

Randomized Milstein algorithm for approximation of solutions of jump-diffusion SDEs

Paweł Przybyłowicz

Verena Schwarz

Michaela Szölgyenyi

Abstract

We investigate the error of the randomized Milstein algorithm for solving scalar jump-diffusion stochastic differential equations. We provide a complete error analysis under substantially weaker assumptions than known in the literature. In case the jump-commutativity condition is satisfied, we prove optimality of the randomized Milstein algorithm by proving a matching lower bound. Moreover, we give some insight into the multidimensional case by investigating the optimal convergence rate for the approximation of jump-diffusion type Lévy's areas. Finally, we report numerical experiments that support our theoretical findings.

Keywords: jump-diffusion SDEs, randomized Milstein algorithm, Lévy's area, n -th minimal error, optimality of algorithms, information-based complexity

MSC (2020): 68Q25, 65C30, 60H10

1 Introduction

Consider the following jump-diffusion stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX(t) = \mu(t, X(t)) dt + \sigma(t, X(t)) dW(t) + \rho(t, X(t-)) dN(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad X(0) = X_0, \quad (1)$$

where $\mu, \sigma, \rho : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are (at least) measurable functions, $T \in (0, \infty)$, $W = (W(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a standard Wiener process, and $N = (N(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a homogeneous Poisson process with intensity $\lambda > 0$ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that satisfies the usual conditions. Furthermore, we assume $p \in [2, \infty)$ and X_0 to be an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable with $\mathbb{E}[|X_0|^{2p}] < \infty$.

Due to their numerous applications in mathematical finance, control theory, and the modelling of energy markets, cf. [15, 20, 21, 23], jump-diffusion SDEs continue to gain scientific interest. Only in very special cases exact solutions are available. It is therefore important to develop efficient (or even in some sense optimal) numerical algorithms.

In this paper, we define the randomized Milstein algorithm, which is a Milstein-type scheme that uses randomization of the drift coefficient in time. We prove L^p -error and optimality of the scheme applied to SDE (1). We provide appropriate upper and lower error estimates in the multidimensional case, extending the findings from [2]. In the case that only a finite number of evaluations of W and N are allowed, this enables us to address the problem of the optimal approximation of jump-diffusion type Lévy's areas. As these Lévy's areas are naturally present in approximation schemes for jump-diffusion SDEs, our result implies lower error bounds. Analysis of the lower bounds and optimality is provided in the Information-Based Complexity (IBC) framework, see [24]. This setting is widely used for investigating optimal algorithms for approximation of solutions of SDEs, see, for example, [5, 6, 11], [12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 22, 10].

The approximate the solutions of SDEs using randomized algorithms is, for example, studied in [11, 12, 17, 18, 22], where the authors consider the randomized Euler–Maruyama scheme for SDEs in the jump-free case, and provide error bounds and optimality results. The articles [4]

and [5] discuss the properties of randomized quadrature rules used for approximating stochastic Itô integrals. Error bounds and optimality results of the randomized Milstein scheme for SDEs without jumps were investigated in [13] and [8]. The latter constructed a two-stage version of the randomized Milstein scheme and examined its error. In this paper we extend the results from [13] and [2] to provide results for jump-diffusion SDEs.

In the scalar case, we consider SDEs (1) with coefficients that are Hölder continuous in time and Lipschitz continuous and differentiable with Lipschitz continuous derivative in space. Under these assumptions we provide upper bounds for the error of the randomized Milstein algorithm. Our assumptions are significantly weaker than any other in the literature, where it is usually assumed that the coefficients are at least twice continuously differentiable in space, cf. [13, 15]. In addition to that, in case jump-commutativity condition (JCC) is satisfied, we prove optimality of the randomized Milstein algorithm among those randomized algorithms that use finitely many evaluations of the driving processes. It turns out that randomization of the drift coefficient in time improves the convergence rate, see Remark 4.2 and Theorem 4.1. In the multidimensional case we establish upper and lower bounds for the approximation of jump-diffusion Lévy's areas using the trapezoidal rule. These error bounds imply lower error bounds for any class of coefficients of multidimensional SDEs for which the two-dimensional SDE generating the Lévy's area is a subproblem. In particular, it implies optimality of the multidimensional Euler–Maruyama algorithm in the class of algorithms that use only finitely many evaluations of W and N . Therefore, the scalar and multidimensional case can differ a lot from a point of view of optimality of algorithms under certain admissible information about W , N , and under certain regularity assumptions. Our numerical experiments match the theoretical results on the convergence of the randomized Milstein algorithm. Most interestingly our experiments suggest that for the simulation of jump-diffusion SDEs the L^p -convergence rate is indeed dependent on p .

The main contributions of the paper are:

- We perform rigorous error analysis for the randomized Milstein algorithm for scalar jump-diffusion SDEs (1) under relatively mild assumptions on the coefficients (Theorem 3.2).
- We investigate lower error bounds in the worst-case setting in the scalar (Theorem 4.1) and multidimensional case (Theorem 4.3). This essentially allows us to establish optimality of the randomized Milstein algorithm in the scalar case with $p = 2$.
- We show that numerical experiments match our theoretical results.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 states the assumptions under which we perform error analysis for the randomized Milstein algorithm. Section 3 is devoted to error analysis of the randomized Milstein process. Lower bounds and optimality analysis in the IBC framework are given in Section 4. In Section 5 we show the results of the numerical experiments. Finally, some auxiliary results used in the proofs can be found in the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

For a random variable $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $\|X\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = (\mathbb{E}[|X|^p])^{1/p}$, where $p \in [2, \infty)$. We take $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t\right)$. Moreover, for $Z \in \{W, N\}$ we define $\mathcal{F}_\infty^Z = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t^Z\right)$ where $\mathcal{F}_t^Z = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \sigma(Z(s))\right)$. The processes W and N are independent, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_\infty^N \perp \mathcal{F}_\infty^W$, cf. [23, p. 64, Theorem 97]. We denote for all functions $f \in C^{0,1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$ the partial derivative of f with respect to y by f'_y . Further we define for all functions $f \in C^{0,1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$, $L_1 f(t, y) = \sigma(t, y) f'_y(t, y)$ and $L_{-1} f(t, y) = f(t, y + \rho(t, y)) - f(t, y)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

We impose the following assumptions on the coefficient functions.

Assumption 2.1. For the functions $\mu, \sigma, \rho: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and for $p \in [2, \infty)$ we assume that there exist constants $\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3 \in (0, 1]$ such that:

- (i) For all $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$, $f \in C^{0,1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})$.
- (ii) There exists a constant $K_1 > 0$ such that for all $t, s \in [0, T]$, $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t, y) - f(t, z)| &\leq K_1|y - z|, \\ |f'_y(t, y) - f'_y(t, z)| &\leq K_1|y - z|, \\ |f(t, y) - f(s, y)| &\leq K_1(1 + |y|)|t - s|^{\varrho_f}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $(\varrho_f, f) \in \{(\varrho_1, \mu), (\varrho_2, \sigma), (\varrho_3, \rho)\}$.

- (iii) There exists a constant $K_2 > 0$ such that for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $t, s \in [0, T]$,

$$|\mu'_y(t, y) - \mu'_y(s, y)| \leq K_2(1 + |y|)|t - s|^{\varrho_1}.$$

- (iv) There exists a constant $K_3 > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$, $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$, and all $f \in \{\sigma, \rho\}$ it holds that

$$|L_1 f(t, y) - L_1 f(t, z)| \leq K_3|y - z|.$$

- (v) For the initial value X_0 we assume that it is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable and that

$$\|X_0\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

By the Lipschitz assumption (2) we obtain that for all $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$ we have

$$|f(t, y)| \leq K_4(1 + |y|), \tag{3}$$

with $K_4 = \max_{i=1,2,3} \{\max\{|f(0, 0)|, K_1\} + K_1 T^{\varrho_i}\}$, and by (i) and (2),

$$|f'_y(t, y)| \leq K_1. \tag{4}$$

Furthermore, we know that for $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$ it holds that for all $t \in [0, T]$ the first partial derivative $f'_y(t, \cdot)$ is absolutely continuous, since it is Lipschitz continuous. Hence, for all $t \in [0, T]$ the second partial derivative $f''_{yy}(t, \cdot)$ exists almost everywhere on \mathbb{R} . For all $t \in [0, T]$ denote by $S_f(t)$ the set of Lebesgue measure 0 for which the second partial derivative $f''_{yy}(t, \cdot)$ does not exist. Then for $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$, $t \in [0, T]$, and all $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus S_f(t)$ it holds that

$$|f''_{yy}(t, y)| \leq K_1.$$

On $S_f(t)$ we define $f''_{yy}(t, \cdot) \equiv 0$. At this point, we like to emphasise that the choice of the values of $f''_{yy}(t, \cdot)$ on $S_f(t)$ does not influence the proof of the main result, since by using the local time theory we see that the suitable bounds we compute are not dependent on these values. Moreover, for $f \in \{\sigma, \rho\}$ we have that there exists a constant $K_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$\max\{|L_1 f(t, y)|, |L_{-1} f(t, y)|\} \leq K_5(1 + |y|). \tag{5}$$

