

Cauchy–Dirichlet problems for a class of hypoelliptic equation in \mathbb{R}^d : a new probabilistic representation formula for the gradient of the solutions

Giuseppe Da Prato

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy

Luciano Tubaro

University of Trento, Trento, Italy

July 7, 2021

Abstract

We are concerned with an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process $X(t, x) = e^{tA}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}\sqrt{C} dW(s)$ in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 1$, where A and C are $d \times d$ matrices, C being semidefinite positive. Our basic assumption is that the matrix $Q_t = \int_0^t e^{sA}C e^{sA^*} ds$ is non singular for all $t > 0$; this implies that the corresponding Kolmogorov operator is hypoelliptic. Then we consider the stopped semigroup $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E} [\varphi(X(T, x)) \mathbb{1}_{T \leq \tau_x^r}]$, $T \geq 0$ where $\mathcal{O}_r = \{g < r\}$ is bounded, g is convex, and $\tau_x^r = \inf\{t > 0 : X(t, x) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}^c\}$. We prove the existence and a new representation formula for the gradient of $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$, where $T > 0$ and φ is bounded and Borel.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification AMS: 35J15, 60G53, 60H99, 60J65.

Key words: hypoelliptic operators, strong Feller property, Cauchy–Dirichlet problem, Cameron–Martin formula, Brownian motion.

Contents

1	Introduction and setting of the problem	2
2	Strong Feller property of $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T > 0$	5
3	Approximating semigroup	8
4	Differentiating the approximating semigroup	11
4.1	Applying the Ehrhard inequality	15

1 Introduction and setting of the problem

We are here concerned with an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process in $\mathbb{R}^d = H$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$X(t, x) = e^{tA}x + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sqrt{C} dW(s), \quad x \in H, t \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where A and C are $d \times d$ matrices, C being symmetric and semi-definite positive. Moreover $W(t)$, $t \geq 0$, represents an H -valued standard Wiener process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We denote by W_A the *stochastic convolution*

$$W_A(t) := \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sqrt{C} dW(s), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

Our basic assumption is the following.

Hypothesis 1. *The matrix $Q_t := \int_0^t e^{sA} C e^{sA*} ds$ is non singular for all $t > 0$.*

Remark 1. Hypothesis 1 arises in controllability problems for the deterministic system $D_t \xi = A\xi + \sqrt{C}u$, where u is a control. See e.g. [Za92].

As well known, the transition semigroup R_t , $t \geq 0$, corresponding to the process $X(t, x)$ is given by

$$R_t \varphi(x) = \int_H \varphi(y) N_{e^{tA}x, Q_t}(dy), \quad t \geq 0, x \in H, \varphi \in B_b(H), \quad (3)$$

where $N_{e^{tA}x, Q_t}$ is the gaussian probability measure on H of mean $e^{tA}x$ and covariance Q_t and $B_b(H)$ denotes the space of all mappings $H \rightarrow H$ which are bounded and Borel. By Hypothesis 1 the matrix $\Lambda_t := Q_t^{-1/2} e^{tA}$ is non singular for all $t > 0$; consequently, by the Cameron–Martin Theorem it follows that $N_{e^{tA}x, Q_t} \ll N_{Q_t}$ and

$$\frac{dN_{e^{tA}x, Q_t}}{dN_{Q_t}}(y) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\Lambda_t x|_H^2 + \langle \Lambda_t x, Q_t^{-1/2} y \rangle_H}, \quad t > 0, y \in H. \quad (4)$$

Therefore a well known representation formula for R_t follows by (3),

$$R_t \varphi(x) = \int_H \varphi(y) e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\Lambda_t x|_H^2 + \langle \Lambda_t x, Q_t^{-1/2} y \rangle_H} N_{Q_t}(dy), \quad t \geq 0, x \in H, \varphi \in B_b(H). \quad (5)$$

By (5) we can deduce that $R_t \varphi$ is differentiable infinitely many times, in particular it is strongly Feller.

The goal of this paper is to generalise the above regularity results to the stopped semigroup $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T \geq 0$, defined by

$$R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X(T, x)) \mathbb{1}_{T \leq \tau_x}], \quad T \geq 0, \varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}), \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{O}_r is an open convex bounded subset of H and τ_x is the exit time from $\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$.

More precisely, we shall assume

Hypothesis 2. (i) $g : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex function of class C^1 such that $g(0) = 0$, $g(x) > 0$ and $g'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \neq 0$. For any $r > 0$ we set $\mathcal{O}_r = \{g < r\}$, $\overline{\mathcal{O}_r} = \{g \leq r\}$ and $\partial\mathcal{O}_r = \{g^{-1}(r)\}$. Moreover, \mathcal{O}_r is bounded.

(ii) There exist $a, b > 0$ such that $|g(x)| + |g'(x)|_H \leq a + e^{b|x|_H}$ for all $x \in H$.

The semigroup $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T \geq 0$, is related, as well known, to the Dirichlet problem in $\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ for the Kolmogorov operator,

$$\mathcal{K}\varphi := \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[CD^2\varphi] + \langle Ax, D\varphi \rangle. \quad (7)$$

This problem is elliptic when the matrix C is non singular, otherwise is hypoelliptic. In the last case the existence of the gradient of $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$, $T \geq 0$, when φ is namely bounded and Borel, is more challenging.

Here is a simple example where Hypothesis 1 is fulfilled.

Example 2. Let $d = 2$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have

$$Q_t = \int_0^t e^{sA} C e^{sA^*} ds = \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s \\ s & s^2 \end{pmatrix} ds = \begin{pmatrix} t & t^2/2 \\ t^2/2 & t^3/3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $\det Q_t > 0$ for any $t > 0$. If $f \in B_b(H)$ and $t > 0$, we conclude that $R_t f$ is of class C^∞ . Note that $u(t, \xi) = R_t f(\xi)$, is the solution of the well known Kolmogorov equation

$$\begin{cases} D_t u(t, \xi_1, \xi_2) = \frac{1}{2} D_{\xi_1}^2 u(t, \xi_1, \xi_2) + \xi_1 D_{\xi_2} u(t, \xi_1, \xi_2) \\ u(0, \xi) = f(\xi), \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

which is *hypoelliptic*.

