

The truncated EM method for stochastic differential equations with Poisson jumps

Shounian Deng^a, Weiyin Fei^{b,*}, Wei Liu^c, Xuerong Mao^d

^aSchool of Science, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210094, China

^bSchool of Mathematics and Physics, Anhui Polytechnic University, Wuhu, Anhui 24100, China

^cDepartment of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai 200234, China

^dDepartment of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G1 1XH, U.K.

Abstract

In this paper, we use the truncated EM method to study the finite time strong convergence for the SDEs with Poisson jumps under the Khasminskii-type condition. We establish the finite time \mathcal{L}^r ($r \geq 2$) convergence rate when the drift and diffusion coefficients satisfy super-linear condition and the jump coefficient satisfies the linear growth condition. The result shows that the optimal \mathcal{L}^r -convergence rate is close to $1/(1 + \gamma)$, where γ is the super-linear growth constant. This is significantly different from the result on SDEs without jumps. When all the three coefficients of SDEs are allowing to grow super-linearly, the \mathcal{L}^r ($0 < r < 2$) strong convergence results are also investigated and the optimal strong convergence rate is shown to be not greater than $1/4$. Moreover, we prove that the truncated EM method preserve nicely the mean square exponentially stability and asymptotic boundedness of the underlying SDEs with Piosson jumps. Several examples are given to illustrate our results.

Keywords: Stochastic differential equations, local Lipschitz condition, Khasminskii-type condition, truncated EM method, Piosson jumps.

1. Introduction

Due to the broad applications in modeling uncertain phenomenon, stochastic differential equations (SDEs) driven by Brownian motions have been attracting lots of attentions [1, 2]. When some unexpected events happen, some jumps may be needed to model the effects of those events. For example, a breaking news after the close of the stock market may lead to a huge difference between today's closing price and tomorrow's opening price. To take both the continuous and discontinuous random effects into consideration, SDEs driven by both Brownian motions and Poisson jumps are often employed as a generalisation of the SDEs only driven by Brownian motions.

Despite the wide applications, the explicit solutions to SDEs are hardly found. Therefore, to construct some efficient numerical methods is of extremely important. The series works of Higham and Kloeden [3, 4, 5] studied some implicit methods for SDEs with Poisson jumps.

*Corresponding author

Email address: wyfei@ahpu.edu.cn (Weiyin Fei)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

October 26, 2021

In their papers, the strong convergence, the convergence rates and stability of different implicit methods were proposed and investigated for some SDEs, whose drift coefficient satisfies non-
15 global Lipschitz condition, and both the diffusion coefficient and the coefficient for the Poisson jumps are global Lipschitzian. When the global Lipschitz condition on the diffusion coefficient is disturbed, the tamed Euler and the tamed Milstein methods were proposed for SDEs driven by the more generalised process, Lévy process [6, 7]. The taming techniques were original
20 proposed in [8] for the construction of explicit methods for SDEs with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients. As indicated in [9], explicit methods have their own advantages on the relatively simple structure and the avoidance of solving some nonlinear systems in each iteration. Therefore, the studies on explicit methods for SDEs with non-global Lipschitz coefficients have been blooming in recent years. Sine and cosine functions were employed in [10] to construct
25 some explicit methods for SDEs with both the drift and diffusion coefficients growing super-linearly. The taming techniques were modified and generalised in [11] and [12]. The truncated Euler method were proposed in [13, 14].

In this paper, we borrow the truncating idea to propose the truncated Euler method for SDEs with Poisson jumps. The main contributions of this work are twofold. Firstly, all the drift
30 coefficient, the diffusion coefficient and the coefficient for Poisson jumps are allowed to grow super-linear. To our best knowledge, this is the first work to study an explicit numerical method for SDEs with all the three coefficients that can grow super-linearly. Secondly, both the finite time convergence and asymptotic behaviours of the method are investigated.

It should be noted that the truncated Euler for SDEs with the global Lipschitzian pure jumps were studied in [15]. Other numerical methods for SDEs with Poisson jumps or Lévy process
35 were also proposed and investigated [16, 17, 18, 19, 20], we just mention some of them here and refer the readers to the references therein. For the detailed and systemic introductions to numerical methods for SDEs and SDEs with jump, we refer the readers to the monographs [21] and [22].

This paper is constructed as follows. Section 2 sees some necessary mathematical preliminaries. Section 3 contain the main results on the finite time convergence. The asymptotic behaviours, stability and boundedness, of the numerical solutions are presented in section 4. Several
40 examples are given in the Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper and points out some future research.

2. Mathematical Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability
45 space with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions (i.e., it is increasing and right continuous while \mathcal{F}_0 contains all \mathbb{P} -null sets). Let \mathbb{E} denote the probability expectation with respect to \mathbb{P} . Let $B(t)$ be an m -dimensional Brownian motion defined on the probability space and is \mathcal{F}_t -adapted. $N(t)$ is a scalar Poisson process with the compensated Poisson process $\tilde{N}(t) = N(t) - \lambda t$,
50 where the parameter λ is a jump intensity. If A is a vector or matrix, its transpose is denoted by A^T . If $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $|x|$ is the Euclidean norm. If A is a matrix, its trace norm is denoted by $|A| = \sqrt{A^T A}$. For two real numbers a and b , we use $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$. For a set G , its indicator function is denoted by \mathbb{I}_G . Moreover, $\mathcal{L}^r = \mathcal{L}^r(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ denotes the space of random variables X with a norm $|x|_r := (\mathbb{E}|X|^r)^{1/r} < \infty$ for $r > 0$. In what follows,
55 for notational simplicity, we use the convention that C represents a generic positive constant, the value of which may be different for different appearances.

Consider a d -dimensional SDEs with Piosson jumps:

$$dx(t^-) = f(x(t^-))dt + g(x(t^-))dB(t) + h(x(t^-))dN(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

with the initial value $x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $x(t^-)$ denotes $\lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} x(s)$. Here, $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the drift coefficient, $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ is the diffusion coefficient, $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the jumps coefficient.

3. Finite time convergence

60 3.1. Convergence rate of the partially truncated EM method in $\mathcal{L}^r(r \geq 2)$

In order to discuss the convergence rates of the truncated EM method in L^r for $r \geq 2$. We assume that f and g can be decomposed as $f(x) = F_1(x) + F(x)$ and $g(x) = G_1(x) + G(x)$, where $F_1, F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, and $G_1, G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$. Moreover, the coefficients F, G, F_1, G_1 and h satisfy the following conditions.

Assumption 3.1. *There exist positive constant $L_1 > 0$ and $\gamma \geq 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |F_1(x) - F_1(y)| \vee |G_1(x) - G_1(y)| \vee |h(x) - h(y)| &\leq L_1|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ |F(x) - F(y)| \vee |G(x) - G(y)| &\leq L_1(1 + |x|^\gamma + |y|^\gamma)|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

The parameter γ , which we call super-linear growth constant. By Assumption 3.1, we can derive that there exists a positive constant K_1 such that

$$|F_1(x)| \vee |G_1(x)| \vee |h(x)| \leq K_1(1 + |x|), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.2)$$

which implies that F_1, G_1 and h satisfy the linear growth condition. Similarly, we have

$$|F(x)| \vee |G(x)| \leq (2L_1 + |F(0)| + |G(0)|)|x|^{1+\gamma}, \quad \forall |x| \geq 1. \quad (3.3)$$

65 We also impose the following standing hypotheses.

Assumption 3.2. *There exists a pair of constant $\bar{r} > 2$ and $L_2 > 0$ such that*

$$(x - y)^T(F(x) - F(y)) + \frac{\bar{r} - 1}{2}|G(x) - G(y)|^2 \leq L_2|x - y|^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.4)$$

By Assumption 3.2, we can derive that for any $r \in [2, \bar{r})$

$$(x - y)^T(f(x) - f(y)) + \frac{r - 1}{2}|g(x) - g(y)|^2 \leq L_3|x - y|^2. \quad (3.5)$$

where $L_3 = 2L_1 + L_2 + \frac{L_1^2 + (r-1)(\bar{r}-1)}{\bar{r}-r}$ (see [23]).

Assumption 3.3. *(Khasminskii-type condition) There exist constants $\bar{p} > \bar{r}, K_2 > 0$ such that*

$$x^T F(x) + \frac{\bar{p} - 1}{2}|G(x)|^2 \leq K_2(1 + |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.6)$$

By Assumption 3.3, we also have that for any $p \in [2, \bar{p})$

$$x^T f(x) + \frac{p-1}{2} |g(x)|^2 \leq K_3(1 + |x|^2), \quad (3.7)$$

where $K_3 = 2K_1 + K_2 + \frac{K_1^2 + (p-1)(\bar{p}-1)}{\bar{p}-p}$ (see [23]).

The truncated idea is to deal with the super-linear coefficients. In the viewpoint of the finite-time convergence, the linear coefficient does not cause any problem to the EM scheme and hence there is no need to truncate it [23]. In our truncated EM method, we only truncate the super-linear terms, that is F and G . To define the truncated EM scheme, we first choose a strictly increasing function $\mu : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\mu(n) \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\sup_{|x| \leq n} |F(x)| \vee |G(x)| \leq \mu(n), \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Denoted by μ^{-1} is the inverse function of μ . We also choose a strictly decreasing function $\varphi : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \varphi(\Delta) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi(\Delta))^{\bar{p}} \leq \Delta^{-1} \wedge \Delta^{-\bar{p}/4}, \quad \forall \Delta \in (0, 1]. \quad (3.8)$$

For a given step size $\Delta \in (0, 1)$, let us define a mapping π_Δ from \mathbb{R}^d to the closed ball $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq \mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))\}$ by

$$\pi_\Delta = (|x| \wedge \mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))) \frac{x}{|x|}.$$

We set $x/|x| = 0$ when $x = 0$. We then define the partially truncated functions

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Delta(x) &= F(\pi_\Delta(x)), \quad G_\Delta(x) = G(\pi_\Delta(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ f_\Delta(x) &= F_1(x) + F_\Delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad g_\Delta(x) = G_1(x) + F_\Delta(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$|F_\Delta(x)| \vee |G_\Delta(x)| \leq \varphi(\Delta), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.9)$$

Obviously, F_Δ and G_Δ are bounded while F and G may not. The following lemma shows that the truncated functions maintain the Khaminskii-type condition nicely (see [13]).

