

ESTIMATION OF INTEGRATED QUADRATIC COVARIATION BETWEEN TWO ASSETS WITH ENDOGENOUS SAMPLING TIMES *

Yoann POTIRON and Per MYKLAND

March 1, 2018

Abstract

When estimating integrated covariation between two assets based on high-frequency data, simple assumptions are usually imposed on the relationship between the price processes and the observation times. In this paper, we introduce an endogenous 2-dimensional model and show that it is more general than the existing endogenous models of the literature. In addition, we establish a central limit theorem for the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator in this general endogenous model in the case where prices follow pure-diffusion processes.

1 Introduction

Covariation between two assets is a crucial quantity in finance. Fundamental examples include optimal asset allocation and risk management. In the past few years, using the increasing amount of high-frequency data available, many papers have been published about estimating this covariance. Suppose that the latent log-price of 2 assets $X = (X_t^{(1)}, X_t^{(2)})$ follows an Itô process

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^{(1)} &= \mu_t^{(1)} dt + \sigma_t^{(1)} dW_t^{(1)} \\ dX_t^{(2)} &= \mu_t^{(2)} dt + \sigma_t^{(2)} dW_t^{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_t^{(1)}, \mu_t^{(2)}, \sigma_t^{(1)}, \sigma_t^{(2)}$ are random processes, and $W_t^{(1)}$ and $W_t^{(2)}$ are standard Brownian motions, with (random) correlation $\text{corr}(W_t^{(1)}, W_t^{(2)}) = \rho_t$. Econometrics usually seeks to infer the integrated covariation $\langle X^{(1)}, X^{(2)} \rangle_t$

$$\langle X^{(1)}, X^{(2)} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \rho_t \sigma_t^{(1)} \sigma_t^{(2)} dt$$

Earlier results were focused on estimating the integrated variance between two assets, such as in probability theory (Genon-Catalot and Jacod (1993), Jacod (1994)). Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard

*We would like to thank Mathieu Rosenbaum and Steven Lalley for helpful discussions and advice. Financial support from the National Science Foundation under grant DMS 14-07812 is greatly acknowledged.

(2001, 2002) introduced the problem in econometrics. Adapted to multiple dimensions, if each process is observed simultaneously at (possibly random) times $0 = \tau_{0,n} < \tau_{1,n} < \dots < \tau_{N,n} = T$, the realized covariation $[X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}]_t$ is defined as the sum of cross log returns

$$[X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}]_t = \sum_{\tau_{i,n} \leq t} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}}^{(2)} \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}}^{(k)} = X_{\tau_{i,n}}^{(k)} - X_{\tau_{i-1,n}}^{(k)}$ for $i \geq 1$. As the observation intervals $\Delta\tau_{i,n}$ get closer (and the observation frequency N goes to infinity), $[X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}]_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \langle X^{(1)}, X^{(2)} \rangle_t$ (see e.g. Theorem I.4.47 in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003)). Furthermore, when the observation times $(\tau_{i,n})_{i \geq 0}$ are independent of X , its estimation error follows a mixed normal distribution (Jacod and Protter (1998), Zhang (2001), Mykland and Zhang (2006)). This gives us insight on how to estimate the integrated covariation. However, in practice, two assumptions are usually not satisfied

1. the observation times of the 2 assets are rarely synchronous
2. there is endogeneity in the price sampling times

The first issue has been studied for a long time. The lack of synchronicity often creates undesirable effects in inference. If we sample at very high frequencies, we observe the Epps effect (Epps (1979)), i.e. the correlation estimates are drastically decreased compared to an estimate with sparse observations. We can see the same effect for exchange rates (Guillaume et al. (1997), Muthuswamy et al. (2001)). Additionnally, asynchronicity can cause difficulties in daily data (Scholes and Williams (1977)). At first, the literature on estimating the covariance mostly relied on a forced synchronization of the data (see Lundin et al. (2001), Brandt and Diebold (2003) among others.), for instance choosing beforehand a window h , and interpolating the values of the two processes at times $(ih)_{i \geq 0}$. Hayashi and Yoshida (2005) introduced the so-called Hayashi-Yoshida estimator

$$\widehat{\langle X^{(1)}, X^{(2)} \rangle}_t = \sum_{\tau_{i,n}^{(1)}, \tau_{j,n}^{(2)} < t} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{(1)}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{j,n}^{(2)}}^{(2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{(1)}, \tau_{i,n}^{(1)}) \cap [\tau_{j-1,n}^{(2)}, \tau_{j,n}^{(2)}) \neq \emptyset\}} \quad (2)$$

where $(\tau_{i,n}^{(k)})_{i \geq 0}$ are the sampling times of asset k . Note that if the observations of both processes are synchronous, (1) and (2) are equal. The consistency of this estimator was originally achieved in a non-random volatility and independence between observation times and prices setting (Hayashi and Yoshida (2005)) before being extended to a general Itô-process price model, with unique assumption that the observation times are stopping times (Hayashi and Kusuoka (2008)). The corresponding central limit theorems were investigated in Hayashi and Yoshida (2008, 2011) under strong predictability of stopping times, which is a more restrictive assumption than only assuming they are stopping times but still allows some dependence between prices and observation times. Note that the second order asymptotic expansion was completed in Dalalyan and Yoshida (2011). Since then, most of the literature has been interested in suitable modifications of this estimator, or the use of a different estimator, that is robust to noisy observations (Zhang (2011), Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2011), Aït-Sahalia et al. (2010),

Christensen et al. (2010), Christensen et al. (2011) among others), with assumption of independence between the sampling times and the prices of the assets. Recently, Koike (2014, 2015) extended the pre-averaged Hayashi-Yoshida estimator first under predictability of stopping times, and then under a more general endogenous setting of stopping times. Interestingly, we can read in Remark 3.5(*i*) of Koike (2015) that under the assumptions chosen, the observation times affect the asymptotic distribution of the realized covariance estimator only through the asymptotic variance, but not through the asymptotic bias. This contrasts with the case of the realized volatility in a pure diffusion setting (Fukasawa (2010b)).

In a general endogenous model, the asymptotic behaviour of (1) in 1-dimension (i.e. $a = 1$ asset) has been investigated in the case of sampling times given by hitting times on a regular grid (Fukasawa (2010a)). The model with uncertainty zones, a more intricate model based on hitting times of random and time-dependent grid, was introduced and studied in Robert and Rosenbaum (2011, 2012). Also, a central limit theorem under hitting times of a non-random, non-time dependent but irregular grid was established in Fukasawa and Rosenbaum (2012). Note that due to the regularity of those three models (see the discussion in the latter paper), we don't observe any bias in the limit distribution. Also, the case of strongly predictable stopping times is treated in Hayashi et al. (2011). Two general results (Fukasawa (2010b), Li and al. (2014)) showed that we can identify and estimate the bias in the limit distribution. As a consequence, we can slightly modify the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator to obtain a better estimator.

As far as the authors know, no investigation of a possible bias in an endogenous model has been carried in the two-dimensional case. This work can be considered as one of the last building blocks of the wall of the limit theory of the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator in a pure-diffusion setting, because we choose to work under the weakest assumptions (adapted to our proofs) regarding the observation times. We describe the asymptotic theory under a general model. It is clear from the work done in 1-dimension that we will obtain (at least in some cases) an asymptotic bias and a different asymptotic variance that we would have expected if we considered independence between sampling times and asset prices. Nevertheless, because of the asynchronicity in the observation times, estimating it is much more challenging. In particular, in the model we introduce, we haven't found any simple conditions such that the convergence of the tricity and the quarticity (Li and al. (2014)), involving only observable variables, to estimate the asymptotic quantities. Estimators in 2-dimension would involve underlying quantities (that we can estimate), such that the volatility of both assets, and we are very doubtful of the existence of other estimators that would only use observable quantities.

Because the authors want to take no position on the joint distribution of the log-return and the waiting time before the next trade of an asset when we have just observed a change of price, we introduce the 1-dimensional hitting times of a random time dependent grid model, which under some conditions will be more general than the models in the existing literature, for instance the model with uncertainty zones or the structural autoregressive conditional duration model (Renault et al. (2012)).

Even though the mixing variables (to keep the notations of the paper) $\tilde{\mu}_{t_i} = \mu_{t_i}(M_i)$ and $\tilde{c}_{t_i} = c_{t_i}(M_i)$ introduced in (1), (4) and (5) of the dynamic mixed hitting-time model (Renault et al. (2012)) can generate all kinds of autoregressive or log-autoregressive dynamics, it only partly accomodates for what Russell (1999) notes “The problem is that it is difficult to model the distribution of a duration when new information can arrive within a duration”. Indeed, even in 1-dimension the model doesn’t capture new information arriving between two trades, because $\mu_{t_i}(\cdot)$ and $c_{t_i}(\cdot)$ must be known with information at time t_i . One natural way to accomodate for new information to arrive between two trades is to allow $\mu_{t_i}(\cdot)$ and $c_{t_i}(\cdot)$ to be time dependent and thus we would need all of the information up to t to know them. Needless to say that if we consider the information I_t of only the observed price process, then the information we have for $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$ I_t and the information up to the i -th trade I_{t_i} will be the same. But in the case where I_t is defined as the information of the observed price together with any information on the underlying (unobserved) price-process or (unobserved) volatility (such that for instance new arrivals in the limit order book), relaxing the assumption on the two mixing mappings will be relevant. One other advantage of our model is that there is a straightforward and natural extension to the multidimensional case.

The paper is organized as follows. We introduce the hitting times of a random time dependent grid model in Section 2. Examples covered by this model are given in Section 3. The main theorem on the limit distribution of the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator is developed in Section 4. Proof of the main theorem is in Section 5.

2 Definition of the model

We first introduce the model in 1-dimension. Suppose that X is the log-price of the security of interest. The sampling times of the asset are given by $(\tau_i)_{i \geq 0}$. In practice, we can only observe the time of a trade, and the price at which the transaction was done. If we suppose no observation error both in the price of the transaction (i.e. the well-known microstructure noise, which can be explained among other things by the discreteness of prices, or the bid-ask mechanism) and in the time of the trade (one reason for this noise could be that there is a lag between the time when a market actor puts an order and the time when this order is executed), it means that we observe the 2-dimensional random variables

$$\left(\Delta X_{\tau_i}, \Delta \tau_i \right)$$

where $\Delta \tau_i = \tau_i - \tau_{i-1}$. In all generality, the space \mathcal{E} of all possible joint-distributions $(\Delta X_{\tau_i}, \Delta \tau_i)$ is very large, but it is only natural to make assumptions to consider only a subspace of \mathcal{E} . After all, this is what we do when we restrict ourselves to the case where X follows an Itô-process, for instance. With this goal in mind, we define the auxiliary process (that we will call the sampling process) X^τ that will drive the observation times, together with the random time dependent grid functions $g_t = (d_t, u_t)$, with g_t functions from \mathbb{R}^+ to $(\mathbb{R}^-, \mathbb{R}^+)$, and where “d” stands for “price will go down” and “u” stands

for “price will go up” in the following way. We define $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i > 0$

$$\tau_i = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1} : \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1}, t]}^\tau \notin \left[d_t(t - \tau_{i-1}), u_t(t - \tau_{i-1}) \right] \right\}$$

where $Y_{[a,b]} := Y_b - Y_a$. In addition, we suppose that the 2-dimensional process (X, X^τ) is an Itô-process. To give an insight on what the sampling process and the random time dependent grid functions can look like, the lector can read Section 3.

The generalization to 2-dimensional process is straightforward. If we set $\zeta_t = \sigma_t \sigma_t^T$, then the (matrix) integrated covariance process is given as $\langle X, X \rangle_t = \int_0^t \zeta_s ds$. This process is also known as the quadratic covariation of X . We also let ρ the associated correlation process of X , i.e. $\forall i, j, \rho^{i,j} = \frac{\zeta^{i,j}}{\zeta^{i,i}}$. Finally, we define the 4-dimensional vector $\Sigma := (\sigma^{(k)})_{k=1,2,3,4}$ with $\sigma^{(k)} := \zeta^{k,k}$, we can express Y as

$$dY_t = \mu_t dt + \Sigma_t dB_t$$

where $B := (B^{(1)}, B^{(2)}, B^{(3)}, B^{(4)})$ with each $B^{(i)}$ being a Brownian motion, which is typically dependent with the other ones.

3 Examples covered by the model

In this section, we pick some examples of the literature (in 1-dimension) and show that our model is more general.

