

COMPOUND POISSON PARTICLE APPROXIMATION FOR MCKEAN-VLASOV SDES

XICHENG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We present a comprehensive discretization scheme for linear and nonlinear stochastic differential equations (SDEs) driven by either Brownian motions or α -stable processes. Our approach utilizes compound Poisson particle approximations, allowing for simultaneous discretization of both the time and space variables in McKean-Vlasov SDEs. Notably, the approximation processes can be represented as a Markov chain with values on a lattice. Importantly, we demonstrate the propagation of chaos under relatively mild assumptions on the coefficients, including those with polynomial growth. This result establishes the convergence of the particle approximations towards the true solutions of the McKean-Vlasov SDEs. By only imposing moment conditions on the intensity measure of compound Poisson processes, our approximation exhibits universality. In the case of ordinary differential equations (ODEs), we investigate scenarios where the drift term satisfies the one-sided Lipschitz assumption. We prove the optimal convergence rate for Filippov solutions in this setting. Additionally, we establish a functional central limit theorem (CLT) for the approximation of ODEs and show the convergence of invariant measures for linear SDEs. As a practical application, we construct a compound Poisson approximation for 2D-Navier Stokes equations on the torus and demonstrate the optimal convergence rate.

Keywords: Compound Poisson approximation, McKean-Vlasov stochastic differential equation, Invariance measure, Navier-Stokes equation, Central Limit Theorem.

AMS 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 65C35, 60H10, 35Q30

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Poisson processes approximation for ODEs	3
1.2. Compound Poisson approximation for SDEs	5
1.3. Compound Poisson particle approximation for DDSDEs	6
1.4. Organization of the paper and notations	7
2. Poisson process approximation for ODEs	8
2.1. Classical solutions for ODEs with Lipschitz coefficients	9
2.2. Filippov solutions for ODEs with one-sided Lipschitz coefficients	13
2.3. DiPerna-Lions solutions for ODEs with $\mathbb{W}^{1,q}$ -coefficients	17
2.4. Particle approximation for DDODEs	19
3. Compound Poisson approximation for SDEs	24
3.1. Weak convergence of approximating SDEs	29
3.2. Convergence of invariant measures	37
3.3. Rate of weak convergence	38
4. Compound Poisson approximation for 2D-NSEs	40
4.1. Diffeomorphism flow of SDEs driven by compound Poisson processes	40
4.2. Compound Poisson approximation for 2D-NSEs	42

This work is partially supported by NNSFC grants of China (Nos. 12131019), and the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Collaborative Research Centre(CRC) 1283 “Taming uncertainty and profiting from randomness and low regularity in analysis, stochastics and their applications”.

5.	Propagation of chaos for the particle approximation of DDSDEs	46
5.1.	Fractional diffusion with bounded interaction kernel	48
5.2.	Brownian diffusion with unbounded interaction kernel	54
5.3.	\mathcal{W}_1 -convergence rate under Lipschitz assumptions	58
6.	Appendix: Martingale solutions	59
	References	63

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be two Borel measurable functions. Throughout this paper, for a probability measure μ over \mathbb{R}^d , we write

$$\sigma[t, x, \mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(t, x, y) \mu(dy), \quad b[t, x, \mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(t, x, y) \mu(dy).$$

Fix $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and consider the following McKean-Vlasov SDE or distribution-dependent SDE (abbreviated as DDSDE):

$$dX_t = \sigma[t, X_t, \mu_t] dL_t^{(\alpha)} + b[t, X_t, \mu_t] dt, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mu_t = \mu_{X_t}$ denotes the probability distribution of X_t , $L_t^{(2)} = W_t$ stands for a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion, and for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $L_t^{(\alpha)}$ is a symmetric and rotationally invariant α -stable process with infinitesimal generator $\Delta^{\alpha/2}$ (the usual fractional Laplacian operator).

In the literature, DDSDE (1.1) is also considered as a nonlinear SDE due to the dependence of its coefficients on the distribution of the solution. By applying Itô's formula, μ_t solves the following nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation in the distributional sense:

$$\partial_t \mu_t = \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu_t}^* \mu_t,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^*$ is the adjoint operator of the generator (local/nonlocal) of SDE (1.1): for $\alpha = 2$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu} f(x) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma[t, x, \mu] \sigma^*[t, x, \mu] \cdot \nabla^2 f(x)) + b[t, x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x),$$

and for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu} f(x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma[t, x, \mu]z) - f(x)}{|z|^{d+\alpha}} dz + b[t, x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x),$$

where σ^* stands for the transpose of matrix σ and p.v. stands for the Cauchy principle value.

In the seminal work by McKean [31], the study of nonlinear SDE (1.1) driven by Brownian motions was initiated. His paper established a natural connection between nonlinear Markov processes and nonlinear parabolic equations. Since then, the McKean-Vlasov SDE has evolved into a fundamental mathematical framework, offering a powerful tool for analyzing complex systems comprising a large number of interacting particles. The McKean-Vlasov SDE describes the dynamics of a single particle, influenced by the collective behavior of the entire system. Its applications have expanded across various fields, including statistical physics, stochastic analysis, economics, and biology. Through the study of the McKean-Vlasov SDE, researchers have gained significant understanding of diverse phenomena, ranging from the behavior of particles in statistical mechanics to intricate dynamics in economic and biological systems. Its utility extends beyond theoretical investigations, playing a vital role in the development of numerical methods, data analysis techniques, and decision-making models. For a more comprehensive overview and references, the survey paper by [6] provides valuable insights into the McKean-Vlasov SDE and its wide-ranging applications.

When b and σ satisfy the following Lipschitz assumption

$$\|\sigma(t, x, y) - \sigma(t, x', y')\| + |b(t, x, y) - b(t, x', y')| \leq \kappa(|x - x'| + |y - y'|), \quad (1.2)$$

it is well-known that for any initial value X_0 , there is a unique strong solution to DDSDE (1.1) (see [40], [6]). From the perspective of Monte-Carlo simulations and practical applications, the McKean-Vlasov SDEs (1.1) are often approximated using an interaction particle system. In the case of Brownian motions ($\alpha = 2$), the approximation takes the following form: For fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{X}^N := (X^{N,1}, \dots, X^{N,N})$ solve the following SDE in \mathbb{R}^{Nd} :

$$dX_t^{N,i} = \sigma[t, X_t^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N}]dW_t^i + b[t, X_t^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N}]dt, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\{W^i, i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Brownian motions, and for a point $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$, the empirical measure of \mathbf{x} is defined by

$$\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(dz) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}(dz) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where δ_{x^i} is the usual Dirac measure concentrated at point x^i . Under Lipschitz assumption (1.2), it is well-known that for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{i=1, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N,i} - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \right) \leq \frac{C}{N},$$

where \bar{X}_t^i solves SDE (1.1) driven by Brownian motion W^i . Since $\bar{X}^i, i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent, the above estimate indicates that the particle system becomes statistically independent as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This property is commonly referred to as the propagation of chaos (see [40], [6]). Furthermore, the fluctuation

$$\eta_t^N := \sqrt{N}(\mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N} - \mu_{X_t})$$

weakly converges to an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (cf. [13]). However, for numerical simulation purposes, it is still necessary to discretize the particle system (1.3) along the time direction by employing methods such as the explicit or implicit Euler's scheme (see [25]).

The objective of this paper is to present a comprehensive discretization scheme for DDSDE (1.1). Our approximation SDE is driven by compound Poisson processes and possesses the advantage of being easily simulated on a computer. Moreover, our proposed scheme not only allows for efficient numerical simulation of the DDSDE but also provides lattice approximations for the equation.

1.1. Poisson processes approximation for ODEs. Numerical methods for ordinary differential equations (ODEs) encompass well-established techniques such as Euler's method, the Runge-Kutta methods, and more advanced methods like the Adams-Bashforth methods and the backward differentiation formulas. These methods enable us to approximate the solution of an ODE over a given interval by evaluating the function at discrete points. In this work, we aim to develop a stochastic approximation method tailored for rough ODEs, which exhibit irregular behavior or involve coefficients that are not smooth.

Let us consider the classical ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\dot{X}_t = b(t, X_t), \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.4)$$

Suppose that the time-dependent vector field $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies the one-sided Lipschitz condition

$$\langle x - y, b(s, x) - b(s, y) \rangle \leq \kappa |x - y|^2 \text{ for a.e. } (s, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.5)$$

and linear growth assumption:

$$|b(s, x)| \leq \kappa(1 + |x|). \quad (1.6)$$

Note that under (1.5), b need not even be continuous. By smooth approximation, it is easy to see that in the sense of distributions, (1.5) is equivalent to (see [5, Lemma 2.2])

$$\text{Sym}(\nabla b) := \frac{\nabla b + (\nabla b)^*}{2} \leq \kappa \mathbb{I}, \quad (1.7)$$

where \mathbb{I} stands for the identity matrix. In particular, if $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a semiconvex function, that is, the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 f$ has a lower bound in the distributional sense, then for $b = -\nabla f$, (1.7) and (1.5) hold.

When b is Lipschitz continuous in x , it is well-known that the flow $\{X_t(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}_{t \geq 0}$ associated to ODE (1.4) is closely related to the linear transport equation

$$\partial_t u + b(t, x) \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad (1.8)$$

and the dual continuity equation

$$\partial_t f + \operatorname{div}(b(t, x)f) = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

In [11], DiPerna and Lions established a well-posedness theory for ODE (1.4) for Lebesgue almost all starting point x by studying the renormalization solution to linear transport equation (1.8) with b being $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}$ -regularity and having bounded divergence, where $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}$ is the usual first order Sobolev space and $p \geq 1$. Subsequently, Ambrosio [1] extended the DiPerna-Lions theory to the case that $b \in BV_{loc}$ and $\operatorname{div} b \in L^1$ by studying the continuity equation (1.9) and using deep results from geometric measure theory. It is noticed that these aforementioned results do not apply to vector field b that satisfies the one-sided Lipschitz condition (1.5).

On the other hand, under the conditions (1.5) and (1.6), the ODE (1.4) can be uniquely solved in the sense of Filippov [14], resulting in a solution family $\{X_t(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}_{t \geq 0}$ that forms a Lipschitz flow in (t, x) (see Theorem 2.8 below). In a recent study, Lions and Seeger [28] investigated the relationship between the solvability of (1.8) and (1.9) and ODE (1.4) when b satisfies (1.5) and (1.6). Condition (1.5) naturally arise in fluid dynamics (cf. [5] and [28]), optimal control theory and viability theory (cf. [2]). From a practical application standpoint, it is desirable to construct an easily implementable numerical scheme. However, the direct Euler scheme is not suitable for solving the ODE (1.4) when b satisfies condition (1.5) or $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}$ -regularity conditions. Our objective in the following discussion is to develop a direct discretization scheme that is well-suited for addressing the aforementioned cases.

For given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $(\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Poisson process with intensity $1/\varepsilon$ (see (2.1) below for a precise definition). We consider the following simple SDE driven only by Poisson process \mathcal{N}^ε :

$$X_t^\varepsilon = x + \varepsilon \int_0^t b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon, \quad (1.10)$$

where X_{s-}^ε stands for the left-hand limit. Since the Poisson process $\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon$ only jumps at exponentially distributed waiting times, the above SDE is always solvable as long as the coefficient b takes finite values. Under (1.5) and (1.6), we show the following convergence: for any $T > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t|^2 \right) \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

where X is the unique Filippov solution of ODE (1.4) and $C = C(\kappa, d, T) > 0$ (see Theorem 2.11). Furthermore, in the sense of DiPerna and Lions (cf. [11] and [9]), we establish the convergence of X^ε in probability to the exact solution under certain $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}$ assumptions on b (see Corollary 2.14). This convergence result is particularly significant as it allows for the construction of Monte-Carlo approximations for the first-order partial differential equations (PDEs) (1.8) or (1.9). In fact, in subsection 2.4, we delve into the study of particle approximations for distribution-dependent ODEs, which are closely related to nonlinear PDEs.

One important aspect to highlight is that unlike the classical Euler scheme, our proposed scheme does not rely on any continuity assumptions in the time variable t . In fact, for any $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \varepsilon \int_0^1 f(s) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon - \int_0^1 f(s) ds \right|^2 = \varepsilon \int_0^1 |f(s)|^2 ds.$$

We complement the theoretical analysis with numerical experiments to showcase the scheme's performance, as illustrated in Remark 2.3.

1.2. Compound Poisson approximation for SDEs. Now we consider the classical stochastic differential equation driven by α -stable processes: for $\alpha \in (0, 2]$,

$$dX_t = \sigma(t, X_t)dL_t^{(\alpha)} + b(t, X_t)dt, \quad X_0 = x. \quad (1.11)$$

The traditional Euler scheme, also known as the Euler-Maruyama scheme, for SDE (1.11) and its variants have been extensively studied in the literature from both theoretical and numerical perspectives. When the coefficients b and σ are globally Lipschitz continuous, it is well-known that the explicit Euler-Maruyama algorithm for SDEs driven by Brownian motions exhibits strong convergence rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ and weak convergence rate of 1 (see [4], [19]).

In the case where the drift satisfies certain monotonicity conditions and the diffusion coefficient satisfies locally Lipschitz assumptions, Gyöngy [15] proved almost sure convergence and convergence in probability of the Euler-Maruyama scheme (see Krylov's earlier work [26]). However, Hutzenthaler, Jentzen, and Kloeden [21] provided examples illustrating the divergence of the absolute moments of Euler's approximations at a finite time. In other words, it is not possible to establish strong convergence of the Euler scheme in the L^p -sense for SDEs with drift terms exhibiting super-linear growth. To overcome this issue, Hutzenthaler, Jentzen, and Kloeden [22] introduced a tamed Euler scheme, where the drift term is modified to be bounded. This modification allows them to demonstrate strong convergence in the L^p -sense with a rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ to the exact solution of the SDE, assuming the drift coefficient is globally one-sided Lipschitz continuous. Subsequently, Sabanis [35] improved upon the tamed scheme of [22] to cover more general cases and provided simpler proofs for the strong convergence.

On the other hand, there is also a considerable body of literature addressing the Euler approximations for SDEs with irregular coefficients, such as Hölder and even singular drifts (see [3], [33], [39], and references therein). However, to the best of our knowledge, there are relatively few results concerning the Euler scheme for SDEs driven by α -stable processes and under non-Lipschitz conditions (with the exception of [32], [27] which focus on the additive noise case).

Our goal is to develop a unified compound Poisson approximation scheme for the SDE (1.11), which is driven by either purely jumping α -stable processes or Brownian motions. To achieve this, let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables taking values in \mathbb{Z}^d , such that for any integer lattice value $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_n = z) = \begin{cases} (2d)^{-1}, & |z| = 1, & \alpha = 2, \\ c_0|z|^{-d-\alpha}, & z \neq 0, & \alpha \in (0, 2), \end{cases} \quad (1.12)$$

where $c_0 = (\sum_{0 \neq z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |z|^{-d-\alpha})^{-1}$ is a normalized constant. Let $\xi_0 = 0$. We define a \mathbb{Z}^d -valued compound Poisson process H^ε by

$$H_t^\varepsilon := \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} \xi_n, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.13)$$

where $(\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Poisson process with intensity $1/\varepsilon$. Let \mathcal{H}^ε be the associated Poisson random measure, i.e., for $t > 0$ and $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon([0, t], E) := \sum_{s \leq t} \mathbb{1}_E(\Delta H_s^\varepsilon) = \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_E(\xi_n).$$

Consider the following SDE driven by compound Poisson process \mathcal{H}^ε :

$$X_t^\varepsilon = x + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \sigma(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) z + \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \right) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz), \quad (1.14)$$

where the integral is a finite sum since the compound Poisson process only jumps at exponentially distributed waiting times. Let S_n^ε be the n -th jump time of $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$. It is easy to see that (see Lemma 3.4)

$$X_t^\varepsilon = x + \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \sigma(S_n^\varepsilon, X_{S_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \xi_n + \varepsilon b(S_n^\varepsilon, X_{S_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right).$$

Indeed, it is possible to choose different independent Poisson processes for the drift and diffusion coefficients in the compound Poisson approximation scheme. However, it is worth noting that doing so would increase the computational time required for simulations. By using the same compound Poisson process for both coefficients, the computational efficiency can be improved as the generation of random numbers for the Poisson process is shared between the drift and diffusion terms.

We note that the problem of approximating continuous diffusions by jump processes has been studied in [23, p.558, Theorem 4.21] under rather abstract conditions. However, from a numerical approximation or algorithmic standpoint, the explicit procedure (1.14) does not seem to have been thoroughly investigated. In this paper, we establish the weak convergence of X^ε to X in the space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of all càdlàg functions under weak assumptions. Notably, these assumptions allow for coefficients with polynomial growth. Furthermore, under nondegenerate and additive noise assumptions, as well as Hölder continuity assumptions on the drift, we establish the following weak convergence rate: for some $\beta = \beta(\alpha) \in (0, 1)$, for any $T > 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$,

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t)| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1} \varepsilon^\beta.$$

It is worth mentioning that when $b = 0$ and σ is the identity matrix, the convergence of X^ε to X corresponds to the classical Donsker invariant principle. Additionally, when the drift b satisfies certain dissipativity assumptions, we show the weak convergence of the invariant measure μ^ε of SDE (1.14) to the invariant measure μ of SDE (1.11), provided that the latter is unique.

As an application, we consider the discretized probabilistic approximation in the time direction for the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations (NSEs) on the torus. Specifically, for a fixed $T > 0$, we focus on the vorticity form of the backward 2D-Navier-Stokes equations on the torus, given by:

$$\partial_s w + \nu \Delta w + u \cdot \nabla w = 0, \quad w(T) = w_0 = \text{curl} \varphi, \quad u = K_2 * w,$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a smooth divergence-free vector field on the torus, and K_2 represents the Biot-Savart law (as described in (4.8) below). The stochastic Lagrangian particle method for NSEs has been previously studied in [8] and [43]. In this paper, we propose a discretized version of the NSEs, defined as follows: for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $X_{s,t}^\varepsilon$ solve the following stochastic system

$$\begin{cases} X_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x) = x + \varepsilon \int_s^t u_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r-}^\varepsilon(x)) d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon \nu} (H_t^\varepsilon - H_s^\varepsilon), \\ w_\varepsilon(s, x) = \mathbb{E} w_0(X_{s,T}^\varepsilon(x)), \quad u_\varepsilon = K_2 * w_\varepsilon, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T, \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

where H_t^ε is defined in (1.13). We establish that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $s \in [0, T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\|u_\varepsilon(s) - u(s)\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon.$$

The scheme (1.15) provides a novel approach for simulating 2D-NSEs using Monte Carlo methods, offering a promising method for computational simulations of these equations.

1.3. Compound Poisson particle approximation for DDSDEs. Motivated by the aforementioned scheme, we can develop a compound Poisson particle approximation for the nonlinear SDE (1.1). Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(\mathcal{N}^{N,i})_{i=1, \dots, N}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. Poisson processes with intensity N and $(\xi_n^{N,i})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i=1, \dots, N}$ i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables with common distribution (1.12). Define for $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$H_t^{N,i} := \left(\xi_1^{N,i} + \dots + \xi_{\mathcal{N}_t^{N,i}}^{N,i} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{N,i} \geq 1}.$$

Then $(H^{N,i})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. compound Poisson processes. Let $\mathcal{H}^{N,i}$ be the associated Poisson random measure, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N,i}([0, t], E) := \sum_{s \leq t} \mathbb{1}_E(\Delta H_s^{N,i}) = \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{N,i}} \mathbb{1}_E(\xi_n^{N,i}), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $(X_0^{N,i})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ be a sequence of symmetric random variables and $\mathbf{X}_t^N = (X_t^{N,i})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ solve the following interaction particle system driven by $\mathcal{H}^{N,i}$:

$$X_t^{N,i} = X_0^{N,i} + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \sigma[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}] z + N^{-1} b[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}] \right) \mathcal{H}^{N,i}(ds, dz). \quad (1.16)$$

Under suitable assumptions on σ , b , and \mathbf{X}_0^N , we will show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (X^{N,1}, \dots, X^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_0^{\otimes k} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.17)$$

where \mathbb{P}_0 represents the law of the solution of the DDSDE (1.1) in the space of càdlàg functions, and $\mathbb{P}_0^{\otimes k}$ denotes the k -fold product measure induced by \mathbb{P}_0 . Here, we have chosen $\varepsilon = 1/N$ in (1.14). In contrast to the traditional particle approximation (1.3), the stochastic particle system (1.16) is fully discretized and can be easily simulated on a computer. The convergence result (1.17) can be interpreted as the propagation of chaos in the sense of Kac [24]. Furthermore, in the case of additive noise, we also establish the quantitative convergence rate with respect to the Wasserstein metric \mathcal{W}_1 under Lipschitz conditions.

1.4. Organization of the paper and notations. This paper is structured as follows:

In Section 2, we introduce the Poisson process approximation for ordinary differential equations (ODEs). We investigate the case where the vector field b is bounded Lipschitz continuous and establish the optimal convergence rate in both the strong and weak senses. Additionally, we present a functional central limit theorem in this setting. Furthermore, we consider the case where b satisfies the one-sided Lipschitz condition (not necessarily continuous), allowing for linear growth. We demonstrate the L^p -strong convergence of X^ε to the unique Filippov solution. When the vector field b belongs to the first-order Sobolev space $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}$ and has bounded divergence, we also show the convergence in probability of X^ε to X . Moreover, we explore particle approximation methods for nonlinear ODEs.

In Section 3, we focus on the compound Poisson approximation for stochastic differential equations (SDEs), which provides a more general framework than the one described in (1.14) above. Under relatively weak assumptions, we establish the weak convergence of X^ε , the convergence of invariant measures, as well as the weak convergence rate.

In Section 4, we concentrate on the 2D Navier-Stokes/Euler equations on the torus and propose a novel compound Poisson approximation scheme for these equations.

In Section 5, we specifically examine the compound Poisson particle approximation for DDSDEs driven by either α -stable processes or Brownian motions. Notably, we consider the case where the interaction kernel exhibits linear growth in the Brownian diffusion case. In the additive noise case, we establish the convergence rate in terms of the \mathcal{W}_1 metric.

In the Appendix, we provide a summary of the relevant notions and facts about martingale solutions that are utilized throughout the paper.

Throughout this paper, we use C with or without subscripts to denote constants, whose values may change from line to line. We also use $:=$ to indicate a definition and set

$$a \wedge b := \max(a, b), \quad a \vee b := \min(a, b).$$

By $A \lesssim_C B$ or simply $A \lesssim B$, we mean that for some constant $C \geq 1$, $A \leq CB$. For the readers' convenience, we collect some frequently used notations below.

- $\mathcal{P}(E)$: The space of all probability measures over a Polish space E .
- $\mathcal{B}(E)$: The Borel σ -algebra of a Polish space E .

- \Rightarrow : Weak convergence of probability measures or random variables.
- $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$: The space of all càdlàg functions from $[0, \infty)$ to \mathbb{R}^d .
- $\Delta f_s := f_s - f_{s-}$: The jump of $f \in \mathbb{D}$ at time s .
- \mathcal{T} : The set of all bounded stopping times.
- C_b^β : The usual Hölder spaces of β -order.
- B_R : The ball in \mathbb{R}^d with radius R and center 0.

2. POISSON PROCESS APPROXIMATION FOR ODES

In this section, we focus on the simple Poisson approximation for ODEs. A distinguishing feature of our approach is that we do not make any regularity assumptions on the time variable. Moreover, we allow the coefficient to satisfy only the one-sided Lipschitz condition (1.5). The convergence analysis relies on straightforward stochastic calculus involving Poisson processes.

Let $(T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with common exponential distribution of parameter 1, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_k \geq t) = e^{-t}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Let $S_0 \equiv 0$, and for $n \geq 1$, define

$$S_n := S_{n-1} + T_n,$$

and for $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{N}_t := \max\{n : S_n \leq t\}.$$

Then \mathcal{N}_t is a standard Poisson process with intensity 1. In particular, S_n is the jump time of \mathcal{N}_t .




FIGURE 1. Standard Poisson process

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}T_k = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\mathcal{N}_t = t, \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{N}_t - t)^2 = t.$$

For given $\varepsilon > 0$, we introduce

$$\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon := \mathcal{N}_{t/\varepsilon}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t^\varepsilon := \mathcal{N}_{t/\varepsilon} - t/\varepsilon. \quad (2.1)$$

Then $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$ is a Poisson process with intensity $1/\varepsilon$. In this paper, we choose a sub- σ field $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$, which is independent of $(T_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and therefore independent of $(\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$. We assume that \mathcal{F}_0 is sufficiently rich so that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable X_0 such that $\mathbb{P} \circ X_0^{-1} = \mu$. In particular, if we introduce the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_t^\varepsilon := \mathcal{F}_0 \vee \sigma\{\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon : s \leq t\}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

then one can verify that $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t^\varepsilon$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t^\varepsilon$ -martingale.

In the following, we will utilize an SDE driven by Poisson process $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$ to construct a discrete approximation for ODEs. We will demonstrate the convergence of this approximation under various assumptions and establish certain functional central limit theorems.

2.1. Classical solutions for ODEs with Lipschitz coefficients. In this section, we begin by considering the case where the vector fields are bounded and Lipschitz. We demonstrate the optimal rates of strong and weak convergence for the Poisson process approximation as introduced in the introduction. Additionally, we establish a central limit theorem for this approximation scheme.

