

Change point estimation for a stochastic heat equation

Markus Reiß*

Claudia Strauch[†]Lukas Trottner[†]

July 21, 2023

Abstract

We study a change point model based on a stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) corresponding to the heat equation governed by the weighted Laplacian $\Delta_{\vartheta} = \nabla \vartheta \nabla$, where $\vartheta = \vartheta(x)$ is a space-dependent diffusivity. As a basic problem the domain $(0, 1)$ is considered with a piecewise constant diffusivity with a jump at an unknown point τ . Based on local measurements of the solution in space with resolution δ over a finite time horizon, we construct a simultaneous M-estimator for the diffusivity values and the change point. The change point estimator converges at rate δ , while the diffusivity constants can be recovered with convergence rate $\delta^{3/2}$. Moreover, when the diffusivity parameters are known and the jump height vanishes with the spatial resolution tending to zero, we derive a limit theorem for the change point estimator and identify the limiting distribution. For the mathematical analysis, a precise understanding of the SPDE with discontinuous ϑ , tight concentration bounds for quadratic functionals in the solution, and a generalisation of classical M-estimators are developed.

MSC subject classifications. Primary 60H15, 62F12; secondary 60F05.

Key words. Change point detection, stochastic heat equation, local measurements.

1. Introduction

We study a change point model based on a parabolic SPDE, which has a piecewise constant diffusivity coefficient and is driven by space-time white noise. The methodology developed for this problem gives fundamental insights, useful for various applications, e.g., heat conduction in a medium, consisting of two different materials with unknown interface.

As a basic model, we consider the weighted Laplace operator $\Delta_{\vartheta} = \nabla \vartheta \nabla$ on $(0, 1)$ (i.e., $\partial_x \vartheta \partial_x$) with Dirichlet boundary conditions and diffusivity

$$\vartheta(x) = \vartheta_- \mathbf{1}_{(0,\tau)}(x) + \vartheta_+ \mathbf{1}_{[\tau,1)}(x), \quad x \in (0, 1), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\tau \in (0, 1)$,

$$\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+ \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}] \text{ for some } \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta} \in (0, \infty). \quad (1.2)$$

Our interest is in estimating the change point τ as well as the diffusivity constants ϑ_+, ϑ_- from observing the corresponding SPDE

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = \Delta_{\vartheta} X(t) dt + dW(t), & t \in (0, T] \\ X(0) = X_0, \\ X(t)|_{\{0,1\}} = 0, & t \in (0, T] \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany.

Email: mreiss@math.hu-berlin.de

[†]Aarhus University, Department of Mathematics, Ny Munkegade 118, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.

Email: strauch@math.au.dk/trottner@math.au.dk

with space-time white noise \dot{W} , i.e., $W = (W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a cylindrical Brownian motion on $L^2((0, 1))$, and deterministic initial condition $X_0 \in C([0, 1])$.

Our data are given by observing the solution to (1.3) locally in space and continuously in time. More precisely, we adopt the local observation scheme by [4] and observe at n equidistant points $x_i = (i - 1/2)/n$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, the local averages

$$X_{\delta,i}(t) := \langle X(t), K_{\delta,i} \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) := \langle X(t), \Delta K_{\delta,i} \rangle \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad (1.4)$$

for some localised kernel functions $K_{\delta,i}(x) = \delta^{-1/2}K(\delta^{-1}(x - x_i))$ with $\delta > 0$ and a smooth function K , satisfying $\text{supp}(K) \subset [-1/2, 1/2]$, $\|K\|_{L^2} = 1$. The kernels $K_{\delta,i}$ model for instance the *point-spread function* in microscopy, see [1] for a concrete application to SPDE activator-inhibitor models in cell motility. For the resolution level, $\delta = n^{-1}$ is assumed so that the observations $X_{\delta,i}(t)$ form non-overlapping local averages of the solution. Let us emphasize here already that the $X_{\delta,i}(t)$ will nevertheless be correlated due to the global SPDE dynamics, which will require a precise analysis in the sequel. Throughout the paper, we allow the diffusivity parameters to vary with δ , i.e., we consider (1.1) with $\vartheta_\pm = \vartheta_\pm(\delta)$ obeying the bounds (1.2) uniformly in δ . We shall study convergence rates and asymptotic distributions of our estimators in the asymptotic regime $\delta \rightarrow 0$, that is, $n \rightarrow \infty$, keeping the observation time T fixed. Quantities possibly depending on δ will then often be denoted by an index δ .

The in-depth analysis of our SPDE-based change point model turns out to be multi-faceted and relies on a subtle combination of statistical concepts with methods from operator and probability theory. In particular, it requires the development of several new (probabilistic) results. First of all, due to the discontinuity of the diffusivity ϑ defined in (1.1), which is inconsistent with the standard existence results formulated in the literature, it has to be clarified in which sense the associated SPDE can be solved. It will be shown in Section 2 that a unique weak solution to (1.3) exists, denoted in the sequel by $(X(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$.