Example 1. (*times generated by hitting a constant barrier*) The usual definition of the model is $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i \geq 1$

$$\tau_i = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1} : \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1}, t]} = a \text{ or } \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1}, t]} = -b \right\}$$

With our new model, we have $X^\tau = X$ and for any non-negative t and s , $d_t(s) = -b$ and $u_t(s) = a$

Example 2. (*model with uncertainty zones*) We follow the notations of Robert and Rosenbaum (2012) and introduce a sequence $(L_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of \mathcal{F}_{τ_i} -measurable discrete variables which represent the absolute in number of ticks of the price jump between the i -th and the $(i+1)$ -th transaction leading to a price change, with $L_i \geq 1$. Let $0 < \eta < 1$ a parameter that quantifies the aversion to price changes (with respect to the tick size) of the market participants. Define also $X_t^{(\alpha)}$ the value of X_t rounded to the nearest multiple of α . Then, define recursively $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i \geq 1$

$$\tau_i = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1} : X_t = X_{\tau_{i-1}}^{(\alpha)} - \alpha \left(L_i - \frac{1}{2} + \eta \right) \text{ or } X_t = X_{\tau_{i-1}}^{(\alpha)} + \alpha \left(L_i - \frac{1}{2} + \eta \right) \right\}$$

In our model, we have that for all $t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$, for all $s \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} X^\tau &= X \\ d_t(s) &= -L_{i-1} \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_{i-1}} < X_{\tau_{i-2}}\}} - (2\eta + L_{i-1} - 1) \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_{i-1}} > X_{\tau_{i-2}}\}} \\ u_t(s) &= L_{i-1} \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_{i-1}} > X_{\tau_{i-2}}\}} + (2\eta + L_{i-1} - 1) \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_{i-1}} < X_{\tau_{i-2}}\}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator function of A

Example 3. (*times generated by hitting an irregular grid*) We follow the notations of Fukasawa and Rosenbaum (2012) and consider the irregular grid $\mathcal{G} = \{p_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, with $p_k < p_{k+1}$. We set $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i \geq 1$

$$\tau_i = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1} : X_t \in \mathcal{G} - \{X_{\tau_{i-1}}\} \right\}$$

where $\mathcal{G} - \{X_{\tau_{i-1}}\}$ means that we removed $\{X_{\tau_{i-1}}\}$ of \mathcal{G} . We can rewrite it for all $t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$, for all $s \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} X^\tau &= X \\ d_t(s) &= p_{k-1} - p_k \\ u_t(s) &= p_{k+1} - p_k \end{aligned}$$

where k is the (random) index such that $p_k = X_{\tau_{i-1}}$.

Example 4. (*structural autoregressive conditional duration model*) There has been several drafts for this model. We follow here a former version (Renault, van der Heijden and Werker (2009)), because we can directly adapt our model. Setting our model as a first hitting-time of a unique barrier instead of the exiting-time zone of a zone (or first hitting time of one of two barriers) as in Renault et al. (2014) wouldn't change much the proofs of this paper, but we choose the exiting-time zone setting because it seems more natural as a generalization of Example 1. In the structural autoregressive conditional duration model, the time τ_i when the next event occurs is given by $\tau_0 = 0$ and for $i > 0$

$$\tau_i = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1} : A_t - A_{\tau_{i-1}} = \tilde{d}_{\tau_{i-1}} \text{ or } A_t - A_{\tau_{i-1}} = \tilde{c}_{\tau_{i-1}} \right\}$$

where A is a standard Brownian motion (not necessarily independent of X). Embedded in our model, we have for all $t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$, for all positive s

$$\begin{aligned} X^\tau &= A \\ d_t(s) &= \tilde{d}_{\tau_{i-1}} \\ u_t(s) &= \tilde{c}_{\tau_{i-1}} \end{aligned}$$

We can see that by allowing the function $g_t = (d_t, u_t)$ to depend on s , but also on t when $t \in (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i]$ and X^τ to be more general than a standard Brownian motion, our model captures a larger subsample of \mathcal{E} .

4 Main result

Without loss of generality, we fix the horizon time $T = 1$, and we consider $[0, 1]$ to represent the course of an economic event, such that an economic day. We first introduce the well-known definition of stable convergence, which is a little bit stronger than convergence in distribution and needed for the statistical purpose of any construction of confidence intervals for instance.

Definition 1. We suppose that the random processes Y_t , μ_t and σ_t are adapted to a filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) . We let Z_n be a sequence of \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable random variables. We say that Z_n converges stably in distribution to Z as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if Z is measurable with respect to an extension of \mathcal{F}_1 so that for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and for all bounded continuous function f , $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_A f(Z_n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_A f(Z)]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that continuous function f refers to continuity with respect to the Skorokhod topology of $\mathbb{D}[0, 1]$. Nevertheless, we can also use the continuity given by the sup-norm, because all our limits are in $\mathbb{C}[0, 1]$. One can consult Chapter VI of Jacod and Shiryaev (2003) as a reference. For further discussion of stable convergence, one can look at Rényi (1963), Aldous and Eagleson (1978), Chapter 3 (p. 56) of Hall and Heyde (1980), Rootzén (1980), and Section 2 (pp. 169-170) of Jacod and Protter (1998).

In this setting, the target of inference - the integrated covariation - can be written $\forall t \in [0, 1]$ as :

$$\langle X^{(1)}, X^{(2)} \rangle_t = \int_0^t \zeta_s^{1,2} ds = \int_0^t \sigma_s^{(1)} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} ds$$

We are going to consider that the grid functions tend uniformly to 0 to obtain a central limit theorem. This is a classical type of asymptotic to make the number of observations go to infinity. For this purpose, we define for $\alpha > 0$ $T_\alpha := \left(\tau_{i,\alpha}^{(k)} \right)_{i \geq 0, k=1,2}$ such that $\tau_{0,\alpha}^{(k)} = 0$ and for $i \geq 1$:

$$\tau_{i,\alpha}^{(k)} = \inf \left\{ t > \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(k)} : \Delta X_t^{(k+2)} \notin \left[\alpha d_t^{(k)}(t - \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(k)}), \alpha u_t^{(k)}(t - \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(k)}) \right] \right\}$$

In the following we will drop the α index when $\alpha = 1$. Finally, we define the usual HY estimator :

$$\widehat{RCV}_{t,\alpha} = \sum_{0 < \tau_{i,\alpha}^{(1)}, \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} < t} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{(1)}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)}}^{(2)} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ [\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)}, \tau_{i,\alpha}^{(1)}) \cap [\tau_{j-1,\alpha}^{(2)}, \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)}) \neq \emptyset \right\}} \quad (3)$$

Assumptions. • (A1) μ, σ and W are adapted to a filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) . Also, μ is integrable and locally bounded. Finally, σ is continuous, and if λ_t^{\min} is the smallest eigen-value of σ_t , then $\inf_{t \in (0,1]} \lambda_t^{\min} > 0$ a.s.

- (A2) $\forall t \in [0, 1]$

$$\rho_t^{3,4} \in [\rho_-^{3,4}, \rho_+^{3,4}] \quad (4)$$

where $\max(-\rho_-^{3,4}, \rho_+^{3,4}) < 1$

- (A3) $g := (g^{(k)})_{k=1,2} := (d^{(k)}, u^{(k)})_{k=1,2}$ where

$$\begin{cases} g^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^+ & \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^+) \\ t & \mapsto g_t^{(k)} \end{cases}$$

is adapted to (\mathcal{F}_t) . Moreover, there exists two non-random constants $0 < g^- < g^+$ such that $\forall t \in [0, 1], \forall s \geq 0$:

$$g^- \leq \min \left(-d_t^{(k)}(s), u_t^{(k)}(s) \right) \leq \max \left(-d_t^{(k)}(s), u_t^{(k)}(s) \right) \leq g^+ \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, there exists non-random constants $K > 0$ and $d > 1/2$ such that

$$\forall s \geq K \quad g_t(s) = g_t(K) \quad (6)$$

$$d_t^{(k)} \text{ and } u_t^{(k)} \text{ derivable with } \forall s \geq 0 \quad \max \left(\left| \left(d_t^{(k)} \right)'(s) \right|, \left| \left(u_t^{(k)} \right)'(s) \right| \right) \leq K \quad (7)$$

$$\forall (u, v) \in [0, 1]^2 \text{ s.t. } 0 < u < v \quad \left\| g_v^{(k)} - g_u^{(k)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq K |v - u|^d \quad (8)$$

where $\|f\|_{\infty} = \sup_{w \geq 0} \max(|f_1(w)|, |f_2(w)|)$ for $f = (f_1, f_2)$.

- (A4) The filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) is generated by finitely many Brownian motions

Remark 1. If we define $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(g^-, g^+, K, d)$ to be the functional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^+)^2$ where $\forall g \in \mathcal{G}$, g verifies (5), (6), (7) and (8), (A3) is equivalent to

$$\exists (g^-, g^+, K, d) \text{ s.t. } \forall t \in [0, 1], g_t \in \mathcal{G}(g^-, g^+, K, d)$$

We can now state the main theorem.

Theorem 1. Assume (A1) – (A4). Then, there exists $AB^{(1)}$, $AB^{(2)}$ and AV processes adapted to (\mathcal{F}_t) such that stably in law as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$,

$$\alpha^{-1} \left(\widehat{RCV}_{t,\alpha} - RCV_t \right) \rightarrow \int_0^t AB_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t AB_s^{(2)} dX_s^{(2)} + \int_0^t (AV_s)^{1/2} d\tilde{W}_s \quad (9)$$

where \tilde{W}_t is a Brownian motion independent of the underlying σ -field. Moreover, $AB^{(1)}$, $AB^{(2)}$, AV are defined in the following.

Remark 2. Because we can identify and estimate the asymptotic bias terms $\int_0^t AB_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)}$ and $\int_0^t AB_s^{(2)} dX_s^{(2)}$, we can follow the construction in Li et al. (2014, p. 587) to compute a “bias-corrected” estimator.

We are defining now the quantities needed to express the asymptotic bias and the variance of our estimator. We first need to rewrite (3) in a different way. Consider the i -th sampling time of the first process, i.e. $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)}$. We define two times, that we will call $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^-$ and $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^+$, which are functions of $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)}$ and $\left(\tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} \right)_{j \geq 0}$, and which correspond respectively to the closest sampling time of the process 2 that is strictly smaller than $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)}$, and the closest sampling time of the process 2 that is (not necessarily strictly) bigger than $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)}$, i.e :

$$\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^- = \max \{ \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} : \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} < \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)} \} \quad (10)$$

$$\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^+ = \min \{ \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} : \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} \geq \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{(1)} \} \quad (11)$$

Note that $\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^-$ is not a (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time. We also define the i -th increment for the 2nd process with this special setting, i.e.

$$\Delta X_{\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^-, \tau_{i,\alpha}^+}^{(2)} := \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^-, \tau_{i,\alpha}^+]}^{(2)} \quad (12)$$

Reordering the terms in (3) and associating them differently give us except for a few terms at the edge

$$\langle \widehat{X^{(1)}}, \widehat{X^{(2)}} \rangle_t = \sum_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^+ < T} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{(1)}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{-,+}}^{(2)} \quad (13)$$

The representation in (13) is very useful in the sense that it gives a natural order between the terms in the sum. Nevertheless, any term of this sum is à priori correlated with any other term. We're aiming at reordering once again the terms in (13), so one term is only correlated with (obviously) itself and the previous and next term (i.e. they are 1-correlated). For this purpose, we need a few definitions. Let T_α the vector-sampling times, of dimension 2, where for each $k = 1, 2$, the k -th component $T_\alpha^{(k)}$ is equal to the sequence of sampling times associated to the process k . Our aim is to construct a subsequence of $T_\alpha^{(1)}$, that depends of $T_\alpha^{(1)}$ and $T_\alpha^{(2)}$, that we call T_α^{1C} where $1C$ stands for "1-correlated". The grid of T_α^{1C} is obtained with the following algorithm. We define $\tau_0^{1C} = \tau_0^{(1)}$, and recursively for $i > 0$,

$$\tau_{i+1,\alpha}^{1C} = \min\{\tau_{u,\alpha}^{(1)} : \exists j \text{ such that } \tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C} \leq \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} < \tau_{u,\alpha}^{(1)}\} \quad (14)$$

In words, once we are at the observation time $\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C}$ (which is a random sampling time of the 1st process), we wait first to hit an observation of the 2nd process, and we then choose the next strictly bigger observation of the 1st process. Similarly to (10), (11) and (12), we define the following times

$$\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C,-} = \max\{\tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} : \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} < \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C}\} \quad (15)$$

$$\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C,+} = \min\{\tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} : \tau_{j,\alpha}^{(2)} \geq \tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C}\} \quad (16)$$

$$\Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} := \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C,-}, \tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C,+}]}^{(2)} \quad (17)$$

First, observe that, except for maybe a few terms at the edge, we can rewrite (13) as

$$\langle \widehat{X^{(1)}}, \widehat{X^{(2)}} \rangle_{t,\alpha} = \sum_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C,+} < T} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \quad (18)$$

Also, we define the following compensated increments of the HY estimator.

$$N_{i,\alpha} = \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} - \int_{\tau_{i-1,\alpha}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C}} \zeta_s^{1,2} ds \quad (19)$$

Note that they are compensated in the sense that they are centered (by breaking $\Delta X_{\tau_{i,\alpha}^{1C}}^{(2)}$ into a left (-), a central and a right (+) part and then conditioning the expectation it is straightforward to show). Similarly, we can show that they are 1-correlated (i.e. for $j > i + 1$, $\mathbb{E}[N_{i,\alpha} N_{j,\alpha}] = 0$).

