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Abstract. We introduce a class of numerical schemes for optimal control problems based on a novel Markov chain approximation, which uses, in turn, a piecewise constant policy approximation, Euler-Maruyama time stepping, and a Gaussian Hermite approximation of the Gaussian increments. We provide lower error bounds of order arbitrarily close to 1/2 in time and 1/3 in space for Lipschitz viscosity solutions, coupling probabilistic arguments with regularization techniques as introduced by Krylov. The corresponding order of the upper bounds is 1/4 in time and 1/5 in space. For sufficiently regular solutions, the order is 1 in both time and space for both bounds. Finally, we propose techniques for further improving the accuracy of the individual components of the approximation.

1. Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0\}$ induced by an $\mathbb{R}^p$-Brownian motion $B$ for some $p \geq 1$. We consider a controlled process governed by

$$
\begin{align*}
&dX_s = \mu(s, X_s, \alpha_s) \, ds + \sigma(s, X_s, \alpha_s) \, dB_s, \quad s \in (t, T), \\
&X_t = x,
\end{align*}
$$

(1.1)

where $\mu$ and $\sigma$ take values, respectively, in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^q$. We assume that the control vector process $\alpha \in A$, the set of progressively measurable processes with values in the set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we will denote by $X^{t,x,\alpha}$ the unique strong solution of (1.1), under the assumptions specified later. To simplify the notation, where no ambiguities arise, we will indicate the starting point $(t, x)$ of the processes involved as a subscript in the expectation, i.e. $E_{t,x}[\cdot]$.

Given a terminal cost function $\psi$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in [0, T]$, the value function of the optimal control problem we consider is defined by

$$
v(t, x) := \sup_{\alpha \in A} E_{t,x}[\psi(X^T_{T})].
$$

(1.2)

For simplicity we take into account only a terminal cost, but the same techniques also apply in presence of an integral running cost.

It is well known that this problem is related to the solution of a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, of the form

$$
\begin{align*}
&\begin{cases}
-\partial_t v + \inf_{a \in A} \left( -\mu(t, x, a) D_x v - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\sigma \sigma^T(t, x, a) D^2_x v] \right) = 0, \\
v(T, x) = \psi(x),
\end{cases} \\
&(t, x) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\
x \in \mathbb{R}^d.
\end{align*}
$$

(1.3)

The possible degeneracy of the diffusion term makes it necessary to consider solutions in the viscosity sense (see [8]). Furthermore, explicit solutions for this kind of nonlinear equations are rarely available, so that their numerical approximation becomes vital. The seminal work by Barles and Souganidis [4] establishes the basic framework for convergence of numerical schemes to the viscosity solution. The fundamental properties required are: monotonicity, consistency, and stability of the
scheme. We recall that, in multiple dimensions, standard finite difference schemes are in general non-monotone. As an alternative to finite difference schemes, semi-Lagrangian (SL) schemes [20, 7, 9] are monotone by construction. The scheme we present in this paper belongs to this family.

In general, the provable order of convergence for second order HJB equations is significantly less than one. By a technique pioneered by Krylov based on “shaking the coefficients” and mollification to construct smooth sub- and/or super-solutions, [10,13,1,2,3] prove certain fractional convergence orders, mainly using PDE-based techniques i.e., a comparison principle and the consistency error.

Here, we study a family of SL schemes based on a discrete time approximation of the optimal control problem. We provide error estimates making use of purely probabilistic techniques and a direct comparison of the two optimal control problems. An important step in order to define our scheme is to approximate the set of controls $\mathcal{A}$ by piecewise constant controls. This introduces an asymmetry between the upper and the lower bound of the error.

The approach most closely related to ours is arguably [17], especially Section 5 therein, where approximations based on piecewise constant policies and subsequently on discrete-time random walks are studied. The analysis there utilizes a combination of stochastic and analytic techniques, in particular through controlling the approximation error by the truncation error between the generator of the controlled process and its discrete approximation, and Itô’s lemma with the dynamic programming principle to aggregate the local error over time. We will be able to improve the order of the error bounds partly by using recent improved estimates for the piecewise constant policy approximation in [14], but also by avoiding the use of the truncation error, the order of which is limited to 1, and replacing it by a direct estimate of the strong and weak approximation error of the scheme for the stochastic differential equation.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows. We propose new discrete approximations of controlled diffusion processes based on piecewise constant controls over intervals of length $h$ and $M$ Gauß-Hermite points. We present a novel analysis technique for the resulting semi-discrete approximations by purely probabilistic techniques and direct use of the dynamic programming principle. This allows us to derive one-sided, lower error bounds of order $h^{(M-1)/2M} + \Delta x^{(M-1)/(3M-1)}$ for timestep $h$ and spatial mesh size $\Delta x$, for Lipschitz viscosity solutions (assumptions (H1) to (H3) below). They coincide with the two-sided bounds in [9] for the standard linear-interpolation SL scheme, i.e. $M = 2$, and improve them for $M > 2$. The achieved upper bounds are identical to [9], i.e. of order $h^{1/4} + \Delta x^{1/5}$. For sufficiently smooth solutions, the corresponding error bounds are of order 1 in both $h$ and $\Delta x$.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we present the setting and the main assumptions for the optimal control problem and we describe the main idea of our approach for a general class of discrete time schemes. In Section 3 the Markov-chain approximation scheme is introduced. Lower error bounds are obtained by using purely probabilistic arguments in Section 4 while upper bounds are obtained in Section 5. Section 6 discusses the order obtained in the case of smooth solutions and further improvements of the components of the scheme, including higher order time stepping and interpolation, while Section 7 concludes.

2. Main assumptions and preliminaries

We consider standard assumptions on the optimal control problem:

- **(H1)** $\mathcal{A}$ is a compact set;
- **(H2)** $\mu : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times A \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times p}$ are continuous functions and there exists $K_0 > 0$ such that
  \[
  |\mu(t, x, a) - \mu(t, y, a)| + \|\sigma(t, x, a) - \sigma(t, y, a)|| \leq K_0|x - y| \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in A,
  \]
  \[
  |\mu(t, x, a) - \mu(s, x, a)| + \|\sigma(t, x, a) - \sigma(s, x, a)|| \leq K_0|t - s|^{1/2} \quad \forall t, s \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in A,
  \]
  \[
  |\mu(t, x, a)| + |\sigma(t, x, a)| \leq K_0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in A;
  \]
- **(H3)** $\psi$ is a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant $L$. 

Under these assumptions one can prove the following regularity result on $v$:

**Proposition 2.1** ([25 Proposition 3.1, Chapter IV]). Let (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. There exists $K \geq 0$ such that

$$|v(t,x) - v(s,y)| \leq LK(|x-y| + (1 + |x|+|y|)|t-s|^{1/2})$$

for any $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t,s \in [0, T]$ (where $L$ denotes the Lipschitz constant of $\psi$ and $K$ only depends on $T$ and $K_0$ in assumption (H2)).

