\le r\le s\le t\le T$,

$$
E\left\{|G(t)-G(s)|^2|G(s)-G(r)|^2\right\} \le C(t-r)^2. \tag{6.86}
$$

Then $\tilde{G}$ also satisfies above inequality, and both $G(t)$ and $\tilde{G}(t)$ are tight.
We prove (6.86). If $r > 0$, let

$$D_1 = \int_0^r u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u), D_2 = \int_r^s u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u), D_3 = \int_s^t u^3 \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u).$$

By Assumption A3, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\theta_0)\| + L|X(t) - \theta_0| \leq C.$$

D_2 follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\Sigma = \int_r^s u^6 \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u)) du$, and

$$\|\Sigma\| \leq \int_r^s u^6 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))\| du \leq C(s-r)s^6.$$

Taking eigen-matrix decomposition $\Sigma = \Gamma' \Lambda \Gamma$, we obtain that ΓD_2 follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance matrix Λ, and

$$E|D_2|^2 = E|\Gamma D_2|^2 = tr(\Lambda) \leq C(s-r)s^6,$$

$$E|D_2|^4 \leq CE|\Gamma D_2|^4 \leq Ctr(\Lambda^2) \leq C(s-r)^2 s^{12}.$$

Similarly we have

$$E|D_1|^2 \leq Cr^7, E|D_1|^4 \leq Cr^{14},$$

$$E|D_3|^2 \leq C(t-s)t^6, E|D_3|^4 \leq C(t-s)^2 t^{12}.$$

Putting them together we arrive at

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{|G(s)-G(r)|^2|G(t)-G(s)|^2\right\} \\
= \;& E\left\{\left|\frac{D_1+D_2}{s^3}-\frac{D_1}{r^3}\right|^2\left|\frac{D_1+D_2+D_3}{t^3}-\frac{D_1+D_2}{s^3}\right|^2\right\} \\
\leq \;& C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{s^6}+\frac{(s^3-r^3)^2}{s^6r^6}|D_1|^2\right)\left(\frac{|D_3|^2}{t^6}+\frac{(t^3-s^3)^2}{t^6s^6}(|D_1|^2+|D_2|^2)\right)\right\} \\
\leq \;& 9C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{s^6}+\frac{s-r}{sr^6}|D_1|^2\right)\left(\frac{|D_3|^2}{t^6}+\frac{t-s}{ts^6}(|D_1|^2+|D_2|^2)\right)\right\} \\
\leq \;& C\left(\frac{(s-r)s^6(t-s)t^6}{s^6t^6}+\frac{(s-r)s^6(t-s)r^7}{ts^{12}}+\frac{(t-s)(s-r)^2s^{12}}{ts^{12}}\right) \\
& +C\left(\frac{(s-r)r^7(t-s)t^6}{sr^6t^6}+\frac{(s-r)(t-s)r^{14}}{sr^6ts^6}+\frac{(s-r)r^7(t-s)(s-r)s^6}{sr^6ts^6}\right) \\
\leq \;& C(t-r)^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Also similar arguments can show that for $0<r<s$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left\{|G(s)-G(r)|^2|G(r)|^2\right\} \\
= \;& E\left\{\left|\frac{D_1+D_2}{s^3}-\frac{D_1}{r^3}\right|^2\left|\frac{D_1}{r^3}\right|\right\} \\
\leq \;& C\cdot E\left\{\left(\frac{|D_2|^2}{s^6}+\frac{s-r}{sr^6}|D_1|^2\right)\frac{|D_1|^2}{r^6}\right\} \\
\leq \;& C\left(\frac{(s-r)s^6r^7}{s^6r^6}+\frac{(s-r)r^{14}}{sr^{12}}\right) \\
\leq \;& Cs^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

With $\tilde{H}(t)=\int_0^t \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(u)$, $\tilde{G}_\delta(t)$ generated by $\tilde{H}(t)$ via scheme (6.78), $\tilde{G}(t)=\frac{1}{t^3}\int_0^t u^3 d\tilde{H}(u)$. Lemma 6.36 below indicates that as $\delta\to 0$,

$$
\max_{t\leq T}|\tilde{G}_\delta(t)-\tilde{G}(t)|=o_p(1).
$$

Finally combining above result with (6.85) we conclude

$$
\max_{t\leq T}|\tilde{G}^m_\delta(t)-\tilde{G}_\delta(t)|\leq \max_{t\leq T}|\tilde{G}^m_\delta(t)-\tilde{G}(t)|+\max_{t\leq T}|\tilde{G}_\delta(t)-\tilde{G}(t)|=o_p(1).
$$

