

# UNIQUENESS OF THE NONLINEAR SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION DRIVEN BY JUMP PROCESSES

ANNE DE BOUARD, ERIKA HAUSENBLAS AND MARTIN ONDREJÁT

**ABSTRACT.** In a recent paper by the first two named authors, existence of martingale solutions to a stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation driven by a Lévy noise was proved. In this paper, we prove pathwise uniqueness, uniqueness in law and existence of strong solutions to this problem using an abstract uniqueness result of Kurtz.

**Keywords and phrases:** Uniqueness results, Yamada-Watanabe-Kurtz Theorem, Stochastic integral of jump type, stochastic partial differential equations, Poisson random measures, Lévy processes, Schrödinger Equation.

**AMS subject classification (2002):** Primary 60H15; Secondary 60G57.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a natural continuation of [13], where the first two named authors proved existence of global solutions to a stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equation driven by a time homogeneous Poisson random measure. The existence of solutions was proved in the weak probabilistic sense, i.e. just on one stochastic basis. The aim of the present paper is to give sufficient conditions in order that these solutions are also strong and unique, i.e. global solutions exist on every stochastic basis and are unique pathwise as well as in law. We proceed first by proving pathwise uniqueness of the solutions and then we apply a result of Yamada-Watanabe-Kurtz to show that these solutions are strong and unique in law.

The Yamada-Watanabe theory has been well developed for stochastic equations driven by Wiener processes, see e.g. [10, 14, 16, 24, 28, 26, 33] or [2] for forward-backward stochastic differential equations. There are also analogous results for equations driven by Poisson random measures. For instance, in [3], the authors develop the Yamada-Watanabe theory for stochastic differential equations driven by both a Wiener process and a Poisson random measure (where the latter is defined on a locally compact space) via the original method of Yamada and Watanabe [33]. In [34], the Yamada-Watanabe theory is presented for variational solutions of partial differential equations driven by a Poisson random measure on a locally compact space also by the method of Yamada and Watanabe [33]. Unfortunately, none of these results is applicable to our problem, mainly because the noise does not live in a locally compact space.

Let us remind the reader that the original proof of Yamada and Watanabe is based on an application of a theorem on existence of a regular version of a conditional probability and their idea has proved in time to be so strong and robust to be applicable not only to stochastic differential equations but also to stochastic partial differential equations driven by various noises. Yet, in 2007, Kurtz [19] presented an abstract Yamada-Watanabe theory aiming not only at stochastic equations but also at many other stochastic problems of different nature. In that paper, Kurtz was the first one to abandon the original idea of the proof of Yamada and Watanabe (regular version of a conditional probability) and based his proof on the universal Skorokhod representation theorem. This approach made it possible to raise the Yamada-Watanabe theory to an abstract level (see also [20]) where details of particular problems, to which it is applicable, play no role. On the other hand, this abstract approach has one disadvantage for applications that everyone who wishes to apply the result must translate his particular problem to the language of [19] which itself is not straightforward.

---

*Date:* May 31, 2018.

The second named author was supported by the FWF-Project P17273-N12.

The research of the third named author on this work was supported by the GAČR grant no. GA 15-08819S.

In this paper, we recourse to [19] due to its generality. We consider mild solutions to stochastic partial differential equations in Banach spaces driven by time homogeneous Poisson random measures on a Polish spaces (which is not in general locally compact, so we cannot apply the results [3] and [34]), we translate this problem to the language of [19] and prove the standard existence of unique strong solutions. This result is then applied to the stochastic non-linear Schrödinger equation driven by a time homogeneous Poisson random measure.

To be more precise, let  $A = \Delta$  be the Laplace operator with  $D(A) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \Delta u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$ . We are interested in the solution of the following equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} i du(t, x) - \Delta u(t, x) dt + \lambda |u(t, x)|^{\alpha-1} u(t, x) dt \\ \quad = \int_S u(t, x) g(z(x)) \tilde{\eta}(dz, dt) + \int_S u(t, x) h(z(x)) \nu(dz) dt, & t \in [0, T], \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases}$$

where  $\eta$  denotes the Poisson random measure corresponding to  $L$  and  $\tilde{\eta}$  the compensated Poisson random measure,  $\nu$  the intensity of the Poisson random measure. This equation can be rewritten in terms of a Lévy process having characteristic measure  $\nu$ . For more details on the connection of Lévy processes and Poisson random measure we refer to section 2.3 in [9] and the references therein. We would like to remark, that Poisson random measures are more general than Lévy processes.

If the stochastic perturbation is a Wiener process, the equation is well treated and existence and uniqueness of the solution is known. For more information see [11, 12]. In case the stochastic perturbation is replaced by a Lévy process with infinite activity, de Bouard and Hausenblas could only show in [13] the existence of a solution, without uniqueness. Here in this work we are interested in conditions under which a unique solution exists.

Since we will use it later on, we will introduce some notations.

**Notation 1.1.**  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the real numbers,  $\mathbb{R}^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_0^+ := \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ . By  $\mathbb{N}$  we denote the set of natural numbers (including 0) and by  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$  we denote the set  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ .

**Notation 1.2.** If  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a filtration and  $\theta$  a measure then we denote by  $\mathcal{F}_t^\theta$  the augmentation of  $\mathcal{F}_t$  by the  $\theta$ -null sets in  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ .

**Definition 1.1.** A measurable space  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  is called Polish if there exists a metric  $\rho$  on  $S$  such that  $(S, \rho)$  is a complete separable metric space and  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}(S, \rho)$ .

**Notation 1.3.** The set of all finite non-negative measures on a Polish space  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  will be denoted by  $M_+(S)$  and  $\mathcal{P}_1(S)$  will stand for probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}$ . If a family of sets  $\{S_n \in \mathcal{S} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  satisfy  $S_n \uparrow S$  then  $M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\})$  denotes the family of all  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued measures  $\theta$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  such that  $\theta(S_n) < \infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By  $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\})$  we denote the  $\sigma$ -field on  $M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\})$  generated by the functions  $i_B : M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\}) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu(B) \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{S}$ .

The proof of the following result shall be deferred to the appendix, see Lemma C.3 in Section C.

**Lemma 1.2.** Let  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be a Polish space and the family  $\{S_n \in \mathcal{S}\}$  satisfy  $S_n \uparrow S$ . Then  $(M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\}), \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\}))$  is a Polish space.

## 2. TIME HOMOGENEOUS POISSON RANDOM MEASURES

Since the definition of time homogeneous Poisson random measure is introduced in many, not always equivalent ways, we give here our definition.

**Definition 2.1.** (see [15], Def. I.8.1) Let  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be a Polish space,  $\nu$  a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ ,  $\{S_n \in \mathcal{S}\}$  such that  $S_n \uparrow S$  and  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . A time homogenous Poisson random measure  $\eta$  over a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , where  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , is a measurable function

$$\eta : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}), \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})),$$

such that

- (i) for each  $B \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$  with  $\mathbb{E}\eta(B) < \infty$   $\eta(B) := i_B \circ \eta : \Omega \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{N}}$  is a Poisson random variable with parameter  $\mathbb{E}\eta(B)$ , otherwise  $\eta(B) = \infty$  a.s.
- (ii)  $\eta$  is independently scattered, i.e. if the sets  $B_j \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , are disjoint, then the random variables  $\eta(B_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , are mutually independent;
- (iii) for each  $U \in \mathcal{S}$ , the  $\bar{\mathbb{N}}$ -valued process  $(N(t, U))_{t \in [0, T]}$  defined by

$$N(t, U) := \eta(U \times (0, t]), \quad t \in [0, T]$$

is  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted and its increments are stationary and independent of the past, i.e. if  $t > s \geq 0$ , then  $N(t, U) - N(s, U) = \eta(U \times (s, t])$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_s$ .

**Remark 2.2.** In the framework of Definition 2.1 the assignment

$$\nu : \mathcal{S} \ni A \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\eta(A \times (0, 1))]$$

defines a uniquely determined measure, called in the following intensity measure.

In addition, the term of Poisson random measure is sometimes defined in another way, starting with the intensity measure and defining the Poisson random measure with given intensity measure. However, we put the equivalence with the other definition as a Lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** A measurable mapping  $\eta : \Omega \rightarrow M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu$  iff

- (a) for any  $U \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $\nu(U) < \infty$ , the random variable  $N(t, U)$  is Poisson distributed with parameter  $t\nu(U)$ , otherwise  $\mathbb{P}(N(t, U) = \infty) = 1$ ;
- (b) for any  $n$  and disjoint sets  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{S}$ , and any  $t \in [0, T]$ , the random variables  $N(t, U_1), N(t, U_2), \dots, N(t, U_n)$  are mutually independent;
- (c) the  $M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n\})$ -valued process  $(N(t, \cdot))_{t \in (0, T]}$  is adapted to  $\mathbb{F}$ ;
- (d) for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\nu(U) < \infty$ , and any  $r, s \geq t$ , the random variables  $N(r, U) - N(s, U)$  are independent of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ .

*Proof.* To see the equivalence of (i) and (a), first observe, that if  $S$  is a separable metric space, the Borel space  $\mathcal{B}(S \times (0, T])$  of the cartesian product  $S \times \mathbb{R}^+$  is the product of the Borel spaces  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ , see [25, p. 6, Theorem 1.10]. This implies the equivalence from (i) to (a). To show the equivalence of (ii) and (b), one has in addition to take into account that the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra can be generated by intervals of the form  $\{(0, t] : t \in (0, T]\}$ . The equivalence of (iii), and (c) and (d) follows by the definition of  $N(t, U)$ .  $\square$

Usually, one starts with specifying the measurable space  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  and the intensity measure  $\nu$  on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ . Given this, then there exists a Poisson random measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  having the intensity measure  $\nu$ .

In order to define a stochastic integral with respect to the Poisson random measure,  $S$  has to be related to a topological vector space and the measure  $\nu$  has either to be finite or has to be a Lévy measure.

**Definition 2.4.** (See [23, Chapter 5.4]) Let  $E$  be a separable Banach space with dual  $E^*$ . A symmetric  $\sigma$ -finite Borel measure  $\nu$  on  $E$  is called a symmetric Lévy measure if and only if

- (i)  $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ , and
- (ii) the function

$$E^* \ni a \mapsto \exp \left( \int_E (\cos \langle x, a \rangle - 1) \nu(dx) \right)$$

is the characteristic function of a Radon measure on  $E$ .

A  $\sigma$ -finite Borel measure  $\nu$  on  $E$  is called a Lévy measure provided its symmetrisation part  $\tilde{\nu}$  is a symmetric Lévy measure.

**Remark 2.5.** Let  $S$  be a separable Banach space, and  $\mathcal{S}$  its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. If the intensity measure  $\nu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the integrability condition

$$\sup_{\substack{a \in S^* \\ |a| \leq 1}} \int_S 1 \wedge |\langle z, a \rangle|^2 \nu(dz) < \infty.$$

then  $\nu$  is a Lévy measure (see [23, Proposition 5.4.1, p. 70]).

For some Banach spaces, one can characterize the Lévy measures in a more precise way. Therefore, let us introduce the following definition. Let  $\{\varepsilon_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of independent, identically distributed random variables with  $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Then a Banach space with norm  $|\cdot|$  is of  $R$ -type  $p$  (Rademacher type  $p$ ), if for any sequence  $\{x_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$  belonging to  $l_p(E)$ , we have (compare [23, p. 40])

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j x_j \right| < \infty \right) = 1.$$

The Minkowski inequality implies, that each Banach space is of  $R$ -type 1, the range of  $p$  is usually between one and two.