Lemma 3.4. *Let Assumption 3.3 hold. Then, for all $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$x^T F_\Delta(x) + \frac{\bar{p}-1}{2} |G_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq 2K_2(1 + |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We can show that for any $p \in [2, \bar{p})$, we have

$$x^T f_\Delta(x) + \frac{p-1}{2} |g_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq K_4(1 + |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.10)$$

where $K_4 = 2K_1 + 2K_2 + \frac{K_1^2 + (p-1)(\bar{p}-1)}{\bar{p}-p}$ (see [23]). We now form the discrete-time truncated EM numerical solutions $X_\Delta(t_k^-) \approx x(t_k^-)$, for $t_k^- = k\Delta t$ by setting $X_\Delta(0) = x_0$ and computing

$$X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-) = X_\Delta(t_k^-) + f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta t + g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta B_k + h(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta N_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq M-1, \quad (3.11)$$

where $\Delta B_k = B(t_{k+1}^-) - B(t_k^-)$, $\Delta N_k = N(t_{k+1}^-) - N(t_k^-)$. It is consentient to use the continuous-time step process $\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)$ which is defined by

$$\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_\Delta(t_k^-) \mathbb{I}_{[t_k^-, t_{k+1}^-)}(t) \quad (3.12)$$

where \mathbb{I} is a indicator function. The other continuous-time process is defined by

$$x_\Delta(t^-) = x_0 + \int_0^t f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds + \int_0^t g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dB(s) + \int_0^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s).$$

It is easy to see that $x_\Delta(t_k^-) = \bar{x}_\Delta(t_k^-) = X_\Delta(t_k^-)$. Moreover, $x_\Delta(t^-)$ is an Itô process with Itô differential

$$dx_\Delta(t^-) = f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)) dt + g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)) dB(t) + h(\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)) dN(t).$$

70 We first state a known result (see [6]) as a lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Under Assumption 3.1 and 3.3 the SDE (2.1) has a unique global solution $x(t)$, moreover, for any $p \in [2, \bar{p})$,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x(t)|^p < \infty, \quad \forall T > 0.$$

In order to bound the p -th moment of the truncated EM solution, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \leq C((\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta^{\hat{p}/2} + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}}) \Delta), \quad \forall \hat{p} \geq 2. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. Fix any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, $t \geq 0$ and $\hat{p} \geq 2$. There is a integer $k \geq 0$ such that $t_k^- \leq t < t_{k+1}^-$. By Assumption 3.1 and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \quad (3.14) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds + \int_{t_k^-}^t g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dB(s) + \int_{t_k^-}^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds \right|^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dB(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\Delta^{\hat{p}-1} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k^-}^t |f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{\hat{p}} ds + \Delta^{(\hat{p}-2)/2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k^-}^t |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{\hat{p}} ds + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right) \\ &\leq C \left(\Delta^{\hat{p}/2} (1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}}) + (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where C is a generic constant, the value of which may change between occurrences. By the characteristic function's argument [24], for $\Delta \in (0, 1]$

$$\mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k|^{\hat{p}} \leq c_0 \Delta, \quad (3.15)$$

where c_0 is a positive constant which is independent of Δ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} &= \mathbb{E} |h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k|^{\hat{p}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} |h(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^{\hat{p}} \mathbb{E} |\Delta N_k|^{\hat{p}} \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E} |\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}}) \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (3.14) and combing with $\Delta^{\hat{p}/2} \leq \Delta$ gives

$$\mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \leq C((\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta^{\hat{p}/2} + (1 + \mathbb{E} |\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}}) \Delta).$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let Assumption 3.1 and 3.3 hold and let $p \in [2, \bar{p})$ be arbitrary. Then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq \Delta \leq 1} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(t^-)|^p \leq C, \quad \forall T > 0, \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. Fix any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $T > 0$. By the Itô formula and (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(t^-)|^p - |x_0|^p &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} \left(x_\Delta^T(s) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + \frac{p-1}{2} |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t |x_\Delta(s^-) + h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^p - |x_\Delta(s^-)|^p \right) ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} \left(\bar{x}_\Delta^T(s) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + \frac{p-1}{2} |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} (x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))^T f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t |x_\Delta(s^-) + h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^p - |x_\Delta(s^-)|^p \right) ds \\ &\leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p K_4 |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} (1 + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2) ds, \quad (3.18)$$

$$I_2 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |F_1(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds, \quad (3.19)$$

$$I_3 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t p |x_\Delta(s^-)|^{p-2} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |F_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds, \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$I_4 = \lambda \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t |x_\Delta(s^-) + h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^p - |x_\Delta(s^-)|^p \right) ds. \quad (3.21)$$

By the Young inequality

$$a^{p-2} b^2 \leq \frac{p-2}{p} a^p + \frac{2}{p} b^p, \quad \forall a, b \geq 0,$$

we then have

$$I_1 \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) ds \right). \quad (3.22)$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$I_2 \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) ds \right). \quad (3.23)$$

By Assumption 3.1, it is not difficult to prove that there exists a positive constant c_1 such that

$$|x_\Delta(s^-) + h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^p - |x_\Delta(s^-)|^p \leq c_1(1 + |x_\Delta(t^-)|^p + |\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^p). \quad (3.24)$$

Hence, we have

$$I_4 \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) ds \right). \quad (3.25)$$

Moreover, by the Young inequality and (3.9), we get

$$I_3 \leq (p-2)\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{p/2} |F_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{p/2} ds. \quad (3.26)$$

By Lemma 3.6 and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{p/2} |F_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{p/2} ds \\ & \leq (\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{p/2} ds \\ & \leq (\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ & \leq C(\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \left((1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{p/2}) \Delta^{1/2} + (\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \Delta^{p/4} \right) \\ & \leq C \left((1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) (\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \Delta^{1/2} + (\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/4} \right) \\ & \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p). \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

Noting that the last inequality in (3.27) has used the condition 3.8 which implies

$$(\varphi(\Delta))^{p/2} \Delta^{1/2} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/4} \leq 1.$$

Inserting (3.27) into (3.26) also gives

$$I_3 \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) ds \right). \quad (3.28)$$

Substituting (3.22), (3.23), (3.25) and (3.28) into (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-)|^p & \leq C \left(\int_0^t (1 + \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-)|^p + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^p) ds \right) \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u)|^p ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u^-)|^p \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u)|^p ds \right).$$

The Gronwall inequality yields

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u^-)|^p \leq C.$$

As this holds for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ while C is independent of Δ , we obtain the required assertion. \square

The following lemma shows that $x_\Delta(t)$ and $\bar{x}_\Delta(t)$ are close to each other in the sense of \mathcal{L}^p .

Lemma 3.8. *Let Assumption 3.1 and 3.3 hold and let $t \in [0, T]$. Then there is a $\bar{\Delta} \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\Delta \in (0, \bar{\Delta}]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^p \leq C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/2} + \Delta \right), \quad 2 \leq p < \bar{p}, \quad (3.29)$$

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^p \leq C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/2} + \Delta^{p/2} \right), \quad 0 < p < 2. \quad (3.30)$$

Consequently

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^p = 0, \quad p > 0. \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. For any $p \geq 2$, by Lemma 3.7, there is a $\bar{\Delta} \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq \Delta \leq \bar{\Delta}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-)|^p \leq C. \quad (3.32)$$

Now, fix any $\Delta \in (0, \bar{\Delta}]$, inserting (3.32) into (3.13) gives (3.29). For any $p \in (0, 2)$, the Hölder inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^p &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta + \Delta \right)^{p/2} = C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/2} + \Delta^{p/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

75 Noting from (3.8) that $(\varphi(\Delta))^p \Delta^{p/2} \leq \Delta^{p/4} \wedge \Delta^{p/2-1}$ for $2 < p < \bar{p}$, we obtain (3.31) from (3.29). \square

Let us propose two lemmas before we state our main results in this paper.

Lemma 3.9. *Let Assumption 3.1 and 3.3 hold. For any real number $n > |x_0|$, define the stopping time*

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |x(t)| \geq n\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}. \quad (3.33)$$

Proof. The proof is given in the Appendix. \square

Lemma 3.10. *Let Assumption 3.1 and 3.3 hold. For any real number $n > |x_0|$, define the stopping time,*

$$\rho_{\Delta,n} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |x_{\Delta}(t^-)| \geq n\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_{\Delta,n} \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}. \quad (3.34)$$

Proof. The proof is given in the Appendix. \square

Now, we will show one of our main results in our paper. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.6 in [25], we only highlight the different parts.

