Strong rate of convergence of the Euler scheme for SDEs with irregular drift driven by Lévy noise
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Abstract
We study the strong rate of convergence of the Euler–Maruyama scheme for a multidimensional stochastic differential equation (SDE)

\[ dX_t = b(X_t)dt + dL_t, \]

with irregular \( \beta \)-Hölder drift, \( \beta > 0 \), driven by a Lévy process with exponent \( \alpha \in (0, 2] \). For \( \alpha \in [2/3, 2] \) we obtain strong \( L_p \) and almost sure convergence rates in the whole range \( \beta > 1 - \alpha/2 \), where the SDE is known to be strongly well–posed. This significantly improves the current state of the art both in terms of convergence rate and the range of \( \alpha \). In particular, the obtained convergence rate does not deteriorate for large \( p \) and is always at least \( n^{-1/2} \); this allowed us to show for the first time that the the Euler–Maruyama scheme for such SDEs converges almost surely and obtain explicit convergence rate. Furthermore, our results are new even in the case of smooth drifts. Our technique is based on a new extension of the stochastic sewing arguments.

1. Introduction

We consider the stochastic differential equation

\[ dX_t = b(X_t)dt + dL_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad X_0 = x_0, \quad (1.1) \]

driven by a \( d \)-dimensional Lévy process \( L \). Here the coefficient \( b \) is a measurable function \( \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \), and the initial condition \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Throughout the article the dimension \( d \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots \} \) is arbitrary.

The ‘strength’ of a Lévy process can often be characterised by a single parameter \( \alpha \in (0, 2] \) called the stable index (for various examples see Section 2.1), with \( \alpha = 2 \) corresponding to the usual Brownian motion. This parameter can be used to describe the regularisation provided by \( L \). Indeed, assuming a natural nondegeneracy condition (which essentially requires that for \( \alpha \neq 2 \) the span of possible jumps is \( \mathbb{R}^d \)), (1.1) has a unique strong solution whenever \( b \) belongs to the Hölder space \( C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d) \), where \( \beta \) satisfies

\[ \beta > 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}. \]

---
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This solution theory was developed in [Pri12, Pri15, Pri18, CSZ18].

Once the well-posedness is understood, it is natural to investigate basic discretisations of the equation. The most classical Euler-Maruyama approximation of (1.1) reads as

\[ dX^n_t = b(X^n_{\kappa_n(t)}) \, dt + dL_t, \quad X^n_0 = x_0, \]  

(1.3)

with \( \kappa_n(t) := |nt|^{-1} \). For Lipschitz \( b \) the convergence of \( X^n \) to \( X \) can be seen by very straightforward arguments. The \( L \)-rate of convergence obtained this way, however, deteriorates for large \( p \). Even though our main focus will be on non-Lipschitz coefficients, it is noteworthy and perhaps surprising that our method coincidentally also solves this moment issue and therefore gives new results even in the Lipschitz case.

One of the first results regarding convergence of \( X^n \) to \( X \) in the case of irregular \( b \) is [PT17]. It is shown there that

\[ \left\| \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |X_t - X^n_t| \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq N n^{-\left(\frac{2\wedge \beta}{p}\right)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \]  

(1.4)

for the case where \( L \) is a truncated symmetric \( \alpha \)-stable process, \( \alpha \in (1,2), \beta > 2 - \alpha \); here \( N = N(\alpha,\beta,p,d) \) is a certain positive constant. This result was improved in [KSI19] in three directions: first, the condition on \( \beta \) is relaxed to \( \beta > 2/\alpha - 1 \); second, the rate of convergence in (1.4) is improved and is \( \frac{2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p} \); third, the class of considered Lévy processes is significantly extended and additionally includes standard isotropic stable processes, tempered stable processes, relativistic stable processes, and others. The same rate \( \frac{2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p} \) is derived [MX18] even for multiplicative noise, under the further relaxed condition \( \beta > 1 - \alpha/2 \), under which strong solutions are known to exist. Very recently, for the case of standard isotropic stable processes, [HSY21] showed that the strong \( L \)-rate of \( \frac{2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p} \) holds in the whole range \( \beta > 1 - \alpha/2 \) even when \( \beta \) denotes regularity only in a certain Sobolev scale. A standard example of a coefficient that possesses Sobolev but not Hölder regularity is one with discontinuity of the first kind, in this case scalar SDEs driven by a Brownian motion and a finite activity Poisson process were studied in [PS21].

From the discussion above, the reader may notice the following gaps in the literature. All of the works mentioned above consider the case \( \alpha \in [1,2] \); recall however that the strong well-posedness of (1.1) is known in the whole range \( \alpha \in (0,2) \). Further, the aforementioned moment issue is still present: the convergence rate becomes arbitrary slow for very large \( p \). Note that this also has the consequence that one can not deduce almost sure convergence of \( |X_t - X^n_t| \) as \( n \to \infty \). Indeed, to show this one has to prove the bound \( \mathbb{E}|X_t - X^n_t|^p \leq N n^{-1+\varepsilon} \) for some \( p > 0, \varepsilon > 0 \), while the best available bound is \( \mathbb{E}|X_t - X^n_t|^p \leq N n^{-1} \), which is not sufficient.

The present paper closes these gaps; the novelties can be summarised as follows. First, our methods are free from the moment issue. Although the \( L \)-rate of convergence does have some dependence on \( p \), it always stays above 1/2 so it can not get arbitrarily poor. Another factor that may provide poor rate in the previous results is if \( \beta/\alpha \) is small. This issue is also not present here. As a corollary, we also obtain almost sure convergence (and rate) of the Euler-Maruyama scheme, to our knowledge for the first time for SDEs of the type (1.1).

Second, we are not restricted to \( \alpha \in [1,2] \). In the regime \( \alpha \in [2/3,2] \) our assumption on \( \beta \) coincides with the optimal condition (1.2). We cover some (but not the optimal)
range of irregular drifts when $\alpha \in (1/2, 2/3)$. For $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ we require $b$ to be regular, the contribution in this case is the handling of high moments.

Third, our results are new even in the smooth drifts where the strong $L_p$ rate, which one trivially gets, namely, $\frac{1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p}$, $p \geq 1$, is improved to $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}$, $p \geq 2$.

Finally, the class of considered driving Lévy processes is fairly large. It is similar to [KS19], so it includes not only the standard stable processes but also their different “relatives”. The conditions on the Lévy process, see [H1 H3] below, are easy to verify for various examples, see Section 2.1.

Our approach is rather different from the one used in the papers [PT17, MX18, KS19b, HSY21] discussed above as we do not rely on any form of Zvonkin transformation or Itô-Tanaka trick (in fact, Itô’s formula is not even once applied for either $X$ or $X^n$). Instead, we employ stochastic sewing, which originates from the work of Lê [Lê20] and has been developed for discretisation problems in [BDG21a, BDG21b, DGL21, LL21]. In [BDG21a] the Euler-Maruyama scheme for fractional Brownian motion-driven SDEs is studied. One may hope due to the scaling correspondance between stable indices and Hurst parameters ($\alpha \leftrightarrow 1/H$) that the methods therein translate easily to the Lévy case. This is unfortunately not the case, for several reasons. First, the usual regime $H < 1$ corresponds to $\alpha > 1$. To consider $\alpha < 1$, one needs tools from the $H > 1$ case, in particular the shifted stochastic sewing lemma [Ger20]. Second, high moments of Lévy processes do not scale (or they don’t even exist for several examples). Finally, there is no useful form of Girsanov theorem to remove the drift at any part of the analysis.

This article deals only with the strong rate of convergence. Clearly, the weak rate of convergence is at least as good as the strong rate of convergence; already with this simple observation our results imply weak rates which are better than the ones available in the literature [KP02, MZ11] in the range of parameters that we cover. An interesting and challenging question is whether these weak rates can be improved further, and whether the range of $\beta$ can be upgraded to $\beta > 1 - \alpha$ (in this range SDE (1.1) is weakly well–posed see [Kul19]). We leave this for the future work.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Our main result concerning the $L_p$ convergence of the numerical scheme is formulated in Section 2. Examples of Lévy processes satisfying the assumptions of the convergence theorem are given in Section 2.1. A number of technical tools needed for the proofs are collected in Section 3. The main results are proved in Section 4, whilst the proofs of some technical auxiliary statements are placed in the Appendix.
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2. Main results

We begin by introducing the basic notation. For $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and a Borel subset $Q$ of $\mathbb{R}^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C^\beta(Q)$ be the corresponding Hölder space, that is, the set of functions $f : Q \to \mathbb{R}$
such that
\[ \|f\|_{C^\beta(Q)} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Q}} |f(x)| + [f]_{C^\beta(Q)} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Q}} |f(x)| + \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{Q}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\beta} < \infty. \]

With a slightly unconventional notation we set \( C^0(Q) \) to be the set of bounded measurable functions equipped with the supremum norm. The definition of the analogous spaces for \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued functions is simply understood coordinate-wise. For \( \beta \in [1, \infty) \) we denote by \( C^\beta(Q) \) the set of functions whose weak derivatives of order 0, 1, \ldots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor \) all have representatives belonging to \( C^{\beta - \lfloor \beta \rfloor}(Q) \). In the particular case \( Q = \mathbb{R}^d \) sometimes we will use a shorthand and write \( C^\beta \) instead of \( C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^d) \) in order not to overcrowd the notation.

Fix a probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) and on it a \( d \)-dimensional Lévy process \( L \), equipped with a right-continuous, complete filtration \( \mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0,1]} \). The conditional expectation given \( \mathcal{F}_t \) will be denoted by \( \mathbb{E}^t \). The Markov transition semigroup associated to the process \( L \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_t)_{t \geq 0} \), and the generator of \( \mathcal{P} \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{L} \).

We fix \( \alpha \in (0, 2], \tilde{\alpha} \in (0, +\infty], d \in \mathbb{N} \) and impose the following assumptions on \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{L} \).

**Assumption H1** (gradient type bound on the semigroup). There exists a constant \( M \) such that for any \( f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d) \), one has
\[ \|\nabla \mathcal{P}_t f\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M t^{-1/\alpha} \|f\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad 0 < t \leq 1. \quad (2.1) \]

**Assumption H2** (action of the generator). For \( \delta = 0, 1 \), and any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a constant \( M = M(\delta, \varepsilon) \) such that for any \( f \in C^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d) \) one has
\[ \|\mathcal{L} f\|_{C^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq M \|f\|_{C^{\delta + \delta + \varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^d)}}. \quad (2.2) \]

**Assumption H3** (moment conditions). For any \( p \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}), \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a constant \( M = M(p, \varepsilon) \) such that
\[ \mathbb{E}[|L_t|^p \wedge 1] \leq M t^{\tilde{\alpha} - \varepsilon}, \quad 0 < t \leq 1. \]

With some abuse of notation, in the sequel when we refer to the parameter \( M \) given a process \( L \) satisfying the above assumptions, we understand the collection of all of the \( M \)-s in H1-H3.

We provide a long list of examples of processes satisfying H1-H3 in Section 2.1. Let us here just briefly mention three of the most standard examples. First let \( \alpha \in (0, 2) \) and \( L \) be the standard \( \alpha \)-stable process. That is, \( L \) is a Lévy process whose characteristic function is
\[ \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda L_t} = e^{-tc_\alpha |\lambda|^{\alpha}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \geq 0, \]
for some constant \( c_\alpha > 0 \). In this case H1-H3 are satisfied with \( \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha \). A similar example is the \( \alpha \)-dimensional cylindrical \( \alpha \)-stable process, that is, let the coordinates of \( L \) be \( d \) independent 1-dimensional standard \( \alpha \)-stable processes. Its characteristic function is given by
\[ \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda L_t} = e^{-t\sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i|^{\alpha}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \geq 0, \]
for some constant $\tilde{c}_\alpha > 0$. In this case H1-H3 are satisfied, again with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$. Finally the most standard of the most standard examples is the $d$-dimensional Brownian motion, which satisfies H1-H3 with $\alpha = 2$, but here $\tilde{\alpha} = +\infty$.

**Convention on the operator $\wedge$.** The expression of the form $c_1 + c_2 \wedge c_3$, where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$, will quite often appear in the paper. We will always mean that in this expression the minimum is taken first and then the addition, thus it equals to $c_1 + (c_2 \wedge c_3) = c_1 + \min(c_2, c_3)$.

**Convention on constants.** Throughout the paper $N$ denotes a positive constant whose value may change from line to line; its dependence is always specified in the corresponding statement.

We begin with the well-posedness of (1.1). As mentioned in the introduction, this is essentially known, but since none of the available results cover the whole range of exponents and generality of driving processes considered herein, we provide a short proof in the appendix. This is done for the sake of presentation as well as to highlight the usefulness of stochastic sewing for well-posedness of SDEs with jumps; our method for obtaining strong well-posedness is very different from [Pri12, Pri15, Pri18, CSZ18].

**Lemma 2.1.** Suppose that $L$ satisfies H1-H3. Suppose additionally that

$$\beta > \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \vee \left(2 - \alpha - \tilde{\alpha}\right)$$

(2.3)

and let $b \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then equation (1.1) has a unique strong solution.

