

THE HEAT MODULATED INFINITE DIMENSIONAL HESTON MODEL AND ITS NUMERICAL APPROXIMATION

FRED ESPEN BENTH, GABRIEL LORD, GIULIA DI NUNNO, AND ANDREAS PETERSSON

ABSTRACT. The HEat modulated Infinite Dimensional Heston (HEIDIH) model and its numerical approximation are introduced and analyzed. This model falls into the general framework of infinite dimensional Heston stochastic volatility models of (F.E. Benth, I.C. Simonsen '18), introduced for the pricing of forward contracts. The HEIDIH model consists of a one-dimensional stochastic advection equation coupled with a stochastic volatility process, defined as a Cholesky-type decomposition of the tensor product of a Hilbert-space valued Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, the mild solution to the stochastic heat equation on the real half-line. The advection and heat equations are driven by independent space-time Gaussian processes which are white in time and colored in space, with the latter covariance structure expressed by two different kernels. In the first part of the paper, regularity results for the HEIDIH model in fractional Sobolev spaces are formulated. These are achieved under smoothness conditions on the covariance kernels, which in particular allow for weighted Matérn kernels. In the second part, numerical approximation of the model is considered. An error decomposition formula, pointwise in space and time, for a semi-explicit finite-difference scheme is proven. For a special case, essentially sharp convergence rates are obtained when this is combined with a fully discrete finite element approximation of the stochastic heat equation. The analysis takes into account a localization error, a pointwise-in-space finite element discretization error and an error stemming from the noise being sampled pointwise in space. The rates obtained in the analysis are higher than what would be obtained using a standard Sobolev embedding technique. Numerical simulations illustrate the results.

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of SPDEs (stochastic partial differential equations) for the modeling of the risk-neutral dynamics of forward prices $f(t, T)$ in commodity markets is well-established, see, e.g, [2, 7, 8, 10]. By a forward price we refer to the price at $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ = (0, \infty)$ of some contract on a commodity (oil, gas, an instantaneous delivery of electricity) delivering at a maturity time T . The basic idea comes from the Heath, Jarrow and Morton approach [23]. A heuristic is the following: assume that the forward price is modeled by an Itô process via $f(t, T) = f(0, T) + \int_0^t \sigma(s, T) d\beta_T(s)$. Here the initial value $f(0, T)$ as well as the standard Brownian motion β_T and the stochastic volatility $\sigma(\cdot, T)$ depend on the maturity time T . Let $x = T - t$ denote the time to maturity, consider a space-time Gaussian process $B(t, x) := \beta_{t+x}(t)$ and

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H15, 60H35, 65M60, 46E22, 46N30.

Key words and phrases. stochastic partial differential equations, infinite dimensional Heston model, forward prices, stochastic heat equation, stochastic advection equation, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, finite element method.

Acknowledgement. The research leading to these results was funded within the project STORM: Stochastics for Time-Space Risk Models, from the Research Council of Norway (RCN), project number: 274410.

let $g(s) := \sigma(s, \cdot + s)$, $X(0, \cdot) := f(0, \cdot)$. Then we define a space-time process X by

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} X(t, x) &:= f(0, t + x) + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x + t) dB(s, x) \\ &= \mathcal{S}(t)X(0)(x) + \int_0^t (\mathcal{S}(t - s)g(s))(x) dB(s, x) \end{aligned}$$

for $t, x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Here \mathcal{S} is the left-shift semigroup defined by $(\mathcal{S}(t)v)(x) := v(t + x)$ for functions v , having the infinitesimal generator $\partial/\partial x$. This is made rigorous by letting $X(t)$ be the mild solution at time t to a stochastic advection equation on \mathbb{R}^+ driven by a Wiener process B in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} following the setting of [16]. Since the term structure of forward prices is believed to be continuous and eventually constant, \mathcal{H} is typically chosen to be a Hilbert space of functions displaying these two features. This is a simple model that nevertheless captures non-Gaussian effects (by letting the volatility term g be stochastic) as well as correlation structures in time to maturity.

In this paper, we present, analyze and study the numerical approximation of the HEIDIH model, which is a special case of the SPDE approach to forward price modeling. Compared to other such models, our work stands out for three reasons.

- (i) In the context of forward pricing, the properties of B are often discussed in terms of its incremental covariance kernel (or function) $q(x, y) = \text{Cov}(B(1, x), B(1, y))$, see, e.g., [2, 10]. It is, however, rare to find any discussion on what properties a given kernel q should have in order for B to be well-defined and thus allow for the existence of $X(t)$ in a given Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . In this work, we give concrete conditions on the covariance kernels involved that allow us to make precise statements not only on the existence of X but on its regularity in terms of fractional Sobolev spaces.
- (ii) We derive convergence rates for numerical approximations of X . While numerical simulations of SPDEs for forward pricing abound, rigorous derivation of sharp convergence rates for the algorithms considered are rare. We mention [5, 6] but note that these only consider one-dimensional noise (i.e., $\beta_T(t) = \beta(t)$ for all T). Such convergence results are needed to guarantee the reliable simulation of forward prices of contracts and options written on them. Furthermore, in contrast to many other numerical analyses of SPDEs, our work focuses on pointwise-in-space errors for X . This is practically relevant since $X(t, \cdot)$ evaluated at the point $x = T - t$ corresponds to the forward price of a contract with maturity time T .
- (iii) The model we construct is parsimonious but sufficiently flexible to allow practitioners to match features of forward prices encountered in real-world data. We return to this point below.

The HEat modulated Infinite Dimensional Heston (HEIDIH) model is a special case of the infinite dimensional stochastic volatility model introduced in [4, 10]. Therein, a price process X and a volatility process Y are coupled via another process Z in the system

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} dX(t) = \mathcal{C}X(t) dt + \Gamma^Z(t) dB(t), & X(0) \in \mathcal{H}, \\ dY(t) = \mathcal{A}Y(t) dt + dW(t), & Y(0) \in \mathcal{H}, \end{cases}$$

on a fixed interval $[0, T]$. Here $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$ is a Hilbert space of functions on \mathbb{R}^+ on which the left-shift semigroup \mathcal{S} is strongly continuous. With \mathcal{U} being another strongly continuous semigroup, we have written $\mathcal{C} := \partial/\partial x$ and \mathcal{A} for the generators of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{U} , respectively. By B and W we denote two independent Wiener processes in \mathcal{H} . The mapping $t \mapsto \Gamma^Z(t)$

is not function-valued as in (1) but operator-valued and is defined by $\Gamma^Z(t) := Y(t) \otimes Z(t)$. The stochastic process Z is \mathcal{H} -valued and takes values on the unit ball in \mathcal{H} and \otimes denote the Hilbert tensor product. The process Z is an intrinsic part of the model and each choice yields different dynamics. One example is the setting $Z(t) := \eta$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, where η is a deterministic function with unit norm. Another is obtained by letting $Z(t) := Y(t)/\|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $Y(t) \neq 0$ and 1 otherwise. In any case $\Gamma^Z(t)(\Gamma^Z(t))^* = Y(t) \otimes Y(t)$, where $(\Gamma^Z(t))^*$ is the adjoint of $\Gamma^Z(t)$, so that $\Gamma^Z(t)$ is a square root of the stochastic variance process $Y(t) \otimes Y(t)$ [10, Proposition 7]. This is the reason the authors of [10] refer to this system as a Heston stochastic volatility model in Hilbert space.

The HEIDIH model is obtained by specifying $\mathcal{A} = a\Delta$ in (2), which is the Laplacian Δ with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions at $x = 0$ coupled with a diffusivity constant $a > 0$. For the state space \mathcal{H} we adopt the setting of [18] and choose $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}^r := H^r(\mathbb{R}^+) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ where $H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is a fractional Sobolev space and $r > 1/2$. An example of a realization of Y and X for this model when $Z(t) := \eta$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and fixed $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ is shown in Figures 1(a) and 1(b), see Remark 4.6 for precise parameter choices.

The generator \mathcal{A} has been chosen to illustrate how precise regularity results and approximation convergence rates can be obtained for Heston stochastic volatility models in Hilbert spaces under suitable conditions on the covariance kernels of B and W . We believe that our results on kernels, regularity in Sobolev spaces and pointwise-in-space approximation results are of interest also for other SPDE models of forward prices. Moreover, the model itself is flexible enough to capture real-world features of forward prices. Specifically:

- (i) The covariance kernels q_W of W and q_B of B can be chosen to match the regularity (i.e., for which r the process X takes values in \mathcal{H}^r) of the prices being modeled. First steps towards a theory for direct estimation of the covariances structures of infinite-dimensional stochastic integrals are taken in [9].
- (ii) A practitioner can influence the behavior of the volatility process Y by specifying the diffusivity constant a . The process $Y(t) = Y(t, \cdot)$ can be seen to be Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^+ due to the noise W being additive, and is therefore completely determined by its covariance function $c_t(x, y) = \text{Cov}(Y(t, x), Y(t, y))$. By an argument that is made rigorous below, the left-shift property of the semigroup \mathcal{S} implies that

$$X(t, x) = X(0, x + t) + \int_0^t Y(s, x + s) \langle Z(s), \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dW(s).$$

By properties of the heat kernel, $\text{Cov}(Y(s, x), Y(s, y)) \rightarrow 0$ as $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$ (see Figure 1(c)) and the rate of decrease can be increased by letting $a \rightarrow 0$. The degree to which the dependence of the volatility with regards to time to maturity is local can therefore be controlled. The local dependence is a realistic feature of the HEIDIH model since contracts close in maturity affect each other.

- (iii) The model directly displays the Samuelson effect. This says that the volatility should be decreasing in time to maturity (see, e.g., [3] for a discussion of this in a commodity pricing context) i.e., that $Y(t, x) \rightarrow 0$ as the time to maturity $x \rightarrow 0$. This is obtained from the fact that $Y(t) \in H^r(\mathbb{R}^+) \subset \mathcal{H}^r$, see also Figure 1(a).

We now outline our results in more detail. In Section 2, we describe some necessary mathematical preliminaries, starting with notation and operator theory. After this, we reiterate properties of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHSs) and fractional Sobolev spaces that we need, and define our state space \mathcal{H}^r .




(a) Volatility process (stochastic heat equation) $Y = (Y(t, x))_{(t,x) \in [0, T] \times [0, 2T]}$.(b) Price process $X = (X(t, x))_{(t,x) \in [0, T]^2}$.(c) Covariance function $(c_T(x, y))_{(x,y) \in [0, 2T]^2}$, where $c_T(x, y) = \text{Cov}(Y(T, x), Y(T, y))$.

FIGURE 1. Realization of the HEIDIH model X in the case that $Z(t) = \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ for $t \in [0, T] = [0, 2]$, the corresponding realization of Y and an illustration of the covariance function $(x, y) \mapsto \text{Cov}(Y(T, x), Y(T, y))$. The process Y has zero Dirichlet boundary conditions.

In Section 3 we introduce cylindrical Wiener processes with covariance kernels and prove some preliminary results of a general nature. First, we completely characterize the kernels that yield classical Q -Wiener processes in \mathcal{H}^r . Then, we derive a class of kernels (which include weighted Matérn kernels) that allow for precise regularity and numerical convergence results in the remainder of the paper.

Section 4 concerns existence, uniqueness and regularity of X and Y . First, we show that under suitable conditions on q_B and $Y(0)$, classical results guarantee existence, uniqueness and Sobolev regularity of Y . We prove a temporal regularity result for the process $Y(\cdot, x)$ with x fixed that is needed for numerical approximation, and note that it is better than what would be obtained from a Sobolev embedding technique. These results are then used when

the HEIDIH model is introduced. Under further assumptions on q_B , Z and $X(0)$, we show that X is well-defined in \mathcal{H}^r for suitable $r > 1/2$.

In Section 5 we turn our attention to numerical approximation of the HEIDIH model. In Section 5.1 we derive an error decomposition formula for a finite-difference approximation of X . This applies to any Heston stochastic volatility model in a Hilbert space as considered in [10], as long the Hilbert space in question has a reproducing kernel. In Section 5.2 we focus on the approximation of Y in the special case of Dirichlet boundary conditions and $Z(t) = \eta$. The analysis is complicated by the fact that the errors are considered pointwise in space. This is rarely considered for finite element approximations, which we use for the approximation of Y . We also need to take into account localization errors, meaning that we approximate the process Y on a fixed domain $(0, D)$ instead of \mathbb{R}^+ . Since we wish to employ rapid noise simulation methods such as the circulant embedding method, we consider pointwise sampling of $W(t)$ rather than the typical case of sampling $P_h W(t)$, where P_h denotes the L_2 -projection onto a finite element grid. This leads to an additional error. We take all of these error sources into account and show in numerical simulations that our results are sharp. Finally, in Section 5.3 we put these results together to derive convergence rates for the full HEIDIH model X and discuss how our regularity results influence practitioners' choice of algorithms, specifically what space-time grids to use for the components X and Y . Section 6 finishes the paper with a discussion of how our results relate to existing results for numerical approximations of SPDEs and an outline of future work.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section briefly presents the mathematical machinery necessary for our results.

