



HAL
open science

Nonparametric moment method for McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations

Fabienne Comte, Valentine Genon-Catalot, Catherine Larédo

► **To cite this version:**

Fabienne Comte, Valentine Genon-Catalot, Catherine Larédo. Nonparametric moment method for McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations. 2024. hal-04460327

HAL Id: hal-04460327

<https://hal.science/hal-04460327>

Preprint submitted on 15 Feb 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

NONPARAMETRIC MOMENT METHOD FOR MCKEAN-VLASOV STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

F. COMTE⁽¹⁾, V. GENON-CATALOT⁽¹⁾, C. LARÉDO⁽²⁾

ABSTRACT. We study the nonparametric estimation of both the potential and the interaction terms of a McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equation (SDE) in stationary regime from a continuous observation on a time interval $[0, T]$, with asymptotic framework $T \rightarrow +\infty$. The problem is quite different from the case of usual diffusions with no interaction term and the observation of only one sample path is not enough to estimate both functions. We consider the observation of four *i.i.d.* sample paths. The observation of two sample paths could be enough at the cost of much more computations. Estimators of the potential and the interaction functions are built using a combination of a moment method and a projection method on sieves. We define a specific risk fitted to this estimation problem and obtain a bound for it. A nonparametric estimator of the invariant density also is proposed. The method is implemented on simulated data for several examples of McKean-Vlasov SDEs and a model selection procedure is experimented.

Keywords and phrases: Invariant density, interaction function, Hermite basis, McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equation, moment method, projection estimators, nonparametric drift estimation.

AMS 2020 CLASSIFICATION. 62G05-62M99-60J60. February 15, 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

McKean-Vlasov processes are described by a stochastic differential equation where the coefficients depend on the distribution of the solution itself. They are also called nonlinear or self-stabilizing processes. These processes have been extensively studied since their first description by McKean (1966), [45], and appear in various applications: for the modelling of granular media in statistical physics (Benedetto *et al.* (1997), [8]), in neurosciences (see *e.g.* Baladron *et al.* (2012), [3], Dawson (1983), [21]), for population dynamics and ecology (Carrillo *et al.* (2014), [11], Molginer and Edelstein-Keshet (1999), [48]), for epidemics dynamics (Ball and Sirl (2020), [4], Forien and Pardoux (2022), [25]) and in finance (see *e.g.* Giesecke *et al.* (2020), [34] and the references therein).

A large number of contributions is devoted to probabilistic properties of these models. Existence and uniqueness of solutions under several different sets of assumptions can be found in *e.g.*, Snitzman (1991), [58], Méléard (1996), [47], Funaki (1984), [27], Gärtner (1988), [28], Benachour

⁽¹⁾: Université de Paris, MAP5, UMR 8145 CNRS, F-75006, FRANCE,
email: fabienne.comte@u-paris.fr,
valentine.genon-catalot@mi.parisdescartes.fr

⁽²⁾ Université Paris Cité, LPSM UMR 8001 CNRS, F-75006, FRANCE,
catherine.laredo@inrae.fr.

et al. (1998a), [6], Benachour *et al.* (1998b), [7], Hermann *et al.* (2008), [35], Kolokoltsov (2010), [42]. More references are given below.

We are interested in a one dimensional McKean-Vlasov process of the form

$$(1) \quad dX(t) = -[b(X(t)) + \phi \star \mu_t(X(t))]dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad X(0) = \eta \sim \nu,$$

where $b(\cdot), \phi(\cdot)$ are deterministic functions, \star denotes the convolution product, $\mu_t(\cdot)$ is the law of $X(t)$, W is a Brownian motion and η is a random variable independent of W . Such process can be obtained as the limit of a system of N interacting particles as N tends to infinity (*propagation of chaos*). More precisely, consider the N -dimensional process given by the stochastic differential system:

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_i^N(t) &= -b(X_i^N(t))dt - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(X_i^N(t) - X_j^N(t))dt + \sigma dW_i(t), \\ &= -b(X_i^N(t))dt - \phi \star \mu_t^N(X_i^N(t))dt + \sigma dW_i(t), \quad X_i^N(0) = X_0^i, i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_t^N = N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_j^N(t)}$ is the empirical measure associated with $(X_j^N(t), j = 1, \dots, N)$, $(W_i, i = 1, \dots, N)$ are N independent Brownian motions, $X_0^i, i = 1, \dots, N$ are independent and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) random variables, independent of $(W_j, j = 1, \dots, N)$. The function ϕ describes the interaction between the N particles.

For any fixed integer p , the process $(X_i^N(t), i = 1, \dots, p)$ converges in distribution as N tends to infinity to p *i.i.d.* McKean-Vlasov processes $(X^{(i)}(t))$, given by

$$dX^{(i)}(t) = -[b(X^{(i)}(t)) + \phi \star \mu_t(X^{(i)}(t))]dt + \sigma dW_i(t), \quad X^{(i)}(0) = X_0^i, i = 1, \dots, p.$$

Thus, the process $(X^{(i)}(t))$ provides a good approximation of the behaviour of the i -th particle of the system (see *e.g.*, Bolley *et al.* (2013), [9], Eberle *et al.* (2019), [24], Fournier and Guillin (2015), [26], Malrieu (2003), [46], Cattiaux *et al.* (2008), [12]). Moreover, existence and uniqueness of invariant distributions for (1) are studied in Benachour *et al.* (1998a,b), [6], [7], Malrieu (2003), [46], Butkovski (2014), [10], Cattiaux *et al.* (2008), [12], Eberle *et al.* (2019), [24], Hermann and Tugaut (2010), [36].

Statistical inference for interacting particle systems and their mean-field limits has started more recently. On the one hand, several papers deal with inference based on the observation on a fixed time interval of an interacting particle system with asymptotic properties as the number N of particles tends to infinity (see *e.g.* parametric inference in Kasonga, 1990, [40], Giesecke *et al.* (2020), [34], Chen (2021), [13], Li *et al.* (2021), [43], Sharrock *et al.* (2023), [53], Lu *et al.* (2022), [44], Amorino *et al.* (2023), [2], Della Maestra and Hoffmann (2022b), [23], Pavlotis and Zanoni (2022), [50], semiparametric inference in Belomestny *et al.* (2023), [5], and nonparametric inference in Della Maestra and Hoffmann (2022a), [22], Comte and Genon-Catalot (2023), [16]).

On the other hand, several papers consider inference based on the observation of the mean-field limit process (1) on a time interval $[0, T]$, that is inference for the limiting process of one typical particle for large N . In Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2021a), [30] and (2021b), [31], estimation of unknown parameters in the potential term b and the interaction term ϕ are studied under the asymptotic framework $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. More recently, statistical inference has been investigated under the assumption of stationarity for (1) when the process is observed in the stationary regime with asymptotic framework $T \rightarrow +\infty$. In Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023a), [32], the case of $b = 0$ and ϕ equal to an odd polynomial is studied and the estimation of the coefficients of the

polynomial is treated by a pseudo-likelihood approach. In Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023b), [33], general functions b and ϕ depending on unknown parameters are considered and a different pseudo-likelihood function is proposed. Pavlotis and Zanoni (2023), [51], use a moment method to estimate the coefficients of polynomial functions b and ϕ .

In here, our aim is the nonparametric estimation of the functions $b(\cdot), \phi(\cdot)$ from the continuous observation of a process distributed as (1) on a time interval $[0, T]$ when the process is in stationary regime and T tends to infinity. When $\phi \equiv 0$ (usual diffusion process), nonparametric inference for the function b , based on the observation of one sample path on a time interval $[0, T]$, when the process is in stationary regime and T is large, is an extensively developed subject. We can quote Hoffmann (1999), [37], Comte *et al.* (2007), [15], see also the book Kessler *et al.* (2012), [41], Dalalyan and Reiss (2006, 2007), [19], [20], Schmisser (2013), [52], Strauch (2015, 2016), [55], [56], Nickl and Ray (2020), [49], Comte and Genon-Catalot (2021), [14].

In the case of the McKean-Vlasov process (1) with $\phi \neq 0$ observed in the stationary regime, the joint nonparametric estimation of (b, ϕ) with general functions (b, ϕ) has never been investigated up to our knowledge. It differs completely from the case of a usual diffusion. Indeed, although there are clear assumptions (see below) for existence and uniqueness of an invariant distribution, this distribution is not explicitly given as a function of b and ϕ . It is solution of an implicit equation. The convolution term depending on the unknown marginal distribution of the process introduces new difficulties for the nonparametric estimation of b and ϕ linked with identifiability problems. For these reasons, the observation of only one sample path is not enough to infer both b and ϕ . The novelty, in what follows, is that we assume that the observation is composed of four independent copies $(X^{(\ell)}(t), t \in [0, T], \ell = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ in stationary regime and our asymptotic framework is $T \rightarrow +\infty$. Actually, only two copies could be sufficient but this would induce cumbersome and tedious additional computations. Our estimation method is a moment method inspired by the work in parametric setting of Pavlotis and Zanoni (2023), [51].

In Section 2, we present our set of assumptions ensuring that equation (1) admits a unique strong solution and that the model has a unique invariant distribution $\rho(x)dx$. We give useful properties of the density ρ and of the process (1) in the stationary regime. Proposition 3 states a result on the infinitesimal generator of (1) often used in the proofs. In Section 3, the principle of the estimation method is described. It is based on properties of the infinitesimal generator of (1), and it combines a moment method with a projection method on finite dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R}, dx) := \mathbb{L}^2(dx)$. Nonparametric estimators of b and ϕ based on the observation of four *i.i.d.* sample paths $(X^{(i)}(t), t \in [0, T])$ distributed as (1) in the stationary regime are built. Defining an adequate risk for the estimators is an additional difficulty since b, ϕ are not square integrable in our framework. We propose a definition of the risk well fitted to the problem which is as follows. For a couple (u, v) of functions, we set, when defined

$$(3) \quad \|(u, v)\|_V^2 := \int (u(x) + v \star \rho(x))^2 \rho(x) dx.$$

The risk of an estimator $(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})$ is defined by

$$(4) \quad \mathbb{E}(\|(\widehat{b} - b, \widehat{\phi} - \phi)\|_V^2).$$

Theorem 1 gives the risk bound of our projection estimators on a fixed space. Section 4 is devoted to the nonparametric estimation of the invariant density which exhibits a parametric rate. In Section 5, we present numerical simulation results on several models for the estimation of

the invariant density and of b and ϕ . In the last case, we experiment a model selection procedure. Section 6 contains concluding remarks and Section 7 is devoted to proofs.

2. ASSUMPTIONS AND PRELIMINARIES.

In the sequel, the notation \lesssim means \leq up to a constant. Our set of assumptions is essentially the same as the one given in Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023b), [33]. Let us set

$$B(x) = \int_0^x b(y)dy, \quad \Phi(x) = \int_0^x \phi(y)dy.$$

The function b is the potential term, the function ϕ is the interaction function. We assume that $b \not\equiv 0$ and that these functions satisfy:

- [H1] The function Φ is even. The functions $x \mapsto B(x)$ and $x \mapsto \Phi(x)$ are C^2 and convex, one of the two being strictly convex: there exist constants K and λ such that

$$\forall x, B''(x) \geq K \geq 0, \quad \Phi''(x) \geq \lambda \geq 0, \quad K + \lambda > 0.$$

- [H2] The functions $B'(x) = b(x)$, $\Phi'(x) = \phi(x)$ are locally Lipschitz with polynomial growth, *i.e.* there exist $c > 0$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^* = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, |b(x) - b(y)| + |\phi(x) - \phi(y)| \leq c|x - y|(1 + |x|^\ell + |y|^\ell).$$

- [H3] The functions $b(x), b'(x), \phi(x), \phi'(x)$ have ℓ polynomial growth: there exists a constant c such that

$$|b(x)| + |b'(x)| + |\phi(x)| + |\phi'(x)| \leq c(1 + |x|^\ell).$$

According to Malrieu (2003), [46], Benachour *et al.* (1998a), [6], Cattiaux *et al.* (2008), [12], Herrmann *et al.* (2008), [35], under assumptions [H1]-[H3], equation (1) admits a unique solution $((X(t), u_t(x)dx), t \geq 0)$, where $u_t(x)dx = \mathcal{L}(X(t))$ is the marginal distribution of $X(t)$. Model (1) admits a unique invariant distribution ρ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \rho(x) dx < +\infty$. And if the initial variable $X(0)$ of (1) follows the invariant distribution ρ , then, for all t , $\mathcal{L}(X(t)) = \mathcal{L}(X(0))$. Thus, we assume

- [H4] The initial variable $X(0)$ follows the invariant distribution ρ .

Under [H1]-[H3], the invariant distribution ρ has density $\rho(x)$ given as the solution of the implicit equation

$$(5) \quad \rho(x) = \frac{1}{M} \exp \left\{ -\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^x [b(u) + \phi \star \rho(u)] du \right\},$$

where $M = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^y [b(u) + \phi \star \rho(u)] du \right\} dy$. As $(\Phi \star \rho)' = \phi \star \rho$, $\int_0^x \phi \star \rho(u) du = \Phi \star \rho(x) - \Phi \star \rho(0)$,

$$(6) \quad \rho(x) \propto \exp \left[-\frac{2}{\sigma^2} (B(x) + \Phi \star \rho(x)) \right].$$

Note that if $b \equiv 0$, there is a one-parameter family of invariant distributions (see *e.g.* Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023a), [16]). The invariant distribution is not unique unless its expectation is specified. We exclude this case here.

Contrary to classical stochastic differential equations, the invariant distribution is not explicit. Nevertheless, we can prove:

Proposition 1. *Under [H1]-[H3],*

$$(7) \quad \rho(x) \lesssim \exp\left[-\frac{(K+\lambda)}{\sigma^2} \left(x + \frac{b(0) + \phi \star \rho(0)}{(K+\lambda)}\right)^2\right],$$

Moreover, for $0 \leq z \leq x$ and for $x \leq z \leq 0$,

$$(8) \quad \frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(z)} \leq \exp[C(x-z)] \quad \text{where} \quad C = -(2/\sigma^2)(b(0) + \phi \star \rho(0)).$$

Note that (7) is proved in Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023b), [33]. Proposition 1 has the obvious consequence that the invariant distribution has moments of any orders and (7) implies that, for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(kx)(\rho(x))^\varepsilon dx < +\infty.$$

Note that, by [H3], $\phi \star \rho$ has polynomial growth as ρ has moments of any order.

Under [H1]-[H4], the initial variable η follows the invariant distribution $\rho(x)dx$, which implies that the distribution $\mathcal{L}(X(t)) = \mu_t(dx)$ satisfies

$$\forall t \geq 0, \mu_t(dx) = \rho(x)dx.$$

Therefore, equation (1) becomes:

$$(10) \quad dX(t) = -(b(X(t)) + \phi \star \rho(X(t)))dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad X(0) = \eta \sim \rho(x)dx.$$

As noted in Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023b), the following holds:

Proposition 2. *Assume [H1]-[H4] and consider the stochastic differential equation*

$$dY(t) = -(b(Y(t)) + \phi \star \rho(Y(t)))dt + \sigma dW(t).$$

Then $(Y(t))$ is a positive recurrent diffusion with stationary density given by (5). If $Y(0) \sim \rho(x)dx$, it is ergodic. Moreover,

- *If $Y(0) \neq X(0)$, $(Y(t)) \not\equiv (X(t))$.*
- *If $Y(0) = X(0) = \eta \sim \rho(x)dx$, then $X(t) = Y(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

The result simply derives from the uniqueness of solutions but it has important consequences. In the stationary regime, the process $(X(t))$ given by (10) is identical to the classical SDE $(Y(t))$ in the stationary regime and is ergodic.