Lemma 6.36. *Given a Brownian motion $B(t)$ we define $G_\delta(t)$ by (6.78) and $G(t) = t^{-3}\int_0^t u^3\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))dB(u)$ as in the proof of Lemma 6.35. Then we have*

$$\max_{t|leqT}|G_\delta(t) - G(t)| = o_p(1).$$

Proof. Denote by $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$ the variance of $G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)$. Then

$$G_\delta(t_1) - G(t_1) = \frac{1}{t_1^3}\int_0^{t_1}(t_1^3 - u^3)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 = \frac{1}{t_1^6}\int_0^{t_1}(t_1^3 - u^3)^2\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))du,$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1\| \le \frac{Ct_1^7}{t_1^6} \le C\delta^{1/2}.$$

Let $C_i^\delta = t_i t_{i+1} t_{i+2}$. We have for $k \ge 1$,

$$G_\delta(t_{k+1}) - G(t_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{C_k^\delta t_{k+1}^3}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}}(C_i^\delta t_{k+1}^3 - C_k^\delta u^3)\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))d\mathbf{B}(u),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k+1} = \frac{1}{t_k^2 t_{k+1}^2 t_{k+2}^2 t_{k+1}^6}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}}(t_i t_{i+1} t_{i+2} t_{k+1}^3 - t_k t_{k+1} t_{k+2} u^3)^2\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))du.$$

Since $|t_i t_{i+1} t_{i+2} t_{k+1}^3 - t_k t_{k+1} t_{k+2} u^3| \le C t_{k+1}^5 \delta^{1/2}$, $t_k t_{k+2} \ge t_{k+1}^2/2$, we obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{k+1}\| \le \frac{C}{t_{k+1}^{12}}\sum_{i=0}^{k}\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} t_{k+1}^{10}\delta du \le \frac{C\delta}{t_{k+1}} \le C\delta^{1/2}.$$

That is, $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k\| \le C\delta^{1/2}$ uniformly over $k \le T\delta^{-1/2}$. As both $G_\delta(t)$ and $G(t)$ are normally distributed, we get

$$E|G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)|^4 \le C\delta,$$

and hence for any $\eta > 0$,

$$P(\max_{k\le k_T} |G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)| > \eta) \le \sum_{k=0}^{k_T} P(|G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)| > \eta)$$
$$\le \sum_{k=0}^{k_T} \frac{E|G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)|^4}{\eta^4} \le \sum_{k=0}^{k_T} \frac{C\delta}{\eta^4} \le \frac{CT\delta^{1/2}}{\eta^4} \to 0.$$

Finally, the tightness of $G(t)$ implies that

$$\max_{s,t\le T, |t-s|\le\delta^{1/2}} |G(t) - G(s)| = o_p(1),$$

and thus

$$\max_{t\le T} |G_\delta(t) - G(t)| \le \max_{k\le k_T} |G_\delta(t_k) - G(t_k)| + \max_{k\le k_T, t_k\le t<t_{k+1}} |G(t) - G(t_k)| = o_p(1).$$

The following lemma is a known result, but we state it explicitly in our context.

Lemma 6.37. *Let $D[0,T]$ be the space of all càdlàg functions on $[0,T]$, equipped with metric $d(X(t),Y(t))$ given by*

$$d(X(t),Y(t)) = \inf\left\{\delta : \exists \textit{one to one map } \Gamma \textit{ on } [0,T] \textit{such that } \sup_{t\le T} |\Gamma(t) - t| \le \delta, \right.$$
$$\left. \sup_{t\le T} |X(\Gamma(t)) - Y(t)| \le \delta\right\}.$$

For processes $X_n(t)$ and $X(t)$ in $D[0,T]$, assume that $X(t)$ is tight, and as $n \to \infty$, $d(X_n(t),X(t)) = o_p(1)$ under the metric in $D[0,T]$. Then we have

$$\sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(t)| = o_p(1).$$

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0, \eta > 0$, by the tightness of $X(t)$, there exists $\delta < \eta/2$ such that

$$P\left(\sup_{s,t\le T, |t-s|\le\delta} |X(t) - X(s)| > \eta/2\right) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Let

$$A_n = \left\{\sup_{s,t\le T, |t-s|\le\delta} |X(t) - X(s)| \le \eta/2\right\} \cap \{d(X_n(t),X(t)) < \delta\},$$

$$B_n = \left\{ \sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(t)| \le \eta \right\}.$$