Theorem 3.11. *Let Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold and assume that there exists a number $p \in (2, \bar{p})$ such that*

$$p > (1 + \gamma)\bar{r}. \quad (3.35)$$

Let $r \in [2, \bar{r})$ be arbitrary. Then for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C\left((\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-p-(1+\gamma)r} + (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p}\right) \quad (3.36)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C\left((\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-p-(1+\gamma)r} + (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p}\right). \quad (3.37)$$

In particular, we define

$$\mu(x) = L_4 x^{1+\gamma}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (3.38)$$

where $L_4 = 2L_1 + |F(0)| + |G(0)|$, and let

$$\varphi(\Delta) = \Delta^{-\varepsilon} \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4 \wedge 1/p] \quad (3.39)$$

to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C \Delta^{[\varepsilon(p-(1+\gamma)r)/(1+\gamma)] \wedge [r(1-2\varepsilon)/2] \wedge [(p-\gamma r)/p]} \quad (3.40)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C \Delta^{[\varepsilon(p-(1+\gamma)r)/(1+\gamma)] \wedge [r(1-2\varepsilon)/2] \wedge [(p-\gamma r)/p]} \quad (3.41)$$

for all $\Delta \in (0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ be arbitrary. Let $e_{\Delta}(t) = x(t) - x_{\Delta}(t)$ for $t > 0$. Fix a number $q \in (r, \bar{r})$, (3.35) means $p > (1 + \gamma)q$. For any integer $n > |x_0|$, define the stopping time

$$\sigma_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |x(t)| \vee |x_{\Delta}(t)| \geq n\}.$$

By the Itô formula, we get that for $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(t \wedge \sigma_n)|^r \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} r|e_\Delta(s^-)|^{r-2} \left(e_\Delta^T(s^-)(f(x(s^-)) - f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))) + \frac{r-1}{2}|g(x(s^-)) - g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\
& \quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \left(|e_\Delta(s^-) + (h(x(s^-)) - h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)))|^r - |e_\Delta(s^-)|^r \right) ds \\
& =: J_1 + J_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Let us estimate J_2 first. Using Assumption 3.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& |x(s^-) - x_\Delta(s^-) + h(x(s^-)) - h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^r \\
& \leq 2^{r-1}(|x(s^-) - x_\Delta(s^-)|^r + |h(x(s^-)) - h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^r) \\
& \leq 2^{r-1}(|x(s^-) - x_\Delta(s^-)|^r + L_1^r|x(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^r) \\
& \leq c_1(|x(s^-) - x_\Delta(s^-)|^r + |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^r),
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_2 = 2^{r-1}(1 + L_1^r 2^{r-1}) > 1$. Hence, by Lemma 3.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 & \leq \lambda(c_2 - 1) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(s \wedge \sigma_n)|^r ds + \lambda c_2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds \\
& \leq \lambda(c_2 - 1) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(s \wedge \sigma_n)|^r ds + C(\Delta^{r/2}(\varphi(\Delta))^r + \Delta).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

By the elementary inequality, J_1 can be decomposed into two parts denoted by $J_1 = J_3 + J_4$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 & = \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} r|e_\Delta(s^-)|^{r-2} \left(e_\Delta^T(s^-)(f(x(s^-)) - f(x_\Delta(s^-))) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{q-1}{2}|g(x(s^-)) - g(x_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds
\end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_4 & = \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} r|e_\Delta(s^-)|^{r-2} \left(e_\Delta^T(s^-)(f(x_\Delta(s^-)) - f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{(r-1)(q-1)}{2(q-r)}|g(x_\Delta(s^-)) - g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

By (3.5), we have

$$J_3 \leq rL_3 \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds. \tag{3.46}$$

The Elementary inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}
J_4 &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} r |e_\Delta(s^-)|^{r-2} \left(e_\Delta^T(s^-) (f(x_\Delta(s^-))) - f_\Delta(x_\Delta(s^-)) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{(r-1)(q-1)}{(q-r)} |g(x_\Delta(s^-)) - g_\Delta(x_\Delta(s^-))|^2 ds \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} r |e_\Delta(s^-)|^{r-2} \left(e_\Delta^T(s^-) (f_\Delta(x_\Delta(s^-))) - f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{(r-1)(q-1)}{(q-r)} |g_\Delta(x_\Delta(s^-)) - g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 ds \\
&=: J_{41} + J_{42}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

In the same way as Theorem 3.6 in [25] was proved, we can show that

$$J_{41} \leq C \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds + (\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-(p-(1+\gamma)r)} \right) \tag{3.48}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{42} &\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds + C \int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{pr/(p-\gamma r)} \right)^{(p-\gamma r)/p} \\
&\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds + C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^{pr/(p-\gamma r)} \Delta^{0.5pr/(p-\gamma r)} + \Delta \right)^{(p-\gamma r)/p} \\
&\leq C \int_0^{t \wedge \sigma_n} \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s^-)|^r ds + C \left((\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

where we use the Lemma 3.8 and the fact that

$$\frac{pr}{p-\gamma r} = r \frac{p}{p-\gamma r} > 2.$$

Inserting (3.48) and (3.49) into (3.47), we have

$$J_4 \leq C \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s \wedge \sigma_n)|^r ds + (\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-(p-(1+\gamma)r)} + (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p} \right). \tag{3.50}$$

Combing (3.43), (3.46) and (3.50), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(t \wedge \sigma_n)|^r &\leq C \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s \wedge \sigma_n)|^r ds + (\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-(p-(1+\gamma)r)} \right) \\
&\quad + (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Gronwall inequality implies

$$\mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(T \wedge \sigma_n)|^r \leq C \left((\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)))^{-(p-(1+\gamma)r)} + (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} + \Delta^{(p-\gamma r)/p} \right).$$

Using Lemma 3.9 and 3.10 and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ gives the desired assertion (3.36). By (3.36) and Lemma 3.8 gives the another assertion (3.37). Recalling (3.38), then $\mu^{-1} = (x/L_4)^{1/(1+\gamma)}$.

85 Substituting this and (3.39) into (3.36) gives (3.40). Similarly, we can get (3.41). Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Corollary 3.12. *Let Assumption 3.1, 3.2 hold and let Assumption 3.3 holds for all $\bar{p} \in (\bar{r}, \infty)$. Let μ and φ be defined in (3.38) and (3.39). Then, for any*

$$r \in [2, \bar{r}), \quad p \in ((1 + \gamma)r \vee \bar{r}, \bar{p}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4 \wedge 1/p], \quad (3.51)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C\Delta^{\varepsilon(p-(1+\gamma)r)/(1+\gamma) \wedge (p-\gamma r)/p} \quad (3.52)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq C\Delta^{\varepsilon(p-(1+\gamma)r)/(1+\gamma) \wedge (p-\gamma r)/p}. \quad (3.53)$$

Proof. Condition 3.51 means

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{p} < \frac{r(1+\gamma)}{2p}$$

which lead to

$$\varepsilon(p - (1 + \gamma)r)/(1 + \gamma) < r(1 - 2\varepsilon)/2.$$

By (3.40) and (3.41), we obtain (3.52) and (3.53). \square

Remark 3.13. *Replacing condition (3.35), that is $p > (1 + \gamma)\bar{r}$, by a weaker one $p > (1 + \gamma)r \vee \bar{r}$ does not affect the results in Theorem 3.11. But, this small change will make the choice of p more flexible in practice.*

Remark 3.14. *Without loss of generality, we assume that \bar{p} is allowed to sufficiently large. In the following discussion, we fixing $2 \leq r < \bar{r}$. By Corollary 3.12, we can conclude that when p , which is a parameter in the Khaminskii-type condition defined in (3.7), is sufficiently large relative to γr , then the order of \mathcal{L}^r -convergence of the truncated EM method is mainly determined by the expression which we call the convergence rate function, namely*

$$R(p, \gamma) := \frac{\varepsilon(p - (1 + \gamma)r)}{1 + \gamma}, \quad \forall p \in ((1 + \gamma)r \vee \bar{r}, \bar{p}), \quad \forall \gamma \in [0, \infty), \quad (3.54)$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/4 \wedge 1/p$. Noting that R is proportional linearly to ε , which means that letting $\varepsilon = 1/4 \wedge 1/p$ will make convergence rate R as large as possible. Hence, this setting gives

$$R(p, \gamma) = \frac{(1/4 \wedge 1/p)(p - (1 + \gamma)r)}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (3.55)$$

To discuss the optimal convergence rate function 3.55, let us consider the following two possible cases:

- If $2 < p < 4$ and $(1 + \gamma)r \vee \bar{r} < p < \bar{p}$, then (3.55) gives

$$R(p, \gamma) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{p}{1 + \gamma} - r \right) = \frac{p}{4} \frac{1}{1 + \gamma} - \frac{r}{4} < \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (3.56)$$

- If $p \geq 4$ and $(1 + \gamma)r \vee \bar{r} < p < \bar{p}$, then (3.55) gives

$$R(p, \gamma) = \frac{p - (1 + \gamma)r}{p(1 + \gamma)} = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma} - \frac{r}{p} < \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (3.57)$$




Fig. 1. Convergence rate R versus growth constant γ with $p = 20$, $\varepsilon = 1/p$ and $r = 2$




Fig. 2. Convergence rate R versus p with $\gamma = 2$, $\varepsilon = 1/p$ and $r = 2$

From (3.57), we can see that $R(p, \gamma)$ is a decreasing function with respect to γ and is an increasing function with respect to p . Fig 1 and Fig 2 show this relationship between convergence rate and Khasminskii-type condition parameter p , super-linear growth constant γ , respectively. Letting $p \rightarrow \infty$, then (3.57) gives

$$R \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}.$$

This is almost the optimal \mathcal{L}^r -convergence rate of the truncated EM method in the case of jumps. Only in the case of $\gamma = 0$, i.e. the drift and diffusion coefficients grows linearly, this convergence rate is close to 1. It should be mentioned that this is significantly different from the result on SDEs without jumps. We already know that for any $r \geq 2$ (see [25])

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_\Delta(T)|^r \leq C\Delta^{r(1-2\varepsilon)/2}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4],$$

which means that the \mathcal{L}^r -convergence rate is close to $r/2$ when there is no jumps in SDE (2.1). In fact, this difference is caused by the following reason: all moments of the Poisson increments $\Delta N_k = N((k+1)\Delta) - N(k\Delta)$ have the same order Δ (see (3.15)), while the Brownian increments $\Delta B_k = B((k+1)\Delta) - B(k\Delta)$ have different orders, namely $\mathbb{E}|\Delta B_k|^{2m} = o(\Delta^m)$ and $\mathbb{E}|\Delta B_k|^{2m+1} = 0$. These properties force the control function $\varphi(\Delta) := \Delta^{-\varepsilon}$ to be not greater than $\Delta^{-1/p} \wedge \Delta^{-1/4}$, when we are trying to bound the moments of the truncated EM solution in Lemma 3.7. This eventually leads to the differences in the convergence rates between SDEs with and without jumps.

3.2. Convergence and convergence rate of the truncated EM method in \mathcal{L}^r ($0 < r < 2$)

In this subsection, we will discuss the convergence in \mathcal{L}^r ($0 < r < 2$) under the assumption that the drift, diffusion and jump terms behave like a polynomial. For this purpose, we first impose the following assumptions.