The infinitesimal generator of the SDE (10) is given by:

$$(11) \quad Lg = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}g'' - (b + \phi \star \rho)g' = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\rho}(g'\rho)'$$

The operator L acts on $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho(x)dx) := \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$ and is defined on the domain \mathcal{D} ,

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{D} = \{g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\rho), g' \text{ abs. continuous}, Lg \in \mathbb{L}^2(\rho), \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} g'(x)\rho(x) = 0\}.$$

(see *e.g.* Genon-Catalot *et al.* (2000), [29]).

Below, we use that, for all function $\Psi \in \mathcal{D}$, $\int L\Psi(x)\rho(x)dx = 0$. This relation obviously holds as, by (11)-(12),

$$\int L\Psi(x)\rho(x)dx = \int \frac{\sigma^2}{2\rho}(\Psi'\rho)'\rho = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \int (\Psi'\rho)' = [\Psi'\rho]_{-\infty}^{+\infty} = 0.$$

In order to apply our estimation method, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Consider a function ψ such that $\psi \in \mathbb{L}^2(dx)$, ψ is absolutely continuous and bounded and ψ' has polynomial growth. Then, $\int_0^x \psi(t)dt$ and $\int_0^x \psi \star \rho(t)dt$ both belong to \mathcal{D} .*

Note that, if a function h has exponential growth, *i.e.* there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that, for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $|h(u)| \leq ae^{au}$, then by Proposition 1 (see (7) and (9)), $h \in \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Now, we can state a key property for the statistical strategy.

Proposition 3. *Assume [H1]-[H4] and that h has exponential growth. Set $h_c = h - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x)\rho(x)dx$ and define the function $\Gamma_h(x)$ by $\Gamma_h(x) = \int_0^x (\Gamma_h)'(y)dy$ where*

$$(13) \quad (\Gamma_h)'(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_{-\infty}^y h_c(u)\rho(u)du = -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} h_c(u)\rho(u)du$$

Then, $\Gamma_h \in \mathcal{D}$, $L\Gamma_h = h_c$, and $(\Gamma_h)' \in \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Moreover, for $(X(t))$ satisfying (10),

$$(14) \quad \int_0^T h_c(X(s))ds = \sigma \int_0^T (\Gamma_h)'(X(s))dW(s) + \Gamma_h(X(0)) - \Gamma_h(X(T)),$$

$$(15) \quad \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h_c(X(s))ds\right) \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} \int [(\Gamma_h)'(x)]^2 \rho(x)dx + \frac{8}{T^2} \int \Gamma_h^2(x)\rho(x)dx.$$

Note that relation (13) holds since $\int h_c(x)\rho(x)dx = 0$.

3. ESTIMATION METHOD FOR THE POTENTIAL AND THE INTERACTION FUNCTIONS.

Notation. For h a function, we set $\|h\|^2 = \int h^2(x)dx$, $\|h\|_{\rho}^2 = \int h^2(x)\rho(x)dx$. For \mathbf{x} a vector in \mathbb{R}^d , $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ denotes the Euclidean norm of the vector. For a matrix M , M^{\perp} denotes its transpose. For M a square matrix, $\text{Tr}(M)$ is the trace of M , and $\|M\|_{\text{op}}$ is the square-root of the largest eigenvalue of MM^{\perp} . If M is symmetric, $\|M\|_{\text{op}}$ is simply equal to $\sup_i \{|\lambda_i|\}$ where the λ_i are the eigenvalues of M . The symbol \lesssim means \leq up to a multiplicative fixed constant.

3.1. Principle of the method. Following Pavliotis and Zanoni (2023), [51], we notice that, for a function ψ satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 1, it follows from the definition of ρ and (11)-(12), that for $\Psi(x) = \int_0^x \psi(y)dy$, as $\int L\Psi(x)\rho(x)dx = 0$, we have

$$(16) \quad \int \psi(x)b(x)\rho(x)dx + \int \psi(x)\phi \star \rho(x)\rho(x)dx = \frac{1}{2} \int \psi'(x)\sigma^2 \rho(x)dx.$$

To estimate b and ϕ , we must take into account that the functions b , ϕ and $\phi \star \rho$ do not belong to $\mathbb{L}^2(dx)$. By [H3], these three functions have polynomial growth and therefore, as ρ has moments of any order, belong to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. So we proceed as follows.

Consider two orthonormal bases of $\mathbb{L}^2(dx)$, $(\varphi_j)_{j \geq 0}$, $(\theta_{\ell})_{\ell \geq 0}$ composed of functions derivable, bounded, with derivatives having polynomial growth, thus satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 1. We denote for $\tau = \varphi$ and $\tau = \theta$:

$$(17) \quad L_{\tau}(q) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} \tau_k^2(x),$$

and assume that $L_\varphi(m) < +\infty, L_\theta(p) < +\infty$ for all fixed $m \geq 1, p \geq 1$. The quantity $L_\tau(q)$ only depends on the space generated by $(\tau_0, \dots, \tau_{q-1})$. Indeed,

$$L_\tau(q) = \sup_{h \in \text{span}(\tau_0, \dots, \tau_{q-1})} \|h\|_\infty^2 / \|h\|^2.$$

It is finite for classical examples of bases. Generally, for all q , $L_\tau(q) \leq c_\tau q^\alpha$ with c_τ, α constants linked with the basis (see Section 3.5). As ρ is bounded, for all j , φ_j belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. For $m \geq 1$, the functions $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{m-1}$ are linearly independent and generate a m -dimensional space

$$S_m = \text{Vect}(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{m-1})$$

which is a subspace of $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Analogously, we define the p -dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$

$$\Sigma_p = \text{Vect}(\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{p-1}).$$

Recall that, by definition (3), for a couple (u, v) of functions, we have set, when defined, $\|(u, v)\|_V^2 = \|u + v \star \rho\|_\rho^2$. Note that $\|(u, v)\|_V^2$ is finite for $(u, v) = (b, \phi)$ and for $(u, v) \in S_m \times \Sigma_p$. Indeed for $(u, v) \in S_m \times \Sigma_p$, $\|u\|_\rho^2 \leq \|\rho\|_\infty \|u\|^2$ and by the Young inequality, $\|v \star \rho\| \leq \|\rho\|_1 \|v\| = \|v\|$, so that $v \star \rho$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(dx) \subset \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Note also that $(u, v) \rightarrow \|(u, v)\|_V$ is only a semi-norm on $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Indeed, $\|(u, v)\|_V = 0$ is equivalent to $u(x) + v \star \rho(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. But this does not always implies $u \equiv 0, v \equiv 0$. Nevertheless, we denote $\langle (u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \rangle_V$ the scalar product associated to the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_V$.

Now, we define the V -orthogonal projection of (b, ϕ) on $S_m \times \Sigma_p$:

$$(18) \quad (b_m^V, \phi_p^V) = \arg \min_{(u, v) \in S_m \times \Sigma_p} \|(b - u, \phi - v)\|_V^2.$$

Setting $b_m^V = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} b_k \varphi_k$ and $\phi_p^V = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} c_\ell \theta_\ell$, we obtain

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{V}_{m,p}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})_{m,p} = \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}$$

using the notation

$$(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})_{m,p} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{p-1})^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_m \\ \mathbf{c}_p \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_{m+p,1}(\mathbb{R})$$

with $\mathbf{b}_m = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})^\perp$ and $\mathbf{c}_p = (c_0, \dots, c_{p-1})^\perp$, and where $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ is the $(m+p) \times (m+p)$ matrix, element of $\mathcal{M}_{m+p,m+p}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$(20) \quad \mathbf{V}_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}^1 = \left(\int \varphi_j \varphi_k \rho \right)_{0 \leq j, k \leq m-1} & \mathbf{V}^{1,2} = \left(\int \theta_\ell \star \rho \varphi_k \rho \right)_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq m-1 \\ 0 \leq \ell \leq p-1}} \\ \mathbf{V}^{2,1} = \left(\int \theta_r \star \rho \varphi_j \rho \right)_{\substack{0 \leq r \leq p-1 \\ 0 \leq j \leq m-1}} & \mathbf{V}^2 = \left(\int \theta_\ell \star \rho \theta_r \star \rho \right)_{0 \leq \ell, r \leq p-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{V}^{2,1} = (\mathbf{V}^{1,2})^\perp$,

$$(21) \quad \mathbf{Z}_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\int (b + \phi \star \rho) \varphi_k \rho \right)_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} \\ \left(\int (b + \phi \star \rho) (\theta_\ell \star \rho) \rho \right)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_{m+p,1}(\mathbb{R}).$$

As the functions $\psi = \varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{m-1}, \theta_0 \star \rho, \dots, \theta_{p-1} \star \rho$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 1, we may apply formula (16) to these functions and we get, using that $(\theta_\ell \star \rho)' = \theta'_\ell \star \rho$,

$$(22) \quad \mathbf{Z}_{m,p} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\int \varphi'_k \rho \right)_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} \\ \left(\int \theta'_\ell \star \rho \right)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_{m+p,1}(\mathbb{R}).$$

3.2. Theoretical constraints and identifiability. Below, vectors are denoted using bold letters and coordinates or functions are denoted with usual letters (not bold).

For $(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}, y_0, \dots, y_{p-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+p}$, we denote

$$(23) \quad (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = (x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}, y_0, \dots, y_{p-1})^\perp = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_m \\ \mathbf{y}_p \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\mathbf{x}_m = (x_0, \dots, x_{m-1})^\perp, \mathbf{y}_p = (y_0, \dots, y_{p-1})^\perp$.

The vector $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})_{m,p}$ in (19) is uniquely defined if and only if the matrix $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ is invertible.

We emphasize that the matrix $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ is symmetric and nonnegative. Indeed,

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}^\perp \mathbf{V}_{m,p} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = \int \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_j \varphi_j(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \right)^2 \rho(x) dx \geq 0.$$

Note that

$$(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}^\perp \mathbf{V}_{m,p} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = \|(u, v)\|_V^2 \quad \text{for} \quad u = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_j \varphi_j, v = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell.$$

As, by (6), the support of ρ is \mathbb{R} , $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ is invertible if:

$$(24) \quad \left\{ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_j \varphi_j(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) = 0 \right\} \Rightarrow (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})_{m,p}$$

Condition (24) is an identifiability constraint linked with the choice of the bases. In Section 3.5, we provide an example of bases for which (24) is fulfilled. Nevertheless, (24) is not enough for our purpose and we need to reinforce the identifiability constraint and set the following assumption:

- [H5] There exists a constant $f_0 > 0$ fixed and not depending on m, p , such that

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+p}, \quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}} = 1, \quad \mathbf{x}^\perp \mathbf{V}_{m,p} \mathbf{x} \geq f_0 > 0.$$

Assumption [H5] ensures that, for all (m, p) , the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ are all larger than f_0 . As a consequence, under [H5], there exists a positive constant s_0 independent of m, p such that

$$\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq s_0.$$

Clearly $s_0 = 1/f_0$ suits.

3.3. Definition of the estimators. To define a nonparametric estimator of b, ϕ , we estimate the functions b_m^V, ϕ_p^V , *i.e.* we build estimators $\widehat{b}_0, \dots, \widehat{b}_{m-1}$ and $\widehat{c}_0, \dots, \widehat{c}_{p-1}$ of the coefficients b_0, \dots, b_{m-1} and c_0, \dots, c_{p-1} and set

$$(25) \quad \widehat{b}_m(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \widehat{b}_j \varphi_j(x), \quad \widehat{\phi}_p(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \widehat{c}_\ell \theta_\ell(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We assume that we have at our disposal four independent paths of (10), $(X^{(i)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, *i.e.*

$$dX^{(i)}(t) = -(b(X^{(i)}(t)) + \phi \star \rho(X^{(i)}(t)))dt + \sigma dW_i(t), \quad X^{(i)}(0) = \eta_i \sim \rho(x)dx,$$

where (W_i) are independent Brownian motions, (η_i) are independent random variables, independent of the Brownian motions (W_i) .

For $m, p \geq 0$, we define an empirical version of the theoretical matrix $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ and of the vector $\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}$, denoted by $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$. The matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ is built using the two sample paths $(X^{(i)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 1, 2$ and the vector $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ is built using the two sample paths $(X^{(i)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 3, 4$. In this way, the estimators $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ are independent. We could use only two sample paths to estimate both, but this independence simplifies considerably the study.

Let us now define $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$. For this, we introduce the following notation. For a function h , let us set

$$\bar{h}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(x - X^{(2)}(t))dt, \quad \bar{\bar{h}}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(x - X^{(4)}(t))dt.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}\bar{h}(x) = \mathbb{E}\bar{\bar{h}}(x) = h \star \rho(x)$ and $h \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))$ can be estimated by $\bar{h}(X^{(1)}(s)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(X^{(1)}(s) - X^{(2)}(t))dt$, using two trajectories. Although $\bar{h}(x), \bar{\bar{h}}(x)$ are random and depend respectively on $X^{(2)}$ and $X^{(4)}$, we omit this dependence in the notation for the sake of simplicity. We set

$$\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^1 & \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^{1,2} \\ (\widehat{\mathbf{V}}^{1,2})^\perp & \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^1 &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right)_{0 \leq j, k \leq m-1} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^{1,2} &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right)_{0 \leq k \leq m-1, 0 \leq \ell \leq p-1} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{V}}^2 &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right)_{0 \leq \ell, r \leq p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ is built using the sample paths $(X^{(i)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 1, 2$ as for $\ell = 0, \dots, p-1$,

$$\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta_\ell(X^{(1)}(s) - X^{(2)}(t))dt.$$

Next, we set

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds \right)_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} \\ \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds \right)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

which depends on the sample paths $(X^{(i)}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, for $i = 3, 4$, as, for $\ell = 0, \dots, p-1$,

$$\overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s) - X^{(4)}(t)) dt.$$

Moments strategies often bring unbiased estimators. Here, due to the use of the functions $\overline{h}(x), \overline{\overline{h}}(x)$ which are unbiased estimators of $h \star \rho$, it is not exactly the case, and we can prove:

Proposition 4. *Under Assumptions [H1]-[H4], it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}) = \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}, \quad \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}) = \mathbf{V}_{m,p} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{m \times m} & \mathbf{0}_{m \times p} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times m} & O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \mathbf{1}_{p \times p} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}$ denote the $p \times p$ matrix with all coefficients equal to 1.

Thus $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ is unbiased and $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ is asymptotically unbiased when T grows to infinity.