Basically, considering our time-dependent variables volatility matrix σ_t and the grid functions as constant through time, we can compute quantities using results in limit theory of Markov chains (Meyn and Tweedie (2009)) that will allow us to get a mixing bias and asymptotic variance, using limit theory techniques developed in Mykland and Zhang (2012). Let $\tilde{W} := (\tilde{W}^{(1)}, \tilde{W}^{(2)}, \tilde{W}^{(3)}, \tilde{W}^{(4)})$

be a 4-dimensional Brownian motion and let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be a volatility matrix . If we set $\tilde{X} = \tilde{\sigma}\tilde{W}$ and we also let $\tilde{g} := (\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2) := \left((\tilde{d}_1, \tilde{u}_1), (\tilde{d}_2, \tilde{u}_2) \right)$, we define the associated observation times

$$\tilde{T}(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) := \tilde{T} := \left(\tilde{T}^{(1)}, \tilde{T}^{(2)} \right) := \left(\tilde{\tau}_i^{(k)} \right)_{k=1,2; i \geq 0} := \left(\tilde{\tau}_i^{(k)}(\tilde{W}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) \right)_{k=1,2; i \geq 0}$$

with $\tilde{\tau}_0^{(1)} = 0$ and for $i \geq 1$:

$$\tilde{\tau}_i^{(1)} = \inf \left\{ t > \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(1)} : \Delta \tilde{X}_t^{(3)} \notin \left[\tilde{d}_1(t - \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(1)}), \tilde{u}_1(t - \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(1)}) \right] \right\}$$

Let $\tilde{\tau}_0^{(2)} = 0$,

$$\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)} = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : x + \Delta \tilde{X}_t^{(4)} \notin \left[\tilde{d}_2(t + u), \tilde{u}_2(t + u) \right] \right\}$$

and for $i \geq 2$:

$$\tilde{\tau}_i^{(2)} = \inf \left\{ t > \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(2)} : \Delta \tilde{X}_t^{(4)} \notin \left[\tilde{d}_2(t - \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(2)}), \tilde{u}_2(t - \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{(2)}) \right] \right\}$$

These stopping times can (and will) be seen as approximations of the observation times when we hold volatility matrix and grid functions constant. We will always start our approximation at an observation time of the process 1. Thus, no other quantities is necessary to get an approximation of future observation times of the first asset. On the contrary, as the times of observations of the second process are not synchronized with the first process, we need two more quantities - x and u - to approximate efficiently the observation times of the second asset. They correspond respectively to the increment of the second sampling process $X^{(4)}$ since the last observation of the second process and the time elapsed since this last observation. Also, technically \tilde{T} doesn't depend on $\left(\tilde{X}^{(k)} \right)_{k=1,2}$ in the sense that they could be defined without knowing any value of the approximate log-price processes, ie. we could note $\tilde{T} := \tilde{T} \left(\left(\tilde{X}^{(k)} \right)_{k=3,4}, \left(\tilde{\zeta}^{i,j} \right)_{3 \leq i,j \leq 4}, \tilde{g}, x, u \right)$. Nevertheless, we will be interested in the joint distribution between the observation times and the log-price processes in the following. We generalize the definitions (10), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), (19) to the approximated observation times, that we will call respectively $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^-$, $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^+$, $\Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_i^{(2)}}^{(2)}$, $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{1C,-}$, $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}^{1C,+}$, $\Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_i^{(2)}}^{1C,-,+}$ and \tilde{N}_i , by putting tild on the symbol of the definitions.

We can now define the ‘‘instantaneous’’ variance of an increment. It depends on the volatility matrix and the grid functions. Similarly, we define the ‘‘instantaneous’’ normalized covariance between an increment and the log-price process of the first asset, and also the one between the increment and the price of the second asset. Finally, we define the average of the approximation of the conditional expectation of $\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} [\Delta \tau_{i+2}^{1C}]$, where if τ is a (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping time, $\mathbb{E}_\tau [Y]$ is defined as the conditional distribution of Y given \mathcal{F}_τ , that we will call instantaneous length of observation.

$$\psi^{AV}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{N}_2^2 + 2\tilde{N}_2\tilde{N}_3 \right] \quad (20)$$

$$\psi^{AC1}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{N}_2 \Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C}}^{(1)} \right] \quad (21)$$

$$\psi^{AC2}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{N}_2 \Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C, -, +}}^{(2)} \right] \quad (22)$$

$$\psi^\tau(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\Delta \tilde{\tau}_2^{1C} \right] \quad (23)$$

For a function $g \in \mathcal{G}$, define the subspace of \mathbb{R}^2 $\mathcal{S}_g := \{(y, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ s.t. } d(v) \leq y \leq u(v)\}$. Let $\tilde{\Pi}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) := (\tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u))_{i \geq 0}$ where $\tilde{\pi}_0$ is a Dirac measure in (x, u) and for $i \geq 1$, $\tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u)$ is the distribution of

$$\tilde{Z}_i := \left(\Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_i^{1C, -}, \tilde{\tau}_i^{1C}]}^{(4)}, \tilde{\tau}_i^{1C} - \tilde{\tau}_i^{1C, -} \right) \quad (24)$$

As mentioned previously, this quantity is crucial in approximating the next observation time for the second process. Thus, it is crucial in computing the ‘‘instantaneous’’ variance and covariances. Setting $\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)$, by strong Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we can show that $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain on the state space \mathcal{S}_g . In the following lemma, we show that for any volatility matrix and grid function, there exists a stationary distribution of $(\tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u))_{i \geq 0}$ which does not depend on x and u . That gives us a deeper instinct on how we are going to prove the theorem. First, we will approximate our log-price process and its observation times in small windows by holding volatility matrix and grid functions constant. Then, we will use this stationary distribution to compute asymptotically the ‘‘instantaneous’’ variation, correlations and length of observation.

Lemma 2. *There exists stationary distributions $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g})$ such that for any initial condition $(x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g$, we have in total variation*

$$\left\| \tilde{\pi}_i(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) - \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}) \right\|_{TV} \rightarrow 0$$

The next definition is the average (regarding the previously defined stationary distributions) of the ‘‘instantaneous’’ variance, covariances and length of observation. For $\theta \in \{AV, AC1, AC2, \tau\}$,

$$\phi^\theta(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^\theta(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g}, x, u) d\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{g})(x, u)$$

We define $\phi_s^\theta := \phi^\theta(\sigma_s, g_s)$ and let the following quantities :

$$\begin{aligned} k_s^{(1)} &= \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-2} \phi_s^{AC1} \left(\phi_s^\tau \right)^{-1} \\ k_s^{1,\perp} &= \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right)^{-1} \left(\left(\sigma_s^{(2)} \right)^{-2} \phi_s^{AC2} - \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \sigma_s^{(2)} \right)^{-1} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} \right) \left(\phi_s^\tau \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

We define now the asymptotic variance and bias :

$$\begin{aligned}
AV_s &= \left(\phi_s^{AV} + 2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} - (k_s^1 + k_s^{1,\perp}) \phi_s^{AC2} \right) \right) (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} \\
&\quad + \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \right)^2 + \left(\sigma_s^{(2)} \right)^2 \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right) \left(k_s^{1,\perp} \right)^2 \\
AB_s^{(1)} &= k_s^{(1)} - k_s^{1,\perp} \rho_s^{1,2} \sigma_s^{(2)} \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \\
AB_s^{(2)} &= k_s^{1,\perp}
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3. Looking at the expression of $AB_s^{(1)}$ and $AB_s^{(2)}$, we might be tempted to think that because of the $\left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right)^{-1}$ term in $k_s^{1,\perp}$, the bias will increase drastically when both assets are highly correlated. In this case, the lector should keep in mind that the second term of $AB_s^{(1)}$, when integrated with respect to $X_s^{(1)}$, and $AB_s^{(2)}$, when integrated with respect to $X_s^{(2)}$, will be roughly of the same magnitude, with an opposite sign, and thus there is no explosion of asymptotic bias. We chose in the above expressions to express the asymptotic bias as a function of increments of observable quantities (i.e. the increments of the price process) and also non-observable quantities. To fix ideas, we can express the asymptotic bias differently. We can rewrite the log-price process as

$$\begin{aligned}
dX_t^{(1)} &= \sigma_t^{(1)} dB_t^{(1)} \\
dX_t^{(2)} &= \rho_t^{1,2} \sigma_t^{(2)} dB_t^{(1)} + \left(1 - (\rho_t^{1,2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \sigma_t^{(2)} dB_t^{1,\perp}
\end{aligned}$$

where $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{1,\perp}$ are independent. Let

$$dX_t^{1,\perp} = \left(1 - (\rho_t^{1,2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \sigma_t^{(2)} dB_t^{1,\perp} \quad (25)$$

the part of $X_t^{(2)}$ that is not correlated to $X_t^{(1)}$. Now, we can express the asymptotic bias as $\int_0^t \tilde{A}B_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t \tilde{A}B_s^{(2)} dB_s^{1,\perp}$. In this case, $\tilde{A}B_s^{(1)} = k_s^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{A}B_s^{(2)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle M^n, B^{1,\perp} \rangle$ where M^n is defined in the proofs, and we can show that this limit exists, and does not tend to ∞ when both assets are highly correlated.

5 Proofs

5.1 Preliminary lemmas

Because we shall prove stable convergence, and because of the local boundedness of σ (because by (A1) σ is continuous), and that $\inf_{t \in (0,1]} \lambda_t^{\min} > 0$ we can without loss of generality assume that for all $t \in [0, 1]$ there exists some nonrandom constants σ^- and σ^+ such that for any eigen value λ_t of σ_t

$$0 < \sigma^- < \lambda_t < \sigma^+ \quad (26)$$

by using a standard localization argument such that the one used in section 2.4.5 of Mykland and Zhang (2012). One can further suppress μ as in Section 2.2 (pp. 1407-1409) of Mykland and Zhang (2009), and act as if X is a martingale.

We define the subspace \mathcal{M} of matrices of dimension 4×4 such that $\forall M \in \mathcal{M}$, for any eigen value λ_M of M , we have

$$\sigma^- < \lambda_M < \sigma^+ \quad (27)$$

and $\frac{(MM^T)^{3,4}}{(MM^T)^{4,4}} \in [\rho_-^{3,4}, \rho_+^{3,4}]$. By (4) of (A2) and (26), we will assume in the following that $\forall t \in [0, 1]$, $\sigma_t \in \mathcal{M}$.

We define σ^p the process (of dimension 4×4) on \mathbb{R}^+ such that

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_t^p &= \sigma_t \quad \forall t \in [0, 1] \\ \sigma_t^p &= \sigma_1 \quad \forall t \in [1, \infty) \end{cases}$$

Define now X^p the process such that for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^p &= \sigma_t^p dW_t \\ X_0^p &= X_0 \end{cases}$$

Because X^p and X have the same initial value and follow the same stochastic differential equation on $[0, 1]$, they are equal for all $t \in [0, 1]$. For simplicity, we keep from now the notation X for X^p .

In the following, C will be defining a constant which does not depend on i or n , but that can vary from a line to another. Also, we are going to use the notation $\tau_{i,n}^\theta$ as a substitute of τ_{i,α_n}^θ , where θ can take various names, such that (1), (2) and so on. Let $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a (not strictly) increasing non-random sequence such that

$$h(n) \rightarrow +\infty \quad (28)$$

$$h(n)\alpha_n \rightarrow 0 \quad (29)$$

To keep notations as simple as possible, we define $\tau_{i,n}^h := \tau_{ih(n),n}^{1C}$, $\tau_{i,n}^{h,-} := \tau_{ih(n),n}^{1C,-}$, $\tau_{i,n}^{h,+} := \tau_{ih(n),n}^{1C,+}$. We also let $A_n := \{i \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } \tau_{i-1,n}^h \leq t\}$, where $t \in [0, 1]$. Finally, for $\theta \in \{(1), (2), 1C, h\}$, we define $s_n^\theta = \sup_{\tau_{i,n}^\theta < T} \Delta \tau_{i,n}^\theta$. We show that these quantities tend to 0 almost surely in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *We have $s_n^\theta \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$.*

Proof. We can follow the proof of Lemma 4.5 in Robert and Rosenbaum (2012) to prove that for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, $s_n^{(k)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. Then, we can notice that a.s. $s_n^{1C} < s_n^{(1)} + s_n^{(2)}$ to deduce that $s_n^{1C} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. To show that $s_n^h \rightarrow 0$, define the process Z such that $Z_0 = 0$ and $\forall i > 0$:

$$Z_t := \begin{cases} \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}, t]}^{(2)} + Z_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}} & \forall t \in [\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}, \tau_{i-1,n}^{1C,+}] \\ \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C,+}, t]}^{(1)} + Z_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C,+}} & \forall t \in [\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C,+}, \tau_{i,n}^{1C}] \end{cases}$$

Substituting X in Lemma 4.5 of Robert and Rosenbaum's proof by our Z , we can follow the same reasoning. The only main change will be that in their notation $M_n \leq Ch(n)\alpha_n$, but this tends to 0 by (29). \square

