A NUMERICAL SCHEME FOR STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS WITH DISTRIBUTIONAL DRIFT

TIZIANO DE ANGELIS, MAXIMILIEN GERMAIN, ELENA ISSOGlio

Abstract. In this paper we present a scheme for the numerical solution of one-dimensional stochastic differential equations (SDEs) whose drift belongs to a fractional Sobolev space of negative regularity (a subspace of Schwartz distributions). We obtain a rate of convergence in a suitable $L^1$-norm and we implement the scheme numerically. To the best of our knowledge this is the first paper to study (and implement) numerical solutions of SDEs whose drift lives in a space of distributions. As a byproduct we also obtain an estimate of the convergence rate for a numerical scheme applied to SDEs with drift in $L^p$-spaces with $p \in (1, \infty)$.

1. Introduction

The aim of our paper is to obtain a numerical algorithm (and its convergence rate) capable of approximating the solution of a one-dimensional SDE of the form

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t)dt + dW_t, \quad X_0 = x, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $W$ is a Brownian motion and $b$ is a distributional drift. In particular, $b(t)$ takes values in a fractional Sobolev space of negative order (defined in Section 2.1) for each $t \in [0, T]$, and $t \mapsto b(t)$ is Hölder continuous (i.e., $b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; H^{-\beta\tilde{q}_0, q_0})$ for $\kappa \in (1/2, 1)$, $\beta_0 \in (0, 1/4)$ and suitable $\tilde{q}_0$ and $q_0$). Existence and uniqueness of solutions for $d$-dimensional versions of (1) were first derived in [6], where the authors give a mathematical meaning to the term $\int_t^0 b(s, X_s)ds$ by introducing the concept of virtual solution. The latter is needed since pointwise evaluation of $b(t, \cdot)$ is meaningless. Further theoretical work on equations of a similar kind can be found, for example, in [3, 5, 11, 12].

We devise a 2-step algorithm for the numerical solution of (1): we first regularise the drift and then apply Euler-Maruyama scheme. This produces a sequence $(X^N_{N \geq 1})$ of solutions of SDEs with a smooth drift and a sequence $(X^{N,m}_{m \geq 1})$ of corresponding Euler-Maruyama approximations for each $N \geq 1$. We prove in Theorem 3.5 that the scheme converges to the original virtual solution of (1) and obtain a strong $L^1$-rate of convergence when we let $(N, m) \to \infty$ simultaneously, i.e., we obtain a rate of convergence for the limit

$$\lim_{(N, m) \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_t - X^{N,m}_t| \right].$$

In order to regularise the drift we first pick a sequence of functions $(b^N_{N \geq 1})$ that converges to $b$ in the appropriate norm for the fractional Sobolev space of negative regularity (i.e., it converges in $C^\kappa([0, T]; H^{-\beta\tilde{q}_0, q_0})$). Then, we further mollify the functions $b^N$ by convolution
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with the heat kernel (we refer to it as randomisation procedure). The first step removes
the difficulty of working with distributions, while the randomisation allows us to control the
convergence rate of the overall scheme as \((N,m) \to \infty\) simultaneously. As explained in detail
at the beginning of Section 6, this approach gives us a better convergence rate than the one
we would obtain if we omitted the randomisation procedure and relied upon known (tight)
bounds in Euler-Maruyama schemes for SDEs with bounded measurable drift.

Due to the distributional nature of our drift, the actual numerical implementation of the
scheme is non-trivial and, in particular, the choice of the approximating functions \(b^N\), in the
first step of the algorithm, needs to be addressed carefully. In general, an explicit representa-
tion of \(b\) can be provided in terms of an infinite sum of Haar wavelets (see Appendix A) and
we construct the sequence \((b^N)_{N\geq1}\) by suitably truncating such series representation. The
main reasons for this choice are: (i) these wavelets form a basis for the fractional Sobolev
spaces of negative order which are needed to accommodate the original drift \(b\); (ii) they enjoy
the so-called multi-resolution property, which improves the computational efficiency of the
algorithm (see further details in Section 7); (iii) since Haar wavelets are piecewise constant
functions, their convolution with the heat kernel only requires knowledge of the cumulative
Gaussian distribution, hence requiring no additional computational effort for our randomisa-
tion procedure.

To illustrate the fine intricacies of our numerical scheme, in Section 7 we discuss in detail
the actual implementation of the algorithm when the drift \(b\) is time-homogeneous and has
the same spatial regularity as the distributional derivative of a sample path of a fractional
Brownian motion (this is a canonical example in this context; see, e.g., the examples in [9, 10]).

To the best of our knowledge our work is the first to address numerical methods for a class
of SDEs whose drift is merely a distribution. This advancement on all the existing results
hinges on the concept of virtual solution given by [6], which links the SDE in (1) to a class
of partial differential equations (PDEs) with distributional drift studied in [10]. It is worth
emphasising that our algorithm does not require a numerical solution of the PDE and instead
it deals directly with the SDE in (1). Hence, the methods that we use here can be adopted
to complement/extend the existing studies on numerical schemes for SDEs whose drift is a
function with low regularity.

The literature on Euler-Maruyama approximation of SDEs whose drift is some function with
low regularity is very vast and here we only provide a short overview. Early contributions are
due to Gyöngy and Krylov [7] who obtain convergence in probability for SDEs with continuous
coefficients. A few years later Yan [33] proves weak convergence for SDEs with particular
discontinuities of the coefficients and an \(L^1\)-rate of convergence under the assumption of a
Lipschitz-continuous drift and a Hölder-continuous diffusion coefficient, in a one-dimensional
setting. Also Halidias and Kloeden [8] prove strong convergence in \(L^2\) (but with no rate)
when the coefficients allow certain types of discontinuity.

More recent results include work by Müller-Gronbach and Yaroslavtseva [21], who obtain
an \(L^p\)-rate of 1/2 (for any \(p \geq 1\)) for one-dimensional SDEs with discontinuous drift, and work
by Neuenkirch et al. [23] where analogous results are obtained in a multi-dimensional setting
with respect to an \(L^2\)-norm. Neuenkirch and Szölgyenyi [22] instead find an \(L^2\)-rate of up to
3/4 for one-dimensional diffusions with possibly discontinuous drift (with Sobolev-Slobodeckij
type regularity). Further related results can also be found in Leobacher and Szölgyenyi [17]
where an \(L^2\)-rate of convergence of 1/2 is obtained for (possibly degenerate) multi-dimensional
SDEs. Notice that in [17] the Euler-Maruyama scheme is applied to a process obtained as a
suitable transformation of the solution of the SDE. Similar ideas were also used in another
paper by the same authors [18] to find an \(L^2\)-rate of convergence of 1/4 but, differently
from [17], the convergence in [18] is for the approximation of the original SDE. Numerical
schemes for non-degenerate SDEs with irregular coefficients are also addressed in works by
Ngo and Taguchi [24] (multi-dimensional setting, rate 1/4) and [25] (one-dimensional setting, rate 1/2).

Our approach is close in spirit to the one adopted by Dareiotis and Gerencsér [4], who use the regularising effect of the Brownian noise to obtain a strong convergence rate of 1/2 for multidimensional SDEs with continuous drift and, in the one-dimensional case, for SDEs with bounded drift. We discuss extensively differences between their approach and ours at the beginning of Section 6. Prior to their work, Menoukeu-Pamen and Taguchi [19] had obtained strong rate of convergence in $L^p$ of order $p\beta/2$ for $d$-dimensional SDEs with $\beta$-Hölder continuous coefficients. Finally, we would like also to mention a new approach developed by Butkovsky et al. [2], who use regularisation by noise and a so-called stochastic sewing lemma to obtain convergence rates for SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motion and a convergence rate of 1/2 for SDEs with continuous drift and multiplicative Brownian noise.

There are also numerous results on weak convergence of Euler-Maruyama approximation of SDEs, however a detailed review falls outside the scopes of our paper. For example, when coefficients are smooth, convergence with rate up to 1 was obtained by Bally and Talay [1] (also work by Mikulevicius and Platen [20] contains further results in that direction). In the case of irregular drift, a scheme in two steps is analysed by Kohatsu-Higa et al. [15]. They first regularise the drift of their SDE and then apply Euler-Maruyama scheme to the more regular process and obtain a rate of weak convergence.

We are not aware of any work dealing with numerical schemes for SDEs with distributional coefficients. We note that a direct comparison of the rate we obtain in the case of distributional drift and the rates obtained in the various papers mentioned above is not necessarily meaningful: the methods used in those papers require that the drift be a function and do not allow easy extensions to the distributional case. Our numerical experiments (see Table 1) show an empirical rate which is well below the standard rate of $1/2$ that is attained with bounded drift and additive Brownian noise (see, e.g., [4]) and suggest that it should be possible to further improve on the theoretical convergence rate that we obtain, hence opening the door to further research in this direction. Finally, it is worth noticing that our results also apply to SDEs with drift in $L^p$-spaces with $p \in (1, \infty)$ (Remark 3.6) for which no rate is known yet.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2.1 we introduce the necessary notation, including the fractional Sobolev spaces of negative order that our drift belongs to. Then in Section 2.2 we introduce the numerical scheme. In Section 3 we present the main results of the paper, whose proofs are then provided in Sections 5 and 6. Background material on SDEs with distributional drift, which is needed to understand our arguments of proof, is presented in Section 4. Section 7 is devoted to implementing our numerical scheme for an example of drift $b$ that has the same regularity as the distributional derivative of one path of a fractional Brownian motion. The paper is completed by two technical appendices that account for important properties of Haar wavelets and their use in the simulation of a fractional Brownian motion and of its sample-path’s derivative (in distributional sense).

2. Setting and numerical scheme

2.1. Notation. Here we introduce the functional analytic framework needed for the well-posedness of equation (1). Throughout the paper we will use $\nabla$ and $\Delta$ for the spatial gradient and Laplacian of a function, respectively, and $\partial_t$ for its partial derivative with respect to time.

For any Banach space $(B, \| \cdot \|_B)$ we denote by $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; B)$ the space of $B$-valued continuous functions of time. This is again a Banach space when endowed with the norm $\| f \|_{\infty, B} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \| f(t) \|_B$. For future reference we also introduce on $\mathcal{C}([0, T]; B)$ the family
of equivalent norms
\[
\|f\|_{\infty,B}^{(\rho)} := \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-\rho t} \|f(t)\|_B, \quad \text{for } \rho \geq 0.
\]

For \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\) we introduce the subspace \(C^\alpha([0, T]; B)\) of functions \(f \in C([0, T]; B)\) such that
\[
[f]_{\alpha,B} := \sup_{s \neq t \in [0, T]} \frac{\|f(t) - f(s)\|_B}{|t - s|^\alpha} < \infty.
\]
This is also a Banach space when endowed with the norm \(\|f\|_{\alpha,B} = \|f\|_{\infty,B} + [f]_{\alpha,B}\).

For \(1 \leq r \leq \infty\) we have the usual \(L^r(\mathbb{R})\)-spaces endowed with the norms \(\|\cdot\|_{L^r}\) and we use the short-hand notation \(L^r\). We denote by \(C^{0,0}(\mathbb{R})\) and \(C^{1,0}(\mathbb{R})\) the closure of the space \(S(\mathbb{R})\) of Schwartz functions with respect to the norms \(\|f\|_{L^\infty}\) and \(\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty}\), respectively. For simplicity of notation we just write \(C^{0,0}\) and \(C^{1,0}\). Further, we define the space of continuous functions (respectively, continuously differentiable functions) which are \(\alpha\)-Hölder continuous (respectively, with \(\alpha\)-Hölder continuous first derivatives) for \(0 < \alpha < 1\), that is the spaces
\[
C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) := \{ f \in C^{0,0}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} < \infty \},
\]
\[
C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) := \{ f \in C^{1,0}(\mathbb{R}) \mid \|f\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} < \infty \},
\]
where the norms are defined as
\[
\|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} := \|f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha},
\]
\[
\|f\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} := \|f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}.
\]
For simplicity of notation we write \(C^{0,\alpha}\) and \(C^{1,\alpha}\) instead of \(C^{0,0}(\mathbb{R})\) and \(C^{1,0}(\mathbb{R})\), respectively.

For all \(s \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(r \in (1, \infty)\) we denote by \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R})\) the fractional Sobolev spaces (or Bessel-potential spaces) defined as the image of \(L^r(\mathbb{R})\) through fractional powers of \(A := I - \frac{1}{2} \Delta\), i.e., \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) := A^{-s/2}(L^r(\mathbb{R}))\). For more details on fractional powers of \(A\) see [31, Remark 1.2]. These spaces are Banach spaces when equipped with the norm
\[
\|f\|_{H^s_r(\mathbb{R})} := \|A^{s/2}f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R})},
\]
and \(A^{s/2}\) is an isomorphism from \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R})\) to \(H^{-s}_r(\mathbb{R})\) for all \(s \in \mathbb{R}\), see again [31]. We observe that if \(s < 0\) then \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R})\) does actually contain distributions, while when \(s \geq 0\) it only contains (measurable) functions. For \(s = 0\) we have the special case \(H^0_r(\mathbb{R}) = L^r(\mathbb{R})\). These spaces enjoy the following inclusion property: for \(1 < r \leq u < \infty\) and \(-\infty < t \leq s < \infty\) such that \(s - \frac{1}{r} \geq t - \frac{1}{u}\) we have
\[
H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \subset H^t_u(\mathbb{R})
\]
(see [29, Theorem 2.8.1]) and, in particular, \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \subset H^{s-q}_r(\mathbb{R})\) for \(\nu > 0\). Setting \(H^s_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}) := H^s_p(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^s_q(\mathbb{R})\), by interpolation we have that if \(f \in H^s_{p,q}(\mathbb{R})\) then \(f\) is an element of all spaces \(H^s_r(\mathbb{R})\) for \(p \wedge q < r < p \vee q\). For simplicity we will use \(H^s_r\) for the space \(H^s_{p,q}\) and, analogously, we denote the associated norm by \(\|\cdot\|_{H^s_r}\).