Provided that $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$ is invertible, using notation (23), relation (19) suggests to define the estimator of $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})_{m,p}$ by

$$\widehat{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p} = \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \\ \widehat{\mathbf{c}}_p \end{pmatrix}.$$

Although under [H5], the theoretical matrix $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ is invertible with minimum eigenvalue away from 0, this does not guarantee the invertibility of $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$. Therefore, to get a proper definition of our estimator, we propose the standard cutoff strategy leading to replace $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1}$ by

$$(26) \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} := \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \quad \text{with} \quad \Delta_{m,p} = \{\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 2s_0\}.$$

Then we set

$$(27) \quad \widetilde{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p} = \widetilde{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_m \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{c}}_p \end{pmatrix}.$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_m = (\widetilde{b}_1, \dots, \widetilde{b}_{m-1})^\perp, \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{c}}_p = (\widetilde{c}_1, \dots, \widetilde{c}_{p-1})^\perp.$$

The estimator of (b, ϕ) is thus given by

$$\widetilde{b}_m(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \widetilde{b}_j \varphi_j(x), \quad \widetilde{\phi}_p(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \widetilde{c}_\ell \theta_\ell(x).$$

By construction, $\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ are independent. The risk of the estimator $(\widetilde{b}_m, \widetilde{\phi}_p)$ is defined by: $\mathbb{E}(\|(\widetilde{b}_m - b, \widetilde{\phi}_p - \phi)\|_V^2)$, (see (3), (4)).

3.4. Study of estimator risk. In the sequel, we use the following notations.

Let $(b, \phi)(x) = (b(x), \phi(x))$ and set $(b, \phi)_{m,p}(x) = (b_m^V(x), \phi_p^V(x))$ where b_m^V and ϕ_p^V given by (18). Analogously, let

$$\widetilde{(b, \phi)}_{m,p}(x) = (\widetilde{b}_m(x), \widetilde{\phi}_p(x)),$$

and recall that (see (3)) $\|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 = \|(b + \phi \star \rho)\|_\rho^2$.

For $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_m \\ \mathbf{y}_p \end{pmatrix}$ a vector of $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^p$, define the square norm associated with $\mathbf{V}_{m,p}$ defined by (20), by

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2 &:= (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}^\perp \mathbf{V}_{m,p} (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p} = \int \left[\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_j \varphi_j(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \right]^2 \rho(x) dx \\ &\leq 2\|\rho\|_\infty \left[\int \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_j \varphi_j(x) \right)^2 dx + \int \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \right)^2 dx \right]. \end{aligned}$$

According to Young's inequality, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \star \rho \right\|^2 \leq \|\rho\|_1^2 \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \right\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_\ell \theta_\ell \right\|^2.$$

Now using that the functions $(\varphi_j)_{0 \leq j \leq m-1}$ and $(\theta_\ell)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1}$ are orthonormal in \mathbb{L}^2 , we get

$$(28) \quad \|(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2 \leq 2\|\rho\|_\infty \|(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2.$$

Now, we can link the V -norm of a couple of functions to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}$ -norm of a vector of $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^p$. Indeed, consider two functions $\omega(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \omega_j \varphi_j(x) \in S_m$ and $\zeta(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \zeta_\ell \theta_\ell(x) \in \Sigma_p$ with coefficients respectively $\boldsymbol{\omega}_m = (\omega_j, 0 \leq j \leq m-1)^\perp$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_p = (\zeta_\ell, 0 \leq \ell \leq p-1)^\perp$. We have

$$\|(\omega, \zeta)\|_V^2 = (\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p}^\perp \mathbf{V}_{m,p} (\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p} = \|(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p}\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2.$$

Thus, using (28), we have

$$\|(\omega, \zeta)\|_V^2 \leq 2\|\rho\|_\infty \|(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p}\|^2$$

where $\|(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p}\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \omega_j^2 + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \zeta_\ell^2 = \|(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\zeta})_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2$.

The following theorem gives a bound for the risk of the estimator $\widetilde{(b, \phi)}_{m,p}(x) = (\widetilde{b}_m(x), \widetilde{\phi}_p(x))$ with fixed m, p .

Theorem 1. *Assume that Assumptions [H1]-[H5] hold and that $L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p) \leq T$, with $L_\varphi(m)$ and $L_\theta(p)$ defined in (17). Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\|\widetilde{(b, \phi)}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 \right) \leq \inf_{(u,v) \in S_m \times \Sigma_p} \|(b - u, \phi - v)\|_V^2 + C \frac{L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p)}{T},$$

where C is a constant depending on b, ϕ, ρ, s_0 .

Let us comment this result. The risk bound shows a decomposition into a bias term $\inf_{(u,v) \in S_m \times \Sigma_p} \|(b - u, \phi - v)\|_V^2$ and a variance term $(L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p))/T$ (see (17)). This result justifies the choice of the V -norm to define the risk. The bias term decreases with (m, p) and

the variance term increases with m, p . This decomposition may be used to realize the square bias-variance compromise provided that the rate of the bias term can be assessed on specific regularity spaces.

We need the following Propositions 5, 6 and Lemma 2 to prove Theorem 1.

Proposition 5. *Under [H1]-[H4], it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2] \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p)}{T}.$$

Proposition 6. *Under [H1]-[H4], $\mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p})^2] \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}$.*

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2) \leq \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p})^2] \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Note that this bound does not depend on p .

Lemma 2. *Under [H1]-[H5],*

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}) \leq (40 + 1/4)s_0^4 \mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2)$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}) \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Remark 1. *Following ideas in Genon-Catalot and Larédo (2023a,b), [32], [33], we might have proposed $T^{-1} \int_0^T \varphi_\ell \star \widehat{\rho}_{[T]}(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_r \star \widehat{\rho}_{[T]}(X^{(1)}(s)) ds$ instead of the term in $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_2$, with $\widehat{\rho}_{[T]}$ computed with the path $X^{(2)}$ as in Section 4, formula (31). It could be used in the definition of $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ also, but would yield additional bias, compared to our strategy. In other words $\widehat{h}(x)$ is an unbiased estimator of $h \star \rho(x)$ which is not the case of $h \star \widehat{\rho}_{[T]}(x)$.*

3.5. Identifiability and risk bound when using the Hermite basis. Let us discuss the respective orders of the bias and variance terms in the bound obtained in Theorem 1.

The variance term order depends on the bases. Let us consider the Hermite basis which is defined as follows. The Hermite polynomial and the Hermite function of order j are given, for $j \geq 0$, by:

$$(29) \quad H_j(x) = (-1)^j e^{x^2} \frac{d^j}{dx^j}(e^{-x^2}), \quad h_j(x) = c_j H_j(x) e^{-x^2/2}, \quad c_j = (2^j j! \sqrt{\pi})^{-1/2}$$

The sequence $(h_j, j \geq 0)$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}^2(dx)$. Hermite functions with odd (resp. even) index are odd (resp. even) and $h_j^*(x) = \sqrt{2\pi} i^j h_j(x)$, where h_j^* is the Fourier transform of h_j . Moreover (see Abramowitz and Stegun (1964, 22.14.17), [1], Szegö (1975), [57] p.242, In-dritz (1961), [39]), $\|h_j\|_\infty \leq \Phi_0$, $\Phi_0 \simeq 1/\pi^{1/4} \simeq 0.7511$, so that the basis $(\varphi_j = h_j)$ is constituted of bounded functions which satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 1.

Moreover, the identifiability condition (24) is fulfilled by the Hermite basis. Indeed, replacing in (24) φ_j by h_j and θ_ℓ by $h_{2\ell-1}$, and applying Fourier transform yields

$$(30) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} y_j i^j h_j(x) + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_{\ell+m} i^{2\ell+1} h_{2\ell+1}(x) \rho^*(x) = 0.$$

Multiplying by $e^{x^2/2}$ gives $P(x) + Q(x)\rho^*(x) = 0$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, where P and Q are polynomials. Let us moreover assume that $V(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ are \mathcal{C}^∞ and let $f^{(n)}(x)$ the n -th derivative of f . Inequality (7) yields that ρ belongs to the Schwarz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) = \{f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), \text{ s.t. } \forall m \geq 1, \forall n \geq 0, f^{(n)}(x) = O(x^{-m}) \text{ at } \infty\}$. Therefore ρ^* also belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Letting $x \rightarrow \infty$ in (30) yields that $P(x) \rightarrow 0$, which implies that the term with highest degree of $P(x)$, i.e. of $y_{m-1}i^{m-1}H_{m-1}(x)$, tends to 0. Therefore $y_{m-1} = 0$. Iterating the procedure yields successively that $y_{m-1}, y_{m-2}, \dots, y_0$ are all equal to 0. Equation (30) reduces to the equation: $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} y_{\ell+m} i^{2\ell+1} h_{2\ell+1}(x) = 0$. The functions $h_j(\cdot)$ being orthogonal, this implies that $y_{\ell+m} = 0$ for $\ell = 0, \dots, p-1$.

Lastly, it is proved in Lemma 1 of Comte and Lacour (2023), [18] that $L_\varphi(m) \leq C\sqrt{m}$. As a consequence, if we use Hermite functions $(h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{m-1})$ to span S_m and $(h_1, h_3, \dots, h_{2p-1})$ to span Σ_p (recall that ϕ is odd), the variance term has order

$$\frac{L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p)}{T} \leq C \frac{\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{p}}{T}.$$

Note that the assumptions of Lemma 1 imply that we cannot use compactly supported bases whose functions are not derivable on \mathbb{R} .

Let us now discuss the square bias term. If the functions b and ϕ were square integrable on \mathbb{R} , we would upper bound the square bias by

$$\|\rho\|_\infty \left(\inf_{u \in S_m} \|b - u\|^2 + \inf_{v \in \Sigma_p} \|\phi - v\|^2 \right) = \|\rho\|_\infty \left(\sum_{j \geq m} \langle b, \varphi_j \rangle^2 + \sum_{\ell \geq p} \langle \phi, \theta_{2\ell+1} \rangle^2 \right)$$

For b and ϕ in Sobolev-Hermite spaces with regularity s_1 and s_2 (see *e.g.* Comte and Genon-Catalot (2020), section 3.4, [17]), the resulting order would be $m^{-s_1} + p^{-s_2}$ and the resulting bias rate would be $T^{-2s_*/(2s_*+1)}$ where $s_* = \min(s_1, s_2)$. This is the optimal rate for estimating a function with regularity s_* . Thus, our bias term is meaningful.

However, the order of our specific bias term taking into account that $b, \phi, \phi \star \rho$ are in $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$ and not in $\mathbb{L}^2(dx)$ would require the definition of specific regularity spaces to assess the rate of

$$\inf_{u \in S_m} \|b - u\|_\rho^2 + \inf_{v \in \Sigma_p} \|(\phi - v) \star \rho\|_\rho^2.$$

4. ESTIMATION OF THE STATIONARY DENSITY

As $\rho \in \mathbb{L}^2(dx)$, we consider an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{L}^2(dx)$, still denoted $(\varphi_j)_{j \geq 0}$ and write $\rho(x) = \sum_{j \geq 0} a_j \varphi_j(x)$ with $a_j = \langle \varphi_j, \rho \rangle = \int \varphi_j(x) \rho(x) dx$. For an integer D , we consider the estimator

$$(31) \quad \hat{\rho}_D = \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \hat{a}_j \varphi_j, \quad \hat{a}_j = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X(s)) ds.$$

We can prove the following result

Proposition 7. *Under Assumptions [H1]-[H4],*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\hat{\rho}_D - \rho\|^2] \leq \|\rho - \rho_D\|^2 + \frac{C}{T},$$

where $\rho_D = \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} a_j \varphi_j$, C is a positive constant (not depending on D, T) and $\|\cdot\|$ is the \mathbb{L}^2 -norm.

It follows from Proposition 7 that the variance of the estimator does not depend on D . Therefore, taking D as large as possible will make the bias term negligible under weak regularity conditions, and ρ can be estimated with (parametric) rate $1/T$. In Comte and Merlevède (2005), the same result is obtained under specific conditions, mainly the so-called Castellana and Leadbetter condition which is difficult to check in general. The interesting point here is that the parametric rate is obtained without such specific condition in our framework.

Remark 2. *In most cases, as mentioned above, the invariant density has no explicit expression. However, in the special case where b is odd and ϕ is linear, ρ is explicit. We follow Hermann and Tugaut (2010) to explain this case. Let us assume that b is odd and $\phi(x) = cx$. Then, $\phi \star \rho(x) = c(x - m)$ where m is the expectation of ρ . The invariant density ρ is given by*

$$\rho(x) = [K(m)]^{-1} \exp[-2\sigma^{-2}(B(x) + \frac{c}{2}(x - m)^2)]$$

where $[K(m)]^{-1}$ is the norming constant and m is solution of

$$\int x \exp[-2\sigma^{-2}(B(x) + \frac{c}{2}(x - m)^2)] dx = m \int \exp[-2\sigma^{-2}(B(x) + \frac{c}{2}(x - m)^2)] dx = mK(m)$$

As B is even, this equation has an obvious solution $m = 0$. As the invariant distribution is unique, we find

$$\rho(x) = \exp[-2\sigma^{-2}(B(x) + \frac{c}{2}x^2)] [\int \exp[-2\sigma^{-2}(B(y) + \frac{c}{2}y^2)] dy]^{-1}.$$

Moreover, equation (10) is equal to

$$dX(t) = -[b(X(t)) + cX(t)]dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad X(0) \sim \rho(x)dx.$$

Models 1,2,3 presented below in Section 5 correspond to such cases and we use them to evaluate the performances of the invariant density estimator.

5. SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS

We implemented the method by simulating $N = 200$ particules following equation (2) with Euler-type discretization scheme with step $\Delta = 0.1$. The initial value is taken equal to 0 and we exclude the 50 first values of the process to reach approximately the stationary regime. Two values of T presented below are $T = 200$ and $T = 2000$, involving $n = 2000$ and $n = 20000$ generated $X_i^N(j\Delta)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$. In all cases, we took $\sigma = 0.25$. The estimation uses the sample paths $X_i^N(j\Delta)$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$.

First, we present 3 models for which we can compute the true density ρ so that we can illustrate the performance of the density estimator described in Section 4 (see Remark 2). With $b = 0.5, c = 0.5$, we consider

- (1) $b(x) = bx$, $\phi(x) = cx$, $\rho(x)$ is a $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/[2(b+c)])$,
- (2) $b(x) = b \tanh(x)$, $\phi(x) = cx$, $\rho(x) = c_1 \exp(-cx^2/\sigma^2)/(\cosh(x))^{2b/\sigma^2}$,
- (3) $b(x) = bx^3$, $\phi(x) = cx$, $\rho(x) = c_2 \exp[-(bx^4/2 + cx^2)/\sigma^2]$.