For any $[0, T-t]$-valued stopping time $\theta$, $v$ satisfies the Dynamic Programming Principle (DPP)

$$v(t,x) = \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t,x}[v(t+\theta, X_t^a)]^{\theta}, \quad (2.1)$$

which can be used to characterize $v$ as the viscosity solution of (1.3).

The main ideas of our approach apply to a very general class of discrete-time schemes. We introduce a time mesh for $N \geq 1$ by

$$h = T/N \quad \text{and} \quad t_n = nh,$$

for $n = 0, \ldots, N$.

The first step in our approximation is to introduce a time discretization of the control set. We consider the set $A_h$ of controls $a \in A$ which are constant in each interval $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$, for $n = 0, \ldots, N-1$, i.e.

$$A_h := \{a \in A : a_s(\omega) \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} a_i \mathbb{1}_{s \in [t_i, t_{i+1})} \forall \omega \in \Omega \text{ s.t. } a_i \in A, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N-1\}.$$

In what follows, we will identify any element of $a \in A_h$ by the sequence of random variables $a_i$ taking values in $A$ (denoted by $a_i \in A$ for simplicity) and will write $a \equiv (a_0, \ldots, a_{N-1})$. Denote by $v_h$ the value function obtained by restricting the supremum in (1.3) to controls in $A_h$, that is

$$v_h(t,x) := \sup_{a \in A_h} \mathbb{E}_{t,x} [\psi(X_T^a)]. \quad (2.2)$$

Clearly, since $A_h \subset A$, one has

$$v(t,x) \geq v_h(t,x), \quad (2.3)$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Under assumptions (H1)-(H3), an upper bound of order $1/6$ for the error related to this approximation was first obtained by Krylov in [17]. Recently, this estimate has been improved to the order $1/4$ in [13], so that one has

$$v(t,x) \leq v_h(t,x) + Ch^{1/4} \quad (2.4)$$

for some constant $C$. Taking $\theta \equiv h$ in (2.1), the DPP for the value function $v_h$ reads

$$v_h(t_n,x) = \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n,x} [v_h(t_{n+1}, X_{t_n}^a)]. \quad (2.5)$$

In particular, the restriction of the control set to $A_h$ implies that the supremum in (2.5) is taken over the set of control values $A$ (compare this with (2.1)). The family of schemes we have in mind are recursively defined by an approximation of (2.5) and lead to the definition of a numerical solution $V$ approximating $v_h$.

Indeed, let us consider a numerical approximation $S$ of the conditional expectation in (2.5),

$$S[f(t_{n+1},\cdot)](t_n,x,a) \approx \mathbb{E}_{t_n,x} f(t_{n+1}, X_{t_n}^a),$$

for any smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in A$. Then we consider $V$ defined by

$$\begin{cases} V(t_n,x) = \psi(x), \\ V(t_n,x) = \sup_{a \in A} S[V(t_{n+1},\cdot)](t_n,x,a), & n = N-1, \ldots, 0. \end{cases}$$
If the set $A$ is compact and the scheme $S$ is sufficiently accurate, we hope to obtain (after a regularization procedure, if necessary) the following bound for the error between $v_h$ and $V$:

$$
\sup_{n=0,\ldots,N} \sup_a |v_h(t_n, x) - V(t_n, x)|
\leq \sup_{n=0,\ldots,N-1} \sup_{a\in A} \left| \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_h(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^a) \right] - S(V(t_{n+1}, \cdot))(t_n, x, a) \right|
\leq \ldots \leq C h^\beta,
$$

for some $\beta > 1/4$ and $C$ eventually depending on $x$. Considering this together with (2.3) and (2.4), we can provide an accurate lower bound for the quantity $(v - V)$, whereas the upper bound on the error will remain restricted to order $1/4$, irrespective of the accuracy of the approximation of $v_h$ we consider. In the absence of further information, this is the best order we can establish theoretically in this way, even if the practically observed order is typically much larger than $1/4$. Here, $S$ can be any approximation scheme. However in the rest of the paper we will focus on a particular Markov chain approximation for which we are able to explicitly derive the rate of convergence $\beta$.

3. Markov chain approximation schemes

We present a class of schemes which are based on a Markov chain approximation of the optimal control problem (2.2). This follows the classical philosophy presented in [19], although they take the opposite direction and use finite difference approximations to construct Markov chains, while here we use time stepping schemes and quadrature formulae to define SL schemes. Similar probabilistic interpretations of such schemes have been given in [7, 17, 10] for the time-dependent case and in [20] for the infinite horizon case. What is new here is the construction of schemes with provable higher order error bounds, and the direct use of the dynamic programming principle for the discrete approximation to derive these bounds.

3.1. Euler-Maruyama scheme. We start with an approximation of the process $X_i^{t, x, \alpha}$ by the Euler-Maruyama scheme. For any given $\alpha \equiv (a_0, \ldots, a_{N-1}) \in A_h$, we consider the following recursive relation:

$$X_{t_{i+1}} = X_{t_i} + \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}, a_i) h + \sigma(t_i, X_{t_i}, a_i) \Delta B_i$$

(3.1)

for $i = 0, \ldots, N - 1$. The increments $\Delta B_i := (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})$ are independent, identically distributed random variables such that

$$\Delta B_i \sim \sqrt{h} N(0, I_p) \quad \forall i = 0, \ldots, N - 1.$$ 

(3.2)

We will denote by $X_i^{t_n, x, \alpha, EM}$ the solution to (3.1) associated with the control $\alpha \equiv (a_0, \ldots, a_{N-1}) \in A_h$ and such that $X_i^{t_n, x, \alpha, EM} = x$. Under assumptions (H1)-(H2), the rate of strong convergence of the scheme (3.1) is $1/2$, as given, e.g., in [15]. Although the result from there is not directly applicable here as the coefficients are non-Lipschitz in time due to the jumps in the control process, we can follow the same steps as in the proof of [21] Theorem 1.1, Chapter I, using the fact that the controls $\alpha \in A_h$ are constant over individual timesteps. Therefore we have:

Proposition 3.1 ([15] Theorem 10.3.5]). Let assumptions (H1)-(H2) be satisfied. Then there exists a constant $K_{EM}$ (independent of $h$) such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ |X_T^\alpha - X_T^{\alpha, EM}| \right] \leq K_{EM} (1 + |x|) h^{1/2}$$

for any $\alpha \in A_h, n = 0, \ldots, N, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

As a consequence, denoting

$$v_{EM}(t_n, x) := \sup_{\alpha \in A_h} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ \psi(X_T^{\alpha, EM}) \right],$$

Moreover, for any $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of $\psi$,

$$|v_h(t_n, x) - v_{\text{EM}}(t_n, x)| \leq \sup_{a \in A_h} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ \psi(X^a_T) - \psi(X^{a, \text{EM}}_T) \right] \leq L K_{\text{EM}} (1 + |x|) h^{1/2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, $v_{\text{EM}}$ still satisfies a DPP,

$$v_{\text{EM}}(t_n, x) = \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_{\text{EM}}(t_{n+1}, X^{a, \text{EM}}_{t_{n+1}}) \right], \tag{3.4}$$

for any $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$.

