Numerical schemes for the rough heat equation

Aurélien Deya

NUMERICAL SCHEMES FOR THE ROUGH HEAT EQUATION

AURÉLIEN DEYA

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to the study of numerical approximation schemes for two of the rough infinite-dimensional systems introduced in [7]. The approach combines rough paths methods with standard considerations on discretizing the solutions of stochastic partial differential equations. Explicit rates of convergence are exhibited in case the perturbation is driven by a multidimensional fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index $H > 1/3$, and some results of simulation are provided.

1. INTRODUCTION

This article must be seen as a companion paper of [7]. It is more generally part of an ongoing project which aims at offering a pathwise approach to rough PDE, through a combination of methods steming from two theories: the rough paths theory, as it is presented in [12], and the theory of analytical semigroups, for which we refer to [26] for instance. The original formalism that is brought into play with this purpose has first been introduced by Gubinelli and Tindel in [15]. The infinite-dimensional system we are interested in can be written in the following way:

$$dy_t = Ay_t\, dt + dX_t(f(y_t)) \quad , \quad y_0 = \psi, \tag{1}$$

where $A : \mathcal{D}(A) \subset B \to B$ is an unbounded operator of a certain Banach space B, $f : B \to B_1$ is a non-linear mapping with values in a possibly different Banach space and $X : [0,T] \to \mathcal{L}(B_1, B)$ is an irregular operator-valued noise. In a rather usual way, the system is in fact interpreted and solved in its mild form, that is to say:

$$y_t = S_t\psi + \int_0^t S_{t-u}\left(dX_u(f(y_u))\right), \tag{2}$$

where $S : [0,T] \to \mathcal{L}(B)$ stands for the semigroup generated by A. The latter formulation even suggests the possibility of a distribution-valued noise, owing to the regularizing effect of the semigroup.

The tools displayed in [15] actually allows the treatment of a very general noisy input, but at the price of restrictive conditions on the (time) regularity of X or on the vector fields f. For this reason, we shall only consider here the case of a finite-dimensional noise, as it was done in [7]. The system we are going to study is more precisely given by:

$$y_t = S_t\psi + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \int_s^t S_{t-u}(f_i(y_u))\, dx_u^i, \tag{3}$$

Date: March 1, 2010.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60H35,60H15,60G22.

Key words and phrases. Rough paths theory; Stochastic PDEs; Approximation schemes; Fractional Brownian motion.

where $x = (x^1, \dots, x^m)$ is an m-dimensional γ-Hölder process. Note that the hypothesis of a finite-dimensional noise also stands in the work of Friz and Caruana [3], as well as in the paper of Teichmann [27].

We also specialize our attention to the case of the heat equation, even if our reasoning could be easily applied to more general analytical semigroups. As for the vector fields f_i, they are defined as the Nemytskii operators associated to regular functions $\tilde{f}_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, or otherwise stated:

$$f_i(y)(\xi) := \tilde{f}_i(y(\xi)) \quad \text{for any function } y.$$

In this context, let us briefly review the results established in [7]:

- **(i)** If x is a γ-Hölder path with $\gamma > 1/2$, a result of existence and uniqueness of a global solution (defined on any interval $[0, T]$), with values in some fractional Sobolev space.
- **(ii)** If x is a γ-Hölder path with $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$, and if x allows the construction of a 2-rough path (x^1, x^2), a result of existence and uniqueness of a local solution (defined on a small interval $[0, T_0]$, $0 < T_0 \leq T$), with values in some fractional Sobolev space again.
- **(iii)** Under the same hypotheses as in **(ii)**, and also assuming that the vector fields can be written as $f_i(y) = S_\varepsilon \tilde{f}_i(y)$, for some fixed parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, a result of existence and uniqueness of a global solution.

In all three cases, the result is shown by means of an abstract fixed-point argument, which does not give any clue on how to represent the solution. The aim of the present paper is to provide some easy-to-implement approximation schemes for the system (3) in the two situations **(i)** and **(iii)**, for which the existence of a global solution has been proved. The efficiency of those schemes will stem from bringing together two kinds of ideas:

- On the one hand, Davie's considerations on the interpretation and resolution of rough standard systems by using a discrete approach [6]. In this context, let us also quote the simplifications suggested in [8] so as to make the resulting algorithm easy to simulate.
- On the other hand, more classical methods to approximate solutions of a stochastic PDE driven by a Wiener noise. It would be futile to try to make an inventory of the huge amount of litterature on the subject, and we will only quote here the work of Gyongy [16] or Hausenblas [17].

As we shall see in Sections 3 and 4, the structure of our schemes will in fact be directly suggested by the very construction of the rough integral $\int_s^t S_{t-u}\, dx^i_u\, f_i(y_u)$, the main features of which will of course be recalled in the course of the study. Let us just say, at this point, that the construction gives rise to a decomposition such that

$$\int_s^t S_{t-u}\, dx^i_u\, f_i(y_u) = M_{ts} + R_{ts}, \tag{4}$$

with M a "main" term and R a "residual" term characterized by a high regularity with respect to the couple (s, t) (the latter notion will be elaborated on in the first section). From this expression, we will deduce, in a quite natural way, the general discrete scheme:

$$y^n_{t^n_{i+1}} = S_{t^n_{i+1} t^n_i} y^n_{t^n_i} + M_{t^n_{i+1} t^n_i}, \quad y^n_0 = \psi,$$

where $0 = t_0^n < t_1^n < \ldots < t_n^n = T$ is a partition of $[0,T]$ the mesh of which tends to 0. The reasoning can here be compared with the recent approach of Jentzen and Kloeden for the treatment of a Wiener noise ([18, 19, 20]). Indeed, in order to define and study efficient approximation schemes, the two authors lean on a Taylor expansion of the solution, that is to say a decomposition that fits the pattern given by (4).

To be more specific, the strategy we mean to follow in this paper can be split up into three steps, each of them corresponding to a different kind of discretization:

- First, a discretization of the driving path x, which is made possible thanks to the continuity properties of the Itô map associated to the system. Some details will be provided about the latter continuity result, the proof of which was almost neglected in [7].
- Secondly, a time discretization based on the decomposition (4), as explained above. The argument will here be largely inspired by the methods of Davie, especially in Case **(iii)**.
- Thirdly, a space discretization, which globally consists in projecting the system into a finite-dimensional space, according to the Galerkin method. The efficiency of the procedure will be ensured by the regularity (in space) of the solution processes given by Theorems 3.4 (in Case **(i)**) and 4.5 (in Case **(iii)**).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first occurence of (explicit) approximation schemes for a PDE involving a fractional noise. The convergence of those schemes will hold for any (geometric) 2-rough path. In terms of applications, we will focus on the fractional Brownian motion case (fBm in the sequel), for which an explicit rate of convergence can be easily derived from the results of [8]. Note that the distance between the exact solution y and its approximation $y^{M,N}$ will be written by means of Hölder norms, as it is always the case when using the rough paths approach. Unfortunately, this makes the comparison with the rates of convergence obtained by Jentzen and Kloeden [18] or Hausenblas [17] (both with a Wiener noise) rather tricky, their results appealing to the supremum norm. As far as we are concerned, we shall only content ourselves with conjectures about the rate of convergence for the supremum norm, based on the observation of empirical errors (see Subsections 3.6 and 4.6).

We hope that the strategy, as well as the technical arguments, displayed in this paper will make possible the approximation of more general rough evolution equations in the future, with a fractional distribution-valued noise or a less restrictive vector field f for instance. For the time being, we cannot handle this task though, insofar as, in those situations, theoretical (global) solutions have not been obtained yet.

The article is organized as follows: in Section 2, we remind the reader with the main tools of algebraic integration theory in the context of rough evolution equations, as they were introduced in [15]. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the numerical scheme for Case **(i)**, also called Young case, and for which the Hölder index is strictly greater than $1/2$. Only developments of order 1 will be involved in this section, so that the scheme could be seen as an adapted version of the usual Euler scheme to this setting. In Section 4, we will handle the scheme for the situation **(iii)**, which requires developments of order 2 and is thus closer to the well-known Milstein approximation scheme for standard differential systems. The appendix finally contains a detailled proof of the cornerstone result of Section 4.

2. Algebraic integration associated to the heat semigroup

This section is intended to serve two purposes. First, it aims at providing some details about the differential operator we are going to work with. It will then be used in order to introduce the key ingredients that lead to an interpretation of the rough integral $\int_s^t S_{t-u}\, dx_u^i\, f_i(y_u)$, with a special attention to the twisted operators $\hat{\delta}$ and $\hat{\Lambda}$.

2.1. **Framework.** All through the paper, we will focus on the heat equation associated to the one-dimensional torus

$$\mathcal{B} = L^2(\mathbb{T}) = \{y \in L^2(0,1) :\ y(0) = y(1)\},$$

with the norm $\|.\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|.\|_{L^2(0,1)}$. Let us already fix the notations for the orthonormal basis of eigenvectors that will be considered in Subsections 3.6 and 4.6: $e_n(\xi) = \sqrt{2}\sin(\pi n \xi)$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}^*$), as well as for the relative eigenvalues $\lambda_n = \pi^2 n^2$. We will denote by y^n the coefficients of a function y in this basis and for any $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, P_N will stand for the orthogonal projector onto $V_N = \mathrm{Span}(e_n,\, 1 \leq n \leq N)$.

As in [15] and [7], we are very soon incited to let the following subspaces come into the picture:

Definition 2.1. *For any $\kappa \geq 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{B}_\kappa = \mathcal{B}_\kappa(\mathbb{T})$ the fractional Sobolev space of order κ on $\mathbb{T}$, characterized by*

$$\mathcal{B}_\kappa = \{y \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) :\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^{2\kappa}(y^n)^2 < \infty\}, \tag{5}$$

and naturally provided with the norm

$$\|y\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}^2 = \|\Delta^\kappa y\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^{2\kappa}(y^n)^2. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, for any $\kappa < 0$, we set $\mathcal{B}_\kappa = (\mathcal{B}_{-\kappa})'$.

Let us first recall some elementary properties associated to those spaces, the proof of which can be found in [1]:

Proposition 2.2. *With the above notations, it holds:*

- *Sobolev inclusions: If $\kappa > 1/4$ and if $0 < \mu < 2\kappa - 1/2$, then $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ is continuously included in the space $\mathcal{C}^\mu([0,1])$ of μ-Hölder functions on $[0,1]$.*
- *Banach algebra: If $\kappa > 1/4$, then $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ is a Banach algebra, or otherwise stated $\|\varphi \cdot \psi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa$.*
- *Projection: For all $0 \leq \kappa < \gamma$ and for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma$,*

$$\|\varphi - P_N\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq \lambda_N^{-(\gamma-\kappa)}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma}. \tag{7}$$

Using the very definition (6), it is not hard to show the following additional properties, which can also be seen as straightforward consequences of more general results from the theory of fractional powers of operators (see [26] for a thorough account on the subject):

Proposition 2.3. *Let S stand for the semigroup generated by the Laplacian operator Δ on the one-dimensional torus. Then the following properties are satisfied:*

- *Contraction: For any $\kappa \geq 0$, S is a contraction operator on $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$.*

- *Regularization: For any $t > 0$ and for all $-\infty < \kappa < \alpha < \infty$, S_t sends $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ into $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ and*
$$\|S_t\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha} \leq c_{\alpha,\kappa} t^{-(\alpha-\kappa)} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}. \tag{8}$$
- *Hölder regularity: For all $t > 0, \alpha > 0$ and for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$,*
$$\|S_t\varphi - \varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq c_\alpha t^\alpha \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha}, \tag{9}$$
$$\|\Delta S_t\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq c_\alpha t^{-1+\alpha} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. Let us have a look at (10) for instance. One has, if $\varphi = \sum_n \varphi^n e_n$, $\Delta S_t\varphi = \sum_n (\lambda_n e^{-t\lambda_n}\varphi^n)\, e_n$, hence
$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta S_t\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_n (\lambda_n e^{-t\lambda_n}\varphi^n)^2 \\
&= \sum_n (\lambda_n^{1-\alpha} e^{-t\lambda_n})^2 (\lambda_n^\alpha \varphi^n)^2 \\
&\leq c_\alpha (t^{-1+\alpha})^2 \sum_n (\lambda_n^\alpha \varphi^n)^2 \;=\; c_\alpha (t^{-1+\alpha})^2 \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\alpha}^2,
\end{aligned}$$
where we have made use of the elementary estimate $\lambda^\kappa e^{-t\lambda} \leq c_\kappa\, t^{-\kappa}$, valid for all $\lambda, \kappa, t > 0$. The other properties can be proved with similar arguments. □

Let us now evoke a result concerning the Nemytskii operators, which will turn out to be of a paramount importance in our study. Remember that for any function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, the Nemytskii operator N_f associated to f is simply defined by the relation: for any $y : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, for any $\xi \in [0,1]$, $N_f(y)(\xi) = f(y(\xi))$. In the sequel, we denote by $\mathcal{C}^{k,b}(\mathbb{R})$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) the space of k-times differentiable functions with bounded derivatives.

Proposition 2.4. *If $0 \leq \kappa < 1/2$, then for any function $f \in \mathcal{C}^{1,b}(\mathbb{R})$, one has*
$$\|N_f(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c_f \left\{1 + \|y\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\}. \tag{11}$$

Proof. Inequality (11) immediately follows from the equivalence of the norms $\|.\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}$ and $\|.\|_{\mathcal{W}_\kappa}$, where
$$\|y\|_{\mathcal{W}_\kappa}^2 = \|y\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 + \int_0^1 d\xi \int_0^1 d\eta\, \frac{|y(\xi) - y(\eta)|^2}{|\xi - \eta|^{1+4\kappa}}.$$
A proof of this equivalence property can be found in [1]. □

Remark 2.5. From now on, we will indifferently write f or N_f.