Then $A_n \subseteq B_n$. Indeed, if $d(X_n(t), X(t)) < \delta$, then there exists a one-to-one map Γ on $[0,T]$, such that $\sup_{t\le T} |\Gamma(t) - t| \le \delta$ and $\sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(\Gamma(t))| \le \delta$. If we also have $\sup_{|t-s|\le\delta} |X(t) - X(s)| \le \eta/2$, then

$$\sup_{t\le T} |X(\Gamma(t)) - X(t)| \le \eta/2,$$

$$\sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(t)| \le \sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(\Gamma(t))| + \sup_{t\le T} |X(\Gamma(t)) - X(t)| \le \delta + \eta/2 \le \eta.$$

Hence we have $P(B_n^C) \le P(A_n^C)$, and

$$P\left(\sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(t)| > \eta \right) \le P\left(\sup_{s,t\le T, |t-s|\le\delta} |X(t) - X(s)| > \eta/2 \right) + P(d(X_n(t), X(t)) \ge \delta).$$

Since $d(X_n(t), X(t)) = o_p(1)$, $\exists N$, for $n > N$, $P(d(X_n(t), X(t)) \ge \delta) < \varepsilon/2$, then

$$P\left(\sup_{t\le T} |X_n(t) - X(t)| > \eta \right) < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 6.38.

$$\max_{k\le T\delta^{-1/2}} |\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(t_k)| = O_p(\delta^{1/2} |\log\delta|),$$

where $\check{x}_k^m$ and X_δ^m are defined by (6.72) and (4.35), respectively.

Proof. The same proof argument of Lemma 6.23 can be easily used to show

$$\mathbf{\Psi}_a = \sup_{0\le s<v\le T} \left| \frac{1}{(v-s)^a} \int_s^v \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u)) d\mathbf{B}(u) \right| \text{ is a.s. finite.} \tag{6.87}$$

By Lemma 6.27 we have

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)| \le \max_{t\in[0,T]} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{X}(t)| + \max_{t\in[0,T]} |\dot{X}(t)| = O_p(1),$$

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]} |X_\delta^m(t)| \le \max_{t\in[0,T]} |X_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| + \max_{t\in[0,T]} |X(t)| = O_p(1),$$

$$\max_{t\in[0,T]} |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))| \le |\nabla g(\theta_0)| + L \cdot \max_{t\in[0,T]} |X_\delta^m(t) - \theta_0| = O_p(1).$$

Let

$$\Upsilon_\delta^m = \max\left\{ \mathbf{\Psi}_a, \max_{t\in[0,T]} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)|, \max_{t\in[0,T]} |X_\delta^m(t)|, \max_{t\in[0,T]} |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))| \right\}.$$

Then $\Upsilon_\delta^m = O_p(1)$. For simplicity we will still use notation Υ_δ^m to denote it after multiplying and adding some generic constant C or adding random variable $\mathbf{\Psi}_a$ in (6.87) so long as it is $O_p(1)$.

For a fixed $a < 1/2$, set $\xi = \sqrt{(a+1)(a+2)/2L}$. By Lemma 6.26 we have for $t < \xi$,

$$M_a(0,t;X_\delta^m) \le 2(t^{1-a}|\nabla g(x_0)| + \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m),$$

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)| \le C(t + t^a \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m),$$

and for $s > 0$ and $t - s < \xi$,

$$M_a(s,t;X_\delta^m) \le 2\left\{ (t-s)^{1-a}\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}_\delta^m(s)| + (t-s)^{1-a}|\nabla g(X_\delta^m(s))| + \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m \right\}.$$

If further $t - s \le s$, then for $s < \xi$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (t-s)^{1-a}\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}_\delta^m(s)| \\
\le\ & C(t-s)^{1-a}\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)(s + s^a \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m) \\
\le\ & C(t-s)^{1-a}\left(3 + \frac{L(t-s)s}{2}\right) + C(t-s)^{1-a}\left(3s^{a-1} + \frac{L(t-s)s^a}{2}\right)\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m \\
\le\ & C(t-s)^{1-a} + C\left[3\left(\frac{t-s}{s}\right)^{1-a} + \frac{L(t-s)^{2-a}s^a}{2}\right]\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m \\
\\
\le\ & C(t-s)^{1-a} + C\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m,
\end{aligned}$$

and for $s \ge \xi$,

$$(t-s)^{1-a}\left(\frac{3}{s} + \frac{L(t-s)}{2}\right)|\dot{X}_\delta^m(s)| \le C(t-s)^{1-a} \Upsilon_\delta^m.$$