Under Assumption 2.1 the existence and uniqueness of a strong solution to the SDE (1) is well-known, see, for example [16, p. 255, Theorem 6]. Since $\mathbb{E}[|X_0|^{2p}] < \infty$, there exists $K_6 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)|^{2p} \right] \leq K_6, \tag{6}$$

and for all $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|X(t) - X(s)|^p \right] \leq K_6 |t - s|, \quad (7)$$

see [22, Lemma 1]. The estimate (7) can be improved if $\rho \equiv 0$. Moreover, under the Assumption 2.1 (i), (ii), for $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$ and fixed $t \in [v_1, v_2] \subset [0, T]$, it is possible to apply the Meyer-Itô formula [16, p. 221, Theorem 71] to the function $\mathbb{R} \ni y \mapsto f(t, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ and to the solution process $(X(s))_{s \in [v_1, v_2]}$. This gives the following parametric version of the Meyer-Itô formula: For all $s, t \in [v_1, v_2]$ it holds that

$$f(t, X(s)) = f(t, X(v_1)) + \int_{v_1}^s \alpha(f, t, u) du + \int_{v_1}^s \beta(f, t, u) dW(u) + \int_{v_1}^s \gamma(f, t, u) dN(u), \quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(f, t, u) &= \alpha_1(f, t, u) + \alpha_2(f, t, u), \\ \alpha_1(f, t, u) &= f'_y(t, X(u))\mu(u, X(u)), \\ \alpha_2(f, t, u) &= \frac{1}{2} f''_{yy}(t, X(u))\sigma^2(u, X(u)), \\ \beta(f, t, u) &= f'_y(t, X(u))\sigma(u, X(u)), \\ \gamma(f, t, u) &= f(t, X(u-) + \rho(u, X(u-))) - f(t, X(u-)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.1 states basic estimates for the functions above. For approximating the solution of SDE (1) we use the randomized Milstein algorithm. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $\delta = T/n$ and let $t_i = i\delta$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Moreover, we use the notation $\Delta Y_i = Y(t_{i+1}) - Y(t_i)$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$,

and $I_{s,t}(Y, Z) = \int_s^t \int_s^{u-} dY(v) dZ(u)$ for $Y, Z \in \{W, N\}$ and $s, t \in [0, T]$. Note that

$$I_{s,t}(N, W) + I_{s,t}(W, N) = (W(t) - W(s))(N(t) - N(s)), \quad (9)$$

and the σ -fields $\sigma(I_{s,t}(Y, Z))$ and \mathcal{F}_s are independent, cf. [7, Fact B.28 (ii)]. Let $\{\xi_i\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ be independent random variables on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, such that the σ -fields $\sigma(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ and \mathcal{F}_∞ are independent, with ξ_i being uniformly distributed on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$. Then the randomized Milstein algorithm $X^{(\delta)}$ is defined recursively through

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(\delta)}(t_0) &= X_0, \\ X^{(\delta)}(t_{i+1}) &= X^{(\delta)}(t_i) + \mu(\xi_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\delta + \sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\Delta W_i + \rho(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\Delta N_i \\ &\quad + L_1\sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(W, W) + L_{-1}\rho(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, N) \\ &\quad + L_{-1}\sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) + L_1\rho(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(W, N), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

In order to analyse the error of the randomized Milstein algorithm we use the so-called time-continuous Milstein approximation $(X_c^{(\delta)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, called the randomized Milstein process. It is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} X_c^{(\delta)}(t_0) &= X_0, \\ X_c^{(\delta)}(t) &= X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i) + \mu(\xi_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))(t - t_i) + \sigma(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))(W(t) - W(t_i)) \\ &\quad + \rho(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))(N(t) - N(t_i)) \\ &\quad + L_1\sigma(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t}(W, W) + L_{-1}\rho(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t}(N, N) \\ &\quad + L_{-1}\sigma(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t}(N, W) + L_1\rho(t_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t}(W, N), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for $t \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

This implies that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $X^{(\delta)}(t_i) = X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i)$. Now, analog to [13], we extend the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in the following way: we take $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_t \cup \mathcal{G}^n)$, where $\mathcal{G}^n = \sigma(\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$. Since \mathcal{G}^n and \mathcal{F}_∞ are independent, W and N are still Wiener and Poisson processes with respect to $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$, respectively. Since in the paper we are integrating

- $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ -progressively measurable processes with respect to the continuous $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingales $(t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, $(W(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$,
- $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted càdlàg processes with respect to the càdlàg $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ -semimartingale $(N(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$,

the (stochastic) integrals are well-defined, see, for example, [16]. Moreover, the randomized Milstein process is $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ -progressively measurable, since it is càdlàg and adapted.

Note that the randomised Milstein process is not an implementable algorithm since it uses all values of W and N and these are not accessible. However we will use it as an auxiliary scheme for our proof that the randomized Milstein algorithm has convergence orders $\delta^{\min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}}$.

3 Error analysis for the randomized Milstein process

Let for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$U_i = (t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i)), \quad V_i = (\xi_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i)).$$

The processes X and $X_c^{(\delta)}$ can be written for all $t \in [0, T]$ as

$$X(t) = X(0) + A(t) + B(t) + C(t),$$

$$X_c^{(\delta)}(t) = X(0) + A^{(\delta)}(t) + B^{(\delta)}(t) + C^{(\delta)}(t),$$

where

$$A(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu(s, X(s)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds,$$

$$B(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sigma(s, X(s)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s),$$

$$C(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho(s, X(s-)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s),$$

$$A^{(\delta)}(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu(V_i) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds,$$

$$B^{(\delta)}(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\sigma(U_i) + \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \sigma(U_i) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^s L_{-1} \sigma(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s),$$

$$C^{(\delta)}(t) = \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\rho(U_i) + \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \rho(U_i) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^{s-} L_{-1} \rho(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s).$$

Lemma 3.1. *Under the Assumption 2.1 it holds that there exists a constant $K_8 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|X_c^{(\delta)}(t)|^p] \leq K_8. \quad (12)$$

Proof. By induction and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[|X_0|^p] < \infty$ we get that

$$\max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}[|X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p] < \infty. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, by (13) and (11) we obtain that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $c_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|X_c^\delta(t)|^p] \leq c_1(1 + \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \mathbb{E}[|X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p]) < \infty. \quad (14)$$

Now, we denote for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$X_c^{(\delta)}(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t \Psi_{1,n}(s) ds + \int_0^t \Psi_{2,n}(s) dW(s) + \int_0^t \Psi_{3,n}(s) dN(s), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{1,n}(s) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mu(V_i) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s), \\ \Psi_{2,n}(s) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\sigma(U_i) + \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \sigma(U_i) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^s L_{-1} \sigma(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s), \\ \Psi_{3,n}(s) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\rho(U_i) + \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \rho(U_i) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^{s^-} L_{-1} \rho(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.6 we have for all $(k, Z) \in \{(1, s), (2, W), (3, N)\}$ that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \Psi_{k,n}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \leq \hat{c} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Psi_{k,n}(s)|^p] ds.$$

From (3) we get that there exist constants $c_2, c_3 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Psi_{1,n}(s)|^p] \leq K_4^p \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[(1 + |X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|)^p] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \leq c_2 + c_3 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[|X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s). \quad (16)$$

By (3), (5), and Lemma A.6 we obtain that there exist constants $c_4, c_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $(k, f) \in \{(2, \sigma), (3, \rho)\}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\Psi_{k,n}(s)|^p] ds &\leq \hat{c} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_0^t |f(U_i)|^p \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \hat{c} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_0^t \left| \int_{t_i}^s L_1 f(U_i) dW(u) \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right] \\ &\quad + \hat{c} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_0^t \left| \int_{t_i}^s L_{-1} f(U_i) dN(u) \right|^p \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right] \\ &\leq c_4 + c_5 \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[|X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here we used that $\int_{t_i}^s L_{-1}f(U_i) dN(u)$ and $\int_{t_i}^{s-} L_{-1}f(U_i) dN(u)$ differ only at finitely many points. Combining (15), (16), and (17) we obtain that there exist constants $c_6, c_7, c_8 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_c^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] &\leq c_6 \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|X(0)|^p \right] + \sum_{k=1}^3 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[|\Psi_{k,n}(s)|^p \right] ds \right) \\ &\leq c_7 \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|X(0)|^p \right] + 1 \right) + c_8 \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_c^{(\delta)}(s)|^p \right] \leq c_7 \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|X(0)|^p \right] + 1 \right) + c_8 \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] ds.$$

The mapping $t \mapsto \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \mathbb{E} \left[|X_c^{(\delta)}(s)|^p \right]$ is monotone and hence Borel measurable. Moreover, by (14) it is bounded. Hence, applying Gronwall's lemma proves the claim. \square

Next we prove the convergence rate of the randomized Milstein algorithm.