Now we are ready to present our main result: $L_p$ convergence of the Euler–Maruyama scheme with an explicit rate. Recall the definition of the process $X$ in (1.1) and its approximation $X^n$ in (1.3).

**Theorem 2.2.** Suppose that $L$ satisfies H1-H3 and that (2.3) holds. Let $b \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, $p > 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a constant $N = N(d, \alpha, \beta, p, \varepsilon, M, \|b\|_{C^3})$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the following bound holds:

$$\left\|\|X - X^n\|_{C^\varepsilon([0,1])}\right\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N n^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{p} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right) + \varepsilon} + N|x_0 - x_0^n|.$$  (2.4)

One can also show the almost sure convergence of $X^n$ to $X$.

**Corollary 2.3.** Suppose that $L$ satisfies H1-H3 and $\beta$ satisfies (2.3). Let $b \in C^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$. Take $x^n_0 = x_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\tau \in [0, 1/2)$, there exists an a.s. finite random variable $\eta$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\|X(\omega) - X^n(\omega)\|_{C^\tau([0,1])} \leq \eta(\omega)n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}.$$

The proofs of these statements are given in Section 4.

**Remark 2.4.** For any $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^d$, equations (1.1) and (1.3) can be rewritten as:

$$dX_t = \tilde{b}(X_t)\,dt + d\tilde{L}_t; \quad dX^n_t = \tilde{b}(X^n_{n\kappa(t)})\,dt + d\tilde{L}_t,$$

where $\tilde{b}(x) := b(x) - \kappa$, $\tilde{L}_t := L_t + \kappa t$. Clearly, if $b \in C^3$, then $\tilde{b} \in C^3$. Therefore, if for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the process $(L_t + \kappa t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ satisfies H1-H3 then Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 hold (provided that all the other conditions on $\beta$, $b$, $p$ are met).
Remark 2.5. In most of the applications $\alpha = \tilde{\alpha}$. In this case Figure 1 shows the region where Theorem 2.2 guarantees the convergence of the Euler scheme. Let us give some context for some of the different regimes of interest for the exponents.

(i) In the regime $\alpha \in [2/3, 2]$, (2.3) coincides with the well-known condition (1.2), and thus Theorem 2.2 establishes strong convergence in the optimal range of $\beta$. We also remark that the threshold $2/3$ appears in the theory of Lévy driven SDEs from time to time, e.g., in [CSZ18, FKM21]. We are unsure whether there is some connection between these appearances, or if this is just an instance of the "law of small numbers".

(ii) The result is new even in the case of smooth drift. In the regime $\beta \geq 1$ the drift is regular enough to make the strong well-posedness of (1.1) trivial. Furthermore, it is easy to get some rate of convergence from elementary arguments: assuming for simplicity $x_0 = x_0^n$, by Gronwall’s lemma one has almost surely

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |X_t - X_t^n| \leq e^{b \int_0^t |\beta| c_1 |b| c_1 (|X^n_t - X^n_{\kappa(t)}| \land 1) \, dt}.
\]

This yields for any $p \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$,

\[
\| \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |X_t - X_t^n| \|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N n^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} \wedge \frac{1}{p}\right)} + \varepsilon,
\]

with some constant $N = N(\alpha, p, \varepsilon, M, \|b\|_{C_1})$. While this may be satisfactory for $p = 1$, it provides little control for high moments of the error; further this does not allow to get almost sure rate of convergence. This is markedly improved by Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.3. In particular, since for any $p$ the $L_p$-rate is at least $1/2$, this also implies almost sure rate of convergence $1/2 - \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon$.

(iii) Whenever $\beta \geq \alpha/2$ (which is enforced by (2.3) for all $\alpha \leq 1$), the minimum in $\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p}$ is the second term, and so in this case the expression for the $L_p$-rate simplifies to $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p} - \varepsilon$. In particular, for $p = 2$ we recover the best possible (up to $\varepsilon$) rate $1 - \varepsilon$ for an Euler-type approximation.

Note that $p$ does not influence the rate when $\tilde{\alpha} = \infty$, which is the case when $L$ is a standard Brownian motion. Therefore in this case Theorem 2.2 is consistent with the results of [BDG21a] in the case $H = 1/2$.

An implementation of the Euler–Maruyama scheme (1.3) would also require simulation of the driving Lévy process $L$. This is a well-studied problem, and many techniques and tricks are available in the literature. We do not discuss this problem here but rather refer the reader to a concise collection of methods for simulating $L$ provided in [Pap08, Section 14].

2.1 Examples of Lévy processes satisfying the main assumptions

Let us present some examples of Lévy processes satisfying H1–H3. Denote by $\Phi$ the characteristic exponent (symbol) of $L$, that is,

\[
\mathbb{E}e^{i\langle \lambda, L_t \rangle} = e^{-t\Phi(\lambda)}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ t \geq 0.
\]
Figure 1: Convergence rates for $\alpha = \tilde{\alpha}$, $p = 2$. Green is the required lower bound for $\beta$; dashed is the classical condition (1.2); shading indicates rate of $L_2$-convergence from $1/2$ to $1$.

Recall that (see, e.g., [App09, Corollary 2.4.20]) $\Phi$ can be written in the form

$$\Phi(\lambda) = -i\langle a, \lambda \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \lambda, Q \lambda \rangle + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 - e^{i\langle \lambda, y \rangle} + i\langle \lambda, y \rangle \mathbb{1}_{|y| \leq 1}) \nu(dy), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix, and $\nu$ is a $\sigma$-finite measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 \wedge |y|^2) \nu(dy) < \infty$. It is common to refer to $(a, Q, \nu)$ as the generating triplet of $L$. We begin with general sufficient conditions on $\Phi$, and then move on to the specific examples. By $\text{Re} \, \Phi$ we mean the real part of $\Phi$.

**Proposition 2.6.** Assume that for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $c_1, c_2, N > 0$ the symbol $\Phi$ satisfies

$$c_1|\lambda|^\alpha \leq \text{Re} \, \Phi(\lambda) \leq c_2|\lambda|^\alpha, \quad \text{when } |\lambda| > N. \quad (2.6)$$

Then the following hold

(i) If $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, then $H_1$ and $H_2$ are satisfied for the process $L$;

(ii) If $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $\int_{|y| \leq 1} |y| \nu(dy) < \infty$ and $H_1$ and $H_2$ are satisfied for the process $\tilde{L}_t := L_t + \kappa t$, where $\kappa = -a + \int_{|y| \leq 1} y \nu(dy)$.

Recall that thanks to Remark 2.4 it is sufficient in Theorem 2.2 to verify Assumptions $H_1$ and $H_2$ for the shifted process $\tilde{L}$. The proof of Proposition 2.6 is provided in the Appendix. To verify $H_3$ the following result can be applied.
Proposition 2.7 ([DS14, Theorem 3.1(c)]). Assume that for some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $C > 0$ the symbol $\Phi$ satisfies

$$|\Phi(\lambda)| \leq C|\lambda|^\alpha, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

Then for any $p \in (0, \alpha)$, there exists $N = N(\kappa, \alpha, C, d)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}|L_t|^p \leq N t^{p/\alpha}, \quad t \in (0, 1].$$

One can also derive an explicit formula for the moments of $L$ in terms of $\Phi$ [DS14, p. 3865]: this is also very useful in verifying [H3]. Namely, for any $p \in (0, 2)$, there exists a constant $N = N(p, d)$ such that for any $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}|L_t|^p = N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 - \text{Re} e^{-t\Phi(\lambda)})|\lambda|^{-p-d} d\lambda.$$  

Now let us give an extensive list of examples of Lévy processes satisfying [H1, H3]. This list is inspired by [Pri12, p. 425], [Pri18, Example 6.2], [SSW12, p. 1147] and [CSZ18, Section 4]. All the corresponding proofs are placed in the Appendix.

Example 2.8 (General non-degenerate $\alpha$–stable process, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$). Take $Q = 0$, $a = 0$, and

$$\nu(D) = \int_0^\infty \int_S r^{-1-\alpha} 1_D(r\xi)\mu(d\xi)dr, \quad D \in B(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $\mu$ is a finite non-negative measure concentrated on the unit sphere $S := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y| = 1\}$ that is non-degenerate, i.e. its support is not contained in a proper linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the shifted process $\tilde{L}_t := L_t + \kappa t$ satisfies [H1, H3] with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$ (and, thus, Theorem 2.2 holds by Remark 2.4). If $\alpha \in [1, 2)$, then $\kappa = 0$; if $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $\kappa = \int_{|y|\leq 1} y\nu(dy) < \infty$

Example 2.9 (Standard isotropic $d$-dimensional $\alpha$–stable process, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$). This is a special case of Example 2.8 with $\mu$ being the uniform measure on $S$. One can check that in this case $\nu(D) = c_\alpha \int_D |y|^{-d-\alpha} dy, \quad D \in B(\mathbb{R}^d)$; thus, $\kappa = 0$ for all values of $\alpha \in (0, 2)$.

Example 2.10 (Cylindrical $\alpha$–stable process, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$). Let $L$ be a $d$-dimensional process whose coordinates are independent standard 1-dimensional $\alpha$-stable processes. Then $L$ satisfies [H1, H3] with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$.

Example 2.11 ($\alpha$-stable-type process, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, see [SSW12, p. 1146]). Take $Q = 0$, $a = 0$, and

$$\nu(D) = \int_0^\infty \int_S r^{-1-\alpha} \rho(r) 1_D(r\xi)\mu(d\xi)dr, \quad D \in B(\mathbb{R}^d),$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

where $\mu$ is a symmetric (that is $\mu(D) = \mu(-D)$ for any Borel set $D$) non-degenerate finite non-negative measure concentrated on $S$ and $\rho: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a measurable function such that for some constants $C, C_1, C_2 > 0$ one has

$$1_{[0,C)}(r) \leq C_1 \rho(r) \leq C_2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.9)

Then $L$ satisfies [H1, H3] with $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$.

Example 2.12 ($\alpha$-stable tempered process, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$). This is a special case of Example 2.11 with $\rho(r) = e^{-c r}$ with some $c > 0$. 


Example 2.13 (Truncated α-stable process, α ∈ (0, 2)). This is a special case of Example 2.11 with ρ_ε = c1_{[0,1]} with some c > 0 and μ being the uniform measure on S. One can check that in this case ν(D) = c_α ∫_{D∩{|y|≤1}}|y|^{-d-α}dy, D ∈ B(ℝ^d).

Example 2.14 (Relativistic α-stable process, α ∈ (0, 2), [CMS90, CVST20]). Take L with symbol Ψ(λ) = (|λ|^2 + C^2/α^2)^{1/2} - C, with some parameter C > 0. It satisfies [H1][H3] with ̃α = α.

Example 2.15 (Brownian motion). If L is the standard d-dimensional Brownian motion, then it satisfies [H1][H3] with α = 2, ̃α = ∞.

Example 2.16 (Linear combinations). a) Let L^{(1)}, L^{(2)} be two independent Lévy processes. Assume that the process L^{(i)}, i = 1, 2, satisfies [H1][H3] with α = α_i, ̃α = ̃α_i. Without loss of generality, assume that α_1 ≤ α_2. Then the process L^{(1)} + L^{(2)} satisfies [H1][H3] with α = α_2, ̃α = (̃α_1 α_2/α_1) ∧ ̃α_2.

b) In particular, if L is a sum of a d-dimensional Brownian motion and the standard α-stable process, then the rate in (2.4) is n^{-(1/2 + 1/2 + ε)} for b ∈ ℝ^d, β > 0.

c) In general, if L has a non-degenerate diffusion part (that is, Q is positive definite) and for some γ > 0 we have ∫_{|y|>1} |y|^γ ν(dy) < ∞, then the statement of Theorem 2.2 is valid with α = 2, ̃α = 2. This corresponds to the rate n^{-(1/2 + 1/2 + ε)}. This significantly improves [KS19b, Remark 2.3].

3. Preliminaries

Before we proceed to the proofs of our main results, let us collect a number of useful methods and bounds which we are going to apply later.

3.1 Shifted stochastic sewing lemma

An important tool to obtain Theorem 2.2 is an adjusted version of [Ger20, Lemma 2.2], which in turn is based on Lévy’s stochastic sewing lemma [Le20]. We need the following notation. For 0 ≤ S ≤ T we denote

\[ Δ_{[S,T]} := \{(s,t) : S ≤ s < t ≤ T, s − (t − s) ≥ S\}. \] (3.1)

For a function f: Δ_{[S,T]} → ℝ^d and a triplet of times (s, u, t) such that S ≤ s ≤ u ≤ t ≤ T, we denote

\[ δf_{s,u,t} := f_{s,t} − f_{s,u} − f_{u,t}. \]

The conditional expectation given \( F_s \) is denoted by \( E^s \).