2.1. Notation and operator theory. Let $(U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ and $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$ be Banach spaces. All Banach spaces in this paper are taken over \mathbb{R} unless otherwise stated. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(U, V)$ the space of bounded linear operators from U to V equipped with the usual operator norm. If U and V are separable Hilbert spaces we write $\mathcal{L}_2(U, V)$ for the space Hilbert–Schmidt operators. This is a separable Hilbert space with an inner product, for an arbitrary ONB (orthonormal basis) $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of U , given by

$$\langle \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2(U, V)} := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \Gamma_1 e_j, \Gamma_2 e_j \rangle_V \text{ for } \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2(U, V).$$

We have $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}_2(U, V)$ if and only if $\Gamma^* \in \mathcal{L}_2(V, U)$ and their norms coincide. We use the shorthand notations $\mathcal{L}(U)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(U)$ when $V = U$ and we write $\Sigma^+(U)$ for the class of positive semidefinite operators when U is a Hilbert space. For operators $\Gamma \in \Sigma^+(U)$, we say that they are trace class if $\text{Tr}(\Gamma) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \Gamma e_j, e_j \rangle = \|\Gamma^{1/2}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U)}^2 < \infty$ for one, equivalently all, ONBs $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of U .

For Hilbert spaces U and V , the tensor $u \otimes v$ is regarded as an element of $\mathcal{L}(V, U)$ by the relation $(u \otimes v)w := \langle v, w \rangle_V u$ for $v, w \in V$ and $u \in U$.

We need the concepts of approximation and entropy numbers from [33]. Given a linear operator Γ between Banach spaces U and V , its n th approximation number $\psi_n(\Gamma)$ is given by

$$\psi_n(\Gamma) := \inf \left\{ \|\Gamma - \tilde{\Gamma}\| : \tilde{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{L}(U, V), \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}) < n \right\},$$

$n \in \mathbb{N}$, while its n th entropy number $\epsilon_n(\Gamma)$ is

$$\epsilon_n(\Gamma) := \inf \left\{ \delta \geq 0 : \Gamma(B_U) \subset \cup_{j=1}^m \{v_j + \delta B_V\} \text{ for some } v_1, \dots, v_m \in V \text{ and } m \leq 2^{n-1} \right\}.$$

Here B_U and B_V denote the unit spheres in U and V , respectively. By [33, Theorems 11.2.3, 12.1.3], both types of numbers satisfy

$$(3) \quad \epsilon_1(\Gamma) = \psi_1(\Gamma) = \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}(U,V)}.$$

Both numbers are also multiplicative in that, if $\Gamma_1 \in \mathcal{L}(U, V)$ and $\Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{V}, V)$ for some additional Banach space \tilde{V} , then

$$(4) \quad \epsilon_{m+n-1}(\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2) \leq \epsilon_m(\Gamma_1) \epsilon_n(\Gamma_2) \text{ and } \psi_{m+n-1}(\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2) \leq \psi_m(\Gamma_1) \psi_n(\Gamma_2)$$

for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ [33, Theorems 11.9.2 and 12.1.5]. If U and V are Hilbert spaces, then

$$(5) \quad \psi_n(\Gamma) \leq 2\epsilon_n(\Gamma)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$(6) \quad \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,V)} = \|(\psi_n(\Gamma))_{n=1}^{\infty}\|_{\ell^2},$$

where ℓ^p denotes the usual space of p -summable sequences [33, Theorems 11.3.4, 12.3.1 and 15.5.5]. Taking (3) and (4) into account, this means in particular that $\mathcal{L}_2(U, V)$ is an operator ideal.

For two Banach spaces U and V , we write $U \hookrightarrow V$ if $U \subset V$ and $\|u\|_V \leq C\|u\|_U$ for some constant $C < \infty$ and all $u \in U$, i.e., the embedding operator $I_{U \hookrightarrow V} \in \mathcal{L}(U, V)$. For Hilbert spaces, we write $U \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} V$ as shorthand for $I_{U \hookrightarrow V} \in \mathcal{L}_2(U, V)$.

Throughout this paper, we adopt the notion of generic constants, which may vary from occurrence to occurrence and are independent of any parameter of interest, such as spatial or temporal step sizes. By $a \lesssim b$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote the existence of a generic constant such that $a \leq Cb$.

2.2. Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. We make heavy use of the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHSs). The properties that we are going to need are listed here, we refer to, e.g., [11, 40] for further details. Throughout the paper we consider symmetric positive semidefinite kernels q on a non-empty subset $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, but usually just refer to q as a kernel on \mathcal{E} when there is no risk of confusion. A Hilbert space $H = H_q(\mathcal{E})$ is said to be the RKHS of a kernel q if it is a Hilbert space of real-valued functions on a non-empty index set $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the conditions

- (i) $q(x, \cdot) \in H_q(\mathcal{E})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$ and
- (ii) for all $f \in H_q(\mathcal{E})$, $x \in \mathcal{E}$, $f(x) = \langle f, q(x, \cdot) \rangle_{H_q(\mathcal{E})}$

are satisfied. The property (ii) is referred to as the reproducing kernel property of the space $H_q(\mathcal{E})$. For each kernel q there is one and only one Hilbert space of functions on \mathcal{E} with these two properties. Moreover, a Hilbert space H of functions on \mathcal{E} is a RKHS if and only if the evaluation functional $\delta_x: H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $\delta_x f = f(x)$, is continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{E}$ [40, Theorem 10.2]. We write H_q for $H_q(\mathcal{E})$ when it is clear from the context what index set \mathcal{E} we have in mind. Since q is positive semidefinite, $|q(x, y)|^2 \leq q(x, x)q(y, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$.

If H_q is separable with an ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$, [11, Theorem 14] yields the kernel decomposition $q(x, \cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j(x)e_j$, the sum being convergent in H_q . This implies that $q(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_j(x)e_j(y)$ with convergence in \mathbb{R} . For index sets \mathcal{E} that are domains in \mathbb{R}^d , continuity of q is a sufficient condition for separability [11, Theorem 15].

Suppose that we are given two RKHSs on an index set $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with kernels q and \tilde{q} . Then $H_{\tilde{q}} \hookrightarrow H_q$ if and only if there is some constant $C \geq 0$ such that $Cq - \tilde{q}$ is a positive semidefinite kernel [1, Theorem I.13.IV, Corollary I.13.IV.2]. We express this by writing $q \gtrsim \tilde{q}$.

For any Hilbert spaces U, H and operator $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}(U, H)$, we may interpret the range $\Gamma(U)$ as a Hilbert space when equipped with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Gamma(U)} := \langle \Gamma^{-1} \cdot, \Gamma^{-1} \cdot \rangle_U$, where Γ^{-1} is the pseudoinverse of Γ [34, Proposition C.0.3]. The norm on $\Gamma(U)$ may also be represented by

$$\|u\|_{\Gamma(U)} = \min_{\substack{v \in U \\ \Gamma v = u}} \|v\|_U,$$

see [34, Remark C.0.2]. Applying this to a RKHS $H_q(\mathcal{E})$ and the operator $R_{\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}$ that restricts functions on \mathcal{E} to functions on a subset $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$, it follows from [11, Theorem 6] that $R_{\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}$ maps $H_q(\mathcal{E})$ to $H_q(\mathcal{D})$ and $H_q(\mathcal{D}) = R_{\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}(H_q(\mathcal{E}))$ with equal norms. Moreover, by [40, Theorem 10.46] there is a linear extension operator $E_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}}$ of functions on \mathcal{D} to functions on \mathcal{E} such that $\|E_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_q(\mathcal{D}), H_q(\mathcal{E}))} = 1$.

2.3. Fractional Sobolev spaces. For a domain $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $L^p(\mathcal{E})$, $p \in [0, \infty]$, for the usual Banach space of p -integrable equivalence classes of functions with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We omit \mathcal{E} when it is clear from the context which domain we refer to. The fractional Sobolev space $H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $r \geq 0$, is a separable Hilbert space and a generalization of the usual Sobolev space $H^k(\mathbb{R}^d) = W^{k,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It consists of all $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 := (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{u}(\xi)|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^r d\xi < \infty,$$

where \hat{u} is the Fourier transform of $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the fractional Sobolev space $H^r(\mathcal{E})$, $r \geq 0$, consists of all $u \in L^2(\mathcal{E})$ for which $u = \tilde{u}|_{\mathcal{E}}$ for some $\tilde{u} \in H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H^r(\mathcal{E})} := \min_{\substack{v \in H^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ v|_{\mathcal{E}} = u}} \|v\|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

When \mathcal{E} is sufficiently regular (such as when it is a possibly unbounded interval in the case of $d = 1$), $H^r(\mathcal{E})$ has a bounded extension operator. It therefore coincides with the usual Sobolev space $W^{r,2}(\mathcal{E})$ with equivalent norms. We refer to [36, Chapter VI] for more details on this. In terms of the restriction operator $R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{E}}$, we have $H^r(\mathcal{E}) = R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{E}}(H^r(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with equal norms. We again omit \mathcal{E} from $H^r(\mathcal{E})$ when it is clear from the context which domain we refer to.

If $r > d/2$, then $H^r(\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, is a RKHS with a stationary (that is, $m_r(x, y) = m_r(x - y)$) for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$) kernel given by

$$m_r(x) := 2^{1-r} (\Gamma(r))^{-1} |x|^{r-d/2} K_{r-d/2}(|x|),$$

see [40, Chapter 10]. Here $K_{r-d/2}$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the second kind and order $r - d/2$. Note that m_r is continuous and bounded on \mathbb{R}^d . By the reproducing property, we obtain that all functions $f \in H^r(\mathcal{E})$ are continuous and bounded, which is a special case of the classical Sobolev embedding theorem.

We also make use of the weighted spaces $H^{r,\alpha} := H^{r,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $r, \alpha \geq 0$. For these we introduce the weight function w_α given by $w_\alpha(x) := (1+x^2)^\alpha$ for $x, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. We set $H^{r,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : x \mapsto w_\alpha(x)u(x) \in H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$. These are special cases of the weighted spaces considered in [22], which we refer to for further details, see also [38, Theorems 2.3.9 and 2.5.6].

They are Hilbert spaces equipped with the inner product $\langle u, v \rangle_{H^{r,\alpha}} := \langle w_\alpha u, w_\alpha v \rangle_{H^r}$. For $s \geq r, \beta \geq \alpha$, $H^{s,\beta} \hookrightarrow H^{r,\alpha}$ with the embedding being compact if and only if both inequalities are strict and $\beta > 0$ [22, Theorem 2.3]. For $r > d/2$, we note that $w_{-\alpha}(x)m_r(x - \cdot)w_{-\alpha}(\cdot) \in H^{r,\alpha}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and that for $f \in H^{r,\alpha}$,

$$w_\alpha(x)f(x) = \langle w_\alpha f, m_r(x - \cdot) \rangle_{H^r} = \langle f, w_{-\alpha}m_r(x - \cdot) \rangle_{H^{r,\alpha}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

From this, we obtain that $H^{r,\alpha}$ is a RKHS with kernel $(x, y) \mapsto w_{-\alpha}(x)m_r(x - y)w_{-\alpha}(y)$.

The state space that we will work with for the HEIDIH model is given by $\mathcal{H}^r := H^r(\mathbb{R}^+) \oplus \mathbb{R}$, $r > 1/2$. We define it for $r \geq 0$. It consists of all $f = \tilde{f} + b$ where $\tilde{f} \in H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. It is equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 := \|\tilde{f}\|_{H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)}^2 + b^2.$$

When $r > 1/2$, it is a RKHS with a kernel given by $(x, y) \mapsto 1 + m_r(x - y)$. We consider H^r as a subspace of \mathcal{H}^r by identifying it with $H^r + 0$.

3. CYLINDRICAL WIENER PROCESSES IN FRACTIONAL SOBOLEV SPACES

In this section, we recall the concept of cylindrical Wiener processes with a focus on processes that have a covariance kernel. We prove a result that completely characterizes Q -Wiener processes in the state space \mathcal{H}^r . Then, we outline the assumptions on the kernels q_W and q_B that are made in the forthcoming sections. Finally, we construct a class of kernels that fulfill all the assumptions made.

Consider $T < \infty$, a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$ fulfilling the usual conditions and a Hilbert space H . We follow [35] and define a (strongly) cylindrical Wiener process as a process $W: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(H, L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}))$ such that $t \mapsto W(t)u$ is a real-valued Wiener process for all $u \in H$. This definition agrees with what is called a generalized Wiener process in [16].

Given a separable RKHS $H_q \hookrightarrow H$ with ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ and a sequence $(\beta_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of real-valued Wiener processes, we construct a cylindrical Wiener process W in H by

$$(7) \quad W(t)u := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \beta_j(t) \langle u, e_j \rangle_H, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u \in H,$$

which converges in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, see [35, Remark 7.3]. Note that $\beta_j = W(\cdot)e_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. The representation does not depend on $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ in the sense that if $(f_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ is another ONB of H_q and we define a real-valued Wiener processes $\tilde{\beta}$ by $\tilde{\beta}_j = W(\cdot)f_j$, then

$$W(t)u = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\beta}_j(t) \langle u, f_j \rangle_H, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad u \in H, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

If U is another Hilbert space such that $H_q \hookrightarrow U$, we obtain a cylindrical Wiener process in U by replacing $\langle u, e_j \rangle_H$ in (7) with $\langle u, e_j \rangle_U$. In H , W will have an incremental covariance operator $Q \in \Sigma^+(H)$ given by $Q = I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H} I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H}^*$ in the sense that $\mathbb{E}[(W(1)u)(W(1)v)] = \langle Qu, v \rangle_H$ for all $u, v \in H$. Similarly, W has covariance $I_{H_q \hookrightarrow U} I_{H_q \hookrightarrow U}^*$ in U . These operators have unique positive square roots. By [16, Corollary B.3], $(I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H} I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H}^*)^{1/2}(H) = (I_{H_q \hookrightarrow U} I_{H_q \hookrightarrow U}^*)^{1/2}(U) = H_q$. In this sense, the distribution of W does not depend on the choice of H in (7). Therefore, we are justified in calling W a cylindrical Wiener process with kernel q and need not specify in which Hilbert space we consider it.