Let f be a random process, s a random number, we define :

$$S(f, s) := \sup_{0 \leq u, v \leq 1, |u-v| \leq s} |f_u - f_v|$$

Lemma 4. *Let f be a bounded random process such that for all non-random sequence $(q_n)_{n \geq 0}$, if $q_n \rightarrow 0$, then $S(f, q_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Let also a random sequence $(s_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that $s_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Then we have $\forall l \geq 1$*

$$S(f, s_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{L}^l} 0$$

Proof. As f is bounded, convergence in \mathbb{P} implies convergence in \mathbf{L}^l for any $l \geq 1$. Hence it is sufficient to show that $S(f, s_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Let $\eta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we want to show that $\exists N > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq N$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S(f, s_n) > \eta) < \epsilon$$

\exists non-random $\chi > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S(f, \chi) > \eta) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Also, $\exists N > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq N$, $\mathbb{P}(s_n \geq \chi) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(S(f, s_n) > \eta) = \mathbb{P}(S(f, s_n) > \eta, s_n > \chi) + \mathbb{P}(S(f, s_n) > \eta, s_n \leq \chi) \leq \mathbb{P}(s_n > \chi) + \mathbb{P}(S(f, \chi) > \eta) < \epsilon$$

\square

We aim to define the approximations of observation times on blocks $(K_{i,n} := [\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i+1,n}^h])_{i \geq 0}$. We need some definitions first. Let $(C_t^{(i)})_{i \geq 0}$ a sequence of independent 4-dimensional Brownian motions (i.e. for each i , $C_t^{(i)}$ is a 4-dimensional Brownian motion), independent of everything we have defined so far. We define $\forall i, n \geq 0$,

$$S_t^{i,n} := \begin{cases} \Delta W_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i+1,n}^h]} & \forall t \in [0, \Delta\tau_{i+1,n}^h] \\ \Delta W_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i+1,n}^h]} + C_{t-\Delta\tau_{i+1,n}^h}^{(i)} & \forall t \geq \Delta\tau_{i+1,n}^h \end{cases}$$

and

$$(\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^k)_{j \geq 0; k=1,2} = \tilde{\Gamma} \left(S^{i,n}, \sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^h}, \alpha_n g_{\tau_{i,n}^h}, \Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i+1,n}^h]}^{(4)}, \tau_{i,n}^h - \tau_{i,n}^{h,-} \right)$$

To keep symmetry in notations, we define for all integers i and n positive integers, $(\tau_{i,j,n}^{(1)})_{j \geq 0}$ consisting of the observation times of the process 1 after $\tau_{i,n}^h$, subtracting the value of $\tau_{i,n}^h$, i.e. $\tau_{i,j,n}^{(1)} = \tau_{i^*+j,n}^{(1)} - \tau_{i^*,n}^{(1)}$ where i^* is the (random) index on the original grid of process 1 corresponding to $\tau_{i,n}^h$ ($\tau_{i^*,n}^{(1)} = \tau_{i,n}^h$). For process 2, we define $\tau_{i,0,n}^{(2)} = 0$ and for integers $j \geq 1$, $\tau_{i,j,n}^{(2)} = \tau_{j^*+j-1,n}^{(2)} - \tau_{i^*,n}^{(1)}$, where j^* is the index on the original grid of process 2 corresponding to the smallest observation time of process 2

bigger (not necessarily strictly) than $\tau_{i,n}^h$. We also define $\tau_{i,j,n}^-, \tau_{i,j,n}^+, \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C}, \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C,-}, \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C,+}, \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^-, \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^+, \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C}, \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C,-}, \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C,+}$ following the construction we used to define (10), (11), (14), (15) and (16). We also set

$$(\tilde{\pi}_{i,j,n})_{j \geq 0} = \Pi \left(S^{i,n}, \sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^h}, \alpha_n g_{\tau_{i,n}^h}, \Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i,n}^h]}^{(4)}, \tau_{i,n}^h - \tau_{i,n}^{h,-} \right)$$

Lemma 5. For $\theta \in \{(1), (2), 1C\}$, any real $l > 0$, any positive integer i and n , any non-negative integer j , we have $0 < C_l^- < C_l^+$ such that :

$$C_l^- \alpha_n^{2l} < \mathbb{E} \left[(\Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^\theta)^l \right] \leq C_l^+ \alpha_n^{2l} \quad (30)$$

where $\Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^\theta := \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^\theta - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^\theta$ and

$$C_l^- \alpha_n^{2l} < \mathbb{E} \left[(\Delta \tau_{i,n}^{(k)})^l \right] \leq C_l^+ \alpha_n^{2l} \quad (31)$$

Proof. For $\theta \in \{(1), (2)\}$, because of (5) and (26), we can deduce (30) using well-known result on exit zone of a Brownian motion (see for instance Borodin and Salminen (2002)). (31) can be deduced using Dubins-Schwarz theorem for continuous local martingale (see, e.g. th. V.1.6 in Revuz and Yor (1999)). If $\theta = 1C$ writing $\Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^\theta = (\tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^{\theta,+} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^\theta) + (\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{\theta,+} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^{\theta,+})$ and working those two terms, we can obtain (30) and (31). \square

Now, we define for $\theta \in \{(1), (2), 1C, h\}$ the number of observation times before t .

$$N_{t,n}^\theta = \sup\{i : \tau_{i,n}^\theta < t\}$$

We have the following lemma :

Lemma 6. For $\theta \in \{(1), (2), 1C\}$, we have that the sequence $(\alpha_n^2 N_{t,n}^\theta)_{n \geq 1}$ is tight

Proof. Here for $\theta \in \{(1), (2)\}$ we can follow the proof of Lemma 4.6 in Robert and Rosenbaum (2012) together with Lemma 3. Also, by definition we have $N_{t,n}^{1C} \leq N_{t,n}^{(1)}$ so we also deduce the tightness of $(\alpha_n^2 N_{t,n}^{1C})_{n \geq 1}$. \square

Lemma 7. Let $(U_{i,n})_{i,n \geq 1}$ an array of positive random variables and $\theta \in \{(1), (2), 1C\}$. If

$$\forall u > 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u \alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad (32)$$

then $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Also, if $\forall u > 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u \alpha_n^{-2} h(n)^{-1} \rfloor} U_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{t,n}^h} U_{i,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $u > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} > \epsilon\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} + \sum_{i=\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor + 1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor < N_{t,n}^\theta\}} - \sum_{i=N_{t,n}^\theta + 1}^{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor > N_{t,n}^\theta\}} > \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} + \sum_{i=\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor + 1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor < N_{t,n}^\theta\}} > \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor + 1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor < N_{t,n}^\theta\}} > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor} U_{i,n} > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor < N_{t,n}^\theta)
\end{aligned}$$

We take the $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ and uses (32). We obtain :

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_{t,n}^\theta} U_{i,n} > \epsilon\right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\lfloor u\alpha_n^{-2} \rfloor < N_{t,n}^\theta)$$

We now tend $u \rightarrow \infty$ and conclude using Lemma 6. The second statement is proved in the same way. \square

Lemma 8. For any $\alpha > 0$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $(x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, x, u) &= \alpha^{-4} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, \alpha g, \alpha x, \alpha^2 u) \\
\psi^{AC1}(\sigma, g, x, u) &= \alpha^{-3} \psi^{AC1}(\sigma, \alpha g, \alpha x, \alpha^2 u) \\
\psi^{AC2}(\sigma, g, x, u) &= \alpha^{-3} \psi^{AC2}(\sigma, \alpha g, \alpha x, \alpha^2 u) \\
\psi^\tau(\sigma, g, x, u) &= \alpha^{-2} \psi^\tau(\sigma, \alpha g, \alpha x, \alpha^2 u)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$, by the scale property we have that $(W_t)_{t \geq 0} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (\alpha^{-1} W_{\alpha^2 t})_{t \geq 0}$. Thus, if we define $\tau = \inf\{t > 0 \text{ s.t. } W_t \notin [d(t), u(t)]\}$ and $\tau_\alpha = \inf\{t > 0 \text{ s.t. } W_t \notin [\alpha d(t), \alpha u(t)]\}$, we have that

$$\tau \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \inf\{t > 0 \text{ s.t. } W_{\alpha^2 t} \notin [\alpha d(t), \alpha u(t)]\} \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} \alpha^{-2} \tau_\alpha$$

We deduce that :

$$(\tau, W_\tau) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (\alpha^{-2} \tau_\alpha, W_{\alpha^{-2} \tau_\alpha}) \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} (\alpha^{-2} \tau_\alpha, \alpha W_{\tau_\alpha}) \tag{33}$$

We can prove the lemma based on the way we proved (33), at the cost of 2-dimension definitions that would be more involved and straightforward applications of Strong Markov propriety of Brownian motions that I won't write, so that we don't lose ourselves in the technicality of this proof. \square

We introduce the number of points in the i -th block in the k -process as the following

$$N_{i,n}^{(k)} = \max\{j \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)} \leq \tau_{i+1,n}^h\}$$

We also introduce the total number of points in the i -th block $N_{i,n} = N_{i,n}^{(1)} + N_{i,n}^{(2)}$. We show now that we can control uniformly the error of the approximations of the observation times.

Lemma 9. *Let $l \geq 1$, we have that*

$$\sup_{i \geq 0, 2 \leq j \leq h(n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Delta \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \right] = o_p(\alpha_n^{2l}) \quad (34)$$

and

$$\sup_{i \geq 0, 2 \leq j \leq h(n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Delta \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C,-,+} - \Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C,-,+} \right|^l \right] = o_p(\alpha_n^{2l}) \quad (35)$$

Proof. We introduce the notation o_p^U where U stands for “uniformly in $i \geq 0$ ”, meaning that the sup of the rests is of the given order

First step : We define $\tilde{s}_n^h = \sup_{i \in A_n} \tilde{\tau}_{i,h(n),n}^{1C}$. We show in this step that

$$\tilde{s}_n^h \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad (36)$$

We define the accumulated time of approximated durations, i.e.

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i,n}^h = \sum_{l=0}^{l=i} \tilde{\tau}_{l,h(n),n}^{1C}$$

Using Lemma 5 together with Lemma 6, $\exists M > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{\tau}_{N_n^h,n}^h \leq M \right) \rightarrow 1$$

We define $Z_0^n = 0$ and $\forall t \in [\tilde{\tau}_{i-1,n}^h, \tilde{\tau}_{i,n}^h]$,

$$Z_t^n = Z_{\tilde{\tau}_{i-1,n}^h}^n + S_{t-\tilde{\tau}_{i-1,n}^h}^{i-1,n}$$

A slight modification of the proof of Lemma 3 will conclude.

Second step : We show that we can do a localization in the number of observations in the i -th block, i.e. there exists a non-random M_n such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max \left(N_{i,n}^{(1)}, N_{i,n}^{(2)} \right) > M_n \right) \quad (37)$$

converges uniformly (in i) towards 0 and M_n increasing at most linearly with $h(n)$, i.e. we have $M_n \leq \beta h(n)$ where $\beta > 0$.

To prove (37), we need some definitions. Define for $i \geq 0$ the order of observation times $O_{i,k,n}$ and the order of the approximated observation times $\tilde{O}_{i,k,n}$ in the following way. Let $\mathbb{T}_{i,n}^O := (\tau_{i,j,n}^O)_{j \geq 0}$ the sorted set of all observation times (corresponding to process 1 and 2) strictly greater than $\tau_{i,n}^h$. Then for $j \geq 1$, we will set $O_{i,j,n} = 1$ if the j -th observation time in $\mathbb{T}_{i,n}^O$ corresponds to an observation of the first process and $O_{i,j,n} = 2$ if it corresponds to an observation of the second process. Similarly, we set $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{i,n}^O$ the sorted set of all approximated times $(\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{(k)})_{j \geq 0, k=1,2}$. $\tilde{O}_{i,j,n}$ are defined in the same way. There exists a $p > 0$ such that for all integers i, j, n :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(O_{i,j+1,n} = 1 \mid O_{i,j,n} = 2\right) \geq p \text{ and } \mathbb{P}\left(O_{i,j+1,n} = 2 \mid O_{i,j,n} = 1\right) \geq p \quad (38)$$

Indeed, let l the (random) index such that $\tau_{i,l,n}^{(1)} = \tau_{i,j,n}^O$. Conditioned on $\{O_{i,j,n} = 1\}$, we know that $O_{i,j+1,n} = 2$ if $\Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,j,n}^l]}$ crosses g^+ or $-g^+$ before $\Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,j,n}^O]}$ crosses g^- or $-g^-$. Using (4) of (A2) and (26), we can easily bound away from 0 this probability, thus we deduce (38). Now, using (14) together with (38) and strong Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we deduce (37).

Third step : let $g = (d, u)$ such that $(g, g) \in \mathcal{G}$, $\sigma \in [\sigma^-, \sigma^+]$ and $\epsilon \leq \frac{g^-}{2}$. We define $\tau(g, \sigma, \epsilon) = \inf\{t > 0 : \sigma W_t = u(t) + \epsilon \text{ or } \sigma W_t = d(t) - \epsilon\}$, where W_t is a standard Brownian motion. We show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau(g, \sigma, \epsilon) - \tau(g, \sigma, 0)\right|^l\right] \leq \gamma^{(l)}(\epsilon) \quad (39)$$

where $\gamma^{(l)}(\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$.