Let us explain our result. We start from an obvious consequence of (6),

$$R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{g(e^{sA}x + h(s)) \leq r, \forall s \in [0, T]\}} \varphi(h(T) + e^{TA}x) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh), \quad \varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}), \quad (9)$$

where $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$ is the law of $W_A(\cdot)$ in $X := L^2(0, T; H)$ or in $E := C([0, T]; H)$, see Lemma 3 below.

Let $x \in H$; then we cannot eliminate x in identity (9) making the translation $h \rightarrow h - e^{tA}x$ and using the Cameron–Martin formula because the measures $N_{e^{tA}x, \mathbb{Q}}$ and $N_{\mathbb{Q}}$ are singular. For this reason we look for another translation $h \rightarrow h - a(x, \cdot)$ such that $a(x, \cdot)$ belongs to $\mathbb{Q}_T(X)$ for all $x \in H$ (and a–fortiori to $\mathbb{Q}_T^{1/2}(X)$, the Cameron–Martin space of $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$) and *such that*:

$$a(x, T) = e^{TA}x, \quad \forall x \in H \quad (10)$$

(see Proposition 6 below). Then the measures $N_{a(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_T}$ and $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$ are equivalent, so that by the Cameron–Martin Theorem we have

$$\frac{dN_{a(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_T}}{dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T}}(h) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} a(x, \cdot)|_X^2 + W_{\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} a(x, \cdot)}(h) \right\}, \quad x \in H, h \in X, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2}$ is the pseudo inverse of $\mathbb{Q}_T^{1/2}$, see e.g. [DaZa14, Theorem 2.23]. Now we take advantage of the special form of $a(x, \cdot)$ for simplifying identity (9). We write

$$|\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} a(x, \cdot)|_X^2 = \langle \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} a(x, \cdot), a(x, \cdot) \rangle_X =: F(x), \quad (12)$$

and,

$$W_{\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} a(x, \cdot)}(h) = \langle \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} a(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2} h \rangle_X = \langle \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} a(x, \cdot), h \rangle_X =: G(x, h). \quad (13)$$

Note that both F and G are regular. Now (11) becomes

$$\frac{dN_{a(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_T}}{dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T}}(h) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\}, \quad x \in H, h \in X, \quad (14)$$

and (9)

$$R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh), \quad \varphi \in B(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} g(h(t) + d(x, t)), \quad k \in E, \quad d(x, t) = e^{tA}x - a(x, t), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (16)$$

In the integral (15) the variable x does not appear under the argument of φ . Since the mapping $x \rightarrow \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot))$ is continuous this fact implies that the semigroup $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T > 0$, is *strong Feller* that is $\varphi \in B_b(H) \Rightarrow R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi \in C_b(H)$ for all $T > 0$, see Proposition 7 below.

More difficult is to show that $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$ is differentiable for all $T > 0$. As it is expected, this will produce a surface integral which, unfortunately, is not covered by the classical assumptions from Airault–Malliavin,

[AiMa88] see also [DaLuTu14]. To overcome this difficulty we introduce in Section 3 an approximating semigroup $R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T > 0$, for all decomposition $\{t_j = \frac{jT}{2^n}, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n\}$ of $[0, T]$, namely by approximating any function h from E by step functions. Then we arrive to an identity for $R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r}\varphi(x)$ (see (44)) that can be easily differentiated with respect to x , see identity (47). It remains to let $n \rightarrow \infty$; this is not easy due to the factor

$$\langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot)y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}h \rangle_{H^{2n}}$$

which appears in the identity (47) because $d_x(x, \cdot)y$ does not belong to the Cameron–Martin space of $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$. Some additional work is required, based on the Ehrhard inequality for the gaussian measure $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$ and the selection principle of Helly. After some manipulations, we arrive at the representation formula (71) which is the main result of the paper. Our procedure was partially inspired by a paper by Linde [Li86], which was dealing, however, with a completely different situation.

We believe that our method could be extended to more general Kolmogorov operators of the form

$$\mathcal{H}_1\varphi = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[CD^2\varphi] + \langle Ax + b(x), D\varphi \rangle, \quad \varphi \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}). \quad (17)$$

where $b : H \rightarrow H$ is suitable nonlinear mapping. This will be the object of a future work.

We end this section with some notation. For any $T > 0$ we consider the law of $X(\cdot, x)$ both in the Banach space $E = C([0, T]; H)$ and in the Hilbert space $X = L^2(0, T; H)$ (in the second case it is concentrated on E which is a Borel subset of X). We shall denote by $|\cdot|_X$ (resp. $|\cdot|_E$) the norm of X (resp. of E). The scalar product from two elements $x, y \in H$ (resp. X) will be denoted either by $\langle x, y \rangle_H$ (resp. $\langle x, y \rangle_X$) or by $x \cdot y$. If $\varphi \in C_b^1(E)$ and $\eta \in E$ we denote by $D\varphi(h) \cdot \eta$ the derivative of φ at h in the direction η .

In what follows several integrals with respect to $dN_{\mathbb{Q}}$ will be considered, according to the convenience, both in X and in E .

2 Strong Feller property of $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T > 0$

We first recall some properties of the gaussian measure \mathbb{Q}_T . The following lemma is well known, see e.g [DaZa14, Theorem 5.2].

Lemma 3. *The law of $W_A(\cdot)$ is gaussian $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$ both in E and in X , where \mathbb{Q}_T is given by*

$$(\mathbb{Q}_T h)(t) = \int_0^T K(t, s)h(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], h \in X \quad (18)$$

where

$$K(t, s) = \begin{cases} \int_0^s e^{(t-r)A} C e^{(s-r)A^*} dr & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T \\ \int_0^t e^{(t-r)A} C e^{(s-r)A^*} dr & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

We note that there exists an orthonormal basis (e_j) on X and a sequence (λ_j) of nonnegative numbers such that

$$\mathbb{Q}_T e_j = \lambda_j e_j, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

and an integer $k_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_{k_0} = 0, \quad \lambda_j > 0, \quad \forall j > k_0.$$

If $k_0 = 0$ then \mathbb{Q}_T is non degenerate.

We shall denote by \mathbb{L}_T the linear operator from X into itself defined by

$$\mathbb{L}_T h(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \sqrt{C} h(s) ds, \quad h \in X, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (20)$$

Its adjoint \mathbb{L}_T^* is given by

$$\mathbb{L}_T^* g(t) = \int_t^T \sqrt{C} e^{(s-t)A^*} g(s) ds, \quad g \in X, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (21)$$

It is easily checked that $\mathbb{Q}_T = \mathbb{L}_T \mathbb{L}_T^*$. Moreover, by [DaZa14, Corollary B5], the Cameron–Martin space of the Gaussian measure $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{Q}_T^{1/2}(X) = \mathbb{L}_T(X), \quad (22)$$

both in E and in X .