Let $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a measurable vector field. Suppose that

$$\|b\|_\infty + \|\nabla b\|_\infty < \infty, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the usual L^∞ -norm in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$. For any \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable initial value X_0 , by the Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem, there is a unique global solution X_t to the following ODE:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s) ds. \quad (2.3)$$

Let $X_t(x)$ be the unique solution starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then

$$X_t = X_t(x)|_{x=X_0}.$$

Now we consider the following SDE driven by Poisson process \mathcal{N}^ε :

$$X_t^\varepsilon = X_0 + \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon. \quad (2.4)$$

Since $s \mapsto \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon$ is a step function (see Figure 1), it is easy to see that

$$X_t^\varepsilon = X_0 + \varepsilon \sum_{s \leq t} b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon = X_0 + \varepsilon \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b(S_n^\varepsilon, X_{S_{n-1}^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \mathbb{1}_{S_n^\varepsilon \leq t},$$

where $\Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon := \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon - \mathcal{N}_{s-}^\varepsilon$ and $S_n^\varepsilon := \varepsilon S_n$. In particular,

$$X_t^\varepsilon - X_{t-}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon b(t, X_{t-}^\varepsilon) \Delta \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$X_t^\varepsilon = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) ds + \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon, \quad (2.6)$$

where we have used that $b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) = b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)$ except countable many points s . It is worth noting that the solvability of the SDE (2.5) does not need any regularity assumptions on b , and the second integral term is a martingale. In a sense, we can view (2.5) as an Euler scheme with random step sizes. Furthermore, let $X_t^\varepsilon(x)$ be the unique solution of (2.4) starting from x . Then

$$X_t^\varepsilon = X_t^\varepsilon(x)|_{x=X_0}.$$

Hence, if $X_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ has a density, then for each $t > 0$, X_t^ε also possesses a density.

First of all we show the following simple approximation result.

Theorem 2.1. (i) (Strong Convergence) *Under (2.2), for any $T > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t|^2 \right) \leq 4e^{2\|\nabla b\|_\infty T} \|b\|_\infty^2 T \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

(ii) (Weak Convergence) *Under (2.2) and $\|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty < \infty$, for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(T, \|b\|_{C_b^2}) > 0$ such that for any f with $\|\nabla f\|_{C_b^1} < \infty$ and $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}f(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E}f(X_t)| \leq C \|\nabla f\|_{C_b^1} \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Proof. Noting that by (2.6) and (2.3),

$$X_t^\varepsilon - X_t = \int_0^t (b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s)) ds + \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t| &\leq \left| \int_0^t (b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s)) ds \right| + \left| \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right| \\ &\leq \|\nabla b\|_\infty \int_0^t |X_s^\varepsilon - X_s| ds + \left| \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Gronwall's inequality and Doob's maximal inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t|^2 \right) &\leq e^{2\|\nabla b\|_\infty T} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4e^{2\|\nabla b\|_\infty T} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right|^2 \\ &= 4e^{2\|\nabla b\|_\infty T} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |\varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &\leq 4e^{2\|\nabla b\|_\infty T} \|b\|_\infty^2 T \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Fix $t > 0$ and $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $u(s, x)$ solve the backward transport equation:

$$\partial_s u + b \cdot \nabla u = 0, \quad u(t, x) = f(x). \quad (2.7)$$

In fact, the unique solution of the above transport equation is given by

$$u(s, x) = f(X_{s,t}(x)),$$

where $X_{s,t}(x)$ solves the following ODE:

$$X_{s,t}(x) = x + \int_s^t b(r, X_{s,r}(x)) dr.$$

Since $\nabla b, \nabla f, \nabla^2 b, \nabla^2 f \in L^\infty$, by the chain rule, it is easy to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 u(s, \cdot)\|_\infty &\leq \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty \|\nabla X_{s,t}\|_\infty^2 + \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|\nabla^2 X_{s,t}\|_\infty \\ &\leq e^{4\|\nabla b\|_\infty(t-s)} \left(\|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty \right), \end{aligned}$$

and for the solution X_t of (2.3),

$$f(X_t) = u(t, X_t) = u(0, X_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_s u + b \cdot \nabla u)(s, X_s) ds = u(0, X_0). \quad (2.8)$$

Moreover, by Itô's formula we have

$$\mathbb{E} f(X_t^\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E} u(t, X_t^\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E} u(0, X_0) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left[\partial_s u(s, X_s^\varepsilon) + \frac{u(s, X_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)) - u(s, X_s^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \right] ds.$$

Hence, by (2.7) and (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} f(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E} f(X_t)| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^t b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) \cdot \int_0^1 \left(\nabla u(s, X_s^\varepsilon + \theta \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)) - \nabla u(s, X_s^\varepsilon) \right) d\theta ds \right| \\ &\leq \|b\|_\infty^2 \|\nabla^2 u\|_\infty \varepsilon \int_0^1 \theta d\theta \leq \|b\|_\infty^2 e^{4\|\nabla b\|_\infty t} \left(\|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty \|\nabla^2 b\|_\infty \right) \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.2. It is noted that the rate of weak convergence is better than the rate of strong convergence in the Poisson process approximation. The order of convergence, both in terms of strong and weak convergence, is the same as the classical Euler approximation of SDEs (see [25]).

Remark 2.3. Consider a measurable function f . For $\varepsilon > 0$, let us define

$$I_f^\varepsilon(t) := \varepsilon \int_0^t f(s) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon = \varepsilon \sum_{s \leq t} f(s) \Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon.$$

By applying Doob's maximal inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| I_f^\varepsilon(t) - \int_0^t f(s) ds \right|^2 \right] \leq 4\varepsilon \int_0^T |f(s)|^2 ds.$$

It is worth noting that the calculation of $I_f^\varepsilon(t)$ can be easily implemented on a computer, where the step size is randomly chosen according to the exponential distribution. As a result, we can utilize the Monte Carlo method to theoretically compute the integral $\int_0^T f(s) ds$. To illustrate the effectiveness of our scheme, we provide an example involving a highly oscillatory function:

$$f(s) := (1 - 2 * ([200 * s] \% 2)) * 100, \quad s \in [0, 1],$$

where $[a]$ stands for the integer part of a and $n \% 2 = 1$ or 0 depends on n being odd or even. Note that $t \mapsto \int_0^t f(s) ds =: F(t)$ oscillates between 0 and 0.5. We simulate the graph using both Euler's scheme and the Poisson approximation scheme, as depicted in Figure 2. From the graph, we can observe that Euler's scheme exhibits instability due to the regular choice of partition points. Conversely, Poisson's scheme demonstrates stability, with partition points being chosen randomly.




FIGURE 2. Comparison between Euler scheme and Poisson scheme

Next, we investigate the asymptotic distribution of the following deviation as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$Z_t^\varepsilon := \frac{X_t^\varepsilon - X_t}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.$$

By (2.4) and (2.6), it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t^\varepsilon &= \int_0^t \sqrt{\varepsilon} b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon + \int_0^t \frac{b(X_s^\varepsilon) - b(X_s)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \sqrt{\varepsilon} b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon + \int_0^t Z_s^\varepsilon B_s^\varepsilon ds, \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$B_s^\varepsilon := \int_0^1 \nabla b(s, \theta X_s^\varepsilon + (1 - \theta) X_s) d\theta = \int_0^1 \nabla b(s, X_s + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \theta Z_s^\varepsilon) d\theta.$$

Note that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\xi \sqrt{\varepsilon} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t^\varepsilon} = \exp \{ t\varepsilon^{-1} (e^{i\xi \sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1) - i\xi t / \sqrt{\varepsilon} \} \rightarrow e^{-\xi^2 t / 2}.$$

This implies that $\sqrt{\varepsilon}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t^\varepsilon$ weakly converges to a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion W_t . Therefore, we formally have $Z^\varepsilon \Rightarrow Z$, where Z solves the following linear SDE:

$$Z_t = \int_0^t b(s, X_s) dW_s + \int_0^t Z_s \cdot \nabla b(s, X_s) ds. \quad (2.10)$$

Clearly, Z_t is an OU process and its infinitesimal generator is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_s f(z) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((b \otimes b)(s, X_s) \cdot \nabla^2 f(z)) + \langle z \cdot \nabla b(s, X_s), \nabla f(z) \rangle. \quad (2.11)$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let \mathcal{L} be given in (2.11) with b being a bounded Lipschitz vector field. For any $(s, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a unique martingale solution $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_s^z(\mathcal{L})$ in the sense of Definition 6.2 in the appendix. Moreover, \mathbb{P} concentrates on the space of continuous functions.*

Proof. Since the diffusion coefficient does not depend on z and the drift is linear in z , it is easy to see that for any $(s, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a unique martingale solution $\mathbb{P}_{s,z} \in \mathcal{M}_s^z(\mathcal{L})$. Moreover, by Proposition 6.3 in appendix, \mathbb{P} concentrates on the space of continuous functions. \square

Now we show the following functional CLT about the above Z^ε .

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that b is bounded and Lipschitz continuous. Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{M}_0^0(\mathcal{L})$ be the unique martingale solution associated with \mathcal{L} starting from 0 at time 0. Let \mathbb{P}_ε be the law of $Z^\varepsilon := \frac{X^\varepsilon - X}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$ in the space \mathbb{D} of càdlàg functions, where X^ε is the unique solution of SDE (2.4) with the same fixed initial value $X_0 = x_0$ as X . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \mathbb{P} \text{ in } \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}).$$

Proof. First of all, for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, by (2.9) and Itô's formula, we have

$$f(Z_t^\varepsilon) = f(0) + \int_0^t \left[A_s^\varepsilon f(Z_s^\varepsilon) + (Z_s^\varepsilon B_s^\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla f(Z_s^\varepsilon) \right] ds + M_t^\varepsilon,$$

where $M_t^\varepsilon := \int_0^t (f(Z_{s-}^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) - f(Z_{s-}^\varepsilon)) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon$ is a martingale and

$$A_s^\varepsilon f(z) = \frac{f(z + \sqrt{\varepsilon}b(s, X_s)) - f(z) - \sqrt{\varepsilon}b(s, X_s) \cdot \nabla f(z)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, the infinitesimal generator of Z_t^ε is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(z) := A_s^\varepsilon f(z) + (z B_s^\varepsilon) \cdot \nabla f(z).$$

From the very definition, it is easy to see that for any $s, R > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{|z| \leq R} |\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(z) - \mathcal{L}_s f(z)| = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

In fact, noting that by Taylor's expansion,

$$A_s^\varepsilon f(z) = \int_0^1 \theta \int_0^1 \text{tr}((b \otimes b)(s, X_s) \cdot \nabla^2 f(z + \theta\theta' \sqrt{\varepsilon}b(s, X_s))) d\theta d\theta',$$

one sees that for each $s > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{|z| \leq R} \left| A_s^\varepsilon f(z) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((b \otimes b)(s, X_s) \cdot \nabla^2 f(z)) \right| = 0.$$

Moreover, by the definition of B_s^ε , we clearly have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |B_s^\varepsilon - \nabla b(s, X_s)| = 0.$$

Thus we have (2.12). On the other hand, by (2.9) and Gronwall's lemma, it is easy to see that for some $C > 0$,

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |Z_t^\varepsilon|^2 \right) \leq C,$$

and for any stopping time τ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0,\delta]} |Z_{\tau+t}^\varepsilon - Z_\tau^\varepsilon|^2 \right) \leq C\delta.$$

Thus, by Aldous' criterion (see [23, p356, Theorem 4.5]), $(\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ is tight. Let \mathbb{P}_0 be any accumulation point. By (2.12) and Theorem 6.4 in appendix, $\mathbb{P}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^0(\mathcal{L})$. By the uniqueness (see Proposition 2.4), one has $\mathbb{P}_0 = \mathbb{P}$. The proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.6. *We emphasize that in the above theorem, the initial value is a nonrandom fixed point. We shall consider the general random initial value in Theorem 2.19 below.*

2.2. Filippov solutions for ODEs with one-sided Lipschitz coefficients. In this section, our focus is on the Poisson process approximation for the ODE (2.3) with one-sided Lipschitz coefficients. We will explore the convergence properties and effectiveness of this approximation scheme in this setting.

(H^b) We assume that for some $\kappa > 0$ and all $(s, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\langle x - y, b(s, x) - b(s, y) \rangle \leq \kappa |x - y|^2, \quad |b(s, x)| \leq \kappa(1 + |x|).$$

Due to the lack of continuity of $x \mapsto b(s, x)$, assumption **(H^b)** does not guarantee the existence of a solution to the ODE (2.3) in the classical sense. In such cases, Filippov [14] introduced a concept of solution in the sense of differential inclusions, providing a unique solution to the ODE (2.3). This notion is closely connected to the study of differential inclusions as discussed in [2].

To define Filippov solutions, we introduce the supporting function H_b of b , defined by

$$H_b(t, x, w) := \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \operatorname{esssup}_{|y-x| \leq \delta} \langle b(t, y), w \rangle,$$

where the essential supremum is taken with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The essential convex hull of b is then given by

$$A_{t,x}^b := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle y, w \rangle \leq H_b(t, x, w), w \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

Note that $A_{t,x}^b$ is a closed convex subset and $H_b(t, x, \cdot)$ is precisely the support function of $A_{t,x}^b$.

Definition 2.7. *We call an absolutely continuous curve $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in \mathbb{R}^d a Filippov solution of ODE (2.3) starting from x_0 if $X_0 = x_0$ and for Lebesgue almost all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\dot{X}_t \in A_{t, X_t}^b.$$

In [14], Filippov proved the following result (see also [20, Theorem 1.42]) .

Theorem 2.8. *Under **(H^b)**, for any starting point $X_0 = x_0$, there is a unique Filippov solution $(X_t(x_0))_{t \geq 0}$ to ODE (2.3). Moreover, for any $x_0, x'_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \geq 0$,*

$$|X_t(x_0) - X_t(x'_0)| \leq e^{2\kappa t} |x_0 - x'_0|. \quad (2.13)$$

Let $b_\delta(t, x) := b(t, \cdot) * \rho_\delta(x)$ be the mollifier approximation of b , where $\rho_\delta(x) = \delta^{-d} \rho(x/\delta)$ and ρ is a smooth density function with compact support. Let $X_t^\delta(x_0)$ be the unique solution of ODE (2.3) corresponding to b_δ and starting from x_0 . Then for any $T > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\delta(x_0) - X_t(x_0)| = 0. \quad (2.14)$$

The existence of a Filippov solution can be established through a compactness argument, while the uniqueness follows from the one-sided Lipschitz condition. It is remarkable that we can show that the Filippov solution of the ODE (2.3) coincides with the L^p -limit of X^ε under assumption **(H^b)**. This result is particularly significant as it provides an explicit time discretization scheme for Filippov solutions. To prove this result, we begin by demonstrating a simple convergence estimate in the case where b is continuous in x .

Lemma 2.9. *Let $X_0^\varepsilon = \xi \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$. Suppose that (\mathbf{H}^b) and for each $t \geq 0$, $x \mapsto b(t, x)$ is continuous. Then for any $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, d, T, p) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon|^p \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p), \quad (2.15)$$

and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t|^{2p} \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p, \quad (2.16)$$

where X is the unique solution of ODE (2.3) starting from ξ .

Proof. For $p \geq 1$, by Itô's formula and $|x + y|^p - |x|^p \leq p|y|(|x| + |y|)^{p-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t^\varepsilon|^p &= |\xi|^p + \int_0^t (|X_{s-}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^p - |X_{s-}^\varepsilon|^p) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\ &\leq |\xi|^p + p\varepsilon \int_0^t |b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)| (|X_{s-}^\varepsilon| + \varepsilon |b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|)^{p-1} d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the linear growth of b in x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s^\varepsilon|^p \right) &\leq \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p + p\varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)| (|X_s^\varepsilon| + \varepsilon |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|)^{p-1} d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p + p\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)| (|X_s^\varepsilon| + \varepsilon |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|)^{p-1} ds \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p + C\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t (1 + |X_s^\varepsilon|^p) ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first estimate by Gronwall's inequality.

Next, we look at (2.16). Since $b(t, x)$ is continuous in x for each $t > 0$, it is well-known that there is a unique classical solution to ODE (2.3) under (\mathbf{H}^b) . Note that

$$Z_t := X_t^\varepsilon - X_t = \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon + \int_0^t [b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s)] ds.$$

By Itô's formula and (\mathbf{H}^b) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_t^\varepsilon|^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \langle Z_s^\varepsilon, b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s) \rangle ds + \int_0^t (|Z_{s-}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 - |Z_{s-}^\varepsilon|^2) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (|Z_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 - |Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 - 2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_s^\varepsilon), Z_s^\varepsilon \rangle) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leq 2\kappa \int_0^t |Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 ds + \int_0^t \left(2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon), Z_{s-}^\varepsilon \rangle + \varepsilon^2 |b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon \int_0^t |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Gronwall's inequality, (2.15) and BDG's inequality, we get for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |Z_s^\varepsilon|^{2p} \right) &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \left(2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon), Z_{s-}^\varepsilon \rangle + \varepsilon^2 |b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right|^p + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \left| 2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_s^\varepsilon), Z_s^\varepsilon \rangle + \varepsilon^2 |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 \right|^2 d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| 2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_s^\varepsilon), Z_s^\varepsilon \rangle + \varepsilon^2 |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 \right|^p d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t (|Z_s^\varepsilon|^4 + \varepsilon^2(1 + |X_s^\varepsilon|^4)) ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \varepsilon^2(1 + |X_s^\varepsilon|^2))^p d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p \\
&\lesssim \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|Z_s^\varepsilon|^{2p} ds + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p,
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies the desired estimate (2.16). \square

Next we show the continuous dependence of X^ε with respect to b and the initial values.

Lemma 2.10. (i) Let $X_0^\varepsilon = \xi \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ and $X^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ be the solution of ODE (2.4) corresponding to b_δ , where b_δ is the smooth approximation of b as in Theorem 2.8. Suppose (\mathbf{H}^b) and ξ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then for any $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, d, T, p) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{\varepsilon, \delta} - X_t^\varepsilon|^{2p} \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p. \quad (2.17)$$

(ii) Let $\xi, \tilde{\xi} \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ and $X^\varepsilon, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon$ be the solutions of ODE (2.4) corresponding to initial values ξ and $\tilde{\xi}$, respectively. Under (\mathbf{H}^b) , for any $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, d, T, p) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - \tilde{X}_t^\varepsilon|^{2p} \right) \leq C\mathbb{E}|\xi - \tilde{\xi}|^{2p} + C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p} + \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\xi}|^{2p})\varepsilon^p. \quad (2.18)$$

Proof. We will only prove (i) since (ii) follows in the same manner. Note that

$$Z_t := X_t^{\varepsilon, \delta} - X_t^\varepsilon = \int_0^t \varepsilon(b_\delta(s, X_{s-}^{\varepsilon, \delta}) - b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon = \int_0^t [\varepsilon B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta} + \varepsilon g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)] d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon,$$

where

$$B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta} := b_\delta(s, X_{s-}^{\varepsilon, \delta}) - b_\delta(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon), \quad g_s^\delta(x) := (b_\delta - b)(s, x).$$

By Itô's formula and (\mathbf{H}^b) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_t|^2 &= \int_0^t (|Z_{s-} + \varepsilon B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta} + \varepsilon g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 - |Z_{s-}|^2) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\
&= \int_0^t (2\varepsilon \langle B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta} + g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon), Z_{s-} \rangle + \varepsilon^2 |B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta} + g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\
&\leq \int_0^t \varepsilon \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_{s-}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2) \right) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\
&= \int_0^t \varepsilon \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_{s-}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2) \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_s|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2) \right) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $p \geq 2$, by BDG's inequality and (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |Z_s|^{2p} \right) &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \varepsilon \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_s|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2) \right) ds \right]^{p/2} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \varepsilon^{p-1} \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_s|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon, \delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2) \right)^p ds \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \left((2\kappa + 1)|Z_s|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + 2\varepsilon(|B_s^{\varepsilon,\delta}|^2 + |g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^2) \right) ds \right]^p \\
& \lesssim \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|Z_s|^{2p} ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^{2p} ds + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used the linear growth of b and estimate (2.15), and the implicit constant only depends on κ, d, T, p . By Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Z_t|^{2p} \right) \lesssim \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^{2p} ds + (1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p.$$

Since for fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $s \in [0, T]$, the law of X_s^ε is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, by the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|g_s^\delta(X_s^\varepsilon)|^{2p} ds = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |b_\delta - b|^{2p}(s, x) \rho_s^\varepsilon(x) dx ds = 0,$$

where $\rho_s^\varepsilon(x)$ is the density of X_s^ε . Thus we obtain the limit (2.17). \square

Now we can show the following main result of this section.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\xi \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ and $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the unique Filippov solution of ODE (2.3) with $X_0 = \xi$. Then for any $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, d, T, p) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t|^{2p} \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p. \quad (2.19)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps.

(Step 1). In this step we assume that ξ has a density. Let $X_t^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ be the unique solution of ODE (2.4) corresponding to b_δ and starting from ξ . By (2.16), for any $T > 0$ and $p \geq 1$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, d, T, p) > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{\varepsilon, \delta} - X_t^\delta|^{2p} \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p.$$

By (2.14), (2.17) and taking limits $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get (2.19).

(Step 2). For general $\xi \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$. Let $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_0$ be a standard normal distribution and independent of ξ . Define

$$\xi_\delta := \xi + \delta\eta, \quad \delta > 0.$$

Clearly, $\xi_\delta \in \cap_{p>1} L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$ has a density and for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\xi_\delta|^p \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^p), \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}|\xi_\delta - \xi|^p = 0.$$

Let $\tilde{X}^{\varepsilon, \delta}$ be the unique solution of ODE (2.4) with $\tilde{X}_0^{\varepsilon, \delta} = \xi_\delta$ and \tilde{X}^δ be the unique Filippov solution of ODE (2.3) with $\tilde{X}_0^\delta = \xi_\delta$. By what we have proved in Step 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\tilde{X}_t^{\varepsilon, \delta} - \tilde{X}_t^\delta|^{2p} \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi_\delta|^{2p})\varepsilon^p \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^{2p})\varepsilon^p.$$

By (2.13) and (2.18), taking limits $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we obtain (2.19). \square

Remark 2.12. *Theorem 2.11 presents a specific discretized SDE approximation for the ODE (2.3) under the assumption of one-sided Lipschitz conditions. This result offers a practical and computationally efficient scheme for approximating the solutions of the ODE using SDEs.*

2.3. DiPerna-Lions solutions for ODEs with $\mathbb{W}^{1,q}$ -coefficients. In this section, we focus on the ODE in the sense of DiPerna-Lions. In this case, the coefficient is permitted to belong to the Sobolev space $\mathbb{W}^{1,q}$, but the initial value is assumed to possess a density. Specifically, we make the following assumption:

(\mathbf{H}_q^b) b is bounded measurable, and for some $q \in [1, \infty]$ and each $R > 0$, there is a Borel measurable function $f_R(s, x) \in L_{loc}^q(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that for Lebesgue almost all $(s, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times B_R \times B_R$,

$$\langle x - y, b(s, x) - b(s, y) \rangle \leq f_R(s, y) |x - y|^2. \quad (2.20)$$

We first show the following result.