In order to show (39), let $\tau^1(g, \sigma, \epsilon) = \inf\{t > 0 : \sigma W_{t+\tau(g, \sigma, 0)} = \min(u(\tau(g, \sigma, 0)) + Kt + \epsilon, g^+) \text{ or } \sigma W_{t+\tau(g, \sigma, 0)} = \max(d(\tau(g, \sigma, 0)) - Kt - \epsilon, g^-)\}$. By (5) and (7) of (A3), we have $\tau(g, \sigma, \epsilon) - \tau(g, \sigma, 0) \leq \tau^1(g, \sigma, \epsilon)$. Conditioned on $\{\tau(g, \sigma, \epsilon)\}$ and using strong Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we can show that $\mathbb{E}_{\tau(g, \sigma, \epsilon)}\left[\left|\tau^1(g, \sigma, \epsilon)\right|^l\right] \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$ using Theorem 2 in Potzelberger and Wang (2001) for instance.

Fourth step : let $k \in \{1, 2\}$. We show here

$$\sum_{j \leq M_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{(k)}\right|^l\right] = o_p^U(\alpha_n^{2l}) \quad (40)$$

The idea is to show that by recurrence in j , $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{(k)}\right|^l\right]$ can be arbitrarily small when n grows. It is then a straightforward analysis exercise to use the localization in second step and choose a different sequence h if necessary, that will still be non-random increasing and following (28) and (29), so that the sum in (40) will be also arbitrarily small. Let's start with $j = 1$ and $k = 1$.

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau_{i,1,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(k)}\right|^l\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau_{i,1,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(k)}\right|^l \mathbf{1}_{E_{i,n}}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\tau_{i,1,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(k)}\right|^l \mathbf{1}_{E_{i,n}^C}\right]$$

where $E_{i,n} = E_{i,n}^{(1)} \cap E_{i,n}^{(2)}$ with

$$E_{i,n}^{(1)} = \left\{ \sup_{s \in [\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}]} |\Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, s]}^{(1)} - \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, s]}^{(1)}| < \eta_{1,n} \right\}$$

$$E_{i,n}^{(2)} = \left\{ \sup_{s \in [\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}]} \|g_s^{(1)} - g_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^{(1)}\|_\infty < \eta_{1,n} \right\}$$

with $\eta_{1,n} = q_n \alpha_n$, $q_n = \max(\alpha_n^{d-1/2}, z_n^{1/2})$ and

$$z_n = \sup_{1 \leq u, v \leq 4} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(S(\sigma^{u,v}, s_n^h \vee \tilde{s}_n^h))^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}$$

By (33) and (39),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,1,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(k)} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{E_{i,n}} \right] \leq C \alpha_n^{2l} \left(\gamma^{(l)} (2q_n) + \gamma^{(l)} (-2q_n) \right)$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 5,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,1,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(k)} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{E_{i,n}^C} \right] \leq C \alpha_n^{2l} \mathbb{P}(E_{i,n}^C)^{1/2} \leq C \alpha_n^{2l} \left(\mathbb{P} \left((E_{i,n}^{(1)})^C \right) + \mathbb{P} \left((E_{i,n}^{(2)})^C \right) \right)^{1/2}$$

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left((E_{i,n}^{(1)})^C \right) &\leq (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}]} |\Delta X_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, s]}^{(1)} - \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tau_{i,n}^h, s]}^{(1)}| \right] \\ &\leq C (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \max_{1 \leq u, v \leq 4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^{\tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}} (\sigma_s^{u,v} - \sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^{u,v})^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq C (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \max_{1 \leq u, v \leq 4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}) S(\sigma^{u,v}, s_n^h \vee \tilde{s}_n^h)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq C (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} [\tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}] \right)^{1/2} z_n \\ &\leq C z_n^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov inequality in the first inequality, conditional Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality in the second inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the fourth inequality, Lemma 5 in the last inequality. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left((E_{i,n}^{(2)})^C \right) &\leq (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [\tau_{i,n}^h, \tau_{i,n}^h + \tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)}]} \|g_s^{(1)} - g_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^{(1)}\|_\infty \right] \\ &\leq C (\eta_{1,n})^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tau_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \vee \tilde{\tau}_{i,1,n}^{(1)} \right)^d \right] \\ &\leq C \alpha_n^{d-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov inequality in the first inequality, (8) of (A3) in the second inequality, Lemma 5 in the last inequality. In summary, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{(k)} \right|^l \right] \leq C \alpha_n^{2l} \left(\gamma^{(l)} (2q_n) + \gamma^{(l)} (-2q_n) + z_n^{1/2} + \alpha^{d-1/2} \right)$$

which we can make arbitrarily small, because $z_n \rightarrow 0$ by first step together with Lemma 4 and the continuity of σ (A1). The case with $k = 2$ is very similar. Finally, for $j > 1$, the same kind of computation techniques, using in addition (7) of (A3), will work.

Fifth step : Prove that uniformly (in i)

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\forall j \leq M_n, O_{i,j,n} = \tilde{O}_{i,j,n} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (41)$$

To show (41), let $j \leq M_n$. We define the (random) index v such that $\tau_{i,v,n}^O = \tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)}$. Modifying suitably h if needed, there exists (using fourth step) a sequence (ϵ_n) such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \tau_{i,j,n}^{(k)} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{(k)} \right| \leq \alpha_n^2 \epsilon_n \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (42)$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \tau_{i,v+1,n}^O - \tau_{i,v,n}^O \right| \leq \alpha_n^2 \epsilon_n \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (43)$$

Using (42) and (43), we can verify (41) by recurrence.

Sixth step : We prove here (34) and (35). Using Lemma 5 and (41)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Delta \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Delta \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \Delta \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \leq M_n, O_{i,j,n} = \tilde{O}_{i,j,n}\}} \right] + o_p^U \left(\alpha_n^{2l} \right)$$

The first term on the right part of the inequality can be bounded by

$$C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \leq M_n, O_{i,j,n} = \tilde{O}_{i,j,n}\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,j-1,n}^{1C} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^{1C} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \leq M_n, O_{i,j,n} = \tilde{O}_{i,j,n}\}} \right] \right)$$

Both terms can be treated with the same trick. Using the second step and Lemma 5, the first term is equal to

$$\sum_{v \leq M_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \mathbf{1}_{\{\forall j \leq M_n, O_{i,j,n} = \tilde{O}_{i,j,n}\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} = \tau_{i,v,n}^{(1)}\}} \right] + o_p^U \left(\alpha_n^{2l} \right)$$

The sum is obviously bounded by

$$\sum_{v \leq M_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \tau_{i,j,n}^{1C} - \tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C} \right|^l \right]$$

and using (40), we prove (34). We can deduce (35) with the same kind of computations. \square

Let M^n the interpolated normalized error, i.e.

$$M_t^n = \alpha_n^{-1} \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C} \wedge t, \tau_{i,n}^{1C} \wedge t]}^{(1)} \Delta X_{[\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C,-} \wedge t, \tau_{i,n}^{1C,+} \wedge t]}^{(2)} - \int_0^t \sigma_s^{(1)} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} ds \right)$$

M_t^n corresponds exactly to the normalized error of the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator if we observe the price of both assets at time t . We remind to the lector the definition of $N_{i,n}$ in (19)

$$N_{i,n} = \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} - \int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \sigma_s^{(1)} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} ds$$

Lemma 10.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\left(\Delta M_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^n \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} (N_{(i-1)h(n)+u})^2 + 2N_{(i-1)h(n)+u} N_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We obtain this equality noting that $(N_{i,n})_{n \geq 0}$ are centered and 1-correlated, and that the terms left converge to 0 in probability. \square

We introduce the observation time at the start of a block, where “s” stands for “start”

$$\tau_{i,n}^s = \sup \{ \tau_{j,n}^h \text{ s.t. } \tau_{j,n}^h < \tau_{i,n}^{1C} \}$$

Lemma 11.

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} (N_{(i-1)h(n)+u})^2 + 2N_{(i-1)h(n)+u} N_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] \\ &= \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \sum_{j=0}^{h(n)-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n^{-1} x, \alpha_n^{-2} v \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i-1,j,n}(x, v) + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First step : approximating with holding volatility constant. Set

$$\tilde{N}_{i,n} = \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}} \right)^{(2)} - \int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \zeta_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s}^{1,2} ds$$

where $A^{(i)}$ is the i -th component of the vector A . we want to show that :

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} (N_{(i-1)h(n)+u})^2 + 2N_{(i-1)h(n)+u} N_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] \\ &= \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} \left(\tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u} \right)^2 + 2\tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u} \tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Noting $F_{i,n} = (N_{i,n})^2 + 2N_{i,n}N_{i+1,n}$ and $\tilde{F}_{i,n} = \left(\tilde{N}_{i,n} \right)^2 + 2\tilde{N}_{i,n}\tilde{N}_{i+1,n}$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \left[\left| F_{i,n} - \tilde{F}_{i,n} \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$$

that we can rewrite as $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \geq 1}^{N_{t,n}^{(1)}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \left[\left| F_{i,n} - \tilde{F}_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right| \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Using Lemma 7, it is sufficient to show that $\forall u > 0$:

$$\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \left[\left| F_{i,n} - \tilde{F}_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right| \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$$

Thus, it is sufficient to show the convergence \mathbf{L}^1 of this quantity, i.e. that

$$\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| F_{i,n} - \tilde{F}_{i,n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right| \right] \rightarrow 0$$

We have that

$$\left| F_{i,n} - \tilde{F}_{i,n} \right| \leq B_{i,n}^{(1)} + 2B_{i,n}^{(2)}$$

where $B_{i,n}^{(1)} = \left| N_{i,n}^2 - \tilde{N}_{i,n}^2 \right|$ and $B_{i,n}^{(2)} = \left| N_{i-1,n}N_{i,n} - \tilde{N}_{i-1,n}\tilde{N}_{i,n} \right|$. We have that

$$B_{i,n}^{(1)} \leq C_{i,n}^{(1)} + C_{i,n}^{(2)} + C_{i,n}^{(3)}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{i,n}^{(1)} &= \left| \left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^2 - \left(\left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}} \right)^{(2)} \right)^2 \right| \\ C_{i,n}^{(2)} &= \left| \left(\int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \zeta_s^{1,2} ds \right)^2 - \left(\int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \zeta_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s}^{1,2} ds \right)^2 \right| \\ C_{i,n}^{(3)} &= 2 \left| \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \zeta_s^{1,2} ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}} \right)^{(2)} \int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \zeta_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s}^{1,2} ds \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let's show that $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[C_{i,n}^{(1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$. We can write it as $C_{i,n}^{(1)} \leq D_{i,n}^{(1)} + D_{i,n}^{(2)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i,n}^{(1)} &= \left| \left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^2 - \left(\left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^2 \right| \\ D_{i,n}^{(2)} &= \left| \left(\left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^2 - \left(\left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}} \right)^{(2)} \right)^2 \right| \end{aligned}$$

We want to show that $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{i,n}^{(1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$. We define :

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i,n}^{(1)} &= \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \\ E_{i,n}^{(2)} &= \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we deduce :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[D_{i,n}^{(1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} + E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right) \left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} - E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} + E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} - E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \right)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Lemma 5, we obtain that :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} + E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right)^2 \right] = O^U (\alpha_n^4)$$

where U stands for “uniformly in $1 \leq i \leq u\alpha_n^{-2}$ ”. Another application of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives us :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(E_{i,n}^{(1)} - E_{i,n}^{(2)} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} - \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \right)^4 \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^4 \right] \right)^{1/2}$$

Using once again Cauchy-Schwarz inequality together with Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Lemma 5, we obtain that :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C,-,+}}^{(2)} \right)^4 \right] = O^U (\alpha_n^4)$$

Similarly, we compute using conditional Burkholder-Davis-Gundy in first inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz in third inequality, Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 together with the continuity of σ (A1) in last equality.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} - \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \right)^4 \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}} \left[\left(\Delta X_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}}^{(1)} - \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \Delta W_{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \right)^4 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}} \left[\left(\int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \left(\sigma_s - \sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s} \right) dW_s \right)^{(1)} \right]^4 \right] \right] \\ &\leq C \sup_{1 \leq j,l \leq 4} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}} \left[\left(\int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \left(\sigma_s^{j,l} - \sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s}^{j,l} \right)^2 ds \right)^2 \right] \right] \\ &= C \sup_{1 \leq j,l \leq 4} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \left(\int_{\tau_{i-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tau_{i,n}^{1C}} \left(\sigma_s^{j,l} - \sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^s}^{j,l} \right)^2 ds \right)^2 \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C \sup_{1 \leq j, l \leq 4} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta \tau_{i,n}^{1C} S(\sigma^{j,l}, s_n^h) \right)^2 \right] + o^U(\alpha_n^4) \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(\Delta \tau_{i,n}^{1C})^4 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{1 \leq j, l \leq 4} (S(\sigma^{j,l}, s_n^h))^8 \right] \right)^{1/2} + o^U(\alpha_n^4) \\
&= O^U(\alpha_n^4)
\end{aligned}$$

With the same kind of computations, we show that $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[D_{i,n}^{(2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$, and we also can show $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[C_{i,n}^{(2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[C_{i,n}^{(3)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$ (thus we have also that $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[B_{i,n}^{(1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$) and $\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{u\alpha_n^{-2}} \mathbb{E} \left[B_{i,n}^{(2)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{i-1,n}^s < t\}} \right] \rightarrow 0$.