Theorem 3.2. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold. Then there exists $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \delta^{\min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}}.$$

Proof. For all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$X(t) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t) = (A(t) - A^{(\delta)}(t)) + (B(t) - B^{(\delta)}(t)) + (C(t) - C^{(\delta)}(t)). \quad (18)$$

We first rewrite each summand of the right hand side of equation (18). We obtain

$$A(t) - A^{(\delta)}(t) = \tilde{A}_1^{(\delta)}(t) + \tilde{A}_2^{(\delta)}(t) + \tilde{A}_3^{(\delta)}(t), \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_1^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mu(s, X(s)) - \mu(s, X(t_i))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds, \\ \tilde{A}_2^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mu(s, X(t_i)) - \mu(\xi_i, X(t_i))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds, \\ \tilde{A}_3^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mu(\xi_i, X(t_i)) - \mu(\xi_i, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

For $\tilde{A}_1^{(\delta)}(t)$ we apply the parametric version of the Meyer-Itô formula (8), that is

$$\mu(s, X(s)) - \mu(s, X(t_i)) = \int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\mu, s, u) du + \int_{t_i}^s \beta(\mu, s, u) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) dN(u).$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{A}_1^{(\delta)}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \tilde{M}_j^{(\delta)}(t), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_1^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\mu, s, u) du \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds, \\ \tilde{M}_2^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \beta(\mu, s, u) dW(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds, \\ \tilde{M}_3^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) dN(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Next we obtain for the second summand of (18),

$$\begin{aligned} B(t) - B^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\sigma(s, X(s)) - \sigma(t_i, X(s))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\sigma(t_i, X(s)) - \sigma(t_i, X(t_i)) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. - \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \sigma(U_i) dW(u) - \int_{t_i}^s L_{-1} \sigma(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\sigma(t_i, X(t_i)) - \sigma(U_i)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s). \end{aligned}$$

Again we apply the parametric version of the Meyer-Itô formula (8) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma(t_i, X(s)) - \sigma(t_i, X(t_i)) - \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \sigma(U_i) dW(u) - \int_{t_i}^s L_{-1} \sigma(U_i) dN(u) \\ &= \int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\sigma, t_i, u) du + \int_{t_i}^s (\beta(\sigma, t_i, u) - L_1 \sigma(U_i)) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(\sigma, t_i, u) - L_{-1} \sigma(U_i)) dN(u). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
B(t) - B^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\sigma, t_i, u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\beta(\sigma, t_i, u) - L_1 \sigma(U_i)) dW(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(\sigma, t_i, u) - L_{-1} \sigma(U_i)) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \quad (21) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\sigma(s, X(s)) - \sigma(t_i, X(s))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\sigma(t_i, X(t_i)) - \sigma(U_i)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dW(s).
\end{aligned}$$

For the third summand of (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
C(t) - C^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\rho(s, X(s-)) - \rho(t_i, X(s-))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\rho(t_i, X(s-)) - \rho(t_i, X(t_i)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \rho(U_i) dW(u) - \int_{t_i}^{s-} L_{-1} \rho(U_i) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\rho(t_i, X(t_i)) - \rho(U_i)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Again we apply the parametric version of the Meyer-Itô formula (8) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho(t_i, X(s-)) - \rho(t_i, X(t_i)) - \int_{t_i}^s L_1 \rho(U_i) dW(u) - \int_{t_i}^{s-} L_{-1} \rho(U_i) dN(u) \\
&= \int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\rho, t_i, u) du + \int_{t_i}^s (\beta(\rho, t_i, u) - L_1 \rho(U_i)) dW(u) + \int_{t_i}^{s-} (\gamma(\rho, t_i, u) - L_{-1} \rho(U_i)) dN(u);
\end{aligned}$$

due to the continuity of the processes

$$\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\rho, t_i, u) du = \int_{t_i}^{s-} \alpha(\rho, t_i, u) du, \quad \int_{t_i}^s \beta(\rho, t_i, u) dW(u) = \int_{t_i}^{s-} \beta(\rho, t_i, u) dW(u).$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
C(t) - C^{(\delta)}(t) &= \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(\rho, t_i, u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\beta(\rho, t_i, u) - L_1 \rho(U_i)) dW(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^{s-} (\gamma(\rho, t_i, u) - L_{-1} \rho(U_i)) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \quad (22) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\rho(s, X(s-)) - \rho(t_i, X(s-))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (\rho(t_i, X(t_i)) - \rho(U_i)) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dN(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate all terms in (19), (20), (21), and (22). We apply Lemma A.6 and Assumption 2.1 (i) for $(f, v, Z) \in \{(\mu, \xi_i, \text{Id}), (\sigma, t_i, W), (\rho, t_i, N)\}$. This shows that there exists a constant $c_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (f(v, X(t_i)) - f(v, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq \hat{c} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |f(v, X(t_i)) - f(v, X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i))|^p \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right] \quad (23) \\
&\leq c_1 \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} [|X(t_i) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p] \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we obtain that there exists $c_2 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for $(f, Z) \in \{(\sigma, W), (\rho, N)\}$ and for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (f(s, X(s-)) - f(t_i, X(s-))) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq \hat{c} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} |f(s, X(s-)) - f(t_i, X(s-))|^p ds \right] \\
&\leq \hat{c} K_1^p \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (1 + |X(s-)|)^p \cdot (s - t_i)^{p \varrho_f} ds \right] \quad (24) \\
&\leq \hat{c} K_1^p \delta^{p \varrho_f} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (1 + |X(s)|)^p ds \right] \leq 2^{p-1} \hat{c} K_1^p \delta^{p \varrho_f} \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)|^p \right] \right) \leq c_2 \delta^{p \varrho_f}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.6 we get that there exist constants $c_3, c_4 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for $(f, v, Z) \in \{(\mu, s, \text{Id}), (\sigma, t_i, W), (\rho, t_i, N)\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(f, v, u) \, du \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\ & \leq c_3 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s |\alpha_1(f, v, u)| \, du \right)^p \right] \, ds + c_4 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s |\alpha_2(f, v, u)| \, du \right)^p \right] \, ds. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Next we estimate the expectations in equation (25) separately. For the first term we use (3), (4), and (6) to obtain that there exists a constant $c_5 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $v \in \{s, t_i\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s |\alpha_1(f, v, u)| \, du \right)^p \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s |f'_y(v, X(u))| \cdot |\mu(u, X(u))| \, du \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq (K_1 K_4)^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s (1 + |X(u)|) \, du \right)^p \right] \leq (K_1 K_4)^p \delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)| \right)^p \right] \leq c_5 \delta^p. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

For the second term we obtain that there exist constants $c_6, c_7, c_8 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $v \in \{s, t_i\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s |\alpha_2(f, v, u)| \, du \right)^p \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{t_i}^s |f''_{yy}(v, X(u))| \cdot |\sigma^2(u, X(u))| \, du \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq \left(\frac{K_1}{2} \right)^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^s \sigma^2(u, X(u)) \, du \right)^p \right] \leq c_6 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} (1 + |X(u)|^2) \, du \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq c_7 \delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)|^2 \right)^p \right] \leq c_8 \delta^p, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

since $|f''_{yy}(t, y)| \leq K_1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, combining equations (25), (26), and (27) we obtain that there exists a constant $c_9 \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \alpha(f, v, u) \, du \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \leq c_9 \delta^p. \quad (28)$$