Let us finally point out a very useful inclusion, which, together with (8), will allow the treatment of pointwise multiplication of elements in $\mathcal{B}$:

Proposition 2.6. *For any $\kappa > 1/4$, the following continuous inclusion holds true:*
$$L^1(0,1) \subset \mathcal{B}_{-\kappa}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. This is a spin-off of the above-quoted Sobolev inclusions. Indeed, if $u \in L^1(0,1)$, then for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa$,
$$\left| \int_0^1 u(\xi)\varphi(\xi)\, d\xi \right| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \|u\|_{L^1(0,1)} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \|u\|_{L^1(0,1)}.$$
□

Remark 2.7. The framework we have just introduced is slightly different from the one studied in [7], where the heat equation on the whole line (and even on $\mathbb{R}^n$) was taken into consideration, by recoursing to general $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ spaces. In fact, working with $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, for some p large enough, turns out to be useful only when treating Case **(ii)** (see the introduction for the notation), in order to handle the pointwise products of elements in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$ that naturally pop out in the expansion of the rough integral. In the two situations **(i)** and **(iii)** we will consider in this paper, the procedure, which actually reduces to a convolution argument, can be replaced with a reasoning based on the inclusion (12), as it will especially appear in Section 4. The advantage of dealing with the equation on the torus rather than on $\mathbb{R}$ lies of course in the possiblity of diagonalizing the heat semigroup, which makes the final algorithms much easier to implement.

2.2. **Tools of algebraic integration.** Let us now present the different elements which, from [12] to [15] to [13], have led to a very thorough understanding of rough differential systems, and offered a quite flexible reformulation of Lyons'original ideas [22], as the studies in [25] or [9] (for instance) can testify. The first two objects that come into play are the incremental operators δ and $\hat{\delta}$:

Definition 2.8. *For any vector space V and any integer $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we will denote by $\mathcal{C}_n(V)$ the set of continuous functions, with values in V, defined on the n-dimensional simplex*

$$\mathcal{S}_n = \{(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in [0,T]^n : \ t_1 > t_2 > \dots > t_n\}.$$

The standard incremental operator $\delta : \mathcal{C}_n(V) \to \mathcal{C}_{n+1}(V)$ is defined by the relation

$$(\delta g)_{t_1 \dots t_{n+1}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^i g_{t_1 \dots \hat{t_i} \dots t_{n+1}},$$

where the notation $\hat{t_i}$ means that this particular index is omitted. If $V = \mathcal{B}_\kappa$ for some $\kappa > 0$, the twisted incremental operator $\hat{\delta} : \mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{B}_\kappa) \to \mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$ is defined by the formula

$$(\hat{\delta} y)_{t_{n+1} \dots t_1} = (\delta y)_{t_{n+1} \dots t_1} - a_{t_{n+1} t_n} y_{t_n \dots t_1}, \quad \text{with } a_{ts} = S_{t-s} - Id\,.$$

The two operators δ and $\hat{\delta}$ are exact cohomological operators, in the following sense:

$$Ker\, \delta_{|\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(V)} = Im\, \delta_{|\mathcal{C}_n(V)} \quad , \quad Ker\, \hat{\delta}_{|\mathcal{C}_{n+1}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)} = Im\, \hat{\delta}_{|\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)}. \tag{13}$$

From an algebraic point of view, the operator δ is well-suited for the study of ordinary differential systems, while $\hat{\delta}$ reveals more appropriate to deal with the system (2), since it takes the perturbation S_{t-u} into account. To clarify this point, let us simply stress the fact that an ordinary system $y_t = a + \int_0^t \sigma(y_u)\, dx_u$ can be written as $y_0 = a$, $(\delta y)_{ts} = \int_s^t \sigma(y_u)\, dx_u$, whereas (3) is equivalent to

$$y_0 = \psi, \ (\hat{\delta} y)_{ts} = \int_s^t S_{t-u}\, dx_u^i\, f_i(y_u). \tag{14}$$

The recourse to the twisted operator $\hat{\delta}$ will more generally be justified all through the different algebraic handlings in the following two sections.

Observe that the cohomology property (13), which is due to the additivity property of the semigroup, entails in particular $\hat{\delta}(\hat{\delta} y)_{tus} = 0$ for any $y \in \mathcal{C}_1(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$ and for all

$s < u < t$. Using a trivial iteration procedure, we get the useful relation: for all $s = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n = t$,

$$(\hat{\delta}y)_{ts} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S_{tt_{i+1}}(\hat{\delta}y)_{t_{i+1}t_i}. \tag{15}$$

In some way, this is the analog, in the twisted context, to the usual telescopic sum $(\delta y)_{ts} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(\delta y)_{t_{i+1}t_i}$.

The notion of process with finite p-variation, that is used by Lyons in [22] or by Friz and Victoir in [11], is here reduced to a more elementary formulation in terms of Hölder functions with several variables. This is done by defining the subspaces $\mathcal{C}_1^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$, $\mathcal{C}_2^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$, $\mathcal{C}_3^{\alpha,\rho}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$ and $\mathcal{C}_3^\mu(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$ characterized by the respective norms:

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_1^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] := \sup_{s<t}\frac{\mathcal{N}[(\delta y)_{ts};\mathcal{B}_\kappa]}{|t-s|^\alpha}, \quad \mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] := \sup_{s<t}\frac{\mathcal{N}[(\hat{\delta}y)_{ts};\mathcal{B}_\kappa]}{|t-s|^\alpha},$$

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_2^\alpha(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] := \sup_{s<t}\frac{\mathcal{N}[y_{ts};\mathcal{B}_\kappa]}{|t-s|^\alpha},$$

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_3^{\alpha,\rho}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] := \sup_{s<u<t}\frac{\mathcal{N}[y_{tus};\mathcal{B}_\kappa]}{|t-u|^\alpha\,|u-s|^\rho},$$

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_3^\mu(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] := \inf\left\{\sum_i \mathcal{N}[y^i;\mathcal{C}_3^{\alpha,\mu-\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] :\ y = \sum_i y^i\right\}.$$

Before we introduce the inversion operator $\hat{\Lambda}$, let us remind the reader with a notational convention that prevails in all of the above-quoted articles on algebraic integration, as far as products of processes are concerned:

Notation 2.9. *If $g \in \mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{L}(V,W))$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}_m(W)$, then the product $gh \in \mathcal{C}_{m+n-1}(W)$ is defined by the formula*

$$(gh)_{t_1\ldots t_{m+n-1}} = g_{t_1\ldots t_n} h_{t_n\ldots t_{n+m-1}}.$$

With this convention, notice the relation: if $g \in \mathcal{C}_2(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa,\mathcal{B}_\alpha))$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$, $\hat{\delta}(gh) \in \mathcal{C}_{n+2}(\mathcal{B}_\alpha)$ is given by

$$\hat{\delta}(gh) = (\hat{\delta}g)h - g(\delta h). \tag{16}$$

We are now in position to present the other fundamental operator, denoted by $\hat{\Lambda}$, and which will allow to invert $\hat{\delta}_{|\mathcal{C}_2(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)}$ under appropriate regularity assumptions:

Theorem 2.10. *Fix a time $T > 0$, a parameter $\kappa \geq 0$ and let $\mu > 1$. For any $h \in \mathcal{C}_3^\mu([0,T];\mathcal{B}_\kappa) \cap Ker\,\hat{\delta}_{|\mathcal{C}_3(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)}$, there exists a unique element*

$$\hat{\Lambda}h \in \cap_{\alpha\in[0,\mu)}\mathcal{C}_2^{\mu-\alpha}([0,T];\mathcal{B}_{\kappa+\alpha})$$

such that $\hat{\delta}(\hat{\Lambda}h) = h$. Moreover, $\hat{\Lambda}h$ satisfies the following contraction property: for all $\alpha \in [0,\mu)$,

$$\mathcal{N}[\hat{\Lambda}h;\mathcal{C}_2^{\mu-\alpha}([0,T];\mathcal{B}_{\kappa+\alpha})] \leq c_{\alpha,\mu,T}\,\mathcal{N}[h;\mathcal{C}_3^\mu([0,T];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]. \tag{17}$$

The proof of this result can be found in [15]. Note however that the main technical arguments used for the construction of $\hat{\Lambda}$ will be recovered through the proofs of Propositions 3.15 and 4.12.

3. Young case

The objective of this section will consist in defining and analyzing an approximation scheme for the system (3) in Case **(i)**, that is to say when x is a γ-Hölder process with $\gamma > 1/2$. It will of course be necessary, at first, to remind the reader with some details about the results established in [7] under those assumptions. For more simplicity, we shall work on the time interval $[0,T] = [0,1]$.

3.1. **Previous results.** Let us fix a γ-Hölder process x, for a certain parameter $\gamma > 1/2$. As explained in [7], the interpretation of (3) requires the identification of a particular operator X^x built from x:

Lemma 3.1. *The operator $X^{\tilde{x}}$, defined for any differentiable process $\tilde{x}$ by the operator-valued integral*

$$X^{\tilde{x},i}_{ts} = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, d\tilde{x}^i_u,$$

can be continuously extended (with respect to the Hölder topology) to a unique operator X^x that satisfied the following properties:

- $\hat{\delta} X^{x,i} = 0$,
- *$X^{x,i}$ commutes with the projection operators P_N ($N \in \mathbb{N}^*$),*
- $X^{x,i} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))$ *for all* $\kappa \geq 0$,
- $X^{x,i} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma-\kappa}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))$ *for all* $0 \leq \kappa < \gamma$.

Proof. It is an integration by parts argument, which gives rise to the expression

$$X^{x,i}_{ts} := S_{ts}(\delta x^i)_{ts} - \int_s^t \Delta S_{tu}(\delta x^i)_{tu}\, du. \tag{18}$$

The details are given in [7]. □

Notation 3.2. *For any fixed $\kappa \in (0,1)$, we define the norm associated to X^x by the formula:*

$$\|X^x\|_{\gamma,\kappa} :=$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \mathcal{N}[X^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))] + \mathcal{N}[X^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}))] + \mathcal{N}[X^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma-\kappa}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))] \right\}. \tag{19}$$

Proposition 3.3. *For any process $z = (z^1, \dots, z^m)$ such that $z^i \in \mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa) \cap \mathcal{C}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B})$ with $0 < \kappa < 1/2$ and $\gamma + \kappa > 1$, we define the integral*

$$\mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, z) = X^{x,i}_{ts} z^i_s + \hat{\Lambda}_{ts}\left(X^{x,i} \delta z^i\right). \tag{20}$$

Then:

- *$\mathcal{J}(\hat{d}x\, z)$ is well-defined via Theorem 2.10, and it coincides with the Riemann integral $\int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx^i_u\, z^i_u$ when x is a differentiable process.*
- *The following etimate holds true:*

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{J}(\hat{d}x\, z); \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq c\|X^x\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\left\{\mathcal{N}[z; \mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] + \mathcal{N}[z; \mathcal{C}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B})]\right\}. \tag{21}$$

In this background, the main result of [7] is summed up by the following statement:

Theorem 3.4. *If $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{2,b}(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,N\}$, the system*

$$(\hat{\delta}y)_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, f(y)) \quad , \quad y_0 = h \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa, \tag{22}$$

interpreted thanks to the previous proposition, admits a unique global solution in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)$, for any κ such that

$$1/4 < \kappa < 1/2 \quad , \quad \gamma + \kappa > 1. \tag{23}$$

Besides, the following estimates holds true:

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \le C\left(\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}, \|X^x\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\right), \tag{24}$$

for some function C that increases with its two arguments. In the latter expression, we have used the notation

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] = \mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] + \mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]. \tag{25}$$

Remark 3.5. It is worth noticing that (24) and (21) implies in particular

$$\mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \le c_{h,x}.$$

Indeed, since y is solution to the system, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\hat{\delta}y)_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} &\le \|\mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, f(y))\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\ &\le c_x\,|t-s|^\gamma\left\{\mathcal{N}[f(y);\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] + \mathcal{N}[f(y);\mathcal{C}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B})]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, thanks to (11) and (9), it holds

$$\mathcal{N}[f(y);\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \le c\left\{1 + \mathcal{N}[y;\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa])\right\},$$

while $\mathcal{N}[f(y);\mathcal{C}_1^\kappa(\mathcal{B})] \le c\mathcal{N}[y;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]$.

3.2. **Scheme and main result.** The three-step procedure evoked in the introduction, and that will be handled into details in the next subsections, naturally leads to the following approximation scheme: if $t_k = t_k^M = \frac{k}{M}$,

$$y_0^{M,N} = P_N h, \quad y_{t_{k+1}}^{M,N} = S_{t_{k+1}t_k} y_{t_k}^{M,N} + X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{x,i,M} P_N f_i(y_{t_k}^{M,N}), \tag{26}$$

where we have set $X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{x,i,M} = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, dx_u^{M,i}$, x^M standing for the linear interpolation of x with mesh $\frac{1}{M}$.

We will assume that x^M tends to x with respect to the Hölder norm, and we label this assumption for further reference:

Hypothesis 1. *There exists a sequence (u_M) which tends to 0 such that*

$$\mathcal{N}[x - x^M;\mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)] \le u_M. \tag{27}$$

We are now in position to state the expected convergence result for (26):

Theorem 3.6. *Let us fix a parameter $\kappa \in (1/4, 1/2)$ such that $\gamma + \kappa > 1$ and $2\kappa > \gamma$, and assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{2,b}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,m\}$. Under Hypothesis 1, if y stands for the solution to (22) given by Theorem 3.4 and $y^{M,M}$ the process defined by the discrete scheme (26) when taking $N = M$, there exists a constant $c_{h,x} = c_{h,x,\gamma,\kappa} > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{0\le p<q\le M} \frac{\|\hat{\delta}(y - y^{M,M})_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}}{|t_q - t_p|^\kappa} \le c_{h,x}\left\{\|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + u_M + \frac{1}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}\right\}. \tag{28}$$

The next three subsections are devoted to the proof of this result, each of them corresponding to the analysis of a different kind of discretization.