Remark 4. If $\det C = 0$ one checks easily that the gaussian measure \mathbb{Q}_T is degenerate and

$$\text{Ker } Q = \{h \in X : \mathbb{L}_T^* h = 0\}.$$

For instance, coming back to Example 2 we see that in that case

$$\text{Ker } Q = \{h = (h_1, h_2) \in E : h_1'(t) = h_2(t)\}.$$

We shall denote in what follows by \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} (resp. $\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2}$) the pseudo-inverse of \mathbb{Q}_T (resp. the pseudo-inverse of $\mathbb{Q}_T^{1/2}$) ⁽¹⁾. Clearly, the domain of \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} is equal to $\mathbb{Q}_T(X)$ and $h \in \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1}(X)$ if and only if the following series is convergent in X

$$\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} h = \sum_{j=k_0+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-1} \langle h, e_j \rangle_X e_j.$$

Similar assertion holds for $\mathbb{Q}_T^{-1/2}$.

Now to introduce the required translation; first we need a lemma.

⁽¹⁾Let $S : X \rightarrow Y$ be a linear, bounded and compact operator; the pseudo-inverse S^{-1} of S is defined as follows. For any $y \in S(X)$ we denote by $S^{-1}y$ the element of minimal norm from the convex set $\{x \in X : S(x) = y\}$.

Lemma 5. Define $U := \int_0^T r e^{rA} C e^{rA^*} dr$. Then $\det U > 0$.

Proof. We have in fact

$$U \geq \frac{T}{2} \int_{T/2}^T e^{rA} C e^{rA^*} dr = \frac{T}{2} \int_0^{T/2} e^{(T/2+z)A} C e^{(T/2+z)A^*} dz = \frac{T}{2} e^{AT/2} Q_{T/2} e^{A^*T/2}.$$

It follows that $\det U \geq \frac{T}{2} e^{T \operatorname{Tr} A} \det Q_{T/2} > 0$, as claimed. \square

Proposition 6. For all $x \in H$ set

$$u(x, t) := e^{(T-t)A^*} U^{-1} e^{TA} x, \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (23)$$

and define $a(x, \cdot) := \mathbb{Q}_T u(x, \cdot)$. Then it results $a(x, T) = e^{TA} x$. Moreover, there is $c_T, c_{1,T} > 0$ such that

$$|u(t, x)|_H \leq c_T |x|_H, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x \in H, \quad (24)$$

and

$$|a(x, t)|_H \leq c_{1,T} |x|_H, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], x \in H. \quad (25)$$

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned} a(x, T) &= \int_0^T K(T, s) u(x, s) ds = \int_0^T \left(\int_0^s e^{(T-r)A} C e^{(s-r)A^*} dr \right) e^{(T-s)A^*} U^{-1} e^{TA} x ds \\ &= \int_0^T \left(\int_0^s e^{(T-r)A} C e^{(T-r)A^*} dr \right) U^{-1} e^{TA} x ds = \int_0^T (T-r) e^{(T-r)A} C e^{(T-r)A^*} dr U^{-1} e^{TA} x = e^{TA} x, \end{aligned}$$

as required. Finally,

$$|u(x, t)|_H \leq \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|e^{sA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}^2 \|U^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} |x|_H, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

so that (24) and (25) follow easily. \square

Now we prove the first new result of the paper.

Proposition 7. Under Hypotheses 1 and 2 the semigroup $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $T > 0$, is strong Feller.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in B(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ and $x_0, x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$. Then by (15) we find

$$\begin{aligned} |R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) - R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x_0)| &\leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_X \left| \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\} - \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x_0) + G(x_0, h) \right\} \right| N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &+ \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_X \mathbf{1}_{\{\Gamma(h+d(x_0, \cdot)) \leq r\} \setminus \{\Gamma(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x_0) + G(x_0, h) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) =: A_1 + A_2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (24) we have

$$F(x) = \langle \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} a(x, \cdot), a(x, \cdot) \rangle_X = \langle u(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_T u(x, \cdot) \rangle_H \leq \|\mathbb{Q}_T\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} c_T^2 |x|_H^2$$

and

$$|G(x, h)| = |\langle \mathbb{Q}_T^{-1} a(x, \cdot), h \rangle_X| \leq c_T T |x|_H |h|_X$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\} - \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x_0) + G(x_0, h) \right\} \\ &= \int_0^1 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F((1-\alpha)x_0 + \alpha x) + G((1-\alpha)x_0 + \alpha x, h) \right\} (x - x_0) d\alpha \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \exp \left\{ G((1-\xi)x_0 + \xi x, h) \right\} |x - x_0| d\alpha \leq \exp \{ c_T T |x|_H |h|_X \} |x - x_0|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$A_1 \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_X \exp \{ c_T T |x|_H |h|_X \} dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T} |x - x_0|.$$

Since the integral above is finite we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} A_1 = 0$. Concerning A_2 we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} A_2 = 0$ by the continuity of $d(x, \cdot)$ and the dominated convergence theorem. The proof is complete. \square

3 Approximating semigroup

We define an approximating semigroup $R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$, $T > 0$, on $B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ setting for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh), \quad (26)$$

where $F(x)$, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ is defined by (12), $d(x, t)$ by (16) and Γ_n by

$$\Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = \sup \{ g(h(t_j) + d(x, t_j)), t_j = \frac{jT}{2^n}, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n \}, \quad \forall h \in E, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (27)$$

and

$$G^n(x, h) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} (u(x, t_j) \cdot h(t_j)) (t_j - t_{j-1}), \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, h \in E. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 8. (i) *It results*

$$|\Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) - \Gamma_n(h_1 + d(x, \cdot))| \leq a + b e^{(|h|_E + |h_1|_E)}, \quad h_1, h_2 \in E. \quad (29)$$

(ii) *Moreover $h \rightarrow \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot))$ belongs to $W^{1,2}(E, N_Q)$*

$$|\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot d(x, \cdot)| \leq (a + b e^{2|h|_E}) |d(x, \cdot)|.$$