The constants c_1 and c_2 are computed numerically so that the function ρ integrates to one. We compute estimators corresponding to the Hermite basis ($\varphi_j = h_j$) $_{0 \leq j \leq D-1}$ (see (29)). The dimension is chosen equal to $D = 5[\sqrt{T}]$, that is 70 for $T = 200$ and 225 for $T = 2000$. Figure 1 shows 20 estimates of the invariant density in dotted green and the true one in bold red. The




FIGURE 1. Density estimation for Examples 1 to 3. 20 estimated curves in dotted green, first line $T = 200$ ($D = 70$), last line $T = 2000$ ($D = 225$). In all cases, the true is in bold red.

choice of the parameters b, c seems important as it influences the simulation results. Note that if D is too large ($D = T$, e.g.), it implies numerical problems. We can see on Figure 1 that the method works very well and is improved when T grows. The three densities, though different, have very similar forms.

Figure 2 presents the estimation of b and ϕ for Example 2. The detail about our protocol of estimation is detailed below. Two other models are illustrated hereafter where b is not odd and/or ϕ is not linear:

- (4) $b(x) = 2(x - 1)^3 + 2x$, $\phi(x) = 4 \tanh(x)$,
- (5) $b(x) = 2x$, $\phi(x) = 2(x + x^3)$.

To compute the estimators of b , we use the Hermite basis $(\varphi_j)_{0 \leq j \leq m-1}$ for $m = 1, \dots, 6$ (see Section 3.5). To compute the estimators of ϕ , we need to take into account that ϕ is odd. So we consider the basis $(\theta_\ell)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1} = (h_{2\ell+1})_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1}$ as Hermite functions of odd index are odd functions. We consider dimensions $m \in \{1, \dots, m_{\max} = 6\}$ and $p \in \{1, \dots, p_{\max} = 3\}$. Larger proposals systematically involve estimators with an obvious variance effect. The fact that we consider small dimensions replaces the cutoff of $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1}$.

For examples (1) to (3), we could have simulated by Euler scheme 4 independent sample paths of $dX(t) = -(b(X(t)) + cX(t))dt + \sigma dB(t)$ instead of the particles system. We found that the




FIGURE 2. Example 2, $T = 2000$. 20 estimated b (left) and ϕ (right), all selected by penalization. The true functions are in bold red.




FIGURE 3. Example 4, estimation of b (left) and ϕ (right) for $T = 200$ (top) and $T = 2000$ (bottom). Dimensions selected by penalization. In all cases, the true is in bold red.

estimation results were of the same type, so we kept the particles system which is suitable for all models.

Though we have no theoretical result concerning an adaptive choice for the dimensions m, p , we propose a criterion following the standard method to select data-driven dimensions. The selection of (m, p) is done by choosing the couple which minimizes

$$Crit(m, p) = -\widehat{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p}^\perp \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} + \kappa \times \frac{\sqrt{m} + 4\sqrt{p}}{T},$$

where $\widehat{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p}^\perp \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} = \|\widehat{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 = \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}^\perp \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$. The criterion is inspired by an estimation of the empirical bias, as usually performed for least-squares contrast minimization, and a second term which has the order of the variance of the estimator. The constant κ is roughly calibrated and chosen here as $\kappa = 5$.

Figure 2 shows 20 estimators computed for 20 independent systems of particles of particles, in the case of Examples 2, for $T = 2000$. Figure 3 illustrates, for example 4, the improvement which occurs when increasing T from 200 to 2000: it is less striking than in the density case, but still existing. Figure 4 shows, for example 5, on the first line all the proposals which are considered for b and ϕ for all couples (m, p) of the list. We can see that the selection of a relevant estimator is crucial. As Hermite bases are parsimonious, small values of m and p perform well. The choice $m = 1$ is generally not good, and the most selected couple for (m, p) is $(2, 1)$.

To conclude, the performance of the density estimator is nice, but the problem of estimating b and ϕ is obviously more difficult. In all cases, the choice of the functions b, ϕ is important because too small or too large ranges of values of the process can generate numerical difficulties.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

6.1. Summary and remaining questions. In this paper, we consider the nonparametric estimation of the functions b, ϕ of model (1) based on the continuous observation on a time interval $[0, T]$ of four *i.i.d.* sample paths in stationary regime. The asymptotic framework is $T \rightarrow +\infty$. Due to the presence of the interaction term in equation (1) which contains a convolution with the unknown marginal law of the process, the problem is completely different from the case of a usual diffusion ($\phi \equiv 0$) and the observation of only one sample path is not enough to estimate both b and ϕ . Actually, two sample paths could be enough but induces much more tedious computations. The estimation method is inspired by a paper in parametric setting of Pavliotis and Zanoni (2023). To build the estimators, we use a combination of a moment method and a projection method. Defining a specific risk for the estimators fitted to the problem, we obtain a bound for the risk of our projection estimators involving as usual a variance term and a square bias term. The order of the variance term is precised for the Hermite basis. The rate of the square bias term which is very specific to the problem and is not simple to evaluate. We sketch a discussion on this point. Note that no benchmark is available for comparison. We also provide a nonparametric estimator of the invariant density of the process which has the parametric rate without any condition such as Castellana and Leadbetter's one. The method is implemented on simulated data using an empirical model selection criterion, and performs reasonably well.

Remaining questions are worth of further research. It would be of interest to propose a theoretical background for assessing the rate of the bias term and for the selection procedure. Moreover, the estimation procedure is based on the estimation of the vector $\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}$ suggested by formula (22), using the moment relation (16). But the vector $\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}$ is also given by (21) and




FIGURE 4. Example 5, $T = 200$. First line: the 6x3 proposals for b (left) and the 3x6 proposals for ϕ (right). Second line: \hat{b}_2 (right) and $\hat{\phi}_1$ (right) selected by penalization. In all cases, the true is in bold red.

could have been estimated by

$$\hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} = \left(\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_k(X^{(3)}(s)) dX^{(3)}(s) \right)_{0 \leq k \leq m-1}^\perp, \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) dX^{(3)}(s) \right)_{0 \leq \ell \leq p-1}^\perp \right)^\perp$$

keeping the same matrix $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$. The other estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}$ requires another study which is worth being done.

6.2. Estimation from the observation of the particle systems. Suppose that the observation is the particles system (2) for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, $t \in [0, T]$ and $X_i^N(0) \sim \rho(x)dx$ with N, T large. Then, we can apply the same estimation method to obtain estimators of b and ϕ . This is illustrated in Section 5 as the easiest way to simulate four independent sample paths $X^{(i)}(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$ is to simulate the particles system (2) for large N . Of course, the theoretical study would have to take into account this point by adding a bias term due to the convergence of the particle system to the limit processes.

6.3. Discrete observations. In practice, only discrete time observations are available. Therefore, it is worth of interest to study the same estimation problem based on discrete observations $(X^{(i)}(j\Delta), j = 1, \dots, n, i = 1, \dots, 4)$ with $\Delta = \Delta_n$ tending to 0 and $n\Delta_n$ tending to infinity (high

frequency framework). One can consider the discretized versions of our estimators and this is actually what is done in the simulation section. The extension of the estimation results would be to the price of some more computations and some additional bias terms under conditions on n, Δ_n . The usual condition for diffusions, $n\Delta_n^2 = o(1)$, would probably be the same.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abramowitz, M. and Stegun, I. A. (1964) *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*. National Bureau of Standards Applied Mathematics Series, 55 For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- [2] Amorino, C., Heidari, A., Pilipauskaitė, V. and Podolskij, M. (2023). Parameter estimation of discretely observed interacting particle systems. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **163**, 350-386.
- [3] Baladron, J., Fasoli, D., Faugeras, O. and Touboul, J. (2012). Mean-field description and propagation of chaos in networks of Hodgkin-huxley and FitzHugh-Nagumo neurons. *Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience* **2(1):10**, 1-50.
- [4] Ball, F. and Sirl, D. (2020) Stochastic *SIR* in Structured Populations. *Stochastic Epidemic Models with Inference*, **Part II**, 123-240. Britton, T. and Pardoux, E., Editors. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **2255**, Mathematical Biosciences Subseries, Springer.
- [5] Belomestny, D., Pilipauskaitė, V. and Podolskij, M. (2023). Semiparametric estimation of McKean-Vlasov SDEs. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **59**, 79-96.
- [6] Benachour, S., Roynette, B. and Vallois, P. (1998a). Nonlinear self-stabilizing processes - I Existence, invariant probability, propagation of chaos. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **75**, 173-201.
- [7] Benachour, S., Roynette, B. and Vallois, P. (1998b). Nonlinear self-stabilizing processes - II Convergence to invariant probability. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **75**, 203-224.
- [8] Benedetto, D., Caglioti, E. and Pulverenti, M. (1997). A kinetic equation for granular media. *Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, **31** (5), 615-641.
- [9] Bolley, F., Gentil, I. and Guillin, A. (2013). Uniform convergence to equilibrium for granular media. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **208**, 429-445.
- [10] Butkovsky, O. (2014). On ergodic properties of nonlinear Markov chains and McKean-Vlasov equations. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **58**, 661-674.
- [11] Carrillo, L.A., Choi, Y.-P., Hauray, M. (2014). The derivation of swarming models: Mean-field limit and Wasserstein distances. In: Muntean A., Toschi F. (eds) *Collective Dynamics from Bacteria to Crowds*. *CISM International Centre for Mechanical Sciences* **553**. Springer, Vienna.
- [12] Cattiaux, P., Guillin, A. and Malrieu, F. (2008). Probabilistic approach for granular media equations in the non-uniformly convex case, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **140**, 19-40.
- [13] Chen, X. (2021). Maximum likelihood estimation of potential energy in interacting particle systems from single-trajectory data. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **26**, 1-13.
- [14] Comte, F. and Genon-Catalot, V. (2021). Drift estimation on non compact support for diffusion models. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **134**, 174-207.
- [15] Comte, F., Genon-Catalot, V. and Rozenholc, Y. (2007). Penalized nonparametric mean square estimation of the coefficients of diffusion processes. *Bernoulli*, **13**, 514-543.
- [16] Comte, F. and Genon-Catalot, V. (2023). Nonparametric adaptive estimation for interacting particle systems. *Scand. J. Statist.* **50**, 1716-1755.
- [17] Comte, F. and Genon-Catalot, V. (2020) Regression function estimation as a partly inverse problem. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **72**, 1023-1054.
- [18] Comte, F. and Lacour, C. (2023) Non compact estimation of the conditional density from direct or noisy data. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.* **59**, no. 3, 1463-1507.
- [19] Dalalyan, A. and Reiss, M. (2006). Asymptotic statistical equivalence for scalar ergodic diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **134**, 248-282.
- [20] Dalalyan, A. and Reiss, M. (2007). Asymptotic statistical equivalence for ergodic diffusions: the multidimensional case. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **137**, 25-47.
- [21] Dawson, D.A. (1983). Critical Dynamics and Fluctuations for a Mean-Field Model of Cooperative Behavior. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **31** 29-85.

- [22] Della Maestra, L. and Hoffmann, M. (2022a). Nonparametric estimation for interacting particle systems: McKean-Vlasov models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **182**, 551-613.
- [23] Della Maestra, L. and Hoffmann, M. (2022b). The LAN property for McKean-Vlasov models in a mean-field regime. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **155**, 109-146.
- [24] Eberle, A., Guillin, A. and Zimmer, R. (2019). Quantitative Harris type theorems for diffusions and McKean-Vlasov processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*. DOI:10.1090/TRAN/7576Corpus ID: 54087155.
- [25] Forien, R. and Pardoux, E. (2022). Household epidemic models and McKean-Vlasov Poisson driven SDEs. *Annals of Applied Probability* **32**, 1210-1233.
- [26] Fournier, N. and Guillin, A. (2015). On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **162**, 707-738.
- [27] Funaki, T. (1984). A certain class of diffusion processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equations. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **67**, 331-348.
- [28] Gärtner, J. (1988). On the McKean-Vlasov limit for interacting diffusions. *Math. Nachr.* **137**, 197-248.
- [29] Genon-Catalot, V., Jeantreau, T. and Larédo, C. (2000). Stochastic volatility models as hidden Markov models and statistical applications. *Bernoulli* **6**, 1051-1079.
- [30] Genon-Catalot, V. and Larédo, C. (2021a). Probabilistic properties and parametric inference of small variance nonlinear self-stabilizing stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **142**, 513-548.
- [31] Genon-Catalot, V. and Larédo, C. (2021b). Parametric inference for small variance and long time horizon McKean-Vlasov diffusion models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15**, 5811-5854.
- [32] Genon-Catalot, V. and Larédo, C. (2023a). Inference for ergodic McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations with polynomial interactions. *Preprint hal-03618498v3*, to appear in *Ann. Institut. H. Poincaré (B) Probab. Statist.*
- [33] Genon-Catalot, V. and Larédo, C. (2023b) Parametric inference for ergodic McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equations. *Preprint hal-04071936v1*, to appear in *Bernoulli*.
- [34] Giesecke, K., Schwenkler, G. and Sirignano, J.A. (2020). Inference for large financial systems. *Mathematical Finance*, **30**, 3-46.
- [35] Herrmann, S., Imkeller, P. and Peithmann, D. (2008). Large deviations and a Kramers' type law for self-stabilizing diffusions. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **18**, 1379-1423.
- [36] Herrmann, S. and Tugaut, J. (2010). Non uniqueness of stationary measures for self-stabilizing diffusions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **120**, 1215-1246.
- [37] Hoffmann, M. (1999). Adaptive estimation in diffusion processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **79**, 135-163.
- [38] Hutton, J.E. and Nelson, P.I. (1984). Interchanging the order of differentiation and stochastic integration. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **18**, 371-377.
- [39] Indritz, J. (1961) An inequality for Hermite polynomials. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12**, 981-983.
- [40] Kasonga, R.A. (1990). Maximum likelihood theory for large interacting systems. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* **50**, 865-875.
- [41] Kessler, M., Lindner, A. and Sørensen, M., Editors (2012). *Statistical methods for stochastic differential equations*. CRC press. Taylor & Francis Group. Boca Raton.
- [42] Kolokoltsov, V.N. (2010). *Non linear Markov processes and kinetic equations* **182**. Cambridge University press.
- [43] Li, Z., Lu, F., Maggioni, M. Tang, S. and Zhang, C. (2021). On the identifiability of interaction functions in systems of interacting particles. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **132**, 135-163.
- [44] Lu, F, Maggioni, M. and Tang, S. (2022). Learning Interaction Kernels in Stochastic Systems of Interacting Particles from Multiple Trajectories. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **22**, 1013-1067.
- [45] McKean, H.P., Jr (1966). A class of Markov processes associated with nonlinear parabolic equation. *PNAS* **6**, 1907-1911.
- [46] Malrieu, F. (2003). Convergence to equilibrium for granular media equations and their Euler schemes. *Annals of applied Probability* **13**, 540-560.
- [47] Méléard, S. (1996). Asymptotic behaviour of some interacting particle systems; McKean-Vlasov and Boltzmann models. In *Probabilistic Models for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1627**, 42-95, Springer.
- [48] Molginer, A. and Edelstein-Keshet, L. (1999). A non-local model for a swarm. *J. Math. Biol.* **38**, 534-570.