Lemma 3.1. Let 0 ≤ S < T ≤ 1, p ∈ [2, ∞) and let (A_{s,t})_{(s,t)∈Δ_{[S,T]}} be a family of random variables in L_p(Ω, ℝ^d) such that A_{s,t} is \( F_t \)-measurable. Suppose that for some \( ε_1, ε_2, ε_3 > 0 \) and \( C_1, C_2, C_3 ≥ 0 \) the bounds

\[ \|A_{s,t}\|_{L_p(Ω)} ≤ C_1|t − s|^{1/2 + ε_1}, \] (3.2)

\[ \|E^{s−(t−s)}δA_{s,u,t}\|_{L_p(Ω)} ≤ C_2|t − s|^{1+ ε_2} + C_3|t − s|^{1+ ε_3}. \] (3.3)

hold for all (s, t) ∈ Δ_{[S,T]} and u = (s + t)/2.
Further, suppose that there exists a process $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t : t \in [S, T]\}$ such that for any $s, t \in [S, T]$ one has

$$
\mathcal{A}_t - \mathcal{A}_s = \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} A_{s+i\frac{t-s}{m}} A_{s+(i+1)\frac{t-s}{m}} \text{ in probability.}
$$

(3.4)

Then there exist constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$, which depend only on $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, \mu$, and $d$ such that for any $S \leq s \leq t \leq T$ we have

$$
\|\mathcal{A}_t - \mathcal{A}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_1 C_1 (t-s)^{1/2+\varepsilon_1} + K_2 C_2 (t-s)^{1+\varepsilon_2} + K_3 C_3 (t-s)^{1+\varepsilon_3}.
$$

(3.5)

The proof of Lemma 3.1 is given in the appendix.

### 3.2 Heat kernel and related bounds

Recall that $\mathcal{P}$ is the Markov transition semigroup associated to the process $L$. Quite often we would apply the following simple observation. For any measurable bounded function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 \leq s \leq t$, and any $\mathcal{F}_s$-measurable random vector $\xi$ one has

$$
\mathbb{E}^s f(L_t + \xi) = \mathcal{P}_{t-s} f(L_s + \xi).
$$

(3.6)

We now formulate some consequences of $[H1][H3]$ in the form that they are actually used in the proofs.

**Proposition 3.2.** Suppose that $[H1]$ and $[H3]$ hold. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, $\rho$ as below, $\mu \in (\varepsilon, 1+\varepsilon]$, $\mu \geq (\beta - \rho)/\alpha$ there exists a constant $N = N(\alpha, \beta, \mu, \varepsilon, \rho)$ such that the following holds for any $f \in C^\beta$:

$$
\|\mathcal{P}_t f\|_{C^\rho} \leq N\|f\|_{C^\beta} t^{\frac{\beta - \rho}{\alpha}}, \quad 0 < t \leq 1, \quad \rho \geq 0; \tag{3.7}
$$

$$
\|\mathcal{P}_t f - \mathcal{P}_s f\|_{C^\rho} \leq N\|f\|_{C^\beta} \frac{t^{\alpha_1}}{s^{\alpha_1}} \eta(t-s)^{\mu-\varepsilon}, \quad 0 \leq s < t \leq 1, \quad \rho = 0, 1. \tag{3.8}
$$

The proof of this proposition is mostly technical and is provided in the appendix.

Assuming that $L$ satisfies $[H3]$, it is immediate to see that this implies that for any $\theta > 0$, $p \geq 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $N = N(p, \theta, \varepsilon, \alpha)$ such that

$$
\|L_t^\theta \wedge 1\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq N t^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{\varepsilon}{\alpha p}} - \varepsilon, \quad t \in [0, 1].
$$

(3.9)

We further recall two elementary inequalities:

$$
|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq |x_1 - x_2|\|f\|_{C^1}, \quad t \in [0, 1].
$$

(3.10)

$$
|f(x_1) - f(x_2) - f(x_3) + f(x_4)| \leq |x_1 - x_2 - x_3 + x_4|\|f\|_{C^1} + |x_1 - x_2||x_1 - x_3|\|f\|_{C^2},
$$

(3.11)

for any $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $f$ from $C^1$ or $C^2$, respectively.
4. Proof of the main results

We will denote $\varphi := X - L$, $\varphi^n = X^n - L$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. We consider the following decomposition of the increments of the error. For $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we write

\[
(X_t - X^n_t) - (X_s - X^n_s) = \int_s^t b(X_r) - b(X^n_r) \, dr + \int_s^t b(X^n_r) - b(X^n_{\kappa(r)}) \, dr
\]

\[
= \int_s^t b(L_r + \varphi_r) - b(L_r + \varphi^n_r) \, dr
\]

\[
+ \int_s^t b(L_r + \varphi^n_r) - b(L_r + \varphi^n_{\kappa(r)}) \, dr
\]

\[
+ \int_s^t b(L_r + \varphi^n_{\kappa(r)}) - b(L_{\kappa(r)} + \varphi^n_{\kappa(r)}) \, dr
\]

\[
=: \mathcal{E}^{n,1}_{s,t} + \mathcal{E}^{n,2}_{s,t} + \mathcal{E}^{n,3}_{s,t}. \tag{4.1}
\]

In the sequel we bound $L_p(\Omega)$ norms of the error terms. First, in Section 4.1 we prove certain a priori bounds for $\varphi, \varphi^n$, then in Section 4.2 we bound $\mathcal{E}^{n,1}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{n,2}$ with the shifted stochastic sewing lemma provided above, in Section 4.3 we bound $\mathcal{E}^{n,3}$. These bounds are combined for the main proof in Section 4.4.

Remark 4.1. This decomposition differs from the one in e.g. [BDG21a]: therein, $\mathcal{E}^{n,2} + \mathcal{E}^{n,3}$ can be treated as one term, and by Girsanov’s theorem, the perturbation $\varphi^n$ can in fact be transformed away. Such trick is not available in the Lévy case due to the lack of an appropriate Girsanov’s theorem.

4.1 A priori bounds

For a random variable $\xi$, a sub-$\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, and $p \geq 1$ we introduce the quantity

\[
\|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)\mid \mathcal{G}} := (\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^p \mid \mathcal{G}])^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{4.2}
\]

which is a $\mathcal{G}$-measurable non-negative random variable. It is clear that

\[
\|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)} = \|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)\mid \mathcal{G}} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)\mid \mathcal{G}}].
\]

Note the following simple bounds valid for $p \geq 1$, $\sigma$-algebras $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$:

\[
\mathbb{E}[|\xi| \mid \mathcal{H}]|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)}; \quad \mathbb{E}[|\xi| \mid \mathcal{G}]|_{L_p(\Omega)\mid \mathcal{G}} \leq \|\xi\|_{L_p(\Omega)\mid \mathcal{G}}. \tag{4.3}
\]

Let $f : [0, 1] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a measurable bounded function adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $p \geq 2$, $0 \leq S \leq T \leq 1$. We consider the following norms and seminorms of $f$:

\[
\|f\|_{L_p^\gamma[S,T]} := \sup_{t \in [S,T]} \|f(t)\|_{L_p(\Omega)};
\]

\[
[f]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma[S,T]} := \sup_{s,t \in [S,T]} \frac{\|f(t) - f(s)\|_{L_p(\Omega)}}{|t-s|^{\gamma}}; \tag{4.4}
\]

\[
[f]_{\mathcal{L}^\gamma[S,T]} := \sup_{s,t \in [S,T]} \frac{\|f(t) - \mathbb{E}^s f(t)\|_{L_p(\Omega)}}{|t-s|^{\gamma}}. \tag{4.5}
\]

Part (iii) of the following lemma is the main a priori estimate on the “stochastic regularity” of $\varphi, \varphi^n$. 

Proof of the main results

(i) Let \( q \geq 1 \). Let \( G \subset F \) be a \( \sigma \)-algebra. Let random variables \( Y, Z \in L_q(\Omega) \) and suppose that \( Z \) in \( G \)-measurable. Then

\[
\|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|G]\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G} \leq 2\|Y - Z\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G}.
\]

(ii) For any \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1, q \geq 1 \), measurable function \( f: [s, t] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d \) adapted to the filtration \( \mathbb{F} \), \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) one has

\[
[f]_{C^\gamma_{s,t}} \leq 2[f]_{C^\gamma_{s,t}}.
\]

(iii) Let \( q \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0 \). Assume that \( \beta > 1 - \alpha \) and that (4.7) holds. There exists a constant \( N = N(\beta, \|b\|_{C^\beta}, \alpha, \tilde{\alpha}, \varepsilon, q, M) \) such that for \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1 \) one has a.s.

\[
\|\varphi_t - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} \leq N|t - s|^{1 + \left(\frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right)}
\]

\[
\|\varphi_t^n - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t^n\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} \leq N|t - s|^{1 + \left(\frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right)}.
\]

Proof. (i) We have

\[
\|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|G]\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G} \leq \|Y - Z\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G} + \|\mathbb{E}[Y|G] - Z\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G}
\]

\[
= \|Y - Z\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G} + \|\mathbb{E}[Y - Z|G]\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G}
\]

\[
\leq 2\|Y - Z\|_{L_q(\Omega)|G},
\]

where the last inequality follows from (4.6).

(ii) Follows immediately from part (i) of the lemma and the definitions of the seminorms (4.1) and (4.5).

(iii) Without loss of generality, we can assume that \( \beta \leq 1 \). Suppose that (4.8) holds for some \( \theta > 0 \) in place of \( 1 + \left(\frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right) \). This is certainly true for \( \theta = 0 \) thanks to the fact that \( b \) is bounded; we proceed now by induction on \( \theta \). We apply (4.6) with \( G = F_s \), \( Y = \varphi_t \), \( Z = \varphi_s + \int_s^t b(L_s + \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t) \, dr \). We get

\[
\|\varphi_t - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} \leq 2\|\varphi_t - \varphi_s - \int_s^t b(L_s + \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t) \, dr\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s}
\]

\[
= 2\|\int_s^t (b(L_r + \varphi_r) - b(L_s + \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t)) \, dr\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s}
\]

\[
\leq N\left\|\int_s^t (|L_r - L_s|^\beta + |\varphi_r - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t|\beta) \wedge 1 \, dr\right\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s}
\]

\[
\leq N\int_s^t \left\|\int_s^t (|L_r - L_s|^\beta + 1) \right\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} + \|\varphi_r - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} \, dr.
\]

Using (4.9), the independence of \( L_r - L_s \) from \( F_s \), and the induction hypothesis, we get a.s.

\[
\|\varphi_t - \mathbb{E}^s \varphi_t\|_{L_q(\Omega)|F_s} \leq N|t - s|^{1 + \left(\frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right)}.
\]

It is elementary to see that if \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is small enough, then the recursion \( \theta_0 = 0, \theta_{i+1} = 1 + \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right) \) reaches \( 1 + \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{q + \varepsilon}\right) \) in finitely many steps (recall that \( \alpha > 1 - \beta \) and thus \( \alpha > (1 - \beta)/(1 - \varepsilon) \) for small enough \( \varepsilon > 0 \)). Recalling our initial assumption \( \beta \leq 1 \), we get (4.8).
Inequality (4.9) is obtained by a similar argument, though one has to be a bit more careful because now $L_{\kappa_n(r)} - L_{\kappa_n(s)}$ is not independent of $F_s$. For fixed $s \in [0,1]$, define $s'$ to be the smallest grid point which is bigger or equal to $s$, that is, $s' = \lceil ns \rceil n^{-1}$. It is crucial to note that $\varphi_{s'}^n$ is $F_s$ measurable.

We proceed by induction as before and assume that (4.9) holds for some $\theta \geq 0$. If $s \leq t < s'$, then $\varphi_t^n$ is $F_s$–measurable. Hence $\varphi_t^n = E^s \varphi_t^n$ and the left–hand side of (4.9) is zero. Therefore it remains to consider the case $t \geq s'$. In this case, using again (4.6) with $G = F_s$, $Y = \varphi_t^n$, $Z = \varphi_s^n + \int_{s'}^t b(L_s + E^s \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}) \, dr$, we deduce

$$
\| \varphi_t^n - E^s \varphi_t^n \|_{L_q(\Omega)\|F_s} \leq 2 \| \varphi_t^n - \varphi_s^n - \int_{s'}^t b(L_s + E^s \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}) \, dr \|_{L_q(\Omega)\|F_s} \\
= 2 \| \int_{s'}^t (b(L_{\kappa_n(r)}) + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}) - b(L_s + E^s \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}) \, dr \|_{L_q(\Omega)\|F_s} \\
\leq N \| \int_{s'}^t (|L_{\kappa_n(r)} - L_s|^{\beta} + |\varphi_{\kappa_n(r)} - E^s \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}|^{\beta}) \wedge 1 \, dr \|_{L_q(\Omega)\|F_s}.
$$

Note that for $r \geq s'$, $\kappa_n(r) \geq s'$, and therefore $L_{\kappa_n(r)} - L_s$ is independent of $F_s$. From here we obtain (4.9) exactly as before.

**Remark 4.3.** The reason for the non-standard portion of our main assumption (2.3) (and the strange threshold $2/3$) is the appearance of the $\alpha/\alpha q$ in (4.8)-(4.9).

