

APPROXIMATION OF THE INVARIANT MEASURE OF STABLE SDES BY AN EULER–MARUYAMA SCHEME

PENG CHEN, CHANG-SONG DENG, RENÉ L. SCHILLING, AND LIHU XU

ABSTRACT. We study approximations of the invariant measure of a stochastic differential equation (SDE) driven by an α -stable Lévy process ($1 < \alpha < 2$) using the Euler–Maruyama (EM) scheme. By a discrete version of Duhamel’s principle and Bismut’s formula in Malliavin calculus, we show that the Wasserstein-1 distance of the invariant measures of the solution and the approximation is – up to a constant – bounded by $\eta^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}$ where η is the step size of the EM scheme. An explicit calculation for Ornstein–Uhlenbeck α -stable process shows that the rate $\eta^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}$ is sharp. A concrete example is given, and the relevant simulations are implemented.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Motivation, contribution and method	2
1.2. Notation	3
1.3. Assumptions and main result	3
2. Ergodicity and moment estimates	4
3. Proof of Theorem 1.2	5
3.1. Auxiliary lemmas	5
3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2	8
4. Malliavin calculus and the proof of Lemma 3.1	11
4.1. Jacobi flow associated with the SDE (1.1)	11
4.2. Bismut’s formula	11
4.3. Time-change method for the SDE (1.1)	12
4.4. Proof of Lemma 3.1	16
5. Example and numerical simulations	17
Appendix A. Proofs of Propositions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 and Lemma 2.5	18
Appendix B. Exact rate for the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process	24
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

We study the solution $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of the following SDE driven by an α -stable Lévy process:

$$(1.1) \quad dX_t = b(X_t) dt + dZ_t, \quad X_0 = x,$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the starting point, $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional, rotationally invariant α -stable Lévy process with index $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a function satisfying **Assumption A** below. If we need to stress the starting point $X_0 = x$, we will write X_t^x instead of X_t .

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H10; 37M25; 60G51; 60H07; 60H35; 60G52.

Key words and phrases. Euler-Maruyama method; invariant measure; convergence rate; Wasserstein distance.

Let $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2, \dots$ be an iid sequence of d -dimensional random vectors, which are Pareto distributed, i.e.

$$(1.2) \quad \tilde{Z}_1 \sim p(z) = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{d-1}|z|^{\alpha+d}} \mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(|z|);$$

we denote by $\sigma_{d-1} = 2\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}/\Gamma(\frac{d}{2})$ the surface area of the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. We will approximate the SDE (1.1) by the following EM scheme:

$$(1.3) \quad Y_0 = x, \quad Y_{k+1} = Y_k + \eta b(Y_k) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the step size, $\sigma^\alpha = \alpha/\sigma_{d-1}d_\alpha$, and $d_\alpha = (\int_0^\infty (1 - \cos y) y^{-\alpha-1} dy)^{-1} = \alpha 2^{\alpha-1} \pi^{-d/2} \Gamma(\frac{d+\alpha}{2}) / \Gamma(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})$, see e.g. [2, Example 2.4.d]. It is easy to see that $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain, and we use again $Y_k = Y_k^x$ in order to stress the starting point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Below we will explain the advantage of choosing a Pareto-distributed sequence $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2, \dots$ rather than an α -stable distributed sequence.

Denote by P_t and Q_k the Markov semigroups of X_t and Y_k , respectively, i.e. for a bounded measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$P_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}f(X_t^x) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k f(x) = \mathbb{E}f(Y_k^x), \quad t \geq 0, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We aim to study the error between the invariant measures of (1.1) and (1.3) in the Wasserstein-1 distance.

1.1. Motivation, contribution and method. The EM approximation of SDEs is a classic research topic, both in probability theory and in numerical analysis, and over the past decades there have been many contributions, see for instance [1, 9, 16, 29, 5, 24] for SDEs driven by a Brownian motion, and [13, 27, 11, 25, 21, 14] for SDEs driven by Lévy noise. Most of these papers focus on error bounds of the solution to the SDE and the EM approximation in a time interval $[0, T]$ for some finite $T > 0$; typically, there appears a constant C_T (depending on T) in the error bounds, which tends to ∞ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

The recent use of Langevin samplings in machine learning, has caused a surge of interest error bounds for the invariant measures of the solution of the SDE and of the EM discretization, see e.g. [22, 30, 3, 12]. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first contribution studying the bound between the invariant measures of solutions to SDEs driven by stable noise and their EM discretizations.

A further motivation of our research is to show that the EM scheme with Pareto distributed innovations can indeed be used to approximate the invariant measures of SDEs driven by an α -stable noise with $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. In order to speed up the EM scheme, actual implementations of the discretization (1.3), use iid random variables $(\tilde{Z}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ with Pareto distribution rather than stable innovations. The advantage of this approach is that the Pareto distribution has an explicitly given density (see (1.2)) which allows for a much simpler sampling than stable random variables. We also show that the convergence rate $\eta^{2/\alpha-1}$ is optimal for the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process on \mathbb{R} .

Our approach in proving the main result is via a discrete version of Duhamel principle and Bismut’s formula in Malliavin calculus. More precisely, we break up the stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ into small pieces $(X_t)_{(k-1)\eta \leq t \leq k\eta}$ for $k \geq 1$ and swap each Y_k by $(X_t)_{(k-1)\eta \leq t \leq k\eta}$, this procedure is very similar to the Lindeberg principle. In order to bound the difference for these swaps, we use the semigroup P_t given by $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and study its regularity via the Malliavin calculus for jump processes. In order to bound the second-order derivative of P_t , we need to adopt the framework of the time-change argument established in [34] and use the Bismut formula.

1.2. Notation. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ denote the collection of all continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the collection of all twice continuously differentiable functions. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ we denote by $\nabla f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\nabla^2 f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ the gradient and the Hessian. For $v, v_1, v_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the directional derivatives are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_v f(x) &= \langle \nabla f(x), v \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x + \varepsilon v) - f(x)}{\varepsilon}, \\ \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) &= \langle \nabla^2 f(x), v_1 v_2^\top \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nabla_{v_1} f(x + \varepsilon v_2) - \nabla_{v_1} f(x)}{\varepsilon},\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle A, B \rangle_{\text{HS}} := \sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij} B_{ij}$ for $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, its Hilbert-Schmidt norm is $\|A\|_{\text{HS}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^d A_{ij}^2}$.

For $v, v_1, v_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can also define $\nabla_v f(x)$ and $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x)$ for twice continuously differentiable functions $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d)^\top : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ in the same way as above. That is, $\nabla_v f(x) = (\nabla_v f_1, \nabla_v f_2, \dots, \nabla_v f_d)^\top$, $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f(x) = (\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f_1, \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f_2, \dots, \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} f_d)^\top$.

Denote by $\mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ the set of all twice continuously differentiable functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} with bounded derivatives up to order 2. For $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, we will use the supremum norm

$$\|\nabla f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla f(x)|,$$

and the supremum Hilbert-Schmidt norm

$$\|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_{\text{HS}}.$$

We write $\lfloor x \rfloor$ for the largest integer which is less than or equal to $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The Wasserstein-1 distance between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on \mathbb{R}^d is defined as

$$(1.4) \quad W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathbb{E}|X - Y|,$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the set of all coupling realizations of μ_1, μ_2 , i.e. all random variables with values in \mathbb{R}^{2d} with marginals μ_1, μ_2 . We also have the following dual description of the Wasserstein distance

$$W_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mu_1(h) - \mu_2(h)|,$$

where $\text{Lip}(1) = \{h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; |h(y) - h(x)| \leq |y - x|\}$ and $\mu_i(h) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x) \mu_i(dx)$, $i = 1, 2$.

1.3. Assumptions and main result. Throughout this paper, we make the following assumption:

Assumption A. The function $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is twice continuously differentiable and there exist constants $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ and $\theta_3, K \geq 0$ such that

$$(1.5) \quad \langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \leq -\theta_1 |x - y|^2 + K \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

and

$$(1.6) \quad |\nabla_v b(x)| \leq \theta_2 |v|, \quad |\nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_2} b(x)| \leq \theta_3 |v_1| |v_2| \quad \forall v, v_1, v_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Remark 1.1. Note that (1.6) immediately entails the following linear growth condition

$$(1.7) \quad |b(x) - b(0)| \leq \theta_2 |x|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Under **Assumption A**, we will show that both $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ are ergodic; we write μ and μ_η , respectively, for their invariant measures, see Propositions 2.1 and 2.3 below. Throughout the paper the constants C, c_1, c_2 and λ may depend on $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, K, \alpha, d, |b(0)|$, but we often suppress this in our notation; moreover, the exact values of the constants may vary from line to line. Our *main result* can be stated as the following theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be defined by (1.1) and (1.3) (step size η), and denote by μ and μ_η , their invariant measures. Under **Assumption A**, there exists a constant C such that the following two statements hold:*

(1) *For every $N \geq 2$ and step size $\eta < \min \{1, \theta_1/(8\theta_2^2), 1/\theta_1\}$, one has*

$$W_1(\text{law}(X_{\eta N}), \text{law}(Y_N)) \leq C(1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}.$$

(2) *For every step size $\eta < \min \{1, \theta_1/\theta_2^2, 1/\theta_1\}$, one has*

$$W_1(\mu, \mu_\eta) \leq C\eta^{2/\alpha-1}.$$

We stress that the rate $\eta^{2/\alpha-1}$ is optimal for the one-dimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, see Proposition B.1 below.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some standard material on ergodicity and moment estimates for X_t and Y_k ; we have included the standard proofs in the Appendix A, to make the paper self-contained. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is presented in Section 3. In Section 4, we use a time-change argument and the Bismut formula to prove Lemma 3.1, which is the key to the proof of our main result. In Section 5, we consider one specific example in dimension 1, and present numerical simulations to demonstrate the theoretical results. Finally, in Appendix B, the exact convergence rate $\eta^{2/\alpha-1}$ is reached for the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process on \mathbb{R} , which explains that the rate in Theorem 1.2(2) is sharp.