**Remark 2.6.** Let  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be a Polish space, the family  $\{S_n \in \mathcal{S}\}$  satisfy  $S_n \uparrow S$ , and  $\nu$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure with  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Fix  $p \in [1, 2]$ . We assume that  $E$  is a separable Banach space of  $R$ -type  $p$ , and that  $\xi : (S, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{B}(E))$  is a measurable mapping. In addition, we assume that the intensity measure  $\nu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$  satisfies the integrability condition

$$(2.1) \quad \int_S 1 \wedge |\xi(z)|_E^p \nu(dz) < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(\{0\}) = 0.$$

Then, the measure  $\nu_E$  induced by  $\xi$  on  $E$  is a Lévy measure (and  $\nu_E(\{0\}) := 0$ ) (compare [23, p. 75]). In addition, if  $\eta$  is a Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu$  over a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , the process

$$L : [0, T] \ni t \mapsto \int_0^t \int_S \xi(z) (\eta - \nu \times \lambda)(dz, ds)$$

is a Lévy process over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

Hence, from now on we will assume during the whole paper that the following convention is valid.

**Convention 2.1.** We convene that  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  is a Polish space,  $\nu$  a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  and  $S_n \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $S_n \uparrow S$  and  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let us consider a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , where  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  denotes a filtration. A process  $\xi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow X$  is progressively measurable, or simply, progressive, if its restriction to  $\Omega \times [0, t]$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, t])$ -measurable for any  $t \geq 0$ . The predictable random field  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+$  is the  $\sigma$ -field generated by all continuous  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted processes (see e.g. Kallenberg [17, Chapter 25, p. 491]).

A real valued stochastic process  $\{x(t) : t \in [0, T]\}$ , defined on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is called predictable, if the mapping  $x : \Omega \times (0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable. A random measure  $\gamma$  on  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}((0, T])$  over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is called predictable, iff for each  $U \in \mathcal{S}$ , the  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued process  $(0, T] \ni t \mapsto \gamma(U \times (0, t])$  is predictable.

**Definition 2.7.** Assume that  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  is a measurable space and  $\nu$  is a non-negative  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ . Assume that  $\eta$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity measure  $\nu$  on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The compensator of  $\eta$  is the unique predictable random measure, denoted by  $\gamma$ , on  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}((0, T])$  over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , such that for each  $T < \infty$  and  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $\mathbb{E}\eta(A \times (0, T]) < \infty$ , the  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued processes  $\{\tilde{N}(t, A)\}_{t \in (0, T]}$  defined by

$$\tilde{N}(t, A) := \eta(A \times (0, t]) - \gamma(A \times (0, t]), \quad 0 < t \leq T,$$

is a martingale on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

**Remark 2.8.** Assume that  $\eta$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu$  on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . It turns out that the compensator  $\gamma$  of  $\eta$  is uniquely determined and moreover

$$\gamma : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \ni (A, I) \mapsto \nu(A) \times \lambda(I).$$

Here  $\lambda$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The difference between a time homogeneous Poisson random measure  $\eta$  and its compensator  $\gamma$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\eta} = \eta - \gamma$ , is called a compensated Poisson random measure.

Let  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be a measurable space and let  $\eta$  be a time homogenous Poisson random measure on  $S$  with intensity measure  $\nu$  being a positive  $\sigma$ -finite measure over  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfying Convention 2.1. We will denote by  $\tilde{\eta}$  the compensated Poisson random measure defined by  $\tilde{\eta} := \eta - \gamma$ , where the compensator  $\gamma : \mathcal{B}((0, T]) \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, T]$  satisfies in our case the following equality

$$\gamma(I \times B) = \lambda(I)\nu(B), \quad I \in \mathcal{B}((0, T]), \quad B \in \mathcal{S}.$$

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $\nu$  be a non-negative  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $S$  satisfying Convention 2.1. Then the following holds

- i.) there exists a probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and a time homogenous Poisson random measure  $\eta : \Omega \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$  with the intensity measure  $\nu$ ;
- ii.) Denote by  $\Theta_\nu$  the law of  $\eta$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ . If  $\eta^\sharp$  is a time homogenous Poisson random measure defined possibly on different stochastic base  $\mathfrak{A}^\sharp = (\Omega^\sharp, \mathcal{F}^\sharp, \mathbb{P}^\sharp)$  and  $\nu$  is the intensity measure for  $\eta^\sharp$  then  $\Theta_\nu$  is the law of  $\eta^\sharp$  on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ .

*Proof.* Part i.) is given by Theorem 8.1 [15, p. 42]. It remains to show ii.). Since  $\nu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, there exists an increasing family  $\{S_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  with  $S_{n+1} \supseteq S_n$ ,  $S_n \uparrow S$ , and  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$ . To show that  $\eta$  and  $\eta^\sharp$  have the same law on  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(S \times (0, T])$ , we have to show that for all  $f : S \times (0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , bounded and continuous, the random variable  $\eta(f) := \int_{S_n} \int_0^T f(s, t) \eta(ds, dt)$  and  $\eta^\sharp(f) := \int_{S_n} \int_0^T f(s, t) \eta^\sharp(ds, dz)$  have the same law, see [25, Theorem 5.8, p. 38]. Since  $S \times \mathbb{R}^+$  is a Polish space, the  $\sigma$  algebra generated by the family of bounded continuous functions coincides with the Borel- $\sigma$ -algebra, see [29, Proposition 1.4, p.5]. Therefore, it is sufficient to show for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{B}(S_n)$  and  $I \in \mathcal{B}((0, T])$ , that the random variables  $\eta(U \times I)$  and  $\eta^\sharp(U \times I)$  have the same law. Let  $\Theta_\nu^\sharp$  be the law of  $\eta^\sharp$  and let us assume  $\nu(U), \lambda(I) < \infty$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then, by the definition of the Poisson random measure and its intensity measure  $\nu$  we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\nu(\eta(U \times I) = k) &= e^{-\lambda(I)\nu(U)} \frac{(\nu(U) \lambda(I))^k}{k!} \\ &= \Theta_\nu^\sharp(\eta^\sharp(U \times I) = k). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\nu(U) = \infty$  or  $\lambda(I) = \infty$ , then  $\Theta_\nu(\eta(U \times I) = \infty) = 1 = \Theta_\nu^\sharp(\eta^\sharp(U \times I) = \infty)$ .  $\square$

Now, one can define the stochastic integral with respect to the Poisson random measure. Here, one has two possibilities at ones disposal, to use predictable integrands, or more general, to use progressively measurable integrands. The stochastic integral with predictable integrands is introduced e.g. in the book of Ikeda and Watanabe [15] or in the book of Applebaum [1], the stochastic integral with progressively measurable integrands is introduced e.g. in [6] in  $M$ -type  $p$  Banach spaces.

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $0 < p \leq 2$ . A Banach space  $E$  is of martingale type  $p$  iff there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $E$ -valued finite martingale  $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^N$  the following inequality holds

$$(2.2) \quad \sup_{0 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{E}|M_n|_E^p \leq C \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=0}^N |M_n - M_{n-1}|_E^p,$$

where as usually, we put  $M_{-1} = 0$ .

Examples of  $M$ -type  $p$  Banach spaces are, e.g.  $L^q(\mathcal{O})$  spaces, where  $\mathcal{O}$  is a bounded domain.  $L^q(\mathcal{O})$  is of  $M$ -type  $p$  for any  $p \leq q$  (see e.g. [32, Chapter 2, Example 2.2]). Is a Banach space  $E$  is of  $M$ -type  $p$  and  $A$  a generator of an analytic semigroup on  $E$ , then the complex interpolation spaces between  $D(A)$  and  $E$  are of  $M$ -type  $p$ . Similar fact holds also for real interpolation spaces, but not in this generality, for more details we refer to Appendix A of [5]. In particular, in [6] it is proven that for any Banach space  $E$  of  $M$ -type  $p$

there exists a unique continuous linear operator  $I$  which associates to each progressively measurable process  $\xi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow L^p(S, \nu; E)$  with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$(2.3) \quad \int_0^T \int_S |\xi(r, x)|_E^p \nu(dx) dr < \infty,$$

for every  $T > 0$ , an adapted  $E$ -valued càdlàg process

$$I_{\xi, \tilde{\eta}}(t) := \int_0^t \int_S \xi(r, x) \tilde{\eta}(dr, dx), \quad t \geq 0$$

such that if a process  $\xi$  satisfying the above condition (2.3) is a random step process with representation

$$(2.4) \quad \xi(r, x) = \sum_{j=1}^n 1_{(t_{j-1}, t_j]}(r) \xi_j(x), \quad x \in S, \quad r \in [0, T],$$

where  $\{t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n < \infty\}$  is a finite partition of  $[0, \infty)$  and for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\xi_j$  is an  $E$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1}}$ -measurable  $p$ -summable simple random variable, then

$$(2.5) \quad I_{\xi, \tilde{\eta}}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_S \xi_j(x) \tilde{\eta}((t_{j-1} \wedge t, t_j \wedge t], dx), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

This definition can be extended to all progressively measurable mappings  $\xi : \Omega \times [0, T] \times S \rightarrow E$  with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\int_0^T \int_S \min(1, |\xi(r, z)|_E^p) \nu(dz) dr < \infty.$$

Some information of the different setting is given in [27].

In addition, we would like to point out in the following Proposition, that we do not need to suppose that the filtration of the given probability space is right continuous. In particular, given a Poisson random measure  $\eta$  over a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F})$ ,  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , with an arbitrary filtration, a progressively measurable  $L^2(S, \nu)$ -valued process  $\xi$ , one can pass to the right continuous augmentation of the filtration without losing the necessary properties. In particular, the following holds.

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let  $E$  be a Banach space  $E$  of  $M$ -type  $p$ ,  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  a measurable space subject to Convention 2.1 and  $\eta$  a Poisson random measure on a filtered probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F})$  with the intensity measure  $\nu$ , with an arbitrary filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Let  $\xi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow L^p(S, \nu; E)$  be a progressively measurable process with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$(2.6) \quad \int_0^T \int_S |\xi(r, x)|_E^p \nu(dx) dr < \infty.$$

Let  $\bar{\mathfrak{A}} = (\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \bar{\mathbb{F}})$ ,  $\bar{\mathbb{F}} = (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the right continuous filtration given by  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t := \bigwedge_{h>0} \mathcal{F}_{t+h}^{\mathbb{P}}$  and let  $\bar{\xi} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow L^p(S, \nu; E)$  be an  $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$ -progressively measurable process with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$(2.7) \quad \int_0^T \int_S |\bar{\xi}(r, x)|_E^p \nu(dx) dr < \infty.$$

Let us assume that  $\xi$  and  $\bar{\xi}$  have the same law on  $L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu; E))$ . Let  $\bar{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  be defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}(t) := \int_0^t \int_S \bar{\xi}(r, x) \tilde{\eta}(dr, dx), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}(t) := \int_0^t \int_S \xi(r, x) \tilde{\eta}(dr, dx), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where the stochastic integral is defined as before. Then, the triplets  $(\eta, \bar{\xi}, \bar{\mathcal{I}})$  and  $(\eta, \xi, \mathcal{I})$  have the same distribution on  $\mathcal{M}(\{S_n \times [0, T]\}) \times L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu; E)) \times E$ .

*Proof.* In fact, this is given by Theorem 7.23 of [17]. To be more precise, let  $\xi$  be given with representation (2.4), then the stochastic integral is defined by the martingale  $(M_n)_{n=1}^k$ , where

$$M_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_S \xi_j(x) \tilde{\eta}((t_{j-1}, t_j], dx)$$

Since for each  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for the conditional expectation

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\eta}((t_{j-1}, t_j] \times U) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1} + \frac{1}{n}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\eta}((t_{j-1}, t_j] \times U) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1}}^+ \right]$$

and on the other hand we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{\eta}((t_{j-1}, t_j] \times U) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{j-1} + \frac{1}{n}} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta \left( (t_{j-1}, t_{j-1} + \frac{1}{n}] \times U \right) - \nu(U) \frac{1}{n}.$$

Since

$$\eta \left( (t_{j-1}, t_{j-1} + \frac{1}{n}] \times U \right)$$

is a Poisson distributed random variable with it parameter  $\nu(U) \frac{1}{n}$ , it follows that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.  $\eta \left( (t_{j-1}, t_{j-1} + \frac{1}{n}] \times U \right) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The assertion follows from the definition of the integral.  $\square$

### 3. PATHWISE UNIQUENESS OF THE STOCHASTIC SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

We are interested in uniqueness of the stochastic Schrödinger equation driven by a Lévy noise. The nonlinear Schrödinger equation is an example of a universal nonlinear model that describes many physical nonlinear systems. The equation can be applied to hydrodynamics, nonlinear optics, nonlinear acoustics, quantum condensates, heat pulses in solids and various other nonlinear instability phenomena. The Schrödinger equation arises also in the context of water waves. In 1968 V.E. Zakharov derived the Nonlinear Schrödinger equation for the two-dimensional water wave problem in the absence of surface tension, that is, for the evolution of gravity driven surface water waves. More recently, Villarroel, et al [30, 31] considered the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with randomly distributed, but isolated jumps. Dealing with jumps one may model sudden changes in the field that occur randomly.