- [49] Nickl, R. and Ray, K. (2020). Nonparametric statistical inference for drift vector fields of multi-dimensional diffusions. *Annals of Statistics*, **48**, 1383-1408.
- [50] Pavliotis, G.A. and Zanoni, A. (2022). Eigenfunction martingale estimators for interacting particle systems and their mean field limit. *Siam. J. Appl. Dyn. Systems*, **21**, 2338-2370.
- [51] Pavliotis, G. A. and Zanoni, A. (2023) A method of moments estimator for interacting particle systems and their mean field. ArXiv:2212.00403v1.
- [52] Schmisser, E. , 2013. Penalized nonparametric drift estimation for a multidimensional diffusion process, *Statistics*, **47**, 61-84.
- [53] Sharrock, L., Kantas, N., Parpas, P. and Pavliotis, G.A. (2023). Online parameter estimation for the McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equation *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **162**, 481-546.
- [54] Stewart, G. W. and Sun, J.-G. (1990). *Matrix perturbation theory*. Boston etc.: Academic Press, Inc.
- [55] Strauch, C. (2015). Sharp adaptive drift estimation for ergodic diffusions: the multivariate case. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **125**, 2562-2602.
- [56] Strauch, C. (2016). Exact adaptive pointwise drift estimation for multidimensional ergodic diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **164**, no. 1-2, 361-400.
- [57] Szegő, G. (1975) *Orthogonal polynomials*. Fourth edition. American Mathematical Society, Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXIII. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I.
- [58] Sznitman, A.-S. (1991). Topics in propagation of chaos. *Ecole d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX-1989. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1464**, 165-251. Springer, Berlin.

7. PROOFS

7.1. Proof of Proposition 1. We have $b'(x) \geq K, \phi'(x) \geq \lambda$. Thus, $(\phi \star \rho)'(x) = \int \phi'(x - y)\rho(y)dy \geq \lambda$. Therefore, for $x \geq 0$,

$$b(x) \geq Kx + b(0), \quad \phi \star \rho(x) \geq \lambda x + \phi \star \rho(0).$$

This implies, for $0 \leq z \leq x$,

$$\int_z^x [b(u) + \phi \star \rho(u)]du \geq (K + \lambda)(x^2 - z^2)/2 + (b(0) + \phi \star \rho(0))(x - z).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(z)} \leq \exp \left[-\frac{(K + \lambda)}{\sigma^2}(x^2 - z^2) + C(x - z) \right], \quad C = -(2/\sigma^2)(b(0) + \phi \star \rho(0)).$$

Analogously, for $x \leq z \leq 0$,

$$\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(z)} \leq \exp \left[-\frac{(K + \lambda)}{\sigma^2}(z^2 - x^2) + C(x - z) \right].$$

Therefore, for all x ,

$$\rho(x) \lesssim \exp \left[-\frac{(K + \lambda)}{\sigma^2}x^2 + Cx \right] \propto \exp \left[-\frac{(K + \lambda)}{\sigma^2} \left(x - \frac{C\sigma^2}{2(K + \lambda)} \right)^2 \right],$$

Moreover, for $0 \leq z \leq x$ or $x \leq z \leq 0$,

$$\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(z)} \leq \exp [C(x - z)]. \quad \square$$

7.2. Proof of Lemma 1. Set $\Psi(x) = \int_0^x \psi(t)dt$. We prove that Ψ and $\int_0^x \psi \star \rho$ both belong to \mathcal{D} defined by (12). We have $\int \Psi^2(x)\rho(x)dx = \int_0^{+\infty} \dots + \int_{-\infty}^0 \dots$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} \Psi^2(x)\rho(x)dx &\leq \int_0^{+\infty} x \int_0^x \psi^2(t)dt\rho(x)dx = \int_{0 < t < x} x\psi^2(t)\rho(x)dxdt \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \psi^2(t) \left(\int_t^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx \right) dt \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \psi^2(t)dt \int_0^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed analogously for the integral on $(-\infty, 0)$ and thus $\Psi \in \mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$.

To prove that $\int_0^x \psi \star \rho(t)dt$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$, it is therefore enough to prove that $\psi \star \rho$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R})$. By the Young inequality,

$$\int (\psi \star \rho)^2(x)dx \leq \left(\int \rho(x)dx \right)^2 \int \psi^2(x)dx < +\infty.$$

Next, we must prove that $\psi(x)\rho(x)$ and $\psi \star \rho(x)\rho(x)$ tend to 0 as x tends to $+\infty$ and $-\infty$. This holds as ψ is bounded by assumption. And $\psi \star \rho$ is also bounded as

$$|\psi \star \rho(x)| \leq \left(\int \psi^2(t)dt \int \rho^2(y)dy \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\|\rho\|_\infty \int \psi^2(t)dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Now, we prove that $L\Psi$ and $L(\int_0^x (\psi \star \rho))$ belong to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. We have $L\Psi = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\psi' - (b + \phi \star \rho)\psi$. As ψ' has polynomial growth, $\int [\psi'(x)]^2\rho(x)dx < +\infty$ by Proposition 1. By our assumptions, $b = V'$ and $\phi \star \rho$ have ℓ polynomial growth. So, it is enough to check that $(1 + x^\ell)\psi(x)$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$ which holds since ψ is bounded and ρ has moments of any order.

We have $L(\int_0^x (\psi \star \rho)) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\psi' \star \rho - (b + \phi \star \rho)\psi \star \rho$. We use that $\psi \star \rho$ is bounded and $b + \phi \star \rho$ has polynomial growth to deduce that $(b + \phi \star \rho)\psi \star \rho$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. Next, as ψ' has polynomial growth, $\psi' \star \rho$ has also polynomial growth. This implies that $\psi' \star \rho$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$. \square

7.3. Useful Lemma. We state here a useful Lemma.

Lemma 3. *Assume [H1]-[H4] and consider a function h such that there exists a positive constant a such that $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}, |h(u)| \leq ae^{au}$. The following integrals are finite and bounded by constants depending on ρ and h only:*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad I_- &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\int_{-\infty}^y h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 \frac{dy}{\rho(y)}, \quad I_+ = \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\int_u^{+\infty} h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 \frac{dy}{\rho(y)}. \\ (2) \quad J_- &= \int_{x < y < 0} \frac{|x|\rho(x)}{\rho^2(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 dx dy, \quad J_+ = \int_{0 < y < x} \frac{x\rho(x)}{\rho^2(y)} \left(\int_y^{+\infty} h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 dx dy. \\ (3) \quad &\int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\int_{-\infty}^x \rho^2(y)dy \right) \frac{dx}{\rho(x)}, \quad \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y)dy \right) \frac{dx}{\rho(x)}. \\ (4) \quad &\int_0^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx \int_0^x \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho^2(y)dy, \quad \int_{-\infty}^0 |x|\rho(x)dx \int_x^0 \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \int_{-\infty}^u \rho^2(y)dy. \\ (5) \quad &\int_0^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx \int_0^x \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \left(\int_u^{+\infty} \rho(y)dy \right)^2, \quad \int_{-\infty}^0 |x|\rho(x)dx \int_x^0 \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^u \rho(y)dy \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3. We start with the first item. It is enough to look at I_- , the other one being analogous. We have:

$$I_- = 2 \int_{u < v < y < 0} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} h(u) \rho(u) h(v) \rho(v) dudv.$$

On the integration set,

$$\frac{\rho(u)\rho(v)}{\rho(y)} = [\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/2} \left[\frac{\rho(u)}{\rho(y)} \right]^{1/2} \left[\frac{\rho(v)}{\rho(y)} \right]^{1/2} \leq [\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/2} e^{(C/2)(u+v)-Cy}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I_- &\leq 2 \int_{u < v < y < 0} h(u)h(v)[\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/2} e^{(C/2)(u+v)-Cy} dy dudv \\ &= 2 \int_{u < v < 0} h(u)h(v)[\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/2} e^{(C/2)(u+v)} \left(\int_v^0 e^{-Cy} dy \right) dudv \\ &= \frac{2}{C} \int_{u < v < 0} [\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/2} e^{(C/2)u} (e^{(C/2)v} - e^{-(C/2)v}) h(u)h(v) dudv \\ &\leq \frac{2}{C} \int_{u < 0} [\rho(u)]^{1/2} |h(u)| e^{(C/2)u} du \int_{v < 0} |(e^{(C/2)v} - e^{-(C/2)v}) h(v)| [\rho(v)]^{1/2} dv \\ &< +\infty \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 1 and the assumption on h .

We prove the second item. We have:

$$J_- = 2 \int_{x < y < 0, u < v < y} |x| \frac{\rho(x)\rho(u)\rho(v)}{\rho^2(y)} h(u)h(v) dx dy dudv.$$

We can write:

$$\frac{\rho(x)\rho(u)\rho(v)}{\rho^2(y)} = [\rho(x)]^{1/3} \left[\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(y)} \right]^{2/3} \left[\frac{\rho(u)}{\rho(y)} \right]^{2/3} \left[\frac{\rho(v)}{\rho(y)} \right]^{2/3} [\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/3}.$$

On the integration set, we have:

$$\frac{\rho(x)\rho(u)\rho(v)}{\rho^2(y)} \leq [\rho(x)\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/3} e^{(2/3)C(x-y)} e^{(2/3)C(u-y)} e^{(2/3)C(v-y)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} J_- &\leq \int_{x < 0, u < v} |x| |h(u)h(v)| [\rho(x)\rho(u)\rho(v)]^{1/3} e^{(2C/3)(x+u+v)} \left(\int_{\sup(x,v)}^{+\infty} e^{-2Cy} dy \right) dx dudv \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 1 and the assumption on h .

We treat (3). By Proposition 1, and Inequality (8), we get straightforwardly that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy = \int_0^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) \left(\int_0^y \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \right) dy < +\infty.$$

For (4), we have:

$$\int_0^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx \int_0^x \frac{1}{\rho^2(u)} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho^2(y)dy = \int_{x>0,0<u<x,0<u<y} x\rho(x) \frac{\rho^2(y)}{\rho^2(u)} dxdu dy.$$

We can write:

$$\rho(x) \frac{\rho^2(y)}{\rho^2(u)} = [\rho(x)]^{1/3} [\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(u)}]^{2/3} [\frac{\rho(y)}{\rho(u)}]^{4/3} [\rho(y)]^{2/3}$$

Therefore, using (8) again,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{x>0,0<u<x,0<u<y} x\rho(x) \frac{\rho^2(y)}{\rho^2(u)} dxdu dy \\ & \leq \int_{x>0,0<u<x,0<u<y} x[\rho(x)]^{1/3} [\rho(y)]^{2/3} \exp[(2/3)C(x-u)] \exp[(4/3)C(y-u)] dxdu dy \\ & \int_{x>0,y>0} x[\rho(x)]^{1/3} [\rho(y)]^{2/3} \exp[(2/3)Cx + (4/3)Cy] \int_0^{x\wedge y} \exp(-2u) du dx dy < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

For (5),

$$\int_0^{+\infty} x\rho(x)dx \int_0^x \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \left[\int_u^{+\infty} \rho(y)dy \right]^2 = \int \mathbf{1}_{0<u<x} \mathbf{1}_{u<y,u<y'} \frac{x\rho(x)\rho(y)\rho(y')}{\rho^2(u)} dx dy dy' du.$$

As above, on the integration set,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x) \frac{\rho(y)\rho(y')}{\rho^2(u)} & = [\rho(x)]^{1/2} [\frac{\rho(x)}{\rho(u)}]^{1/2} [\frac{\rho^{3/4}(y)\rho^{3/4}(y')}{\rho^{3/2}(u)}] [\rho(y)\rho(y')]^{1/4} \\ & \leq [\rho(x)]^{1/2} [\rho(y)]^{1/4} [\rho(y')]^{1/4} e^{(C/2)x + (3C/4)(y+y')} e^{-(5C/4)u}, \end{aligned}$$

and conclude that the first integral of (5) is finite. We proceed analogously for the second one. \square

7.4. Proof of Proposition 3. Recall that h having exponential growth, belongs to $\mathbb{L}^2(\rho)$ as noted before the proposition. Let us find $\Gamma_h = g$ such that $g \in \mathcal{D}$ and $Lg = h_c$. Using (11) and (12), we obtain, taking into account that we want $\lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} g'(y)\rho(y) = 0$,

$$g'(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_{-\infty}^y h_c(u)\rho(u)du = -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} h_c(u)\rho(u)du,$$

where the equality above comes from the fact that $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} h_c(u)du = 0$. We choose $g(x) = \int_0^x g'(u)du$ which gives $Lg = h_c$. We must now prove

$$(32) \quad \mathcal{I} = \int [g'(y)]^2 \rho(y) dy < +\infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{J} = \int g^2(x)\rho(x)dx < +\infty.$$

We can split \mathcal{I} into $\mathcal{I} = \frac{4}{\sigma^4} (\mathcal{I}_+ + \mathcal{I}_-)$ with

$$\mathcal{I}_- = \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y h_c(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2, \quad \mathcal{I}_+ = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_y^{+\infty} h_c(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2.$$

It is enough to look at the first integral, the other one being analogous. We have, using $h_c = h - \int h\rho$,

$$\mathcal{I}_- \leq 2 \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 + 2 \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y \rho(u)du \right)^2 \left(\int h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2.$$

These integrals are finite by Lemma 3 (with $h(u) = 1$ for the second one).

Now, we also split $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_+ + \mathcal{J}_-$, with

$$\mathcal{J}_+ = \int_0^{+\infty} [g(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx, \quad \mathcal{J}_- = \int_{-\infty}^0 [g(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx,$$

and only treat \mathcal{J}_- . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_- &\leq \int_{-\infty}^0 |x| \rho(x) \int_x^0 [g'(y)]^2 dy dx = \int_{x < y < 0} |x| [g'(y)]^2 \rho(x) dx dy \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_{x < y < 0} |x| \frac{dy}{\rho^2(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y h(u)\rho(u)du \right)^2 \rho(x) dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_{x < y < 0} |x| \frac{dy}{\rho^2(y)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y \rho(u)du \right)^2 \left(\int h(z)\rho(z)dz \right)^2 \\ &:= \mathcal{J}_-^{(1)} + \mathcal{J}_-^{(2)} \times \left(\int h(z)\rho(z)dz \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

These integrals are finite by Lemma 3.

Thus, (32) is satisfied and $\Gamma_h = g$ belongs to \mathcal{D} and satisfies $L\Gamma_h = h_c$. Then (14) is obtained thanks to the Ito formula, and (15) is deduced using that $X(t)$ is stationary. \square

7.5. Proof of Proposition 4. Obviously, $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds \right) = \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx$. For the term $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds$, the expectation is computed in two steps by using the independence of $X^{(3)}$ and $X^{(4)}$.

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds \right) = \int \mathbb{E}(\bar{\theta}'_\ell(x)) \rho(x) dx = \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

Gathering both terms yields that $\mathbb{E}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p}) = \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}$.