### 3.2. Gauß-Hermite quadrature.

Recalling that $\Delta B_t \sim \sqrt{t} \mathcal{N}(0, I_p)$, we can also write (3.3) as

$$v_{\text{EM}}(t_n, x) = \sup_{a \in A} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} v_{\text{EM}} \left( t_{n+1}, x + \mu(t_n, x, a) h + \sqrt{h} \sigma(t_n, x, a) y \right) e^{-\frac{\|y\|^2}{2}} dy. \tag{3.5}$$

The discrete-time scheme we are going to define is based on the Gauß-Hermite approximation of the right-hand term in (3.5). Let us start for simplicity with the case $p = 1$.

Let $M \geq 2$ and denote by $\{ \zeta_i \}_{i=1,\ldots,M}$ the zeros of the Hermite polynomial $H_M$ of order $M$ and by $\{ \omega_i \}_{i=1,\ldots,M}$ the corresponding weights given by

$$\omega_i = \frac{2^{M-1} M! \sqrt{\pi}}{M^2 |H_{M-1}(\zeta_i)|^2}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, M.$$ 

Therefore, defining

$$\lambda_i := \frac{\omega_i}{\sqrt{\pi}} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_i := \sqrt{2} \zeta_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, M,$$

for any smooth real-valued function $f$ (say $f$ at least $C^{2M}$) we can make use of the following approximation (see [13, p. 395] for instance):

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(y) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\pi}} dy = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(\sqrt{2} y) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\pi}} dy \approx \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \omega_i f(\sqrt{2} \xi_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i f(\xi_i). \tag{3.6}$$

Observe that $\lambda_i \geq 0, \forall i = 1, \ldots, M$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i = 1$. Defining the sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\{ \zeta_n \}_{n=0,\ldots,N-1}$ such that for any $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_n = \xi_i) = \lambda_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, M,$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta_n] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}[\zeta_n] = 1 \quad \forall n = 0, \ldots, N - 1.$$

For any control $\alpha = (a_0, \ldots, a_{N-1}) \in A_h$, in the sequel we will denote by $X^{t_n, x, \alpha, h}$ the Markov chain approximation of the process $X^{t_n, x, \alpha, \text{EM}}$ recursively defined by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
X_{t_n} = x, \\
X_{t_{n+1}} = X_{t_n} + \mu(t_n, X_{t_n}, a_n) h + \sqrt{h} \sigma(t_n, X_{t_n}, a_n) \zeta_i, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.7}$$

\text{FIGURE 1. Analytical expressions of } \{ (\xi_i, \lambda_i) \}_{i=1,\ldots,M} \text{ for } M = 2, 3, 4. \text{ We refer to [3, p. 464] for numerical approximations of } \{ (\zeta_i, \omega_i) \}_{i=1,\ldots,M} \text{ for larger } M.
for $i = n, \ldots, N - 1$. Therefore, starting from (3.6) and applying the Gauß-Hermite quadrature formula (3.8), our scheme will be defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
V(t_n, x) &= \sup_{a \in A} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i V \left( t_{n+1}, x + \mu(t_n, x, a)h + \sqrt{\nu}(t_n, x)\xi_i \right) \\
&= \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right], \quad n = N - 1, \ldots, 0, \\
V(t_N, x) &= \psi(x).
\end{align*}
$$

Referring to the notation in Section 2 one has

$$
\mathcal{S}[V(t_{n+1}, \cdot) | (t_n, x, a) := \mathbb{E} \left[ V \left( t_{n+1}, x + h\mu(t_n, x, a) + \sqrt{h}\sigma(t_n, x)\xi_n \right) \right].
$$

**Remark 1.** For $M = 2$, (3.8) is the SL scheme introduced by Camilli and Falcone in [7], for now without considering interpolation on any spatial grid.

Iterating, we obtain the following representation formula for $V$:

$$
V(t_n, x) = \sup_{a \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ \psi(X_{t_n}^{a, h}) \right].
$$

**The rate of weak convergence.** In this section, we prove the rate of weak convergence of the random walk $X^{a, h}$ defined by (3.7) to the process $X^{a, \text{EM}}$ given by the Euler-Maruyama scheme (3.1). For a smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ we aim to estimate

$$
\sup_{a \in A} \left| \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, \text{EM}})] - \mathbb{E} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, h})] \right|,
$$

which leads to the weak convergence error for the approximation in (3.7).

**Proposition 3.2.** Let assumptions (H1)-(H2) be satisfied and let $M \geq 2$. Then there exists a constant $C \equiv C(M)$ such that for any function $f \in C^{2M}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ one has

$$
\left| \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, \text{EM}})] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, h})] \right| \leq C \| D^{(2M)} f \|_\infty (1 + |x|^{2M}) h^M,
$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $a \in A$, $h \geq 0$ and $n = 0, \ldots, N - 1$, and where we denoted for $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\| D^{(k)} f \|_\infty := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d, |\beta| = k} \left| \frac{\partial |\beta| f(z)}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots \partial x_d^{\beta_d}} \right|.
$$

**Proof.** We adapt a standard argument from numerical quadrature. Let us take for simplicity $d = 1$ (the case $d > 1$ works in the same way) and denote $z = x + h\mu(t_n, x, a)$. By Taylor expansion, we can write

$$
\mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, \text{EM}})] = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(z + \sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a)y) \frac{e^{-y^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} dy
$$

$$
= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{2M-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{k!} (\sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a)y)^k + \frac{f^{(2M)}(z)}{(2M)!} (\sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a)y)^{2M} \right\} \frac{e^{-y^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} dy,
$$

for some $\hat{z}$. In the same way we get

$$
\mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} [f(X_{t_n+1}^{a, h})] = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{2M-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{k!} (\sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a)\xi_i)^k + \frac{f^{(2M)}(z)}{(2M)!} (\sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a)\xi_i)^{2M} \right\}.
$$

for some $\hat{z}$. At this point we recall that, by construction, the Gauß-Hermite quadrature formula is exact for any polynomial of degree $\leq 2M - 1$, so for any $k \in \{0, \ldots, 2M - 1\}$ we have

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{f^{(k)}(z)}{k!} (\sqrt{2h}\sigma(t_n, x, a))^k \left( \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} y^k e^{-y^2} dy - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i z_i^k \right) = 0.
$$
This implies that