2. ERGODICITY AND MOMENT ESTIMATES

In this section we state three propositions on the ergodicity and moment estimates of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$. The proofs are standard and postponed to Appendix A for completeness. For further use, we define

$$V(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Using a standard Lyapunov function criterion for the ergodicity of Markov process, we have:

Proposition 2.1. *Let **Assumption A** hold and denote by $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the solution to the SDE (1.1). Then, $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ admits a unique invariant probability measure μ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{|f| \leq V} |\mathbb{E}[f(X_t^x)] - \mu(f)| \leq c_1 V(x) e^{-c_2 t}, \quad t > 0,$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. In particular, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{E}|X_t^x| \leq C(1 + |x|), \quad t > 0.$$

The following moment estimate can be shown with [33, Theorem 1.2]. We refer to [10, 7, 8, 18, 15, 31] for more results on the contraction property in the Wasserstein distance for solutions of SDEs.

Proposition 2.2. *Under **Assumption A**, there exist for any $t > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ constants $C > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$W_1(\text{law}(X_t^x), \text{law}(X_t^y)) \leq C e^{-\lambda t} |x - y|.$$

For the EM approximation we have

Proposition 2.3. *Let Assumption A hold and denote by $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ the Markov chain defined by (1.3). If the step size satisfies $\eta < \min \{1, \theta_1/\theta_2^2, 1/\theta_1\}$, the chain $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ admits a unique invariant measure μ_η , such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$,*

$$(2.3) \quad \sup_{|f| \leq V} |\mathbb{E}f(Y_k^x) - \pi_\eta(f)| \leq c_1 V(x) e^{-c_2 k},$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Remark 2.4. Although the proof of Proposition 2.3 relies on a Lyapunov function criterion for the ergodicity of Markov process, the heavy tails of the chain make the calculations quite different from those in [20].

In addition, we need the following lemma for the moment estimate of $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$, which is proved in Appendix A.

Lemma 2.5. *Let Assumption A hold and denote by $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ the Markov chain defined by (1.3). If the step size satisfies $\eta < \min \left\{1, \frac{\theta_1}{8\theta_2^2}, \frac{1}{\theta_1}\right\}$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{E}|Y_k^x| \leq C(1 + |x|),$$

for some constant $C > 0$, which is independent of η .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We begin with a few auxiliary lemmas which will be used to prove Theorem 1.2.

3.1. Auxiliary lemmas. The first auxiliary lemma is about the regularity of the semigroup induced by $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$. We will prove it using Malliavin's calculus in Section 4 further down.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$ and X_t^x be the solution to the SDE (1.1). For all vectors $v, v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad |\nabla_v P_t h(x)| \leq e^{\theta_2} |v|$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} P_t h(x)| \leq C t^{-1/\alpha} |v_1| |v_2|,$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Using the inequality (2.2), we can obtain the following estimate:

Lemma 3.2. *Let X_t be the solution to the SDE (1.1). Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^x - x| \leq C(1 + |x|) (t \vee t^{1/\alpha}).$$

Proof. From the SDE we know that $X_t^x = x + \int_0^t b(X_r^x) dr + Z_t$. By (1.7) and (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t^x - x| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t b(X_r^x) dr \right| + \mathbb{E}|Z_t| \\ &\leq \int_0^t (|b(0)| + \theta_2 \mathbb{E}|X_r^x|) dr + t^{1/\alpha} \mathbb{E}|Z_1| \\ &\leq C(1 + \theta_2)(1 + |b(0)| + |x|) (t \vee t^{1/\alpha}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We need two further lemmas. The first is just an intermediate step for the proof of the second lemma, which is the key to proving Theorem 1.2. Notice that the fractional Laplacian operator $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ is the infinitesimal generator of the rotationally invariant α -stable Lévy process $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$, which is defined as a principal value (p.v.) integral: for any $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$,

$$(3.3) \quad (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) = d_\alpha \cdot \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x+y) - f(x)) \frac{dy}{|y|^{\alpha+d}}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|\nabla f\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} < \infty$. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ one has*

$$(3.4) \quad |(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(y)| \leq \frac{d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \sigma_{d-1}}{(2-\alpha)(\alpha-1)} |x-y|^{2-\alpha}.$$

Proof. From the definition of the fractional Laplacian (3.3) and the symmetry of the representing measure we have for any $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) &= d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^\infty \frac{f(x+r\theta) - f(x) - r \langle \theta, \nabla f(x) \rangle \mathbf{1}_{(0,R)}(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr d\theta \\ &= d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^R \int_0^r \frac{\langle \theta, \nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(x) \rangle}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &\quad + d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_R^\infty \int_0^r \frac{\langle \theta, \nabla f(x+\theta s) \rangle}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \end{aligned}$$

Then, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(y)| \\ &\leq d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^R \int_0^r \frac{|\nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y+\theta s) + \nabla f(y)|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &\quad + d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_R^\infty \int_0^r \frac{|\nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(y+\theta s)|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral we have

$$\begin{aligned} &d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^R \int_0^r \frac{|\nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y+\theta s) + \nabla f(y)|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &\leq d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^R \int_0^r \frac{|\nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(x)| + |\nabla f(y+\theta s) - \nabla f(y)|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &\leq 2d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_0^R \frac{s}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta = \frac{d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \sigma_{d-1}}{2-\alpha} R^{2-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and for the second term we get

$$\begin{aligned} &d_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_R^\infty \int_0^r \frac{|\nabla f(x+\theta s) - \nabla f(y+\theta s)|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &\leq d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_R^\infty \int_0^r \frac{|x-y|}{r^{\alpha+1}} ds dr d\theta \\ &= \frac{d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \sigma_{d-1}}{\alpha-1} |x-y| R^{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired result follows upon taking $R = |x-y|$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be defined by (1.1) and (1.3), respectively. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\|\nabla f\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} < \infty$,*

$$|P_\eta f(x) - Q_1 f(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|) (\|\nabla f\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty}) \eta^{2/\alpha}.$$

Proof. From (1.1) and (1.3), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(X_\eta^x) - f(Y_1)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(x + \int_0^\eta b(X_r^x) dr + Z_\eta \right) - f \left(x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathcal{J}_1 + \mathcal{J}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_1 := \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(x + \int_0^\eta b(X_r^x) dr + Z_\eta \right) - f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_\eta) \right],$$

$$\mathcal{J}_2 := \mathbb{E}[f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_\eta) - f(x + \eta b(x))] - \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z} \right) - f(x + \eta b(x)) \right].$$

We can bound \mathcal{J}_1 using (1.6) and Lemma 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{J}_1| &\leq \|\nabla f\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^\eta b(X_r^x) dr - \eta b(x) \right| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f\|_\infty \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} |b(X_r^x) - b(x)| dr \\ &\leq \theta_2 \|\nabla f\|_\infty \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} |X_r^x - x| dr \\ &\leq C \theta_2 (1 + |x|) \|\nabla f\|_\infty \int_0^\eta r^{1/\alpha} dr \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|) \|\nabla f\|_\infty \eta^{1+1/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term of \mathcal{J}_2 we use Dynkin's formula (see e.g. [4]) to get

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_\eta) - f(x + \eta b(x))] = \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E}[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_r)] dr.$$

For the second part of \mathcal{J}_2 we use that $d_\alpha = \alpha \sigma_{d-1}^{-1} \sigma^{-\alpha}$ and Taylor's formula to see

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[f \left(x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z} \right) - f(x + \eta b(x)) \right] \\ &= \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left\langle \nabla f \left(x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} t \tilde{Z} \right), \tilde{Z} \right\rangle dt \right] \\ &= \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \int_{|z| \geq 1} \int_0^1 \left\langle \nabla f(x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} tz), z \right\rangle \frac{dt dz}{\sigma_{d-1} |z|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &= \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{|z| \geq \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha}} \int_0^1 \left\langle f(x + \eta b(x) + tz), z \right\rangle \frac{dt dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &= \eta (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x)) - \mathcal{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R} := \eta d_\alpha \int_{|z| < \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha}} \int_0^1 \left\langle \nabla f(x + \eta b(x) + tz), z \right\rangle \frac{dt dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}}.$$

Together, the above estimates yield

$$|\mathcal{J}_2| \leq |\mathcal{R}| + \left| \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_r)] dr - \eta(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x)) \right|.$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}| &= \eta d_\alpha \left| \int_{|z| < \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha}} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(x + \eta b(x) + tz) - \nabla f(x + \eta b(x)), z \rangle \frac{dt dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \right| \\ &\leq \eta d_\alpha \int_{|z| < \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha}} \int_0^1 |\nabla f(x + \eta b(x) + tz) - \nabla f(x + \eta b(x))| \frac{dt dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \eta d_\alpha \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \int_{|z| < \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha}} \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d-2}} \leq C \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \eta^{2/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_r)] dr - \eta(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x)) \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} |(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x) + Z_r) - (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x + \eta b(x))| dr \\ &\leq C \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [|Z_r|^{2-\alpha}] dr \\ &= C \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \int_0^\eta \mathbb{E} [|Z_1|^{2-\alpha}] r^{2/\alpha-1} dr \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} [|Z_1|^{2-\alpha}] \|\nabla^2 f\|_{\text{HS}, \infty} \eta^{2/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows if we combine all estimates. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2. For $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$, thanks to the discrete version of the classical Duhamel principle, it is easy to check that

$$(3.5) \quad P_{N\eta} h(x) - Q_N h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N Q_{i-1} (P_\eta - Q_1) P_{(N-i)\eta} h(x).$$