In order to model abrupt changes in the medium, as it can e.g. be the case for the propagation of light in optical fibers, or of other parameters, one can use Lévy noise. In [13] the first and second author investigated the existence of solution, if the Lévy measure has infinite activity. However, no uniqueness was proven.

From now on,  $S$  will be a Borel subset of a separable Banach function space continuously embedded in the Sobolev space  $W_{\infty}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . As mentioned in the introduction, the equation we are considering is given by

(3.1)

$$\begin{cases} i du(t, x) - \Delta u(t, x) dt + \lambda |u(t, x)|^{\alpha-1} u(t, x) dt \\ \quad = \int_S u(t, x) g(z(x)) \tilde{\eta}(dz, dt) + \int_S u(t, x) h(z(x)) \gamma(dz, dt), & t \in [0, T], \\ u(0) = u_0. \end{cases}$$

with  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Here,  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  and  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are two functions satisfying the following items:

(i)  $g, \nabla g, h$  and  $\nabla h$  are of linear growth, i.e. there exist some constants  $C_g$  and  $C_h$  such that

$$|g(\xi)|, |\nabla g(\xi)| \leq C_g |\xi| \quad \text{and} \quad |h(\xi)|, |\nabla h(\xi)| \leq C_h |\xi|.$$

(ii)  $g(0) = 0$  and  $h(0) = 0$ .

(iii)  $|\Im(h(\xi))| \lesssim |\xi|^2$  and  $|\Im(g(\xi))| \lesssim |\xi|^2$

Here,  $\Im$  denotes the imaginary part of a number. From condition (i) one can derive from condition (2.1) a similar condition for the associated Nemytski operator defined later on.

Let us denote by  $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  the group of isometries generated by the operator  $-iA$ . In particular, for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  let us denote the solution of the following Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} i \dot{u}(t) &= Au(t), \\ u(0) &= u_0, \end{cases}$$

by  $\mathcal{T}(t)u_0$ . Observe,  $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  forms a unitary group on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $H_2^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ . In the framework of evolution equation one considers the mild solution of Equation (3.1), which is given by the following integral equation for  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= \mathcal{T}(t)u_0 + i\lambda \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s)(|u(s)|^{\alpha-1}u(s)) ds \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s) [u(s)G(z)] \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds) - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s) [u(s)H(z)] \nu(dz) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we used the Nemytskii operators corresponding to  $g$  and  $h$ . In particular, the mappings  $G : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $H : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denote the Nemytskii operators associated to the functions  $g$  and  $h$  defined by

$$(G(y))(x) := g(y(x)), \quad \text{and} \quad (H(y))(x) := h(y(x)), \quad y \in S, x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $T > 0$ . We call  $u$  an  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued mild solution to Equation (3.1) on the time interval  $[0, T]$ , iff  $u$  is an adapted cádlág process in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the terms

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t |\mathcal{T}(t-s)[|u(s)|^{\alpha-1}u(s)]|_{L^2} ds, \quad \int_0^t \int_{\{y \in S : |\mathcal{T}(t-s)u(s)G(y)|_{L^2} < 1\}} |\mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)]|_{L^2}^2 \nu(dy) ds, \\ \int_0^t \int_{\{y \in S : |\mathcal{T}(t-s)u(s)G(y)|_{L^2} \geq 1\}} |\mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)]|_{L^2} \nu(dy) ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_0^t \int_S |\mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)H(y)]|_{L^2} \nu(dy) ds,$$

are  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. finite and for any  $t \in [0, T]$ , the process  $u$  solves  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. the integral equation

(3.2)

$$\begin{aligned} u(t) &= \mathcal{T}(t)u_0 + i\lambda \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s)[|u(s)|^{\alpha-1}u(s)] ds \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s) [u(s)G(y)] \tilde{\eta}(dy, ds) - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s) [u(s)H(y)] \nu(dy) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since in the proof of existence of solution compactness arguments are used, the underlying probability space gets lost. Hence, a concept of probabilistic weak solutions has to be introduced, which is done in the following definition.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . A martingale solution on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to the Problem (3.1) is a system

$$(3.3) \quad (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F}, \eta, u)$$

such that

- (i)  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is a filtered probability space with filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,
- (ii)  $\eta$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  over  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with intensity measure  $\nu$  satisfying Convention 2.1,
- (iii)  $u$  is an  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued mild solution to the Problem (3.1).

Let us remind that  $S$  is a function space continuously embedded in the Sobolev space  $W_\infty^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . In addition, we assume that the intensity measure satisfies the following integrability conditions:

$$\text{i.) } C_0(\nu) := \int_S |z|_{L^\infty}^2 \nu(dz) < \infty;$$

- ii.)  $C_1(\nu) := \int_S |z|_{W_\infty^1}^2 \nu(dz) < \infty$ ;
- iii.)  $C_2(\nu) := \int_S \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 |z(x)|^2 dx \nu(dz) < \infty$ ;
- iv.)  $C_3(\nu) := \int_S |z|_{L^\infty}^4 \nu(dz) < \infty$ .

**Remark 3.3.** *One can see from the proof of Theorem 2.7 in [13] that the large jumps have no effect on the uniqueness result and one can easily generalize our Theorem 3.4 to the case where one has large jumps without any bounded moments.*

Let

$$1 \leq \alpha < \begin{cases} 1 + 4/(d-2) & \text{for } d > 2, \\ \infty & \text{for } d = 1 \text{ or } 2, \end{cases}$$

In [13] we have shown that under the conditions stated above, there exists a martingale solution. For the sake of completeness, we state here the main result of the article. Before, since we will need it later on, let us introduce the mass by

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{E}(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x)|^2 dx,$$

and the energy by

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{H}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{\alpha + 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u(x)|^{\alpha-1} u(x) \overline{u(x)} dx.$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $\eta$  be a time homogenous Poisson random measure on  $S$  with Lévy measure  $\nu$  satisfying the integrability conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) given above. If  $u_0 \in H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$ , and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^2 |u_0(x)|^2 dx < \infty,$$

*then there exists a  $H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued martingale solution to (3.1), which is càdlàg in  $H_2^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $\gamma < 1$ .*

*In addition, there exists a constant  $C = C(T, C_0(\nu), C_3(\nu), C_g, C_h)$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |u(t)|_{L^2}^2 \leq C (1 + \mathbb{E}|u(0)|_{L^2}^2)$$

*and for any  $T > 0$  there exists a constant  $C = C(T, C_0(\nu), C_1(\nu), C_g, C_h) > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{t \in [0, T] \cap \mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{H}(u(t)) \leq C (1 + \mathbb{E}\mathcal{H}(u(0))).$$

The proof of Theorem 3.4 uses compactness arguments, hence, as mentioned before, the existence of a solution is shown, but no uniqueness of the solution. Here, we are interested in the uniqueness of the solution to Equation (3.1). However, similar to the concept of solutions, there exist several concepts of uniqueness.

**Definition 3.5.** *The equation (3.1) is pathwise unique if, whenever  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}, \eta, u_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are solutions to (3.2) such that  $\mathbb{P}(u_1(0) = u_2(0)) = 1$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(u_1(t) = u_2(t)) = 1$  for every  $0 \leq t \leq T$ .*

Under certain conditions pathwise uniqueness of the stochastic Schrödinger equation driven by Lévy noise can be shown.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let us assume that  $g, h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are Lipschitz continuous. Let us assume that*

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} 1 \leq \alpha < \infty & \text{if } d = 1, \text{ or } 2, \\ 1 \leq \alpha < \frac{d}{d-2} & \text{if } d > 2. \end{cases}$$

*Let be given a filtered probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , with filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , a Poisson random measure defined on  $\mathfrak{A}$  adapted to the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$ , and two mild solutions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  to equation (3.1) over  $\mathfrak{A}$ ,*

on  $[0, T]$  such that  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are càdlàg in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . If there exists some  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$  with

$$(3.7) \quad \delta > \begin{cases} \frac{d}{2} - \frac{d}{2(\alpha-1)}, & \text{if } d = 1, 2, \\ \frac{d}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha-1}, & \text{if } d > 2, \end{cases}$$

and the solutions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , then  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are indistinguishable in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

**Remark 3.7.** Condition (3.6) is needed to apply the Strichartz estimate and Sobolev embedding theorems, in order to handle the nonlinearity. The restriction compared to usual conditions is due to the fact that we have to estimate the difference of solutions in  $L^2$ , in order to tackle the stochastic terms.

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* Note that the solutions given by Theorem 1.2 of [13] satisfy the assumption of the Theorem 3.6. Moreover, if  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are as above, then they belong a.s. to  $L^\infty([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))$ .

In the first step we will introduce a family of stopping times  $\{\tau_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and show that on the time interval  $[0, \tau_m]$  the solutions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are indistinguishable. In the second step, we will show that  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_m < T) \rightarrow 0$  for  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . From this follows that  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are indistinguishable on the time interval  $[0, T]$ .

**Step I.** Let us introduce the stopping times  $\{\tau_m^1 : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{\tau_m^2 : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  given by

$$\tau_m^i := \sup\{s > 0 : |u_i(s)|_{H_2^\delta} < m\} \wedge T, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The aim is to show that  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are indistinguishable on the time interval  $[0, \tau_m]$ , with  $\tau_m = \inf(\tau_m^1, \tau_m^2)$ .