We denote by \((P_t)_{t \geq 0}\) the (killed) heat semigroup on \(L^r\) generated by \(-A\), that is, the semigroup with kernel \(p(t, x) = e^{-t(2\pi t)^{-1/2}} \exp\{-\frac{x^2}{2t}\}\). This is a bounded analytic semigroup and \(D(A^{s/2}) = H^s_r\) for \(s \in \mathbb{R}\), see [12, 28] for details. Moreover for all \(t > 0\) and all \(s \in \mathbb{R}\) the operator \(P_t\) maps \(H^s_r\) into itself and, furthermore, for any \(f \in H^{-s}_r\) and for any \(\varepsilon > 0\) there is a constant \(c = c_\varepsilon > 0\) such that
\[
\|P_t f\|_{H^{-s}_r} \leq \|f\|_{H^{-s}_r},
\]
\[
\|P_t f - f\|_{H^{-s}_{r+(s+\varepsilon)}} \leq c t^{\varepsilon/2}\|f\|_{H^{-s}_r}.
\]
These bounds can be obtained (as in, e.g., [13]) using the following facts: (i) $P_t$ is a contraction on $L^r$, (ii) for $s > 0$ the operators $A^{s/2}$ and $P_t$ commute by [26, Theorem II.6.13] and (iii) $A^{s/2}$ is an isomorphism as mentioned above. For more details, see the footnote\(^1\).

We will also need estimates for the $L^\infty$-norm of $P_t f$ and of its gradient. To get those estimates, we use the fractional Morrey inequality ([28, Theorem 2.8.1, Remark 2]) which guarantees the embeddings
\[
H^{\nu}_r(\mathbb{R}) \subset C^{0,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad H^{1+\nu}_r(\mathbb{R}) \subset C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}),
\]
if $\alpha := \nu - 1/r > 0$. Then, using arguments similar to those for [5], combined with fractional Morrey inequality, one obtains that for all $f \in H^{-s}_r$, $t \in (0, T]$ and $\nu > 1/r$ we have
\[
\|P_t f\|_{L^\infty} \leq c t^{-(s+\nu)/2}\|f\|_{H^{-s}_r},
\]
\[
\|\nabla (P_t f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq c t^{-(1+\nu)/2}\|f\|_{H^{-s}_r},
\]
where $c > 0$ varies from line to line and depends on $T$. For more details, see the footnote\(^2\).

2.2. Description of the scheme. Our numerical scheme for [1] is based on two subsequent approximations and a randomisation procedure. In order to justify pointwise evaluation of the distributional coefficient $b$, we approximate it by a sequence of bounded functions $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ that converges to $b$ in a suitable norm (see Assumption 2). We further mollify the sequence $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ by convolution with the (killed) heat kernel and then we apply a generalised Euler-Maruyama scheme. The mollification can be interpreted as a randomisation procedure in space and it allows us to obtain a uniform rate of convergence for the overall scheme (see the discussion at the beginning of Section 3).

To fix notation, let us consider a bounded measurable function $b^N : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and fix a constant $\eta_N > 0$. Then the SDE
\[
dX_t^N = (P_{\eta_N} b^N)(t, X_t^N) \, dt + dW_t, \quad X_0^N = x,
\]
admits a unique strong solution. Note that in [8] we slightly abuse the notation, because the solution $X^N$ depends both on $N$ and $\eta_N$ but we only indicate the dependence on $N$. Here and in what follows we always consider $\eta_N \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let us consider an equally-spaced partition of $[0, T]$ by setting $t_k := \frac{kt}{m}$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m$. Further, let us define
\[
k(t) := \sup\{k : t_k \leq t\}.
\]
Then the Euler-Maruyama approximation of the solution $X^N$ is given by
\[
X_t^{N,m} = x + \int_{0}^{t} (P_{\eta_N} b^N)(t_k(s), X_{t_k(s)}^{N,m}) \, ds + W_t,
\]

\(^1\)To show that $P_t$ is a contraction on $H^{-s}_r$ for $s > 0$ we write $\|P_t f\|_{H^{-s}_r} = A^{-s/2} P_t A^{-s/2} f \|_{L^r}$ and since $A^{-s/2} f \in L^r(\mathbb{R})$ we get $\|P_t A^{-s/2} f\|_{L^r} \leq \|A^{-s/2} f\|_{L^r} = \|f\|_{H^{-s}_r}$. To prove it is a contraction for $H^s_r$ the idea is the same but we write $P_t f = A^{-s/2} A^{s/2} P_t f$. To show the second equation in [5] we proceed with similar ideas and use the fact that $\|P_t g - g\|_{L^r} \leq c t^{s/2}\|A^{s/2} g\|_{L^r}$ if $g \in D(A^{s/2})$, from [28, Theorem II.6.13]. For $f \in H^{-s}_r$ we choose $g = A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2} f$ and we get $\|P_t f - f\|_{H^{1+\epsilon}_r} = \|A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2}(P_t f - f)\|_{L^r}$ and since $A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2} f \in L^r(\mathbb{R})$ we get $\|P_t A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2} f - A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2} f\|_{L^r} \leq c t^{\epsilon/2}\|A^{-(s+\epsilon)/2} f\|_{L^r} = c t^{\epsilon/2}\|f\|_{H^{-s}_r}$.

\(^2\)By [28, Theorem II.6.13], for $t \in (0, T)$, $\nu > 0$ and $g \in L^r$ we have that $\|A^{\nu/2} P_t g\|_{L^r} \leq c^{t-\nu/2}\|g\|_{L^r}$. Then choosing $\alpha = \nu + s$ and $g = A^{s/2} f$ we get $\|P_t f\|_{H^\nu} = \|A^{s/2} P_t f\|_{L^r} = \|A^{\nu/2} P_t A^{s/2} f\|_{L^r} \leq c t^{(s+\nu)/2}\|f\|_{H^{-s}_r}$.

Now if $\nu > 1/r$ we can use fractional Morrey inequality and since $\|P_t f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|P_t f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq \|P_t f\|_{H^\nu}$ we conclude. Similarly for the second bound in [7], simply replace $\nu$ by $1 + \nu$ and use $\|\nabla P_t f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|P_t f\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq \|P_t f\|_{H^{1+\nu}}$ to conclude.
and it is computed numerically according to
\[ X_t^{N,m} = X_{t_k(t)}^{N,m} + (P_{\eta_N} b^N_0(t_k(t), X_{t_{k-1}}^{N,m}))((t - t_k(t)) + \sqrt{t - t_k(t)} \, \varepsilon_k), \]
with \((\varepsilon_k)_k\) i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables.

In general, the numerical implementation of the scheme is more complicated than a standard Euler scheme since the mollified drift \(P_{\eta_N} b^N_0\) may not be easily computable. However, we choose \(b_0\) as a finite linear combination (with time-dependent coefficients) of Haar wavelets, which are piecewise constant functions with a very simple structure. Haar wavelets are convenient because they form an unconditional Schauder basis for the space \(H^s\) for \(-1/2 < s < 1/2\) and \(P_{\eta_N} b^N_0\) reduces to a finite sum of terms of the form
\[ (P_{\eta_N} 1_{[x_1,x_2]})(x) = e^{-\eta_N} \Phi((x_2 - x)\eta_N^{-1/2}) - e^{-\eta_N} \Phi((x_1 - x)\eta_N^{-1/2}), \]
where \(\Phi\) is the cumulative distribution of a standard normal and \(x_1 < x_2\) are suitable real numbers (see Appendix A for details and Figure 1 for an illustration of a Haar wavelet). This procedure introduces no additional numerical complication and suggests that Haar wavelets are a natural candidate for a numerical implementation of the scheme.

**3. Main theoretical results**

The main theoretical result of the paper, given in Theorem 3.5, states a rate of convergence of the numerical scheme in an \(L^1\)-norm. To prove this result, we first find the rate of convergence of \(X^N_t\) to \(X_t\) in terms of the rate of convergence of \(b^N_0\) to \(b\) (Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.3). Then, for fixed \(N\), we obtain the rate of convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme (Proposition 3.4). Finally, combining the two we obtain a global rate of convergence for the scheme (Theorem 3.5).

Let us start by introducing the main assumptions on \(b\) and \(b^N_0\) which are needed for the results of this section.

**Assumption 1.** Let \(\beta_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{4})\) and \(\eta_0 \in (4, \frac{1}{\beta_0})\) and fix \(\tilde{\eta}_0 := (1 - \beta_0)^{-1}\). For some \(\kappa \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)\) we take \(b \in C^\kappa([0,T]; H^{-\beta_0}_{\tilde{\eta}_0,\eta_0})\).

Notice in particular that \(b \in C^\kappa([0,T]; H^{-\beta_0}_{\tilde{\eta}_0,\eta_0})\) by interpolation, since \(1 < \tilde{\eta}_0 < 4/3\). For future reference we also set \(\gamma_0 := 1 - \beta_0 - \frac{1}{\tilde{\eta}_0}\) and notice that under Assumption 1 we have \(\gamma_0 > \frac{1}{2}\).

**Assumption 2.** Let \((b^N_0)_{N \geq 1} \subset C^\frac{1}{2}([0,T]; H^{-\beta_0}_{\eta_0,\eta_0})\) be such that
\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} b^N_0 = b \quad \text{in} \quad C^\frac{1}{2}([0,T]; H^{-\beta_0}_{\eta_0,\eta_0}).
\]
The rate of convergence of $X^N$ to $X$ is given in the next proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let Assumptions [2] and [3] hold. Take any $(\beta, q)$ such that $\beta \in (\beta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $q_0 \geq q > \hat{q} \geq \hat{q}_0$, where $\hat{q} := (1 - \beta)^{-1}$. Then, for any $1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ there is a constant $C_\gamma > 0$ such that

\[
(11) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left| X_t^N - X_t \right| \leq C_\gamma \| P_{\eta_N} b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}}^{-\beta}}^2
\]

as $N \to \infty$.

The proof of this result builds on a number of lemmas and we give it in Section 5 (the constant $C_\gamma > 0$ is found explicitly). It is worth noticing that on the right-hand side of (11) we use the $H_{\hat{q}}^{-\beta}$-norm with $(\beta, q)$ possibly different from $(\beta_0, q_0)$. The reasons for this will become clear later (see in particular Proposition 3.3) and in the next remark we show that the right-hand side of (11) is well-defined.

**Remark 3.2.** Let us fix $(\beta_0, q_0)$ according to Assumption [2] and let us pick $(\beta, q)$ such that $\beta \in (\beta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $q_0 \geq q > \hat{q} \geq \hat{q}_0$, where $\hat{q} := (1 - \beta)^{-1}$. This is always possible thanks to Assumption [2] and, as a special case, we can pick $q = 2$ as needed in Proposition 3.3 below. In this setting:

(i) The embedding $H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta} \subset H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$ holds. Indeed $H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta} \subset H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$ by embedding of Sobolev spaces of negative order, see [4], and we also have $H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta} \subset H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$ by interpolation of $L^p$-spaces. Combining the above we have

$b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}) \subset C^\kappa([0, T]; H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta})$

and, in particular, $b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta})$. Thanks to [5] also $P_{\eta_N} b$ belongs to the same space as $b$. Similarly, $b^N, P_{\eta_N} b^N \in C^\kappa([0, T]; H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^0)$.

(ii) For $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ as in Assumption [2] we have $P_{\eta_N} b^N \to b$ in $C([0, T]; H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta})$ as $N \to \infty$. Indeed, $b, P_{\eta_N} b$ and $P_{\eta_N} b^N$ belong to $H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$ due to the item above and, thanks to [5], we have

\[
\| P_{\eta_N} b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}} \leq \| P_{\eta_N} (b^N - b) \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}} + \| P_{\eta_N} b - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}}
\]

\[
\leq \| b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}} + \| P_{\eta_N} b - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}}
\]

\[
\leq \| b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}} + c \eta_N^{\frac{\beta - \beta_0}{2}} \| b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}}.
\]

If $\beta > \beta_0$, the last term clearly goes to zero as $\eta_N \to 0$. Moreover, since $-\beta_0 - \frac{1}{q_0} \geq -\beta - \frac{1}{\hat{q}}$ by assumption, using [4] we have $H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta_0} \subset H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$. Hence

\[
\| b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}} \leq c \| b^N - b \|_{2\gamma - 1, H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta_0}} \to 0 \quad \text{as } N \to \infty.
\]

In order to obtain a convergence rate in our scheme as we let $(N, m) \to \infty$ simultaneously we need to write the right-hand side of (11) explicitly in terms of $N$. For that we define a specific sequence $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ that satisfies Assumption [2]. In particular, the approximating sequence $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ is defined via a suitable truncation of the series expansion of $b$ in Haar wavelets. Let

$$\{h_{j, m}, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

be a system of Haar wavelets on $\mathbb{R}$ (Definition A.1). Since $b(t) \in H_{\hat{q}_0 \hat{q}_0}^{-\beta}$ for any $\beta \in (\beta_0, \frac{1}{2})$, $q \in [\hat{q}_0, q_0]$ and all $t \in [0, T]$, by Remark 3.2 part (i), then we have (see [31] Theorem 2.9) or
\( \| \mu(t; \beta, q) \| f_{q, 2} \| = \left[ \int_\mathbb{R} \left( \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta, q)|^{2j} 1_{[2^{-j}, 2^{j} - 1)(m+1)]}(x) \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} dx \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \)

We note that if \( q = 2 \) the expression above simplifies to

\[
\| \mu(t; \beta, 2) \| f_{2, 2} = \left[ \int_\mathbb{R} \left( \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta, 2)|^{2j} 1_{[2^{-j}, 2^{j} - 1)(m+1)]}(x) \right) dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

We have

\[
\int_\mathbb{R} \left( \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta, 2)|^{2j} 1_{[2^{-j}, 2^{j} - 1)(m+1)]}(x) \right) dx = \left[ \sum_{j=-1}^{\infty} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta, 2)|^{2j} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

where we can swap the sums and the integral by monotone convergence.

Since the norms are equivalent for all \( t \in [0, T] \) then

\[
\| b \|_{\infty, H_{q}^{\beta}} < \infty \iff \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \mu(t; \beta, q) \| f_{q, 2} < \infty.
\]
Thanks to the above and \cite{13} it is immediate to see that \( \| b_N(t) - b(t) \|_{H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}} \) decreases to zero as \( N \to \infty \). Moreover \( t \mapsto \| b_N(t) - b(t) \|_{H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}} \) is continuous and therefore by Dini’s theorem \( b_N \to b \) in \( \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}) \) as \( N \to \infty \). Since \( (b_N)^{N \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}) \) and

\[
\lim_{N \to \infty} \left( \sup_{t, s \in [0, T]} \| b_N(t) - b_N(s) \|_{H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}} \right) = \sup_{t, s \in [0, T]} \| b(t) - b(s) \|_{H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}} \leq [b], \quad \kappa, H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}, \delta \kappa,
\]

then \( (b_N)^{N \geq 1} \) is also a bounded subset of \( \mathcal{C}([0, T]; H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}) \). Recalling that \( \kappa \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \) we can conclude that \( b_N \to b \) in \( \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}) \) as \( N \to \infty \) since the embedding \( \mathcal{C}^1 \subset \mathcal{C}^\kappa \) is compact. Hence, \( (b_N)^{N \geq 1} \) satisfies Assumption 2.