For $(f, Z) \in \{(\sigma, W), (\rho, N)\}$ and $t \in [0, T]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)) \, dW(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\ & \leq \hat{c} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_i}^s (\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)) \, dW(u) \right|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Further, there exists a constant $c_{10} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_i}^s (\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)) \, dW(u) \right|^p \right] \leq c_{10} (s - t_i)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^s |\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)|^p \, ds \right].$$

Moreover, for $u \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)| &\leq |\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(t_i, X(u))| + |L_1 f(t_i, X(u)) - L_1 f(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))| \\ &\leq K_3 |X(u) - X(t_i)| + K_3 |X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)| + K_1^2 (1 + |X(u)|) \cdot |u - t_i|^{\varrho_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and by (6), (7) we have that there exist constants $c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{13} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)|^p \right] \leq c_{11} (u - t_i) + c_{12} (u - t_i)^{p\varrho_2} + c_{13} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right].$$

Hence, there exist constants $c_{14}, c_{15}, c_{16} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\beta(f, t_i, u) - L_1 f(U_i)) dW(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq c_{14} \delta^{\frac{p}{2}+1} + c_{15} \delta^{p(\varrho_2 + \frac{1}{2})} + c_{16} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Moreover, for $(f, Z) \in \{(\sigma, W), (\rho, N)\}$ and $t \in [0, T]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^{s^-} (\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq \hat{c} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)) dN(u) \right|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)) dN(u) \right|^p \right] \leq \hat{c} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^s |\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)|^p ds \right].$$

Further, there exist constants $c_{17}, c_{18}, c_{19} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_i}^s |\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)|^p du \\ &\leq c_{17} \int_{t_i}^s |X(u) - X(t_i)|^p du + c_{18} \delta |X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p + c_{19} \int_{t_i}^s (1 + |X(u)|)^p \cdot |u - t_i|^{p\varrho_3} du, \end{aligned}$$

hence, by (6) and (7) there exist constants $c_{20}, c_{21}, c_{22} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^{s^-} (\gamma(f, t_i, u) - L_{-1} f(U_i)) dN(u) \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) dZ(s) \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq c_{20} \delta^2 + c_{21} \delta^{p(\varrho_3 + \frac{1}{p})} + c_{22} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

With this preliminary calculations we can estimate the error of the randomized Milstein algorithm as follows. It holds that there exists a constant $c_{23} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \\ & \leq c_{23} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|A(t) - A^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[|B(t) - B^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[|C(t) - C^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Combining (21) resp. (22) with (23), (24), (28), (29), and (30), we obtain that there exist constants $c_{24}, c_{25}, c_{26}, c_{27} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|B(t) - B^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{24} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3 + \frac{1}{p}\}} + c_{25} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds, \quad (32)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|C(t) - C^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{26} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_3, \varrho_2 + \frac{1}{2}\}} + c_{27} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds. \quad (33)$$

Next we estimate the remaining terms in (19) and (20). The estimation of $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{M}_1^{(\delta)}(t)|^p]$ is already included in (28). Analog to the steps in [13, pages 8–10] and by applying Lemma A.1 we obtain that there exists a constant $c_{28} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{M}_2^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{28} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{1}{2} + \varrho_1, 1\}}. \quad (34)$$

We now show the upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{M}_3^{(\delta)}(t)|^p]$. There exists a constant $c_{29} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ there exists $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ with $t \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{M}_3^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] & \leq c_{29} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(\mu, s, u) - \gamma(\mu, t_i, u)) \, dN(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds \right|^p \right] \right. \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) \, d\tilde{N}(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds \right|^p \right] \\ & \quad + \lambda^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) \, du \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds \right|^p \right] \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_\ell}^t \left(\int_{t_\ell}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) \, dN(u) \right) \, ds \right|^p \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By Lemmas A.6 and A.1 we obtain that there exists a constant $c_{30} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s (\gamma(\mu, s, u) - \gamma(\mu, t_i, u)) \, dN(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds \right|^p \right] \\ & \leq \hat{c} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^s |\gamma(\mu, s, u) - \gamma(\mu, t_i, u)|^p \, du \right] \, ds \\ & \leq \hat{c} K_7 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^s (1 + |X(u-)|)^p \cdot (s - t_i)^{p\varrho_1} \, du \right] \, ds \leq c_{30} \delta^{p(\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p})}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Similar as above, by the Hölder inequality, (6), and Lemma A.1 we obtain that there exists a constant $c_{31} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_\ell}^t \left(\int_{t_\ell}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) dN(u) \right) ds \right|^p \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{t_\ell}^t \left| \int_{t_\ell}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) dN(u) \right| ds \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq \delta^{p-1} \int_{t_\ell}^{t_{\ell+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_\ell}^s \gamma(\mu, s, u) dN(u) \right|^p \right] ds \leq \hat{c} \delta^{p-1} \int_{t_\ell}^{t_{\ell+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_\ell}^s |\gamma(\mu, s, u)|^p du \right] ds \leq c_{31} \delta^{p+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Further we obtain that there exists a constant $c_{32} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) du \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right|^p \right] \\ \leq T^{p-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) du \right|^p \right] ds \leq T^{p-1} \delta^{p-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^s |\gamma(\mu, t_i, u)|^p du \right] ds \leq c_{32} \delta^p. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^{t_\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) d\tilde{N}(u) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) ds \right|^p \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Z}_{\ell-1}|^p \right], \quad (39)$$

where

$$\tilde{Z}_k = \sum_{i=0}^k \tilde{Y}_i, \quad k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\},$$

with $Z_{-1} = 0$, and

$$\tilde{Y}_i = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left(\int_{t_i}^s \gamma(\mu, t_i, u) d\tilde{N}(u) \right) ds.$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_k := \mathcal{F}_{t_{k+1}}$. Then it holds that $\{\tilde{Z}_k, \mathcal{G}_k\}_{k=0,1,\dots,n-1}$ is a discrete-time martingale, since \tilde{Z}_k is adapted to \mathcal{G}_k for $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and from Fubini's theorem for conditional expectations (see [1]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{Z}_{k+1} - \tilde{Z}_k | \mathcal{G}_k] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_{k+2}} \left(\int_{t_{k+1}}^s \gamma(\mu, t_{k+1}, u) d\tilde{N}(u) \right) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{k+1}} \right] \\ &= \int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_{k+2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_{k+1}}^s \gamma(\mu, t_{k+1}, u) d\tilde{N}(u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_{k+1}} \right] ds = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the discrete version of the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Jensen's inequality we obtain that there exist constants $c_{33}, c_{34} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Z}_k|^p \right] \leq c_{33} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^k |\tilde{Y}_i|^2 \right)^{p/2} \right] \leq c_{33} n^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{Y}_i|^p \right] \leq c_{34} \delta^{\frac{p}{2}+1}, \quad (40)$$

for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Combining (35), (36), (37), (38), (39), and (40) we get that there exists a constant $c_{35} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{M}_3(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{35} \delta^{p \min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}, 1\}}. \quad (41)$$

By (28), (34), and (41) we get that there exists a constant $c_{36} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{A}_1^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{36} \delta^{p \min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}, 1\}}. \quad (42)$$

Analog to the proof of [13, equation 33] we get that there exists a constant $c_{37} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{A}_2^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{37} \delta^{p(\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2})}. \quad (43)$$

Moreover, we can estimate $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{A}_3^{(\delta)}(t)|^p]$ by using (23). Therefore, by (23), (42), and (43) we have that there exist constants $c_{38}, c_{39} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|A(t) - A^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] \leq c_{38} \delta^{p \min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}, 1\}} + c_{39} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds. \quad (44)$$

Using (31), (32), (33), and (44) we have that there exist constants $c_{40}, c_{41} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t)|^p \right] &\leq c_{40} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}} + c_{41} \int_0^t \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(t_i) - X^{(\delta)}(t_i)|^p \right] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(s) \, ds \\ &\leq c_{40} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}} + c_{41} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(u) - X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(u) - X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] \leq c_{40} \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}} + c_{41} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(u) - X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] \, ds. \quad (45)$$

The function $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(u) - X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] \in [0, \infty)$ is Borel measurable, since it is non-decreasing and bounded due to (6) and (12). Therefore, by applying Gronwall's lemma to (45) we obtain that there exists a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \mathbb{E} \left[|X(u) - X_c^{(\delta)}(u)|^p \right] \leq C \delta^{p \min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}}.$$

□

Remark 3.3. Note that for the classical Milstein scheme $\bar{X}^{(\delta)}$, which can be seen as a randomized Milstein process with ξ_i fixed to t_i for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have that there exists a constant $K_9 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - \bar{X}_c^{(\delta)}(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_9 \delta^{\min\{\frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}}.$$

This follows from a straightforward modification of the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Remark 3.4. In the jump-free case ($\rho = 0$) we get from the proof of Theorem 3.2 that there exists $K_{10} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X(t) - X_c^{(\delta)}(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_{10} \delta^{\min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \varrho_2\}}.$$

Hence our result implies the same upper error bound for the randomized Milstein process as in [13, Proposition 1] but under slightly weaker assumptions on μ and σ . Moreover, for $\varrho_2 = \min\{\frac{1}{2} + \varrho_1, 1\}$ we recover the upper error bound from [8], which therein is obtained for a two-stage randomized Milstein scheme.