Fix  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . To get uniqueness on  $[0, \tau_m]$  we first stop the original solution processes at time  $\tau_m$  and extend the processes  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  by other processes to the whole interval  $[0, T]$ . For this propose, let  $y_1$  be a solution to

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} y_1(t) &= \mathcal{T}(t - \tau_m)u_1(\tau_m) - i \int_{\tau_m}^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)y_1(s) G(z) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds) \\ &\quad - i \int_{\tau_m}^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)y_1(s) H(z) \gamma(dz, ds), \quad t \geq \tau_m, \end{aligned}$$

and let  $y_2$  be a solution to

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} y_2(t) &= \mathcal{T}(t - \tau_m)u_2(\tau_m) - i \int_{\tau_m}^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)y_2(s) G(z) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds) \\ &\quad - i \int_{\tau_m}^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)y_2(s) H(z) \gamma(dz, ds), \quad t \geq \tau_m. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are càdlàg in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $u_1(\tau_m)$  and  $u_2(\tau_m)$  are well defined and belong  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. to  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Since, in addition,  $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a strongly continuous group on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the existence of unique solutions  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  to (3.8) and (3.9) in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  can be shown by standard methods. Now, let us define two processes  $\bar{u}_1$  and  $\bar{u}_2$  which are equal to  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  on the time interval  $[0, \tau_m]$  and follow the linear Schrödinger equation  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  afterwards. In particular, let

$$\bar{u}_1(t) = \begin{cases} u_1(t) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < \tau_m, \\ y_1(t) & \text{for } \tau_m \leq t \leq T, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\bar{u}_2(t) = \begin{cases} u_2(t) & \text{for } 0 \leq t < \tau_m, \\ y_2(t) & \text{for } \tau_m \leq t \leq T. \end{cases}$$

Note, that  $\bar{u}_1$  and  $\bar{u}_2$  solve the truncated equation corresponding to (3.2), that is

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} u(t) &= \mathcal{T}(t)u_0 + i\lambda \int_0^t 1_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) \mathcal{T}(t - s) \left( |u(s)|^{\alpha-1} u(s) \right) ds \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)u(s) G(z) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds) \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t - s)u(s) H(z) \gamma(dz, ds). \end{aligned}$$

For  $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\xi \in \mathcal{N}^2(\Omega; L^2([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)))$  progressively measurable with respect to the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$ , let us define the integral operator

(3.11)

$$(\mathfrak{I}\xi)(t) := (\mathfrak{T}u_0)(t) + (\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\xi)(t) + (\mathfrak{G}\xi)(t) + (\mathfrak{H}\xi)(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $\mathfrak{T}$  is defined by

$$(\mathfrak{T}u_0)(t) := \mathcal{T}(t)u_0, \quad u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

the integral operator  $\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}$  with respect to the nonlinear term is defined by

$$(\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\xi)(t) = i\lambda \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s) (|\xi(s)|^{\alpha-1}\xi(s)) 1_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

$\mathfrak{G}$  is defined by

$$(\mathfrak{G}\xi)(t) = -i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s)\xi(s) G(z) \tilde{\eta}(dz, ds), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and  $\mathfrak{H}$  is defined by

$$(\mathfrak{H}\xi)(t) := -i \int_0^t \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s)\xi(s) H(z) \gamma(dz, ds), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In the next step we will calculate the difference  $\bar{u}_1 - \bar{u}_2$ . Fix  $0 \leq t \leq T$ . Similarly as before we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_1(t) - \bar{u}_2(t) &= (\mathfrak{G}\bar{u}_1)(t) - (\mathfrak{G}\bar{u}_2)(t) \\ &\quad + (\mathfrak{H}\bar{u}_1)(t) - (\mathfrak{H}\bar{u}_2)(t) + (\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\bar{u}_1)(t) - (\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\bar{u}_2)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Note, that  $\mathfrak{G}$  and  $\mathfrak{H}$  are linear. In addition,  $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a unitary group on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathfrak{G}u_1(t) - \mathfrak{G}u_2(t)|_{L^2}^2 \leq \int_0^t \int_S \mathbb{E} |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s))G(z)|_{L^2}^2 \nu(dz) ds.$$

Due to the integrability conditions on page 3, i.e. the integrability condition i.), and the fact that  $g$  is Lipschitz continuous, we know that for any  $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  we have  $\int_S |vG(z)|_{L^2} \nu(dz) \leq C_g C_0(\nu) |v|_{L^2}$  and we can proceed

$$\mathbb{E} |\mathfrak{G}\bar{u}_1(t) - \mathfrak{G}\bar{u}_2(t)|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_g C_0(\nu) \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)|_{L^2}^2 ds.$$

Similarly, we get for  $\mathfrak{H}$  by the Minkowski inequality and the Lipschitz continuity of  $h$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\mathfrak{H}\bar{u}_1(t) - \mathfrak{H}\bar{u}_2(t)|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C_h t \int_0^t \int_Z \mathbb{E} |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s))H(z)|_{L^2}^2 \nu(dz) ds \\ &\leq C C_h C_0(\nu) T \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)|_{L^2}^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

The only term, which has to be carefully analysed is the nonlinear term given by

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\bar{u}_1)(t) - (\mathfrak{F}_{\tau_m}\bar{u}_2)(t) \\ &= i\lambda \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s) (|\bar{u}_1(s)|^{\alpha-1}\bar{u}_1(s) - |\bar{u}_2(s)|^{\alpha-1}\bar{u}_2(s)) 1_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\gamma'$  and  $\sigma$  be given such that  $\frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{\gamma'}$ ,

$$(3.12) \quad -\delta + \frac{d}{2} < \frac{d}{\sigma(\alpha-1)},$$

and

$$(3.13) \quad 2 \geq \gamma' \begin{cases} \geq 1 & \text{if } d = 1, \\ > 1 & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \geq \frac{2d}{d+2} & \text{if } d > 2. \end{cases}$$

Due to our assumption on  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$ , such a couple  $(\gamma', \sigma)$  exists. Let  $(\gamma, \rho)$  be an admissible pair, i.e.  $2/\rho = d(1/2 - 1/\gamma)$ . Let  $\gamma$  be the conjugate exponent to  $\gamma'$ , and  $\rho'$  the conjugate exponent to  $\rho$ . Then

$$(3.14) \quad 2 \leq \gamma \begin{cases} \leq \infty & \text{if } d = 1, \\ < \infty & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \leq \frac{2d}{d-2} & \text{if } d > 2, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq \rho' \begin{cases} \leq \frac{4}{3} & \text{if } d = 1, \\ < 2 & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \leq 2 & \text{if } d > 2. \end{cases}$$

Before continuing, let us shortly introduce the Strichartz estimate. Let us define the convolution operator

$$(3.15) \quad \mathfrak{T}u(t) := \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-r)u(r) dr, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Let  $(p_0, q_0), (p_1, q_1) \in [2, \infty) \times [1, \infty)$  be two admissible pairs. Then for all  $T > 0$  we have by the Strichartz estimate (see [22, p. 64])

$$|\mathfrak{T}u|_{L^{q_0}(0,T;L^{p_0})} \leq C |u|_{L^{q'_1}(0,T;L^{p'_1})}.$$

Applying the Strichartz estimate we have, for any  $r \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \mathcal{T}(t-s) (|\bar{u}_2(s)|^{\alpha-1} \bar{u}_2(s) - |\bar{u}_1(s)|^{\alpha-1} \bar{u}_1(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) ds \right|_{L^2}^{\rho' r} \\ & \leq \left| (|\bar{u}_2(s)|^{\alpha-1} \bar{u}_2(s) - |\bar{u}_1(s)|^{\alpha-1} \bar{u}_1(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) \right|_{L^{\rho'}([0, T]; L^{\gamma'})}^{\rho' r}. \end{aligned}$$

The Hölder inequality gives for  $\sigma$  with  $\frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{\gamma'}$ , i.e.

$$(3.16) \quad \sigma \begin{cases} \geq 2 & \text{if } d = 1, \\ > 2 & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \geq d & \text{if } d > 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \leq \left( \int_0^T (|\bar{u}_2(s)|^{\alpha-1} + |\bar{u}_1(s)|^{\alpha-1}) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)} |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s)|_{L^2}^{\rho'} ds \right)^r \\ & \leq \left( \int_0^T (|\bar{u}_2(s)| + |\bar{u}_1(s)|) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)} |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s)|_{L^2}^{\rho'} ds \right)^r. \end{aligned}$$

By inequality (3.12) and Sobolev embeddings Theorems we know that  $H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^{\sigma(\alpha-1)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  continuously. This implies

$$\dots \leq \left( \int_0^T (|\bar{u}_2(s)| + |\bar{u}_1(s)|) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)} |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s)|_{L^2}^{\rho'} ds \right)^r.$$

By the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \dots & \leq C(T) \sup_{s \in [0, T]} (|\bar{u}_2(s)| + |\bar{u}_1(s)|) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s) \Big|_{H_2^\delta}^{(\alpha-1)\rho' r} \\ & \quad \times \int_0^T |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s)|_{L^2}^{r\rho'} ds. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of the stopping time gives

$$\dots \leq m^{(\alpha-1)\rho' r} \int_0^T |(\bar{u}_1(s) - \bar{u}_2(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_m)}(s)|_{L^2}^{r\rho'} ds.$$

Now, taking  $r = 2/\rho'$ , an application of the Grownwall Lemma gives  $\mathbb{E}|\bar{u}_1(t) - \bar{u}_2(t)|_{L^2}^2 = 0$ . Since  $\bar{u}_1$  and  $\bar{u}_2$  are càdlàg on  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , both processes  $\bar{u}_1$  and  $\bar{u}_2$  are indistinguishable in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  on the time interval  $[0, \tau_m]$ .

**Step II.** We show that  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_m < T) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Observe, that it holds for  $\delta$

$$\{\tau_m \leq T\} \subset \{|u_1|_{L^\infty([0,T];H_2^\delta)} \geq m \text{ or } |u_2|_{L^\infty([0,T];H_2^\delta)} \geq m\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_m < T) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|u_1|_{L^\infty([0,T];H_2^\delta)} \geq m\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|u_2|_{L^\infty([0,T];H_2^\delta)} \geq m\right).$$

Since  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are càdlàg in  $H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.  $\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |u_1(s)|_{H_2^\delta} < \infty$  and  $\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |u_2(s)|_{H_2^\delta} < \infty$ , it follows

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|u_i|_{L^\infty([0,T];H_2^\delta)} \geq m\right) \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . This implies  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_m \leq T) \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, both processes  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are undistinguishable on  $[0, T]$ .  $\square$

Due to the pathwise uniqueness one can show that a unique strong solution exists.

**Theorem 3.8.** *If the conditions of Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.6 are satisfied, then there exists a unique strong solution to equation (3.2) in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\delta < 1$  be the constant given in Theorem 3.6. In order to apply the Theorem 5.14 below, we put  $Y = H_2^{-30d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $Y_0 = \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $X = H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and

$$\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{D}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

We have chosen  $Y = H_2^{-30d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , since  $Y$  can be arbitrarily large, only we have to be sure that following points has to be satisfied and these points are satisfied by this choice. The functions

- $a : [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $b : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $c : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times S \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $\theta_i^{\alpha_i} : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,  $\alpha_i \in A_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $\{\Xi_t : t \in [0, T]\}$ , where  $\Xi_t : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$

are defined by

- $a(t, x) := \mathcal{T}(t)x$ , for  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $x \in X$ ;
- $b(t, s, x) := \mathcal{T}(t-s)1_{[0,t)}(s)F_\alpha(x) + \int_S \mathcal{T}(t-s)1_{[0,t)}(s)[xH(z)]\nu(dz)$ , where  $F_\alpha(x) = |x|^{\alpha-1}x$ , for  $s, t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x \in X \subset L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , so that  $F_\alpha(x) \in L^{\alpha+1/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ;
- $c(t, s, z, x) := \mathcal{T}(t-s)1_{[0,t)}(s)(xG(z))$ , for  $s, t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x \in X$  and  $z \in S$ ;
- $A_0 = \{1\}$ ,  $A_1 = \emptyset$ ,

$$\theta_0^1 : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \ni u \mapsto \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } u \notin \mathbb{D}(0, T; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)) \\ 1 & \text{if } u \in \mathbb{D}(0, T; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)), \end{cases}$$

- For all  $\phi \in Y^*$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\Xi_t^\phi(u) = \infty$  for  $u \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \setminus \mathbb{D}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$  and, for  $u \in \mathbb{D}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_t^\phi(u) = & \int_0^t \left\{ \langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)F_\alpha(u(s)), \phi \rangle + \int_{\{y \in S : |\langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)], \phi \rangle| < 1\}} \langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)], \phi \rangle^p \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\{y \in S : |\langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)], \phi \rangle| \geq 1\}} \langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)G(y)], \phi \rangle + \langle \mathcal{T}(t-s)[u(s)H(y)], \phi \rangle \nu(dy) \right\} ds \end{aligned}$$

for  $u \in \mathbb{D}(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ , where  $F_\alpha(x)$  is as above.