Proof. (i) follows from Hypothesis 2(ii) and (ii) is a well known consequence of the local lipschitzianity of Γ_n . \square

Proposition 9. *Under Hypotheses 1, 2 for all $\varphi \in B(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ it results*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) - R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)| &\leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} F(x)\} \left| \exp\{G^n(x, h)\} - \exp\{G(x, h)\} \right| N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &\quad + \|\varphi\|_\infty \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\} \setminus \{\Gamma(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h)\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Taking into account (24), yields

$$|G^n(x, h)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} |u(x, t_j)|_H |h(t_j)|_H (t_j - t_{j-1}) \leq c_T |x|_{C(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})} |h|_E, \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, h \in E \quad (31)$$

Now, set

$$B_n := \{h : g(h(t_i)) + d(x, t_i) \leq r, \quad t_j = \frac{jT}{2^n}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n\}, \quad B = \{h : g(h(t)) + d(x, t) \leq r, \quad t \in [0, T]\}.$$

Then $B \subset B_n$ and $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n = B$, so that $N_{\mathbb{Q}}(B_n) \downarrow N_{\mathbb{Q}}(B)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G^n(x, h) = G(x, h), \quad \forall h \in E, x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r} \quad (32)$$

and by (23) there is $c_T > 0$ such that

$$\exp\{G^n(x, h)\} \leq e^{c_T |h|_E}, \quad \forall h \in E, \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}. \quad (33)$$

The conclusion follows from the dominated convergence theorem. \square

It useful to write an expression of $R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$ as a finite dimensional integral. To this purpose we consider the linear mapping

$$E = C([0, T]; H) \rightarrow H^{2^n}, \quad h \rightarrow (h(t_1), h(t_2), \dots, h(t_{2^n})), \quad t_j = \frac{jT}{2^n}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n, \quad (34)$$

whose law is obviously gaussian, say $N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\varphi : H^{2^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded and Borel we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E \varphi(h(t_1), h(t_2), \dots, h(t_{2^n})) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) &= \mathbb{E}[\varphi(W_A(t_1), W_A(t_2), \dots, W_A(t_{2^n})))] \\ &= \int_{H^{2^n}} \varphi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2^n}) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_{2^n}). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now we can write the approximating semigroup as an integral over H^{2^n} , namely

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi)\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi), \quad \xi \in H^{2^n}, \quad (36)$$

where

$$\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)) = \sup\{g(\xi_j + d(x, t_j)), t_j = \frac{jT}{2^n}, j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n\}$$

and

$$G^n(x, \xi) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} (u(x, t_j) \cdot \xi_j) (t_j - t_{j-1}), \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \xi \in H^{2^n}.$$

Proposition 10. $\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}$ has a bounded inverse for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so the Cameron–Martin space of $N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}$ is the whole H^{2^n} .

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then by (35) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda(\sum_{h=1}^{2^n} \langle \xi_h, W_A(t_h) \rangle_H)}] = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n} \xi, \xi \rangle_{H^{2^n}}}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2^n})$$

We claim that if $\mathbb{Q}_{T,n} \xi = 0$ then $\xi = 0$. In fact, if $\mathbb{Q}_{T,n} \xi = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda(\sum_{h=1}^{2^n} \langle \xi_h, W_A(t_h) \rangle_H)}] = 1$ and so,

$$\sum_{h=1}^{2^n} \langle \xi_h, W_A(t_h) \rangle_H = 0, \quad N_{\mathbb{Q}_{n,T}}\text{-a.s.} \quad (37)$$

Now, setting $L(t) = \int_0^t e^{-sA} dW(s)$, and $\rho_i = e^{-t_i A^*} \xi_i$, we have

$$\langle \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \cdots + \rho_{2^n}, L(t_1) \rangle + \langle \rho_2 + \cdots + \rho_{2^n}, L(t_2) - L(t_1) \rangle + \cdots + \langle \rho_{2^n}, L(t_{2^n}) - L(t_{2^n-1}) \rangle = 0.$$

Multiplying both sides by $\langle \rho_1 + \rho_2 + \cdots + \rho_{2^n}, L(t_1) \rangle$ and taking expectation, yields

$$\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \cdots + \rho_{2^n} = 0,$$

since $\mathbb{E}(\langle v, L(t_1) \rangle^2) = \langle Q_{t_1} v, v \rangle$ and Q_{t_1} is non singular by Hypothesis 1.

Similarly we obtain $\rho_k + \rho_{k+1} + \cdots + \rho_{2^n} = 0$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, 2^n$, which implies finally $\xi = 0$. \square

4 Differentiating the approximating semigroup

First note that by (28) we have

$$(G_h^n(x, h) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} (u(x, t_j) \cdot d_x(x, t_j)y) (t_j - t_{j-1}), \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, h \in E. \quad (38)$$

Lemma 11. *For all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $y \in H$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ we have*

$$D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y =: M_1(n, x, y) + M_2(n, x, y), \quad (39)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(n, x, y) = & \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \\ & \times \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x^n(x, h)y - G_h^n(x, h) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

and

$$M_2(n, x, y) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot)y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} h \rangle_{H^{2n}} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh), \quad (41)$$

where

$$\langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot)y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} h \rangle_{H^{2n}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2^n} (\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1})_{i,j} (d_x(x, t_i)y) \cdot h(t_j), \quad (42)$$

where

$$(\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1})_{i,j} = \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1} \psi_i, \psi_j \rangle_{H^{2n}}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 2^n$$

and (ψ_j) is the standard orthogonal basis of H^{2n} .

