

Nonparametric calibration for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations based on discrete observations

Florian Hildebrandt and Mathias Trabs

Universität Hamburg

Nonparametric estimation for semilinear SPDEs, namely stochastic reaction-diffusion equations in one space dimension, is studied. We consider observations of the solution field on a discrete grid in time and space with infill asymptotics in both coordinates. Firstly, based on a precise analysis of the Hölder regularity of the solution process and its nonlinear component, we show that the asymptotic properties of diffusivity and volatility estimators derived from realized quadratic variations in the linear setup generalize to the semilinear SPDE. In particular, we obtain a rate-optimal joint estimator of the two parameters. Secondly, we derive a nonparametric estimator for the reaction function specifying the underlying equation. The estimate is chosen from a finite-dimensional function space based on a simple least squares criterion. Oracle inequalities with respect to both the empirical and usual L^2 -risk provide conditions for the estimator to achieve the usual nonparametric rate of convergence. Adaptivity is provided via model selection.

Keywords: infill asymptotics, realized quadratic variation, model selection, semilinear stochastic partial differential equations.

2010 MSC: 60F05, 62G05, 60H15

1 Introduction

In view of a growing number of stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) models used in the natural sciences as well as in mathematical finance, their data-based calibration has become an increasingly active field of research during the last few years. Studying stochastic reaction-diffusion equations, this article advances the statistical theory for SPDEs based on discrete observations in time and space to a semilinear framework and provides a first nonparametric estimator for the reaction function. Specifically, we consider the mild solution $X = (X_t(x), x \in [0, 1], t \geq 0)$ of the SPDE

$$\begin{cases} dX_t(x) = (\vartheta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} X_t(x) + f(X_t(x))) dt + \sigma dW_t(x), \\ X_t(0) = X_t(1) = 0, \\ X_0(x) = \xi(x), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with dW denoting a white noise in space and time and an initial condition $\xi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The equation is parameterized in terms of the volatility $\sigma^2 > 0$, the diffusivity $\vartheta > 0$ and a possibly nonlinear reaction function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on which we impose no parametric assumptions. Reaction-diffusion equations are typically used to model a scenario where local production of some quantity X with the nonlinear reaction function f competes with a linear diffusion effect while undergoing

internal fluctuations, see [35] as well as, e.g., [24] for the physical background. Of particular interest is the case where f is a polynomial of odd degree with a negative leading coefficient. With $f \equiv 0$ the model also includes the classical linear stochastic heat equation on an interval.

A complete calibration of the model decomposes into the parametric estimation of σ^2 and ϑ and the nonparametric estimation of f . We study the practically most natural situation where X is observed at a discrete grid $\{(t_i, y_k)\}_{i=0, \dots, N, k=0, \dots, M} \subset [0, T] \times [0, 1]$ in time and space with $T > 0$ either fixed or $T \rightarrow \infty$. Our focus lies on a high frequency regime in time and space where both the number M of spatial observations and the number N of temporal observations tend to infinity.

So far, the vast majority of literature on statistics for SPDEs deals with linear equations, see [12, 31] for reviews of various available approaches and observation schemes. The statistical analysis of semilinear SPDEs is limited to few works, most of which have only appeared during the last two years: Within the *spectral approach*, where one considers the observations $\langle X_t, e_k \rangle, t \in [0, T], k \leq K \rightarrow \infty$ with $(e_k)_{k \geq 1}$ being the eigenbasis of the differential operator in the underlying SPDE, Cialenco and Glatt-Holtz [13] considered diffusivity estimation for the stochastic two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation. This theory has been generalized by Pasemann and Stannat [41] as well as Pasemann et al. [40] to more general equations. Diffusivity estimation based on the *local measurements* approach due to Altmeyer and Reiß [3] was studied in a semilinear framework, see Altmeyer et al. [1, 2]. Here, the observations are given by $\langle X_t, K_h \rangle, t \in [0, T]$, for a kernel function K_h that localizes in space as $h \rightarrow 0$. In both approaches, the key idea to analyse the semilinear framework is to regard the solution process as a perturbation of the linear case, i.e., to decompose $X_t = X_t^0 + N_t$ with X_t^0 being the solution to the corresponding linear system. Exploiting that the regularity of the nonlinear component N_t exceeds the regularity of X_t^0 in the Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{D}((-A_\vartheta)^\gamma)$, $\gamma > 0$, where $A_\vartheta = \vartheta A$ is the driving differential operator, statistical methods for the linear equation turn out to be applicable also in the semilinear model.

To estimate the parameters σ^2 and ϑ based on fully discrete observations, we extend the realized quadratic variation based methods developed in Hildebrandt and Trabs [26] and Bibinger and Trabs [7] to the semilinear framework (1). Similar methods have also been applied to various linear SPDE models, e.g., in [11, 14, 34, 43, 45]. Specifically, assuming $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ in the model (1), we show that the asymptotic properties of the realized quadratic variations based on space, time and the double increments

$$D_{ik} := X_{t_{i+1}}(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - X_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) + X_{t_i}(y_k)$$

derived for the case $f \equiv 0$ are robust with respect to a nonlinear perturbation of the equation. In particular, using double increments, the parameters (σ^2, ϑ) can be estimated jointly at the rate

$$\left(\frac{\delta^3 \vee \Delta^{3/2}}{T} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{with} \quad \delta := y_{k+1} - y_k, \quad \Delta := t_{i+1} - t_i.$$

This rate is generally slower than the usual parametric rate $(MN)^{-1/2}$, unless a *balanced sampling design* $\delta \approx \sqrt{\Delta}$ is present. Nevertheless, in view of an immediate extension of the lower bound from [26] to the case $T \rightarrow \infty$, this rate is seen to be optimal up to a logarithmic factor.

As for spectral and local observations, our findings rely on the higher order regularity of the nonlinear component of the solution process. However, we quantify the regularity in terms of Hölder spaces instead of the Sobolev spaces since, being based on power variations, our estimators exploit the regularity properties of X in the spaces of Hölder continuous functions. Besides the concrete application in statistics, our detailed account of the Hölder regularity in time and space also provides structural insights from a theoretical probabilistic point of view.

Similar to [2, 41], our techniques can principally be applied to more general types of semilinear SPDEs, e.g., Burgers' equation where the nonlinearity is given by $F(u) = -u \frac{\partial}{\partial x} u$. To facilitate the analysis, we would have to consider a more regular noise process than a cylindrical Brownian motion. Indeed, in order to obtain the higher order regularity of the nonlinear component, it is necessary for the solution process to take values in the domain of the nonlinearity. This is generally not the

case for equations driven by space-time white noise and we restrict our analysis to nonlinearities of Nemytskii-type where $F(u) = f \circ u$. Also, a more regular noise process would be necessary to obtain the existence of a function-valued solution process to equation (1) in space dimension $d \geq 2$, which is a crucial requirement for dealing with discrete observations.

To the authors' knowledge, the only work on estimation of the nonlinearity in semilinear SPDEs was conducted by Goldys and Maslowski [22] who studied a parametric problem, assuming a full observation $(X_t)_{t \leq T}$ of a controlled SPDE as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Somewhat related, Pasemann et al. [40] studied estimation of the diffusivity parameter when the nonlinearity is only known up to a finite-dimensional nuisance parameter by using a joint maximum likelihood approach for spectral observations. Since it follows, e.g., from the absolute continuity result in Koski and Loges [30] that even the simple linear function $f(x) = \vartheta_0 x$ for some $\vartheta_0 < 0$ cannot be identified in finite time, a consistent estimation of the reaction function requires $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Nonparametric estimation of the reaction function f turns out to be comparable to nonparametric drift estimation for finite-dimensional SDEs. The latter problem, has been addressed in the statistics literature for high-frequency observations in multiple works, see, e.g., to [15, 21, 27]. The starting point for drift estimation for SDEs is to formulate a regression model based on the discrete observations. Generalizing this approach to the infinite-dimensional SPDE framework, our key insight is the regression-type decomposition

$$\frac{X_{t+\Delta} - S(\Delta)X_t}{\Delta} = f(X_t) + \text{“stochastic noise term”} + \text{“negligible remainder terms”}$$

where $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is the strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2((0, 1))$ generated by the operator $\vartheta_2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$. Note that, in contrast to the finite-dimensional situation, the time increments in the response variables have to be corrected in terms of the semigroup due to its presence in the nonlinear component $N_t = \int_0^t S(t-s)f(X_s) ds$. Doing so, the contribution of the linear component to the right hand side of the regression model automatically becomes stochastically independent of the covariate X_t and can, thus, be treated as stochastic noise. Clearly, computing $S(\Delta)X_t$ is not feasible in the discrete observation scheme, as it depends on the whole spatial process $(X_t(x), x \in (0, 1))$, and we replace it by an empirical counterpart. Additionally, the semigroup depends on the possibly unknown parameter ϑ which we address by employing a plug-in approach. Doing so, we obtain an approximation $\check{S}_t^\Delta \approx S(\Delta)X_t$ which is only based on the discrete data.

To estimate f , we adapt the nonparametric least squares approach by [16] which was successfully applied to ergodic one-dimensional diffusion processes in Comte et al. [15]. Hence, our nonparametric estimator is defined as the minimizer of

$$\gamma_{N,M}(g) := \frac{1}{MN} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(g(X_{t_i}(y_k)) - \frac{X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - \check{S}_{t_i}^\Delta(y_k)}{\Delta} \right)^2$$

over the functions g from a suitable finite-dimensional approximation space. Working in an ergodic regime for the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$, we derive \mathcal{O}_p -type oracle inequalities for the estimator when the risk is either the empirical 2-norm with evaluations at the data points or the usual L^2 -norm on a compact set. These oracle inequalities reflect the well-known bias-variance trade-off in nonparametric statistics. Under sufficient conditions on the sampling frequencies δ and Δ , an optimal choice of the dimension of the approximation space yields the usual nonparametric rate $T^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}$ where α is some regularity parameter associated with f . Employing a model selection approach similar to [15], we obtain an adaptive estimator.

While our parametric estimators for (σ^2, ϑ) are constructed as method of moments estimators directly based on the covariance structure of the discrete observations in the linear case, our nonparametric estimator for f is based on an approximation of the spatially continuous model. As a consequence, our estimation method requires a fine observation mesh throughout the whole space

domain. In particular, the condition $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$ becomes our fundamental requirement.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide a thorough introduction of the SPDE model and the considered observation scheme. Further, we derive precise results on the Hölder regularity in time and space of the solution process and show the higher order regularity of its nonlinear component. In Section 3, we conclude that the asymptotic properties of realized quadratic variations based on space, time and double increments as well as the corresponding estimators mainly carry over from the linear setting. Section 4 is devoted to nonparametric estimation of f . As a first step, we introduce the approximation spaces which serve as the candidate functions for estimating f . Then, we define the estimator and derive corresponding oracle inequalities. To that aim, we assume, firstly, that the diffusivity parameter ϑ is known and then employ a plug-in approach. All proofs are collected in Section 5.1.

We use the notations $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ as well as $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we use the shorthand $a \wedge b := \min(a, b)$ and $a \vee b := \max(a, b)$ as well as $[a] := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : k \leq a\}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For two sequences $(a_n), (b_n)$, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ to indicate that there exists some $c > 0$ such that $|a_n| \leq c|b_n|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and we write $a_n \approx b_n$ if $a_n \lesssim b_n \lesssim a_n$. Throughout $a_n, b_n \rightarrow \infty$ is meant in the sense of $a_n \wedge b_n \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $a_n = a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $(a_n) \equiv a$. When we write statements like $M, N \rightarrow \infty$, we implicitly assume that M and N depend on a common index $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_n, M_n \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Convergence in probability and convergence in distribution are denoted by $\xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ and $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$, respectively. The total variation distance of two probability measures P, Q on some measure space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) is denoted by $\|P - Q\|_{\text{TV}} := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |P(A) - Q(A)|$. For a sequence (X_n) of real random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, we use the usual stochastic Landau symbols: $X_n = o_p(a_n)$ indicates that $X_n/a_n \rightarrow 0$ holds in probability and $X_n = \mathcal{O}_p(a_n)$ means that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}(|X_n/a_n| \geq C) \leq \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

2 Basic assumptions and Hölder regularity of the solution process

Throughout, we work on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ equipped with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions. In order to introduce the reaction-diffusion equations from (1) thoroughly, let us consider the semilinear SPDE

$$dX_t = \left(\vartheta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} X_t + F(X_t) \right) dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0 = \xi, \quad (2)$$

where W denotes a cylindrical Brownian motion on $L^2((0, 1))$ and where the nonlinearity F is given by

$$F(u) = f \circ u \quad \text{for some } f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

For simplicity, we will also refer to the functional by f , i.e., we write $f(u) = f \circ u$ for functions $u: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Throughout, the parameters σ and ϑ are strictly positive constants. As usual, the Dirichlet boundary conditions in (2) are implemented into the domain of the differential operator $A_\vartheta := \vartheta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$, namely, we define $\mathcal{D}(A_\vartheta) := H^2((0, 1)) \cap H_0^1((0, 1))$ where $H^k((0, 1))$ denotes the L^2 -Sobolev spaces of order $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and with $H_0^1((0, 1))$ being the closure of $C_c^\infty((0, 1))$ in $H^1((0, 1))$. We denote the strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2((0, 1))$ generated by the operator A_ϑ by $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$. Recall that a cylindrical Brownian motion W is defined as a linear mapping $L^2((0, 1)) \ni u \mapsto W(\cdot)(u)$ such that $t \mapsto W_t(u)$ is a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion for all normalized $u \in L^2((0, 1))$ and such that the covariance structure is given by $\text{Cov}(W_t(u), W_s(v)) = (s \wedge t) \langle u, v \rangle$, for $u, v \in L^2((0, 1))$, $s, t \geq 0$. W can thus be understood as the anti-derivative in time of space-time white noise.

Without further notice, in the sequel we will work under the standing assumption that there is a unique mild solution

$$X_t = S(t)\xi + \sigma \int_0^t S(t-s) dW_s + \int_0^t S(t-s)f(X_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

such that $X := (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov process with state space

$$E := C_0([0, 1]) := \{u \in C([0, 1]) : u(0) = u(1) = 0\}$$

and such that $X \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, E)$ holds almost surely for all $\xi \in E$. It follows from [18, Example 7.8] that this assumption is fulfilled, e.g., when f satisfies

$$f(\lambda + \eta)\text{sgn}(\lambda) \leq a(|\eta|)(1 + |\lambda|), \quad \lambda, \eta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4)$$

for some increasing function $a: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. This is particularly satisfied when f is a polynomial of odd degree with a negative leading coefficient. Note that the existence of continuous trajectories is a crucial requirement for dealing with fully discrete observations. Even in the linear setting $f \equiv 0$, function valued solutions to equation (2) only exist in dimension one. In order to deal with larger dimensions, it would be necessary to consider a more regular noise process than a cylindrical Brownian motion.

In our whole analysis, the decomposition of X into its linear and its nonlinear component turns out to be useful. The decomposition is given by $X_t = S(t)\xi + X_t^0 + N_t$, $t \geq 0$, where

$$X_t^0 := \sigma \int_0^t S(t-s) dW_s, \quad N_t := \int_0^t S(t-s)f(X_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

and (X_t^0) is the mild solution to the associated linear SPDE ($f \equiv 0$, $\xi \equiv 0$). Recall that the operator A_ϑ has a complete orthonormal system of eigenvectors in $L^2((0, 1))$, namely, its eigenpairs $(-\lambda_\ell, e_\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$ are given by

$$e_\ell(y) = \sqrt{2} \sin(\pi \ell y), \quad \lambda_\ell = \vartheta \pi^2 \ell^2, \quad y \in [0, 1], \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Employing this sine base, the cylindrical Brownian motion W can be realized via $W_t = \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \beta_\ell(t) e_\ell$ in the sense that $W_t(\cdot) = \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \beta_\ell(t) \langle \cdot, e_\ell \rangle$ for a sequence of independent standard Brownian motions $(\beta_\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$. In particular, the linear component of X admits the representation

$$X_t^0(x) = \sum_{\ell \geq 1} u_\ell(t) e_\ell(x), \quad t \geq 0, x \in [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

where $(u_\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$ are one dimensional independent processes satisfying the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck dynamics $du_\ell(t) = -\lambda_\ell u_\ell(t) dt + \sigma d\beta_\ell(t)$ or, equivalently,

$$u_\ell(t) = u_\ell(0) e^{-\lambda_\ell t} + \sigma \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_\ell(t-s)} d\beta_\ell(s), \quad u_\ell(0) = \langle \xi, e_\ell \rangle$$

in the sense of a usual finite-dimensional stochastic integral. From representation (5) it is evident that $(t, x) \mapsto X_t^0(x)$ is a two-parameter centered Gaussian field with covariance structure

$$\text{Cov}(X_s^0(x), X_t^0(y)) = \sigma^2 \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{e^{-\lambda_\ell |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_\ell(t+s)}}{2\lambda_\ell} e_\ell(x) e_\ell(y), \quad s, t \geq 0, x, y \in [0, 1]. \quad (6)$$

In our analysis, we will always assume that either $\xi = 0$ or that ξ follows the stationary distribution on E associated with the Markov process X , provided that it exists. For the linear system $f \equiv 0$,

the stationary distribution can be realized by letting $\{\beta_\ell, \langle \xi, e_\ell \rangle, \ell \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be independent with $\langle \xi, e_\ell \rangle \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/(2\lambda_\ell))$ such that each coefficient process $t \mapsto \langle X_t, e_\ell \rangle$ is stationary with covariance function $c(s, t) := \frac{\sigma^2}{2\lambda_\ell} e^{-\lambda_\ell |t-s|}$, $s, t \geq 0$. For semilinear equations there are generally no explicit expressions for the invariant distribution, though its existence can be guaranteed via abstract criteria in a large variety of cases, see, e.g., Proposition 2.1 below.

As a final standing assumption, we require that the nonlinearity f and its derivative are at most of polynomial growth, i.e., there exist constants $c > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|f(x)|, |f'(x)| \leq c(1 + |x|^d), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (7)$$

This assumption will be essential for our whole analysis as it allows to deduce the higher order regularity of (N_t) from properties of X .

The set of basic assumptions just introduced is sufficient for generalizing realized-quadratic-variation-based estimators for σ^2 and ϑ to the semilinear framework, as long as the time horizon T remains bounded. When dealing with the case $T \rightarrow \infty$, on the other hand, we need to impose a stricter assumption, that ensures that the error induced by the nonlinearity remains negligible uniformly in time, namely:

- (B) The process X from (3) with zero or, in case of existence, stationary initial condition satisfies $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_\infty^p) < \infty$ for any $p \geq 1$.

For the nonparametric estimation of the nonlinearity f , our analysis will rely on a concentration inequality derived via the mixing property of a stationary process. Hence, we will later assume:

- (M) For the Markov process X from (3), there exists a stationary distribution π on E and the mild solution with $X_0 = \xi \sim \pi$ satisfies $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_\infty^p) = \mathbf{E}(\|X_0\|_\infty^p) < \infty$ for any $p \geq 1$. Furthermore, X is exponentially β -mixing, i.e., there exist constants $L, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\beta_X(t) := \int_E \|P_t(u, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \pi(du) \leq L e^{-\gamma t}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

where $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the transition semigroup on E associated with the Markov process X .

Sufficient conditions for Assumptions (B) and (M) to be satisfied are given in the following Proposition which is a slight extension of results derived in Goldys and Maslowski [23].

Proposition 2.1. *If there are constants $a, b, c, \beta \geq 0$ such that*

$$\text{sgn}(x)f(x+y) \leq -a|x| + b|y|^\beta + c \quad (9)$$

holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, then Assumptions (B) and (M) are satisfied.

A proof for the above proposition is given in Section 5.4. Condition (9) requires that $-f$ has at least linear growth at infinity and is, not surprisingly, stronger than the general existence condition (4). Still, it covers a large class of systems, including the case where f is a polynomial of odd degree with a negative leading coefficient.

Finally, for the nonparametric estimation of f on a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, we will need that the $L^2(A)$ -norm is comparable to the empirical norm induced by the process X . This can be achieved by requiring the following equivalence condition.

- (E) For the Markov process X from (3) there exists a stationary distribution π on E and, if $\xi \sim \pi$, the random variables $\xi(x)$ admit a Lebesgue density μ_x for each $x \in (0, 1)$. Further, for any compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, there are constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$ and $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_x(z) &\leq c_1 \quad \text{for all } z \in A, x \in (0, 1), \\ \mu_x(z) &\geq c_0 \quad \text{for all } z \in A, x \in (b, 1-b). \end{aligned}$$

The presence of the constant b in the above lower bound is due to the degeneracy induced by the Dirichlet boundary conditions. Specifically, Assumption (E) will be used in order to conclude the existence of constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$c\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \leq \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} t^2(X_0(\frac{k}{M}))\right) \leq C\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2$$

holds for all functions $t \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with support in the compact set A . Assumption (E) is clearly satisfied in the case where f is a linear function $f(x) = \vartheta_0 x$ for some $\vartheta_0 < 0$. Indeed, the corresponding stationary distribution matches the stationary distribution for the case $f \equiv 0$ with λ_ℓ replaced by $\tilde{\lambda}_\ell := \lambda_\ell - \vartheta_0$. Thus, the random variables $X_0(x)$, $x \in (0, 1)$, are Gaussian and (E) can be checked by examining their variances. Concerning more general nonlinearities f , there is a large amount of literature concerned with the existence and regularity of Lebesgue densities corresponding to the marginal distributions associated with various SPDE models, see, e.g., [4, 36, 38, 39]. However, to the author's best knowledge, there are so far no estimates on the densities of the random variables $X_t(x)$ that hold uniformly in $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for some infinite set $\mathcal{X} \subset (0, 1)$. Deriving a sufficient condition on f to ensure (E) goes beyond the scope of this work and is postponed to further research.