It remains to prove \eqref{15}. For \( q = 2 \), using \eqref{17}, \eqref{14} and the fact that \( j \geq N + 1 \) in the sum we have

\[
\| b_N(t) - b(t) \|^2_{H^{-\beta}_2} \leq c \sum_{j > N} \sum_{|m| > 2j} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta, 2)|^2
\]

\[
\leq c 2^{-(N+1)(\beta - \beta_0)} \sum_{j > N} \sum_{|m| > 2j} |\mu_{j,m}(t; \beta_0, 2)|^2
\]

\[
\leq c 2^{-(N+1)(\beta - \beta_0)} \| \mathbf{\mu}(t; \beta_0, 2) \|_{L^2}^2.
\]

Taking supremum over \( t \in [0, T] \) and recalling \eqref{18} we conclude.

Since the drift in the SDE for \( X^N \) is Lipschitz in space and \( 1/2 \)-Hölder continuous in time we expect a standard strong convergence rate of \( 1/2 \) for the Euler-Maruyama scheme. This is confirmed in the next proposition where, however, we are particularly interested in the dependence of the multiplicative constants on \( N \). By controlling those constants, later on, we will establish an overall rate of convergence for the scheme as we let \( (N, m) \to \infty \) at the same time.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let Assumption \ref{1} hold and let \( b_N \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T]; H^{-\beta}_{\theta_0}) \) for some fixed \( N \). Then, as \( m \to \infty \), we have

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X^N_t - X^m_t|^2 \right] \leq C_2(N) m^{-1} + C_3(N) m^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\]

with

\[
C_2(N) := c \| P_{\eta_N} b_N \|_{\infty, L^\infty} \left( 1 + \| \nabla (P_{\eta_N} b_N) \|_{\infty, L^\infty} \right),
\]

\[
C_3(N) := c' \left( \| \nabla (P_{\eta_N} b_N) \|_{\infty, L^\infty} + \| P_{\eta_N} b_N \|_{\frac{1}{2}, L^\infty} \right)
\]

and \( c, c' > 0 \) constants independent of \( (N, m) \).

The proof of the proposition is given in Section \ref{6}.

Combining the results above we obtain the full convergence result, that summarises the theoretical findings in the paper.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let Assumption \ref{1} hold, let \( (b_N)^{N \geq 1} \) be defined as in \eqref{13} (so that Assumption \ref{2} holds too) and let \( \theta_* := \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{3}{4} - \beta_0(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) \right]^{-1} \). Then, as \( m \to \infty \), taking \( \eta_N = m^{-\theta_*} \) and \( N = 2\theta^4 \log_2 m \) we have

\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X^N_t - X_t|^2 \right] \leq c \left( m^{-\theta_* \left( \frac{1}{4} - \beta_0 \left( \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \varepsilon \right)} \right),
\]

where \( \varepsilon > 0 \) can be arbitrarily small and \( c > 0 \) is a constant depending on \( \varepsilon \).
Before proving the theorem, we offer some basic insight into the meaning of the rate in (21) (in Figure 2 we also plot two examples).

**Remark 3.6.**

- If \( q_0 \approx 1/\beta_0 \), which is the largest possible \( q_0 \), then the rate decreases as \( \beta_0 \) increases, and the best rate is obtained when \( \beta_0 \) is close to zero. The rate is illustrated in Figure 2a as a function of \( \beta_0 \in (0, 1/4) \).
- For \( \beta_0 \approx 0 \) we have \( q_0 \approx 1 \) and we can pick any \( 4 < q_0 < \infty \). Then we obtain a convergence rate for SDEs with drift in \( C^{\kappa}([0, T]; L^1 \cap L^{q_0}) \) for \( \kappa > 1/2 \). The rate is illustrated in Figure 2b as a function of \( q_0 > 4 \). While existence of strong solutions for SDEs with drift in \( L^p([0, T]; L^q) \)-spaces was obtained in [16], we are not aware of convergence rates results for numerical schemes if \( b \in C^{\kappa}([0, T]; L^{q_0}) \) and \( 1 < q_0 < \infty \).
- In the extreme case when \( \beta_0 \approx 0 \) and \( q_0 \to \infty \) (i.e. \( b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; L^1 \cap L^\infty) \) with \( \kappa > 1/2 \)) we obtain a convergence rate of \( m^{-1/6} \). However, if we assumed \( b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; L^\infty) \) from the start, we would have been able to obtain a better rate from the Euler-Maruyama scheme using ideas from [4] (notice though that the constants in [4, Lemma 2.2] depend exponentially on \( \|b\|_{L^\infty} \)). The approach we take in Section 6 allows us to avoid that the constants in Proposition 3.4 depend exponentially on the \( L^\infty \)-norm of \( b^N \), which is essential when \( b \) is a distribution. Clearly, if \( b \in C^{\kappa}([0, T]; L^\infty) \) that caution is no longer needed.

**Proof of Theorem 3.5.** Fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and let \( c_\varepsilon > 0 \) be a constant that may vary from line to line, possibly depending on \( \|b\|_{L^\infty, H^{0, -\beta_0}} \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) but independent of \( N \) and \( m \). In the rest of this proof we will use Proposition 3.1 with \( \gamma = \gamma_0 - 1/2\varepsilon \) so that the constant \( C_\gamma \) is absorbed in \( c_\varepsilon > 0 \).

Using triangular inequality, (11) from Proposition 3.1 (with \( q = 2 \)) and (19) from Proposition 3.4 we obtain

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ |X_{t,m}^N - X_t| \right] 
\leq c_\varepsilon \left( \|P_{\eta_N}(b^N - b)\|_{L^{2\gamma_0-1-\varepsilon}}^{2\gamma_0-1-\varepsilon} + \|P_{\eta_N} b - b\|_{L^{2\gamma_0-1-\varepsilon}}^{2\gamma_0-1-\varepsilon} + C_2(N)m^{-1} + C_3(N)m^{-1/2} \right).
\]
The $L^\infty$-norms appearing in the constants $C_2(N)$ and $C_3(N)$ in (20) can be estimated further by using (7). Recall that $(b^N)_{N \geq 1}$ fulfils Assumptions 2 thanks to Proposition 3.3. The most favourable estimates in (7) are obtained for $r = q_0$, $s = \beta_0$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{\gamma_0} + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small. Then, we have
\[
\|P_{\eta_N} b^N\|_{\infty, L^\infty} \leq c \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(\beta_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma_0} + \varepsilon)} \|b^N\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta_0}} \leq c \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(2\gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} \|b\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta_0}},
\]
(23) \[
\|\nabla(P_{\eta_N} b^N)\|_{\infty, L^\infty} \leq c \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\beta_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma_0} + \varepsilon)} \|b^N\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta_0}} \leq c \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(2\gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} \|b\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta_0}},
\]
where the final inequality in each of the above expressions follows from the convergence $\lim_{N \to \infty} b^N = b$ in $\mathcal{C}^2([0, T]; \mathcal{H}_{\beta_0})$ and we used $\beta_0 + 1/q_0 = 1 - \gamma_0$ and $1 + \beta_0 + 1/q_0 = 2 - \gamma_0$.

Using also (5) to bound the first two terms on the right-hand side of (22) (where $\varepsilon$ may change from line to line) we have
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_t^{N,m} - X_t| \right] \leq c_\varepsilon \left( \|b^N - b\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta}}^{2\gamma_0 - 1 - \varepsilon} + \eta_N^{(\beta - \beta_0)(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) - \varepsilon} + \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(3 - 2\gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} m^{-1} + \eta_N^{-\frac{1}{2}(2\gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right),
\]
(24) where for the final two terms we selected the leading order in $\eta_N$ by using that $\eta_N \in (0, 1)$, with no loss of generality, and $1 + \beta_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \geq 2(\beta_0 + \frac{1}{\gamma_0})$, since $\beta_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Thanks to Proposition 3.3 and abusing slightly the notation by letting $\varepsilon > 0$ vary from the first to the second inequality, we have
\[
\|b^N - b\|_{\infty, \mathcal{H}_{\beta}}^{2\gamma_0 - 1 - \varepsilon} \leq c 2^{-(N+1)(\beta - \beta_0)(2\gamma_0 - 1 - \varepsilon)} \leq c 2^{-N \frac{3}{4}(\beta - \beta_0)(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) + \varepsilon}. 
\]
(25) The aim is to let $N$ and $m$ diverge to infinity and $\eta_N \to 0$ at the same time. In order to do so we choose suitable $N$ and $\eta_N$ depending on $m$. Take $\eta_N = m^{-\theta}$ for some $\theta > 0$ to be determined. The last three terms in (24) read
\[
m^{-\theta(\beta - \beta_0)(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) + \varepsilon} + m^{-1 + \frac{1}{2}\theta(3 - 2\gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} + m^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\theta(2 - \gamma_0 + \varepsilon)}
\]
(26) and, as $m \to \infty$, the leading terms are the first and last one. By comparing (25) and (24) we notice that there is no loss of generality in choosing $N = 2\theta \log_2 m$. Finally, plugging (25) and (26) back into (24), ignoring terms of lower order in $m$, we obtain
\[
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_t^{N,m} - X_t| \right] \leq c_\varepsilon \left(m^{-\theta(\beta - \beta_0)(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) + \varepsilon} + m^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\theta(2 - \gamma_0 + \varepsilon)} \right) \leq c_\varepsilon \left(m^{-\theta(\frac{3}{4} - \beta_0)(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) + \varepsilon} + m^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\theta(2 - \gamma_0) + \varepsilon} \right),
\]
where for the second inequality we have chosen the best possible $\beta$, which is just below $\frac{1}{2}$, and with a slight abuse of notation we have allowed $\varepsilon$ to vary from line to line. It remains to select $\theta > 0$ that gives the fastest convergence rate. Notice that the first term on the right-hand side of the expression above is decreasing in $\theta$ whereas the second one is increasing. Then the optimum is attained when the exponents are equal and we get
\[
\theta_* = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{3}{4} - \beta_0(\gamma_0 - \frac{1}{2}) \right]^{-1},
\]
as claimed. \qed
Remark 3.7. Our numerical experiments in Figure 7 and Table 4 (see Section 7) show a convergence rate of the scheme which is better than the theoretical one we obtain in Theorem 3.3. It is however important to emphasise that the rate observed numerically is lower than the usual m−1/2 expected from Euler scheme with smoother drift.

4. Background material on virtual solutions

As anticipated, the proofs of Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.4 rely upon a few technical lemmas. To set out clearly our arguments and keep the exposition self-contained it is convenient to review and complement some results from [6].

We will work in the framework of [6] but we restrict our attention to [0, T] × R rather than working with [0, T] × R^d as in the original paper. Throughout this section we make the following standing assumption.

Assumption 3. Let β ∈ (0, 1), fix  p := \frac{1}{1−β} and let q ∈ (\frac{p}{\beta}, \frac{1}{β}). We take b ∈ C([0, T]; H^{−β}_{p,q}).

Notice that Assumption 3 is implied by Assumption 1 (with (β_0, q_0) instead of (β, q) and q > 4). It was shown in [6, Theorem 28] that under Assumption 3 for every x ∈ R there exists a unique in law virtual solution of (1). A virtual solution of (1) is given in terms of a stochastic basis (Ω, F, F, P, W) and an F-adapted, continuous stochastic process X := (X_t)_{t ∈ [0, T]} (shortened as (X, F)) such that the integral equation

(27) \quad X_t = x + u(0, x) − u(t, X_t) + (λ + 1) \int_0^t u(s, X_s)ds

holds for all t ∈ [0, T], with probability one. Here u is the mild solution of the following parabolic Kolmogorov-type PDE

(28) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \Delta u + b \nabla u − (λ + 1)u = −b & \text{on } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \\ u(T) = 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R} \end{cases}

with λ > 0. The mild solution u is unique in C([0, T]; H^{1+δ}_p), for any (δ, p) ∈ K(β, q), where the set K(β, q) is defined as

(29) \quad K(β, q) := \{ (δ, p) \mid β < δ < 1 − β, \ \frac{1}{β} < p < q \}.

The set K(β, q) is drawn in Figure 3 for the reader’s convenience and it is not empty thanks to Assumption 3. Notice that the stochastic integral that appears in (27) is well-defined thanks to fractional Morrey’s inequality [6].

Remark 4.1 (Uniqueness). We remark that, thanks to the shape of K(β, q) and to the embedding [1], given two couples (δ_1, p_1), (δ_2, p_2) ∈ K(β, q), it is always possible to find (δ, p) ∈ K(β, q) such that H^{1+δ_1}_{p_1} ⊂ H^{1+δ}_{p} and H^{1+δ_2}_{p_2} ⊂ H^{1+δ}_{p}, see Figure 3. Since the solution u to (28) is unique in the space H^{1+δ}_{p}, it follows that it must coincide with the solutions found in the spaces H^{1+δ_1}_{p_1} and H^{1+δ_2}_{p_2}. Hence, the solution of (28) is unique in the whole triangle K(β, q).

It is worth noticing that the concept of virtual solution follows a Zvonkin-type transformation based on heuristic application of Itô’s formula to u(t, X_t). This allows to replace the drift term b(t, X_t)dt in (1) with the terms in (27) depending on u and ∇u. The reader might have noticed that the PDE (28) and the virtual SDE (27) depend on an extra parameter λ, while the original SDE (1) does not. This is due to a technical step in the proof, that leads to
Figure 3. An illustration of the set $K(\beta, q)$ (figure modified from [6]).

Given an admissible couple $(\beta, q)$, there exists a unique mild solution $u \in C([0, T]; H_p^{1+\delta})$ for the PDE (28), for all $(\delta, p)$ in the grey triangle. For any two points $(\delta_1, p_1), (\delta_2, p_2) \in K(\beta, q)$, it is always possible to find $(\delta, p) \in K(\beta, q)$ such that $H_p^{1+\delta_1} \subset H_p^{1+\delta}$ and $H_p^{1+\delta_2} \subset H_p^{1+\delta}$, see dotted lines for embeddings.

good properties of $u$. However, it is possible to show that the virtual solution is independent of $\lambda$, as shown in [6, Section 3.3].