Then we have

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} W_1(\text{law}(X_{\eta N}), \text{law}(Y_N)) &= \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |P_{N\eta} h(x) - Q_N h(x)| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1} (P_\eta - Q_1) P_{(N-i)\eta} h(x)| \\ &\quad + \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{N-1} (P_\eta - Q_1) h(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

First, we bound the last term. By Lemma 3.2, (1.3) and (1.6), for $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$ and $\eta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(P_\eta - Q_1)h(x)| &= |\mathbb{E}h(X_\eta^x) - \mathbb{E}h(Y)| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}h(X_\eta^x) - h(x)| + |\mathbb{E}h(Y) - h(x)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|X_\eta^x - x| + \mathbb{E}|Y - x| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|) \eta^{1/\alpha} + \eta |b(x)| + \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_1| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|) \eta^{1/\alpha} + \eta^{1/\alpha} (|b(0)| + \theta_2 |x|) + \sigma^{-1} \eta^{1/\alpha} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{Z}_1| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|) \eta^{1/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (2.4) we get

$$(3.7) \quad \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{N-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)h(x)| \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|Y_{N-1}^x|)\eta^{1/\alpha} \leq C(1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}.$$

Next, we bound the first term in (3.6); we distinguish between two cases:

Case 1: $N \leq \eta^{-1} + 1$. By Lemmas 3.4 and 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} |(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| &\leq C(1 + |x|) (\|\nabla P_{(N-i)\eta}h\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 P_{(N-i)\eta}h\|_{\text{HS},\infty}) \eta^{2/\alpha} \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|)[(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \eta^{2/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (2.4), we get

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| &\leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|Y_{i-1}^x|)[(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \eta^{2/\alpha} \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|)[(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \eta^{2/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $N - 1 \leq \eta^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} [(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} &= \eta^{-1/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} i^{-1/\alpha} \leq \eta^{-1/\alpha} \int_0^{N-1} r^{-1/\alpha} dr \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \eta^{-1/\alpha} (N-1)^{-1/\alpha+1} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \eta^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| &\leq C(1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} [(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \\ &\leq C \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} (1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $N > \eta^{-1} + 1$. By Proposition 2.2, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla P_t h(x) - \nabla P_t h(y)| \leq C e^{-\lambda t} |x - y|, \quad h \in \text{Lip}(1), t \geq 0.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| &= \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_1 P_{(N-i)\eta-1}h(x)| \\ &\leq C e^{-\lambda[(N-i)\eta-1]} \sup_{g \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_1 g(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

where $i \leq \lfloor N - \eta^{-1} \rfloor$. By Lemmas 3.4 and 3.1,

$$|(P_\eta - Q_1)P_1 g(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|) (\|\nabla P_1 g\|_\infty + \|\nabla^2 P_1 g\|_{\text{HS},\infty}) \eta^{2/\alpha} \leq C(1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha}.$$

Combining this with (2.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N - \eta^{-1} \rfloor} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| &\leq C \eta^{2/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N - \eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda[(N-i)\eta-1]} (1 + \mathbb{E}|Y_{i-1}^x|) \\ &\leq C(1 + |x|)\eta^{2/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N - \eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda[(N-i)\eta-1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} e^{-\lambda[(N-i)\eta^{-1}]} &= \sum_{i=\lfloor \eta^{-1} \rfloor}^{N-1} e^{-\lambda(i\eta^{-1})} \leq e^\lambda \int_{\lfloor \eta^{-1} \rfloor - 1}^{N-1} e^{-\lambda r} dr \\ &\leq e^\lambda \eta^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} dr = \lambda^{-1} e^\lambda \eta^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| \leq C\lambda^{-1}e^\lambda(1+|x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}.$$

For $i \geq \lfloor N - \eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1$, by almost the same as the calculation in the first case, we find

$$\sum_{i=\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{N-1} [(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \eta^{-1}.$$

Combining this with (3.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{N-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| \\ &\leq C(1+|x|)\eta^{2/\alpha} \sum_{i=\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{N-1} [(N-i)\eta]^{-1/\alpha} \leq C\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}(1+|x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have just shown estimates for $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} \dots$ and $\sum_{i=\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{N-1} \dots$. Adding them up we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor} + \sum_{i=\lfloor N-\eta^{-1} \rfloor + 1}^{N-1} \right) \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Both, Case 1 and Case 2 lead to an estimate of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sup_{h \in \text{Lip}(1)} |Q_{i-1}(P_\eta - Q_1)P_{(N-i)\eta}h(x)| \leq C(1+|x|)\eta^{2/\alpha-1}.$$

Substituting this and (3.7) into (3.6), the first assertion of Theorem 1.2 follows.

It remains to prove Part (2). It is easy to see from (2.1) and (2.3), that we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_1(\mu, \text{law}(X_{\eta k})) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W_1(\text{law}(Y_k), \mu_\eta) = 0.$$

By the triangle inequality and Part (1) with $x = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\mu, \mu_\eta) &\leq W_1(\mu, \text{law}(X_{\eta N})) + W_1(\text{law}(X_{\eta N}), \text{law}(Y_N)) + W_1(\text{law}(Y_N), \mu_\eta) \\ &\leq W_1(\mu, \text{law}(X_{\eta N})) + C\eta^{2/\alpha-1} + W_1(\text{law}(Y_N), \mu_\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ finishes the proof. □

4. MALLIAVIN CALCULUS AND THE PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1

4.1. Jacobi flow associated with the SDE (1.1). The *Jacobi flow* is the derivative of X_t^x with respect to the initial value x ; the Jacobi flow in direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined by

$$\nabla_v X_t^x := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{X_t^{x+\epsilon v} - X_t^x}{\epsilon}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

This limit exists and satisfies

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \nabla_v X_t^x = \nabla_{\nabla_v X_t^x} b(X_t^x), \quad \nabla_v X_0^x = v.$$

Similarly, for $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we can define $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$, which satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x = \nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} b(X_t^x) + \nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^x} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} b(X_t^x), \quad \nabla_{v_1} \nabla_{v_1} X_0^x = 0.$$

Then, we first have the following estimates of $\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$ and $\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any starting point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all directions $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the following (deterministic) estimates hold:*

$$(4.3) \quad |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x| \leq e^{\theta_2} |v_1|, \quad t \in (0, 1],$$

$$(4.4) \quad |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x| \leq \frac{\theta_3}{2\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{4\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

Proof. By (4.1) and (1.6), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 = 2 \langle \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x, \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} b(X_t^x) \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \rangle \leq 2\theta_2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2,$$

and Gronwall's inequality yields for $t \in (0, 1]$

$$|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x|^2 \leq e^{2\theta_2 t} |v_1|^2 \leq e^{2\theta_2} |v_1|^2.$$

This proves the first assertion. Writing $\zeta(t) := \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x$, we see from (4.2), (1.6), (4.3), the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and the elementary estimate $2AB \leq A^2 + B^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} |\zeta(t)|^2 &= 2 \langle \zeta(t), \nabla_{\zeta(t)} b(X_t^x) \rangle + 2 \langle \zeta(t), \nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^x} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} b(X_t^x) \rangle \\ &\leq 2\theta_2 |\zeta(t)|^2 + 2\theta_3 e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2| |\zeta(t)| \\ &\leq 4\theta_2 |\zeta(t)|^2 + \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} e^{4\theta_2} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\zeta(0) = 0$, we can use again Gronwall's inequality and get for all $t \in (0, 1]$

$$|\zeta(t)|^2 \leq \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} e^{4\theta_2} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 \int_0^t e^{4\theta_2(t-s)} ds \leq \frac{\theta_3^2}{8\theta_2^2} e^{8\theta_2} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2. \quad \square$$

4.2. Bismut's formula. (See also [23]). Let $u \in L_{loc}^2([0, \infty) \times (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., we have $\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |u(s)|^2 ds < \infty$ for all $t > 0$. Let $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion and assume that u is adapted to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(W_s : 0 \leq s \leq t)$; i.e., $u(t)$ is \mathcal{F}_t measurable for $t \geq 0$. Define

$$(4.5) \quad U_t = \int_0^t u(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

For a $t > 0$, let $F_t : C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be an \mathcal{F}_t measurable map. If the following limit exists

$$D_U F_t(W) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(W + \epsilon U) - F_t(W)}{\epsilon}$$

in $L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R})$, then $F_t(W)$ is said to be m -dimensional *Malliavin differentiable* and $D_U F_t(W)$ is called the *Malliavin derivative* of $F_t(W)$ in the direction U .