Assumption 3.15. There exists positive constant K_n such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \vee |g(x) - g(y)| \vee |h(x) - h(y)| \leq K_n|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |x| \vee |y| \leq n. \quad (3.58)$$

Assumption 3.16. *There exist constants $\bar{K} > 0$ such that*

$$2x^T f(x) + |g(x)|^2 + \lambda(2x^T h(x) + |h(x)|^2) \leq \bar{K}(1 + |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.59)$$

We also give a known result as a lemma.

Lemma 3.17. *Under Assumption 3.15 and 3.16 the SDE (2.1) has a unique global solution $x(t)$, moreover,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x(t)|^2 < \infty, \quad \forall T > 0. \quad (3.60)$$

In this subsection, all the three coefficients of the SDEs are allowed to grow super-linearly. Hence, we have to truncate the three terms. Similarly, we first choose a strictly increasing function $\mu : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\mu(n) \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\sup_{|x| \leq n} |f(x)| \vee |g(x)| \vee |h(x)| \leq \mu(n), \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (3.61)$$

Denoted by μ^{-1} is the inverse function of μ . We also choose a constant $\Delta^* \in (0, 1)$ and a strictly decreasing function $\varphi : (0, \Delta^*) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\varphi(\Delta^*) \geq \mu(1), \quad \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \varphi(\Delta) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(\Delta)\Delta^{1/4} \leq 1. \quad (3.62)$$

For a given step size $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$, the truncated functions are defined as below

$$f_\Delta(x) = f(\pi_\Delta(x)), \quad g_\Delta(x) = g(\pi_\Delta(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad h_\Delta(x) = h(\pi_\Delta(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

105 where π_Δ is defined as the same as before. The following lemma also shows that the truncated functions preserve the Khaminskii-type condition. The proof is given in the Appendix.

Lemma 3.18. *Let Assumption 3.16 hold. Then, for all $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$, we have*

$$2x^T f_\Delta(x) + |g_\Delta(x)|^2 + \lambda(2x^T h_\Delta(x) + |h_\Delta(x)|^2) \leq 2\bar{K}(1 + |x|^2), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.63)$$

We now give the discrete-time truncated EM scheme

$$X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-) = X_\Delta(t_k^-) + f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta + g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta B_k + h_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta N_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq M-1, \quad (3.64)$$

where $X_\Delta(t_k^-)$, ΔB_k and ΔN_k is defined the same as before. The continuous-time form is defined by

$$x_\Delta(t^-) = x_0 + \int_0^t f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))ds + \int_0^t g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))dB(s) + \int_0^t h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))dN(s). \quad (3.65)$$

where $\bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)$ is defined in (3.12). In order to state our main result, we first give some useful lemmas.

Lemma 3.19. *For any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$ and $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \leq C_{\hat{p}}(\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}}\Delta, \quad \hat{p} \geq 2, \quad (3.66)$$

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \leq C_{\hat{p}}(\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}}\Delta^{\hat{p}/2}, \quad 0 < \hat{p} < 2. \quad (3.67)$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.68)$$

Proof. Fix any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$, $t \geq 0$ and $\hat{p} \geq 2$. There is an integer $k \geq 0$ such that $t_k^- \leq t < t_{k+1}^-$. By Assumption , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \quad (3.69) \\ & \leq C_{\hat{p}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds \right|^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dB(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right) \\ & \leq C_{\hat{p}} \left(\Delta^{\hat{p}-1} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k^-}^t |f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{\hat{p}} ds + \Delta^{(\hat{p}-2)/2} \mathbb{E} \int_{t_k^-}^t |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^{\hat{p}} ds + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right) \\ & \leq C_{\hat{p}} \left(\Delta^{p/2} (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\hat{p}}$ is a generic constant. The property of Poisson increments implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_k^-}^t h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) dN(s) \right|^{\hat{p}} & \leq (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \mathbb{E} |\Delta N_k|^{\hat{p}} \\ & \leq c_0 (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (3.69) and recalling $\hat{p} \geq 2$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} \leq C_{\hat{p}} (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta.$$

Noting from (3.8) that $(\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta = (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta^{1/2} \Delta^{1/2} \leq \Delta^{1/2}$, we obtain (3.68) from (3.66).

For $0 < \hat{p} < 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^{\hat{p}} & \leq \left(\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(t^-)|^2 \right)^{\hat{p}/2} \\ & \leq \left(C_{\hat{p}} (\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta \right)^{\hat{p}/2} = C_{\hat{p}} (\varphi(\Delta))^{\hat{p}} \Delta^{\hat{p}/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof is complete. \square

110 The following lemma give the moment bound of the truncated EM solutions.

Lemma 3.20. *Let Assumption 3.15 and 3.16 hold. Then*

$$\sup_{0 \leq \Delta \leq \Delta^*} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-)|^2 \leq C, \quad \forall T > 0. \quad (3.70)$$

Proof. Fix any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$ and $T > 0$. By the Itô formula and Assumption 3.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-)|^2 & \leq \mathbb{E}|x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2x_\Delta^T(s^-) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\ & \quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2x_\Delta(s^-)^T h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}|x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2\bar{x}_\Delta^T(s^-) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2\bar{x}_\Delta^T(s^-) h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2 \right) ds + \bar{J}_1 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}|x_0|^2 + 2\bar{K} \int_0^t \left(1 + \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 \right) ds + \bar{J}_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.71}$$

where

$$\bar{J}_1 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(2(x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))^T f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + 2\lambda(x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))^T h_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) \right) ds.$$

By Lemma 3.19, (3.61) and 3.62, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{J}_1 & \leq 2(\lambda + 1)\varphi(\Delta) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| ds \\
& \leq 2(\lambda + 1)TC(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta^{1/2} \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (3.71) and using Lemma 3.19 gives

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t^-)|^2 \leq C + 2\bar{K} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds.$$

Hence, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u)|^2 \leq C + 2\bar{K} \int_0^t \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u)|^2 ds.$$

The Gronwall inequality yields

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(u)|^2 \leq C.$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

As the proof is in a similar way as Lemma 3.10 and 3.11 were proved, we also have the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.21. *Let Assumption 3.15 and 3.16 hold. For any real number $n > |x_0|$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\rho_{\Delta,n} \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}, \tag{3.72}$$

where τ_n and $\rho_{\Delta,n}$ is the same as before.

115 Now, let us show the convergence of the truncated EM methods for the SDEs.

Theorem 3.22. *Let Assumption 3.15 and 3.16 hold. Then, for any $r \in (0, 2)$*

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_\Delta(T)|^r = 0 \tag{3.73}$$

and

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|x(T) - \bar{x}_\Delta(T)|^r = 0. \tag{3.74}$$

Proof. Let $\tau_n, \rho_{\Delta,n}, \theta_{\Delta,n}$ and $e_{\Delta}(t)$ be the same as before. Applying the Young inequality, we have that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T)|^r &= \mathbb{E}\left(|e_{\Delta}(T)|^r \mathbb{I}_{(\theta_{\Delta,n} > T)}\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(|e_{\Delta}(T)|^r \mathbb{I}_{(\theta_{\Delta,n} \leq T)}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(|e_{\Delta}(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^r\right) + \frac{r\delta}{2} \mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T)|^2 + \frac{2-r}{2\delta^{r/(2-r)}} \mathbb{P}(\theta_{\Delta,n} \leq T).\end{aligned}\quad (3.75)$$

By Lemma 3.17 and 3.20, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T)|^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E}|x(T)|^p + 2\mathbb{E}|x_{\Delta}(T)|^p \leq C. \quad (3.76)$$

Using Lemma 3.21, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta_{\Delta,n} \leq T) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau_n \leq T) + \mathbb{P}(\rho_{\Delta,n} \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}. \quad (3.77)$$

Inserting (3.76) and (3.77) into (3.75), we get

$$\mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T)|^r \leq \mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^r + \frac{Cr\delta}{2} + \frac{C(2-r)}{2n^2\delta^{r/(2-r)}}.$$

Now, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. We can choose δ sufficiently small such that

$$\frac{Cr\delta}{2} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

and then choose n sufficiently large such that

$$\frac{C(2-r)}{2n^2\delta^{r/(2-r)}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

We may assume that Δ^* is sufficiently small for $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta^*)) \geq n$. In the same way as Theorem 3.5 in [13] was proved, we can show that for all $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$

$$\mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T)|^2 \leq C\Delta,$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|e_{\Delta}(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^r\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Hence, we obtain the required assertion (3.73). Combining this with Lemma (3.19) gives (3.74). Thus, the proof is complete. \square

For the purpose of getting the convergence rates a time T , we need some additional conditions.

Assumption 3.23. *There exists a constant $\bar{L}_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}2(x-y)^T(f(x)-f(y)) + |g(x)-g(y)|^2 \\ + 2\lambda(x-y)^T(h(x)-h(y)) + \lambda|h(x)-h(y)|^2 \leq \bar{L}_1|x-y|^2,\end{aligned}\quad (3.78)$$

¹²⁰ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 3.24. *There exist constant $\bar{L}_2 > 0$ and $\bar{\gamma} \geq 0$ such that*

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \vee |h(x) - h(y)| \leq \bar{L}_2(1 + |x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + |y|^{\bar{\gamma}})|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (3.79)$$

Obviously, this condition implies

$$|f(x)| \vee |h(x)| \leq \bar{L}_3|x|^{1+\bar{\gamma}}, \quad (3.80)$$

where $\bar{L}_3 = 2\bar{L}_1 + |f(0)| + |g(0)|$.