For the numerical scheme illustrated in Section 2.2 we also need to consider the approximating PDE

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_t u_N + \frac{1}{2} \Delta u_N + a_N \nabla u_N - (\lambda + 1) u_N &= -a_N & & \text{on } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \\
 u_N(T) &= 0 & & \text{on } \mathbb{R},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a_N := P_{\eta_N} b^N$, for each $N \geq 1$.

We will now review the arguments that guarantee existence, uniqueness and regularity of the solutions to (28) and (30). Under Assumption 3 and for $(\delta, p) \in K(\beta, q)$, [6, Theorem 14] guarantees that for each $\lambda > 0$ there exists a unique solution $u_\lambda \in C([0, T]; H_p^{1+\delta})$ to (28). Since the time derivative and the second spatial derivative of $u_\lambda$ are not well defined, $u_\lambda$ is a so-called mild solution (for details see, e.g., [10]), and it is obtained as a fixed point in the space $C([0, T]; H_p^{1+\delta})$ equipped with the norm $\| \cdot \|_{\infty, H_p^{1+\delta}}$, with $\rho > \lambda$ sufficiently large. Using fractional Morrey’s inequality [6] it is possible to embed the fractional Sobolev space $H_p^{1+\delta}$ in smoother spaces. In particular we have

$$
u_\lambda \in C([0, T]; C^{1,\gamma}), \quad \text{with } \gamma = \delta - 1/p.
$$

Analogously, (30) admits a unique solution $u_\lambda^N \in C([0, T]; H_p^{1+\delta})$ (regularity of $u_\lambda^N$ could of course be upgraded to $C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}) \cap C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$ by virtue of higher regularity of $a_N$ but this will not be needed for our purposes).

Next, [6, Lemma 20] gives useful bounds for the gradient of $u_\lambda$ and $u_\lambda^N$. We give a statement which is adapted to our notation:

**Lemma 4.2.** Let $(\delta, p) \in K(\beta, q)$. There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that, given any $\lambda > \lambda_0$, letting $u = u_\lambda$ and $u^N = u_\lambda^N$ be the mild solutions in $C([0, T]; H_p^{1+\delta})$ to the corresponding problems

---

3We note that there is a typo in the statement of [6, Lemma 20]. Indeed it can be easily checked from the proof that the condition $\rho < \lambda$ is not needed therein.
Remark 4.4. Notice that in Lemma 4.2 we can choose \( \rho > 0 \) large enough so that the denominator is positive.

Lemma 4.3. Let \((\delta, p) \in K(\beta, q)\) and let \( u = u_\lambda \) and \( u^N = u_\lambda^N \) be the mild solutions in \( C([0,T]; H_\delta^{1+\delta}) \) to (28) and (30), respectively. Then, if \( a^N \to b \) in \( C([0,T]; H_q^{-\beta}) \), there is a constant \( c_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
\|u - u^N\|_{\infty, H_\delta^{1+\delta}} \leq c_0 \left( \|u\|_{\infty, H_\delta^{1+\delta}} + 1 \right) \rho^\frac{\delta + \beta - 1}{2} + \lambda \rho^{-1} \|b - a^N\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}},
\]

for any \( \rho > \lambda \) that is sufficiently large to guarantee that the denominator above is positive.

For future reference we define

\[
c(\rho) := \frac{c_0 \left( \|u\|_{\infty, H_\delta^{1+\delta}} + 1 \right) \rho^\frac{\delta + \beta - 1}{2} + \lambda \rho^{-1}}{1 - c_0 \left( \|b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} \rho^\frac{\delta + \beta - 1}{2} + \lambda \rho^{-1} \right)},
\]

for \( \rho > 0 \) large enough so that the denominator is positive.

Remark 4.4. Notice that in Lemma 4.2 we can choose \( N \geq N_0 \), sufficiently large, so that \( \lambda_0 \) depends only on \( \delta, \beta \) and \( \|b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} \), because \( a^N \to b \) in \( C([0,T]; H_q^{-\beta}) \). Then, in Lemma 4.3 we can choose \( \rho > \rho_0 \) so that the denominator in (34) is positive and \( \rho_0 > \lambda_0 \) (as needed for the fixed point in [6] Theorem 14).

From now on we will simplify our notation and set \( u = u_\lambda \), for some \( \lambda \) sufficiently large so that Lemma 4.2 holds. In order to solve equation (27) and find a virtual solution of (1), one has to transform the SDE (27) into a more standard one. This is achieved by setting \( Y_t := \varphi(t, X_t) \), where

\[
\varphi(t, x) := x + u(t, x).
\]

Notice that \( \varphi \in C([0,T]; C^{1}) \) thanks to (33). Moreover by Lemma 4.2 \( x \mapsto \varphi(t, x) \) is invertible for each fixed \( t \in [0,T] \), with its inverse denoted by

\[
\psi(t, \cdot) := \varphi^{-1}(t, \cdot).
\]

By Lemma 4.2 \( \psi(t, \cdot) \) is 2-Lipschitz, uniformly in \( t \). Then, solving (27) is equivalent to solving the standard SDE for \( Y \) below

\[
Y_t = y_0 + \lambda + 1 \int_0^t u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))ds + \int_0^t (\nabla u(s, \psi(s, Y_s)) + 1) dW_s,
\]

where \( y_0 = \varphi(0, x) \). Existence of a weak solution for (38) is guaranteed by [27] Theorem 10.2.2 since its coefficients \( \tilde{b}(t, y) := (\lambda + 1)u(t, \psi(t, y)) \) and \( \tilde{\sigma}(t, y) := \nabla u(t, \psi(t, y)) + 1 \) are bounded continuous with \( \tilde{\sigma} \) uniformly non-degenerate (see [6] Proposition 27 for details).
Likewise, letting $\varphi^N(t, x) := x + u^N(t, x)$, $y^N_0 := \varphi^N(0, x)$ and $\psi^N(t, \cdot) := (\varphi^N)^{-1}(t, \cdot)$, the analogue of (38) for the approximated SDE (8) is given by an SDE for $Y^N := \psi^N(t, X^N_t)$. That is

$$Y^N_t = y^N_0 + (\lambda + 1) \int_0^t u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) \, ds + \int_0^t (\nabla u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) + 1) \, dW_s. \tag{39}$$

Moreover, $\psi^N(t, \cdot)$ is 2-Lipschitz, uniformly in $t$, by Lemma 4.2.

**Remark 4.5.** In [6] the authors work in $d$ dimensions and find weak solutions for the SDE for $Y$. However, for $d = 1$ both equations (38) and (39) admit a unique strong solution if $\gamma := \delta - 1/p > 1/2$. That is because the diffusion coefficient is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous (see (31)), whilst the drift is Lipschitz. This result is used in the proof of Proposition 3.1 to justify the use of the same Brownian motion when estimating $Y^N - Y$.

We conclude this section with some further remarks on the set $\mathcal{K}(\beta, q)$ and on the different choices $(\delta, p)$, and we explain the implications for the solution $u$. To facilitate the discussion, let us consider $(\beta_0, q_0)$ as in Assumption 1 and let us define

$$\mathcal{H}(\beta_0, q_0) := \{ (\delta, p) \in \mathcal{K}(\beta_0, q_0) \mid \delta - 1/p > 1/2 \}. \tag{40}$$

The sets $\mathcal{H}(\beta_0, q_0)$ and $\mathcal{K}(\beta_0, q_0)$ are illustrated in Figure 4.
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**Figure 4.** The sets $\mathcal{K}(\beta_0, q_0)$ (large grey triangle), $\mathcal{K}(\beta_1, q_1)$ (small light grey triangle) and $\mathcal{H}(\beta_0, q_0)$ (small black triangle) are drawn here.

**Remark 4.6.** Let $b \in C^\kappa([0, T]; H_{\beta_0, q_0}^{-\beta_0})$, where $(\beta_0, q_0)$ is fixed and satisfies Assumption 1. Recall that Assumption 3 is automatically satisfied.

(i) The set $\mathcal{H}(\beta_0, q_0)$ defined in (40) is not empty (see the black triangle in Figure 4).

(ii) Although our drift $b$ satisfies Assumption 1 in Propositions 3.1 and 3.3 we chose to look at it as an element of a larger space. In particular, we used the embedding (see Remark 3.2)

$$b \in C([0, T]; H_{\beta_0, q_0}^{-\beta_0}) \subset C([0, T]; H_{\beta_1, q_1}^{-\beta_1}),$$

for $0 < \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $q_0 > q_1 > \tilde{q}_1 > \tilde{q}_0$. 

(iii) Since the solution of (28) is unique in $K(\beta_0, q_0)$ (see large triangle in Figure 4), then we can always pick $(\delta, p) \in H(\beta_0, q_0)$ such that $u \in C([0, T]; H^{1+\delta}_p)$ and $\nabla u(t, \cdot) \in C^\gamma$ for $\gamma = \delta - \frac{1}{p} > 1/2$ and all $t \in [0, T]$. The largest Hölder exponent we can find in $H(\beta_0, q_0)$ is $\gamma_0 - \varepsilon$, where $\gamma_0 = 1 - \beta_0 - 1/q_0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small. This means that for the solution of (28) we have $\nabla u(t, \cdot) \in C^\gamma$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. The largest $\gamma < \gamma_0$.

5. Convergence rate of $X^N - X$

In this section we prove Proposition 3.1. It turns out that in order to show the convergence rate of $X^N$ to $X$ stated in Proposition 3.1 we must provide an upper bound for the local time at zero of $Y - Y^N$. Recall that for any real-valued continuous semi-martingale $\bar{Y}$, the local time $L^0_t(\bar{Y})$ is defined as

\[ L^0_t(\bar{Y}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^t 1_{\{|\bar{Y}_s| \leq \varepsilon\}} \text{d}(\bar{Y})_s, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (41) \]

for all $t \geq 0$. Now we derive a bound on (41) that will be needed later on.

**Lemma 5.1.** For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any real-valued, continuous semi-martingale $\bar{Y}$ we have

\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ L^0_t(\bar{Y}) \right] \leq 4\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon \left[ \int_0^t \left( 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s \in (0, \varepsilon]\}} + 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s \geq \varepsilon\}} e^{1-\bar{Y}_s/\varepsilon} \right) \text{d}\bar{Y}_s \right] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s \geq \varepsilon\}} e^{1-\bar{Y}_s/\varepsilon} \text{d}(\bar{Y})_s \right]. \quad (42) \]

**Proof.** For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ we define (see Figure 5)

\[ g_\varepsilon(y) := 0 \cdot 1_{\{y < 0\}} + y 1_{\{0 \leq y < \varepsilon\}} + \varepsilon \left[ 2 - e^{1-y/\varepsilon} \right] 1_{\{y \geq \varepsilon\}}. \]

Straightforward calculations allow to show that $g_\varepsilon \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\})$ and it is semi-concave, in the sense that $y \mapsto g_\varepsilon(y) - y^2$ is concave. Moreover, we have

\[ 0 \leq g_\varepsilon(y) \leq 2\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R} \quad (43) \]

\[ g'_\varepsilon(y) = 1_{\{0 \leq y < \varepsilon\}} + e^{1-y/\varepsilon} 1_{\{y \geq \varepsilon\}}, \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R} \quad (44) \]

\[ g''_\varepsilon(-\infty, 0) = g''_\varepsilon([0, \varepsilon]) = 0, \quad (45) \]

\[ g''_\varepsilon(y) = -\varepsilon e^{1-y/\varepsilon}, \quad \text{for } y > \varepsilon. \quad (46) \]
Now, an application of Itô-Tanaka formula gives

\[ g_\varepsilon(Y_t) - g_\varepsilon(Y_0) \]
\[ = \int_0^t g'_\varepsilon(Y_s) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s \neq 0\}} dY_s + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t g''_\varepsilon(Y_s) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s \neq 0\} \cap \{Y_s \neq \varepsilon\}} d(Y)_s \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} [g'_\varepsilon(0+) - g'_\varepsilon(0-)] L^0_t(Y) \]

where \( g'_\varepsilon(0 \pm) \) denotes the left/right limit of the derivative at zero. Rearranging terms, taking expectations and using \((43)-(46)\) gives \((42)\). □

The next lemma controls the approximation error between \( u \) and \( u^N \). We recall that \( a^N = P_{\varepsilon N} b^N \).

**Lemma 5.2.** Let Assumption 3 hold and fix \((\delta,p) \in \mathcal{K}(\beta,q)\). Let \( u,u^N \in C([0,T];H^{1+\delta}_p) \) be the mild solutions to \((28)\) and \((30)\), respectively. Then, for \( \rho > \rho_0 \) and \( N > N_0 \) as in Remark 4.4 and all \( t \in [0,T] \) we have

\[ \| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa_\rho \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H^{-\beta}_q} \]
\[ \| \nabla u^N(t) - \nabla u(t) \|_{L^\infty} \leq \kappa_\rho \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H^{-\beta}_q} \]

with

\[ \kappa_\rho := c \cdot c(\rho) \cdot e^{\rho T}, \]

where \( c(\rho) > 0 \) is given in \((35)\) and \( c > 0 \).

**Proof.** Let \( \gamma := \delta - 1/p \). Since \( \gamma > 0 \), by the fractional Morrey’s inequality \((6)\) we have \( H^{1+\delta}_p \subset C^{1,\gamma} \) and we can find \( c > 0 \) such that for all \( t \in [0,T] \) it holds

\[ \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{L^\infty} & \leq \| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{C^{1,\gamma}} \leq c \| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{H^{1+\delta}_p} \\
\| \nabla u^N(t) - \nabla u(t) \|_{L^\infty} & \leq \| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{C^{1,\gamma}} \leq c \| u^N(t) - u(t) \|_{H^{1+\delta}_p}.
\end{array} \right. \]

Then, recalling \((2)\) and \((34)\) we easily obtain

\[ \| u^N - u \|_{\infty,H^{1+\delta}_p} \leq e^{\rho T} \| u^N - u \|_{\infty,H^{1+\delta}_p} \leq c(\rho) e^{\rho T} \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H^{-\beta}_q}. \]

Combining \((50)\) and \((51)\) gives \((48)\).

Now we provide a bound on the difference \( \psi - \psi^N \), where \( \psi \) is defined in \((37)\).