### 4.2 Bounds on $\mathcal{E}^{n,1}$, $\mathcal{E}^{n,2}$

Since $\mathcal{E}^{n,1}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{n,2}$ have similar forms (difference of averages of $b$ along $L$ with two different perturbations), we state a lemma that can be applied to both.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $p \in [2, \infty)$. Assume $H_1, H_2$ and $1 - \alpha/2 < \beta < 2$. Let $g, h : [0,1] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded, adapted, measurable functions. Assume that there exist constants $\tau, \gamma, \varepsilon_0 \in (0,1], C_g, C_h > 0$ such that

$$
\frac{\beta - 2}{\alpha} + \tau > 0, \quad \gamma + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha} > 0
$$

and for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ one has a.s.

$$
E^s|g_t - E^s g_t| \leq C_g|t - s|^\tau, \\
\|h_t - E^s h_t\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_h|t - s|^{\varepsilon_0}.
$$

Then there exists a constant $N = N(\alpha, \beta, p, d, \|b\|_{C^\beta})$ such that for any $0 \leq S \leq T \leq 1$

$$
\left\| \int_S^T b(L_r + g_r) - b(L_r + h_r) \, dr \right\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N(T - S)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha}} \|g - h\|_{\mathcal{E}^p_{S,T}} \\
+ N(T - S)^{\gamma + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha} + 1} |g - h|_{C^\beta_{S,T}} \\
+ NC_g(T - S)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha} + \tau} \|g - h\|_{\mathcal{E}^0_{S,T}}.
$$

**Remark 4.5.** It is pivotal that the seminorm appearing in the right–hand side of (4.13) is $|g - h|_{C^\beta_{S,T}}$ rather than a much less precise seminorm $|g - h|_{\mathcal{E}^0_{S,T}}$ (recall Lemma 4.2(ii) and the definitions of the seminorms in (4.5) and (4.4)). This will be crucial for bounding $\mathcal{E}^{n,2}$, see Remark 4.7 below.
Proof. Fix $0 \leq S \leq T \leq 1$. Put

$$A_{s,t} := \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)} \int_s^t b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}h_r) \, dr, \quad (s,t) \in \Delta_{[S,T]};$$

$$A_t := \int_0^t b(L_r + g_r) - b(L_r + h_r) \, dr, \quad t \in [S,T].$$

Let us verify that the processes $A$, $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy all the conditions of the stochastic sewing lemma (Lemma 3.1).

Let $(s,t) \in \Delta_{[S,T]}$. Then recalling (3.6) and (5.10), we see that

$$|A_{s,t}| \leq \int_s^t \left| \mathcal{P}_r \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}b(L_{s-(t-s)} + \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}g_r) - \mathcal{P}_r \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}b(L_{s-(t-s)} + \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}h_r) \right| \, dr$$

$$\leq \int_s^t \left| \mathcal{P}_r \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}b \right| C_1 \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}(g_r - h_r) \, dr.$$ 

Thus, by (3.7) and (4.3), we have

$$\|A_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \|b\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta} \int_s^t (r-s)^{\frac{(\beta-1)\alpha}{\alpha}} \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}(g_r - h_r) \|_{L_p(\Omega)} \, dr$$

$$\leq N(t-s)^{1+\frac{(\beta-1)\alpha}{\alpha}} \sup_{r \in [S,T]} \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}(g_r - h_r) \|_{L_p(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq N(t-s)^{1+\frac{(\beta-1)\alpha}{\alpha}} \sup_{r \in [S,T]} \|g_r - h_r\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$$

$$= N(t-s)^{1+\frac{(\beta-1)\alpha}{\alpha}} \|g - h\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta_{[S,T]}}.$$ 

Note that by the assumption $\beta > 1 - \alpha/2$, we have $1 + \frac{\beta-1}{\alpha} > 1/2$. Therefore, condition (3.2) is satisfied with $C_1 = N\|g - h\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta_{[S,T]}}$.

Now let us verify condition (3.3). As required, we take $(s,t) \in \Delta_{[S,T]}$, and $u := (t+s)/2$. It will be convenient to denote $s_1 := s - (t-s)$, $s_2 := s - (u-s)$, $s_3 := s$, $s_4 := u$, $s_5 := t$. One has $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq s_3 \leq s_4 \leq s_5$. Then we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)} \delta A_{s,u,t}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^s \delta A_{s_1,s_4,s_5}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^s \int_{s_3}^{s_4} (b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}h_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_2}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_2}h_r)) \, dr$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}^s \int_{s_4}^{s_5} (b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}h_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_3}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_3}h_r)) \, dr$$

$$=: I_1 + I_2. \quad (4.14)$$

Here in the term $I_2$ we used the identity $u - (t-s) = s = s_3$. We begin with the analysis of $I_1$. Recalling (3.6), we obviously have

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E}^s \mathbb{E}^{s_2} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} (b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}h_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_2}g_r) - b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_2}h_r)) \, dr$$

$$= \mathbb{E}^s \int_{s_3}^{s_4} \left( \mathcal{P}_{r-s_2} b(L_{s_2} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}g_r) - \mathcal{P}_{r-s_2} b(L_{s_2} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1}h_r) \right).$$
Using (3.8), we easily deduce:

\[- \mathcal{P}_{r-s_2} b(L_{s_2} + E^{s_2} g_r) - b(\mathcal{P}_{r-s_2} L_{s_2} + E^{s_2} h_r)) \, dr.\]

Applying (3.11) and (3.7) we see that

\[
|I_1| \leq \|b\|_{C^s} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} (r - s_2)^{\frac{\beta-1+\rho}{\alpha}} \|E^s_{1}(g_r - h_r) - E^{s_2}(g_r - h_r)\| \, dr \\
+ \|b\|_{C^s} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} (r - s_2)^{\frac{\beta-2}{\alpha}} \|E^s_{1}(g_r - h_r)\| \|E^{s_2} - E^{s_1}\| \, dr.
\]

(4.15)

Using conditional Jensen's inequality and the assumption (4.11), we see that a.s.

\[
E^s_{1}|E^{s_2}(g_r - E^{s_1} g_r)| = E^s_{1}|E^{s_2}(g_r - E^{s_1} g_r)| \leq E^s_{1}|g_r - E^{s_1} g_r| \leq C_g |r - s_1|^\gamma.
\]

(4.16)

Similarly,

\[
E^s_{1}|E^{s_2}(g_r - h_r) - E^{s_1}(g_r - h_r)| = E^s_{1}|E^{s_2}(g_r - h_r) - E^{s_1}(g_r - h_r)| \leq E^s_{1}|(g_r - h_r) - E^{s_1}(g_r - h_r)|.
\]

(4.17)

Combining (4.15), (4.16), (4.17), and using the Minkowski inequality together with (4.3) we finally get

\[
\|I_1\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N(s_4 - s_1)^{\gamma + \frac{\beta-1+\rho}{\alpha} + 1} \|g - h\|_{C^s_{p}[S,T]} \\
+ NC_g(s_3 - s_2)^{\frac{\beta-2}{\alpha}} (s_4 - s_3)(s_4 - s_1)^\gamma \|g - h\|_{\varphi^0_{p}[S,T]} \\
\leq N(t - s)^{\gamma + \frac{\beta-1+\rho}{\alpha} + 1} \|g - h\|_{C^s_{p}[S,T]} + NC_g(t - s)^{\frac{\beta-2}{\alpha} + 1 + \tau} \|g - h\|_{\varphi^0_{p}[S,T]},
\]

(4.18)

where the last inequality follows from the fact \(s_3 - s_2 = s_4 - s_3 = (t - s)/2\) and \(s_4 - s_1 = (u - s) + (t - s) = \frac{3}{2}(t - s)\). By exactly the same argument (we just need to take \(s_3\) in place of \(s_2, s_4\) in place of \(s_3, s_5\) in place of \(s_4\), we get the exact same bound for \(I_2\), and then by (4.14), for \(E^{s-(t-s)}\delta A_{s,u,t}\) as well. Since by the assumptions of the lemma \(\gamma + \frac{\beta-1+\rho}{\alpha} + 1 > 1\) and \(\frac{\beta-2}{\alpha} + 1 + \tau > 1\), we see that condition (3.3) is satisfied with \(C_2 = N\|g - h\|_{C^s_{p}[S,T]}\) and \(C_3 = NC_g\|g - h\|_{\varphi^0_{p}[S,T]}\).

It remains to verify condition (3.3). Let \(s, t \in [S,T], s < t\). Fix \(m \in \mathbb{N}\). Denote \(t_i := s + \frac{t-s}{m}i, i = 0, \ldots, m\). Note that \(t_i - (t_{i+1} - t_i) = t_{i-1}\). Then we have

\[
|A_t - A_s| - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} A_{t_i,t_{i+1}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} |b(L_r + g_r) - \mathcal{P}_{r-t_{i-1}} b(L_{t_{i-1}} + E^{t_{i-1}} g_r)| \, dr \\
+ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} |b(L_r + h_r) - \mathcal{P}_{r-t_{i-1}} b(L_{t_{i-1}} + E^{t_{i-1}} h_r)| \, dr \\
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (|b(L_r + g_r)| + |b(L_r + h_r)|) \, dr \\
=: I_{m,1} + I_{m,2} + I_{m,3}.
\]

(4.19)

Using (3.8), we easily deduce:

\[
|b(L_r + g_r) - \mathcal{P}_{r-t_{i-1}} b(L_{t_{i-1}} + E^{t_{i-1}} g_r)|
\]
This together with \((3.9)\), \((4.11)\) and the Minkowski inequality yields
\[
\|I_{m,1}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq N\|b\|_{C^\theta}(t-s) \frac{1}{m^{(\frac{2}{n} \wedge \frac{2}{n} \wedge (\beta \tau) \wedge 1) - \varepsilon}}. \tag{4.20}
\]
Similarly, with the help of \((4.12)\) we bound
\[
\|I_{m,2}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq NCG_h\|b\|_{C^\theta}(t-s) \frac{1}{m^{(\frac{2}{n} \wedge \frac{2}{n} \wedge (\beta \varepsilon) \wedge 1) - \varepsilon}}. \tag{4.21}
\]
Finally, it is obvious that \(|I_{m,3}| \leq Nm^{-1}\|b\|_{C^\theta}^\alpha\). Therefore, substituting this, \((4.20)\) and \((4.21)\) into \((4.19)\), we see that the sum \(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} A_{t_i,t_{i+1}}\) converges to \(A_t - A_s\) in \(L^1(\Omega)\) and hence in probability as \(m \to \infty\). Hence, \((3.4)\) holds.

Thus, all the conditions of \textit{Lemma 3.1} are satisfied. The claimed bound \((4.13)\) follows now from \((3.5)\).

\textbf{Corollary 4.6.} Assume that all the conditions of \textit{Theorem 2.2} are satisfied. Then there exists a constant \(N = N(\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}, \beta, p, d, \|b\|_{C^\theta}, \varepsilon, M)\) such that for all \(0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1\) and all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) the following holds:
\[
\|E_{s,t}^{n,1}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq N(t-s)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1 - \mu_0}{\alpha}} \|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{\mathcal{E}_p^{0}(s,t)} + N(t-s)^{3 + \frac{\beta - 1 - \mu_0}{\alpha}} [\varphi - \varphi^n]_{\mathcal{E}_p^{1/2}(s,t)}; \tag{4.22}
\]
\[
\|E_{s,t}^{n,2}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq N(t-s)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1 - \mu_0}{\alpha} - 1} + N(t-s)^{3 + \frac{\beta - 1 - \mu_0}{\alpha} - 1} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2} - (\frac{\beta \tau}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{\alpha}{\beta})}}. \tag{4.23}
\]

\textit{Proof.} Recall that \(\beta > 2 - \tilde{\alpha} - \alpha\) and \(\beta > 1 - \alpha/2\). Without loss of generality, we can assume that \(\beta \leq 2\); indeed, if \(\beta > 2\) then we just take \(2\) in place of \(\beta\), this will not affect neither condition \((2.3)\), nor the bounds on the right-hand side of \((4.22)\) and \((4.23)\). Thus, till the end of the proof choose arbitrary \(\delta > 0\) small enough so that
\[
2 \geq \beta > \max(2 - \tilde{\alpha} - \alpha + \delta \alpha, 1 - \alpha/2 + \delta \alpha). \tag{4.24}
\]

To establish \((4.22)\) and \((4.23)\), we will apply \textit{Lemma 4.4} with \(\tau = 1 + (\beta \tau / \alpha) - \delta, \gamma = 1/2\). Thanks to \((4.24)\) and the assumption \(\beta > 1 - \alpha/2\), we see that condition \((4.10)\) holds.

First let us obtain \((4.22)\). We apply \textit{Lemma 4.4} with \(g = \varphi, h = \varphi^n\). It follows from \((4.8)\) with \(q = 1\) that \((4.11)\) holds with \(C_g \leq N\). Similarly, \((4.9)\) and \((4.3)\) imply that \((4.12)\) holds. Thus all the assumptions of \textit{Lemma 4.4} are satisfied. Taking into account \((4.7)\) and the fact that \(1 + (\beta - 1 - \mu_0)/\alpha \leq 1 + \beta \alpha - \tau\), we see that \((4.13)\) yields \((4.22)\).