The SPDEs we consider in the paper are built on stochastic integrals with respect to cylindrical Wiener processes W . Consider a predictable process $\Psi: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_2(H_q, H)$. Itô integrals taking values in H are well-defined with

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_0^t \Psi(s) dW(s) \right\|_H^2 \right] = \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\|\Psi(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_q, H)}^2] ds,$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, provided that the integral on the right hand side is finite. We refer to [35] and [16, Section 4.2] for more details on Wiener processes in Hilbert spaces and the Itô integral.

If $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H$, the sum

$$W(t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \beta_j(t) e_j, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

converges in $L^2(\Omega, H)$. It is then called a Q -Wiener process, and its covariance operator $Q = I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H} I_{H_q \hookrightarrow H}^*$ is trace-class. It induces a cylindrical Wiener process by $W(t)u := \langle W(t), u \rangle$ and we do not make a notational difference between the two concepts. Many papers dealing with SPDE models for forward prices assume that W is a Q -Wiener process, see, e.g., [4, 10]. It is therefore important to clarify when this is the case in our setting with the state space \mathcal{H}^r . The following theorem completely characterizes the kernels q that satisfy $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^r$, so that W is a Q -Wiener process in \mathcal{H}^r .

Theorem 3.1. *There is a separable RKHS $H_q = H_q(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^r$ if and only if there is a separable RKHS $H_{\tilde{q}} = H_{\tilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that $H_{\tilde{q}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r$, a function $f \in H_{\tilde{q}}$ and a constant $c \geq 0$ with*

$$q(x, y) = \langle \tilde{q}(x, \cdot) + f, \tilde{q}(y, \cdot) + f \rangle_{H_{\tilde{q}}} + c = \tilde{q}(x, y) + f(x) + f(y) + \|f\|_{H_{\tilde{q}}}^2 + c$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

If this holds for $r \geq 0$, then the cylindrical Wiener process W with kernel q is an \mathcal{H}^r -valued Q -Wiener process and fulfills

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\langle W(1), u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \langle W(1), v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} \tilde{q}(x, y) \tilde{u}(x) \tilde{v}(y) dx dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} a_u \tilde{v}(x) f(x) + a_v \tilde{u}(x) f(x) dx + a_u a_v (\|f\|_{H_{\tilde{q}}}^2 + c) \end{aligned}$$

for all $u = \tilde{u} + a_u, v = \tilde{v} + a_v \in \mathcal{H}^r = H^r \oplus \mathbb{R}$.

If this holds for $r > 1/2$, then $x \mapsto W(t, x)$ is a mean square continuous and bounded random field for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\mathbb{E}[W(1, x)W(1, y)] = q(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Note that if $H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r$ for some $r > 1/2$, without the \mathcal{L}_2 property of the embedding, there might not be a Q -Wiener process with covariance function q . However, as long as $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^0 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^+) \oplus \mathbb{R}$, this theorem shows that we can still interpret q as the covariance function of W in a weaker L^2 sense. One might also consider embeddings in negatively weighted spaces. We do not pursue this direction but focus instead on constructing kernels q such that $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First, suppose that there is a separable RKHS H_q such that $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^r = H^r \oplus \mathbb{R}$. Let $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be an ONB of H_q and write $e_j = f_j + c_j$ with $f_j \in \mathcal{H}^r, c_j \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since

$$(8) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 + c_j^2 = \|I_{H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_q, \mathcal{H}^r)} < \infty$$

we have $(c_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^2$. Moreover, due to the fact that $f_j = e_j - c_j$, the evaluation operator δ_x is well-defined on f_j . Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |f_j(x)|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |e_j(x) - c_j|^2 \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |e_j(x)|^2 = 2\|(c_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}\|_{\ell^2}^2 + 2q(x, x) < \infty,$$

we may define a kernel \tilde{q} by

$$\tilde{q}(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} f_j(x)f_j(y)$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The kernel \tilde{q} is symmetric and positive semidefinite. We define a Hilbert space H by

$$H := \left\{ v = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} v_j f_j, (v_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \|v\|^2 := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} v_j^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

An ONB of this space is $(f_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$. Moreover, H is a RKHS: for $v \in H$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$|v(x)|^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |v_j| |f_j(x)| \right)^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |v_j|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |f_j(x)|^2 = \|v\|_H^2 \tilde{q}(x, x).$$

Since also $\tilde{q}(x, \cdot) \in H$ and $\langle \tilde{q}(x, \cdot), v \rangle_H = v(x)$, we find that $H = H_{\tilde{q}}$ is the RKHS of \tilde{q} . The fact that $H_{\tilde{q}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r$ follows directly from (8). Let $\mathcal{J} = \{j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } f_j \neq 0\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} q(x, y) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (f_j(x) + c_j)(f_j(y) + c_j) \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} f_j(x)f_j(y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} c_j f_j(x) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} c_j f_j(y) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} c_j^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c} c_j^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the split is justified by $(c_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}, (f_j(x))_{j=1}^{\infty}$ and $(f_j(y))_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$. By setting $f = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} c_j f_j(x)$ and $c = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^c} c_j^2$ we obtain one direction of the first claim of Theorem 3.1. The other direction is obtained by analogous arguments.

For the second claim, consider the same setting as above. Since $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^r$,

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle W(1), u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r} \langle W(1), v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r}] &= \langle Qu, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r} = \langle I_{H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* u, I_{H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* v \rangle_{H_q} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle I_{H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* u, e_j \rangle_{H_q} \langle I_{H_q \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* v, e_j \rangle_{H_q} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle u, e_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r} \langle v, e_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this identity with $r = 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[\langle W(1), u \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0} \langle W(1), v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^0}] \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\langle \tilde{u}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} + a_u c_j) (\langle \tilde{v}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} + a_v c_j) \\
 &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \langle \tilde{u}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} \langle \tilde{v}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_u c_j \langle \tilde{u}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_u c_j \langle \tilde{v}, f_j \rangle_{L^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j^2 \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} \tilde{q}(x, y) \tilde{u}(x) \tilde{v}(y) \, dx \, dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \tilde{a}_u v(x) f(x) + a_v \tilde{u}(x) f(x) \, dx + a_u a_v (\|f\|_{H_{\tilde{q}}}^2 + c).
 \end{aligned}$$

The exchange of summation and integration in the last step is justified in the first case by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} |f_j(x)| |f_j(y)| |\tilde{u}(x)| |\tilde{v}(y)| \, dx \, dy \\
 & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} |\tilde{u}(x)| \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} |f_j(x)|^2 \right)} \, dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} |\tilde{v}(y)| \sqrt{\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} |f_j(y)|^2 \right)} \, dy \\
 & \leq \|I_{H_q \hookrightarrow L_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_q, L_2)} \|\tilde{v}\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

using Hölder's inequality twice. The justification in the second and third cases is similar.

For the third claim, we first note that $x \mapsto W(t, x)$ is a well-defined random field for all $t \in [0, T]$ due to [24, Theorem 7.5.1] and the fact that $(x, y) \mapsto m_r(y - x) + 1$ is continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$. The claim follows by taking $u = m_r(x - \cdot) + 1$ and $v = m_r(y - \cdot) + 1$ in (9). \square

Up to this point, we have let W denote a general cylindrical Wiener process. We now introduce the key assumptions on the kernels of B and W in (2) which we use to deduce regularity results for this system in Section 4. Due to the presence of the term Γ^Z in (2), the assumptions mostly concern the covariance of W .

Assumption 3.2. Let B and W in (2) be cylindrical Wiener processes with kernels q_B and q_W , respectively. Let $r_B > 1/2$ and $r_W \geq 0$. Assume the following for the RKHSs H_{q_B} and H_{q_W} on \mathbb{R}^+ :

- (i) The embedding $H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{r_B}$ holds true.
- (ii) The embedding $H_{q_W} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^{r_W}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ holds true.
- (iii) There is an ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of H_{q_W} such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|e_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)}^2 < \infty$.

We also need the following assumption for our numerical analysis of approximations to Y in Section 5.

Assumption 3.3. Under the same conditions as in Assumption 3.2, let q_w be defined on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. For some $s_W > 1/2$ and $\alpha > 0$, $H_{q_w}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^{s_W, \alpha}(\mathbb{R})$.

We end this section with an example of a class of kernels q that fulfill all parts of these assumptions. They are based on stationary kernels q_s that are positive definite, integrable and continuous on \mathbb{R} . We recall that under these conditions, q_s has a positive Fourier transform $\hat{q}_s: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ which is also integrable on \mathbb{R}^d , see [40, Chapter 6].

Proposition 3.4 (Weight-stationary kernels). *Let $q_s \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ be a stationary positive definite kernel with a spectral density \hat{q}_s such that for some constant $C < \infty$, $\sigma > 1/2$, $\hat{q}_s(\xi) \leq Cw_{-\sigma}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $w: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a continuous symmetric function such that the mapping $f(x) \mapsto w_\alpha(x)w(x)f(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, is bounded with respect to $\mathcal{L}(H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}))$ for some $\alpha > 1/4$. Let C_0 be an arbitrary non-negative constant and let the kernel q on \mathbb{R} be defined by*

$$q(x, y) := w(x)q_s(x - y)w(y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then $H_q = H_q(\mathbb{R}^+)$ fulfills

- (i) $H_q \hookrightarrow H^{r,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ for all $r \leq \sigma$,
- (ii) $H_q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)$ for all $r < \sigma - 1/2$, and
- (iii) there is an ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of H_q such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|e_j\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)}^2 < \infty$.

For the proof of this proposition, we need two lemmas. The first deals with the restriction of kernels on \mathbb{R} to kernels on \mathbb{R}^+ . We prove it for general domains in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, be a (possibly unbounded) domain and let q be a kernel on \mathbb{R}^d such that $H_q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is separable. Then $H_q(\mathcal{D})$ is separable and*

- (i) if $H_q(\mathbb{R}^d) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $H_q(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r(\mathcal{D})$ and
- (ii) if there is an ONB $(e_j^{\mathbb{R}^d})_{j=1}^\infty$ of $H_q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|e_j^{\mathbb{R}^d}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 < \infty$, then there is an ONB $(e_j^{\mathcal{D}})_{j=1}^\infty$ of $H_q(\mathcal{D})$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \|e_j^{\mathcal{D}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D})}^2 < \infty$.

Proof. We recall that $R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}(H_q(\mathbb{R}^d)) = H_q(\mathcal{D})$ with equal norms. Therefore, if $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ is an ONB of $H_q(\mathbb{R}^d)$, an ONB $(\tilde{e}_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of $H_q(\mathcal{D})$ is obtained by letting $\tilde{e}_j^{\mathcal{D}} = R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}e_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. This shows that $H_q(\mathcal{D})$ is separable.

For (i), we note that $I_{H_q(\mathcal{D}) \hookrightarrow R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}(H^r(\mathbb{R}^d))} = R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}I_{H_q(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)}E_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d}$, where we write $E_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d}: H_q(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow H_q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for the extension operator of functions on \mathcal{D} to functions on \mathbb{R}^d . This is Hilbert–Schmidt by the ideal property of this class. Since $R_{\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}(H^r(\mathbb{R}^d)) = H^r(\mathcal{D})$, this finishes the proof of (i). The statement in (ii) follows directly from the definition of the L^∞ -norm. \square

The next lemma shows that part (i) of Proposition 3.4 is satisfied and also that Assumption 3.3 is fulfilled.

Lemma 3.6. *Under the conditions of Proposition 3.4, $H_q(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^{\sigma,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two steps. First, we show that $H_{m_{w,\sigma}}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^{\sigma,\alpha}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we show that $H_q(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H_{m_{w,\sigma}}(\mathbb{R})$. Here we write $m_{v,\sigma}$ for the weighted Matérn kernel $(x, y) \mapsto v(x)m_\sigma(x - y)v(y)$, where v is a given function on \mathbb{R} .

For the first step, it suffices to check that $m_{w_{-\alpha},\sigma} \gtrsim m_{w,\sigma}$. This means that there is some constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n d_i (Cw_{-\alpha}(x_i)m_\sigma(x_i - x_j)w_{-\alpha}(x_j) - w(x_i)m_\sigma(x_i - x_j)w(x_j)) d_j \geq 0.$$

Since $w_{-\alpha}$ is a strictly positive function, this is equivalent to showing that there is some constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n d_i (Cm_\sigma(x_i - x_j) - w_\alpha(x_i)w(x_i)m_\sigma(x_i - x_j)w(x_j)w_\alpha(x_j)) d_j \geq 0.$$

This in turn is equivalent to $H_{m_{w_\alpha w, \sigma}} \hookrightarrow H^\sigma$. We now use the fact (see [32, Proposition 5.20]) that $H_{m_{w_\alpha w, \sigma}} = \{u : u = w_\alpha wv \text{ for some } v \in H^\sigma\} = \{u : u = w_\alpha wv \text{ for some } v \in (H_0^\sigma)^\perp\}$. Here $H_0^\sigma := \{u \in H^\sigma : w_\alpha wu = 0\}$, which is closed in H^σ by continuity of the evaluation operator. The norm of this RKHS may be represented by $\|u\|_{H_{m_{w_\alpha w, \sigma}}} = \|v\|_{H^\sigma}$ for the unique $v \in (H_0^\sigma)^\perp$ such that $u = w_\alpha wv$. Moreover, since we have assumed that the mapping $f \mapsto w_\alpha wf$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}(H^\sigma)$, we have for all $u = w_\alpha wv$ that $\|u\|_{H^\sigma} \lesssim \|v\|_{H^\sigma}$. This shows that $H_{m_{w_\alpha w, \sigma}} \hookrightarrow H^\sigma$.

