

# Drift parameter estimation for nonlinear stochastic differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motion

Yaozhong Hu

David Nualart

Hongjuan Zhou

## Abstract

We derive the strong consistency of the least squares estimator for the drift coefficient of a fractional stochastic differential system. The drift coefficient is one-sided dissipative Lipschitz and the driving noise is additive and fractional with Hurst parameter  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, 1)$ . We assume that continuous observation is possible. The main tools are ergodic theorem and Malliavin calculus. As a by-product, we derive a maximum inequality for Skorohod integrals, which plays an important role to obtain the strong consistency of the least squares estimator.

**Keywords.** Fractional Brownian motion, parameter estimation, nonlinear stochastic differential equation, one-sided dissipative Lipschitz condition, maximum inequality, moment estimate, Hölder continuity, strong consistency.

## 1 Introduction and main result

In this paper, we study a parameter estimation problem for the following stochastic differential equation (SDE) driven by a fractional Brownian motion (fBm)

$$dX_t = -f(X_t)\theta dt + \sigma dB_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.1) \quad \{\text{nl.sde}\}$$

where  $X_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a given initial condition. The notations appearing in the above equation are explained as follows. For the diffusion part,  $B = (B^1, \dots, B^d)$  is a  $d$ -dimensional fBm of Hurst parameter  $H \in (0, 1)$ . The diffusion coefficient  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d)$  is an  $m \times d$  matrix, with  $\sigma_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$  being given vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . For the drift part, the function  $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$  satisfies some regularity and growth conditions that we shall specify below. We write  $f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_l(x))$ , with  $f_j(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, l$ , being vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . We assume that  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_l) \in \mathbb{R}^l$  is an unknown constant parameter. In equation (1.1) we have used matrix notation, where the vectors are understood as column vectors. With above notations, we may write (1.1) as

$$dX_t = - \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j f_j(X_t) dt + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_j dB_t^j.$$

Our objective is to estimate the parameter vector  $\theta$ , from the continuous observations of the process  $X = \{X_t, t \geq 0\}$  in a finite interval  $[0, T]$ . We consider a least squares type estimator, which consists of minimizing formally the quantity  $\int_0^T |\dot{X}_t + f(X_t)\theta|^2 dt$ , where and in what follows we use  $|\cdot|$  to denote the Euclidean norm of a vector or the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of a matrix. From this procedure, the least squares estimator (LSE) is given explicitly by

$$\hat{\theta}_T = - \left( \int_0^T (f^{tr} f)(X_t) dt \right)^{-1} \int_0^T f^{tr}(X_t) dX_t, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $f^{tr}$  denotes the transpose of the matrix  $f$ . Substituting (1.1) into the above expression we have

$$\hat{\theta}_T = \theta - \left( \int_0^T (f^{tr} f)(X_t) dt \right)^{-1} \int_0^T f^{tr}(X_t) \sigma dB_t. \quad (1.3) \quad \{\text{theta.est}\}$$

In the above equation, the stochastic integral with respect to the fBm is understood as a divergence integral (or Skorohod integral). See Section 2 for its definition.

In order to state the main result of the paper, we introduce the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1.1.** *The functions  $f_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$  are continuously differentiable and there is a positive constant  $L_1$  such that the Jacobian matrices  $\nabla f_j(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$  satisfy  $\sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(x) \geq L_1 I_m$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $I_m$  is the  $m \times m$  identity matrix.* \{f.cond12\}

In the above hypothesis and in what follows we use the notation  $A \geq B$  to denote the fact that  $A - B$  is a non-negative definite matrix.

We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  the class of functions  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that there are two positive constants  $L_2$  and  $\gamma$  with

$$|g(x)| + |\nabla g(x)| \leq L_2(1 + |x|^\gamma), \quad (1.4) \quad \{1.4\}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$  the class of functions  $g \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that there are two positive constants  $L_2$  and  $\gamma$  with

$$|g(x)| + |\nabla g(x)| + |\mathbb{H}(g)(x)| \leq L_2(1 + |x|^\gamma), \quad (1.5) \quad \{1.5\}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\mathbb{H}(g) = \left( \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}$  denotes Hessian matrix of  $g$ .

It is easy to see that under Hypothesis 1.1,  $f$  satisfies the one-sided dissipative Lipschitz condition:

$$\langle x - y, (f(x) - f(y))\theta \rangle \geq L_1 |x - y|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (1.6) \quad \{1.6\}$$

According to the papers [3, 4, 8] and the references therein, under Hypothesis 1.1 and assuming  $f_{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq l$ , the SDE (1.1) admits a unique solution  $X_t$  in  $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^m)$  for all  $\alpha < H$ . Now we state the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume Hypothesis 1.1 and that the components of  $f$  belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$  when  $H \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , and they belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$  when  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ . Suppose that  $\mathbb{P}(\det(f^{tr} f)(\bar{X}) > 0) > 0$ , where  $\bar{X}$  is the random variable appearing in Theorem 2.1. Then the least squares estimator  $\hat{\theta}_T$  of the parameter  $\theta$  is strongly consistent in the sense that  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{\theta}_T - \theta| = 0$  almost surely.* \{thm.cons\}

**Remark 1.3.** *Condition  $\mathbb{P}(\det(f^{tr} f)(\bar{X}) > 0) > 0$  means that  $\nu(\det(f^{tr} f) > 0) > 0$ , where  $\nu$  is the invariant measure of the SDE (1.1). A sufficient condition for this to hold is  $\det(f^{tr} f)(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .*

**Remark 1.4.** *When  $f(x) = x$  is linear, this inference problem of  $\theta$  has been extensively studied in the literature and various kinds of estimation methods are proposed. We refer interested readers to [6, 7] and the references therein.*

For a general nonlinear case, let us first mention the paper [10] in which the maximum likelihood estimator is analyzed. The paper [8] is more related to our work, where Neuenkirch and Tindel studied the discrete observation case and proved the strong consistency of the following estimator

$$\bar{\theta}_n = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \left| \frac{1}{n\alpha_n^2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( |X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k} - f(X_{t_k}; \theta)\alpha_n|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^d |\sigma_j|^2 \alpha_n^{2H} \right) \right|$$

when  $H > \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $\alpha_n = t_k - t_{k-1}$  satisfies that  $\alpha_n n^\alpha$  converges to a constant as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some small  $\alpha > 0$ . Their approach relies on Young's inequality from the rough path theory to handle Skorohod integrals, which cannot be applied for the case  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

We will give the proof of our main theorem in Section 4. The proof relies on a maximum inequality for Skorohod integrals which will be presented in Section 3. The main tools we use are Malliavin calculus and ergodic theorem, which will be recalled in Section 2.

## 2 Preliminaries

First, let us recall an ergodic theorem for the solution to equation (1.1) that is crucial for our arguments. The  $d$ -dimensional fBm  $B = \{(B_t^1, \dots, B_t^d), t \geq 0\}$  with Hurst parameter  $H \in (0, 1)$ , is a zero mean Gaussian process whose components are independent and have the covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}(B_t^i B_s^i) = R_H(t, s) := \frac{1}{2}(|t|^{2H} + |s|^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H}), \quad (2.1)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . The probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  we are taking is the canonical probability space of the fractional Brownian motion. Namely,  $\Omega = C_0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is the set of continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  equipped with the uniform topology on any compact interval;  $\mathcal{F}$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the probability measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  such that the coordinate process  $B_t(\omega) = \omega(t)$  is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter  $H \in (0, 1)$ .