Now let us prove \((4.23)\). We will again apply \textit{Lemma 4.4} with \(g_t = \varphi^n_t, h_t = \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(t)}\) and the same \(\tau, \gamma\) as above. Thanks to \((4.9)\) with \(q = 1\) we see that \((4.11)\) holds with \(C_g \leq N\). Further, if \(0 \leq \kappa_n(t) \leq s < t \leq 1\) then
\[
\|\varphi^n_{\kappa_n(t)} - \mathbb{E}^s\varphi^n_{\kappa_n(t)}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0.
\]
If \(0 \leq s < \kappa_n(t) \leq t \leq 1\), then thanks to \((4.9)\)
\[
\|\varphi^n_{\kappa_n(t)} - \mathbb{E}^s\varphi^n_{\kappa_n(t)}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq N|\kappa_n(t) - s| \leq N(t-s).
\]
Hence, (4.12) holds. Thus all the assumptions of Lemma 4.4 are satisfied. Therefore (4.13) implies
\[
\|E_{s,t}^n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} = \left\| \int_s^t b(L_r + \varphi^n_r) - b(L_s + \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}) \, dr \right\| \\
\leq N(t - s)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha}} \|\varphi^n - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n} \|_{\mathcal{E}_{p,[s,t]}^n} \\
+ N(t - s)^{\frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha}} \left[ \varphi^n - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n} \right]_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1/2},[s,t]}.
\] (4.25)

Note that for any \( r \in [0, 1] \), we clearly have
\[
\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} = (r - \kappa_n(r))b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}).
\] (4.26)

Since \( b \) is bounded, this implies
\[
\|\varphi^n - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n} \|_{\mathcal{F}_{r',[s,t]}^p} \leq \|b\|_{\infty} \sup_{r \in [s,t]} |r - \kappa_n(r)| \leq Nn^{-1}.
\] (4.27)

Let now \( s \leq r' \leq r \leq t \). If \( \kappa_n(r) \leq r' \), then both \( \varphi^n_r \) and \( \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} \) are \( \mathcal{F}_{r'} \)-measurable, so trivially
\[
\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} - \mathbb{E}_{r'}[\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}] = 0
\] (4.28)

Otherwise if \( s \leq r' < \kappa_n(r) \leq r \leq t \), then by (4.26) and (4.6),
\[
\|\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} - \mathbb{E}_{r'}[\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}]\|_{L_p(\Omega)}
\leq (r - \kappa_n(r))\|b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}) - \mathbb{E}_{r'} b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)})\|_{L_p(\Omega)}
\leq N(r - \kappa_n(r))\|b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}) - b(L_{r'} + \varphi^n_{r'})\|_{L_p(\Omega)}
\leq N(r - \kappa_n(r))\left[|L_{\kappa_n(r)} - L_{r'}|\|\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|\varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} - \varphi^n_{r'}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}\right]
\leq N(r - \kappa_n(r))(|r - r'|^{\frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha}} + |r - r'|^{\beta \wedge 1}),
\]

where in the last inequality we used (3.9). Note that if \( \alpha \geq 1 \), then clearly \( \beta \wedge 1 \geq \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \). Further, if \( \alpha < 1 \), then \( \beta > 1/2 \) thanks to (2.3). Thus in both cases \( \beta \wedge 1 \geq \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2} \), and we continue the above inequality as follows:
\[
\|\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} - \mathbb{E}_{r'}[\varphi^n_r - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)}]\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N(r - \kappa_n(r))|r - r'|^{\left(\frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-\varepsilon}}
\leq Nn^{-\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right)^{+\varepsilon}}|r - r'|^{\beta \wedge 1},
\]

where in the last inequality we used that \( r - \kappa_n(r) \leq n^{-1} \land |r - r'| \). This together with (4.28) yields
\[
\left[ \varphi^n - \varphi^n_{\kappa_n(r)} \right]_{\mathcal{C}_p^{1/2},[s,t]} \leq Nn^{-\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right)^{+\varepsilon}}.
\] (4.29)

Substituting this and (4.27) into (4.25), we finally get
\[
\|E_{s,t}^n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N(t - s)^{1 + \frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha}} n^{-1} + N(t - s)^{\frac{\beta - 1}{\alpha}} \left[ n^{-\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right)^{+\varepsilon}} \right],
\]

where we also used the fact that \( \alpha \leq 2 \) and thus \( \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{2} \). \( \square \)
Remark 4.7. We see now why it was important that the seminorm $|·|_{C_p^H[s,t]}$ rather than $|·|_{C_p^H[s,t]}$ appeared in (4.13), recall Remark 4.5. Indeed, by taking $r \in [s, t]$ such that $r = \kappa_n(r)$ and $s \leq r' \leq r \leq t$ it is easy to see that the best one can get is

$$\|\varphi_r^n - \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n - \varphi_r^n - \varphi_{\kappa_n(r')}^n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} = (r' - \kappa_n(r'))\|b(L_{\kappa_n(r')} + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r')}^n)\|_{L_p(\Omega)}.$$  

This implies that $[\varphi_r^n - \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n]_{C_p^H[s,t]} = \infty$ for any $\gamma > 0$, and is obviously much worse than (4.29).

4.3 Bounds on $\mathcal{E}^{n,3}$

Lemma 4.8. Under the conditions of Theorem 2.2 there exists a constant $N = N(\alpha, \beta, p, d, \|b\|_{C^3}, \varepsilon, M)$ such that for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ and all $n \in N$ the following holds:

$$\|\mathcal{E}^{n,3}_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq Nn^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{\alpha}{2p}\right) + \varepsilon}|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}. \quad (4.30)$$

Proof. To simplify notations, set $\psi_s := \varphi_{\kappa_n(s)}^n$. We will apply Lemma 3.1 with $S = 0$, $T = 1$ for the processes

$$A_{s,t} := E^{s-(t-s)} \int_s^t b(L_r + E^{s-(t-s)} \psi_r) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + E^{s-(t-s)} \psi_r) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_{[0,1]}: \quad (4.31)$$

$$A_t := \mathcal{E}^{n,3}_{t} = \int_0^t b(L_r + \psi_r) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \psi_r) dr, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

First we verify (3.2). If $s \leq t \leq s + 2/n$, then we have from (3.9)

$$\|A_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \int_s^t \|b(L_r + E^{s-(t-s)} \psi_r) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + E^{s-(t-s)} \psi_r)\|_{L_p(\Omega)} dr$$

$$\leq \|b\|_{C^3} \int_s^t \|L_r - L_{\kappa_n(r)}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}^{\beta \wedge 1} dr$$

$$\leq N|t - s|n^{-\left(\frac{\beta \wedge \alpha}{n} \wedge \frac{2}{2p}\right) + \varepsilon}$$

$$\leq N|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon} n^{-\left(\frac{\beta \wedge \alpha}{n} \wedge \frac{2}{2p}\right) + 2\varepsilon}. \quad (4.32)$$

Now consider the case $t \geq s + 2/n$. Then we note that $r \geq s$ implies $\kappa_n(r) \geq s - (t - s)$, and in fact $\kappa_n(r) - (s - (t - s)) \geq (t - s)/2$. Recalling (3.6), we see that

$$A_{s,t} = \int_s^t \left(P_{\kappa_n(r) -(t-s)} - P_{\kappa_n(r) -(s-(t-s))}\right) b(L_{s-(t-s)} + E^{s-(t-s)} \psi_r) dr.$$

Applying (3.6) with $\rho = 0$, $\beta \wedge ((1 - \varepsilon)\alpha)$ in place of $\beta$, $\mu = (\frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$, we get (note that all the assumptions of Proposition 3.2 are satisfied with such choice of parameters)

$$|A_{s,t}| \leq N \int_s^t n^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right) + 2\varepsilon}|t - s|^{-\left((1-\varepsilon)\frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right) - \varepsilon} \leq n^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right) + 2\varepsilon}|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}.$$ 

Taking $p$th moment and recalling (4.32), we see that the condition (3.2) is satisfied with $C_1 = Nn^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{n} \wedge \frac{1}{2}\right) + 2\varepsilon}$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon$. 

Proof of the main results
Moving on to the condition \((3.33)\), take \((s,t) \in \Delta_{[0,1]}\) and \(u := (t+s)/2\). As before, denote \(s_1 := s - (t-s)\), \(s_2 := s - (u-s)\), \(s_3 := s - u\), \(s_4 := u\), \(s_5 := t\). We need to bound \(\mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}\delta A_{t,u,t} = \mathbb{E}^{s_1, s_4, s_5}\). By a standard computation we see that

\[
\mathbb{E}^{s_1, s_4, s_5} = \mathbb{E}^{s_1, s_2} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) dr \\
= \mathbb{E}^{s_1, s_4} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) dr \\
+ \mathbb{E}^{s_1, s_2} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) dr \\
=: I_1 + I_2.
\]

The two terms are treated in exactly the same way, so we only discuss bounding of the first one. When \(|t-s| \geq 4/n\), then for \(r \geq s_3\) we have

\[
k_n(r) - s_2 \geq s_3 - 1/n - s_2 \geq (t-s)/4 > 0.
\]

Therefore we first write

\[
I_1 = \mathbb{E}^{s_1} \int_{s_3}^{s_4} (\mathbb{P}_{r-s_2} - \mathbb{P}_{\kappa_n(r)-s_2}) b(L_{s_2} + \mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r}) dr.
\]

Applying \((3.33)\) with \(\rho = 1, \beta \wedge 1\) in place of \(\beta, \mu = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6}\), and using \((4.33)\) yields (we see again that all the assumptions of Proposition 3.2 are satisfied with such choice of parameters)

\[
|I_1| \leq \int_{s_3}^{s_4} \|\mathbb{P}_{r-s_2} - \mathbb{P}_{\kappa_n(r)-s_2}\|_{\mathcal{L}^1} \mathbb{E}^{s_1} |\mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r} - \mathbb{E}^{s_2, \psi_r}| dr \\
\leq N \int_{s_3}^{s_4} n^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6})} \left| t-s \right|^{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6}\right)} \mathbb{E}^{s_1} |\mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_r} - \mathbb{E}^{s_2, \psi_r}| dr.
\]

Recall that \(\psi_r = \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}\) and that by \((4.30)\) we have a.s.

\[
\mathbb{E}^{s_1} |\mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}} - \mathbb{E}^{s_2, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}}| = \mathbb{E}^{s_1} |\mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}} - \mathbb{E}^{s_2, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}}| \\
\leq \mathbb{E}^{s_1} |\mathbb{E}^{s_1, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}} - \mathbb{E}^{s_2, \psi_{\kappa_n(r)}}| \\
\leq N |\kappa_n(r) - s_1|^{1-\epsilon + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha}} \\
\leq N |t-s|^{1-\epsilon + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha}}.
\]

Substituting this into \((4.35)\), we get

\[
|I_1| \leq N n^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6}) + \epsilon} |s_4 - s_3| \left| t-s \right|^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6} + \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} - \epsilon} \leq N n^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6}) + \epsilon} \left| t-s \right|^{1+\tilde{\epsilon}}
\]

where \(\tilde{\epsilon} := \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{\alpha} - \epsilon > 0\). Thanks to \((2.3)\). By a similar argument, the same bound holds for \(I_2\). Therefore, taking \(L_p\) norm and recalling \((4.33)\) we can conclude that in the case \(|t-s| \geq 4/n\) we have

\[
\|\mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)}\delta A_{s,u,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N n^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{6}) + \epsilon} \left| t-s \right|^{1+\tilde{\epsilon}}.
\]
Next, consider the case $|t - s| \leq 4/n$. Note that $\psi_r = \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n$ is always $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_n(r)-\frac{1}{n}}\omega(0)$ measurable. Therefore, if $r \in [\kappa_n(s), \kappa_n(s) + \frac{2}{n}]$, then $\psi_r$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\kappa_n(s)}$-measurable. Since $\kappa_n(s) \leq s_1$ and $\kappa_n(s) \leq s_2$ this implies that $\mathbb{E}^s \psi_r = \mathbb{E}^s \psi_r = \psi_r$ and thus the integrand in $I_1$ is zero. Hence, we can concentrate on the case $r \geq \kappa_n(s) + \frac{2}{n}$. In this case, $\kappa_n(r) = 1/n \geq s_2$. Thus we get

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E}_{s}^{s_1} \mathbb{E}_{\kappa_n(r)}^{s_1} \int_{[s, s_1]} \left[ b(L_r + \mathbb{E}^s \psi_r) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \mathbb{E}^s \psi_r) \right] \, dr$$

As before, we have a.s. from (4.9), $\mathbb{E}^s |\mathbb{E}^s \psi_r - \mathbb{E}^s \psi_r| \leq N |t-s|^{1-\varepsilon} \frac{n}{\kappa_n(s)} + \frac{1}{\kappa_n(s)}$. Therefore applying (3.7) with $\rho = 1$, we immediately deduce

$$|I_1| \leq N |t-s|^{1-\varepsilon} \frac{n}{\kappa_n(s)} + \frac{1}{\kappa_n(s)} \int_{[s, s_1]} \left[ \|P_1 b\|_1 + \|P_{r-\kappa_n(r)} + \frac{1}{\kappa_n(s)}\|_1 \right] \, dr$$

where in the penultimate inequality we used our main condition (3.6), and in the last inequality we used the fact that $|t-s| \leq 4/n$. By the same argument, exactly the same bound holds also for $|I_2|$. Recalling now (4.33) and (4.36), we can therefore conclude that (3.33) is satisfied with $C_2 = N n^{-\frac{1}{\kappa_n(s)} + \frac{1}{\kappa_n(s)}} + 2\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon \wedge \tilde{\varepsilon}$.