**Remark 3.9.** *Roughly speaking, the setting in Theorem 3.8 has to fit to the setting in Section 4 and has to be chosen as follows. The space  $X$  has to be a space such that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $u(t)$  is an  $X$ -valued random variable. Note, that this space need not coincide with the space where the process is càdlàg. The space  $Y$  has to be chosen such that the mappings  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are well defined,  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y)$  corresponds to the Kurtz space (denoted in his paper by  $Z_1$ ), and  $\mathcal{X}$  is the path space. Additional regularity properties of the solution*

can be incorporated in the family of functions  $\{\theta_0^{\alpha_0} : \alpha_0 \in A_0\}$  and  $\{\theta_1^{\alpha_1} : \alpha_1 \in A_1\}$ , where  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  are index sets. In our case, we choose  $A_1 = \{1\}$  and  $A_2 = \emptyset$ . To make sure that the integrals in (4.2) are well defined, the family of functions  $\{\Xi_t : t \in (0, T], \phi \in Y^*\}$  has to be defined in a proper way.

**Remark 3.10.** *The setting need not to be unique. Thus, instead of the setting above, we could chose  $X = H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_0 = D([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,  $A_1 = \emptyset$ , and  $A_2 = \emptyset$ . Indeed, due to the fact that given pathwise uniqueness in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with the condition  $\mathbb{P}(u \in \mathbb{D}([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))) = 1$  one has pathwise uniqueness in  $H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and we could take directly  $\mathcal{X} = D([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))$ .*

In the next step, we have to verify that the mappings  $a, b$  and  $c$  are measurable. In fact, first note that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a strongly continuous unitary group on  $H_2^{-30d}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , therefore,  $a$  is measurable. To show that  $b$  is measurable, we first investigate the measurability of  $\mathcal{T}(t-s)1_{[0,t)}(s)F_\alpha(x)$ . Here, we show that  $F_\alpha : H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow Y$  is continuous, from which follows that  $F_\alpha : H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow Y$  is measurable. Indeed, using Hölder inequality, it is easily seen that for any  $x, y \in L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|F_\alpha(x) - F_\alpha(y)|_{L^{\alpha+1/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \left( |x|_{L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{\alpha-1} + |y|_{L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^{\alpha-1} \right) |x - y|_{L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

and the continuity result follows from the embeddings  $H_2^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow L^{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $L^{\alpha+1/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow Y$ . Since  $1_{[0,t)}(s)$  is measurable, and  $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is pointwise strongly continuous, we are done. It remains to show that the second term of  $b$  is measurable, but this follows since, by the Lipschitz continuity of  $h$ , and the fact that  $h(0) = 0$ , the Nemitsky operator  $H$  is continuous from  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $Y$ . Similarly the last mapping  $c$  can be handled. It remains to verify that

$$\theta_0 : Y \ni u \mapsto \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } u \notin \mathbb{D}([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)), \\ 1 & \text{if } u \in \mathbb{D}([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)), \end{cases}$$

is a measurable mapping. But this is given, since  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; H_2^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d))$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y)$ . Now, the existence of the strong solutions follows by an application of Theorem 5.14.  $\square$

#### 4. THE ABSTRACT UNIQUENESS RESULT

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be separable Fréchet spaces,  $Y_0 \subseteq Y^*$  separates points in  $Y$ ,  $\mathcal{X}$  a Borel subset in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], Y)$ ,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are two index sets and

- $a : [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $b : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $c : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times S \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $\theta_i^{\alpha_i} : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,  $\alpha_i \in A_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $\{\Xi_t^\phi : t \in [0, T], \phi \in Y^*\}$ , where  $\Xi_t : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ .

measurable mappings,  $\nu$  a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ , and, finally,  $S_n \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $S_n \uparrow S$  and  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$ .

Let  $\eta$  be a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with the intensity measure  $\nu$  on the space  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  defined over a probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  denotes a filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Given is an abstract evolution equation of the following form:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle u(t), \varphi \rangle &= \langle a(t, u(0)), \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \langle b(t, s, u(s)), \varphi \rangle ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_S \langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle \tilde{\eta}(dx, ds), \end{aligned}$$

for every  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\varphi \in Y_0$ . We define next the terminus of solution in the way we will use it in the following pages of the article.

**Definition 4.1.** We say that a 6-tuple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}, u, \eta)$ ,  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , consisting of a filtered probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , a time homogeneous Poisson random measure  $\eta$  on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  over  $\mathfrak{A}$  with the intensity measure  $\nu$  and a process  $u$  on  $[0, T]$ , being  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted and càdlàg in  $Y$ , is a solution of (4.1) provided that

$$\mathbb{P}(u(t) \in X) = 1, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}(u \in \mathcal{X}) = 1,$$

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

$$(4.2) \quad \int_0^t |b(t, s, u(s), \varphi)| ds + \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle| < 1\}} |\langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle|^p \wedge 1 \nu(dx) ds \\ + \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle| \geq 1\}} |\langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle| \nu(dx) ds < \infty \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

hold for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\varphi \in Y_0$ , and  $u$  solves equation (4.1).

**Remark 4.2.** Additional regularity properties, which are not part of the definition of the solution, but which are essential for the pathwise uniqueness, are incorporated by the additional mappings  $\theta_0^{\alpha_0}$  and  $\theta_1^{\alpha_1}$ ,  $\alpha_0 \in A_0$ ,  $\alpha_1 \in A_1$ .

**Hypothesis 4.1.** A solution satisfies the additional regularity properties given by  $\{\theta_0^{\alpha_0} : \alpha_0 \in A_0\}$  and  $\{\theta_1^{\alpha_1} : \alpha_1 \in A_1\}$ , where  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  are index sets, such that

$$(HYP) \quad \mathbb{P}(\theta_0^{\alpha_0}(u) < \infty) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \theta_1^{\alpha_1}(u) < \infty.$$

**Definition 4.3.** If  $\eta \in M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times \mathbb{R}_+\})$  then we define

$$(4.3) \quad \eta_t(V) = \eta(V \cap (S \times (0, t])), \quad \eta^t(V) = \eta(V \cap (S \times (t, T])), \quad V \in \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}((0, T]).$$

**Lemma 4.4.** If  $\eta$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure over a filtered probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , then, for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\eta_t$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable  $M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times \mathbb{R}_+\})$ -valued random variable and  $\eta^t$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ .

*Proof.* The first assertion of the Lemma follows directly from the definition. In particular, since  $\eta$  is adapted to the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$ , the first assertion follows. The second assertion follows from the independently scattered property. In particular, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $U, V \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $s \in (0, t]$  and  $r_1, r_2 \in (t, \infty)$  the sets  $U \cap S_n \times [0, s]$  and  $V \cap S_n \times (r_1, r_2)$  are disjoint, therefore the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the random variables  $\{\eta_t(U \cap S_n) : U \in \mathcal{S}\}$  and  $\{\eta^t(U \cap S_n) : U \in \mathcal{S}\}$  are independent. Hence, the filtration generated by  $\eta^t$  and the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\eta_t$  are independent.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a filtered probability space with filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,  $u$  a  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y)$ -valued random variable over  $\mathfrak{A}$ , and  $\eta$  an  $M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ -valued random variable over  $\mathfrak{A}$ . In addition, we assume that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $u(t)$  and  $\eta_t$  are  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable and  $\eta^t$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ . If there exists a solution  $\bar{\mathfrak{A}} = (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  of Equation (4.1) satisfying Equation (4.1) and the assumption of Definition 4.1, such that the law of  $(u, \eta)$  coincides with the law of  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times [0, T]\})$ , then  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{P}})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}, u, \eta)$  is a solution to Equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1.

Before giving the proof of Lemma 4.5, let us introduce some notations. For jointly Borel measurable mappings  $\check{a} : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\check{b} : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\check{c} : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times Z \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a time homogeneous Poisson random measure  $\eta$  with the intensity measure  $\nu$  and an adapted càdlàg process  $v$  in  $Y$  with  $v(t) \in X$  a.s. for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ , both defined on a probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , satisfying

$$\int_0^\infty |\check{b}(t, s, v(s))|_Y ds + \int_0^\infty \int_{\{x \in S: |\check{c}(t, s, x, v(s))|_Y \leq 1\}} |\check{c}(t, s, x, v(s))|_Y^p \nu(dx) ds \\ + \int_0^\infty \int_{\{x \in S: |\check{c}(t, s, x, v(s))|_Y > 1\}} |\check{c}(t, s, x, v(s))|_Y \nu(dx) ds < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for every  $t \in (0, T]$ , define a nonlinear map  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}$

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}(v, \eta)(t) &= \check{a}(t, v_0) + \int_0^\infty \check{b}(t, s, v(s)) ds \\ &+ \int_0^\infty \int_S \check{c}(t, s, x, v(s)) \check{\eta}(dx, ds). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}(v, \eta)$  actually depends via the compensator of  $\check{\eta}$ , also on the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.5:* It is rather standard to prove that  $\eta$  is a time homogenous Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu$  for the augmented filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{P}})_{t \geq 0}$ , cf. Lemma 4.4, and that all the measure and integrability assumptions in Definition 4.1 are satisfied for  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $u$  and  $\eta$ . So it just remains to prove that the actual equation (4.1) holds, i.e. that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$  and  $\varphi \in Y^*$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}(u, \eta)(t) - \langle u(t), \varphi \rangle = 0) = 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is defined with  $\check{a} = \langle a, \varphi \rangle$ ,  $\check{b} = \langle b, \varphi \rangle$  and  $\check{c} = \langle c, \varphi \rangle$ ;

Fix  $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$  and  $\varphi \in Y^*$ . Let us remind, that the mappings

- $a : [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,  $b : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $c : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times S \times X \rightarrow Y$ ,
- $\theta_i^{\alpha_i} : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,  $\alpha_i \in A_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $\Xi_t^\varphi : [0, T] \times \mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,

are measurable. Hence, the mapping

$$X \ni v_0 \mapsto \mathfrak{a}_t := \langle a(t, v_0), \varphi \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$$

is Borel measurable. Since  $u$  and  $\bar{u}$  belongs a.s. to  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y)$  and  $u(0)$ ,  $\bar{u}(0)$  belongs a.s. to  $X$ ,  $u(0)$  and  $\bar{u}(0)$  have the same law on  $X$ , it follows by Lemma 1.22 [17] that the triplets  $(\mathfrak{a}_t(u(0)), u, \eta)$  and  $(\mathfrak{a}_t(\bar{u}(0)), \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  have the same law on  $X \times \mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \times M_{\mathbb{R}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ .

Since  $b : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times X \rightarrow Y$ , is measurable, for any  $s \in [0, T]$   $u(s)$  and  $\bar{u}(s)$  are  $X$ -valued random variables,  $\mathcal{L}aw(\bar{u}(s)) = \mathcal{L}aw(u(s))$ , it follows that for any  $s, t \in [0, T]$  and  $\omega \in$  the processes  $\{\bar{\mathfrak{b}}_t(s) : s \geq 0\}$  and  $\{\mathfrak{b}_t(s) : s \geq 0\}$ , defined by

$$\bar{\mathfrak{b}}_t(s, \omega) := \langle b(t, s, \bar{u}(s, \omega)), \varphi \rangle, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

and

$$\mathfrak{b}_t(s, \omega) := \langle b(t, s, u(s, \omega)), \varphi \rangle, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

have the same law for each  $t \in [0, T]$ . In addition, we know by the definition of the solution that

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}\left(\int_0^t |\bar{\mathfrak{b}}_t(s)| ds < \infty\right) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^t |\mathfrak{b}_t(s)| ds < \infty\right) = 1.$$

By Theorem 8.3 of [24], it follows that for any  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\mathcal{L}aw\left(\bar{u}, \int_0^t \bar{\mathfrak{b}}_t(s) ds\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}aw\left(u, \int_0^t \mathfrak{b}_t(s) ds\right)$$

are equal on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \times Y$ . Finally, since  $c : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times S \times X \rightarrow Y$  is measurable, for any  $s \in [0, T]$ , the random variable  $\bar{u}(s)$  is  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_s$ -measurable, and the random variable  $u(s)$  is  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable. It follows that the processes  $\{\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_t(s) : s \geq 0\}$  and  $\{\mathfrak{c}_t(s) : s \geq 0\}$ , defined by

$$\bar{\mathfrak{c}}_t(s, \omega) := \langle c(t, s, \bar{u}(s, \omega)), \varphi \rangle, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

and

$$\mathfrak{c}_t(s, \omega) := \langle c(t, s, u(s, \omega)), \varphi \rangle, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

are adapted to the filtrations  $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_s)_{s \in [0, T]}$  and  $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \in [0, T]}$ , respectively. In addition, since due to the fact that  $\bar{u}$  is a solution, and the law of  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  coincides with the law of  $(u, \eta)$ , we know that