We define the shift operators  $\mu_t : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  as

$$\mu_t \omega(\cdot) = \omega(\cdot + t) - \omega(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega.$$

The probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  is invariant with respect to the shift operators  $\mu_t$ . The ergodic property of the SDE (1.1) is summarized in the following theorem (see [4, 8]).

**Theorem 2.1.** *Assume the drift function  $f$  satisfies Hypothesis 1.1 and its components belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Then, the following results hold:*

(i) *There exists a random variable  $\overline{X} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\mathbb{E}|\overline{X}|^p < \infty$  for all  $p \geq 1$  such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |X_t(\omega) - \overline{X}(\mu_t \omega)| = 0 \quad (2.2)$$

*for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost all  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

(ii) *For any function  $g \in \mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , we have*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(X_t) dt = \mathbb{E}[g(\overline{X})] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.3)$$

Next we recall some background material on the Malliavin calculus for the fBm  $B$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}^d$  denote the set of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued step functions on  $[0, \infty)$  with compact support. The Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}^d$  is defined as the closure of  $\mathcal{E}^d$  endowed with the inner product

$$\langle (\mathbb{1}_{[0, s_1]}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{[0, s_d]}), (\mathbb{1}_{[0, t_1]}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{[0, t_d]}) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^d} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^d B_{s_j}^j \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^d B_{t_j}^j \right) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^d R_H(s_i, t_i).$$

Then the mapping  $(\mathbb{1}_{[0, t_1]}, \dots, \mathbb{1}_{[0, t_d]}) \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^d B_{t_j}^j$  can be extended to a linear isometry between  $\mathfrak{H}^d$  and the Gaussian space  $\mathcal{H}_1$  spanned by  $B$ . We denote this isometry by  $\varphi \in \mathfrak{H}^d \mapsto B(\varphi)$ . For  $d = 1$ , we simply write  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^1$  and  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}^1$ .

When  $H = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $B$  is just a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion and  $\mathfrak{H}^d = L^2([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ . When  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , let  $|\mathfrak{H}|^d$  be the linear space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued measurable functions  $\varphi$  on  $[0, \infty)$  such that

$$\|\varphi\|_{|\mathfrak{H}|^d}^2 = \alpha_H \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{[0, \infty)^2} |\varphi_r^j| |\varphi_s^j| |r - s|^{2H-2} dr ds < \infty,$$

where  $\alpha_H = H(2H - 1)$ . Then  $|\mathfrak{H}|^d$  is a Banach space with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{|\mathfrak{H}|^d}$  and  $\mathcal{E}^d$  is dense in  $|\mathfrak{H}|^d$ . Furthermore, for any  $\varphi \in L^{\frac{1}{H}}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\|\varphi\|_{|\mathfrak{H}|^d} \leq b_{H,d} \|\varphi\|_{L^{\frac{1}{H}}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (2.4) \quad \{\text{lh.norm}\}$$

for some constant  $b_{H,d} > 0$  (See [9]). Thus, we have continuous embeddings  $L^{\frac{1}{H}}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d) \subset |\mathfrak{H}|^d \subset \mathfrak{H}^d$  for  $H > \frac{1}{2}$ .

When  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , the covariance of the fBm  $B^j$  can be expressed as

$$R_H(t, s) = \int_0^{s \wedge t} K_H(s, u) K_H(t, u) du,$$

where  $K_H(t, s)$  is a square integrable kernel defined as

$$K_H(t, s) = d_H \left( \left( \frac{t}{s} \right)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} (t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - (H - \frac{1}{2}) s^{\frac{1}{2}-H} \int_s^t v^{H-\frac{3}{2}} (v-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} dv \right),$$

for  $0 < s < t$ , with  $d_H$  being a constant depending on  $H$  (see [9]). The kernel  $K_H$  satisfies the following estimates

$$|K_H(t, s)| \leq c_H \left( (t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} + s^{H-\frac{1}{2}} \right), \quad (2.5) \quad \{\text{kh.est1}\}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s) \right| \leq c'_H (t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (2.6) \quad \{\text{kh.est2}\}$$

for all  $s < t$  and for some constants  $c_H, c'_H$ . Now we define a linear operator  $K_H$  from  $\mathcal{E}^d$  to  $L^2([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$  as

$$K_H(\phi)(s) = \left( K_H(T, s) \phi(s) + \int_s^T (\phi(t) - \phi(s)) \frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s) dt \right) \mathbb{1}_{[0, T]}(s), \quad (2.7) \quad \{\text{kstar}\}$$

where the support of  $\phi$  is included in  $[0, T]$ . One can show that this definition does not depend on  $T$ . Then the operator  $K_H$  can be extended to an isometry between the Hilbert space  $\mathfrak{H}^d$  and  $L^2([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$  (see [9]), and if  $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}^d$  has support in  $[0, T]$ , then (2.7) holds. For  $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}^d$  with support in  $[0, T]$ , we define

$$\|\phi\|_{K_T^d}^2 := \int_0^T |\phi(t)|^2 ((T-t)^{2H-1} + t^{2H-1}) dt + \int_0^T \left( \int_s^T |\phi(t) - \phi(s)| (t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} dt \right)^2 ds.$$

By the estimates (2.5) and (2.6), there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $H$  such that for any  $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}^d$  with support in  $[0, T]$ ,

$$\|\phi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d}^2 = \|K_H(\phi)\|_{L^2([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq C \|\phi\|_{K_T^d}^2. \quad (2.8) \quad \{\text{hnorm.est}\}$$

Next, we introduce the derivative operator and its adjoint, the divergence. Consider a smooth and cylindrical random variable of the form  $F = f(B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})$ , where  $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d \times n})$  ( $f$  and its

partial derivatives are all bounded). We define its Malliavin derivative as the  $\mathfrak{H}^d$ -valued random variable given by  $DF = (D^1F, \dots, D^dF)$  whose  $j$ th component is given by

$$D_s^j F = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i^j}(B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n}) \mathbb{1}_{[0, t_j]}(s).$$

By iteration, one can define higher order derivatives  $D^{j_1, \dots, j_i} F$  that take values on  $(\mathfrak{H}^d)^{\otimes i}$ . For any natural number  $p$  and any real number  $q \geq 1$ , we define the Sobolev space  $\mathbb{D}^{p,q}$  as the closure of the space of smooth and cylindrical random variables with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{p,q}$  given by

$$\|F\|_{p,q}^q = \mathbb{E}(|F|^q) + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_i=1}^d \|D^{j_1, \dots, j_i} F\|_{(\mathfrak{H}^d)^{\otimes i}}^2 \right)^{\frac{q}{2}} \right].$$

Similarly, if  $\mathbb{W}$  is a general Hilbert space, we can define the Sobolev space of  $\mathbb{W}$ -valued random variables  $\mathbb{D}^{p,q}(\mathbb{W})$ .

For  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , the adjoint of the Malliavin derivative operator  $D^j$ , denoted as  $\delta^j$ , is called the divergence operator or Skorohod integral (see [9]). A random element  $u$  belongs to the domain of  $\delta^j$ , denoted as  $\text{Dom}(\delta^j)$ , if there exists a positive constant  $c_u$  depending only on  $u$  such that

$$|\mathbb{E}(\langle D^j F, u \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}})| \leq c_u \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for any  $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ . If  $u \in \text{Dom}(\delta^j)$ , then the random variable  $\delta^j(u)$  is defined by the duality relationship

$$\mathbb{E}(F \delta^j(u)) = \mathbb{E}(\langle D^j F, u \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}),$$

for any  $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ . In a similar way, we can define the divergence operator on  $\mathfrak{H}^d$  and we have  $\delta(u) = \sum_{j=1}^d \delta^j(u_j)$  for  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \cap_{j=1}^d \text{Dom}(\delta^j)$ . We make use of the notation  $\delta(u) = \int_0^\infty u_t dB_t$  and call  $\delta(u)$  the divergence integral of  $u$  with respect to the fBm  $B$ .