**Lemma 5.3.** Take \( \rho > \rho_0 \) and \( N > N_0 \) as in Remark 4.4 and \( \kappa_\rho \) as in Lemma 5.2. Under Assumption 3 we have

\[ \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}} | \psi(t,x) - \psi^N(t,x) | \leq 2 \kappa_\rho \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H^{-\beta}_q}. \]

**Proof.** Recall that \( \varphi \in C([0,T];C^1) \) was defined in \((36)\). For any \( y,y' \in \mathbb{R} \) we have

\[ | \varphi(t,y) - \varphi(t,y') |^2 \geq | u(t,y) - u(t,y') |^2 + | y - y' |^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} | y - y' |^2 \]

where the final inequality uses Lemma 4.2. Now, taking \( y = \psi(t,x) \) and \( y' = \psi^N(t,x) \) in the above inequality gives

\[ | \varphi(t,\psi(t,x)) - \varphi(t,\psi^N(t,x)) | \geq \frac{1}{2} \psi(t,x). \]
The latter implies

\[ |\psi(t, x) - \psi^N(t, x)| \leq 2 |\varphi(t, \psi(t, x)) - \varphi(t, \psi^N(t, x))| + 2 |\varphi^N(t, \psi^N(t, x)) - \varphi(t, \psi^N(t, x))| \]

where the final equality uses \( \varphi(t, \psi(t, x)) = x = \varphi^N(t, \psi^N(t, x)) \). By definition of \( \varphi \) and \( \varphi^N \) and (48), from Lemma 5.2 we also obtain

\[ |\varphi^N(t, \psi^N(t, x)) - \varphi(t, \psi^N(t, x))| = \|u(t) - u^N(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2\kappa_\rho \|b - a^N\|_{\infty, H^\frac{-\beta}{2}}. \]

Combining the above expressions we get (52).

In the next proposition we provide an upper bound for the local time at zero of \( Y - Y^N \). For \( r > 0 \) we denote by \( O(r) \) a generic function with the same asymptotic behaviour of \( r \) as \( r \to 0 \).

**Proposition 5.4.** Let Assumption \( \square \) and \( \square \) hold. Take arbitrary \((\beta, q)\) that satisfies Assumption \( \square \) and such that \( \beta \in [\beta_0, \frac{1}{2}] \) and \( q_0 \geq q > \tilde{q} \geq q_0 \). Then, for any \( \frac{1}{2} < \gamma < \gamma_0 \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ L^0_T(Y^N - Y) \right] \leq c_\gamma \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H^\frac{\gamma - 1}{2}} + c' \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |Y^N_s - Y_s| ds \right] + O(\|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H^\frac{\gamma - 1}{2}}) \]

as \( N \to \infty \), with \( c_\gamma, c' > 0 \) given constants (\( c_\gamma \) depending on \( \gamma \)).

**Proof.** It is clear that \( \mathcal{H}(\beta_0, q_0) \neq \emptyset \) by Remark 4.6 and that we can choose \((\beta, q)\) as indicated, thanks to Assumption \( \square \). Let us also recall Remark 4.6 part (iii), so that for the solution \( u \) of (52) we have \( \nabla u(t, \cdot) \in C^\gamma \) for all \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma < \gamma_0 \).

Thanks to (38) and (39) it is easy to derive the dynamics of \( \bar{Y} := Y^N - Y \) (recall that \( Y \) and \( Y^N \) are strong solutions by Remark 4.5). Then, applying Lemma 5.1, we obtain

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ L^0_T(Y^N - Y) \right] \leq 4\varepsilon \left[ -2(1 + \lambda) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \left( \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_s \geq \varepsilon\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_s < \varepsilon\}} \right) e^{1-Y_s/\varepsilon} \right] (u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))) ds \right]
\]

where we have removed the martingale term. Adding and subtracting terms we have

\[
|u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))| \\
\leq |u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y^N_s))| + |u(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y^N_s))| + |u(s, \psi(s, Y_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))|.
\]

In order to estimate the right-hand side of the expression above we use Lemma 4.2, Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, upon recalling that \( a^N \to b \) in the space \( C([0, T]; H^\frac{-\beta}{2}) \), by Remark 3.2 part (ii). Since \( \psi(s, \cdot) \) and \( \psi^N(s, \cdot) \) are \( 2 \)-Lipschitz, and \( u(s, \cdot) \) and \( u^N(s, \cdot) \) are \( \frac{1}{2} \)-Lipschitz, uniformly in \( s \in [0, T] \) we have

\[
|u^N(s, \psi^N(s, Y^N_s)) - u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))| \leq 2\kappa_\rho \|b - a^N\|_{\infty, H^\frac{-\beta}{2}} + |Y^N_s - Y_s|,
\]

where we have removed the martingale term. Adding and subtracting terms we have

\[
= 2 |\varphi^N(t, \psi^N(t, x)) - \varphi(t, \psi^N(t, x))|
\]
for $\rho > \rho_0$ and $N > N_0$ as in Remark 4.4 and $\kappa_\rho$ as in Lemma 5.2. Similarly, for the term in (54) involving the gradient of $u$ and $u^\gamma$ we get

\begin{equation}
|\nabla u^N(s, \psi(s, Y^N_s)) - \nabla u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))| \leq \kappa_\rho \|b - a^N\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} + 2^{\gamma+1} \kappa_\rho^\gamma |u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}} \|b - a^N\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ |\nabla u(s, \psi(s, Y^N_s)) - \nabla u(s, \psi(s, Y_s))|,
\end{equation}

where for the second term on the right-hand side above we used that $\nabla u(t, \cdot)$ is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous for any $1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0$, and then used Lemma 5.3. Now, plugging (55) and (56) into (54) and using the well-known inequality

\[(x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_k)^2 \leq k(x_1^2 + \ldots + x_k^2)\]

we obtain

\begin{equation}
E[L^0_t(Y^N - Y)] \leq 4\varepsilon + 4(1+\lambda) \left(2\kappa_\rho t\|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} + E \left[\int_0^t |Y^N_s - Y_s| ds\right]\right)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} 3t\|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} - \frac{\|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}}{\varepsilon} + 4(2\kappa_\rho)^2 \|u\|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^2 \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}^{2\gamma-1}\right)
\end{equation}

For simplicity, we denote by $I_t^{N,\varepsilon}$ the last term in (57). To find an upper bound for $I_t^{N,\varepsilon}$ we pick $\zeta \in (0,1)$ such that $\gamma\zeta > 1/2$ and recall that $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ so that $\varepsilon^\zeta > \varepsilon$. Using the fact that $\nabla u(s, \cdot)$ is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous uniformly in $s \in [0,T]$ with constant $|u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}$, that $\psi$ is $2$-Lipschitz and that $\nabla u$ is uniformly bounded by $1/2$ thanks to Lemma 4.2 we get

\begin{equation}
I_t^{N,\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} 3E \left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\varepsilon < Y^N_s - Y_s \leq \varepsilon^\zeta\}} e^{1-(Y^N_s - Y_s)/\varepsilon} 2^{\gamma} |u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^2 (Y^N_s - Y_s)^{2\gamma} ds\right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} 3E \left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{\varepsilon < Y^N_s - Y_s \leq \varepsilon^\zeta\}} e^{1-(Y^N_s - Y_s)/\varepsilon} (2\|u\|_{L^\infty})^2 ds\right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(3T2^{2\gamma} |u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^2 \varepsilon^{2\gamma\zeta} + 3T e^{1-\varepsilon^{\zeta-1}}\right).
\end{equation}

With no loss of generality we can take $\varepsilon = \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}$. Combining (57) and (58) we then find

\begin{equation}
E[L^0_t(Y^N - Y)] \leq c_1 \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}} + c_2 \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}^{2\gamma-1} + c_3 \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}^{2\gamma\zeta-1} + c_4 \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}^{-1} \exp\left(1 - \|a^N - b\|_{\infty, H_q^{-\beta}}^{\zeta-1}\right)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ c_5 E \left[\int_0^t |Y^N_s - Y_s| ds\right],
\end{equation}

where

\[c_1 = 4 + 8T(1+\lambda)\kappa_\rho + 3T \kappa_\rho^2, \quad c_2 = 12T(2\kappa_\rho)^2 |u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^2, \quad c_3 = 3T2^{2\gamma} |u|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^2, \quad c_4 = 3T, \quad c_5 = 4(1+\lambda).\]
Since $\zeta \in (0,1)$, the term containing the exponential goes to zero faster than any polynomial as $N \to \infty$. Moreover, $\zeta$ can be taken arbitrarily close to one and $1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ was also arbitrary, hence (53) holds and the proof is complete with $c_\gamma = c_3$ and $c' = c_5$. \hfill $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.1, which we recall below for the reader’s convenience.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Take any $(\beta, q)$ such that $\beta \in (\beta_0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $q_0 \geq q > q_0$, where $q_0 := (1 - \beta^{-1})$. Then, for any $1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ there is a constant $C_\gamma > 0$ such that

$$(59) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_t^N - X_t| \right] \leq C_\gamma \| P_{\eta_N} b^N - b \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}}^{2\gamma-1}$$

as $N \to \infty$.

**Proof.** Recall the embedding $b \in C([0,T];H_{q-\beta}^{-\beta}) \subset C([0,T];H_{q-\beta})$ (Remark 3.2 part (i)) and notice that $a^N = P_{\eta_N} b^N \to b$ in $\mathbb{C}([0,T];H_{q-\beta})$ as $N \to \infty$ (Remark 3.2 part (ii)). Next we note that

$$|X_t^N - X_t| = |\psi^N(t,Y_t^N) - \psi(t,Y_t)|$$

$$\leq |\psi^N(t,Y_t^N) - \psi(t,Y_t^N)| + |\psi(t,Y_t^N) - \psi(t,Y_t)|$$

$$\leq 2\kappa_\rho \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}} + 2|Y_t^N - Y_t|,$$

where in the final inequality we have used Lemma 5.3 and that $\psi(t,.)$ is 2-Lipschitz, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$ (Lemma 4.2). Therefore it is sufficient to find a bound for $|Y_t^N - Y_t|$.

From Itô-Tanaka formula we get

$$|Y_t^N - Y_t| = |y_0^N - y_0| + \int_0^t \text{sign}(Y_s^N - Y_s)d(Y_s^N - Y_s) + \frac{1}{2}L_t^0(Y^N - Y).$$

Taking expectation, using (38) and (39) and removing the martingale term we obtain

$$(60) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_t^N - Y_t| \right] = |u^N(0,x) - u(0,x)| + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ L_t^0(Y^N - Y) \right] + (1 + \lambda) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \text{sign}(Y_s^N - Y_s) \left( u^N(s,\psi^N(s,Y_s^N)) - u^N(s,\psi(s,Y_s)) \right) ds \right]$$

$$\leq |u^N(0,x) - u(0,x)| + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ L_t^0(Y^N - Y) \right] + 2(1 + \lambda) t\kappa_\rho \| b - a^N \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}} + (1 + \lambda) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |Y_s^N - Y_s| ds \right],$$

where the inequality follows from the bound (55) used in Proposition 5.4. Using (48) we have

$$|u^N(0,x) - u(0,x)| \leq \kappa_\rho \| a^N - b \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}}.$$

Thanks to Proposition 5.4 we have an upper bound for the local time and, in particular, for any $1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0$ we have

$$(61) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_t^N - Y_t| \right] \leq C \| a^N - b \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}}^{2\gamma-1} + C' \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |Y_s^N - Y_s| ds \right] + O\left( \| a^N - b \|_{\infty,H_{q-\beta}}^{2\gamma-1} \right),$$

as $N \to \infty$, where

$$C = \frac{3}{2} 2^{2\gamma} T \| u \|_{\infty,C^{1,\gamma}}^2, \quad C' = 3(1 + \lambda).$$

By an application of Gronwall’s lemma we conclude the proof and the constant $C_\gamma > 0$ in (59) reads $C_\gamma = 1 + \frac{3}{2} 2^{2\gamma} T \| u \|_{\infty,C^{1,\gamma}}^2 e^{3T(1 + \lambda)}$. \hfill $\square$
6. Convergence rate for Euler-Maruyama scheme

In this section we prove Proposition 3.4, which gives a bound for

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |X_t^{N,m} - X_t| \right],
$$

where $N$ is fixed and $m$ tends to infinity. Let us start with some initial considerations.

For each $N$ the drift in the equation for $X^N$ is certainly bounded, $\frac{1}{2}$-H"older continuous in time and Lipschitz continuous in space, since $b^N$ is bounded measurable. Therefore we could use classical results (see, e.g., [4]) on the convergence of the Euler-Maruyama scheme in order to obtain a rate of convergence of order $m^{-1/2}$. Following this approach, the multiplicative constant in front of the rate $m^{-1/2}$ depends exponentially on the Lipschitz constant of the drift, i.e., in our case on the exponential of $|\nabla(P_{\eta_N}b^N)|_{\infty\!,L^\infty}$.

Substantially more refined results for SDEs with additive noise were obtained recently by [4], who found a strong convergence rate of order $m^{-1/2}$ under the sole requirement of a bounded (time-homogeneous) drift; see [4] Theorem 1.2. In that theorem the multiplicative constant that appears in front of the rate $m^{-1/2}$ depends exponentially on the $L^\infty$-norm of the drift ([4], Lemma 2.2), i.e., in our case on the exponential of $|\nabla(P_{\eta_N}b^N)|_{\infty\!,L^\infty}$.

Both $|\nabla(P_{\eta_N}b^N)|_{\infty\!,L^\infty}$ and $|P_{\eta_N}b^N|_{\infty\!,L^\infty}$ explode as $N \to \infty$ (and $\eta_N \to 0$) at a rate depending on the inverse of $\eta_N$, hence increasing the overall approximation error exponentially as we send $(N, m) \to \infty$ at the same time. Of course one could let $\eta_N \to 0$ very slowly, in order to compensate for the exponential explosion, but this would produce a very slow rate of convergence of $X^N \to X$ (see Proposition 3.1) hence deteriorating, once again, the overall convergence rate. Here we find a compromise by contenting ourselves with a convergence rate for the Euler Maruyama scheme of order $m^{-1/2-\epsilon}$ but with a multiplicative constant which grows polynomially with the inverse of $\eta_N$ (rather than exponentially).

We use a transformation which is the analogue of the one used to define the virtual solutions. That is, we transform the processes $X^N$ and $X^{N,m}$ into new processes $Y^N$ and $Y^{N,m}$ whose dynamics are expressed in terms of Itô’s diffusions with 'nice' coefficients.