For the second step, let us note that the separable space H_{q_s} is continuously embedded into $H^\sigma = H_{m_\sigma}$ (a straightforward consequence of [40, Theorem 10.12], see also [40, Corollary 10.13]). Therefore $m_\sigma \gtrsim q_s$. This directly implies $m_{w, \sigma} \gtrsim q$, which finishes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove the rest of Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Since q is continuous, $H_q(\mathbb{R})$ is separable. With this in mind, let us first show Proposition 3.4(ii). By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, it suffices to show that $H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}^+) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)$. We do this by combining the approximation number properties (5) and (6) with the observation that $(\epsilon_n(I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^r(\mathbb{R})}))_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell^2$. This observation follows from the results of [22], wherein entropy numbers of embeddings between weighted Besov-type spaces $B_{p, q}^s(\mathbb{R})$ are studied. We note that $H^r(\mathbb{R}) = B_{2, 2}^r(\mathbb{R})$ with equivalent norms for all $r \geq 0$ [38, Theorems 2.3.9 and 2.5.6]. With this in mind, we have by [22, Theorem 4.2] that $\epsilon_n(I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^r(\mathbb{R})})$ is bounded from above and below by a constant (independent of n) times $n^{-(\sigma-r)}$ in the case that $\sigma < r+2\alpha$ and $n^{-2\alpha}$ in the case that $\sigma > r+2\alpha$. In either of these two cases, therefore, the number is bounded by $n^{-1/2-\epsilon}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ so that $H^{\sigma, \alpha} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r$. In case $2\alpha = \sigma - r > 1/2$ we can find some $\tilde{\alpha} \in (1/4, \alpha)$ so that $H^{\sigma, \alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{\sigma, \tilde{\alpha}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} H^r$, hence we arrive at the same conclusion. We note at this point that the results of [22] are for spaces of complex-valued functions, but it follows directly from the definition that the entropy numbers of embeddings of our real-valued spaces are bounded by those of the complex-valued spaces.

For the claim (iii), we recall that an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, E)$, where H is a separable Hilbert space and E is a Banach space, is said to be γ -radonifying if

$$\|T\|_{\gamma(H, E)}^2 := \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_j T e_j \right\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right] < \infty$$

where this operator norm is independent of the choice of ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of H and sequence of iid standard Gaussian random variables $(\xi_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ [39, Corollary 3.21]. We will show that $I_{H_q(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \in \gamma(H_q(\mathbb{R}), L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$, from which the result follows by [39, Theorem 3.23] and Lemma 3.5. First, we note that the class of γ -radonifying operators is an operator ideal [39, Theorem 6.2]. Moreover, $B_{\infty, 1}^0(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, a consequence of [38, Proposition 2.5.7]. We also have

$$I_{H_q(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = I_{B_{\infty, 1}^0(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow B_{\infty, 1}^0(\mathbb{R})} I_{H_q(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.6, it suffices to note that $I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow B_{\infty, 1}^0(\mathbb{R})} \in \gamma(H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}), B_{\infty, 1}^0(\mathbb{R}))$. This follows from [29, (2.2)] if it holds that $(n^{-1/2} \epsilon_n(I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}))_{n=1}^\infty \in \ell^1$. Using [22, Theorem 4.2], (3) and (4), we see that $\epsilon_n(I_{H^{\sigma, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{R})})$ is bounded by a constant times $n^{-\sigma}$ if $\sigma - 1/2 < 2\alpha$, by $n^{-2\alpha-1/2}(1 + \log(n))$ if $\sigma - 1/2 > 2\alpha$ and by $(n/(1 + \log(n)))^{-\sigma}$ if $2\alpha = \sigma - 1/2$. From this the result follows. \square

Remark 3.7. For the weight in Proposition 3.4, possible choices include $w = w_{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 1/4$ (or a rescaling thereof) or smooth bump functions. For the stationary kernel q_s , one might choose it to be a Matérn kernel. This class includes exponential kernels as special cases and is defined by

$$q_s(x) := \zeta 2^{1-\nu} / \Gamma(\nu) (\sqrt{2\nu}x/\mu)^\nu K_\nu((\sqrt{2\nu}x)/\mu)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Here K_ν is the modified Bessel function of the second kind with order $\nu > 0$ and Γ is the Gamma function. It is scaled by the positive parameters, the variance ζ and the correlation length μ . The assumption on q_s in Proposition 3.4 holds with $\sigma = \nu + 1/2$, see, e.g., [31, Example 6.8]. The exponential kernel is obtained with $\nu = 1/2$.

Remark 3.8. Since we are mainly interested in Wiener processes on the half-space \mathbb{R}^+ , we restricted ourselves to this case. Proposition 3.4 holds true also in \mathbb{R}^d , with the bounds on σ and α replaced by dimension-dependent constants. Moreover, if the application at hand calls for genuinely non-stationary kernels, Hölder conditions could be analyzed using similar techniques.

4. EXISTENCE, UNIQUENESS AND SOBOLEV REGULARITY OF THE HEIDIH MODEL

In this section we discuss existence and uniqueness of the two components X and Y in the HEIDIH model (2). We start with the volatility process Y , which is the mild solution

$$(10) \quad Y(t) = \mathcal{U}(t)Y(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) dW(s), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

to the stochastic heat equation

$$(11) \quad dY(t) = \mathcal{A}Y(t) dt + dW(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

starting at $Y(0)$ on \mathbb{R}^+ . We recall that \mathcal{A} denotes the Laplacian $a\Delta$ with homogeneous zero boundary conditions at $x = 0$ of either Dirichlet or Neumann type scaled by a diffusion coefficient a . We derive spatial regularity results in a fractional Sobolev sense along with a pointwise-in-space temporal Hölder regularity result. The latter is needed for the numerical approximation in the next section. With these results in place, we consider the full system (2) and derive existence, uniqueness and fractional Sobolev regularity for the mild solution

$$(12) \quad X(t) = \mathcal{S}(t)X(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{S}(t-s)\Gamma^Z(s) dB(s)$$

under suitable assumptions on $X(0)$, Z and B .

4.1. The stochastic heat equation. We pose (11) as an equation in the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$, but impose sufficient regularity of the components to guarantee that it takes values in $H^r(\mathbb{R}^+) \subset \mathcal{H}^r$ for $r > 1/2$. We let the operator $\mathcal{A} = a\Delta$ be the realization of the Laplacian in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Since the spectrum $\sigma(-\mathcal{A})$ is contained in $[0, \infty]$, $-\mathcal{A} + \epsilon$ is a sectorial operator for all $\epsilon > 0$. Fractional powers of the self-adjoint and positive definite operator $-\mathcal{A} + \epsilon$ are therefore well-defined and $-\mathcal{A}$ is the generator of an analytic semigroup [41, Section 2.7, Theorem 3.1]. By the proofs of [19, Theorems 1-2], we have the following characterizations of the domains of the operators $(-\mathcal{A} + \epsilon)^{r/2}$ for small $r \geq 0$:

$$(13) \quad \dot{H}^r := \text{dom}((-\mathcal{A} + \epsilon)^{r/2}) = H^r(\mathbb{R}^+) \text{ if } r \in [0, \theta).$$

In the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions we have $\theta = 1/2$, while in the case of Neumann boundary conditions we have $\theta = 3/2$. Here, we also made implicit use of the fact that the

Bessel potential norm and the so called Sobolev–Slobodeckij norm (see, e.g., [41, (1.70)]) are equivalent in our setting, which follows from the existence of an extension operator, see, e.g., [41, Theorem 1.33]. The equality (13) should be understood as the existence of a canonical isomorphism with norm equivalence, with respect to the Hilbert space structure of $\dot{H}^r \hookrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$ when this is equipped with the graph norm $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^r} := \|(-\mathcal{A} + \epsilon)^{r/2} \cdot\|_{L^2}$. The sequence $(\dot{H}^r)_{r \geq 0}$ consists of spaces that are continuously and densely embedded into one another. By interpolation techniques (cf. [41, Theorem 16.3]) one may show that $\dot{H}^r \hookrightarrow H^r$ for all $r \geq 0$.

Let the Wiener process W in (2) have covariance kernel q_w fulfilling Assumption 3.2(ii) for some $r_w \geq 0$. If we regard W as a Q -Wiener process in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$, its covariance operator is given by $Q = I_{H_{q_w} \hookrightarrow L^2} I_{H_{q_w} \hookrightarrow L^2}^*$. Since $Q^{1/2}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)) = H_{q_w}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, we have $Q^{1/2}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^2} \dot{H}^r$ if and only if $H_{q_w}(\mathbb{R}^+) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}^2} H^r$, provided that $r < \min(r_w, \theta)$. Therefore, [26, Assumption 3] is fulfilled and we obtain the following existence, uniqueness and regularity result.

Theorem 4.1 ([26, Theorem 1]). *Suppose that the covariance kernel q_w of W fulfills Assumption 3.2(ii) and let $\rho := \min(r_w, \theta)$. Suppose also that $Y(0) \in \dot{H}^{s+1}$. Then there exists a unique mild solution $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ to (10). Moreover, for all $r < \rho + 1$, there is a continuous modification of Y in \dot{H}^r such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\|Y(t)\|_{\dot{H}^r}^2] < \infty$ and there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$*

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|Y(t_1) - Y(t_2)\|_{\dot{H}^r}^2]^{1/2} \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^{\min(1, \rho+1-r)/2}.$$

Remark 4.2. In [26, Theorem 1], the regularity is restricted to $r < 2$. This is only due to the nonlinearities considered in [26], which are not present in our setting.

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, we obtain from the Hölder estimate (14) that there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$, $\mathbb{E}[|Y(t_1, x) - Y(t_2, x)|^2] \leq C|t_1 - t_2|^{\min(1, r)}$ for all $r < \rho + 1/2$. If $r_w = 0$, we therefore obtain that $Y(\cdot, x)$ is Hölder continuous with respect to the root mean squared norm with exponent essentially $1/4$. However, also for such relatively rough noise, the Hölder exponent can be seen to be essentially $1/2$ provided that Assumption 3.2(iii) is fulfilled. This we show in the next proposition. A concrete example of a covariance kernel in this setting includes a weighted Matérn kernel with smoothness parameter ν close to 0, see Remark 3.7. For the proof, we recall that the semigroup associated with $-\mathcal{A}$ has an explicit representation by the reflection method. Indeed, with $\Phi(x, t) = e^{-x^2/(4at)}/\sqrt{4\pi at}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $t > 0$, denoting the heat kernel,

$$(15) \quad (\mathcal{U}(t)v)(x) = \int_0^\infty (\Phi(x-y, t) \pm \Phi(x+y, t))v(y) dy, \quad t > 0, x \geq 0,$$

for $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The sign is positive for Neumann boundary conditions and negative for Dirichlet boundary conditions. This can be seen by the density of smooth functions with compact support in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Alternatively, we may write

$$(16) \quad (\mathcal{U}(t)v)(x) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \Phi(x-y, t)\tilde{v}(y) dy, \quad t > 0, x \geq 0,$$

where \tilde{v} is an even extension of v around 0 for Neumann boundary conditions and an odd extension in the Dirichlet case.

Proposition 4.3. *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 4.1 together with Assumption 3.2(iii), there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y(t_1, x) - Y(t_2, x)|^2]^{1/2} \leq C|t_1 - t_2|^{r/2}$$

for all $r < 1$.

Proof. By differentiation of $\Phi(x, \cdot)$, we have, in the notation of (16),

$$|\mathcal{U}(t)v(x) - \mathcal{U}(s)v(x)| \leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_s^t \frac{(x-y)^2 + 2r}{4r^2} \Phi(x-y, r) \tilde{v}(y) dr dy.$$

Since $x \mapsto \Phi(x, r)$ and $x \mapsto x^2 \Phi(x, r)$ integrates to 1 and $2ar$, we obtain $\|(\mathcal{U}(t) - \mathcal{U}(s))v\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim (t-s)(s)^{-1} \|v\|_{L^\infty}$ for $0 < s \leq t$. Moreover, \mathcal{U} is stable in L^∞ in the sense that $\|\mathcal{U}(t)v\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Combining these two estimates yields, for all $r \in [0, 1]$, a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $0 < s \leq t < \infty$ and $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$,

$$(17) \quad \|(\mathcal{U}(t) - \mathcal{U}(s))v\|_{L^\infty} \leq Cs^{-r}(t-s)^r \|v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

We now prove the claim for $Y(0) = 0$. The extension to the general case follows by the estimates above using the fact that $Y(0) \in H^1$ implies that $Y(0)$ is bounded and Hölder continuous with exponent arbitrarily close to $1/2$ by the Sobolev embedding theorem.