For  $p > 1$ , as a consequence of Meyer's inequality, the divergence operator  $\delta$  is continuous from  $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathfrak{H}^d)$  into  $L^p(\Omega)$ , which means

$$\mathbb{E}(|\delta(u)|^p) \leq C_p \left( \mathbb{E}(\|u\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d}^p) + \mathbb{E}(\|Du\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathfrak{H}^d}^p) \right), \quad (2.9) \quad \{\text{div.pm}\}$$

for some constant  $C_p$  depending on  $p$ .

### 3 Moment estimates and maximal inequality for divergence integrals with respect to fBm

When  $H > \frac{1}{2}$ , thanks to (2.4) and (2.9), the following lemma provides a useful estimate for the  $p$ -norm of the divergence integral with respect to fBm. {maxineq}

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and let  $u$  be an element of  $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathfrak{H}^d)$ ,  $p > 1$ . Then  $u$  belongs to the domain of the divergence operator  $\delta$  in  $L^p(\Omega)$ . Moreover, we have* {pnorm.g}

$$\mathbb{E}(|\delta(u)|^p) \leq C_{p,H} \left( \mathbb{E}(\|u\|_{L^{1/H}([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d]}^p) + \mathbb{E}(\|Du\|_{L^{1/H}([0,\infty)^2;\mathbb{R}^d \times d]}^p) \right).$$

Now we consider the case of  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . First we will derive an estimate for the  $p$ -norm of  $\|u \mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}\|_{\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathbb{W}}$ , where  $u$  is a stochastic process with values in a Hilbert space  $\mathbb{W}$ .

Consider the functions  $L^t$  and  $L^{t,s}$  defined for  $0 < s < t < b$  by

$$L^t(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) := (b-t)^{\lambda_0} t^{\lambda_1}, \quad (3.1) \quad \{1\mathfrak{t}\}$$

$$L^{t,s}(\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) := (b-t)^{\lambda_2}(t-s)^{\lambda_3}s^{\lambda_4}. \quad (3.2) \quad \{\mathbf{1ts}\}$$

where the  $\lambda_i$ 's are parameters. We denote by  $C$  a generic constant that depends only on the coefficients of the SDE (1.1), the Hurst parameter  $H$  and the parameters introduced along the paper.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  and  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Fix  $b \geq 0$ . Let  $\mathbb{W}$  be a Hilbert space and consider a  $\mathbb{W}$ -valued stochastic process  $u = \{u_t, t \geq 0\}$  satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i)  $\|u_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{W})} \leq K_1 L^t(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ ;
- (ii)  $\|u_t - u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{W})} \leq K_2 L^{t,s}(\lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4)$ , for all  $s < t \leq b$ ,

where the parameters  $\lambda_i$  satisfy  $\lambda_0 > -H$ ,  $\lambda_1, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_2 > -\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\lambda_3 > \frac{1}{2} - H$ . Then for all  $0 \leq a \leq b$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(\|u\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}\|_{\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathbb{W}}^p) \leq CK_2^p b^{p\lambda_4} (b-a)^{pH+p\lambda_2+p\lambda_3} + CK_1^p b^{p\lambda_1} (b-a)^{pH+p\lambda_0}. \quad (3.3) \quad \{\mathbf{u.pnorm}\}$$

*Proof.* To simplify we assume  $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{R}$ . Using the isometry of the operator  $K_H$ , we can write

$$\mathbb{E}(\|u\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^p) = \mathbb{E}\left(\|K_H(u\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]})\|_{L^2([0,b])}^p\right).$$

We decompose the integral appearing in (2.7) into sum of three terms according to the cases where one of  $s, t$  is in the interval  $(a, b)$  or both. In this way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_H(u\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}) &= K_H(b, s)u_s\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(s) + \left(\int_s^b (u_t - u_s)\frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s)dt\right)\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}(s) \\ &\quad + \left(\int_a^b u_t\frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s)dt\right)\mathbb{1}_{[0,a]}(s) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}(\|u\mathbb{1}_{[a,b]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^p) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i, \quad (3.4) \quad \{\mathbf{est}\}$$

where  $A_i = \mathbb{E}\left(\|I_i\|_{L^2([0,b])}^p\right)$ . Now we estimate each term  $A_i$  in (3.4). For  $A_1$ , applying Minkowski inequality and condition (i), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq C \left(\int_a^b ((b-s)^{2H-1} + s^{2H-1}) \|u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)}^2 ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq CK_1^p \left(\int_a^b ((b-s)^{2H-1} + s^{2H-1})(b-s)^{2\lambda_0} s^{2\lambda_1} ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq CK_1^p \left(\int_a^b ((b-s)^{2H-1} + (s-a)^{2H-1})(b-s)^{2\lambda_0} s^{2\lambda_1} ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= CK_1^p b^{p\lambda_1} (b-a)^{pH+p\lambda_0}. \end{aligned}$$

For the term  $A_3$ , applying again Minkowski inequality and condition (i), we can write

$$A_3 \leq C \left(\int_0^a \left(\int_a^b \|u_t\|_{L^p(\Omega)}(t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} dt\right)^2 ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

$$\leq CK_1^p \left( \int_0^a \left( \int_a^b (b-t)^{\lambda_0} t^{\lambda_1} (t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} dt \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Denote  $g(t) = (b-t)^{\lambda_0} t^{\lambda_1}$  which is positive. Then

$$A_3 \leq CK_1^p \left( \int_{[a,b]^2} g(t_1)g(t_2)dt_1dt_2 \int_0^a (t_1-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Now

$$\int_0^a (t_1-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}ds \leq \int_0^a (t_1-a)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}ds \leq C(t_1-a)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-a)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In the same way we have

$$\int_0^a (t_1-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}ds \leq C(t_2-a)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_1-a)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using the fact that if  $u \leq a_1$  and  $u \leq a_2$ , then  $u \leq \sqrt{a_1 a_2}$ , we see that

$$\int_0^a (t_1-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}(t_2-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}}ds \leq (t_1-a)^{H-1}(t_2-a)^{H-1}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$A_3 \leq CK_1^p \left( \int_a^b (b-t)^{\lambda_0} (t-a)^{H-1} t^{\lambda_1} dt \right)^p \leq CK_1^p b^{p\lambda_1} (b-a)^{pH+p\lambda_0}.$$

For  $A_2$ , applying Minkowski inequality and condition (ii), yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\leq C \left( \int_a^b \left( \int_s^b \|u_t - u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)} (t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} dt \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq CK_2^p \left( \int_a^b \left( \int_s^b (b-t)^{\lambda_2} (t-s)^{\lambda_3} s^{\lambda_4} (t-s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} dt \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq CK_2^p \left( \int_a^b (b-s)^{2\lambda_2+2\lambda_3+2H-1} s^{2\lambda_4} ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &= CK_2^p b^{p\lambda_4} (b-a)^{pH+p\lambda_2+p\lambda_3}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Suppose now that  $u$  is a  $d$ -dimensional stochastic process. We will make use of the notation  $\|u\|_{p,a,b} := \sup_{a \leq t \leq b} \|u_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)}$ . Consider the following regularity conditions on  $u$ :

**Hypothesis 3.3.** Assume that there are constants  $K > 0$ ,  $\beta > \frac{1}{2} - H$  and  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ , such that the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process  $u = \{u_t, t \geq 0\}$  and its derivative  $\{Du_t, t \geq 0\}$  satisfy the following conditions:

{hypo.u}

$$(i) \quad \|u\|_{p,0,\infty} = \sup_{t \geq 0} \|u_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty,$$

$$(ii) \quad \|u_t - u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K(t-s)^\beta,$$

$$(iii) \quad \|Du_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq Kt^\lambda,$$

$$(iv) \|Du_t - Du_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K(t-s)^\beta s^\lambda,$$

for all  $0 \leq s < t$ .