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\langle \bar{c}(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle| < 1\}} |\bar{\mathbf{c}}_t(x, s)|^p \nu(dx) ds < \infty \right) = 1,$$

and, therefore,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\langle c(t, s, x, u(s)), \varphi \rangle| < 1\}} |\mathbf{c}_t(x, s)| \nu(dx) ds < \infty \right) = 1.$$

Hence,  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. the process  $[0, T] \ni s \mapsto \bar{\mathbf{c}}_t(s) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. the process  $[0, T] \ni s \mapsto \mathbf{c}_t(s) \in \mathbb{R}$  are belonging (but of the large jumps) to  $L^p([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ . It follows by Proposition B.1-(ii) that they are progressively measurable. Hence, Theorem A.2 is applicable and we know that  $(\bar{\mathcal{I}}(t), \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  and  $(\mathcal{I}(t), u, \eta)$  have the same law on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \times M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ , where

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}}(t) := \int_0^t \int_S \check{c}(t, s, \bar{u}(s), z) \bar{\eta}(dz, ds), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}(t) := \int_0^t \int_S \check{c}(t, s, u(s), z) \eta(dz, ds), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

To deal with the large jumps, we use the fact that

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\bar{\mathbf{c}}_t(x, s)| \geq 1\}} |\bar{\mathbf{c}}_t(x, s)| \nu(dx) ds < \infty \right) = 1,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \int_0^t \int_{\{x \in S: |\mathbf{c}_t(x, s)| \geq 1\}} |\mathbf{c}_t(x, s)| \nu(dx) ds < \infty \right) = 1.$$

and proceed as above with  $p = 1$ .

Summing up, it follows that, if  $(u, \eta)$  and  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  have the same law on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \times M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ , then  $\mathcal{K}_{\bar{\mathfrak{A}}}(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})(t), \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  and  $(\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}(u, \eta)(t), u, \eta)$  have the same law on  $Y \times \mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y) \times M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$ . Since for all  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\mathcal{K}_{\bar{\mathfrak{A}}}(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})(t) - \bar{u}(t) = 0) = 1,$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{A}}(u, \eta)(t) - u(t) = 0) = 1.$$

In particular, the six tuple  $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, u, \eta)$  is a solution to (4.1). □

## 5. UNIQUENESS

Throughout this section, the notation of Section 4 will be kept. We are going to prove here that the abstract result of Kurtz [19] can be applied to the problem (4.1). Or, in other words, that pathwise uniqueness for the equation (4.1) implies joint uniqueness in law and strong existence for the equation (4.1).

In order to show this, let us define the Kurtz's *compatibility structure* and *C-compatibility* according to [19, Definition 3.3].

Throughout this section we fix an intensity measure  $\nu$  and sets  $S_n \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $S_n \uparrow S$  and  $\nu(S_n) < \infty$ .

**Definition 5.1.** *Let us denote*

$$Z_1 = \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y), \quad Z_2 = M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}) \times X,$$

$$\mathcal{B}_t^{Z_1} = \sigma(\pi_s : s \leq t), \quad \mathcal{B}_t^{Z_2} = \sigma(R_t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(X),$$

where  $\pi$  and  $R$  are the canonical mappings,  $\pi : \mathbb{D}([0, T], Y) \ni \pi \mapsto \pi(t) \in Y$ ,

$$R_t : M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}) \rightarrow M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}) : \mu \mapsto \mu(\cdot \cap (S \times (0, t])),$$

and denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  the Kurtz compatibility structure  $\{(\mathcal{B}_t^{Z_1}, \mathcal{B}_t^{Z_2}) : t \in [0, T]\}$ .

**Definition 5.2.** If  $A$  is an  $Z_1$ -valued random variable over some probability space  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ,  $B$  an  $Z_2$ -valued random variable over  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ , then  $\mathcal{F}_t^A$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t^B$  are the coarsest  $\sigma$ -algebras such that the mappings

$$A : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t^A) \rightarrow (Z_1, \mathcal{B}_t^{Z_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad B : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t^B) \rightarrow (Z_2, \mathcal{B}_t^{Z_2})$$

are measurable.

**Remark 5.3.** If  $A$  is an  $Z_1$ -valued random variable over  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $B = (\eta, \xi)$  an  $Z_2$ -valued random variable over  $\mathfrak{A}$ , it is rather standard to see that

$$\mathcal{F}_t^A = \sigma(A_s : s \leq t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_t^B = \sigma(\eta_t) \vee \sigma(\xi)$$

hold for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , as defined in (4.3).

**Definition 5.4.** We say that  $Z_1$ -valued random variables  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible with an  $Z_2$ -valued random variable  $B$  provided that

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[h(B) | \mathcal{F}_t^{A_1} \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{A_n} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B] = \mathbb{E}[h(B) | \mathcal{F}_t^B] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

holds for every  $t \in [0, T]$  and every real bounded Borel measurable function  $h$  on  $Z_2$ .

**Remark 5.5.**  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatibility of random variables  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  with a random variable  $B$  is actually a property of the joint law of  $(A_1, \dots, A_n, B)$ , as follows from [19, Remark 3.5]. Hence we can introduce the notion of  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatibility for Borel probability measures on  $Z_1^n \times Z_2$ , see [19, Definition 3.6] and Definition 5.6 below.

**Definition 5.6.** A probability measure on  $Z_1^n \times Z_2$  is called  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible provided that, if any  $(A_1, \dots, A_n, B)$  are distributed according to  $\mu$  then  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible with  $B$  in the sense of Definition 5.4.

**Lemma 5.7.** Let  $\eta$  be a time homogeneous Poisson random measure with the intensity measure  $\nu$  on  $S$  for some filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and let  $u_0$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable  $X$ -valued random variable. Then  $Z_1$ -valued random variables  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible with  $B = (\eta, u_0)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{F}_t^{A_1} \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{A_n} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -independent of  $\sigma(\eta^t)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\eta = \eta_t + \eta^t$ , (5.1) holds if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}[h(\eta^t) | \mathcal{F}_t^{A_1} \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{A_n} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B] = \mathbb{E}[h(\eta^t) | \mathcal{F}_t^B].$$

But  $\sigma(\eta^t)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t^B = \sigma(\eta_t) \vee \sigma(u_0)$  are  $\mathbb{P}$ -independent by Lemma 4.4, hence (5.1) holds if and only if  $\mathcal{F}_t^{A_1} \vee \dots \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{A_n} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -independent of  $\sigma(\eta^t)$ .  $\square$

Now we are ready to define a Kurtz convexity constraint  $\Gamma_\nu$ , see [19, page 958].

**Definition 5.8.** If  $\mu$  is a Borel probability measure on  $Z_1 \times Z_2$  and a random vector  $(u, \eta, u_0)$  over a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  has the distribution  $\mu$ , we say that  $\mu$  satisfies a convexity constraint  $\Gamma_\nu$  provided that

- (a)  $u(0) = u_0$  almost surely,
- (b) there exists a solution  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  to the equation (4.1) satisfying 4.1, in particular (HYP), such that  $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\bar{\eta}$  and the law of  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  coincides with the law of  $(u, \eta)$ .

**Remark 5.9.** Paradoxically, despite of the notion, we need not prove here that the Kurtz's convexity constraint  $\Gamma_\nu$  really defines a convex set of probability measures on  $Z_1 \times Z_2$ . For us,  $\Gamma_\nu$  is viewed as a mere constraint with no convexity properties. We will explain more in the proof of Theorem 5.14.

Finally, we define the Kurtz set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$ , see [19, page 958].

**Definition 5.10.** Let  $\beta$  be a Borel probability measure on  $X$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  the set of probability measures  $\mu$  on  $Z_1 \times Z_2$  such that

- (a)  $\mu$  satisfies the convexity constraint  $\Gamma_\nu$ ,
- (b)  $\mu$  is  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible,
- (c)  $\mu(Z_1 \times \cdot) = \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta$  on  $\mathcal{B}(Z_2)$ ,

where  $\Theta_\nu$  is the probability measure introduced in Lemma 2.9.

**Remark 5.11.** Observe that the condition (b) in Definition 5.10 is superfluous as it follows from (a) due to Lemma 5.7. We however present Definition 5.10 as it is, to be conformal with Kurtz's notation in [19].

**Remark 5.12.** The Kurtz set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  is in fact convex. We however do not need the convexity in this paper so we do not prove it either.

We can now give a full description of the set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$ .

**Corollary 5.13.** Let  $\beta$  be a Borel probability measure on  $X$ . Then  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  if and only if

- there exists a solution  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  to the equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1,
- $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\bar{\eta}$ ,
- $\mu$  is the law of  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{u}(0))$ ,
- $\beta$  is the law of  $\bar{u}(0)$ .

**Theorem 5.14.** Let  $\beta$  be a Borel probability measure on  $X$  and assume that

- there exists a solution  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{F}}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}, \bar{u}, \bar{\eta})$  to the equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1 such that  $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\bar{\eta}$  and  $\beta$  is the law of  $\bar{u}(0)$ ,
- whenever  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}, u^1, \eta)$  and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}, u^2, \eta)$  are solutions to the equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1 such that  $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\bar{\eta}$ ,  $\beta$  is the law of  $u^1(0)$  and  $u^1(0) = u^2(0)$  a.s. then  $u^1 = u^2$  a.s.

Then there exists a Borel measurable mapping

$$F : M_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}) \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{D}([0, T]; Y)$$

depending on  $\nu$  and  $\beta$  such that

- (1) if  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}, u, \eta)$  is a solution to the equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1 such that  $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\eta$  and  $\beta$  is the law of  $u(0)$  then  $u = F(\eta, u(0))$  a.s. and  $u$  is adapted to the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmentation of the filtration  $(\sigma(\eta_t), \sigma(u(0)))_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,
- (2) if  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$  is a stochastic basis,  $\xi^*$  is an  $X$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_0$ -measurable random variable with law  $\beta$  and  $\eta$  is a time homogeneous  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ -Poisson random measure with intensity  $\nu$  then  $u = F(\eta, \xi)$  is  $(\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{P}})_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted,  $u(0) = \xi$  a.s. and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{P}})_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}, u, \eta)$  is a solution to (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1.

Consequently, if  $(\Omega^i, \mathcal{F}^i, \mathbb{F}^i, (\mathcal{F}_t^i)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}^i, u^i, \eta^i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are solutions to the equation (4.1) satisfying Hypothesis 4.1 such that  $\nu$  is the intensity measure of  $\eta^1$  and  $\eta^2$ ,  $\beta$  is the law of  $u^1(0)$  and  $u^2(0)$  then the law of  $(u^1, \eta^1)$  coincides with the law of  $(u^2, \eta^2)$ .

*Proof.* By the assumptions in Theorem 5.14, the Kurtz set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  is non-empty and pointwise uniqueness holds for  $\mathcal{C}$ -compatible solutions of  $(\Gamma_\nu, \Theta_\nu \times \beta)$  in the sense of [19, p. 959]. Hence by the implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) in [19, Theorem 3.14], joint uniqueness in law holds for compatible solutions, i.e.  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  contains exactly one measure, and there exists a strong compatible solution in the sense of [19, p. 959] and [19, Lemma 3.11], i.e. (1) holds.

To prove (2), once  $u = F(\eta, \xi)$ , we have that the law of  $(u, \eta, \xi)$  coincides with the law of  $(\bar{u}, \bar{\eta}, \bar{u}(0))$ . Hence  $u(0) = \xi$  a.s. and  $u$  is compatible with  $(\eta, u(0))$  by [19, Remark 3.5]. Thus  $u$  is adapted to the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmentation of the filtration  $(\sigma(\eta_t) \vee \sigma(u(0)))_{t \in [0, T]}$  by [19, Lemma 3.11]. The rest then follows from Lemma 4.5.