Putting them together we conclude

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(s)| \le C(t-s)(\Upsilon_\delta^m + 1) + C(t-s)^a \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2} \Upsilon_\delta^m$$
$$\le C(\Upsilon_\delta^m + 1)\left[(t-s) + (t-s)^a \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2}\right] = \Upsilon_\delta^m \left[(t-s) + (t-s)^a \delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2}\right],$$

where we use the notation convention noted early to write Υ_δ^m for $C(\Upsilon_\delta^m + 1)$.
The theorem assumption implies that $\delta^{a/2-1/4} m^{-1/2} < C_0$ for some generic constant C_0. For $\delta^{1/2} < \xi$, we have if $t - s \le \delta^{1/2}$ and $t - s \le s$,

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(s)| \le \left[\delta^{1/2} + \delta^{a/2}\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2}\right] \Upsilon_\delta^m \le \delta^{1/2}(1 + C_0)\Upsilon_\delta^m \le \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m,$$

and if $t \le \delta^{1/2}$,

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)| \le \left[\delta^{1/2} + \delta^{a/2}\delta^{1/4} m^{-1/2}\right] \Upsilon_\delta^m \le \delta^{1/2}(1 + C_0)\Upsilon_\delta^m \le \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m.$$

Remind that $t_k = k\delta^{1/2}$ for any $k \ge 1$, and $t_{k+1} - t_k = \delta^{1/2} \le t_k$. Then for any $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$,

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k)| \le \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m, \;\; |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t)| \le \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m,$$

and thus

$$|\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k)| \le |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_1)| + |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_2) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t_1)| + \cdots + |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t_{k-1})| \le k\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m = t_k \Upsilon_\delta^m,$$

$$|X_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) - X_\delta^m(t_k)| \le \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)| dt \le \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m.$$

Define $\check{z}_0^m = 0$, $\check{z}_k^m = (\check{x}_k^m - \check{x}_{k-1}^m)/\delta^{1/2}$. Using the definition of $\check{x}_k^m$ and $\check{y}_k^m$ in (6.72), we obtain

$$\check{z}_1^m = (\check{x}_1^m - x_0)/\delta^{1/2} = -\delta^{1/2}\nabla g(x_0) - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}(H(t_1) - H(t_0)).$$

Then using (6.87) we get

$$|\check{z}_1^m| \le \delta^{1/2}|\nabla g(x_0)| + m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}\delta^{a/2}\mathbf{\Psi}_a \le \delta^{1/2}(|\nabla g(x_0)| + C_0\mathbf{\Psi}_a).$$

Again we use the notation convention to write Υ_δ^m for $\Upsilon_\delta^m + |\nabla g(x_0)| + C_0\mathbf{\Psi}_a$ (which is still $O_p(1)$). Using above result, the notation convention, and the definition of $\check{x}_k^m$ and $\check{y}_k^m$

in (6.72), we get

$$|\check{x}_1^m - x_0| \le \delta^{1/2}\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m = \delta\Upsilon_\delta^m, \;\; |X_\delta^m(t_1) - x_0| \le \int_0^{t_1} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t)|dt \le \delta\Upsilon_\delta^m.$$

Let $a_k = |\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(t_k)|$. Then $a_0 = 0$, $a_1 \le 2\delta\Upsilon_\delta^m$. For $k \ge 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_\delta^m(t_k) &= X_\delta^m(t_{k-1}) + \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \dot{X}_\delta^m(t)dt \\ &= X_\delta^m(t_{k-1}) + \delta^{1/2}\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k) + \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} (\dot{X}_\delta^m(t) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k))dt. \end{aligned}$$

Set $Z_\delta^m(t) = \dot{X}_\delta^m(t)$, $b_k = |\check{z}_k^m - Z_\delta^m(t_k)|$. Then $b_0 = 0$, $b_1 \le 2\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m$. Combining above equality with the definition of $\check{z}_k^m$ (i.e. $\check{x}_k^m = \check{x}_{k-1}^m + \delta^{1/2}\check{z}_k^m$), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} a_k = |\check{x}_k^m - X_\delta^m(t_k)| &\le |\check{x}_{k-1}^m - X_\delta^m(t_{k-1})| + \delta^{1/2}|\check{z}_k^m - Z_\delta^m(t_k)| + \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} |\dot{X}_\delta^m(t_k) - \dot{X}_\delta^m(t))|dt \\ &\le a_{k-1} + \delta^{1/2}b_k + \delta\Upsilon_\delta^m \\ &\le a_1 + \delta^{1/2}(b_2 + \cdots + b_k) + (k-1)\delta\Upsilon_\delta^m \\ &\le \delta^{1/2}S_k + k\delta\Upsilon_\delta^m, \end{aligned} \tag{6.88}$$