It remains to verify that the process $\mathcal{E}^{n,3}$ satisfies (3.4). Let $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$. In what follows, $K$ and $\varepsilon' > 0$ are constants that may change from line to line and whose value may depend on all the parameters but not on $s, t$ (it could even depend on $n$ but it is easy to see that it does not). First, using (4.6), we write

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{s, t}^{n,3} - \mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)} \mathcal{E}_{s, t}^{n,3} \|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq 2 \int_t \left[ b(L_r + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n) \right] \, dr$$

Next, we have trivially

$$\|\mathbb{E}^{s-(t-s)} \mathcal{E}_{s, t}^{n,3} - A_{s, t} \|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \int_t \left[ b(L_r + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n) - b(L_{\kappa_n(r)} + \varphi_{\kappa_n(r)}^n) \right] \, dr$$
By our choice of $s, t$ taking supremum over $s, t$ we obtain the claimed error estimate (2.4).

and substituting this back into (4.38) together with the Kolmogorov continuity theorem, we get

$$\|A - A_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + Nm^{-\epsilon'} \leq Nm^{-\epsilon'}, \tag{4.37}$$

Fix now $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote $t_i := s + \frac{i-\alpha}{m}$, $i = 0, \ldots, m$. We get

$$\|A - A_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \|A_{t_i, t_{i+1}} - A_{s, t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|A_{t_1} - A_0\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + Nm^{-\epsilon'} \leq Nm^{-\epsilon'},$$

which implies (4.35). The claimed bound (4.35) is therefore given by (4.1).

---

**4.4 Main proofs**

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** We use (4.22), (4.23), and (4.30) to bound each term in (4.1). Since $1 + \frac{(\beta-1)\alpha}{\alpha} > 1/2$ and $\gamma := \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \wedge \frac{1}{p} \right) - \varepsilon < 1$, we have that with an $\epsilon' > 0$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ the following bound holds

$$\|\varphi_t - \varphi_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{L^{p_{\epsilon', \gamma}}(\Omega)} + \|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{L^{p_{\gamma, \epsilon}}(s, t)}.$$

Take $S > 0$ small enough so that $S^{\delta'}N \leq 1/2$. If for some $m = 0, 1, \ldots, [S^{-1}]$, $s, t \in [mS, (m+1)S]$, then trivially both (semi)norms on the right-hand side above can be replaced by the ones on $[mS, (m+1)S]$. Moreover, one notices that $\|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{L^p_{\gamma, \epsilon}(mS, (m+1)S)} \leq \|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p_{\gamma, \epsilon}(\Omega)} + \|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{L^{p_{\gamma, \epsilon}}(mS, (m+1)S)}$. Therefore, upon dividing by $|t - s|^{1/2}$ and taking supremum over $s, t \in [mS, (m+1)S]$, we have

$$\|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq [S^{-1}] \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p_{\gamma, \epsilon}(\Omega)} + \|\varphi - \varphi^n\|_{L^{p_{\gamma, \epsilon}}(mS, (m+1)S)}.$$

By our choice of $S$, the estimate buckles and we get

$$\|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq n^{1-\gamma} + \|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \tag{4.38}$$

and consequently,

$$\|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq n^{1-\gamma} + 2\|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$  

Iterating this bound $[S^{-1}]$ times yields

$$\max_{m=0, \ldots, [S^{-1}]} \|\varphi_{mS} - \varphi^n_{mS}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq Nn^{1-\gamma} + N|x_0 - x^n_0|.$$  

and substituting this back into (4.38) together with the Kolmogorov continuity theorem, we obtain the claimed error estimate (2.2).

**Proof of Corollary 2.3.** Fix $\tau \in [0, 1/2]$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $p > 2$, $\delta \in [0, \varepsilon)$ such that $1/2 - 1/p - \delta/2 > \tau$ and $p\varepsilon/2 > 1$. Set

$$\eta(\omega) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (n^{1-\varepsilon} \|X(\omega) - X^n(\omega)\|_{C^\tau([0, 1])}).$$
Then by Theorem 2.2,
\[ E\eta^p = E[\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{\frac{\beta - \frac{p}{2}}{\alpha}} \|X(\omega) - X^n(\omega)\|_{C^*(0,1)]}^p] \]
\[ \leq E\left[ \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{\frac{\beta - \frac{p}{2}}{\alpha}} \|X(\omega) - X^n(\omega)\|_{C^*(0,1)]}^p \right] \]
\[ \leq N \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{\frac{\beta - \frac{p}{2} + \frac{\eta d}{2}}{\alpha}} \leq N \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{-p/2} < \infty. \]

Thus \( \eta < \infty \) a.s. which completes the proof.

**Appendix A. Proofs of the well-posedness of SDE (1.1)**

To show that SDE (1.1) is strongly well-posed we will run a fixed point argument. Throughout the Appendix we will assume that assumptions [1][3] holds. We will assume without loss of generality that \( \beta \leq 2 \). For a measurable bounded function \( f: [0, 1] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \gamma \in (0, 1], p \geq 1, T \in (0, 1) \) put

\[ \|f\|_{\mathcal{E}^\alpha_{p,T}} := \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|f(t)\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \sup_{s,t \in [0,T]} \frac{\|f(t) - f(s)\|_{L_p(\Omega)}}{(t-s)\gamma}. \]

and consider a mapping

\[ Sf(t) := \eta + \int_0^t b(L_s + f_s) ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \]

where \( \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is a \( \mathcal{F}_0 \)-measurable vector. We claim the following contraction bound.

**Lemma A.1.** Let \( \varphi, \psi: [0, 1] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) be bounded, adapted, measurable functions. Suppose that \( 1 - \alpha/2 < \beta < 2 \). Assume that there exist constants \( \tau \in (0, 1], \tau > (2 - \beta)/\alpha, C_{\varphi}, C_{\psi} > 0, T_0 \in (0, 1) \) such that for any \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_0 \) one has a.s.

\[ E^s|\varphi_t - E^s\varphi_t| \leq C_{\varphi}|t - s|^{\tau}; \quad E^s|\psi_t - E^s\psi_t| \leq C_{\psi}|t - s|^{\tau}. \]  

(A.1)

Then there exist constants \( N = (\alpha, \beta, p, d, \|b\|_{C^d}), \varepsilon = \varepsilon(\alpha, \beta) > 0 \) such that for any \( T \in (0, T_0) \)

\[ \|S\varphi - S\psi\|_{\mathcal{E}^\gamma_{\frac{1}{2},[0,T]}} \leq N(1 + C_{\varphi})T^\varepsilon \|\varphi - \psi\|_{\mathcal{E}^\gamma_{\frac{1}{2},[0,T]}}. \]  

(A.2)

**Proof.** We will apply Lemma 4.4 for \( g = \varphi, h = \psi, \beta = 1/2, \gamma = 2 \). We see that all the conditions of the Lemma are satisfied and it follows from (4.13) that for any \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T \)

\[ \|(S\varphi(t) - S\psi(t)) - (S\varphi(s) - S\psi(s))\|_{L_p(\Omega)} = \|\int_s^t (b(L_s + \varphi_s) - b(L_s + \psi_s)) ds\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \]
\[ \leq N(1 + C_{\varphi})|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon} \|\varphi - \psi\|_{\mathcal{E}^\gamma_{\frac{1}{2},[0,T]}}, \]  

(A.3)

where \( \varepsilon := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(\beta - 1)/\alpha}{2} > 0 \) thanks to (2.3). Therefore, by taking in the above inequality \( s = 0 \), we get

\[ \|S\varphi(t) - S\psi(t)\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq NT^\varepsilon(1 + C_{\varphi})\|\varphi - \psi\|_{\mathcal{E}^\gamma_{\frac{1}{2},[0,T]}}. \]

Combining this with (A.3), we get the desired bound (A.2). \( \square \)
Proof of Lemma 2.1: strong uniqueness. Let $X$, $\tilde{X}$ be two strong solutions to (1.1) with the initial condition $\eta$ adapted to the same filtration $\mathcal{F}$; here $\eta$ is $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Define $\varphi := X - L$, $\tilde{\varphi} := \tilde{X} - L$. Since $X, \tilde{X}$ solve (1.1), we obviously have $\mathcal{S}\varphi = \varphi$, $\mathcal{S}\tilde{\varphi} = \tilde{\varphi}$.

It follows from (2.3) that one can choose $\delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$\beta > \max(2 - \tilde{\alpha} - \alpha + \delta \alpha, 1 - \alpha/2 + \delta \alpha)$$

(A.4)

Then by Lemma 4.2(iii), condition (A.1) holds with $\tilde{\Sigma}$ Indeed, if $\beta < 1 - \alpha$ we have not imposed any moment conditions on $\eta$. Define $\eta := X - L, \tilde{\eta} := \tilde{X} - L$. Since $X, \tilde{X}$ solve (1.1), we obviously have $\mathcal{S}\eta = \eta, \mathcal{S}\tilde{\eta} = \tilde{\eta}$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Denote $\theta := 1 + \frac{\beta \lambda \Lambda \tilde{\alpha}}{\alpha} - \varepsilon$. First we note that

$$1 + (\beta \Lambda - \alpha)\theta - \theta > 0$$

(A.8)

Indeed, if $\beta \geq 1$ this is obvious; otherwise since $\beta > 1 - \alpha$ we have

$$\theta < 1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} < 1 + \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} = \frac{1}{1 - \beta}$$

which implies (A.8). Fix now $T_0 \in (0, 1]$ small enough such that

$$(8\|b\|_{C^0})^{\beta \Lambda \tilde{\alpha} T_0 + (\beta \Lambda)\theta - \theta} \leq 1$$

(A.9)
We will prove by induction over \( n \) that (A.7) holds with \( 8M^*\|b\|_{C^\beta} \) in place of \( N \), where

\[
M^* := M(\beta \land (\bar{\alpha} - \varepsilon/2), \varepsilon/2) + 1;
\]

recall the definition of the function \( M = M(p, \varepsilon) \) in [13].

The case \( n = 0 \) is obvious. Assume that the lemma holds for some \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \), and let us prove it for \( n + 1 \). Arguing similar to the proof of [Lemma 4.2] and using (4.6), we derive for any \( 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T_0 \)

\[
\mathbb{E}^s[\varphi_t^{(n+1)} - E^s\varphi_t^{(n+1)}] \leq 2\mathbb{E}^s[\varphi_t^{(n+1)} - \varphi_t] - \int_s^t b(L_s + E^s\varphi_r)\,dr
\]

\[
= 2\mathbb{E}^s\left| \int_s^t (b(L_r + \varphi_r^{(n)}) - b(L_s + E^s\varphi_r))\,dr \right|
\]

\[
\leq 4\|b\|_{C^\beta} \int_s^t (\mathbb{E}^s[|L_r - L_s|^{\beta\land 1} \land 1] + (\mathbb{E}^s[|\varphi_r^{(n)} - E^s\varphi_r|])^{\beta\land 1})\,dr
\]

\[
\leq 4\|b\|_{C^\beta} (M^*|t - s|^{1 + \frac{\beta\land 1 - \varepsilon}{\alpha}} + (8\|b\|_{C^\beta} M^*)^{\beta\land 1}|t - s|^{1 + \frac{\beta\land 1}{\theta}})
\]

(A.10)

\[
\leq 4\|b\|_{C^\beta} M^*\left(|t - s|^{\theta} + (8\|b\|_{C^\beta})^{\beta\land 1}|t - s|^{\theta} T^{1 + (\beta\land 1)\theta - \theta} \right)
\]

(A.11)

\[
\leq 8\|b\|_{C^\beta} M^*|t - s|^{\theta},
\]

where in (A.10) we used the induction step and assumption [13] in (A.11) we used (A.8), and in the last inequality we used (A.9). This proves (A.7) for \( n + 1 \), and thus completes the proof.