2.1 Observation scheme

Throughout, we assume that the following set of observations derived from a single sample path of the process X from (3) is available: we suppose to have $(M + 1)(N + 1)$ time- and space-discrete observations

$$\{X_{t_i}(y_k), i = 0, \dots, N, k = 0, \dots, M\}$$

on a regular grid $\{(t_i, y_k)\}_{i,k} \subset [0, T] \times [0, 1]$ with a time horizon $T > 0$ and $M, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. More precisely, we assume that

$$y_k = b + k\delta \quad \text{and} \quad t_i = i\Delta \quad \text{where} \quad \delta = \frac{1 - 2b}{M}, \quad \Delta = \frac{T}{N}$$

for some fixed $b \in [0, 1/2)$. Concerning the time horizon, it will always be assumed that either $T > 0$ is fixed or that $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Due to the boundedness of the space domain, we have high frequency observations in space whenever $M \rightarrow \infty$. High frequency observations in time are present when $T/N \rightarrow 0$. This is trivially satisfied if T is fixed and $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that the spatial locations y_k are equidistant inside a (possibly proper) sub-interval $[b, 1 - b] \subset [0, 1]$. For certain statistical procedures, we will exclude observations close to the boundary by requiring $b > 0$. This is done to prevent undesired boundary effects, which lead to biased estimates.

2.2 Hölder regularity of the solution process

In this section, we discuss the Hölder regularity of the process $(X_t(y), t \geq 0, y \in [0, 1])$ in time and space and, in particular, we show the higher order regularity of its nonlinear component $(N_t(y), t \geq 0, y \in [0, 1])$. For $\alpha > 0$, we consider the Hölder spaces $C^\alpha := C^\alpha([0, 1])$ consisting of all $u \in C^{[\alpha]}$ such that

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha} := \sum_{k=0}^{[\alpha]} \|u^{(k)}\|_\infty + \sup_{x, y \in [0, 1]} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^{\alpha - [\alpha]}} < \infty.$$

The Hölder continuous functions with Dirichlet boundary conditions are denoted by

$$C_0^\alpha := \{u \in C^\alpha, u(0) = u(1) = 0\}.$$

Recall that the linear component $(X_t^0(x), x \in [0, 1], t \geq 0)$ of X is a Gaussian process and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}((X_t^0(\xi) - X_t^0(\eta))^2) &= \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{\sigma^2}{2\lambda_\ell} (1 - e^{-2\lambda_\ell t})(e_\ell(\xi) - e_\ell(\eta))^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{\sigma^2}{2\lambda_\ell} (e_\ell(\xi) - e_\ell(\eta))^2 \approx |\xi - \eta|, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}((X_t^0(x) - X_s^0(x))^2) &= \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_\ell} (1 - e^{-\lambda_\ell |t-s|}) \left(1 - \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda_\ell |t-s|}}{2} e^{-2\lambda_\ell s}\right) e_\ell^2(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{\sigma^2}{\lambda_\ell} (1 - e^{-\lambda_\ell |t-s|}) \approx \sqrt{|t-s|}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

From this observation it follows that, almost surely, $X_t^0 \in E$ for any $t \geq 0$, $x \mapsto X_t^0(x)$ is 2γ -Hölder continuous and $t \mapsto X_t^0(x)$ is locally γ -Hölder continuous for any $\gamma < 1/4$. The following proposition generalizes this fact to the semilinear setting and shows that, under Assumption (B), the corresponding Hölder norms are $L^p(\mathbf{P})$ -bounded as functions of time.

Proposition 2.2. *For any $p \in [1, \infty)$ the following hold.*

- (i) *For any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have $X \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^\gamma)$ a.s. and, if Assumption (B) is satisfied, then $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p) < \infty$.*
- (ii) *For any $\gamma < 1/4$ and $T > 0$, we have $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in C^\gamma([0, T], E)$ a.s. and, if Assumption (B) is satisfied, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t - X_s\|_\infty^p) \leq C|t-s|^{\gamma p}$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.*

Furthermore, the same results hold for X replaced by $f_0(X)$ where $f_0(x) := f(x) - f(0)$.

We remark that a norm bound as in (i) with $p = 1$ is also derived in Cerrai [10, Proposition 4.2]. To prove the above proposition, we analyze the linear and the nonlinear component of X separately. The regularity of (X_t^0) can be assessed by using properties (10) and (11) together with general techniques for the study of continuity properties for linear equations, especially the Garsia-Rodemich-Rumsey inequality, see Lemma 5.1. The regularity of (N_t) is a consequence of the regularizing property of the semigroup $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$ in view of the fact that, due to our basic assumptions, the process $f(X)$ is continuous as a function of time and space.

Having derived the Hölder regularity of the process X and, in particular, of $f(X)$, we can use the regularizing impact of $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$ once more to show that the regularity of $N_t = \int_0^t S(t-s)f(X_s) ds$, $t \geq 0$, exceeds the regularity of X . A related strategy has been pursued by Pasemann and Stannat [41] who studied the higher order regularity of the nonlinear component of X in the spaces $\mathcal{D}((-A_\vartheta)^\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, see also Section 5.4. For our purpose, we can proceed similarly to Sinestrari [44] who studied the Hölder regularity of mild solutions to deterministic systems. We employ the decomposition $N_t = N_t^0 + M_t$ where

$$N_t^0 := \int_0^t S(t-s)f_0(X_s) ds, \quad M_t := \int_0^t S(r)m dr \quad (12)$$

for $m \equiv f(0)$ and $f_0(x) = f(x) - f(0)$. Note that f_0 maps E and, in particular, $C_0^{2\alpha}$ into itself.

Proposition 2.3. *For any $T > 0$, $p \geq 1$ and $\gamma < 1/4$ the following hold.*

- (i) *For any $t \geq 0$, we have $N_t^0 \in C_0^{2+2\gamma}$ and $\sup_{t \leq T} \|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} < \infty$ almost surely. In particular, if Assumption (B) is satisfied, then $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}^p) < \infty$.*

(ii) We have $(N_t^0)_{t \leq T} \in C^{1+\gamma}([0, T], E)$ and $\frac{d}{dt}N_t^0 = f_0(X_t) + A_\vartheta N_t^0$ in E almost surely. In particular, under Assumption (B), there exists $C > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}(\|\frac{d}{dt}(N_t^0 - N_s^0)\|_\infty^p) \leq C(t-s)^{\gamma p}$ holds for all $s, t \geq 0$.

Furthermore, the same results hold for (N_t) and f instead of (N_t^0) and f_0 , provided that we replace E by $C([b, 1-b])$ and $C_0^{2\gamma}$ by $C^{2\gamma}([b, 1-b])$ for some $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

3 Diffusivity and volatility estimation

Using our precise analysis of the Hölder regularity of the linear and the nonlinear component of the solution process from Section 2.2, we are now able to carry the central limit theorems for space and double increments from Hildebrandt and Trabs [26] as well as the central limit theorem for time increments, derived in Bibinger and Trabs [7], over to the semilinear framework. As a consequence, resulting method of moments estimators for the volatility σ^2 and the diffusivity ϑ apply in the semilinear framework and, under quite general assumptions, their asymptotic properties remain unchanged. As before, X denotes the mild solution of equation (2) with zero or stationary initial condition and we consider the observation scheme defined in Section 2.1. The constant b defining the minimal distance of spatial observations to the boundary of $[0, 1]$ is assumed to be strictly positive so that Proposition 2.3 provides the regularity of the process $(N_t(x), x \in [b, 1-b], t \geq 0)$ in space and time.

First, let us consider the realized quadratic variation based on time increments, i.e.,

$$\bar{V}_t := \frac{1}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - X_{t_i}(y_k))^2.$$

In case $f \equiv 0$, we denote the above expression by V_t . An immediate extension of Bibinger and Trabs [7, Theorem 3.4] to the case $T \rightarrow \infty$ shows that the central limit theorem

$$\sqrt{MN} \left(V_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{\sqrt{\pi\vartheta}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{B\sigma^4}{\pi\vartheta} \right), \quad N, M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (13)$$

with $B := 2 + \sum_{J=1}^{\infty} \left(2\sqrt{J} - \sqrt{J+1} - \sqrt{J-1} \right)^2$ holds under the assumptions

$$M = o(\Delta^{-\rho}) \text{ for some } \rho < 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad TM = o(\Delta^{-1}). \quad (14)$$

Note that the condition $TM = o(\Delta^{-1})$ is already covered by $M = o(\Delta^{-\rho})$ when T is fixed. In the case $T \rightarrow \infty$, this condition becomes necessary in order to neglect the bias. A central limit theorem for time increments in the case $T \rightarrow \infty$ is also proved by Kaino and Uchida [28]. We obtain the following extension of (13) to the semilinear framework.

Theorem 3.1. *Grant assumption (14). If T is fixed and finite, the central limit theorem (13) remains valid for \bar{V}_t . If $T \rightarrow \infty$, it remains valid if Assumption (B) is satisfied and there exists $\rho < 1/2$ such that $TM = o(\Delta^{-\rho})$.*

While the result for a fixed time horizon carries over from the linear setting without any extra assumptions on the interplay between M, N and T , the additional assumption for the case $T \rightarrow \infty$ is considerably stricter. In the proof of the above theorem, we show that $R_t := \bar{V}_t - V_t = o_p(1/\sqrt{MN})$, which proves the result in view of Slutsky's Lemma. In fact, it follows from the temporal regularity properties of the processes (X_t^0) and (N_t) , that R_t is of the order $\mathcal{O}_p(\Delta^\alpha)$ for any $\alpha < 3/4$. Hence, the reason for the additional assumption in the case $T \rightarrow \infty$ is that $\sqrt{MN}\Delta^\alpha = \sqrt{MT}\Delta^{2\alpha-1}$ is required to tend to 0.

Next, we consider the realized quadratic variation based on space increments, i.e.,

$$\bar{V}_{\text{sp}} := \frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_i}(y_k))^2.$$

Since the terms indexed by $i = 0$ do not contribute to the sum if $X_0 = 0$, in this case, we sum over $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ instead of $\{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Recall from Hildebrandt and Trabs [26, Theorem 3.3] that, denoting \bar{V}_{sp} in the case $f \equiv 0$ with stationary initial condition by V_{sp} , the central limit theorem

$$\sqrt{MN} \left(V_{\text{sp}} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2\vartheta} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{\sigma^4}{2\vartheta^2} \right), \quad M, N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (15)$$

holds under the condition

$$N = o(M). \quad (16)$$

Theorem 3.2. *Grant assumption (16). If T is fixed and finite, the central limit theorem (15) remains valid for \bar{V}_{sp} . If $T \rightarrow \infty$, it remains valid under Assumption (B).*

Although our proof strategy for the above theorem is the same as for time increments, here, the result carries over from the linear setting with no extra conditions on M, N and T , at all. Indeed, by using a summation by parts formula to rewrite $R_{\text{sp}} := \bar{V}_{\text{sp}} - V_{\text{sp}}$, we can profit from the fact that the second order spatial increments of (N_t) , namely $N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - 2N_{t_i}(y_k) + N_{t_i}(y_{k-1})$, are of the order $\mathcal{O}_p(\delta^2)$, thanks to the spatial regularity of the process (N_t) .

Finally, we consider the realized quadratic variation based on double increments, i.e.,

$$\bar{\mathbb{V}} := \frac{1}{MN\Phi_\vartheta(\delta, \Delta)} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \bar{D}_{ik}^2$$

with $\bar{D}_{ik} := X_{t_{i+1}}(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) + X_{t_i}(y_k)$ and the renormalization

$$\Phi_\vartheta(\delta, \Delta) := 2 \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{1 - e^{-\pi^2 \vartheta \ell^2 \Delta}}{\pi^2 \vartheta \ell^2} (1 - \cos(\pi \ell \delta)) \approx \delta \wedge \sqrt{\Delta}.$$

As discussed in [26] for the linear case, if a so called *balanced sampling design* is present, i.e. $\delta/\sqrt{\Delta} \equiv r$ for some $r > 0$, we can also consider

$$\bar{\mathbb{V}}_r := \frac{1}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \bar{D}_{ik}^2.$$

In the case $X_0 = 0$, $\bar{\mathbb{V}}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{V}}_r$ are redefined just like \bar{V}_{sp} . Recall from [26, Theorem 3.7] that, denoting $\bar{\mathbb{V}}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{V}}_r$ in the case $f \equiv 0$ with stationary initial condition by \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}_r , respectively, the central limit theorem

$$\sqrt{MN}(\mathbb{V} - \sigma^2) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, C(r/\sqrt{\vartheta})\sigma^4), \quad N, M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (17)$$

for some bounded and strictly positive continuous function $C(\cdot)$ on $[0, \infty]$ holds under the conditions

$$\delta/\sqrt{\Delta} \rightarrow r \in \{0, \infty\} \quad \text{or} \quad \delta/\sqrt{\Delta} \equiv r > 0 \quad (18)$$

as well as

$$\Delta \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad T = o(M). \quad (19)$$

Furthermore, in case of a balanced sampling design $\delta/\sqrt{\Delta} \equiv r > 0$, [26, Corollary 3.8] states that we have

$$\sqrt{MN}(\mathbb{V}_r - \psi_{\vartheta}(r)\sigma^2) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}\left(0, C(r/\sqrt{\vartheta})\psi_{\vartheta}^2(r)\sigma^4\right), \quad N, M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\psi_{\vartheta}(r) := \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi\vartheta}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{r^2}{4\vartheta}} + \frac{r}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} \int_{\frac{r}{2\sqrt{\vartheta}}}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} dz\right). \quad (21)$$

Theorem 3.3. *Grant assumptions (18) and (19). If T is fixed and finite, the central limit theorems (17) and (20) remain valid for \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}_r , respectively. If $T \rightarrow \infty$, they remain valid if Assumption (B) is satisfied and there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ such that $T = o(M^a)$.*

As for space increments, there are essentially no additional assumptions compared to the linear setting. The influence induced by the nonlinearity is negligible, in particular, since the double increments computed from the process (N_t) decay in both Δ and δ at the same time, as opposed to the double increments computed from (X_t^0) which are roughly of the order $(\delta \wedge \sqrt{\Delta})^{1/2}$, see also Lemma 5.3.

It is straightforward to derive asymptotically normal method of moments estimators for σ^2 or ϑ based on the above central limit theorems when one of the parameters is known, as discussed in, e.g., [7, 11, 14, 26]. Joint estimation of the parameters (σ^2, ϑ) remains possible in the semilinear framework as well by exploiting the central limit theorems for \mathbb{V}_r . To that aim, one needs to revert to subsets of the data having a balanced sampling design $\tilde{\delta}/\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}} \equiv r$ for two different values of r . Let us briefly recall the estimation procedure from [26]:

Choose $v, w \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $v \approx \max(1, \delta^2/\Delta)$ and $w \approx \max(1, \sqrt{\Delta}/\delta)$. Then, $\tilde{\Delta} := v\Delta$ and $\tilde{\delta} := w\delta$ satisfy

$$r := \tilde{\delta}/\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}} \approx 1.$$

Using double increments on the coarser grid, namely

$$\bar{D}_{v,w}(i, k) := X_{t_{i+v}}(y_{k+w}) - X_{t_i}(y_{k+w}) - X_{t_{i+v}}(y_k) + X_{t_i}(y_k),$$

we set

$$V^\nu := \frac{1}{(M-w+1)(N-\nu v+1)\sqrt{\nu v\Delta}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-w} \sum_{i=0}^{N-\nu v} \bar{D}_{\nu v,w}^2(i, k), \quad \nu = 1, 2.$$

In the case $X_0 = 0$ we employ the obvious redefinition of V^ν . The final estimator for (σ^2, ϑ) is then defined as

$$(\hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\vartheta}) := \arg \min_{(\hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\vartheta}) \in H} \left((V^1 - 2\hat{\sigma}^2\psi_{\hat{\vartheta}}(r))^2 + (V^2 - 2\hat{\sigma}^2\psi_{\hat{\vartheta}}(\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}))^2 \right) \quad (22)$$

for some compact set $H \subset (0, \infty)^2$. In fact, denoting by G_r the inverse function of $\vartheta_2 \mapsto \psi_{\vartheta_2}(r)/\psi_{\vartheta_2}(r/\sqrt{2})$, whose existence is proved in [26], we have the representation

$$\hat{\vartheta} = G_r(V^1/V^2), \quad \hat{\sigma}^2 = V^1/\psi_{\hat{\vartheta}_2}(r),$$

provided that V_1/V_2 lies in the range of $\vartheta_2 \mapsto \psi_{\vartheta_2}(r)/\psi_{\vartheta_2}(r/\sqrt{2})$. Due to consistency of (V^1, V^2) , the latter is true with probability tending to one. In combination with the analysis in [26] and Theorem 3.3, one immediately obtains the following result.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume $T \max(\sqrt{\Delta}, \delta) \rightarrow 0$ and let H be a compact subset of $(0, \infty)^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ such that (σ^2, ϑ) lies in its interior. If there exist values $v \approx \max(1, \delta^2/\Delta)$ and $w \approx \max(1, \sqrt{\Delta}/\delta)$ such that $w\delta/\sqrt{v\Delta}$ is constant, then we have*

$$(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2)^2 + (\hat{\vartheta} - \vartheta)^2 = \mathcal{O}_p\left(\frac{\delta^3 \vee \Delta^{3/2}}{T}\right)$$

for $T, N, M \rightarrow \infty$ and $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. This convergence rate is optimal up to a logarithmic factor.

Remark 3.5. The inverse of the squared rate, $T/(\delta^3 \vee \Delta^{3/2})$, is exactly the order of magnitude of the size of balanced sub-samples of the data. Further, the rate optimality of the estimator can be deduced just like in [26], where the case $f \equiv 0$ on a fixed time horizon T is treated: Allowing $T \rightarrow \infty$, the quantity $1/\sqrt{r_{\delta,\Delta,T}}$ with

$$r_{\delta,\Delta,T} := \begin{cases} \frac{T}{\Delta^{3/2}}, & \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\delta} \gtrsim 1, \\ \frac{T}{\delta^3} \cdot \log \frac{\delta^2}{\sqrt{\Delta}}, & \frac{\sqrt{\Delta}}{\delta} \rightarrow 0 \end{cases}$$

is a lower bound for joint estimation of (σ^2, ϑ) . The above logarithmic factor is probably due to technical issues. Comparison with the upper bound from Theorem 3.4 shows that the estimator (22) is (almost) rate optimal.

4 Nonparametric estimation of the nonlinearity

The following section discusses nonparametric estimation of f . We adapt an estimation procedure, introduced by Comte et al. [15] in the context of one-dimensional diffusions, to the SPDE setting. Note that the parameters (σ^2, ϑ) can be estimated well using the methods analyzed in the previous section. Thus, in a first step, we will assume that these parameters (in fact, only ϑ is necessary) are known. Later, a plug-in approach will be considered.

In contrast to the previous section, we will strictly require that the mild solution X , defined by (3), admits a stationary distribution, denoted by π , and, moreover, that the mixing assumption (M) is satisfied. Furthermore, it will be essential for the derivation of our oracle inequalities that we have $T \rightarrow \infty$. From now on, let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed compact set on which we want to estimate f .

Before treating the actual estimation problem, we introduce the approximation spaces serving as candidate functions for the estimation of f in the following section.

4.1 Approximation spaces

In order to estimate f on the set A , we consider a sequence $(S_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite-dimensional sub-spaces of $L^2(A)$ such that $D_m := \dim(S_m) \rightarrow \infty$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$. For a well chosen m , we will estimate f by the function $\hat{f}_m \in S_m$ that minimizes the empirical loss to be defined later. Like in [5], our key assumption on the approximation spaces (S_m) is the following.

- (N) There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an orthonormal basis $(\varphi_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m}$ of S_m , $|\Lambda_m| = D_m$, with

$$\left\| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \varphi_\lambda^2 \right\|_\infty \leq CD_m.$$

It is shown in Birgé and Massart [8] that Assumption (N) is equivalent to requiring $\|t\|_\infty^2 \leq CD_m \|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2$ for all $t \in S_m$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Additionally, it will be necessary for our analysis to require the minimal continuity of the approximation spaces given by the following assumption.

- (H) For any $g \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m$, let $\bar{g}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the extension of g by zero on the set A^c . Then, the function \bar{g} is piecewise Hölder continuous, i.e., there are constants $\alpha > 0$ and $-\infty = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_L = \infty$, $L \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\bar{g}|_{(a_l, a_{l+1})} \in C^\alpha((a_l, a_{l+1}))$ for any $1 \leq l \leq L-1$.

Let us briefly recall some examples of approximation spaces with property (N) that are considered in [5]. In fact, all of those also meet our additional continuity requirement (H). We assume that A is a closed interval and take $A = [-a, a]$ for some $a > 0$ without loss of generality.

Example 4.1.

[T] The trigonometric spaces

$$S_m = \text{span}\left(\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2a}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \sin\left(\frac{k\pi}{a} \cdot\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{a} \cdot\right), 1 \leq k \leq m\right\}\right)$$

have dimension $D_m = 2m + 1$ and property (N) follows directly from the fact that the trigonometric base functions are uniformly bounded.