where $S_k = b_1 + \cdots + b_k$.
Note that $Z_\delta^m(t) = \dot{X}_\delta^m(t)$ obeys

$$dZ_\delta^m(t) = -\frac{3}{t}Z_\delta^m(t)dt - \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))dt - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}dH(t),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\delta^m(t_{k+1}) &= Z_\delta^m(t_k) - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{3}{t}Z_\delta^m(t)dt - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))dt \\ &\quad -m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}(H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)) \\ &= Z_\delta^m(t_k) - \frac{3\delta^{1/2}}{t_k}Z_\delta^m(t_k) - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\frac{3}{t}Z_\delta^m(t)dt - \frac{3}{t_k}Z_\delta^m(t_k)\right]dt - \delta^{1/2}\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t_k)) \\ &\quad - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) - \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t_k))]dt - m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}(H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)). \end{aligned} \tag{6.89}$$

For $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\frac{3}{t} Z_\delta^m(t) - \frac{3}{t_k} Z_\delta^m(t_k)\right] dt\right| &\leq \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left|\frac{3}{t}[Z_\delta^m(t) - Z_\delta^m(t_k)]\right| du + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left|\left(\frac{3}{t} - \frac{3}{t_k}\right) Z_\delta^m(t_k)\right| dt \\ &\leq \frac{3\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m}{t_k} + \frac{3(t_{k+1}-t_k)^2}{t_k t_{k+1}} t_k \Upsilon_\delta^m \\ &\leq 6\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m,\end{aligned}$$

$$\left|\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) - \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t_k))] du\right| \leq L \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |X_\delta^m(t) - X_\delta^m(t_k)| du \leq L\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m.$$

Recall (6.75) and note that $\check{z}_k^m = \check{d}_{k-1}^m / \delta^{1/2}$,

$$\check{z}_{k+1}^m = \frac{k-1}{k+2} \check{z}_k^m - \delta^{1/2} \nabla g(\check{y}_k^m) - m^{-1/2} \delta^{1/4} (H(t_{k+1}) - H(t_k)).$$

Using above equality and (6.89), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} b_{k+1} &= |\check{z}_{k+1}^m - Z_\delta^m(t_{k+1})| \leq \left(1 - \frac{3}{k+2}\right) |\check{z}_k^m - Z_\delta^m(t_k)| + \frac{6}{k(k+2)} |Z_\delta^m(t_k)| \\ &\quad + \left|\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\frac{3}{t} Z_\delta^m(t) dt - \frac{3}{t_k} Z_\delta^m(t_k)\right] dt\right| + \delta^{1/2} |\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t_k)) - \nabla g(\check{y}_k^m)| \\ &\quad \left|\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} [\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) - \nabla g(X_\delta^m(t_k))] dt\right| \\ &\leq b_k + 12\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m + L\delta^{1/2} \left|X_\delta^m(t_k) - \check{x}_k^m - \frac{k-1}{k+2} \delta^{1/2} \check{z}_k^m\right| + L\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq b_k + 12\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m + L\delta^{1/2} \left(a_k + \delta^{1/2} (|Z_\delta^m(t_k)| + |\check{z}_k^m - Z_\delta^m(t_k)|)\right) + L\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m \\ &\leq b_k + 12\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m + L\delta^{1/2} (\delta^{1/2} S_k + k\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m + \delta^{1/2} (\Upsilon_\delta^m + b_k)) + L\delta \Upsilon_\delta^m \\ &\leq b_k + C\delta S_k + C\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $\delta \leq T\delta^{1/2} k^{-1}$.
Let $b_1' = b_1$, $b_{k+1}' = b_k' + C\delta S_k' + C\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m$, where $S_k' = b_1' + b_2' + ... + b_k'$. Then we can prove by induction that $b_k \leq b_k'$. Indeed, if $b_j \leq b_j'$ for $j = 1, ..., k$, then $S_k \leq S_k'$,

$$b_{k+1} \leq b_k + C\delta S_k + C\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m \leq b_k' + C\delta S_k' + C\delta^{1/2} k^{-1} \Upsilon_\delta^m = b_{k+1}'.$$

Next, since $C\delta S'_k + C\delta^{1/2}k^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta \geq 0$, and $\{b'_k\}$ is non-decreasing, we have $S'_k \leq kb'_k$,

$$b'_{k+1} \leq b'_k + C\delta k b'_k + C\delta^{1/2}k^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta.$$