Lemma 3.25. *Let Assumption 3.15, 3.16, 3.23 and 3.24 hold. Let $n > |x_0|$ be a real number and let $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$ be sufficiently small such $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)) \geq n$. Let τ_n and $\rho_{\Delta,n}$ be the same as before. Let*

$$\theta_{\Delta,n} = \tau_n \wedge \rho_{\Delta,n} \quad \text{and} \quad e_{\Delta}(s^-) = x(t^-) - x_{\Delta}(t^-) \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^2 \leq C(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta.$$

Proof. We write $\theta_{\Delta,n} = \theta$ for simplicity. By the Itô formula and Assumption 3.23, we get that for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|e_{\Delta}(t \wedge \theta)|^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \left(2e_{\Delta}^T(s^-)(f(x(s^-)) - f_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))) + |g(x(s^-)) - g_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))|^2 \right) ds \\ & \quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \left(|e_{\Delta}(s^-) + (h(x(s^-)) - h_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-)))|^2 - |e_{\Delta}(s^-)|^2 \right) ds \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \left(2(x(s^-) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))^T (f(x(s^-)) - f_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))) + |g(x(s^-)) - g_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))|^2 \right) ds + \bar{J}_2 \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \left(2\lambda(x(s^-) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))^T (h(x(s^-)) - h_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))) + \lambda|h(x(s^-)) - h_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))|^2 \right) ds + \bar{J}_3 \\ & \leq \bar{L}_1 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|x(s \wedge \theta) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(s \wedge \theta)|^2 ds + \bar{J}_2 + \bar{J}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.81)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{J}_2 &= 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} (x_{\Delta}(s^-) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))^T (f(x(s^-)) - f_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))) ds, \\ \bar{J}_3 &= 2\lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} (x_{\Delta}(s^-) - \bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))^T (h(x(s^-)) - h_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-))) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the condition $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)) \geq n$ and the definition of the truncated functions f_{Δ} and g_{Δ} , we have that

$$f_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-)) = f(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-)) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{\Delta}(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-)) = g(\bar{x}_{\Delta}(s^-)), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \theta.$$

Hence, by Assumption 3.24 and the Hölder inequality as well as Lemma 3.19 and 3.20, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{J}_2 &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |f(x(s^-)) - f(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds \\
&\leq 2\bar{L}_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| (1 + |x(s^-)|^{\bar{\gamma}} + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{\bar{\gamma}}) |x(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| ds \\
&\leq \bar{L}_2 \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \mathbb{E} |x(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds + C \int_0^{t \wedge \theta} \mathbb{E} (1 + |x(s^-)|^{2\bar{\gamma}} + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{2\bar{\gamma}}) |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds \\
&\leq \bar{L}_2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |x(s \wedge \theta) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s \wedge \theta)|^2 ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^T (1 + \mathbb{E} |x(s^-)|^2 + \mathbb{E} |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2)^{\bar{\gamma}} (\mathbb{E} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^{2/(1-\bar{\gamma})})^{1-\bar{\gamma}} ds \\
&\leq \bar{L}_2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |x(s \wedge \theta) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s \wedge \theta)|^2 ds + C(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta. \tag{3.82}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\bar{J}_3 \leq \lambda \bar{L}_2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |x(s \wedge \theta) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s \wedge \theta)|^2 ds + C(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta. \tag{3.83}$$

Inserting (3.82), (3.83) into (3.81) and combining Lemma 3.19, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(t \wedge \theta)|^2 \leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(s \wedge \theta)|^2 ds + C(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta.$$

The Gronwall inequality complete the proof. \square

Theorem 3.26. *Let Assumption 3.15, 3.16, 3.23 and 3.24 hold. Let $r \in (0, 2)$. If*

$$\varphi(\Delta) \geq \mu \left(\bar{L}_3^{-(1+\bar{\gamma})} ((\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2})^{-1/(2-r)} \right) \tag{3.84}$$

holds for all sufficiently small $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^)$, then for every such small Δ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} |x(T) - x_\Delta(T)|^r \leq C(\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2} \tag{3.85}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} |x(T) - \bar{x}_\Delta(T)|^r \leq C(\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2}. \tag{3.86}$$

Proof. Let $\tau_n, \rho_{\Delta,n}, \theta_{\Delta,n}$ and $e_\Delta(t)$ be the same as before. By (3.75) - (3.77), inequality

$$\mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(T)|^r \leq \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^r + \frac{Cr\delta}{2} + \frac{C(2-r)}{2n^2\delta^{r/(2-r)}}$$

holds for any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$, $n > |x_0|$ and $\delta > 0$. We can therefore choose $\delta = (\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2}$ and $n = \bar{L}_3^{-(1+\bar{\gamma})} ((\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2})^{-1/(2-r)}$ to get

$$\mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(T)|^r \leq \mathbb{E} |e_\Delta(T \wedge \theta_{\Delta,n})|^r + C(\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2}.$$

By condition (3.84), we have

$$\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)) \geq \bar{L}_4^{-1+\bar{\gamma}} ((\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2})^{-1/(2-r)} = n.$$

Using Lemma 3.25, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(T)|^r \leq (\mathbb{E}|e_\Delta(T)|^2)^{r/2} \leq C((\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta)^{r/2} = C(\varphi(\Delta))^r \Delta^{r/2}.$$

Combining this with Lemma (3.19) gives (3.86). Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Corollary 3.27. *Let Assumption 3.15, 3.16, 3.23 and 3.24 hold. Define*

$$\mu(n) = \bar{L}_3 n^{1+\bar{\gamma}}, \quad n \geq 0. \quad (3.87)$$

Let $0 < r \leq 2/(2 + \bar{\gamma})$ and

$$\varphi(\Delta) = \Delta^{-\varepsilon}, \quad \varepsilon \in \left[\frac{r(1 + \bar{\gamma})}{4 + 2r\bar{\gamma}}, \frac{1}{4} \right]. \quad (3.88)$$

Assume that $\bar{\Delta} \in (0, 1)$ and

$$\varphi(\bar{\Delta}) \geq \mu\left(\bar{L}_3^{-(1+\bar{\gamma})} (\bar{\Delta}^{r/2} (\varphi(\bar{\Delta}))^r)^{-1/(2-r)}\right) \quad (3.89)$$

hold. Then, for every $\Delta \in (0, \bar{\Delta})$,

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - x_\Delta(T)|^r \leq C\Delta^{r/2-r\varepsilon} \quad (3.90)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T) - \bar{x}_\Delta(T)|^r \leq C\Delta^{r/2-r\varepsilon}. \quad (3.91)$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 3.26 along with (3.87) and (3.88) gives the required assertion (3.90) and (3.91). \square

Remark 3.28. *Substituting (3.87) and (3.88) into (3.89) gives*

$$\bar{\Delta}^{-\varepsilon} \geq \bar{\Delta}^{-r(1-2\varepsilon)(1+\bar{\gamma})/(2(2-r))}, \quad \text{namely} \quad \varepsilon \geq \frac{r(1 + \bar{\gamma})}{4 + 2r\bar{\gamma}}.$$

But, condition (3.88) means

$$\frac{r(1 + \bar{\gamma})}{4 + 2r\bar{\gamma}} \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{namely} \quad r \leq \frac{2}{2 + \bar{\gamma}} \leq 1.$$

Hence, we have to force r to be not greater than $2/(2 + \bar{\gamma})$ in the corollary 3.27.

Remark 3.29. *Fixing $\bar{\gamma} \geq 0$, by (3.88) and (3.90), we can conclude that convergence rate is a increasing function with respect to ε . Hence, substituting*

$$\varepsilon = \frac{r(1 + \bar{\gamma})}{4 + 2r\bar{\gamma}}$$

into $r/2(1 - 2\varepsilon)$ obtains the optimal \mathcal{L}^r -convergence rate, that is

$$R := \frac{r(2-r)}{2(2+r\bar{\gamma})}, \quad \text{for } 0 < r \leq \frac{2}{2+\bar{\gamma}}, \quad (3.92)$$

which means convergence rate R increases as r increases. In other words, the higher moment has a better convergence rate for SDEs with jumps when $0 < r \leq 2/(2 + \bar{\gamma})$. If we take

$$r = \frac{2}{2 + \bar{\gamma}},$$

then (3.92) becomes

$$R = \frac{1}{4 + 2\bar{\gamma}},$$

this is the maximum of optimal \mathcal{L}^r -convergence rate. In particular, if $\bar{\gamma} = 0$, i.e. the drift and diffusion coefficients grows linearly, then convergence rate is equal to $1/4$ by choosing $r = 1$.

4. Asymptotic behaviours

130 4.1. Stability

In this subsection, we will show that the partially truncated EM method can preserve the mean square exponential stability of the underlying SDEs (2.1). For the purpose of stability, we also assume that

$$f(0) = g(0) = h(0) = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

which means

$$|F_1(x)| \vee |G_1(x)| \vee |h(x)| \leq K_1|x|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.2)$$

We first impose the following assumption.

Assumption 4.1. Assume that there exist positive constant $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 + \lambda K_1(2 + K_1)$ and $\theta \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$2x^T F_1(x) + (1 + \theta)|G_1(x)|^2 \leq -\alpha_1|x|^2$$

and

$$2x^T F(x) + (1 + \theta^{-1})|G(x)|^2 \leq \alpha_2|x|^2$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

If there is no super-linear term $G(x)$, we set $\theta = 0$ and $\theta^{-1}|G(x)|^2 = 0$. Similarly, when linear term $G_1(x)$ is absent, we set $\theta = \infty$ and $\theta|G_1(x)|^2 = 0$. Moreover, this assumption means

$$2x^T f(x) + |g(x)|^2 + \lambda(x^T h(x) + |h(x)|^2) \leq -(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))|x|^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.3)$$

It is therefore known that the SDEs (2.1) is exponentially stable in the mean square sense. We state the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let Assumption 3.1 - 3.3 and 4.1 hold. Then for any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of the SDEs (2.1) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}|x(t)|^2 \leq |x_0|^2 e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

135 The following theorem shows that the truncated EM method preserves this mean square exponential stability perfectly. We will employ the technique due to Guo et al. [23] to prove our results.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Assumption 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.1 hold. Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))$, there exists a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \Delta^*)$ such that for all $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$ and any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of the truncated EM method (3.11) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \leq |x_0|^2 e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon)t_k^-}, \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Fix $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*)$. In the same way as Theorem 4.3 in [23] was proved, we have

$$2x^T f_\Delta(x) + |g_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq -(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)|x|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.5)$$

From (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + |f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \Delta^2 + |g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta B_k|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2X_\Delta(t_k^-)^T f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta + |h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\Delta f_\Delta^T(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k + 2X_\Delta(t_k^-)^T h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

for $0 \leq k \leq M - 1$. The property of Brownian increments implies

$$\mathbb{E}|g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta B_k|^2 = \Delta \mathbb{E}|g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2.$$