Remark 3.7. The assumption $2\kappa > \gamma$ will be used in order to simplify some rates of convergence that will occur in the proof. We could easily get rid of it though, at the price of an additional term $\frac{c}{M^{\gamma-\kappa}}$ in (28).

Remark 3.8. The particular choice $N = M$ has only been made so as to get a nice expression for the estimate. Nevertheless, it is not hard to get a more general result with possibly different N, M, following the arguments of the subsequent proof.

Remark 3.9. For sake of clarity, we will present the time and space discretization procedures in two separate parts, even if, in this case, the similarity of the methods displayed in each part could have justified a more direct formulation, with a simultaneous time-space discretization.

3.3. **Discretization of the driving process.** At first glance, this step, which, roughly speaking, will consist in replacing $X^{x,i}$ with $X^{x,i,M}$ in the decomposition (20) of the integral, may look pointless from a theoretical point of view. The relevance of the procedure will in fact become clear during the implementation phase of the algorithm, since $X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k}$ actually reduces to

$$X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, dx^{i,M}_u = M \cdot (\delta x^i)_{t_{k+1}t_k} \cdot \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, du,$$

and so, only the simulation of the increment $(\delta x^i)_{t_{k+1}t_k}$ will be required. Note that this observation about the practical usefulness of a discretization of x will also account for the importance of Subsection 4.3 in the study of (62).

Notation 3.10. *For any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we denote by $\overline{y}^M$ the Wong-Zakaï approximation associated to x^M (with the same initial condition h), or otherwise stated the solution to the system (22) when x is replaced with its interpolation x^M.*

The transition from y to $\overline{y}^M$ is made possible thanks to the following continuity result:

Proposition 3.11. *The Itô map associated to the system (22) is locally Lipschitz with respect to h and X^x. In other words, if y (resp. $\tilde{y}$) stands for the solution driven by X^x (resp. $X^{\tilde{x}}$), with initial condition h (resp. $\tilde{h}$), then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\ \leq C\left(\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}, \|\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}, \|X^x\|_{\gamma,\kappa}, \|X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\right)\left\{\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\right\}, \quad (29)\end{aligned}$$

for a certain function C growing with its four arguments.

Proof. The inequality is first proved locally, on a small interval $[0, T_0]$, and then extended to $[0, 1]$ using Gronwall's Lemma (in its discrete version).

Local argument: Let us consider a small interval $[0, T_0]$. By writing, for all $s < t \in [0, T_0]$,

$$\hat{\delta}(y-\tilde{y})_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}\left(\hat{d}x\ [f(y) - f(\tilde{y})]\right) + \mathcal{J}_{ts}\left(\hat{d}\,[x-\tilde{x}]\ f(\tilde{y})\right),$$

Inequality (21) immediately leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]&\\ \leq c_1 T_0^{\gamma-\kappa}\|X^x\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\Big\{&\mathcal{N}[f_i(y)-f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^0([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\\ &+\mathcal{N}[f_i(y)-f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^{\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B})]\Big\}\\ &+c_2\|X^x-X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}\left\{\mathcal{N}[f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\mathcal{N}[f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^{\kappa}(\mathcal{B})]\right\}. \quad (30)\end{aligned}$$

According to (24),

$$\mathcal{N}[f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^0(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\mathcal{N}[f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^{\kappa}(\mathcal{B})]\leq c\mathcal{N}[\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\leq c_{\tilde{x},\tilde{h}}.$$

Besides, from

$$\begin{aligned}[f_i(y_t)-f_i(\tilde{y}_t)]-[f_i(y_s)-f_i(\tilde{y}_s)]=&\int_0^1 dr\, f_i'(y_s+r(\delta y)_{ts})\cdot\delta(y-\tilde{y})_{ts}\\ &+\int_0^1 dr\,[f_i'(y_s+r(\delta y)_{ts})-f_i'(\tilde{y}_s+r(\delta\tilde{y})_{ts})]\cdot(\delta\tilde{y})_{ts},\end{aligned}$$

one can deduce, owing to (24) and the continuous inclusion $\mathcal{B}_\kappa\subset L^\infty(0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{N}[f_i(y)-f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^{\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B})]\\ &\leq\ c_1\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\\ &\qquad +c_2\mathcal{N}[\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\left\{\|y_t-\tilde{y}_t\|_\infty+\|y_s-\tilde{y}_s\|_\infty\right\}\\ &\leq\ c_{\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\left\{\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ is a Banach algebra, one has, for any $t\in[0,T_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f_i(y_t)-f_i(\tilde{y}_t)\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}&=\|\int_0^1 dr\, f_i'(\tilde{y}_t+r(y_t-\tilde{y}_t))\cdot(y_t-\tilde{y}_t)\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\\ &\leq\ c\|y_t-\tilde{y}_t\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\left\{\|y_t\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+\|\tilde{y}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

and so, using (24) again,

$$\mathcal{N}[f_i(y)-f_i(\tilde{y});\mathcal{C}_1^0([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\leq c_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}}\left\{\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\}.$$

Going back to (30), one can now assert that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]&\\ \leq c_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\left\{T_0^{\gamma-\kappa}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\|X^x-X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}+\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\},&\end{aligned}$$

and then, as $y_t-\tilde{y}_t=\hat{\delta}(y-\tilde{y})_{t0}+S_{t0}(h-\tilde{h})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]&\\ \leq c^1_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\left\{T_0^{\gamma-\kappa}\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]+\|X^x-X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}+\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\}.&\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by picking $T_0\in(0,1]$ such that $c^1_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}T_0^{\gamma-\kappa}=\frac{1}{2}$, we get

$$\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]\leq 2\,c^1_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\left\{\|X^x-X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}+\|h-\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\right\}.$$

Extension of the result. With the same arguments as in the first step, one easily deduce, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([kT_0, (k+1)T_0], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\ \leq 2\, c^1_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}} \left\{ \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa} + \|y_{kT_0} - \tilde{y}_{kT_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \right\},$$

and so, as

$$y_{kT_0} - \tilde{y}_{kT_0} = S_{kT_0,0}[h - \tilde{h}] + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} S_{kT_0,(l+1)T_0} \hat{\delta}(y - \tilde{y})_{(l+1)T_0, lT_0}$$

(use (15)),

$$\mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([kT_0, (k+1)T_0], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\ \leq 2\, c^1_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}} \Big\{ \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa} + \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\ + T_0^\kappa \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([lT_0, (l+1)T_0], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \Big\}.$$

Gronwall's Lemma then allows to assert that

$$\mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([kT_0, (k+1)T_0], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\ \leq c^2_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\, e^{c^3_{h,\tilde{h},x,\tilde{x}}\, k} \left\{ \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_{\gamma,\kappa} + \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \right\}.$$

Inequality (29) finally stems from the relation (use (15) again)

$$\mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,1], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{J_{T_0}} \mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([kT_0, (k+1)T_0], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)],$$

where J_{T_0} is the smallest integer such that $J_{T_0} \cdot T_0 \geq 1$.

□

Hypothesis 1 is then needed to establish the following result, which can be seen as a refinement of Lemma 3.1:

Lemma 3.12. *There exists a constant $c_{\gamma,\kappa}$ such that*

$$\|X^x - X^{x,M}\|_{\gamma,\kappa} \leq c_{\gamma,\kappa}\, \mathcal{N}[x - x^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)] \leq c_{\gamma,\kappa}\, u_M.$$

Proof. Remember that X^x is defined by (18). From this expression, we obviously get, for any test-function φ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(X^{x,i}_{ts} - X^{x,i,M}_{ts})\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\ &\leq \|S_{ts}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \left|\delta(x^i - x^{M,i})_{ts}\right| + \int_s^t \|\Delta S_{tu}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \left|\delta(x^i - x^{M,i})_{tu}\right| du \\ &\leq \mathcal{N}[x - x^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)]\, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \left\{ |t-s|^\gamma + \int_s^t |t-u|^{-1+\gamma}\, du \right\} \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{N}[x - x^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)]\, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} |t-s|^\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

which allows to extend the estimate to any element of $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ and as a consequence

$$\mathcal{N}[X^{x,i} - X^{x,i,M}; \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))] \leq 2\mathcal{N}[x - x^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)].$$

One can then resort to the same argument in order to cope with

$$\mathcal{N}[X^{x,i} - X^{x,i,M}; \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}))] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}[X^{x,i} - X^{x,i,M}; \mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma-\kappa}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}_\kappa))].$$

□

The association of the two previous results immediately gives the expected control:

Corollary 3.13. *With the above notations, there exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[y - \overline{y}^M; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq c_{h,x} u_M. \tag{31}$$

3.4. **Time discretization.** In this subsection, we mean to study the intermediate infinite-dimensional scheme:

$$y^M_{t_{k+1}} = S_{t_{k+1}t_k} y^M_{t_k} + X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} f_i(y^M_{t_k}) \quad , \quad y^M_0 = h. \tag{32}$$

Let us first extend y^M on $[0,1]$ in a continuous way, by following the definition: if $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$,

$$y^M_t := S_{tt_k} y^M_{t_k} + X^{x,i,M}_{tt_k} f_i(y^M_{t_k}).$$

Now observe that by setting $r^M_{ts} := \hat{\Lambda}_{ts}\left(X^{x,i,M} \delta f_i(y^M)\right)$, one can write, for any $k \in \{0, \dots, M-1\}$,

$$y^M_{t_{k+1}} = S_{t_{k+1}t_k} y^M_{t_k} + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, dx^{i,M}_u\, f_i(y^M_u) - r^M_{t_{k+1}t_k}. \tag{33}$$

Extending the expression to all times $s < t$ gives the two formulas:

Lemma 3.14. *If $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$, then*

$$(\hat{\delta} y^M)_{ts} = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx^{i,M}_u\, f_i(y^M_u) - y^{M,\sharp}_{ts}, \tag{34}$$

with

$$y^{M,\sharp}_{ts} = r^M_{tt_q} - S_{ts} r^M_{st_p} + \sum_{k=p}^{q-1} S_{tt_{k+1}} r^M_{t_{k+1}t_k}, \tag{35}$$

while if $t_p \leq s < t < t_{p+1}$,

$$(\hat{\delta} y^M)_{ts} = X^{x,i}_{ts} f_i(y^M_{t_p}). \tag{36}$$

Proof. Formula (36) is a straightforward consequence of the relation $\hat{\delta} X^{x,i,M} = 0$. As for (34), it follows from the association of (33) and the algebraic relation (15), which gives

here

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{ts} &= \sum_{k=p+1}^{q-1} S_{tt_{k+1}}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k+1}t_k} + (\hat{\delta}y^M)_{tt_q} + S_{tt_{p+1}}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{p+1}s} \\ &= \left[\int_{t_{p+1}}^{t_q} S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M) - \sum_{k=p+1}^{q-1} S_{tt_{k+1}} r^M_{t_{k+1}t_k}\right] \\ &\qquad + \left[\int_{t_q}^{t} S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M) - r^M_{tt_q}\right] + S_{tt_{p+1}}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{p+1}s} \qquad (37)\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{p+1}s} &= (\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{p+1}t_p} - S_{t_{p+1}s}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{st_p} \\ &= \left[\int_{t_p}^{t_{p+1}} S_{t_{p+1}u}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M) + r^M_{t_{p+1}t_p}\right] \\ &\qquad - S_{t_{p+1}s}\left[\int_{t_p}^{s} S_{su}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M) - r^M_{st_p}\right], \qquad (38)\end{aligned}$$

it suffices to inject (38) in (37) to get (34).

□

We are going to lean on the two expressions (34) and (36) in order to establish a uniform estimate (with respect to M) for $\mathcal{N}[y^M; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,1], \mathcal{B}_\kappa))]$, which is the main result of this subsection:

Proposition 3.15. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[y^M; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,1], \mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq c_{h,x}. \qquad (39)$$

Proof. Using an iteration procedure on l, the following assertion will actually be proved: there exists a constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(x)$ and a constant $N_l = N_l(h,x)$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}[y^M; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0, l\varepsilon])] \leq N_l.$$

For $l = 0$, take $N_0 = \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}$. Now assume that the property holds true for l, and let $s, t \in [0, (l+1)\varepsilon]$.

1st case: $s, t \in [l\varepsilon, (l+1)\varepsilon]$.

1st subcase: $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$, with $|t-s| \geq \frac{1}{M}$. Then, from (34),

$$(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{ts} = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M) - y_{ts}^{M,\sharp}.$$

Appealing to the estimate (21) for x^M, together with the fact that $\|X^x - X^{x,M}\|_{\gamma,\kappa}$ tends to 0, one easily deduces

$$\|\int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, f_i(y_u^M)\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c_x\, |t-s|^\kappa\, \varepsilon^{\gamma-\kappa} \left\{1 + \mathcal{N}[y^M; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.$$

Besides, thanks to the contraction property (17) of $\hat{\Lambda}$, one gets

$$\|r^M_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le c_x\,|t-s|^{\gamma+\kappa}\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\},$$

and by the same property,

$$\|r^M_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le c_x\,|t-s|^{\gamma}\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|y^{M,\sharp}_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}\\
&\le \|r^M_{tt_q}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+\|r^M_{st_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+\|r^M_{t_qt_{q-1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+c_\kappa\sum_{k=p}^{q-2}|t-t_{k+1}|^{-\kappa}\,\|r^M_{t_{k+1}t_k}\|_{\mathcal{B}}\\
&\le c_x\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}\cdot\\
&\qquad\qquad\left\{|t-s|^\gamma+\frac{1}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}\left(\frac{1}{M}\sum_{k=p}^{q-2}|t-t_{k+1}|^{-\kappa}\right)\right\}\\
&\le c_x\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}\left\{|t-s|^\gamma+\frac{|t-s|^{1-\kappa}}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}\right\}\\
&\le c_x\,|t-s|^\gamma\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

2nd subcase: $t_p \le s < t < t_{p+1}$. Then $(\hat\delta y^M)_{ts} = X^{x,i,M}_{ts} f_i(y^M_{t_p})$, so that

$$\|(\hat\delta y^M)_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le c_x\,|t-s|^\gamma\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.$$

3rd subcase: $t_p \le s < t_{p+1} \le t < t_{p+2}$ with $|t-s| \le 1/M$. Just notice that $\|(\hat\delta y^M)_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le \|(\hat\delta y^M)_{tt_{p+1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|(\hat\delta y^M)_{t_{p+1}s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}$, so that we can go back to the second subcase.