Similarly, let $b^*_1 = b'_1$, $b^*_{k+1} = b^*_k + C\delta k b^*_k + C\delta^{1/2}k^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta$. The same argument leads to $b'_k \leq b^*_k$. It is easy to derive from the definition that

$$\begin{aligned}
b^*_{k+1} &= (1 + C\delta k)b^*_k + C\delta^{1/2}k^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta \\
&= (1 + C\delta k)((1 + C\delta(k-1))b^*_{k-1} + C\delta^{1/2}(k-1)^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta) + C\delta^{1/2}k^{-1}\Upsilon^m_\delta \\
&= \cdots \\
&\leq (1 + C\delta k)^k \left(b^*_1 + C\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta \sum_{j=1}^{k} j^{-1} \right) \\
&\leq (1 + C\delta k)^k \left(\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta + C\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta(1 + \log(k)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $k_T = \lfloor T/\delta^{1/2} \rfloor$. Then using (6.88) and above bound result we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{k \leq k_T} |\check{x}^m_k - X^m_\delta(t_k)| = \max_{k \leq k_T} a_k \leq \delta^{1/2} S^*_{k_T} + k_T \delta \Upsilon^m_\delta \\
&\leq \delta^{1/2} k_T b^*_{k_T} + T\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta \\
&\leq (1 + C\delta T/\delta^{1/2})^{T/\delta^{1/2}} C\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta(1 + \log(T/\delta^{1/2})) + T\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq CTe^{CT^2}\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta(1 + T + |\log\delta|/2) + T\delta^{1/2}\Upsilon^m_\delta \\
&= O_p(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.6 As in Lemma 6.34, we may realize x^m_k, $B(t)$, $H(t)$, $\check{x}^m_k$, and $X^m_\delta(t)$ [defined by $B(t)$ via (4.35)] on some common probability spaces and consider their versions $\tilde{x}^m_k$, $\tilde{B}(t)$, $\tilde{H}(t)$, $\tilde{\check{x}}^m_k$, and $\tilde{X}^m_\delta(t)$ on the probability spaces. Applying Lemma 6.38, we have

$$\max_{k \leq T\delta^{-1/2}} |\tilde{\check{x}}^m_k - \tilde{X}^m_\delta(t_k)| = O_P(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|).$$

Combining above result together with Lemmas 6.34 we obtain

$$\max_{k\leq T/\delta^{1/2}} |\tilde{x}_k^m - \tilde{X}_\delta^m(t_k)| = o_p(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}) + O_P(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|).$$

For process $X_\delta^m(t)$, we have shown in the proof of Lemma 6.38

$$\max_{t-s\leq\delta^{1/2}} |X_\delta^m(t) - X_\delta^m(s)| \leq \delta^{1/2}\Upsilon_\delta^m = O_p(\delta^{1/2}),$$

and thus the same result also holds for $\tilde{X}_\delta^m(t)$. Therefore we can conclude

$$\max_{t\leq T} |\tilde{x}_\delta^m(t) - \tilde{X}_\delta^m(t)| = o_p(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4}) + O_p(\delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|),$$

where we use the fact that $x_\delta^m(t) = x_k^m$ for $t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}$. With the theorem condition $m^{1/2}\delta^{1/4}|\log\delta| \to 0$ we immediately arrive at

$$m^{1/2}\delta^{-1/4} \max_{t\leq T} |\tilde{x}_\delta^m(t) - \tilde{X}_\delta^m(t)| = o_p(1),$$

and Theorem 4.5 indicates that $m^{1/2}\delta^{-1/4}[x_\delta^m(t) - X(t)]$ weakly converges to $V(t)$.

Remark 6.1. *The proof arguments in fact also establish*

$$\max_{t\leq T} |y_\delta^m(t) - X(t)| = O_p(m^{-1/2}\delta^{1/4} + \delta^{1/2}|\log\delta|).$$

6.8 Proof of Theorem 4.7

Part (i) can be proved by using the same argument for showing Theorem 3.3. First we will show parts (ii) and (iii) in one dimension. From solution (4.25) of SDE (4.24) we find that $V(t)$ follows a normal distribution with mean zero and variance

$$\Gamma(t) = \int_0^t \exp\left[-2\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(u))du.$$

It is easy to check that $\Gamma(t)$ satisfies ODE

$$\dot{\Gamma}(t) + 2[\mathbb{H}g(X(t))]\Gamma(t) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t)) = 0,$$

and show that the limit $\Gamma(\infty)$ of $\Gamma(t)$ as $t \to \infty$ is equal to

$$\Gamma(\infty) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))[2\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}.$$

Thus as $t \to \infty$, $V(t)$ converges in distribution to $V(\infty) = [\Gamma(\infty)]^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{Z}$ is a standard normal random variable.