Theorem 2.13. *Let $X_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with $\mathbb{E}|X_0| < \infty$. Suppose that **(\mathbf{H}_q^b)** holds, and ODE (2.3) admits a solution X_t with initial value X_0 and X_t has a density $\rho_t(x) \in L_{loc}^p(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, where $p = \frac{q}{q-1}$. Then for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C_T > 0$ such that for all $R \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon, h \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t| \geq h \right) \leq C_T \left(\frac{1 + \|b\|_\infty^2}{R^2} + \frac{\|f_R\|_{L^q([0, T] \times B_R)} \|\rho\|_{L^p([0, T] \times B_R)} + 1}{\log(1 + h^2 / (36\varepsilon \|b\|_\infty))} \right).$$

Proof. We follow the proof in [34]. By (2.6) we have

$$Z_t^\varepsilon := X_t^\varepsilon - X_t = \int_0^t b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s) ds + \int_0^t \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon.$$

Fix $\delta > 0$. By applying Itô's formula to function $x \mapsto \log(\frac{|x|^2}{\delta^2} + 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{|Z_t^\varepsilon|^2}{\delta^2} + 1 \right) &= 2 \int_0^t \frac{\langle Z_s^\varepsilon, b(s, X_s^\varepsilon) - b(s, X_s) \rangle}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} ds + \int_0^t \log \left(\frac{|Z_{s-}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 + \delta^2}{|Z_{s-}^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left[\log \left(\frac{|Z_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + \delta^2}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \right) - \frac{2\varepsilon \langle b(s, X_s^\varepsilon), Z_s^\varepsilon \rangle}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \right] d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \\ &=: I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t). \end{aligned}$$

For $R > 0$, define a stopping time

$$\tau_R := \inf\{t > 0 : |X_t^\varepsilon| \vee |X_t| \geq R\}.$$

For $I_1(t)$, by the assumption we have

$$I_1(t \wedge \tau_R) \leq 2 \int_0^t \frac{f_R(s, X_s) |Z_s^\varepsilon|^2}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_s| < R\}} ds \leq 2 \int_0^t f_R(s, X_s) \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_s| < R\}} ds.$$

For $I_2(t)$, by Doob's maximal inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |I_2(t)|^2 \right) &\leq 4\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \log \left(\frac{|Z_{s-}^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)|^2 + \delta^2}{|Z_{s-}^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \right) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^\varepsilon \right)^2 \\ &= 4\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T \left| \log \left(\frac{|Z_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 + \delta^2}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} \right) \right|^2 d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|\log(1+r) - r| \leq Cr^2, \quad r > -\frac{1}{2}, \quad (2.21)$$

and for $A_s^\varepsilon := \frac{|Z_s^\varepsilon + \varepsilon b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2 - |Z_s^\varepsilon|^2}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2}$ and $\delta > \varepsilon \|b\|_\infty$,

$$|A_s^\varepsilon| \leq 2 \frac{\varepsilon \|b\|_\infty}{\delta} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 \|b\|_\infty^2}{\delta^2} \leq 3 \frac{\varepsilon \|b\|_\infty}{\delta}. \quad (2.22)$$

In particular, we further have for $\delta \geq 6\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |I_2(t)|^2 \right) \leq 4 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} |\log(1 + A_s^\varepsilon)|^2 d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \lesssim \int_0^T \mathbb{E} (|A_s^\varepsilon|^2 + |A_s^\varepsilon|^4) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty^2 T}{\delta^2}.$$

Similarly, for $I_3(t)$, by (2.21) and (2.22), we have for $\delta \geq 6\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(t) &= \int_0^t \left(\log(1 + A_s^\varepsilon) - A_s^\varepsilon \right) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon \int_0^t \frac{|b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)|^2}{|Z_s^\varepsilon|^2 + \delta^2} ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t |A_s^\varepsilon|^2 d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{\varepsilon t \|b\|_\infty^2}{\delta^2} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty^2 t}{\delta^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above calculations, we obtain that for $\delta \geq 6\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|b\|_\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \log \left(\frac{|Z_t^\varepsilon|^2}{\delta^2} + 1 \right) \right) &\lesssim \int_0^T \mathbb{E} (f_R(s, X_s) \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_s| < R\}}) ds + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|b\|_\infty}{\delta} \\ &= \int_0^T \left(\int_{B_R} f_R(s, x) \rho_s(x) dx \right) ds + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|b\|_\infty}{\delta} \\ &\leq \|f_R\|_{L^q([0, T] \times B_R)} \|\rho\|_{L^p([0, T] \times B_R)} + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|b\|_\infty}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Now for any $h \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta = 6\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|b\|_\infty$, by Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} |Z_t^\varepsilon| > h \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge \tau_R]} \log \left(\frac{|Z_t^\varepsilon|^2}{\delta^2} + 1 \right) \right) / \log(1 + (h/\delta)^2) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|f_R\|_{L^q([0, T] \times B_R)} \|\rho\|_{L^q([0, T] \times B_R)} + 1}{\log(1 + h^2/(36\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty^2))}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

On the other hand, it is standard to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_R \leq T) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (|X_t| + |X_t^\varepsilon|)^2 \right)}{R^2} \leq \frac{C(1 + \|b\|_\infty^2 T^2)}{R^2},$$

which together with (2.23) yields the desired estimate. \square

As a consequence, we have

Corollary 2.14. *Assume that $\nabla b \in L^q(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ for some $q > d$ and $b, \operatorname{div} b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $p = \frac{q}{q-1}$ and $T > 0$. For any $X_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with density $\rho_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there is a unique solution X_t to ODE (2.3) so that X_t admits a density $\rho_t(x) \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover, there is a constant $C_T > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon, h \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon - X_t| \geq h \right) \leq C_T \frac{\|\nabla b\|_{L^q([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \|\rho\|_{L^p([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} + 1}{\log(1 + h^2/(36\varepsilon\|b\|_\infty))}.$$

Proof. Let $r \in (d, q)$. By Morrey's inequality (see [12, p143, Theorem 3]), there is a constant $C = C(d, r) > 0$ such that for Lebesgue almost all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|b(s, x) - b(s, y)| \leq C|x - y| \left(\frac{1}{|B_{|x-y|}|} \int_{B_{|x-y|}} |\nabla b(s, y + z)|^r dz \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C|x - y| (\mathcal{M}|\nabla b(s, \cdot)|^r(y))^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}|\nabla b(s, \cdot)|^r(y) := \sup_{r \geq 0} \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} |\nabla b(s, y + z)|^r dz.$$

Hence, (2.20) holds with $f_R(s, y) = (\mathcal{M}|\nabla b(s, \cdot)|^r(y))^{1/r}$ and by the L^p -boundedness of the maximal function (cf. [36]),

$$\|(\mathcal{M}|\nabla b|^r)^{1/r}\|_{L^q([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|\nabla b\|_{L^q([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

By the DiPerna-Lions theory (see [11, Corollary II.1] and [1, 9]), for any $X_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with a density $\rho_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there is a unique solution X_t to ODE (2.3) with density $\rho_t(x) \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^p(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Now by Theorem 2.13 with $R = \infty$, we obtain the desired estimate. \square

Remark 2.15. *Corollary 2.14 provides a discretization approximation for ODEs with $\mathbb{W}^{1,q}$ -coefficients. Let us consider the case where $d = 2$ and the vector field $b(x)$ is defined as*

$$b(x) = (-x_2, x_1)/|x|^\alpha \phi(x),$$

where $\alpha < 1$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. It can be easily seen that $\operatorname{div} b \in L^\infty$ and $\nabla b \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $q \in [1, 2/\alpha)$. Additionally, it should be noted that b is Hölder continuous at the point 0.

2.4. Particle approximation for DDODEs. In this section, we turn our attention to the study of nonlinear or distribution-dependent ODEs (DDODEs) and the corresponding interaction particle system. We establish the strong convergence of the particle approximation scheme, as well as a central limit theorem, similar to what was discussed earlier. It is important to note that our scheme is fully discretized, with the time scale chosen as $\varepsilon = 1/N$. This choice allows for efficient numerical implementation and analysis of the particle system.

Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel measurable functions. For a (sub)-probability measure μ over \mathbb{R}^d , we define

$$b(t, x, \mu) := F(t, x, (\phi_t \otimes \mu)(x)),$$

where

$$(\phi_t \otimes \mu)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_t(x, y) \mu(dy).$$

Now we consider the following DDODE:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s, \mu_{X_s}) ds, \quad (2.24)$$

where X_0 is any random variable and μ_{X_s} stands for the distribution of X_s . Suppose that

$$\begin{cases} |F(t, x, r) - F(t, x', r')| \leq \kappa(|x - x'| + |r - r'|), \\ |\phi(t, x, y) - \phi(t, x', y')| \leq \kappa(|x - x'| + |y - y'|) \end{cases} \quad (2.25)$$

and

$$|F(t, x, r)| + |\phi(t, x, y)| \leq \kappa. \quad (2.26)$$

Under the above conditions, it is well-known that DDODE (2.24) has a unique solution. In particular, μ_{X_t} solves the following nonlinear first order PDE in the distributional sense:

$$\partial_t \mu_{X_t} + \operatorname{div}(b(t, \cdot, \mu_{X_t}) \mu_{X_t}) = 0.$$

Remark 2.16. *If $X_0 = x$ is a fixed point, then $\mu_{X_s} = \delta_{X_s}$ is a Dirac measure and*

$$b(s, X_s, \mu_{X_s}) = F(s, X_s, \phi_s(X_s, X_s)).$$

In this case, there is no interaction. Now, suppose that X_0 has a density ρ_0 , and let $b(t, x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(t, x, y) \mu(dy)$. Then, X_t also has a density $\rho_t(x)$, and in the distributional sense, we have

$$\partial_t \rho_t(x) + \operatorname{div} \left(\rho_t(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(t, x, y) \rho_t(y) dy \right) = 0.$$

In particular, if we consider the case where $b(t, x, y) = -\mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(x - y)$, we obtain

$$\partial_t V_t(x) = (V_t^2(x))'/2,$$

which is the classical Burgers equation.

Now we construct the interaction particle approximation for DDODE (2.24). Let $(\mathcal{N}^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a family of i.i.d. standard Poisson processes. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\mathcal{N}_t^{N,k} := \mathcal{N}_{Nt}^k, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_t^{N,k} := \mathcal{N}_{Nt}^k - Nt, \quad t > 0.$$

Let $(X_0^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variables with common distribution ν . We consider the following interaction particle system driven by Poisson processes: for $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$X_t^{N,i} = X_0^i + \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t b(s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{s-}^N) d\mathcal{N}_s^{N,i} = X_{t-}^{N,i} + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N b(t, X_{t-}^{N,i}, X_{t-}^{N,j}) \Delta \mathcal{N}_t^{N,i},$$

where we have chosen $\varepsilon = 1/N$ in Poisson approximation (2.4), and

$$\mu_s^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_s^{N,j}}.$$

In order to show the convergence rate, we need the following simple lemma (see [40]).

Lemma 2.17. *Let $\xi^N := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N)$ be a sequence of i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables with common distribution μ . Let $\mu_{\xi^N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\xi_j}$ be the empirical measure of ξ^N . Then there is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any nonnegative measurable function $f(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|f(\xi_i, \mu_{\xi^N}) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})|^2 &\lesssim_C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x, \mu) - f(x, \bar{\mu}))^2 \mu(dx) + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(x, y)^2 \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, y) \bar{\mu}(dy) \right)^2 \mu(dy) + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, x)^2 \mu(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}|f(\xi_i, \mu_{\xi^N}) - f(\xi_i, \mu)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(x, y)^2 \mu(dx) \mu(dy) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x, x)^2 \mu(dx) \right). \quad (2.28)$$

Proof. By definition we have

$$\mathbb{E}|f(\xi_i, \mu_{\xi^N}) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\xi_i, \xi_j) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) (f(\xi_i, \xi_k) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) \right].$$

Since for $j \neq k \neq i$, ξ_i, ξ_j, ξ_k are independent and have the same distribution μ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(f(\xi_i, \xi_j) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) (f(\xi_i, \xi_k) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) \right] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x, \mu) - f(x, \bar{\mu}))^2 \mu(dx).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|f(\xi_i, \mu_{\xi^N}) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})|^2 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x, \mu) - f(x, \bar{\mu}))^2 \mu(dx) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[f(\xi_i, \xi_j) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu}) \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[(f(\xi_i, \xi_j) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) (f(\xi_i, \xi_i) - f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})) \right] \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(x, \mu) - f(x, \bar{\mu}))^2 \mu(dx) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}|f(\xi_i, \xi_j)|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left(|f(\xi_i, \bar{\mu})|^2 + |f(\xi_i, \xi_i)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this, we derive the desired estimate. \square

Let \bar{X}_t^i solve the following DDODE:

$$\bar{X}_t^i = X_0^i + \int_0^t b(s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i}) ds, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.29)$$

Clearly, $(\bar{X}^1, \dots, \bar{X}^N)$ are i.i.d. random processes. We present a simple result regarding the propagation of chaos, which is consistent with [40]. This result highlights the independence of the particle system as the number of particles increases, and provides support for the validity and effectiveness of the approximation scheme.

Theorem 2.18. *Under (2.25) and (2.26), for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, T, d) > 0$ independent of N such that for all $i = 1, \dots, N$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N, i} - \bar{X}_t^i|^2 \right) \leq \frac{C}{N}.$$

Proof. Let $\bar{\mu}_t^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\bar{X}_t^j}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{N, i} - \bar{X}_t^i &= \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t b(s, X_{s-}^{N, i}, \mu_{s-}^N) d\mathcal{N}_s^{N, i} - \int_0^t b(s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i}) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t b(s, X_{s-}^{N, i}, \mu_{s-}^N) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^{N, i} + \int_0^t [b(s, X_s^{N, i}, \mu_s^N) - b(s, \bar{X}_s^i, \bar{\mu}_s^N)] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t [b(s, \bar{X}_s^i, \bar{\mu}_s^N) - b(s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i})] ds \\ &=: I_1(t) + I_2(t) + I_3(t). \end{aligned}$$

Below for a nonnegative function $f(t)$, we write

$$f^*(t) := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} f(s).$$

For $I_1(t)$, by Doob's maximal inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_1^*(T)|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t b(s, X_{s-}^{N, i}, \eta_{s-}^N) d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^{N, i} \right|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{N} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |b(s, X_s^{N, i}, \eta_s^N)|^2 ds \right) \leq \frac{4\|b\|_\infty^2 T}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

For $I_2(t)$, by the Lipschitz assumptions (2.25), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|I_2^*(t)|^2 \lesssim \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_s^{N, i} - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |X_s^{N, j} - \bar{X}_s^j| \right)^2 ds.$$

For $I_3(t)$, by (2.28) we have

$$\mathbb{E}|I_3^*(T)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N} \|b\|_\infty^2.$$

Combining the above calculations, we obtain that for each $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s^{N, i} - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_s^{N, i} - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |X_s^{N, j} - \bar{X}_s^j| \right)^2 ds.$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s^{N, i} - \bar{X}_s^i|^2 \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |X_s^{N, j} - \bar{X}_s^j| \right)^2 ds$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \|X_s^{N,j} - \bar{X}_s^j\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right)^2 ds \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N} + \int_0^t \sup_{j=1, \dots, N} \|X_s^{N,j} - \bar{X}_s^j\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on i . The desired estimate now follows by Gronwall's inequality again. \square

Next we consider the asymptotic distribution of the following fluctuation:

$$Z_t^N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (X_t^{N,i} - \bar{X}_t^i).$$

Note that

$$Z_t^N = \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t b[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{s-}^N] d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^{N,i} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \left(b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N] - b[s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i}] \right) ds.$$

Since b is bounded, one sees that the martingale part converges to zero in L^2 . Indeed,

$$\frac{1}{N^3} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t b[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{s-}^N] d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^{N,i} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N]|^2 ds \leq \frac{\|b\|_\infty^2 t}{N}.$$

Therefore, it is not expected that Z_t^N converges to some non-degenerate Gaussian distribution. Moreover, let

$$a_t^N := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \left(b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N] - b[s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i}] \right) ds.$$

By (2.25), (2.28) and Theorem 2.18, it is easy to see that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E} |a_t^N|^2 \leq T \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N] - b[s, \bar{X}_s^i, \mu_{\bar{X}_s^i}] \right|^2 ds \leq C_T,$$

where C_T does not depend on N . We aim to show the following result about the fluctuation.

Theorem 2.19. *Suppose that (2.25) and (2.26) hold. Then as $N \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{N}(Z_t^N - a_t^N)_{t \geq 0} \Rightarrow (Y_t)_{t \geq 0},$$

where $Y_t = \int_0^t b(s, X_s, \mu_{X_s}) dW_s$ is a Gaussian martingale, and X_t solves the following DDODE:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_s, \mu_{X_s}) ds, \quad (2.30)$$

and $X_0 \sim \nu$, is the common distribution of $X_0^{N,i}$, and W is a one dimensional standard Brownian motion.

Proof. By definition it is easy to see that

$$Y_t^N := \sqrt{N}(Z_t^N - a_t^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(X_t^{N,i} - \int_0^t b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N] ds \right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_s^{N,i} d\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_s^{N,i}, \quad (2.31)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_s^{N,i} := b[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{s-}^N] / N.$$

For any stopping time τ and $\delta > 0$, by Doob's maximal inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} |Y_{\tau+t}^N - Y_\tau^N|^2 \right) \leq 4N \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left(\int_\tau^{\tau+\delta} |\mathcal{A}_s^{N,i}|^2 ds \right) \leq 4\|b\|_\infty^2 \delta.$$

To prove the result, we consider an auxiliary process \tilde{X}_t , which satisfies (2.30) with starting point \tilde{X}_0 independent of X_0^i . Clearly, we also have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} |\tilde{X}_{\tau+t} - \tilde{X}_\tau| \leq \|b\|_\infty \delta.$$

Thus by Aldous' criterion (see [23, p356, Theorem 4.5]), the law \mathbb{P}_N of $(\tilde{X}_\cdot, Y^N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ is tight. Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathbb{P}_N weakly converges to \mathbb{P}_∞ . We show that \mathbb{P}_∞ is a martingale solution of the following second order operator starting from $\nu \otimes \delta_0$ at time 0

$$\mathcal{L}_s f(x, y) = b[s, x, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla_x f(x, y) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((b \otimes b)[s, x, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla_y^2 f(x, y)).$$

For $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, we need to show that for $w_t = (x_t, y_t) \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$,

$$f(w_t) - f(w_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_s f(w_s) ds,$$

is a \mathbb{P}_∞ -martingale. On one hand, let

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m a_i h_i(x) g_i(y), h_i, g_i \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d), a_i \in \mathbb{R}, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Since \mathcal{E} is dense in $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, it suffices to consider $f(x, y) = h(x)g(y)$, where $h, g \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. On the other hand, since \tilde{X} solves ODE (2.29), we have

$$h(\tilde{X}_t) = h(\tilde{X}_0) + \int_0^t b[s, \tilde{X}_s, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla h(\tilde{X}_s) ds.$$

Therefore, we only need to consider $f(x, y) = g(y)$. By (2.31) and Itô's formula, we have

$$g(Y_t^N) = g(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{A}_s^N g(Y_s^N) ds + M_t^N,$$

where $M_t^N := \sum_{i=1}^N \int_0^t (g(Y_{s-}^N + \mathcal{A}_s^{N,i}) - g(Y_{s-}^N)) d\tilde{N}_s^{N,i}$ is a martingale, and

$$\mathcal{A}_s^N g(y) := N \sum_{i=1}^N \left(g(y + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^{N,i}) - g(y) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^{N,i} \cdot \nabla g(y) \right),$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^{N,i} := b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N]/N.$$

Below, for simplicity of notations, we write

$$B_s(x, y) := (b \otimes b)(s, x, y), \quad \mathcal{A}_s g(y) := \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(B_s[\tilde{X}_s, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla^2 g(y)).$$

By Theorem 6.4, it suffices to show

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left| \mathbb{E} \mathcal{A}_s^N g(Y_s^N) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{A}_s g(Y_s^N) \right| ds = 0.$$

Observe that by Taylor's expansion,

$$\mathcal{A}_s^N g(y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{tr} \left(B_s[X_s^{N,i}, \mu_s^N] \cdot \int_0^1 \theta \int_0^1 \nabla_y^2 g(y + \theta \theta' \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^{N,i}) d\theta d\theta' \right).$$

Let

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g(y) := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{tr}(B_s[\bar{X}_s^i, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla^2 g(y)) = \text{tr}(B_s[\mu_{\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}, \mu_s] \cdot \nabla^2 g(y)).$$

Then

$$\mathcal{A}_s^N g(y) - \mathcal{A}_s g(y) = \mathcal{A}_s^N g(y) - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g(y) + \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g(y) - \mathcal{A}_s g(y)$$

By Theorem 2.18, it is easy to see that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{A}_s^N g - \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g\|_\infty^2 \leq C/N.$$

Moreover, since $\mu_{\bar{X}_s^i} = \mu_s$, by (2.28), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g(Y_s^N) - \mathcal{A}_s g(Y_s^N) \right) ds \right|^2 \leq t \int_0^t \left| \mathbb{E} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_s^N g(Y_s^N) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{A}_s g(Y_s^N) \right|^2 ds \\ &= \frac{t}{2} \int_0^t \left| \mathbb{E} \left(\text{tr} \left((B_s[\mu_{\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}, \mu_s] - \mathbb{E} B_s[\tilde{X}_s, \mu_s]) \cdot \nabla^2 g(Y_s^N) \right) \right) \right|^2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{t}{2} \|\nabla^2 g\|_\infty \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| B_s[\mu_{\bar{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}, \mu_s] - \mathbb{E} B_s[\tilde{X}_s, \mu_s] \right|^2 ds \leq \frac{C}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_s^N f - \mathcal{L}_s f)(\tilde{X}_s, Y_s^N) ds \right|^2 \leq \frac{C}{N}.$$

Thus, by Theorem 6.4 in appendix, we get $\mathbb{P}_\infty \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\nu \otimes \delta_0}(\mathcal{L})$ and conclude the proof. \square

Remark 2.20. *By the above theorem, one sees that $(\sqrt{N}(Z_t^N - a_t^N))_{t \in [0, T]}$ weakly converges to a Gaussian martingale with covariance matrix $\int_0^t (b \otimes b)(s, X_s, \mu_s) ds$.*

3. COMPOUND POISSON APPROXIMATION FOR SDES

The main objective of this section is to introduce a unified compound Poisson approximation for SDEs driven by either Brownian motions or α -stable processes. This is accomplished by selecting different scaling parameters. We establish the convergence of the approximation SDEs under relatively mild assumptions, as demonstrated in Theorem 3.16. Furthermore, under more restrictive assumptions, we derive the convergence rate in Theorem 3.19. Additionally, we obtain the convergence of the invariant measures under dissipativity assumptions, as presented in Theorem 3.17. The convergence of the generators plays a pivotal role in our proofs. In essence, our results can be interpreted as a form of nonlinear central limit theorem. In the subsequent section, we will apply this framework to address nonlinear partial differential equations (PDEs), with a specific focus on the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations on the torus.

Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued symmetric random variables with common distribution $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $\xi_0 = 0$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a compound Poisson process H^ε by

$$H_t^\varepsilon := \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} \xi_n, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$ is the Poisson process with intensity $1/\varepsilon$ (see (2.1)). Let \mathcal{H}^ε be the associated Poisson random measure, i.e., for $t > 0$ and $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{H}^\varepsilon([0, t], E) := \sum_{s \leq t} \mathbb{1}_E(\Delta H_s^\varepsilon) = \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} \mathbb{1}_E(\xi_n), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\Delta H_s^\varepsilon := H_s^\varepsilon - H_{s-}^\varepsilon$. More precisely, for a function $f(s, z) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_0^t f(s, z) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) := \sum_{s \leq t} f(s, \Delta H_s^\varepsilon) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon = 1\}} = \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} f(S_n^\varepsilon, \xi_n), \quad (3.3)$$

where $S_n^\varepsilon = \varepsilon S_n$ is the n -th jump time of $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$. Note that the compensated measure of \mathcal{H}^ε is given by $d\nu(dz)/\varepsilon$. We also write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon([0, t], E) := \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon([0, t], E) - t\nu(E)/\varepsilon,$$

which is called the compensated Poisson random measure of \mathcal{H}^ε .

Fix $\alpha > 0$. We make the following assumptions for the probability measure ν above:
(H $_\nu^\alpha$) ν is symmetric, i.e., $\nu(-dz) = \nu(dz)$. If $\alpha \geq 2$, we suppose that

$$\nu(|z|^\alpha) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^\alpha \nu(dz) < \infty.$$

If $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, we suppose that

$$\sup_{\lambda \geq 1} \left[\lambda^{\alpha-2} \int_{|z| \leq \lambda} |z|^2 \nu(dz) + \lambda^\alpha \int_{|z| > \lambda} \nu(dz) \right] < \infty, \quad (3.4)$$

and there is a Lévy measure ν_0 and constants $\beta_0 \in [0, 1]$, $\beta_1, c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any measurable function $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|G(z)| \leq c_1(|z|^2 \wedge 1), \quad |G(z) - G(z')| \leq c_1(|z - z'| \wedge 1)^{\beta_0}, \quad (3.5)$$

it holds that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(z) \nu_\varepsilon(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(z) \nu_0(dz) \right| \leq c_1 c_2 \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\nu_\varepsilon(dz) := \nu(dz/\varepsilon^{1/\alpha})/\varepsilon. \quad (3.7)$$

Remark 3.1. If $\beta_0 = 0$ in (3.5), then (3.6) means that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|z|^2 \wedge 1) |\nu_\varepsilon - \nu_0|(dz) \leq c_1 c_2 \varepsilon^{\beta_1},$$

where $|\nu_\varepsilon - \nu_0|(dz)$ stands for the total variation measure. Examples 1 and 2 below correspond to $\beta_0 = 0$ and $\beta_1 = \frac{2}{\alpha} - 1$. For $\beta_0 > 0$, condition (3.6) is used in Example 3 below.

In the following we provide several examples for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ to illustrate the above assumptions.

Example 1. Let $\nu(dz) = c_0 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap B_1^c}(z) |z|^{-d-\alpha} dz$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, where \mathcal{C} is a cone with vertex 0 and c_0 is a normalized constant so that $\nu(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$. It is easy to see that **(H $_\nu^\alpha$)** holds with $\nu_0(dz) = c_0 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(z) |z|^{-d-\alpha} dz$ and $\beta_0 = 0$, $\beta_1 = \frac{2}{\alpha} - 1$. In this case $(\nu_\varepsilon - \nu_0)(dz) = c_0 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C} \cap B_{\varepsilon^{1/\alpha}}}(z) |z|^{-d-\alpha} dz$. In particular, if $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{R}^d$, then up to a constant, ν_0 is just the Lévy measure of a rotationally invariant and symmetric α -stable process.

Example 2. Let $\nu(dz) = c_0 \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{1}_{|z_i| > 1} |z_i|^{-1-\alpha} dz_i \delta_{\{0\}}(dz_i^*)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, where c_0 is a constant so that $\nu(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$ and z_i^* denotes the remaining variables except z_i . It is easy to see that **(H $_\nu^\alpha$)** holds with $\nu_0(dz) = c_0 \sum_{i=1}^d |z_i|^{-1-\alpha} dz_i \delta_{\{0\}}(dz_i^*)$ and $\beta_0 = 0$, $\beta_1 = \frac{2}{\alpha} - 1$. In this case, ν_0 is a cylindrical Lévy measure.