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{t_n,x} \left[ f(X_{t_{n+1}}^n) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n,x} \left[ f(X_{t_{n+1}}^h) \right] \right| \\
\leq \int_0^{\infty} f^{(2M)}(\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma^2(t_n, x, a) y^2}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}} dy - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \omega_i f^{(2M)}(\varepsilon) \frac{(2\pi)^{2M} \sigma(t_n, x, a) z_i)^{2M}}{(2M)!} \\
\leq C\|f^{(2M)}\|_{\infty} h^M (1 + x^{2M}),
\]

where the constant \( C \) depends on \( M \) and the constants in assumption (H2), and we used the fact that \( |\sigma(t, x, a)| \leq C_0 (1 + |x|) \) for some \( C_0 \geq 0 \) depending on \( K_0 \) in (H2).

\[ \square \]

**Multi-dimensional Brownian motion.** In the case of \( p > 1 \), it is possible to define an approximation by a tensor product of the formula (3.6), that is

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} f(\sqrt{2}y) \frac{e^{-|y|^2}}{\pi^{p/2}} dy \approx \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_p=1}^{\lambda_i \cdots \lambda_i} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_p=1}^{\lambda_i \cdots \lambda_i} f(\xi_{i_1}, \ldots, \xi_{i_p}),
\]

and \( \{\xi_n\}_{n=0, \ldots, N-1} \) are i.i.d. random variables in \( \mathbb{R}^p \) such that if \( \xi_i \equiv (\xi_{i_1}, \ldots, \xi_{i_p})^T \),

\[
\mathbb{P}(\xi_n = \xi_i) = \lambda_i \cdots \lambda_i.
\]

Then one can define an approximation to \( v \) by

\[
\begin{align*}
V(t_n, x) &= \sup_{a \in A} \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_p=1}^{\lambda_i \cdots \lambda_i} V(t_{n+1}, x + \mu(t_n, x, a)h + \sqrt{2}\sigma(t_n, x, a)\xi_i) \\
&= \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n,x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^h) \right], \\
&= \psi(x).
\end{align*}
\]

It is easy to observe that this construction leads to an exponential growth of the computational complexity in the dimension \( p \), as it requires at each time step and for each node the evaluation of the solution at \( M^p \) points. Retracing the proof of Proposition 3.2, one can deduce that in order to guarantee a weak error estimates of order \( h^M \), it is sufficient to find weights \( \lambda_i \) and nodes \( \xi_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, M \), for some \( M \in \mathbb{N} \) possibly lower than \( M^p \), which integrate exactly all polynomials of degree lower or equal than \( 2M - 1 \). Moreover, the probabilistic interpretation of our scheme also requires that \( \lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, M \).

Such pairs \( \{ (\lambda_i, \xi_i) \}_{i=1, \ldots, M} \) are characterised by the linear programming problem (for \( \lambda \))

\[
A \lambda = b, \quad \lambda \geq 0,
\]

with \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times M^p} \) and \( b \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell} \) defined by

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
\gamma_1(\xi_1) & \cdots & \gamma_1(\xi_{M^p}) \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\gamma_\ell(\xi_1) & \cdots & \gamma_\ell(\xi_{M^p})
\end{pmatrix}
\quad \text{and} \quad b_i = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \gamma_i(\sqrt{2}y) \frac{e^{-|y|^2}}{\pi^{p/2}} dy \quad i = 1, \ldots, \ell,
\]

where \( \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_\ell\} \) is a basis for the space of polynomials of degree \( 2M - 1 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( \ell = \binom{2M-1+p}{p} \).

The existence of a solution of the form \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M, 0, \ldots, 0) \) for some \( M \leq \ell \) follows from Tchakaloff’s Theorem (see [23], and also [5] for a recent simpler proof). A constructive method for independent Gaussian random variables as in the present case is proposed in [11], while an efficient procedure for the general, dependent case applied to the uniform measure is given in [24]. This gives a substantial reduction for large \( p \) and moderate \( M \) in particular. Table 4.1 in [24] gives numerical values for \( \ell \) versus \( M^p \) for \( M = 3 \) and different \( p \), such as: \( p = 2; \ell = M^p = 9; p = 3: \ell = 23, M^p = 27; p = 5: \ell = 96, M^p = 243; p = 10: \ell = 891, M^p = 59049 \).

In what follows, we will use the notation \( \{ (\lambda_i, \xi_i) \}_{i=1, \ldots, M} \) to generalise [68] to any \( p \geq 1 \).
Lipschitz regularity of approximation. We conclude this section with a regularity result for \( V \). This is an important property of our scheme strongly exploited in Lemma 3.1 and Section 5.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. There exists \( K \geq 0 \) such that

\[
|V(t_n, x) - V(t_n, y)| \leq LK|x - y|
\]

for any \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( n = 0, \ldots, N \) (where \( L \) is the Lipschitz constant of \( \psi \) and \( K \) only depends on \( T \) and the constant \( K_0 \) in Assumption (H2)).

**Proof.** We proceed by backward induction in \( n \). For \( n = N \), \( V(t_n, \cdot) \) is Lipschitz with constant \( L_N := L \) given by (H3). Let \( V(t_i, \cdot) \) be Lipschitz continuous with constant \( L_i \) (only depending on \( T \) and \( K_0 \) in Assumption (H2)) for any \( i = n + 1, \ldots, N \). By classical estimates and thanks to the definition of \((\hat{\lambda}_i, \hat{\xi}_i)\) such that \( \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\lambda}_i \hat{\xi}_i = 0 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^M |\hat{\lambda}_i|^2 = p \), one has

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[|X_{t_{n+1}}^{n,x,a,h} - X_{t_{n+1}}^{n,y,a,h}|^2\right]
\]

\[
\leq |x - y|^2 + h^2 \mu(t_n, x, a) - \mu(t_n, y, a)|^2 + h \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\lambda}_i \left|\sigma(t_n, x, a) - \sigma(t_n, y, a)\right| \hat{\xi}_i^2
\]

\[
+ 2h \left|\mu(t_n, x, a) - \mu(t_n, y, a)\right|
\]

\[
+ 2\sqrt{h} \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\lambda}_i \left|\sigma(t_n, x, a) - \sigma(t_n, y, a)\right| \hat{\xi}_i
\]

\[
+ 2h^{3/2} \sum_{i=1}^M \hat{\lambda}_i \left|\mu(t_n, x, a) - \mu(t_n, y, a)\right| \left|\sigma(t_n, x, a) - \sigma(t_n, y, a)\right| \hat{\xi}_i
\]

\[
\leq (1 + K_2^3hp + 2K_0h + K_0^2h^2)|x - y|^2.
\]

Hence, by the definition of \( V \) one has

\[
|V(t_n, x) - V(t_n, y)| \leq L_{n+1} \mathbb{E}\left[|X_{t_{n+1}}^{n,x,a,h} - X_{t_{n+1}}^{n,y,a,h}|\right] \leq L_{n+1}(1 + Ch)^{1/2}|x - y|,
\]

where \( C \) only depends on \( K_0 \) in (H2), which gives

\[
L_n := \sup_{x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq y} \frac{|V(t_n, x) - V(t_n, y)|}{|x - y|} \leq L_{n+1}(1 + Ch)^{1/2}.
\]

Iterating, one obtains

\[
L_n \leq L(1 + Ch)^{N/2} \leq Le^{ChN/2} \leq Le^{CT},
\]

which concludes the proof. \( \square \)

### 3.3. The fully discrete scheme.

In order to be able to compute the numerical solution practically in reasonable complexity, we need to introduce some sort of recombination, otherwise the total number of nodes of all trajectories grows exponentially in \( N \).