4 Lower bounds and optimality

In this section we first consider the scalar case under the JCC and then we study the multidimensional case. In both cases we set $p = 2$ and assume availability only of standard information, given by values of W and N at a finite number of points. We investigate lower bounds and optimality in the IBC framework, cf. [24].

4.1 Scalar case and optimality of the randomized Milstein algorithm

We investigate lower bound and optimality of the randomized Milstein algorithm in the case where $p = 2$ and when the JCC is satisfied, that is

$$L_{-1}\sigma(t, y) = L_1\rho(t, y), \quad (t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (46)$$

see [15]. It follows that under condition (46) the randomized Milstein algorithm uses only standard discrete information about W, N , i.e., the values $W(t_1), \dots, W(t_n), N(t_1), \dots, N(t_n)$, since, by (9) and (10), in that case it has the form

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(\delta)}(t_0) &= X_0, \\ X^{(\delta)}(t_{i+1}) &= X^{(\delta)}(t_i) + \mu(\xi_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\delta + \sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\Delta W_i + \rho(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\Delta N_i \\ &\quad + L_1\sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(W, W) + L_{-1}\rho(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))I_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, N) \\ &\quad + L_{-1}\sigma(t_i, X^{(\delta)}(t_i))\Delta W_i\Delta N_i, \quad \text{for } i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if the JCC holds, the scheme is implementable.

In order to provide worst-case error and optimality analysis we define the following function classes. For $K \in (0, \infty)$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, a function $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to the function class F_K^γ if and only if for all $t, s \in [0, T]$ and all $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ it satisfies

- (i) $f \in C^{0,1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$,
- (ii) $|f(0, 0)| \leq K$,
- (iii) $|f(t, y) - f(t, z)| \leq K|y - z|$,
- (iv) $|f(t, y) - f(s, y)| \leq K(1 + |y|)|t - s|^\gamma$,
- (v) $\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, y) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, z) \right| \leq K|y - z|$.

In this paper we consider drift coefficients μ from the class

$$\mathcal{M}_K^{\varrho_1} = \left\{ \mu \in F_K^{\varrho_1} : \left| \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial y}(t, y) - \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial y}(s, y) \right| \leq K(1 + |y|)|t - s|^{\varrho_1} \text{ for all } t, s \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

while we assume that the diffusion and jump coefficients (σ, ρ) are from the class

$$\mathcal{B}_K^{\varrho_2, \varrho_3} = \left\{ (\sigma, \rho) \in F_K^{\varrho_2} \times F_K^{\varrho_3} : |L_1\sigma(t, y) - L_1\sigma(t, z)| \leq K|y - z|, \right. \\ \left. |L_1\rho(t, y) - L_1\rho(t, z)| \leq K|y - z|, L_{-1}\sigma(t, y) = L_1\rho(t, y), \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], y, z \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

where we recall that $L_1f(t, y) = \sigma(t, y)f'_y(t, y)$ and $L_{-1}f(t, y) = f(t, y + \rho(t, y)) - f(t, y)$. Moreover, for all $p \in [2, \infty)$,

$$\mathcal{J}_K^p = \{X_0 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : X_0 \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_0\text{-measurable, } \mathbb{E}[|X_0|^{2p}] \leq K\}.$$

The class of input data (μ, σ, ρ, X_0) is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K) = \mathcal{M}_K^{\varrho_1} \times \mathcal{B}_K^{\varrho_2, \varrho_3} \times \mathcal{J}_K^p.$$

We call $\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K, T$ the parameters of the class $\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K)$.

We now describe the model of computation. An information vector has the form

$$\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N) = [\mu(\xi_0, y_0), \dots, \mu(\xi_{k_1-1}, y_{k_1-1}), \sigma(t_0, y_0), \dots, \sigma(t_{k_1-1}, y_{k_1-1}), \\ \rho(t_0, y_0), \dots, \rho(t_{k_1-1}, y_{k_1-1}), \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}(t_0, y_0), \dots, \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}(t_{k_1-1}, y_{k_1-1}), \\ \sigma(t_0, z_0), \dots, \sigma(t_{k_1-1}, z_{k_1-1}), \rho(t_0, v_0), \dots, \rho(t_{k_1-1}, v_{k_1-1}), \\ W(s_0), \dots, W(s_{k_2-1}), N(q_0), \dots, N(q_{k_3-1}), X_0],$$

where $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $[\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k_1-1}]$ is a random vector on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with values in $[0, T]^{k_1}$. We assume that the σ -fields $\sigma(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{k_1-1})$ and \mathcal{F}_∞ are independent. Moreover, $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{k_1-1} \in [0, T]$, $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{k_2-1} \in [0, T]$, and $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{k_3-1} \in [0, T]$ are given time points. We assume that $s_i \neq s_j$, $q_i \neq q_j$ for all $i \neq j$. The evaluation points y_j, z_j, v_j for the spatial variables of $\mu, \sigma, \partial\sigma/\partial y$, and ρ can be given in an adaptive way with respect to (μ, σ, ρ, X_0) and $[W, N]$. This means that for some measurable mappings ψ_j , $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_1 - 1\}$, it holds that

$$(y_0, z_0, v_0) = \psi_0(W(s_0), \dots, W(s_{k_2-1}), N(q_0), \dots, N(q_{k_3-1}), X_0)$$

and

$$(y_j, z_j, v_j) = \psi_j(\mu(\xi_0, y_0), \dots, \mu(\xi_{j-1}, y_{j-1}), \sigma(t_0, y_0), \dots, \sigma(t_{j-1}, y_{j-1}), \\ \rho(t_0, y_0), \dots, \rho(t_{j-1}, y_{j-1}), \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}(t_0, y_0), \dots, \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial y}(t_{j-1}, y_{j-1}), \\ \sigma(t_0, z_0), \dots, \sigma(t_{j-1}, z_{j-1}), \rho(t_0, v_0), \dots, \rho(t_{j-1}, v_{j-1}), \\ W(s_0), \dots, W(s_{k_2-1}), N(q_0), \dots, N(q_{k_3-1}), X_0).$$

The total number of evaluations of μ, σ, ρ, W , and N is $l = 6k_1 + k_2 + k_3$.

Any algorithm \mathcal{A} that uses the information $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N)$ and computes the approximation to $X(T)$, is of the form

$$\mathcal{A}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N) = \varphi(\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N)), \quad (47)$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{3k_1+k_2+k_3+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel measurable function. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by Φ_n the class of all algorithms (47) with total number of evaluations $l \leq n$.

For $(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0) \in \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K)$ we define the error of $\mathcal{A} \in \Phi_n$ as

$$e^{(p)}(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N) = \|\mathcal{A}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N) - X(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0)(T)\|_p.$$

The worst-case error of \mathcal{A} in a subclass \mathcal{G} of $\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K)$ is defined by

$$e^{(p)}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, W, N) = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0) \in \mathcal{G}} e^{(p)}(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N),$$

while the n -th minimal error in \mathcal{G} is

$$e_n^{(p)}(\mathcal{G}, W, N) = \inf_{\mathcal{A} \in \Phi_n} e^{(p)}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, W, N).$$

The aim is to find sharp bounds for $e_n^{(p)}(\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, p, K), W, N)$, i.e. lower and upper error bounds which match up to constants.

The randomized Milstein algorithm can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_n^{RM}(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0, W, N) = X^{(\delta)}(T),$$

where $X^{(\delta)}(T)$ is defined in (10), and we have that $\mathcal{A}_n^{RM} \in \Phi_{8n}$.