Concerning $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}$, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right) = \int \varphi_j(x) \varphi_k(x) \rho(x) dx$$

and with the same two-step computation as previously, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right) = \int \mathbb{E}(\bar{\theta}_\ell(x)) \varphi_k(x) \rho(x) dx = \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \varphi_k(x) dx.$$

Now we prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right) = \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \theta_r \star \rho(x) dx + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

First, we split:

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \theta_r \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx = A_1(\ell, r) + A_2(\ell, r) + A_3(\ell, r) + A_4(\ell, r),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\ell, r) &= T^{-1} \int_0^T (\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) (\bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) ds, \\ A_2(\ell, r) &= T^{-1} \int_0^T (\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) ds, \quad A_3(\ell, r) = A_2(r, \ell), \\ A_4(\ell, r) &= T^{-1} \int_0^T \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \theta_r \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

The term $A_4(\ell, r)$ is centered as $\mathbb{E}(\theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) = \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \theta_r \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx$. By the two-step computation already used, the terms $A_2(\ell, r)$, $A_3(r, \ell)$ are centered too by the independence of $X^{(1)}$ and $X^{(2)}$, as

$$\mathbb{E}^{X^{(1)}(s)} (\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) = 0.$$

For the term $A_1(\ell, r)$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E} A_1(\ell, r) = \int \rho(u) du \mathbb{E} [(\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u)) (\bar{\theta}_r(u) - \theta_r \star \rho(u))];$$

We intend to use Proposition 3. Set $\theta_{\ell,u}(x) = \theta_\ell(u - x)$ and note that $\theta_{\ell,u}^c(x) = \theta_{\ell,u}(x) - \int \theta_{\ell,u}(x) \rho(x) dx = \theta_\ell(u - x) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u)$. Now with $\Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}$ such that $L\Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}} = \theta_{\ell,u}^c$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta_{\ell,u}^c(X^{(2)}(t)) dt &= \bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) \\ (33) \quad &= \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) + \frac{1}{T} \left(\Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(T)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E} [(\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u)) (\bar{\theta}_r(u) - \theta_r \star \rho(u))] = T_{\ell,r}^{(1)}(u) + T_{\ell,r}^{(2)}(u) + T_{\ell,r}^{(3)}(u) + T_{\ell,r}^{(4)}(u)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\ell,r}^{(1)}(u) &= \frac{\sigma^2}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) \Gamma'_{\theta_{r,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) ds \right) = \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \int \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) \Gamma'_{\theta_{r,u}}(y) \rho(y) dy \\ T_{\ell,r}^{(2)}(u) &= \frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(T)) \right) \left(\Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}(X^{(2)}(T)) \right) \right] \\ T_{\ell,r}^{(3)}(u) &= \frac{\sigma}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) \left(\Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}(X^{(2)}(T)) \right) \right] \\ T_{\ell,r}^{(4)}(u) &= T_{r,\ell}^{(3)}(u) \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\ell,r}^{(2)}(u) &\leq \frac{2}{T^2} \left(\int \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) dy \int \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^{1/2}, \\ T_{\ell,r}^{(3)}(u) &\leq \frac{2\sigma}{T^{3/2}} \left(\int (\Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y))^2 \rho(y) dy \int \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we must integrate all these terms w.r.t. $\rho(u)du$.

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the second and the third inequalities leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \rho(u) T_{\ell,r}^{(1)}(u) du &= \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \int \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) \Gamma'_{\theta_{r,u}}(y) \rho(y) \rho(u) du dy, \\ \int \rho(u) T_{\ell,r}^{(2)}(u) du &\leq \frac{\sigma^4}{T^2} \left(\int \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) \rho(u) du dy \int \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) \rho(u) du dy \right)^{1/2} \\ \int \rho(u) T_{\ell,r}^{(3)}(u) du &\leq \frac{2\sigma}{T^{3/2}} \left(\int [\Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y)]^2 \rho(y) \rho(u) du dy \int \Gamma_{\theta_{r,u}}^2(y) \rho(y) \rho(u) du dy \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Computations analogous to the ones of Lemma 3 allow to prove that the integrals above are finite. We only treat the first one. Recall that

$$\Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_{-\infty}^y \theta_{\ell,u}^c(z) \rho(z) dz = -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} \theta_{\ell,u}^c(z) \rho(z) dz.$$

Therefore, we split

$$T_{\ell,r}^{(1)}(u) = \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \left(\int_{y<0} \dots + \int_{y>0} \dots \right).$$

As θ_{ℓ} is bounded, $\theta_{\ell,u}^c(\cdot)$ is bounded too, so

$$\int_{y<0} \dots \lesssim \int_{y<0} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \int_{z<y, z'<y} \rho(z) \rho(z') dz dz' \propto \int_{y<0} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_{z<y} \rho(z) dz \right)^2$$

which is finite by Lemma 3.

Gathering the four terms, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int (\bar{\theta}_{\ell}(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_{\ell} \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) (\bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) ds \right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \int \left(\int \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) \Gamma'_{\theta_{r,u}}(y) \rho(y) dy \right) \rho(u) du + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_{\ell}(X^{(1)}(s)) \bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \right) &= \int \theta_{\ell} \star \rho(x) \theta_r \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{T} \int \left(\int \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) \Gamma'_{\theta_{r,u}}(y) \rho(y) dy \right) \rho(u) du + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} O(1). \end{aligned}$$

This states a more precise result and ends the proof. \square

7.6. Proof of Theorem 1. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widetilde{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 &= \|\widehat{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} + \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c} \\ &= \left(\|\widehat{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)_{m,p}\|_V^2 + \|(b, \phi)_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} + \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c} \end{aligned}$$

where we use Pythagoras theorem: $(b, \phi)_{m,p} - (b, \phi)$ is orthogonal to $S_m \times \Sigma_p$ w.r.t the V -scalar product and thus V -orthogonal to $\widehat{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)_{m,p}$. Therefore

$$\|\widetilde{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 \leq \|\widehat{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)_{m,p}\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} + \|(b, \phi)_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 + \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c}$$

The middle rhs term is the squared bias term. Let us study the two others. We write, on $\Delta_{m,p}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)_{m,p}\|_V^2 &= \|\widehat{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}_{m,p} - (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \\ &= \|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}) + \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}) + (\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \\ &\leq 3\|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 + 3\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 + 3\|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &:= \|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \\ T_2 &:= \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \\ T_3 &:= \|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \\ T_4 &:= \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c} \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\widetilde{(\widehat{b}, \widehat{\phi})}_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2) \leq \|(b, \phi)_{m,p} - (b, \phi)\|_V^2 + 3\mathbb{E}(T_1 + T_2 + T_3) + \mathbb{E}(T_4).$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is structured in a study of the terms, $\mathbb{E}(T_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ and relies on the results stated in Propositions 5 , 6 and Lemma 2.

• Study of $T_4 = \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c}$. For this term, we have

Lemma 4. *Under [H5], it holds*

$$(34) \quad \mathbb{E}(T_4) = \mathbb{E}(\|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c}) \leq (4 + 1/4)s_0^2 \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \mathbb{E}\left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2\right).$$

The bound for $\mathbb{E}(T_4)$ follows then from Proposition 6,

$$\mathbb{E}(T_4) \lesssim s_0^2 \|(b, \phi)\|_V^2 \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Let

$$(35) \quad \Omega_{m,p} = \left\{ \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}} < \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

We write that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c) = \mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c \cap \Omega_{m,p}) + \mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c \cap \Omega_{m,p}^c).$$

We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{m,p}^c) \leq 4\mathbb{E}\left(\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}}^2\right) \leq 4\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbb{E}\left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2\right).$$

Therefore, using [H5],

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c \cap \Omega_{m,p}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{m,p}^c) \leq 4s_0^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right).$$

Next, on $\Delta_{m,p}^c$, due to [H5], it holds that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} > s_0$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c \cap \Omega_{m,p}) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} > s_0\}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{s_0^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right).$$

Using (47), we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta_{m,p}^c \cap \Omega_{m,p}) \leq \frac{s_0^2}{4} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right).$$

Adding both bounds gives (34) and concludes the proof of Lemma 4. \square

- Study of $T_3 = \|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}$.

Using (28) and Lemma 2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(T_3) &\leq 2\|\rho\|_{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right) \|\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m,p}}^2 \\ (36) \quad &\leq 80.5 s_0^4 \|\rho\|_{\infty} \mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2) \|\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can prove the following result:

Lemma 5. *We have*

$$\|\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 \leq 2\|\rho\|_{\infty} \|b + \phi \star \rho\|_{\rho}^2 = 2\|\rho\|_{\infty} \|(b, \phi)\|_{\mathbf{V}}^2.$$

Thus, by (36), Proposition 6 and Lemma 5, we obtain,

$$\mathbb{E}(T_3) \lesssim s_0^4 \frac{L_{\varphi}(m)}{T}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5. First, we note that, using (16) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 &= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\int \varphi_k(x) [b(x) + \phi \star \rho(x)] \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\int \theta_{\ell} \star \rho(x) [b(x) + \phi \star \rho(x)] \rho(x) dx \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using again the relation $\int (u \star v) w = \int u (v_- \star w)$ with $v_-(x) = v(-x)$ yields

$$\int \theta_{\ell} \star \rho(x) [(b(x) + \phi \star \rho(x))] \rho(x) dx = \int \theta_{\ell}(x) (b + \phi \star \rho) \rho \star \rho_-(x) dx.$$

Therefore, by the projection argument and the Young inequality ($\|u \star v\| \leq \|u\|_1 \|v\|$) as $\|\rho\|_1 = 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 &\leq \int (b + \phi \star \rho)^2 \rho^2 + \int [(b + \phi \star \rho) \rho \star \rho_-]^2 \\ &\leq \int (b + \phi \star \rho)^2 \rho^2 + \|\rho_-\|_1^2 \int (b + \phi \star \rho)^2 \rho^2 \\ &\leq 2\|\rho\|_{\infty} \int (b + \phi \star \rho)^2 \rho = 2\|\rho\|_{\infty} \|(b, \phi)\|_{\mathbf{V}}^2. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

- Study of $\mathbb{E}(T_2)$. Using [H5] and (28) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(T_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2 \right) \leq \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right) \\ &\leq s_0 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 5 yields that

$$(37) \quad \mathbb{E}(T_2) \lesssim s_0 \frac{L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p)}{T}.$$

- Study of $T_1 = \|(\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1})(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p})\|_{\mathbf{V}_{m,p}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}$. By (28),

$$T_1 \leq 2\|\rho\|_\infty (\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}}) \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2.$$

As the two factors of the right-hand-side are independent

$$\mathbb{E}(T_1) \leq 2\|\rho\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 \right).$$

Using Lemma 2 we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right) \leq (40 + 1/4)s_0^4 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right),$$

$$\mathbb{E}(T_1) \leq 2(40 + 1/4)s_0^4 \|\rho\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2 \right).$$

By applying Proposition 5 and 6 and using $L_\varphi(m) \leq T$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(T_1) \lesssim s_0^4 \frac{L_\varphi(m) + L_\theta(p)}{T}.$$

Gathering the five bounds ends the proof of Theorem 1. \square

7.7. Proof of Proposition 5. We have

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{Z}_{m,p}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{m+p}}^2] &= \frac{\sigma^4}{4} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove two lemmas for each term of the r.h.s.

Lemma 6. *Assume that φ_k is a differentiable and bounded basis. Let $g_k := \Gamma_{\varphi'_k}$ be defined by $Lg_k = [\varphi'_k - \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx]$ (see Proposition 3). Then,*

$$(39) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} \int [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{8}{T^2} \int g_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Lemma 7. Recall $\bar{\theta}'_\ell(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta'_\ell(x - X^{(4)}(t)) dt$. Let $G_{x,\ell}$ be defined by

$LG_{x,\ell}(y) = \theta'_\ell(x - y) - \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x)$ and h_ℓ be defined by $Lh_\ell = \theta'_\ell \star \rho - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 &\leq \frac{4\sigma^2}{T} \int (G'_{x,k}(y))^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy \\ &+ \frac{8}{T^2} \int (G_{x,\ell}(y))^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy \\ &+ \frac{4\sigma^2}{T} \int [h'_\ell(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{8}{T^2} \int [h_\ell(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{L_\theta(p)}{T}.$$

From the two Lemmas and formula (38), we get the result of Proposition 5. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. By definition of L and $g_k := \Gamma_{\varphi'_k}$ and Proposition 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi'_k(x) \rho(x) dx &= \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T g'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) dW_3(s) \\ &+ \frac{1}{T} [g_k(X^{(3)}(0)) - g_k(X^{(3)}(T))], \end{aligned}$$

and consequently by (15),

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi'_k(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi'_k \rho \right)^2 \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} \int [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{8}{T^2} \int g_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

This yields inequality (39).

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} g'_k(x) &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(x)} \int_{-\infty}^x \left(\varphi'_k(y) - \int \varphi'_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right) \rho(y) dy \\ &= -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} \left(\varphi'_k(y) - \int \varphi'_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right) \rho(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

We split the term

$$\int [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx = \int_0^{+\infty} [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^0 [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx := \frac{4}{\sigma^4} (I_+ + I_-)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_+ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left[\int_x^{+\infty} \left(\varphi'_k(y) - \int \varphi'_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right) \rho(y) dy \right]^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \varphi'_k(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 + 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \int \varphi'_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now we write by integration by part,

$$\int_x^{+\infty} \varphi'_k(y) \rho(y) dy = -\varphi_k(x) \rho(x) - \int_x^{+\infty} \varphi_k(y) \rho'(y) dy$$

as φ_j is bounded and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \rho(x) = 0$.

As a consequence for all $x > 0$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \varphi'_k(y) \rho(y) \mathbf{1}_{[x,+\infty)}(y) dy \right)^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left\{ \varphi_k^2(x) \rho^2(x) + \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \varphi_k(y) \rho'(y) \mathbf{1}_{[x,+\infty)}(y) dy \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq 2L_\varphi(m) \rho^2(x) + 2 \int_0^{+\infty} [\rho'(y)]^2 \mathbf{1}_{[x,+\infty)}(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

by using the usual projection argument. Thus

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \varphi'_k(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \leq 2L_\varphi(m) + 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} [\rho'(y)]^2 dy$$

where, thanks to some adaptation of Lemma 3, noting that $\rho'(y) = \rho(y) \times k(y)$ where $k(y)$ has polynomial growth, we can prove

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} [\rho'(y)]^2 dy = \int_0^{+\infty} [\rho'(y)]^2 \left(\int_0^y \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \right) dy < +\infty.$$

The second term is easier and analogous.