Second step : approximating using $(\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n})_{i,j,n \geq 0}$ instead of $(\tau_{i,n})_{i,n \geq 0}$. We set

$$\tilde{N}_{i,j,n} = \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^h} \Delta W_{\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C}} \right)^{(1)} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i,n}^h} \Delta W_{\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C,-,+}} \right)^{(2)} - \int_{\tilde{\tau}_{i,j-1,n}^{1C}}^{\tilde{\tau}_{i,j,n}^{1C}} \zeta_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^{1,2} ds$$

we want to show that :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} \left(\tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u} \right)^2 + 2\tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u} \tilde{N}_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] \\
&= \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} \left(\tilde{N}_{i-1,u,n} \right)^2 + 2\tilde{N}_{i-1,u,n} \tilde{N}_{i,u+1,n} \right] + o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same kind of computations as in the first step together with Lemma 9, we conclude.

Third step : express the result as a function of ψ^{AV} . Using Lemma 8 in last equality, we deduce for any integer u such that $2 \leq u \leq h(n)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\left(\tilde{N}_{i-1,u,n} \right)^2 + 2\tilde{N}_{i-1,u,n} \tilde{N}_{i-1,u+1,n} \right] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, x, v \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i,u-2,n}(x, v) \\
&= \alpha_n^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n^{-1} x, \alpha_n^{-2} v \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i,u-2,n}(x, v)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 12. $\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, g \in \mathcal{G}, \exists \pi(\sigma, g)$ distribution such that :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \sum_{j=0}^{h(n)-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n^{-1} x, \alpha_n^{-2} u \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i-1,j,n}(x, u) \\
&= \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} h(n) \phi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \right) + o_p(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We define the transition functions of the Markov chains $(\tilde{Z}_i(\sigma, g))_{i \geq 0}$ defined in (24). For $(x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_g)$ (borelians of \mathcal{S}_g)

$$P(\sigma, g)((x, u), B) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{Z}_1(\sigma, g) \in B \mid \tilde{Z}_0(\sigma, g) = (x, u)\right)$$

First step : We prove that $\forall \sigma \in \mathcal{M}$, $\forall g \in \mathcal{G}$, the state space \mathcal{S}_g is ν -small, i.e. there exists a non-trivial measure ν on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\forall (x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g, \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_g), P(\sigma, g)((x, u), B) \geq \nu(B)$. Let $B = [x_a, x_b] \times [u_a, u_b]$. We are choosing ν such that $\nu = 0$ outside $[-\frac{g^-}{4}, \frac{g^-}{4}] \times [3, 4]$. Thus, without loss of generality, we have that $[x_a, x_b] \times [u_a, u_b] \subset [-\frac{g^-}{4}, \frac{g^-}{4}] \times [3, 4]$. We want to show that $\exists c > 0$ such that uniformly

$$P(\sigma, g)((x, u), B) \geq c(x_b - x_a)(u_b - u_a)$$

There are two useful ways to rewrite $(\tilde{X}^{(3)}, \tilde{X}^{(4)})$. The first one is :

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(3)} := \sigma^{(3)} \tilde{B}_t^{(3)} \tag{44}$$

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(4)} := \rho^{3,4} \sigma^{(4)} \tilde{B}_t^{(3)} + \left(1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2\right)^{1/2} \sigma^{(4)} \tilde{B}_t^{3,\perp} \tag{45}$$

where $\tilde{B}^{(3)}$ and $\tilde{B}^{3,\perp}$ are independent, $\rho^{3,4} \in [\rho_-^{3,4}, \rho_+^{3,4}]$ and $\max(-\rho_-^{3,4}, \rho_+^{3,4}) < 1$ (because $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}$),

$$\delta = \left(1 - \max\left(\left(\rho_-^{3,4}\right)^2, \left(\rho_+^{3,4}\right)^2\right)\right)^{1/2} \tag{46}$$

The other way to rewrite it is :

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(4)} := \sigma^{(4)} \tilde{B}_t^{(4)} \tag{47}$$

$$\tilde{X}_t^{(3)} := \rho^{3,4} \sigma^{(3)} \tilde{B}_t^{(4)} + \left(1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2\right)^{1/2} \sigma^{(3)} \tilde{B}_t^{4,\perp} \tag{48}$$

where $\tilde{B}^{(4)}$ and $\tilde{B}^{4,\perp}$ are independent. For $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ a standard Brownian motion, $a < x < b$, we denote the exiting-zone time of the Brownian motion

$$\tau_x^{a,b} = \inf\{t > 0 \text{ s.t. } x + B_t = a \text{ or } x + B_t = b\}$$

and $p_1(x, a, b, t)$ the density of $\tau_x^{a,b}$. We also define $p_2(x, a, b, s, y)$ the distribution of $B_s + x$ conditioned on $\{\tau_x^{a,b} \geq s\}$. Finally, let $p_3(x, a, b, t, y)$ the distribution of $\tau_x^{a,b}$ conditioned on $\{B_{\tau_x^{a,b}} = b\}$. All the formulas can be found in Borodin and Salminen (2002). Consider the spaces $C_1 = C_3 = \{(x, a, b, t) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \text{ s.t. } a \leq x \leq b, t > 0\}$, $C_2 = \{(x, a, b, t, y) \in \mathbb{R}^5 \text{ s.t. } a \leq x \leq b, a < y < b, t > 0\}$. The functions p_i are continuous on C_i and positive. Thus, for all compact set $K_i \subset C_i$, we have

$$\inf_{k \in K_i} p_i(k) > 0 \tag{49}$$

We can bound below

$$P(\sigma, g)((x, u), B) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(E_0 \cap E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4 \mid \tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\right)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0 &= \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq \tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}} |\tilde{X}_s^{(3)}| < \frac{\epsilon \sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15 \sigma^+}, \tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)} \leq K \right\} \\
E_1 &= \left\{ \sup_{\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)} \leq s \leq K+1} |\tilde{X}_s^{(3)}| < \frac{\epsilon \sigma^-}{10 \sigma^+}, \sup_{\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)} \leq s \leq K+1} \left| \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, s]}^{3, \perp} \right| < \frac{g^- \sigma^-}{4 (\sigma^+)^2} \right\} \\
E_2 &= \left\{ \sup_{K+1 \leq s \leq \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}} |\tilde{X}_s^{(3)}| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{5}, \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} \in [K+2, K+3] \right\} \\
E_3 &= \left\{ \forall s \in [\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, K+4] \tilde{X}_s^{(3)} \in [d_1(K), u_1(K)], \tilde{X}_{K+4}^{(3)} \in [u_1(K) - 2\epsilon, u_1(K) - \epsilon] \right\} \\
&\quad \cap \left\{ \sup_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} \leq s \leq K+4} \left| \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, s]}^{(4)} \right| < \frac{g^-}{12} \right\} \\
E_4 &= \left\{ \tilde{\tau}_1^{(1)} \in [u_a + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, u_b + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}], \inf_{K+4 \leq s \leq \tilde{\tau}_1^{(1)}} \Delta \tilde{X}_{[K+4, s]}^{(3)} > -2\epsilon, \sup_{K+4 \leq s \leq \tilde{\tau}_1^{(1)}} \left| \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, s]}^{(4)} \right| < g^- \right\} \\
&\quad \cap \left\{ \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, \tilde{\tau}_1^{(1)}]}^{(4)} \in [x_a, x_b] \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon = \frac{g^- \sigma^-}{24 \sigma^+}$. Using extensively Bayes formula, we can rewrite

$$\mathbb{P} \left(E_0 \cap E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_1 \in B\} \mid \tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u) \right) = I \times II \times III \times IV \times V$$

where $I = \mathbb{P} \left(E_0 \mid \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$, $II = \mathbb{P} \left(E_1 \mid E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$, $III = \mathbb{P} \left(E_2 \mid E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$, $IV = \mathbb{P} \left(E_3 \mid E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$ and $V = \mathbb{P} \left(E_4 \mid E_3 \cap E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$.

We prove that I is uniformly bounded away from 0. Using (27), (44), (45) and (46), we deduce that $E_0^{(1)} \cap E_0^{(2)} \subset E_0$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0^{(1)} &= \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq K} |\tilde{B}_s^{(3)}| < \frac{\epsilon \sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15 (\sigma^+)^2} \right\} \\
E_0^{(2)} &= \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq K} \left| \frac{x}{\sigma^{(4)} (1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}} + \tilde{B}_s^{3, \perp} \right| \geq \frac{g^+}{\delta \sigma^-} + \frac{\epsilon \sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15 (\sigma^+)^2} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Conditionally on $\{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}$, $E_0^{(1)}$ and $E_0^{(2)}$ are independent. Thus, we deduce

$$I \geq \mathbb{P} \left(E_0^{(1)} \mid \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(E_0^{(2)} \mid \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$$

Using Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we obtain that the right part of the inequality is equal to

$$\left(1 - \int_0^K p_1 \left(0, -\frac{\epsilon \sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15 (\sigma^+)^2}, \frac{\epsilon \sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15 (\sigma^+)^2}, t \right) dt \right) \int_0^K p_1 \left(y_0^{(1)}, -y_0^{(2)}, y_0^{(2)}, t \right) dt$$

where $y_0^{(1)} = \frac{x}{\sigma^{(4)}(1-(\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$, $y_0^{(2)} = \frac{g^+}{\delta\sigma^-} + \frac{\epsilon\sigma^- \min(\sigma^-, 1)}{15(\sigma^+)^2}$, which is uniformly (in x , σ and g) bounded away from 0 using (27) and (49).

We prove that II is uniformly bounded away from 0. Conditionally on $E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}$, the two quantities of E_1 are independent. Thus, we bound below II (the same way we did for I) by :

$$\left(1 - \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}}^{K+1} p_1 \left(\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}}^{(3)}, -\frac{\epsilon\sigma^-}{10\sigma^+\sigma^{(3)}}, \frac{\epsilon\sigma^-}{10\sigma^+\sigma^{(3)}}, t \right) dt \right) \left(1 - \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}}^{K+1} p_1 \left(0, -\frac{g^-\sigma^-}{4\sigma^+\sigma^{(4)}}, \frac{g^-\sigma^-}{4\sigma^+\sigma^{(4)}}, t \right) dt \right)$$

which is uniformly bounded away from 0 using (27) together with (49).

We prove that III is uniformly bounded away from 0. Using (27), (44), (45) and (46), we deduce that $E_2^{(1)} \cap E_2^{(2)} \subset E_2$ where

$$E_2^{(1)} = \left\{ \sup_{K+1 \leq s \leq K+3} \left| \tilde{B}_s^{(3)} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+} \right\}$$

$$E_2^{(2)} = \left\{ \sup_{K+1 \leq s \leq K+2} \left| \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, s]}^{3, \perp} \right| < \frac{g^-}{2\sigma^+}, \sup_{K+2 \leq s \leq K+3} \left| \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, s]}^{3, \perp} \right| \geq \frac{g^+}{\delta\sigma^-} + \frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+\delta} \right\}$$

Conditionally on $E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}$, $E_2^{(1)}$ and $E_2^{(2)}$ are independent. Thus, we deduce

$$III \geq \mathbb{P} \left(E_2^{(1)} \middle| E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(E_2^{(2)} \middle| E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$$

Using Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we obtain that the right part of the inequality conditioned on $\{\tilde{B}_{K+1}^{(3)}, \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, K+1]}^{3, \perp} \middle| E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}\}$ is equal to

$$\left(1 - \int_0^2 p_1 \left(\tilde{B}_{K+1}^{(3)}, -\frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+}, \frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+}, t \right) dt \right) \left(1 - \int_0^1 p_1 \left(\Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, K+1]}^{3, \perp}, -\frac{g^+}{2\sigma^+}, \frac{g^+}{2\sigma^+}, t \right) dt \right)$$

$$\times \int_{-\frac{g^-}{2\sigma^+}}^{\frac{g^-}{2\sigma^+}} \int_1^2 p_1 \left(y, -\left(\frac{g^+}{\delta\sigma^-} + \frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+\delta} \right), \frac{g^+}{\delta\sigma^-} + \frac{\epsilon}{5\sigma^+\delta}, t \right) dt dq(y)$$

where q is the (conditional) distribution of $\Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, K+1]}^{3, \perp} + B_1$ conditioned on $\left\{ \tau_{\Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_1^{(2)}, K+1]}^{3, \perp}}^{-\frac{g^-}{2\sigma^+}, \frac{g^-}{2\sigma^+}} \geq 1 \right\}$.