Denote by $P(\theta;t)$ the probability distribution of $X_\delta^m(t)$ at time t. Then from the Fokker-Planck equation we have

$$\frac{\partial P(\theta;t)}{\partial t} = \nabla\left[-\nabla g(\theta)P(\theta;t) - \frac{\delta}{2m}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(t))\,\nabla P(\theta;t)\right],$$

and its stationary distribution $P(\theta)$ satisfies

$$0 = \nabla\left[-\nabla g(\theta)P(\theta) - \frac{\delta}{2m}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\,\nabla P(\theta)\right],$$

which has solution

$$P(\theta) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{2m}{\delta\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})}g(\theta)\right\}.$$

The corresponding stationary distribution $P_0(v)$ for $V_\delta^m(\infty) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}(X_\delta^m(\infty) - \check{\theta})$ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(v) &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{m}{\delta\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})}g\left(\check{\theta} + \sqrt{\delta/m}\,v\right)\right\} \sim \exp\left\{-\frac{2m}{\delta\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})}\left[g(\check{\theta}) + \frac{\delta\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(\check{\theta})}{2m}v^2\right]\right\} \\ &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(\check{\theta})}{\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})}v^2\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\nabla g(\check{\theta}) = 0$, and the asymptotics are based on taking $\delta \to 0$, $m \to \infty$. Therefore, P_0 converges to $N\left(0, \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})}{2\boldsymbol{I\!H}(\check{\theta})}\right)$, and we conclude that $V_\delta^m(\infty)$ has a limiting normal distribution with mean zero and variance $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(\check{\theta})[2\boldsymbol{I\!H}g(\check{\theta})]^{-1} = \Gamma(\infty)$.

Similarly we can show parts (ii) and (iii) in the multivariate case by following matrix arguments in Gardiner (2009, chapters 4 & 6) and Da Prato and Zabczyk (1996, chapter 9) as follows. Using the explicit solution (4.25) of SDE (4.24) we find that $V(t)$ follows a

normal distribution with mean zero and variance matrix

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(t) &= \int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] du \\ &= \int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] du + \zeta_t,\end{aligned} \tag{6.90}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_t = &\int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] \left\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'\right\} \\ &\exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] du.\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof for Part 3 of Theorem 3.3, we can show that as $t \to \infty$, $|\zeta_t| \to 0$. Indeed, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for any $u > t_0$,

$$\left|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'\right| < \epsilon, \quad \left|\mathbb{H}g(X(u))[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]^{-1}\right| > 1 - \epsilon,$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_0^{t_0} \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] \left\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'\right\}\right. \\ &\left.\exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right] du\right| \\ &\le \left|\exp\left[-2\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right]\right| \int_0^{t_0} \left|\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'\right| du \\ &\le C\left|\exp\left[-2\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv\right]\right| \to 0,\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{t_0}^{t} \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \left\{ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \right\} \right. \\
&\left. \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] du \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \int_{t_0}^{t} \left| \exp\left[-2\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \mathbb{H}g(X(u)) \right| du |\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))|^{-1} \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2(1-\epsilon)} \left| 1 - \exp\left[-2\int_{t_0}^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \right| |\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))|^{-1} \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2(1-\epsilon)} |\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))|^{-1} \to 0, \text{ as we let } \epsilon \to 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

and these results implies that the integral in ζ_t can be divided into two parts over $[0, t_0]$ and $[t_0, t]$, both of which go to zero as $t \to \infty$.

Now we will verify the detailed balance condition using (6.90) and $\zeta_t \to 0$. Direct algebraic manipulations show

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{H}g(X(t))\Gamma(t) + \Gamma(t)\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \\
&= \int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] du \\
&+ \int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(u))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \mathbb{H}g(X(t))du \\
&= \int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] du \\
&+ \int_0^t \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \mathbb{H}g(X(t))du \\
&+ \mathbb{H}g(X(t))\zeta_t + \zeta_t \mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{d}{du} \left\{ \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \exp\left[-\int_u^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \right\} du \\
&+ \mathbb{H}g(X(t))\zeta_t + \zeta_t \mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \\
&= \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \\
&- \exp\left[-\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \exp\left[-\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{H}g(X(t))\zeta_t + \zeta_t \mathbb{H}g(X(t)),
\end{aligned}
$$

where by the assumption we have that as $t \to \infty$, $\int_0^t \mathbb{H}g(X(v))dv \to \infty$, which together with $\zeta_t \to 0$ indicate that the last three terms on the right hand size of above expression go to zero. Hence we have shown that as $t \to \infty$, $\mathbb{H}g(X(t))\Gamma(t) + \Gamma(t)\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \to \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'$, that is, their limits obey the following detailed balance condition,

$$\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))\Gamma(\infty) + \Gamma(\infty)\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty)) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]'. \tag{6.91}$$