Example 3. Let $\nu(dz) = c_0 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} |k|^{-1-\alpha} \delta_k(dz)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, where c_0 is a constant so that $\nu(\mathbb{R}) = 1$. First of all it is easy to see that (3.4) holds. We now verify that (3.6) holds for $\nu_0(dz) = c_0 |z|^{-1-\alpha} dz$ and $\beta_0 \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta_1 < (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\beta_0$. Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} G(z) \nu_\varepsilon(dz) = c_0 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{G(k\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})}{\varepsilon |k|^{1+\alpha}} = c_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{G(z_\varepsilon)}{|z_\varepsilon|^{1+\alpha}} dz,$$

where $z_\varepsilon = \text{sgn}(z) [|z| \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}] \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, and $[a]$ denotes the integer part of a real number $a > 0$. Here we have used the convention $\frac{0}{0} = 0$. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{c_0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(z) \nu_\varepsilon(dz) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(z) \nu_0(dz) \right| \leq \int_{|z| < 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left| \frac{G(z_\varepsilon)}{|z_\varepsilon|^{1+\alpha}} - \frac{G(z)}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} \right| dz$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{|z| \geq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} |G(z_\varepsilon)| \left| \frac{1}{|z_\varepsilon|^{1+\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} \right| dz \\
& + \int_{|z| \geq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \frac{|G(z_\varepsilon) - G(z)|}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} dz \\
& =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by (3.5) we clearly have

$$I_1 \leq c_1 \int_{|z| < 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left(|z_\varepsilon|^{1-\alpha} + \frac{|z|^2}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} \right) dz \lesssim c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}.$$

Since $|z_\varepsilon - z| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, we have for $|z| \geq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$,

$$|z|/2 \leq |z_\varepsilon| \leq 2|z|,$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{|z_\varepsilon|^{1+\alpha}} - \frac{1}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} \right| \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{|z|^{2+\alpha}}.$$

Hence,

$$I_2 \lesssim c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{|z| \geq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \frac{|z|^2 \wedge 1}{|z|^{2+\alpha}} dz \lesssim \begin{cases} c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}, & \alpha \in (1, 2), \\ c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} |\log \varepsilon|, & \alpha = 1, \\ c_1 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, & \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

For I_3 , noting that by (3.5),

$$|G(z_\varepsilon) - G(z)| \leq c_1 (|z|^\alpha \wedge 1) \varepsilon^{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})\beta_0},$$

we have

$$I_3 \lesssim c_1 \varepsilon^{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})\beta_0} \int_{|z| \geq 2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \frac{|z|^\alpha \wedge 1}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} dz \lesssim c_1 \varepsilon^{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})\beta_0} |\log \varepsilon|.$$

Combining the above calculations, we obtain (3.6) for any $\beta_0 \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta_1 < (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})\beta_0$.

Remark 3.2. For the above examples, one sees that for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^\alpha \nu(dz) = \infty, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^\beta \nu(dz) < \infty, \quad \beta \in [0, \alpha).$$

The following lemma is useful.

Lemma 3.3. Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) , for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $\beta \in [0, \alpha)$, we have

$$\sup_{\lambda \geq 1, \varepsilon \in (0, 1]} \left[\lambda^{\alpha-2} \int_{|z| \leq \lambda} |z|^2 \nu_\varepsilon(dz) + \lambda^{\alpha-\beta} \int_{|z| > \lambda} |z|^\beta \nu_\varepsilon(dz) \right] < \infty, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\nu_\varepsilon(dz) := \nu(dz/\varepsilon^{1/\alpha})/\varepsilon$.

Proof. First of all, by (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{|z| > \lambda} |z|^\beta \nu(dz) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{2^k \lambda \leq |z| < 2^{k+1} \lambda} |z|^\beta \nu(dz) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)\beta} \lambda^\beta \int_{2^k \lambda \leq |z| < 2^{k+1} \lambda} \nu(dz) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)\beta} \lambda^\beta 2^{-k\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha} \leq C \lambda^{\beta-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate follows by the change of variables. \square

Now, we introduce a general approximating scheme for SDEs driven by either Brownian motions or α -stable processes. Let $\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, z) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b_\varepsilon(t, x) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, be two families of Borel measurable functions. Suppose that

$$\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, -z) = -\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, z).$$

Note that the above assumption implies that

$$\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, 0) \equiv 0.$$

Consider the following SDE driven by compound Poisson process \mathcal{H}^ε :

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^\varepsilon &= X_0^\varepsilon + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \right) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) \\ &= X_0^\varepsilon + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) + \int_0^t b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\ &= X_0^\varepsilon + \sum_{s \leq t} \left(\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, \Delta H_s^\varepsilon) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Note that H_s^ε and $\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon$ jump simultaneously, that is, $\Delta H_s^\varepsilon \neq 0$ if and only if $\Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon = 1$. In particular,

$$X_t^\varepsilon - X_{t-}^\varepsilon = \sigma_\varepsilon(t, X_{t-}^\varepsilon, \Delta H_t^\varepsilon) + b_\varepsilon(t, X_{t-}^\varepsilon) \Delta \mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon.$$

Moreover, by the symmetry of ν and $\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, -z) = -\sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, z)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) \nu(dz) = 0, \quad (3.10)$$

we thus can write SDE (3.9) as the following form:

$$X_t^\varepsilon = X_0^\varepsilon + \int_0^t b_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \right) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon(ds, dz), \quad (3.11)$$

where the last term is the stochastic integral with respect to the compensated Poisson random measure $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon$, which is a local càdlàg martingale.

Without any conditions on σ and b , SDE (3.9) is always solvable since there are only finite terms in the summation of (3.9) and it can be solved recursively. In fact, we have the following explicit construction for the solution of SDE (3.9).

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\Gamma_0^\varepsilon \equiv X_0^\varepsilon$. For $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we define Γ_n^ε recursively by*

$$\Gamma_{n+1}^\varepsilon := \Gamma_n^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(S_{n+1}^\varepsilon, \Gamma_n^\varepsilon, \xi_{n+1}) + b_\varepsilon(S_{n+1}^\varepsilon, \Gamma_n^\varepsilon),$$

where $S_n^\varepsilon = \varepsilon S_n$. Then $(\Gamma_n^\varepsilon)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov chain, and for any $t \geq 0$,

$$X_t^\varepsilon = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon.$$

Proof. It is direct by definitions (3.9) and (3.3). □

Based on the above lemma, we have the following algorithm.

- (1) Fix a step $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and iteration number N .
- (2) Initialize $S_0^\varepsilon = 0$ and $\Gamma_0^\varepsilon = X_0^\varepsilon$. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) .
- (3) Generate N -i.i.d. random variables $(T_n) \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ and $(\xi_n) \sim \nu$.
- (4) For $n = 0$ to $N - 1$
 $S_{n+1}^\varepsilon = S_n^\varepsilon + \varepsilon * T_{n+1}$; $\Gamma_{n+1}^\varepsilon = \Gamma_n^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(S_{n+1}^\varepsilon, \Gamma_n^\varepsilon, \xi_{n+1}) + b_\varepsilon(S_{n+1}^\varepsilon, \Gamma_n^\varepsilon)$.
- (5) For given $t > 0$, let $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon := \max\{n : S_n^\varepsilon \leq t\}$ and output $X_t^\varepsilon = \Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon$.

The following simple lemma provides a tail probability estimate for $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$, which informs us on how to choose the value of N in practice.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon \geq \frac{(e-1)t}{\varepsilon} + n) \leq e^{-n}.$$

Proof. By Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon \geq \frac{(e-1)t}{\varepsilon} + n) \leq e^{-\frac{(e-1)t}{\varepsilon} - n} \mathbb{E}e^{\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon} = e^{-n}.$$

□

Remark 3.6. *The sequence $(\Gamma_n^\varepsilon)_{n \geq 0}$ forms a Markov chain with a state space of \mathbb{R}^d . These lemmas provide us with a practical method for simulating X_t^ε using a computer. It is important to note that approximating a diffusion process with a Markov chain is a well-established topic, as discussed in [38, Chapter 11.2]. Therein, the focus is on the time-homogeneous case, and piecewise linear interpolation is used for approximation. In our approach, we embed the Markov chain into a continuous process using a Poisson process. It is crucial to highlight that Γ_n^ε is not independent of $\mathcal{N}_t^\varepsilon$ due to the time-inhomogeneous nature of σ and b . Our computations heavily rely on the calculus of stochastic integrals with jumps.*

Note that for a bounded measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(X_t^\varepsilon) - f(X_0) &= \sum_{s \leq t} f(X_s^\varepsilon) - f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \\ &= \sum_{s \leq t} (f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, \Delta H_s^\varepsilon) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) \Delta \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon) - f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) \\ &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) - f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(X_s^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon)) - f(X_s^\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \nu(dz) ds + M_t^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where M_t^ε is a martingale defined by

$$M_t^\varepsilon := \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) - f(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon(ds, dz).$$

This is just the Itô formula of jump processes. In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}f(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E}f(X_0) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(X_s^\varepsilon) ds \right),$$

where the infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)}$ of Markov process $(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, x, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, x)) - f(x)}{\varepsilon} \nu(dz) =: \mathcal{A}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) + \mathcal{B}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x)$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, x, z)) - \mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x)}{\varepsilon} \nu(dz)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := \frac{\mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - f(x)}{\varepsilon}, \quad \mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := f(x + b_\varepsilon(s, x)). \quad (3.13)$$

By convention we have used that

$$\mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x + y) = f(x + y + b_\varepsilon(s, x)). \quad (3.14)$$

Note that by the symmetry of ν and $\sigma(t, x, -z) = -\sigma(t, x, z)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, x, z)) + \mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x - \sigma_\varepsilon(s, x, z)) - \mathcal{D}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x)}{2\varepsilon} \nu(dz). \quad (3.15)$$

The concrete choices of σ_ε (depending on α) and b_ε will be given in the following subsection.

3.1. Weak convergence of approximating SDEs. In this section, our aim is to construct appropriate functions σ_ε and b_ε such that the law of the approximating SDE converges to the law of the classical SDE driven by α -stable processes or Brownian motions. The key aspect of our construction lies in demonstrating the convergence of the generators. It is important to note that the drift term is assumed to satisfy dissipativity conditions and can exhibit polynomial growth.

Let

$$\sigma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$$

be two Borel measurable functions. We make the following assumptions on σ and b :

(\mathbf{H}_b^σ) $\sigma(t, x, z)$ and $b(t, x)$ are locally bounded and continuous in x , and for some $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 > 0$,

$$\sigma(t, x, -z) = -\sigma(t, x, z), \quad |\sigma(t, x, z)| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)|z|, \quad (3.16)$$

and for the same β_0 as in (3.5),

$$|\sigma(t, x, z) - \sigma(t, x, z')| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)(|z - z'| \wedge 1)^{\beta_0}, \quad (3.17)$$

and for some $m \geq 1$, $\kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4 \geq 0$ and $\kappa_5 < 0$,

$$|b(t, x)| \leq (\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^m, \quad \langle x, b(t, x) \rangle \leq \kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}. \quad (3.18)$$

We introduce the coefficients of the approximating SDE (3.9) by

$$b_\varepsilon(t, x) := \frac{\varepsilon b(t, x)}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(t, x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}}, \quad \sigma_\varepsilon(t, x, z) := \begin{cases} \sqrt{\varepsilon}\sigma(t, x, z), & \alpha \geq 2, \\ \sigma(t, x, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}z), & \alpha \in (0, 2). \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

Remark 3.7. *The purpose of introducing the function b_ε is to ensure the dissipativity of the approximating SDEs, as demonstrated in Lemma 3.11 below. On the other hand, the introduction of σ_ε with different scaling parameters for different values of α is aimed at ensuring the convergence of the generators, as shown in Lemma 3.9 below. It is worth noting that the drift term b can exhibit polynomial growth, and in the case of linear growth (i.e., $m = 1$), one can simply choose $b_\varepsilon(t, x) = \varepsilon b(t, x)$. Furthermore, by the definition of b_ε , it is evident that*

$$|b_\varepsilon(t, x)| \leq (\varepsilon|b(t, x)|) \wedge (\sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(t, x)|^{\frac{1}{m}}). \quad (3.20)$$

In the next lemma we shall show that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x)$ converges to $\mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} f(x)$ with

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} f(x) = \mathcal{A}_s^{(0)} f(x) + b(s, x) \cdot \nabla f(x), \quad (3.21)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_s^{(0)} f(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(s, x, z) \otimes \sigma(s, x, z) \nu(dz) \cdot \nabla^2 f(x) \right), & \alpha \geq 2, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma(s, x, z)) + f(x - \sigma(s, x, z)) - 2f(x)}{2} \nu_0(dz), & \alpha \in (0, 2). \end{cases}$$

This observation suggests that X^ε is expected to weakly converge to a solution of the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \sigma_\nu^{(2)}(t, X_t) dW_t + b(t, X_t) dt, & \alpha \geq 2, \\ dX_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(t, X_{t-}, z) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(dt, dz) + b(t, X_t) dt, & \alpha \in (0, 2), \end{cases} \quad (3.22)$$

where W_t is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion, and

$$\sigma_\nu^{(2)}(t, x) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma(t, x, z) \otimes \sigma(t, x, z) \nu(dz) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and when $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, for a d -dimensional symmetric Lévy process $L_t^{(\alpha)}$ with Lévy measure ν_0 ,

$$\mathcal{H}([0, t] \times E) := \sum_{s \leq t} \mathbb{1}_E(\Delta L_s^{(\alpha)}), \quad t \geq 0, E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}([0, t] \times E) := \mathcal{H}([0, t] \times E) - t\nu_0(E), \quad t \geq 0, E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (3.23)$$

Remark 3.8. Let $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\nu(dz) = d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \bar{\nu}(dz_i) \delta_{\{0\}}(dz_i^*)$, where $\bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |z|^\alpha \bar{\nu}(dz) < \infty$, and z_i^* represents the remaining variables except for z_i . Let $\sigma(t, x, z) = \sigma_0(t, x)z$, where $\sigma_0(t, x) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ is Borel measurable. In this case, we can take

$$\sigma_\nu^{(2)}(t, x) = \sigma_0(t, x) \sqrt{\bar{\nu}(|z|^2)/d}.$$

Let $\{e_i, i = 1, \dots, d\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Suppose that $\sigma(t, x, z) = \sqrt{2d} \cdot z$, $b = 0$ and

$$\nu(dz) = \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\delta_{e_i}(dz) + \delta_{-e_i}(dz) \right).$$

Then $\mathcal{A}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) = \Delta_\varepsilon f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{f(x + \sqrt{2d\varepsilon}e_i) + f(x - \sqrt{2d\varepsilon}e_i) - 2f(x)}{2d\varepsilon}$ is the standard discrete Laplacian.

The following lemma is crucial for taking limits.

Lemma 3.9. Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) , for any $R > 0$, there is a constant $C_R > 0$ such that for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $s \geq 0$ and $|x| \leq R$,

$$|\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} f(x)| \leq C_R \left(o(\varepsilon) \mathbb{1}_{\alpha=2} + \varepsilon^{\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \|f\|_{C_b^\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha>2} + \varepsilon^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \|f\|_{C_b^2} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha<2} \right),$$

where β_1 is from (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) . Moreover, if b is bounded measurable and $\kappa_1 = 0$ in (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) , then the constant C_R can be independent of $R > 0$.

Proof. Below we drop the time variable for simplicity. Recalling $\mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) = \frac{f(x+b_\varepsilon(x)) - f(x)}{\varepsilon}$, by Taylor's expansion and the definition (3.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - b(x) \cdot \nabla f(x)| &\leq |\mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \varepsilon^{-1} b_\varepsilon(x) \cdot \nabla f(x)| + |(\varepsilon^{-1} b_\varepsilon(x) - b(x)) \cdot \nabla f(x)| \\ &\leq |b_\varepsilon(x)| \int_0^1 \frac{|\nabla f(x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)) - \nabla f(x)|}{\varepsilon} d\theta + |\varepsilon^{-1} b_\varepsilon(x) - b(x)| \|\nabla f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{-1} |b_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon} |b(x)|^{2-\frac{1}{m}}}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} |b(x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} \|\nabla f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \varepsilon |b(x)|^2 \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty + \sqrt{\varepsilon} |b(x)|^{2-\frac{1}{m}} \|\nabla f\|_\infty \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\varepsilon} (1 + |b(x)|^2) \|\nabla f\|_{C_b^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Next, by (3.14) and Taylor's expansion again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) + \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x - \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) - 2\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) \\ &= \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) \cdot \int_0^1 \left[\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla f(x + \theta \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) - \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla f(x - \theta \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) \right] d\theta \\ &= \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 \left[\text{tr}((\sigma_\varepsilon \otimes \sigma_\varepsilon)(x, z) \cdot \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 f(x + \theta' \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z))) \right] d\theta' d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

When $\alpha \geq 2$, recalling $\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(x, z)$, by (3.15) and (3.25) we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(0)} f(x) = \mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{tr}((\sigma \otimes \sigma)(x, z) \cdot \nabla^2 f(x)) \nu(dz)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^1 \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \left[\text{tr}((\sigma \otimes \sigma)(x, z) \cdot (\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 f(x + \theta' \theta \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(x, z)) - \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 f(x))) \right] d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{tr}((\sigma \otimes \sigma)(x, z) \cdot (\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 f(x) - \nabla^2 f(x))) \nu(dz).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon f(x) = f(x + b_\varepsilon(x))$, by (3.16), we have for $\alpha = 2$,

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(0)} f(x)| \leq C_R o(\varepsilon), \quad (3.26)$$

and for $\alpha > 2$,

$$|\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(0)} f(x)| \leq C_R \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \nu(|z|^\alpha) + \varepsilon^{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1} \nu(|z|^2) \right) \|\nabla^2 f\|_{C_b^{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}}. \quad (3.27)$$

When $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, recalling $\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) = \sigma(x, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} z)$ and by (3.15) and the change of variables, we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x + \sigma(x, z)) + \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x)}{2} \nu_\varepsilon(dz), \quad (3.28)$$

where

$$\nu_\varepsilon(dz) = \nu(dz / \varepsilon^{1/\alpha}) / \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for $f_\varepsilon := \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} f - f$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathcal{A}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f(x)}{2} \nu_0(dz) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f(x)}{2} (\nu_\varepsilon(dz) - \nu_0(dz)) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f_\varepsilon(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f_\varepsilon(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f_\varepsilon(x)}{2} \nu_\varepsilon(dz) \right| =: I_1(x) + I_2(x).
\end{aligned}$$

For $I_1(x)$, set

$$G_x(z) := \frac{f(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f(x)}{2}.$$

Then by (3.25), we have

$$|G_x f(z)| \leq \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|)^2 |z|^2,$$

and

$$|G_x f(z) - G_x f(z')| \leq 2\|\nabla f\|_\infty |\sigma(x, z) - \sigma(x, z')|.$$

Thus by (3.17) and (3.6), we have

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R} I_1(x) \leq C_R \|f\|_{C_b^2} \varepsilon^{\beta_1}.$$

For $I_2(x)$, noting that by (3.25),

$$|f_\varepsilon(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f_\varepsilon(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f_\varepsilon(x)| \leq \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|)^2 |z|^2$$

and by (3.20),

$$|f_\varepsilon(x + \sigma(x, z)) + f_\varepsilon(x - \sigma(x, z)) - 2f_\varepsilon(x)| \leq 4\varepsilon \|\nabla f\|_\infty |b(x)|,$$

we have

$$I_2(x) \leq \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|)^2 \int_{|z| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} |z|^2 \nu_\varepsilon(dz) + 4\varepsilon \|\nabla f\|_\infty |b(x)| \int_{|z| > \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \nu_\varepsilon(dz).$$

Combining the above calculations and by (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) - \mathcal{A}^{(0)} f(x)| \leq C_R \|f\|_{C_b^2} (\varepsilon^{\beta_1} + \varepsilon^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \leq 2C_R \|f\|_{C_b^2} \varepsilon^{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}) \wedge \beta_1}, \quad (3.29)$$

which together with (3.24), (3.26) and (3.27) yields the desired estimate. If b is bounded and $\kappa_1 = 0$, that is, $|\sigma(t, x, z)| \leq \kappa_0 |z|$, from the above proof, one sees that C_R is independent of R . \square

For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$U_\beta(x) := (1 + |x|^2)^{\beta/2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We need the following elementary Hölder estimate about U_β .

Lemma 3.10. *For any $\beta \in (0, 2]$, there is a constant $C = C(\beta, d) > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|U_\beta(x+y) + U_\beta(x-y) - 2U_\beta(x)| \leq C|y|^\beta.$$

Proof. For $\beta \in (0, 1]$, noting that

$$|U_\beta(x+y) - U_\beta(x)| \leq |g(x+y) - g(x)|^\beta,$$

where $g(x) := (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$, and by $|\nabla g(x)| \leq 1$, we immediately have

$$\begin{aligned} |U_\beta(x+y) + U_\beta(x-y) - 2U_\beta(x)| &\leq |U_\beta(x+y) - U_\beta(x)| + |U_\beta(x-y) - U_\beta(x)| \\ &\leq |g(x+y) - g(x)|^\beta + |g(x-y) - g(x)|^\beta \leq 2|y|^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

For $\beta \in (1, 2]$, by Taylor's expansion we have

$$U_\beta(x+y) + U_\beta(x-y) - 2U_\beta(x) = y \cdot \int_0^1 [\nabla U_\beta(x+\theta y) - \nabla U_\beta(x-\theta y)] d\theta.$$

In view of $\nabla U_\beta(x) = \beta x(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}$, it suffices to show

$$|x(1 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - y(1 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq C|x - y|^{\beta-1},$$

furthermore, for each $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$|x_i(1 + |x_i|^2 + |x_i^*|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - y_i(1 + |y_i|^2 + |y_i^*|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq C|x - y|^{\beta-1},$$

where x_i^* stands for the remaining variables except x_i . The above estimate can be derived as a consequence of the following two estimates: for any $a > 0$,

$$|x(a + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - y(a + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}|x - y|\right)^{\beta-1}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$|a(1 + a^2 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - a(1 + a^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq 2|x - y|^{\beta-1}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}.$$

Set

$$g_1(x) := |x|^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}(a + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta-2}{2(\beta-1)}}, \quad g_2(x) := a^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}(1 + a^2 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta-2}{2(\beta-1)}}.$$

For $\beta \in (1, 2]$, it is easy to see that

$$|g_1'(x)| \leq \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}, \quad |\nabla g_2(x)| \leq 1.$$

Hence, for $x \cdot y \geq 0$,

$$|x(a + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - y(a + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq |g_1(x) - g_1(y)|^{\beta-1} \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}|x - y|\right)^{\beta-1},$$

and for $x \cdot y < 0$,

$$|x(a + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - y(a + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq |x|^{\beta-1} + |y|^{\beta-1} \leq 2|x - y|^{\beta-1},$$

and

$$|a(1 + a^2 + |x|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} - a(1 + a^2 + |y|^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}| \leq |g_2(x) - g_2(y)|^{\beta-1} \leq |x - y|^{\beta-1}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

We need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.11. *Under (3.18), for $\kappa_6 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$\kappa_4 + \kappa_5 < \kappa_6 \text{ if } m = 1 \text{ and } \kappa_6 < 0 \text{ if } m > 1, \quad (3.30)$$

there are $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\varepsilon^{-1} [\langle x, b_\varepsilon(t, x) \rangle + |b_\varepsilon(t, x)|^2] \leq \kappa_6 |x|^2 + C_1. \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. By (3.19) and (3.18) we have

$$\varepsilon^{-1}\langle x, b_\varepsilon(t, x) \rangle = \frac{\langle x, b(t, x) \rangle}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(t, x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} \leq \frac{\kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(t, x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}}.$$

When $m = 1$, by $|b_\varepsilon(t, x)| \leq \varepsilon|b(t, x)|$ and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-1}[\langle x, b_\varepsilon(t, x) \rangle + |b_\varepsilon(t, x)|^2] &\leq \frac{\kappa_3 + (\kappa_4 + \kappa_5)|x|^2}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} + \varepsilon\kappa_2^2(1 + |x|)^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\kappa_4 + \kappa_5}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} + 2\varepsilon\kappa_2^2\right)|x|^2 + \frac{\kappa_3}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} + 2\varepsilon\kappa_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for given $\kappa_6 > \kappa_4 + \kappa_5$, if ε_0 is small enough, then for some $C_1 > 0$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\varepsilon^{-1}[\langle x, b_\varepsilon(t, x) \rangle + |b_\varepsilon(t, x)|^2] \leq \kappa_6|x|^2 + C_1.$$

When $m > 1$, for any $K \geq 1$, thanks to $\kappa_5 < 0$, by Young's inequality, there are constants $\varepsilon_0, C_0(K) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$\frac{\kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(t, x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} \leq \frac{\kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}(\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^{m-1}} \leq K\kappa_5|x|^2 + C_0.$$

Hence, by $|b_\varepsilon(t, x)|^2 \leq \varepsilon|b(t, x)|^{\frac{2}{m}} \leq \varepsilon\kappa_2^2(1 + |x|)^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-1}[\langle x, b_\varepsilon(t, x) \rangle + |b_\varepsilon(t, x)|^2] &\leq \kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + K\kappa_5|x|^2 + C_0 + \kappa_2^2(1 + |x|)^2 \\ &\leq (\kappa_4 + 2\kappa_2^2 + K\kappa_5)|x|^2 + C_1(K), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.31) by $\kappa_5 < 0$ and choosing K large enough. \square

Now we show the following Lyapunov's type estimate.

Lemma 3.12. *Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) , for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$ and $\kappa_6 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (3.30), there are constants $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, $C_0 = C_0(\beta) > 0$, $C_1 = C_1(\beta, \nu) > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $s \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)}U_\beta(x) \leq (C_0\kappa_6 + C_1(\kappa_1^{2\wedge\alpha}\mathbb{1}_{\beta \in (0,2)} + \kappa_1^\beta\mathbb{1}_{\beta \geq 2}))U_\beta(x) + C_2. \quad (3.32)$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the above estimate for $|x|$ being large. We divide the proofs into three steps. For the sake of simplicity, we drop the time variable.