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and both $F_t(W)$ and $G_t(W)$ be d -dimensional Malliavin differentiable functionals. Then we have the following product and chain rules:

$$D_U(\langle F_t(W), G_t(W) \rangle) = \langle D_U F_t(W), G_t(W) \rangle + \langle F_t(W), D_U G_t(W) \rangle,$$

and

$$D_U \nabla \phi(F_t(W)) = \nabla_{D_U F_t(W)} \nabla \phi(F_t(W)).$$

The following integration by parts formula is often called *Bismut's formula*. For a Malliavin differentiable $F_t(W)$ such that $F_t(W), D_U F_t(W) \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R})$, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{E}[D_U F_t(W)] = \mathbb{E} \left[F_t(W) \int_0^t \langle u(s), dW_s \rangle \right].$$

4.3. Time-change method for the SDE (1.1). (See also [34]). We will now turn to the SDE driven by a rotationally invariant α -stable Lévy process with $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. We can express such drivers as subordinated Brownian motion. More precisely, let $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be an independent $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ -stable subordinator. Then, $Z_t := W_{S_t}$ is a rotationally invariant α -stable Lévy process, see e.g. [28]. This means that we can re-write (1.1) as

$$(4.7) \quad dX_t = b(X_t) dt + dW_{S_t}, \quad X_0 = x.$$

Let \mathbb{W} be the space of all continuous functions from $[0, \infty)$ to \mathbb{R}^d vanishing at $t = 0$; we equip \mathbb{W} with the topology of locally uniform convergence, and the Wiener measure $\mu_{\mathbb{W}}$; therefore, the coordinate process

$$W_t(w) = w_t$$

are a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. Let \mathbb{S} be the space of all increasing, càdlàg (right continuous with finite left limits) functions from $[0, \infty)$ to $[0, \infty)$ vanishing at $t = 0$; we equip \mathbb{S} with the Skorohod metric and the probability measure $\mu_{\mathbb{S}}$ so that for any $l \in \mathbb{S}$ the coordinate process

$$S_t(l) := l_t$$

is an $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ -stable subordinator. On the product measure space

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) := (\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{W}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{S}), \mu_{\mathbb{W}} \times \mu_{\mathbb{S}}),$$

we define

$$L_t(w, l) := w_{l_t}.$$

The process $\{L_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a rotationally invariant α -stable Lévy process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We will use the following two natural filtrations associated with the Lévy process L_t and the Brownian motion W_t :

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma \{L_s(w, l); s \leq t\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{W}} := \sigma \{W_s(w); s \leq t\}.$$

In particular, we can regard the solution X_t^x of the SDE (4.7) as an (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted functional on Ω , and therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} f(X_t^x) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{W}} f(X_t^x(w_l)) \mu_{\mathbb{W}}(dw) \mu_{\mathbb{S}}(dl).$$

For every fixed $l \in \mathbb{S}$, we denote by X_t^l the solution to the SDE

$$(4.8) \quad dX_t^l = b(X_t^l) dt + dW_{l_t}, \quad X_0^l = x.$$

We will now fix a path $l \in \mathbb{S}$, and consider the SDE (4.8). Unless otherwise mentioned, all expectations are taken with respect to the Wiener space $(\mathbb{W}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{W}), \mu_{\mathbb{W}})$. First of all, notice that $t \rightarrow W_{l_t}$ is a centered Gaussian process with independent increments. In particular, W_{l_t} is a càdlàg $\mathcal{F}_{l_t}^{\mathbb{W}}$ -martingale. Thus, under **Assumption A**, it is well known that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the SDE (4.8) admits a unique càdlàg $\mathcal{F}_{l_t}^{\mathbb{W}}$ -adapted solution $X_t^{x;l}$, see e.g. [26, p.249, Theorem 6].

The main aim of this section is to establish the following result:

Lemma 4.2. *Under Assumption A one has for all functions $\phi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, all directions $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in (0, 1]$*

$$(4.9) \quad |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}| \leq e^{\theta_2} |v_1|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^{x;l}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}} \phi(X_t^{x;l}) \right] \right| \\ & \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{l_t} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}} \phi(X_t^{x;l}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l}, dW_{l_s} \rangle \right] \right| + \|\nabla \phi\|_{\infty} \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla_{v_i} X_t^{x;l}$ ($i = 1, 2$) is determined by the following linear equation:

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \nabla_{v_i} X_t^{x;l} = \nabla_{\nabla_{v_i} X_t^{x;l}} b(X_t^{x;l}), \quad \nabla_{v_i} X_0^{x;l} = v_i.$$

In order to prove Lemma 4.2, we use a time-change argument to transform the SDE (4.8) into an SDE driven by a standard Brownian motion; this allows us to use Bismut's formula (4.6). For every $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we define

$$l_t^{\epsilon} := \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_t^{t+\epsilon} l_s ds + \epsilon t = \int_0^1 l_{\epsilon s+t} ds + \epsilon t.$$

Since $t \mapsto l_t$ is increasing and right continuous, it follows that for each $t \geq 0$,

$$l_t^{\epsilon} \downarrow l_t \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon \downarrow 0.$$

Moreover, $t \mapsto l_t^{\epsilon}$ is absolutely continuous and strictly increasing. Let γ^{ϵ} be the inverse function of l^{ϵ} , i.e.

$$l_{\gamma_t^{\epsilon}}^{\epsilon} = t, \quad t \geq l_0^{\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{l_t^{\epsilon}}^{\epsilon} = t, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By definition, γ_t^{ϵ} is absolutely continuous on $[l_0^{\epsilon}, \infty)$. Let us now define

$$Y_t^{x;l^{\epsilon}} := X_{\gamma_t^{\epsilon}}^{x;l^{\epsilon}}, \quad t \geq l_0^{\epsilon}.$$

Changing variables in (4.8) we see that for $t \geq l_0^{\epsilon}$,

$$(4.11) \quad Y_t^{x;l^{\epsilon}} = x + \int_0^{\gamma_t^{\epsilon}} b(X_s^{x;l^{\epsilon}}) ds + W_t = x + \int_{l_0^{\epsilon}}^t b(Y_s^{x;l^{\epsilon}}) \dot{\gamma}_s^{\epsilon} ds + W_t$$

($\dot{\gamma}_s^{\epsilon}$ denotes the derivative in s). Hence, for any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$(4.12) \quad \nabla_v Y_t^{x;l^{\epsilon}} = v + \int_{l_0^{\epsilon}}^t \nabla_{\nabla_v Y_s^{x;l^{\epsilon}}} b(Y_s^{x;l^{\epsilon}}) \dot{\gamma}_s^{\epsilon} ds,$$

which has a solution of the form

$$(4.13) \quad \nabla_v Y_t^{x;l^{\epsilon}} = J_{l_0^{\epsilon}, t}^{x;l^{\epsilon}} v,$$

involving a matrix exponential

$$(4.14) \quad J_{s,t}^{x;l^\epsilon} = \exp \left[\int_s^t \nabla b(Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}) \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon ds \right], \quad l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t < \infty.$$

It is easy to see that $J_{s,t}^{x;l^\epsilon} J_{l_0^\epsilon,s}^{x;l^\epsilon} = J_{l_0^\epsilon,t}^{x;l^\epsilon}$ for all $l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t < \infty$.

Now, we come back to the Malliavin calculus from Section 4.2. Fixing $t \geq l_0^\epsilon$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution $Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}$ is a d -dimensional functional of Brownian motion $\{W_s\}_{l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t}$.

Let U be as in Section 4.2. The Malliavin derivative of $Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}$ in direction U exists in $L^2((\mathbb{W}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{W}), \mu_{\mathbb{W}}); \mathbb{R}^d)$ and is given by

$$D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}(W) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}(W + \delta U) - Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}(W)}{\delta}.$$

To simplify notation, we drop the W in $D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}(W)$ and write $D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon} = D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}(W)$. By (4.11), it satisfies the equation

$$D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon} = \int_{l_0^\epsilon}^t \left(\nabla_{D_U Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}) \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon + u(s) \right) ds,$$

and this equation has a unique solution which is given via the matrix exponential (4.14):

$$(4.15) \quad D_U Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon} = \int_{l_0^\epsilon}^t J_{s,t}^{x;l^\epsilon} u(s) ds.$$

For $t > 0$ and $v_1, v_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $u_{t,i}, U_{t,i} : [l_0^\epsilon, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$u_{t,i}(s) := \frac{1}{t - l_0^\epsilon} \nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, \quad U_{t,i;s} := \int_0^s u_{t,i}(r) dr$$

for $l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t$ and $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$(4.16) \quad D_{U_{t,i}} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon} = \frac{s - l_0^\epsilon}{t - l_0^\epsilon} \nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, \quad l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t.$$

In addition, (4.12) implies that for $s \in [l_0^\epsilon, t]$

$$(4.17) \quad D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon} = \int_{l_0^\epsilon}^s \left(\nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} Y_r^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_r^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_r^{x;l^\epsilon}) + \nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_r^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_r^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right) \dot{\gamma}_r^\epsilon dr.$$

The following lemma contains the upper bounds on the derivatives.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $v_1, v_2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in (0, 1]$. Then,*

$$(4.18) \quad |\nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| \leq e^{\theta_2 \gamma_s^\epsilon} |v_i|$$

and

$$(4.19) \quad |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| \leq \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2 \gamma_s^\epsilon} \sqrt{\gamma_s^\epsilon} |v_1| |v_2|.$$

for $l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t$ and $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Recall that $\theta_1 > 0$ and $\dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon \geq 0$. By (4.12) and (1.6), we have for any $l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t$

$$\frac{d}{ds} |\nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 = 2\dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon \left\langle \nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, \nabla_{\nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right\rangle \leq 2\theta_2 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |\nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2,$$

and this implies because of Gronwall's lemma

$$|\nabla_{v_i} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 \leq \exp \left[2\theta_2 \int_{l_0^\epsilon}^s \dot{\gamma}_r^\epsilon dr \right] |v_i|^2 = e^{2\theta_2(\gamma_s^\epsilon - \gamma_{l_0^\epsilon}^\epsilon)} |v_i|^2 = e^{2\theta_2 \gamma_s^\epsilon} |v_i|^2.$$

Using (4.17) and (1.6) we find for any $l_0^\epsilon \leq s \leq t$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 &= 2\dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon \left\langle D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, \nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + 2\dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon \left\langle D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, \nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}} b(Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right\rangle \\ &\leq 2\theta_2 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 + 2\theta_3 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| |D_{U_{t,2}} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| |\nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|. \end{aligned}$$

Now (4.16) and (4.18) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 &\leq 2\theta_2 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 + 2\theta_3 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| |\nabla_{v_2} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| |\nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}| \\ &\leq 4\theta_2 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 + \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |\nabla_{v_2} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 |\nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 \\ &\leq 4\theta_2 \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon |D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 + \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon e^{4\theta_2 \gamma_s^\epsilon} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_{l_0^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon} = 0$, we can use Gronwall's inequality to see

$$|D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}|^2 \leq \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 \int_{l_0^\epsilon}^s \dot{\gamma}_u^\epsilon e^{4\theta_2 \gamma_u^\epsilon} e^{4\theta_2(\gamma_s^\epsilon - \gamma_u^\epsilon)} du = \frac{\theta_3^2}{2\theta_2} |v_1|^2 |v_2|^2 e^{4\theta_2 \gamma_s^\epsilon} \dot{\gamma}_s^\epsilon. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. From (1.6) we see that

$$\frac{d}{dt} |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}|^2 = 2 \left\langle \nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}, \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}} b(X_t^{x;l}) \right\rangle \leq 2\theta_2 |\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}|^2.$$

This yields for all $t \in (0, 1]$

$$|\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}|^2 \leq e^{2\theta_2 t} |v_1|^2 \leq e^{2\theta_2} |v_1|^2,$$

i.e. (4.9) holds.