As an application of (2.9) and Proposition 3.2, we give the following estimate for the  $p$ -th moment of the divergence integral  $\delta(u\mathbb{1}_{[0,T]})$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $p \geq 2$ . Assume that the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stochastic process  $\{u_t, t \geq 0\}$  satisfies Hypothesis 3.3. Then for any  $T > 0$ , the divergence integral  $\delta(u\mathbb{1}_{[0,T]})$  is in  $L^p(\Omega)$ , and*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\delta(u\mathbb{1}_{[0,T]})|^p) \leq CT^{pH}(1 + T^{p\lambda})(1 + T^{p\beta}),$$

where the constant  $C$  is independent of  $T$ .

*Proof.* We will use inequality (2.9) to prove the proposition and it suffices to compute the right-hand side of (2.9). Applying Proposition 3.2 to  $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\lambda_3 = \beta$  and  $\lambda_i = 0, i \neq 3$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|u\mathbb{1}_{[0,T]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d}^p) \leq C \left( \|u\|_{p,0,\infty}^p T^{pH} + K^p T^{p\beta+pH} \right).$$

To compute the  $p$ -th moment of the derivative of  $u$ , we use the functions  $L^t$  and  $L^{t,s}$  introduced in (3.1) and (3.2), respectively, to write the conditions (iii) and (iv) of Hypothesis 3.3 as

$$\|Du_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq KL^t(0, \lambda),$$

and

$$\|Du_t - Du_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq KL^{t,s}(0, \beta, \lambda).$$

Then we use Proposition 3.2 for  $\mathbb{W} = \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$  and take into account the isomorphism  $\mathfrak{H} \otimes (\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d) \cong \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathfrak{H}^d$  to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|Du\mathbb{1}_{[0,T]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathfrak{H}^d}^p) \leq CK^p T^{pH+p\lambda}(1 + T^{p\beta}).$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

When  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ , the divergence integral  $\left\{ \int_0^t u_s dB_s, t \geq 0 \right\}$  is not a martingale, so we cannot apply Burkholder inequality to bound the maximum of the integral. However, if the process  $u$  satisfies some regularity conditions in Hypothesis 3.3, we can use a factorization method to estimate the maximum, as it has been done in [1]. This result is given in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\{u_t, t \geq 0\}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stochastic process. For the divergence integral  $\int_0^t u_s dB_s, t \geq 0$ , we have the following statements:*

1. *Let  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ . Assume that the stochastic process  $u$  satisfies Hypothesis 3.3. Then the divergence integral  $\int_0^t u_s dB_s$  is in  $L^p(\Omega)$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and for any  $0 \leq a < b$  we have the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a,b]} \left| \int_a^t u_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \leq C(b-a)^{pH}(1 + (b-a)^{p\beta})(1 + b^{p\lambda}),$$

where  $C$  is a generic constant that does not depend on  $a, b$ .

2. *Let  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = H$  with  $p > q$ . Suppose that for all  $T > 0$*

- (i)  $\int_0^T \mathbb{E}(|u_s|^p) ds < \infty$ ,
- (ii)  $\int_0^T \int_0^s \mathbb{E}(|D_t u_s|^p) dt ds < \infty$ .



Then the divergence integral  $\int_0^t u_s dB_s$  is in  $L^p(\Omega)$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and for any interval  $[a, b]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left| \int_a^t u_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \leq C \left( (b-a)^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_a^b \mathbb{E}(|u_s|^p) ds + (b-a)^{\frac{2p}{q}} \int_a^b \int_a^s \mathbb{E}(|D_t u_s|^p) dt ds \right),$$

where the constant  $C$  does not depend on  $a, b$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $u$  is a smooth function. The general case follows from a limiting argument. We will use the elementary integral  $\int_s^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (r-s)^{-\alpha} dr = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\alpha\pi)}$  for any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , and a stochastic Fubini's theorem. For any  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{p}, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left| \int_a^t u_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{\sin(\alpha\pi)}{\pi} \right)^p \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left| \int_a^t \left( \int_s^t (t-r)^{\alpha-1} (r-s)^{-\alpha} dr \right) u_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{\sin(\alpha\pi)}{\pi} \right)^p \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left| \int_a^t \left( \int_a^r (r-s)^{-\alpha} u_s dB_s \right) (t-r)^{\alpha-1} dr \right|^p \right) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\sin(\alpha\pi)}{\pi} \right)^p \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left( \int_a^t \left| \int_a^r (r-s)^{-\alpha} u_s dB_s \right|^p dr \right) \left| \int_a^t (t-r)^{\frac{p(\alpha-1)}{p-1}} dr \right|^{p-1} \right) \\ &\leq C_{\alpha, p} (b-a)^{p\alpha-1} \int_a^b \mathbb{E}(|G_r|^p) dr, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5} \quad \{\text{max.ineq}\}$$

where

$$G_r := \int_a^r (r-s)^{-\alpha} u_s dB_s, \quad r \in [a, b].$$

Case  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ : Using Lemma 3.1 for  $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{q})$  and  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = H$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|G_r|^p) &\leq C_{p, H} \left( \left( \int_a^r (r-s)^{-\frac{\alpha}{H}} |\mathbb{E}(u_s)|^{\frac{1}{H}} ds \right)^{pH} + \mathbb{E} \left( \int_a^r \int_a^s (r-s)^{-\frac{\alpha}{H}} |D_\mu u_s|^{\frac{1}{H}} d\mu ds \right)^{pH} \right) \\ &\leq C_{p, H} \left( \int_a^r (r-s)^{-\alpha q} ds \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left( \int_a^r |\mathbb{E}(u_s)|^p ds \right) \\ &\quad + C_{p, H} \left( \int_a^r \int_a^s (r-s)^{-\alpha q} d\mu ds \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left( \int_a^r \int_a^s \mathbb{E}(|D_\mu u_s|^p) d\mu ds \right) \\ &\leq C_{\alpha, p, q, H} \left( (r-a)^{\frac{p}{q}-\alpha p} \int_a^r \mathbb{E}(|u_s|^p) ds + (r-a)^{\frac{2p}{q}-\alpha p} \int_a^r \int_a^s \mathbb{E}(|D_\mu u_s|^p) d\mu ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \left| \int_a^t u_s dB_s \right|^p \right) \leq C \left( (b-a)^{\frac{p}{q}} \int_a^b \mathbb{E}(|u_s|^p) ds + (b-a)^{\frac{2p}{q}} \int_a^b \int_a^s \mathbb{E}(|D_\mu u_s|^p) d\mu ds \right).$$

Case  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ : Denote  $\psi(t) = (r-t)^{-\alpha} u_t$  for  $t \in [a, r]$ . Then by (2.9),

$$\mathbb{E}(|G_r|^p) \leq \mathbb{E}(\|\psi \mathbb{1}_{[a, r]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d}^p) + \mathbb{E}(\|D(\psi \mathbb{1}_{[a, r]})\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathfrak{H}^d}^p). \tag{3.6} \quad \{\text{gr.pm}\}$$