Theorem 4.1. *It holds that*

$$e_n^{(2)}(\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) = \Theta(n^{-\min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}})$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. The upper bound $O(n^{-\min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}})$ on $e_n^{(2)}(\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N)$ follows from Theorem 3.2 and the fact that $e_n^{(2)}(\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) \leq e^{(2)}(\mathcal{A}_n^{RM}, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N)$.

We now turn to the lower bound. Let \mathcal{A} be any algorithm from Φ_n that uses at most n evaluations of (μ, σ, ρ) , W , and N . We consider the following subclasses of $\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K)$:

$$\mathcal{G}_1(\varrho_1, 1, 1, 2, K) = \bar{\mathcal{M}}_K^{\varrho_1} \times \{(0, 0)\} \times \{0\},$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}_K^{\varrho_1} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_K^{\varrho_1} \mid \mu(t, x) = \mu(t, 0) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_2(1, \varrho_2, 1, 2, K) = \{0\} \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_K^{\varrho_2, 1} \times \{0\},$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_K^{\varrho_2, 1} = \left\{ (\sigma, 0) \in \mathcal{B}_K^{\varrho_2, 1} \mid \sigma(t, y) = \sigma(t, 0) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_3(1, 1, \varrho_3, 2, K) = \{0\} \times \bar{\mathcal{B}}_K^{1, \varrho_3} \times \{0\},$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_K^{1, \varrho_3} = \left\{ (0, \rho) \in \mathcal{B}_K^{1, \varrho_3} \mid \rho(t, y) = \rho(t, 0) \text{ for all } t \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

For $(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0) \in \mathcal{G}_1(\varrho_1, 1, 1, 2, K)$ we have $X(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0)(T) = \int_0^T \mu(t, 0) dt$. Since $k_1 = O(n)$ by [14, Section 2.2.9, Proposition 2] we obtain that

$$e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_1(\varrho_1, 1, 1, 2, K)) = \Omega(n^{-(\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2})}).$$

Next, for $(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0) \in \mathcal{G}_2(1, \varrho_2, 1, 2, K)$ we have $X(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0)(T) = \int_0^T \sigma(t, 0) dW(t)$. Since $k_2 = O(n)$, [11, Proposition 5.1(i)] gives

$$e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_2(1, \varrho_2, 1, 2, K)) = \Omega(n^{-\varrho_2}).$$

Finally, for $(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0) \in \mathcal{G}_3(1, 1, \varrho_3, 2, K)$ we have $X(\mu, \sigma, \rho, X_0)(T) = \int_0^T \rho(t, 0) dN(t)$. Since $k_3 = O(n)$, [22, Lemma 6] yields

$$e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_3(1, 1, \varrho_3, 2, K)) = \Omega(n^{-\varrho_3}).$$

Due to the fact that $\mathcal{G}_1(\varrho_1, 1, 1, 2, K) \cup \mathcal{G}_2(1, \varrho_2, 1, 2, K) \cup \mathcal{G}_3(1, 1, \varrho_3, 2, K) \subset \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K)) \\ & \geq \max\{e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_1(\varrho_1, 1, 1, 2, K)), e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_2(1, \varrho_2, 1, 2, K)), e(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}_3(1, 1, \varrho_3, 2, K))\} \\ & = \Omega(n^{-\min\{\varrho_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \varrho_2, \varrho_3\}}). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with the upper bound proves the claim. \square

Remark 4.2. For $\varrho_2 = \varrho_3 = 1$ and $\varrho_1 \in (1/2, 1)$ we compare the worst case errors for the classical Euler–Maruyama algorithm \mathcal{A}_n^E , randomized Euler–Maruyama algorithm \mathcal{A}_n^{RE} , classical Milstein algorithm \mathcal{A}_n^M , and randomized Milstein algorithm \mathcal{A}_n^{RM} in the class $\mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K)$:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{(2)}(\mathcal{A}_n^E, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) &= O(n^{-1/2}), \quad e^{(2)}(\mathcal{A}_n^{RE}, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) = O(n^{-1/2}), \\ e^{(2)}(\mathcal{A}_n^M, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) &= O(n^{-\varrho_1}), \quad e^{(2)}(\mathcal{A}_n^{RM}, \mathcal{F}(\varrho_1, \varrho_2, \varrho_3, 2, K), W, N) = O(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that in the considered case the randomized Milstein algorithm outperforms the other (classical) algorithms.

4.2 Multidimensional case and optimality of the Euler–Maruyama algorithm

In this section we show results that give insight into lower error bounds for the problem of approximation of solutions of systems of jump-diffusion SDEs in the case when only standard information about W and N is available. For this we extend results from [2] and consider the following jump-diffusion Lévy’s area

$$J(N, W) = I_{0,T}(N, W) = \int_0^T \int_0^{t-} dN(s) dW(t) = \int_0^T N(t-) dW(t) = \int_0^T N(t) dW(t). \quad (48)$$

The last equality holds since W is continuous while $N(t)$ and $N(t-)$ differ in an at most finite number of time points almost surely. Note that $J(N, W) = X(T)$ where X is the solution of the two-dimensional SDE

$$\begin{aligned} dY(t) &= dN(t), \\ dX(t) &= Y(t) dW(t), \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

In order to approximate (48) we consider an arbitrary algorithm of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_n(N, W) = \varphi_n(\mathcal{N}_n(N, W)) \quad (50)$$

for some Borel-measurable function $\varphi_n: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where

$$\mathcal{N}_n(N, W) = [N(t_1), \dots, N(t_n), W(t_1), \dots, W(t_n)]$$

and

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T \quad (51)$$

is a fixed discretization of $[0, T]$. In particular, we consider the trapezoidal method $\mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)$ based on the mesh (51), which is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2} (W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)) (N(t_{i+1}) + N(t_i)). \quad (52)$$

Theorem 4.3. For the trapezoidal method (52) based on the equidistant mesh $t_i = iT/n$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{1/2} \cdot \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)\|_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{1/2} \cdot \inf_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)\|_2 = \frac{\lambda^{1/2} T}{2},$$

and therefore it is the optimal method among all methods of the form (50).

Proof. From the projection property for the conditional expectation we get for any algorithm (50) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)|^2 \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathbb{E}[J(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)]|^2 \right],$$

since $\mathcal{A}_n(N, W)$ is $\sigma(\mathcal{N}_n(N, W))$ -measurable. Therefore, we also have

$$\inf_{\mathcal{A}_n} \mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)|^2 \right] \geq \inf_{0=t_0 < t_1 \dots < t_n=T} \mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathbb{E}[J(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)]|^2 \right]. \quad (53)$$

Hence, we need to compute

$$\mathbb{E}[J(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} N(t) dW(t) \middle| \mathcal{N}_n(N, W) \right]. \quad (54)$$

For all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ we define

$$J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) = \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} N(t) dW(t).$$

From the definition of the Itô integral we get for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ that

$$J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} J_m^i(N, W) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

where

$$J_m^i(N, W) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} N(s_j^i) (W(s_{j+1}^i) - W(s_j^i)), \quad (55)$$

with $s_j^i = t_i + j(t_{i+1} - t_i)/m$ for all $j \in \{0, \dots, m\}$. Further, we denote $\Delta W_j^i = W(s_{j+1}^i) - W(s_j^i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) \Delta W_j^i | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)]. \quad (56)$$

Since by Proposition A.5 the processes N and W are conditionally independent given the σ -algebra $\sigma(\mathcal{N}_n(N, W))$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) \Delta W_j^i | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\Delta W_j^i | \mathcal{N}_n(W)]. \quad (57)$$

Moreover, by [6, Lemma 8] and [19, Lemma 3.1], we have for all $s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$

$$\mathbb{E}[N(s) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] = \frac{N(t_{i+1})(s - t_i) + N(t_i)(t_{i+1} - s)}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \quad (58)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta W_j^i | \mathcal{N}_n(W)] = \frac{(W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i))(s_{j+1}^i - s_j^i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i}. \quad (59)$$

Plugging (57),(58), and (59) into (56), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] &= \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\Delta W_j^i | \mathcal{N}_n(W)] \\ &= \frac{W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] \cdot (s_{j+1}^i - s_j^i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[N(s_j^i) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] \cdot (s_{j+1}^i - s_j^i)$ is a (pathwise) Riemann sum for the stochastic process $(\mathbb{E}[N(s) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)])_{s \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]}$ with continuous sample paths, it holds for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ almost surely that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \frac{W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[N(t) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] dt. \quad (60)$$

Moreover, from (55) and by Jensen's inequality for the conditional expectation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[|\mathbb{E}[J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] - \mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)]|^2\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) - J_m^i(N, W)|^2\right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Hence, by (61)

$$\mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty \text{ in } L^2(\Omega)$$

and by (60)

$$\mathbb{E}[J_m^i(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] \rightarrow \frac{W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[N(t) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] dt \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$ as well as almost sure convergence imply convergence in probability. Moreover by the uniqueness of the limit in probability we get that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \frac{W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[N(t) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] dt \text{ a.s.} \quad (62)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[N(t) | \mathcal{N}_n(N)] dt = \frac{1}{2}(N(t_{i+1}) + N(t_i))(t_{i+1} - t_i). \quad (63)$$

Hence by plugging (63) into (62) we get for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ that

$$\mathbb{E}[J_{t_i, t_{i+1}}(N, W) | \mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \frac{1}{2}(W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i))(N(t_{i+1}) + N(t_i)). \quad (64)$$

Combining (64) and (54) we get that $\mathbb{E}[J(N, W)|\mathcal{N}_n(N, W)] = \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)$ corresponds to the trapezoidal method.