Proof. We first write identity (26) as

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi),$$

Then we drop the dependence on x under the domain of integration by making the translation $\xi \rightarrow \xi - d(x, \cdot)$ and recalling that $d(x, T) = 0$; we write

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi - d(x, \cdot)) \right\} N_{d(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi). \quad (43)$$

So, using again the Cameron–Martin Theorem (this is possible thanks to Proposition 10), we have

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi - d(x, \cdot)) \right\} \chi_n(x, \xi) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi), \quad (44)$$

where

$$\chi_n(x, \xi) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} d(x, \cdot)\|_{H^{2n}}^2 + \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} d(x, \cdot), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} \xi \rangle_{H^{2n}} \right\}. \quad (45)$$

We now can differentiate $R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)$ at any given direction $y \in H$. Taking into account that for any $x, y \in H$ we have,

$$D_x \chi_n(x, \xi) \cdot y = \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (\xi - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{H^{2n}} \chi_n(x, \xi). \quad (46)$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi - d(x, \cdot)) \right\} \\ &\times \left[-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x) y + G_x^n(x, \xi - d(x, \cdot)) y - \langle G_\xi^n(x, \xi - d(x, \cdot)), d_x(x, \cdot) y \rangle_{H^{2n}} \right. \\ &\left. + \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (\xi - d(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{H^{2n}} \right] \chi_n(x, \xi) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Here F_x and G_x denote the derivatives with respect to x of F and G respectively, whereas G_ξ is the derivative with respect to ξ . Now making the opposite translation $\xi_j \rightarrow \xi_j + d(x, t_j)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 2^n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \\ &\times \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x) y + G_x^n(x, \xi) y - \langle G_\xi^n(x, \xi), d_x(x, \cdot) y \rangle_{H^{2n}} \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi) \\ &+ \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(h, \xi) \right\} \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (\xi) \rangle_{H^{2n}} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

We arrive at the conclusion making the change of variables (34). □

In Section 4 we shall easily prove the existence of the limit of $M_1(n, x, y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Instead a problem arises, as said in the introduction, for the term $M_2(n, x, y)$ due to the factor

$$\langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} (d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2} h \rangle_{H^{2n}},$$

because $d_x(x, \cdot)y$ does not belong to $Q_T^{1/2}(X)$. So, we look in the next Lemma 16 for a different expression of $M_2(n, x, y)$ that does not contain this term. Before we need to recall the definition and some properties of the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}_T})$. We shall need a result which is a straightforward generalisation of [Ce01, Proposition 6.1.5]

Lemma 12. *For any $\varphi \in C_b^1(E)$ there exists a sequence $(\varphi_n) \in C_b^1(X)$ such that*

$$(i) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(h) \rightarrow \varphi(h), \quad \forall h \in E.$$

$$(ii) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle D\varphi_n(h), \eta \rangle_X = D\varphi(h) \cdot \eta, \quad \forall h, \eta \in E.$$

Proof. For any $\varphi \in C_b^1(E)$ set

$$\varphi_n : H \rightarrow E, \quad x \rightarrow \varphi_n(x)(t) = \frac{n}{2} \int_{t-\frac{1}{n}}^{t+\frac{1}{n}} \hat{\varphi}(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and $\hat{\varphi}(s)$ is the extension by oddness of $\varphi(s)$, for $s \in (-T, 0)$ and $s \in (T, 2T)$. Then it is easy to check that (φ_n) fulfills (i) and (ii). \square

The following result is similar to [BoDaTu18, Proposition 4.2].

Proposition 13. *For all $\varphi \in C_b^1(E)$ and any $\eta \in Q^{1/2}(X) \subset E$ the following integration by parts formula holds*

$$\int_E D\varphi(h) \cdot \eta N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) = \int_E \varphi(h) \langle Q^{-1/2}h, Q^{-1/2}\eta \rangle_H N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh). \quad (49)$$

Proof. Let $\varphi_n \in C_b^1(X)$ be a sequence as in Lemma 12; then we have

$$\int_H \langle D\varphi_n(h), \eta \rangle_X N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) = \int_H \varphi_n(x) \langle Q^{-1/2}h, Q^{-1/2}\eta \rangle_H dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh). \quad (50)$$

The conclusion follows letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Corollary 14. *For all $\varphi, \psi \in C_b^1(E)$ and any $\eta \in Q^{1/2}(X) \subset E$ the following integration by parts formula holds*

$$\int_E D\varphi \cdot \eta \psi dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T} = - \int_E D\psi \cdot \eta \varphi dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T} + \int_E \varphi \psi \langle Q^{-1/2}x, Q^{-1/2}z \rangle_X dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T}. \quad (51)$$

Remark 15. By (51) it follows, by standard arguments, that the gradient operator D is closable in $L^p(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ for any $p \geq 1$; we shall still denote by D its closure and by $W^{1,p}(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ its domain. Finally, it is well known that all Lipschitz continuous function $\varphi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to $W^{1,p}(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$. [See also Lemma 8](#)

Now we are ready to prove the announced lemma.

Lemma 16. *Assume Hypotheses 1 and 2. Let $M_2(n, x, y)$ given by (41). Then for all $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $y \in H$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following identity holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
M_2(n, x, y) &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) D_h \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot) y) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\
&\quad + \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{\{r-\epsilon \leq \Gamma_n(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r+\epsilon\}} \varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h+d(x, \cdot))) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot) y) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\
&= : M_{2,1}(n, x, y) + M_{2,2}(n, x, y).
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Proof. By (48) we have

$$M_2(n, x, y) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(\xi) \rangle_{H^{2n}} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi).$$

Let us first assume in addition that $\varphi \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$. Then we argue similarly to [BoDaTu18, Proposition 4.5], defining a mapping $\theta_\epsilon : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\theta_\epsilon(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s \leq r - \epsilon \\ \frac{1}{2\epsilon}(s - r + \epsilon), & \text{if } r - \epsilon \leq s \leq r + \epsilon \\ 1, & \text{if } s \geq r + \epsilon. \end{cases} \tag{53}$$

Then we approximate $M_2(n, x, y)$ by setting

$$M_2^\epsilon(n, x, y) = \int_{H^{2n}} \theta_\epsilon(\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x, \cdot))) \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(\xi) \rangle_{H^{2n}} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi),$$

so that the $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} M_2^\epsilon(n, x, y)$ exists and is given by

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} M_2^\epsilon(n, x, y) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \langle \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(d_x(x, \cdot) y), \mathbb{Q}_{T,n}^{-1/2}(\xi) \rangle_{H^{2n}} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi), \tag{54}$$