Conclusion of the 1st case:

$$\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([l\varepsilon,(l+1)\varepsilon])] \le c_x\varepsilon^{\gamma-\kappa}\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.$$

2nd case: $s < l\varepsilon \le t \le (l+1)\varepsilon$. One has $\|(\hat\delta y^M)_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le \|(\hat\delta y^M)_{t,l\varepsilon}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|(\hat\delta y^M)_{l\varepsilon,s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}$, and so, owing to the recurrence assumption,

$$\|(\hat\delta y^M)_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le |t-s|^\kappa\left\{\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([l\varepsilon,(l+1)\varepsilon])]+N_l\right\}.$$

The association of the two cases gives

$$\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])] \le c_x\varepsilon^{\gamma-\kappa}\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}+N_l.$$

Since, for any $t\in[0,(l+1)\varepsilon]$, $\|y^M_t\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \le \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]$, one deduces

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\\
&\qquad\le \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+2N_l+2c_x\varepsilon^{\gamma-\kappa}\left\{1+\mathcal{N}[y^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}^{0,\kappa}([0,(l+1)\varepsilon])]\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

To achieve the proof, it now suffices to pick ε such that $2c_x\varepsilon^{\gamma-\kappa}=1/2$ and to set

$$N_{l+1} = 2\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}+4N_l+1.$$

□

Remark 3.16. This uniform boundedness result could be used in order to prove the convergence of y^M towards the solution y of (3), by following the arguments of Davie [6]. As far as we are concerned, we will directly establish, in the next subsection, the convergence of the approximation $y^{M,M}$ defined by (26).

3.5. **Space discretization.** This is the final step. So, we go back to the study of the process $y^{M,N}$ steming from the general scheme (26), and that we extend to $[0,1]$ just as in the previous subsection. Thanks to Corollary 3.13, it only remains to control the norm $\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma([0,1],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]$, where we recall that the notation $\overline{y}^M$ stands for the Wong-Zakai approximation, as it has been defined in Subsection 3.3.

Notice that (26) can be seen as a particular case of (32), by replacing $(y \mapsto f_i(y))$ with the field $(y \mapsto P_N f_i(y))$. It means that both decompositions (34) and (36) remains valid for $y^{M,N}$, if we take of course

$$r_{ts}^{M,N} := \hat{\Lambda}_{ts}\left(X^{x,i,M} P_N(\delta f_i(y^{M,N}))\right),$$

$$y_{ts}^{M,N,\sharp} := r_{tt_q}^{M,N} - S_{ts} r_{st_p}^{M,N} + \sum_{k=p}^{q-1} S_{tt_{k+1}} r_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{M,N},$$

for $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$. Moreover, since the operator P_N is a contraction on any $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$, the arguments displayed in the proof of Proposition 3.15 still hold true in this context, which allows to conclude:

Proposition 3.17. *There exists a constant $c_{x,h}$ such that for all $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[y^{M,N}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}^{0,\kappa}([0,1])] \leq c_{x,h}.$$

Now assume that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.6 are satisfied, which means that $2\kappa > \gamma$ and $M = N$. The comparison between $y^{M,M}$ and $\overline{y}^M$ will appeal to the two following technical results:

Lemma 3.18. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that if $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$, with $|t-s| \geq 1/M$, then*

$$\|y_{ts}^{M,M,\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq \frac{c_{h,x}}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} |t-s|^\kappa.$$

Proof. We use the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.15, together with the result of Proposition 3.17, which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|y_{ts}^{M,N,\sharp}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\
&\leq \|r_{tt_q}^{M,N}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|r_{st_p}^{M,N}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|r_{t_q t_{q-1}}^{M,N}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + c_\kappa \sum_{k=p}^{q-2} |t - t_{k+1}|^{-\kappa} \|r_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{M,N}\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\
&\leq c_{h,x}\left\{ \frac{1}{M^\gamma} + \frac{1}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=p}^{q-1} |t - t_{k+1}|^{-\kappa} \right) \right\} \\
&\leq c_{h,x}\left\{ \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^{\gamma-\kappa}} + \frac{|t-s|^{1-\kappa}}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} \right\} \leq c_{x,h} \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

where, for the last inequality, we have used the fact that $1/4 < \kappa < 1/2 < \gamma < 1$. □

Lemma 3.19. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that if $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$, with $|t-s| \geq 1/M$, one has*

$$\|\int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, (P_M - Id) f_i(y_u^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq \frac{c_{h,x}}{M^{2(\gamma-\kappa)}}\, |t-s|^\kappa .$$

Proof. As P_M commutes with the semigroup, one can write

$$\int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, (P_M - \mathrm{Id}) f_i(y_u^{M,M}) \\ = X_{ts}^{x,i,M}(P_M - \mathrm{Id}) f_i(y_s^{M,M}) + (P_M - \mathrm{Id})\hat{\Lambda}_{ts}(X^{x,i,M}\delta f_i(y^{M,M})).$$

Now, Hypothesis 1, together with the uniform control given by Proposition 3.17, easily yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{ts}^{x,i,M}(P_M - \mathrm{Id}) f_i(y_s^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} &\leq c_x\, |t-s|^{\gamma-\kappa}\, \|(P_M - \mathrm{Id}) f_i(y_s^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &\leq c_x \frac{|t-s|^{\gamma-\kappa}}{M^{2\kappa}} \|f_i(y_s^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\ &\leq c_{h,x} \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(P_M - \mathrm{Id})\hat{\Lambda}_{ts}(X^{x,i,M}\delta f_i(y^{M,M}))\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M^{2(\gamma-\kappa)}} \|\hat{\Lambda}_{ts}(X^{x,i,M}\delta f_i(y^{M,M}))\|_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma} \leq c_{h,x} \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^{2(\gamma-\kappa)}}.l \end{aligned}$$

□

We are now in position to prove the main result of this subsection, which, associated to Corollary 3.13, achieves the proof of Theorem 3.6.

Proposition 3.20. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}(\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq c_{h,x} \left\{ \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{1}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} \right\}. \tag{40}$$

Proof. Local result. Consider first an interval $I_0 = [0, T_0]$, with T_0 a time to be precised at the end of this first step, and let $s, t \in [0, T_0]$.

1st case: if $t_p \leq s < t < t_{p+1}$, then

$$\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{ts} = (\hat{\delta}\overline{y}^M)_{ts} - X_{ts}^{x,i,M} P_M f_i(y_{t_p}^{M,M}),$$

hence

$$\|\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c_{h,x}\, |t-s|^\gamma \leq c_{h,x} \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^{\gamma-\kappa}}.$$

2nd case: if $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} \leq t < t_{p+2}$, we go back to the previous case by noticing that

$$\|\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{ts}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq \|\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{tt_{p+1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \|\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{t_{p+1}s}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}.$$

3^{rd} *case*: $t_p \leq s < t_{p+1} < \ldots < t_q \leq t < t_{q+1}$ with $|t-s| \geq 1/M$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{ts} \\
&\quad = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\ \big[f_i(\overline{y}_u^M) - P_M f_i(y_u^{M,M})\big] + y_{ts}^{M,M,\sharp} \\
&\quad = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\ \big[f_i(\overline{y}_u^M) - f_i(y_u^{M,M})\big] \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, (\mathrm{Id} - P_M) f_i(y_u^{M,M}) + y_{ts}^{M,M,\sharp}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to the two previous lemmas, one can assert that

$$\| \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\, (\mathrm{Id} - P_M) f_i(y_u^{M,M}) + y_{ts}^{M,M,\sharp} \|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c_{h,x} \frac{|t-s|^\kappa}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}.$$

Besides, it is not hard to see that

$$\| \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^{i,M}\ \big[f_i(\overline{y}_u^M) - f_i(y_u^{M,M})\big] \|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c_{h,x}^1\, |t-s|^\kappa\, T_0^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)],$$

for some constant $c_{h,x}^1$ that we fix for the rest of the proof.

Summing up the three cases, we get

$$\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\kappa([0,T_0];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq \frac{c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} + c_{h,x}^1 T_0^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)].$$

In order to estimate $\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \mathcal{C}_1^0([0,T_0],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]$, it now suffices to observe that $\overline{y}_s^M - y_s^{M,M} = \hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M})_{s0} + S_{s0}(h - P_M h)$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\
&\qquad \leq \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{2\, c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} + 2\, c_{h,x}^1 T_0^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, pick T_0 such that $2\, c_{h,x}^1 T_0^{\gamma-\kappa} = 1/2$ to obtain

$$\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq 2\|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{4\, c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}. \tag{41}$$

Extending the result: By following the same steps as in the local reasoning, we clearly get, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\kappa([T_0, T_0+\eta];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\
&\qquad\qquad \leq \frac{c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} + c_{h,x}^1 \eta^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0+\eta],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)],
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (41), leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\kappa([0,T_0+\eta];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \\
&\qquad \leq 2\, \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{5\, c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} + c_{h,x}^1 \eta^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0+\eta],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)],
\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0+\eta];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)]$$
$$\leq 5\|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{10\, c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} + 2\, c_{h,x}^1 \eta^{\gamma-\kappa} \mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,T_0+\eta],\mathcal{B}_\kappa)].$$

By taking $\eta = T_0$, we deduce

$$\mathcal{N}[\overline{y}^M - y^{M,M}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^{0,\kappa}([0,2T_0];\mathcal{B}_\kappa)] \leq 10\, \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{20\, c_{h,x}^2}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}}.$$

We repeat the procedure until the whole interval $[0,1]$ is covered. □

3.6. **Numerical result for the fBm.** Let X an m-dimensional fBm with Hurst index $H > 1/2$. In order to exhibit an explicit rate of convergence in this situation, consider the following approximation result from [8]: .

Lemma 3.21. *For any $0 < \gamma < H$, there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{\gamma,X}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}[X - X^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)] \leq c_{\gamma,X} \frac{\sqrt{\log(M)}}{M^{H-\gamma}}. \tag{42}$$

Theorem 3.6 can thus be turned into:

Theorem 3.22. *Fix two parameters $\kappa \in (1/4, 1/2)$ and $\gamma \in (1/2, H)$ such that $\gamma + \kappa > 1$ and $2\kappa > \gamma$, and assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{2,b}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$. Let Y the solution to the system*

$$(\hat{\delta} Y)_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}X\, f(Y)) \quad , \quad Y_0 = h \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa,$$

interpreted in a pathwise sense thanks to Proposition 3.3, and let $Y^{M,M}$ the process defined through the numerical scheme (26). Then there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{\gamma,\kappa,h,X}$ such that

$$\sup_{0\leq p<q\leq M} \frac{\|\hat{\delta}(Y - Y^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}}{|t_q - t_p|^\kappa}$$
$$\leq c_{\gamma,\kappa,h,X} \left\{ \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{\sqrt{\log(M)}}{M^{H-\gamma}} + \frac{1}{M^{\gamma+\kappa-1}} \right]. \tag{43}$$

Practically speaking, the fact that the semigroup can be diagonalized in the chosen basis e_n (remember the notation of Section 2) makes the implementation of (26) really simple. Indeed, by setting $Y_{t_k}^{M,M,l} = \left\langle Y_{t_k}^{M,M}, e_l \right\rangle$, one has, for any $l \in \{1,\dots,M\}$,

$$Y_{t_{k+1}}^{M,M,l} = e^{-\lambda_l/M} Y_{t_k}^{M,M,l} + \frac{M^2}{\lambda_l} \left\{1 - e^{-\lambda_l/M}\right\} \sum_{i=1}^m (\delta X^i)_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left\langle f_i(Y_{t_k}^{M,M}), e_l \right\rangle. \tag{44}$$

The following Matlab code is a possible implementation of the algorithm, for which we have taken $m = 1$, and as in [20],

$$h(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\sin(\pi\xi) + \frac{3}{5}\sin(3\pi\xi)\ (\xi \in [0,1]), \quad f_k(x) = \frac{k\cdot(1-x)}{1+x^2}\ (x \in \mathbb{R}). \tag{45}$$

The parameter k is meant to vary so as to observe the influence of the perturbation.

The procedure more precisely simulate the evolution in time of the functional-valued process $Y^{M,M}$. At each step, the Fourier coefficients $\left\langle f_i(Y^{M,M}_{t_k}), e_l \right\rangle$ are computed by means of the discrete sinus transform function **dst** (and its inverse **idst**). As for the fBm increments, they are computed via (an appropriety rescaled version of) the Matlab-function **wfbm**, which lean on the decomposition of the process in a wavelet basis, according to the method proposed by Abry and Sellan in [2]. Let us finally point out that the action of the semigroup is likely to be qualified by turning the heat semigroup S^{Δ} into $S_t = S^{\Delta}_{\kappa t}$, for some parameter κ. The above theoretical study remains valid for the modified system, of course.

```
function [l]=eigval(N)
l=[]; for i=1:N, l(i)=(pi*i)^2;end

function [S]=semigr(M,N,l,kappa)
S=[];for i=1:N, v(i)=exp(-l(i)^2/(kappa*M));end

function=simulyoung(H,M,N,k,kappa)
l=eigval(N);S=semigr(M,N,l,kappa);
X=(1/M)^H*wfbm(H,M+1);
A=[1/2,0,3/5,zeros(1,N-3)];
u=zeros(1,N);fy=zeros(1,N);
for i=1:M
    u=dst(A(i,:));fy=0.5*idst(k*(1-u)./(1+u.^2));
    A(i+1,:)=S.*A(i,:)
             +((kappa./l).*(1-S))*M*(X(i+1)-X(i)).*fy;
    end
E=[];for j=1:M+1, E(j,:)=dst(A(j,:));end
plot(linspace(0,1,N+2),
     [0,dst([1/2,0,3/5,zeros(1,N-3)]),0]);
F(1)=getframe;for p=1:M
    plot(linspace(0,1,N+2),[0,E(p+1,:),0]);
    hold off;
    F(p+1)=getframe;end
movie(F,1,2)
```

Figure 3.6 corresponds to simulations of the process $t \mapsto Y^{M,N}_t(\frac{1}{2})$ for different values of the parameter k ($k = 1, 5, 20, 50$), with the same realization of a fBm with Hurst index $H = 0.6$. The above-described parameter κ has been taken equal to $\kappa = 100$.