Using (4.16) with $s = t$ and $i = 2$, the chain rule and Bismut's formula (4.6), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_2} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[D_{U_{t,2}} \left(\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{t - l_0^\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, dW_s \rangle \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{t,2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(Y_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We can now use the fact that for each $t \geq 0$,

$$Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon} = X_t^{x;l^\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_v Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon} = \nabla_v X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_t^\epsilon - l_0^\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \int_0^{l_t^\epsilon} \langle \nabla_{v_2} Y_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, dW_s \rangle \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{l_t^\epsilon, 2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_t^\epsilon - l_0^\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, dW_{l_s^\epsilon} \rangle \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{l_t^\epsilon, 2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma_{l_t^\epsilon}^\epsilon = t$, (4.19) implies that for every $t \in (0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{D_{U_{l_t^\epsilon, 2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \nabla \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}), D_{U_{l_t^\epsilon, 2}} \nabla_{v_1} Y_{l_t^\epsilon}^{x;l^\epsilon} \rangle \right] \right| \\
&\leq \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2 \gamma_{l_t^\epsilon}^\epsilon} \sqrt{\gamma_{l_t^\epsilon}^\epsilon} |v_1| |v_2| \\
&= \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2 t} \sqrt{t} |v_1| |v_2| \\
&\leq \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|,
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.20) \quad & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{1}{l_t^\epsilon - l_0^\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, dW_{l_s^\epsilon} \rangle \right] \right| + \|\nabla \phi\|_\infty \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2\theta_2}} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|.
\end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as in the proof of [34, Lemma 2.5], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.21) \quad & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{l_t^\epsilon - l_0^\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l^\epsilon}, dW_{l_s^\epsilon} \rangle \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{l_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}} \phi(X_t^{x;l}) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l}, dW_{l_s} \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from [34, Lemma 2.2], we know that

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}} \phi(X_t^{x;l^\epsilon}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^{x;l}} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^{x;l}} \phi(X_t^{x;l}) \right].$$

Letting in (4.20) $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and using (4.21) and (4.22), completes the proof. \square

4.4. Proof of Lemma 3.1. Because of (4.3), we can use the differentiation theorem for parameter dependent integrals to get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_v P_t h(x)| &= |\nabla_v \mathbb{E}[h(X_t^x)]| = |\mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_v X_t^x} h(X_t^x)]| \\
&= |\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla h(X_t^x), \nabla_v X_t^x \rangle]| \leq \|\nabla h\| e^{\theta_2} |v| \leq e^{\theta_2} |v|.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to see the second inequality, we define for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$(4.23) \quad h_\epsilon(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_\epsilon(y) h(x - y) dy,$$

where g_ϵ is the density of the normal distribution $N(0, \epsilon^2 I_d)$. It is easy to see that h_ϵ is smooth, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\epsilon(x) = h(x)$, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \nabla h_\epsilon(x) = \nabla h(x)$ and $|h_\epsilon(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

and some $C > 0$. Moreover, $\|\nabla h_\epsilon\| \leq \|\nabla h\| \leq 1$. Using the differentiability theorem for parameter dependent integrals we get

$$\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E} [h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] = \mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] + \mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^x} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)].$$

From (4.4) we get

$$|\mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| = |\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla h_\epsilon(X_t^x), \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x \rangle]| \leq \frac{\theta_3}{2\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{4\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.2, [34, (3.3)] and (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^x} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| \\ & \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{S_t} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x) \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x, dW_{S_s} \rangle \right] \right| + \|\nabla h_\epsilon\|_\infty \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2| \\ & \leq e^{\theta_2} |v_1| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{S_t} \left| \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x, dW_{S_s} \rangle \right| \right] + \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2|. \end{aligned}$$

The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, Itô’s isometry and (4.9) give

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{S_t} \left| \int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^x, dW_{S_s} \rangle \right| \right] &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} \frac{1}{l_t} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \langle \nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l}, dW_{l_s} \rangle \right] \mu_{\mathbb{S}}(dl) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}} \frac{1}{l_t} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |\nabla_{v_2} X_s^{x;l}|^2 dl_s \right)^{1/2} \mu_{\mathbb{S}}(dl) \\ &\leq e^{\theta_2} |v_2| \int_{\mathbb{S}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{l_t}} \mu_{\mathbb{S}}(dl) \\ &= e^{\theta_2} |v_2| \mathbb{E} [S_t^{-1/2}] \\ &\leq C e^{\theta_2} |v_2| t^{-1/\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is taken from [6, Theorem 2.1 (ii) (c)]. Thus, we have for all $t \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E} [h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| &\leq |\mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| + |\mathbb{E} [\nabla_{\nabla_{v_2} X_t^x} \nabla_{\nabla_{v_1} X_t^x} h_\epsilon(X_t^x)]| \\ &\leq \frac{\theta_3}{2\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{4\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2| + e^{\theta_2} |v_1| C e^{\theta_2} |v_2| t^{-1/\alpha} + \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2}\theta_2} e^{2\theta_2} |v_1| |v_2| \\ &\leq e^{4\theta_2} \left(\frac{\theta_3}{2\sqrt{2}\theta_2} + C t^{-1/\alpha} + \frac{\theta_3}{\sqrt{2}\theta_2} \right) |v_1| |v_2| \\ &\leq C e^{4\theta_2} t^{-1/\alpha} |v_1| |v_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ using dominated convergence,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E} [h_\epsilon(X_t^x)] = \nabla_{v_2} \nabla_{v_1} \mathbb{E} [h(X_t^x)],$$

completing the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

5. EXAMPLE AND NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we discuss an example in dimension 1.

Example 5.1. If $b(x) = -x \in \mathbb{R}$, then the SDE (1.1) has the following form:

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + dZ_t,$$

and the corresponding EM discretization is

$$Y_{k+1} = Y_k - \eta Y_k + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_{k+1}.$$




FIGURE 1. The histogram represents the sample distribution of μ_η with $\alpha = 1.2$ and the red curve plots the graph of g_μ , the density function of μ .

It is easy to check that the constants appearing in **Assumption A**, (1.5)–(1.7), can be chosen to be

$$\theta_1 = 1, \quad K = 0, \quad \theta_2 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_3 = 0.$$

From the proof of Proposition B.1 below, we know that the invariant measure of the Markov process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, μ is given by the law of $\alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1$.

In Figures 1, 2 and 3, we set $Y_0 = 0$, the number of iterations is $N = 50000$, and the sample size is equal to 2500. Therefore, the histograms in Figures 1, 2 and 3 can be approximately regarded as the sample distribution of μ_η , the invariant measure of the Markov process $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$. Since μ is given by the law of $\alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1$, Fourier inversion yields the following expression for the density function g_μ of μ :

$$g_\mu(x) = \frac{\alpha^{1/\alpha}}{\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-t^\alpha} \cos(\alpha^{1/\alpha} x t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

From Figures 1, 2 and 3, it is easy to see that the invariant probability measure of the Markov process $(Y_k)_{k \geq 0}$, μ_η is very close to μ .

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS 2.1, 2.2 AND 2.3 AND LEMMA 2.5

Proof of Proposition 2.1. The generator \mathcal{L}^α of the process X_t is given

$$\mathcal{L}^\alpha f(x) = \langle b(x), \nabla f(x) \rangle + (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x), \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$$

where $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ is the fractional Laplace operator, which is the generator of the rotationally symmetric α -stable Lévy process Z_t ; it is defined as a principal value integral

$$(A.1) \quad (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f(x) = d_\alpha \cdot \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x+y) - f(x)) \frac{dy}{|y|^{\alpha+d}}.$$

It is not difficult to see that for all functions from the set

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}); \int_{|z| \geq 1} |f(x+z) - f(x)| \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} < \infty \right\}.$$




FIGURE 2. The histogram represents the sample distribution of μ_η with $\alpha = 1.5$ and the red curve plots the graph of g_μ , the density function of μ .




FIGURE 3. The histogram represents the sample distribution of μ_η with $\alpha = 1.8$ and the red curve plots the graph of g_μ , the density function of μ .

$\mathcal{L}^\alpha f$ is well-defined; moreover $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{L}^\alpha(\mathcal{D})$ can be embedded into the *full generator* $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^\alpha$, i.e. the set of all pairs of (bounded) Borel functions (f, g) such that $f(X_t) - f(X_0) - \int_0^t g(X_s) ds$ is a (local) martingale, see the discussion in [2, pp. 24–26].