Now, by a classical integration by parts formula we have, see e.g. [Bo98]

$$\begin{aligned}
M_2^\epsilon(n, x, y) &= \int_{H^{2n}} \theta_\epsilon(\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot))) (D_h \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \cdot d_x(x, T) y) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_{H^{2n}} \theta_\epsilon(\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot))) \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) (D_h \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \cdot d_x(x, \cdot) y) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_{H^{2n}} (D_h \theta_\epsilon(\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot))) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot) y)) \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi).
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Taking into account that the first integral vanishes, because $d_x(x, T)y = 0$, and that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D\theta_\epsilon(\Gamma_n a(\xi + d(x, \cdot))), (d(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{H^{2n}} &= \theta'_\epsilon(\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot))) \langle \Gamma'_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)), d(x, \cdot)y \rangle_{H^{2n}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \langle \Gamma'_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)), d_x(x, \cdot)y \rangle_{H^{2n}} \mathbb{1}_{[r-\epsilon, r+\epsilon]}, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce by (55), letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} M_2(n, x, y) &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) (D_h \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} \cdot d_x(x, \cdot)y) N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi) \\ &+ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{\{r-\epsilon \leq \Gamma_n(\xi+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r+\epsilon\}} \langle \Gamma'_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)), d(x, \cdot)y \rangle_{H^{2n}} \varphi(\xi_{2^n}) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, \xi) \right\} N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,n}}(d\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

So the conclusion of the lemma follows, by the change of variables (34), when $\varphi \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$. The case when $\varphi \in C(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ can be handled by a uniform approximation of φ by $C^1(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ functions. Finally, if $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ we conclude using the strong Feller property of the semigroup, see Proposition 7. \square

It remains to compute the limit in (52). This we will do using the Ehrhard inequality.

4.1 Applying the Ehrhard inequality

Define

$$\Lambda_x(s) := N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(\Gamma(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq s), \quad \Lambda_{n,x}(s) := N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(\Gamma_n(\xi+d(x, \cdot)) \leq s), \quad \forall s > 0, x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (57)$$

Since g is convex by Hypothesis 2(i), the mapping $\Gamma(\cdot + d(x, \cdot))$ (resp. $\Gamma_n(\cdot + d(x, \cdot))$) is convex as well. By applying the Ehrhard inequality (see e.g. [Bo98, Th. 4.4.1]) we see that for any $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ the real function

$$[0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, s \rightarrow S_x(s) := \Phi^{-1}(\Lambda_x(s)), \text{ (resp. } [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, s \rightarrow S_{n,x}(s) := \Phi^{-1}(\Lambda_{n,x}(s))),$$

where

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^z e^{-\frac{1}{2}v^2} dv, \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

is concave. Note that $\Phi^{-1} : (0, 1) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty)$. As a consequence, $\Lambda_x(\cdot)$ (resp. $\Lambda_{n,x}(\cdot)$) is differentiable at any $s > 0$ up to a discrete set N_s where there exist the left and the right derivative; we shall denote by $D_r^+ \Lambda_x(s)$ (resp. $D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(s)$) the right derivatives at any discontinuity point, and also (with the same symbol) the derivative at the other points.

It follows that $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T} \circ (\Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)))^{-1}$ (resp. $N_{\mathbb{Q}_T} \circ (\Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)))^{-1}$) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure ℓ and it results

$$\frac{dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T} \circ (\Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)))^{-1}}{d\ell}(s) = D_r^+ \Lambda_x(s), \quad \text{(resp. } \frac{dN_{\mathbb{Q}_T} \circ (\Gamma_n(\xi + d(x, \cdot)))^{-1}}{d\ell}(s) = D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(s)), \quad s > 0.$$

(58)

Note that for any x , $\Lambda_{n,x}(s)$ is increasing on s and decreasing on n . Moreover, $\Lambda_{n,x}(0) = 0$ and $\Lambda_{n,x}(s) \uparrow 1$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Also

$$D^+ S_x(s) = \sqrt{2\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2} S^2(s)} D^+ \Lambda_x(s) \quad (59)$$

Now we are going to estimate $D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(s)$ independently of n , x and $s \in [r/2, 3r/2]$. Then we shall show that $D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x} \rightarrow D_r^+ \Lambda_x$.

Lemma 17. *There exists $K_r > 0$ independent of x , n , s such that*

$$D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(s) \leq K_r, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall s \in [r/2, 3r/2]. \quad (60)$$

Moreover, it results

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x} = D_r^+ \Lambda_x, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}. \quad (61)$$

Proof. We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. There is $l_1 > 0$ such that

$$0 < l_1 \leq \Lambda_{n,x}(s), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \forall n \geq 2, \forall s \in [r/2, 3r/2]. \quad (62)$$

It is enough to show (62) for $\Lambda_{2,x}(s)$, because $\Lambda_{2,x}(s) \geq \Lambda_{n,x}(s)$ for $n \geq 2$.

Since the convex set $\{\xi \in H^{2n} : \Gamma_2(\xi + d(x, \cdot)) < s\}$ is open and non empty and the measure $N_{\mathbb{Q}_{T,2}}$ is non degenerate by Proposition 10, it follows that there is $l_1(x)$ such that

$$0 < l_1(x) \leq \Lambda_{n,x}(s), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \forall n \geq 2, \forall s \in [r/2, 3r/2].$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ is compact, the conclusion follows.

Step 2. There is $l_2 < 1$ such that

$$\Lambda_{n,x}(s) < l_2 < 1, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall s \in [r/2, 3r/2]. \quad (63)$$

In fact, thanks to Hypothesis 2(ii), there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\Lambda_{n,x}(s) \leq M, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall s \in [r/2, 3r/2]. \quad (64)$$

Step 3. Conclusion.

Note first that

$$S_{n,x}(s) \downarrow S_x(s) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}.$$

The sequence $(S_{n,x}(\cdot))$ is obviously increasing and also concave by the Ehrhard inequality. Therefore, all elements of $(S'_{n,x}(\cdot))$ are positive and decreasing; so, they are BV in the interval $[r/2, 3r/2]$.

We claim that the sequence $(S'_{n,x}(r))$ is equi-bounded in $[r/2, 3r/2]$ in BV norm. To show this fact it is enough to see that $(S'_{n,x}(r))$ is namely equi-bounded at r_1 (because it is decreasing). In fact, since $S_{n,x}$ is concave we have if $0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{r}{2}$,

$$S'_{n,x}(r_1) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}(S_{n,x}(r_1 + \epsilon) - S_{n,x}(r_1)) \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} S_{n,x}(r_2) = \frac{2}{\epsilon} \Phi^{-1}(r_2). \quad (65)$$

Therefore we can apply the selection principle of Helly, see e.g. [KoFo70, Theorem 5 page 372] to the sequence $(S'_{n,x}(\cdot))$ and conclude that there exists a subsequence of $(S'_{n,x}(\cdot))$ still denoted by $(S'_{n,x}(\cdot))$ that converges in all points of $[r/2, 3r/2]$ to a function $f(x, \cdot)$.