We will estimate the above two items on the right-hand side one by one. For  $a \leq s < t < r$ ,

$$|\psi(t) - \psi(s)| = |(r-t)^{-\alpha} (u_t - u_s) + ((r-t)^{-\alpha} - (r-s)^{-\alpha}) u_s|$$

$$\leq (r-t)^{-\alpha}|u_t - u_s| + (r-t)^{-2\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha|u_s|,$$

where we have used the inequality  $1 - (r-t)^\alpha(r-s)^{-\alpha} \leq (r-s)^{-\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha$ . Thus, using Hypothesis 3.3 (ii), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi(t) - \psi(s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq (r-t)^{-\alpha}\|u_t - u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} + (r-t)^{-2\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha\|u_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq K(r-t)^{-\alpha}(t-s)^\beta + \|u\|_{p,a,b}(r-t)^{-2\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\|\psi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} = (r-t)^{-\alpha}\|u_t \mathbb{1}_{[a,r]}\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq (r-t)^{-\alpha}\|u\|_{p,a,b}, \quad (3.8) \quad \{\text{psi}\}$$

This means that  $\psi$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.2 with  $W = \mathbb{R}^d$  with the functions  $L^t(-\alpha, 0)$  and  $L^{t,s}(-\alpha, \beta, 0) + L^{t,s}(-2\alpha, \alpha, 0)$  if we choose  $\alpha \in (\max(\frac{1}{p}, \frac{1}{2} - H), H)$ , which requires  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ . In this way, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\psi \mathbb{1}_{[a,r]}\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d}^p) \leq C(r-a)^{pH-p\alpha}(1 + (r-a)^{p\beta}). \quad (3.9) \quad \{\text{psi.hnorm}\}$$

Similarly, using Hypotheses 3.3 (iii) and (iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D\psi(t) - D\psi(s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq (r-t)^{-\alpha}\|Du_t - Du_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} + (r-t)^{-2\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha\|Du_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq K(r-t)^{-\alpha}(t-s)^\beta s^\lambda + K(r-t)^{-2\alpha}(t-s)^\alpha s^\lambda \end{aligned} \quad (3.10) \quad \{\text{dpsi.dif}\}$$

and

$$\|D\psi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} = (r-t)^{-\alpha}\|Du_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K(r-t)^{-\alpha}t^\lambda. \quad (3.11) \quad \{\text{dpsi}\}$$

This means that  $D\psi$  satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3.2 with  $\mathbb{W} = \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$  with the functions  $L^t(-\alpha, \lambda)$  and  $L^{t,s}(-\alpha, \beta, \lambda) + L^{t,s}(-2\alpha, \alpha, \lambda)$ . Using Proposition 3.2 for  $D\psi$  with  $W = \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\|D(\psi \mathbb{1}_{[a,r]})\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathfrak{H}^d}^p) \leq C(r-a)^{pH-p\alpha}(1 + (r-a)^{p\beta})b^{p\lambda}. \quad (3.12) \quad \{\text{dpsi.hnorm}\}$$

Substituting the bounds of (3.9) and (3.12) into (3.6), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|G_r|^p) \leq C(r-a)^{pH-p\alpha}(1 + (r-a)^{p\beta})(1 + b^{p\lambda}). \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, putting this estimate into (3.5), we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Proof of the main theorem

$\{\text{proof}\}$

### 4.1 Estimates of the solution of SDE

Before we present the proof of the main theorem, we need some auxiliary results. First, we prove some estimates for the  $p$ -th moment of the solution of the SDE (1.1).

$\{\text{p.moment}\}$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $H \in (0, 1)$  and  $p \geq 1$ . Assume the drift function  $f$  of the SDE (1.1) satisfies Hypotheses 1.1 and its components belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Let  $X$  be the unique solution to (1.1). Then we have the following statements:*

- (1) *There exists a constant  $C_p > 0$  such that  $\|X_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C_p$ , and  $\|X_t - X_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C_p|t - s|^H$  for all  $t \geq s \geq 0$ .*

(2) The Malliavin derivative of the solution  $X_t$  satisfies for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$

$$|D_s X_t| \leq |\sigma| e^{-L_1(t-s)}, \text{ a.s.} \quad (4.1) \quad \{\text{ineq.dext}\}$$

Moreover, if  $v \leq u \leq s \leq t$ , we have

$$\|D_u X_t - D_v X_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq C e^{-L_1(t-u)} (1 \wedge |u - v|), \quad (4.2) \quad \{\text{ineq3.dext}\}$$

$$\|D_u X_t - D_u X_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq C e^{-L_1(s-u)} (1 \wedge |t - s|), \quad (4.3) \quad \{\text{ineq2.dext}\}$$

and

$$\|D_u X_t - D_v X_t - (D_u X_s - D_v X_s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq C e^{-L_1(s-u)} (1 \wedge |u - v|) (1 \wedge |t - s|), \quad (4.4) \quad \{\text{ineq4.dext}\}$$

where  $C$  is a generic constant.

*Proof.* For the proof of the first result we refer to [3], [4], and [8].

To show the second part of this proposition, taking the Malliavin derivative for  $s \leq t$  on both sides of equation (1.1) yields

$$D_s X_t = - \int_s^t \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_s X_r dr + \sigma, \quad (4.5) \quad \{\text{de.xt}\}$$

where  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ . Denote  $Z_t = D_s X_t$  for  $t \geq s$ . We can write the above equation as the following ordinary differential equation for  $t \geq s$ :

$$\begin{cases} dZ_t = - \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_t) Z_t dt, \\ Z_s = \sigma. \end{cases}$$

Differentiating  $|Z_t|^2$  with respect to  $t$ , and using (1.6), we get

$$\frac{d|Z_t|^2}{dt} = 2 \langle Z_t, - \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_t) Z_t \rangle \leq -2L_1 |Z_t|^2.$$

By Gronwall's lemma, we obtain

$$|Z_t|^2 \leq e^{-2L_1(t-s)} |\sigma|^2,$$

and this implies (4.1).

We now proceed to the proof of (4.2). For  $v \leq u \leq t$ , equation (4.5) implies

$$D_u X_t - D_v X_t = - \int_u^t \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) (D_u X_r - D_v X_r) dr + \int_v^u \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_v X_r dr. \quad (4.6) \quad \{\text{md.dif}\}$$

Repeating the above arguments for  $D_u X_t - D_v X_t$ ,  $t \geq u$ , we can write

$$|D_u X_t - D_v X_t| \leq e^{-L_1(t-u)} \left| \int_v^u \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_v X_r dr \right|.$$

Applying Minkowski inequality and (4.1) to  $D_v X_r$ , and then using the fact that the  $L^p$ -norm of  $|\nabla f_j(X_r)|$  is bounded due to condition (1.4), we obtain

$$\|D_u X_t - D_v X_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq e^{-L_1(t-u)} \int_v^u \left\| \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_v X_r \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} dr$$

$$\leq C e^{-L_1(t-u)} \int_v^u e^{-L_1(r-v)} dr \leq C e^{-L_1(t-u)} (1 \wedge |u-v|).$$

This proves (4.2). To prove (4.3), we use equation (4.5) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t - D_u X_s|^p) = \mathbb{E} \left( \left| \int_s^t \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_u X_r dr \right|^p \right).$$

Applying Minkowski inequality and using (4.1) for  $D_u X_r$ , and the fact that the  $L^p$ -norm of  $|\nabla f_j(X_r)|$  is bounded, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_u X_t - D_u X_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} &\leq \int_s^t \left\| \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) D_u X_r \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} dr \\ &\leq C \int_s^t e^{-L_1(r-u)} dr \leq C e^{-L_1(s-u)} (1 \wedge |t-s|). \end{aligned}$$