Define $V(x) := (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$. It is easy to check that $V \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^\alpha)$, and $\mathcal{L}^\alpha V$ is a well-defined measurable function. Since

$$\nabla V(x) = \frac{x}{V(x)}, \quad \nabla^2 V(x) = \frac{V(x)^2 I_d - xx^T}{V(x)^3},$$

(I_d denotes the $d \times d$ identity matrix) we see that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$|\nabla V(x)| \leq 1, \quad \|\nabla^2 V(x)\|_{\text{HS}} \leq 2\sqrt{d}.$$

Thus, (1.5) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle b(x), \nabla V(x) \rangle &= \frac{1}{V(x)} \langle b(x) - b(0), x \rangle + \frac{1}{V(x)} \langle b(0), x \rangle \\ &\leq -\theta_1 \frac{|x|^2}{V(x)} + \frac{K}{V(x)} + \frac{|b(0)||x|}{V(x)} \\ &\leq -\theta_1 V(x) + \theta_1 + K + |b(0)|, \end{aligned}$$

and we see from (A.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} V(x) &= d_\alpha \int (V(x+y) - V(x) - \langle \nabla V(x), y \rangle \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(|y|)) \frac{dy}{|y|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &= d_\alpha \int_{|y|<1} \int_0^1 \int_0^r \langle \nabla^2 V(x+sy), yy^T \rangle_{\text{HS}} ds dr \frac{dy}{|y|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &\quad + d_\alpha \int_{|y|\geq 1} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla V(x+ry), y \rangle dr \frac{dy}{|y|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &\leq d_\alpha \sqrt{d} \int_{|y|<1} \frac{|y|^2}{|y|^{\alpha+d}} dy + d_\alpha \int_{|y|\geq 1} \frac{|y|}{|y|^{\alpha+d}} dy \\ &= \frac{d_\alpha \sqrt{d} \sigma_{d-1}}{2-\alpha} + \frac{d_\alpha \sigma_{d-1}}{\alpha-1} =: C_{d,\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^\alpha V(x) \leq -\lambda_1 V(x) + q_1 \mathbf{1}_{A_1}(x)$$

for the compact set $A_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; |x| \leq 2 + 2\theta_1^{-1}(K + |b(0)| + C_{d,\alpha})\}$ and with $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}\theta_1$, $q_1 = \theta_1 + K + |b(0)| + C_{d,\alpha}$.

Thus, [20, Theorem 5.1] yields that the process $(X_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic, i.e. there exists a unique invariant probability measure μ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|P_t(x, \cdot) - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} = 0,$$

where $P_t(x, dz)$ is the transition function of the process $(X_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ denotes the total variation norm on the space of signed measures. Furthermore, because of the inequality above and [20, Theorem 6.1], we have

$$\sup_{|f| \leq V} |\mathbb{E}[f(X_t^x)] - \mu(f)| \leq c_1 V(x) e^{-c_2 t}$$

for suitable constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Moreover, by [20, Theorem 4.2], $|\mu(V)| < \infty$. Since $|x| \leq V(x) \leq 1 + |x|$,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^x| \leq \mathbb{E}[V(X_t^x)] \leq |\mu(V)| + C(1 + V(x)) e^{-\theta_4 t} \leq |\mu(V)| + C(2 + |x|).$$

and this means that we have

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^x| \leq C(1 + |x|)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. □

Proof of Proposition 2.2. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, (1.6) implies that

$$\langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \leq \theta_2 |x - y|^2,$$

and (1.5) shows for all $|x - y|^2 > 2K/\theta_1$ that

$$\langle b(x) - b(y), x - y \rangle \leq -\theta_1 |x - y|^2 + K \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} |x - y|^2.$$

Hence, we can use [33, Theorem 1.2] with $K_1 = \theta_2$, $K_2 = \frac{\theta_1}{2}$ and $L_0 = \frac{2K}{\theta_1}$ to get the desired estimate. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Denote by $P(x, dy) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \in dy \mid Y_0 = x)$. Because of

$$Y_1 = x + \eta b(x) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_1$$

and (1.2), we have

$$P(x, dy) = \mathbf{1}_{(\eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma, \infty)}(|y - x - \eta b(x)|) \frac{\alpha \eta \, dy}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha |y - x - \eta b(x)|^{\alpha+d}}.$$

Since $V(y) \leq |y| + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(y) P(x, dy) &\leq \int_{|y-x-\eta b(x)| > \eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} \frac{\alpha \eta (|y| + 1) \, dy}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha |y - x - \eta b(x)|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &= \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{|z| > \eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} (|z + x + \eta b(x)| + 1) \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{|z| > \eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} (|z| + |x + \eta b(x)| + 1) \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{|z| \geq \eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} (|z| + |x + \eta(b(x) - b(0))| + \eta|b(0)| + 1) \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (1.5) and (1.7), we further have

$$\begin{aligned} |x + \eta(b(x) - b(0))|^2 &= |x|^2 + 2\eta \langle b(x) - b(0), x \rangle + \eta^2 |b(x) - b(0)|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - 2\theta_1 \eta + \theta_2^2 \eta^2) |x|^2 + 2K\eta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(y) P(x, dy) \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{|z| > \eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} (|z| + (1 - 2\theta_1 \eta + \theta_2^2 \eta^2)^{1/2} |x| + \sqrt{2K\eta} + \eta|b(0)| + 1) \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\ &= \frac{\alpha \eta}{\sigma_{d-1} \sigma^\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \int_{\eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma}^{\infty} \frac{dr \, d\theta}{r^\alpha} + (1 - 2\theta_1 \eta + \theta_2^2 \eta^2)^{1/2} |x| + \sqrt{2K\eta} + \eta|b(0)| + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma(\alpha - 1)} + (1 - 2\theta_1 \eta + \theta_2^2 \eta^2) |x| + \sqrt{2K\eta} + \eta|b(0)| + 1 \\ &\leq (1 - \theta_1 \eta) |x| + \frac{\alpha \eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma(\alpha - 1)} + \sqrt{2K\eta} + \eta|b(0)| + 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities hold because of $\eta < \min \{1, \theta_1 \theta_2^{-2}, \theta_1^{-1}\}$. Hence, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(y) P(x, dy) \leq \lambda_2 V(x) + q_2 \mathbf{1}_{A_2}(x)$$

with

$$\lambda_2 = 1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\eta < 1, \quad q_2 = 1 + \frac{\theta_1}{2}\eta + \frac{\alpha}{\sigma(\alpha-1)}\eta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \sqrt{2K\eta} + \eta|b(0)|,$$

$$\text{and the compact set } A_2 = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d; |x| \leq 1 + \frac{2\alpha\eta^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}}{\theta_1\sigma(\alpha-1)} + \frac{2\sqrt{2K}}{\theta_1}\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{2|b(0)|}{\theta_1} \right\}.$$

In addition, the proof of irreducibility is standard, see e.g. [17, Appendix A].

We can now use this and [19, Theorem 6.3] to see that the process $(Y_k^x)_{k \geq 0}$ is exponentially ergodic, i.e. there exists a unique invariant probability μ_η such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$,

$$\sup_{|f| \leq V} |\mathbb{E}f(Y_k) - \mu_\eta(f)| \leq c_1 V(x) e^{-c_2 k},$$

for suitable constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. □

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Notice that $|y| \leq V(y)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} V(Y_{k+1}) &= V\left(Y_k + \eta b(Y_k) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_{k+1}\right) \\ &= V(Y_k + \eta b(Y_k)) + V\left(Y_k + \eta b(Y_k) + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_{k+1}\right) - V(Y_k + \eta b(Y_k)) \\ &= V(Y_k) + \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla V(Y_k + rb(Y_k)), b(Y_k) \rangle dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma}} \left\langle \nabla V\left(Y_k + \eta b(Y_k) + r\tilde{Z}_{k+1}\right), \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \right\rangle dr. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\nabla V(x) = V(x)^{-1}x$, (1.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A.2)} \quad \int_0^\eta \langle \nabla V(Y_k + rb(Y_k)), b(Y_k) \rangle dr &\leq \int_0^\eta \frac{\langle Y_k, b(Y_k) \rangle + r|b(Y_k)|^2}{V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))} dr \\ &\leq \int_0^\eta \frac{\langle Y_k, b(Y_k) - b(0) \rangle + |b(0)||Y_k| + r|b(Y_k)|^2}{V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))} dr \\ &\leq \int_0^\eta \frac{-\theta_1|Y_k|^2 + K + |b(0)||Y_k| + r|b(Y_k)|^2}{V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))} dr. \end{aligned}$$