Let \( \Delta x \equiv (\Delta x_1, \ldots, \Delta x_d) \in (\mathbb{R}^{>0})^d \) and consider the space grid \( G_{\Delta x} := \{ x_m = m\Delta x : m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \} \). Let \( I[\cdot] \) denote the linear (P1) interpolation operator with respect to the space variable, satisfying for every Lipschitz function \( \phi \) (with Lipschitz constant \( L_\phi \)):

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & I[\phi](x_m) = \phi(x_m), \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \\
(ii) \quad & |I[\phi](x) - \phi(x)| \leq L_\phi |\Delta x|, \\
(iii) \quad & |I[\phi](x) - \phi(x)| \leq C|\Delta x|^2 \|D^2 \phi\|_{\infty} \quad \text{if } \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \\
(iv) \quad & \text{for any functions } \phi_1, \phi_2 : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi_1, \phi_2 \Rightarrow I[\phi_1] \leq I[\phi_2].
\end{align*}
\]

(3.11)
We define an approximation on this fixed grid, denoted by $V_F$, by:

$$
\begin{align*}
V_F(t_n, x_m) &= \sup_{a \in A} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_{n+1}, x_m + \mu(t_n, x_m, a)h + \sqrt{h}\sigma(t_n, x_m, a) \xi_i), \\
V_F(t_N, x_m) &= \psi(x_m),
\end{align*}
$$

(3.12)

for $n = N - 1, \ldots, 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We will refer to this as the fully discrete scheme.

From the properties of (multi-)linear interpolation it follows that for every $q_k(x) \geq 0, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\sum_k q_k(x) = 1$ and $|\{k : q_k > 0\}| \leq 2^p$ such that

$$
I[\phi](x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} q_k(x)\phi(x_k).
$$

From this, (3.12) gives

$$
V_F(t_n, x_m) = \sup_{a \in A} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_n, a) V_F(t_{n+1}, x_k)
$$

with $\hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_n, a) := \sum_{k=1}^{M} \hat{\lambda}_k q_k(x_m + \mu(t_n, x_m, a)h + \sqrt{h}\sigma(t_n, x_m, a) \xi_i) \geq 0$ and $\sum_k \hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_n, a) = 1$.

Therefore, $\hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_n, a)$ are interpretable as transition probabilities of a controlled Markov chain with state space $G_{\Delta x}$ and the number of nonzero transitions from each node bounded by $|\{k : \hat{\lambda}_{i}(t_n, a) > 0\}| \leq 2^d \ell$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Then, there exists $C_T \geq 0$ such that

$$
\sup_{n=0, \ldots, N, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |V(t_n, x_m) - V_F(t_n, x_m)| \leq L C_T \frac{|\Delta x|}{h}.
$$

**Proof.** The result follows by properties (3.11)(ii),(iv) and by the Lipschitz continuity of $V$ proved in Proposition 3.3 (see also [9, Lemma 7.1]).

Observe that, in absence of further regularity assumptions, this introduces the following “inverse” CFL condition for the convergence of the fully discrete scheme:

$$
\frac{|\Delta x|}{h} \to 0 \quad \text{as } |\Delta x|, h \to 0.
$$

4. A LOWER BOUND FOR $v$

In order to obtain error estimates for the scheme described in Section 3 we will adapt the technique of “shaking parameters” and regularization introduced by Krylov in [16, 18] and studied later by many authors (see for instance [11, 2, 3]) for obtaining the rate of convergence of monotone numerical scheme for second order HJB equations. We do so without passing by the PDE consistency error and work instead with the direct estimates we presented in the previous section.

We refer to Section 6 for a discussion of the regular case.

### 4.1. Regularization

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $E_h$ be the set of progressively measurable processes $e$ bounded by $\varepsilon$ which are constant in each time interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, that is,

$$
E_h := \{\text{prog. meas. process } e : e(s) \equiv e_i, \forall s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}] \text{ with } |e_i| \leq \varepsilon, i = 0, \ldots, n - 1\}.
$$

For any pair $(\alpha, e) \in A_h \times E_h$, let us consider the process $X^{t_n, x, \alpha, e}$ defined as an $\varepsilon$-perturbation of the dynamics (3.1):

$$
\begin{align*}
X^{t_n, x, \alpha, e} &= x \\
X^{t_{i+1}, x, \alpha, e} &= X^{t_i, x, \alpha, e} + \mu(t_i, X^{t_i, x, \alpha, e} + e_i, a_i) h + \sigma(t_i, X^{t_i, x, \alpha, e} + e_i, a_i) \Delta B_i,
\end{align*}
$$

(4.1)

for $i = n, \ldots, N - 1$. We define the following “perturbed” value function:

$$
v^\varepsilon(t_n, x) := \sup_{\alpha \in A_h, e \in E_h} E_{t_n, x} \left[\psi(X^{t_n, x, \alpha, e})\right]
$$

(4.2)
for \( n = 0, \ldots, N, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

**Proposition 4.1.** Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Then there exists a constant \( C \geq 0 \) such that

\[
|v_{EM}(t_n, x) - v^e(t_n, x)| \leq LC\varepsilon
\]

and

\[
|v^e(t_n, x) - v^e(t_n, y)| \leq LC|x - y|,
\]

for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N \) and \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

**Proof.** Let us fix a control \( \alpha \in A_h \) and \( e \in \mathcal{E}_h \).

For any \( i = n, \ldots, N - 1 \), we denote for simplicity

\[
X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} \equiv X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}} \quad \text{and} \quad X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x,e} \equiv X_{t_i}^{e}.
\]

By the definition of processes (3.1) and (4.1) one has

\[
X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_{i+1}}^{\alpha,x} = \left( X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} \right) + h \left( \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}}, a_i) - \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{e} + e_i, a_i) \right) + \sqrt{h} \left( \sigma(t_i, X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}}, a_i) - \sigma(t_i, X_{t_i}^{e} + e_i, a_i) \right) \Delta B_i
\]

for any \( i = n, \ldots, N - 1 \).