As it was already stressed in the introduction, it seems difficult to compare the control (43) to the results of Jentzen and Kloeden [20] or Hausenblas [17], expressed with a supremum norm (in time). Given the constraints on the two parameters κ and γ, (43)



FIGURE 1. Influence of the perturbation term through the observation of the path $t \mapsto Y_t^{M,N}(\frac{1}{2})$, for different values of the parameter k in (45) ($k = 1, 5, 20, 50$). Here, $M = N = 1000$, $H = 0.6$.

only gives rise to the following estimates: if $h \in V_M$,

$$\sup_{p\in\{0,\dots,M\}} \|Y_{t_p} - Y_{t_p}^{M,M}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c\frac{\log(M)}{M^{\frac{1}{2}(H-1/2)}}, \tag{46}$$

and there is no doubt that the latter inequality is not optimal.

In order to observe the actual rate of convergence of the algorithm, we have represented, on Figure 3.6, a few simulations of the function

$$n \mapsto \log_2 \|Y_1^{M_0,M_0} - Y_1^{2^n,2^n}\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Here M_0 stands for a very large fixed integer, so that Y^{M_0,M_0} can be considered as the "exact" solution to the problem. The results lead to the following conjecture:

Conjecture: If X is an m-dimensional fBm with Hurst index $H > 1/2$, and if Y stands for the solution to (22), then there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{h,X}$ such that

$$\sup_{p\in\{0,\dots,M\}} \|Y_{t_p} - Y_{t_p}^{M,M}\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} \leq c\frac{\log(M)}{M^H}. \tag{47}$$



FIGURE 2. Simulation results for $n \mapsto \log_2 \|Y_1^{M_0,M_0} - Y_1^{2^n,2^n}\|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Here, $M_0 = 2^{11}$, $H = 0.6$, $\kappa = 100$.

Nevertheless, note that we have no idea on how to prove such a result for the time being.

4. Rough case with a regularized integrand

We now intend to deal with Case **(iii)** of the introduction, and so to consider a γ-Hölder process x with $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$. To this end, we will follow the same strategy, and thus the same presentation, as in the previous section.

To be more precise, the system we are going to envisage here is the following:

$$y_0 = \psi \in \mathcal{B}_1 \quad , \quad (\hat{\delta} y)_{ts} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u^i\, S_\varepsilon f_i(y_u), \tag{48}$$

where:

- $x = (x^1, \dots, x^m)$ is a γ-Hölder process, with $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$,
- $f_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are regular functions,
- ε is a strictly positive fixed parameter.

We will not go over the necessity of regularizing f via S_ε again, since it was extensively commented in [7]. The role played by ε will anyway become clear through the various estimates of this section.

4.1. **Previous results.** This time, the interpretation of (48) will rest on the existence of three operator-valued processes, denoted by X^x, X^{ax} and X^{xx}, steming from x. Their construction requires the following additional assumption:

Hypothesis 2. *We assume that x is a 2-rough path, which means that there exists a process $x^2 \in \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^m \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that*

$$\delta x^2 = (\delta x) \otimes (\delta x).$$

Lemma 4.1. *Under Hypothesis (2), the operator-valued processes*

$$X_{ts}^{\tilde{x},i} = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, d\tilde{x}_u^i, \quad X_{ts}^{a\tilde{x},i} = \int_s^t a_{tu}\, d\tilde{x}_u^i, \quad X_{ts}^{\tilde{x}\tilde{x},ij} = \int_s^t S_{tu}\, d\tilde{x}_u^j\, (\delta\tilde{x}^i)_{us},$$

defined for any differentiable process $\tilde{x}$, can be continuously and uniquely extended (with respect to the Hölder topology) in three operator-valued processes $X^{x,i}$, $X^{ax,i}$ and $X^{xx,ij}$ that satisfy:

(H1) *From an algebraic point of view:*

$$\hat{\delta} X^{x,i} = 0, \quad X^{x,i} = X^{ax,i} + \delta x^i, \quad \hat{\delta} X^{xx,ij} = X^{x,i}(\delta x^j). \tag{49}$$

$$X^{x,i},\ X^{ax,i} \text{ and } X^{xx,ij} \text{ commute with the semigroup and the projectors } P_N. \tag{50}$$

(H2) *From an analytical point of view:*

$$X^{x,i} \in \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{B})) \cap \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}_1)), \quad X^{ax,i} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{1+\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B})) \tag{51}$$

$$X^{xx,ij} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{B})) \cap \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}_1)). \tag{52}$$

Proof. As in Lemma 3.1, the proof reduces to an integration by parts argument, which ends up with the three expressions:

$$X_{ts}^{x,i} = S_{ts}(\delta x^i)_{ts} - \int_s^t \Delta S_{tu}(\delta x^i)_{tu}\, du, \tag{53}$$

$$X_{ts}^{ax,i} = a_{ts}(\delta x^i)_{ts} - \int_s^t \Delta S_{tu}(\delta x^i)_{tu}\, du, \tag{54}$$

$$X_{ts}^{xx,ij} = S_{ts} x_{ts}^{2,ij} - \int_s^t \Delta S_{tu}\left[x_{tu}^{2,ij} + (\delta x^i)_{tu}(\delta x^j)_{us}\right] du. \tag{55}$$

The details can be found in [7]. □

Notation 4.2. *In order to simplify some of our future expressions, we set*

$$\begin{aligned}\|X^x\|_\gamma &= \|(X^x, X^{ax}, X^{xx})\|_\gamma \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^m \big\{\mathcal{N}[X^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{B}))] + \mathcal{N}[X^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^\gamma(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}_1))] \\ &\qquad + \mathcal{N}[X^{ax,i}; \mathcal{C}_2^{1+\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}))] \\ &\qquad + \mathcal{N}[X^{xx,ij}; \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B},\mathcal{B}))] + \mathcal{N}[X^{xx,ij}; \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_1,\mathcal{B}_1))]\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

One of the fundamental principles of algebraic integration theory is that the interpretation of the rough integral $\int_s^t y_u\, dx_u$ ($\gamma < 1/2$) is only possible for a specific class of integrands y, usually called the class of controlled processes (with respect to x). The structure at stake in the twisted background induced by (48) is given by the following definition:

Definition 4.3. *For any $\kappa \in (1/3, \gamma)$, we define the space $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$ of κ-controlled processes (with respect to x) by the formula*

$$\hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa = \Big\{ y \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}^\gamma_1(\mathcal{B}_1) : \ (\hat{\delta} y)_{ts} = X^{x,i}_{ts} y^{x,i}_s + y^\sharp_{ts},\ y^{x,i} \in \mathcal{C}^\kappa_1(\mathcal{B}_1) \cap \mathcal{C}^0_1(\mathcal{B}_1),\ y^\sharp \in \mathcal{C}^{2\kappa}_2(\mathcal{B}_1) \Big\},$$

and we provide this space with the seminorm

$$\mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa] = \mathcal{N}[y^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}^0_1(\mathcal{B}_1)] + \mathcal{N}[y^{x,i}; \mathcal{C}^\kappa_1(\mathcal{B}_1)] + \mathcal{N}[y^\sharp; \mathcal{C}^{2\kappa}_2(\mathcal{B}_1)].$$

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{2,b}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and let $\kappa \in (1/3, \gamma)$. Under Hypothesis 2, we define, for any $y \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$ with decomposition $\hat{\delta} y = X^{x,i} y^{x,i} + y^\sharp$, the integral*

$$\mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(y)) = X^{x,i}_{ts} S_\varepsilon f_i(y_s) + X^{xx,ij}_{ts} S_\varepsilon(y^{x,j}_s \cdot f_i'(y_s)) + \hat{\Lambda}_{ts}\left(X^{x,i} S_\varepsilon f_i(y)^\sharp + X^{xx,ij} S_\varepsilon \delta(y^{x,j} \cdot f_i'(y)) \right), \quad (57)$$

where $f_i(y)^\sharp$ is given by

$$f_i(y)^\sharp_{ts} = a_{ts} y_s \cdot f_i'(y_s) + y^\sharp_{ts} \cdot f_i'(y_s) + (X^{ax,j}_{ts} y^{x,j}_s) \cdot f_i'(y_s) + \int_0^1 dr\ [f_i'(y_s + r(\delta y)_{ts}) - f_i'(y_s)] \cdot (\delta y)_{ts}. \quad (58)$$

Then:

- *$\mathcal{J}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(y))$ is well-defined via Theorem 2.10, and for any $\psi \in \mathcal{B}_1$, there exists a unique element $z \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$ such that $z_0 = \psi$, $(\hat{\delta} z)_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(y))$.*
- *If x is a differentiable process, then $\mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(y))$ coincides with the Riemann integral $\int_s^t S_{tu}\, dx_u\, S_\varepsilon f(y_u)$.*
- *The following estimation holds true (with a slight abuse of notation): For any interval $I = [l_1, l_2]$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{J}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(y)); \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa(I)] \leq c\, \|X^x\|^2_\gamma \left\{ 1 + |I|^{2(\gamma-\kappa)}\, \mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa(I)]^2 + |I|^{2(\gamma-\kappa)}\, \|y_{l_1}\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} \right\}, \quad (59)$$

where $c = c(\varepsilon)$ is a strictly positive constant.

Proof. Let us go back on a few details of this proof, the framework we consider in this paper being slightly different from the one in [7], as explained in Remark 2.7. Let us more exactly focus on the intricate term $X^{x,i} S_\varepsilon f_i(y)^\sharp$. The first three terms coming from the decomposition of $f_i(y)^\sharp$ can be easily handled, since, owing to regularity results of Lemma 4.1, one can respectively write, for any $s < u < t$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|X^{x,i}_{tu} S_\varepsilon(a_{us} y_s \cdot f_i'(y_s))\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} &\leq \|X^x\|_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma \varepsilon^{-1} \|a_{us} y_s \cdot f_i'(y_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &\leq c \|X^x\|_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma |u-s| \varepsilon^{-1} \|y_s\|_{\mathcal{B}},\end{aligned}$$

$$\|X^{x,i}_{tu} S_\varepsilon(y^\sharp_{us} \cdot f_i'(y_s))\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq c \|X^x\|_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma |u-s|^{2\kappa} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa],$$

$$\|X^{x,i}_{tu} S_\varepsilon((X^{ax,j}_{us} y^{x,j}_s) \cdot f_i'(y_s))\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq c \|X^x\|^2_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma |u-s|^{1+\gamma} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa].$$

The fourth term in (58) requires more attention, because it is made of a pointwise multiplication of two functions we wish to retrieve increments from. To do so, we use the continuous inclusion $L^1(0,1) \subset \mathcal{B}_{-\kappa}$ given by Proposition 2.6, and which allows to assert

$$\begin{aligned}&\|X^{x,i}_{tu} S_\varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 dr \ [f_i'(y_s + r(\delta y)_{ts}) - f_i'(y_s)] \cdot (\delta y)_{ts} \right) \|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\ &\leq c \|X^x\|_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma \varepsilon^{-1-\kappa} \|(\delta y)_{us} \cdot (\delta y)_{us}\|_{L^1(0,1)} \\ &\leq c \|X^x\|_\gamma |t-u|^\gamma \varepsilon^{-1-\kappa} \|(\delta y)_{us}\|^2_{\mathcal{B}}.\end{aligned}$$

The other assumptions are straightforward consequences of Lemma 4.1. The details can be easily adapted from [7]. □

With the above formalism, we have the following result of existence and uniqueness at our disposal (see [7]):

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{3,b}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and fix a parameter $\kappa \in (1/3, \gamma)$. Under Hypothesis 2, the system*

$$y_0 = h \in \mathcal{B}_1 \quad , \quad (\hat{\delta} y)_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x \, S_\varepsilon f(y)), \tag{60}$$

interpreted thanks to the previous proposition, admits a unique global solution y in $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$. Besides, the following control on y holds true:

$$\mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa] \leq C(\|X^x\|_\gamma, \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}), \tag{61}$$

for some function $C = C_\varepsilon$ that grows with its arguments.

Remark 4.6. As it will be precised in Remark 4.10, the subspaces $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$ ($\kappa \in (1/3, \kappa)$) of $\hat{\mathcal{C}}^\gamma_1$ can be seen as intermediate structures which, from a technical point of view, enables of course to give a sense to the system when x is only γ-Hölder, but leads above all to the continuity result (64), expressed in terms of γ only. For this reason, we will systematically fix, in the sequel, the parameter κ for any given $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$, by taking $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{3} + \gamma)$ for instance.

4.2. **Scheme and main result.** From the considerations of Subsection 4.1, the conception of an approximation scheme for the system (60) is essentially based on the following observation: Although the definition (57) of the rough integral $\mathcal{J}(\hat{d}x \, z)$ involves the "enrichment" of the integrand z by adding a new process z^x, the notion of solution to the system can be expressed independently of the controlled process structure. Indeed, if y is solution to the system, it is clear that we necessarily have $y^x = S_\varepsilon f(y)$ [1]. With this

[1]Note however that the resolution of the system lets the space $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa$ come into play, as well as the proof of Proposition 4.8.

observation in mind, the following scheme pops out quite naturally: for all $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{cases} y_0^{M,N} = P_N h \\ y_{t_{k+1}}^{M,N} = S_{t_{k+1}t_k} y_{t_k}^{M,N} + X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{x,i,M} P_N S_\varepsilon f_i(y_{t_k}^{M,N}) \\ \qquad\qquad + X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{xx,ij,M} P_N S_\varepsilon \left((S_\varepsilon P_N f_j(y_{t_k}^{M,N})) \cdot f_i'(y_{t_k}^{M,N}) \right), \end{cases} \tag{62}$$

where $t_k = t_k^M = \frac{k}{M}$ and, as in Section 3:

$$\begin{cases} X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{x,i,M} = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, dx_u^{M,i}, \\ X_{t_{k+1}t_k}^{xx,ij,M} = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} S_{t_{k+1}u}\, dx_u^{M,i}\, (\delta x^{M,j})_{ut_k}, \end{cases}$$

x^M standing for the linear interpolation of x with mesh $1/M$.