One can write by (1.7) and the fact $r \leq \eta \leq \min\left\{1, \frac{\theta_1}{8\theta_2^2}, \frac{1}{\theta_1}\right\}$

$$\begin{aligned} -\theta_1|Y_k|^2 + K + |b(0)||Y_k| + r|b(Y_k)|^2 &\leq -\frac{3}{4}\theta_1|Y_k|^2 + 2\eta\theta_2^2|Y_k|^2 + \frac{|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2r|b(0)|^2 + K \\ &\leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2}|Y_k|^2 + \frac{|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2r|b(0)|^2 + K, \end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned} V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))^2 &= |Y_k + rb(Y_k)|^2 + 1 \\ &= |Y_k|^2 + 2r \langle Y_k, b(Y_k) \rangle + r^2|b(Y_k)|^2 + 1 \\ &\leq |Y_k|^2 + 2r \langle Y_k, b(Y_k) - b(0) \rangle + 2r|b(0)||Y_k| + 2r^2\theta_2^2|Y_k|^2 + 2r^2|b(0)|^2 + 1 \\ &\leq (1 - 2r\theta_1)|Y_k|^2 + 2r|b(0)||Y_k| + 2r^2\theta_2^2|Y_k|^2 + 2\eta^2|b(0)|^2 + 1 + 2\eta K \\ &\leq |Y_k|^2 + \frac{2r|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2\eta^2|b(0)|^2 + 1 + 2\eta K. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $V \geq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{-\theta_1|Y_k|^2 + K + |b(0)||Y_k| + r|b(Y_k)|^2}{V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))} \\
& \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} \frac{|Y_k|^2}{V(Y_k + rb(Y_k))} + \frac{|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2r|b(0)|^2 + K \\
& \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} \frac{|Y_k|^2}{\sqrt{|Y_k|^2 + \frac{2r|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2\eta^2|b(0)|^2 + 1 + 2\eta K}} + \frac{|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2|b(0)|^2 + K \\
& \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} \sqrt{|Y_k|^2 + \frac{2r|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2\eta^2|b(0)|^2 + 1 + 2\eta K} + C_1 \\
& \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} V(Y_k) + C_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_1 := \frac{\theta_1}{2} \left(\frac{2|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2|b(0)|^2 + 1 + 2K \right) + \frac{|b(0)|^2}{\theta_1} + 2|b(0)|^2 + K.$$

Combining this with (A.2), we arrive at

$$\int_0^\eta \langle \nabla V(Y_k + rb(Y_k)), b(Y_k) \rangle dr \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{2} \eta V(Y_k) + C_1 \eta.$$

In addition, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \nabla V \left(y + \eta b(y) + r \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \right), \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \right\rangle \right] \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{d-1}} \int_{|z| \geq 1} \left[\langle \nabla V(y + \eta b(y) + rz), z \rangle - \langle \nabla V(y + \eta b(y)), z \rangle \mathbb{1}_{(0, \eta^{1/\alpha})}(|z|) \right] \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\
& = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{d-1}} \int_{1 \leq |z| \leq \eta^{-1/\alpha}} \int_0^r \langle \nabla^2 V(y + \eta b(y) + sz), zz^\top \rangle_{\text{HS}} \frac{ds dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \\
& \quad + \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{d-1}} \int_{|z| \geq \eta^{-1/\alpha}} \langle \nabla V(y + \eta b(y) + rz), z \rangle \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \nabla V \left(y + \eta b(y) + r \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \right), \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \right\rangle \right] \right| \\
& \leq \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_{d-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{|z| \leq \eta^{-1/\alpha}} \int_0^r 2\sqrt{d}|z|^2 \frac{dz ds}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} + \int_{|z| \geq \eta^{-1/\alpha}} |z| \frac{dz}{|z|^{\alpha+d}} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{2\alpha\sqrt{d}}{2-\alpha} r \eta^{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha}} + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \eta^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since \tilde{Z}_{k+1} is independent of Y_k , we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} \langle \nabla V (Y_k + \eta b(Y_k) + r \tilde{Z}_{k+1}), \tilde{Z}_{k+1} \rangle dr \right] \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^{\eta^{1/\alpha}/\sigma} \left(\frac{2\alpha\sqrt{d}}{2-\alpha} r \eta^{\frac{\alpha-2}{\alpha}} + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \eta^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \right) dr \\ & = \left(\frac{\alpha\sqrt{d}}{(2-\alpha)\sigma^2} + \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\sigma} \right) \eta := C_2\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[V(Y_{k+1})] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\eta\right) \mathbb{E}[V(Y_k)] + (C_1 + C_2)\eta,$$

which we can iterate to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V(Y_{k+1})] & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\eta\right)^{k+1} |x| + (C_1 + C_2)\eta \sum_{j=0}^k \left(1 - \frac{\theta_1}{2}\eta\right)^j \\ & \leq |x| + \frac{2(C_1 + C_2)}{\theta_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|Y_k^x| \leq \mathbb{E}[V(Y_k^x)] \leq C(1 + |x|),$$

for some constant C , which is independent of η . \square

APPENDIX B. EXACT RATE FOR THE ORNSTEIN–UHLENBECK PROCESS

In this section, we assume that μ is the invariant measure of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process on \mathbb{R} :

$$dX_t = -X_t dt + dZ_t, \quad X_0 = x,$$

where Z_t is a rotationally symmetric α -stable Lévy process ($1 < \alpha < 2$), and μ_η is the invariant measure of

$$Y_{k+1} = Y_k - \eta Y_k + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $Y_0 = x$, $\sigma = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2d_\alpha}\right)^{1/\alpha}$ with $d_\alpha = \left(2 \int_0^\infty \frac{1-\cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy\right)^{-1}$, and \tilde{Z}_j are iid random variables with density

$$(B.1) \quad p(z) = \frac{\alpha}{2|z|^{\alpha+1}} \mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(|z|).$$

Proposition B.1. *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$,*

$$0 < \liminf_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{W_1(\mu, \mu_\eta)}{\eta^{2/\alpha-1}} \leq \limsup_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{W_1(\mu, \mu_\eta)}{\eta^{2/\alpha-1}} < \infty.$$

Proof. Since $X_t = e^{-t}x + e^{-t} \int_0^t e^s dZ_s$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi X_t}] &= e^{i\xi e^{-t}x} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \int_0^t \xi e^{-t+s} dZ_s} \right] = e^{i\xi e^{-t}x} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\int_0^t |\xi e^{-t+s}|^\alpha ds} \right] \\ &= e^{i\xi e^{-t}x} e^{-\alpha^{-1}|\xi|^\alpha(1-e^{-\alpha t})} \\ &\xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\alpha^{-1}|\xi|^\alpha} = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi \alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the invariant measure μ is given by the law of $\alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1$.

It is easy to see that

$$Y_{k+1} = (1-\eta)^{k+1}x + \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} \sum_{i=0}^k (1-\eta)^i \tilde{Z}_{k+1-i}.$$

Denote by $\varphi(\xi) = \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi \tilde{Z}_j}]$ the characteristic function of the Pareto distribution. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_{k+1}}] = e^{i\xi(1-\eta)^{k+1}x} \prod_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \tilde{Z}_{k+1-i}} \right] = e^{i\xi(1-\eta)^{k+1}x} \prod_{i=0}^k \varphi \left(\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \xi \right).$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and denoting by Y_η a random variable with distribution μ_η , we get

$$(B.2) \quad \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] = \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \varphi \left(\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \xi \right).$$

For $\xi > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \varphi(\xi) &= 2 \int_1^\infty [1 - \cos(\xi z)] p(z) dz = \alpha \int_1^\infty [1 - \cos(\xi z)] \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} \\ &= \alpha \xi^\alpha \left(\int_0^\infty [1 - \cos u] \frac{du}{u^{\alpha+1}} - \int_0^\xi [1 - \cos u] \frac{du}{u^{\alpha+1}} \right) \\ &= \sigma^\alpha \xi^\alpha - \alpha \xi^\alpha \int_0^\xi [1 - \cos u] \frac{du}{u^{\alpha+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p(z)$ is symmetric, cf. (B.1), we have $\varphi(\xi) = \varphi(-\xi)$, and so

$$\varphi(\xi) = 1 - \sigma^\alpha |\xi|^\alpha + \alpha |\xi|^\alpha \int_0^{|\xi|} [1 - \cos u] \frac{du}{u^{\alpha+1}}.$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $c := \inf_{0 < u \leq 1} (1 - \cos u) / u^2 > 0$, we get for all $|\xi| \leq 1$,

$$\varphi(\xi) \geq 1 - \sigma^\alpha |\xi|^\alpha + \alpha |\xi|^\alpha \int_0^{|\xi|} cu^2 \frac{du}{u^{\alpha+1}} = 1 - \sigma^\alpha |\xi|^\alpha + \frac{c\alpha}{2-\alpha} |\xi|^2.$$

Thus, for $|\xi| \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1 \wedge \sigma^\alpha$,

$$(B.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \log \varphi \left(\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \xi \right) &\geq \log \left(1 - \sigma^\alpha \left| \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \xi \right|^\alpha + \frac{c\alpha}{2-\alpha} \left| \frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1-\eta)^i \xi \right|^2 \right) \\ &= \log \left(1 - \eta(1-\eta)^{\alpha i} |\xi|^\alpha + \frac{c\alpha}{(2-\alpha)\sigma^2} \eta^{2/\alpha} (1-\eta)^{2i} |\xi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(1 - x + \frac{c\alpha}{(2-\alpha)\sigma^2} x^{2/\alpha} \right) + x}{x^{2/\alpha}} = \frac{c\alpha}{(2-\alpha)\sigma^2}.$$

Therefore, there is some constant $C = C(\alpha, \sigma) > 0$ such that for small enough $x > 0$

$$\log \left(1 - x + \frac{c_1 \alpha}{(2 - \alpha) \sigma^2} x^{2/\alpha} \right) \geq -x + Cx^{2/\alpha}.$$

If we use this in (B.3), we obtain for all $|\xi| \leq 1$ and small enough $\eta > 0$,

$$\log \varphi \left(\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1 - \eta)^i \xi \right) \geq -\eta(1 - \eta)^{\alpha i} |\xi|^\alpha + C\eta^{2/\alpha} (1 - \eta)^{2i} |\xi|^2.$$