Now we investigate its error in order to get the minimal possible error among all methods of the form (50). To do so, let us consider the step process given for all $t \in [0, T]$ by

$$\hat{N}_n(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(t) \frac{N(t_i) + N(t_{i+1})}{2}.$$

The process $(\hat{N}_n(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is not adapted to the initial filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. However, it is adapted to $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_t^W \cup \mathcal{F}_\infty^N)$, $t \geq 0$. Moreover, $(W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is still a one-dimensional Wiener process with respect to the filtration $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, since \mathcal{F}_∞^N and \mathcal{F}_∞^W are independent. Hence

$$J(\hat{N}_n, W) = \int_0^T \hat{N}_n(t) dW(t)$$

is a well-defined Itô integral of the $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -simple process $(\hat{N}_n(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and therefore

$$J(\hat{N}_n, W) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{N(t_i) + N(t_{i+1})}{2} (W(t_{i+1}) - W(t_i)) = \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W).$$

Since $(N(t) - \hat{N}_n(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -progressively measurable process, by the Itô isometry and Jensen's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)|^2 \right] &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[|N(t) - \hat{N}_n(t)|^2 \right] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(N(t) - N(t_i))^2 \right] - 2\mathbb{E} \left[N(t) - N(t_i) \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[N(t_{i+1}) - N(t) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[(N(t_{i+1}) - N(t))^2 \right] \right) dt \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (t_{i+1} - t_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda^2}{12} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (t_{i+1} - t_i)^3 \geq \frac{\lambda}{4n} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (t_{i+1} - t_i) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{\lambda^2}{12} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (t_{i+1} - t_i) \right)^3 \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda T^2}{4n} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Therefore,

$$\inf_{0=t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n=T} \mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)|^2 \right] \geq \frac{\lambda T^2}{4n} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n^2}.$$

Hence, by (53) we conclude

$$n^{1/2} \cdot \inf_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda T^2}{4} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n}}. \tag{66}$$

Moreover, for the trapezoidal method $\mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)$ based on the equidistant mesh $t_i = iT/n$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we get by (65) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)|^2 \right] = \frac{\lambda T^2}{4n} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n^2}, \tag{67}$$

and hence

$$n^{1/2} \cdot \inf_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)\|_2 \leq n^{1/2} \cdot \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n^T(N, W)\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda T^2}{4} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n}}. \quad (68)$$

From (66) and (68) we arrive at

$$n^{1/2} \cdot \inf_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|J(N, W) - \mathcal{A}_n(N, W)\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda T^2}{4} + \frac{\lambda^2 T^3}{12n}},$$

which together with (67) imply the thesis. \square

Remark 4.4. Consider any class of coefficients of multidimensional SDEs for which (49) is a subproblem. Then by Theorem 4.3, in the worst case setting with respect to the coefficients, the error cannot be smaller than $\Omega(n^{-1/2})$. Therefore, no matter if the JCC (46) is satisfied or not, we can apply the Euler–Maruyama (or randomized Euler–Maruyama) scheme in order to achieve the optimal error bound $O(n^{-1/2})$ if the error is measured in the $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm, see, for example, [11], [12].

Remark 4.5. In Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 we have considered only the L^2 -error. Matching upper and lower bounds that depend on p remain an open problem. Our numerical experiments in Section 5 suggest that for jump-diffusion SDEs the error indeed depends on p .

5 Numerical experiments

We implement¹ the randomized Milstein algorithm for the SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = \sin(M \cdot X(t)(1+t)^{\varrho_1}) dt + \cos(M \cdot X(t) \cdot (1+t)^{\varrho_2}) dW(t) \\ \quad + \left(-X(t) + \frac{\pi}{2M \cdot (1+t)^{\varrho_2}} \right) dN(t), \quad t \in [0, 1], \\ X(0) = 1. \end{cases}$$

that has already been considered in the jump-free case in [13]. The jump coefficient is chosen so that the JCC is satisfied. The verification of Assumption 2.1 is straight forward, for the JCC (46), see Remark 5.2. In our simulations we set $\lambda = 100$, $M = 100$, $\varrho_1 = 0.1$, and $\varrho_2 = 0.6$.

We estimate the L^p -error similar as in [20, p. 14] by

$$\text{error}(k) = \text{mean} \left(|X^{(k)}(T) - X^{(k-1)}(T)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Here $X^{(k)}(T)$ is the approximation of $X(T)$ with step size $\delta^{(k)}$, where $\delta^{(k)} = 2^{-k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The mean is taken over 2^{16} sample paths.

Remark 5.1. In the implementation the interesting part is how the values ξ_i are computed. For the randomization we first simulate independent uniformly distributed random variables ξ_i on the corresponding intervals for the finest discretization grid. Iteratively we compute the values for the discretization grid with doubled step size as follows: One time interval in the larger grid consists of two time intervals of equal length in the finer grid. For those two intervals we have simulated two values ξ_i . Now we simulate an independent Bernoulli(0.5) random variable that determines which of the values ξ_i we take. This choice is then uniformly distributed on the interval of the large grid and hence consistent with the randomized Milstein algorithm.

¹The program code is available as ancillary file from the arXiv page of this paper.

For $p \in [2, \infty)$ we obtain by Theorem 3.2 the theoretical convergence rate

$$\min \left\{ \frac{2}{p}, \varrho_1 + \frac{1}{p}, \varrho_2, \varrho_2 \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{2}{p}, 0.1 + \frac{1}{p}, 0.6 \right\}.$$

For $p = 1$ we take as theoretical convergence rate the same rate as for $p = 2$, because the L^1 -error can be estimated by the L^2 -error using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. In Figure 1 we plot the $\log_2(\text{error}(k))$ over $\log_2(\delta^{(k)})$ for $p \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and the corresponding theoretical convergence orders.




Figure 1: Error estimates and theoretical convergence order for $p \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

We see that the observed convergence order is decreasing with increasing p . Further we notice that for $p = 1$ the convergence of the simulation is higher than the theoretical convergence rate. This is reasonable because we took the rate of the L^2 -error. For $p = 2$ we observe that the simulation confirms the theoretical results; the slope of the simulation matches the convergence rate, which we proved to be optimal. Also for $p = 3$ and $p = 4$ the simulations confirm the theoretical results, since the simulation converges at least as fast as the theoretically obtained upper bound; we have not proven any lower bound.

Next, we regress the slope of the simulated $\log_2(\text{error}(k))$ in dependence of the corresponding $\log_2(\delta^{(k)})$ for all $p \in \{1, \dots, 8\}$ and compare it to the theoretical upper bounds on the convergence rates we have proven, see Figure 2. We observe that for the simulations the convergence order is dependent on p , which confirms also this theoretical finding.

Remark 5.2. Let us assume that the diffusion coefficient is of the form $\sigma(t, y) = F(\alpha(t)y + \beta(t))$ while the jump coefficient $\rho(t, y) = -y + \gamma(t)$ for some functions $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, let us assume that there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

- $F(x_0) = 0$,
- $\alpha(t) \cdot \gamma(t) + \beta(t) = x_0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Then the JCC (46) is satisfied for the pair (σ, ρ) . This provides a new class of functions (σ, ρ) satisfying the JCC which may, in contrast to the class considered in [15], be nonlinear.




Figure 2: Slopes of the simulation (estimated by linear regression) in comparison to theoretical convergence rates

A Appendix

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward and will be omitted.