(Step 1). Note that

$$\nabla U_\beta(x) = \beta x U_{\beta-2}(x),$$

and

$$\nabla^2 U_\beta(x) = \beta U_{\beta-2}(x)\mathbb{I} + \beta(\beta - 2)U_{\beta-4}(x)(x \otimes x). \quad (3.33)$$

By (3.13) and (3.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)}U_\beta(x) &= \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^1 \langle b_\varepsilon(x), \nabla U_\beta(x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)) \rangle d\theta \\ &= \varepsilon^{-1}\beta \int_0^1 [\langle b_\varepsilon(x), x \rangle + \theta|b_\varepsilon(x)|^2] U_{\beta-2}(x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)) d\theta \\ &\leq \beta [\kappa_6|x|^2 + C_1] \int_0^1 U_{\beta-2}(x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)) d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following estimate: there is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$(1 + |x|^2)/2 \leq 1 + |x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \leq 2(1 + |x|^2). \quad (3.34)$$

In fact, noting that by (3.20) and (3.18),

$$|b_\varepsilon(x)| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}|b(x)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}\kappa_2(1 + |x|), \quad (3.35)$$

for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ with ε_0 small enough, we have

$$1 + |x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \leq 1 + (|x| + |b_\varepsilon(x)|)^2 \leq 1 + (|x| + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \kappa_2(1 + |x|))^2 \leq 2(1 + |x|^2),$$

and for $|x| > 1$,

$$1 + |x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \geq 1 + (|x| - |b_\varepsilon(x)|)^2 \geq 1 + (|x| - \sqrt{\varepsilon} \kappa_2(1 + |x|))^2 \geq (1 + |x|^2)/2,$$

and for $|x| \leq 1$,

$$1 + |x + \theta b_\varepsilon(x)|^2 \geq 1 \geq (1 + |x|^2)/2.$$

Hence, we have (3.34). Thus, for $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$\mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) \leq \begin{cases} \beta \kappa_6 |x|^2 \left(\frac{1+|x|^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} + C_1 \left(\frac{1+|x|^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}, & \kappa_6 > 0, \beta \leq 2, \\ \beta \kappa_6 |x|^2 \left(\frac{1+|x|^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} + C_1 (2(1+|x|^2))^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}, & \kappa_6 < 0, \beta > 2, \\ \beta \kappa_6 |x|^2 (2(1+|x|^2))^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} + C_1 (2(1+|x|^2))^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}, & \kappa_6 > 0, \beta > 2, \\ \beta \kappa_6 |x|^2 (2(1+|x|^2))^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1} + C_1 \left(\frac{1+|x|^2}{2}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}-1}, & \kappa_6 < 0, \beta \leq 2, \end{cases}$$

which implies by Young's inequality that for some $C_0 = C_0(\beta) > 0$,

$$\mathcal{B}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) \leq C_0 \kappa_6 U_\beta(x) + C. \quad (3.36)$$

(Step 2). In the remaining steps we treat $\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x)$. First of all, we consider the case of $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\beta \in [2, \alpha]$. By (3.15), (3.25) and $\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) = \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(x, z)$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 \text{tr}((\sigma \otimes \sigma)(x, z) \cdot \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 U_\beta(x + \theta \theta' \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(x, z))) d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz).$$

Since $\beta \geq 2$, by (3.33) and (3.35), we have for $\varepsilon \leq 1/\kappa_2^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma(x, z)|^2 \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 U_{\beta-2}(x + \theta \theta' \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(x, z) + b_\varepsilon(x)) d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma(x, z)|^2 (1 + |x|^{\beta-2} + |\sigma(x, z)|^{\beta-2} + |b_\varepsilon(x)|^{\beta-2}) \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|\sigma(x, z)|^2 (1 + |x|^{\beta-2}) + |\sigma(x, z)|^\beta) \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.16) and (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) , we further have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} ((\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|)^2 (1 + |x|^{\beta-2}) |z|^2 + (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|)^\beta |z|^\beta) \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \kappa_1^\beta |x|^\beta) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|z|^2 + |z|^\beta) \nu(dz) \lesssim \kappa_1^\beta U_\beta(x) + C. \end{aligned}$$

(Step 3). Next we consider the case of $\beta \in (0, 2)$. Let κ_1 be the same as in (3.16) and write $\gamma := (4\kappa_1)^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda\alpha}}$. By (3.15) we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) = J_1(x) + J_2(x),$$

where

$$J_1(x) := \int_{|z| < \gamma} \frac{\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) + \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x - \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) - 2\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x)}{2\varepsilon} \nu(dz)$$

and

$$J_2(x) := \int_{|z| \geq \gamma} \frac{\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x + \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) + \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x - \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)) - 2\mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x)}{2\varepsilon} \nu(dz).$$

For $J_1(x)$, by (3.25) and (3.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(x) &= \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{|z|<\gamma} \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 \operatorname{tr}((\sigma_\varepsilon \otimes \sigma_\varepsilon)(x, z), \mathcal{D}^{(\varepsilon)} \nabla^2 U_\beta(x + \theta\theta' \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z))) d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{|z|<\gamma} \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 \beta |\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)|^2 U_{\beta-2}(x + \theta\theta' \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) + b_\varepsilon(x)) d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that for $\beta \in (0, 2)$,

$$\beta(\beta - 2) |\langle \sigma(x, z), y \rangle|^2 U_{\beta-4}(y) \leq 0.$$

For ε_0 small enough, and for $|z| < \gamma = (4\kappa_1)^{-1} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2\wedge\alpha}}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, $\theta' \in (-1, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |x + \theta\theta' \sigma_\varepsilon(x, z) + b_\varepsilon(x)| &\geq |x| - |\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)| - |b_\varepsilon(x)| \\ &\stackrel{(3.16)}{\geq} |x| - (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|) \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2\wedge\alpha}} |z| - |b_\varepsilon(x)| \\ &\stackrel{(3.35)}{\geq} |x| - (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|) (4\kappa_1)^{-1} - \sqrt{\varepsilon} \kappa_2 (1 + |x|) \\ &\geq |x|/2 - C_3. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $|x| > 4C_3$, by (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) ,

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(x) &\leq \int_{|z|<\gamma} \frac{\beta |\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)|^2}{2\varepsilon} \left(1 + \left|\frac{|x|}{2} - C_3\right|^2\right)^{\frac{\beta-2}{2}} \nu(dz) \\ &\leq \int_{|z|<\gamma} \frac{\beta (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{2\wedge\alpha}} |z|^2}{2\varepsilon} \left(\frac{|x|^2}{16}\right)^{\frac{\beta-2}{2}} \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\beta (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{2\wedge\alpha}}}{2\varepsilon} \left(\frac{|x|^2}{16}\right)^{\frac{\beta-2}{2}} \gamma^{2-(2\wedge\alpha)} \leq C_1 \kappa_1^{2\wedge\alpha} |x|^\beta + C_2. \end{aligned}$$

For $J_2(x)$, since $\beta \in (0, 2)$, by Lemma 3.10, (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) and Lemma 3.3, we directly have

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(x) &\lesssim \int_{|z|\geq\gamma} |\sigma_\varepsilon(x, z)|^\beta \varepsilon^{-1} \nu(dz) \\ &\leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)^\beta \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2-2\wedge\alpha}-1} \int_{|z|\geq\gamma} |z|^\beta \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)^\beta \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{2-2\wedge\alpha}-1} \gamma^{\beta-2\wedge\alpha} \leq C_1 \kappa_1^{2\wedge\alpha} |x|^\beta + C_2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $|x| \geq 4C_3$,

$$\mathcal{A}^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) \leq C_1 \kappa_1^{2\wedge\alpha} U_\beta(x) + C_2. \quad (3.37)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 3.13. From the above proofs, one sees that if $|\sigma(t, x, z)| \leq \kappa_0 |z|$, then for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta(x) \leq C_0 \kappa_6 U_\beta(x) + C_2,$$

where κ_6 is given in (3.30).

As an easy corollary, we have

Corollary 3.14. Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) , for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$ and $T > 0$, it holds that for some $C_1 > 0$ depending on T ,

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon|^\beta \right) \leq C_1 (1 + \mathbb{E}|X_0|^\beta), \quad (3.38)$$

and for some $C_2 > 0$ independent of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}U_\beta(X_t^\varepsilon) \leq e^{\kappa_7 t} \mathbb{E}U_\beta(X_0) + C_2(e^{\kappa_7 t} - 1)/\kappa_7, \quad (3.39)$$

where $\kappa_7 := C_0\kappa_6 + C_1(\kappa_1^{2\wedge\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\beta \in (0,2)} + \kappa_1^\beta \mathbb{1}_{\beta \geq 2}) \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Lemma 3.12).

Proof. By Itô's formula and Lemma 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa_7 t} U_\beta(X_t^\varepsilon) &= U_\beta(X_0) + \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_7 s} (\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} U_\beta - \kappa_7 U_\beta)(X_s^\varepsilon) ds + M_t^\varepsilon \\ &\leq U_\beta(X_0) + C_2 \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_7 s} ds + M_t^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

where M_t^ε is a local martingale given by

$$M_t^\varepsilon = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\kappa_7 s} (U_\beta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon + \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) + b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) - U_\beta(X_{s-}^\varepsilon)) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon(ds, dz).$$

By applying stochastic Gronwall's lemma (see [41, Lemma 3.7]) and utilizing the fact that β can be chosen arbitrarily in the interval $(0, \alpha)$, we obtain equation (3.38). Moreover, for $R > 0$, define

$$\tau_R^\varepsilon := \inf \{t > 0 : |X_t^\varepsilon| \geq R\}.$$

By the optimal stopping theorem and taking expectations for (3.40), we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^{-\kappa_7 t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon} U_\beta(X_{t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)\right) \leq \mathbb{E}U_\beta(X_0) + C_2(1 - \mathbb{E}e^{-\kappa_7 t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon})/\kappa_7.$$

Letting $R \rightarrow \infty$ and by Fatou's lemma, we obtain (3.39). \square

For given $T > 0$, let \mathcal{T}_T be the set of all stopping times bounded by T .

Lemma 3.15. *For any $T, \gamma > 0$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \sup_{\tau, \eta \in \mathcal{T}_T, \tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta} \mathbb{P}(|X_\tau^\varepsilon - X_\eta^\varepsilon| > \gamma) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\tau, \eta \in \mathcal{T}_T$ with $\tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta$. For any $R > 0$, define

$$\zeta_R := \inf \{t > 0 : |X_t^\varepsilon| > R\}, \quad \tau_R := \zeta_R \wedge \tau, \quad \eta_R := \zeta_R \wedge \eta.$$

We prove the limit for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. For $\alpha = 2$, it is easier. By (3.9), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\eta_R}^\varepsilon - X_{\tau_R}^\varepsilon &= \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon + \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| > \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by (3.20) and (3.18), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|I_1| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} |b(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon)| d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} |b(s, X_s^\varepsilon)| ds\right) \leq C_R \delta.$$

For I_2 , by (3.10) and the isometry of stochastic integrals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left|\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}^\varepsilon, z) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\varepsilon(ds, dz)\right|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} |\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z)|^2 \nu(dz) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < 1} |\sigma(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z)|^2 \nu_\varepsilon(dz) ds\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 R)^2 \left(\int_{|z| < 1} |z|^2 \nu_\varepsilon(dz) \right) \delta \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} C_R \delta.$$

Fix $\beta \in (0, \alpha \wedge 1)$. For I_3 , by $|\sum_i a_i|^\beta \leq \sum_i a_i^\beta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_3|^\beta &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} |\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z)|^\beta \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(ds, dz) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} |\sigma_\varepsilon(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z)|^\beta \nu(dz) d\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon}\right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq 1} |\sigma(s, X_s^\varepsilon, z)|^\beta \nu_\varepsilon(dz) ds \right) \\ &\leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 R)^\beta \left(\int_{|z| \geq 1} |z|^\beta \nu_\varepsilon(dz) \right) \delta \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} C_R \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality and (3.38),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_\eta^\varepsilon - X_\tau^\varepsilon| \geq \gamma) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|X_{\eta_R}^\varepsilon - X_{\tau_R}^\varepsilon| \geq \gamma; \zeta_R > T) + \mathbb{P}(\zeta_R \leq T) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{P}(|I_i| \geq \frac{\gamma}{3}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^\varepsilon| \geq R \right) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}|I_1| + \left(\frac{3}{\gamma}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 + \left(\frac{3}{\gamma}\right)^\beta \mathbb{E}|I_3|^\beta + \frac{C}{R^\beta} \\ &\leq C_{R, \gamma} \delta + C/R^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero by firstly letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then $R \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Let \mathbb{Q}_ε be the law of $(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$ in \mathbb{D} . Now we can show the following main result of this section.

Theorem 3.16. *Let $\mu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the law of X_0^ε . Suppose that (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) hold, and μ_ε weakly converges to μ_0 as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, and there is a unique martingale solution \mathbb{Q} associated with $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}$ starting from μ_0 at time 0. Then \mathbb{Q}_ε weakly converges to \mathbb{Q} as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Moreover, if $\alpha \geq 2$, then \mathbb{Q}_0 concentrates on the space of all continuous functions.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.15 and Aldous' criterion (see [23, p356, Theorem 4.5]), $(\mathbb{Q}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)}$ is tight in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$. Let \mathbb{P}_0 be any accumulation point. By Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 6.4 in appendix, one has $\mathbb{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^{(0)})$. By the uniqueness, we have $\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathbb{Q}$ and \mathbb{Q}_ε weakly converges to \mathbb{Q} as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. If $\alpha \geq 2$, then by Proposition 6.3, \mathbb{Q} concentrates on the space of all continuous functions. \square

3.2. Convergence of invariant measures. In this section we show the following convergence of invariant measures under dissipativity assumptions.

Theorem 3.17. *Suppose that b and σ do not depend on the time variable. Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}_b^σ) , if for some $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$,*

$$\kappa_7(\beta) := C_0 \kappa_6 + C_1 (\kappa_1^{2 \wedge \alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\beta \in (0, 2)} + \kappa_1^\beta \mathbb{1}_{\beta \geq 2}) < 0,$$

where the above constants appear in Lemma 3.12, then for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is an invariant probability measure μ_ε associated with the semigroup $P_t^\varepsilon f(x) := \mathbb{E}f(X_t^\varepsilon(x))$, where $X_t^\varepsilon(x)$ is the unique solution of SDE (3.9) starting from $X_0^\varepsilon = x$. Moreover, $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is tight and any accumulation point μ_0 is a stationary distribution of SDE (3.22).

Proof. Let $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$. If $\kappa_7(\beta) < 0$, then by (3.39), it is easy to see that

$$\sup_\varepsilon \sup_{T \geq 1} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|X_t^\varepsilon|^\beta dt < \infty. \quad (3.41)$$

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $T \geq 1$, we define a probability measure over \mathbb{R}^d by

$$\mu_{\varepsilon, T}(A) := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}\{X_t^\varepsilon \in A\} dt, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By (3.41), one sees that $(\mu_{\varepsilon, T})_{T \geq 1}$ is tight. Let μ_ε be any accumulation point of $(\mu_{\varepsilon, T})_{T \geq 1}$. By the classical Krylov-Bogoliubov argument (cf. [10, Section 3.1]), one can verify that μ_ε is an invariant probability measure associated with the semigroup $(P_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}$, and by (3.41),

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^\beta \mu_\varepsilon(dx) < \infty.$$

From this, by Prohorov's theorem we derive that $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)}$ is tight. Let μ_0 be any accumulation point of $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)}$ and for subsequence $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, μ_{ε_k} weakly converges to μ_0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Let $X_0^{\varepsilon_k}$ have the distribution μ_{ε_k} and $X_t^{\varepsilon_k}$ be the unique solution of SDE (3.9). Since $\mu_{\varepsilon_k} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an invariant probability measure of SDE (3.9), we have for each $t > 0$ and $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mu_{\varepsilon_k}(f) = \mathbb{E}f(X_t^{\varepsilon_k}).$$

By Theorem 3.16 and taking weak limits, we obtain

$$\mu_0(f) = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}f(w_t), \quad t > 0,$$

where \mathbb{Q} is a martingale solution of SDE (3.22) with initial distribution μ_0 . In other words, μ_0 is a stationary distribution of \mathbb{Q} . \square

Remark 3.18. *If SDE (3.22) has a unique stationary distribution μ (or invariant probability measure), then $\mu_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \mu$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.*

Example. Let $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and consider the following SDE

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t)dL_t^{(\alpha)} + b(X_t)dt, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (3.42)$$

where for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $L_t^{(\alpha)}$ is a standard rotationally invariant and symmetric α -stable process, and for $\alpha = 2$, $L_t^{(2)}$ is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are two locally Lipschitz continuous functions. Suppose that for some $\kappa_1 \geq \kappa_0 > 0$,

$$\kappa_0|\xi|^2 \leq |\sigma(x)\xi|^2 \leq \kappa_1|\xi|^2,$$

and for some $m \geq 1$ and $\kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4 > 0$ and $\kappa_5 < 0$ (with $\kappa_4 + \kappa_5 < 0$ in the case of $m = 1$),

$$|b(x)| \leq (\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^m, \quad \langle x, b(x) \rangle \leq \kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}.$$

It is well-known that SDE (3.42) has a unique invariant probability measure μ (see [42]). If we consider the approximating SDE (3.9) with σ_ε and b_ε being defined by (3.19), then SDE (3.9) admits an invariant probability measure μ_ε , and by Theorem 3.17,

$$\mu_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \mu, \quad \varepsilon \downarrow 0.$$

3.3. Rate of weak convergence. Now we aim to show the rate of weak convergence as done for ODE (see Theorem 2.1). However, in this case, we will utilize the regularity estimate for the associated parabolic equation. To achieve this, we will require the following stronger assumptions:

(H') Suppose that for some $\kappa_1 > 0$ and all $0 \neq z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|b\|_\infty + \|\nabla b\|_\infty + \|\sigma(\cdot, z)/|z|\|_\infty + \|\nabla_z \sigma\|_\infty + \|\nabla_x \sigma(\cdot, z)/|z|\|_\infty \leq \kappa_1,$$

and for any $\varphi \in C_b^1$ and $t > 0$, the following parabolic equation admits a solution u ,

$$\partial_s u + \mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} u = 0, \quad s \in [0, t), \quad u(t, x) = \varphi(x),$$

with regularity estimate that for some $\gamma > 2$ and $\beta < 1$,

$$\|u(s, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty, \quad \|u(s, \cdot)\|_{C_b^\gamma} \leq C(t-s)^{-\beta} \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1}, \quad s \in [0, t). \quad (3.43)$$

We can show

Theorem 3.19. *Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (\mathbf{H}') , for any $\varphi \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $T > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t)| \leq C \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2, \gamma]} + \varepsilon^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha < 2} \right) \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1}, \quad (3.44)$$

where β_1 is from (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and γ is from (\mathbf{H}') .

Proof. Fix $t > 0$. Under (\mathbf{H}') , by Itô's formula, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t^\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E}u(t, X_t^\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E}u(0, X_0) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (\partial_s u + \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u)(s, X_s^\varepsilon) ds$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t) = \mathbb{E}u(t, X_t) = \mathbb{E}u(0, X_0).$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.15,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_t)| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u - \mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} u)(s, X_s^\varepsilon) ds \right| \leq \int_0^t \|\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u(s) - \mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} u(s)\|_\infty ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \|u(s)\|_{C_b^\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2, \gamma]} + \varepsilon^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \|u(s)\|_{C_b^2} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha < 2} \right) ds \\ &\lesssim \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2, \gamma]} + \varepsilon^{\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha < 2} \right) \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\beta} ds, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired estimate by $\beta < 1$. \square

Remark 3.20. *Estimate (3.43) is the classical Schauder estimate, which is well-studied in the literature of partial differential equations (PDEs), particularly for the case of continuous diffusion with $\alpha = 2$. In the case of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, the estimate can be found in [17]. Here, we provide a brief proof specifically for the additive noise case. We consider the following forward PDE:*

$$\partial_t u = \Delta^{\alpha/2} u + b \cdot \nabla u, \quad u(0) = \varphi, \quad \alpha \in (1, 2].$$

Let P_t be the semigroup associated with $\Delta^{\alpha/2}$, that is,

$$P_t \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}\varphi(x + L_t^{(\alpha)}).$$

By Duhamel's formula, we have

$$u(t, x) = P_t \varphi(x) + \int_0^t P_{t-s}(b \cdot \nabla u)(s, x) ds.$$

It is well-known that by the gradient estimate of heat kernels, for $\beta, \gamma \geq 0$ (see [7] [17]),

$$\|P_t \varphi\|_{C_b^{\beta+\gamma}} \leq C t^{-\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \|\varphi\|_{C_b^\gamma}, \quad t > 0.$$

Hence, for $\beta \in (2 - \alpha, 1]$ and $\gamma \in (2, \alpha + \beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_{C_b^\gamma} &\lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{\alpha}} \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1} + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{\beta-\gamma}{\alpha}} \|b(s) \cdot \nabla u(s)\|_{C_b^\beta} ds \\ &\lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{\alpha}} \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1} + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{\beta-\gamma}{\alpha}} \|b(s)\|_{C_b^\beta} \|u(s)\|_{C_b^{\beta+1}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality of Volterra's type, we obtain that for any $\gamma \in (2, \alpha + \beta)$,

$$\|u(t)\|_{C_b^\gamma} \lesssim t^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{\alpha}} \|\varphi\|_{C_b^1}.$$

In this case we have the weak convergence rate (3.44) for Hölder drift b .

4. COMPOUND POISSON APPROXIMATION FOR 2D-NSEs

In this section, we develop a discrete compound Poisson approximation for the 2D Navier-Stokes or Euler equations on the torus. We shall show the optimal rate of convergence for this approximation. Our scheme heavily relies on the stochastic Lagrangian particle representation of the NSEs, which has been previously studied in works such as [30], [8], and [43].

4.1. Diffeomorphism flow of SDEs driven by compound Poisson processes. In this subsection we show the diffeomorphism flow property of SDEs driven by compound Poisson processes and the connection with difference equations. More precisely, fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $X_{s,t}(x)$ solve the following SDE:

$$X_{s,t}(x) = x + \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(b_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r-}(x)) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} z \right) \mathcal{H}^\varepsilon(dr, dz), \quad t > s \geq 0,$$

where $b_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded continuous function, and \mathcal{H}^ε is defined as in (3.2). By the definition, we can rephrase the above SDE as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{s,t}(x) &= x + \sum_{r \in (s,t]} \left(b_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r-}(x)) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \Delta H_r \right) \mathbb{1}_{\Delta \mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon = 1} \\ &= x + \int_s^t b_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r-}(x)) d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} (H_t^\varepsilon - H_s^\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon$ is defined by (2.1) and H_t^ε is defined by (3.1). For given $T > 0$, bounded continuous functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$u(s, x) := \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_{s,T}(x)) + \int_s^T \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s,r}(x)) dr, \quad s \in [0, T].$$

Since $s \mapsto \mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon$ is stochastically continuous and b_ε is bi-continuous, by (4.1) and the dominated convergence theorem, it is easy to see that

$$(s, x) \mapsto u(s, x) \text{ is bi-continuous on } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.2)$$

The following lemma states that u solves the backward Kolmogorov equation. Although the proof is standard, we provide a detailed proof for the convenience of the readers.