We claim that $f(x, s)$ is the derivative of $S_x(s)$ in $[r/2, 3r/2]$. This follows by an elementary argument writing,

$$S_{n,x}(s) = \int_{r_1}^s S'_{n,x}(v) dv, \quad s \in [r/2, 3r/2].$$

(recall that $S_{n,x}(\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous by [Bo98, Corollary 4.4.2]). By the Dominated Convergence theorem it follows that for $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$S_x(s) = \int_{r_1}^s S'_x(v) dv, \quad s \in [r/2, 3r/2],$$

which implies

$$S'_x(s) = f(x, s), \quad s \in [r/2, 3r/2],$$

as required.

Therefore there is a subsequence of $(S'_{n,x})$ which converges to S'_x and consequently all the sequence $(S'_{n,x})$ will converges to S'_x . Thus $\Lambda_x(r)$ has the right derivative for $r \in [r/2, 3r/2]$, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$, and (61) follows.

Finally, taking into account (65) and (59), it results

$$D_r^+ \Lambda_x(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} S_x^2(r)} S'_x(r) \leq \frac{1}{\pi\epsilon} \Phi^{-1}(r_2).$$

So, (60) follows. □

The next lemma is devoted to the computation of $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} M_{2,2}(n, x, y)$, defined by (52).

Lemma 18. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $r > 0$, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $y \in H$. Then it results*

$$M_{2,2}(n, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}}[\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r) D_{n,r}^+ \Lambda_x(r)]. \quad (66)$$

Proof. Let us recall that by (52) we have,

$$M_{2,2}(n, x, y) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{\{r-\epsilon \leq \Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r+\epsilon\}} \varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh),$$

Taking into account (58) it follows that

$$M_{2,2}(n, x, y) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{r-\epsilon}^{r+\epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = s)] D_{n,r} \Lambda_x(s) ds.$$

Note that the existence of a regular distribution of

$$\mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = s)]$$

is granted because E is separable, see [Du02, 10.2.2].

It follows that

$$M_{2,2}(n, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r)] D_{n,r}^+ \Lambda_x(r),$$

by virtue of the dominated convergence theorem. □

We prove now the following result.

Proposition 19. *Assume Hypotheses 1 and 2 and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}} \varphi(x) \cdot y &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x^n(x, h)y \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r)] D_{n,r}^+ \Lambda_x(r). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Moreover, there is $c_{2,T}(r) > 0$ such that the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}} \varphi(x)| &\leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty} c_{2,T}(r) + \|\varphi\|_{\infty} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \exp \{c_T \|h\|_E\} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|F_x(x)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} + T c_{2,T}(r) \|U^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \|h\|_E \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Proof. From Lemmas 11, 16 and 18 we obtain

$$D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}} \varphi(x) \cdot y = M_1(n, x, y) + M_{2,1}(n, x, y) + M_{2,2}(n, x, y)$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}} \varphi(x) \cdot y &= \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x^n(x, h)y - (G_h^n(x, h) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)) \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &\quad + \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) (D_h \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r)] D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(r). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$D_h \exp \{G^n(x, h)\} \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) = \exp \{G^n(x, h)\} G_h^n(d_x(x, \cdot)y \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)),$$

we obtain letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, after some simplifications, identity (67). Finally, we prove (68). First by (33) we have

$$\exp \{G^n(x, h)\} \leq \exp \{c_T |h|_E\}.$$

Moreover by (28) it follows that

$$G_x^n(x, h) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^n} u_x(x, t_j) \cdot h(t_j) (t_j - t_{j-1}), \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \quad h \in E$$

and therefore we have

$$|G_x^n(x, h)| \leq T \|u_x(x, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \|h\|_E \leq T c_T^2 \|U^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)} \|h\|_E, \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, \quad h \in E \quad (69)$$

Finally, by Hypothesis 2(ii) there exists $c_{1T} > 0$ such that

$$|\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)| \leq c_{1,T} |h|_E.$$

Finally, taking into account (60) and Lemma 8, yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r) D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(r)] \right| \\ & \leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty} c_{1,T} |D_r^+ \Lambda_x(r)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty} c_{1,T} K_r. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The conclusion follows. \square

5 Main results

Now we take $\varphi \in B_b(H)$ and prove a representation formula for $D_x R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)$.

Theorem 20. *Assume Hypotheses 1 and 2. Then there exists the gradient of $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$ for all $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$ and it results*

$$\begin{aligned} D_x R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y &= \int_{\{\Gamma(h+d(x, \cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\} \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x(x, h)y \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r) D_r^+ \Lambda_x(r)]. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Proof. We recall that by Proposition 19 we have

$$D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y = I(n, x, y) + J(n, x, y),$$

where

$$I(n, x, y) = \int_{\{\Gamma_n(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G^n(x, h) \right\} \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x^n(x, h)y \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \quad (72)$$

and

$$J(n, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}} [\varphi(h(T)) \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] D_r^+ \Lambda_{n,x}(r). \quad (73)$$

Step 1. Convergence of $I(n, x, y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$ and all $y \in H$ we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(n, x, y) = \int_{\{\Gamma(h+d(x,\cdot)) \leq r\}} \varphi(h(T)) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F(x) + G(x, h) \right\} \left(-\frac{1}{2} F_x(x)y + G_x(x, h)y \right) N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh) \quad (74)$$

This follows by the dominated convergence theorem arguing as in the proof of Proposition 9.

Step 2. Convergence of $J(n, x, y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $r > 0$, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$, $y \in H$. Then, we have,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(n, x, y) = -\mathbb{E}[\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma'(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y) | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] D_r \Lambda_x(r). \quad (75)$$

First we notice that $\Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot))$ converges uniformly to $\Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot))$ for any x . Moreover, since the function $h \rightarrow \sup_{t_j} h(t_j)$ is Lipschitz continuous in E and g fulfills Hypothesis 2(ii), it follows that $\Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot))$ belongs to a bounded subset of $W^{1,2}(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}_T})$, by Lemma 8. So, a subsequence of $(\Gamma_n'(h + d(x, \cdot)))$ (which we still denote by $(\Gamma_n'(h + d(x, \cdot)))$) converges to $\Gamma'(h + d(x, \cdot))$ in $L^1(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}_T})$

Now we start from (73) which we write as

$$J(n, x, y) = \mathbb{E}[\Psi_n(h) | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] D_r \Lambda_{n,x}(r),$$

where

$$\Psi_n(h) = -\varphi(h(T)) (\Gamma_n'(h + d(x, \cdot)) \cdot (d_x(x, \cdot)y)). \quad (76)$$

Note that $D_r \Lambda_{n,x}(r) \rightarrow D_r \Lambda_x(r)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 17.