Since δ_x is continuous on H^r for $r > 1/2$, Theorem 4.1 justifies moving δ_x inside the Itô integral below, so that by the Itô isometry

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|Y(t_1, x) - Y(t_2, x)|^2] &= \mathbb{E}[|\delta_x(Y(t_1) - Y(t_2))|^2] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \delta_x \mathcal{U}(t_2 - s) dW(s) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_1} \delta_x (\mathcal{U}(t_2 - s) - \mathcal{U}(t_1 - s)) dW(s) \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |(\mathcal{U}(t_2 - s)e_j)(x)|^2 ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |((\mathcal{U}(t_2 - s) - \mathcal{U}(t_1 - s))e_j)(x)|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we let $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be an ONB of H_{q_w} such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|e_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 < \infty$, see Assumption 3.2(iii). Then, the claimed estimate follows by making use of (17) for the second term and stability of \mathcal{U} in L^∞ for the first term. \square

4.2. Regularity of the HEIDIH model. For the full model (2), we let B and W be Wiener processes with kernels q_B and q_W . For q_B , we assume that Assumption 3.2(i) is fulfilled and for the components of Y we consider the same setting as in Theorem 4.1. For the process Z , we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4.4. Let, for some $r > 1/2$, $Z = (Z(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ be an adapted stochastic process in \mathcal{H}^r fulfilling $\|Z(t)\| = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Let Z be such that the $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^r)$ -valued process Γ^Z given by $\Gamma^Z(t) := Y(t) \otimes Z(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, is predictable and fulfills

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|\Gamma^Z(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_B}, \mathcal{H}^r)}^2] dt < \infty.$$

In [10], two examples for Z are studied in detail. First, the constant setting $Z(t) := \eta \in \mathcal{H}^r$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ with $\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{H}^r} = 1$. Second, the setting in which $\Gamma^Z(t)$ is the unique positive definite square root of $Y(t) \otimes Y(t)$, i.e., letting

$$Z(t) := \begin{cases} Y(t)/\|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}} & \text{for } Y(t) \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

see [10, Proposition 4]. Note that $1 \in \mathcal{H}^r$ with $\|1\|_{\mathcal{H}^r} = 1$. For these two examples, Γ^Z is an adapted process with a continuous version. This follows from the continuity of Y , see [10, Lemma 5]. We note that the authors of [10] assume that the covariance operator of B is trace-class when confirming that the integral in Assumption 4.4 is finite for these two examples, see [10, Lemma 8]. For us, this translates to $H_{q_B} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_2} \mathcal{H}^r$. However, it is sufficient to require that $H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|\Gamma^Z(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^r)}^2 dt &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T |\langle Z(t), e_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r}|^2 \|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 dt \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T |\langle I_{H_{q_w}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* Z(t), e_j \rangle_{H_{q_w}}|^2 \|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 dt \\ (18) \quad &= \int_0^T \|I_{H_{q_w}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* Z(t)\|_{H_{q_w}}^2 \|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 dt \\ &\leq \|I_{H_{q_w} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_{q_w}, \mathcal{H}^r)} \int_0^T \|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

almost surely and $\|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_B}, \mathcal{H}^r)} \lesssim \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^r)}$ for $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^r)$.

The regularity of X , as well as its existence and uniqueness as a process in \mathcal{H}^r , now follows from [16, Theorem 6.10]. This makes use of the fact that \mathcal{S} is a contraction C_0 -semigroup on \mathcal{H}^r . This is true under the convention $(\mathcal{S}(t)f)(x) = \tilde{f}(x+t) + a$ for $f = \tilde{f} + a \in H^r \oplus \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{H}^r$, see [18, Appendix A.1].

We summarize these remarks in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that for some $r > 1/2$, Assumption 4.4 is fulfilled and $X(0) \in \mathcal{H}^r$. Suppose also that the conditions of Theorem 4.1 as well as Assumption 3.2(i) hold true for some $\rho = r_B = r$. Then there exists a unique mild solution $X = (X(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ given by (12) which is \mathcal{H}^r -valued and has a continuous modification.*

We end this section by commenting on the special case that $Z(t) := \eta \in \mathcal{H}^r$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Let $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be an ONB of H_{q_B} . By (7) and approximation by simple functions, it follows from independence of B and W that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_x \int_0^t \mathcal{S}(t-s) \Gamma^Z(s) dW(s) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t Y(s, x+t-s) \langle \eta, e_k \rangle d\beta_k(s) \\ (19) \quad &= \|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \eta\|_{H_{q_B}} \int_0^t Y(s, x+t-s) d\tilde{\beta}(s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(20) \quad \tilde{\beta}(t) := \|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \eta\|_{H_{q_B}}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \eta, e_j \rangle \beta_j(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

is a real-valued Wiener process. We see that in this case the stochastic volatility is directly given by Y while η is a global (in x) scaling parameter. A convenient choice for η is to first set $\tilde{\eta} := \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(1 + m_r(x_j - \cdot))$ for some constants a_j and points $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $j = 1, \dots, N \in \mathbb{N}$, where we recall that $(x, y) \mapsto 1 + m_r(x - y)$ is the kernel of \mathcal{H}^r . This class of functions is dense in \mathcal{H}^r , see [11, Corollary 2]. Then

$$\|\tilde{\eta}\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i(1 + m_r(x_i - x_j))a_j$$

so with $\eta := \tilde{\eta}/\|\tilde{\eta}\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}$ we obtain the expression

$$\|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \eta\|_{H_{q_B}}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i q_B(x_i, x_j) a_j}{\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i(1 + m_r(x_i - x_j)) a_j}$$

which can readily be computed.

Remark 4.6. An example of the setting above with $Z(t) = \eta \in \mathcal{H}^r$, is shown in Figures 1(a) and 1(b). Here $X(0)$ and $Y(0)$ are smooth bump functions while $q_W(x, y) = w(x)q_s(x - y)w(y)$, where $w(x) = 10^{-1/2}(1 + x^2)^{-3/4}$ and q_s is a Matérn kernel with $\nu = \mu = 0.1$ and unit variance, see Remark 3.7. In $\mathcal{A} = a\Delta$ we have set $a = 0.05$. By Theorems 4.1 and 4.5, we obtain that both X and Y take values in \mathcal{H}^r for $r = 1.1$. We have chosen η and q_B in such a way that $H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r$ with $\|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \eta\|_{H_{q_B}} = 1$.

5. NUMERICAL APPROXIMATION

A rigorous understanding of convergence rates in numerical approximations of SPDEs is vital for several reasons. First, they allow us to theoretically understand different approximation methods with respect to computational speed. Second, if the approximations are used in Monte Carlo methods, the convergence rates can help us to choose sample sizes in an optimal way [30]. Third, understanding how different sources of errors contribute in different ways to the overall error lets us tune the various parts of the algorithm, so that each error source contributes equally, leading to a computationally efficient algorithm. We return to this last part in Section 5.2.

Arguably, most literature on numerical approximation of SPDEs focus on the analysis of errors as measured in a spatial L^2 -norm in some mean square sense, see, e.g., [25, 28, 31] and the references within. This is especially true for finite element approximations. In the context of SPDE models of forward prices, the convergence discussed for the discontinuous Galerkin finite element method in [2] is of this type. In our setting, this would translate to errors of the form $\mathbb{E}[\|X(t_i) - \hat{X}(t_i)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)}^2]$ in the numerical approximation of the HEIDIH model, where \hat{X} refers to a given approximation and $(t_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ are points on a temporal grid. However, the spatial argument x in $X(t, x)$ refers to time to maturity. To price contracts delivering a commodity at a fixed time, therefore, we should instead consider pointwise-in-space errors, i.e., errors of the form $\mathbb{E}[|X(t_i, x_j) - \hat{X}(t_i, x_j)|^2]^{1/2}$ where $(t_i, x_j)_{i,j=1}^\infty$ are points on a space-time grid. This is the approach we take below, where we first prove a general error decomposition formula for X . We then restrict ourselves to the setting that $Z(t) = \eta$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and Y is equipped with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In this case we derive sharp convergence rates with respect to pointwise-in-space errors for fully discrete approximations of X and Y .

5.1. Error decomposition formula for a finite difference scheme in space and time. We consider approximating the process X on a spatiotemporal grid $(t_i, x_j)_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0} = (ik, jk)_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ using finite differences with equal uniform step sizes k in both time and space. The approximation is denoted by \hat{X} and we set $\hat{X}(0) = X(0) \in \mathcal{H}^r$. Otherwise, \hat{X} is defined on the grid by the recursion

$$(21) \quad \hat{X}(t_{i+1}, x_j) = \hat{X}(t_i, x_{j+1}) + \delta_{x_j}(\hat{Y}(t_i) \otimes \hat{Z}(t_i))\Delta B^i, \quad i, j \geq 0,$$

where the \mathcal{H}^r -valued stochastic processes \hat{Y}, \hat{Z} are given approximations Y and Z , respectively, and $\Delta B^i = B(t_{i+1}) - B(t_i)$. Iterating this, we obtain in closed form

$$(22) \quad \hat{X}(t_n, x_j) = \delta_{x_j}\mathcal{S}(t_n)X(0) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \delta_{x_j}\mathcal{S}(t_n - t_{i+1})(\hat{Y}(t_i) \otimes \hat{Z}(t_i)) dB(r).$$

This leads to the following error decomposition. We remark that since we do not use any particular property of Y , this result applies to any Heston stochastic volatility model of forward prices in the sense of [4, 10]. Note also that, due to the use of a grid with equal step sizes in both space and time, the part of (12) associated with $X(0)$ is solved exactly.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that \hat{Y}, \hat{Z} are such that $t \mapsto \hat{\Gamma}^{\hat{Z}t} = \hat{Y}(t) \otimes \hat{Z}(t)$ is a predictable $\mathcal{L}_2(\mathcal{H}^r)$ -valued process fulfilling*

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\Gamma}^{\hat{Z}}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_B}, \mathcal{H}^r)}^2] dt < \infty.$$

The approximation error $X(t_n, x_j) - \hat{X}(t_n, x_j)$ at the points $t_n = nk \leq T$ and $x_j = jk \in \mathbb{R}^+$ can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - \hat{X}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right] &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[Y(r, t_n + x_j - r)^2 \|I_{H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \hat{Z}(r)\|_{H_{q_B}}^2 \right. \\ &\quad - 2Y(r, t_n + x_j - r)\hat{Y}(t_i, t_n + x_j - t_{i+1}) \\ &\quad \times \langle I_{H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* Z(r), I_{H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \hat{Z}(t_i) \rangle_{H_{q_B}} \\ &\quad \left. + \hat{Y}(t_i, t_n + x_j - t_{i+1})^2 \|I_{H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \hat{Z}(t_i)\|_{H_{q_B}}^2 \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

In the special case that $Z(t) = \hat{Z}(t) = \eta \in \mathcal{H}^r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - \hat{X}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right] \\ = \|I_{H_{q_B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r}^* \eta\|_{H_{q_B}}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Y(r, t_n + x_j - r) - \hat{Y}(t_i, t_n + x_j - t_{i+1}) \right|^2 \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that since $\delta_{x_j} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}^r, \mathbb{R})$, the Itô isometry immediately yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - \hat{X}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right] \\ = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|Y(r, t_n + x_j - r)\langle Z(r), \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r} - \hat{Y}(r, t_n + x_j - t_{i+1})\langle \hat{Z}(r), \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_B}, \mathcal{H}^r)}^2 \right] dr \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows as in (18). \square

5.2. A localized finite element discretization of the stochastic heat equation. The second part of Proposition 5.1 shows that in the case that $Z(t) = \eta$, it suffices to deduce a pointwise-in-space error estimate for an approximation of Y in order to derive a corresponding estimate for X . We turn to this setting now, and assume in addition that $\mathcal{A} = a\Delta$ is equipped with Dirichlet zero boundary conditions at $x = 0$.

The approximation scheme we use for Y below is semi-implicit in time. This means that we must formulate it on a finite domain $(0, D)$ for sufficiently large D . From (22) we see that we must at least take $D \geq 2T - k$ if we want to evaluate X up to $t = T$. We restrict the initial condition and the noise using the restriction operator $R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)}$ and introduce an artificial boundary condition at $x = D$. This causes a so called localization error. Such errors were recently investigated in detail in the Walsh setting in [13], considering localization of stochastic heat equations on \mathbb{R} to $(0, D)$. We use similar arguments for the semigroup framework of [16] that we have adopted here.

We let $\mathcal{A}_D := a\Delta$ denote the realization in $L^2(0, D)$ of the Laplacian with Dirichlet zero boundary conditions at $x = 0$ and $x = D$. The analytic semigroup $\mathcal{S}_D = (\mathcal{S}_D(t))_{t \geq 0}$ of contractions generated by \mathcal{A}_D maps $L^2(0, D)$ into a space of continuous and bounded functions on $[0, D]$. It has an explicit representation by

$$(\mathcal{S}_D(t)v)(x) = \int_0^D \Phi_D(x, y, t)v(y) dy$$

for $x \in [0, D], t > 0$ and $v \in L^2((0, D))$, where

$$\Phi_D(x, y, t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e_{D,j}(x)e_{D,j}(y)e^{-\lambda_{D,j}t},$$

with $\lambda_{D,j} := a\pi^2 j^2 / D^2$ and $e_{D,j}(x) := \sqrt{2/D} \sin(\pi j x / D)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}, x \in [0, D]$. Directly from this representation, we obtain the rescaling property

$$(23) \quad (\mathcal{S}_D(t)v)(x) = (\mathcal{S}_1(t/D^2)v(\cdot/D))(x/D), \quad x \in [0, D], t > 0.$$

Using the fact that the sine functions $x \mapsto \sin(\pi j x)$ are uniformly bounded in L^∞ with respect to j , this can be used to see that there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $D > 0, v \in L^\infty((0, D))$ and $0 < s \leq t < \infty$,

$$(24) \quad \|(\mathcal{S}_D(t) - \mathcal{S}_D(s))v\|_{L^\infty} \leq s^{-1}(t - s)\|v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Moreover, for all $D > 0$ and $t < \infty$, \mathcal{S}_D is stable in the sense that

$$\|\mathcal{S}_D(t)v\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

We now let Y_D be the mild solution

$$Y_D(t) = \mathcal{S}_D(t)Y_D(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{S}_D(t-s)R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} dW(s), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

to

$$dY_D(t) = \mathcal{A}_D Y_D(t) dt + R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} dW(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

with initial condition $Y_D(0) = R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} Y(0)$. Fractional powers $(-\mathcal{A}_D)^{r/2}$, $r \geq 0$ are well-defined since $-\mathcal{A}_D$ is self-adjoint and positive definite. They are explicitly given by

$$(-\mathcal{A}_D)^{r/2}v := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_{D,j})^{r/2} \langle v, e_{D,j} \rangle_{L^2((0, D))} e_{D,j}$$

in terms of the eigenvalues $(\lambda_{D,j})_{j=1}^\infty$ and eigenfunctions $(e_{D,j})_{j=1}^\infty$ of $-\mathcal{A}_D$, cf. [28, Appendix B]. This is well-defined for $v \in L^2$ such that the sequence on the right hand side is summable. This space is denoted by $\dot{H}_D^r := \text{dom}((-\mathcal{A}_D)^{r/2})$ and by another appeal to [19, Theorem 1],

$$(25) \quad \dot{H}_D^r = H^r((0, D)) \text{ if } r \in [0, 1/2)$$

with equivalent norms.