We must point out here that the constraint  $\Gamma_\nu$  need not define a convex subset of Borel probability measures on  $Z_1 \times Z_2$  if we apply just the implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) in [19, Theorem 3.14]. The convexity of the Kurtz set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Gamma_\nu, \mathcal{C}, \Theta_\nu \otimes \beta}$  is needed just for the implication (a)  $\Leftarrow$  (b) in [19, Theorem 3.14] which we do not apply in our case.  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. UNIQUENESS OF THE STOCHASTIC INTEGRAL

Let  $X$  and  $E$  be two separable Banach. Later on we will take  $X$  to be one of the spaces  $E$  or  $L^p(S, \nu, E)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$  be an arbitrary filtered probability space and  $\eta$  be a Poisson random measure define over  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}(\Omega \times [0, T]; X)$  be the space of (equivalence classes of) progressively measurable functions  $\xi : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow X$ .

For  $q \in (1, \infty)$  we set

$$(A.1) \quad \mathcal{N}^q(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{F}; X) = \left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{F}; X) : \int_0^\infty |\xi(t)|^q dt < \infty \text{ a.s.} \right\},$$

$$(A.2) \quad \mathcal{M}^q(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{F}; X) = \left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{F}; X) : \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty |\xi(t)|^q dt < \infty \right\}.$$

Let  $E$  be a space of martingale type  $p$  and put  $X = L^p(E; \nu)$ , and let  $\xi \in \mathcal{N}^p(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{F}; X)$ . In particular,  $\xi : \Omega \times [0, T] \times S \rightarrow E$  be a progressively measurable process such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$(A.3) \quad \int_0^T \int_S |\xi(r, z)|_E^p \nu(dz) dr < \infty.$$

Let us consider the law of the triplet  $(\eta, \xi, I)$ , where  $I$  is the Itô integral of  $\xi$  with respect to  $\eta$  as defined on page 6. We have shown in Theorem 2.4 of [7] that the law is unique in case

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_S |\xi(r, z)|_E^p \nu(dz) dr < \infty.$$

In this appendix we want to extend this result to all progressively processes  $\xi$  satisfying only (A.3). However, before stating the Theorem we want to define uniqueness in law.

**Definition A.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  be a measurable space. When we say that  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$  have the same law on  $X$  (and write  $\mathcal{L}aw(\xi_1) = \mathcal{L}aw(\xi_2)$  on  $X$ ), we mean that  $\xi_i, i = 1, 2$ , are  $X$ -valued random variables defined over some probability spaces  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathbb{P}_i), i = 1, 2$ , such that

$$\mathbb{P}_1 \bar{\circ} \xi_1 = \mathbb{P}_2 \bar{\circ} \xi_2,$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_i \bar{\circ} \xi_i(A) = \mathbb{P}_i(\xi_i^{-1}(A)), A \in \mathcal{X}, i = 1, 2$ , is a probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  called the law of  $\xi_i$ .

**Theorem A.2.** Let  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathbb{P}_i), i = 1, 2$ , be two probability spaces and  $(\mathcal{F}_t^i)_{t \in [0, T]}$  a filtration of  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$ . Assume that  $\{(\xi_i, \eta_i), n \in \mathbb{N}\}, i = 1, 2$ , are two  $L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu, E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})$  valued random variables defined on  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_i), i = 1, 2$ , respectively. Assume that  $\eta_1$  is a time homogeneous Poisson random measure over  $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, (\mathcal{F}_t^1)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P}_1)$  with intensity  $\nu$ . Furthermore, assume that  $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{N}(\Omega_1 \times [0, T]; L^p(S, \nu, E))$  with respect to  $(\mathcal{F}_t^1)_{t \in [0, T]}$ .

Let

$$I_i(t) := I(\xi_i, \eta_i)(t) = \int_0^t \int_S \xi_i(s, z) \tilde{\eta}_i(dz, ds).$$

(i) If  $\mathcal{L}aw((\xi_1, \eta_1)) = \mathcal{L}aw((\xi_2, \eta_2))$  on

$$L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu; E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}),$$

then  $\mathcal{L}aw((I_1, \xi_1, \eta_1)) = \mathcal{L}aw((I_2, \xi_2, \eta_2))$  on

$$\mathbb{D}([0, T]; E) \times L^p(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p(S, \nu; E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}).$$

(ii) If  $\mathcal{L}aw((\xi_1, \eta_1)) = \mathcal{L}aw((\xi_2, \eta_2))$  on

$$L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu; E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}),$$

then  $\mathcal{L}aw((I_1, \xi_1, \eta_1)) = \mathcal{L}aw((I_2, \xi_2, \eta_2))$  on

$$L^p([0, T]; E) \times L^p([0, T]; L^p(S, \nu; E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}).$$

*Proof.* In fact, Theorem A.2 follows from Theorem 2.4 in [7] by localization. First, for a fixed  $R > 0$  let us first introduce the stopping times

$$\tau_i^R = \inf_{t>0} \left\{ \int_0^t |\xi(s)|_X^p ds \geq R \right\}.$$

Put  $\xi_i^R := 1_{[0, \tau_i^R]} \xi$ . Observe, using the shifted Haar projection defined in (B.2) one obtains a sequence of simple functions  $\{\mathfrak{h}_n^s \xi_i^R : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}^i$ -a.s.  $\mathfrak{h}_n^s \xi_i^R \rightarrow \xi_i^R$  in  $L^p([0, T]; E)$ . In addition

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_S |\xi_i^R(r, z)|_E^p \nu(dz) dr \leq R.$$

Thus, Theorem 2.4 in [7] is applicable and we have  $\mathcal{L}aw((I_1^R, \xi_1^R, \eta_1)) = \mathcal{L}aw((I_2^R, \xi_2^R, \eta_2))$  on

$$(\mathbb{D}([0, T]; X) \cap L^p([0, T]; X)) \times L^p([0, T]; L^p(Z, \nu; E)) \times M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\}),$$

where

$$(A.4) \quad I_i^R(t) = \int_0^t \int_S \xi_i^R(s, z) \tilde{\eta}_i(ds, dz), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Let

$$A_i^R := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega_i : \int_0^T |\xi_i(s)|_{L^p(Z, \nu; E)}^p ds \leq R \right\}.$$

Then, first, on  $A_i^R$ ,  $\xi_i^R = \xi_i$ , secondly,  $A^{R_1} \supset A^{R_2}$  for  $R_1 > R_2$ , and, thirdly, by Lemma 1.14 [17],  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(A_i^R) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$ . Take a set

$$B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{D}([0, T]; X) \cap L^p([0, T]; B)) \\ \times \mathcal{B}(L^p([0, T]; L^p(Z, \nu; E))) \times \mathcal{B}(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n \times (0, T]\})).$$

Since  $\xi_i^R \leq \xi_i$ , we have by the dominated convergence Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_1((u_1, \xi_1, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_1((u_1, \xi_1, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3, \tau_1^R > t) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_1((u_1^R, \xi_1^R, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_2((u_2^R, \xi_2^R, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_2((u_2^R, \xi_2^R, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3, \tau_1^R > t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_2((u_2, \xi_2, \eta) \in B_1 \times B_2 \times B_3). \end{aligned}$$

Now, the assertion follows.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. THE HAAR PROJECTION

**B.1. The Haar projection onto  $L^q$ -spaces.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Pi^n = \{s_0^n = 0 < s_1^n < \dots < s_{2^n}^n\}$  be a partition of the interval  $[0, T]$  defined by  $s_j^n = j 2^{-n} T$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 2^n$ . Each interval of the form  $(s_{j-1}^n, s_j^n]$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $j = 1, \dots, 2^n$  is called a *dyadic* interval. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the  $j^{\text{th}}$  element, for  $j = 1, \dots, 2^n$ , of the Haar system of order  $n$  is the indicator function of the interval  $(s_{j-1}^n, s_j^n]$ , i.e.  $1_{(s_{j-1}^n, s_j^n]}$ . First, given a function  $x : [0, T] \rightarrow Y$ ,  $Y$  a Banach space, let us define the averaging operator  $\iota_{j,n} : L^p(0, T, Y) \rightarrow Y$  over the interval  $(s_{j-1}^n, s_j^n]$  by

$$(B.1) \quad \iota_{j,n}(x) := \frac{1}{s_j^n - s_{j-1}^n} \int_{s_{j-1}^n}^{s_j^n} x(s) ds, \quad x \in L^p([0, T], Y).$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathfrak{h}_n^s : L^p([0, T], Y) \rightarrow L^p([0, T], Y)$  be the *shifted Haar projection* of order  $n$ , i.e.

$$(B.2) \quad \mathfrak{h}_n^s x = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n-1} \mathbf{1}_{(s_j^n, s_{j+1}^n]} \otimes \iota_{j,n}(x), \quad x \in L^p([0, T]; Y),$$

where we put  $\iota_{0,n} = 0$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In the above, for  $f \in L^p([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  and  $y \in Y$ , by  $f \otimes y$  we mean an element of  $L^p([0, T], Y)$  defined by  $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto f(t)y \in Y$ . For completeness, let us cite the following results taken from [8, Appendix B].

**Proposition B.1.** *The following holds:*

- (i) *For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the shifted Haar projection  $\mathfrak{h}_n^s : L^p([0, T]; Y) \rightarrow L^p([0, T]; Y)$  is a continuous operator.*
- (ii) *For all  $x \in L^p([0, T]; Y)$ ,  $\mathfrak{h}_n^s x \rightarrow x$  in  $L^p([0, T]; Y)$ .*

**Remark B.2.** *Observe, for any  $\xi \in \mathcal{N}_p([0, T]; X)$ , the process  $[0, T] \ni t \mapsto \mathfrak{h}_n^s x(t)$  is simple, left continuous and predictable and the sequence  $\{\mathfrak{h}_n^s \xi : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  converges to  $\xi$  in  $L^p([0, T]; Y)$ .*

**B.2. The Haar projection onto the Skorohod space.** If the underlying space is the Skorohod space, the Haar projection have to defined by another way. For the Skorohod space we refer to Billingsley [4], Ethier and Kurtz [21] and Jacod and Shiryaev [16].

Let  $(Y, |\cdot|_Y)$  be a separable Banach space. The space  $\mathbb{D}([0, 1]; Y)$  denotes the space of all right continuous functions  $x : [0, 1] \rightarrow Y$  with left-hand limits. Let  $\Lambda$  denote the class of all strictly increasing continuous functions  $\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\lambda(0) = 0$  and  $\lambda(1) = 1$ . Obviously any element  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  is a homeomorphism of  $[0, 1]$  onto itself. Let us define the Prohorov metric  $d_0$  by

$$(B.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\lambda\|_{\log} &:= \sup_{t \neq s \in [0, 1]} \left| \log \frac{\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)}{t - s} \right|, \\ \Lambda_{\log} &:= \{ \lambda \in \Lambda : \|\lambda\|_{\log} < \infty \} \\ d_0(x, y) &:= \inf \left\{ \|\lambda\|_{\log} \vee \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |x(t) - y(\lambda(t))|_Y : \lambda \in \Lambda_{\log} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The space  $\mathbb{D}([0, 1]; Y)$  equipped with the metric  $d_0$  is a separable complete metric space. Here, in this section we shortly introduce the so called 'dyadic projection' onto the Haar system. For more detailed information we refer to [8].

**Definition B.3.** *Assume that  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . The  $n$ -th order dyadic projection is an operator  $\mathfrak{h}_n^{\mathbb{D}} : \mathbb{D}([0, T]; E) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}([0, T]; E)$ , such that  $\mathfrak{h}_n^{\mathbb{D}} x, x \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_0^+; E)$ , is defined by*

$$(B.4) \quad (\mathfrak{h}_n^{\mathbb{D}} x)(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{(2^{-n}i, 2^{-n}(i+1)]}(t) x(2^{-n}i), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

An important property of the dyadic projection is given in the following result.