Finally we prove (4.4). Using (4.6), we have the following estimate

$$\|D_u X_t - D_v X_t - (D_u X_s - D_v X_s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} = \left\| \int_s^t \sum_{j=1}^l \theta_j \nabla f_j(X_r) (D_u X_r - D_v X_r) dr \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})}.$$

Applying Minkowski inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_u X_t - D_v X_t - (D_u X_s - D_v X_s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \\ &\leq C \int_s^t \|\nabla f_j(X_r)\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times m})} \|D_u X_r - D_v X_r\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} dr \\ &\leq C (1 \wedge |u-v|) \int_s^t e^{-L_1(r-u)} dr \leq C e^{-L_1(s-u)} (1 \wedge |u-v|) (1 \wedge |t-s|). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.4) and proof of the proposition is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** It is worth pointing out that the solution of the SDE (1.1) is Hölder continuous in  $L^p$  for all  $p \geq 1$  with exponent  $H$ , i.e.,  $\|X_t - X_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^m)} \leq C|t-s|^H$ . However, the Malliavin derivative of  $X_t$  is more regular, i.e.,  $\|D_u X_t - D_u X_s\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})} \leq C|t-s|$ . That is, the Hölder continuity exponent is improved from  $H$  to 1. This is because the noise in the SDE is additive.

The next lemma provides bounds for the norm of the derivative of a function of the solution to equation (1.1).

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $p \geq 2$ . Consider a function  $g = (g^1, \dots, g^d) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  whose components belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Then for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$ , we have

$$\|Dg(X_t) - Dg(X_s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K(t-s)^H s^\lambda, \quad (4.7) \quad \{\text{derg.norm}\}$$

and

$$\|Dg(X_s)\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K s^\lambda, \quad (4.8) \quad \{\text{dg.norm}\}$$

for any  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ , where  $K$  is a constant that may depend on  $\lambda$ .

*Proof.* Consider the  $\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function  $\phi := Dg(X_t) - Dg(X_s)$ . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{\mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d}^2 &\leq C \|\phi\|_{K_t^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d}^2 \leq C \int_0^t |\phi(u)|^2 ((t-u)^{2H-1} + u^{2H-1}) du \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \left( \int_v^t |\phi(u) - \phi(v)|(u-v)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} du \right)^2 dv =: C(A_1 + A_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\phi\|_{L^p(\Omega; \mathfrak{H}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^2 \|A_i\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It remains to estimate  $\|A_i\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . First, we write  $\phi(u)$  as

$$\phi(u) = \nabla g(X_t) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_u X_s) + (\nabla g(X_t) - \nabla g(X_s)) \cdot D_u X_s. \quad (4.9) \quad \{\text{phi.u}\}$$

Thus, by the submultiplicativity of Hilbert-Schmidt norm, i.e.,  $|AB| \leq |A||B|$ , we have

$$|\phi(u)| \leq \begin{cases} |\nabla g(X_t)| |D_u X_t - D_u X_s| + |X_t - X_s| |D_u X_s| \\ \quad \times \int_0^1 \|\mathbb{H}(g(X_s + r(X_t - X_s)))\| dr & \text{when } u \leq s \leq t; \\ |\nabla g(X_t)| |D_u X_t| & \text{when } s \leq u \leq t. \end{cases}$$

Here  $\mathbb{H}(g) = (\mathbb{H}(g^1), \dots, \mathbb{H}(g^d))$  is understood as the third order tensor, and  $\|\mathbb{H}(g)\|^2 = \sum_i |\mathbb{H}(g^i)|^2$ . Since the components of  $g$  belong to  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , Proposition 4.1 says that the  $L^p$  norm of  $|\nabla g(X_t)|$  and  $\|\mathbb{H}(g(X_t))\|$  are both bounded for any  $t \geq 0, p \geq 1$ . Due to these facts and the inequalities (4.1) and (4.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|\phi(u)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq C \begin{cases} (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_t)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t - D_u X_s|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ \quad + e^{-L_1(s-u)} \int_0^1 (\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbb{H}(g(X_s + r(X_t - X_s)))\|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} dr \\ \quad \times (\mathbb{E}(|X_t - X_s|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} & \text{when } u \leq s \leq t; \\ (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_t)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} & \text{when } s \leq u \leq t \end{cases} \\ &\leq C e^{-L_1(s-u)} (t-s)^H \mathbf{1}_{\{u < s\}} + C e^{-L_1(t-u)} \mathbf{1}_{\{u > s\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_1\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \left( \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}(|\phi|^p))^{\frac{2}{p}} ((t-u)^{2H-1} + u^{2H-1}) du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(t-s)^H \left( \int_0^s e^{-2L_1(s-u)} ((t-u)^{2H-1} + u^{2H-1}) du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + C \left( \int_s^t e^{-2L_1(t-u)} ((t-u)^{2H-1} + u^{2H-1}) du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(t-s)^H, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the following arguments. For the second summand, we have bounded  $e^{-2L_1(t-u)}$  by 1 and applied the inequality  $t^{2H} - s^{2H} \leq (t-s)^{2H}$ . For the first summand, we bound  $(t-u)^{2H-1}$  by  $(s-u)^{2H-1}$  and decompose the integral in the intervals  $[0, 1]$  and  $[1, s]$  (if  $s \geq 1$ ).

Now we discuss  $A_2$ . For  $v < u$ , we decompose

$$\phi(u) - \phi(v) = \begin{cases} (\nabla g(X_t) - \nabla g(X_s)) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t) \\ \quad + \nabla g(X_s) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t - (D_u X_s - D_v X_s)) & \text{when } v < u < s < t; \\ (\nabla g(X_t) - \nabla g(X_s)) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t) \\ \quad + \nabla g(X_s) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t + D_v X_s) & \text{when } v < s < u < t; \\ \nabla g(X_t) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t) & \text{when } s < v < u < t. \end{cases} \quad (4.10) \quad \{\text{phi.u}\}$$

We shall consider the above three cases separately.

*Case 1):*  $v < u < s < t$ . In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \int_0^1 (\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbb{H}(g(X_s + r(X_t - X_s)))\|^{4p}))^{\frac{1}{4p}} dr \\ &\quad \times (\mathbb{E}(|X_t - X_s|^{4p}))^{\frac{1}{4p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t - D_v X_t|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_s)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t - D_v X_t - (D_u X_s - D_v X_s)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Case 2):*  $s < v < u < t$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} &= (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_t) \cdot (D_u X_t - D_v X_t)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_t)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t - D_v X_t|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Case 3):*  $v < s < u < t$ . We have

$$\phi(u) - \phi(v) = \nabla g(X_t) \cdot D_u X_t - \nabla g(X_t) \cdot (D_v X_t - D_v X_s) - (\nabla g(X_t) - \nabla g(X_s)) \cdot D_v X_s,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq (\mathbb{E}(|\nabla g(X_t)|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} \left( (\mathbb{E}(|D_u X_t|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} + (\mathbb{E}(|D_v X_t - D_v X_s|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}} \right) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 (\mathbb{E}(\|\mathbb{H}(g(X_s + r(X_t - X_s)))\|^{4p}))^{\frac{1}{4p}} dr \\ &\quad \times (\mathbb{E}(|X_t - X_s|^{4p}))^{\frac{1}{4p}} (\mathbb{E}(|D_v X_s|^{2p}))^{\frac{1}{2p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above cases, and using the inequalities (4.1) to (4.4) in Proposition 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}(|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|^p))^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq C|t - s|^H e^{-L_1(s-u)} |u - v|^\epsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{v < u < s < t\}} + C e^{-L_1(t-u)} |u - v|^\epsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{v > s\}} \\ &\quad + C \left( e^{-L_1(t-u)} + e^{-L_1(s-v)} |t - s|^H \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{v < s < u < t\}} \\ &:= \sum_{i=1}^4 A_{2i}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.11) \quad \{\text{phiuv.pm}\}$$