The term I_- is treated analogously using the second formula for g'_k . Therefore,

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{T} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int [g'_k(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Now, with $g_k(x) = \int_0^x g'_k(u) du$, we look at $\int g_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx$ and split it again into $\int_0^{+\infty} \dots + \int_{-\infty}^0 \dots$. We use that for $x \geq 0$,

$$[g_k(x)]^2 = \left(\int_0^x g'_k(u) du \right)^2 \leq x \int_0^x [g'_k(u)]^2 du.$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} g_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx &\leq \frac{2}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} x \rho(x) dx \int_0^x du \left(\frac{1}{\rho(u)} \int_u^{+\infty} \varphi'_k(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \\ &+ \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} x \rho(x) dx \int_0^x du \left(\frac{1}{\rho(u)} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \int \varphi'_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, with the same integration by part for $\int \varphi'_k \rho$ as previously, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} g_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx &\leq \frac{16}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} x \rho(x) dx \int_0^x du \left[L_\varphi(m) + \frac{1}{\rho^2(u)} \int_u^{+\infty} [\rho'(y)]^2 dy \right] \\ &+ \frac{16}{\sigma^4} \left(\int [\rho'(z)]^2 dz \right) \int_0^{+\infty} x \rho(x) dx \int_0^x du \frac{1}{\rho^2(u)} \left(\int_u^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3, all integrals being finite, we obtain the result. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. We have

$$\overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx = \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) - \theta'_\ell \star \rho(X^{(3)}(s)) + \theta'_\ell \star \rho(X^{(3)}(s)) - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

Then, for all x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\theta}'_\ell(x) - \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta'_\ell(x - X^{(4)}(t)) dt - \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T G'_{x,\ell}(X^{(4)}(t)) dW_4(t) + \frac{1}{T} [G'_{x,\ell}(X^{(4)}(0)) - G'_{x,\ell}(X^{(4)}(T))]. \end{aligned}$$

And,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta'_\ell \star \rho(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx = \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T h'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) dW_3(s) + \frac{1}{T} [h_\ell(X^{(3)}(0)) - h_\ell(X^{(3)}(T))].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T ds \left(\frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(t)) dW_3(t) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T ds \left(\frac{1}{T} [G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(0)) - G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(T))] \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T h'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) dW_3(s) + \frac{1}{T} [h_\ell(X^{(3)}(0)) - h_\ell(X^{(3)}(T))] \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T ds \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}^{X^{(3)}(s)} \int_0^T dt [G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(t))]^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T ds \frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}^{X^{(3)}(s)} [G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(0)) - G'_{X^{(3)}(s),\ell}(X^{(4)}(T))]^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\sigma^2}{T^2} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [h'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s))]^2 ds + \frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} [h_\ell(X^{(3)}(0)) - h_\ell(X^{(3)}(T))]^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{\theta}'_\ell(X^{(3)}(s)) ds - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x) \rho(x) dx \right)^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T} \int [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T^2} \int [G_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy + \frac{1}{T} \int [h'_\ell(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{1}{T^2} \int [h_\ell(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have to study $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1}$ for each of the above terms following the lines of Lemma 6. By formula (13), we have for $y \geq 0$,

$$G'_{x,\ell}(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} (\theta'_\ell(x-z) - \theta'_\ell \star \rho(x)) \rho(z) dz.$$

By integration by part, we obtain, for $y \geq 0$

$$G'_{x,\ell}(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \left\{ \theta_\ell(x-y) \rho(y) + \int_y^{+\infty} \theta_\ell(x-z) \rho'(z) dz - \theta_\ell \star \rho'(x) \int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right\}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 &= \frac{4}{\sigma^4} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left\{ \theta_\ell(x-y) + \frac{1}{\rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} \theta_\ell(x-z) \rho'(z) dz - \frac{\theta_\ell \star \rho'(x)}{\rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right\}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{12}{\sigma^4} \left(L_\theta(p) + \frac{1}{\rho^2(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} [\rho'(z)]^2 dz + \int (\rho')^2 \frac{\int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz}{\rho^2(y)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \int_0^{+\infty} [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(y) \rho(x) dx dy &\leq \frac{12}{\sigma^4} \left(L_\theta(p) + \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} [\rho'(z)]^2 dz dy \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int (\rho'(x))^2 \int_0^{+\infty} \int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Following the proof of Lemma 3, we prove that all integrals are finite. The same holds for the case $y \leq 0$. The order of the term is $L_\theta(p)$.

The terms $\int [G_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy$ are treated in a similar way with an additional integration due to the bound $G_{x,\ell}^2(y) \leq |x| \int_{[0,x]} [G'_{x,\ell}(u)]^2 du$. This yields the same order $L_\varphi(p)$ for the sum over ℓ .

Now, for the terms in h_ℓ , we note that

$$\theta'_\ell \star \rho - \int \theta'_\ell \star \rho \rho = \theta_\ell \star \rho' - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho' \rho.$$

By Formula (13), we get, for $x \geq 0$,

$$h'_\ell(x) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} \left(\theta_\ell \star \rho'(u) - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho'(z) \rho(z) dz \right) \rho(u) du$$

so that

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} [h'_\ell(x)]^2 \leq \frac{4}{\sigma^4 \rho^2(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \left(\theta_\ell \star \rho'(u) - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho'(z) \rho(z) dz \right) \rho(u) du \right)^2.$$

Now, note that for $x \geq 0$

$$\int_x^{+\infty} \theta_\ell \star \rho'(u) \rho(u) du = \int \theta_\ell(v) \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{u \geq x} \rho'(u-v) \rho(u) du \right) dv$$

which yields

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \theta_\ell \star \rho'(u) \rho(u) du \right)^2 \leq \int \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{u \geq x} \rho'(u-v) \rho(u) du \right)^2 dv.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \int_0^\infty [h'_\ell(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx &\leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \left\{ \int_0^{+\infty} \int \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{u \geq x} \rho'(u-v) \rho(u) du \right)^2 dv \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int \left(\int \rho'(u-v) \rho(u) du \right)^2 dv \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(u) du \right)^2 \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, this term is bounded by $C(\rho)/\sigma^4$ where $C(\rho)$ is a constant depending on ρ only.

We proceed as done several times previously with $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int_0^\infty h_k^2(x) \rho(x) dx$, which yields the same order. \square

7.8. Proof of Proposition 6. Recall that the matrices $\widehat{V}_{m,p}$ and $V_{m,p}$ are symmetric nonnegative. To obtain Proposition 6, we prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\text{Tr}(\widehat{V}_{m,p} - V_{m,p})^2 \right] \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Let us recall that for a function h , $\bar{h}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(x - X^{(2)}(s)) ds$. We have $\text{Tr}(\widehat{V}_{m,p} - V_{m,p})^2 = T_{11} + 2T_{12} + T_{22}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{11} = \text{Tr}(\widehat{V}^1 - V^1)^2 &= \sum_{j,k=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi_j \varphi_k \rho \right)^2 \\ T_{12} = \text{Tr}(\widehat{V}^{1,2} - V^{1,2})(\widehat{V}_{1,2} - V_{1,2})^\perp &= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho \varphi_k \rho \right)^2 \\ T_{22} = \text{Tr}(\widehat{V}^2 - V^2)^2 &= \sum_{\ell,r=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho \theta_r \star \rho \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8. We have $\mathbb{E}(T_{11}) \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T} + \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T^2}$

Proof of Lemma 8. Let $g_{jk}(x) = \Gamma_{\varphi_j \varphi_k}$ where Γ_h is defined in Proposition 3. We have:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \varphi_j \varphi_k \rho \right)^2 \leq \frac{2\sigma^2}{T} \int [g'_{jk}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{8}{T^2} \int g_{jk}^2(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

For each integral of the rhs, we write $\int = \int_{-\infty}^0 + \int_0^{+\infty}$ and use the appropriate expression of g_{jk} in each integral. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} [g'_{jk}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx &= \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} [\varphi_j(y) \varphi_k(y) - \int \varphi_j(z) \varphi_k(z) \rho(z) dz] \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left[\left(\int_x^{+\infty} [\varphi_j(y) \varphi_k(y) \rho(y) dy] \right)^2 + \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \left(\int \varphi_j(z) \varphi_k(z) \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} [\varphi_j(y)\varphi_k(y)\rho(y)dy] \right)^2 &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_x^{+\infty} \varphi_j^2(y)\rho^2(y)dy \\ &\leq L_\varphi(m) \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y)dy. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed analogously for the second term. This yields

$$\sum_{0 \leq j, k \leq m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} [g'_{jk}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx \leq c_1 L_\varphi(m),$$

with

$$\frac{\sigma^4}{4} c_1 = 2 \times \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy + 2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \int \rho^2(x) dx.$$

The integral on $(-\infty, 0)$ is treated analogously. This yields

$$\sum_{0 \leq j, k \leq m-1} \int [g'_{jk}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx \leq C_1 L_\varphi(m).$$

Next,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \rho(x) g_{jk}^2(x) dx \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \rho(x) x \int_0^x [g'_{jk}(y)]^2 dy = \int_{0 < y < x} x \rho(x) [g'_{jk}(y)]^2 dx dy.$$

We can compute as above

$$\rho^2(y) \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} [g'_{jk}(y)]^2 \leq 2L_\varphi(m) \int_y^{+\infty} \rho^2(z) dz + 2 \left(\int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \int \rho^2(u) du.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sigma^4}{4} \sum_{0 \leq j, k \leq m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} \rho(x) g_{jk}^2(x) dx &\leq 2L_\varphi(m) \int_{0 < y < x, y < z} x \frac{\rho(x)\rho^2(z)}{\rho^2(y)} dx dy dz \\ &\quad + 4L_\varphi(m) \int_{0 < y < x, y < z < z'} x \frac{\rho(x)\rho(z)\rho(z')}{\rho^2(y)} dx dy dz dz' \int \rho^2(u) du, \end{aligned}$$

where all the integrals are finite. Analogously, $\int_{-\infty}^0 \rho(x) g_{jk}^2(x) dx \lesssim L_\varphi(m)$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 9. $\mathbb{E}T_{12} \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T} + \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T} + \frac{1}{T^2}$.

Proof of Lemma 9.

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \varphi_k(x) \rho(x) dx = T_1(k, \ell) + T_2(k, \ell)$$

$$T_1(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T [\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))] \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds$$

$$T_2(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) \varphi_k(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

The second term is easier. Set $h_{\ell k} = \Gamma_{\varphi_k \theta_\ell \star \rho}$ so that

$$T_2(k, \ell) = \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T h'_{\ell k}(X^{(1)}(s)) dW_1(s) + \frac{1}{T} [h_{\ell k}(X^{(1)}(0)) - h_{\ell k}(X^{(1)}(T))].$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_2(k, \ell)]^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T} \int [h'_{\ell k}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx + \frac{1}{T^2} \int h_{\ell k}^2(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

We must compute, for $x > 0$, (and then for $x < 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sigma^2}{4} \rho^2(x) \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int [h'_{\ell k}(x)]^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \theta_\ell \star \rho(y) \varphi_k(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \left(\int \theta_\ell \star \rho(y) \varphi_k(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int_x^{+\infty} [\theta_\ell \star \rho(y)]^2 \rho^2(y) dy + 2 \int [\theta_\ell \star \rho(y)]^2 \rho^2(y) dy \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int_x^{+\infty} [\theta_\ell \star \rho(y)]^2 \rho^2(y) dy &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int_x^{+\infty} \left(\int \theta_\ell(z) \rho(y-z) dz \right)^2 \rho^2(y) dy \\ &\leq \int_x^{+\infty} \int \rho^2(y-z) dz \rho^2(y) dy = \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy \int \rho^2(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int [\theta_\ell \star \rho(y)]^2 \rho^2(y) dy \leq \left(\int \rho^2(y) dy \right)^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} [h'_{\ell k}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx &\lesssim \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy \int \rho^2(u) du \\ &\quad + \left(\int \rho^2(y) dy \right)^2 \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed analogously for $\int_0^{+\infty}$.

The other term $\int [h_{jk}(x)]^2 \rho(x) dx$ is treated analogously.

This means that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{k, \ell} T_2^2(k, \ell) \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{T} + \frac{1}{T^2}.$$

Let us now study $T_1(k, \ell)$. This term contains the two trajectories $X^{(1)}$ and $X^{(2)}$. For each x , set $\theta_\ell(x-z) = \theta_{\ell, x}(z)$ and $G_{x, \ell} = \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell, x}}$ so that

$$\bar{\theta}_\ell(x) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(x) = \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T G'_{x, \ell}(X^{(2)}(t)) dW_2(t) + \frac{1}{T} [G_{x, \ell}(X^{(2)}(0)) - G_{x, \ell}(X^{(2)}(T))].$$

Recall that

$$G'_{x,\ell}(y) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} [\theta_\ell(x-z) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(x)] \rho(z) dz = -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \int_{-\infty}^y [\theta_\ell(x-z) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(x)] \rho(z) dz$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(k, \ell) &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \left[\frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T G'_{X^{(1)}(s), \ell}(X^{(2)}(t)) dW_2(t) \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \frac{1}{T} [G_{X^{(1)}(s), \ell}(X^{(2)}(0)) - G_{X^{(1)}(s), \ell}(X^{(2)}(T))] \\ &:= S_1(k, \ell) + S_2(k, \ell). \end{aligned}$$

We have:

$$S_1(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) G'_{X^{(1)}(s), \ell}(X^{(2)}(t)) ds \right] dW_2(t)$$

Using the independence of the two trajectories, we get

$$\mathbb{E} S_1^2(k, \ell) = \frac{1}{T^4} \int_0^T dt \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \varphi_k(X^{(1)}(s)) G'_{X^{(1)}(s), \ell}(X^{(2)}(t)) ds \right)^2 = \frac{1}{T} \int \varphi_k^2(x) [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy.$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{E} S_2^2(k, \ell) \leq \frac{2}{T^2} \int \varphi_k^2(x) [G_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy$. We have to compute $\sum_{k,\ell}$ of the two terms. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \int \varphi_k^2(x) [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy &\leq L_\varphi(m) \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(x) \rho(y) dx dy \\ &\lesssim L_\varphi(m) \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_0^{+\infty} [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(y) dy \right] \\ &+ L_\varphi(m) \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_{-\infty}^0 [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(y) dy \right] \end{aligned}$$

We only treat the term containing $\int_0^{+\infty}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_0^{+\infty} [G'_{x,\ell}(y)]^2 \rho(y) dy \right] &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_y^{+\infty} \theta_\ell(x-z) \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \right] \\
&+ \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int \theta_\ell(x-z) \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \left(\int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \right] \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int \theta_\ell(u) \mathbf{1}_{[y,+\infty)}(x-u) \rho(x-u) du \right)^2 \right] \\
&+ \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \int \rho(x) dx \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right)^2 \left(\int \theta_\ell(u) \rho(x-u) du \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) \frac{\rho(x-u)}{\rho(y)} \mathbf{1}_{x-u>y>0} dx dy du \\
&+ \int \rho(x) \rho^2(x-u) dx du \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\rho(y)} \left(\int_y^{+\infty} \rho(z) dz \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Using the bound on ρ and a previous study, we find that the second term above is finite. For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) \frac{\rho(x-u)}{\rho(y)} \mathbf{1}_{x-u>y>0} dx dy du \leq \int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{C(x-u-y)} \mathbf{1}_{x-u>y>0} dx dy du \\
&= \int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{C(x-u)} \int_0^{x-u} e^{-Cy} dy \mathbf{1}_{x-u>0} dx dy du \\
&= \int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{C(x-u)} \mathbf{1}_{x-u>0} dx du - \int \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{-C(x-u)} \mathbf{1}_{x-u>0} dx du \\
&= \int du e^{-Cu} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{Cx} dx - \int du e^{Cu} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{-Cx} dx
\end{aligned}$$

The two terms of the sum are analogous. We look at the first one. For this, we compute, using Proposition 1 (where b is given):

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(x) \rho(x-u) &\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2} [(x+b)^2 + (x-u+b)^2] \right) \\
&\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2} (u^2/2) \right) \exp \left(-\frac{2(K+\lambda)}{\sigma^2} [(x+b-(u/2))]^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_u^{+\infty} \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{Cx} \lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2} (u^2/2) \right) \int e^{Cx} \exp \left(-\frac{2(K+\lambda)}{\sigma^2} [(x+b-(u/2))]^2 \right) dx \\
&\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2} (u^2/2) \right) e^{C((u/2)-b)} \int e^{Cz} \exp \left(-\frac{2(K+\lambda)}{\sigma^2} z^2 \right) dz \\
&\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2} (u^2/2) \right) e^{C((u/2)-b)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\int du e^{-Cu} \int_u^{+\infty} \rho(x) \rho(x-u) e^{Cx} dx \lesssim \int du \exp\left(-\frac{K+\lambda}{\sigma^2}(u^2/2)\right) e^{-C(u/2)} < +\infty.$$

This means that

$$\sum_{k,l} \mathbb{E} S_1^2(k, \ell) \lesssim \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T}.$$

Now, we look at $\sum_{k,\ell} \mathbb{E} S_2^2(k, \ell)$. This brings no new difficulty and we can prove that this sum is bounded by a constant $\times \frac{L_\varphi(m)}{T^2}$. \square

Lemma 10. $\mathbb{E}(T_{22}) \lesssim \frac{1}{T}$

Proof of Lemma 10. We write the decomposition

$$T_{2,2} = \sum_{0 \leq \ell, r \leq p-1} (A_1(\ell, r) + A_2(\ell, r) + A_3(\ell, r) + A_4(\ell, r))^2$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\ell, r) &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) (\bar{\theta}_r(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) ds \\ A_2(\ell, r) &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (\bar{\theta}_\ell(X^{(1)}(s)) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s))) \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) ds \\ A_3(\ell, r) &= A_2(r, \ell) \\ A_4(\ell, r) &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \theta_\ell \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) \theta_r \star \rho(X^{(1)}(s)) ds - \int \theta_\ell \star \rho \theta_r \star \rho \rho. \end{aligned}$$

We only treat the term $A_1(\ell, r)$ as the other ones are easier and analogous terms have been already treated previously.