The subsequent hypothesis is the counterpart of Hypothesis 1:

Hypothesis 3. *There exists a sequence v_M that tends to 0 such that, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[x - x^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)] + \mathcal{N}[x^2 - x^{2,M}; \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^m \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)] \leq v_M.$$

Provided with those notations, we are now able to state the main result of this section:

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{3,b}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Under Hypotheses 2 and 3, there exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that, if y denotes the solution to (60) and $y^{M,M}$ is defined by the discrete scheme (62) by taking $M = N$, then, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq p < q \leq M} \frac{\|\hat{\delta}(y - y^{M,M})_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}}{|t_q - t_p|^\gamma} \leq c_{h,x} \left\{ \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + v_M + \frac{1}{M^{3\gamma - 1}} \right\}. \tag{63}$$

Here again, the proof will be split up into three subsections.

4.3. **Discretization of the driving process.** As in Subsection 3.3, the continuity of the Itô map will be resorted to so as to reduce the problem to the study of the Wong-Zakai approximation $\overline{y}^M$ (we use the same notation as in Subsection 3.3):

Proposition 4.8. *Let $x, \tilde{x}$ two γ-Hölder processes, with $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$, which satisfies Hypothesis 2, and let $h, \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_1$. If y (resp. $\tilde{y}$) denotes the solution to the system (60) driven by x (resp. $\tilde{x}$), with initial condition h (resp. $\tilde{h}$), then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma([0,1]; \mathcal{B}_1)] \\ &\qquad \leq C(\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \|\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \|X^x\|_\gamma, \|X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma) \left\{ \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

for some function $C = C_\varepsilon$ that grows with its arguments.

Proof. It relies on the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.6 in [8]. If $y \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^x$ and $\tilde{y} \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^{\tilde{x}}$ for two different signals $x, \tilde{x}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^{x,\tilde{x}}(I)] &= \mathcal{N}[(y, y^x) - (\tilde{y}, \tilde{y}^x); \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^{x,\tilde{x}}(I)] \\ &:= \mathcal{N}[y - \tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma(I, \mathcal{B}_1)] + \mathcal{N}[y^x - \tilde{y}^x; \mathcal{C}_1^{0,\kappa}(I, \mathcal{B}_1)] + \mathcal{N}[y^\sharp - \tilde{y}^\sharp; \mathcal{C}_2^{2\kappa}(I, \mathcal{B}_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

First, consider a time $T_0 > 0$. From the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\delta}(y-\tilde{y})_{ts} &= \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{dx}\, f(y)) - \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d\tilde{x}}\, f(\tilde{y}))\\ &= X^{x,i}_{ts} S_\varepsilon \left[f_i(y_s) - f_i(\tilde{y}_s)\right] + \left[X^{x,i}_{ts} - X^{\tilde{x},i}_{ts}\right] S_\varepsilon f_i(\tilde{y}_s)\\ &\quad + X^{xx,ij}_{ts} S_\varepsilon \left[y^{x,j}_s \cdot f_i'(y_s) - \tilde{y}^{x,j}_s \cdot f_i'(\tilde{y}_s)\right]\\ &\quad + \left[X^{xx,ij}_{ts} - X^{\tilde{x}\tilde{x},ij}_{ts}\right] S_\varepsilon(\tilde{y}^{x,j}_s \cdot f_i'(\tilde{y}_s))\\ &\quad + \hat{\Lambda}_{ts}\Big(X^{x,i} S_\varepsilon \left[f_i(y)^\sharp - f_i(\tilde{y})^\sharp\right] + \left[X^{x,i} - X^{\tilde{x},i}\right] S_\varepsilon f_i(y)^\sharp\\ &\qquad + X^{xx,ij} S_\varepsilon \delta \left[y^{x,j} \cdot f_i'(y) - \tilde{y}^{x,j} \cdot f_i'(\tilde{y})\right]\\ &\quad + \left[X^{xx,ij} - X^{\tilde{x}\tilde{x},ij}\right] S_\varepsilon \delta(\tilde{y}^{x,j} \cdot f_i'(\tilde{y}))\Big),\end{aligned}$$

some standard (albeit tedious) computations yield, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{x,\tilde{x}}_\kappa([kT_0,(k+1)T_0])]\\ &\le c_{x,\tilde{x},y,\tilde{y},y_{kT_0},\tilde{y}_{kT_0}} \left\{T_0^\kappa\, \mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{x,\tilde{x}}_\kappa([0,T_0]) + \|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma + \|y_{kT_0} - \tilde{y}_{kT_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\right\}, \quad (65)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&c_{x,\tilde{x},y,\tilde{y},y_{kT_0},\tilde{y}_{kT_0}}\\ &\qquad = c\left\{1 + \|X^x\|_\gamma + \|X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma + \|y_{kT_0}\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|\tilde{y}_{kT_0}\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa]^2 + \mathcal{N}[\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{\tilde{x}}_\kappa]^2\right\},\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c_\varepsilon > 0$. Remember that the notation $\|X^x\|_\gamma$ is defined by (56).

We now rest on the control (61), together with the inequality

$$\|y_{kT_0}\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} \le c\left\{\|h\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \mathcal{N}[y; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa]^2\right\},$$

to assert that

$$c_{x,\tilde{x},y,\tilde{y},y_{kT_0},\tilde{y}_{kT_0}} \le c^1_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}} := C(\|X^x\|_\gamma, \|X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma, \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \|\tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}),$$

for some growing function $C = C_\varepsilon$. Choose finally T_0 such that $c^1_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}} \cdot T_0^\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$, so that the following local estimate can be deduced from (65):

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{x,\tilde{x}}_\kappa([kT_0,(k+1)T_0])]\\ &\le 2\, c^1_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}} \left\{\|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma + \|y_{kT_0} - \tilde{y}_{kT_0}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\right\}\\ &\le 2c^1_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}}\Big\{\|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma + \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\ &\qquad\qquad + T_0^\kappa \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{x,\tilde{x}}_\kappa(lT_0,(l+1)T_0])]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's Lemma just as in the proof of (29), we get, for any k,

$$\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^{x,\tilde{x}}_\kappa([kT_0,(k+1)T_0])] \le c_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}} \left\{\|X^x - X^{\tilde{x}}\|_\gamma + \|h - \tilde{h}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\right\}.$$

Finally, (64) is a straightforward consequence of the inequality (obtained from (15))

$$\mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma([0,1],\mathcal{B}_1)] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{N_{T_0}-1} \mathcal{N}[y-\tilde{y};\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^{x,\tilde{x}}([kT_0,(k+1)T_0])],$$

where N_{T_0} is the smallest integer such that $N_{T_0}\cdot T_0 \geq 1$, so that $N_{T_0} \leq 1+\frac{1}{T_0} \leq 1+(2\,c^1_{x,\tilde{x},h,\tilde{h}})^\kappa$.

□

Corollary 4.9. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that, if y stands for the solution to (60) and $\overline{y}^M$ the Wong-Zakai approximation to the same system, associated to x^M, then, for any $M\in\mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[y-\overline{y}^M;\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma(\mathcal{B}_1)] \leq c_{h,x} v_M. \tag{66}$$

Proof. This is of course a consequence of (64), together with the estimate

$$\|X^x - X^{x,M}\|_\gamma \leq c_{h,x}\left\{\mathcal{N}[x-x^M;\mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)] + \mathcal{N}[x^2-x^{2,M};\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^m\otimes\mathbb{R}^m)]\right\}.$$

The latter inequality is easily checked from the three expressions in (53) and (55), just as in Lemma 3.12.

□

Remark 4.10. It is worth noticing that the previous results lead to an equivalent definition of the notion of solution to (48), which is more in accordance with the point of view of [11]: A process $y\in\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma([0,1],\mathcal{B}_1)$ is solution to (48) if for any sequence of differentiable processes x^M that converges to x in the sense of Hypothesis 3, the sequence y^M of the associated solutions convergences to y in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma([0,1],\mathcal{B}_1)$. This observation points out the artificial side of the structure $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_\kappa^x$, and is thus complementary to Remark 4.6.

4.4. **Time discretization.** The intermediate scheme we intend to look at here is given by:

$$\begin{cases} y_0^M = h \\ y_{t_{k+1}}^M = S_{t_{k+1}t_k} y_{t_k}^M + X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} S_\varepsilon f_i(y_{t_k}^M) + X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} S_\varepsilon\left(S_\varepsilon f_j(y_{t_k}^M)\cdot f_i'(y_{t_k}^M)\right). \end{cases} \tag{67}$$

In order to prove the convergence of this scheme towards the solution y of the system, it would be tempting to use the same approach as in the finite-dimensional case, and more exactly the same strategy as the one displayed in [8], which appeals to standard results for the (regular) Milstein scheme. Unfortunately, we are not in position to apply the reasoning of the latter reference, at least not directly: we must indeed take into consideration the dependence of the constant that appears in estimate (64) with respect to the initial conditions $h,\tilde{h}$, and which we could get rid of in the case of standard differential systems (see [8] for further explanations). For this reason, it becomes first necessary to get a uniform estimate on y^M:

Proposition 4.11. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that, for any $M\in\mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\sup_{0\leq p<q\leq M} \frac{\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_qt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}}{|t_q-t_p|^\gamma} \leq c_{h,x}. \tag{68}$$

The proof of this result, the main part of which will be postponed to the appendix for sake of clarity, essentially consists in combining Davie's considerations on rough discrete schemes ([6]) with the principles of the proof of Theorem 4.5, as they appear in [7] or, in a more detailled formulation (but in a slightly different context), in [9]. Let us first introduce a few notations.

In accordance with Remark 4.6, we assume that the parameter κ has been fixed in the interval $(1/3, \gamma)$. Then we set

$$\eta_l^L = \frac{1}{L+l} \quad , \quad \tau_0^L = 0 \ , \ \tau_{l+1}^L = \tau_l^L + \eta_l^L, \ I_l^L = [\tau_l^L, \tau_{l+1}^L],$$

so that the interval $[0,1]$ can be covered with a finite number of intervals I_l^L, for any $L \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We also denote by $k_l = k_l^L$ the index such that $t_{k_0} = 0$ and $t_{k_l - 1} < \tau_l^L, t_{k_l} \geq \tau_l^L$ for $l \geq 1$. Finally, define

$$J^M_{t_q t_p} = (\hat{\delta} y^M)_{t_q t_p} - X^{x,i,M}_{t_q t_p} S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_p}) - X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_q t_p} S_\varepsilon \left(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_p}) \cdot f_i'(y^M_{t_p}) \right), \tag{69}$$

$$K^M_{t_q t_p} = (\hat{\delta} y^M)_{t_q t_p} - X^{x,i,M}_{t_q t_p} S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_p}). \tag{70}$$

With those notations, the following controls hold true:

Proposition 4.12. *There exist α_1, α_2 (that only depend on γ, κ) and $L = L(x, h, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ such that for any $M \geq M_0 = M_0(L)$, for any l,*

$$\|y^M_{t_{k_l}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq (L+l)^{\alpha_2} \quad , \quad \|J^M_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq (L+l)^{\alpha_1} |t_q - t_p|^{3\kappa}, \ \text{if } t_p, t_q \in I_l^L. \tag{71}$$

Proof. See Appendix. □

From (71), (68) is an almost straightforward consequence of the definition of J^M, together with the regularity assumptions on $X^{x,M}$ and $X^{xx,M}$, as they are stated in Lemma 4.1. Indeed, if $t_p, t_q \in I_l^L$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\hat{\delta} y^M)_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\
&\leq \|J^M_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|X^{x,i,M}_{t_q t_p} S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_p})\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_q t_p} S_\varepsilon \left(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_p}) \cdot f_i'(y^M_{t_p}) \right)\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\
&\leq (L+l)^{\alpha_1} |t_q - t_p|^{3\kappa} + c^1_\varepsilon \|X^x\|_\gamma |t_q - t_p|^\gamma + c^2_\varepsilon \|X^x\|_\gamma |t_q - t_p|^{2\gamma} \\
&\leq c_{\varepsilon,h,x} |t_q - t_p|^\gamma .
\end{aligned}$$

The extension of the result to all t_p, t_q can then be easily obtained using the algebraic relation (15), and taking into account the fact that the interval $[0,1]$ can be covered with a finite number $J_L = J_{h,x}$ of successive intervals I_l^L.