[P] Piecewise polynomials on a dyadic grid: Most conveniently, these spaces are parameterized in terms of a pair $m = (p, r)$ with $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \{0, \dots, r_{\max}\}$ and $r_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ being some fixed value. Let $(p_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be the complete orthonormal system in $L^2([0, 1])$ such that p_l is the rescaled Legendre polynomial of degree l for $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Further, for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{-2^p, \dots, 2^p - 1\}$, let $I_j^p := [ja2^{-p}, (j+1)a2^{-p}]$. Then, for $m = (p, r)$, we define

$$S_{(p,r)} := \text{span}\left(\{\varphi_{j,l}^p, l \leq r, -2^p \leq j \leq 2^p - 1\}\right)$$

with

$$\varphi_{j,l}^p(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2^p}{a}} p_l\left(\frac{2^p x}{a} - j\right) \mathbf{1}_{I_j^p}(x), \quad x \in A.$$

Clearly, $\dim(S_{p,r}) = (r+1)2^{p+1} \leq (r_{\max} + 1)2^{p+1}$ and property (N) holds with a constant C depending on r_{\max} .

[W] The dyadic wavelet generated spaces: For arbitrary $r \in \mathbb{N}$, there are functions $\phi, \psi \in C^r(\mathbb{R})$ with support in $[0, 1]$ such that

$$\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{a}\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{a} + 1\right), \sqrt{\frac{2^p}{a}}\psi\left(\frac{2^p \cdot}{a} - j\right), -2^p \leq j < 2^p, p \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$$

is a complete orthonormal system in $L^2(A)$, see, e.g., [19]. Then, for the subspace

$$S_m = \text{span}\left(\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{a}\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{a} + 1\right), \sqrt{\frac{2^p}{a}}\psi\left(\frac{2^p \cdot}{a} - j\right), -2^p \leq j < 2^p, p \leq m\right\}\right)$$

we have $\dim(S_m) = 2^{m+2}$ by the formula for the finite geometric sum and property (N) is fulfilled.

The following definition due to Baraud et al. [5] proves to be useful in analyzing the nonparametric estimator. We fix an orthonormal basis $(\varphi_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda_m)$ of S_m according to Assumption (N) and define the matrices $V^m, B^m \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_m \times \Lambda_m}$ by

$$V_{\lambda, \lambda'}^m := \|\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}\|_{L^2(A)}, \quad B_{\lambda, \lambda'}^m := \|\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}\|_\infty.$$

These expressions are convenient in order to express certain estimates, e.g., $|\varphi_\lambda(Z)\varphi_{\lambda'}(Z)| \leq B_{\lambda, \lambda'}^m$ and $\mathbf{E}(|\varphi_\lambda(Z)\varphi_{\lambda'}(Z)|^2) \lesssim (V_{\lambda, \lambda'}^m)^2$ when Z is an A -valued random variable with a bounded Lebesgue density. Further, let

$$L_m := \max(\rho^2(V^m), \rho(B^m)), \quad \rho(H) := \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_m}, \|a\| \leq 1} \sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} |a_\lambda a_{\lambda'} H_{\lambda, \lambda'}|, \quad H \in \{V^m, B^m\}. \quad (23)$$

For our main oracle inequalities, we will have to require that L_m is asymptotically negligible with respect to the time horizon T . For the previous examples of approximation spaces, the quantity L_m can be linked directly to the dimension D_m . In fact, it is shown in [5] that $L_m \lesssim D_m^2$ for [T] and $L_m \lesssim D_m$ for [P] and [W].

4.2 Construction and analysis of the estimator

For a moment, let us consider observations that are discrete in time but continuous in space, i.e., the data is given by

$$\{X_{t_i}(x), x \in [0, 1], i = 0, \dots, N\}.$$

From (3), it is evident that we can decompose

$$X_{t+\Delta} = S(\Delta)X_t + \sigma \int_t^{t+\Delta} S(t+\Delta-s) dW_s + \int_t^{t+\Delta} S(t+\Delta-s) f(X_s) ds.$$

By rearranging, we can pass to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X_{t+\Delta} - S(\Delta)X_t}{\Delta} &= f(X_t) + \frac{\sigma}{\Delta} \int_t^{t+\Delta} S(t+\Delta-s) dW_s \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_t^{t+\Delta} \left(S(t+\Delta-s) f(X_s) - f(X_t) \right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

yielding the regression model

$$Y_i^{\text{cont}} = f(X_{t_i}) + R_i^{\text{cont}} + \varepsilon_i^{\text{cont}}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N-1, \quad (24)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i^{\text{cont}} &:= \frac{X_{t_{i+1}} - S(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta}, \\ \varepsilon_i^{\text{cont}} &:= \frac{\sigma}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} S(t_{i+1}-s) dW_s, \\ R_i^{\text{cont}} &:= \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left(S(t_{i+1}-s) f(X_s) - f(X_{t_i}) \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The main term in the regression model is given by $f(X_{t_i})$, $\varepsilon_i^{\text{cont}}$ is the stochastic noise term and R_i^{cont} is a negligible bias. Note that the stochastic noise term is stochastically independent of the covariate X_{t_i} . The corresponding least squares estimator is defined by

$$\hat{f}_m^{\text{cont}} := \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \gamma_N(g), \quad \gamma_N(g) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|Y_i^{\text{cont}} - g(X_{t_i})\|_{L^2}^2$$

with $L^2 := L^2((0, 1))$. Note that this estimator hinges on the parameter ϑ through the semigroup $S(\cdot)$ appearing in the response variables Y_i^{cont} which, for now, is assumed to be known.

Now, let us return to the fully discrete observation scheme described in Section 2.1. In order to derive a discretized version of the estimator discussed in the previous section, we assume that the discrete observations are recorded at the locations

$$t_i = i\Delta \quad \text{and} \quad y_k = \frac{k}{M}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq N$ and $0 \leq k \leq M$, i.e., the parameter b specifying the margin of the spatial observation window is set to $b = 0$. With observations distributed throughout the whole space domain $(0, 1)$, we have the possibility to approximate the coefficient processes $x_k(t) := \langle X_t, e_k \rangle_{L^2}$ by their empirical counterpart $\langle X_t, e_k \rangle_M := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} X_t(y_l) e_k(y_l)$. Recall that there is a discrete version of the orthonormality property for the sine base, see e.g. [26, Section 5] or the proof of [42, Theorem 2.1]. In particular, for $k \leq M-1$, we have the relation

$$\langle X_t, e_k \rangle_M = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} X_t(y_l) e_k(y_l) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^+} x_\ell(t) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^-} x_\ell(t)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_k^+ := k + 2M \cdot \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\mathcal{I}_k^- := 2M - k + 2M \cdot \mathbb{N}_0$. In order to approximate the expression $S(\Delta)X_{t_i}$ appearing in the definition of \hat{f}_m^{cont} , we define $\hat{S}(\Delta) := \hat{S}_M(\Delta)$ by

$$\hat{S}(\Delta)X_t := \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} e^{-\lambda_\ell \Delta} \langle X_t, e_\ell \rangle_M e_\ell$$

which only hinges on X_t through the discrete data $(X_t(y_k), k = 1, \dots, M-1)$. Now, from the space-continuous regression model (24), we pass to

$$Y_i = \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) + R_i + \varepsilon_i. \quad (25)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &:= \frac{\hat{S}(0)X_{t_{i+1}} - \hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta}, \\ R_i &:= R_i^{\text{cont}} + f(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) + \frac{S(\Delta)X_{t_i} - \hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta} + \frac{\hat{S}(0)X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{t_{i+1}}}{\Delta}, \\ \varepsilon_i &:= \varepsilon_i^{\text{cont}}. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce the corresponding least squares estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_m &:= \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|Y_i - \hat{S}(0)g(X_{t_i})\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(\frac{\langle X_{t_{i+1}}, e_k \rangle_M - e^{-\lambda_k \Delta} \langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M}{\Delta} - \langle g(X_{t_i}), e_k \rangle_M \right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which is purely based on the fully discrete observations.

Under Assumption (H), it is possible to derive a convenient and intuitive representation for our estimator \hat{f}_m based on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $H: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Hölder continuous in an environment of y_k for each $1 \leq k \leq M-1$ and set $h_k := \langle H, e_k \rangle_{L^2}$. Then, the series $H_k := \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^+} h_l - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^-} h_l$ converges and we have $\langle H, e_k \rangle_M = H_k$ as well as*

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M H^2(y_k) = \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H_l^2$$

with $H^M := \hat{S}(0)H = \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H_l e_l$.

The Hölder condition in the above lemma can be relaxed to requiring convergence of the Fourier series of H at y_k to $H(y_k)$ for each $1 \leq k \leq M-1$.

Under Assumptions (H) and (E), the random variables $X_{t_i}(y_k)$ hit a discontinuity of the extension \bar{g} of some $g \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m$ with probability zero and, hence, the above lemma is applicable with $H := \frac{X_{t_{i+1}} - \hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta} - g(X_{t_i})$. In particular, the estimator \hat{f}_m can, almost surely, be expressed via

$$\hat{f}_m = \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \gamma_{N,M}(g), \quad \gamma_{N,M}(g) := \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(\frac{X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - S_{t_i}^\Delta(y_k)}{\Delta} - g(X_{t_i}(y_k)) \right)^2 \quad (27)$$

where $S_{t_i}^\Delta := \hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}$.

The natural empirical norm associated with the discrete observations scheme is given by

$$\|g\|_{N,M}^2 := \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} g^2(X_{t_i}(y_k))$$

and, in the sequel, we derive a bound on $\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2)$ with $f_A := f\mathbf{1}_A$. As before, π denotes the stationary distribution for X and, for nonrandom $g \in L^2(A)$, let

$$\|g\|_{\pi,M}^2 := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(g^2(X_0(y_k))).$$

Recall that, under Assumption (E), there are constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$c\|g\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \leq \|g\|_{\pi,M}^2 \leq C\|g\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \quad (28)$$

holds for all $g \in L^2(A)$. The oracle choice for an estimate of f_A from the space S_m is given by

$$f_m := \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \|f - g\|_{L^2(A)}^2. \quad (29)$$

Theorem 4.3. *Grant Assumptions (M), (E), (N) and (H). Further, assume that $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as well as $\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N} \rightarrow \infty$, $L_m = o(\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N})$ and $D_m \leq N$. Then, for any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have*

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2) \lesssim \|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2}.$$

Remark 4.4. Under the same assumptions as in the above theorem, we can obtain the oracle inequality

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m^{\text{cont}}(X_{t_i}) - f_A(X_{t_i})\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma$$

for the estimator \hat{f}_m^{cont} from (26) based on space-continuous observations. In fact, this result can be obtained without the continuity Assumption (H).

We encounter the usual bias-variance trade-off in nonparametric statistics: When we choose m too small the estimator is not sufficiently versatile, leading to a large bias term $\|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2$. On the other hand, when choosing m too large, the estimated function will closely follow the concrete realization of the data, leading to a large variance term D_m/T . Now, assuming that $\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)} \approx D_m^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$, balancing the bias and the variance term shows that it is optimal to choose $D_m \approx T^{\frac{1}{1+2\alpha}}$. Under the additional assumption that

$$T\left(\Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2}\right) \rightarrow 0$$

holds for some $\gamma < 1/2$, the last two terms on the right hand side of the oracle inequality in Theorem 4.3 can be regarded as negligible remainders and we obtain the usual (squared) nonparametric rate

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2) \lesssim T^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+1}}.$$

In fact, some caution is necessary in order to prevent a contradiction between $D_m \approx T^{\frac{1}{1+2\alpha}}$ and the condition $L_m = o(\frac{T}{\log^2 N})$ in the theorem, as already pointed out in [15]. When working with [P] or [W], we have $L_m \approx D_m$ and the conditions can be met at the same time. When working with the trigonometric spaces [T], we have $L_m \approx D_m^2$ and, thus, it is only possible to take $D_m \approx T^{\frac{1}{1+2\alpha}}$, provided that $\alpha > 1/2$. For a function f meeting our fundamental requirement $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, the k -th

Fourier coefficients are generally of the order $1/k$, a faster decay is only present in the exceptional case where the function f is periodic on A . Thus, we have $\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)} \approx D_m^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 1/2$ and it is still possible to achieve a convergence rate of $T^{-\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{2\tilde{\alpha}+1}}$ for any $\tilde{\alpha} < \alpha$. In general, the true value of the regularity parameter α is unknown, as it is a property of the unknown function f . This issue will be addressed via an adaptive procedure that chooses the approximation space S_m in a data driven way, see Theorem 4.7.

In contrast to the term Δ^γ , $\gamma < 1/2$, on the right hand side of the oracle inequality, Comte et al. [15] obtain the smaller bound Δ in their corresponding result in the context of SODEs. In fact, this error term arises from bounding the bias terms R_i^{cont} in the underlying regression model. The difference in the order of magnitude is due to the fact that for the SPDE model there only is temporal Hölder regularity up to exponent $1/4$, as opposed to exponent $1/2$ in the finite-dimensional setting. The last term on the right hand side of the oracle inequality in Theorem 4.3 arises from bounding the bias terms induced by the discrete approximation of the continuous model, namely $R_i - R_i^{\text{cont}}$. Naturally, it is not present in the result from [15]. In the proof, we show that, for $h \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{E}(\|S(h)X_t - \hat{S}(h)X_t\|_{L^2}^2) = \mathcal{O}(1/M)$. This error is caused by approximating the coefficient processes of X by their empirical counterparts, in order to get an approximation of the semigroup. Due to the roughness of the paths $x \mapsto X_t(x)$, the corresponding approximation quality is rather poor. A similar effect can be observed in Kaino and Uchida [29] where a spectral approximation is used for parametric estimation for the linear equation. The approximation error of the order $\mathcal{O}(1/M)$ gets further amplified by dividing by the squared renormalization Δ^2 , leading to the condition $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$. Under this condition, the observation frequency in space is much larger than in time which, in particular, rules out a balanced sampling design. The error term $\mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t) - \hat{S}(0)f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2)$ induced by $R_i - R_i^{\text{cont}}$ turns out to be negligible with respect to Δ^γ under the condition $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

Figure 1 shows ten exemplary realizations of the estimator \hat{f}_m with the trigonometric basis [T] when f is the linear function $f(x) := \vartheta_0 x$ for some $\vartheta_0 < 0$ such that discrete observations of the solution process can be generated by means of the replacement method introduced in Hildebrandt [25]. The compact set on which f is estimated is $A = [-1, 1]$. The general shape of the function f is captured accurately inside some interval containing the origin, roughly $[-0.5, 0.5]$. It is evident from the histograms that areas further away from the origin do not contain as many data points which, naturally, affects the quality of the estimator there. Also, there is a boundary effect caused by the fact that the functions in S_m are necessarily periodic over $[-1, 1]$.

In order to prove Theorem 4.3, we adapt the proof strategy from [15] to our infinite-dimensional setting. The main steps of the proof are explained in the following.

For an arbitrary function $g \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m$, we can use Lemma 4.2 and the regression model (25) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{N,M}(g) - \gamma_{N,M}(f) &= \|g - f\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle Y_i - \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}), \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)g(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &= \|g - f\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \varepsilon_i + R_i, \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)g(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of \hat{f}_m , we have $\gamma_{N,M}(\hat{f}_m) - \gamma_{N,M}(f) \leq \gamma_{N,M}(f_m) - \gamma_{N,M}(f)$ and using the above expansion on both sides of this inequality yields

$$\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{N,M}^2 \leq \|f_m - f\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \varepsilon_i + R_i, \hat{S}(0)\hat{f}_m(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)f_m(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Since both \hat{f}_m and f_m are A -supported, if we insert $f = f\mathbf{1}_A + f\mathbf{1}_{A^c}$ in the above equation, then the terms $\|f\mathbf{1}_{A^c}\|_{N,M}^2$ on both sides of the inequality cancel. We arrive at the fundamental oracle




Figure 1: Ten realizations of the estimator \hat{f}_m from (27) with the trigonometric basis [T] on $A = [-1, 1]$ (blue or gray) along with the true underlying function $f(x) = -0.3 \cdot x$ (black). The barplot shows a histogram of the corresponding discrete observations $\{X_{t_i}(y_k)\}_{i,k}$. The sample sizes are given via $M = 500$, $T = 200$, $\Delta = 0.05$. The dimension of the approximation space was chosen to be $D_m = 2m + 1 = 29$, which corresponds to $D_m \approx \sqrt{T}$. The discrete observations of X are obtained by means of the replacement method with parameter $L = 1$, see [25]. The parameter values are $\sigma^2 = \vartheta = 0.05$.

inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 &\leq \|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \varepsilon_i, \hat{S}(0)\hat{f}_m(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)f_m(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle R_i, \hat{S}(0)\hat{f}_m(X_{t_i}) - \hat{S}(0)f_m(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

By treating each of the three terms appearing on the right hand side above individually, we can derive the following proposition.

Proposition 4.5. *Grant Assumptions (M), (N) and (H) and assume $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$. For $\underline{c} > 0$, define*

$$\Omega_{N,M,m} := \Omega_{N,M,m,\underline{c}} := \left\{ \|t\|_{N,M}^2 \geq \underline{c} \|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \text{ for all } t \in S_m \right\}.$$

Then, for any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}} \right) \lesssim \|f_A - f_m\|_{\pi,M}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2}.$$

The event $\Omega_{N,M,m}$ has been introduced since the proof requires bounding the stochastic noise term $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \varepsilon_i, \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}) \rangle_{L^2}$ uniformly over all $\|\cdot\|_{N,M}$ -normalized $t \in S_m$. The latter is difficult since both the object to be bounded and the norm are random objects. On the event $\Omega_{N,M,m}$, it is sufficient

to bound it uniformly over all $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(A)}$ -normalized $t \in S_m$ which is possible thanks to Assumption (N).

Under Assumption (E), we can further bound $\|f_A - f_m\|_{\pi, M}^2 \lesssim \|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2$, hence, Proposition 4.5 already provides the relevant terms appearing in the oracle inequality from Theorem 4.3. The second main step of the proof of the theorem is to verify that the event $\Omega_{N, M, m}^c$ has negligible probability. To that aim, let us consider

$$\Xi_{N, M, m} := \left\{ \left| \frac{\|t\|_{N, M}^2}{\|t\|_{\pi, M}^2} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \forall t \in S_m \right\}$$

which satisfies $\Xi_{N, M, m} \subset \Omega_{N, M, m, \frac{1}{2}}$. Since $\mathbf{E}(\|t\|_{N, M}^2) = \|t\|_{\pi, M}^2$ and

$$\left| \frac{\|t\|_{N, M}^2}{\|t\|_{\pi, M}^2} - 1 \right| \approx \left| \frac{\|t\|_{N, M}^2 - \|t\|_{\pi, M}^2}{\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2} \right|$$

under Assumption (E), bounding the probability of $\Xi_{N, M, m}^c$ is equivalent to deriving a concentration inequality for $\|t\|_{N, M}^2$ uniformly over all $L^2(A)$ -normalized $t \in S_m$. This can be done using the standard techniques for β -mixing sequences, see, e.g., [20]: by means of the mixing assumption (8) in (M), we approximate $(X_{t_0}, \dots, X_{t_N})$ by a process with independent blocks and then apply a variant of Bernstein's inequality. We obtain the following bound for $\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N, M, m}^c)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Grant Assumptions (M), (E), (N) and (H). Then, there are constants $K, K' > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N, M, m}^c) \leq K \left(N\beta_X(q_N\Delta) + D_m^2 \exp\left(-K' \frac{p_N}{L_m}\right) \right)$$

holds for any $p_N, q_N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N = 2p_Nq_N$. In particular, with the constants γ and L from the β -mixing condition (8) as well as $\tilde{K} := K \cdot (L \vee 1)$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N, M, m}^c) \leq \tilde{K} \left(N \exp(-\gamma q_N\Delta) + D_m^2 \exp\left(-K' \frac{p_N}{L_m}\right) \right).$$

The conclusion of the main theorem is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, we refer to Section 5.3 for further details on the proof.

In order to choose an appropriate approximation space S_m in a purely data-driven way, let $\mathcal{M}_{N, M} := \{1, \dots, \bar{m}\}$ be the indexes of a sequence of approximation spaces S_m with dimensions D_m , subject to the nesting assumption $S_m \subset S_{\bar{m}}$ for $m \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}$. We define the model selection method

$$\hat{m} := \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}} \left\{ \gamma_{N, M}(\hat{f}_m) + \text{pen}(m) \right\} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{pen}(m) := \kappa \frac{\sigma^2 D_m}{T}$$

for some appropriate constant $\kappa > 0$. Note that the penalty term is of the order of the stochastic error in the underlying regression problem such that \hat{m} automatically balances the deterministic approximation error and the stochastic error. The parameter σ^2 in the penalty can be replaced by some a priori upper bound of the volatility or $\hat{\sigma}^2$ -dependent. The adaptive estimator for the reaction function is then $\hat{f}_{\hat{m}}$ fulfilling

$$(\hat{m}, \hat{f}_{\hat{m}}) = \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}, f_m \in S_m} \left\{ \gamma_{N, M}(f_m) + \text{pen}(m) \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.7. *Grant Assumptions (M), (E), (N) and (H) and let κ be sufficiently large (depending only on the constants in Assumption (E)). Further, assume that $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as well $\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N} \rightarrow \infty$, $L_{\bar{m}} = o(\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N})$ and $D_{\bar{m}} \leq N$. Then, for any $\gamma < 1/2$ we have*

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_{\hat{m}} - f_A\|_{N, M}^2) \lesssim \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}} \inf_{f_m \in S_m} \left\{ \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} \right\} + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \Delta^\gamma.$$

For the sake of brevity, the remaining results are only formulated with respect to the non-adaptive estimator \hat{f}_m . The extensions to the adaptive case are straightforward.