But, the Poisson increments satisfy $\mathbb{E} \Delta N_k = \lambda \Delta$ and $\mathbb{E}(\Delta N_k)^2 = \lambda \Delta(1 + \lambda \Delta)$. Hence, using the independence of the increments and (4.2), we find that

$$2\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-) h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k| \leq 2K_1 \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k| = 2K_1 \lambda \Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k|^2 &\leq K_1^2 \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k|^2 \\ &\leq K_1^2 \lambda \Delta(1 + \lambda \Delta) \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \\ &= K_1^2 \lambda \Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + K_1^2 \lambda^2 \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E}|\Delta f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) h(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta N_k| &\leq 2K_1 \Delta \mathbb{E}(|X_\Delta(t_k^-) f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|) \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k| \\ &\leq K_1 \lambda \Delta^2 (\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Substituting (4.7)-(4.9) into (4.6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + 2X_\Delta(t_k^-)^T f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-)) \Delta + |g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \Delta \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda K_1(2 + K_1) \Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + (1 + K_1 \lambda) \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \\ &\quad + (K_1^2 \lambda^2 + K_1 \lambda) \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

By (4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &\leq (1 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))\Delta)\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \\ &\quad + (1 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2\mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 + (K_1^2\lambda^2 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

By (3.1) and (4.1), we have

$$|F_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq 4L_1|x|^2, \text{ if } |x| \leq 1,$$

and

$$|F_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq (\varphi(\Delta))^2 \leq (\varphi(\Delta))^2|x|^2, \text{ if } |x| > 1.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta|f_\Delta(x)|^2 &\leq 2(K_1^2 + 4L_1 + (\varphi(\Delta))^2)\Delta|x|^2 \\ &\leq 2\left((K_1^2 + 4L_1)\Delta + \Delta^{1/2 \wedge (\bar{p}-2)/\bar{p}}\right)|x|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where (3.8) have been used. For any $\epsilon \in (0, \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))$, there is a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \Delta^*)$ sufficiently small such that for all $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$, $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1))\Delta \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{cases} 2(1 + K_1\lambda)\left((K_1^2 + 4L_1)\Delta + \Delta^{1/2 \wedge (\bar{p}-2)/\bar{p}}\right) \leq 0.5\epsilon \\ (K_1^2\lambda^2 + K_1\lambda)\Delta \leq 0.5\epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

For each such Δ , we have

$$(1 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2\mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 + (K_1^2\lambda^2 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \leq \epsilon\Delta\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2.$$

Inserting this into (4.11), we yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &\leq (1 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon)\Delta)\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq |x_0|^2(1 - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon)\Delta)^{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Elementary inequality $1 + x \leq e^x$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ gives

$$\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 \leq |x_0|^2 e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon)t_{k+1}^-}. \quad (4.14)$$

Thus, the proof is complete. \square

4.2. Asymptotic boundedness

¹⁴⁰ In this subsection, we will show that the truncated EM method maintains the asymptotic boundedness of the underlying of SDEs (2.1). The additional assumption is the following one.

Assumption 4.4. Assume that there exist constant $\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\alpha}_2, \bar{\beta}_2 > 0$ and $\bar{\beta}_1 > \bar{\beta}_2 + \max(\lambda(4K_1^2 + 1), 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1))$ such that

$$2x^T F_1(x) + (1 + \theta)|G_1(x)|^2 \leq \bar{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\beta}_1|x|^2$$

and

$$2x^T F(x) + (1 + \theta^{-1})|G(x)|^2 \leq \bar{\alpha}_2 + \bar{\beta}_2|x|^2$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

When there is no super-linear term $G(x)$, we set $\theta = 0$ and $\theta^{-1}|G(x)|^2 = 0$. Similarly, if linear term $G_1(x)$ is absent, we set $\theta = \infty$ and $\theta|G_1(x)|^2 = 0$. Moreover, (3.2) implies

$$\lambda(2x^T h(x) + |h(x)|^2) \leq \lambda(|x|^2 + 2|h(x)|^2) \leq 4\lambda K_1^2 + \lambda(4K_1 + 1)|x|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence, by Assumption 4.4, we have

$$2x^T f(x) + |g(x)|^2 + \lambda(2x^T h(x) + |h(x)|^2) \leq \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}|x|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (4.15)$$

where $\hat{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 4\lambda K_1^2$ and $\hat{\beta} = \bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - \lambda(4K_1^2 + 1)$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let Assumption 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.4 hold. Then for any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of the SDEs (2.1) satisfy*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x(t)|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 4\lambda K_1^2}{\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - \lambda(4K_1^2 + 1)}. \quad (4.16)$$

Proof. Let τ_n , $\hat{\alpha}$, and $\hat{\beta}$ be the same as before, $\sigma_n = t \wedge \tau_n$. For any $t \geq 0$, the Itô formula gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\hat{\beta}\sigma_n}|x(\sigma_n)|^2\right] &= |x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{\sigma_n} e^{\hat{\beta}s} \left(2x^T(s)f(x(s)) + |g(x(s))|^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ 2x^T(s)h(x(s)) + |h(x(s))|^2 + \hat{\beta}|x(s)|^2\right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.15), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\hat{\beta}\sigma_n}|x(\sigma_n)|^2\right] \leq |x_0|^2 + \hat{\alpha} \int_0^{\sigma_n} e^{\hat{\beta}s} ds = |x_0|^2 + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\beta}}(e^{\hat{\beta}\sigma_n} - 1).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\hat{\alpha}t}|x(t)|^2\right] \leq |x_0|^2 + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\beta}}(e^{\hat{\beta}t} - 1)$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}|x(t)|^2 \leq \frac{|x_0|^2}{e^{\hat{\beta}t}} + \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\hat{\beta}}.$$

Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $0 < A < 1$ and $B \geq 0$. If*

$$D_k \leq AD_{k-1} + B, \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.17)$$

Then

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} D_k \leq \frac{B}{1-A}. \quad (4.18)$$

¹⁴⁵ **Proof.** The proof is given in the Appendix. \square

Theorem 4.7. *Let Assumption 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.4 hold. Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, \bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - \max(\lambda(4K_1^2 + 1), 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1)))$, there is a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \Delta^*)$ and any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of the partially truncated EM method satisfy*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) + \epsilon}{\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon}. \quad (4.19)$$

Proof. Fix $\epsilon \in (0, \bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2)$. In the same way as Theorem 5.3 in [23] was proved, we have

$$2x^T f_\Delta(x) + |g_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq \bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 - (\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - 0.5\epsilon)|x|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.20)$$

as long as $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta}_1)$, where $\hat{\Delta}_1 \in (0, \Delta^*)$ is sufficiently small for which

$$\frac{\bar{\alpha}_2}{(\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\hat{\Delta}_1)))^2} \leq 0.5\epsilon. \quad (4.21)$$

Using the independence of the Poisson increments and (3.2) as well as Lemma 3.7, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|h(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta N_k|^2 &\leq 2K_1^2 \mathbb{E}(1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2) \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k|^2 \\ &\leq 2K_1^2 \lambda \Delta (1 + \lambda \Delta) \mathbb{E}(1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2) \\ &\leq 2K_1^2 \lambda \Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + 2K_1^2 \lambda \Delta + C\Delta^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)h(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta N_k| &\leq 2K_1 \mathbb{E}(|X_\Delta(t_k^-)| (1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|)) \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k| \\ &\leq 4K_1 \lambda \Delta \mathbb{E}(1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2) \\ &\leq 4K_1 \lambda \Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + 4K_1 \lambda \Delta \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E}|\Delta f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))h(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta N_k| &\leq 2K_1 \Delta \mathbb{E}((1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|)|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|) \mathbb{E}|\Delta N_k| \\ &\leq K_1 \lambda \Delta^2 (\mathbb{E}(1 + |X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2) + \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2) \\ &\leq K_1 \lambda \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 + C\Delta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ arbitrarily. For any $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta}_1)$, substituting (4.22)-(4.24) into (4.6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + 2X_\Delta(t_k^-)^T f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))\Delta + |g_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \Delta\right) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1)\Delta \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 + (1 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1)\Delta + C\Delta^2 \\ &\leq (1 - (\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - 0.5\epsilon)\Delta) \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \\ &\quad + (\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1))\Delta + C\Delta^2 \\ &\quad + (1 + K_1\lambda)\Delta^2 \mathbb{E}|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

where (4.20) have been used. By (3.2) and (3.9), we have

$$|f_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq 2|F_1(x)|^2 + 2|F(x)|^2 \leq 4K_1^2(1 + |x|^2) + 2(\varphi(\Delta))^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence, by (3.8), we get

$$\Delta|f_\Delta(x)|^2 \leq 4K_1^2\Delta(1 + |x|^2) + 2\Delta^{1/2 \wedge (\bar{p}-2)/\bar{p}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Consequently, there is a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \hat{\Delta}_1)$ sufficiently small such that for any $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$, $\Delta(\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2 - \epsilon) < 1$ and

$$C\Delta + (1 + K_1\lambda)\Delta|f_\Delta(X_\Delta(t_k^-))|^2 \leq \epsilon + 0.5\epsilon|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2. \quad (4.26)$$

Thus, fix any $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$. Inserting (4.26) into (4.25) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_{k+1}^-)|^2 &\leq (1 - (\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \epsilon)\Delta)\mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \\ &\quad + (\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) + \epsilon)\Delta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