Then

\[
\left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_{i+1}}^{\alpha,e} \right|^2 = \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} \right|^2 + h^2 \left| \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}}, a_i) - \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{e} + e_i, a_i) \right|^2 + 2h \left( \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}}, a_i) - \mu(t_i, X_{t_i}^{e} + e_i, a_i) \right) \Delta B_i
\]

Taking the expectation, a straightforward calculation shows that

\[
E \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_{i+1}}^{\alpha,e} \right|^2 \right] \leq E \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} \right|^2 \right] + K_0^2 h^2 E \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} - e_i \right|^2 \right] + K_0^2 h E \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} - e_i \right|^2 \Delta B_i \right]^2
\]

\[
\leq E \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{e} \right|^2 \right] \left( 1 + 2K_0^2 h + 4K_0^2 h \right) + \varepsilon^2 \left( 2K_0^2 h^2 + 4K_0^2 h \right) + \varepsilon^2 \left( 2K_0^2 h^2 + 4K_0^2 h \right)
\]

where we also used the inequalities \( 2a \cdot b \leq |a|^2 + |b|^2 \) and \( |a + b|^2 \leq 2(|a|^2 + |b|^2) \), and denoted by \( C \) any positive constant independent of \( h, e \) and \( a \).

By iteration (using the fact that \( 1 + Ch \leq e^{CT} \)) we finally get

\[
E_{t_n,x} \left[ \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_{i+1}}^{\alpha,e} \right|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon^2 e^{CT},
\]

for any \( i = n, \ldots, N \) and we can conclude that

\[
|v_{EM}(t_n, x) - v^e(t_n, x)| \leq \sup_{\alpha \in A_h, e \in \mathcal{E}_h} E_{t_n,x} \left[ \left| \psi(X_{t_i}^{\alpha,\text{EM}}) - \psi(X_{t_i}^{\alpha,e}) \right| \right] \leq LC\varepsilon
\]

so that the first property is proved. The Lipschitz continuity of \( v^e \) follows by the estimate

\[
E \left[ \sup_{i=n,\ldots,N} \left| X_{t_i}^{\alpha,x} - X_{t_i}^{\alpha,y} \right| \right] \leq K|x - y|
\]
that leads to
\[ |v^\varepsilon(t_n, x) - v^\varepsilon(t_n, y)| \leq LK|x - y|, \]
for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \), where the constant \( K \) is the same constant that appears in Proposition 2.1.

Moreover, the value function \( v^\varepsilon \) satisfies the following DPP:
\[ v^\varepsilon(t_n, x) = \sup_{a \in A, |\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon} E_{t_n, x} \left[ v^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X^a_{t_{n+1}}) \right], \quad (4.3) \]
for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N - 1 \).

The step that follows consists in a regularization of the function \( v^\varepsilon \). For the regularization procedure, we consider a smooth function \( \delta : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, +\infty) \) supported in the unit ball \( B_1(0) \) with \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta(x) \, dx = 1 \), and we define \( \{ \delta_\varepsilon \}_{\varepsilon > 0} \) as the following sequence of mollifiers:
\[ \delta_\varepsilon(x) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^d} \delta \left( \frac{x}{\varepsilon} \right). \]
Then define, for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N \),
\[ v_\varepsilon(t_n, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v^\varepsilon(t_n, x - \xi) \delta_\varepsilon(\xi) d\xi. \quad (4.4) \]

**Proposition 4.2.** Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. The function \( v_\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \) defined by (4.4) is \( C^\infty \) for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N \). Moreover,

(i) there exists a constant \( C \geq 0 \) such that
\[ |v_\varepsilon(t_n, x) - v^\varepsilon(t_n, x)| \leq LC\varepsilon \quad n = 0, \ldots, N, x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \]

(ii) for any \( k \geq 1 \) one has
\[ \sup_{n=0,\ldots,N} \left\| D^{(k)} v_\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \right\|_{\infty} \leq LC_k \varepsilon^{1-k}, \quad (4.5) \]
for a constant
\[ C_k = \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d, |eta| = k} \int \left| \frac{\partial^{|eta|} \delta(\xi)}{\partial x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots \partial x_d^{\beta_d}} \right| d\xi; \]

(iii) \( v_\varepsilon \) satisfies the following super-dynamic programming principle
\[ v_\varepsilon(t_n, x) \geq \sup_{a \in A} E_{t_n, x} \left[ v_\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X^a_{t_{n+1}}) \right] \quad (4.6) \]
for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N - 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

**Proof.** The regularity of \( v_\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \) and properties (i)-(ii) follow by the properties of mollifiers and the Lipschitz continuity of \( v^\varepsilon \) (Proposition 4.1). It remains to prove (iii). By the definition of \( v_\varepsilon \), equality (4.3) and using the fact that
\[ X^a_{t_{n+1}} = X^a_{t_{n+1}} - \xi \quad \forall n = 0, \ldots, N - 1, a \in A, |\xi| \leq \varepsilon, \]
we have
\[
v_c(t_n, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v^c(t_n, x - \xi) \delta_c(\xi) d\xi
\]
\[
\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{a \in A, \|x\| \leq \varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v^c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] \delta_c(\xi) d\xi
\]
\[
= \sup_{a \in A} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v^c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \delta_c(\xi) d\xi \right]
\]
\[
\geq \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \right]
\]
where for the last two inequalities we applied, respectively, Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 4.2 (ii) and using the definition of $V$ we also have for any $n = 0, \ldots, N-1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

\[
V(t_n, x) - v_c(t_n, x)
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) - v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] + C(1 + |x|^{2M}) \|D(2M) v_c(t_{n+1}, \cdot)\|_{\infty} h^M \right\}
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \right] + LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) \varepsilon^{1-2M} h^M \right\},
\]
which concludes the proof. \( \square \)

### 4.2. A lower bound for the discrete time scheme

Applying (3.3), Proposition 4.1, and Proposition 4.2 (i), we obtain
\[
v(t_n, x) \geq v_c(t_n, x) - LC_{EM} (1 + |x|) h^{1/2} - LC \varepsilon,
\]
for some new $C$. Recalling that $v_c$ satisfies the super-dynamic programming principle given by Proposition 4.2 (iii) and using the definition of $V$ we also have for any $n = 0, \ldots, N-1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

\[
V(t_n, x) - v_c(t_n, x)
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) - v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] + C(1 + |x|^{2M}) \|D(2M) v_c(t_{n+1}, \cdot)\|_{\infty} h^M \right\}
\]
\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ v_c(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, EM}) \right] + LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) \varepsilon^{1-2M} h^M \right\},
\]
where for the last two inequalities we applied, respectively, Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.2 (ii).