By Hypothesis 2(ii) we have

$$|\Psi_n(h)| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty (a + e^{b|x|_E}), \quad \forall h \in E,$$

so that, there exists $M > 0$ such that $|\Psi_n(h)|_{L^1(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})} \leq M$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also $\Psi_n(h) \rightarrow \Psi(h)$ for all $h \in E$ by Lemma 16(iii). Therefore $\Psi_n \rightarrow \Psi$ in $L^1(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ by the dominated convergence theorem.

Now we can show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Psi_n | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] = \mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r]. \quad (77)$$

To this aim write

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[\Psi_n | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] - \mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r]| \\ & \leq |\mathbb{E}[\Psi_n - \Psi | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r]| + |\mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] - \mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r]| \\ & := J_1(n) + J_2(n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Psi_n \rightarrow \Psi$ in $L^1(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}})$ we have

$$|J_1(n)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^1(E, N_{\mathbb{Q}}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (78)$$

For dealing with $J_2(n)$, note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma_n(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] = \mathbb{E}[\Psi | \Gamma(h + d(x, \cdot)) = r] \quad (79)$$

because Γ_n is decreasing to Γ , see e.g. [Du02, 10.1.7]. Now step 2 follows from (78) and (79).

Step 3. Esistence of $D_x R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi$, for all $\varphi \in C_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$.

Let us recall that by Proposition 9 and Steps 1,2 we know that

(i) there exists the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) = R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}.$$

(ii) there exists the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y =: \Xi(x) \cdot y \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}, y \in H.$$

(iii) There exists $M_{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}} > 0$ such that

$$|R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)| + |D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)| \leq M_{\|\varphi\|_{\infty}}, \quad \forall x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}. \quad (80)$$

Let now $x, x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_r}$. Since

$$R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) - R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x_0) = \int_0^1 (D_x R_{T,n}^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi)(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) d\alpha.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain, by the dominated convergence theorem

$$R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) - R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x_0) = \int_0^1 \Xi(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) d\alpha.$$

This implies that $R_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x)$ is differentiable at x in the direction y and

$$DR_T^{\mathcal{O}_r} \varphi(x) \cdot y = \Psi(x) \cdot y.$$

Step 4. $\varphi \in B_b(\overline{\mathcal{O}_r})$

Since $R_T^{\mathcal{O}}$ is strong Feller (Proposition 7), we have $R_{T/2}^{\mathcal{O}} \in C_b(H)$, so, the conclusion follows starting from $T/2$.

The proof is complete. □

Example 21. We continue here Example 2 Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have $e^{tA} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ t & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $e^{tA^*} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ We have seen that Hypothesis 1 is fulfilled. Let U as in Lemma 5

$$U = \int_0^T r e^{rA} C e^{rA^*} dr = \int_0^T \begin{pmatrix} r & r^2 \\ r^2 & r^3 \end{pmatrix} ds = \frac{1}{12} \begin{pmatrix} 6T^2 & 4T^3 \\ 4T^3 & 3T^4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (81)$$

so that $\det U > 0$ and

$$U^{-1} = \frac{6}{T^2} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & -\frac{4}{T} \\ -\frac{4}{T} & \frac{6}{T^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 6 we have

$$u(x, s) = \frac{6}{T^4} \begin{pmatrix} T^2 - 2Ts & 2(T - 3s) \\ 2T & 6 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x \in H, \quad s \in [0, T].$$

So,

$$|u(x, s)|_H \leq T^{-4} C_1(T) |x|_H \quad (82)$$

and

$$|K(t, s)|_H \leq C_2(T), \quad \forall t, s \in [0, T], \quad (83)$$

where $C_1(T), C_2(T)$ are continuous in $(0, +\infty)$. Moreover

$$|a(t, x)|_H = |\mathbb{Q}_T u(t, x)|_H \leq T^{-3} C_1(T) |x|_H \quad (84)$$

Finally, $G(x, h) = \langle u(t, x), h \rangle_H \leq |h|_X |u(t, x)|$.

Concerning Hypothesis 2, assume that $g(x) = |x|^2$. Then

$$\Lambda(x, r) = \int_{\|h+d(x, \cdot)\|_E \leq r} N_{\mathbb{Q}_T}(dh)$$

Note that by (60) we know that $D_r \Lambda(x, r)$ is uniformly bounded in x .

References

- [AiMa88] H. Airault and P. Malliavin. *Intégration géométrique sur l'espace de Wiener*, Bull. Sci. Math. **112**, 3–52, 1988.
- [Bo98] V.I. Bogachev, *Gaussian Measures*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1998.
- [Ce01] S. Cerrai, *Second order PDE's in finite and infinite dimension. A probabilistic approach*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1762. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [BoDaTu18] S. Bonaccorsi, G. Da Prato and L. Tubaro, *Construction of a surface integral under local Malliavin assumptions, and related integration by parts formulas*. J. Evol. Equ. , no. 2, 871–897, 2018.
- [DaLuTu14] G. Da Prato, A. Lunardi and L. Tubaro, *Surface measures in infinite dimension*, Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl. **25**, 309–330, 2014.
- [DaZa14] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, second edition, 2014.
- [Du02] R. M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 2002.
- [KoFo70] A.N. Kolmogorov and S.V. Fomin, *Introductory real analysis*. Dover, New York, 1970.
- [Li86] W. Linde, *Gaussian measure of translated nballs in Banach spaces*, Theory Probab. Appl. **34**, no.2, 1986.
- [Nu06] D. Nualart, *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*. Probability and its Applications, Springer-Verlag, 1995. Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [Ph78] R. R. Phelps, Gaussian null sets and differentiability of Lipschitz map on Banach spaces, *Pac. J. Math.*, **77**, 523-531, 1978.
- [Ta00] A. Talarczyk, *Dirichlet problem for parabolic equations on Hilbert spaces*, Studia Math., **141**, 109-142, 2000.
- [Za92] J.Zabczyk, *Mathematical Control Theory: An Introduction*, Birkhäuser, 1992.