Applying Lemma 4.6 to (4.27) gives the required assertion (4.19). \square

5. Examples

Example 5.1. Consider the following scalar SDEs with jumps

$$dx(t^-) = -x^5(t^-)dt + x^2(t^-)dB(t) + x^2(t^-)dN(t), \quad (5.1)$$

with the initial value $x(0) = 1$, where $B(t)$ is a scalar Brownian motion and $N(t)$ is a scalar Poisson process with jump intensity $\lambda = 0.5$. Obviously, we have

$$f(x) = -x^5, \quad g(x) = x^2, \quad h(x) = x^2.$$

It is easy to check that Assumption 3.24 is satisfied with

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \vee |h(x) - h(y)| \leq \bar{L}_2(1 + x^4 + y^4)|x - y| \quad (5.2)$$

for a constant $\bar{L}_2 > 0$. The elementary inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} &2\lambda(x - y)(h(x) - h(y)) + \lambda|h(x) - h(y)|^2 \\ &= (x - y)(x^2 - y^2) + 0.5|x^2 - y^2|^2 \\ &\leq |x + y||x - y|^2 + 0.5|x + y|^2|x - y|^2 \\ &\leq (x^2 + y^2 + 1)|x - y|^2 + (x^2 + y^2)|x - y|^2 \\ &= (2(x^2 + y^2) + 1)|x - y|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Also, we have

$$-(x^3y + xy^3 + x^2y^2) = -xy(x^2 + y^2) - x^2y^2 \leq 0.5(x^4 + y^4). \quad (5.4)$$

By (5.3) and (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(x-y)(f(x)-f(y)) + |g(x)-g(y)|^2 + 2\lambda(x-y)|h(x)-h(y)| + \lambda|h(x)-h(y)|^2 \\
& \leq (x-y)\left(- (x-y)(x^4+x^3y+x^2y^2+xy^3+y^4)\right) + |x^2-y^2|^2 \\
& \quad + \left(2(x^2+y^2)+1\right)|x-y|^2 \\
& \leq -0.5(x^4+y^4)|x-y|^2 + 2(x^2+y^2)|x-y|^2 + \left(2(x^2+y^2)+1\right)|x-y|^2 \\
& = \left(-0.5(x^4+y^4)+4(x^2+y^2)+1\right)|x-y|^2 \\
& \leq 17|x-y|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Note that in the last inequality the elementary inequality

$$kab \leq \frac{1}{2}a^2 + \frac{1}{2}k^2b^2, \quad \forall a, b, k \in \mathbb{R}$$

has been used. Hence, Assumption 3.23 is satisfied. For Assumption 3.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2x^T f(x) + |g(x)|^2 + \lambda(2x^T h(x) + |h(x)|^2) \\
& = -2x^6 + x^4 + 0.5(2x^3 + x^4) \\
& = (-x^6 + \frac{3}{2}x^4) + (x^3 - x^6) \\
& = x^2\left(-\left(x^2 - \frac{3}{4}\right)^2 + \frac{9}{16}\right) + (x^3 - x^6) \\
& \leq \frac{9}{16}x^2 + \frac{1}{4},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where we use the elementary inequality $ab \leq a^2 + b^2/4$ in the last inequality. By (5.2), we can choose $\mu(n) = n^5$ such that

$$\sup_{|x| \leq n} (|f(x)| \vee |g(x)| \vee |h(x)|) = \sup_{|x| \leq n} (|x^5| \vee |x^2| \vee |x^2|) \leq n^5, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Letting $\bar{\gamma} = 4$, $r = 2/(2 + \bar{\gamma}) = 1/3$ and $\varepsilon = 1/4$. If we choose $\varphi(\Delta) = \Delta^{-\varepsilon} = \Delta^{-1/4}$, then all the conditions in (3.62) hold for all $\Delta^* \in (0, 1]$. Hence, the truncating factor is defined as $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)) = \Delta^{-1/20}$ and the truncated functions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\Delta(x) &= f\left(\left(|x| \wedge \Delta^{-0.05}\right) \frac{x}{|x|}\right) \\
g_\Delta(x) &= g\left(\left(|x| \wedge \Delta^{-0.05}\right) \frac{x}{|x|}\right) \\
h_\Delta(x) &= h\left(\left(|x| \wedge \Delta^{-0.05}\right) \frac{x}{|x|}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the given step size Δ and the time T , the X_{k+1} is calculated by

$$X_{k+1} = X_k + f_\Delta(X_k)\Delta + g_\Delta(X_k)\Delta B_k + h_\Delta(X_k)\Delta N_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq T/\Delta - 1, \tag{5.7}$$

with $X_0 = 1$. Then, by Corollary 3.27, the truncated EM scheme converges strongly with rate $r/2 - r\varepsilon = 1/(4 + 2\bar{\gamma}) = 1/12$ to the true solution of the SDE 5.1.




Fig. 3. $\mathcal{L}^{1/3}$ -convergence of truncated EM scheme 5.7 of SDEs 5.1

As SDEs 5.1 does not have any explicit solutions, the scheme (5.7) with step size 2^{-16} is treated as the solution of the SDEs 5.1 in the numerical experiment. The number of simulation is 500. The $\mathcal{L}^{1/3}$ errors at time $T = 4$, that is

$$\left(\mathbb{E}|X(T) - x_{\Delta}(T)|^{1/3}\right)^3 \approx \left(\frac{1}{500} \sum_{i=1}^{500} |[X(T)]^i - [x_{\Delta}(T)]^i|^{1/3}\right)^3,$$

with step sizes 2^{-15} , 2^{-14} , 2^{-13} , 2^{-12} and 2^{-11} are displayed in Fig 3. The numerical result shows that our numerical findings are consistent with the theoretical results obtained in this paper.

Example 5.2. Consider the following scalar SDEs with jumps

$$dx(t^-) = -(x(t^-) + x^5(t^-))dt + x^2(t^-)dB(t) + x(t^-)dN(t), \quad (5.8)$$

with the initial value $x(0) = 0.5$, where $B(t)$ is a scalar Brownian motion and $N(t)$ is a scalar Poisson process with jump intensity $\lambda = 0.5$. Obviously, we have

$$F_1(x) = -x, \quad F(x) = -x^5, \quad G_1(x) = 0, \quad G(x) = x^2, \quad h(x) = x,$$

and

$$|F_1(x)| \vee |G_1(x)| \vee |h(x)| = |x|, \quad \text{with } K_1 = 1.$$

Setting $\theta = \infty$ gives

$$2xF_1(x) + (1 + \theta)|G_1(x)|^2 = -2x^2,$$

and

$$2xF(x) + (1 + \theta^{-1})|G(x)|^2 = -2x^6 + x^4 \leq -2x^2\left(x^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{8}x^2 \leq \frac{1}{8}x^2.$$

Hence, Assumption 4.1 is satisfied with $\alpha_1 = 2$ and $\alpha_2 = 1/8$. Moreover, we have

$$(x - y)(F(x) - F(y)) + \frac{\bar{r} - 1}{2}|G(x) - G(y)| \leq \left(1 + \frac{(\bar{r} - 1)}{4}\right)|x - y|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$$




Fig. 4. Simulation of one path in Example 5.2




Fig. 5. Mean square of 1000 paths in Example 5.2

which means that Assumption 3.2 is satisfied for any \bar{r} . Also, we can check that Assumption 3.3 is fulfilled for any \bar{p} (see [23]). By Theorem 4.2, the SDE 5.8 is stable exponentially in the mean square sense for any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and the solution of SDE 5.8 satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}|x(t^-)|^2 \leq |x_0|^2 e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2+K_1))t^-} = |x_0|^2 e^{-0.375t^-}, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Letting $r = 2$, $\bar{r} = 3$. If we choose $\mu(n) = n^5$, $\gamma = 4$, $\varphi(\Delta) = \Delta^{-1/40}$, and $p = 40$, then by Corollary 3.12, the numerical solution will converge strongly to the true solution in \mathcal{L}^2 with convergence rate $1/(1 + \gamma) - r/p = 0.15$. Finally, by Theorem 4.3, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.375)$, there exists a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \Delta^*)$ such that for all $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$ and any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of the truncated EM method (3.11) satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}|X_{\Delta}(t_k^-)|^2 \leq |x_0|^2 e^{-(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda K_1(2+K_1) - \epsilon)t_k^-} = |x_0|^2 e^{-(0.375 - \epsilon)t_k^-}, \quad \forall k \geq 0.$$

Fig 4 and Fig 5 demonstrate the mean square exponential stability of the truncated EM method.

Example 5.3. Consider the following scalar SDEs with jumps

$$dx(t^-) = (x(t^-) - x^3(t^-))dt + x(t^-)dB(t) + x(t^-)dN(t), \quad (5.9)$$

with the initial value $x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, where $B(t)$ is a scalar Brownian motion and $N(t)$ is a scalar Poisson process with jump intensity $\lambda = 0.1$. We decompose the drift and diffusion coefficient in the form with

$$F_1(x) = -2x, \quad F(x) = 3x - x^3, \quad G_1(x) = x, \quad G(x) = 0, \quad h(x) = x, \quad (5.10)$$

which means

$$|F_1(x)| \vee |G_1(x)| \vee |h(x)| = 2|x|, \quad \text{with } K_1 = 2.$$

Setting $\theta = 0$ gives

$$2xF_1(x) + (1 + \theta)|G_1(x)|^2 = -3x^2,$$

and

$$2xF(x) + (1 + \theta^{-1})|G(x)|^2 = 2x(3x - x^3) = -2(x^2 - 1.5)^2 + 4.5 \leq 4.5.$$




Fig. 6. Simulation of one path in Example 5.3




Fig. 7. Mean square of 1000 paths in Example 5.3

Hence, Assumption 4.4 is satisfied with

$$\bar{\alpha}_1 = 0, \quad \bar{\beta}_1 = 3, \quad \bar{\alpha}_2 = 4.5, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\beta}_2 = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

It is easy to check that coefficients of the SDE 5.9 with their decompositions in (5.10) satisfy Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 for any $\bar{p} > 2$. Applying Theorem 4.5 gives that for any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution of SDE 5.9 satisfies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x(t)|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 4\lambda K_1^2}{\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - \lambda(4K_1^2 + 1)} \approx 4.69. \quad (5.12)$$

Moreover, we can choose $\mu(n) = 4n^3$ and $\varphi(\Delta) = \Delta^{-\varepsilon}$ and let $r = 2$, $\bar{\gamma} = 2$, $p = 50$ as well as $\varepsilon = 1/50$ to define the numerical solution $X_\Delta(t_k)$ by the partially truncated EM method. By Theorem 3.11, this solution of truncated EM will converge to the true solution in \mathcal{L}^2 with convergence rate $1/(1 + \bar{\gamma}) - r/p \approx 0.2933$. Finally, by Theorem 4.7, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1.3)$, there exists a $\hat{\Delta} \in (0, \Delta^*)$ such that for all $\Delta \in (0, \hat{\Delta})$ and any initial value $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the numerical solution satisfies

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|X_\Delta(t_k^-)|^2 \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\alpha}_2 + 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) + \varepsilon}{\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_2 - 2\lambda K_1(2 + K_1) - \varepsilon} = \frac{6.1 + \varepsilon}{1.4 - \varepsilon}.$$

The asymptotic boundedness of the numerical method is shown in Fig 6 and Fig 7.