4.5. **Space discretisation.** Let us go back to the main scheme (62). The projection operator P_N being a contraction on each $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$, the arguments used in the previous subsection remain valid for $y^{M,N}$, as a quick overview of the proof of Proposition 4.12 shows. This remark allows us to apply the latter result to $y^{M,N}$ without further explanations:

Proposition 4.13. *There exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that, for all $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq p < q \leq M} \frac{\|(\hat{\delta} y^{M,N})_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}}{|t_q - t_p|^\gamma} \leq c_{h,x}. \tag{72}$$

Now, in order to compare $y^{M,N}$ with the Wong-Zakai approximation $\overline{y}^M$, we are in position to follow the lines of [8]. This requires, for sake of clarity, the introduction of the two following notations:

Notation 4.14. *For any process $x \in \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^m)$ that satisfy Hypothesis 2, we denote by ψ_x the flow of the system (60), or in other words: $z = \psi_x(h_1; t_0, t_1)$ if and only if $z = \tilde{y}_{t_1}$, where $\tilde{y} \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_1^\gamma$ is the unique solution to the system*

$$\tilde{y}_{t_0} = h_1 \quad , \quad (\hat{\delta}\tilde{y})_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}x\, S_\varepsilon f(\tilde{y})), \text{ for all } t > s \geq t_0.$$

Besides, we denote by ψ^M the numerical flow associated to the dynamic of the scheme (62), that is to say: $z = \psi^M(h_1; t_p, t_q)$ if and only if $z = \tilde{y}^M_{t_q}$, where $\tilde{y}^M$ is characterized by $\tilde{y}^M_{t_q} = h_1$ and

$$(\hat{\delta}\tilde{y}^M)_{t_{k+1}t_k} = X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} S_\varepsilon f_i(\tilde{y}^M_{t_k}) + X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} S_\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon f_j(\tilde{y}^M_{t_k}) \cdot f_i'(\tilde{y}^M_{t_k})) \text{ for all } k \geq p.$$

Lemma 4.15. *For any $h_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and any $k \geq 0$,*

$$\|\psi_{x^M}(h_1; t_k, t_{k+1}) - \psi^M(h_1; t_k, t_{k+1})\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq \frac{C(\|h_1\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \|X^x\|_\gamma)}{M^{3\gamma}}, \tag{73}$$

for some function $C = C_\varepsilon$ that grows with its two arguments.

Proof. Observe first that if $\tilde{y} = \psi_{x^M}(h_1; t_k, .)$, one has, thanks to decomposition (57),

$$\psi_{x^M}(h_1; t_k, t_{k+1}) - \psi^M(h_1; t_k, t_{k+1}) = \hat{\Lambda}_{t_{k+1}t_k}(J),$$

for a certain element $J \in \mathcal{C}_3^{3\gamma}(\mathcal{B}_1)$, with

$$\mathcal{N}[J; \mathcal{C}_3^{3\gamma}(\mathcal{B}_1)] \leq C_\varepsilon(\|X^x\|_\gamma) \left\{ \mathcal{N}[\tilde{y}; \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^x_\kappa]^2 + \|h_1\|^2_{\mathcal{B}_1} \right\}.$$

(73) is then deduced from the contraction property (17), together with the uniform estimate (61). □

Lemma 4.16. *For any $\alpha \geq 0$, there exists a constant c_α such that*

$$\|\psi^M(y^{M,N}_{t_k}; t_k, t_{k+1}) - y^{M,N}_{t_{k+1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq c_\alpha \frac{\varepsilon^{-1-\alpha}}{M^\gamma N^{2\alpha}}.$$

Proof. It suffices to write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\psi^M(y^{M,N}_{t_k}; t_k, t_{k+1}) - y^{M,N}_{t_{k+1}} \\
&= X^{x,i,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left((\mathrm{Id} - P_N) S_\varepsilon f_i(y^{M,N}_{t_k}) \right) \\
&\quad + X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left((\mathrm{Id} - P_N) S_\varepsilon \left(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^{M,N}_{t_k}) \cdot f_i'(y^{M,N}_{t_k}) \right) \right) \\
&\quad + X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left(P_N S_\varepsilon \left(\left((\mathrm{Id} - P_N) S_\varepsilon f_j(y^{M,N}_{t_k}) \right) \cdot f_i'(y^{M,N}_{t_k}) \right) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and to apply the property (7). □

We are now ready to prove the main result of this subsection. Together with Corollary 4.9, it achieves the proof of Theorem 4.7.

Proposition 4.17. *With the notations we have introduced so far, there exists a constant $c_{h,x}$ such that*

$$\sup_{0\le p<q\le M}\frac{\|\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M-y^{M,M})_{t_qt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}}{|t_q-t_p|^\gamma}\le c_{h,x}\left\{\|h-P_Mh\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\frac{1}{M^{3\gamma-1}}\right\} \tag{74}$$

Proof. Let us start from the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\delta}(\overline{y}^M-y^{M,M})_{t_qt_p}\\
&= \left[\psi_{x^M}(\overline{y}^M_{t_p};t_p,t_q)-\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_p};t_p,t_q)-S_{t_qt_p}(\overline{y}^M_{t_p}-y^{M,M}_{t_p})\right]\\
&\quad+\left[\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_p};t_p,t_q)-y^{M,M}_{t_q}\right]\\
&= A^M_{t_qt_p}+B^M_{t_qt_p}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Propositions 4.8 and 4.13, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A^M_{t_qt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} &\le C(\|X^x\|_\gamma,\|\overline{y}^M_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1},\|y^{M,M}_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1})\,|t_q-t_p|^\gamma\,\|\overline{y}^M_{t_p}-y^{M,M}_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\le c_{x,h}\,|t_q-t_p|^\gamma\,\|\overline{y}^M_{t_p}-y^{M,M}_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1},
\end{aligned}$$

and the latter increment can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{y}^M_{t_p}-y^{M,M}_{t_p}\\
&= [\psi_{x^M}(h;0,t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(P_Nh;0,t_p)]\\
&\qquad+\left[\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_0;0,t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_p};t_p,t_p)\right]\\
&= [\psi_{x^M}(h;0,t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(P_Nh;0,t_p)]\\
&\qquad+\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}\left[\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_k};t_k,t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_{k+1}};t_{k+1},t_p)\right]\\
&= [\psi_{x^M}(h;0,t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(P_Nh;0,t_p)]\\
&\quad+\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}\left[\psi_{x^M}(\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_k};t_k,t_{k+1});t_{k+1},t_p)-\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_{k+1}};t_{k+1},t_p)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

By using Propositions 4.8 and 4.13 again, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\overline{y}^M_{t_p}-y^{M,N}_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\qquad\le c_{h,x}\left\{\|h-P_Nh\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\sum_{k=0}^{p-1}\|\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,N}_{t_k};t_k,t_{k+1})-y^{M,N}_{t_{k+1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, combining the results of Lemmas 4.15 and 4.16, we get

$$\|\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,N}_{t_k};t_k,t_{k+1})-y^{M,N}_{t_{k+1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\le\frac{c_{h,x,\varepsilon}}{M^{3\gamma}},$$

which allows to conclude as far as the estimation of $\|A^{M,}_{t_qt_p}\|$ is concerned. Use the same argument for $\|B^M_{t_qt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}$, starting this time from the decomposition

$$\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_p};t_p,t_q)-y^{M,M}_{t_q}=\sum_{k=p}^{q-1}\left[\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_k};t_k,t_q)-\psi_{x^M}(y^{M,M}_{t_{k+1}};t_{k+1},t_q)\right].$$

The details are left to the reader.

□

4.6. **Numerical results for the fBm.** The existence of a Lévy area associated to the fBm has been established by means of various constructions (see [4], [11] or [29] for instance) that all lead to the same object X^2. Besides, as it is shown in [8], the rate of convergence, with respect to the Hölder topologies, of the approximated rough path $\mathbf{X}^M = (X^M, X^{2,M})$ based on linear interpolation, is actually given by the rate of convergence of the first component. Owing to (42), this gives:

Lemma 4.18. *For any $\gamma < H$, there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{\gamma,X}$ such that, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathcal{N}[X - X^M; \mathcal{C}_1^\gamma] + \mathcal{N}[X^2 - X^{2,M}; \mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}] \leq c_{\gamma,X} \frac{\sqrt{\log M}}{M^{H-\gamma}}. \tag{75}$$

Corollary 4.19. *Fix $\gamma \in (1/3, H)$ and assume that $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^{3,b}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Let Y the solution to the system*

$$(\hat{\delta} Y)_{ts} = \mathcal{J}_{ts}(\hat{d}X\, f(Y)) \quad , \quad Y_0 = h \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa, \tag{76}$$

interpreted in a pathwise sense thanks to Proposition 4.4, and let $Y^{M,M}$ the process defined through the numerical scheme (62). Then there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{\gamma,\kappa,h,X}$ such that

$$\sup_{0\leq p<q\leq M} \frac{\|\hat{\delta}(Y - Y^{M,M})\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa}}{|t_q - t_p|^\kappa} \leq c_{\gamma,\kappa,h,X} \left\{ \|h - P_M h\|_{\mathcal{B}_\kappa} + \frac{\sqrt{\log(M)}}{M^{H-\gamma}} + \frac{1}{M^{3\gamma-1}} \right\}. \tag{77}$$

By projecting $Y^{M,N}$ onto the l^{th}-component of the chosen basis, one retrieves the iterative procedure:

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{M,N,l}_{t_{k+1}} &= e^{-\lambda_l/M} y^{M,N,l}_{t_k} \\ &\quad + M \sum_{i=1}^m (\delta X^i)_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda_l(t_{k+1}-u+\varepsilon)} du \right) \left\langle f_i(Y^{M,N}_{t_k}), e_l \right\rangle \\ &\quad + M^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^m (\delta X^i)_{t_{k+1}t_k} (\delta X^j)_{t_{k+1}t_k} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} e^{-\lambda_l(t_{k+1}-u+\varepsilon)} du\, (u - t_k) \right) \\ &\qquad\qquad \left\langle (S_\varepsilon P_N f_j(Y^{M,N}_{t_k})) \cdot f_i'(Y^{M,N}_{t_k}), e_l \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The computation of the Fourier coefficients $\left\langle f_i(Y^{M,N}_{t_k}), e_l \right\rangle$ can be implemented with the discrete sinus transform, as it was done in the Young case, according to the approximation formula:

$$\left\langle f_i(y^{M,N}_{t_k}), e_l \right\rangle \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^N f_i \left(y^{M,N}_{t_k} \left(\frac{n}{N} \right) \right) e_l \left(\frac{n}{N} \right).$$

As for the computation of $\left\langle (S_\varepsilon P_N f_j(Y_{t_k}^{M,N})) \cdot f_i'(Y_{t_k}^{M,N}), e_l \right\rangle$, it can be achieved with the same idea, starting from the approximation:

$$\left\langle \left(S_\varepsilon P_N f_j(y_{t_k}^{M,N}) \right) \cdot f_i'(y_{t_k}^{M,N}), e_l \right\rangle \approx \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{p=0}^{N} \sum_{m=0}^{N} e_l\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) e_p\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) e_p\left(\frac{m}{N}\right) e^{-\lambda_p \varepsilon} f_i'\left(y_{t_k}^{M,N}\left(\frac{n}{N}\right)\right) f_j\left(y_{t_k}^{M,N}\left(\frac{m}{N}\right)\right).$$

The following Matlab code shows a possible implementation of the algorithm, when:

$$m = 2 \quad , \quad h(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}\sin(\pi\xi) + \frac{3}{5}\sin(3\pi\xi)$$

$$f_1(x) = \frac{1-x}{1+x^2} \quad , \quad f_2(x) = \cos(x).$$

To be more precise, the function is meant to simulate the process $t \mapsto Y_t^{M,N}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$.

```
function [l]=eigval(N)
l=[]; for i=1:N, l(i)=(pi*i)^2;end

function [S]=semigr(M,N,l,kappa)
S=[];for i=1:N, v(i)=exp(-l(i)^2/(kappa*M));end

function []=simulrough(H,M,N,kappa,ep)
l=eigval(N); C=semigr(M,N,l,kappa);
X1=(1/M)^H*wfbm(H,M+1); X2=(1/M)^H*wfbm(H,M+1);
De=(kappa./l).*(exp(-(ep*(l/kappa)))
                    -exp(-((1/m)+ep)*(l/kappa)));
Dde=(kappa./(M*l)).*exp(-ep*(l/kappa))-(kappa^2)./(l.^2)
    .*(exp(-(ep*(l/kappa)))-exp(-((1/M)+ep)*(l/kappa)));
Se=exp(-ep*l);A=[1/2,0,3/5,zeros(1,N-3)];
for i=1:M
    u=dst(A(i,:)); fy1=0.5*idst((1-u)./(1+u.^2));
    fpu1=(u.^2-2*u-1)./((1+u.^2).^2);
    fy2=0.5*idst(cos(u)); fpu2=sin(u);
    w1=Se.*fy1; u1=dst(w1);
    w2=Se.*fy2; u2=dst(w2);
    v11=fpu1.*u1; x11=0.5*idst(v11);
    v12=fpu1.*u2; x12=0.5*idst(v12);
    v21=fpu2.*u1; x21=0.5*idst(v21);
    v22=fpu2.*u2; x22=0.5*idst(v22);
A(i+1,:)=C.*A(i,:)+(m*(X1(i+1)-X1(i))*De).*fy1
          +(m*(X2(i+1)-X2(i))*De).*fy2
```

```
        +(m^2*((X1(i+1)-X1(i))^2)*Dde).*x11
        +(m^2*((X2(i+1)-X2(i))^2)*Dde).*x22
        +(m^2*((X1(i+1)-X1(i))*
              (X2(i+1)-X2(i)))*Dde).*x12
        +(m^2*((X1(i+1)-X1(i))*
              (X2(i+1)-X2(i)))*Dde).*x21;
end
y=zeros(1,M+1);
for j=1:(M+1)
for l=1:((N-1)/2)
    y(j)=y(j)+A(j,2*l+1)*(-1)^l;
end
end
plot(linspace(0,1,M+1),y)
```

As in the Young case, let us finally allow us to express a conjecture about the actual rate of convergence of the algorithm with respect to the supremum norm (in time). The estimate is based on the observation of the empirical error for different samples of a fBm (see Figure 4.6).