Under Assumption 3.2(ii), the ideal property of $\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_W}, \dot{H}_D^r)$ yields that for $r < s := \min(r_W, 1/2)$

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \|R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_W}, \dot{H}_D^r)} &\leq \|I_{H^r((0, D)) \hookrightarrow \dot{H}_D^r}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^r((0, D)), \dot{H}_D^r)} \|R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^r(\mathbb{R}^+), H^r((0, D)))} \\ &\quad \times \|I_{H_{q_W} \hookrightarrow H^r(\mathbb{R}^+)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_W}, H^r(\mathbb{R}^+))}. \end{aligned}$$

The setting of Theorem 4.1 therefore suffices to ensure that the stochastic convolution $t \mapsto Y_D(t) - \mathcal{S}_D(t)Y_D(0)$ has a continuous modification in \dot{H}^r for all $r < s + 1$. This may not hold for the entire process $t \mapsto Y_D(t)$ since $Y(0) \in \dot{H}^{s+1}$ does not ensure that $Y_D(0) \in \dot{H}_D^{s+1}$. However, $Y(0) \in \dot{H}^{s+1}$ does guarantee that $Y_D(0)$ is bounded and Hölder continuous with exponent $r < s + 1/2$. We use these properties to deduce the following pointwise-in-space localization error between Y and Y_D .

Proposition 5.2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 along with Assumption 3.2(iii) be satisfied. Then, there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $D \geq 1$, $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in [0, D]$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|Y(t, x) - Y_D(t, x)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C e^{-(D-x)^2/(8aT)}.$$

Proof. We assume for simplicity that $Y(0) = 0$ since the terms involving $Y(0)$ and $Y_D(0)$ can be estimated by similar arguments as below. First, pointwise evaluation of Y_D is admissible since the process takes values in \dot{H}_D^r for all $r < \min(r_W, 1/2) + 1$ by (26). Therefore, by the Itô isometry, we have for any $x \in [0, D]$,

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|Y(t, x) - Y_D(t, x)|^2 \right] &= \int_0^t \|\delta_x \mathcal{S}(t-s) - \delta_x \mathcal{S}_D(t-s) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{q_W}, \mathbb{R})}^2 ds \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^\infty \int_0^t |\delta_x \mathcal{S}(t-s) e_j - \delta_x \mathcal{S}_D(t-s) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} e_j|^2 ds \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^\infty \int_0^t |\delta_x \mathcal{S}(s) e_j - \delta_x \mathcal{S}_D(s) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} e_j|^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

where $(e_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ is an arbitrary ONB of H_{q_W} . We choose the ONB in Assumption 3.2(iii). For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we use the kernel (15) and make the split

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_x \mathcal{S}(s) e_j - \delta_x \mathcal{S}_D(s) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} e_j \\ &= \int_0^\infty (\Phi(x-y, s) - \Phi(x+y, s)) e_j(y) dy - \int_0^D \Phi_D(x, y, s) e_j(y) dy \\ &= \int_D^\infty (\Phi(x-y, s) - \Phi(x+y, s)) e_j(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^D (\Phi(x-y, s) - \Phi(x+y, s) - \Phi_D(x, y, s)) e_j(y) dy =: \text{I} + \text{II}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\int_x^\infty \Phi(y, t) \, dy \leq e^{-x^2/(4at)}$$

for $x \geq 0$ and $t > 0$. Applying this to the first term, it is bounded by

$$|\text{I}| \leq \|e_j\|_{L^\infty} \left(\int_{D-x}^\infty \Phi(y, s) \, dy + \int_{D+x}^\infty \Phi(y, s) \, dy \right) \leq \|e_j\|_{L^\infty} (e^{-(D+x)^2/(4as)} + e^{-(D-x)^2/(4as)})$$

which in turn can be bounded by $2\|e_j\|_{L^\infty} e^{-(D-x)^2/(4aT)}$. For the term II, we use the fact that

$$\Phi_D(x, y, t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi(x + y + 2nD, t) - \Phi(x - y + 2nD, t), \quad t > 0, x, y \in (0, D),$$

to rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II} &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \neq 0}} \int_0^D (\Phi(x + y + 2nD, s) - \Phi(x - y + 2nD, s)) e_j(y) \, dy \\ &= \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \neq 0}} \int_{x+2nD}^{x+(2n+1)D} \Phi(y, s) e_j(y - x - 2nD) \, dy - \int_{-x-2nD}^{-x-(2n-1)D} \Phi(y, s) e_j(y + x + 2nD) \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using the non-negativity and symmetry of Φ , it is bounded by

$$|\text{II}| \leq 2\|e_j\|_{L^\infty} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \neq 0}} \int_{x+2nD}^\infty \Phi(y, t) \, dy \leq 2\|e_j\|_{L^\infty} e^{-(D+x)^2/(4as)} \leq 2\|e_j\|_{L^\infty} e^{-(D-x)^2/(4aT)}.$$

These estimates along with Assumption 3.2(iii) in (27) finish the proof. \square

We now introduce a fully discrete approximation of Y_D based on finite elements and the backward Euler scheme. For this we consider a spatial $(x_j)_{j=0, \dots, N_h}$ as well as a temporal grid $(t_i)_{i=0, \dots, N_k}$ for $h, k \in (0, 1]$. As before $x_j = jh$ and $t_i = ik$, and we assume for simplicity that $N_h = D/h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N_k = T/k \in \mathbb{N}$. We let V_h be the space of piecewise linear functions on the spatial grid and V_h^0 the subspace of functions that are zero at $x = 0$ and $x = D$. Both are finite dimensional Hilbert subspaces of $L^2((0, D))$ when equipped with the topology of this space. The latter is a subspace of $H_0^1(D) := \{v \in H^1 : v(0) = v(1) = 0\}$. We define a discrete operator \mathcal{A}_h on V_h^0 by

$$\langle \mathcal{A}_h u_h, v_h \rangle_{L^2} := -a \langle u'_h, v'_h \rangle_{L^2}, \quad u_h, v_h \in V_h^0.$$

We write $P_h^0 : L^2 \rightarrow V_h^0$ for the orthogonal L^2 -projection onto V_h^0 and define the interpolant $I_h : H^r \rightarrow V_h$ by $(I_h v)(x_j) := v(x_j)$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, N_h\}$. The latter is bounded on $H^r((0, D))$ for $r > 1/2$. A discretization of Y_D is now given by the V_h^0 -valued sequence $Y_D^{h,k} = (Y_D^{h,k}(t_i))_{i=0, \dots, N_k}$ which is defined by $Y_D^{h,k}(0) = P_h^0 Y_D(0)$ and

$$(28) \quad (I - k\mathcal{A}_h) Y_D^{h,k}(t_{i+1}) = Y_D^{h,k}(t_i) + P_h^0 I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} \Delta W^i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, N_k - 1,$$

where I denotes the identity on V_h^0 , otherwise.

The last term in (28) is well-defined since δ_x is bounded on H_{qW} for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Therefore I_h is well-defined on H_{qW} and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} \Delta W^i\|_{V_h}^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} dW(s) \right\|_{V_h}^2 \right] = \|I_h\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{qW}((0,D)), V_h)}^2 < \infty,$$

since I_h has finite-dimensional range. Note that, since δ_x is bounded on V_h , we have similarly

$$\text{Cov}((I_h \Delta W^i)(x_m), (I_h \Delta W^i)(x_n)) = k \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \delta_{x_m} I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} e_j, \delta_{x_n} I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} e_j \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$$

where $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an ONB of $H_{qW}(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Since $(R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is an ONB of $H_{qW}((0,D))$, we obtain

$$\text{Cov}((I_h \Delta W^i)(x_m), (I_h \Delta W^i)(x_n)) = k q_W(x_m, x_n).$$

Therefore, $I_h \Delta W^i$ may be obtained by sampling a Gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^{N_h+1} with covariance matrix \mathbf{C} , having entries $\mathbf{C}_{i,j} = k q_W(x_i, x_j)$. For (weighted) Matérn covariance functions this can be accomplished in log-linear complexity with respect to N_h by using a circulant embedding algorithm (see [20]) and multiplying by the weight function.

We define an approximation $\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k} = (\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ of the semigroup \mathcal{S}_D by

$$\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t) := \mathcal{K}_{\{0\}}(t)I + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(t) (I - k \mathcal{A}_h)^{i+1}.$$

where \mathcal{K} is the indicator function. Here we have extended the temporal grid by $t_i = ik$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This allows us to write (28) in closed form by

$$(29) \quad Y_D^{h,k}(t_n) = \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_n) P_h^0 Y_D(0) + \int_0^{t_n} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_n - s) P_h^0 I_h R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} dW(s)$$

for $t_n \leq T$. Like \mathcal{S}_D , this operator family has a scaling property

$$(30) \quad (\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t) v_h)(x) = (\mathcal{S}_1^{h/D, k/D^2}(t/D^2) v(\cdot/D))(x/D), \quad x \in [0, D], t > 0.$$

In order to derive a pointwise-in-space error bound for $Y_D(t_i) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i)$, we need some stability and error estimates for the finite element method. We collect them in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *In the setting outlined above, the following estimates hold:*

- (i) $\sup_{D>0} \sup_{h \in (0,1]} \|P_h^0\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty((0,D)))} < \infty$,
- (ii) $\sup_{D>0} \sup_{h \in (0,1]} h^{-\min(s,2)} \|(I - I_h)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^s((0,D)), L^2((0,D)))} < \infty$, $s \in (1/2, 2]$,
- (iii) $\sup_{D,t>0} \sup_{h,k \in (0,1]} t^s (h^{2s} + k^s)^{-1} \|\mathcal{S}_D(t) - \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t) P_h^0\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty((0,D)))} < \infty$, $s \in [0, 1]$, and
- (iv) $\sup_{D,t>0} \sup_{h,k \in (0,1]} t^{r/2} \|(-\mathcal{A}_h)^{r/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t) P_h^0 v\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2((0,D)))} < \infty$.

Proof. The stability estimate (i) is [15, Theorem 1]. This is stated for $D = 1$, but the proof holds also for general D with no change in the bound.

A proof of the interpolation error (ii) is given in [17, Example 3] for domains $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $r > 1$, but the argument is the same in our case, noting that C does not depend on the size of \mathcal{D} . The restriction $r > 1$ is required in \mathbb{R}^2 for I_h to be well-defined on $H^r(\mathcal{D})$, but $r > 1/2$

suffices in our case. The proof uses the Sobolev–Slobodeckij norm, but this is bounded by the norm of $H^r((0, D))$ and, crucially, the bound is uniform in D .

For the semigroup error bound (iii), we first use (i) along with [14, (1.17)] to obtain a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $v \in L^\infty((0, 1))$, $h, k \in (0, 1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\mathcal{S}_1^{h,k}(t_n)P_h^0 v\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|v\|_{L^\infty}$. By [14, (1.14) and (1.21)], there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $v \in L^\infty((0, 1))$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $h, k \in (0, 1]$,

$$\|(\mathcal{S}_1(t_n) - \mathcal{S}_1^{h,k}(t_n)P_h^0)v\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ct_n^{-1}(h^2 + k)\|v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Combining these estimates with (23), (24) and (30) yields the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$, $D > 0$, $h, k \in (0, 1]$ and $v \in L^\infty((0, D))$,

$$\|(\mathcal{S}_D(t) - \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t)P_h^0)v\|_{L^\infty} \leq Ct^{-1}(h^2 + k)\|v\|_{L^\infty}.$$

The same rescaling argument yields stability of $\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}$ for general D , whence we obtain (iii).

Finally, the proof of (iv) is given in [37, Lemma 7.3] along with an interpolation argument (see, e.g., [12, Theorem A.4] for a justification), noting that the estimate of [37] does not depend on the specific semigroup. \square

We are now ready to prove a pointwise-in-space error bound for $Y_D(t_i) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i)$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 along with Assumption 3.2(iii) and Assumption 3.3 be satisfied. Then, for all $r_1 \in [0, 1]$, $r_2 \in [0, 1/2)$ and $r_3 \in [0, \min(s_W, 2))$, there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $D \geq 1$, $h, k \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, N_k$, and $x \in [0, D]$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C (t_i^{-r_1}(h^{2r_1} + k^{r_1}) + h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2} + Dh^{r_3}).$$

Proof. In an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 4.3, we again use the fact that δ_x is continuous on $H^r((0, D))$ for any $r > 1/2$ when applying the Itô isometry and then bound the integrands by the L^∞ norm. With the mild formulas (10) and (29), we split the error into three parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x)|^2 \right] &\lesssim \|(\mathcal{S}_D(t_i) - \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i)P_h^0)Y_D(0)\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{t_i} \|(\mathcal{S}_D(t_i - s) - \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s)P_h^0)e_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{t_i} \|\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s)P_h^0(I - I_h)R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)}e_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in (0, D)$. Again, the ONB $(e_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of $H_{q_W} = H_{q_W}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ is arbitrary. The first term on the right hand side is handled directly by Lemma 5.3(iii).