Next, we assess the quality of \hat{f}_m in terms of the more intuitive distance measure $\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}$, rather than $\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}$. Using the triangle inequality as well as the equivalence of the empirical and the $L^2(A)$ -norm on $\Xi_{N,M,m}$, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 &\leq 2\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + 2\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \\ &= 2\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}} + 2\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c} + 2\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \\ &\simeq 2\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}} + 2\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c} + 2\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, thanks to Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, it is straightforward, to derive an upper bound in probability. Bounding $\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2)$, on the other hand, is more challenging since the behavior of $\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2$ on the set $\Xi_{N,M,m}^c$ is a priori unclear. This issue can be circumvented by considering the truncated version

$$\hat{f}_m^{K_N} := (-K_N) \vee (\hat{f}_m \wedge K_N)$$

where (K_N) is a sequence of positive numbers with $K_N \rightarrow \infty$ such that $K_N \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \rightarrow 0$ sufficiently fast.

Corollary 4.8. *Grant Assumptions (M), (E), (N) and (H). Further, assume that $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as well as $\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N} \rightarrow \infty$, $L_m = o(\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N})$ and $D_m \leq N$. Then, for any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have*

$$\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 = \mathcal{O}_p\left(\|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2}\right)$$

with f_m from (29). Furthermore, for a sequence (K_N) with $K_N \rightarrow \infty$ and $K_N/N^\beta \rightarrow 0$ for some $\beta > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m^{K_N} - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2) \lesssim \|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2}.$$

4.2.1 Estimation of f with unknown diffusivity and volatility

While our nonparametric estimator for f does not hinge on the volatility parameter σ^2 , the diffusivity parameter ϑ enters the least square criterion in (27) via the expressions

$$S_{t_i}^\Delta(y_k) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} e^{-\pi^2 \vartheta \ell^2} \langle X_{t_i}, e_\ell \rangle_M e_\ell(y_k).$$

In practice, this parameter will generally be unknown and has to be replaced by an estimate. To that aim, we make use of the double increments based estimator $\hat{\vartheta}$ from (22), while omitting the spatial observations $y_k \notin [b, 1-b]$ for an arbitrary but fixed $b > 0$. Recall that the computation of $\hat{\vartheta}$ does not require prior knowledge of the volatility parameter σ^2 and Theorem 3.4 reveals the (squared) convergence rate $(\vartheta - \hat{\vartheta})^2 = \mathcal{O}_p((\Delta^{3/2} \vee \delta^3)/T)$. Since the conclusion of Theorem 4.3 is only useful as long as $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we work in the regime $M\sqrt{\Delta} \rightarrow \infty$ where the (squared) convergence rate is given by $(\vartheta - \hat{\vartheta})^2 = \mathcal{O}_p(\Delta^{3/2}/T)$. Now, based on the estimator $\hat{\vartheta}$, we can define an approximation $\check{S}(\Delta)$ of the discretized semigroup $\hat{S}(\Delta)$, namely

$$\check{S}(\Delta)u := \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} e^{-\hat{\lambda}_\ell \Delta} \langle u, e_\ell \rangle_M e_\ell \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\lambda}_\ell := \pi^2 \hat{\vartheta} \ell^2$$

for continuous functions $u: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The corresponding nonparametric estimator for f is then given by

$$\check{f}_m := \arg \min_{g \in S_m} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(\frac{X_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - \check{S}_{t_i}^\Delta(y_k)}{\Delta} - g(X_{t_i}(y_k)) \right)^2$$

where $\check{S}_{t_i}^\Delta := \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}$. In order to analyze the convergence rate of \check{f}_m , we incorporate the approximation of the semigroup into the regression model. Due to $\hat{S}(0) = \check{S}(0)$ and in view of (25), it is now given by

$$\frac{\hat{S}(0)X_{t_{i+1}} - \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta} = \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) + R'_i + \varepsilon_i \quad \text{with} \quad R'_i := R_i + \frac{\hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i} - \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}}{\Delta}.$$

Based on this representation, we are now going to show that the approximation of the discretized semigroup does not affect the convergence rate of the nonparametric estimator. In fact, since our error bound for $\hat{\vartheta}$ from Theorem 3.4 is a priori only valid in probability sense, the same holds for \check{f}_m .

Theorem 4.9. *Grant Assumptions (M), (E), (N) and (H). Further, assume that $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$, $T\sqrt{\Delta} \rightarrow 0$ as well as $\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N} \rightarrow \infty$, $L_m = o(\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N})$ and $D_m \leq N$. Then, for any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have*

$$\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 = \mathcal{O}_p \left(\|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} \right)$$

with f_m from (29). Furthermore, the same bound holds for $\|\check{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2$.

Remark 4.10. The proof does not make use of any properties of $\hat{\vartheta}$ apart from its convergence rate. In general, if $\tilde{\vartheta}$ is any estimator for ϑ with $|\tilde{\vartheta} - \vartheta| = \mathcal{O}_p(a_{M,N,T})$ for some convergence rate $a_{M,N,T}$, we get the additional term $\frac{a_{M,N,T}^2}{\Delta^{3/2}}$ in the above upper bound. For $\hat{\vartheta}$, this additional term does not appear in the theorem, as it is dominated by D_m/T .

5 Proofs

We start by proving the results on the Hölder regularity of the linear and nonlinear component of X . The two subsequent sections contain the proofs of our main results, namely on diffusivity and volatility estimation, Section 5.2, and on nonparametric estimation of the nonlinearity f , Section 5.3. Further proofs and auxiliary results are deferred to Section 5.4.

5.1 Proofs for the Hölder regularity of X

We verify the results on the Hölder regularity of the processes X and (N_t) claimed in Propositions 2.2 and 2.3 of Section 2.2, respectively. To that aim, recall that for $s \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$ the Sobolev spaces $W^{s,p} := W^{s,p}((0, 1))$ are defined as the set of all $[s]$ -times weakly differentiable functions $u: (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{s,p}} := \sum_{k=0}^{[s]} \|u^{(k)}\|_{L^p} + \left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|u^{([s])}(\xi) - u^{([s])}(\eta)|^p}{|\xi - \eta|^{1+(s-[s])p}} d\xi d\eta \right)^{1/p} < \infty.$$

Further, the Sobolev embedding theorem states that for any $s \geq 0$, $p \geq 1$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$\alpha \leq s - \frac{1}{p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad W^{s,p} \subset C^\alpha \quad (31)$$

and the embedding is continuous. Our first step is an analysis of the Hölder regularity of the linear component (X_t^0) . We remark that the norm bounds in statements (i) and (ii) of the following lemma are also stated in Cerrai [10] as well as Da Prato and Zabczyk [18]. The remaining results are derived using similar techniques. We provide a complete proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 5.1. For any $p \in [1, \infty)$, the following hold.

(i) $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_\infty^p) < \infty$.

(ii) For any $\gamma < 1/2$, we have $(X_t^0) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^\gamma)$ a.s. and $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p) < \infty$.

(iii) For any $\gamma < 1/4$ and $T > 0$, we have $(X_t^0)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in C^\gamma([0, T], E)$ a.s. and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0 - X_s^0\|_\infty^p) \leq C|t - s|^{\gamma p}$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.

Proof. (iii) The property $(X_t^0)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in C^\gamma([0, T], E)$ is a consequence of Kolmogorov's criterion and $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0 - X_s^0\|_\infty^p) \leq C|t - s|^{\gamma p}$ for all $p \geq 1$. To verify the latter statement, assume, without loss of generality that $s, t \in (a, a + 1)$ for some $a \geq 0$ and define $\mathcal{U} := (a, a + 1) \times (0, 1)$. Using (10) and (11), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(|X_t^0(x) - X_s^0(y)|^2) &\lesssim \sqrt{|t - s|} + |x - y| \leq \sqrt{|t - s|} + \sqrt{|x - y|} \\ &\lesssim ((t - s)^2 + (x - y)^2)^{1/4} \end{aligned}$$

holds uniformly in $x, y \in (0, 1)$ and $s, t \geq 0$. The last step follows from the equivalence of norms on \mathbb{R}^2 . Now, since $(t, x) \mapsto X_t^0(x)$ is a continuous function, the Garsia-Rodemich-Rumsey inequality, see e.g., [17, Theorem B.1.5], provides the following bound on its increments: for any $\alpha > 0, \beta > 4$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ (independent of a) such that

$$|X_s^0(x) - X_t^0(y)| \leq c((x - y)^2 + (t - s)^2)^{\frac{\beta - 4}{2\alpha}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}} \frac{|X_u^0(\xi) - X_v^0(\eta)|^\alpha}{(|\xi - \eta|^2 + |u - v|^2)^{\beta/2}} d\xi d\eta du dv \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad (32)$$

for all $(x, s), (y, t) \in \mathcal{U}$. Note that for $x = y$, the right hand side of the above inequality is independent of x . Now, choose $\alpha = 2m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in such a way that $\alpha = 2m > p$. Then, by applying Jensen's inequality to the concave function $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni h \mapsto h^{p/\alpha}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\sup_x |X_s^0(x) - X_t^0(x)|^p) &\leq c^p (t - s)^{\frac{\beta - 4}{2m} p} \left(\int_{\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}} \frac{\mathbf{E}(|X_u^0(\xi) - X_v^0(\eta)|^{2m})}{(|\xi - \eta|^2 + |u - v|^2)^{\beta/2}} d\xi d\eta du dv \right)^{\frac{p}{\alpha}} \\ &\lesssim c^p (t - s)^{\frac{\beta - 4}{2m} p} \left(\int_{\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}} \frac{(|\xi - \eta|^2 + |u - v|^2)^{m/4}}{(|\xi - \eta|^2 + |u - v|^2)^{\beta/2}} d\xi d\eta du dv \right)^{\frac{p}{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

The above integral is finite as long as $\beta - \frac{m}{2} < 2$. Now, the result follows since for any given $\gamma < 1/4$, we can pick $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta < 2 + \frac{m}{2}$ such that $\frac{\beta - 4}{2m} \leq \gamma$.

Assertion (i) can be proved similarly by taking $s = t$ and $y = 1$ in (32) to obtain a bound for $\sup_x |X_t^0(x)| = \sup_x |X_t^0(x) - X_s^0(y)|$. Note that, in order to be able to chose $y = 1$, we have to modify the set \mathcal{U} by taking, e.g., $\mathcal{U} = (a, a + 1) \times (-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and extend (X_t^0) by defining $X_t^0(z) := 0$ for $z \notin [0, 1]$ such that (X_t^0) is a continuous function on \mathcal{U} .

(ii) Clearly, A_ϑ is a second order differential operator whose eigenvalues satisfy the condition $\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \lambda_\ell^{-\rho} < \infty$ for any $\rho > 1/2$. Thus, by [18, Theorem 5.25], $(X_t^0) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, W^{2\alpha, p})$ holds for any $\alpha > 0$ and $p > 1$ such that $1/p + \alpha < 1/4$. Now, by choosing α close to $1/4$ and p sufficiently large, $(X_t^0) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^\gamma)$ follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem (31). Now, with the bound (10) for the Gaussian process (X_t^0) , we get for any $h \in (0, 1)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{W^{h, q}}^q) &\lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_\infty^q) + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbf{E}(|X_t^0(\xi) - X_t^0(\eta)|^q)}{|\xi - \eta|^{1+hq}} d\xi d\eta \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_\infty^q) + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{|\xi - \eta|^{q/2}}{|\xi - \eta|^{1+hq}} d\xi d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (i), this shows that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{W^{h,q}}^q) < \infty$, as long as $h < 1/2$. Further, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we have $\|X_t^0\|_{C^\gamma} \lesssim \|X_t^0\|_{W^{h,q}}$, provided that $h - \frac{1}{q} > \gamma$. Thus, choosing $h \in (\gamma, \frac{1}{2})$ and $q > \max((h - \gamma)^{-1}, p)$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{C^\gamma}^p) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{W^{h,q}}^{q \frac{p}{q}}) \leq \mathbf{E}(\|X_t^0\|_{W^{h,q}}^q)^{\frac{p}{q}}$$

by Jensen's inequality. The claim now follows by taking the supremum over $t \geq 0$ in the above inequality. \square

Before proving Proposition 2.2, we recall some facts from semigroup theory. For details, in particular, on analytic semigroups generated by differential operators, we refer to, e.g., [33]. To deal with the situation where $f(0) \neq 0$ and, hence, $f(X_t) \notin E$, we need to regard $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$ as a semigroup acting on the space $\tilde{E} = C([0, 1])$. To that aim, consider the part $A_{\tilde{E}}$ of $A_\vartheta = \vartheta \Delta$ in \tilde{E} , i.e., $A_{\tilde{E}}x := A_\vartheta x$ for $x \in \mathcal{D}(A_{\tilde{E}}) := \{x \in \tilde{E} \cap \mathcal{D}(A_\vartheta) : A_\vartheta x \in \tilde{E}\}$. Note that $A_{\tilde{E}}$ generates a semigroup $(S_{\tilde{E}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \tilde{E} which is not strongly continuous. Indeed, we have $\overline{\mathcal{D}(A_{\tilde{E}})}^{\tilde{E}} = E$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} S_{\tilde{E}}(t)x = x$ in \tilde{E} holds if and only if $x \in E$. Nevertheless, $(S_{\tilde{E}}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ defines a so called *analytic* semigroup on \tilde{E} which retains many properties of C_0 -semigroups. In particular, for any $x \in \tilde{E}$, it holds that $\int_0^t S_{\tilde{E}}(r)x \, dr \in \mathcal{D}(A_{\tilde{E}})$ and we have the representation

$$S_{\tilde{E}}(t)x - x = A_{\tilde{E}} \int_0^t S_{\tilde{E}}(r)x \, dr. \quad (33)$$

Hence, if $r \mapsto \|A_{\tilde{E}}S_{\tilde{E}}(r)x\|_{\tilde{E}}$ is integrable over $[0, t]$, then $S_{\tilde{E}}(t)x - x = \int_0^t A_{\tilde{E}}S_{\tilde{E}}(r)x \, dr$. Since the definitions of the semigroups S and $S_{\tilde{E}}$ and their generators agree on the intersection of their domains, respectively, we will refer to both by $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and A_ϑ from now on. The following inequalities, which are particular cases of results derived in Sinestrari [44], are our main tool to study the regularity of (N_t) .

Lemma 5.2. *We fix an element $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda_1)$. For any $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 2) \setminus \{1\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$:*

- (i) $\|A_\vartheta^n S(t)x\|_\infty \leq C e^{-\lambda_0 t} t^{-n} \|x\|_\infty$ for all $x \in \tilde{E}$,
- (ii) $\|S(t)x\|_{C_0^\alpha} \leq C e^{-\lambda_0 t} t^{-\alpha/2} \|x\|_\infty$ for all $x \in \tilde{E}$,
- (iii) $\|A_\vartheta S(t)x\|_\infty \leq C t^{-(1-\alpha/2)} \|x\|_{C_0^\alpha}$ for all $x \in C_0^\alpha$,
- (iv) $\|A_\vartheta^n S(t)x\|_{C_0^\beta} \leq C e^{-\lambda_0 t} t^{-(n+\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2})} \|x\|_{C_0^\alpha}$ for all $x \in C_0^\alpha$ where it is required that either $n \geq 1$ or $\alpha \leq \beta$.

For a proof of (i), (ii) and (iv), we refer to [33, Proposition 2.3.1], (iii) follows from [44, Proposition 1.11]. Further, in order to transfer the spatial to the temporal regularity, of particular importance for our study are the so called intermediate spaces, defined by

$$D_{A_\vartheta}(\alpha, \infty) := \left\{ x \in \tilde{E} : \|x\|_{D_{A_\vartheta}(\alpha, \infty)} := \|x\|_{\tilde{E}} + \sup_{t > 0} \frac{\|S(t)x - x\|_{\tilde{E}}}{t^\alpha} < \infty \right\}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1),$$

which are Banach spaces with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{D_{A_\vartheta}(\alpha, \infty)}$. These spaces can be defined for arbitrary analytic semigroups on a Banach space, see, e.g. [44]. For our concrete choice of A_ϑ and \tilde{E} , they are given by the Dirichlet-Hölder spaces

$$D_{A_\vartheta}(\alpha, \infty) = C_0^{2\alpha}([0, 1]), \quad \alpha \neq \frac{1}{2},$$

where the norms are equivalent, see Lunardi [32].

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Due to Lemma 5.1, it remains to prove the statements for (N_t) and, if ξ follows the stationary distribution, for $(\xi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\xi_t := S(t)\xi$.

(i) *Step 1.* We show $\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} < \infty$ a.s. for all $t \geq 0$ and, under Assumption (B), $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p) < \infty$: From Lemma 5.2 (ii) we have that

$$\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} \leq \int_0^t \|S(t-s)f(X_s)\|_{C_0^\gamma} ds \lesssim \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_0(t-s)}(t-s)^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|f(X_s)\|_\infty ds$$

and, consequently,

$$\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} \lesssim \sup_{s \leq t} \|f(X_s)\|_\infty \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} dr$$

is almost surely finite by our basic assumptions. Also, using Jensen's inequality and the fact that $r \mapsto a(r) := e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}$ is integrable over \mathbb{R}_+ , we get

$$\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p \leq \int_0^t a(t-s) \|f(X_s)\|_\infty^p ds \cdot \left(\int_0^t a(r) dr \right)^{p-1} \lesssim \int_0^t a(t-s) \|f(X_s)\|_\infty^p ds.$$

Thus, Fubini's theorem and the polynomial growth condition on f from (7) yield

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p) \lesssim \sup_{s \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_s)\|_\infty^p) \lesssim 1 + \sup_{s \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_s\|_\infty^{dp})$$

which is finite under Assumption (B).

Step 2: We show $(N_t) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^\gamma)$: In order to verify $\|N_{t+h} - N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ for $h \rightarrow 0$ almost surely, we use the decomposition

$$N_{t+h} - N_t = (S(h) - I)N_t + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-r)f(X_r) dr.$$

To treat the first term, choose $\alpha \in (\gamma, \frac{1}{2})$. Then, using (33) and property (iv) of Lemma 5.2, we can bound

$$\|(S(h) - I)N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} \lesssim \int_0^h \|A_\theta S(r)N_t\|_{C_0^\gamma} dr \leq \|N_t\|_{C_0^\alpha} \int_0^h e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-(1+\frac{\gamma-\alpha}{2})} dr$$

which tends to 0 for $h \rightarrow 0$. For the second term, it follows from bound (ii) in Lemma 5.2 that

$$\left\| \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-r)f(X_r) dr \right\|_{C_0^\gamma} \lesssim \sup_{r \leq T} \|f(X_r)\|_\infty \int_t^{t+h} e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} dr$$

which also tends to 0 almost surely for $h \rightarrow 0$.

Step 3: Steps 1 and 2 verify claim (i) in the case $\xi = 0$. To treat the case where ξ follows the stationary distribution, we use the fact that X has the same distribution as $\tilde{X} = (X_{1+t})_{t \geq 0}$. Again, we have the decomposition

$$\tilde{X}_t = S(1+t)\xi + X_{1+t}^0 + N_{1+t}$$

and (i) has already been proved for the second and third term. For the first term, the result follows from $\|S(1+t)\xi\|_{C_0^\gamma} \lesssim \|\xi\|_\infty = \|X_0\|_\infty$ by inequality (ii) in Lemma 5.2.

Step 4. We transfer the result (i) from X to $f_0(X)$: First of all, $f_0(X) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^\gamma)$ almost surely holds due to the result for X and the assumption $f_0 \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Further, we have

$$\|f_0(X_t)\|_{C_0^\gamma} = \|f_0(X_t)\|_\infty + \sup_{\xi \neq \eta} \frac{|f(X_t(\xi)) - f(X_t(\eta))|}{|\xi - \eta|^\gamma} \leq \|f_0(X_t)\|_\infty + \|f'(X_t)\|_\infty \|X_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}$$

and, under Assumption (B),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_t)\|_{C_0^\gamma}^p) &\lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_t)\|_\infty^p) + \mathbf{E}(\|f'(X_t)\|_\infty^{2p}) + \mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^{2p}) \\ &\lesssim 1 + \mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_\infty^{2dp}) + \mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_{C_0^\gamma}^{2p}) < \infty\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $t \geq 0$.

(ii) *Step 1.* We show the claim for (N_t) : Using the same decomposition for the increments of (N_t) as in the proof of (i), we get

$$\|N_t - N_s\|_\infty \leq \|(S(t-s) - I)N_s\|_\infty + \int_s^t \|S(t-r)f(X_r)\|_\infty dr$$

for $s < t$. For the first term, by definition of the intermediate spaces, it holds that

$$\|(S(t-s) - I)N_s\|_\infty \lesssim \|N_s\|_{D_{A_\theta}(\gamma, \infty)} (t-s)^\gamma \lesssim \|N_s\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} (t-s)^\gamma. \quad (34)$$

By Lemma 5.2 (i) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \int_s^t S(t-r)f(X_r) dr \right\|_\infty^p &\leq \left(\int_s^t \|S(t-r)f(X_r)\|_\infty dr \right)^p \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_s^t e^{-\lambda_0(t-r)} \|f(X_r)\|_\infty dr \right)^p \\ &\leq (t-s)^{p-1} \int_s^t e^{-p\lambda_0(t-r)} \|f(X_r)\|_\infty^p dr.\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By combining (34) and (35), we obtain $(N_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in C^\gamma([0, T], E)$ almost surely and, under Assumption (B),

$$\mathbf{E}(\|N_t - N_s\|_\infty^p) \lesssim (t-s)^{\gamma p} \mathbf{E}(\|N_s\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}^p) + (t-s)^p (1 + \sup_{h \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|X_h\|_\infty^{pd})),$$

from which the result for (N_t) follows due to (i).