Observing that
\[
\mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ \sup_{i=n, \ldots, N} |X_{t_i}^{a, h}|^{2M} \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^{2M})
\]
for some $C \geq 0$ independent of $a$, we can iterate inequality (4.8) and get
\[
V(t_n, x) - v_c(t_n, x) \leq \|V(t_N, \cdot) - v_c(t_N, \cdot)\|_{\infty} + LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) \varepsilon^{1-2M} h^{M-1}
\]
\[
\leq LC \varepsilon + LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) \varepsilon^{1-2M} h^{M-1}. 
\]
Therefore, by this last inequality and (4.7), we can conclude that for any $n = 0, \ldots, N, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

\[
v(t_n, x) \geq V(t_n, x) - LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) \varepsilon^{1-2M} h^{M-1} + h^{1/2} + \varepsilon.
\]
Balancing the terms with $\varepsilon$ and $h$, i.e. taking $\varepsilon = h^{(M-1)/2M}$ and observing that $1/2 > (M-1)/2M$, one has
\[
v(t_n, x) \geq V(t_n, x) - LC(1 + |x|^{2M}) h^{(M-1)/2M}.
\]
4.3. A lower bound for the fully discrete scheme. The contribution from the interpolation error has to be added to (4.9), giving an overall error of

\[ O\left( h^{(M-1)/2M} + \frac{|\Delta x|}{h} \right). \]

Optimising the choice of \( \Delta x \) with respect to \( h \) we get

\[ |\Delta x| \sim h^{(3M-1)/2M}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.10)

This effectively leads to order \((M-1)/(2M)\) in time and \((M-1)/(3M-1)\) in space, which can be made arbitrarily close to 1/2 and 1/3, respectively, by choosing \( M \) large enough.

Remark 2 (Comparison with existing results). By a Taylor expansion it is possible to compute the consistency error of the scheme with respect to the HJB equation (1.3). For simplicity let us consider the uncontrolled one-dimensional \((p = d = 1)\) case with \( \mu \equiv 0 \). Using the fact that \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i = 1 \), \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i \xi_i^2 = 1 \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i \xi_i^{2k+1} = 0 \) (\( \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \)), one gets

\[ \frac{1}{h} \left( V(t_{n+1}, x) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i v(t_n, x + \sqrt{h} \sigma(t_n, x) \xi_i) \right) \]

\[ = v(t_n, x) - \frac{1}{2} (\sigma(t_n, x))^2 v_{xx}(t_n, x) + \frac{h}{2} v_t(t_n, x) - \frac{h}{4!} (\sigma(t_n, x))^4 v_{4x}(t_n, x) \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i \xi_i^4 + O(h^2), \]

which shows that the scheme has order 1 consistency, for all \( M \). Applying the results in [9], this would lead to error estimates of order \( h^{1/4} + \Delta x/h \), i.e., with the optimal choice of \( \Delta x \) order 1/4 in \( h \) and 1/5 in \( \Delta x \). A similar limitation applies to the analysis in [17].

The improvement we get for the lower bound is due to the fact that, splitting the two contributions of the error coming from Euler-Maruyama time stepping and the Gauss-Hermite quadrature formula, we can reduce the second one by increasing \( M \), whereas for the first one the lower regularity requirement allows us to get order 1/2.

5. An upper bound for \( v \)

In order to obtain the upper bound, we use (2.1) to estimate the error introduced by the piecewise approximation of the controls. This restricts the convergence rate to order 1/4 in \( h \) and 1/5 in \( \Delta x \) and hence it will not lead to an improvement with respect to the rates in [9] even for large \( M \). Here, we briefly sketch how to adapt the techniques developed in the previous sections to obtain this upper bound.

The first important observation is that the estimates based on the super-dynamic programming principle and the convexity of the supremum operator at the end of page 11 work only in the direction of the lower bound. However, under suitable regularity assumptions on the numerical scheme, it is possible to revert the role of numerical and exact solution and exploit the same arguments applying the regularization on the numerical solution \( V \). Our scheme satisfies by construction these assumptions so that we can proceed in this direction. The same approach has been applied in [11, 12, 15]. For completeness, we mention that for general schemes not satisfying the desired regularity, to obtain the upper bound it becomes necessary to pass through a switching system approximation of the optimal control problem, see [2, 6].

5.1. Regularization. Let us define the solution of the scheme with shaken coefficients

\[
\begin{align*}
V^\varepsilon(t_n, x) &= \sup_{a \in A, \|v\| \leq \varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i V^\varepsilon \left( t_{n+1}, x + \mu(t_n, x + e, a) h + \sqrt{h} \sigma(t_n, x + e, a) \hat{\xi}_i \right), \\
V^\varepsilon(t_N, x) &= \psi(x),
\end{align*}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)
for \( n = N - 1, \ldots, 0 \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \). We then proceed to the regularization of \( V^\varepsilon \) defining, for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N \),

\[
V^\varepsilon(t_n, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V^\varepsilon(t_n, x - \eta)\delta_\varepsilon(\eta)\,d\eta.
\]

Thanks to the regularity of \( V \) and in particular its Lipschitz continuity proved in Proposition 3.3 one can prove the analogue of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2.

**Proposition 5.1.** Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. One has:

(i) the function \( V^\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \) is Lipschitz continuous with the same constant as \( V \) and there exists a constant \( C \geq 0 \) such that for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
|V(t_n, x) - V^\varepsilon(t_n, x)| \leq LC\varepsilon;
\]

(ii) the function \( V^\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \) is \( C^\infty \) for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N \) and there exists a constant \( C \geq 0 \) such that

\[
|V(t_n, x) - V^\varepsilon(t_n, x)| \leq LC\varepsilon,
\]

and for any \( k \geq 1 \) one has

\[
\sup_{n=0,\ldots,N} \left\| D^{(k)} V^\varepsilon(t_n, \cdot) \right\|_\infty \leq LC_k\varepsilon^{1-k},
\]

for a certain constant \( C_k \geq 0 \);

(iii) \( V^\varepsilon \) satisfies the following super-dynamic programming principle

\[
V^\varepsilon(t_n, x) \geq \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right]
\]

for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N - 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \).

Proof. The proof follows by similar arguments as those used in the lower bound, Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. \( \square \)

5.2. An upper bound for the fully discrete scheme. We start by providing an upper bound for the error between \( v^h \) and the solution of the fully discrete scheme \( V^\hat{\varepsilon} \). Applying (3.3), Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 5.1 one obtains for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \)

\[
v^h(t_n, x_m) - V^\hat{\varepsilon}(t_n, x_m) \leq v_{\text{EM}}(t_n, x_m) - V^\varepsilon(t_n, x_m) + LK_{\text{EM}}(1 + |x_m|)h^{1/2} + 2LC\varepsilon + LC_T \frac{|x|}{h}.
\]

It remains to estimate the difference between \( v_{\text{EM}} \) and \( V^\varepsilon \). One has for any \( n = 0, \ldots, N - 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
v_{\text{EM}}(t_n, x_m) - V^\varepsilon(t_n, x_m)
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ v_{\text{EM}}(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, \text{EM}}) \right] - \sup_{a \in A} \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ v_{\text{EM}}(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, \text{EM}}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, \text{EM}}) \right] \right\}
\]

\[
+ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, \text{EM}}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right]
\]

\[
\leq \sup_{a \in A} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ v_{\text{EM}}(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t_n, x_m} \left[ V^\varepsilon(t_{n+1}, X_{t_{n+1}}^{a, h}) \right] \right\} + LC(1 + |x_m|^{2M})\varepsilon^{1-2M}h^M.
\]