Using that $[(1/T) \int_0^T \Phi(u) du]^2 \leq (1/T) \int_0^T \Phi^2(u) du$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sum_{r,\ell} A_1^2(\ell, r) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{r,\ell} \int [(\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u)) (\bar{\theta}_r(u) - \theta_r \star \rho(u))]^2 \rho(u) du \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} (\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u))^2 \right) \left(\sum_{r=0}^{p-1} (\bar{\theta}_r(u) - \theta_r \star \rho(u))^2 \right) \rho(u) du \right\} \\ (40) \quad &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} (\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u))^2 \right)^2 \rho(u) du \right\} := \mathbb{A}_1 \end{aligned}$$

We first work on the sums and write each as e.g. $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \langle \varphi_\ell, \Xi \rangle^2$ for some complicated and random Ξ , in order to upper bound the term by $\int \Xi^2$.

Recall that

$$\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) = \frac{\sigma}{T} \int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_\ell, u}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) + \frac{1}{T} (\Gamma_{\theta_\ell, u}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_\ell, u}(X^{(2)}(T))),$$

with $\theta_{\ell,u}(z) = \theta_\ell(u - z)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y) &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{v \leq y} \theta_\ell(u - v) \rho(v) dv - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) \int_{-\infty}^y \rho(v) dv \right) \\ (41) \quad &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{u-z \leq y} \varphi_\ell(z) \rho(u - z) dz - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) \int_{-\infty}^y \rho(v) dv \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$(42) \quad = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(y)} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{u-z \geq y} \theta_\ell(z) \rho(u - z) dz - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) \int_y^{+\infty} \rho(v) dv \right).$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} (\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u))^2 \leq \frac{2}{T^2} (\sigma^2 B_1(u) + C_1(u)),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} B_1(u) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) \right)^2 \\ C_1(u) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} (\Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(0)) - \Gamma_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(T)))^2 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$(43) \quad \mathbb{A}_1 = \int \rho(u) du \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} (\bar{\theta}_\ell(u) - \theta_\ell \star \rho(u))^2 \right) \leq \frac{8}{T^4} (\sigma^4 \int \rho(u) du B_1^2(u) + \int \rho(u) du C_1^2(u)),$$

We work on $B_1(u)$ and split it into in order to use the two forms of $\Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(y)$. We have:

$$\int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)} \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) + \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) \geq 0)} \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s)$$

Now, we use (41) for the first stochastic integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)} \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell,u}}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) &= \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s))} \theta_\ell(z) \rho(u - z) dz \right) dW_2(s) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \theta_\ell \star \rho(u) \int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{X^{(2)}(s)} \rho(v) dv \right) dW_2(s) \end{aligned}$$

By the stochastic Fubini theorem (see *e.g.* Hutton and Nelson, 1984, Lemma 2.1), we interchange the ordinary and the stochastic integral. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s))} \theta_\ell(z) \rho(u - z) dz \right) dW_2(s) \\ &= \int \theta_\ell(z) \rho(u - z) \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s) \right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the above equality, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
(44) \quad & \sum_{\ell} \left[\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \left(\int \mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s))} \theta_{\ell}(z) \rho(u-z) dz \right) dW_2(s) \right]^2 \\
&= \sum_{\ell} \left[\int \theta_{\ell}(z) \rho(u-z) \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s) \right) dz \right]^2 \\
&= \int \rho^2(u-z) \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s) \right)^2 dz \\
&= \int \rho^2(v) \mathbf{1}_{v < 0} M_T^2(v) dv
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$(45) \quad M_T(v) = \int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v \leq X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s).$$

More simply,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\ell} \left(\theta_{\ell} \star \rho(u) \int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \int_{-\infty}^{X^{(2)}(s)} \rho(v) dv dW_2(s) \right)^2 \\
&= \int \rho^2(z) dz \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \int_{-\infty}^{X^{(2)}(s)} \rho(v) dv dW_2(s) \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

We proceed in the same way for the term containing $\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}$ using the second expression of $\Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell}, u}(y)$. So that by gathering all terms, we have obtained

$$B_1(u) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} \left(\int_0^T \Gamma'_{\theta_{\ell}, u}(X^{(2)}(s)) dW_2(s) \right)^2 \lesssim B_{11}(u) + B_{12}(u) + B_{13}(u) + B_{14}(u)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{11}(u) &= \int \rho^2(u-z) dz \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(u-z \leq X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s) \right)^2 = \int \rho^2(v) \mathbf{1}_{v < 0} M_T^2(v) dv \\
B_{12}(u) &= \int \rho^2(z) dz \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \int_{-\infty}^{X^{(2)}(s)} \rho(v) dv dW_2(s) \right)^2 \\
B_{13}(u) &= \int \rho^2(u-z) dz \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(0 \leq X^{(2)}(s) < u-z)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} dW_2(s) \right)^2 \\
B_{14}(u) &= \int \rho^2(z) dz \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(X^{(2)}(s) > 0)}}{\rho(X^{(2)}(s))} \int_{X^{(2)}(s)}^{+\infty} \rho(v) dv dW_2(s) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\int \rho(u) B_1^2(u) du \lesssim 4 \sum_{i=1}^4 \int \rho(u) B_{1i}^2(u) du.$$

We only look at the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \rho(u) B_{11}^2(u) du &= \int \rho(u) \rho^2(v) \rho^2(v') \mathbf{1}_{v < 0, v' < 0} M_T^2(v) M_T^2(v') dudvdv' \\ &= \int \rho^2(v) \rho^2(v') \mathbf{1}_{v < 0, v' < 0} M_T^2(v) M_T^2(v') dv dv'. \end{aligned}$$

We have to take the expectation of the above term. Hence, we deal with $\mathbb{E}(M_T^2(v) M_T^2(v'))$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities yields

$$\mathbb{E}(M_T^2(v) M_T^2(v')) \leq (\mathbb{E}(M_T^4(v)) \mathbb{E}(M_T^4(v')))^{1/2} \lesssim (\mathbb{E}(\langle M(v) \rangle_T^2) \mathbb{E}(\langle M(v') \rangle_T^2))^{1/2}.$$

We have (see (45)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\langle M(v) \rangle_T^2) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho^2(X^{(2)}(s))} ds \right)^2 \leq T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < X^{(2)}(s) < 0)}}{\rho^4(X^{(2)}(s))} \right) ds \\ &= T^2 \int \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < x < 0)}}{\rho^3(x)} dx \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \rho(u) B_{11}^2(u) du &\lesssim T^2 \int \rho^2(v) \rho^2(v') \mathbf{1}_{v < 0, v' < 0} \left(\int \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < x < 0)}}{\rho^3(x)} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v' < x' < 0)}}{\rho^3(x')} dx dx' \right)^{1/2} dv dv' \\ &= T^2 \left[\int \rho^2(v) \mathbf{1}_{v < 0} \left(\int \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < x < 0)}}{\rho^3(x)} dx \right)^{1/2} dv \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

We split $\rho^2(v) = \rho^{1/2}(v) \rho^{3/2}(v)$ and get:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \rho(u) B_{11}^2(u) du &= T^2 \left[\int \rho^{1/2}(v) \mathbf{1}_{v < 0} \left(\int \rho^3(v) \frac{\mathbf{1}_{(v < x < 0)}}{\rho^3(x)} dx \right)^{1/2} dv \right]^2 \\ &\leq T^2 \left[\int \rho^{1/2}(v) \mathbf{1}_{v < 0} \exp[-(3/2)Cv] \left(\int_v^0 \exp(3Cxdx) \right)^{1/2} dv \right]^2 \\ &\lesssim T^2. \end{aligned}$$

Dealing analogously with the other terms, we finally find (see (40) and (43)):

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbb{A}_1 \lesssim \frac{1}{T^2}.$$

The proof of Lemma 10 is complete. \square

7.9. Proof of Lemma 2. We split the expectation along

$$\Omega_{m,p} = \left\{ \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}} < \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

(see (35)) and its complement. On the complement, we have, by the definition of $\Delta_{m,p}$ ((26)),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}^c} \right) &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left((\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 + \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2) \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}^c} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}^c} \right) \\ &\leq 10 s_0^2 \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{m,p}^c) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{m,p}^c) \leq 4\mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right) \leq 4\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right).$$

Thus, gathering the last two inequalities, we get, using [H5],

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}^c} \right) \leq 40s_0^4 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right).$$

For the other term, we have with [H5],

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right) \leq s_0^2 \mathbb{E} \left(\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right).$$

Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}$. Then we use the following theorem:

Theorem. (Stewart and Sun (1990)) *Let \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} be $(m \times m)$ matrices. If \mathbf{A} is invertible and $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}} < 1$, then $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} := \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}$ is invertible and it holds*

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}}}.$$

We have $\|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}} = \|\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}} < 1/2$ on $\Omega_{m,p}$, so that $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} - \mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} &= \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{op}}} = \frac{\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}}}{1 - \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1/2} - \mathbf{Id}_{m+p}\|_{\text{op}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}}{2} \|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$(47) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{m,p}} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p}^{-1} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_{m,p}} \right) \leq \frac{s_0^4}{4} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{m,p} - \mathbf{V}_{m,p}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \right).$$

By (46) and (47), we get Lemma 2. \square

7.10. Proof of Proposition 7. Let $g_j := \Gamma_{\varphi_j}$ be such that $Lg_j = \varphi_j - \int \varphi_j \rho$, as defined in Proposition 3, which is such that by (13)

$$(48) \quad g'_j(x) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(x)} \int_{-\infty}^x (\varphi_j(y) - \int \varphi_j \rho) \rho(y) dy = -\frac{2}{\sigma^2 \rho(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} (\varphi_j(y) - \int \varphi_j \rho) \rho(y) dy,$$

and by (14)

$$(49) \quad \int_0^T \left(\varphi_j(X(s)) - \int \varphi_j \rho \right) ds = \sigma \int_0^T g'_j(X(s)) dW(s) + g_j(X(0)) - g_j(X(T)).$$

First by Pythagoras Theorem, the equality

$$(50) \quad \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\rho}_m - \rho\|^2 = \|\rho - \rho_m\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\rho}_m - \rho_m\|^2$$

holds. The result will follow from a bound on the second rhs term, $\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\rho}_m - \rho_m\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{a}_j - a_j)^2]$ which is the variance term.

By formula (49), and Inequality (15) in Proposition 3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\rho}_m - \rho_m\|^2) &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi_j(X(s)) ds - \int \varphi_j \rho \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left\{ \sigma^2 \int (g'_j)^2(x) \rho(x) dx + \frac{4}{T} \int g_j^2(x) \rho(x) dx \right\} := \frac{2}{T} (\mathbb{T}_1 + \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{T}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now we use (48), and write

$$\mathbb{T}_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} I_j^+ + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} I_j^-,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } I_j^- &= \frac{4}{\sigma^4} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\int_{-\infty}^x \varphi_k(y) \rho(y) dy - \left(\int \varphi_j \rho \right) \int_{-\infty}^x \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \frac{dx}{\rho(x)}, \\ I_j^+ &= \frac{4}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \varphi_k(y) \rho(y) dy - \left(\int \varphi_j \rho \right) \int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \frac{dx}{\rho(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Both terms are handled similarly, so we consider the first one only.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} I_j^+ &\leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} \varphi_j(y) \rho(y) dy \right)^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\int \varphi_j \rho \right)^2 \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \right\} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ \int_x^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy + \left(\int \rho^2 \right) \int_x^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right\} \frac{dx}{\rho(x)} \\ &\leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} C(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

where $C(\rho)$ is a finite constant coming from Lemma 3.

For \mathbb{T}_2 , we write $\mathbb{T}_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_{-\infty}^0 g_j^2 \rho + \int_0^{+\infty} g_j^2 \rho \right)$ and consider only the last sum, both terms being again similar. For $x \geq 0$, we write that

$$g_j^2(x) = \left(\int_0^x g'_j(u) du \right)^2 \leq x \int_0^x (g'_j)^2(u) du.$$

$$\text{Thus } \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} g_j^2(x) \rho(x) dx \leq \int_0^{+\infty} x \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left(\int_0^x (g'_j)^2(u) du \right) \rho(x) dx$$

Using (48), we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_0^{+\infty} g_j^2(x) \rho(x) dx \leq \frac{8}{\sigma^4} \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ \int_x^{+\infty} \left[\int_u^{+\infty} \rho^2(y) dy + \left(\int \rho^2 \right) \left(\int_u^{+\infty} \rho(y) dy \right)^2 \right] \frac{du}{\rho^2(u)} \right\} x \rho(x) dx.$$

This term is finite by Lemma 3. So \mathbb{T}_2 is bounded by say $C^*(\rho)/\sigma^4$. This yields

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{\rho}_m - \rho_m\|^2) \leq \frac{C(\rho)}{\sigma^4} \frac{1}{T} \left(1 + \frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Plugging this in (50) ends the proof of Proposition 7. \square