Step 2. The case where ξ follows the stationary distribution can be treated as in (i) since

$$\|S(1+t)\xi - S(1+s)\xi\|_\infty \lesssim (t-s)^\gamma \|S(1)\xi\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} \lesssim (t-s)^\gamma \|X_0\|_\infty.$$

Step 3. We transfer the result (ii) from X to $f_0(X)$: First of all, the pathwise property is again a consequence of the assumption $f_0 \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Next, without loss of generality, assume that d from (7) is given by $d = 2m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, using the formula $a^n - b^n = (a-b) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a^k b^{n-1-k}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}|f(X_t(x)) - f(X_s(x))| &\leq \int_{X_s(x)}^{X_t(x)} |f'(h)| dh \lesssim \int_{X_s(x)}^{X_t(x)} (1 + h^{2m}) dh \\ &= |X_t(x) - X_s(x)| + \frac{1}{2m+1} |X_t(x)^{2m+1} - X_s(x)^{2m+1}| \\ &\lesssim |X_t(x) - X_s(x)| \underbrace{\left(1 + \sum_{k=0}^{2m} |X_t(x)^k X_s(x)^{2m-k}| \right)}_{=: Z_{s,t}}\end{aligned}$$

where we have assumed $X_t(x) \geq X_s(x)$ without loss of generality. Consequently, since $(s, t) \mapsto \|Z_{s,t}\|_\infty$ is bounded in $L^p(\mathbf{P})$ for any $p \geq 1$ under Assumption (B), we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t) - f(X_s)\|_\infty^p) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|X_t - X_s\|_\infty^{2p})^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(\|Z_{s,t}\|_\infty^{2p})^{1/2} \lesssim (t-s)^{\gamma p}. \quad \square$$

We turn to the excess Hölder regularity of the nonlinear component (N_t) of X . Since (N_t) is the pathwise solution of the equation $dN_t = A_\vartheta N_t + f(S(t)\xi + X_t^0 + N_t)$, $N_0 = 0$, the almost sure properties are a consequence of the results of Sinestrari [44] on the regularity of solutions to deterministic systems. In the following, we give a direct proof for them, both for the sake of completeness and since we require its steps in order to bound the respective norms in $L^p(\mathbf{P})$.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. (i) Due to Proposition 2.2, we have $f_0(X_t) \in D_{A_\vartheta}(\gamma, \infty) = C_0^{2\gamma}$ for any $\gamma < 1/4$. Further, for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in (\gamma, \frac{1}{4})$, Lemma 5.2 (iv) yields that

$$\|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} \lesssim \int_0^t \|A_\vartheta S(t-s)f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} ds \leq \int_0^t h(t-s)\|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{2\tilde{\gamma}}} ds$$

with $h(r) := e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-1+\tilde{\gamma}-\gamma}$. Since h is integrable over \mathbb{R}_+ and $A_\vartheta = \vartheta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$, the almost sure properties $N_t^0 \in C_0^{2+2\gamma}$ and $\sup_{t \leq T} \|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} < \infty$ immediately follow from $f_0(X) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C_0^{2\tilde{\gamma}})$, cf. Proposition 2.2. Further, Jensen's inequality gives

$$\|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}^p \lesssim \int_0^t h(t-s)\|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{2\tilde{\gamma}}}^p ds \left(\int_0^t h(r) dr \right)^{p-1}.$$

Consequently, under Assumption (B), $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}^p) \lesssim \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_t)\|_{C_0^{2\tilde{\gamma}}}^p)$ is finite, by Proposition 2.2.

(ii) In order to prove $\frac{d}{dt}N_t = A_\vartheta N_t^0 + f_0(X_t)$ in E , note that the usual decomposition for the increments of (N_t^0) and formula (33) yield the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{-1}(N_{t+\Delta}^0 - N_t^0) - A_\vartheta N_t^0 - f_0(X_t) &= \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_0^\Delta (S(r) - I)A_\vartheta N_t^0 dr \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_t^{t+\Delta} \left(S(t+\Delta-r)f_0(X_r) - f_0(X_t) \right) dr. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\|(S(r) - I)A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_\infty \lesssim r^\gamma \|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(h)f_0(X_r) - f_0(X_t)\|_\infty &\leq \|S(h)(f_0(X_r) - f_0(X_t))\|_\infty + \|(S(h) - I)f_0(X_t)\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim \|f_0(X_r) - f_0(X_t)\|_\infty + h^\gamma \|f_0(X_t)\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (i) and Proposition 2.2 yield $\|\Delta^{-1}(N_{t+\Delta}^0 - N_t^0) - A_\vartheta N_t^0 - f_0(X_t)\|_\infty \lesssim \Delta^\gamma \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on bounded time intervals, almost surely.

The properties claimed for $\frac{d}{dt}N_t^0$ now follow from the properties of $f_0(X_t)$ provided by Proposition 2.2 and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_\vartheta N_{t+\Delta}^0 - A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_\infty &\leq \|(S(\Delta) - I)A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_\infty + \int_t^{t+\Delta} \|A_\vartheta S(t+\Delta-r)f_0(X_r)\|_\infty dr \\ &\lesssim \Delta^\gamma \|A_\vartheta N_t^0\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} + \int_t^{t+\Delta} (t+\Delta-r)^{-1+\gamma} \|f_0(X_r)\|_{C_0^{2\gamma}} dr \end{aligned}$$

where the bound on the integrand is taken from result (iii) in Lemma 5.2.

It remains to analyze the regularity of the process (M_t) . First of all, by (33), we have $A_\vartheta M_t = S(t)m - m$ and $m \in C^{2\gamma}([b, 1-b])$ is trivially fulfilled. Further, setting $m_t := S(t)m$, we have $m_t(x) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{e^{-\lambda_{2\ell+1}t}}{2\ell+1} e^{2\ell+1} x$. The mean value theorem yields

$$m_t(x) - m_t(y) = (x-y)8 \sum_{\ell \geq 0} e^{-\lambda_{2\ell+1}t} \cos(\pi(2\ell+1)z)$$

for some z between x and y . Thanks to the bound on trigonometric series from [26, Lemma A.7], the sum $\sum_{\ell \geq 0} e^{-\lambda_{2\ell+1}t} \cos(\pi(2\ell+1)z)$ is uniformly bounded in $t > 0$ and $z \in [b, 1-b]$ and we can conclude $\sup_{t \geq 0} \|A_{\vartheta} M_t\|_{C^{2\gamma}([b, 1-b])} < \infty$. The same argument shows that

$$\|S(t+\Delta)m - S(t)m\|_{C([b, 1-b])} \lesssim \sup_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda_{2\ell+1}\Delta}}{2\ell+1} \lesssim \sqrt{\Delta}.$$

Hence,

$$\|\Delta^{-1}(M_{t+\Delta} - M_t) - S(t)m\|_{C([b, 1-b])} \leq \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_t^{t+\Delta} \|(S(r)m - S(t)m)\|_{C([b, 1-b])} dr \lesssim \sqrt{\Delta}$$

and, in particular, $\frac{d}{dt}M_t = S(t)m$ in $C([b, 1-b])$ as well as $\|\frac{d}{dt}(M_{t+\Delta} - M_t)\|_{C([b, 1-b])} \lesssim \sqrt{\Delta} \lesssim \Delta^\gamma$. \square

5.2 Proofs for the estimators of σ^2 and ϑ

In the following, we prove the central limit theorems for the realized quadratic variations in the semilinear framework, as claimed in Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 of Section 3. Central limit theorems for the derived method of moments estimators for σ^2 and ϑ follow directly in view of the delta method.

Note that the central limit theorems for space and double increments have been derived in [26] for the linear case $f \equiv 0$, assuming a stationary initial condition. In fact, by employing a perturbation argument together with Slutsky's Lemma, one can easily show that these central limit theorems remain valid in the case $X_0 = 0$ when using the slight modification explained in Section 3. We omit a detailed verification for the sake of brevity.

We start by proving the result for time increments.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. It is sufficient to consider the process $X_{t+t_0}^0 + N_{t+t_0}$ instead of X_t : if ξ follows the stationary distribution, then X has the same distribution as \tilde{X} with $\tilde{X}_t := X_{t_0+t} = S(t)S(t_0)\xi + X_{t+t_0}^0 + N_{t+t_0}$ for any $t_0 > 0$ and $(S(t)S(t_0)\xi)_{t \geq 0}$ can be chosen arbitrarily regular by choosing t_0 sufficiently large. In fact, since the properties of (N_t) used in the sequel, are the same under each of the initial conditions, we can assume $\xi = 0$ for simplicity. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_t &= \frac{1}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_{i+1}}^0(y_k) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k))^2 + \frac{1}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (N_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - N_{t_i}(y_k))^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_{i+1}}^0(y_k) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k))(N_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - N_{t_i}(y_k)) \\ &=: V_t + R_1 + R_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since V_t satisfies the claimed central limit theorem (13), due to Slutsky's lemma, it suffices to prove that R_1 and R_2 are of the order $o_p(1/\sqrt{MN})$.

If T is finite, it follows from Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 2.3 that for all $\gamma < 1/4$ and \mathbf{P} -almost all realizations $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a constant $C = C(\omega, T)$ such that $|X_{t_{i+1}}^0(y_k) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k)| \leq C\Delta^\gamma$ and $|N_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - N_{t_i}(y_k)| \leq C\Delta$ for all $i \leq N$, $k \leq M$ and $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, R_1 and R_2 are of the order $o_p(\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma})$ and the statement follows due to the condition $M = o(\Delta^{-\rho})$ for some $\rho < 1/2$.

If $T \rightarrow \infty$ and Assumption (B) is satisfied, Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 2.3 yield $\mathbf{E}(|R_1|) \lesssim \Delta^{3/2}$ and, by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the cross terms, we get $\mathbf{E}(|R_2|) \lesssim \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}$ for any $\gamma < 1/4$. The claim follows since $\sqrt{MN}\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} = \sqrt{TM}\Delta^{2\gamma}$ converges to 0 for any $\gamma \in (\frac{\rho}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$ and the fact that convergence in $L^1(\mathbf{P})$ implies convergence in probability. \square

Next, we prove the result for space increments.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We only consider the case of a finite time horizon, the case $T \rightarrow \infty$ can be treated similarly by taking expectations. Further, it suffices to consider the case $\xi = 0$, see also the proof of Theorem 3.1. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{V}_{\text{sp}} &= \frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_i}^0(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k))^2 + \frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - N_{t_i}(y_k))^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (X_{t_i}^0(y_{k+1}) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k))(N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - N_{t_i}(y_k)) \\ &=: V_{\text{sp}} + R_1 + R_2\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows if R_1 and R_2 are of the order $o_p(1/\sqrt{MN})$.

To bound the term R_2 , we use the summation by parts formula

$$\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} a_k(b_{k+1} - b_k) = - \sum_{k=0}^{M-2} (a_{k+1} - a_k)b_{k+1} + a_{M-1}b_M - a_0b_0. \quad (36)$$

Setting $a_k := N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - N_{t_i}(y_k)$ and $b_k := X_{t_i}^0(y_k)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}R_2 &= \frac{2}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-2} X_{t_i}^0(y_{k+1})(N_{t_i}(y_{k+2}) - 2N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) + N_{t_i}(y_k)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N ((N_{t_i}(y_N) - N_{t_i}(y_{N-1}))X_{t_i}^0(y_N) + (N_{t_i}(y_1) - N_{t_i}(y_0))X_{t_i}^0(y_0)).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 2.3, we have $(X_t^0) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, C([b, 1-b]))$ and $\sup_{t \leq T} \|A_{\vartheta} N_t\|_{C([b, 1-b])} < \infty$ almost surely. Thus, there exists a random variable $C = C(\omega, T)$ with $|N_{t_i}(y_{k+2}) - 2N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) + N_{t_i}(y_k)| \leq C\delta^2$, $|N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) - N_{t_i}(y_k)| \leq C\delta$ and $|X_{t_i}^0| \lesssim C$ for all $i \leq N$, $k \leq M-1$ and $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ almost surely. It follows that $|R_1| \leq C^2\delta$ and $|R_2| \lesssim C^2\delta$ hold almost surely and, therefore, the claim follows from the fact that $\sqrt{MN}\delta \approx \sqrt{N/M}$ tends to 0, by assumption. \square

Finally, we prove the result for double increments. To that aim, let \mathbb{N}_{ik} denote the double increments computed from the process (N_t) , i.e., $\mathbb{N}_{ik} := N_{t_{i+1}}(y_{k+1}) - N_{t_{i+1}}(y_k) - N_{t_i}(y_{k+1}) + N_{t_i}(y_k)$. The first step of the proof of Theorem 3.3 is given by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that the constant b from the observation scheme defined in Section 2.1 is strictly positive and let $p \geq 1$.*

(i) *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta \in (0, 1]$ be such that $\alpha + \beta < \frac{3}{2}$. If T is finite, then there exists a random variable $C = C(\omega, T) > 0$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{N}_{ik}| \leq C\delta^\alpha \Delta^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}}$$

holds for all $i \leq N, k \leq M$ and $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ almost surely. If Assumption (B) is satisfied, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}(|\mathbb{N}_{ik}|^p) \leq C \left(\delta^\alpha \Delta^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}} \right)^p$$

holds for all $i \leq N, k \leq M, N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ uniformly in $T > 0$.

(ii) *Let $\gamma < 2$ and $\varepsilon < 1/4$. If T is finite, then there exists a random variable $C = C(\omega, T) > 0$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{N}_{ik}| \leq C\delta^\gamma \Delta^\varepsilon$$

holds for all $i \leq N, k \leq M$ and $N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ almost surely. If Assumption (B) is satisfied, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}(|\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{N}_{ik}|^p) \leq C(\delta^\gamma \Delta^\varepsilon)^p$$

holds for all $i \leq N, k \leq M, N, M \in \mathbb{N}$ uniformly in $T > 0$.

Proof. We write $\mathbb{N}_{ik} = \mathbb{N}_{ik}^0 + \mathbb{M}_{ik}$ where \mathbb{N}_{ik}^0 and \mathbb{M}_{ik} are the double increments computed from the processes (N_t^0) and (M_t) defined by (12), respectively. In the following, these double increments are estimated separately.

(i) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{N}_{ik}^0| &\leq \delta^\alpha \|N_{t_{i+1}}^0 - N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^\alpha} \\ &\leq \delta^\alpha \left(\|S(\Delta) - I\|_{C_0^\alpha} \|N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^\alpha} + \left\| \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} S(t_{i+1} - s) f_0(X_s) ds \right\|_{C_0^\alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Further, using formula (33) and Lemma 5.2 (iv) in combination with $\alpha + \beta - 1 \leq \alpha$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(\Delta) - I\|_{C_0^\alpha} \|N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^\alpha} &= \left\| \int_0^\Delta A_\vartheta S(r) N_{t_i}^0 dr \right\|_{C_0^\alpha} \\ &\leq \int_0^\Delta \|S(r)\|_{L(C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}, C_0^\alpha)} \|A_\vartheta N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}} dr \\ &\lesssim \int_0^\Delta r^{-\frac{1-\beta}{2}} \|A_\vartheta N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}} dr \lesssim \Delta^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}} \|A_\vartheta N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 5.2 (iii) and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} S(t_{i+1} - s) f_0(X_s) ds \right\|_{C_0^\alpha} &\lesssim \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (t_{i+1} - s)^{-\frac{1-\beta}{2}} \|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}} ds \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}}^p ds \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \Delta^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1-\beta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, noting $\alpha + \beta - 1 < \frac{1}{2}$, Propositions 2.2 and 2.3 yield the claim for the case of a finite time horizon and, under Assumption (B),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(|\mathbb{N}_{ik}^0|^p) &\lesssim \delta^{p\alpha} \left(\Delta^{p\frac{1+\beta}{2}} \mathbf{E}(\|A_\vartheta N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}}^p) + \Delta^{p-1-p\frac{1-\beta}{2}} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^{\alpha+\beta-1}}^p) ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \delta^{p\alpha} \Delta^{p\frac{1+\beta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

To verify that \mathbb{M}_{ik} is of the claimed order, recall that in the proof of Proposition 2.3 it is shown that $\frac{d}{dt} M_t = S(t)m =: m_t$ and that $|m_t(x) - m_t(y)| \lesssim |x - y|$ holds uniformly in $t > 0$ and $x, y \in [b, 1 - b]$. Thus, we have $\mathbb{M}_{ik} = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (m_s(y_{k+1}) - m_s(y_k)) ds$ and, consequently, $|\mathbb{M}_{ik}| \lesssim \Delta \delta \lesssim \delta^\alpha \Delta^{\frac{1+\beta}{2}}$.

(ii) For $\gamma \in (1, 2)$, we have

$$|\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)}^0 - \mathbb{N}_{ik}^0| \leq \delta^\gamma \|N_{t_{i+1}}^0 - N_{t_i}^0\|_{C_0^\gamma}.$$

Using the decomposition

$$N_{t_{i+1}}^0 - N_{t_i}^0 = \int_0^{t_i} S(t_i - s)(f_0(X_{s+\Delta}) - f_0(X_s)) ds + \int_0^\Delta S(t_{i+1} - s) f_0(X_s) ds,$$

we get from Lemma 5.2 (i) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^{t_i} S(t_i - s)(f_0(X_{s+\Delta}) - f_0(X_s)) ds \right\|_{C_0^\gamma} &= \left\| \int_0^{t_i} S(r)(f_0(X_{t_{i+1}-r}) - f_0(X_{t_i-r})) dr \right\|_{C_0^\gamma} \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{t_i} e^{-\lambda_0 r} r^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|f_0(X_{t_{i+1}-r}) - f_0(X_{t_i-r})\|_\infty dr. \end{aligned}$$

Further, for $h < 1/2$, Lemma 5.2 (iii) gives

$$\left\| \int_0^\Delta S(t_{i+1} - s)f_0(X_s) ds \right\|_{C_0^\gamma} \lesssim \int_0^\Delta (t_{i+1} - r)^{-\frac{\gamma-h}{2}} \|f_0(X_r)\|_{C_0^h} dr.$$

Now, the result in case of a fixed T follows from the path regularity of $f_0(X)$. Further, under Assumption (B), we can use Jensen's and Hölder's inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(|\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)}^0 - \mathbb{N}_{ik}^0|^p) &\lesssim \delta^\gamma \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_{t+\Delta}) - f_0(X_t)\|_\infty^p) + \delta^\gamma \Delta^{p-1-\frac{\gamma-h}{2}p} \int_0^\Delta \mathbf{E}(\|f_0(X_{t_{i+1}-r})\|_{C_0^h}^p) dr \\ &\lesssim \delta^\gamma \Delta^{p\varepsilon} + \delta^\gamma \Delta^{p(1-\frac{\gamma-h}{2})}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows, since one can pick $h \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that $1 - \frac{\gamma-h}{2} \geq \varepsilon$.

To estimate $|\mathbb{M}_{ik}|$, recall that in the proof of Proposition 2.3 it is shown that $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} M_t = \frac{1}{\vartheta} A_\vartheta M_t = \frac{1}{\vartheta}(S(t) - I)m$ and that $\|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} M_t - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} M_s\|_{C([b,1-b])} = \frac{1}{\vartheta} \|S(t)m - S(s)m\|_{C([b,1-b])} \lesssim \sqrt{|t-s|}$. Further, recall that by Taylor's formula, we have the expansion $h(x+\delta) = h(x) + \delta h'(x) + \int_x^{x+\delta} (x+\delta-z)h''(z) dz$ for any $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, we can write

$$\delta^{-2}(h(x+\delta) - 2h(x) + h(x-\delta)) = \int K_\delta(z-x)h''(z) dz$$

with $K_\delta(z) := \delta^{-1}K(\delta^{-1}z)$ and the triangular kernel $K(z) := (1-|z|)\mathbf{1}_{\{-1 \leq z \leq 1\}}$. Application to the double increments yields

$$\mathbb{M}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{M}_{ik} = \delta^2 \int_{x-\delta}^{x+\delta} K_\delta(z-x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} (M_{t_{i+1}}(z) - M_{t_i}(z)) dz$$

and, consequently, $|\mathbb{M}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{M}_{ik}| \lesssim \delta^2 \sqrt{\Delta} \lesssim \Delta^\gamma \Delta^\varepsilon$. \square

The above lemma is the main ingredient for the following proof of the central limit theorem for double increments.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. As for time and space increments, we can assume $\xi = 0$ and the claim follows if we verify $|R_i| = o_p(1/\sqrt{MN})$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, with

$$R_1 := \frac{1}{MN\Phi_\vartheta(\delta, \Delta)} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{N}_{ik}^2, \quad R_2 := \frac{1}{MN\Phi_\vartheta(\delta, \Delta)} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \mathbb{N}_{ik} D_{ik}$$

and where D_{ik} are the double increments computed from (X_t^0) . In the following, we verify the claim under Assumption (B). The result for the case of a fixed T can be shown analogously by using the pathwise properties of (N_t) derived in Lemma 5.3. We treat the cases $M\sqrt{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $M\sqrt{\Delta} \rightarrow \infty$ separately.