For the second term, we choose the ONB of Assumption 3.2(iii) and use Lemma 5.3(iii) to see that it is bounded by a constant times

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|e_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 (h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2})^2 \int_0^\infty (t_i - s)^{-2r_2} dr_2 \lesssim (h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2})^2$$

for all $r_2 < 1/2$.

For the third term we use the Poincaré inequality

$$\|v_h\|_{H^1((0, D))} \lesssim D\|v_h\|_{H_0^1} = D\|A_h^{1/2}v_h\|_{L^2((0, D))}$$

for $v_h \in V_h^0$ along with an interpolation argument and a Sobolev embedding to obtain that for all $\epsilon > 0$ it is bounded by

$$D^{1+2\epsilon} \int_0^{t_i} \|(-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1/2+\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{qW}, L^2)}^2 ds.$$

We use the identity (6) to obtain a bound on the integrand in terms of approximation numbers. In order to make use of (4), the sum is split into two parts:

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \|(-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1/2+\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_{qW}, L^2)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi_{2j-1} \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1/2+\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} \right)^2 \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \psi_{2j} \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1/2+\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the first sum, we use (3), (4) and (5) to see that for all $r_3 < s_W$

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{2j-1} \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1/2+\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} \right) \\ & \leq 2\psi_j \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(-1/2+2\epsilon)/2} \right) \|(-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(1-\epsilon)/2} \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \|I - I_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{r_3}, L^2)} \\ & \quad \times \|R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H^{r_3}(\mathbb{R}), H^{r_3}((0,D)))} \epsilon_j(I_{H^{s_W, \alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{r_3}}) \|I_{H_{qW} \hookrightarrow H^{s_W, \alpha}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_{qW}(\mathbb{R}), H^{s_W, \alpha}(\mathbb{R}))} \\ & \quad \times \|E_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_{qW}(\mathbb{R}^+), H_{qW}(\mathbb{R}))}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.3(ii) and (iv) along with Hölder's inequality for sequence spaces, therefore, it is bounded by a constant times

$$(t_i - s)^{\epsilon-1} h^{2 \min(r_3, 2)} \left\| \left(\psi_j \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(-1/2+2\epsilon)/2} \right) \right)_{j=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{\ell^p}^2 \left\| \left(\epsilon_j(I_{H^{s_W, \alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{r_3}}) \right)_{j=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{\ell^q}^2$$

for all $p, q > 2$ such that $1/p + 1/q = 1/2$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.4, for sufficiently small $s_W - r_3 > 0$, $\epsilon_j(I_{H^{s_W, \alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{r_3}}) \leq j^{r_3 - s_W}$. Letting $q > 1/(s_W - r_3)$ yields $(\epsilon_j(I_{H^{s_W, \alpha} \hookrightarrow H^{r_3}}))_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^q$. By the min-max principle, the eigenvalues of $-\mathcal{A}_h \in \mathcal{L}(V_h^0)$ are bounded from below by the eigenvalues of $-\mathcal{A}$. Since approximation numbers coincide with eigenvalues for self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces (see [33, Proposition 11.3.3]), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\psi_j \left((-\mathcal{A}_h)^{(-1/2+2\epsilon)/2} \right) \right)_{j=1}^{\infty} \right\|_{\ell^p}^2 & \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (a\pi^2 j^2 / D^2)^{p(-1/2+2\epsilon)/2} \right)^{2/p} \\ & = a^{2\epsilon-1/2} D^{1-4\epsilon} \pi^{4\epsilon-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{2\epsilon p - p/2} \right)^{2/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p > 2$, this sum is finite as long as $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. The second sum in (31) is handled in the same way, so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{t_i} \|\mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t_i - s) P_h^0(I - I_h) R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0,D)} e_j\|_{L^\infty}^2 ds \lesssim D^2 h^{2 \min(r_3, 2)}. \quad \square$$

Remark 5.5. The singularity $t_i^{-r_1}$ may be removed by assuming sufficient regularity of Y_D , cf. [14, Theorem 3.6]. We do not discuss this further other than noting that this requires $Y(0, x) = 0$ for $x = D$. In practice this entails assuming that $Y(0)$ has compact support since we employ Y_D as an approximation of Y with increasing D .

Remark 5.6. Suppose that $Y(0) = 0$ and that q_W is given by a weight-stationary kernel as in Proposition 3.4 with smoothness parameter $\sigma > 1/2$ and weight parameter $\alpha_W > 1/4$. Taking also Lemma 3.6 into account, the result of Proposition 5.4 reads: there is for all $r_2 \leq 1/2$ and $r_3 \leq \sigma$ a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $D \geq 1$, $h, k \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, N_k$, and $x \in [0, D]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C (h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2} + Dh^{r_3}).$$

We see that the rate in time is essentially $1/2$ no matter the value of σ while the rate in space varies between $1/2$ and 1 . If we had sampled the noise by $P_h^0 R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} \Delta W$ directly in (28) instead of employing I_h we would see a convergence rate of 1 in space no matter the value of σ . A covariance matrix of the elements in the vector corresponding to $P_h^0 R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} \Delta W$ can be computed and used for this purpose. There are two problems with this approach, however. First, the matrix involves integrals that must in general be computed numerically. This can be very expensive. Second, even for weighted Matérn kernels, there are no theoretical guarantees that circulant embedding algorithms can be employed. Then more expensive methods, such as using a Cholesky decompositions and multiplying with the resulting dense matrix for sampling, must be employed.

Remark 5.7. In the proof of Proposition 5.4, we used a Sobolev embedding technique for the term involving I_h . Had we also used it for the other integral term, we could employ classical techniques (see, e.g., [42, Theorem 1.1]) combined with interpolation between error estimates in $\mathcal{S}_D(t) - \mathcal{S}_D^{h,k}(t) P_h^0$ measured in L^2 and \dot{H}_D^1 norms (cf. [28, Lemma 3.12]) to obtain a convergence rate of essentially $h^{1/2} + k^{1/4}$. That is, assuming that no essential smoothness of the kernel in the Hilbert–Schmidt sense was available. This is the case if a weight-stationary kernel as in Proposition 3.4 with $\sigma = 1/2 + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small is used. From the previous remark, we see that this rate would be suboptimal in time. It would also be suboptimal in space if we were to sample the noise by $P_h^0 R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} \Delta W$ directly.

Traditionally, finite element approximations of the stochastic heat equation have been analyzed in L^2 norms in space, see, e.g., [42, 28]. In the same setting as in Remark 5.6, suppose also for simplicity that $D = 1$. Then, an application of [27, Lemma 3.12] and Lemma 5.3(ii) yields for all $r_2 \in [0, 1/2 + \min(\sigma - 1/2, 1/2)/2]$ and $r_3 \in [0, \sigma]$, the existence of a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $h, k \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, N_k$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|Y_D(t_i) - Y_D^{h,k}(t_i)\|_{L^2}^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C(h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2} + h^{r_3}).$$

Compared to the results of Proposition 5.4, we see that if σ is close to $1/2$, the same rate is obtained. Otherwise, the rate can be as high as $3/2$ in space and $3/4$ in time. The reason for the potentially higher rate is that Assumption 3.2(ii) may be used with $r_W < \sigma - 1/2$ combined with (25). Since no such equivalence is available in our L^∞ setting, a lower rate is obtained. This is however sharp, which we now demonstrate in simulations.

We let $D = T := 1$, $Y_D := 0$ and $a := 0.05$. We let the kernel q_W of W be of Matérn class (see Remark 3.7) with $\mu = \zeta := 1$ and increasing $\nu > 0$. This may be regarded as a weighted stationary kernel in Proposition 3.4 by choosing the weight function as a smooth




FIGURE 2. Errors $\max_{t_i, x} \mathbb{E}[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{k, h}(t_i, x)|^2]^{1/2}$ for the discretized and localized stochastic heat equation and decreasing space step sizes h with time step k fixed and small.




FIGURE 3. Errors $\max_{t_i, x} \mathbb{E}[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{k, h}(t_i, x)|^2]^{1/2}$ for the discretized and localized stochastic heat equation and decreasing time step sizes k with space step h fixed and small.

bump function with large but finite support and equal to 1 in a sufficiently large neighborhood of 0. In this context, the results of Proposition 5.4 hold true with $s_W := \nu + 1/2$. We plot

approximations of the errors

$$(32) \quad \max_{\substack{i \in \{0, \dots, N_k\} \\ x \in [0, D]}} \mathbb{E}[|Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{k,h}(t_i, x)|^2]^{1/2}$$

based on Monte Carlo approximations with sample size $N = 100$. First, we fix $k = 2^{-14}$ and examine the spatial convergence rate for decreasing $h > 0$. We replace Y_D with a reference solution computed at $h = 2^{-10}$. As we see from Figure 2, the convergence rate increases from essentially $1/2$ when $s_W \approx 1/2$ to 1 when $s_W \geq 1$. This is in line with the results of Proposition 3.4. Next, we fix $h = 2^{-9}$ and examine the temporal convergence rate for decreasing $k > 0$. We replace Y_D with a reference solution computed at $k = 2^{-14}$. We see from Figure 3, that the convergence rate stays constant no matter the value of s_W . This is again in line with the results of Proposition 3.4.

The sample size was chosen to ensure that the plots in Figures 2 and 3 were sufficiently stable. We used the same $N = 100$ samples of W across all values of h for a given value of s_W . The samples across different s_W were drawn independently of each other. The sample size $N = 100$ does not yield a precise estimate of (32). However, we are only interested in observing the rate with which the error decrease as h or k tends to 0, and in this sense the Monte Carlo error will never dominate, at least in a mean square sense and for fixed t_i, x . For, with $E_{i,x} := |Y_D(t_i, x) - Y_D^{k,h}(t_i, x)|^2$, it follows from Proposition 5.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N E_{i,x}^{(j)} \right)^{1/2} - \mathbb{E}[E_{i,x}]^{1/2} \right|^2 \right] \leq 4 \mathbb{E}[E_{i,x}] \lesssim (t_i^{-r_1} (h^{2r_1} + k^{r_1}) + h^{2r_2} + k^{r_2} + Dh^{r_3})^2,$$

where $(E_{i,x}^{(j)})_{j=1}^N$ are the independent samples of $E_{i,x}$ that make up the Monte Carlo estimate.

5.3. A fully discrete finite difference-finite element discretization of the HEIDIH model. We end this section on numerical approximation by combining the results of Propositions 5.1, 5.2 and 5.4, thereby obtaining a fully discrete approximation result for the HEIDIH model in the case that $Z(t) := \eta$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

We employ the same finite difference method of Section 5.1 to define an approximation $X_D^{h,k}$ on a space-time grid with equal spatial and temporal step sizes $k \in (0, T]$. Recalling (19), this is defined by

$$(33) \quad X_D^{h,k}(t_{i+1}, x_j) = X_D^{h,k}(t_i, x_{j+1}) + \|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r} \eta\|_{H_{q_B}} Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x_j) \Delta \tilde{\beta}^i$$

for $t_i = ik \geq 0$ and $x_j = jk \geq 0$. Here $Y_D^{h,k}$ is the approximation of Y_D defined by (28) and $\tilde{\beta}$ the real-valued Wiener process defined in (20) with $\Delta \tilde{\beta}^i = \tilde{\beta}(t_{i+1}) - \tilde{\beta}(t_i)$. Note that $Y_D^{h,k}$ is computed on a space-time grid with temporal step size k and spatial mesh size h that may not be equal. Since $Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, \cdot)$ is a piecewise linear function on $[0, D]$, the scheme (33) is well-defined even if $h \neq k$. The closed form is given by

$$(34) \quad X_D^{h,k}(t_n, x_j) = \delta_{x_j} \mathcal{S}(t_n) X(0) + \|I_{H_{q_B}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r} \eta\|_{H_{q_B}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x_j + t_n - t_{i+1}) d\tilde{\beta}(r).$$

Theorem 5.8. *Let the conditions of Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 5.4 be satisfied. Then, for all $s_1 < 1/2, s_2 < \min(s_W, 2)$ and $T \geq 1$ there is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all*

$h, k \in (0, 1]$ and $D \geq 2T - k$,

$$\max_{n, j \in \{0, \dots, N_k\}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - X_D^{h,k}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C \left(k^{s_1} + h^{2s_1} + Dh^{s_2} + e^{-(D+k-2T)^2/(8aT)} \right).$$

Proof. While it might not be possible to extend $Y_D^{h,k}$ to \mathcal{H}^r if r is big, the equations (19) and (34) are well-defined so that we may use the second error decomposition formula in Proposition 5.1 and split the error by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - X_D^{h,k}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \|I_{H_{q_B}}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r \eta\|_{H_{q_B}}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, t_n + x_j - t_{i+1}) - Y(r, t_n + x_j - r) \right|^2 \right] dr \\ &\lesssim \int_0^k \|(I - P_h^0)R_{\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (0, D)} Y(0)\|_{L^\infty((0, D))}^2 dr \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \max_{x \in [0, 2T-k]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Y_D^{h,k}(t_i, x) - Y_D(t_i, x) \right|^2 \right] dr \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \max_{x \in [0, 2T-k]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Y_D(t_i, x) - Y(t_i, x) \right|^2 \right] dr \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \max_{x \in [0, 2T-k]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| Y(t_i, x) - Y(r, x) \right|^2 \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by a constant times k by Lemma 5.3(i). The others are treated by Propositions 5.4 (with $r_1 = r_2 = s_1$ and $r_3 = s_2$), 5.2 and 4.3, respectively. \square

Remark 5.9. Note that this result provides a convergence estimate in a discrete L^2 norm defined by $\|v\|_k^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{N_k} k|v(x_j)|^2$ for functions v on $(x_j)_{j=0}^{N_k}$. We have

$$\max_{n \in \{0, \dots, N_k\}} \mathbb{E} [\|X(t_n, \cdot) - X_D^{h,k}(t_n, \cdot)\|_k^2]^{1/2} \leq \max_{n, j \in \{0, \dots, N_k\}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| X(t_n, x_j) - X_D^{h,k}(t_n, x_j) \right|^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, a (non-discrete) $L^2((0, D))$ bound can be obtained for Y using (5.4). In that case, it is suboptimal for smooth noise, see the discussion after Remark 5.7.