Lemma A.1. *Under Assumption 2.1 there exists a constant $K_7 \in (0, \infty)$ such that for $f \in \{\mu, \sigma, \rho\}$ and for all $t_1, t_2, t, u \in [0, T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\alpha_1(f, t, u)| &\leq K_7(1 + |X(u)|), \\
|\beta(f, t, u)| &\leq K_7(1 + |X(u)|), \\
|\beta(\mu, t_1, u) - \beta(\mu, t_2, u)| &\leq K_7(1 + |X(u)|^2) \cdot |t_1 - t_2|^{\varrho_1}, \\
|\gamma(f, t, u)| &\leq K_7(1 + |X(u-)|), \\
|\gamma(\mu, t_1, u) - \gamma(\mu, t_2, u)| &\leq K_7(1 + |X(u-)|)|t_1 - t_2|^{\varrho_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Following [3] and [7] we recall the notion of conditional independence and some of its useful consequences.

Definition A.2 ([3, p. 36-II, Definition 43]). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2,$ and \mathcal{F}_3 be three sub- σ -fields of \mathcal{F} . \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_3 are called conditionally independent given \mathcal{F}_2 , if for all positive random variables Y_1 and Y_3 , which are measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_1 respectively \mathcal{F}_3 it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 | \mathcal{F}_2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] \text{ a.s.}$$

Theorem A.3 ([3, p. 36-II, Theorem 45]). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2,$ and \mathcal{F}_3 be three sub- σ -fields of \mathcal{F} . Further let \mathcal{F}_{12} be the σ -field generated by \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 . Then \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_3 are called conditionally independent given \mathcal{F}_2 , if and only if for all \mathcal{F}_3 -measurable and integrable random variables Y_3 it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_{12}] = \mathbb{E}[Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] \text{ a.s.}$$

Proposition A.4 ([7, Proposition A.23]). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2,$ and \mathcal{F}_3 be three sub- σ -fields of \mathcal{F} . Further let $Y_1, Y_3: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be integrable random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[|Y_1 Y_3|] < \infty$. Assume that $\sigma(Y_1) \subset \mathcal{F}_1$ and $\sigma(Y_3) \subset \mathcal{F}_3$. Further assume that \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_3 are conditionally independent given \mathcal{F}_2 . Then it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 | \mathcal{F}_2] \cdot \mathbb{E}[Y_3 | \mathcal{F}_2] \text{ a.s.}$$

Proposition A.5 ([7, Lemma B.18]). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $X, Y: \Omega \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be stochastic processes, which are both $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, \infty)) | \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable and independent, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_\infty^X \perp \mathcal{F}_\infty^Y$, where $\mathcal{F}_\infty^Z = \sigma(\bigcup_{t \geq 0} \sigma(Z(t)))$ for both $Z \in \{X, Y\}$. Further, assume that $\mathbb{E}[|X(t)|] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|Y(t)|] < \infty$ for all $t \geq 0$. Additionally, let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_i^X, t_j^Y \in [0, \infty)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ be such that $0 \leq t_1^X < t_2^X < \dots < t_n^X$, $0 \leq t_1^Y < t_2^Y < \dots < t_m^Y$. Then \mathcal{F}_∞^X and \mathcal{F}_∞^Y are conditionally independent given $\sigma(X(t_1^X), \dots, X(t_n^X), Y(t_1^Y), \dots, Y(t_m^Y))$.

The following estimate is a direct consequence of the Hölder, the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy, and the Kunita inequality, see [9].

Lemma A.6. Let $q \in [2, \infty)$, $a, b \in [0, T]$ with $a < b$, $Z \in \{\text{Id}, W, N\}$, $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in [a, b]}$ is a predictable stochastic process such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_a^b |Y(t)|^q dt \right] < \infty$$

Then there exists a constant $\hat{c} \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $t \in [a, b]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [a, t]} \left| \int_a^s Y(u) dZ(u) \right|^q \right] \leq \hat{c} \int_a^t \mathbb{E}[|Y(u)|^q] du.$$

Acknowledgements

V. Schwarz and M. Szölgyenyi are supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): DOC 78.

References

- [1] R. A. Brooks. Conditional expectations associated with stochastic processes. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 41:33–42, 1972.
- [2] J. M. C. Clark and R. J. Cameron. The maximum rate of convergence of discrete approximations for stochastic differential equations, in: *Stochastic differential systems filtering and control. Stochastic Differential Systems Filtering and Control*, pages 162–171, 1980.
- [3] C. Dellacherie and P. Meyer. *Probabilities and Potential*. North-Holland mathematic studies. Elsevier North-Holland, inc., 1978.
- [4] M. Eisenmann and R. Kruse. Two quadrature rules for stochastic Itô-integrals with fractional Sobolev regularity. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 16:2125–2146, 2018.
- [5] S. Heinrich. Complexity of stochastic integration in Sobolev classes. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 476:177–195, 2019.
- [6] P. Hertling. Nonlinear Lebesgue and Itô integration problems of high complexity. *Journal of Complexity*, 17:366–387, 2001.
- [7] A. Kałuża. *Optimal algorithms for solving stochastic initial-value problems with jumps*. PhD thesis, AGH University of Science and Technology, Kraków. <https://winntbg.bg.agh.edu.pl/rozprawy2/11743/full11743.pdf>, 2020.
- [8] R. Kruse and Y. Wu. A randomized Milstein method for stochastic differential equations with non-differentiable drift coefficients. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series B*, 24:3475–3502, 2019.

- [9] H. Kunita. Stochastic differential equations based on Lévy processes and stochastic flows of diffeomorphisms. In *Real and stochastic analysis*, pages 305–373. Springer, 2004.
- [10] T. Müller-Gronbach and L. Yaroslavtseva. Sharp lower error bounds for strong approximation of sdes with discontinuous drift coefficient by coupling if noise. 2020. arXiv:2010.00915.
- [11] P. Morkisz and P. Przybyłowicz. Strong approximation of solutions of stochastic differential equations with time-irregular coefficients via randomized Euler algorithm. *Applied Numerical Mathematics*, 78:80–94, 2014.
- [12] P. M. Morkisz and P. Przybyłowicz. Optimal pointwise approximation of SDE’s from inexact information. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 324:85–100, 2017.
- [13] P. M. Morkisz and P. Przybyłowicz. Randomized derivative-free Milstein algorithm for efficient approximation of solutions of SDEs under noisy information. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 383, 2021. 113112.
- [14] E. Novak. *Deterministic and Stochastic Error Bounds in Numerical Analysis*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1349. Springer, 1988.
- [15] E. Platen and N. Bruti-Liberati. *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps in Finance*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [16] P. Protter. *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2005.
- [17] P. Przybyłowicz. Minimal asymptotic error for one-point approximation of sdes with time-irregular coefficients. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 282:98–110, 2015.
- [18] P. Przybyłowicz. Optimal global approximation of SDEs with time-irregular coefficients in asymptotic setting. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 270:441–457, 2015.
- [19] P. Przybyłowicz. Optimal global approximation of stochastic differential equations with additive poisson noise. *Numerical Algorithms*, 73:323–348, 2016.
- [20] P. Przybyłowicz and M. Szölgényi. Existence, uniqueness, and approximation of solutions of jump-diffusion SDEs with discontinuous drift. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 403:126191, 2021.
- [21] P. Przybyłowicz, M. Szölgényi, and F. Xu. Existence and uniqueness of solutions of SDEs with discontinuous drift and finite activity jumps. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 174:109072, 2021.
- [22] P. Przybyłowicz, M. Sobieraj, and Ł. Stępień. Efficient approximation of SDEs driven by countably dimensional Wiener process and Poisson random measure. *SIAM Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 60:824–855, 2022.
- [23] R. Situ. *Theory of Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps and Applications*. Mathematical and Analytical Techniques with Applications to Engineering. Springer, 2005.
- [24] J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. *Information-Based Complexity*. Academic Press, New York, 1988.

Paweł Przybyłowicz

Faculty of Applied Mathematics, AGH University of Science and Technology, Al. Mickiewicza
30, 30-059 Krakow, Poland

pprzybyl@agh.edu.pl

Michaela Szölgyenyi

Department of Statistics, University of Klagenfurt, Universitätsstraße 65-67, 9020 Klagenfurt,
Austria

michaela.szoelgyenyi@aau.at

Verena Schwarz ✉

Department of Statistics, University of Klagenfurt, Universitätsstraße 65-67, 9020 Klagenfurt,
Austria

verena.schwarz@aau.at