Throughout this section Assumptions 1 and 2 are enforced. Since the index $N$ is fixed, it is convenient to simplify the notation and write

$$
\hat{X} := X^N, \quad \hat{X}^m := X^{N,m}, \quad \hat{a} := a^N = P_{\eta_N}b^N, \quad \hat{u} := u^N,
$$

and denote

$$
\hat{\varphi}(t, x) := \varphi^N(t, x) = x + \hat{u}(t, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\psi}(t, x) := \psi^N(t, x).
$$

Using this notation we can define $\hat{Y}_t := \hat{\varphi}(t, \hat{X}_t)$ and $\hat{Y}^m_t := \hat{\varphi}(t, \hat{X}^m_t)$ so that $\hat{X}_t = \hat{\psi}(t, \hat{Y}_t)$ and $\hat{X}^m = \hat{\psi}(t, \hat{Y}^m_t)$. Recalling that $\hat{\psi}(t, \cdot)$ is 2-Lipschitz, uniformly in $t$, we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{X}_t^m - \hat{X}_t| \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}^m_t - \hat{Y}_t| \right].
$$

In order to estimate the right-hand side in the expression above, we first find the dynamics of $\hat{Y}$ and $\hat{Y}^m$ in the next lemma.

**Lemma 6.1.** The dynamics of $\hat{Y}$ is given by

$$
\hat{Y}_t = \hat{\varphi}(0, x) + (1 + \lambda) \int_0^t \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s))ds + \int_0^t (\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s)) + 1)dW_s,
$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, for any $m \geq 1$ the dynamics of $\hat{Y}^m$ is given by

$$
\hat{Y}^m_t = \hat{\varphi}(0, x) + (1 + \lambda) \int_0^t \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}^m_s))ds + \int_0^t (\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}^m_s)) + 1)dW_s + E^m_t,
$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$.
for all \( t \in [0, T] \), where the ‘error process’ \( E_t^m \) can be written in terms of \( \hat{X}^m \) as
\[
E_t^m := \int_0^t \left( \hat{a}(t_k(s), \hat{X}_{t_k(s)}^m) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) \left( 1 + \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) ds.
\]

**Proof.** We start by proving (64). Since \( \hat{a} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \), the unique mild solution \( \hat{u} \) of the associated PDE (30) must be a classical solution, i.e., \( \hat{u} \in C^{1,2}((0, T) \times \mathbb{R}) \). Then, applying Itô’s formula we obtain
\[
\hat{u}(t, \hat{X}_t) = \hat{u}(0, x) + \int_0^t \left( \partial_t \hat{u} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \hat{u} + \hat{a} \nabla \hat{u} \right)(s, \hat{X}_s)ds + \int_0^t \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s)dW_s
\]
\[
= \hat{u}(0, x) + \int_0^t \left( (1 + \lambda) \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}_s) \right) ds + \int_0^t \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s)dW_s.
\]

Plugging this into the definition of \( \hat{Y} \) and using the SDE (8) for \( \hat{X} \) we get
\[
\hat{Y}_t = \hat{\psi}(t, \hat{X}_t) = \hat{u}(t, \hat{X}_t) + \hat{X}_t
\]
\[
= \hat{\psi}(0, x) + (1 + \lambda) \int_0^t \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s))ds + \int_0^t (\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s)) + 1)dW_s,
\]
upon recalling that \( \hat{X}_s = \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s) \).

The proof of (65) follows the same ideas but we have the additional error term \( E_t^m \), due to the special drift of \( \hat{X}^m \) in (9). By Itô’s formula indeed we obtain
\[
\hat{u}(t, \hat{X}_t^m) = \hat{u}(0, x) + \int_0^t \left( \partial_t \hat{u} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \hat{u} \right)(s, \hat{X}_s^m) + \hat{a}(t_k(s), \hat{X}_{t_k(s)}^m) \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m)dW_s.
\]

Using the PDE (30) we can substitute
\[
(\partial_t \hat{u} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \hat{u})(s, \hat{X}_s^m) = [(1 + \lambda) \hat{u} - \hat{a} \nabla \hat{u} - \hat{a}](s, \hat{X}_s^m)
\]
in (66) to obtain
\[
\hat{u}(t, \hat{X}_t^m) = \hat{u}(0, x) + \int_0^t \left( (1 + \lambda) \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) ds
\]
\[
+ \int_0^t \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m)dW_s + E_t^{1,m},
\]
with
\[
E_t^{1,m} := \int_0^t \left( \hat{a}(t_k(s), \hat{X}_{t_k(s)}^m) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m)ds.
\]

Using the SDE (8) for \( \hat{X}^m \) and the definition of \( \hat{Y}^m \) we get
\[
\hat{Y}_t^m = \hat{\psi}(0, x) + (1 + \lambda) \int_0^t \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s^m))ds + \int_0^t (\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s^m)) + 1)dW_s
\]
\[
+ E_t^{1,m} + E_t^{2,m}
\]
where
\[
E_t^{2,m} := \int_0^t \left( \hat{a}(t_k(s), \hat{X}_{t_k(s)}^m) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}_s^m) \right) ds.
\]
Hence, (65) follows by setting \( E_t^m = E_t^{1,m} + E_t^{2,m} \). \( \Box \)
To find a bound for $63$ and prove the rate of convergence of the scheme, we will proceed similarly to the proof of Proposition 3.1. Indeed, we will apply Itô-Tanaka formula to $|\hat{Y}^m - \hat{Y}|$ and estimate the resulting terms. Preliminary bounds are obtained in the next two lemmas.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let $s \mapsto |dE^m_s|$ be the infinitesimal variation of $E^m$. Then

$$E \left[ \int_0^t |dE^m_s| \right] \leq c_1(N)m^{-1} + c_2(N)m^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

with

$$c_1(N) = 6T\|a^N\|_{\infty,L^\infty} + \frac{3}{4}T^2\|\nabla a^N\|_{\infty,L^\infty}\|a^N\|_{\infty,L^\infty} \quad \text{and}$$

$$c_2(N) = T^\frac{3}{2}\|\nabla a^N\|_{\infty,L^\infty} + \frac{3}{2}[a^N]_{\frac{1}{2},L^\infty}T^\frac{3}{2}.$$

**Proof.** By definition of $E^m_t$ and using $|\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{X}_s^m)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ from Lemma 4.2 we have

$$E \left[ \int_0^t |dE^m_s| \right] \leq \frac{3}{2}E \left[ \int_0^t |\hat{a}(t_k(s), \hat{X}^m_{t_k(s)}) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}^m_s)| \, ds \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{3}{2}E \left[ \int_0^t |\hat{a}(0, x) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}^m_s)| \, ds + \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\hat{a}(t_k, \hat{X}^m_{t_k}) - \hat{a}(t, \hat{X}^m_t)| \, ds \right]$$

$$+ \frac{3}{2}E \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\hat{a}(t_k, \hat{X}^m_{t_k}) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}^m_s)| \, ds + \int_{t_k(t)}^t |\hat{a}(t_{k(s)}, \hat{X}^m_{t_{k(s)}}) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}^m_s)| \, ds \right].$$

The first and last term in the final expression above are bounded by $6\frac{T}{m}\|\hat{a}\|_{\infty,L^\infty}$, recalling that $0 \leq t - t_{k(t)} \leq T/m$. In the third term we recall the Hölder seminorm (3) and obtain

$$E \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\hat{a}(t_k, \hat{X}^m_{t_k}) - \hat{a}(s, \hat{X}^m_s)| \, ds \right] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} E[|\hat{a}(t_k) - \hat{a}(s)|_{L^\infty}] \, ds$$

$$\leq [\hat{a}]_{\frac{1}{2},L^\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (s - t_k)^\frac{1}{2} \, ds \leq [\hat{a}]_{\frac{1}{2},L^\infty} T^\frac{3}{2} m^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

where in the final inequality we use that there are at most $m$ terms in the sum.

Finally, for the second term we have

$$E \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\hat{a}(t_k, \hat{X}^m_{t_k}) - \hat{a}(t, \hat{X}^m_t)| \, ds \right] \leq \|\nabla \hat{a}\|_{\infty,L^\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{k(t)-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} E \left[ |\hat{X}^m_{t_k} - \hat{X}^m_t| \right] \, ds.$$
Thanks to (9), each term in the sum above can be easily estimated as
\[
\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \hat{X}^m_{t_k} - \hat{X}^m_s \right| \right] ds
\]
\[
= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{a}(t_k, \hat{X}^m_{t_k}) (s-t_k) + (W_s - W_{t_k})| \right] ds
\]
\[
\leq \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (\|\hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty (s-t_k) + \mathbb{E} ||(W_s - W_{t_k})||) ds
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty (t_{k+1} - t_k)^2 + \mathbb{E} ||W_1|| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (s-t_k) \frac{1}{2} ds
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty \left( \frac{T}{m} \right)^2 + 2 \mathbb{E} ||W_1|| \left( \frac{T}{m} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}},
\]
where again we used \( t_{k+1} - t_k = T/m \).

Combining all of the above estimates we conclude
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |dE_s^m| \right] \leq 6\|\hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty \frac{T}{m} + 3 \frac{2}{m} \|\nabla \hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty \left( \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{a}\|_{\infty, L}\infty T^{2m-1} + \frac{2}{3} T^{2m-\frac{3}{2}} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \|\hat{a}\|_{\frac{1}{2}, L}\infty T^{2m-\frac{3}{2}}.
\]

Rearranging terms gives (69). \( \square \)

**Lemma 6.3.** The following holds
\[
\text{(70)} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ L_T^0 (\hat{Y} - \hat{Y}^m) \right] \leq 4(1+\lambda)\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |\hat{Y}^m_s - Y_s| ds \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |dE_s^m| \right].
\]

**Proof.** This estimate uses arguments analogous to those in the proof of Proposition 5.4. By Lemma 5.1 and using the dynamics (64) and (65), and the fact that \( \hat{u}(t, \cdot) \) and \( \hat{\psi}(t, \cdot) \) are Lipschitz (uniformly in \( t \in [0, T] \)) we obtain
\[
\text{(71)} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ L_T^0 (\hat{Y} - \hat{Y}^m) \right] \leq 4\varepsilon + 4(1+\lambda)\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |\hat{Y}_s - \hat{Y}_s^m| ds \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |dE_s^m| \right] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{Y}_s - \hat{Y}_s^m > \varepsilon\}} e^{1-(\hat{Y}_s - \hat{Y}_s^m)/\varepsilon} \|\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s)) - \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s^m))\|^2 ds \right]
\]

having removed the martingale term. Notice that the last term is analogous to \( I_t^{V,\varepsilon} \) in (58) and with very similar calculations we get
\[
\text{(72)} \quad \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{Y}_s - \hat{Y}_s^m > \varepsilon\}} e^{1-(\hat{Y}_s - \hat{Y}_s^m)/\varepsilon} \|\nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s)) - \nabla \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s^m))\|^2 ds \right] \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \|\hat{u}\|_{\infty, C^{1,\gamma}}^{2\gamma} T \varepsilon^{2\gamma} + T \exp(1 - \varepsilon^{\zeta - 1}) \right),
\]

with \( 1/2 < \gamma < \gamma_0 \) and any \( \zeta \in (0, 1) \) such that \( 2\gamma \zeta > 1 \). Hence the right-hand side of (72) tends to zero as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Noting that also \( 4\varepsilon \to 0 \) in (71) concludes the proof. \( \square \)

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.4 which we recall below for the reader’s convenience.
Proposition 3.4. Let Assumption 1 hold and let $b^N \in C^1([0,T];H^0_{\psi_0,q_0})$ for some fixed $N$. Then, as $m \to \infty$, we have

$$
\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_{t}^{N,m} - X_{t}^{N}| \right] \leq C_2(N)m^{-1} + C_3(N)m^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

with

$$
C_2(N) := c \|P_{\eta_0} b^N\|_{L^\infty} \left( 1 + \| \nabla (P_{\eta_0} b^N) \|_{L^\infty} \right),
$$

$$
C_3(N) := c' \left( \| \nabla (P_{\eta_0} b^N) \|_{L^\infty} + \| P_{\eta_0} b^N \|_{L^\infty} \right)
$$

and $c, c' > 0$ constants independent of $(N, m)$.

Proof. Since $\hat{\psi}(t, \cdot) = \psi^N(t, \cdot)$ is 2-Lipschitz we have

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{X}_t - \hat{Y}_t| \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{\psi}(t, \hat{Y}_t^{m}) - \hat{\psi}(t, \hat{Y}_t)| \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t| \right].
$$

We apply Itô-Tanaka formula to $|\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t|$, using (64) and (65), and removing the martingale term by taking expectation. Thus we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t| \right] = (1 + \lambda)\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \text{sign}(\hat{Y}_s^{m} - \hat{Y}_s) \left( \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s^{m})) - \hat{u}(s, \hat{\psi}(s, \hat{Y}_s)) \right) ds \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \text{sign}(\hat{Y}_s^{m} - \hat{Y}_s) \hat{d}E_s^{m} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ L_t^{0}(\hat{Y}_m^{m} - \hat{Y}_m) \right],
$$

where we have also used that, $\psi^N(t, \cdot)$ is 2-Lipschitz, uniformly in $t \in [0,T]$ and $\hat{u}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$-Lipschitz. Applying Lemma 6.3 to the term featuring the local time we get

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t| \right] \leq 3(1 + \lambda)\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |\hat{Y}_s^{m} - \hat{Y}_s| ds \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |dE_s^{m}| \right].
$$

Then, by Lemma 6.2 we obtain

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t| \right] \leq 3(1 + \lambda)\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |\hat{Y}_s^{m} - \hat{Y}_s| ds \right] + 2c_1(N)m^{-1} + 2c_2(N)m^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

with $c_1, c_2 > 0$ as in Lemma 6.2. By Gronwall’s inequality we get

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ |\hat{Y}_t^{m} - \hat{Y}_t| \right] \leq \frac{1}{2}C_2(N)m^{-1} + \frac{1}{2}C_3(N)m^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

where

$$
C_2(N) := 4c_1(N)e^{3(1+\lambda)T} \quad \text{and} \quad C_3(N) := 4c_2(N)e^{3(1+\lambda)T}.
$$

Then, finally plugging (77) into (75) we obtain (73). □
7. Implementation and Numerical Results

7.1. Numerical implementation. This section is devoted to implementing the algorithm for a specific example with a time-homogeneous drift. Here the drift $b$ is given as the generalised derivative of one path of a fractional Brownian motion, which can be shown to belong to the correct fractional Sobolev space. We explain how to produce an example of $b$ (more specifically of $b^N$ for any $N$) and furthermore we show some plots of the numerical error obtained with the method proposed in this paper.