Using the definition of E_1 together with (27) and (49), we have III which is uniformly bounded away from 0.

We prove that IV is uniformly bounded away from 0. Using (47) and (48), we deduce that $E_3^{(1)} \cap E_3^{(2)} \subset E_3$ where

$$E_3^{(1)} = \left\{ \sup_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} \leq s \leq K+4} \left| \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, s]}^{(4)} \right| < \frac{\epsilon\sigma^-}{5\sigma^+\sigma^{(4)}} \right\}$$

$$E_3^{(2)} = \left\{ \forall s \in [\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, K+4] \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, s]}^{4, \perp} \in [y_3^{(1)}, y_3^{(2)}], \Delta \tilde{B}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, K+4]}^{4, \perp} \in [y_3^{(3)}, y_3^{(4)}] \right\}$$

with $y_3^{(1)} = \frac{d_1(K)+2\epsilon/5}{\sigma^{(4)}(1-(\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$, $y_3^{(2)} = \frac{u_1(K)-2\epsilon/5}{\sigma^{(4)}(1-(\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$, $y_3^{(3)} = \frac{u_1(K)-8\epsilon/5}{\sigma^{(4)}(1-(\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$, $y_3^{(4)} = \frac{u_1(K)-7\epsilon/5}{\sigma^{(4)}(1-(\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$.

Conditionally on $E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}$, $E_3^{(1)}$ and $E_3^{(2)}$ are independent. Thus, we deduce

$$IV \geq \mathbb{P} \left(E_3^{(1)} \middle| E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(E_3^{(2)} \middle| E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \right)$$

Using Markov propriety of Brownian motions, we obtain that the right part of the inequality conditioned on $\{\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} \mid E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}\}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \int_0^{K+4-\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}} p_1 \left(0, -\frac{\epsilon\sigma^-}{5\sigma^+\sigma^{(4)}}, \frac{\epsilon\sigma^-}{5\sigma^+\sigma^{(4)}}, t\right) dt\right) \left(1 - \int_0^{K+4-\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}} p_1 \left(0, y_3^{(1)}, y_3^{(2)}, t\right) dt\right) \\ & \quad \times \int_{y_3^{(3)}}^{y_3^{(4)}} p_2 \left(0, y_3^{(1)}, y_3^{(2)}, K+4-\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, y\right) dy \end{aligned}$$

which is uniformly bounded away from 0 using (27), (46) and (49).

We prove that $V > c(x_b - x_a)(u_b - u_a)$. Using (44) and (45), we deduce that $E_4^{(1)} \cap E_4^{(2)} \subset E_4$ where

$$\begin{aligned} E_4^{(1)} &= \left\{ \tilde{\tau} \in [u_a + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, u_b + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}], \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}}^{(3)} = u_1(K) \right\} \\ E_4^{(2)} &= \left\{ \sup_{K+4 \leq s \leq \tilde{\tau}} \left| \Delta \tilde{B}_{[K+4, s]}^{3, \perp} \right| < \frac{5g^-}{6\sigma^{(4)} \left(1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2\right)^{1/2}}, \Delta \tilde{B}_{[L+4, \tilde{\tau}]}^{3, \perp} \in [y_4^{(1)}, y_4^{(2)}] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau} &= \inf\{t > K+4 : \tilde{X}_t^{(3)} = u_1(K) \text{ or } \Delta \tilde{X}_{[K+4, t]}^{(3)} = -2\epsilon\}, y_4^{(1)} = \frac{x_a - \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, K+4]}^{(4)} - \rho^{3,4} \sigma^{(4)} (\sigma^{(3)})^{-1} (u_1(K) - \tilde{X}_{K+4}^{(3)})}{\sigma^{(4)} (1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}, \\ y_4^{(2)} &= \frac{x_b - \Delta \tilde{X}_{[\tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)}, K+4]}^{(4)} - \rho^{3,4} \sigma^{(4)} (\sigma^{(3)})^{-1} (u_1(K) - \tilde{X}_{K+4}^{(3)})}{\sigma^{(4)} (1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}. \text{ We have} \end{aligned}$$

$$V = \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}}^{(3)} = u_1(K) \right) \mathbb{P} \left(E_4^{(1)} \cap E_4^{(2)} \mid E_3 \cap E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\} \cap \{\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}}^{(3)} = u_1(K)\} \right)$$

The first term on the right part of the equation is uniformly bounded away from 0 (Borodin and Salminen (2002)). Because $\tilde{\tau}$ is a function of $\tilde{X}^{(3)}$ and $\tilde{B}^{3, \perp}$ is independent with $\tilde{X}^{(3)}$, $\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{B}^{3, \perp}$ are independent. Thus the second term on the right conditioned on

$$\{y_4^{(1)}, y_4^{(2)}, X_{K+4}^{(3)}, \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} \mid E_3 \cap E_2 \cap E_1 \cap E_0 \cap \{\tilde{Z}_0 = (x, u)\}\}$$

can be expressed as :

$$\int_{u_a + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} - (K+4)}^{u_b + \tilde{\tau}_2^{(2)} - (K+4)} \int_{y_4^{(1)}}^{y_4^{(2)}} p_3 \left(\frac{X_{K+4}^{(3)}}{\sigma^{(3)}}, \frac{X_{K+4}^{(3)} - 2\epsilon}{\sigma^{(3)}}, \frac{u_1(K)}{\sigma^{(3)}}, t \right) p_2 \left(0, -\frac{5g^-}{y_4^{(3)}}, \frac{5g^-}{y_4^{(3)}}, t, y \right) dt dy$$

where $y_4^{(3)} = 6\sigma^{(4)} \left(1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2\right)^{1/2}$. We have that $y_4^{(1)}$ and $y_4^{(2)}$ are dominated by $\frac{3g^-}{4\sigma^{(4)} (1 - (\rho^{3,4})^2)^{1/2}}$. Using this together with (27), (46) and (49), we deduce that $V \geq c(x_b - x_a)(u_b - u_a)$.

Second step : We prove that $\left\| \psi^{AV} \right\|_{\infty} := \sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}, g \in \mathcal{G}, (x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g} \left| \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, x, u) \right| < \infty$. To show this :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C, -, +}}^{(2)} - \tilde{\zeta}^{1,2} \Delta \tilde{\tau}_2^{1C} \right)^2 \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C}}^{(1)} \Delta \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}_2^{1C, -, +}}^{(2)} \right)^2 + \left(\tilde{\zeta}^{1,2} \Delta \tilde{\tau}_2^{1C} \right)^2 \right]$$

The second term in the right part of the inequality is uniformly bounded using (27) and Lemma 5. Using successively Cauchy-Schwarz and Burholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, (27) and Lemma 5, we can also bound uniformly the first term. The other term of (20) can be bounded in the same way.

Third step : Define $q = (\sigma, g, x, u)$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{(\sigma, g, x, u) \text{ s.t. } \sigma \in \mathcal{M}, g \in \mathcal{G}, (x, u) \in \mathcal{S}_g\}$. Prove that $\forall q \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists a measure $\tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g)$ such that

$$\sup_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \left| \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}_l(\sigma, g, x, u)(y, v) - n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g)(y, v) \right| = no_p(1)$$

To show this, we use first step together with *Th.16.0.2 (v)* (Meyn and Tweedie (2009)). We obtain that there exists $\tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g)$ where

$$\left\| P^n(\sigma, g)((x, u), \cdot) - \tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g) \right\|_{TV} \leq 2r^n$$

where $r = 1 - \nu(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Thus, we deduce :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}_l(\sigma, g, x, u)(y, v) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g)(y, v) \right| \\ & \leq \left\| \psi^{AV} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| \tilde{\pi}_l(\sigma, g, x, u) - \tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g) \right\|_{TV} \leq 2 \left\| \psi^{AV} \right\|_{\infty} r^l \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

We want to show that $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N > 0$ such that $\forall n \geq N$:

$$\left| \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}_l(\sigma, g, x, u)(y, v) - n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma, g, y, v) d\tilde{\pi}(\sigma, g)(y, v) \right| < \epsilon n \quad (51)$$

The rest is a straightforward analysis exercise. Let $\epsilon > 0$. $\exists N_1 > 0$ such that $r^{N_1} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Choosing $N > 8N_1\epsilon^{-1} \left\| \psi^{AV} \right\|_{\infty}^{-1}$, we first use the triangular inequality, and then split the sum of the left part of (51) in two parts, one up to N_1 and the other one up to N . We use (50) in the second part to obtain (51).

Fourth step : Proving the Lemma. Let $w > 0$. From Lemma 7, we just have to show that

$$\alpha_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor w\alpha_n^{-2}h(n)^{-1} \rfloor} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{h(n)-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV}(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n^{-1}y, \alpha_n^{-2}v) d\tilde{\pi}_{i-1,j,n}(y, v) - h(n)\phi^{AV}(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}) \right|$$

tends to 0 in probability. Using third step together with standard results on regular conditional distributions (see for instance Leo Breiman (1992)), we prove the lemma. \square

Lemma 13.

$$\alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{(1)} \right)^2 \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{(2)} \right)^2 h(n) \phi^{AV}(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}) \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} [\Delta \tau_{i,n}^h] \right)^{-1} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\phi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \right) \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^\tau \right)^{-1} \right] + o_p(1)$$

Proof. First step : Defining

$$\begin{cases} u_{i,n} & := \sum_{j=0}^{h(n)-2} \int_X \psi^\tau \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, x, u \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i-1,j,n}(x, u) \\ A_0 & := \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[h(n) \phi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \right) \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} [\Delta \tau_{i,n}^h] \right)^{-1} \right] \\ A_1 & := \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[h(n) \phi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \right) \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h (u_{i,n})^{-1} \right] \end{cases}$$

we have that $A_0 = A_1 + o_p(1)$. To show this, in light of Lemma 9, we have that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} [\Delta \tau_{i,n}^h] - u_{i,n} \right| \leq h(n) C_n$$

where C_n tends to 0 in probability. From this, we can easily show that $A_0 = A_1 + o_p(1)$.

Second step : We have that

$$A_1 = \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\phi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \right) \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^\tau \right)^{-1} \right] + o_p(1)$$

To prove it, we can mimic the proof of Lemma 12, together with Lemma 9. □

5.2 Computation of the limits of $\langle M^n \rangle_t$, $\langle M^n, X^{(1)} \rangle_t$ and $\langle M^n, X^{(2)} \rangle_t$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M^n \rangle_t &= \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\left(\Delta M_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^n \right)^2 \right] + o_p(1) \\ &= \alpha_n^{-2} \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\sum_{u=2}^{h(n)} \left(N_{(i-1)h(n)+u} \right)^2 + 2N_{(i-1)h(n)+u} N_{(i-1)h(n)+u+1} \right] + o_p(1) \\ &= \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \sum_{j=0}^{h(n)-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \psi^{AV} \left(\sigma_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, g_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}, \alpha_n^{-1}x, \alpha_n^{-2}u \right) d\tilde{\pi}_{i-1,j,n}(x, u) + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 2.2.11 of Jacod and Protter (2012) in first equality, Lemma 10 in second equality, Lemma 11 in third equality.