**Proposition B.4.** *The following holds.*

- i.) *If  $x \in \mathbb{D}([0, T]; E)$  then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_0(x, \mathfrak{h}_n^{\mathbb{D}} x) = 0$ ;*
- ii.) *if  $K \subset \mathbb{D}([0, T]; E)$  is compact, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in K} d_0(x, \mathfrak{h}_n^{\mathbb{D}} x) = 0.$$

Finally, we need the fact, that the integral operator is continuous operator on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], E)$ .

**Proposition B.5.** *If  $(x_n) \rightarrow x$  in  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, E)$ , then for all  $s, t \in (0, T]$  we have*

$$\int_s^t x_n(r) dr \rightarrow \int_s^t x(r) dr$$

*in  $E$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

## APPENDIX C. POLISH MEASURE SPACES

Let  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be a Polish space and let  $S_n \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfy  $S_n \uparrow S$ . Then there exists a metric  $\varrho$  on  $S$  such that  $(S, \varrho)$  is a complete separable metric space,  $\mathcal{B}(S, \varrho) = \mathcal{S}$  and  $S_n$  is closed for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , see e.g. [18, (13.5) page 83]. Consider the Lévy-Prokhorov metric on  $M_+(S, \varrho)$

$$\pi(\mu, \nu) = \inf \{ \varepsilon > 0 : \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \forall A \in \mathcal{S} \}$$

where  $A^\varepsilon = \{x \in S : \exists a \in A, \varrho(x, a) < \varepsilon\}$ . Then  $(M_+(S, \varrho), \pi)$  is a complete separable metric space and  $\pi(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$  iff

$$\int_S f d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_S f d\mu, \quad \forall f \in C_b(S, \varrho),$$

see e.g. [4, page 72-73], where the proof for probability measures can be quite easily adapted to finite non-negative measures.

**Lemma C.1.** *The  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{M}_+(S)$  on  $M_+(S)$  generated by the mappings  $\mu \mapsto \mu(A)$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  coincides with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(M_+(S), \pi)$ .*

*Proof.* The mapping  $\mu \mapsto \mu(A)$  is upper semicontinuous on  $(M_+(S), \pi)$  for every  $A \subseteq S$  closed and lower semicontinuous for every  $A \subseteq S$  open, hence Borel measurable for every  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{M}_+(S) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(M_+(S), \pi)$ . On the other hand, let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a countable basis of open sets in  $(S, \varrho)$  closed under finite unions. Then

$$\{\mu : \pi(\mu, \theta) < r\} = \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, r)} \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \{\mu : \mu(A) \leq \theta(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \theta(A) \leq \mu(A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{M}_+(S).$$

Hence open balls in  $(M_+(S), \pi)$  belong to  $\mathcal{M}_+(S)$  and since  $(M_+(S), \pi)$  is separable, every open set is a countable union of open balls. Consequently, every open set in  $(M_+(S), \pi)$  belong to  $\mathcal{M}_+(S)$ , hence  $\mathcal{B}(M_+(S), \pi) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_+(S)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma C.2.** *The set of integer-valued measures  $M_{\mathbb{N}}(S)$  is closed in  $(M_+(S, \varrho), \pi)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\pi(\mu_n, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mu_n$  be integer-valued and  $k < \mu(A) < k + 1$  for some integer  $k$  and some  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ . By regularity, we can find a compact  $C \subseteq A$  such that  $k < \mu(C) \leq \mu(A) < k + 1$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $k < \mu(C) - \delta$  and  $\mu(C^{2\delta}) + \delta < k + 1$ . If  $\pi(\mu_n, \mu) < \delta$  then

$$k < \mu(C) - \delta \leq \mu_n(C^\delta) \leq \mu(C^{2\delta}) + \delta < k + 1,$$

which cannot happen as  $\mu_n(C^\delta)$  is an integer.  $\square$

**Lemma C.3.**  *$(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}))$  is a Polish space.*

*Proof.* Consider the metric

$$\rho(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \min \{1, \pi(\mu(\cdot \cap S_n), \nu(\cdot \cap S_n))\}, \quad \mu, \nu \in M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}).$$

Then  $(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho)$  is a metric space and the mapping

$$I : (M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho) \rightarrow (M_{\mathbb{N}}(S), \pi)^{\mathbb{N}} : \mu \mapsto (\mu(\cdot \cap S_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

is a homeomorphism onto a closed set in  $(M_{\mathbb{N}}(S), \pi)^{\mathbb{N}}$ , hence  $(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho)$  is a complete separable metric space by Lemma C.2. To show closedness, let  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \pi(\mu_j(\cdot \cap S_n), \theta_n) = 0$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $m < k$ . If  $f \in C_b(S_m)$  and we extend  $f$  by zero on  $S \setminus S_m$  then  $f \in C_b(S)$  since  $S_m$  is clopen. So  $\partial S_n = \emptyset$ ,

$$\theta_n(S \setminus S_n) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j((S \setminus S_n) \cap S_n) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$\int_S f d\theta_k = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f d\mu_j(\cdot \cap S_k) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f d\mu_j(\cdot \cap S_m) = \int_S f d\theta_m$$

so  $\theta_m(\cdot) = \theta_k(\cdot \cap S_m)$ . In particular,  $\theta_n(A) \uparrow$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\theta(A) = \lim_n \theta_n(A)$  is a  $\sigma$ -additive,  $\mathbb{N}$ -valued measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\theta_m(\cdot) = \theta(\cdot \cap S_m)$ .

Now, by Lemma C.1, the mapping  $\mu \mapsto \mu(A \cap S_k)$  is  $\mathcal{B}(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho)$  measurable for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  since  $I$  is Borel measurable. Hence  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho)$ . On the other hand, the mapping

$$(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\})) \rightarrow (M_{\mathbb{N}}(S), \mathcal{B}(M_{\mathbb{N}}(S))) : \mu \mapsto \mu(\cdot \cap S_k)$$

is measurable for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  by Lemma C.1. So, if  $\theta \in M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\})$  is fixed, the mapping

$$(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \mu \mapsto \pi(\mu(\cdot \cap S_k), \theta(\cdot \cap S_k))$$

is measurable for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consequently, the mapping

$$(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \mu \mapsto \rho(\mu, \theta)$$

is measurable. Since  $(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho)$  is a separable metric space and every open set is a countable union of open balls, we conclude that  $\mathcal{B}(M_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\}), \rho) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(\{S_n\})$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Applebaum. *Lévy processes and stochastic calculus. 2nd ed.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed. edition, 2009.
- [2] K. Bahlali, B. Mezerdi, M. N'zi, and Y. Ouknine. Weak solutions and a Yamada-Watanabe theorem for FBSDEs. *Random Oper. Stoch. Equ.*, 15:271–285, 2007.
- [3] M. Barczy, Zenghu Li, and G. Pap. Yamada-Watanabe results for stochastic differential equations with jumps. *Int. J. Stoch. Anal.*, pages Art. ID 460472, 23, 2015.
- [4] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures.* Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [5] Z. Brzeźniak. Stochastic Partial Differential Equations in M-Type 2 Banach Spaces. *Potential Analysis*, 4:1-45, 1995.
- [6] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Hausenblas. Maximal regularity for stochastic convolutions driven by Lévy processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 145:615-637, 2009.
- [7] Z. Brzeźniak and E. Hausenblas. Uniqueness in law of the Itô integral with respect to Lévy noise. In *Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications VI*, volume 63 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 37–57. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011.
- [8] Z. Brzeźniak, E. Hausenblas, and E. Motyl. Uniqueness in law of the stochastic convolution process driven by Lévy noise. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 57, 15, 2013.
- [9] Z. Brzeźniak, E. Hausenblas, and P. Razafimandimby. Stochastic Reaction Diffusion Equation driven by Jump Processes, *Pot. Analysis*, online, 2018.
- [10] A.S. Cherny. On the strong and weak solutions of stochastic differential equations governing Bessel processes. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 70:213–219, 2000.
- [11] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. A stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with multiplicative noise. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 205:161–181, 1999.
- [12] A. de Bouard and A. Debussche. The stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation in  $H^1$ . *Stochastic Anal. Appl.*, 21:97–126, 2003.
- [13] A. de Bouard and E. Hausenblas. The stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equation with Lévy noise of infinite activity, available on Archive (arXiv:1702.02523).
- [14] H. Engelbert. On the theorem of T. Yamada and S. Watanabe. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 36:205–216, 1991.
- [15] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, volume 24 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam; Kodansha, Ltd., Tokyo, second edition, 1989.
- [16] J. Jacod. Weak and strong solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Stochastics*, 3:171–191, 1980.
- [17] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability.* Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [18] A. S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [19] T. G. Kurtz. The Yamada-Watanabe-Engelbert theorem for general stochastic equations and inequalities. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 12:951–965, 2007.
- [20] T. G. Kurtz. Weak and strong solutions of general stochastic models. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 19:no. 58, 16, 2014.
- [21] S. Ethier and T. Kurtz. *MARKOV PROCESSES.* Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986.
- [22] F. Linares and G. Ponce. *Introduction to nonlinear dispersive equations. 2nd ed.* New York, NY: Springer, 2009.
- [23] W. Linde. *Probability in Banach spaces: stable and infinitely divisible distributions.* A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., Chichester, second edition, 1986.
- [24] M. Ondreját. Uniqueness for stochastic evolution equations in Banach spaces. *Diss. Math.*, 426:1–63, 2004.
- [25] K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces.* Probability and Mathematical Statistics, No. 3. Academic Press, Inc., New York-London, 1967.

- [26] Huijie Qiao. A theorem dual to Yamada-Watanabe theorem for stochastic evolution equations. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 10:367–374, 2010.
- [27] B. Rüdiger and S. Tappe. Isomorphisms for spaces of predictable processes and an extension of the Itô integral. *Stochastic Anal. Appl.*, 30:529–537, 2012.
- [28] S. Tappe. The Yamada-Watanabe theorem for mild solutions to stochastic partial differential equations. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 18:13, 2013.
- [29] N. N. Vakhania, V. I. Tarieladze, and S. A. Chobanyan. *Probability distributions on Banach spaces*, volume 14 of *Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series)*. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987.
- [30] J. Villarroel, M. Maldonado, and J. Prada. On the integrability of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with randomly dependent linear potential. *J. Phys. A*, 47:215202, 19, 2014.
- [31] J. Villarroel and M. Montero. On the integrability of the Poisson driven stochastic nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, 127:372–393, 2011.
- [32] W. Wołczyński. Geometry and martingales in Banach spaces. In *Probability–Winter School (Proc. Fourth Winter School, Karpacz, 1975)*, pages 229–275. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 472. Springer, Berlin, 1975.
- [33] T. Yamada and S. Watanabe. On the uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 11:155–167, 1971.
- [34] Huiyan Zhao. Yamada-Watanabe theorem for stochastic evolution equation driven by poisson random measure. *International Scholarly Research Notices*, pages Art. ID 982190, 7, 2014.

ANNE DE BOUARD, CMAP, ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, CNRS, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, 91128 PALAISEAU

DEBOUARD@CMAP.POLYTECHNIQUE.FR

ERIKA HAUSENBLAS, LEHRSTUHL ANGEWANDTE MATHEMATIK, MONTANUNIVERSITÄT LEOBEN, FRANZ-JOSEF-STRASSE 18, 8700 LEOBEN

ERIKA.HAUSENBLAS@UNILEOBEN.AC.AT

MARTIN ONDREJÁT, THE INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION THEORY AND AUTOMATION, POD VODÁRENSKOU VĚŽÍ 4, CZ-182 08, PRAGUE 8, CZECH REPUBLIC

ONDREJAT@UTIA.CAS.CZ