Case $M\sqrt{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(1)$: Using Lemma 5.3 with $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 1$ yields $\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{N}_{ik}^2) \lesssim \Delta^2$ and, hence,

$$\sqrt{MN} \mathbf{E}(|R_1|) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{MN}}{MN\sqrt{\Delta}} \sum_{i,k} \mathbf{E}(\mathbb{N}_{ik}^2) \lesssim \sqrt{MN} \Delta^{3/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

For the cross terms, we take $\beta = 1$ and $\alpha = \frac{a}{2} < \frac{1}{2}$ in Lemma 5.3 to bound

$$\mathbf{E}(|D_{ik}\mathbb{N}_{ik}|) \leq \mathbf{E}(D_{ik}^2)^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(\mathbb{N}_{ik}^2)^{1/2} \lesssim \Delta^{1/4} \Delta \delta^{a/2},$$

implying $\sqrt{MN} \mathbf{E}(|R_1|) \rightarrow 0$.

Case $M\sqrt{\Delta} \rightarrow \infty$: With $\beta = 1/2$ and $\alpha = \frac{a+3}{4} < 1$ in Lemma 5.3, we get $\mathbf{E}(\mathbb{N}_{ik}^2) \lesssim \Delta^{3/2} \delta^{2\alpha}$ and, hence, $\sqrt{MN} \mathbf{E}(|R_1|) \rightarrow 0$. To treat the cross terms, we use formula (36) with $a_k := \mathbb{N}_{ik}$ and $b_k := H_{ik} := X_{t_{i+1}}^0(y_k) - X_{t_i}^0(y_k)$ to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} D_{ik} \mathbb{N}_{ik} &= - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-2} (\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{N}_{ik}) H_{i(k+1)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{N}_{i(M-1)} H_{iM} - \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{N}_{i0} H_{i0}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since $\mathbf{E}(H_{ik}^2) \lesssim \sqrt{\Delta}$, Lemma 5.3 gives for any $\gamma < 2$ and $\varepsilon < 1/4$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-2} (\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{N}_{ik}) H_{i(k+1)}\right|\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{M-2} \mathbf{E}((\mathbb{N}_{i(k+1)} - \mathbb{N}_{ik})^2)^{1/2} \mathbf{E}(H_{i(k+1)}^2)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\delta^\gamma \Delta^\varepsilon \sqrt{\Delta}}{\delta} = \delta^{\gamma-1} \Delta^{\varepsilon+1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by picking ε and γ in such a way that $2\gamma - 4 + 4\varepsilon > a$, we get $\sqrt{MN} \delta^{\gamma-1} \Delta^{\varepsilon+1/4} \rightarrow 0$. For the remaining two terms in (37), take $\alpha = \frac{a+1}{2} < 1$ and $\beta = 1/2$ in Lemma 5.3. Then,

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\left|\frac{1}{MN\delta} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{N}_{i(M-1)} H_{iM}\right|\right) \lesssim \frac{\Delta^{1/4} \delta^\alpha \Delta^{3/4}}{M\delta} \approx \Delta \delta^\gamma$$

and, since $\sqrt{MN} \Delta \delta^\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\sqrt{MN} \mathbf{E}(|R_2|) \rightarrow 0$, which finishes the proof. \square

5.3 Proofs for the nonparametric estimator of f

For the proof of Theorem 4.3, we follow the main proof strategy from Comte et al. [15, Proposition 1]. First, we verify our estimate for $\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2$ on the event $\Omega_{N,M,m}$.

Proof of Proposition 4.5. By applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Young's inequality and Lemma 4.2 to (30), we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 &\leq \|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\hat{S}(0)(\hat{f}_m(X_{t_i}) - f_m(X_{t_i}))\|_{L^2} \|R_i\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N,M} \sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{1}{\eta} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{\eta}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|R_i\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\eta} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N,M}^2 + \eta \left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{4}{\eta}\right) \|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{4}{\eta} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{\eta}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|R_i\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \eta \left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $\eta > 0$. Taking $\eta = 8$ and rearranging gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 &\leq 3\|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + \frac{16}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|R_i\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 16 \left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The claim of the proposition follows by bounding the expectation on $\Omega_{N,M,m}$ of the three terms on the right hand side of the above inequality.

For the first term, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}}) \leq \mathbf{E}(\|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2) = \|f_m - f_A\|_{\pi,M}^2.$$

To treat the second term, we show that

$$\mathbf{E}(\|R_i\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \Delta^\gamma \quad (39)$$

holds for any $\rho < 1/4$ and $\gamma < 1/2$: First of all, with $f_0 := f - f(0)$ and $\mathbf{1} := \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(h)f(X_s) - f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2 &\lesssim \|S(h)f_0(X_s) - f_0(X_s)\|_\infty^2 + f(0)^2 \|S(h)\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + \|f(X_s) - f(X_t)\|_\infty^2 \\ &\lesssim h^\gamma \|f_0(X_s)\|_{D_{A^\theta}(\gamma/2, \infty)}^2 + f(0)^2 \sum_{\ell \geq 1} (1 - e^{-\lambda_\ell \Delta})^2 \langle \mathbf{1}, e_\ell \rangle^2 \\ &\quad + \|f(X_s) - f(X_t)\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using Jensen's inequality, $D_{A^\theta}(\frac{\gamma}{2}, \infty) = C_0^\gamma$ and $\langle \mathbf{1}, e_\ell \rangle^2 \lesssim \ell^{-2}$, we get for any $\gamma < 1/2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left(\|R_i^{\text{cont}}\|_{L^2}^2 \right) &\leq \frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \|S(t_{i+1} - s)f(X_s) - f(X_{t_i})\|_{L^2}^2 ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \Delta^\gamma \mathbf{E} \left(\|f_0(X_s)\|_{C_0^\gamma}^2 \right) ds + f(0)^2 \sqrt{\Delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbf{E} \left(\|f(X_s) - f(X_{t_i})\|_\infty^2 \right) ds \lesssim \Delta^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

in view of Proposition 2.2. Further, by Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t) - \hat{S}(0)f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t)\|_{C^{2\alpha}}^2 + \|f(X_t)\|_\infty^2 + \|f(X_t)\|_{D_\alpha}^2) \delta^{\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}}$$

with the space D_α defined in (45). The expectation on the right hand side is finite as long as $\alpha < 1/4$, due to Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 2.2. Thus, by picking α sufficiently close to $1/4$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t) - \hat{S}(0)f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \delta^{\gamma/2} = M^{-\gamma/2} = o(\Delta^\gamma)$$

under the condition $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$. To bound $\Delta^{-2}\mathbf{E}(\|S(h)X_t - \hat{S}(h)X_t\|_{L^2}^2)$ for $h \in \{0, \Delta\}$, we use the usual decomposition $X_t = S(t)X_0 + X_t^0 + N_t$ where we can fix a convenient value for $t > 0$, due to stationarity. Since the decomposition is trivial for $t = 0$, we pick $t := t_1 = \Delta$. The linear component X_t^0 can easily be treated due to independence in view of Lemma 4.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\|S(h)X_t^0 - \hat{S}(h)X_t^0\|_{L^2}^2) &= \mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} e^{-2\lambda_k h} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \setminus \{k\}} u_\ell(t) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^-} u_\ell(t)\right)^2\right) + \mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{\ell \geq M} e^{-2\lambda_\ell h} u_\ell^2(t)\right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell \geq M} \mathbf{E}(u_\ell^2(t)) \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \end{aligned}$$

and dividing by the squared renormalization Δ^2 yields the claimed $\mathcal{O}(1/(M\Delta^2))$ -bound. The other two terms in the decomposition are of lower order: For $S(t)X_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S(h)S(t)X_0 - \hat{S}(h)S(t)X_0\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} e^{-2\lambda_k h} \left(\langle S(t)X_0, e_k \rangle_{L^2} - \langle S(t)X_0, e_k \rangle_M\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \geq M} e^{-2\lambda_k(h+t)} \langle X_0, e_k \rangle_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the first sum, Lemma 4.2 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\langle S(t)X_0, e_k \rangle_{L^2} - \langle S(t)X_0, e_k \rangle_M\right)^2 &= \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \setminus \{k\}} e^{-\lambda_l t} \langle X_0, e_l \rangle_{L^2} - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^-} e^{-\lambda_l t} \langle X_0, e_l \rangle_{L^2}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{l \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-) \setminus \{k\}} e^{-2\lambda_l t} \end{aligned}$$

and, thus, with $t = \Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} e^{-2\lambda_k h} \left(\langle S(t_1)X_0, e_k \rangle_{L^2} - \langle S(t_1)X_0, e_k \rangle_M\right)^2 \\ &\leq \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{l \geq M} e^{-2\lambda_l \Delta} \leq \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \int_{M\sqrt{\Delta}}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi^2 \vartheta x^2} dx \lesssim \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{1}{M^2 \Delta^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The same bound holds for the second sum since

$$\sum_{k \geq M} e^{-2\lambda_k(h+\Delta)} \langle X_0, e_k \rangle_{L^2}^2 \leq \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 e^{-2\lambda_M \Delta} \lesssim \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{1}{M^2 \Delta} \lesssim \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \frac{1}{M^2 \Delta^{3/2}}.$$

Therefore, assuming $M\Delta^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\Delta^{-2}\mathbf{E}(\|S(h)S(t_1)X_0 - \hat{S}(h)S(t_1)X_0\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|X_0\|_{L^2}^2) \frac{1}{M^2 \Delta^{7/2}} = o\left(\frac{1}{M\Delta^2}\right).$$

For the nonlinear part, set $B_k := \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \setminus \{k\}} n_\ell(t) - \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^-} n_\ell(t)$ with $n_\ell(t) := \langle N_t, e_\ell \rangle_{L^2}$. Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$B_k^2 \leq \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-) \setminus \{k\}} \lambda_\ell^{2\alpha} n_\ell^2\right) \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-) \setminus \{k\}} \lambda_\ell^{-2\alpha}\right) \leq \|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2 \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-) \setminus \{k\}} \lambda_\ell^{-2\alpha}\right).$$

Since, furthermore, $\sum_{\ell \geq M} n_\ell^2(t) \leq \lambda_M^{-2\alpha} \|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\|S(h)N_t - \hat{S}(h)N_t\|_{L^2}^2) \leq \mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} B_k^2\right) + \mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{\ell \geq M} n_\ell^2(t)\right) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2) \left(\sum_{k \geq M} \lambda_k^{-2\alpha} + \lambda_M^{-2\alpha}\right)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{M^{4\alpha-1}} \mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2).$$

Now, by Remark 5.5, we have $\mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2) < \infty$ for $\alpha = 1/2$ and, thus, $\mathbf{E}(\|S(h)N_t - \hat{S}(h)N_t\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \frac{1}{M}$, which finishes the proof of (39).

To treat the third term on the right hand side of (38), consider an orthonormal system $\{\varphi_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda_m\}$ of S_m with the property $\|\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \varphi_\lambda^2\|_\infty \leq CD_m$ which exists due to Assumption (N). Since on $\Omega_{N,M,m}$, $\|t\|_{N,M} = 1$ implies $\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \leq 1/\underline{c}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\underline{c}} \sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{L^2} \leq 1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \\ & = \frac{1}{\underline{c}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\Lambda_m}, \|\alpha\| \leq 1} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \alpha_\lambda \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

To handle the expectation of the above bound, note that $\varepsilon_i = \frac{\sigma}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} S(t_{i+1}-s) dW_s$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t_i} and $\widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})} := \hat{S}(0)\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})$ is \mathcal{F}_{t_i} -measurable, implying

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i} \right) &= \int_0^1 \mathbf{E}((\widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})})(x) \varepsilon_i(x) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i}) dx \\ &= \int_0^1 (\widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})})(x) \mathbf{E}(\varepsilon_i(x) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i}) dx \\ &= \int_0^1 (\widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})})(x) \mathbf{E}(\varepsilon_i(x)) dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $j < i$, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_j})}, \varepsilon_j \rangle_{L^2} \right) = \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbf{E} \left(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i} \right) \langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_j})}, \varepsilon_j \rangle_{L^2} \right) = 0$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}} \right) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right).$$

Further, Parseval's relation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}^2 \right) &= \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, e_k \rangle_{L^2} \langle \varepsilon_i, e_k \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\Delta^2} \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, e_k \rangle_{L^2} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_k(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_k(s) \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\Delta^2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{E}(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, e_k \rangle_{L^2}^2) \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_k(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_k(s) \right)^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{\Delta^2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda_k \Delta}}{2\lambda_k} \mathbf{E}(\langle \widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}, e_k \rangle_{L^2}^2) \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\Delta} \mathbf{E}(\|\widehat{\varphi_\lambda(X_{t_i})}\|_{L^2}^2) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{M\Delta} \mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \varphi_\lambda^2(X_{t_i}(y_k))\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Above, we have used independence of the (one-dimensional) stochastic integrals from \mathcal{F}_{t_i} and pairwise independence of $\{\beta_k, k \geq 1\}$ in the third step as well as Lemma 4.2 in the last step. In view of Assumption (N), we have shown

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}\right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{T} \left\| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \varphi_\lambda^2 \right\|_\infty \lesssim \frac{D_m}{T}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

The following proof verifies our bound on the probability of the event $\Xi_{N,M,m}$.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. We follow the steps of the proof of Lemma 1 in [15] which employs the standard technique for deriving concentration inequalities for β -mixing sequences, see, e.g., Theorem 4 in Doukhan [20, Section 1.4.2]. We require Bernstein's inequality, which states that for independent real-valued random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_n with $|Z_i| \leq B$ and $\mathbf{E}(Z_i^2) \leq \nu^2$ for some constants $B, \nu > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(|S_n - \mathbf{E}(S_n)| \geq \nu\sqrt{2x} + Bx) \leq 2e^{-nx} \quad \text{where } S_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \quad (40)$$

for any $x > 0$, see, e.g., Massart [37, Proposition 2.9]. In order to be able to make use of (40) in our context, we need to approximate the sequence X_{t_0}, \dots, X_{t_N} by independent blocks. In fact, using Berbee's coupling Lemma [6], it can be shown (see, e.g., the discussion following Lemma 5.1 in [46]) that there exists a process $(X_{i\Delta}^*, 0 \leq i \leq N-1)$ with the following properties. For every $j = 0, \dots, p_N - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{j,1} &:= (X_{[2jq_N+1]\Delta}, \dots, X_{[(2j+1)q_N]\Delta}) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (X_{[2jq_N+1]\Delta}^*, \dots, X_{[(2j+1)q_N]\Delta}^*) =: U_{j,1}^*, \\
U_{j,2} &:= (X_{[(2j+1)q_N]\Delta}, \dots, X_{[2(j+1)q_N]\Delta}) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (X_{[(2j+1)q_N]\Delta}^*, \dots, X_{[2(j+1)q_N]\Delta}^*) =: U_{j,2}^*
\end{aligned}$$

and for each $a \in \{1, 2\}$, $U_{0,a}^*, \dots, U_{p_N-1,a}^*$ are independent and $\mathbf{P}(U_{j,a} \neq U_{j,a}^*) \leq \beta_X(q_N \Delta)$. Here, β_X is the β -mixing coefficient of X which is in our case given by (8). Set $\Omega^* := \{X_{i\Delta} = X_{i\Delta}^*, i = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ and $\mathbf{P}^* := \mathbf{P}(\cdot \cap \Omega^*)$. Clearly,

$$\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \leq \mathbf{P}(\Omega^* \cap \Xi_{N,M,m}^c) + \mathbf{P}((\Omega^*)^c)$$

and, using the union bound, we get

$$\mathbf{P}((\Omega^*)^c) \leq 2p_N \beta_X(q_N \Delta) \leq N \beta_X(q_N \Delta).$$

It remains to show $\mathbf{P}^*(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \lesssim D_m^2 \exp(-K' \frac{p_N}{L_m})$. To that aim, set

$$v_{N,M}(t) := \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} (t(X_{i\Delta}(y_k)) - \mathbf{E}(t(X_{i\Delta}(y_k))))$$

so that $v_{N,M}(t^2) = \|t\|_{N,M}^2 - \|t\|_{\pi,M}^2$. Recall the constants $0 < c < C < \infty$ from the implication (28) of Assumption (E). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^* (\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) &= \mathbf{P}^* \left(\sup_{t \in S_m \setminus \{0\}} \left| \frac{\|t\|_{N,M}^2 - \|t\|_{\pi,M}^2}{\|t\|_{\pi,M}^2} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \mathbf{P}^* \left(\sup_{t \in S_m \setminus \{0\}} \left| \frac{\|t\|_{N,M}^2 - \|t\|_{\pi,M}^2}{c\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}^* \left(\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{L^2(A)}=1} |v_{N,M}(t^2)| \geq \frac{c}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, each $t \in S_m$ with $\|t\|_{L^2(A)} = 1$ has a representation $t = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \alpha_\lambda \varphi_\lambda$ with $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \alpha_\lambda^2 = 1$ and

$$v_{N,M}(t^2) = \sum_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_m} \alpha_\lambda \alpha_{\lambda'} v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}).$$

On the set $\{|v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \leq 2V_{\lambda\lambda'}^m(2Cx)^{1/2} + 2B_{\lambda\lambda'}^m, x, \forall \lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_m\}$ with $x := \frac{c^2}{64CL_m}$, we have

$$\sum_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_m} |\alpha_\lambda \alpha_{\lambda'}| |v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \leq 2(2Cx)^{1/2} \rho(V^m) + 2x\rho(B^m) \leq \frac{c}{2\sqrt{2}} + \frac{c^2}{32C} \leq \frac{c}{2}$$

where the last bound is due to $c \leq C$ and, hence, $\sup_{t \in S_m, \|t\|_{L^2(A)}=1} |v_{N,M}(t^2)| \leq \frac{c}{2}$ is fulfilled. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^* (\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) &\leq \mathbf{P}^* \left(\exists \lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_m : |v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \geq 2V_{\lambda\lambda'}^m(2Cx)^{1/2} + 2B_{\lambda\lambda'}^m, x \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda_m} \mathbf{P}^* \left(|v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \geq 2V_{\lambda\lambda'}^m(2Cx)^{1/2} + 2B_{\lambda\lambda'}^m, x \right). \end{aligned}$$

We decompose $v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}) = v_{N,M}^1(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}) + v_{N,M}^2(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})$ where

$$v_{N,M}^a(t) := \frac{1}{p_N} \sum_{j=0}^{p_N-1} \left(Z_{j,a}(t) - \mathbf{E}(Z_{j,a}(t)) \right), \quad Z_{j,a}(t) := \frac{1}{q_N} \sum_{i=1}^{q_N} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} t(U_{j,a}^i(y_k))$$

and $U_{j,a}^i$ denotes the i -th entry of $U_{j,a}$. Under \mathbf{P}^* , the family $(Z_{0,a}(t), \dots, Z_{p_N-1,a}(t))$ is independent for $a \in \{1, 2\}$ by construction and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_{j,a}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| &\leq B_{\lambda,\lambda'}^m, \\ \mathbf{E} \left(Z_{j,a}^2(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}) \right) &\leq \frac{1}{q_N M} \sum_{i=1}^{q_N} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\varphi_\lambda^2(U_{j,a}^i(y_k)) \varphi_{\lambda'}^2(U_{j,a}^i(y_k)) \right) \\ &= \|\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}\|_{\pi,M}^2 \leq C \|\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'}\|_{L^2(A)}^2 = C(V_{\lambda,\lambda'}^m)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Jensen's inequality in the second line. Thus, by the Bernstein inequality (40), we get

$$\mathbf{P}^* \left(|v_{N,M}(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \geq 2V_{\lambda\lambda'}^m(2Cx)^{1/2} + B_{\lambda\lambda'}^m, x \right) \leq \sum_{a=1}^2 \mathbf{P}^* \left(|v_{N,M}^a(\varphi_\lambda \varphi_{\lambda'})| \geq V_{\lambda\lambda'}^m(2Cx)^{1/2} + B_{\lambda\lambda'}^m, x \right) \leq 4e^{-p_N x}.$$

Summing up, we have shown

$$\mathbf{P}^* (\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \leq 4D_m^2 \exp \left(-p_N \frac{c^2}{64CL_m} \right)$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Based on the previous results, we are now ready to verify the conclusion of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Consider $\Omega_{N,M,m} = \Omega_{N,M,m,\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ as defined in Proposition 4.5 with $c > 0$ from the implication (28) of Assumption (E). Then, on $\Xi_{N,M,m}$, we have $\|t\|_{N,M}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|t\|_{\pi,M}^2 \geq \frac{c}{2}\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2$ for all $t \in S_m$, implying $\Xi_{N,M,m} \subset \Omega_{N,M,m}^c$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2) &= \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}}) + \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}^c}) \\ &\lesssim \|f_A - f_m\|_{\pi,M}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{N,M,m}^c}) \\ &\lesssim \|f_A - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 4.5 and Assumption (E). In the following, we conclude the theorem by showing that