155 6. Conclusions and future research

In this paper, the truncated EM method is investigated for SDEs driven by both Brownian motions and Poisson jumps. Both the finite time convergence and asymptotic behaviours of the method are studied. The \mathcal{L}^r ($r \geq 2$) strong convergence is proved when the drift and diffusion coefficients satisfy super-linear growth condition and the coefficient for Poisson jumps satisfies
160 linear growth condition. When $0 < r < 2$, we are able to prove the \mathcal{L}^r convergence of the methods to SDEs with all the three coefficients allowing to grow super-linearly.

In the future works, we will report on the SDEs driven by Lévy process and the \mathcal{L}^r convergence for SDEs whose all the three coefficients can grow super-linearly.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 3.9

Proof. By the Itô formula and (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x(t \wedge \tau_n)|^2 &\leq |x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_n} K_3(1 + |x(s)|^2) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_n} (2x(s)^T h(x(s)) + |h(x(s))|^2) ds \\ &\leq |x_0|^2 + (K_3 + 2\lambda(2K_1 + K_1^2)) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}(1 + |x(s \wedge \tau_n)|^2) ds \end{aligned}$$

for any $0 < t < T$. The Gronwall inequality shows

$$\mathbb{E}|x(T \wedge \tau_n)|^2 \leq C.$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_n \leq T) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}.$$

165 Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 3.10

Proof. We write $\rho_{\Delta, n} = \rho$ for simplicity. For $0 \leq t \leq T$, the Itô formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t \wedge \rho)|^2 &= |x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (2x_\Delta^T(s) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (2x_\Delta^T(s) h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds \\ &= |x_0|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (2\bar{x}_\Delta^T(s) f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |g_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} 2(x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))^T f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) ds \\ &\quad + \lambda \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (2x_\Delta^T(s) h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

By (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (2x_\Delta^T(s) h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)) + |h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (|x_\Delta(s^-)|^2 + 2|h(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))|^2) ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} (|x_\Delta(s^-)|^2 + 4K_1^2(1 + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2)) ds \\ &\leq 4K_1^2 T + (8K_1^2 T + 1) \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds + 8K_1^2 T \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds. \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

Substituting this into (B.1) and applying 3.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t \wedge \rho)|^2 &\leq |x_0|^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} 2K_4(1 + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2)ds + 4\lambda K_1^2 T \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} 2(x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))^T f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))ds \\
&\quad + \lambda(8K_1^2 T + 1)\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds + \lambda 8K_1^2 T \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds \\
&\leq (|x_0|^2 + 2K_4 T + 4\lambda L_1^2 T) + (4K_4 + \lambda(8K_1^2 T + 1)) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s \wedge \rho)|^2 ds \\
&\quad + (4K_4 + 8\lambda K_1^2 T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds. \tag{B.3}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds \leq C.$$

By (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |f_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds \\
&\leq K_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| (1 + |\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|) ds + I_5 \\
&\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \rho} |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s \wedge \rho)|^2 ds + 1 \right) + I_5 \tag{B.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_5 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)| |F_\Delta(\bar{x}_\Delta(s^-))| ds.$$

Using Lemma (3.8), condition 3.8 and (3.9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &\leq \varphi(\Delta) \int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s^-) - \bar{x}_\Delta(s^-)|^2 \right)^{1/2} ds \\
&\leq C(\varphi(\Delta))^2 \Delta^{1/2} = C(\varphi(\Delta)\Delta^{1/4})^2 \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(t \wedge \rho)|^2 \leq C \left(1 + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(s \wedge \rho)|^2 ds \right).$$

The Gronwall inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}|x_\Delta(T \wedge \rho)|^2 \leq C,$$

which implies (3.72). Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 3.18

Proof. Fix any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$. Recall that $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta^*)) \geq 1$, we get $\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta)) \geq 1$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| \leq \mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))$, by the definition of the truncated function, we obtain the required assertion (3.63). For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| > \mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))$, by (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2x^T f_\Delta(x) + |g_\Delta(x)|^2 + \lambda(2x^T h_\Delta(x) + |h_\Delta(x)|^2) \\
&= 2(x - \pi_\Delta(x))^T f_\Delta(x) + 2\lambda(x - \pi_\Delta(x))^T h_\Delta(x) \\
&\quad + 2\pi_\Delta(x)^T f_\Delta(x) + |g_\Delta(x)|^2 + 2\lambda\pi_\Delta(x)^T h_\Delta(x) + \lambda|h_\Delta(x)|^2 \\
&\leq \left(\frac{|x|}{\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))} - 1\right) \left(2\pi_\Delta(x)^T f(\pi_\Delta(x)) + 2\lambda\pi_\Delta(x)^T h(\pi_\Delta(x))\right) + \bar{K}(1 + |\pi_\Delta(x)|^2) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{|x|}{\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))} - 1\right) (\bar{K}(1 + |\pi_\Delta(x)|^2)) + \bar{K}(1 + |\pi_\Delta(x)|^2) \\
&= \frac{|x|}{\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))} \bar{K}(1 + |\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))|^2) \\
&= \bar{K}|x| \left(\frac{1}{\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))} + |\mu^{-1}(\varphi(\Delta))|\right) \\
&\leq \bar{K}|x|(1 + |x|) \leq \bar{K}(1 + |x|)^2 \leq 2\bar{K}(1 + |x|).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof. \square

170 Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 4.6

Proof. (4.17) is equivalent to the following expression

$$D_k + \frac{B}{A-1} \leq A \left(D_{k-1} + \frac{B}{A-1} \right), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots.$$

Hence, we have

$$D_k + \frac{B}{A-1} \leq A^k \left(D_0 + \frac{B}{A-1} \right).$$

It follows

$$D_k \leq A^k \left(D_0 + \frac{B}{A-1} \right) + \frac{B}{1-A}.$$

Recalling $0 < A < 1$ and taking $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the required assertion 4.18. Thus, the proof is complete. \square

Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 71571001, 61703003).

References

References

- [1] E. Allen, *Modeling with Itô Stochastic Differential Equations*, Springer, Dordrecht, 2007.
- [2] X. Mao, *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*, Horwood, 2nd edition, 2008.
- 180 [3] D. J. Higham, P. E. Kloeden, Numerical methods for nonlinear stochastic differential equations with jumps, *Numer. Math.* 101 (2005) 101–119.
- [4] D. J. Higham, P. E. Kloeden, Convergence and stability of implicit methods for jump-diffusion systems, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.* 3 (2006) 125–140.
- 185 [5] D. J. Higham, P. E. Kloeden, Strong convergence rates for backward Euler on a class of nonlinear jump-diffusion problems, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 205 (2007) 949–956.
- [6] K. Dareiotis, C. Kumar, S. Sabanis, On tamed Euler approximations of SDEs driven by Lévy noise with applications to delay equations, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 54 (2016) 1840–1872.
- [7] C. Kumar, S. Sabanis, On tamed Milstein schemes of SDEs driven by Lévy noise, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 22 (2017) 421–463.
- 190 [8] M. Hutzenthaler, A. Jentzen, P. E. Kloeden, Strong convergence of an explicit numerical method for SDEs with nonglobally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22 (2012) 1611–1641.
- [9] D. J. Higham, *Stochastic ordinary differential equations in applied and computational mathematics*, *IMA J. Appl. Math.* 76 (2011) 449–474.
- 195 [10] Z. Zhang, H. Ma, Order-preserving strong schemes for SDEs with locally Lipschitz coefficients, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 112 (2017) 1–16.
- [11] S. Sabanis, A note on tamed Euler approximations, *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 18 (2013) 1–10.
- [12] M. Hutzenthaler, A. Jentzen, Numerical approximations of stochastic differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 236 (2015) 1–95.
- 200 [13] X. Mao, The truncated Euler-Maruyama method for stochastic differential equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 290 (2015) 370–384.
- [14] X. Mao, Convergence rates of the truncated Euler-Maruyama method for stochastic differential equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 296 (2016) 362–375.
- [15] L. Tan, C. Yuan, Convergence rates of truncated EM scheme for NSDDEs, *ArXiv e-prints* (2018).
- 205 [16] C. Kumar, S. Sabanis, On explicit approximations for Lévy driven SDEs with super-linear diffusion coefficients, *Electron. J. Probab.* 22 (2017) 1–19.
- [17] X. Yang, X. Wang, A transformed jump-adapted backward Euler method for jump-extended CIR and CEV models, *Numer. Algorithms* 74 (2017) 39–57.
- [18] P. Przybył owicz, Optimal global approximation of stochastic differential equations with additive Poisson noise, *Numer. Algorithms* 73 (2016) 323–348.
- 210 [19] W. Mao, S. You, X. Mao, On the asymptotic stability and numerical analysis of solutions to nonlinear stochastic differential equations with jumps, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 301 (2016) 1–15.
- [20] X. Wang, S. Gan, Compensated stochastic theta methods for stochastic differential equations with jumps, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 60 (2010) 877–887.
- [21] P. E. Kloeden, E. Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- 215 [22] E. Platen, N. Bruti-Liberati, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps in Finance*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [23] Q. Guo, W. Liu, X. Mao, R. Yue, The partially truncated Euler-Maruyama method and its stability and boundedness, *Appl. Numer. Math.* 115 (2017) 235–251.
- 220 [24] J. Bao, B. Böttcher, X. Mao, C. Yuan, Convergence rate of numerical solutions to SFDEs with jumps, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 236 (2011) 119–131.
- [25] Q. Guo, W. Liu, X. Mao, A note on the partially truncated Euler-Maruyama method, *Applied Numerical Mathematics* 130 (2018) 157–170.