We deduce (using Lemma 12 in first equality and Lemma 13 in third equality)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M^n \rangle_t &= \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} h(n) \phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{AV} + o_p(1) \\ &= \alpha_n^2 \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[h(n) \phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{AV} \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} [\Delta \tau_{i,n}^h] \right)^{-1} \right] + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{i \in A_n} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h} \left[\phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{AV} \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^\tau \right)^{-1} \right] + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.2.11 of Jacod and Protter (2012) again, we deduce :

$$\langle M^n \rangle_t = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}_n} \phi_{\tau_{i-1,n}^h}^{AV} \Delta \tau_{i,n}^h \left(\phi_{\tau_{i,n}^h}^\tau \right)^{-1} + o_p(1)$$

Using Lemma 3 together with Prop. I.4.44 (page 51) in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003), we obtain

$$\langle M^n \rangle_t \rightarrow \int_0^t \phi_s^{AV} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds \quad (52)$$

Using the same approximations and computations, we also compute :

$$\langle M^n, X^{(1)} \rangle_t \rightarrow \int_0^t \phi_s^{AC1} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds \quad (53)$$

$$\langle M^n, X^{(2)} \rangle_t \rightarrow \int_0^t \phi_s^{AC2} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds \quad (54)$$

5.3 Computation of the asymptotic bias and variance

We follow the idea in 1-dimension in pp. 155-156 of Mykland and Zhang (2012), and define an auxiliary martingale

$$\tilde{M}_t^n = M_t^n - \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} dX_s^{1,\perp}$$

where $X_t^{1,\perp}$ is defined in (25). Using (53), we deduce :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{M}^n, X^{(1)} \rangle_t &= \langle M^n, X^{(1)} \rangle_t - \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} d\langle X^{(1)} \rangle_s \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^t \phi_s^{AC1} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds - \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} (\sigma_s^{(1)})^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we choose

$$k_s^{(1)} = \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-2} \phi_s^{AC1} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1}$$

By the same techniques that we used to compute (53), we have that :

$$\langle M^n, \int_0^\cdot \rho_s^{1,2} \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{(1)} \rangle_t \rightarrow \int_0^t \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds \quad (55)$$

Using (54) and (55) we compute :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{M}^n, X^{1,\perp} \rangle_t &= \langle M^n, X^{1,\perp} \rangle_t - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} d\langle X^{1,\perp} \rangle_s \\ &= \langle M^n, X^{(2)} - \int_0^\cdot \rho_s \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{(1)} \rangle_t - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} d\langle X^{1,\perp} \rangle_s \\ &= \langle M^n, X^{(2)} \rangle_t - \langle M^n, \int_0^\cdot \rho_s \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{(1)} \rangle_t - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} d\langle X^{1,\perp} \rangle_s \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^t \left(\phi_s^{AC2} - \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} \right) (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} ds - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right) (\sigma_s^{(2)})^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we choose

$$k_s^{1,\perp} = \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2\right)^{-1} \left(\left(\sigma_s^{(2)}\right)^{-2} \phi_s^{AC2} - \left(\sigma_s^{(1)}\sigma_s^{(2)}\right)^{-1} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} \right) (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1}$$

By (A4), there exists $S > 0$ such that the S Brownian motions $\{D^{(1)}, \dots, D^{(S)}\}$ generate the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. To show that $\langle \tilde{M}^n, D^{(s)} \rangle_t$ tends to 0 in probability, we decompose $D^{(s)} = D^{s,1} + D^{s,2}$ where $D^{s,1}$ belongs to the space spanned by $\{X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}\}$, $D^{s,2}$ is orthogonal to this space. By what precedes, we have clearly $\langle \tilde{M}^n, D^{s,1} \rangle_t$ tends to 0 in probability. Also, $D^{s,2}$ is a martingale that is, conditionally on the observations times of both processes, independent of \tilde{M}^n . Thus we also deduce that $\langle \tilde{M}^n, D^{s,2} \rangle_t$ converges to 0 in probability.

We can now compute :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{M}^n \rangle_t &= \langle M^n - \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} dX_s^{1,\perp} \rangle_t \\ &= \langle M^n \rangle_t + \int_0^t \left(\sigma_s^{(1)}\right)^2 \left(k_s^{(1)}\right)^2 ds + \int_0^t \left(\sigma_s^{(2)}\right)^2 \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2\right) \left(k_s^{1,\perp}\right)^2 ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} d\langle X^{(1)}, M^n \rangle_s - 2 \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} d\langle X^{1,\perp}, M^n \rangle_s \\ &\stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\rightarrow} \int_0^t \left(\phi_s^{AV} + 2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} - \left(k_s^{(1)} + k_s^{1,\perp} \right) \phi_s^{AC2} \right) \right) (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \right)^2 + \left(\sigma_s^{(2)} \right)^2 \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right) \left(k_s^{1,\perp} \right)^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

By letting

$$\begin{aligned} AV_s &= \left(\phi_s^{AV} + 2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \sigma_s^{(2)} \rho_s^{1,2} \phi_s^{AC1} - \left(k_s^{(1)} + k_s^{1,\perp} \right) \phi_s^{AC2} \right) \right) (\phi_s^\tau)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^2 \left(k_s^{(1)} \right)^2 + \left(\sigma_s^{(2)} \right)^2 \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right) \left(k_s^{1,\perp} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

we deduce using Theorem 2.28 in Mykland and Zhang (2012) that stably in law as $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$:

$$\alpha_n^{-1} \left(\widehat{RCV}_{t,n} - RCV_t \right) \rightarrow \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} dX_s^{1,\perp} + \int_0^t (AV_s)^{1/2} d\tilde{W}_s$$

Now, we can express the asymptotic bias $AB_t = \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} dX_s^{1,\perp}$ differently :

$$\begin{aligned} AB_t &= \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{1,\perp} \\ &= \int_0^t k_s^{(1)} dX_s^{(1)} - \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} \rho_s^{1,2} \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} \rho_s^{1,2} \sigma_s^{(2)} dB_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} \left(1 - (\rho_s^{1,2})^2 \right)^{1/2} \sigma_s^{(2)} dW_s^{1,\perp} \\ &= \int_0^t \left(k_s^{(1)} - k_s^{1,\perp} \rho_s^{1,2} \sigma_s^{(2)} \left(\sigma_s^{(1)} \right)^{-1} \right) dX_s^{(1)} + \int_0^t k_s^{1,\perp} dX_s^{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

We thus deduce the expression of $AB_s^{(1)}$ and $AB_s^{(2)}$.

6 Concluding remarks

We have introduced in this paper the random time dependent grid model, and we have shown that it is more general than some of the endogenous models of the literature. In addition, we saw that this model allows new information to arrive between two observation times.

Under this model, we have proved the central limit theorem of the Hayashi-Yoshida estimator. Our main theorem states that there is an asymptotic bias, thus it suggests an improvement of the classical Hayashi-Yoshida estimator by computing a “bias-corrected” estimator.

We chose to work under the random time dependent grid model assumption. More general conditions can be found and we could state a central limit theorem under those conditions, without assuming the existence of the processes driving the observation times. Nevertheless, those conditions wouldn't be straightforward to verify and proving that the existing models of the literature follow them would involve similar proofs.

The techniques used for the proof of the main theorem can probably be applied to noisy observations. In particular, independence between the price processes and the noise is not needed. As long as we can approximate the joint distribution of the noise and the returns by a Markov chain, ideas of our proof can be used. This work is under consideration.

References

- [1] Aït-Sahalia, Y., J. Fan and D. Xiu (2010) High-frequency covariance estimates with noisy and asynchronous financial data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105, 1504-1517.
- [2] Aldous, D.J. and G.K. Eagleson (1978) On mixing and stability of limit theorems, *Annals of Probability* 6, 325-331.
- [3] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., P.R. Hansen, A. Lunde and N. Shephard (2011) Multivariate realised kernels: consistent positive semi-definite estimators of the covariation of equity prices with noise and non-synchronous trading, *Journal of Econometrics* 162, 149-169.
- [4] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E. and N. Shephard (2001) Non-gaussian Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 63, 167-241.
- [5] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E. and N. Shephard (2002) Econometric analysis of realized volatility and its use in estimating stochastic volatility models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 64, 253-280.
- [6] Borodin, A.N. and P. Salminen (2002) *Handbook of Brownian Motion - Facts and Formulae*. Probability and Its applications, Basel : Birkhauser.

- [7] Brandt, M.W. and F.X. Diebold (2003) A no-arbitrage approach to range-based estimation of covariances and correlations. Penn Institute for Economic Research Working Paper 9664.
- [8] Breiman, L. (1992) *Probability*. Classics in Applied Mathematics 7, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA.
- [9] Christensen, K., S. Kinnebrock and M. Podolskij (2010) Pre-averaging estimators of the ex-post covariance matrix in noisy diffusion models with non-synchronous data, *Journal of Econometrics* 159, 116-133.
- [10] Christensen, K., M. Podolskij and M. Vetter (2013) On covariation estimation for multivariate continuous Itô semimartingales with noise in non-synchronous observation schemes, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 120, 59-84.
- [11] Dalalyan, A. and N. Yoshida (2011) Second-order asymptotic expansion for a non-synchronous covariation estimator. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 47, 748-789.
- [12] Epps, T.W. (1979) Comovements in stock prices in the very short run. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 74, 291-298.
- [13] Fukasawa, M. (2010a) Central limit theorem for the realized volatility based on tick time sampling. *Finance and Stochastics* 14, 209-233.
- [14] Fukasawa, M. (2010b) Realized volatility with stochastic sampling. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 120, 829-552.
- [15] Fukasawa, M. and M. Rosenbaum (2012). Central limit theorems for realized volatility under hitting times of an irregular grid, *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 122 (12), 3901-3920.
- [16] Genon-Catalot, V. and J. Jacod (1993) On the estimation of the diffusion coefficient for multidimensional diffusion. *Annales Institut Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 29, 119-151
- [17] Guillaume, D.M., M.M. Dacorogna, R. Dave, U.A. Müller, R. B. Olsen, and O. V. Pictet (1997) From the Bird's Eye to the Microscope : A Survey of New Stylized Facts of the Intradaily Foreign Exchange Markets. *Finance and Stochastics* 1, 95-129.
- [18] Hall, P. and C.C. Heyde (1980) *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*. Academic Press.
- [19] Hayashi, T., J. Jacod and N. Yoshida. Irregular sampling and central limit theorems for power variations: the continuous case. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré Probabilités et Statistiques* 47, 1197-1218.
- [20] Hayashi, T. and S. Kusuoka (2008) Consistent estimation of covariation under nonsynchronicity. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* 11, 93-106.

- [21] Hayashi, T. and N. Yoshida (2005) On covariance estimation of non-synchronously observed diffusion processes. *Bernoulli* 11, 359-379.
- [22] Hayashi, T. and N. Yoshida (2008) Asymptotic normality of a covariance estimator for nonsynchronously observed diffusion processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* 60, 357-396.
- [23] Hayashi, T. and N. Yoshida (2011) Nonsynchronous covariation process and limit theorems. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 121, 2416-2454.
- [24] Jacod, J. (1994) Limit of Random Measures Associated with the Increments of a Brownian Semimartingale. Technical report, Université de Paris VI
- [25] Jacod, J. and P. Protter (1998) Asymptotic error distributions for the Euler method for stochastic differential equations. *Annals of Probability* 26, 267-307.
- [26] Jacod, J. and P. Protter (2012) *Discretization of Processes*. Springer.
- [27] Jacod, J. and A. Shiryaev (2003) *Limit Theorems For Stochastic Processes* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- [28] Koike, Y. (2014) Limit theorems for the pre-averaged Hayashi-Yoshida estimator with random sampling. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 124 (8), 2699-2753.
- [29] Koike, Y. (2015) Time endogeneity and an optimal weight function in pre-averaging covariance estimation. Preprint, Available at arXiv: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7889v2>.
- [30] Li, Y., P.A. Mykland, E. Renault, L. Zhang and X. Zheng (2014) Realized volatility when sampling times are possibly endogenous. *Econometric Theory* 30, 580-605.
- [31] Lundin, M.C., M.M. Dacorogna and U.A. Müller (1999) Correlation of high frequency financial time series. In P. Lequex (eds), *The Financial Markets Tick by Tick*, pp. 91-126. New York: Wiley.
- [32] Meyn, S.P. and R.L. Tweedie (2009) *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Muthuswamy, J., S. Sarkar, A. Low and E. Terry (2001) Time Variation in the Correlation Structure of Exchange Rates: High Frequency Analysis *Journal of Futures Markets* 21, 127-144.
- [34] Mykland, P.A., and L. Zhang (2006) ANOVA for Diffusions and Itô Processes. *Annals of Statistics* 34, 1931-1963.
- [35] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2009) Inference for Continuous Semimartingales Observed at High Frequency. *Econometrica* 77, 1403-1445.
- [36] Mykland, P.A. and L. Zhang (2012) The econometrics of High Frequency Data. In M. Kessler, A. Lindner and M. Sørensen (eds.), *Statistical Methods for Stochastic Differential Equations*, pp. 109-190. Chapman nad Hall/CRC Press.

- [37] Pötzelberger, K. and L. Wang (2001) Boundary crossing probability for Brownian motion. *Journal of Applied Probability* 38, 152-164.
- [38] Renault, E., T. van der Heijden and B.J. Werker (2009) A structural autoregressive conditional duration model. Presented at the 2010 Winter Meetings of the Econometric Society in Atlanta.
- [39] Renault, E., T. van der Heijden and B.J. Werker (2014). The dynamic mixed hitting-time model for multiple transaction prices and times. *Journal of Econometrics* 180, 233-250.
- [40] Rényi, A. (1963) On stable sequences of events. *Sanky Series A* 25, 293-302.
- [41] Revuz, D. and M. Yor (1999) *Continuous Martingales and Brownian motion*. 3rd ed., Germany: Springer.
- [42] Rootzén, H. (1980) Limit distributions for the error in approximations of stochastic integrals. *Annals of Probability* 8, 241-251.
- [43] Russell, J.R. (1999) Econometric modeling of multivariate irregularly-spaced high-frequency data. University of Chicago Graduate School of Business Working Paper.
- [44] Robert, C.Y. and M. Rosenbaum (2011) A new approach for the dynamics of ultra-high-frequency data: the model with uncertainty zones. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 9, 344-366.
- [45] Robert, C.Y. and M. Rosenbaum (2012) Volatility and covariation estimation when microstructure noise and trading times are endogenous. *Mathematical Finance* 22 (1), 133-164.
- [46] Scholes, M. and J. Williams (1977) Estimating betas from nonsynchronous data. *Journal of Financial Economics* 5, 309-327.
- [47] Zhang, L. (2001) From Martingales to ANOVA : Implied and Realized Volatility. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Chicago, Department of Statistics.
- [48] Zhang, L. (2011) Estimation covariation: Epps effect, microstructure noise. *Journal of Econometrics* 160, 33-47.