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) = o(\Delta^\gamma).$$

We consider the Hilbert space $H^N := (L^2(0,1))^N$ equipped with the inner product $\langle u, v \rangle_{H^N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_i, v_i \rangle_{L^2}$ for $u, v \in H^N$. Note that $\|t\|_{N,M}^2 = \|\bar{t}\|_{H^N}^2$ with $\bar{t} := (\hat{S}(0)t(X_0), \dots, \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_{N-1}}))$. Clearly, the vector $(\hat{S}(0)\hat{f}_m(X_0), \dots, \hat{S}(0)\hat{f}_m(X_{(N-1)\Delta}))$ is the orthogonal projection in H^N of $\bar{Y} := (Y_0, \dots, Y_{N-1})$ onto the subspace $\{(\hat{S}(0)t(X_0), \dots, \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_{N-1}})), t \in S_m\}$. Denoting the corresponding projection operator by Π_m , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 &\leq \|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{N,M}^2 = \|\Pi_m \bar{Y} - \bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 = \|(I - \Pi_m)\bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 + \|\Pi_m(\bar{Y} - \bar{f})\|_{H^N}^2 \\ &\leq \|\bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 + \|\bar{Y} - \bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 \end{aligned}$$

since the operator norm of the projections is given by one. Now,

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) = \mathbf{E}(\|f\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) \leq \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_0)\|_\infty^4)^{1/2} \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)^{1/2} \lesssim \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)^{1/2}$$

and, due to $Y_i = \hat{S}(0)f(X_{t_i}) + R_i + \varepsilon_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\|\bar{Y} - \bar{f}\|_{H^N}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{E}(\|R_i + \varepsilon_i\|_{L^2}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) \\ &\lesssim (\mathbf{E}(\|R_i\|_{L^2}^4)^{1/2} + \mathbf{E}(\|\varepsilon_i\|_{L^2}^4)^{1/2}) \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown just like in the proof of Proposition 4.5 that $\mathbf{E}(\|R_i\|_{L^2}^4) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and an explicit calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\|\varepsilon_i\|_{L^2}^4) &= \frac{\sigma^4}{\Delta^4} \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_\ell(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_\ell(s) \right)^2 \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^4}{\Delta^4} \sum_{\ell, \ell' \geq 1} \mathbf{E} \left(\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_\ell(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_\ell(s) \right)^2 \left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_{\ell'}(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_{\ell'}(s) \right)^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\Delta^4} \left(\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda_\ell \Delta}}{2\lambda_\ell} \right)^2 = \mathcal{O}(\Delta^{-3}). \end{aligned}$$

Gathering bounds, we have shown

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) \lesssim \Delta^{-3/2} \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)^{1/2}.$$

Using Lemma 4.6 in view of $D_m \leq N$, we get

$$\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \lesssim N \exp(-\gamma q_N \Delta) + N^2 \exp\left(-K' \frac{N}{2q_N L_m}\right).$$

Under the condition $\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N} \rightarrow \infty$, it is possible to choose (q_N) such that $q_N / (\frac{\nu \log N}{\Delta}) \rightarrow 1$ for some fixed $\nu > 0$. Then, we have

$$N \exp(-\gamma q_N \Delta) \leq N \exp(-\frac{\gamma \nu}{2} \log(N)) = N^{-(\frac{\gamma \nu}{2}-1)}.$$

Further, since $L_m = o(\frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N})$, for any $\beta > 0$ we have $L_m \leq \beta \frac{N\Delta}{\log^2 N}$ for sufficiently large N , implying

$$K' \frac{N}{2q_N L_m} \geq K' \frac{N\Delta}{4\nu \log N L_m} \geq \frac{K'}{4\nu\beta} \log(N)$$

as well as

$$N^2 \exp\left(-K' \frac{N}{2q_N L_m}\right) \leq N^{2-\frac{K'}{4\nu\beta}}.$$

Hence, for arbitrary $\alpha > 0$, we can choose ν sufficiently large and β sufficiently small such that $\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \leq N^{-(2\alpha+3)}$ and, thus,

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}^c}) \lesssim \Delta^{-3/2} \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{T^{3/2} N^\alpha} \lesssim \frac{1}{N^\alpha} = \frac{\Delta^\alpha}{T^\alpha} = o(\Delta^\alpha).$$

From here, the claim follows by choosing $\alpha = \gamma$. \square

Next, we prove our risk bound for our adaptive estimator.

Proof of Theorem 4.7. Due to the above argument in the proof of Theorem 4.3, it suffices to bound the estimation error on the event $\Xi_{N,M,\hat{m}}$. Since $\gamma_{N,M}(\hat{f}_{\hat{m}}) + \text{pen}(\hat{m}) \leq \gamma_{N,M}(f_m) + \text{pen}(m)$ for any $m \in \mathcal{M}_{N,M}$ and $f_m \in S_m$, we can modify the fundamental inequalities (30) and (38), respectively, to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_{\hat{m}} - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + 2\text{pen}(\hat{m}) &\leq 3\|f_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 + 2\text{pen}(m) + \frac{16}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|R_i\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + 16 \left(\sup_{t \in S_{\hat{m},m}: \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(\widehat{X}_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with $S_{m',m} := \text{span}(S_{m'} \cup \{f_m\})$. In view of (39) and Assumption (E), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_{\hat{m}} - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,\hat{m}}}) \\ &\leq 3\|f_m - f_A\|_{\pi,M}^2 + 2\text{pen}(m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \Delta^\gamma\right) \\ &\quad + 16\mathbf{E}\left(\left(\sup_{t \in S_{\hat{m},m}: \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle t(\widehat{X}_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{8}\text{pen}(\hat{m})\right) \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,\hat{m}}}\right) \\ &\lesssim \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \text{pen}(m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \Delta^\gamma\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}_{N,M}} \mathbf{E}\left(\left(\Gamma(m', m)^2 - \frac{1}{8}\text{pen}(m')\right)_+ \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,\hat{m}}}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

with

$$\Gamma(m', m) := \sup_{t \in S_{m',m}: \|t\|_{N,M}=1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(\widehat{X}_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}. \tag{42}$$

Using a martingale concentration of $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle t(\widehat{X}_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}$ and a classical chaining argument, Lemma 5.7 shows

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\left(\Gamma(m', m)^2 - \frac{1}{8} \text{pen}(m') \right)_+ \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}} \right) \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} e^{-D_{m'}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_{\bar{m}} - f\|_{N, M}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}}) \lesssim 3\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + 2\text{pen}(m) + 32 \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}} e^{-D_{m'}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \Delta^\gamma\right).$$

For our choices of approximation spaces, we have $\sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}_{N, M}} e^{-D_{m'}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ such that this term is negligible. \square

Next, we prove our oracle inequality for the L^2 -risk.

Proof of Corollary 4.8. First, we prove the bound in probability: For any $a > \|f\|_{L^2(A)}^2$, the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \geq 2a) &\leq \mathbf{P}(\|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \geq a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \geq a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2) + \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N, M, m}^c). \end{aligned}$$

Now, as in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we have $\|t\|_{N, M}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\|t\|_{\pi, M}^2 \geq \frac{c}{2}\|t\|_{L^2(A)}^2$ on $\Xi_{N, M, m}$ for all $t \in S_m$ where $c > 0$ is the constant from (28). Thus, using $\hat{f}_m - f_m \in S_m$ as well as Markov's inequality and the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \geq a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N, M}^2 \geq \frac{c}{2}(a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2)) \\ &\leq \frac{2\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} \|\hat{f}_m - f_m\|_{N, M}^2)}{c(a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2)} \\ &\leq \frac{4\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} \|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{N, M}^2) + 4\|f_m - f_A\|_{\pi, M}^2}{c(a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we set $a := K(\|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + D_m/T + \Delta^\gamma + (M\Delta^2)^{-1})$ for some $K > 1$. By Proposition 4.5 and Assumption (E), the above bound can be estimated up to a constant by

$$\frac{\|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + D_m/T + \Delta^\gamma + (M\Delta^2)^{-1}}{a - \|f_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2} \leq \frac{1}{K-1}.$$

Using $\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N, M, m}^c) \lesssim N^{-\alpha}$ for any power $\alpha > 0$ from the proof of Theorem 4.3, we can conclude that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{N, M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\|\hat{f}_m - f_A\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \geq 2K(\|f_A - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2})\right) \leq \varepsilon$$

which verifies the claimed bound in probability.

Next, we consider the truncated estimator $\hat{f}_m^{K_N}$: We have

$$\|\hat{f}_m^{K_N} - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \leq \|\hat{f}_m^{K_N} - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} + 2(\|f\|_{L^\infty(A)}^2 + K_N^2) \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}^c}$$

and, thus, as soon as $K_N \geq \|f\|_{L^\infty(A)}$, we can further bound

$$\|\hat{f}_m^{K_N} - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \leq \|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}} + 4K_N^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, m}^c}.$$

For the expectation of the first term, we get like in the above derivation of the bound in probability that $\mathbf{E}(\|\hat{f}_m - f\|_{L^2(A)}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N,M,m}}) \lesssim \|f_A - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + D_m/T + \Delta^\gamma + (M\Delta^2)^{-1}$. The expectation of the second term, $4K_N^2 \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)$, decreases faster than any negative power of N , thanks to Lemma 4.6 and the growth assumption on K_N . Thus, $4K_N^2 \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \lesssim N^{-\gamma} \lesssim \Delta^\gamma$, which finishes the proof. \square

The following proof verifies that the convergence rate is not affected when the parameter ϑ appearing in the definition of \hat{f}_m is replaced by an appropriate estimator.

Proof of Theorem 4.9. We verify the bound for $\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2$. The bound for $\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{L^2(A)}^2$ then follows as in the proof of Corollary 4.8. We define

$$\Psi_{N,M}^h := \left\{ (\hat{\vartheta} - \vartheta)^2 \leq h \frac{\Delta^{3/2}}{T} \right\}.$$

Step 1: We show that

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\Psi_{N,M}^h} \Delta^{-2} \|\hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i} - \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim \frac{h}{T}.$$

For fixed $\underline{\vartheta} \in (0, \vartheta)$, we have $\hat{\vartheta} \geq \underline{\vartheta}$ on the event $\Psi_{N,M}^h$ as soon as T is sufficiently large. Thus, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i} - \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} (e^{-\lambda_k \Delta} - e^{-\hat{\lambda}_k \Delta})^2 \langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M^2 \\ &\lesssim (\vartheta - \hat{\vartheta})^2 \Delta^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \lambda_k^2 e^{-\vartheta \pi^2 k^2 \Delta} \langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M^2 \\ &\leq h \frac{\Delta^{7/2}}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \lambda_k^2 e^{-\vartheta \pi^2 k^2 \Delta} \langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M^2 \end{aligned}$$

on $\Psi_{N,M}^h$. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\Psi_{N,M}^h} \|\hat{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i} - \check{S}(\Delta)X_{t_i}\|_{L^2}^2) \lesssim h \frac{\Delta^{7/2}}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \lambda_k^2 e^{-\vartheta \pi^2 k^2 \Delta} \mathbf{E}(\langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M^2)$$

and the claim follows from a Riemann sum argument if we show that $\mathbf{E}(\langle X_{t_i}, e_k \rangle_M^2) \lesssim \lambda_k^{-1}$. To that aim, we apply the decomposition $X_t = S(t)\xi + X_t^0 + N_t$. As in previous results, $S(t)\xi$ is negligible since we can choose t arbitrarily large due to stationarity. For the linear part, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\langle X_{t_i}^0, e_k \rangle_M^2) \lesssim \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-} \frac{1}{\lambda_\ell} \lesssim \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1}{(k + 2\ell M)^2} \leq \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1}{(1 + 2\ell)^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda_k}.$$

Finally, for the nonlinear part, define $n_\ell(t) := \langle N_t, e_\ell \rangle_{L^2}$. Then, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the spaces D_α from (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N_t, e_k \rangle_M^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-)} \lambda_\ell^{2\alpha} n_\ell^2 \right) \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-)} \lambda_\ell^{-2\alpha} \right) \leq \|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2 \left(\sum_{\ell \in (\mathcal{I}_k^+ \cup \mathcal{I}_k^-)} \lambda_\ell^{-2\alpha} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2 \left(\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \lambda_\ell^{-(2\alpha-1)} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \|N_t\|_{D_\alpha}^2, \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\alpha > 3/4$. Now, by picking $\alpha \in (\frac{3}{4}, 1)$, we get $\mathbf{E}(\langle N_t, e_k \rangle_M^2) \lesssim \lambda_k^{-1}$ in view of Remark 5.5.

Step 2: By Markov's inequality, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \geq a\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\{\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \geq a\} \cap \Psi_{N,M}^h \cap \Xi_{N,M,m}\right) + \mathbf{P}((\Psi_{N,M}^h)^c) + \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \\ &\leq a^{-1} \mathbf{E}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\Psi_{N,M}^h \cap \Xi_{N,M,m}} \|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2\right) + \mathbf{P}((\Psi_{N,M}^h)^c) + \mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c) \end{aligned}$$

for any $a > 0$. Now, using Step 1, we can show

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\mathbf{1}_{\Psi_{N,M}^h \cap \Xi_{N,M,m}} \|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2\right) \lesssim \|f - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2} + \frac{h}{T}$$

just like in the proof of Proposition 4.5. Further, $\mathbf{P}(\Xi_{N,M,m}^c)$ converges to 0 under the assumptions of this theorem and, thanks to Theorem 3.4, $\mathbf{P}((\Psi_{N,M}^h)^c)$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing h sufficiently large. Since $h/T \lesssim D_m/T$ holds for any fixed h , we have shown that, for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, we can pick $K > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{M,N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\|\check{f}_m - f_A\|_{N,M}^2 \geq K(\|f_A - f_m\|_{L^2(A)}^2 + \frac{D_m}{T} + \Delta^\gamma + \frac{1}{M\Delta^2})\right) < \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

5.4 Further proofs and auxiliary results

Before turning to the auxiliary results for nonparametric estimation of the nonlinearity f , we prove that condition (9) implies Assumptions (B) and (M).

Proof of Proposition 2.1. First, we sketch the existence proof and show that Assumption (B) is satisfied for $\xi = 0$. To that aim, we follow the line of arguments from [18, Theorem 7.7], see also [23, Proposition 6.1]. As before, write $m \equiv f(0)$ as well as $f_0(x) = f(x) - m$ and decompose $X_t = w(t) + v(t)$ with $w(t) := X_t^0 + \int_0^t S(r)m dr$ and $v(t) := S(t)\xi + \int_0^t S(t-s)f_0(X_s) dt$. It follows from Lemma 5.1 and $\|S(r)m\|_\infty \lesssim e^{-\lambda_0 r} \|m\|_\infty$ (cf. Lemma 5.2) that $w \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, E)$ holds almost surely and

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbf{E}(\|w_t\|_\infty^p) < \infty. \quad (43)$$

Further, since $F_0(u) := f_0 \circ u$ is a locally Lipschitz continuous function from E into itself, there exists a solution to equation (2) up to a terminal time $t_{\max} = t_{\max}(\omega) > 0$. Thus, global existence follows from an a-priori estimate on $\|v(\cdot)\|_\infty$. We consider the approximation $v_n := nR(n, A_\vartheta)S(t)\xi + \int_0^t nR(n, A_\vartheta)S(t-s)f_0(v(s) + w(s)) ds$ where $R(n, A_\vartheta) := (nI - A_\vartheta)^{-1}$ is the resolvent operator of A_ϑ . Then, v_n is differentiable in time, even when v is not. Now, for any $x \in E$ and $x^* \in \partial\|x\|$, it follows like in [18, Example 7.8] that $\langle A_\vartheta x, x^* \rangle \leq 0$ where $\partial\|x\|$ is the subdifferential of the norm. Recall that, for a function $u \in E$, the functional $h_u: E \ni v \mapsto \sigma_u v(\xi_u)$ with $\xi_u \in \arg \max_r |u(r)|$ and $\sigma_u := \text{sgn}(u(\xi_u))$ is an element of $\partial\|u\|$. Thus, setting $\delta_n(t) := v'_n(t) - A_\vartheta v_n - f(v_n(t) + w(t))$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^-}{dt} \|v_n(t)\|_\infty &\leq \left\langle \frac{d}{dt} v_n(t), h_{v_n(t)} \right\rangle = \langle A_\vartheta v_n(t), h_{v_n(t)} \rangle + \langle f(v_n(t) + w(t)), h_{v_n(t)} \rangle + \langle \delta_n(t), h_{v_n(t)} \rangle \\ &\leq \langle f(v_n(t) + w(t)), h_{v_n(t)} \rangle + \|\delta_n(t)\|_\infty \\ &\leq -a\|v_n(t)\|_\infty + b\|w(t)\|_\infty^\beta + c + \|\delta_n(t)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's inequality and the fact that $v_n(t) \rightarrow v(t)$ and $\delta_n(t) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact time intervals yields

$$\|v(t)\|_\infty \leq e^{-at} \|\xi\|_\infty + \int_0^t e^{-a(t-s)} (b\|w(s)\|_\infty^\beta + c) ds.$$

By Jensen's inequality, we pass to

$$\|v(t)\|_\infty^p \lesssim e^{-apt} \|\xi\|_\infty^p + \int_0^t e^{-a(t-s)} (b\|w(t)\|_\infty^\beta + c)^p ds \cdot \left(\int_0^t e^{-as} ds \right)^{p-1}$$

and Fubini's theorem as well as (43) show that there exists $K > 0$ such that for non-random initial conditions $\xi = x \in E$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_\infty^p) \lesssim e^{-apt} \|x\|_\infty^p + K. \quad (44)$$

In particular, Assumption (B) with $\xi = 0$ is satisfied.

Further, based on their derivation of lower bounds for the transition densities associated with the Markov semigroup (P_t) , Goldys and Maslowski [23, Theorem 6.3] show the existence of an invariant measure π on E and of constants $C, \gamma > 0$ such that

$$\|P_t^* \nu - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C \left(\int_E \|u\|_\infty \nu(du) + 1 \right) e^{-\gamma t} \quad \text{with} \quad P_t^* \nu := \int_E P_t(u, \cdot) \nu(du)$$

holds for all probability measures ν on E . Thus, we have $\|P_t(x, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C(\|x\|_\infty + 1)e^{-\gamma t}$ and $P_t(x, \cdot)$ converges weakly to $\pi(\cdot)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in E$. By Skorokhod's representation theorem, there exists a probability space on which there are E -valued random variables Z, Z_1, Z_2, \dots with $Z_i \sim P_i(x, \cdot)$, $Z \sim \pi$ and $Z_i \rightarrow Z$ almost surely. Denoting the expectation on the second probability space by $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}$, Fatou's Lemma yields

$$\int_E \|u\|_\infty^p \pi(du) = \tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\|Z\|_\infty^p) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\|Z_i\|_\infty^p) = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \|u\|_\infty^p P_i(x, du) < \infty$$

by (44). Thus, if $X_0 = \xi \sim \pi$, then $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_\infty^p) = \mathbf{E}(\|X_0\|_\infty^p) < \infty$ and

$$\int_E \|P_t(u, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \pi(du) \leq C \left(\int_E \|u\|_\infty \pi(du) + 1 \right) e^{-\gamma t} \lesssim e^{-\gamma t},$$

as required for (M) as well as (B) in case of a stationary initial condition. \square

5.4.1 Technical Lemmas for the nonparametric estimator of f

The following proof verifies the connection between the L^2 -norm on $[0, 1]$ and its empirical counterpart.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. In view of Dini's test, the Hölder condition implies convergence of the Fourier series of H at the points y_k , i.e., $\bar{H}^n(y_k) := \sum_{l=1}^n h_l e_l(y_k) \rightarrow H(y_k)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $1 \leq k \leq M-1$. Therefore,

$$|\langle H, e_k \rangle_M - \langle \bar{H}^n, e_k \rangle_M| \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} |H(y_l) - \bar{H}^n(y_l)| |e_k(y_l)|$$

tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the sequence $\langle \bar{H}^n, e_k \rangle_M = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^+ \cap [1, n]} h_l - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}_k^- \cap [1, n]} h_l$ converges to the limit $\langle H, e_k \rangle_M$, proving the first part of the Lemma. In the same way, using $e_l(y_k) = \pm e_j(y_k)$ for $l \in \mathcal{I}_j^\pm$, one can show that $H(y_k) = \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H_l e_l(y_k)$. Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} H^2(y_k) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H_l e_l(y_k) \right)^2 = \sum_{l, l'=1}^{M-1} H_l H_{l'} \langle e_l, e_{l'} \rangle_M = \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H_l^2 = \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2. \quad \square$$

The following lemma analyzes the regularity of X_t in the spaces

$$D_\varepsilon := \mathcal{D}((-A_\vartheta)^\varepsilon) := \left\{ u \in L^2((0, 1)) : \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^{2\varepsilon} \langle u, e_k \rangle^2 < \infty \right\} \quad (45)$$

endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{D_\varepsilon} := \|(-A_\vartheta)^\varepsilon u\|_{L^2}$. For $\varepsilon < 1/4$, these spaces can be identified with L^2 -Sobolov spaces on $(0, 1)$, namely $D_\varepsilon = W^{2\varepsilon, 2}$ and the norms are equivalent. For a proof of this characterization, we refer to, e.g., [9].