Lemma 4.1. *For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $s \mapsto u(s, x)$ is continuous differentiable, and*

$$\partial_s u(s, x) + \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u(s, x) + f(s, x) = 0, \quad s \in [0, T], \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} \varphi(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\varphi(x + \sqrt{\varepsilon} z + b_\varepsilon(s, x)) - \varphi(x)}{\varepsilon} \nu(dz).$$

Proof. Fix $s, h \in [0, T]$ with $s + h \leq T$. Note that by the flow property of $X_{s,t}(x)$,

$$X_{s,T}(x) = X_{s+h,T} \circ X_{s,s+h}(x).$$

This follows directly from the unique solvability of SDE (4.1). Since $X_{s+h,T}(\cdot)$ and $X_{s,s+h}(\cdot)$ are independent, by definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(s, x) &= \mathbb{E}\varphi(X_{s+h,T} \circ X_{s,s+h}(x)) + \int_{s+h}^T \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s+h,r} \circ X_{s,s+h}(x)) dr + \int_s^{s+h} \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s,r}(x)) dr \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}\varphi(X_{s+h,T}(y)) + \int_{s+h}^T \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s+h,r}(y)) dr \right]_{y=X_{s,s+h}(x)} + \int_s^{s+h} \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s,r}(x)) dr \\ &= \mathbb{E}u(s+h, X_{s,s+h}(x)) + \int_s^{s+h} \mathbb{E}f(r, X_{s,r}(x)) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $u(s+h, \cdot)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}u(s+h, X_{s,s+h}(x)) = u(s+h, x) + \int_s^{s+h} \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_r^{(\varepsilon)} u(s+h, X_{s,r}(x)) dr.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{u(s+h, x) - u(s, x)}{h} = -\frac{1}{h} \int_s^{s+h} \left(\mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_r^{(\varepsilon)} u(s+h, X_{s,r}(x)) + \mathbb{E} f(r, X_{s,r}(x)) \right) dr.$$

By the dominated convergence theorem and (4.2), it is easy to see that

$$\partial_s^+ u(s, x) + \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u(s, x) + f(s, x) = 0,$$

where ∂_s^+ (resp. ∂_s^-) stands for the right (resp. left) hand derivative. Similarly, we can show

$$\partial_s^- u(s, x) + \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u(s, x) + f(s, x) = 0.$$

Since $(s, x) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} u(s, x) + f(s, x)$ is continuous, we complete the proof. \square

Remark 4.2. *The continuity of b_ε and f in time variable t can be dropped by smooth approximation. In this case, (4.3) holds only for Lebesgue almost all $s \in [0, T]$.*

Next, we investigate the C^1 -diffeomorphism property of the mapping $x \mapsto X_{s,t}(x)$. To ensure the homeomorphism property of this mapping, we need to impose a condition on the gradient of $b_\varepsilon(s, x)$. More specifically, we assume that the gradient of $b_\varepsilon(s, x)$ is not too large.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that $(s, x) \mapsto \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, x)$ is continuous and for some $\kappa > 0$,*

$$|\nabla_x b_\varepsilon(s, x)| \leq \kappa \varepsilon \leq 1, \quad \operatorname{div} b_\varepsilon = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Then there is an $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $\{X_{s,t}(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}_{0 \leq s < t}$ forms a C^1 -diffeomorphism flow and for some constant $C = C(d) > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \det(\nabla X_{s,t}(x)) + \mathbb{E} \det(\nabla X_{s,t}(x))^{-1} \leq e^{C\kappa^2 \varepsilon(t-s)}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $s = 0$ and write $X_t := X_{0,t}(x)$. Let $J_t := \nabla X_t$. By (4.1) we clearly have

$$J_t = \mathbb{I} + \int_0^t \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}) J_{s-} d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon,$$

and by Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \det(J_t) &= 1 + \int_0^t \left[\det((\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-})) J_{s-}) - \det(J_{s-}) \right] d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon \\ &= 1 + \int_0^t \left[\det(\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-})) - 1 \right] \det(J_{s-}) d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Note that for a matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ with $|b_{ij}| \leq \ell$ (see [45, Lemma 2.1]),

$$|\det(\mathbb{I} + B) - 1 - \operatorname{tr} B| \leq C_d \ell^2 (1 + \ell)^{d-2}.$$

By (4.4) we have

$$|\det(\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-})) - 1| \leq C\kappa^2 \varepsilon^2,$$

and there is an ε_0 small enough so that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$|\det(\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}))^{-1} - 1| \leq C\kappa^2 \varepsilon^2.$$

Thus by (4.5), we have

$$\det(J_t)^{-1} = 1 + \int_0^t \left[\det(\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_{s-}))^{-1} - 1 \right] \det(J_{s-})^{-1} d\mathcal{N}_s^\varepsilon.$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \det(J_t) = 1 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left[\det(\mathbb{I} + \nabla b_\varepsilon(s, X_s)) - 1 \right] \det(J_s) d\left(\frac{S}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq 1 + C\kappa^2\varepsilon \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \det(J_s) ds,$$

and also

$$\mathbb{E} \det(J_t)^{-1} \leq 1 + C\kappa^2\varepsilon \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \det(J_s)^{-1} ds.$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we obtain the desired estimates. \square

4.2. Compound Poisson approximation for 2D-NSEs. Fix $T > 0$. In this subsection we consider the following backward 2D-NSE on the torus $\mathbb{T}^2 = [-\pi, \pi]^2$:

$$\partial_s u + \nu \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = 0, \quad \operatorname{div} u = 0, \quad u(T) = \varphi, \quad (4.6)$$

where ν stands for the viscosity constant and p is the pressure, $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a divergence free smooth velocity field. Let $w = \operatorname{curl}(u)$ be the curl of u . Then w solves the following vorticity equation

$$\partial_s w + \nu \Delta w + u \cdot \nabla w = 0, \quad w(T) = \operatorname{curl}(\varphi) =: w_0. \quad (4.7)$$

If we assume

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u(x) dx = 0,$$

then the velocity field u can be uniquely recovered from vorticity w by the Biot-Savart law:

$$u = K_2 * w,$$

where K_2 is the Biot-Savart kernel on the torus and takes the following form (see [30, (2.19)] and [37, p256, Theorem 2.17]):

$$K_2(x) := (-x_2, x_1)/(2\pi|x|^2) + K_0(x), \quad K_0 \in C^\infty([-\pi, \pi]^2). \quad (4.8)$$

Since $K_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$, we clearly have

$$\|K_2 * w\|_\infty \leq C\|w\|_\infty. \quad (4.9)$$

Let $X_{s,t}(x)$ solve the following nonlinear SDE on the torus \mathbb{T}^2 :

$$\begin{cases} X_{s,t}(x) = x + \int_s^t u(r, X_{s,r}(x)) ds + \sqrt{\nu} W_t, & t \in [s, T], \\ w(s, x) = \mathbb{E} w_0(X_{s,T}(x)), & u = K_2 * w. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

It is well-known that there is a one-to-one correspondence between (4.6) and (4.7) (see [30] [8] [43]). Motivated by the approximation in Section 3, we may construct the compound Poisson approximation for system (4.10) as follows: for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{cases} X_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x) = x + \varepsilon \int_s^t u_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r}^\varepsilon(x)) d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}(H_t^\varepsilon - H_s^\varepsilon), \\ w_\varepsilon(s, x) = \mathbb{E} w_0(X_{s,T}^\varepsilon(x)), & u_\varepsilon = K_2 * w_\varepsilon, \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

where H_t^ε is a compound Poisson process defined in (1.13). By Lemma 4.1, w_ε solves the following nonlinear discrete difference equation:

$$\partial_s w_\varepsilon + \mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} w_\varepsilon = 0, \quad u_\varepsilon = K_2 * w_\varepsilon,$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{f(x + \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu} e_i + \varepsilon u_\varepsilon(s, x)) + f(x - \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu} e_i + \varepsilon u_\varepsilon(s, x)) - 2f(x)}{2\varepsilon}.$$

The following Beale-Kato-Majda's estimate for the Biot-Savart law on the torus is crucial for solving stochastic system (4.11).

Lemma 4.4. *For any $\gamma \in (0, 1]$, there is a constant $C = C(\gamma) > 0$ such that for any $w \in C_b^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^2)$,*

$$\|\nabla(K_2 * w)\|_\infty \leq C(1 + \|w\|_\infty(1 + \log(1 + [w]_\gamma))),$$

where $[w]_\gamma := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|}{|x - y|^\gamma}$.

Proof. Let $H(x) := (-x_2, x_1)/(2\pi|x|^2)$. By (4.8), it suffices to make an estimate for $\nabla H * w$. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, by definition and the cancellation property $\int_{|y|=s} \nabla H(y) dy = 0$, we have

$$\nabla H * w(x) = \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \nabla H(y) w(x - y) dy = I_\varepsilon(x) + J_\varepsilon(x),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon(x) &:= \int_{|y| \leq \varepsilon} \nabla H(y) (w(x - y) - w(x)) dy, \\ J_\varepsilon(x) &:= \int_{\varepsilon < |y| \leq \pi} \nabla H(y) w(x - y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

For I_ε , since $|\nabla H(y)| \leq 4|y|^{-2}$, we have

$$\|I_\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq 4[w]_\gamma \int_{|y| \leq \varepsilon} |y|^{\gamma-2} dy \leq C[w]_\gamma \varepsilon^\gamma.$$

For J_ε , we have

$$\|J_\varepsilon\|_\infty \leq 4\|w\|_\infty \int_{\varepsilon < |y| \leq \pi} |y|^{-2} dy \leq C\|w\|_\infty(1 + \log 1/\varepsilon).$$

Combining the above two estimates and choosing $\varepsilon = ([w]_\gamma + 1)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\|H * w\|_\infty \leq C(1 + \|w\|_\infty(1 + \log(1 + [w]_\gamma))).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 4.5. *In the whole space, the above estimates need to be modified as follows (see [30]):*

$$\|\nabla u\|_\infty \leq C(1 + \|w\|_\infty(1 + \log(1 + [w]_\gamma + \|w\|_p))), \quad p \in [1, \infty).$$

The presence of $\|w\|_p$ and the Jacobian determinant in Theorem 4.3, which depend on the bound of ∇b_ε , pose challenges when solving the approximating equation (4.11) for NSEs on the entire space. This is why we consider NSEs on the torus instead.

Now we can establish the solvability for stochastic system (4.11).

Theorem 4.6. *For any $w_0 \in C_b^1(\mathbb{T}^2)$, there is a unique solution $X_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x)$ to stochastic system (4.11) so that $w_\varepsilon \in C([0, T]; C_b^1(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $s \in [0, T]$,*

$$\|\nabla w_\varepsilon(s)\|_\infty \leq C. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. We use Picard's iteration method. Let $u_0(t, x) = K_2 * w_0(x)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X_{s,t}^n(x)$ solve

$$X_{s,t}^n(x) = x + \varepsilon \int_s^t u_{n-1}(r, X_{s,r-}^n(x)) d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon \nu} (H_t^\varepsilon - H_s^\varepsilon), \quad t \in [s, T], \tag{4.13}$$

and define recursively,

$$u_n(s, x) := K_2 * w_n(s, \cdot)(x), \quad w_n(s, x) := \mathbb{E}w_0(X_{s,T}^n(x)). \tag{4.14}$$

Clearly, we have $u_n \in C([0, T]; C_b^1(\mathbb{T}^2))$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\|\nabla X_{s,t}^n\|_\infty \leq 1 + \int_s^t \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty \mathbb{E}\|\nabla X_{s,r}^n\|_\infty dr.$$

By Gronwall's inequality we get

$$\mathbb{E}\|\nabla X_{s,T}^n\|_\infty \leq e^{\int_s^T \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty dr}.$$

Moreover, by (4.9) and Lemma 4.4 with $\gamma = 1$, we have

$$\|u_n(s)\|_\infty + \|\nabla u_n(s)\|_\infty \lesssim 1 + \|w_n(s)\|_\infty (1 + \log(1 + \|\nabla w_n(s)\|_\infty)),$$

and by definition (4.14),

$$\|\nabla w_n(s)\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty \mathbb{E}\|\nabla X_{s,T}^n\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty e^{\int_s^T \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty dr}. \quad (4.15)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_n(s)\|_\infty &\lesssim_C 1 + \|w_0\|_\infty (1 + \log(1 + \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty e^{\int_s^T \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty dr})) \\ &\lesssim_C 1 + \|w_0\|_\infty \left(1 + \log(1 + \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty) + \int_s^T \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty dr \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality again, we obtain

$$\sup_n \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|\nabla u_n(s)\|_\infty \leq C. \quad (4.16)$$

On the other hand, by (4.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|X_{s,t}^n - X_{s,t}^m\|_\infty &\leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \int_s^t \|u_{n-1}(r, X_{s,r-}^n) - u_{n-1}(r, X_{s,r-}^m)\|_\infty d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \int_s^t \|u_{n-1}(r) - u_{m-1}(r)\|_\infty d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_s^t \|\nabla u_{n-1}(r)\|_\infty \mathbb{E}\|X_{s,r}^n - X_{s,r}^m\|_\infty dr + \int_s^t \|u_{n-1}(r) - u_{m-1}(r)\|_\infty dr, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.16) implies by Gronwall's inequality that

$$\sup_{t \in [s, T]} \mathbb{E}\|X_{s,t}^n - X_{s,t}^m\|_\infty \leq C \int_s^T \|u_{n-1}(r) - u_{m-1}(r)\|_\infty dr.$$

Thus, by (4.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_n(s) - w_m(s)\|_\infty &\leq \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty \mathbb{E}\|X_{s,T}^n - X_{s,T}^m\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty \int_s^T \|u_{n-1}(r) - u_{m-1}(r)\|_\infty dr \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty \int_s^T \|w_{n-1}(r) - w_{m-1}(r)\|_\infty dr. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality again, we have

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|w_n(s) - w_m(s)\|_\infty = 0,$$

and also,

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \sup_{t \in [s, T]} \mathbb{E}\|X_{s,t}^n - X_{s,t}^m\|_\infty = 0.$$

By taking limits for (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain the desired result. Moreover, estimate (4.12) follows by (4.15) and (4.16). \square

Now we can show the following main result of this section.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that $\varphi \in C^5(\mathbb{T}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is divergence free and satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \varphi(x) dx = 0$. Let $u \in C([0, T]; C^5(\mathbb{T}^2; \mathbb{R}^2))$ be the unique solution of NSE (4.6). Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|u_\varepsilon(s) - u(s)\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Proof. For $x \in \mathbb{T}^2$, let $\tilde{X}_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x)$ solve the following SDE on torus \mathbb{T}^2 ,

$$\tilde{X}_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x) = x + \varepsilon \int_s^t u(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r-}^\varepsilon(x)) d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}(H_t^\varepsilon - H_s^\varepsilon), \quad (4.17)$$

where H_t^ε is a compound Poisson process defined in (1.13). Since $u(r, \cdot)$ is a function on \mathbb{T}^2 and $u(r, x+z) = u(r, x)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{T}^2$, one sees that

$$\tilde{X}_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x+z) = \tilde{X}_{s,t}^\varepsilon(x) + z, \quad z \in \mathbb{T}^2.$$

Let $w = \text{curl}(u)$ and $w_0 = \text{curl}(\varphi)$,

$$\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(s, x) := \mathbb{E}w_0(\tilde{X}_{s,T}^\varepsilon(x)).$$

By (4.7) and Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}_\varepsilon(s, x) &= \mathbb{E}w(T, \tilde{X}_{s,T}^\varepsilon(x)) = w(s, x) + \mathbb{E} \int_s^T (\partial_s w + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_r^{(\varepsilon)} w)(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon(x)) dr \\ &= w(s, x) + \mathbb{E} \int_s^T (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_r^{(\varepsilon)} w - \nu \Delta w - u \cdot \nabla w)(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon(x)) dr, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s^{(\varepsilon)}$ is the generator of SDE (4.17) and given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f(x) := \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{f(x + \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \varepsilon u(s, x)) + f(x - \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \varepsilon u(s, x)) - 2f(x)}{2\varepsilon}.$$

Hence,

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(s) - w(s)\|_\infty \leq \int_s^T \|(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_r^{(\varepsilon)} w - \nu \Delta w - u \cdot \nabla w)(r)\|_\infty dr. \quad (4.18)$$

Noting that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{f(x + \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \varepsilon u(s, x)) + f(x - \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \varepsilon u(s, x)) - 2f(x + \varepsilon u(s, x))}{2\varepsilon} - \nu \partial_i^2 f(x) \\ &= \nu \int_0^1 \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-1}^1 (\partial_i^2 f(x + \theta\theta' \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \varepsilon u(s, x)) - \partial_i^2 f(x)) d\theta' d\theta \\ &= \nu \int_0^1 \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \theta\theta' \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu} \int_0^1 \partial_i^3 f(x + \theta\theta'\theta'' \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \theta'' \varepsilon u(s, x)) d\theta'' d\theta' d\theta \\ &= \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu^3} \int_0^1 \frac{\theta^2}{2} \int_{-1}^1 \theta' \int_0^1 (\partial_i^3 f(x + \theta\theta'\theta'' \sqrt{\varepsilon\nu}e_i + \theta'' \varepsilon u(s, x)) - \partial_i^3 f(x)) d\theta'' d\theta' d\theta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{f(x + \varepsilon u(s, x)) - f(x)}{\varepsilon} - u(s, x) \cdot \nabla f(x) = u(s, x) \cdot \int_0^1 (\nabla f(x + \theta\varepsilon u(s, x)) - \nabla f(x)) d\theta,$$

we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s^{(\varepsilon)} f - \nu \Delta f - u \cdot \nabla f\|_\infty \lesssim (\varepsilon\nu^2 + \sqrt{\varepsilon^3\nu^3}\|u\|_\infty) \|\nabla^4 f\|_\infty + \varepsilon\|u\|_\infty^2 \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty.$$

Substituting this into (4.18), we obtain that for all $\varepsilon, \nu \in (0, 1]$,

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(s) - w(s)\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon \int_s^T (1 + \|u(r)\|_\infty^2) \|w(r)\|_{C_b^4} dr. \quad (4.19)$$

On the other hand, by (4.17) and (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_{s,t}^\varepsilon - X_{s,t}^\varepsilon\|_\infty &\leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left(\int_s^t \|u(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r}^\varepsilon)\|_\infty d\mathcal{N}_r^\varepsilon \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_s^t \|u(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r}^\varepsilon)\|_\infty dr \\ &\leq \int_s^t \mathbb{E} \|u_\varepsilon(r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(r, X_{s,r}^\varepsilon)\|_\infty dr + \int_s^t \|u(r) - u_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr \\ &\leq \int_s^t \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_{s,r}^\varepsilon - X_{s,r}^\varepsilon\|_\infty dr + \int_s^t \|u(r) - u_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr, \end{aligned}$$

which implies by Gronwall's inequality that

$$\mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_{s,T}^\varepsilon(\cdot) - X_{s,T}^\varepsilon(\cdot)\|_\infty \lesssim \int_s^T \|u(r) - u_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr,$$

and

$$\|\tilde{w}_\varepsilon(s) - w_\varepsilon(s)\|_\infty \leq \|\nabla w_0\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \|\tilde{X}_{s,T}^\varepsilon(\cdot) - X_{s,T}^\varepsilon(\cdot)\|_\infty \lesssim \int_s^T \|u(r) - u_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr.$$

Combining this with (4.19) and (4.9) yields that

$$\|w_\varepsilon(s) - w(s)\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon + \int_s^T \|u(r) - u_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr \lesssim \varepsilon + \int_s^T \|w(r) - w_\varepsilon(r)\|_\infty dr.$$

By Gronwall's inequality and (4.9), we obtain the desired estimate. \square

Remark 4.8. *In addition to the 2D-Navier-Stokes equations on the torus, we can also consider the construction of a compound Poisson approximation for 3D-Navier-Stokes equations on the torus. This will be the focus of our future work. We anticipate that similar convergence results for short time will be obtained in this case as well, following the methodology described in [43].*

5. PROPAGATION OF CHAOS FOR THE PARTICLE APPROXIMATION OF DDSDEs

In this section, we investigate the propagation of chaos in the context of the interaction particle approximation for McKean-Vlasov SDEs driven by either Brownian motions or α -stable processes. The notion of propagation of chaos refers to the convergence of the particle system to the solution of the McKean-Vlasov SDE as the number of particles tends to infinity. This provides a direct full discretization scheme for nonlinear SDEs, allowing for efficient numerical simulations.

Fix an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a symmetric probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $(\mathcal{N}^{N,i})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. Poisson process with intensity N and $(\xi_n^{N,i})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i=1,\dots,N}$ i.i.d. \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables with common distribution ν . Define for $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$H_t^{N,i} := \left(\xi_1^{N,i} + \dots + \xi_{\mathcal{N}_t^{N,i}}^{N,i} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{N,i} \geq 1}.$$

Then $(H^{N,i})_{i=1,\dots,N}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. compound Poisson processes with intensity $N dt \nu(dz)$. Let $\mathcal{H}^{N,i}$ be the associated Poisson random measure, that is,

$$\mathcal{H}^{N,i}([0, t], E) := \sum_{s \leq t} \mathbb{1}_E(\Delta H_s^{N,i}) = \sum_{n \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{N,i}} \mathbb{1}_E(\xi_n^{N,i}), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N,i}$ the compensated Poisson random measure, that is,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N,i}(dt, dz) := \mathcal{H}^{N,i}(dt, dz) - Ndt\nu(dz).$$

For a point $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$, the empirical measure of \mathbf{x} is defined by

$$\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(dz) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}(dz) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where δ_{x^i} is the usual Dirac measure concentrated at point x^i . Let

$$\sigma_N(t, x, y, z) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad b_N(t, x, y) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$$

be two Borel measurable functions. Suppose that

$$\sigma_N(t, x, y, -z) = -\sigma_N(t, x, y, z).$$

For a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we write

$$\sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_N(t, x, y, z) \mu(dy), \quad b_N[t, x, \mu] := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b_N(t, x, y) \mu(dy).$$

Let $\mathbf{X}_t^N = (X_t^{N,i})_{i=1, \dots, N}$ solve the following interaction particle system driven by $\mathcal{H}^{N,i}$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{N,i} &= X_0^{N,i} + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sigma_N[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z] + b_N[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}] \right) \mathcal{H}^{N,i}(ds, dz) \\ &= X_{t-}^{N,i} + \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\sigma_N(t, X_{t-}^{N,i}, X_{t-}^{N,j}, \Delta H_t^{N,i}) + b_N(t, X_{t-}^{N,i}, X_{t-}^{N,j}) \Delta \mathcal{N}_t^{N,i} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where \mathbf{X}_0^N is a symmetric \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variables. For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by Itô's formula (see (3.12)), we have

$$f(X_t^{N,i}) = f(X_0^{N,i}) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{\mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}^N} f(s, X_s^{N,i}) ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Theta_{\mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}^N} f(s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, z) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N,i}(ds, dz), \quad (5.2)$$

where for a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) := \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^N f(x) := N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(f(x + \sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z] + b_N[t, x, \mu]) - f(x) \right) \nu(dz), \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\Theta_{\mu}^N f(t, x, z) := \Theta_{t, \mu}^N f(x, z) := f(x + \sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z] + b_N[t, x, \mu]) - f(x). \quad (5.4)$$

As in Section 2, we write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) = \mathcal{A}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) + \mathcal{B}_{\mu}^N f(t, x),$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) := N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x + \sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z]) - \mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) \right) \nu(dz),$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) := N(\mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) - f(x)), \quad \mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) := f(x + b_N[t, x, \mu]).$$

Note that by the symmetry of ν and $\sigma_N(t, x, y, -z) = -\sigma_N(t, x, y, z)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu}^N f(t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x + \sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z]) + \mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x - \sigma_N[t, x, \mu, z]) - 2\mathcal{D}_{\mu}^N f(t, x)}{2N^{-1}} \nu(dz).$$

We shall give precise choices of σ_N and b_N below in different cases.

5.1. Fractional diffusion with bounded interaction kernel. In this section we fix $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and let

$$\sigma(t, x, y, z) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad b(t, x, y) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$$

be two Borel measurable functions. We make the following assumptions:

$(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b})$ In addition to (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, we suppose that σ and b are continuous in (x, y) , and

$$\sigma(t, x, y, -z) = -\sigma(t, x, y, z), \quad |\sigma(t, x, y, z)| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x||z|),$$

and for the same β_0 as in (3.5),

$$|\sigma(t, x, y, z) - \sigma(t, x, y, z')| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1|x|)(|z - z'| \wedge 1)^{\beta_0},$$

where $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 > 0$. Moreover, for some $m \geq 1$ and $\kappa_2 > 0$,

$$|b(t, x, y)| \leq (\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^m, \quad (5.5)$$

and for some $\kappa_3, \kappa_4 \geq 0$ and $\kappa_5 < 0$,

$$\langle x, b(t, x, y) \rangle \leq \kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}. \quad (5.6)$$

In the above assumptions, we have assumed boundedness of the coefficients with respect to the variable y , which imposes a restriction on the interaction kernel. However, in the next subsection, we relax this assumption and consider the case of unbounded kernels. Now, we introduce the approximation coefficients σ_N and b_N as defined in (3.19).

$$\sigma_N(t, x, y, z) := \sigma(t, x, y, N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}z), \quad b_N(t, x, y) := \frac{b(t, x, y)}{N + \sqrt{N}|b(t, x, y)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}}, \quad (5.7)$$

and also define for $t \geq 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu^\infty f(t, x) := \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^\infty f(x) := \mathcal{A}_\mu^\infty f(t, x) + b[t, x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x), \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu^\infty f(t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{f(x + \sigma[t, x, \mu, z]) + f(x - \sigma[t, x, \mu, z]) - 2f(x)}{2} \nu_0(dz),$$

and ν_0 is the Lévy measure from (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) . We consider the following McKean-Vlasov SDE:

$$dX_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma[t, X_{t-}, \mu_{X_{t-}}, z] \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(dt, dz) + b[t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}] dt, \quad (5.9)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is defined as (3.23) and μ_{X_t} is the law of X_t . By Itô's formula, the nonlinear time-inhomogeneous infinitesimal generator of X_t is given by $\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu_{X_t}}^\infty$.

The following lemma is the same as Lemma 3.9.

Lemma 5.1. *Under $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b})$, where $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, for any $R > 0$, there is a constant $C_R > 0$ such that for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \sup_{|x| \leq R} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^N f(x) - \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^\infty f(x)| \leq C_R N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \|f\|_{C_b^2},$$

where β_1 is from (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) . Moreover, if b is bounded measurable and $\kappa_1 = 0$, then C_R can be independent of $R > 0$.

Proof. Below we drop the time variable for simplicity. Recall that

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu^N f(x) = N(f(x + b_N[x, \mu]) - f(x)).$$

By Taylor's expansion and the definition (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{B}_\mu^N f(x) - b[x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x)| &\leq |\mathcal{B}_\mu^N f(x) - Nb_N[x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x)| + |(Nb_N[x, \mu] - b[x, \mu]) \cdot \nabla f(x)| \\ &\leq N|b_N[x, \mu]| \int_0^1 (|\nabla f(x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]) - \nabla f(x)|) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + |Nb_N[x, \mu] - b[x, \mu]| \cdot \|\nabla f\|_\infty \\
& \leq N|b_N[x, \mu]|^2 \|\nabla^2 f\|_\infty + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\sqrt{N}|b(x, y)|^{2-\frac{1}{m}}}{N + \sqrt{N}|b(x, y)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} \mu(dy) \|\nabla f\|_\infty \\
& \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{|b(x, y)|^2}{N} + \frac{|b(x, y)|^{2-\frac{1}{m}}}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \mu(dy) \|\nabla f\|_{C_b^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under (5.5), we clearly have

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathcal{B}_\mu^N f(x) - b[x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x)| \leq C_R N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla f\|_{C_b^1}.$$

Moreover, as in (3.29) we also have

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathcal{A}_\mu^N f(x) - \mathcal{A}_\mu^\infty f(x)| \leq C_R N^{-(1-\frac{\alpha}{2}) \wedge \beta_1} \|f\|_{C_b^2}.$$

Combining the above two estimates, we obtain the desired estimate. \square

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 3.12.

Lemma 5.2. *Under $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b})$, where $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$, there are constants $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_0 = C_0(\beta) > 0$, $C_1 = C_1(\beta, \nu) > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^N U_\beta(x) \leq (C_0 \kappa_6 + C_1 \kappa_1^\alpha) U_\beta(x) + C_2,$$

where $U_\beta(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{\beta/2}$ and κ_6 is given in (3.30).