Conjecture: If X is an m-dimensional fBm with Hurst index $H \in (1/3, 1/2]$, and if Y stands for the solution to (76), then there exists an almost surely finite random variable $c_{h,X}$ such that

$$\sup_{p\in\{0,\dots,M\}} \|Y_{t_p} - Y^{M,M}_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq c\frac{\log(M)}{M^{2H-1/2}}. \tag{78}$$

5. Appendix: Proof of Proposition 4.12

The following development of $\hat{\delta}J^M$ will turn out to be useful in the course of the reasoning:

Lemma 5.1. *With the notations of Subsection 4.4, one has, for all* $0 \leq k < l < m \leq M$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\delta}J^M)_{t_m t_l t_k} &= X^{x,i,M}_{t_m t_l} S_\varepsilon \left\{ \int_0^1 dr\, f_i'(y^M_{t_k} + r(\delta y^M)_{t_l t_k}) \cdot K^M_{t_l t_k} \right\} \\
&\quad + X^{x,i,M}_{t_m t_l} S_\varepsilon \left\{ (\delta x^j)_{t_l t_k} \int_0^1 dr\, \left[f_i'(y^M_{t_k} + r(\delta y^M)_{t_l t_k}) - f_i'(y^M_{t_k}) \right] \cdot S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_k}) \right\} \\
&\quad + X^{xx,ij,M}_{t_m t_l} S_\varepsilon \delta \left(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M) \cdot f_i'(y^M) \right)_{t_l t_k} \\
&\quad + X^{x,i,M}_{t_m t_l} S_\varepsilon \left\{ \int_0^1 dr\, f_i'(y^M_{t_k} + r(\delta y^M)_{t_l t_k}) \cdot a_{t_l t_k} y^M_{t_k} \right\} \\
&\quad + X^{x,i,M}_{t_m t_l} S_\varepsilon \left\{ \int_0^1 dr\, f_i'(y^M_{t_k} + r(\delta y^M)_{t_l t_k}) \cdot X^{ax,i,M}_{t_l t_k} S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_k}) \right\}. \qquad (79)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is a matter of standard algebraic and analytical developments, which start with the relation (16). □



FIGURE 3. Simulation results for $n \mapsto \log_2 \|Y_1^{M_0,M_0} - Y_1^{2^n,2^n}\|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Here, $M_0 = 2^{11}$, $H = 0.4$, $\kappa = 100$.

Proof of Proposition 4.12. We use an iteration procedure on l. The three parameters α_1, α_2, L will be determined during the proof. Besides, for any $L \geq 1$, we know that the interval $[0,1]$ can be covered with a finite number of intervals $I_0^L, I_1^L, \ldots, I_{J_L}^L$. The iteration will stop at $l = J_L$ and, for some reasons that will become clear during the heredity step, we take $M_0(L) = L + J_L$.

Initialization: $l = 0$. A first condition has to be imposed on L: $\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_{1,p}} \leq L^{\alpha_2}$. Then, on $I_0^L = [0, \tau_1^L]$, let us show by iteration on q: for every $t_q \leq \tau_1^L$ and every $t_p < t_q$, $\|J^M_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq L^{\alpha_1} |t_q - t_p|^{3\kappa}$. If $q = 1$, then, owing to the definition of y^M, $J^M_{t_1 t_0} = 0$. Assume the inequality holds true for any $\tilde{q} \leq q$ and that $t_{q+1} \leq \tau_1^L$. Let $t_p < t_{q+1}$. Pick the index $m = m(p, q+1)$ such that $|t_m - t_p| \leq \frac{1}{2}|t_{q+1} - t_p|$, $|t_{q+1} - t_{m+1}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|t_{q+1} - t_p|$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|J^M_{t_{q+1} t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\
&\quad \leq \|J^M_{t_q t_m}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|J^M_{t_m t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta} J^M)_{t_{q+1} t_m t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta} J^M)_{t_{q+1} t_q t_m}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\
&\quad \leq 2^{1-3\kappa} L^{\alpha_1} |t_{q+1} - t_p|^{3\kappa} + \|(\hat{\delta} J^M)_{t_{q+1} t_m t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta} J^M)_{t_{q+1} t_q t_m}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the decomposition (79), it is easily checked that if $s<u<t$ belong to the partition of $[0,1]$ with mesh $\frac{1}{M}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\hat{\delta}J^M)_{tus}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\leq\ c_x^1\,|t-u|^{\gamma}\,\|K^M_{us}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+c_x^2\,|t-u|^{\gamma}\,|u-s|^{\gamma}\,\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{us}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\quad+c_x^3\,|t-u|^{\gamma}\,|u-s|^{\gamma}\,|u-s|\,\|y^M_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+c_x^4\,|t-u|^{2\gamma}\,\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{us}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\quad+c_x^5\,|t-u|^{2\gamma}\,|u-s|\,\|y^M_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+c_x^6\,|t-u|^{\gamma}\,|u-s|\,\|y^M_s\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\quad+c_x^7\,|t-u|^{\gamma}\,|u-s|^{1+\gamma}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for sake of clarity, we have not marked down the dependence with respect to the ε parameter in the latter estimate. This will also be the case in the rest of the proof.

According to the iteration hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|K^M_{t_mt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}&\leq\ \|X^{xx,ij}_{t_mt_p}S_\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_p})\cdot f_i'(y^M_{t_p}))\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\|J^M_{t_mt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\leq\ c_x^8\,|t_m-t_p|^{2\gamma}+|t_m-t_p|^{2\gamma}\,L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_0^L)^{3\kappa-2\gamma}
\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_mt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\leq\ \|X^{x,i}_{t_mt_p}S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_p})\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\|X^{xx,ij}_{t_mt_p}S_\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_p})\cdot f_i'(y^M_{t_p}))\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\|J^M_{t_mt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\leq\ c_x^9\,|t_m-t_p|^{\gamma}+|t_m-t_p|^{\gamma}\,L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_0^L)^{3\kappa-\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides,

$$\|y^M_{t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\leq\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_p0}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\leq\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}+c_x^{10}(\eta_0^L)^{\gamma}+L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_0^L)^{3\kappa}.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\hat{\delta}J^M)_{t_{q+1}t_mt_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\qquad\leq|t_{q+1}-t_p|^{3\kappa}\left\{c_x^{11}+c_x^{12}L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_0^L)^{\gamma}+c_x^{13}(\eta_0^L)^{1+\gamma-3\kappa}\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate can be obtained for $\|(\hat{\delta}J^M)_{t_{q+1}t_qt_m}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}$ by the same procedure, so that it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|J^M_{t_{q+1}t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\\
&\qquad\leq|t_{q+1}-t_p|^{3\kappa}\left\{L^{\alpha_1}2^{1-3\kappa}+c_x^{14}+c_x^{15}L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_0^L)^{\gamma}+c_x^{16}(\eta_0^L)^{1+\gamma-3\kappa}L^{\alpha_2}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This inequality raises the two following hypotheses:

$$L^{\alpha_1}(\eta_L^0)^{\gamma}\leq 1\quad,\quad L^{\alpha_1}(1-2^{1-3\kappa})\geq c_x^{14}+c_x^{15}+c_x^{16}(\eta_0^L)^{1+\gamma-3\kappa}L^{\alpha_2}.$$

The first hypothesis is satisfied if $\alpha_1<\gamma$. As for the second one, it is equivalent to

$$c_x^{17}L^{-\alpha_1}+c_x^{18}L^{-(\alpha_1-\alpha_2+1+\gamma-3\kappa)}\leq 1,$$

and this can be checked for L large enough, provided $\alpha_1-\alpha_2+1+\gamma-3\kappa>0$, that is to say $\alpha_2<1+\alpha_1+\gamma-3\kappa$.

Under those assumptions, we finally recover $\|J^M_{t_{q+1}t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}\leq L^{\alpha_1}\,|t_{q+1}-t_p|^{3\kappa}$. This achieves the iteration on q and so the initialization step of the iteration on l.

Heredity. Assume the property holds true for $l \geq 0$. Then one can write

$$\begin{aligned}\|y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} &\leq \|y^M_{t_{k_l}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}-1}t_{k_l}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\ &\leq (L+l)^{\alpha_2} + \|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}-1}t_{k_l}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \\ &\leq (L+l)^{\alpha_2} + c_x^{19}M^{-\gamma} + c_x^{20}(\eta_l^L)^{\gamma} + (\eta_l^L)^{3\kappa}(L+l)^{\alpha_1} \\ &\leq (L+l)^{\alpha_2} + c_x^{21}(\eta_l^L)^{\gamma} + (\eta_l^L)^{3\kappa}(L+l)^{\alpha_1}.\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate $\|(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1}$ in the third inequality, we have only used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}(\hat{\delta}y^M)_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}} = X^{x,i}_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}} S_\varepsilon f_i(y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}-1}}) \\ + X^{xx,ij}_{t_{k_{l+1}}t_{k_{l+1}-1}} S_\varepsilon((S_\varepsilon f_j(y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}-1}}))\cdot f_i'(y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}-1}})).\end{aligned}$$

Now observe that

$$\frac{(L+l+1)^{\alpha_2} - (L+l)^{\alpha_2}}{c_x^{21}(L+l)^{-\gamma} + (L+l)^{\alpha_1-3\kappa}} \sim_{L\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_2(L+l)^{\alpha_2-1}}{c_x^{21}(L+l)^{-\gamma} + (L+l)^{\alpha_1-3\kappa}}.$$

This implies that if L is large enough, then $\|y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}}}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq (L+l+1)^{\alpha_2}$, provided $\alpha_2 - 1 + \gamma > 0$ et $\alpha_2 - 1 - \alpha_1 + 3\kappa > 0$, which reduces to $\alpha_2 > 1 - \gamma$ since we have already assumed that $\alpha_1 < \gamma$.

The verification of $\|J^M_{t_q t_p}\|_{\mathcal{B}_1} \leq (L+l+1)^{\alpha_1} |t_q - t_p|^{3\kappa}$ can then be done just as in the initialization step, by replacing h with $y^M_{t_{k_{l+1}}}$.

In brief, the conditions on the two parameters α_1 et α_2 reduce to the following inequalities:

$$0 < \alpha_1 < \gamma \quad , \quad 1 - \gamma < \alpha_2 < 1 + \alpha_1 + \gamma - 3\kappa.$$

It is not hard to realize that those conditions can actually be satisfied if we first choose $\alpha_1 \in (\kappa, \gamma)$, since in that case

$$(1 + \alpha_1 + \gamma - 3\kappa) - (1 - \gamma) = \alpha_1 + 2\gamma - 3\kappa > 2(\gamma - \kappa) > 0.$$

□

References

[1] R. A. Adams. *Sobolev spaces.* Academic Press, 1975.

[2] Abry, P. and F. Sellan. The wavelet-based synthesis for the fractional Brownian motion proposed by F. Sellan and Y. Meyer: Remarks and fast implementation. *Appl. and Comp. Harmonic Anal.*, 3(4), pp. 377-383, 1996.

[3] M. Caruana and P.Friz. Partial differential equations driven by rough paths. *Journal of Differential Equations* Volume 247, Issue 1, 1 July 2009, Pages 140-173.

[4] L. Coutin, Z. Qian: Stochastic rough path analysis and fractional Brownian motion. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **122** (2002), 108–140.

[5] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[6] A. Davie: Differential equations driven by rough paths: an approach via discrete approximation. *Appl. Math. Res. Express.* (2007), No. 2, 40 pp.

[7] A. Deya, M.Gubinelli, S. Tindel: Non-linear rough heat equation. *Arxiv* Preprint (2009).

[8] A. Deya, A.Neuenkirch, S. Tindel: A Milstein-type scheme without Lévy area terms for SDES driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Arxiv* Preprint (2009).

[9] A. Deya, S. Tindel: Rough Volterra equations 2: convolutional generalized integrals. *Arxiv* Preprint (2008).
[10] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel. *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
[11] P. Friz and N. Victoir. *Multidimensional dimensional processes seen as rough paths*. Cambridge University Press, to appear.
[12] M. Gubinelli. Controlling rough paths. *Jour. Funct. Anal.* 216:86-140, 2004.
[13] M. Gubinelli. Ramification of rough paths. Preprint, 2006.
[14] M. Gubinelli, A. Lejay and S. Tindel. Young integrals and SPDEs *Pot. Anal.* 25:307–326, 2006.
[15] M. Gubinelli and S. Tindel. Rough evolution equations *Ann. Prob.*, 2010.
[16] Gyongy, I. Lattice approximations for stochastic quasi-linear parabolic partial differential equations driven by space-time white noise. *Potential Anal.* 11 1-37, 1999.
[17] Hausenblas, E. Approximation for semilinear stochastic evolution equations. *Potential Anal.* 18 141-186, 2003.
[18] Jentzen, A. and Kloeden, P. E. Overcoming the order barrier in the numerical approximation of stochastic partial differential equations with additive space-time noise. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 465 649-667, 2009.
[19] Jentzen, A. and Kloeden, P. E. Taylor expansions of solutions of stochastic partial differential equations with additive noise. *Ann. Probab.* 43. To appear, 2009.
[20] A. Jentzen, P. Kloeden, G. Winkel: Efficient simulation of non-linear parabolic spdes with additive noise. *Arxiv preprint*, 2009.
[21] J. León and J. San Martin. Linear stochastic differential equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter less than 1/2. To appear at *Stoch. And Stoch. Reports*.
[22] T. Lyons and Z. Qian. *System control and rough paths*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
[23] T. Lyons. Differential equations driven by rough signals. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 14(2):215–310, 1998.
[24] B. Maslowski and D. Nualart. Evolution equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 202(1):277–305, 2003.
[25] A. Neuenkirch, I. Nourdin, S. Tindel: Delay equations driven by rough paths. To appear at *Elec. J. Probab.*
[26] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, volume 44 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
[27] J. Teichmann. Another approach to some rough and stochastic partial differential esquations. *Arxix preprint*, 2009.
[28] S. Tindel, C. A. Tudor, and F. Viens. Stochastic evolution equations with fractional Brownian motion. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 127(2):186–204, 2003.
[29] J. Unterberger: Stochastic calculus for fractional Brownian motion with Hurst exponent $H > 1/4$: a rough path method by analytic extension. *Ann. Prob.* **37**(2) (2009), 565–614.
[30] L. C. Young. An inequality of Hölder type, connected with Stieljes integration. *Acta Math.*, 67:251–282, 1936.

Aurélien Deya, Institut Élie Cartan Nancy, Université de Nancy 1, B.P. 239, 54506 Vandœuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, France
E-mail address: deya@iecn.u-nancy.fr