With the limit $\Gamma(\infty)$ of $\Gamma(t)$ as $t \to \infty$, we conclude that $V(t)$ converges in distribution to $V(\infty) = [\Gamma(\infty)]^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{Z}$ is a standard normal random vector.
Denote by $P(\theta; t)$ the probability distribution of $X_\delta^m(t)$ at time t. Then from the Fokker-Planck equation we have

$$\frac{\partial P(\theta;t)}{\partial t} = \nabla \left[-\nabla g(\theta) P(\theta;t) - \frac{\delta}{2m} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(t))]' \nabla P(\theta;t) \right],$$

and under the detailed balance condition (6.91) its stationary distribution $P(\theta)$ satisfies

$$0 = \nabla \left[-\nabla g(\theta) P(\theta) - \frac{\delta}{2m} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))[\boldsymbol{\sigma}(X(\infty))]' \nabla P(\theta) \right],$$

which corresponds to a normal stationary distribution $N(0, \Gamma(\infty))$ for $V_\delta^m(\infty) = (m/\delta)^{1/2}(X_\delta^m(\infty) - \check{\theta})$. Thus, we conclude that $V_\delta^m(\infty)$ has a limiting normal distribution with mean zero and variance $\Gamma(\infty)$.

6.9 Proof of Theorem 4.8

As $\nabla g(\check{\theta}) = 0$, by Taylor expansion we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&g(X_\delta^m(t)) = g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{-1/2}\nabla g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + \frac{\delta}{2m}[V_\delta^m(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + o_P(\delta/m),\\
&\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t)) = \nabla g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{-1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V_\delta^m(t) + o_P((\delta/m)^{1/2}),\\
&g(X(t)) \sim g(\check{\theta}) + \nabla g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}] + \frac{1}{2}[X(t)-\check{\theta}]'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}]\\
&= g(\check{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2}[X(t)-\check{\theta}]'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}],\\
&\nabla g(X(t)) \sim \mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X(t)-\check{\theta}], \quad \mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \sim \mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta}),\\
&g(X_\delta^m(t)) \sim g(\check{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2}[X_\delta^m(t)-\check{\theta}]'\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})[X_\delta^m(t)-\check{\theta}],\\
&X_\delta^m(t) - \check{\theta} = X(t) - \check{\theta} + (\delta/m)^{-1/2}V_\delta^m(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus by Theorems 4.2 we have that $g(X_\delta^m(t))$ and $\nabla g(X_\delta^m(t))$ behave like, respectively,

$$g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\nabla g(X(t))V(t) + \frac{\delta}{2m}[V(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t),$$

and

$$\nabla g(X(t)) + (\delta/m)^{1/2}\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t).$$

Similar to the stationary distribution part of the proof for Theorem 4.7, when $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ is positive definite, we can derive the stationary distribution of $V(t)$ to be a normal distribution with mean zero and variance $\Gamma(\infty)$ defined by (4.38). Thus, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[V(t)] = 0, \qquad E\{[V(t)]'\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t)\} = tr[\Gamma(\infty)\mathbb{H}g(X(t))],\\
&Var\{\mathbb{H}g(X(t))V(t)\} = tr[\Gamma(\infty)\{\mathbb{H}g(X(t))\}^2].
\end{aligned}
$$

where the expectation is taken under the stationary distribution. Taking the trace on both sides of (4.38) we obtain

$$tr[\Gamma(\infty)\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))] = tr[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))\Gamma(\infty)] = tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))]/2,$$

and multiplying $\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))$ on both sides of (4.38) and then taking the trace operation we arrive at

$$tr[\Gamma(\infty)\{\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))\}^2] = tr[\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))\Gamma(\infty)\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))] = tr[\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2(X(\infty))\mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))]/2.$$

Putting these results together and using $\mathbb{H}g(X(t)) \to \mathbb{H}g(X(\infty))$ as $t \to \infty$, we prove (4.45) and (4.46).

For the saddle point case, for simplicity we assume that $\mathbb{H}g(\check{\theta})$ is diagonal with eigenvalues λ_i. Then $V(t)$ has covariance function (Gardiner (2009))

$$[Cov(V(t), V(s))]_{ii} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{ii}(X(t))}{2\lambda_i}\left[e^{-\lambda_i|t+s|} - e^{-\lambda_i|t-s|}\right],$$

which, for negative λ_i, diverge as $t, s \to \infty$. Thus, $V(t)$ does not have any limiting stationary distribution.