Inserting this into (B.2), we see for all $|\xi| \leq 1$ and small enough $\eta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \log \varphi \left(\frac{\eta^{1/\alpha}}{\sigma} (1 - \eta)^i \xi \right) \\ &\geq -\eta |\xi|^\alpha \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (1 - \eta)^{\alpha i} + C\eta^{2/\alpha} |\xi|^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (1 - \eta)^{2i} \\ &= -|\xi|^\alpha \frac{\eta}{1 - (1 - \eta)^\alpha} + C|\xi|^2 \frac{\eta^{2/\alpha}}{1 - (1 - \eta)^2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\alpha} |\xi|^\alpha - |\xi|^\alpha \Omega(\eta) + |\xi|^2 \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1}). \end{aligned}$$

In the last equality we use that

$$\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \left[\frac{\eta}{1 - (1 - \eta)^\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right] \eta^{-1} = \frac{\alpha - 1}{2\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{\eta^{2/\alpha}}{1 - (1 - \eta)^2} \eta^{-2/\alpha+1} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Here and in the following, the notation $f(\eta) = \Omega(g(\eta))$ as $\eta \downarrow 0$ means that $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\eta)}{g(\eta)}$ is a positive (finite) constant. With the elementary inequality $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we see for all $|\xi| \leq 1$ and sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] &\geq \exp \left[-\frac{1}{\alpha} |\xi|^\alpha - |\xi|^\alpha \Omega(\eta) + |\xi|^2 \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1}) \right] \\ &\geq e^{-|\xi|^\alpha/\alpha} [1 - |\xi|^\alpha \Omega(\eta) + |\xi|^2 \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1})], \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(B.4)} \quad \int_{-1}^1 \left(\mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] - \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi \alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1}] \right) d\xi &\geq \int_{-1}^1 e^{-\alpha^{-1} |\xi|^\alpha} [-|\xi|^\alpha \Omega(\eta) + |\xi|^2 \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1})] d\xi \\ &= -\Omega(\eta) + \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1}) = \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$h(x) := \frac{1}{M} \left(\frac{\sin x}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \neq 0\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x=0\}} \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$M := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \left| \frac{x \cos x - \sin x}{x^2} \right| \in (0, \infty).$$

Since $h \in \text{Lip}(1)$ and

$$h(x) = \frac{1}{2M} \int_{-1}^1 e^{i\xi x} d\xi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

it follows from the Fubini theorem and (B.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(\mu, \mu_\eta) &\geq \left| \mathbb{E} [h(Y_\eta)] - \mathbb{E} [h(\alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1)] \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2M} \int_{-1}^1 e^{i\xi x} d\xi \right) \mathbb{P}(Y_\eta \in dx) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2M} \int_{-1}^1 e^{i\xi x} d\xi \right) \mathbb{P}(\alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1 \in dx) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{2M} \int_{-1}^1 \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] d\xi - \frac{1}{2M} \int_{-1}^1 \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi \alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1}] d\xi \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{2M} \left| \int_{-1}^1 (\mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi Y_\eta}] - \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi \alpha^{-1/\alpha} Z_1}]) d\xi \right| \\
&\geq \Omega(\eta^{2/\alpha-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the upper bound in Theorem 1.2 (2), finishes the proof. \square

Acknowledgement. The research of L. Xu is supported in part by NSFC No. 12071499, Macao S.A.R. grant FDCT 0090/2019/A2 and University of Macau grant MYRG2020-00039-FST. R.L. Schilling was supported through the joint Polish–German NCN–DFG ‘Beethoven 3’ grant (NCN 2018/31/G/ST1/02252; DFG SCHI 419/11-1). P. Chen is supported by the Initial Scientific Research Fund of Young Teachers in Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics (1008-YAH21111).

REFERENCES

1. V. Bally and D. Talay (1996): The law of the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations. *Probability theory and related fields*. **104**, 43–60.
2. B. Böttcher, R.L. Schilling and J. Wang (2013): *Lévy-Type Processes: Construction, Approximation and Sample Path Properties*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **2099**, Lévy Matters III, Springer, Cham.
3. P. Chen, J. Lu and L. Xu (2021): Approximation to stochastic variance reduced gradient Langevin dynamics by stochastic delay differential equations. To appear in: *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*.
4. P. Chen and L. Xu (2019): Approximation to stable law by the Lindeberg principle *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **480**, 123338.
5. K. Dareiotis and M. Gerencs (2020): On the regularisation of the noise for the Euler-Maruyama scheme with irregular drift. *Electronic Journal of Probability*. **25**, 1–18.
6. C.-S. Deng, R.L. Schilling and Y.-H. Song (2017): Subgeometric rates of convergence for Markov processes under subordination. *Advances in Applied Probability* **49**, 162–181.
7. A. Eberle and A. Guillin (2019): Couplings and quantitative contraction rates for Langevin dynamics. *The Annals of Probability*. **47**, 1982–2010.
8. A. Eberle, A. Guillin and R. Zimmer (2019): Quantitative Harris-type theorems for diffusions and McKean-Vlasov processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*. **371**, 7135–7173.
9. W. Fang and M.B. Giles (2016): Adaptive Euler-Maruyama method for SDEs with non-globally Lipschitz drift. In: *International Conference on Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods in Scientific Computing*. Springer, Cham, pp. 217–234.
10. Y. Guan and J. Wu (2017): Exponential ergodicity for non-Lipschitz multivalued stochastic differential equations with Lévy jumps. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis, Quantum Probability and Related Topics*. **20**, 1750002.
11. J. Jacod (2004): The Euler scheme for Lévy driven stochastic differential equations: limit theorems. *The Annals of Probability*. **32**, 1830–1872.
12. X. Jin, G. Pang, L. Xu and X. Xu (2021): An approximation to steady-state of $M/Ph/n + M$ queue. Preprint *arXiv:2109.03623* [math.PR].
13. A. Janicki, Z. Michna and A. Weron (1996): Approximation of stochastic differential equations driven by α -stable Lévy motion. *Applicationes Mathematicae*. **24**, 149–168.
14. F. Kühn and R.L. Schilling (2019): Strong convergence of the Euler-Maruyama approximation for a class of Lévy-driven SDEs. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **129**, 2654–2680.
15. M. Liang and J. Wang (2020): Gradient estimates and ergodicity for SDEs driven by multiplicative Lévy noises via coupling. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **130**, 3053–3094.
16. V. Lemaire (2007): An adaptive scheme for the approximation of dissipative systems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **117**, 1491–1518.

17. J. Lu, Y. Tan and L. Xu (2020): Central limit theorem and self-normalized Cramér-type moderate deviation for Euler-Maruyama scheme. Preprint *arXiv:2012.04328[math.PR]*.
18. D. Luo and J. Wang: (2019): Refined basic couplings and Wasserstein-type distances for SDEs with Lévy noises. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **129**, 3129–3173.
19. S.P. Meyn and R.L. Tweedie (1992): Stability of Markovian processes I: Criteria for discrete-time chains. *Advances in Applied Probability*. **24**, 542–574.
20. S.P. Meyn and R.L. Tweedie (1993): Stability of Markovian processes III: Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*. **25**, 518–548.
21. R. Mikulevičius and F. Xu (2018): On the rate of convergence of strong Euler approximation for SDEs driven by Lévy processes. *Stochastics*. **90**, 569–604.
22. T.H. Nguyen, U. Simsekli and G. Richard (2019): Non-asymptotic analysis of Fractional Langevin Monte Carlo for non-convex optimization. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pp. 4810–4819.
23. J. Norris (1986): Simplified Malliavin calculus. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XX 1984/85*. Springer, Berlin, pp. 101–130.
24. G. Pagès and F. Panloup (2020): Unadjusted Langevin algorithm with multiplicative noise: Total variation and Wasserstein bounds. Preprint *arXiv:2012.14310[math.PR]*.
25. O.M. Pamen and D. Taguchi (2017): Strong rate of convergence for the Euler-Maruyama approximation of SDEs with Hölder continuous drift coefficient. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **127**, 2542–2559.
26. P.E. Protter (2004): *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations* 2nd ed. Springer, Berlin.
27. P. Protter and D. Talay (1997): The Euler scheme for Lévy driven stochastic differential equations. *The Annals of Probability*. **25**, 393–423.
28. K. Sato (1999): *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
29. J. Shao (2018): Weak convergence of Euler-Maruyama’s approximation for SDEs under integrability condition. Preprint *arXiv:1808.07250[math.PR]*.
30. U. Simsekli, L. Sagun and M. Gurbuzbalaban (2019): A tail-index analysis of stochastic gradient noise in deep neural networks. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, pp. 5827–5837.
31. F.-Y. Wang (2020): Exponential contraction in Wasserstein distances for diffusion semigroups with negative curvature. *Potential Analysis*. **53**, 1123–1144.
32. J. Wang (2008): Criteria for ergodicity of Lévy type operators in dimension one. *Stochastic processes and their applications*. **118**, 1909–1928.
33. J. Wang (2016): L^p -Wasserstein distance for stochastic differential equations driven by Lévy processes. *Bernoulli*. **22**, 1598–1616.
34. X. Zhang (2013): Derivative formulas and gradient estimates for SDEs driven by α -stable processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*. **123**, 1213–1228.

(P. Chen) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, NANJING 211106, CHINA

Email address: chenpengmath@nuaa.edu.cn

(C.-S. Deng) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430072, CHINA

Email address: dengcs@whu.edu.cn

(R.L. Schilling) TU DRESDEN, FAKULTÄT MATHEMATIK, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATISCHE STOCHASTIK, 01062 DRESDEN, GERMANY

Email address: rene.schilling@tu-dresden.de

(L. Xu) 1. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MACAU, MACAU S.A.R., CHINA. 2. ZHUHAI UM SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH INSTITUTE, ZHUHAI, CHINA

Email address: lihuxu@um.edu.mo