Suppose that D is large, so that the error is dominated by the space and time discretization. The relationship between the spatial step size h and time step size k have important consequences for the efficiency of the algorithm. If s_W is close to $1/2$, we must choose h on the same order of magnitude as k in order for the term h^{s_2} not to dominate in the error estimate of Theorem 5.8. If $s_W \geq 1$, we can choose h on the same order as \sqrt{k} and still achieve a convergence rate of $1/2$ as $k \rightarrow 0$. We illustrate this point in Figure 4, where we have let $T = 1$ and $a = 0.05$, and chosen q_B and η so that $\|I_{H_{q_B}}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}^r\|_{H_{q_B}} = 1$. We have chosen q_W as in Remark 4.6 with q_s being a Matérn kernel with $\mu = \zeta = 1$. We let $\nu = s_W - 0.5$ range from 0.05 to 0.5 and plot the error

$$\max_{n, j \in \{0, \dots, N_k\}} \mathbb{E} [\|X_D(t_n, x_j) - X_D^{k,h}(t_n, x_j)\|^2]^{1/2}$$




FIGURE 4. HEIDIH model errors $\max_{t_n, x_j} \mathbb{E} [|X_D(t_n, x_j) - X_D^{k,h}(t_n, x_j)|^2]^{1/2}$ for decreasing space and time mesh sizes. Here the approximation of X is computed on a grid with equal space and time step sizes k , while Y is computed with space step size h equal to k or \sqrt{k} .

for decreasing k and choose either $h = k$ or $h = \sqrt{k}$. We have replaced $X_D(t_n, x_j)$ with a reference solution at $k = 2^{-11}$ in the first case, $k = 2^{-12}$ in the second, and used $N = 100$ samples in a Monte Carlo approximation of the error. We see that, as expected, the rate $1/2$ is achieved for all s_W when $h = k$ but only for $s_W \geq 1$ when $h = \sqrt{k}$. If $s_W \geq 1$, it is important that the choice $h = \sqrt{k}$ is made, however, since this yields a much faster algorithm with the same convergence rate compared to $h = k$, see Figure 5.

6. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

We end this paper with a brief discussion of our results with regard to novelty and future research.

The HEIDIH model was introduced as a special case of the infinite dimensional Heston stochastic volatility model of [10]. As far as we know, this paper is the first to consider numerical approximation of such a model, as well as providing a detailed regularity analysis. In particular, we focused on how regularity of the covariance kernels of the driving Wiener processes influence regularity of the model and gave concrete examples of covariance kernels that fit into our setting. A basic result for finite difference approximations that applies to all infinite dimensional Heston stochastic volatility models of forward prices was proven in Proposition 5.1. In the special case that $Z(t) = \eta$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ we were able to deduce and prove sharp convergence rates for a fully implementable and computationally efficient algorithm in Theorem 5.8. Future areas of research include the approximation of the HEIDIH model with other choices of Z , such as $Z(t) = Y(t)/\|Y(t)\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $Y(t) \neq 0$. The main challenge then is to find an efficient way of computing the terms $\langle \hat{Y}(t_i), \Delta B^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^r}$ and $\|\hat{Y}(t_i)\|_{\mathcal{H}^r}$ in (21). Had $r = 0$ this could be solved by numerical integration, but for $r > 1/2$ the problem is




FIGURE 5. Computation time in seconds of one sample of $X_D^{k,h}$ for the different grid choices in Figure 4 for the case $s_W = 1$. The simulations were computed in MATLAB[®] R2021b on an Intel[®] Core[™] i7-10510U processor.

harder. Another area for numerical development is other boundary conditions for Y . The Dirichlet condition was in our numerical simulations chosen due to the availability of suitable deterministic non-smooth data error estimates [14]. This led to relatively low convergence rates, as noted in Section 5.2.

A large part of our numerical analysis was dedicated to finding sharp convergence rates for numerical approximations to the stochastic heat equation. There is a large body of literature dedicated to this topic, see [25] for a review of early results. In our setting, the situation is complicated by the fact that we need pointwise-in-space error estimates, that localization errors need to be taken into account and that sampling the Wiener process W pointwise causes an additional error.

We are not aware of any pointwise-in-space error estimates for finite element approximations of the stochastic heat equation. However, for finite difference schemes there is a long tradition, starting with [21] in the Walsh setting. The results of [21] is for noise that is white in both space and time. We are not aware of any case for which noise colored by a concrete covariance kernel was considered for finite difference approximations.

Localization have been dealt with before in the Walsh setting, in [13] for example. We showed how similar arguments can be adapted to the semigroup framework of [16] considered in [10].

The question of how sampling the Wiener process W pointwise affect the convergence of approximations of the stochastic heat equation has, as far as we know, barely been analyzed at all in the literature. In terms of finite elements it means replacing the L_2 -projection P_h^0 with the interpolant I_h in $P_h^0 \Delta W^i = P_h^0(W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i))$ and the question of what effect this has is mentioned as open in [28, Section 6.2]. We showed in theory as well as by numerical simulations that there is a negative effect on the convergence if the noise is rough (i.e., if

$H_{q_W} \hookrightarrow H^{s_W, \alpha}(\mathbb{R})$ for $s_W \geq 1$) but not otherwise. In future work, we plan to extend this analysis to equations with non-linear terms in multiple dimensions.

REFERENCES

1. N. Aronszajn, *Theory of reproducing kernels*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **68** (1950), 337–404 (English).
2. Andrea Barth and Fred Espen Benth, *The forward dynamics in energy markets – infinite-dimensional modelling and simulation*, Stochastics **86** (2014), no. 6, 932–966 (English).
3. Fred Espen Benth, Jurate Saltyte Benth, and Steen Koekebakker, *Stochastic modeling of electricity and related markets*, Advanced Series on Statistical Science & Applied Probability, vol. 11, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, Singapore, April 2008.
4. Fred Espen Benth, Giulia Di Nunno, and Iben Cathrine Simonsen, *Sensitivity analysis in the infinite-dimensional Heston model*, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. **24** (2021), no. 2, 29 (English), Id/No 2150014.
5. Fred Espen Benth and Heidar Eyjolfsson, *Simulation of volatility modulated Volterra processes using hyperbolic stochastic partial differential equations*, Bernoulli **22** (2016), no. 2, 774–793 (English).
6. Fred Espen Benth, Heidar Eyjolfsson, and Almut E. D. Veraart, *Approximating Lévy semistationary processes via Fourier methods in the context of power markets*, SIAM J. Financ. Math. **5** (2014), 71–98 (English).
7. Fred Espen Benth and Paul Krühner, *Derivatives pricing in energy markets: an infinite-dimensional approach*, SIAM J. Financ. Math. **6** (2015), 825–869 (English).
8. Fred Espen Benth and Florentina Paraschiv, *A space-time random field model for electricity forward prices*, J. Bank. Financ. **95** (2018), 203–216.
9. Fred Espen Benth, Dennis Schroers, and Almut E.D. Veraart, *A weak law of large numbers for realised covariation in a hilbert space setting*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **145** (2022), 241–268.
10. Fred Espen Benth and Iben Cathrine Simonsen, *The Heston stochastic volatility model in Hilbert space*, Stoch. Anal. Appl. **36** (2018), no. 4, 733–750. MR 3854540
11. Alain Berlinet and Christine Thomas-Agnan, *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 2004. MR 2239907
12. James H. Bramble and Xuejun Zhang, *The analysis of multigrid methods*, Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. VII, Handb. Numer. Anal., VII, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000, pp. 173–415. MR 1804746
13. David Jean-Michel Candil, *Localization errors of the stochastic heat equation*, Ph.D. thesis, 2022, Available at <https://infoscience.epfl.ch/record/291119>., p. 221.
14. M. Crouzeix, S. Larsson, and V. Thomée, *Resolvent estimates for elliptic finite element operators in one dimension*, Math. Comput. **63** (1994), no. 207, 121–140 (English).
15. M. Crouzeix and V. Thomée, *The stability in L_p and W_p^1 of the L_2 -projection onto finite element function spaces*, Math. Comput. **48** (1987), 521–532 (English).
16. Giuseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk, *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, second ed., Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications, vol. 152, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014. MR 3236753
17. Todd Dupont and Ridgway Scott, *Polynomial approximation of functions in Sobolev spaces*, Math. Comp. **34** (1980), no. 150, 441–463. MR 559195
18. Ivar Ekeland and Erik Taffin, *Optimal bond portfolios*, Paris-Princeton lectures on mathematical finance 2004., Berlin: Springer, 2007, pp. 51–102 (English).
19. D. Fujiwara, *Concrete characterization of the domains of fractional powers of some elliptic differential operators of the second order*, Proc. Japan Acad. **43** (1967), 82–86 (English).
20. I. G. Graham, F. Y. Kuo, Dirk Nuyens, R. Scheichl, and I. H. Sloan, *Analysis of circulant embedding methods for sampling stationary random fields*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **56** (2018), no. 3, 1871–1895 (English).
21. István Gyöngy, *Lattice approximations for stochastic quasi-linear parabolic partial differential equations driven by space-time white noise. II*, Potential Anal. **11** (1999), no. 1, 1–37 (English).
22. Dorothee Haroske and Hans Triebel, *Entropy numbers in weighted function spaces and eigenvalue distributions of some degenerate pseudodifferential operators. I*, Math. Nachr. **167** (1994), 131–156 (English).
23. David Heath, Robert Jarrow, and Andrew Morton, *Bond pricing and the term structure of interest rates: A new methodology for contingent claims valuation*, Econometrica **60** (1992), no. 1, 77–105.

24. Tailen Hsing and Randall Eubank, *Theoretical foundations of functional data analysis, with an introduction to linear operators*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2015. MR 3379106
25. A. Jentzen and P. E. Kloeden, *The numerical approximation of stochastic partial differential equations*, Milan J. Math. **77** (2009), no. 1, 205–244 (English).
26. Arnulf Jentzen and Michael Röckner, *Regularity analysis for stochastic partial differential equations with nonlinear multiplicative trace class noise*, Journal of Differential Equations **252** (2012), no. 1, 114–136.
27. Rafail Khraminskii, *Stochastic stability of differential equations*, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, vol. 66, Springer, 2012.
28. Raphael Kruse, *Strong and weak approximation of semilinear stochastic evolution equations*, Lecture notes in mathematics, vol. 2093, Springer, Cham, 2014. MR 3154916
29. T. Kühn and W. Linde, *Gaussian approximation numbers and metric entropy*, J. Math. Sci., New York **238** (2019), no. 4, 471–483 (English).
30. Annika Lang, *A note on the importance of weak convergence rates for SPDE approximations in multilevel Monte Carlo schemes*, Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods, MCQMC, Leuven, Belgium, April 2014 (Ronald Cools and Dirk Nuyens, eds.), Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol. 163, 2016, pp. 489–505.
31. Gabriel J. Lord, Catherine E. Powell, and Tony Shardlow, *An introduction to computational stochastic pdes*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
32. Vern I. Paulsen and Mrinal Raghupathi, *An introduction to the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, vol. 152, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016 (English).
33. Albrecht Pietsch, *Operator ideals. Licenced ed*, vol. 20, Elsevier (North-Holland), Amsterdam, 1980 (English).
34. Claudia Prévôt and Michael Röckner, *A Concise Course on Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*, Lecture notes in mathematics, vol. 1905, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
35. Markus Riedle, *Cylindrical Wiener processes*, Séminaire de Probabilités XLIII, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 2006, Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 191–214. MR 2790373
36. Elias M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Math. Ser., vol. 30, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970 (English).
37. Vidar Thomée, *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*, second ed., Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 25, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. MR 2249024
38. Hans Triebel, *Theory of function spaces*, Monographs in Mathematics, vol. 78, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983. MR 781540
39. Jan van Neerven, *γ -radonifying operators—a survey*, The AMSI-ANU Workshop on Spectral Theory and Harmonic Analysis, Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ., vol. 44, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 2010, pp. 1–61. MR 2655391
40. Holger Wendland, *Scattered data approximation*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, vol. 17, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005. MR 2131724
41. Atsushi Yagi, *Abstract parabolic evolution equations and their applications*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. MR 2573296
42. Yubin Yan, *Galerkin finite element methods for stochastic parabolic partial differential equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **43** (2005), no. 4, 1363–1384. MR 2182132

(Fred Espen Benth)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OSLO.
POSTBOKS 1053, BLINDERN, 0316 OSLO, NORWAY.

Email address: `fredb@math.uio.no`

(Gabriel Lord)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMAPP, RADBOUD UNIVERSITY.
POSTBUS 9010, 6500 GL NIJMEGEN, THE NETHERLANDS.

Email address: `gabriel.lord@ru.nl`

(Giulia Di Nunno)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OSLO.
POSTBOKS 1053, BLINDERN, 0316 OSLO, NORWAY.

AND

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE, NHH NORWEGIAN SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS.
HELLEVEIEN 30, 5045 BERGEN, NORWAY.

Email address: `giulian@math.uio.no`

(Andreas Petersson)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF OSLO.
POSTBOKS 1053, BLINDERN, 0316 OSLO, NORWAY.

Email address: `andreep@math.uio.no`