Of course, care is needed because the drift $b$ is a distribution and its definition cannot be given directly as in the case of functions. Let us consider one realization of a two-sided fractional Brownian motion $\mathbb{P}\{B^H(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for some Hurst index $H > 1/2$. It is known that a.e. path is $\gamma$-Hölder continuous for any $\gamma < H$. We then choose an arbitrarily large integer $K$ and cut the fractional Brownian path by multiplying it by a $C^\infty$ cut-off function, supported on $[-K,K]$, which is constantly equal to 1 on $[-K+1,K-1]$. We denote the cut path again by $B^H(x)$, with a slight abuse of notation. Notice that this path depends on the cut-off function and on the length $2K$ of the support but in practice we can ignore this aspect as we always work on a finite domain when performing numerical simulations. For more details on how to simulate a path of a fractional Brownian motion we refer the reader to Appendix B. It can be shown (see [10, Section 4.1]) that the path $B^H$, which has been cut, belongs to the fractional Sobolev space $H^s_r$ for any $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, H)$ and for any $r \in [2, \infty)^4$. Now we take the generalised derivative of $B^H$ (derivative in the distributional sense) with respect to $x$ and we have \( \frac{d}{dx} B^H(.) \in H^s_{r-1} \) for all $r \in [2, \infty)$ (see e.g. [31] Section 3.1.1, eq. (3.6)).

Setting. Let $H > 3/4$ and fix $s = H - \epsilon > 3/4$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. We further set $-\beta_0 := s - 1$ and $q_0 := \frac{1}{1-q_0} > 1$. Then $b := \frac{d}{dx} B^H \in H^{-\beta_0}_{q_0}$ for all $q_0 \geq 2$ and $\beta_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$. In particular, $b \in H^{-\beta_0}_{q_0}$ for all $q_0 \in (4, \frac{1}{q_0})$ as needed in Assumption 2.

Notice that $H > 3/4$ is needed in order to satisfy the assumption $\gamma_0 > 1/2$ of Proposition 3.1. One of the difficulties in implementing the algorithm is to ensure that the approximations $b^N$ satisfy Assumption 2 while, at the same time, retaining numerical tractability and ease of computing. We do so by using the Haar and Faber systems, which are described in detail in Appendix A for the reader’s convenience. Haar and Faber functions provide bases systems for fractional Sobolev spaces with certain orders. Since these functions are piecewise linear with compact support, they are stored exactly (i.e. with no loss of precision) on machines as finite dimensional vectors.

Let $b$ be chosen according to the specifications in Setting above. We assume without loss of generality that the path is supported on $I := (0,1)$. To ensure this, we simply rescale the function $B^H$ to have support on $I$ (by setting $y = (x + K) / 2K$ so that $B^H(y) \neq 0$ only if $y \in I$). Then we can rescale it back to its original domain once we have calculated the Haar/Faber coefficients in the series representation for the approximation $b^N$ of the drift $b$ (see next paragraph).

By results illustrated in Appendix A (see Lemma A.7) we can express $b$ as an infinite sum. In particular we have

\[
(79) \quad b = \mu_0 h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m},
\]

4See Appendix B for the definition.

5The argument uses an equivalent norm in the Besov space $B^{s'}_{r';2}$ for all $r' \geq 1$ (see [30] equation (10.19)) to show that any $s$-Hölder continuous function with compact support belongs to $B^{s'}_{r';2}$ for $s' < s, r' \geq 1$, together with the embedding $B^{s'}_{r';2} \subset H^{s''}_{r''}$ (see [30] equation (11.17)) for all $r'' > r'$ and $s'' = s' - \frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{r''}$.  


with \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \) defined in Remark A.3 (for \( k = 0 \)) and \( \mu_0 \) defined in (90), both in the sense of dual pairing, and \( \{h_0, h_{j,m}, j \in \mathbb{N}, m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1\} \) being the Haar system introduced in Definition A.5. The idea is to cut the above series representation to a finite sum to obtain an approximation for \( b \) that can be computed numerically. Let us define \( b^N \) as

\[
b^N := \mu_0 h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{N} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m}.
\]

By Theorem A.2 we know that \( b^N \) converges to \( b \) in \( H^{-\beta_0}_0 \). Moreover, by Proposition 3.3 for any \( \beta > \beta_0 \) the truncation error is given by

\[
\|b^N - b\|_{\infty, H^{-\beta}_0} \leq c 2^{-(N+1)(\beta-\beta_0)} \|b\|_{\infty, H^{-\beta_0}_0}.
\]

Regularising \( b^N \) with the (killed) heat semigroup gives

\[
P_{\eta_N} b^N = \mu_0 P_{\eta_N} h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{N} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} P_{\eta_N} h_{j,m}.
\]

We recall that the functions \( P_{\eta_N} h_{j,m} \) are explicitly expressed through the Gaussian cumulative distribution function as described in (10).

At this point it is not yet clear how to calculate the coefficients \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \) and \( \mu_0 \) in practice, because they are defined via dual pairing in fractional Sobolev spaces. To overcome this problem we make use of the link between the Haar representation of \( b \) and the Faber series representation of \( B^H \). This is helpful because \( B^H \) is a function and not a distribution and its coefficients in the Faber series representation can be explicitly calculated. We know that \( B^H \in H^{-\beta_0+1}_0(I) \) because \( \text{supp}(B^H) \subset I \) and \( B^H \in H^{-\beta_0+1}_0(\mathbb{R}) \) (see (87)). Thus by Theorem A.9 we have the representation

\[
B^H = \tilde{\mu}_0 v_0 + \tilde{\mu}_1 v_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} v_{j,m}
\]

in terms of the Faber system \( \{v_0, v_1, v_{j,m}, j \in \mathbb{N}, m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1\} \) on \( I \), introduced in Definition A.8. The coefficients \( \tilde{\mu} \) are explicitly given in (92) in terms of the values of \( B^H \) at the mesh points of the partition. Moreover, as explained in Remark A.10 they are linked to the coefficients appearing in the Haar expansion (79), so that the latter have the explicit representation

\[
\left\{
\begin{aligned}
\mu_0 &= B^H(1) - B^H(0) \\
\tilde{\mu}_{j,m} &= -2^j \left( B^H\left(\frac{m+1}{2^j}\right) - 2 B^H\left(\frac{m+1/2}{2^j}\right) + B^H\left(\frac{m}{2^j}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
\right.
\]

as given in (94).

In Figure 6 we see four examples of the approximation \( P_{\eta_N} b^N \) of the drift \( b = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} B^H \) (using Haar functions) and the approximation of \( B^H \) (using Faber functions). The domain in each picture is \((0, 1)\) and the number of mesh points is \( 2^N + 1 \). In Figure 6a we have \( N = 2 \) and \( \eta_N = 10^{-3} \). In Figure 6b we have the same path \( B^H \) but its derivative \( b \) approximated with higher resolution, i.e., \( N = 8 \) and \( \eta_N = 10^{-3} \). The impact of the heat kernel is visible in Figure 6b and Figure 6c, where \( N = 2 \) and \( N = 8 \) as above, but the regularisation parameter is set to \( \eta_N = 10^{-5} \). Note that the variation for the derivative of \( B^H \) increases dramatically: the range on the vertical axis goes from \([-1.5, 1.5]\) for \( N = 2 \) to \([-4, 4]\) for \( N = 8 \) and \( \eta_N = 10^{-5} \). This is consistent with the fact that, in the limit as \( N \to \infty \) and \( \eta_N \to 0 \), we must have an infinite variation, since the function tends to a distribution.

To conclude, we employ Monte Carlo methods to evaluate numerically the error and compare our results with the theoretical rates predicted by Theorem 3.3. We simulate 200 sample
Figure 6. Approximation of a path of $B^H$ (solid red line) with Hurst parameter $H = 0.85$ and its approximated derivative (dotted blue line) using Haar and Faber functions with different choice of parameters $N$ and $\eta_N$. Note that the scales on the vertical axis in each panel are different for the two functions. The scale on the LHS of each panel refers to $B^H$ and the scale on the RHS refers to the derivative approximation.

paths to estimate the expectation. We look at the $L^1$-convergence of the Euler approximation as $m$ increases, $N$ is constant, and $\eta_N$ is chosen according to Theorem 3.5. Notice that $N$ can be taken constant, provided it is sufficiently large, since $N$ in Theorem 3.5 varies logarithmically in $m$ (hence slowly compared to other terms). The initial condition is $X_0 = 0$. We pick $N = 9$ and $m_0 = 2^9$ time points as a proxy of our true solution. Then we calculate the approximated solution with $m \in \{2^4, 2^5, 2^6, 2^7, 2^8\}$. In Figure 7 we plot the error $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|X_{t,N,m}^N - X_t^{N,m_0}|]$ against $m$ in a log-log scale, for the case $\beta_0 = 0.05$. In this case we observe a numerical convergence rate of 0.23, that is, we empirically have

$$\log \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_{t,N,m}^N - X_t^{N,m_0}| \right] \right) \approx -0.23 \log(m).$$

We performed the same simulation with drifts of various regularity, i.e., $b \in H^{1/4}_0$ for $\beta_0 = 0.00, 0.05, 0.10, 0.15$ and 0.20 (and $q_0 > 4$ fixed) and then we computed the empirical
rate. The results are summarised in Table 1 together with the respective theoretical rate. We observe a deteriorating trend of the theoretical convergence rate as $\beta_0$ increases whereas numerical experiments suggest a fairly stable convergence rate. However, one should be careful that such discrepancies may in part be due to the fact that in the numerical experiment we cannot fully capture the distributional nature of the drift.

![Figure 7. Estimation of the $L^1$-error (in log-log scale) of the Euler-Maruyama scheme with $N = 9$, $m = 2^4, \ldots, 2^8$ for $b \in H_{-0.05}$, for any $q_0 > 4$. We observe an empirical slope of $-0.23$.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta_0$</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.15</th>
<th>0.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical rate</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical rate</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Empirical and theoretical convergence rates as a function of the regularity parameter $\beta_0$.

### 7.2. Some remarks on the use of Haar functions.

We conclude by briefly discussing the additional difficulties arising in the numerical implementation if we decided to use a standard mollification of $b$ rather than its Haar series expansion.

As shown above, $b^{N-1}$ has an exact representation in terms of $2^N$ coefficients which are associated to $2^N$ Haar functions. The regularisation with the heat kernel introduces a (negligible) numerical error as we only need to compute the Gaussian cumulative distribution function (as in (10)) whose precise approximation is implemented in any programming language. The exactness of the representation is lost if we use generic smooth approximations of $b$ (e.g. by standard mollification with $b^\varepsilon \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R})$). Indeed, the representation on a machine of the mollification $b^\varepsilon$ is itself an approximation, hence introducing an extra layer of numerical error.

Another interesting property of Haar and Faber functions is the so-called *multi resolution property*: in order to refine the approximation (e.g., by doubling the number of mesh points) one only needs to calculate $b^N$ at the new mesh points. To give some intuition let us consider the following situation. Suppose we have calculated $B^H$ on a mesh of $2^N$ intervals (that is we have $B^H$ evaluated in $2^N + 1$ points). Taking the ‘numerical derivative’ of this function we also have an approximation of $b$, denoted $b^{N-1}$, expressed in terms of $2^N$ Haar functions (hence $2^N$ values). Suppose now that we double the number of points in the mesh, having
2^{N+1} intervals in total in the refined mesh. We then evaluate $B^H$ at the new points (for a total of $2^N$ new values). Using the Haar representation of $b^{N-1}$ and the link between Haar and Faber functions (which is used to approximate $B^H$ at all points of the mesh), we can refine the approximation from $b^{N-1}$ to $b^N$ by keeping the ‘old’ $2^N$ Haar coefficients and calculating the ‘new’ Haar coefficients associated to the additional mesh points. That is, we only need to calculate $2^N$ new coefficients of Haar functions in the refined mesh. This is in sharp contrast with approximation methods using smooth functions. Those methods would indeed require, in each subsequent refinement of the mesh, to re-calculate all the values for $b^N$; that means $2^{N+1}$ values in total in each refinement. Hence the computational burden is doubled.

**Appendix A. Haar and Faber Basis**

In this appendix we introduce Haar and Faber functions and discuss some of their key properties. These functions form a basis for certain fractional Sobolev spaces, which we use throughout the paper. Roughly speaking, Haar functions are ‘step functions’ that form a basis for $\mathcal{H}^r$, the space of Schwartz distributions. Moreover we use $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{C}_c^\infty$ to indicate $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty$-functions with compact support and $\mathcal{D}'$ for its dual. Next we introduce the Haar wavelet system on $\mathbb{R}$, see [31] equations (2.93)–(2.96).

**Definition A.1** (Haar wavelets on $\mathbb{R}$). Let us define the mother wavelet $x \mapsto h_M(x)$ by

$$h_M := \mathbf{1}_{[0,1/2)} - \mathbf{1}_{[1/2,1)}.$$  

The Haar wavelet system on $\mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$h_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}, \ m \in \mathbb{Z}$$

where $h_{-1,m}(x) := \sqrt{2}|h_M(x - m)|$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $h_{j,m}(x) := h_M(2^jx - m)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Alternatively we can rearrange the system (80) as follows

$$h^k_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}, \ m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1$$

where $h^k_{-1,0}(x) := h_{-1,k}(x)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $h^k_{j,m}(x) := h_{j,m}(x - k)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1$.