Now we can obtain the existence part of [Lemma 2.1]

Proof of [Lemma 2.1] strong existence. We fix again \( \delta > 0 \) small enough such that (A.4) holds. For any \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) we apply [Lemma A.1] to \( \varphi^{(n)} \) and \( \varphi^{(n+1)} \) with \( \tau = 1 + \frac{\beta\land\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha} - \delta \); as in the proof of uniqueness part it is clear that \( \tau > (2 - \beta)/\alpha \). We see that by [Lemma A.2] condition (A.1) holds for some universal \( T_0, C_\varphi = C_\psi = N \), where \( T_0, N \) do not depend on \( n \). Thus, all the conditions of [Lemma A.1] are met and we have for any \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \), \( T \in (0, T_0) \)

\[
\|\varphi^{(n+2)} - \varphi^{(n+1)}\|_{\mathbb{E}^s[0,T]}^{1/2} = \|\mathcal{S}\varphi^{(n+1)} - \mathcal{S}\varphi^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{E}^s[0,T]}^{1/2} \leq NT^\varepsilon\|\varphi^{(n+1)} - \varphi^{(n)}\|_{\mathbb{E}^s[0,T]}
\]

Pick now \( T \in (0, T_0) \) small enough so that \( NT^\varepsilon \leq 1/2 \). It is immediate to see that \( \|\varphi^{(1)} - \varphi^{(0)}\|_{\mathbb{E}^s[0,T]} \) is finite. Furthermore, the moment assumptions on \( \eta \). Thus, for any \( t \in [0, T] \) the sequence \( (\varphi_t^{(n)} - \eta)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} = (\varphi_t^{(n)} - \varphi_t^{(0)})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \) converges in \( L_2(\Omega) \) as \( n \to \infty \). Denote its limit by \( \psi_t \). We have

\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\psi_t - (\varphi_t^{(n)} - \eta)\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \quad \text{(A.12)}
\]

Put \( X_t := \eta + \psi_t + L_t \). We claim that (a version of) \( X \) is a strong solution to (1.1) on \([0, T]\). Indeed, for any \( t \in [0, T] \) random vector \( X_t \) is clearly \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-measurable as a limit of \( \mathcal{F}_t \)-measurable random vectors; further, recalling (A.6) we have

\[
\left\| X_t - \eta - \int_0^t b(X_s)\,ds - L_t \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)} = \left\| \psi_t - \int_0^t b(L_s + \eta + \psi_s)\,ds \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)}
\]
By (A.12), the right-hand side of the above inequality tends to 0 as \( X \) coincides with the moments of \( t \) where \( \tilde{\eta} \) that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
\text{Proof of Proposition 2.6.} \quad \text{Recall that we denoted the generating triplet of App. B. Proofs of the auxiliary statements of the article}
\]

\[
\text{Proofs of the auxiliary statements of the article} \quad \text{Appendix B. Proofs of the auxiliary statements of the article}
\]

\[
\text{Therefore, by [KS19a, Lemma A.3(i)],} \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\chi}_t = \eta + \int_0^t b(\tilde{X}_s) \, ds + L_t \text{ a.s. In particular,} \quad \tilde{\chi}_t := \eta + \int_0^t b(X_s) \, ds + L_t \text{ coincides with} \quad X \text{ for a.e.} \quad \omega, t \text{ and therefore satisfies}
\]

\[
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\chi}_t = \eta + \int_0^t b(\tilde{X}_s) \, ds + L_t \text{ for all} \quad t \in [0, T]) = 1.
\]

Repeating this argument finitely many times (recall that no assumptions were made on the moments of \( \eta \)) we get strong existence of solutions to SDE (1.1) on [0, 1].

\[
\text{Appendix B. Proofs of the auxiliary statements of the article}
\]

\[
\text{Proof of Proposition 2.6.} \quad \text{Recall that we denoted the generating triplet of} \quad L \text{ by} \quad (a, Q, \nu). \quad \text{By [SSW12, Theorem 1.3] with} \quad f(s) = s^\alpha, \quad \text{assumption (2.6) implies that there exists}\]

\[
t_0 = t_0(\alpha) > 0 \quad \text{such that the gradient bound} \quad (2.1) \quad \text{holds for small enough} \quad t \in (0, t_0]. \quad \text{If} \quad t \in (t_0, 1], \text{then}
\]

\[
\|\nabla P_t f\|_{C^0} \leq \|P_{t-t_0} \nabla P_{t_0} f\|_{C^0} \leq N t_0^{-1/\alpha} \|.f\|_{C^0} \leq \tilde{N} t^{-1/\alpha} \|.f\|_{C^0},
\]

where \( \tilde{N} = N t_0^{-1/\alpha} \), which proves (2.1).

Now we move on to (1.2) Fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Note that by [KS19a, Lemma A.2], (2.1) implies that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
\int_{|y| \leq 1} |y|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} \nu(dy) < \infty.
\]

Therefore, by [KS19a, Lemma A.3(i)], \( Q = 0 \).

\[
\text{If} \quad \alpha \in [1, 2], \text{then} \quad [KS19a, \text{Theorem 3.2(iii)}] \quad \text{implies for any} \quad f \in C^{\alpha + \varepsilon}
\]

\[
\mathcal{L} f(x) = \langle a, \nabla f(x) \rangle + \int_{|y| \geq 1} (f(x+y) - f(x)) \nu(dy) + \int_{|y| \leq 1} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(x+\lambda y) - \nabla f(x), y \rangle \, d\lambda \nu(dy).
\]

Hence

\[
\|\mathcal{L} f\|_{C^0} \leq |a| \|f\|_{C^1} + 2 \|f\|_{C^0} \nu(|y| \geq 1) + \|f\|_{C^{\alpha + \varepsilon}} \int_{|y| \leq 1} |y|^{\alpha + \varepsilon} \nu(dy) \leq N \|f\|_{C^{\alpha + \varepsilon}}.
\]

Very similarly, \( \|\mathcal{L} f\|_{C^1} \leq N \|f\|_{C^{\alpha + \varepsilon}}. \)

If \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), then by above \( \int_{|y| \leq 1} |y| \nu(dy) < \infty \). Consider now the process \( \tilde{L}_t := L_t + \kappa t \), where \( \kappa = -a + \int_{|y| \leq 1} y \nu(dy) \). Let \( \tilde{L} \) be its generator. It is immediate to see that

\[
\mathbb{E} e^{t(\lambda \tilde{L})} = \exp \left( t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{(\lambda y)} - 1) \nu(dy) \right), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ t \geq 0.
\]
Therefore all the conditions of [KS19a, Theorem 3.2(ii)] are satisfied and, thus, for any \( f \in C^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \)

\[
\tilde{L} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x + y) - f(y)) \nu(dy).
\]

Hence \( \|\tilde{L} f\|_{C^0} \leq \|f\|_{C^{\alpha+\varepsilon}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|y|^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \wedge 2) \nu(dy) \leq N \|f\|_{C^{\alpha+\varepsilon}} \). The bound on \( \|\tilde{L} f\|_{C^1} \) is established by the same argument.

Proofs that Examples 2.8 to 2.16 satisfy H1–H3. We begin with Example 2.8. In this case, Re \( \Phi(\lambda) = c_\alpha \int_S |\langle \lambda, \xi \rangle|^{\alpha} \mu(d\xi) \), for some \( c_\alpha > 0 \) and the upper bound in (2.6) is immediate. The lower bound follows from the argument presented in [Pri12] p. 424–425 (after Hypothesis 2). By Proposition 2.6 this implies that \( L \) (or its shifted version) satisfies [H1] and [H2].

It is easy to see that \( \int_{|y| \geq 1} |y|^p \nu(dy) < \infty \) for any \( p \in (0, \alpha) \), which implies [Sat13, Theorem 25.3] that

\[
\mathbb{E} \|L_1\|^p < \infty, \quad p \in (0, \alpha).
\]

(B.1)

If \( \alpha \in (1, 2) \), then by [Sat13] formula (14.15)], Law(\( L_t - \kappa t \)) = Law(t^{1/\alpha}(L_1 - \kappa)) for some \( \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, using (B.1), we get for \( p \in (0, \alpha) \), \( t \in (0, 1] \)

\[
\mathbb{E} \|L_t\|^p \leq N(t^{p/\alpha} \mathbb{E}\|L_1\|^p + t^p + t^{p/\alpha}) \leq N t^{p/\alpha},
\]

since \( \alpha > 1 \). This shows [H3].

If \( \alpha = 1 \), then by [Sat13] formula (14.16)], Law(\( L_t \)) = Law(tL_1 + \kappa t \log t) for some \( \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, by (B.1), for any \( p \in (0, 1) \)

\[
\mathbb{E} \|L_t\|^p \leq N t^{p/(1-\varepsilon)},
\]

which is [H3].

Finally, if \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), then consider the process \( \tilde{L}_t := L_t + \kappa t \), for \( \kappa = \int_{|y| \leq 1} |y| \nu(dy) \) (this integral is finite by [Sat13, Proposition 14.5]). By above, \( \tilde{L} \) satisfies [H1] and [H2]. Further, an easy direct calculation (see also [Sat13, Remark 14.6]) shows that \( \tilde{\Phi} \) has a symbol

\[
\tilde{\Phi}(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{0}^{\infty} (1 - e^{i\lambda \cdot \xi}) r^{-1-\alpha} dr \mu(d\xi).
\]

Hence Law(\( \tilde{L}_t \)) = \( t^{1/\alpha} \tilde{L}_t \), and thus thanks to (B.1), \( \mathbb{E} |\tilde{L}_t|^p \leq N t^{p/\alpha} \) for \( p \in (0, \alpha) \). Thus, \( \tilde{L} \) satisfies [H3].

Example 2.9 is a special case of Example 2.8 with \( \mu \) being uniform measure on \( S \).

Similarly, Example 2.10 is a special case of Example 2.8 with \( \mu = \sum_{k=1}^{d} (\delta_{e_k} + \delta_{-e_k}) \), where \( (e_k) \) is the standard basis in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), see, e.g., [Pri12] p. 425.

Now let us move on to Example 2.11. The Lévy process \( L \) now has the symbol

\[
\Phi(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{0}^{\infty} (1 - \cos(\langle \lambda, \xi \rangle) r^{-1-\alpha} r \mu(d\xi) dr,
\]

where we used the fact that \( \mu \) is symmetric. It is easy to see that non-degeneracy of \( \mu \) implies that \( \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\langle \lambda, \xi \rangle| \mu(d\xi) > 0 \) for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{S} \) and thus

\[
\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{S}} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\langle \lambda, \xi \rangle| \mu(d\xi) > 0.
\]

(B.2)

Applying (2.8), we get for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d \)

\[
\Phi(\lambda) \leq N \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{0}^{\infty} (1 - \cos(\langle r\lambda, \xi \rangle) r^{-1-\alpha} dr \mu(d\xi) \leq N |\lambda|^\alpha \int_{\mathbb{S}} |\langle \lambda, \xi \rangle|^\alpha \mu(d\xi) \leq N |\lambda|^\alpha.
\]

(B.3)
Similarly, denoting \( \lambda := \frac{\alpha}{|\lambda|} \), we get for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d \), with \(|\lambda| > 1/C\)

\[
\Phi(\lambda) \geq \int_S \int_0^C (1 - \cos(r(\lambda, \xi))) r^{-1-\alpha} \, d\mu(d\xi)
\]

\[
= |\lambda|^\alpha \int_S |(\lambda, \xi)|^\alpha \int_0^C |(\lambda, \xi)| (1 - \cos r) r^{-1-\alpha} \, d\mu(d\xi)
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{10} |\lambda|^\alpha \int_S |(\lambda, \xi)|^\alpha \int_0^C r^{1-\alpha} \, d\mu(d\xi)
\]

\[
\geq N |\lambda|^\alpha \int_S |(\lambda, \xi)|^2 \mu(d\xi)
\]

\[
\geq N |\lambda|^\alpha \left( \int_S |(\lambda, \xi)| \mu(d\xi) \right)^2
\]

\[
\geq N |\lambda|^\alpha.
\]

where we used inequality \( 1 - \cos r > \frac{r^2}{2} \) valid for \( r \in [0, 1] \) and \( \text{(B.2)} \). Combining this with \( \text{(B.3)} \), we see that symbol \( \Phi \) satisfies \( \text{(2.6)} \) for large \(|\lambda|\) and \( \text{(2.7)} \) for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, \( L \) satisfies \( \text{H1} \) \( \text{H3} \).

Examples 2.12 and 2.13 are special cases of Example 2.11.

In case of \( \text{Example 2.14} \) we have \( N^{-1} |\lambda|^\alpha \leq \Phi(\lambda) \leq N |\lambda|^\alpha \) for large enough \( |\lambda|\).

Further, \( \Phi(\lambda) \leq N \lambda^2 \) for small enough \( |\lambda|\). Thus, by \( \text{Proposition 2.6} \) and \( \text{Proposition 2.7} \) assumptions \( \text{H1} \) \( \text{H3} \) holds for the relativistic \( \alpha \)-stable process with \( \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha \).

Example 2.15 namely when \( L \) is a Brownian motion, is obvious.

Finally, let us treat \( \text{Example 2.16} \). We begin with part a). Put \( L := L^{(1)} + L^{(2)} \).

Let \( \mathcal{P} \) (respectively \( \mathcal{P}^{(i)} \)) be the semigroup associated with \( L \) (respectively \( L^{(i)}, i = 1, 2 \)).