where we have used  $1 \wedge |u - v| \leq C|u - v|^\epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  and  $1 \wedge |t - s| \leq C|t - s|^H$ . Now we apply Minkowski's inequality to  $\|A_2\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and then an application of (4.11) yields

$$\|A_2\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left( \int_0^t \left( \int_v^t (\mathbb{E}|\phi(u) - \phi(v)|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} (u - v)^{H - \frac{3}{2}} du \right)^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 A_2^{(i)},$$

where

$$A_2^{(i)} = \left( \int_0^t \left( \int_v^t A_{2i}(u-v)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} du \right)^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For  $i = 1$ , fix  $\lambda \in (0, H]$  and set  $\epsilon = 1 - H + \lambda$  for  $A_{21}$  in (4.11). In this way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_2^{(1)} &\leq C(t-s)^H \left( \int_0^s \left( \int_v^s e^{-L_1(s-u)} (u-v)^{\lambda-\frac{1}{2}} du \right)^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(t-s)^H \left( \int_0^s (s-v)^{2\lambda-1} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(t-s)^H s^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the following estimate. For any  $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_v^s e^{-L_1(s-u)} (u-v)^\alpha du &\leq \int_0^{s-v} e^{-L_1(s-v-x)} x^\alpha dx \\ &\leq \int_0^{\frac{s-v}{2}} e^{-L_1(\frac{s-v}{2})} x^\alpha dx + \int_{\frac{s-v}{2}}^{s-v} \left( \frac{s-v}{2} \right)^\alpha e^{-L_1(s-v-x)} dx \\ &\leq C \left( e^{-L_1(\frac{s-v}{2})} \left( \frac{s-v}{2} \right)^{\alpha+1} + \left( \frac{s-v}{2} \right)^\alpha \right) \leq C(s-v)^\alpha, \quad (4.12) \quad \{\text{int.est2}\} \end{aligned}$$

taking into account the fact that the function  $xe^{-L_1x}$  is bounded on  $[0, \infty)$ .

For  $i = 2$ , choosing  $\epsilon = 1$ , we can write

$$A_2^{(2)} \leq C \left( \int_s^t \left( \int_v^t e^{-L_1(t-u)} (u-v)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} du \right)^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Using (4.12) by setting  $\lambda = H - \frac{1}{2}$ , we have

$$A_2^{(2)} \leq C \left( \int_s^t (t-v)^{2H-1} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(t-s)^H.$$

For  $i = 3$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2^{(3)} &\leq C \left( \int_0^s \left( \int_s^t e^{-L_1(t-u)} (u-v)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} du \right)^2 dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \int_s^t \left( \int_0^s e^{-2L_1(t-u)} (u-v)^{2H-3} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du \leq C \int_s^t (u-s)^{H-1} du \leq C(t-s)^H. \end{aligned}$$

For  $i = 4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2^{(4)} &\leq C(t-s)^H \left( \int_0^s \left( \int_s^t (u-v)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} du \right)^2 e^{-L_1(s-v)} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(t-s)^H \left( \int_0^s (s-v)^{2H-1} e^{-L_1(s-v)} dv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(t-s)^H. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of (4.7). The proof of (4.8) is similar.  $\square$

We next apply Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 to deduce the estimate for the  $p$ -th moment of the divergence integral  $Z_{g,t}$  which is defined as

$$Z_{g,t} := \int_0^t g(X_s) dB_s, \quad (4.13) \quad \{\text{zgt.def}\}$$

where  $\{X_t, t \geq 0\}$  is the solution of the SDE (1.1), and the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfies some regularity and growth conditions. \{\text{zt.pnorm}\}

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let the divergence integral  $Z_{g,T}$  be defined by (4.13).*

1. *If  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$  and  $p \geq 2$ , assume that the components of the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  belong to the space  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(|Z_{g,T}|^p) \leq CT^{pH}(1 + T^{p\lambda})(1 + T^{pH}),$$

*for any  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ , where  $C > 0$  is a constant independent of  $T$ .*

2. *If  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , assume that the components of the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  belong to the space  $\mathcal{C}_p^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . Then for  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(|Z_{g,T}|^p) \leq CT^{pH},$$

*for all  $T > 0$ , where  $C > 0$  is independent of  $T$ .*

*Proof.* First, for  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ , by Proposition 4.1, the process  $\{g(X_t), t \geq 0\}$  satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Hypothesis 3.3 with  $\beta = H$ , which requires  $H > \frac{1}{2} - H$ , i.e.,  $H > \frac{1}{4}$ . By (4.7) and (4.8) of Lemma 4.3,  $Dg(X_t)$  satisfies conditions (iii) and (iv) of Hypothesis 3.3 with  $\beta = H$  and  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ . By Proposition 3.4, we obtain the result.

Second, for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , applying the results in the preceding Proposition 4.1, we get that  $g(X_t)$  and  $\nabla g(X_t)$  are bounded in  $L^p(\Omega)$ , so clearly  $g(X_t)$  is in the space  $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathfrak{H}^d)$ . Applying Lemma 3.1 to  $Z_{g,T}$  yields

$$\mathbb{E}(|Z_{g,T}|^p) \leq C_{p,H} \left( \left( \int_0^T \mathbb{E}(|g(X_t)|^{\frac{1}{H}}) dt \right)^{pH} + \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T \int_0^t |D_s g(X_t)|^{\frac{1}{H}} ds dt \right)^{pH} \right).$$

Then we use (4.1) and integrate  $s$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|Z_{g,T}|^p) &\leq C_{p,H} \left( \left( \int_0^T \mathbb{E}(|g(X_t)|^{\frac{1}{H}}) dt \right)^{pH} + \frac{|\sigma|^p H^{pH}}{L_1^{pH}} \mathbb{E} \left( \int_0^T |\nabla g(X_t)|^{\frac{1}{H}} (1 - e^{-\frac{L_1}{H}t}) dt \right)^{pH} \right) \\ &\leq C_{p,H} \left( \int_0^T \mathbb{E}(|g(X_t)|^{\frac{1}{H}}) dt \right)^{pH} + C_{p,H,L_1,\sigma} \left( \int_0^T (\mathbb{E}|\nabla g(X_t)|^p)^{\frac{1}{pH}} dt \right)^{pH} \leq CT^{pH}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

The following lemma is an important ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose  $f$  satisfies  $\mathbb{P}(\det(f^{tr}f)(\overline{X}) > 0) > 0$ , then  $\mathbb{E}((f^{tr}f)(\overline{X}))$  is invertible.* \{\text{f.erg.pos}\}

*Proof.* Let  $\nu$  be the law of  $\overline{X}$ . Applying Minkowski determinantal inequality and Jensen's inequality yields

$$\det \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (f^{tr}f)(x) \nu(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \det((f^{tr}f)(x))^{\frac{1}{t}} \nu(dx),$$

which is positive under our hypothesis. □



Next we proceed to prove Theorem 1.2. Recall that the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_T$  is given by (1.3). By Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f^{tr} f)(X_t) dt \rightarrow \mathbb{E}((f^{tr} f)(\bar{X})) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

which is invertible. Therefore,

$$\left( \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f^{tr} f)(X_t) dt \right)^{-1} \rightarrow (\mathbb{E}((f^{tr} f)(\bar{X})))^{-1} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.14) \quad \{\mathbf{k11}\}$$

Fix  $j = 1, \dots, l$  and consider the function  $g_j(x) = f_j^{tr}(x)\sigma : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote

$$Z_{j,t} = \int_0^t g_j(X_s) dB_s = \int_0^t f_j^{tr}(X_s) \sigma dB_s.$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, l$ . Taking into account (4.14), to show  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} |\hat{\theta}_T - \theta| = 0$  it suffices to show

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} Z_{j,T} = 0 \quad (4.15) \quad \{\mathbf{ecua1}\}$$

for each  $j = 1, \dots, l$ . The proof of (4.15) will be done in two steps.