See Figure [1] for the plot of a generic Haar function $h_{j,m}$. For future reference note that

$$h_{j,m}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{m}{2^j}, \frac{m+1/2}{2^j}\right) \\ -1 & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{m+1/2}{2^j}, \frac{m+1}{2^j}\right) \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

It turns out that the Haar wavelets system (80) (or equivalently (81)) is an unconditional basis for fractional Sobolev spaces on $\mathbb{R}$ of order “close to zero” (i.e. $-1/2 < s < 1/r$), as detailed in the theorem below which is taken from [32] Theorem 3.3 and Remark 3.4].
Theorem A.2. Let \( 0 \leq r < \infty, \ - \frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{1}{r} \), and let \( f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}) \). Then \( f \in H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \) if and only if it can be represented as

\[
\begin{align*}
  f &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} h^k_{j,m} 2^{-j(s-\frac{1}{2})} h_{j,m}, \\

text{with unconditional convergence in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and locally in any space } H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \sigma < s. \text{ Here } \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \text{ means } m = 0 \text{ when } j = -1.
\end{align*}
\]

The representation is unique, with the coefficients given by

\[
\mu^k_{j,m} := 2^j(\frac{s}{2}+1) \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) h^k_{j,m}(x) \, dx,
\]

where the integral is to be understood in the sense of dual pairing. Moreover the system

\[
\left\{ 2^{-j(s-\frac{1}{2})} h_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}, \ k \in \mathbb{Z}, \ m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1 \right\}
\]

is an unconditional normalised basis of \( H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \).

Remark A.3. Let us denote

\[
\tilde{\mu}^k_{j,m} := 2^j \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) h^k_{j,m}(x) \, dx = 2^j(\frac{s}{2}+\frac{1}{2}) \mu^k_{j,m}.
\]

It follows from Theorem A.2 and (84) that \( \tilde{\mu}^0_{j,m} = \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \), where \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \) is defined as in (85) but with \( h^k_{j,m} \) replaced by \( h_{j,m} \).

Moreover, from (83) we get the more compact representation

\[
\begin{align*}
  f &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu_{j,m} 2^{-j(s-\frac{1}{2})} h_{j,m}, \\
  \text{where } \mu_{j,m} &= \mu^0_{j,m} \text{ and } h_{j,m} \text{ are as in (82).}
\end{align*}
\]

Remark A.4. The coefficients \( \tilde{\mu}^k_{j,m} \) do not actually depend on \( r \) or \( s \). More precisely, if \( f \in H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^{s'}_{r'}(\mathbb{R}) \) for some \( r \neq r' \) and \( s \neq s' \) then the representation (86) is exactly the same in both spaces, with the same coefficients.

In what follows we need fractional Sobolev spaces on the domain \( I = (0,1) \). For that we recall [31] Definition 1.24 (i): let \( I \) be an open set in \( \mathbb{R} \), then

\[
H^s_r(I) := \{ f \in \mathcal{D}'(I) : f = h_1 \text{ for some } h \in H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \}
\]

endowed with the norm

\[
\| f \|_{H^s_r(I)} = \inf \{ \| h \|_{H^s_r(\mathbb{R})} : h \in H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \text{ with } f = h_1 \}.
\]

Next we introduce the Haar wavelet system on \( I := (0,1) \) (see [31] equations (2.128) and (2.129) for details) which is useful for the fractional Sobolev space \( H^s_r(I) \).

Definition A.5 (Haar waves on \( I = (0,1) \)). The Haar wavelet system on \( I \) is given by

\[
\{ h_0, h_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N}, \ m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1 \}
\]

where

\[
h_0(x) := 1_I(x)
\]

and \( h_{j,m} \) is as in (82).
Notice that the system (88) is essentially the restriction of (80) to the interval I. In particular, \( h_{j,m} \) is now restricted to values of \( m \) between 0 and \( 2^j - 1 \) rather than \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \) as in Definition [A.1]. Moreover, the set of elements \( h_{-1,m} \), defined on \( \mathbb{R} \), with \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \), has been replaced by \( h_0 \), defined on I. For the fractional Sobolev spaces on \( H^s(I) \) we have again a representation in terms of Haar functions, as illustrated below. For more details see [31, Theorem 2.13].

**Theorem A.6.** Let \( 2 \leq r < \infty, -\frac{1}{2} < s < \frac{1}{r} \), and let \( f \in \mathcal{D}'(I) \). Then \( f \in H^s_r(I) \) if and only if it can be represented as

\[
(89) \quad f = \mu_0 h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \mu_{j,m} 2^{-j(s-\frac{1}{r})} h_{j,m},
\]

with unconditional convergence in any space \( H^\sigma(I) \) with \( \sigma < s \). The representation is unique, with the coefficients given by

\[
(90) \quad \mu_0 := \int_I f(x) h_0(x) \, dx
\]

and, for \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1 \), by

\[
\mu_{j,m} := 2^{j(s-\frac{1}{r}+1)} \int_I f(x) h_{j,m}(x) \, dx,
\]

where the integrals are to be understood in the sense of dual pairing. Moreover the system

\[
\left\{ h_0, 2^{-j(s-\frac{1}{r})} h_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N}, m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1 \right\}
\]

is an unconditional normalised basis of \( H^s_r(I) \).

Notice that (89) can be written in terms of \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \) (see Remark [A.3]) as

\[
(91) \quad f = \mu_0 h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m}.
\]

Of course a distribution \( f \) defined on I can be seen as a distribution defined on \( \mathbb{R} \) but only supported on I (in the sense that \( f(\phi) = 0 \) for all \( \phi \in \mathcal{D} \) supported on \( \mathbb{R} \setminus I \)). The link between the series representations on I and on \( \mathbb{R} \) is given in the next lemma.

**Lemma A.7.** If \( f \in H^s_r(\mathbb{R}) \) and \( \text{supp}(f) \subset I \) then its representation on \( \mathbb{R} \) given by (86) (or equivalently by (83)) coincides with its representation on I given by (91).

**Proof.** First we remark that in this case the restriction of \( f \) to I (denoted again by \( f \)) belongs to \( H^s_r(I) \) by definition of the latter space. Since \( \text{supp}(f) \subset I \), it follows that \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m}^k = 0 \) for all \( k \neq 0 \) because the functions \( h_{j,m}^k \) are supported on \( (k, k+1) \) while \( f \) is supported on \( (0,1) \) which implies that the dual pairing between \( h_{j,m}^k \) and \( f \) is non-zero only if \( k = 0 \). Hence the Haar representation (86) becomes

\[
f = \sum_{j=-1}^{+\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m}^k h_{j,m}^k
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m}
\]

\[
= \tilde{\mu}_{-1,0} h_{-1,0} + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m},
\]
where we used the fact that $\bar{\mu}^0_{j,m} = \tilde{\mu}_{j,m}$. The proof can be concluded by noticing that

$$
\bar{\mu}_{-1,0} = 2^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) h_{-1,0}(x) dx h_{-1,0} = 2^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \sqrt{2} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(x) dx \sqrt{2} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)} = \int I f(x) \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(x) dx \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)} = \mu_0h_0.
$$

□

Next we recall the definition of Faber functions. They are denoted by $v_{jm}$ and are hat-functions, defined as the normalised integrals of the Haar functions $h_{jm}$ on $I$. Notice that the Faber series representation holds in general only on bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}$. Here we only recall their definition on the unit interval $I = (0, 1)$. More details can be found in [32, Section 3.2.1].

**Definition A.8 (Faber basis on $I$).** The Faber system on $(0, 1)$ is given by

$$
\{v_0, v_1, v_{j,m} : j \in \mathbb{N}, m = 0, \ldots, 2^j - 1\}
$$

where

$$
v_0(x) := 1 - x \quad \text{and} \quad v_1(x) := x
$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ (and zero outside $I$), and the hat-functions are defined as

$$
v_{j,m}(x) = 2^{j+1} \int_0^x h_{j,m}(y) dy,
$$

that is

$$
v_{j,m}(x) := \begin{cases} 
2^{j+1}(x - 2^{-j}m) & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{m}{2^j}, \frac{m+1/2}{2^j}\right) \\
2^{j+1}(2^{-j}(m+1) - x) & \text{if } x \in \left[\frac{m+1/2}{2^j}, \frac{m+1}{2^j}\right) \\
0 & \text{else}.
\end{cases}
$$

Using the Faber system on $I$ it is possible to represent elements of fractional Sobolev spaces on domain $I$ for $1/2 < s < 1 + 1/r$ and $2 \leq r < \infty$ as we see below. For a proof see [31, Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.3].

**Theorem A.9.** Let $g \in H^s_r(I)$ for $2 \leq r < \infty$, and $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1 + \frac{1}{r}$. Then we have the unique Faber representation for $g$

$$
g = \bar{\mu}_0v_0 + \bar{\mu}_1v_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^j-1} \bar{\mu}_{j,m}v_{j,m}
$$

with unconditional convergence in $C(I)$ and in $H^s_r(I)$ with $\sigma < s$. Here the coefficients $\bar{\mu}$ are explicitly given by

$$
\bar{\mu}_{j,m} = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta_{2^{-j+1}} g \right) (2^{-j}m)
$$

$$
\bar{\mu}_0 = g(0)
$$

$$
\bar{\mu}_1 = g(1)
$$

and where $\Delta_{2^{-j}} g(x) := g(x + 2h) - 2g(x + h) + g(x)$.

This representation of $g$ using Faber functions is fundamental to calculate the coefficients for the Haar representation of $g'$, as we see below.
Remark A.10. In the proof of the above theorem (see [31, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.3]) the following expansion for \( g' \in H^{-1}_{r} (I) \) is derived:

\[
g' = (\tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_0) h_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{2^{j-1}-1} 2^{j+1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} h_{j,m}.
\]

Comparing it with (91) from Theorem A.6 with \( f = g' \), we obtain an explicit representation of the coefficients \( \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} \) and \( \mu_0 \) that appear in (91), that is:

\[
(93) \quad \mu_0 = \tilde{\mu}_1 - \tilde{\mu}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_{j,m} = 2^{j+1} \tilde{\mu}_{j,m}.
\]

The link expressed in (93) together with the explicit expression (92) is crucial to evaluate numerically the coefficients in the Haar expansion of an element \( f \in H^{-r}_{r} (I) \) for \( \frac{1}{2} < s < 1+\frac{1}{r} \) and \( 2 \leq r < \infty \). Indeed to do so we only need to evaluate the associated function \( g \) at (a finite number of) mesh points:

\[
(94) \quad \begin{cases}
\mu_0 &= g(1) - g(0) \\
\tilde{\mu}_{j,m} &= -2^j \left( g(\frac{m+1}{2^j}) - 2g(\frac{m+1/2}{2^j}) + g(\frac{m}{2^j}) \right).
\end{cases}
\]

**Appendix B. Simulation of fractional Brownian motion**

In this section we explain in detail how to implement the simulation of a fractional Brownian motion (fBm) on a given mesh so that the paper is self-contained. Recall that a fBm is a centred Gaussian process \( \{B^H(x), x \in \mathbb{R}\} \) with covariance given by

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ B^H(x)B^H(y) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( x^{2H} + y^{2H} + |x-y|^{2H} \right).
\]

Sometimes we will also use \( B^H(x; \omega) \) to emphasise explicitly the random nature of the process.

Our aim is to simulate the values of a sample path of a fBm \( B^H(x) \) on a finite grid \( \mathbf{x} := (x_k)_{k=1, \ldots, n} \). We consider \( n \) independent standard Gaussian random variables \( \{G_k\}_{k=1, \ldots, n} \) and then correlate them with the positive-definite correlation matrix

\[
C_{i,j} = \mathbb{E} \left[ B^H(x_i)B^H(x_j) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( x_{i}^{2H} + x_{j}^{2H} + |x_{i}-x_{j}|^{2H} \right).
\]

To do so, we use the Cholesky decomposition method and calculate the lower triangular matrix \( M \) such that \( C = MM^\top \). Then we set \( B := MG \) where \( G \) is the \( n \)-dimensional vector with components \( G_k \). If we evaluate \( G \) for a given \( \omega \) we get the path of a fBm \( B^H(\cdot; \omega) \) evaluated at the grid \( \mathbf{x} \), which is given by the vector \( B = B(\omega) = MG(\omega) \). Figure 8 shows the path of one such simulation for \( H = 0.85 \). The plot in Figure 8a was drawn with \( n = 64 \) mesh points and the one in Figure 8b with \( n = 128 \).

We conclude this appendix by discussing how to refine the path, namely how to add new points in the mesh and new values for those points, while at the same time keeping the old values fixed. This procedure has been referred to as _multi-resolution property_ for \( B^H \), in Section 7 of this paper.

Suppose we have simulated a fBm \( B^H \) on a grid \( \mathbf{x} := \{x_k, k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n\} \), having set \( B^H(x_0) = 0 \) for simplicity. Let us denote by \( B \) the \( n \)-dimensional vector with the simulated fBm on \( \mathbf{x} \). We now refine our grid by adding another \( n \) points, in particular by adding the midpoint of every interval to work with double precision. We denote by \( \tilde{\mathbf{x}} := \{\tilde{x}_k, k = 1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) the new points in the mesh, where \( \tilde{x}_k := \frac{x_k + x_{k-1}}{2} \). Our aim is to find the values of the same path of the fBm \( B^H \) at the new mesh points \( \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \). In particular, we want to find a \( 2n \)-dimensional vector \( B_1 \) whose transpose reads \( B_1^\top := (B^\top, \tilde{B}^\top) \) where the component \( \tilde{B} \) contains the values of the fBm on the new points \( \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \). Once we have this, reordering the vector \( B_1 \) will give us the same path of fBm \( B^H \) but on the refined mesh \( \{\tilde{x}_1, x_1, \tilde{x}_2, \ldots, x_n\} \).
Next we construct $\tilde{B}$. Let us denote by $\tilde{G}$ another $n$-dimensional vector of independent standard Gaussian random variables, and let $G^\top_1 := (G^\top, \tilde{G}^\top)$. Let $C_1$ be the new correlation matrix of the fBm evaluated at the (not ordered) refined mesh $\{x, \tilde{x}\}$. This matrix must be of the form

$$C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} C & A \\ A^\top & \tilde{C} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\tilde{C}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given by

$$A_{i,j} = \mathbb{E} \left[ B^H(x_i)B^H(\tilde{x}_j) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( x_i^{2H} + \tilde{x}_j^{2H} + |x_i - \tilde{x}_j|^{2H} \right)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{i,j} = \mathbb{E} \left[ B^H(\tilde{x}_i)B^H(\tilde{x}_j) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( \tilde{x}_i^{2H} + \tilde{x}_j^{2H} + |\tilde{x}_i - \tilde{x}_j|^{2H} \right)$$

and $C$ the correlation matrix associated to the original mesh points $x$.

The Cholesky root $M_1$ of $C_1$ must be of the form

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ N & P \end{pmatrix}$$

with $P$ being lower triangular and $M$ being the root of $C$. Note that $N$ and $P$ can be calculated. Then from $B_1 = M_1G_1$ we get that $\tilde{B} = NG + P\tilde{G}$.
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