Similarly let \( \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^{(i)} \) be the generators of \( L \), respectively \( L^{(i)} \). Then for any \( f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^d) \), \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) we have by independence of \( L^{(1)} \) and \( L^{(2)} \)

\[
\mathcal{P}_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}\mathcal{P}_t^{(2)} f(x + L_t^{(1)}).
\]

Thus, since \( L^{(2)} \) satisfies \( \text{H1} \)

\[
|\nabla \mathcal{P}_t f(x)| = |\mathbb{E}\nabla \mathcal{P}_t^{(2)} f(x + L_t^{(1)})| \leq N t^{-1/\alpha_2} \| f \|_{\mathcal{C}^0}.
\]

Therefore, \( L \) satisfies \( \text{H1} \) with \( \alpha = \alpha_2 \). Similarly, since \( \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}^{(2)} \), we see that \( L \) satisfies \( \text{H2} \) with \( \alpha = \alpha_2 \). Finally, to verify \( \text{H3} \) we fix \( p \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_1 \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \land \tilde{\alpha}_2) \). If \( p < \tilde{\alpha}_1 \), then there is nothing to prove:

\[
\mathbb{E}[|L_t^{(1)} + L_t^{(2)}|^p \land 1] \leq N \mathbb{E}|L_t^{(1)}|^p + N \mathbb{E}|L_t^{(2)}|^p \leq N t^{p/\alpha_2 - \epsilon},
\]

since \( \alpha_2 \geq \alpha_1 \). Alternatively, if \( \tilde{\alpha}_1 \leq p < \tilde{\alpha}_2 \), then

\[
\mathbb{E}[|L_t^{(1)} + L_t^{(2)}|^p \land 1] \leq N \mathbb{E}|L_t^{(1)}|^\tilde{\alpha}_1 - \epsilon \alpha_1 + N \mathbb{E}|L_t^{(2)}|^p \leq N (t^{\tilde{\alpha}_1 - 2\epsilon} + t^{\tilde{\alpha}_2 - \epsilon}) \leq N t^{\tilde{\alpha}_2 - 2\epsilon},
\]

where in the last inequality we used the fact that \( p < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \).

Part b) of \( \text{Example 2.16} \) is immediate.
To treat part c) of Example 2.16 we recall that by [App09, Theorem 2.4.16] Lévy–Itô decomposition holds. Namely, there exists a $d$-dimensional Brownian motion $W$ with covariance matrix $Q$ and an independent Poisson random measure $N$ such that

$$L_t = W_t + J_t = W_t + at + \int_0^t \int_{|x| \geq 1} xN(dr,dx) + \int_0^t \int_{|x| \leq 1} x\tilde{N}(dr,dx), \quad (B.4)$$

where $\tilde{N}$ is the compensated Poisson measure, that is, $\tilde{N}(D_1, D_2) := N(D_1, D_2) - \text{Leb}(D_1)\nu(D_2)$, $D_1 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, $D_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\text{Leb}$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$. By noting, that the processes $W$ and $J$ are independent, it is easy to see that $H1$ is satisfied with $\alpha = 2$ by exactly the same argument as in the proof of part a) above.

$H2$ is satisfied with $\alpha = 2$ by the same argument as we used in the proof of Proposition 2.6 recall that $\int_{|y| \leq 1} |y|^2 \nu(dy) < \infty$ thanks to the requirements to the jump measure.

To show $H3$, we note that for any $p \in (0, 2]$\!

$$E|W_t|^p \leq N t^{p/2}; \quad (B.5)$$

$$E\left| \int_0^t \int_{|x| \leq 1} x\tilde{N}(dr,dx) \right|^p \leq N t^{p/2} \left( \int_{|x| \leq 1} x^2 \nu(dx) \right)^{p/2} = N t^{p/2}, \quad (B.6)$$

where the inequality follows from, e.g., [Kum04 Lemma 2.4]. Further, by definition

$$E\left| \int_0^t \int_{|x| \geq 1} xN(dr,dx) \right|^\gamma \leq E \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\Delta L_s| \mathbb{1}(|\Delta L_s| \geq 1)^\gamma \leq E \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\Delta L_s|^\gamma \mathbb{1}(|\Delta L_s| \geq 1) = t \int_{|x| \geq 1} |x|^\gamma \nu(dx) = N t.$$

If $p \leq (\gamma \wedge 1)$, then combining this with $\text{(B.5)}, \text{(B.6)}$ and substituting into the decomposition $\text{(B.4)}$, we get

$$E|L_t|^p \leq N t^{p/2} + N t^{p/(\gamma \wedge 1)} \leq N t^{p/2}.$$

If $(\gamma \wedge 1) \leq p \leq 2$, then similarly

$$E[|L_t|^p \wedge 1] \leq N t^{p/2} + N t \leq N t^{p/2}.$$

Thus $L$ satisfies $H3$ with $\alpha = 2, \tilde{\alpha} = 2$.

**Proof of Lemma 3.1** The proof follows the ideas of [Ger20, proof of Lemma 2.2] as well as the proof of the original stochastic sewing lemma [Le20]. We will use the following bound [Ger20, inequality (2.10)]. Let $(Z_i)_{i=2,...,M}$ be a sequence of random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Then for any $p \geq 2$ there exits a constant $N = N(p)$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=2}^M Z_i \right\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq N \sum_{i=2}^M \left\| \mathbb{E}^{[i-2]} Z_i \right\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + N \left( \sum_{i=2}^M \left\| Z_i \right\|_{L_p(\Omega)}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (B.7)$$

This bound follows from the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality applied separately to even and odd terms of the sum of martingale differences $\sum_{i=2}^M (Z_i - \mathbb{E}^{[i-2]} Z_i)$. 

\square
Now we proceed to the proof. For $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the uniform partition of $[s,t]$: $t_i^m := s + i(t-s)2^{-m}$, $i = 0, \ldots, 2^m$. Put

$$A_{s,t}^m := \sum_{i=1}^{2^m-1} A_{t_i^m, t_{i+1}^m}, \ m \in \mathbb{N}.$$ 

Then it follows from (3.4) and the Fatou’s lemma that

$$\|A_t - A_s\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \liminf_{m \to \infty} \|A_{s,t}^m\|_{L_p(\Omega)}.$$  

(B.8)

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we apply (B.7) with $M := 2^m$, $Z_i := \delta A_{t_i^m, t_{i+1}^m}$, $G_i := F_{t_i^m}$. We get

$$\|A_{s,t}^{m+1} - A_{s,t}^m\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \left|\sum_{i=2}^{2^m} \delta A_{t_{i-1}^m, t_{i-2}^m, t_i^m}\right|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|A_{t_{i+1}^m, t_{i+2}^m}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq N \left(\sum_{i=2}^{2^m} \|E F_{t_{i-2}^m}^{m-1} \delta A_{t_{i-1}^m, t_{i-2}^m, t_i^m}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}\right)^{1/2} + \|A_{t_{i+1}^m, t_{i+2}^m}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq N 2^m C_2^{-2m(1+\varepsilon_2)}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_2} + N 2^m C_3^{-2m(1+\varepsilon_3)}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_3}$$

$$+ N 2^m C_2^{-m(1+\varepsilon_1)}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_1} + C_1 2^{-m(1+\varepsilon_1)}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_1}$$

$$\leq NC_2^{-m\varepsilon_2}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_2} + NC_3^{-m\varepsilon_3}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_3}$$

$$+ C_1^{-m\varepsilon_1}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_1} + C_1 2^{-m(1+\varepsilon_1)}|t - s|^{1+\varepsilon_1},$$  

(B.9)

where in the penultimate inequality we used bounds (3.2) and (3.3), the fact that $t_{i-1}^m - (t_i^m - t_{i-1}^m) = t_{i-2}^m$ and inequality $\|A_{s,u,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \|A_{s,u}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|A_{u,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|A_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$.

Summing up inequalities (B.9) over $m$ and using (3.2) once again, we deduce for $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\|A_{s,t}^m\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \|A_{s,t}^{i+1} - A_{s,t}^i\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|A_{s,t}^1\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq NC_2^{-1+\varepsilon_2} + NC_3^{-1+\varepsilon_3} + NC_1^{-1+\varepsilon_1}.$$ 

This together with (B.8) yields the desired estimate (3.5). □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We begin with the proof of (3.7). We proceed by induction. The case $\rho = 0$ is obvious. Indeed $\|P_t f\|_{C^\rho} \leq \|f\|_{C^\rho} \leq \|f\|_{C^\beta}$.

Assume now that the statement is proved for $\rho \in [0,M]$, $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let us prove it for $\rho \in (M,M+1]$.

Let $\rho = M + 1$. If $\beta \geq 1$, then by the definition of the norm

$$\|P_t f\|_{C^{\beta+1}} \leq \|P_t f\|_{C^\rho} + \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \|\partial_i P_t f\|_{C^\rho}$$

$$\leq \|f\|_{C^\rho} + \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \|P_t \partial_i f\|_{C^\rho}$$

$$\leq \|f\|_{C^\rho} + N t^{(\beta-M-1)/\alpha} \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \|\partial_i f\|_{C^{\beta-1}}.$$
\[ \leq N t^{(\beta - M - 1)/\alpha} \| f \|_{C^\beta}, \]  

(B.10)

where in the third inequality we have used the induction step. If \( \beta = 0 \), then

\[
\| P_t f \|_{C^{M+1}} \leq \| P_t f \|_{C^0} + \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \| \partial_i P_t f \|_{C^M} \\
\leq \| f \|_{C^0} + \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \| P_{t/2} \partial_i P_{t/2} f \|_{C^M} \\
\leq \| f \|_{C^0} + N t^{-M/\alpha} \sup_{i \in \{1, \ldots, d\}} \| \partial_i P_{t/2} f \|_{C^0} \\
\leq \| f \|_{C^0} + N t^{-M/\alpha} t^{-1/\alpha} \| f \|_{C^0} \\
\leq N t^{-(M+1)/\alpha} \| f \|_{C^0},
\]

(B.11)

where in the third inequality we used the induction step and in the fourth inequality we used (2.1). Finally, if \( \beta \in (0, 1) \), \( f \in C^\beta \), then define for \( \lambda > 0 \) the interpolation function

\[
K(\lambda, f) := \inf_{\alpha \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d), b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} (\| a \|_{C^0} + \lambda \| b \|_{C^1}).
\]

It is well-known, that if \( f \in C^\beta \), then

\[
N^{-1} \| f \|_{C^\beta} \leq \sup_{\lambda > 0} \frac{K(\lambda, f)}{\lambda^\beta} \leq N \| f \|_{C^\beta},
\]

(B.12)

see, e.g., [Lun18, Example 1.8]. Then for any \( a \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d), b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that \( f = a + b \) we get using (B.10) and (B.11)

\[
\| P_t f \|_{C^{M+1}} = \| P_t (a + b) \|_{C^{M+1}} \leq N t^{-(M+1)/\alpha} \| a \|_{C^0} + N t^{-M/\alpha} \| b \|_{C^1} \\
\leq N t^{-(M+1)/\alpha} (\| a \|_{C^0} + t^{1/\alpha} \| b \|_{C^1}).
\]

Taking infimum over all \( a \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^d), b \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \) such that \( f = a + b \) and using (B.12), we get

\[
\| P_t f \|_{C^{M+1}} \leq N t^{-(M+1)/\alpha} K(t^{1/\alpha}, f) \leq N \| f \|_{C^\beta} t^{-(M+1)/\alpha} t^{\beta/\alpha},
\]

which is (3.7). Thus, the case \( \rho = M + 1, \beta \geq 0 \) is proven.

Finally if \( \rho \in (M, M + 1) \), then by above and the standard interpolation inequality

\[
\| P_t f \|_{C^\rho} \leq \| P_t f \|_{C^{M+1}}^{1-\rho} \| P_t f \|_{C^M}^{\rho} \leq N \| f \|_{C^\beta} t^{\frac{1-\rho}{\alpha} (M+1-\rho)} t^{\frac{\rho - M - 1}{\alpha} (\rho - M)} \\
\leq N \| f \|_{C^\beta} t^{\frac{\beta - M - 1}{\alpha} (\rho - M)}. 
\]

Now let us prove (3.8). First note that it follows from assumptions of the proposition that \( 1 + \varepsilon \geq \mu \geq (\beta - \rho)/\alpha \). Thus

\[
\beta - \rho - \alpha - \varepsilon \alpha \leq 0.
\]

(B.13)

We see that for any \( 0 \leq s < t, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \),

\[
P_t f(x) - P_s f(x) = \int_s^t \partial_r P_r f(x) \, dr = \int_s^t L P_r f(x) \, dr,
\]
where we used the fact that for $r > 0$ we have $P_r f \in C^2$ by \eqref{eq:holder} and we applied Itô’s formula for Lévy processes, see, e.g., [App09, Theorem 4.4.7]. Therefore, by \eqref{eq:holder} and \eqref{eq:holder}, taking also into account \eqref{eq:holder}, we deduce

\[
\|P_t f - P_s f\|_{C^\rho} \leq \int_s^t \|L P_r f\|_{C^\rho} dr \leq N \int_s^t \|P_r f\|_{C^{\rho + \alpha + \epsilon}} dr \\
\leq N\|f\|_{C^\beta} \int_s^t r^{\frac{\beta - \rho - \alpha - \epsilon}{\alpha}} dr \\
\leq N\|f\|_{C^\beta} \int_s^t \frac{r^{\frac{\beta - \rho - \mu}{\alpha}}}{s^{\frac{\beta - \rho - \mu}{\alpha}}} (r - s)^{\mu - 1 - \epsilon} dr \\
\leq N\|f\|_{C^\beta} s^{\frac{\beta - \rho - \mu}{\alpha}} (t - s)^{\mu - \epsilon},
\]

where in the penultimate inequality we used obvious bounds $r \geq s$ and $r \geq r - s$ (we note that the corresponding exponents are nonpositive since $\frac{\beta - \rho - \mu}{\alpha} \leq 1 + \epsilon$), and in the last bound we used that $\mu > \epsilon$ and the singularity is integrable. This implies \eqref{eq:holder}. \qed
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