*Step 1:* Fix  $j = 1, \dots, l$ . We first show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} Z_{j,n} = 0.$$

Since the components of  $f$  belong to the space  $\mathcal{C}_p^i(\mathbb{R}^m)$  with  $i = 1, 2$ , depending on  $H > \frac{1}{2}$  or  $H < \frac{1}{2}$ , respectively, clearly the function  $g_j(x)$  satisfies the conditions in Proposition 4.4. Applying Proposition 4.4,

$$\mathbb{E}(|Z_{j,n}|^p) \leq \begin{cases} Cn^{pH} & \text{when } H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \\ Cn^{p(2H+\lambda)} & \text{when } H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}) \end{cases} \quad (4.16) \quad \{\mathbf{e.4.14}\}$$

for any  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ . We will choose  $p$  and  $\lambda$  in such a way that  $p > \frac{1}{1-H}$  if  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $0 < \lambda < 1 - 2H$  and  $p > \frac{1}{1-2H-\lambda}$  if  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

On the other hand, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , by Chebyshev inequality and the above estimates we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|n^{-1} Z_{j,n}| > \epsilon) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^{-p} \mathbb{E}(|n^{-1} Z_{j,n}|^p) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^{-p} n^{(H-1)p} & \text{when } H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \\ C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^{-p} n^{(2H+\lambda-1)p} & \text{when } H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \end{cases} \\ &< \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By Borel-Cantelli lemma,  $n^{-1} Z_{j,n} \rightarrow 0$  a.s. as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Step 2:* For any  $T > 0$  we define the integer  $k_T$  by  $k_T \leq T < k_T + 1$ . We write

$$\frac{1}{T} Z_{j,T} = \frac{k_T}{T} \frac{1}{k_T} \int_0^{k_T} g_j(X_t) dB_t + \frac{1}{T} \int_{k_T}^T g_j(X_t) dB_t.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{T} |Z_{j,T}| \leq \frac{1}{k_T} \left| \int_0^{k_T} g_j(X_t) dB_t \right| + \frac{1}{T} \left| \int_{k_T}^T g_j(X_t) dB_t \right|.$$

Clearly from Step 1 the first summand converges to 0 almost surely as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . For the second summand, observe that

$$\frac{1}{T} \left| \int_{k_T}^T g_j(X_t) dB_t \right| \leq \frac{1}{k_T} \sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right|. \quad (4.17) \quad \{\text{eq1.cons}\}$$

Now we apply Theorem 3.5 to the  $p$ -th moment of  $\sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right|$ . When  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right|^p \right] &\leq C \left( \int_{k_T}^{k_T+1} \mathbb{E}(|g_j(X_s)|^p) ds + \int_{k_T}^{k_T+1} \int_{k_T}^s \mathbb{E}(|D_\mu g_j(X_s)|^p) d\mu ds \right) \\ &\leq C \int_{k_T}^{k_T+1} \mathbb{E}(|g_j(X_s)|^p + |\nabla g_j(X_s)|^p) ds \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $H \in (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $g_j$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_p^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ , so by Lemma 4.3 it satisfies Hypothesis 3.3. Then applying Theorem 3.5 yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right|^p \right] \leq C(k_T + 1)^{p\lambda}$$

for all  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , and any  $\lambda \in (0, H]$ . By Chebyshev inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{k_T} \sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-p} \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{k_T^p} \sup_{t \in [k_T, k_T+1]} \left| \int_{k_T}^t g_j(X_s) dB_s \right|^p \right) \leq C \epsilon^{-p} k_T^{p\lambda-p}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $p$  large enough, the above right-hand side is summable with respect to  $k_T$  and the desired result just follows from Borel-Cantelli Lemma. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Remark 4.6.** From the proof of Theorem 1.2 we can see that the random variables  $\xi_t = t^{-1} Z_{j,t}$  converge to 0 as  $t$  tends to infinity for every  $j = 1, \dots, l$  in the following sense. For any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{k \leq t \leq k+1} |\xi_t| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

This type of convergence is analogous to the complete convergence of a sequence of random variables (see [5]), which implies the almost sure convergence.

**Remark 4.7.** If we assume that the parameter vector  $\theta$  belongs to a compact set  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ , the upper bound of the  $p$ -th moment of  $X_t$  would be independent of  $\theta$ , and, correspondingly, the constants  $C$  and  $K$  that appear in Proposition 4.1, Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 would be independent of  $\theta$  as well. As a consequence, we get the uniform strong convergence of the random variables  $\xi_t = t^{-1} Z_{j,t}$  to 0 as  $t$  tends to infinity for every  $j = 1, \dots, l$ , in the sense of

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{t \geq T} |\xi_t| > \epsilon \right) = 0$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Furthermore, if the function  $f$  satisfies  $(f^{\text{tr}} f)^{-1} \leq L_3 I_l$  where  $L_3 > 0$  is a constant independent of  $\theta$  and  $I_l$  is an  $l \times l$  identity matrix, the uniform strong consistency of  $\hat{\theta}_T$  can be established by observing that  $\left( \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T (f^{\text{tr}} f)(X_t) dt \right)^{-1} \leq L_3 I_l$ .

## Acknowledgement

David Nualart is supported by the NSF grant DMS1512891.

## References

- [1] Alòs, E., and Nualart, D. A maximal inequality for the Skorohod integral. *In: Stochastic Differential and Difference Equations*. Progr. Systems Control Theory, **23**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1997.
- [2] Essaky, E., and Nualart, D. On the  $1/H$ -variation of the divergence integral with respect to fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter  $H < \frac{1}{2}$ . *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **125** (2015), no. 11: 4117-4141.
- [3] Garrido-Atienza, M., Kloeden, P., and Neuenkirch A. Discretization of stationary solutions of stochastic systems driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **60** (2009), no. 2: 151-172.
- [4] Hairer, M. Ergodicity of stochastic differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **33** (2005), no. 2: 703-758.
- [5] Hsu, P., and Robbins, H. Complete convergence and the law of large numbers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **33** (1947), no. 2: 25-31.
- [6] Hu, Y., and Nualart, D. Parameter estimation for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **80** (2010), no. 11-12: 1030-1038.
- [7] Hu, Y., Nualart, D., and Zhou, H. Parameter estimation for fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes of general Hurst parameter. To appear at *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.*
- [8] Neuenkirch, A., and Tindel, S. A least square-type procedure for parameter estimation in stochastic differential equations with additive fractional noise. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* **17** (2014), no. 1: 99-120.
- [9] Nualart, D. The Malliavin calculus and related topics. Second edition, Springer, 2006.
- [10] Tudor, C., and Viens, F. Statistical aspects of the fractional stochastic calculus. *Ann. Statist.* **35** (2007), no. 3: 1183-1212.

Yaozhong Hu: Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2G1. *E-mail address:* [yaozhong@ualberta.ca](mailto:yaozhong@ualberta.ca)

David Nualart and Hongjuan Zhou: Department of Mathematics, University of Kansas, 405 Snow Hall, Lawrence, Kansas, 66045, USA. *E-mail address:* [nualart@ku.edu](mailto:nualart@ku.edu), [zhj@ku.edu](mailto:zhj@ku.edu)