Observing that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{t_n, x} \left[ \sup_{i=n,\ldots,N} \left| X_{t_i}^{a, \text{EM}} \right|^{2M} \right] \leq C(1 + |x|^{2M})
\]
for some $C \geq 0$ independent of $\alpha$, we can iterate inequality (6.3) and get

$$v_{EM}(t_n, x_m) - V_c(t_n, x) \leq \|v_{EM}(t_N, \cdot) - V_c(t_N, \cdot)\|_{\infty} + LC(1 + |x_m|^{2M})\varepsilon^{1-2M}h^{M-1}$$

$$\leq LC\varepsilon + LC(1 + |x_m|^{2M})\varepsilon^{1-2M}h^{M-1}.$$ 

Therefore, by this last inequality we can conclude that for any $n = 0, \ldots, N, m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$v_h(t_n, x_m) \leq V_E(t_n, x_m) - LC(1 + |x_m|^{2M})\left(\varepsilon^{1-2M}h^{M-1} + h^{1/2} + \varepsilon + \frac{|\Delta x|}{h}\right),$$

which, optimizing $\varepsilon$ with respect to $h$, gives an upper bound for $v_h - V_E$ of

$$O\left(h^{(M-1)/2M} + \frac{|\Delta x|}{h}\right)$$

analogous to the lower bound. Hence, if for the piecewise constant control approximation one has the estimate $0 \leq v - v_h \leq Ch^\rho$ for some $\rho > 0$ the overall obtained upper bound is

$$O\left(h^{(M-1)/2M} + h^\rho + \frac{|\Delta x|}{h}\right).$$

As mentioned in Section 2 (see specifically (2.4)), the best available estimate given in [14] has $\rho = 1/4$, which improves the rate $\rho = 1/6$ in [17]. Observing that $(M - 1)/2M \geq 1/4$ for every $M \geq 2$, one gets an upper bound for the difference $v - V_E$ of

$$O\left(h^{(M-1)/2M} + h^\rho\right).$$

Optimizing the choice of $\Delta x$ with respect to $h$ this gives order $\rho$ in time and $\rho/(1 + \rho)$ in space. In particular, for $\rho = 1/4$ as in [14] this gives the rate $1/4$ in time and $1/5$ in space, as announced at the beginning of the section, which coincides with the result in [9].

6. THE REGULAR CASE AND IMPROVEMENTS

The regular case. If the value function $v$ can be shown to be sufficiently smooth, the regularization step is not necessary and it is also possible to consider the rate of weak convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme, which is one, and under differentiability assumptions on $\psi$ this gives

$$\sup_{i=n, \ldots, N} \mathbb{E}_{\bar{t}_i, x} \left[\psi(X_{t_i}^\alpha) - \psi(X_{t_i}^{EM})\right] \leq \tilde{K}_{EM}h.$$

Thus, we obtain the following lower estimate

$$v(t_n, x) \geq V(t_n, x) + C(1 + |x|^{2M})h^{M-1} + \tilde{K}_{EM}h, \quad (6.1)$$

which is of order 1 as we would expect in the regular case. When the interpolation is added, if $v$ is sufficiently smooth, (3.11)(iii) can be applied. This, together with (6.1), gives estimates for the lower bound of order $O(h + \frac{\Delta x^2}{h})$. It is also shown in [14] that $0 \leq v - v_h \leq Ch$ holds if $v_h$ is sufficiently smooth. This would lead, for $|\Delta x| \sim h$, to error estimates of order 1. In many cases, this corresponds to the practically observed situation so that choosing $|\Delta x| \sim h$ is sufficient to observe convergence, with order 1, of the fully discrete scheme.

Higher order time stepping. In the smooth case it can also make sense to consider higher order approximation schemes for the stochastic differential equation (in the non-smooth case, the necessity of heavier regularization neutralizes the improvements from the higher order schemes). For instance, in the case of coefficients independent of time, one could adapt the weak-second order Taylor scheme (see [15])

$$X_{t_{n+1}} = x + \mu(x)h + \left(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma\sigma(x) + \frac{1}{2}\mu\mu(x) + \frac{1}{4}\mu\sigma^2(x)\right)h^2 + \sigma(x)\Delta B_t$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}\sigma\sigma(x)\Delta B_t^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\mu\sigma(x) + \frac{1}{2}\mu\sigma(x) + \frac{1}{4}\sigma\sigma(x)\right)h\Delta B_t.$$
to the controlled equation (1.1) and obtain an error contribution of order $h^2$ from the time stepping scheme for the semi-discrete approximation. Retracing the steps of the proof of Proposition 3.2, $M \geq 2$ is still sufficient to guarantee order 2 for the Gauß-Hermite approximation, as the higher order terms resulting from $B^i_2$ are integrated sufficiently accurately. The overall lower bound of the error for the fully discrete scheme would be $O(h^2 + |\Delta x|^2/h)$, which leads to order 2 in $h$ and $4/3$ in $|\Delta x|$. However, no improvement of the upper bound is guaranteed due again to the control approximation, which, as explained in (13), can be improved only if $v_h$ is smooth too, which is usually not the case even if $v$ is.

Higher order interpolation. A remaining bottleneck is the accumulated interpolation error $|\Delta x|^2/h$, which is dictated by the need for (multi-)linear interpolation to ensure the monotonicity of the scheme. Some recent results (see [22] and [9] Section 6) indicate that monotonicity of the interpolation step is not needed to ensure convergence of the scheme, as long as the interpolation is “limited” to avoid overshoots. An interesting example is the monotonicity preserving cubic interpolation (see [12], and [9, Section 6] for an application to semi-Lagrangian schemes) which preserves the monotonicity of the input data in intervals where the data are monotone, and is of high order if the data are monotone overall. In special cases where the monotonicity of the value function is known a priori (such as typical utility maximisation problems in finance), this could lead to a practical improvement of the order, although a theoretical proof of the higher order seems difficult.

7. Conclusions and perspectives

This paper analyses numerical schemes for HJB equations based on a discrete time approximation of the optimal control problem. Using purely probabilistic arguments and under very general assumptions, in Section 4 we give a lower bound for the solution generated by such an approximation. The error bound obtained in this way allows us to improve one side of the current results from the literature. The upper bound for the solution obtained in a similar way in Section 5 is consistent with, but does not improve, the best available results. In ongoing work, we are investigating the use of duality to obtain symmetric error bounds. Clearly, this will be restricted to special cases where a continuous dual problem with no duality gap can be given.
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