Proof. For simplicity we drop the time variable. For $\mathcal{B}_\mu^N U_\beta(x)$, by Taylor's expansion we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_\mu^N U_\beta(x) &= N \int_0^1 \langle b_N[x, \mu], \nabla U_\beta(x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]) \rangle d\theta \\
&= \beta N \int_0^1 \langle b_N[x, \mu], x + \theta b_N[x, \mu] \rangle U_{\beta-2}(x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]) d\theta.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

By (5.5) and (5.6), for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there are N_0 large enough so that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$|b_N(x, y)| \leq N^{-1/2} |b(x, y)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq N^{-1/2} \kappa_2 (1 + |x|) \leq \varepsilon_0 (1 + |x|), \tag{5.11}$$

and as in Lemma 3.11, for the κ_6 given in (3.30),

$$N \langle x, b_N(x, y) \rangle + N |b_N(x, y)|^2 \leq \kappa_6 |x|^2 + C_1.$$

Thus, for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$,

$$N \langle b_N[x, \mu], x + \theta b_N[x, \mu] \rangle \leq N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\langle b_N(x, y), x \rangle + |b_N(x, y)|^2) \mu(dy) \leq \kappa_6 |x|^2 + C_1$$

and

$$(1 + |x|^2)/2 \leq 1 + |x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]|^2 \leq 2(1 + |x|^2).$$

Hence, as in (3.36), we have

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu^N U_\beta(x) \leq C_0 \kappa_6 U_\beta(x) + C.$$

For $\mathcal{A}_\mu^N U_\beta(x)$, as in (3.37) we also have

$$|\mathcal{A}_\mu^N U_\beta(x)| \leq C_0 \kappa_1^\alpha U_\beta(x) + C.$$

Combining the above two estimates, we obtain the desired estimate. \square

By the above Lyapunov estimate and Itô's formula, the following corollary is the same as Corollary 3.14. We omit the details.

Corollary 5.3. Under $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, \mathbf{b}})$, for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$ and $T > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{i=1, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} U_{\beta}(X_t^{N, i}) \right) \leq C(1 + \mathbb{E}U_{\beta}(X_0)), \quad (5.12)$$

where $U_{\beta}(x) = (1 + |x|^2)^{\beta/2}$. Moreover, there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}U_{\beta}(X_t^{N, i}) \leq e^{\kappa_7 t} \mathbb{E}U_{\beta}(X_0) + C_2(e^{\kappa_7 t} - 1)/\kappa_7, \quad (5.13)$$

where $\kappa_7 := C_0\kappa_6 + C_1\kappa_1^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ (see Lemma 5.2).

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 3.15.

Lemma 5.4. Under $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, \mathbf{b}})$, for any $T, \gamma > 0$, it holds that

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_N \sup_{\tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta \leq T} \mathbb{P} \left(|X_{\eta}^{N, 1} - X_{\tau}^{N, 1}| \geq \gamma \right) = 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Proof. Let $\tau, \eta \in \mathcal{T}_T$ with $\tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta$. For fixed $R > 0$, define

$$\zeta_R := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : |X_t^{N, 1}| > R \right\}, \quad \tau_R := \zeta_R \wedge \tau, \quad \eta_R := \zeta_R \wedge \eta.$$

By (5.1), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\eta_R}^{N, 1} - X_{\tau_R}^{N, 1} &= \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} b_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N} \right] d\mathcal{N}_s^{N, 1} + \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \mathcal{H}^{N, 1}(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| > N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \mathcal{H}^{N, 1}(ds, dz) =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by (5.5) and $\eta_R - \tau_R \leq \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_1| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \left| b \left[s, X_{s-}^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N} \right] \right| d\mathcal{N}_s^{N, 1} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \left| b \left[s, X_s^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N} \right] \right| ds \right) \leq C_R \delta. \end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , by (3.10) and the isometry of stochastic integrals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \sigma_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N, 1}(ds, dz) \right|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left| \sigma_N \left[s, X_s^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}, z \right] \right|^2 \nu(dz) d(Ns) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\nu_N(dz) = N\nu(N^{1/\alpha}dz)$. By the change of variables, we further have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| < 1} \left| \sigma \left[s, X_s^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}, z \right] \right|^2 \nu_N(dz) ds \right) \\ &\leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 R)^2 \left(\int_{|z| < 1} |z|^2 \nu_N(dz) \right) \delta \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} C_R \delta. \end{aligned}$$

For I_3 , let $\beta \in (0, \alpha \wedge 1)$. By $|\sum_i a_i|^{\beta} \leq \sum_i |a_i|^{\beta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_3|^{\beta} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left| \sigma_N \left[s, X_s^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}, z \right] \right|^{\beta} \mathcal{H}^{N, 1}(ds, dz) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq N^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left| \sigma_N \left[s, X_s^{N, 1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}, z \right] \right|^{\beta} \nu(dz) d(Ns) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{|z| \geq 1} \left| \sigma \left[s, X_s^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \right| \nu_N(dz) ds \right) \\
&\leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 R)^\beta \left(\int_{|z| \geq 1} |z|^\beta \nu_N(dz) \right) \delta \stackrel{(3.8)}{\leq} C_R \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality and (5.12),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|X_\eta^{N,1} - X_\tau^{N,1}| \geq \gamma) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|X_{\eta_R}^{N,1} - X_{\tau_R}^{N,1}| \geq \gamma; \zeta_R > T) + \mathbb{P}(\zeta_R \leq T) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbb{P}(|I_i| \geq \frac{\gamma}{3}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N,1}| \geq R \right) \\
&\leq \frac{3}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}|I_1| + \left(\frac{3}{\gamma}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 + \left(\frac{3}{\gamma}\right)^\beta \mathbb{E}|I_3|^\beta + \frac{C}{R^\beta} \\
&\leq C_{R, \gamma} \delta + C/R^\beta,
\end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero by firstly letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then $R \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Now we can show the following main result of this subsection about the propagation of chaos.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that for any $k \leq N$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (X_0^{N,1}, \dots, X_0^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mu_0^{\otimes k}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5.15)$$

and DDSDE (5.9) admits a unique martingale solution $\mathbb{P}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty)$ with initial distribution μ_0 in the sense of Definition 6.2 in appendix. Then under $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b})$, for any $k \leq N$,

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (X_0^{N,1}, \dots, X_0^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_0^{\otimes k}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. We use the classical martingale method (see [18]). Consider the following random measure with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$,

$$\omega \rightarrow \Pi_N(\omega, dw) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X^{N,i}(\omega)}(dw) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}).$$

By Lemma 5.4, Aldous' criterion (see [23]) and [40, (ii) of Proposition 2.2], the law of Π_N in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}))$ is tight. Without loss of generality, we assume that the law of Π_N weakly converges to some $\Pi_\infty \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}))$. Our aim below is to show that Π_∞ is a Dirac measure, i.e.,

$$\Pi_\infty(d\eta) = \delta_{\mathbb{P}_0}(d\eta), \quad \Pi_\infty - a.s.,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty)$ is the unique martingale solution of DDSDE (5.9). If we can show the above assertion, then by [40, (i) of Proposition 2.2], we conclude (5.16).

Let $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For given $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$, we define a functional $M_\eta^f(t, \cdot)$ on \mathbb{D} by

$$M_\eta^f(t, w) := f(w_t) - f(w_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{s, \eta}^\infty f(w_s) ds, \quad t \geq 0, \quad w \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{s, \eta}^\infty$ is defined by (5.8) with $\mu = \eta_s$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \leq t$. For given $g \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$ and $0 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_n \leq s$, we also introduce a functional Ξ_f^g over $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$ by

$$\Xi_f^g(\eta) := \int_{\mathbb{D}} (M_\eta^f(t, w) - M_\eta^f(s, w)) g(w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_n}) \eta(dw).$$

By definition we have

$$\Xi_f^g(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} \left(f(w_t) - f(w_s) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_{r, \eta}^\infty f(w_r) dr \right) g(w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_n}) \eta(dw)$$

and

$$\Xi_f^g(\Pi_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\left(f(X_t^{N,i}) - f(X_s^{N,i}) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_{r,\Pi_N}^\infty f(X_r^{N,i}) dr \right) g(X_{s_1}^{N,i}, \dots, X_{s_n}^{N,i}) \right]. \quad (5.17)$$

By definition (5.8) and $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu,\alpha}^{\sigma,b})$, it is easy to see that

$$\eta \mapsto \Xi_f^g(\eta) \text{ is bounded continuous on } \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}).$$

Hence, by the weak convergence of Π_N to Π_∞ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} |\Xi_f^g(\Pi_N)| = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})} |\Xi_f^g(\eta)| \Pi_\infty(d\eta). \quad (5.18)$$

On the other hand, let

$$\tilde{\Xi}_f^g := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\left(f(X_t^{N,i}) - f(X_s^{N,i}) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_{r,\Pi_N}^N f(X_r^{N,i}) dr \right) g(X_{s_1}^{N,i}, \dots, X_{s_n}^{N,i}) \right], \quad (5.19)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_N}^N$ is defined by (5.3). By Itô's formula (5.2), we have

$$\tilde{\Xi}_f^g = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\left(\int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Theta_{r,\Pi_N}^N f(X_{r-}^{N,i}, z) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N,i}(dr, dz) \right) g(X_{s_1}^{N,i}, \dots, X_{s_n}^{N,i}) \right],$$

where $\Theta_{r,\Pi_N}^N f$ is defined by (5.4). By the isometry of stochastic integrals,

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{\Xi}_f^g|^2 \leq \frac{\|g\|_\infty^2}{N} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \int_s^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\Theta_{r,\Pi_N}^N f(X_r^{N,i}, z)|^2 \nu(dz) ds \right).$$

Let $\beta \in (0, \frac{\alpha}{2})$. Noting that by (5.4), (5.11) and $|\sigma(r, x, y, z)| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1 |x|) |z|$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Theta_{r,\eta}^N f(x, z)| &\leq (|b_N[r, x, \eta_{r-}]|^\beta + |\sigma_N[r, x, \eta_{r-}, z]|^\beta) \|f\|_{C_b^\beta} \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{1+|x|^\beta}{N^{\beta/2}} + (1+|x|^\beta) \frac{|z|^\beta}{N^{\beta/\alpha}} \right) \|f\|_{C_b^\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.3 and (5.12), we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{\Xi}_f^g|^2 \lesssim \frac{\|g\|_\infty^2 \|f\|_{C_b^\beta}^2}{N^{1+\beta}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \int_s^t (1 + \mathbb{E} |X_r^{N,i}|^{2\beta}) ds \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N^\beta}, \quad (5.20)$$

where the implicit constant does not depend on N .

Claim: The following limit holds:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} |\Xi_f^g(\Pi_N) - \tilde{\Xi}_f^g| = 0. \quad (5.21)$$

Indeed, by definition (5.17), (5.19) and Lemma 5.1, for any $R \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\Xi_f^g(\Pi_N) - \tilde{\Xi}_f^g| &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left(\int_s^t |\mathcal{L}_{r,\Pi_N}^\infty f - \mathcal{L}_{r,\Pi_N}^N f|(X_r^{N,i}) dr \right) \|g\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sup_{r \leq t} \sup_{|x| \leq R} \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathcal{L}_{r,\mu}^\infty f(x) - \mathcal{L}_{r,\mu}^N f(x)| \cdot \|g\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \sup_{r \leq t} \left(\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} (\|\mathcal{L}_{r,\mu}^\infty f\|_\infty + \|\mathcal{L}_{r,\mu}^N f\|_\infty) \sup_i \mathbb{P}(|X_r^{N,i}| \geq R) \right) \|g\|_\infty \\ &\leq C_R N^{-(\frac{2-\alpha}{2}) \wedge \beta_1} + C \sup_i \sup_{r \leq t} \mathbb{E} |X_r^{N,i}|^\beta / R^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (5.21) by (5.12).

Combining (5.18), (5.20) and (5.21) we obtain that for each $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})} |\Xi_f^g(\eta)| \Pi_\infty(d\eta) = 0 \Rightarrow \Xi_f^g(\eta) = 0 \text{ for } \Pi_\infty\text{-a.s. } \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}).$$

Since $C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $C_c(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$ are separable, one can find a common Π_∞ -null set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$ such that for all $\eta \notin \mathcal{Q}$ and for all $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$, $0 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_n \leq s$,

$$\Xi_f^g(\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{D}} (M_\eta^f(t, w) - M_\eta^f(s, w)) g(w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_n}) \eta(dw) = 0.$$

Moreover, by (5.15), we also have

$$\Pi_\infty\{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}) : \eta_0 = \mu_0\} = 1.$$

Thus by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty)$ (see Definition 6.2 in appendix), for Π_∞ -almost all $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D})$,

$$\eta \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty).$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty)$ only contains one point by uniqueness, all the points $\eta \notin \mathcal{Q}$ are the same. Hence, Π_N weakly converges to the one-point measure $\delta_{\mathbb{P}_0}$. The proof is complete. \square

Remark 5.6. For each $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nd}$, let $\mathbf{X}_t^N = \mathbf{X}_t^N(\mathbf{x})$ be the unique solution of SDE (5.1) with starting point \mathbf{x} . Suppose that $\kappa_7 < 0$ (see (5.13)). Then for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the semigroup $P_t^N f(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{X}_t^N(\mathbf{x}))$ admits an invariant probability measure $\mu_N(d\mathbf{x})$, which is symmetric in the sense

$$\mu_N(d\pi_N(\mathbf{x})) = \mu_N(d\mathbf{x}), \quad \pi_N(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is any permutation of } \mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^N).$$

Indeed, by (5.13), for any $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$, we have

$$\sup_N \sup_{i=1, \dots, N} \sup_{T>0} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,i}|^\beta dt < \infty. \quad (5.22)$$

Now we define a probability measure $\mu_{N,T}$ over \mathbb{R}^{Nd} by

$$\mu_{N,T}(A) := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_t^N \in A) dt, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{Nd}).$$

By (5.22), the family of probability measures $\{\mu_{N,T}, T \geq 1\}$ is tight. By the classical Krylov-Bogoliubov argument (cf. [10, Section 3.1]), any accumulation point μ_N of $\{\mu_{N,T}, T \geq 1\}$ is an invariant probability measure of P_t^N , that is, for any nonnegative measurable function f on \mathbb{R}^{Nd} ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{Nd}} f(\mathbf{x}) \mu_N(d\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{Nd}} P_t^N f(\mathbf{x}) \mu_N(d\mathbf{x}), \quad t > 0.$$

The symmetry of μ_N follows from the symmetry of \mathbf{X}_t^N . Moreover, by (5.22) one sees that

$$\sup_N \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^\beta \mu_N^{(1)}(dx) < \infty,$$

where $\mu_N^{(1)}$ is the 1-marginal distribution of μ_N .

Note that the existence of invariant probability measures for DDSDE (5.9) has been investigated in [16] under dissipativity assumptions. However, an open question remains regarding the conditions under which any accumulation point of $\mu_N^{(1)}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ becomes an invariant probability measure of DDSDE (5.9). This question is closely connected to the problem of propagation of chaos in uniform time, as discussed in [29]. In future research, we plan to address this question and explore the assumptions on the coefficients that lead to convergence of empirical measures and the emergence of invariant probability measures for DDSDE (5.9). Such investigations will contribute to a deeper understanding of the dynamics and statistical properties of DDSDEs and their particle approximations.

5.2. Brownian diffusion with unbounded interaction kernel. In the previous section, we focused on interaction terms that are bounded in the second variable y , which excluded unbounded interaction kernels such as $b(x, y) = \bar{b}(x - y)$, where \bar{b} exhibits linear growth. In this section, we address the case of unbounded interaction kernels in the context of Brownian diffusion. Our results provide insights into the behavior of DDSDEs with unbounded interaction kernels and broaden the applicability of compound Poisson approximations in modeling and numerical simulations.

Fix $\alpha > 2$. We make the following assumptions about σ and b :

($\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b}$) We suppose that (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) holds, and σ and b are continuous in (x, y) , and for some $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 \geq 0$,

$$\sigma(t, x, y, -z) = -\sigma(t, x, y, z), \quad |\sigma(t, x, y, z)| \leq (\kappa_0 + \kappa_1(|x| + |y|))|z|. \quad (5.23)$$

Suppose that

$$b(t, x, y) = b_1(t, x) + b_2(t, x, y),$$

where for some $m \geq 1$ and $\kappa_2 > 0$,

$$|b_1(t, x)| \leq (\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^m, \quad (5.24)$$

and for some $\kappa_3, \kappa_4 \geq 0$ and $\kappa_5 < 0$,

$$\langle x, b_1(t, x) \rangle \leq \kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}, \quad (5.25)$$

and for some $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$,

$$|b_2(t, x, y)| \leq c_1 + c_2|x| + c_3|y|. \quad (5.26)$$

As in (3.19), we introduce the approximation coefficients of σ_N and b_N as:

$$\sigma_N(t, x, y, z) := N^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sigma(t, x, y, z),$$

and

$$b_N(t, x, y) := \frac{b_1(t, x)}{N + \sqrt{N}|b_1(t, x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} + \frac{b_2(t, x, y)}{N}. \quad (5.27)$$

For $t \geq 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we also define

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu^\infty f(t, x) := \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^\infty f(x) := \mathcal{A}_\mu^\infty f(t, x) + b[t, x, \mu] \cdot \nabla f(x), \quad (5.28)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu^\infty f(s, x) := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sigma[t, x, \mu, z] \otimes \sigma[t, x, \mu, z] \right) \nu(dz) \cdot \nabla^2 f(x) \right).$$

Consider the following McKean-Vlasov SDE:

$$dX_t = \sigma_\nu^{(2)}(t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}) dW_t + b[t, X_t, \mu_{X_t}] dt, \quad (5.29)$$

where W_t is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion, and

$$\sigma_\nu^{(2)}(t, x, \mu) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma[t, x, \mu, z] \otimes \sigma[t, x, \mu, z] \nu(dz) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By Itô's formula, the nonlinear time-inhomogeneous generator of DDSDE (5.29) is given by $\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^\infty$.

The following lemma is the same as Lemmas 5.1 and 3.9. We omit the details.

Lemma 5.7. *Under ($\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b}$), where $\alpha > 2$, for any $R > 0$, there is a constant $C_R > 0$ such that for any $f \in C_b^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and for all N and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\mu(\cdot | \cdot) \leq R$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0, |x| \leq R} |\mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^N f(x) - \mathcal{L}_{t, \mu}^\infty f(x)| \leq C_R N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2) \wedge 1}{2}} \|f\|_{C_b^{\alpha \wedge 3}}.$$

Moreover, if b is bounded measurable and $\kappa_1 = 0$, then C_R can be independent of $R > 0$.

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.8. *Under $(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, b})$, where $\alpha > 2$, for any $\beta \in [2, \alpha]$, there are constants $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{s, \mu}^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(x) \leq C_0|x|^\beta + C_1\mu(|\cdot|)^\beta + C_2. \quad (5.30)$$

Moreover, if $m > 1$, then for any $\kappa_6 < 0$, there are constants $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_3 = C_3(\beta, \nu) > 0$ and $C_4 = C_4(N_0, \kappa_i, c_i) > 0$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $s \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{s, \mu}^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(x) \leq \kappa_6|x|^\beta + (\beta c_3 + C_3\kappa_1^\beta)\mu(|\cdot|)^\beta + C_4. \quad (5.31)$$

Proof. We only prove (5.31). For simplicity we drop the time variable. By (5.24)-(5.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N\langle x, b_N[x, \mu] \rangle + N|b_N[x, \mu]|^2 &\leq \frac{\kappa_3 + \kappa_4|x|^2 + \kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{N^{-1}}|b_1(x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} + |x| \cdot (c_1 + c_2|x| + c_3\mu(|\cdot|)) \\ &\quad + \frac{2\kappa_2^2(1 + |x|)^2}{N} + \frac{2(c_1 + c_2|x| + c_3\mu(|\cdot|))^2}{N} \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{N^{-1}}|b_1(x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} + C_0 + C_1|x|^2 + \left(\frac{c_3}{4} + \frac{4c_3}{N}\right)\mu(|\cdot|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $m > 1$ and $\kappa_5 < 0$, for any $K > 0$, by (5.24), there are N_0 large enough and $C_3 > 0$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\frac{\kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{N^{-1}}|b_1(x)|^{1-\frac{1}{m}}} \leq \frac{\kappa_5|x|^{m+1}}{1 + \sqrt{N^{-1}}(\kappa_2(1 + |x|))^{m-1}} \leq K\kappa_5|x|^2 + C_3.$$

Thus, for any $\kappa_6 < 0$, there is an N_0 large enough such that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$N\langle x, b_N[x, \mu] \rangle + N|b_N[x, \mu]|^2 \leq \kappa_6|x|^2 + \frac{c_3}{2}\mu(|\cdot|)^2 + C_4. \quad (5.32)$$

For $\mathcal{B}_\mu^N(|\cdot|^\beta)$, substituting (5.32) into (5.10), we get

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(x) \leq \beta \left(\kappa_6|x|^2 + \frac{c_3}{2}\mu(|\cdot|)^2 + C_4 \right) \int_0^1 |x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} d\theta.$$

On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon, \theta \in (0, 1)$, by $|a + b|^p \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|a|^p + C_\varepsilon|b|^p$, we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon)|x|^{\beta-2} - C_\varepsilon|b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} \leq |x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|x|^{\beta-2} - C'_\varepsilon|b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2}.$$

Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$, by (5.24) and (5.26), there is an N_0 large enough so that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$|b_N[x, \mu]| \leq \frac{\kappa_2(1 + |x|)}{N} + \frac{c_1 + c_2|x| + c_3\mu(|\cdot|)}{N} \leq \delta(1 + |x| + \mu(|\cdot|)). \quad (5.33)$$

Thus for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, one can choose N_0 large enough so that for all $N \geq N_0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$,

$$(1 - \varepsilon)|x|^{\beta-2} - \varepsilon(1 + \mu(|\cdot|))^{\beta-2} \leq |x + \theta b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|x|^{\beta-2} + \varepsilon(1 + \mu(|\cdot|))^{\beta-2}.$$

Hence, for any $\kappa_6 < 0$, there is an N_0 large enough so that for all $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(x) \leq \beta(\kappa_6|x|^\beta + c_3\mu(|\cdot|)^\beta + C_5). \quad (5.34)$$

For $\mathcal{A}_\mu^N U_\beta(x)$, as in the Step 2 of Lemma 3.12 and by (5.33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}_\mu^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(x)| &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma[x, \mu, z]|^2 \int_0^1 \theta \int_{-1}^1 |x + \theta\theta'N^{-1/2}\sigma[x, \mu, z] + b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} d\theta' d\theta \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\sigma[x, \mu, z]|^2 \left(|x|^{\beta-2} + |\sigma[x, \mu, z]|^{\beta-2} + |b_N[x, \mu]|^{\beta-2} \right) \nu(dz) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \kappa_1^\beta(|x|^\beta + \mu(|\cdot|)^\beta)) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |z|^\beta) \nu(dz), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.34) and the arbitrariness of $\kappa_6 < 0$ yields the desired estimate. \square

Remark 5.9. When $m = 1$, the similar estimate of (5.31) still hold, but parameter dependence becomes cumbersome.

We have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.10. Under $(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\nu, \alpha}^{\sigma, \mathbf{b}})$, where $\alpha > 2$, for any $\beta \in [2, \alpha)$ and $T > 0$, it holds that

$$\sup_{i=1, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta \right) < \infty. \quad (5.35)$$

Moreover, if $m > 1$, then for any $\kappa < 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta \leq \frac{e^{\kappa t}}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N, i}|^\beta + C, \quad (5.36)$$

and for any $i = 1, \dots, N$,

$$\mathbb{E} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta \leq e^{\kappa t} \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N, i}|^\beta + C e^{\kappa t} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} |X_0^{N, j}|^\beta + C. \quad (5.37)$$

Proof. For fixed $\beta \in [2, \alpha)$, by Itô's formula (5.2) and (5.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta &= |X_0^{N, i}|^\beta + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{s, \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(X_s^{N, i}) ds + M_t^{N, i} \\ &\leq |X_0^{N, i}|^\beta + \int_0^t \left(C_0 |X_s^{N, i}|^\beta + C_1 \mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(|\cdot|^\beta) + C_2 \right) ds + M_t^{N, i}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

where

$$M_t^{N, i} = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Theta_{\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}}^N(|\cdot|^\beta)(X_{s-}^{N, i}, z) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N, i}(ds, dz)$$

is a local martingale. Noting that

$$\mu_{\mathbf{x}^N}(|\cdot|^\beta) \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |X_s^{N, j}|^\beta =: A_s^{N, \beta}, \quad (5.39)$$

we have

$$A_t^{N, \beta} \leq A_0^{N, \beta} + (C_0 + C_1) \int_0^t A_s^{N, \beta} ds + C_2 t + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N M_t^{N, i}.$$

For any $q \in (0, 1)$ and $T > 0$, by stochastic Gronwall's inequality (see [41, Lemma 3.7]), we have

$$\sup_N \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |A_t^{N, \beta}|^q \right) < \infty$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{N, i}|^{\beta q} \right) \leq C \left(\mathbb{E} |X_0^{N, i}|^\beta + C_2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^T A_s^{N, \beta} ds + C_3 T \right)^q < \infty.$$

In particular, $M_t^{N, i}$ is a martingale. If $m > 1$, then by (5.38) and (5.31), for any $\kappa < 0$,

$$d\mathbb{E} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta / dt \leq (\kappa - (\beta c_3 + C_3 \kappa_1^\beta)) \mathbb{E} |X_t^{N, i}|^\beta + (\beta c_3 + C_3 \kappa_1^\beta) \mathbb{E} A_t^{N, \beta} + C_4,$$

and

$$d\mathbb{E} A_t^{N, \beta} / dt \leq \kappa \mathbb{E} A_t^{N, \beta} + C_4.$$

Solving these two differential inequalities, we obtain the desired estimates. \square

Remark 5.11. If $m > 1$, then by (5.37), as in Remark 5.6 one can show the existence of invariant probability measures for the semigroup P_t^N defined through SDE (5.1).

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 5.4.