Lemma 5.4. *Under Assumption (M), we have $\mathbf{E}(\|X_t\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) = \mathbf{E}(\|X_0\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}(\|f(X_t)\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) = \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_0)\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon < 1/4$ and $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. We use the usual decomposition $X_t = S(t)X_0 + X_t^0 + N_t$. By stationarity, we may choose $t = 1$. As before, $\mathbf{E}(\|X_1^0\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) < \infty$ can be shown by a direct calculation. Further, $\mathbf{E}(\|S(1)X_0\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) < \infty$ follows from

$$\|S(1)X_0\|_{D_\varepsilon}^2 = \sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-2\lambda_k} \lambda_k^{2\varepsilon} \langle X_0, e_k \rangle^2 \leq \|X_0\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-2\lambda_k} \lambda_k^{2\varepsilon} \lesssim \|X_0\|_{\infty}^2.$$

To treat $N_1 = \int_0^1 S(1-s)f(X_s) ds$, note that

$$\|(-A_\vartheta)^\varepsilon S(h)u\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k^{2\varepsilon} e^{-2\lambda_k h} \langle u, e_k \rangle^2 \leq \sup_{\lambda \geq \lambda_1} \lambda^{2\varepsilon} e^{-2\lambda h} \|u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The function $\lambda \mapsto \lambda^{2\varepsilon} e^{-2\lambda h}$ attains its maximum over \mathbb{R}_+ in $\lambda^* := \varepsilon/h$ and is monotonically decreasing on $[\lambda^*, \infty)$. Thus, we have $\sup_{\lambda \geq \lambda_1} \lambda^{2\varepsilon} e^{-2\lambda h} \leq g^2(h)$ with $g(h) := (\frac{\varepsilon}{eh})^\varepsilon$ for $h \leq \varepsilon/\lambda_1$ and $g(h) := \lambda_1^\varepsilon e^{-\lambda_1 h}$ for $h > \varepsilon/\lambda_1$. Since $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, we can use Jensen's inequality to show

$$\begin{aligned} \|N_1\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p &\leq \left(\int_0^1 g(1-s) \|f(X_s)\|_{L^2} ds \right)^p \leq \left(\int_0^1 g(s) ds \right)^{p-1} \left(\int_0^1 g(1-s) \|f(X_s)\|_{L^2}^p ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \int_0^1 g(1-s) \|f(X_s)\|_{L^2}^p ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{E}(\|N_1\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_0)\|_{L^2}^p) \lesssim \mathbf{E}(\|f(X_0)\|_{\infty}^p) < \infty$ by Assumption (M) which shows the claim for X_t . In order to transfer the result to $f(X_t)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(X_t)\|_{D_\varepsilon}^2 &\lesssim \|f(X_t)\|_{W^{2\varepsilon, 2}}^2 = \|f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{(f(X_t(x)) - f(X_t(y)))^2}{|x-y|^{1+4\varepsilon}} dx dy \\ &\leq \|f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f'(X_t)\|_{\infty}^2 \|X_t\|_{D_\varepsilon}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|f'(X_t)\|_{\infty}^4 + \|X_t\|_{D_\varepsilon}^4, \end{aligned}$$

from where the claim follows by Assumption (M) and (7) in view of the first part of this proof. \square

Remark 5.5. The treatment of the nonlinear component in the above proof shows that $\mathbf{E}(\|N_t\|_{D_\varepsilon}^p) < \infty$ holds for all $\varepsilon < 1$.

The following lemma is useful for bounding the expression $\|\hat{S}(0)f(X_t) - f(X_t)\|_{L^2}^2$ appearing in the remainder term R_i from the regression model (25). Of particular interest to us is the situation where α is close to $1/4$ and, hence, the exponent $\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}$ can be chosen close to $1/4$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $H \in C^{2\alpha}([0, 1]) \cap D_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Further, let $H^M := \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} H_k e_k$ where $H_k := \langle H, e_k \rangle_M = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H(y_l) e_k(y_l)$. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|H - H^M\|_{L^2}^2 \leq CK^2 \delta^{\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}}$$

where $K := \max(\|H\|_{\infty}, \|H\|_{C^{2\alpha}}, \|H\|_{D_\alpha})$.

Proof. First of all, by regarding H_k as a Riemann sum, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} |H_k - h_k| &= \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} H(y_l) e_k(y_l) - \int_0^1 H(y) e_k(y) dy \right| \leq \sum_{l=0}^M \int_{y_l}^{y_{l+1}} |H(y_l) e_k(y_l) - H(y) e_l(y)| dy \\ &\lesssim (\|e_k\|_{\infty} \|H\|_{C^{2\alpha}} + \|H\|_{\infty} \|e_k\|_{C^{2\alpha}}) \delta^{2\alpha} \lesssim (\|H\|_{C^{2\alpha}} + \|H\|_{\infty} k^{2\alpha}) \delta^{2\alpha} \lesssim K \lambda_k^\alpha \delta^{2\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Similarly, since $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} H^2(y_k) = \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} H_k^2$ holds by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H\|_{L^2}^2 \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^{M-1} H^2(y_k) - \|H\|_{L^2}^2 \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \int_{y_k}^{y_{k+1}} |H^2(y_k) - H^2(y)| dy \\ &\leq \|H^2\|_{C^{2\alpha}} \delta^{2\alpha} \leq 2\|H\|_{\infty} \|H\|_{C^{2\alpha}} \delta^{2\alpha} \lesssim K^2 \delta^{2\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Also, note that for $h_k := \langle H, e_k \rangle_{L^2}$ and any $R \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\sum_{l \geq R} h_l^2 \leq \lambda_R^{-2\alpha} \sum_{l \geq R} \lambda_l^{2\alpha} h_l^2 \leq \|H\|_{D_\alpha}^2 \lambda_R^{-2\alpha} \lesssim K^2 / R^{4\alpha}. \quad (48)$$

The three inequalities just derived are now used to bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|H - H^M\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\langle H - H^M, H \rangle_{L^2} \\ &\leq \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2 - \|H\|_{L^2}^2 + 2|\langle H - H^M, H \rangle_{L^2}| : \end{aligned}$$

Due to (47), the first term can be bounded by $K^2 \delta^{2\alpha} \lesssim K^2 \delta^{\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}}$ up to a constant. For the second term, using Parseval's identity, we get

$$|\langle H - H^M, H \rangle_{L^2}| = \left| \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} (h_l - H_l) h_l + \sum_{l=M}^{\infty} h_l^2 \right| \leq \left| \sum_{l=1}^{M-1} (h_l - H_l) h_l \right| + \sum_{l=M}^{\infty} h_l^2 =: T_1 + T_2.$$

It follows directly from (48) that $T_2 \lesssim K^2 / M^4 \lesssim K^2 \delta^{\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}}$. To estimate T_1 , we decompose

$$T_1 \leq \left| \sum_{l=1}^{M_0-1} (h_l - H_l) h_l \right| + \left| \sum_{l=M_0}^{M-1} (h_l - H_l) h_l \right| =: T_{11} + T_{12}$$

for some intermediate value $M_0 \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$. Now, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (46), we get

$$T_{11}^2 \leq \left(\sum_{l=1}^{M_0-1} \lambda_l^{-2\alpha} (h_l - H_l)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{M_0-1} \lambda_l^{2\alpha} h_l^2 \right) \lesssim K^2 M_0 \delta^{4\alpha} \|H\|_{D_\alpha}^2 \lesssim K^4 M_0 \delta^{4\alpha}$$

and, by (48),

$$T_{12}^2 \leq \sum_{l=M_0}^{M-1} (h_l - H_l)^2 \sum_{l=M_0}^{M-1} h_l^2 \lesssim (\|H\|_{L^2}^2 + \|H^M\|_{L^2}^2) \sum_{l=M_0}^{\infty} h_l^2 \lesssim K^4 / M_0^{4\alpha}.$$

Balancing the bounds for T_{11} and T_{12} shows that it is optimal to take $M_0 \approx \delta^{-\frac{4\alpha}{4\alpha+1}}$ and, with this choice, we obtain the overall bound $T_1 \lesssim K^2 \delta^{\frac{8\alpha^2}{4\alpha+1}}$ which finishes the proof. \square

Finally, we bound the expectation of $\Gamma(m', m)$ from (42).

Lemma 5.7. *Let $C \geq 1$ be a constant satisfying property (28). If $\text{pen}(m') \geq 400 \log(12\sqrt{C}) \frac{\sigma^2 D_{m'}}{T}$, then*

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\left(\Gamma(m', m)^2 - \frac{1}{8} \text{pen}(m') \right)_+ \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}} \right) \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} e^{-D_{m'}}.$$

Proof. Step 1. For any $\tau, v > 0$ and $t \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} S_m$, we prove that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(\widehat{X}_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \geq \tau, \|t\|_{N, M}^2 \leq v^2 \right) \leq e^{-(T\tau^2)/(2\sigma^2 v^2)}. \quad (49)$$

Since

$$\widehat{t(X_{t_i})} = \hat{S}(0)t(X_{t_i}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} \langle X_{t_i}, e_\ell \rangle_M e_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_i = \frac{\sigma}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} S(t_{i+1} - s) dW_s,$$

Parseval's identity yields

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \widehat{t(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} \langle t(X_{t_i}), e_\ell \rangle_M \frac{\sigma}{\Delta} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-\lambda_\ell(t_{i+1}-s)} d\beta_\ell(s) = \frac{\sigma}{T} Y^M(T)$$

with the Itô process $Y^M(s) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} Y_\ell(s)$, $s \geq 0$, and, for $\ell = 1, \dots, M-1$,

$$Y_\ell(s) := \int_0^s H_\ell(h) d\beta_\ell(h), \quad H_\ell(h) := \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(X_{t_i}), e_\ell \rangle_M e^{-\lambda_\ell(t_{i+1}-h)} \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(h).$$

For each ℓ , the processes Y_ℓ as well as Y^M are martingales with quadratic variation satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Y^M \rangle_T &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} \langle Y_\ell \rangle_T = \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(X_{t_i}), e_\ell \rangle_M^2 \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} e^{-2\lambda_\ell(t_{i+1}-s)} ds \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{M-1} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle t(X_{t_i}), e_\ell \rangle_M^2 \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda_\ell \Delta}}{2\lambda_\ell} \leq N\Delta \|t\|_{N,M}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 4.2 in the last inequality. For any $\lambda > 0$, the process $(\exp(\lambda Y_s^M - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \langle Y^M \rangle_s), s \geq 0)$ inherits the martingale property from Y^M . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \widehat{t(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \geq \tau, \|t\|_{M,N}^2 \leq v^2\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\sigma}{T} Y^M(T) \geq \tau, \langle Y^M \rangle_T \leq T v^2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\exp\left(\lambda Y^M(T) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \langle Y^M \rangle_T\right) \geq \exp\left(\lambda \frac{T\tau}{\sigma} - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} T v^2\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \frac{T\tau}{\sigma} + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} T v^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing the minimizer $\lambda = \frac{\tau}{\sigma v^2}$ yields (49).

Step 2. We use a chaining argument to deduce from Step 1 a bound for (41): Due to the nesting assumption, we have on $\Xi_{N,M,\bar{m}}$ that

$$\sup_{t \in S_{m',m}: \|t\|_{N,M} = 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \widehat{t(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \lesssim \sup_{t \in S_{m',m}: \|t\|_{L^2} = 1} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \widehat{t(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Since the dimension of $S_{m',m}$ is bounded by $D_{m'} + 1$, we can cover the L^2 -unit ball in $S_{m',m}$ with a ε -net \mathcal{G}_ε of the maximal size $(3/\varepsilon)^{D_{m'}+1}$ [37, Lemma 4.14]. Considering a sequence $\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}$ of ε_k -nets with $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon 2^{-k}$, $k \geq 1$, and some $\varepsilon > 0$, we denote for any $t \in S_{m',m}$ by $\pi_k(t)$ the closest element in $\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}$ and set $\pi_0(f) = 0$. We obtain from $t = \sum_{k \geq 1} (\pi_k(t) - \pi_{k-1}(t))$ and Lemma 4.2 the decomposition

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle \widehat{t(X_{t_i})}, \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k \geq 1} \langle \hat{S}_0(\pi_k(t) - \pi_{k-1}(t))(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2}.$$

Under Assumption (E) and on the event $\Xi_{N,M,\bar{m}}$, we have $\|\pi_k(t) - \pi_{k-1}(t)\|_{N,M} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3C}{2}} \|\pi_k(t) - \pi_{k-1}(t)\|_{L^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3C}{2}} \varepsilon (2^{-k} + 2^{-k+1}) \leq 4\sqrt{C} \varepsilon 2^{-k}$ for C from (28). Together with Step 2, we obtain for

$\varepsilon = C^{-1/2}/4$ and any sequence (τ_k) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\Gamma(m', m) \geq \sum_{k \geq 1} 2^{-k} \tau_k\right\} \cap \Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{t_k \in \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}, t_{k-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}} \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \hat{S}_0(t_k - t_{k-1})(X_{t_i}), \varepsilon_i \rangle_{L^2} \geq 2^{-k} \tau_k, \|t_k - t_{k-1}\|_{N, M} \leq 4\sqrt{C}\varepsilon 2^{-k}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{t_k \in \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}, t_{k-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}} e^{-T\tau_k^2/(2\sigma^2)} \\ & = \sum_{k \geq 1} \exp\left(-T\tau_k^2/(2\sigma^2) + \log|\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}| + \log|\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}|\right). \end{aligned}$$

In view of $\log|\mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon_k}| \leq (D_{m'} + 1)\log(3/\varepsilon_k) = (D_{m'} + 1)(\log(3/\varepsilon) + k\log 2) \leq 2\log(3/\varepsilon)(D_{m'} + 1)k$ we choose $\tau_k^2 = \frac{2\sigma^2}{T}(D_{m'} + \tau + 4\log(3/\varepsilon)(D_{m'} + 2)k)$ for some $\tau > 0$. Then the above probability is bounded by

$$e^{-\tau - D_{m'}} \sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-4\log(3/\varepsilon)k} \leq e^{-\tau - D_{m'}}.$$

Owing to $(\sum_{k \geq 1} 2^{-k} \tau_k)^2 \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} 2^{-k} \tau_k^2 = \frac{2\sigma^2}{T}(D_{m'} + \tau + 4\log(3/\varepsilon)(D_{m'} + 2) \sum_{k \geq 1} k 2^{-k}) \leq \frac{2\sigma^2 \tau}{T} + \frac{50\sigma^2}{T} \log(3/\varepsilon) D_{m'}$. We conclude that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\Gamma(m', m)^2 - 50\log(3/\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma^2 D_{m'}}{T} \geq \frac{2\sigma^2 \tau}{T}\right\} \cap \Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}\right) \leq e^{-\tau - D_{m'}}.$$

If $\text{pen}(m') \geq 400\log(3/\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma^2 D_{m'}}{T}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(\left(\Gamma(m', m)^2 - \frac{1}{8}\text{pen}(m')\right)_+ \mathbf{1}_{\Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}}\right) & \leq \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\Gamma(m', m)^2 - 50\log(3/\varepsilon) \frac{\sigma^2 D_{m'}}{T} \geq r\right\} \cap \Xi_{N, M, \bar{m}}\right) dr \\ & \leq e^{-D_{m'}} \int_0^\infty e^{-Tr/(2\sigma^2)} dr = \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} e^{-D_{m'}}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] Altmeyer, R., Bretschneider, T., Janák, J., and Reiß, M. (2020a). Parameter estimation in an SPDE model for cell repolarisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.06340*.
- [2] Altmeyer, R., Cialenco, I., and Pasemann, G. (2020b). Parameter estimation for semilinear SPDEs from local measurements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14728*.
- [3] Altmeyer, R. and Reiß, M. (2020). Nonparametric estimation for linear SPDEs from local measurements. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* Forthcoming.
- [4] Bally, V. and Pardoux, E. (1998). Malliavin calculus for white noise driven parabolic SPDEs. *Potential Anal.*, 9(1):27–64.
- [5] Baraud, Y., Comte, F., and Viennet, G. (2001). Adaptive estimation in autoregression or β -mixing regression via model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 29(3):839–875.
- [6] Berbee, H. C. P. (1979). *Random walks with stationary increments and renewal theory*. Mathematical Centre Tracts. Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam.
- [7] Bibinger, M. and Trabs, M. (2020). Volatility estimation for stochastic PDEs using high-frequency observations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(5):3005–3052.

- [8] Birgé, L. and Massart, P. (1997). From model selection to adaptive estimation. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, pages 55–87. Springer, New York.
- [9] Bonforte, M., Sire, Y., and Vázquez, J. L. (2015). Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic behaviour for fractional porous medium equations on bounded domains. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(12):5725–5767.
- [10] Cerrai, S. (1999). Ergodicity for stochastic reaction-diffusion systems with polynomial coefficients. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 67(1-2):17–51.
- [11] Chong, C. (2020). High-frequency analysis of parabolic stochastic PDEs. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(2):1143–1167.
- [12] Cialenco, I. (2018). Statistical inference for SPDEs: an overview. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.*, 21(2):309–329.
- [13] Cialenco, I. and Glatt-Holtz, N. (2011). Parameter estimation for the stochastically perturbed Navier-Stokes equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 121(4):701–724.
- [14] Cialenco, I. and Huang, Y. (2020). A note on parameter estimation for discretely sampled SPDEs. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 20(3).
- [15] Comte, F., Genon-Catalot, V., Rozenholc, Y., et al. (2007). Penalized nonparametric mean square estimation of the coefficients of diffusion processes. *Bernoulli*, 13(2):514–543.
- [16] Comte, F. and Rozenholc, Y. (2002). Adaptive estimation of mean and volatility functions in (auto-)regressive models. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 97(1):111–145.
- [17] Da Prato, G. and Zabczyk, J. (1996). *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [18] Da Prato, G. and Zabczyk, J. (2014). *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [19] Daubechies, I. (1992). *Ten lectures on wavelets*, volume 61 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA.
- [20] Doukhan, P. (1994). *Mixing*, volume 85 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Properties and examples.
- [21] Galtchouk, L. I. and Pergamenshchikov, S. M. (2015). Efficient pointwise estimation based on discrete data in ergodic nonparametric diffusions. *Bernoulli*, 21(4):2569–2594.
- [22] Goldys, B. and Maslowski, B. (2002). Parameter estimation for controlled semilinear stochastic systems: identifiability and consistency. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 80(2):322–343.
- [23] Goldys, B. and Maslowski, B. (2006). Lower estimates of transition densities and bounds on exponential ergodicity for stochastic PDE’s. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(4):1451–1496.
- [24] Haken, H. (2013). *Synergetics: Introduction and advanced topics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [25] Hildebrandt, F. (2020). On generating fully discrete samples of the stochastic heat equation on an interval. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 162. Article 108750.
- [26] Hildebrandt, F. and Trabs, M. (2019). Parameter estimation for spdes based on discrete observations in time and space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01004*.

- [27] Hoffmann, M. (1999). Adaptive estimation in diffusion processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 79(1):135–163.
- [28] Kaino, Y. and Uchida, M. (2020). Adaptive estimator for a parabolic linear SPDE with a small noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05353*.
- [29] Kaino, Y. and Uchida, M. (2021). Parametric estimation for a parabolic linear SPDE model based on discrete observations. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 211:190–220.
- [30] Koski, T. and Loges, W. (1985). Asymptotic statistical inference for a stochastic heat flow problem. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 3:185–189.
- [31] Lototsky, S. V. (2009). Statistical inference for stochastic parabolic equations: a spectral approach. *Publ. Mat.*, 53(1):3–45.
- [32] Lunardi, A. (1985). Interpolation spaces between domains of elliptic operators and spaces of continuous functions with applications to nonlinear parabolic equations. *Math. Nachr.*, 121(1):295–318.
- [33] Lunardi, A. (2012). *Analytic semigroups and optimal regularity in parabolic problems*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [34] Mahdi Khalil, Z. and Tudor, C. (2019). Estimation of the drift parameter for the fractional stochastic heat equation via power variation. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.*, 6(4):397–417.
- [35] Manthey, R. (1986). Existence and uniqueness of a solution of a reaction-diffusion equation with polynomial nonlinearity and white noise disturbance. *Math. Nachr.*, 125:121–133.
- [36] Marinelli, C., Nualart, E., and Quer-Sardanyons, L. (2013). Existence and regularity of the density for solutions to semilinear dissipative parabolic SPDEs. *Potential Anal.*, 39(3):287–311.
- [37] Massart, P. (2007). *Concentration inequalities and model selection*, volume 1896 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin. Lectures from the 33rd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2003.
- [38] Mueller, C. and Nualart, D. (2008). Regularity of the density for the stochastic heat equation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 13(74):2248–2258.
- [39] Nualart, D. and Quer-Sardanyons, L. (2009). Gaussian density estimates for solutions to quasi-linear stochastic partial differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(11):3914–3938.
- [40] Pasemann, G., Flemming, S., Alonso, S., Beta, C., and Stannat, W. (2020). Diffusivity estimation for activator-inhibitor models: Theory and application to intracellular dynamics of the actin cytoskeleton. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.09421*.
- [41] Pasemann, G. and Stannat, W. (2020). Drift estimation for stochastic reaction-diffusion systems. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 14(1):547–579.
- [42] Rohde, A. (2004). On the asymptotic equivalence and rate of convergence of nonparametric regression and Gaussian white noise. *Statist. Decisions*, 22(3):235–243.
- [43] Shevchenko, R., Slaoui, M., and Tudor, C. A. (2019). Generalized k -variations and Hurst parameter estimation for the fractional wave equation via Malliavin calculus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02369*.
- [44] Sinestrari, E. (1985). On the abstract Cauchy problem of parabolic type in spaces of continuous functions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 107(1):16–66.

- [45] Torres, S., Tudor, C., Viens, F., et al. (2014). Quadratic variations for the fractional-colored stochastic heat equation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 19.
- [46] Viennet, G. (1997). Inequalities for absolutely regular sequences: application to density estimation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(4):467–492.