Lemma 5.12. *For any $T, \gamma > 0$, it holds that*

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_N \sup_{\tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta \leq T} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_\eta^{N,1} - X_\tau^{N,1}| \geq \gamma\right) = 0. \quad (5.40)$$

Proof. Let $\tau, \eta \in \mathcal{T}_T$ with $\tau \leq \eta \leq \tau + \delta$. For any $R > 0$, define

$$\zeta_R := \inf \left\{ t > 0 : |X_t^{N,1}| \wedge A_t^{N,2} > R \right\},$$

where $A_t^{N,2}$ is defined by (5.39), and

$$\tau_R := \zeta_R \wedge \tau, \quad \eta_R := \zeta_R \wedge \eta.$$

By (5.1), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\eta_R}^{N,1} - X_{\tau_R}^{N,1} &= \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \mathcal{H}^{N,1}(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} b_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N} \right] d\mathcal{N}_s^{N,1} =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by (3.10) and the isometry of stochastic integrals, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_1|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sigma_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N}, z \right] \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{N,1}(ds, dz) \right|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \sigma \left[s, X_s^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}, z \right] \right|^2 \nu(dz) ds \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \sigma(s, X_s^{N,1}, X_s^{N,j}, z) \right|^2 \nu(dz) ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} (1 + |X_s^{N,1}|^2 + A_s^{N,2}) ds \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |z|^2 \nu(dz) \leq C_R \delta. \end{aligned}$$

For I_2 , by (5.24) and (5.26) we similarly have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_2| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} |b_N \left[s, X_{s-}^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{s-}^N} \right]| d\mathcal{N}_s^{N,1} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} |b_N \left[s, X_s^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N} \right]| d(Ns) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} (|b_1(s, X_s^{N,1})| + |b_2[s, X_s^{N,1}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}]|) ds \right) \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{\tau_R}^{\eta_R} (1 + |X_s^N|^m + A_s^{N,2}) ds \right) \leq C_R \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality and (5.35),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_\eta^{N,1} - X_\tau^{N,1}| \geq \gamma) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|X_{\eta_R}^{N,1} - X_{\tau_R}^{N,1}| \geq \gamma; \zeta_R > T) + \mathbb{P}(\zeta_R \leq T) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbb{P}(|I_i| \geq \frac{\gamma}{3}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (|X_t^{N,1}| \vee |A_t^{N,2}| \geq R) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{3}{\gamma}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}|I_1|^2 + \frac{3}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}|I_2| + \frac{C}{R} \\ &\leq C_{R, \gamma} \delta + C/R, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero by firstly letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and then $R \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The following propagation of chaos result can be proven using the same methodology as presented in Theorem 5.5. Due to the similarity of the arguments, we omit the detailed proof here.

Theorem 5.13. *Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that for any $k \leq N$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (X_0^{N,1}, \dots, X_0^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mu_0^{\otimes k}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and DDSDE (5.29) admits a unique martingale solution $\mathbb{P}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}^\infty)$ with initial distribution μ_0 in the sense of Definition 6.2 in appendix. Then under $(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{\nu,\alpha}^{\sigma,b})$, for any $k \leq N$,

$$\mathbb{P} \circ (X_0^{N,1}, \dots, X_0^{N,k})^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_0^{\otimes k}, \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

5.3. \mathcal{W}_1 -convergence rate under Lipschitz assumptions. In this section, we establish the quantitative convergence rate of the propagation of chaos phenomenon for the additive noise particle system given by:

$$X_t^{N,i} = X_0^{N,i} + N^{-1} \int_0^t b[s, X_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}] d\mathcal{N}_s^{N,i} + N^{-1/\alpha} H_t^{N,i}, \quad (5.41)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, $\mathcal{N}^{N,i}$ and $H^{N,i}$ are the same as in the beginning of this section, and $b(s, x, y) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies that for some $\kappa > 0$ and for all s, x, y, y' ,

$$|b(s, x, y)| \leq \kappa, \quad |b(s, x, y) - b(s, x', y')| \leq \kappa(|x - x'| + |y - y'|). \quad (5.42)$$

The associated limiting McKean-Vlasov SDE is given by

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b[s, X_s, \mu_{X_s}] ds + L_t^{(\alpha)}. \quad (5.43)$$

Under (5.42), it is well-known that (5.43) has a unique solution for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$. We aim to show the following result.

Theorem 5.14. *Suppose that $\{X_0^{N,i}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ are i.i.d. \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variables with common distribution μ_0 . Under (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) and (5.42), where $\alpha > 1$, for any $T > 0$, there is a constant $C = C(\kappa, \alpha, T, d, \|b\|_\infty) > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_{X_t^{N,1}}, \mu_{X_t}) \leq C \left(N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2,3)} + N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (1,2)} \right),$$

where β_1 is from (\mathbf{H}_ν^α) , and for two probability measures $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ denotes the Wasserstein 1-distance defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_1(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \sup_{\|\phi\|_{C_b^1} \leq 1} |\mu_1(\phi) - \mu_2(\phi)|. \quad (5.44)$$

Proof. Let $\mu_t := \mu_{X_t}$ and $\tilde{X}_t^{N,i}$ solve the following particle system:

$$\tilde{X}_t^{N,i} = X_0^{N,i} + N^{-1} \int_0^t b[s, \tilde{X}_{s-}^{N,i}, \mu_s] d\mathcal{N}_s^{N,i} + N^{-1/\alpha} H_t^{N,i}. \quad (5.45)$$

Clearly, $\{\tilde{X}_t^{N,i}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ are i.i.d. By (5.41) and (5.45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_t^{N,i}| &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}] - b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_s] \right| ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| b[s, X_s^{N,i}, \mu_{\mathbf{X}_s^N}] - b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}] \right| ds \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}] - b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_s] \right| ds =: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by (5.42) we have

$$I_1 \leq \frac{\kappa}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E}|X_s^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}| + \mathbb{E}|X_s^{N,j} - \tilde{X}_s^{N,j}| \right) ds.$$

For I_2 , since $\{\tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ are i.i.d., by (2.27), (5.42) and definition (5.44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E} \left| b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s^N}] - b[s, \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}, \mu_s] \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} ds \\ &\lesssim \int_0^t \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s^{N,1}}, \mu_s) ds + \frac{\|b\|_\infty}{\sqrt{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 3.19 and Remark 3.20, we have

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s^{N,1}}, \mu_s) \lesssim N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2,3)} + N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (1,2)}. \quad (5.46)$$

Combining the above calculations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_t^{N,i}| &\leq \frac{\kappa}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E}|X_s^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_s^{N,i}| + \mathbb{E}|X_s^{N,j} - \tilde{X}_s^{N,j}| \right) ds \\ &\quad + C \left(N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2,3)} + N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (1,2)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies by Gronwall's inequality that for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_t^{N,i}| \lesssim \frac{\kappa}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_s^{N,j} - \tilde{X}_s^{N,j}| ds + N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2,3)} + N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (1,2)}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}|X_t^{N,i} - \tilde{X}_t^{N,i}| \lesssim N^{-\frac{(\alpha-2)\wedge 1}{2}} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (2,3)} + N^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{2} \wedge \beta_1} \mathbb{1}_{\alpha \in (1,2)}.$$

These together with (5.46) yield the desired estimate. \square

Remark 5.15. *Based on the aforementioned convergence result, an interesting direction for future work is to investigate the convergence of the fluctuation of the empirical measure given by:*

$$\eta_t^N := \sqrt{N}(\mu_{\mathbf{X}_t^N} - \mu_{X_t}).$$

This corresponds to studying the central limit theorem for the particle system, which characterizes the asymptotic behavior of the fluctuations around the mean behavior.

6. APPENDIX: MARTINGALE SOLUTIONS

In this section, we provide a brief overview of some key notions and results related to the martingale solutions associated with the operators \mathcal{L}_t . These concepts and results are well-known and can be found in Jacob-Shiryaev's textbook [23]. We include them here for the convenience of the readers.

Let $\mathbb{D} := \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the space of all càdlàg functions from \mathbb{R}_+ to \mathbb{R}^d , which is endowed with the Skorokhod topology (see [23, p325] for precise definition). The canonical process in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by

$$w_t(\omega) = \omega_t, \quad \omega \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_t^0 := \sigma\{w_s, s \leq t\}$ be the natural filtration and $\mathcal{B}_t := \cap_{s>t} \mathcal{B}_s^0$. For $R > 0$, we introduce

$$\tau_R(\omega) := \inf \{t > 0 : |\omega_t| \vee |\omega_{t-}| \geq R\}, \quad \omega \in \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

and

$$J(\omega) := \{t > 0 : \omega(t) - \omega(t-) > 0\}, \quad V(\omega) := \{R > 0 : \tau_R(\omega) < \tau_{R+}(\omega)\} \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$V'(\omega) := \{R > 0 : \tau_R(\omega) \in J(\omega), |\omega(\tau_R(\omega)-) - \omega(\tau_R(\omega))| = R\}. \quad (6.2)$$

It is well-known that τ_R is an \mathcal{B}_t^0 -stopping time, that is, for all $t \geq 0$, $\{\tau_R \leq t\} \in \mathcal{B}_t^0$. Moreover, the function $R \mapsto \tau_R(\omega)$ is nondecreasing and left continuous, and $J(\omega)$, $V(\omega)$ and $V'(\omega)$ are at most countable (see [23, p340, Lemma 2.10]). The following proposition can be found in [23, p341, Propositions 2.11 and 2.12] and [23, p349, Lemma 3.12].

Proposition 6.1. *For each $R, t > 0$, the mappings $\omega \mapsto \tau_R(\omega)$ and $\omega \mapsto (w_{t \wedge \tau_R})(\omega)$ are continuous with respect to the Skorokhod topology at each point ω such that $R \notin V(\omega) \cup V'(\omega)$. Moreover, for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, the set $\{R > 0 : \mathbb{P}(\omega : R \in V(\omega) \cup V'(\omega)) > 0\}$ is at most countable.*

Let $\mathcal{L} := (\mathcal{L}_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be a family of linear operators from $C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We introduce the following notion of martingale solutions (see [38]).

Definition 6.2. *Let $s > 0$ and $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We call a probability measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ a martingale solution associated with \mathcal{L} and with initial distribution μ_0 at time s if $\mathbb{P} \circ w_s^{-1} = \mu_0$, and for all $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the process*

$$M_t := f(w_t) - f(w_s) - \int_s^t \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr$$

is a local \mathcal{B}_t -martingale after time s under the probability measure \mathbb{P} . All the martingale solutions starting from μ_0 at time s is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_s^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L})$. If $\mu_0 = \delta_x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we shall simply write $\mathcal{M}_s^x(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{M}_s^{\delta_x}(\mathcal{L})$. If the operator \mathcal{L} also depends on the probability measure \mathbb{P} itself, then we shall call the probability measure \mathbb{P} a solution of nonlinear martingale problems.

First of all we present the following purely technical result.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that for each $(s, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$, there is a unique martingale solution $\mathbb{P}_{s,x} \in \mathcal{M}_s^x(\mathcal{L})$ so that for each measurable $A \subset \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $(s, x) \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{s,x}(A)$ is Borel measurable. Then $\{\mathbb{P}_{s,x}, (s, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is a family of strong Markov probability measures. If in addition, \mathcal{L} is a second order differential operator with the form:*

$$\mathcal{L}_s f(x) = \text{tr}(a(s, x) \cdot \nabla^2 f(x)) + b(s, x) \cdot \nabla f(x),$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$ is a symmetric matrix-valued locally bounded measurable function and $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector-valued locally bounded measurable function, then for each (s, x) , $\mathbb{P}_{s,x}$ concentrates on the space of continuous functions.

Proof. The statement that the uniqueness of martingale solutions implies the strong Markov property is a well-known result (see [38, Theorem 6.2.2]). We omit the details here. Now, let us prove the second conclusion. Without loss of generality we assume $s = 0$. To show that $\mathbb{P}_{0,x}$ concentrates on the space of continuous functions, by Kolmogorov's continuity criterion, it suffices to show that for any $R, T > 0$ and $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{0,x}} |w_{t_1 \wedge \tau_R} - w_{t_0 \wedge \tau_R}|^4 \leq C_R |t_1 - t_0|^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Let $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T$. Since $\tau_R \circ \theta_{t_0} = \tau_R - t_0$ for $t_0 < \tau_R$, we have

$$t_1 \wedge \tau_R = t_0 + (t_1 - t_0) \wedge (\tau_R - t_0), \quad t_0 < \tau_R.$$

Since $\{t_0 < \tau_R\} \in \mathcal{B}_{t_0}$, by the Markov property one sees that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{0,x}} |w_{t_1 \wedge \tau_R} - w_{t_0 \wedge \tau_R}|^4 = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{0,x}} \left[|w_{t_1 \wedge \tau_R} - w_{t_0}|^4 \mathbb{1}_{t_0 < \tau_R} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{0,x}} \left[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{0,x}} \left(|w_{t_0+(t_1-t_0)\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_{t_0})} - w_{t_0}|^4 \middle| \mathcal{B}_{t_0} \right) \mathbb{1}_{t_0 < \tau_R} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{0,x}} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} |w_{s+(t_1-t_0)\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^4 \right) \Big|_{(s,y)=(t_0,w_{t_0})} \mathbb{1}_{t_0 < \tau_R} \right]. \tag{6.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\beta \geq 1$. Define $f(x) = |x - y|^{2\beta}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_s f(x) &= 2\beta |x - y|^{2(\beta-1)} \left[\text{tr}(a(s, x)) + \langle x - y, b(s, x) \rangle \right] \\
&\quad + 4\beta(\beta - 1) |x - y|^{2(\beta-2)} \langle a(s, x)(x - y), x - y \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any $R > 0$ and $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \sup_{|x| \leq R} |\mathcal{L}_s f(x)| \leq C_R (|x - y|^{2(\beta-1)} + |x - y|^{2\beta-1}).$$

Now for $s, t \in [0, T]$, by the definition of martingale solutions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} |w_{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^{2\beta} &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} f(w_{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)}) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_s^{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr \right) \\
&\leq C_R \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_s^{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} (|w_r - y|^{2(\beta-1)} + |w_r - y|^{2\beta-1}) dr \right) \\
&= C_R \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_0^{t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} (|w_{s+r} - y|^{2(\beta-1)} + |w_{s+r} - y|^{2\beta-1}) dr \right) \\
&\leq C_R \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_0^t (|w_{s+r\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^{2(\beta-1)} + |w_{s+r\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^{2\beta}) dr \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} |w_{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^{2\beta} \leq C_R \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_0^t |w_{s+r\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^{2(\beta-1)} dr \right).$$

In particular, if one takes $\beta = 1$, then for any $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} |w_{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^2 \leq C_R t.$$

Furthermore, taking $\beta = 2$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} |w_{s+t\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^4 \leq C_R \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{s,y}} \left(\int_0^t |w_{s+r\wedge(\tau_R\circ\theta_s)} - y|^2 dr \right) \leq C_R t^2.$$

Substituting this into (6.4), we obtain (6.3). The proof is complete. \square

Next we show a result that provides a way to construct a martingale solution for the operator \mathcal{L}_s . Let $\{(X_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)\}$ be a family of \mathbb{R}^d -valued càdlàg adapted processes on some stochastic basis $(\Omega^\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}^\varepsilon, \mathbb{P}^\varepsilon; (\mathcal{F}_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0})$. Let \mathbb{Q}_ε be the law of X^ε in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Let $\{\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon = (\mathcal{L}_t^\varepsilon)_{t \geq 0}, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)\}$ be a family of *random* linear operators from $C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose that

(H) \mathbb{Q}_ε weakly converges to \mathbb{Q}_0 in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, and for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$M_t^\varepsilon := f(X_t^\varepsilon) - f(X_0^\varepsilon) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_s^\varepsilon f(X_s^\varepsilon) ds \tag{6.5}$$

is a local $\mathcal{F}_t^\varepsilon$ -martingale with localized stopping time sequence $(\tau_n^\varepsilon)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where for each $R > 0$,

$$\tau_R^\varepsilon := \inf \{ t > 0 : |X_t^\varepsilon| \vee |X_{t-}^\varepsilon| \geq R \}.$$

Moreover, for each $t, R > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon} \left| \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon} (\mathcal{L}_s^\varepsilon f - \mathcal{L}_s f)(X_s^\varepsilon) ds \right| = 0. \tag{6.6}$$

We have the following result about the martingale solutions.

Theorem 6.4. *Under (H), it holds that $\mathbb{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mu_0 := \mathbb{Q}_0 \circ w_0^{-1}$.*

Proof. For given $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define

$$M_t := f(w_t) - f(w_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_s f(w_s) ds. \quad (6.7)$$

Recall the definitions $V(\omega)$ and $V'(\omega)$ in (6.1) and (6.2). Since $\mathbb{T} := \{R > 0 : \mathbb{Q}_0(\omega : R \in V(\omega) \cup V'(\omega)) > 0\}$ is at most countable and $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \tau_R \rightarrow \infty$, to show $\mathbb{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0^{\mu_0}(\mathcal{L})$, it suffices to show that for each $R \in \mathbb{T}$ and $s < t$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_0}(M_{t \wedge \tau_R} | \mathcal{B}_{s \wedge \tau_R}) = M_{s \wedge \tau_R},$$

or equivalently, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$ and $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n \leq s_0$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_0} \left[(M_{t \wedge \tau_R} - M_{s \wedge \tau_R}) G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \right] = 0, \quad (6.8)$$

where $G(w) := g(w_{s_1}, \dots, w_{s_n})$. Note that by the assumption,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon} \left[(M_{t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - M_{s \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) G(X_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right] = 0, \quad (6.9)$$

where M_t^ε is defined by (6.5) and $\tau_R^\varepsilon := \inf \{t > 0 : |X_t^\varepsilon| \vee |X_{t-}^\varepsilon| \geq R\}$. We want to take weak limits. Since by Proposition 6.1,

$$\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \omega \mapsto \left[(f(w_{t \wedge \tau_R}) - f(w_{s \wedge \tau_R})) G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \right] (\omega) =: H(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is bounded and \mathbb{Q}_0 -a.s. continuous, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\varepsilon} H = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_0} H.$$

Thus, by definitions (6.5) and (6.7), to prove (6.8), it remains to show

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon} \left(G(X_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^{t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_r^\varepsilon f(X_r^\varepsilon) dr \right) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_0} \left(G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R}^{t \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr \right). \quad (6.10)$$

Since for each r , $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}_r f(x)$ is a continuous function, by Proposition 6.1, one sees that

$$\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni \omega \mapsto \left(G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R}^{t \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr \right) (\omega) \in \mathbb{R}$$

is bounded and \mathbb{P}_0 -a.s. continuous. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon} \left(G(X_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon}^{t \wedge \tau_R^\varepsilon} \mathcal{L}_r^\varepsilon f(X_r^\varepsilon) dr \right) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\varepsilon} \left(G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R}^{t \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_0} \left(G(w_{\cdot \wedge \tau_R}) \int_{s \wedge \tau_R}^{t \wedge \tau_R} \mathcal{L}_r f(w_r) dr \right), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (6.6) yields (6.10). The proof is complete. \square

Acknowledgement: The author would like to express their gratitude to Zimo Hao, Rongchan Zhu, and Xiangchan Zhu for their valuable discussions and helpful suggestions. The numerical experiments presented in Remark 2.3 were conducted by Ming-Yang Lai.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ambrosio L. (2004). Transport equation and Cauchy problem for BV vector fields. *Invent. Math.* 158, 2 (2004), 227-260.
- [2] Aubin J.P. and Cellina A. (1984). *Differential inclusions: set-valued maps and viability theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [3] Bao J., Huang X. and Yuan C. (2019). Convergence rate of Euler-Maruyama scheme for SDEs with Hölder-Dini continuous drifts. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 32(2):848-871, 2019.
- [4] Bally V. and Talay D. (1996). The law of the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations. I. Convergence rate of the distribution function. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 104 43-60.
- [5] Bouchut F., James F., and Mancini S. (2005). Uniqueness and weak stability for multi-dimensional transport equations with one-sided Lipschitz coefficient. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)* 4, 1 (2005), 1-25.
- [6] Chaintron L.P. and Diez A. (2021). Propagation of chaos: a review of models, methods and applications. Available in arXiv:2106.14812.
- [7] Chen Z.Q. and Zhang X. (2023). Heat kernels for time-dependent non-symmetric mixed Lévy-type operators. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 285 (2023) 109947.
- [8] Constantin P., Iyer G.(2008). A stochastic Lagrangian representation of the three-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math. LXI*, 330-345 (2008).
- [9] Crippa G. and De Lellis C.(2008). Estimates and regularity results for the DiPerna– Lions flow. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 616 (2008), 15-46.
- [10] Da Prato G., Zabczyk J. (1996). *Ergodicity for Infinite-Dimensional Systems*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 229. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1996).
- [11] DiPerna R.J., Lions P.L. (1989). Ordinary differential equations, transport theory and Sobolev spaces, *Invent. Math.* 98(1989) 511-547.
- [12] Evans L.C., Gariepy R.F. (1992). *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, London, 1992.
- [13] Fernandez B. and Méléard S.: A Hilbertian approach for fluctuations on the McKean-Vlasov model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **71** (1997) 33-53.
- [14] Filippov A.F.: Differential equations with discontinuous right-hand side, *Amer.Math.Soc.Transl. Ser. 2* 42 (1960), 199-231.
- [15] Gyöngy I. (1998). A note on Euler's approximations. *Potential Anal.* 8, (1998), 205–216.
- [16] Hammersley W.R.P., Šiška D. and Szpruch L. (2021). McKean–Vlasov SDEs under measure dependent Lyapunov conditions. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré - Probabilités et Statistiques* 2021, Vol. 57, No. 2, 1032-1057.
- [17] Hao Z., Wu M. and Zhang X. (2020). Schauder estimates for nonlocal kinetic equations and applications. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 140 (2020) 139-184.
- [18] Hao Z., Röckner M. and Zhang X. (2022). Strong convergence of propagation of chaos for McKean-Vlasov SDEs with singular interactions. Available in arXiv:2204.07952.
- [19] Higham D. J., Mao X. and Stuart A. M. (2002). Strong convergence of Euler type methods for nonlinear stochastic differential equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40, (2002), 1041–1063.
- [20] Hörmander L.: *Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.
- [21] Hutzenthaler M., Jentzen A. and Kloeden P.E. (2011). Strong and weak divergence in finite time of Euler's method for stochastic differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients. *Proc. R. Soc. A* 467, (2011), 1563-1576.
- [22] Hutzenthaler M., Jentzen A. and Kloeden P.E. (2012). Strong convergence of an explicit numerical method for SDEs with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22, (2012), 1611–1641.
- [23] Jacod J. and Shiryaev N. (2002). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Wissenschaften, vol. 288, Springer, Heidelberg.
- [24] Kac,M., *Probability and Related Topics in the Physical Sciences* (NewYork: Interscience, 1958).
- [25] Kloeden P. E. and Platen E. (1992). *Numerical solution of stochastic differential equations*, vol. 23 of Applications of Mathematics (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.
- [26] Krylov N. V. (1990). A simple proof of the existence of a solution to the Ito equation with monotone coefficients. *Theory Probab. Appl.* 35, (1990), 583–587.
- [27] Li Y. and Zhao G. (2023). Euler-Maruyama scheme for SDE driven by Lévy processes with Hölder drift. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.13952v1>.
- [28] Lions P.L. Seeger B. (2023). Transport equations and flows with one-sided Lipschitz velocity fields. arXiv:2306.13288v1.
- [29] Liu W., Wu L. and Zhang C. (2021). Long-Time Behaviors of Mean-Field Interacting Particle Systems Related to McKean–Vlasov Equations. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 387, 179-214 (2021).

- [30] Majda A.J., Bertozzi A.L.(2002). *Vorticity and incompressible flow*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [31] McKean H. P. (1967). Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations. In *Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ., 1967)*, pages 41-57. Air Force Office Sci. Res., Arlington, Va.
- [32] Mikulevicius M. and Xu F. (2018). On the rate of convergence of strong Euler approximation for SDEs driven by Lévy processes. *Stochastics*, 90(4):569-604, 2018.
- [33] Ngo H.L. and Taguchi D. (2016). Strong rate of convergence for the Euler-Maruyama approximation of stochastic differential equations with irregular coefficients. *Mathematics of Computation*, Vol. 85, Number 300, July 2016, Pages 1793-1819.
- [34] Röckner M. and Zhang X. (2010). Weak uniqueness of Fokker–Planck equations with degenerate and bounded coefficients. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 348 (2010) 435-438.
- [35] Sabanis S. (2013). A note on tamed Euler approximations. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 18 (2013), no. 47, 1-10.
- [36] Stein E.M. (1970). *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [37] Stein E.M. and Weiss G. (1971). *Introduction to Fourier analysis on Euclidean spaces*. Princeton University Press, 1971.
- [38] Stroock D.W. and Varadhan S.R.S. (2006). *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [39] Suo Y., Yuan C. and Zhang S.Q. (2022). Weak convergence of Euler scheme for SDEs with low regular drift. *Numer. Algorithms*, 90(2):731-747, 2022.
- [40] Sznitman A.-S. (1991). Topics in propagation of chaos. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989*, volume 1464 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 165-251. Springer, Berlin.
- [41] Xie L. and Zhang X. (2020). Ergodicity of stochastic differential equations with jumps and singular coefficients. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 56 (2020), no. 1, 175-229.
- [42] Zhang X. and Zhang X.(2023). Ergodicity of supercritical SDEs driven by α -stable processes and heavy-tailed sampling. *Bernoulli* 29(3), 2023, 1933-1958.
- [43] Zhang X. (2010). A stochastic representation for backward incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *Prob. Theory and Rel. Fields* 148(1-2), 305-332 (2010).
- [44] Zhang X. (2012): Stochastic functional differential equations driven by Lévy processes and quasi-linear partial integro-differential equations. *Ann. of Appl. Probab.*, Vol. 22, No. 6, 2505-2538(2012).
- [45] Zhang X. (2013). Degenerate irregular SDEs with jumps and application to integro-differential equations of Fokker-Planck type. *Electron. J. Probab.* 18 (2013), no. 55, 1-25.

XICHENG ZHANG: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, CHINA, EMAIL: XICHENGZHANG@GMAIL.COM