For estimating the change point τ and the diffusivity parameters ϑ_\pm appearing in (1.1), we employ a (modified) likelihood-based approach, leading to a CUSUM-type structure. The analysis of the resulting estimators requires an adaptation of general results from empirical process theory, as given in the standard references [30] or [21], to population quantities varying with δ . More specifically, we define a simultaneous M-estimator for the true parameters $(\vartheta_-^0(\delta), \vartheta_+^0(\delta), \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta), \tau^0)$ and investigate its asymptotic behaviour in Section 3. Here, $\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)$ is a nuisance parameter that, in a certain sense, represents the best constant approximation of the discontinuous diffusivity on the change point interval $[\delta(\lceil \tau^0 / \delta \rceil - 1), \delta \lceil \tau^0 / \delta \rceil]$. Its inclusion in our estimator is vital for obtaining optimal convergence rates for the diffusivity parameters $\vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)$.

The proof of consistency (see Theorem 3.8 for the concrete statement) relies on ideas underlying the consistency theorem for M-estimators. In the case of change point analysis based on independent observations (as carried out in Section 14.5.1 of [21]), the verification of the required conditions can draw on well-known results concerning uniform convergence and on established concepts such as Glivenko–Cantelli or Donsker classes. In contrast, in our framework, we first need to perform a careful study of the concentration properties of the components that appear in the (modified) log-likelihood function determining our estimators. In particular, it is crucial to understand the concentration behaviour of linear combinations of certain martingales $M_{\delta,i}$ and quadratic variation terms $I_{\delta,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, \delta^{-1}$, and in both cases the investigation (carried out in Section 3.2) requires new ideas. The individual martingale terms $M_{\delta,i}$ are not independent, which is why we use a coupling approach based on the Dambis–Dubins–Schwarz theorem to prove the deviation inequality stated in Proposition 3.5. The random variables $I_{\delta,i}$ are not independent either and, moreover, determined by nonlinear unbounded quadratic functionals, whose joint concentration properties are established by methods from Malliavin calculus. This allows us to prove a Bernstein inequality (cf. Proposition 3.4), which is essential for verifying optimal

convergence rates of our estimators.

Indeed, if the jump height $\eta(\delta) = |\vartheta_+^0(\delta) - \vartheta_-^0(\delta)|$ between the true parameters does not vanish in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we prove that our approach yields estimators with error bounds

$$|\widehat{\vartheta}_\pm^\delta - \vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{3/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad |\widehat{\tau}^\delta - \tau^0| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta). \quad (1.5)$$

For the change point estimator $\widehat{\tau}^\delta$, this is the best precision we can hope for because our observations are at distance $x_i - x_{i-1} = \delta$ in space. The diffusivity parameter estimators $\widehat{\vartheta}_\pm^\delta$ converge at rate $\delta^{3/2}$, which is the optimal rate for estimation of the constant diffusivity without change point based on multiple local measurements, as shown in [5] in a general context. In contrast to standard change point models, the proof cannot rely on well-known concepts such as VC classes, but is again essentially based on the concentration analysis in Section 3.2 and on generalized M-estimation techniques for δ -dependent distances.

Our second main result is a functional limit theorem for the change point estimator. For the ease of exposition, we assume the diffusivity parameters $\vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)$ to be known and study the most challenging case in terms of change point identification, where the jump height $\eta = \eta(\delta)$ tends to zero. Motivated by the first main result, we expect that the change point can be detected even if η is only slightly larger than $\delta^{3/2}$. Moreover, we can never have a faster error rate than the observation distance δ . In this setting, we establish indeed a limit theorem with rate $\delta^3 \eta^{-2}$. More precisely, for $\eta = o(\delta)$, $\delta^{3/2} = o(\eta)$ and thus $\vartheta_\pm^0(\delta) \rightarrow \vartheta_*$ for some $\vartheta_* \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$, we prove

$$\frac{\eta^2}{\delta^3} \frac{T \|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta_*} (\widehat{\tau} - \tau^0) \xrightarrow{d} \arg \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ B^{\leftrightarrow}(h) + \frac{|h|}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.6)$$

for the change point estimator $\widehat{\tau}^\delta$, where B^{\leftrightarrow} is a two-sided Brownian motion, T the fixed observation horizon, and K the kernel function. The resulting limiting process has been identified for many change point detection problems, and the distribution of its minimizer is well known, cf. [11, Lemma 1.6.3].

Statistics for SPDEs has been attracting a lot of attention recently, see [10] and the website [3] for an overview. Nonparametric estimation for SPDEs based on local measurements has been introduced in [4] and has been successfully applied to estimate the diffusivity of actin concentration in a cell-repolarisation model [1]. Generalisations to semilinear equations and multiplicative noise are available [2, 18]. To the best of our knowledge, the natural problem of estimating an interface or change point in the diffusivity has not been treated so far. The problem of identifying change points based on independent observations has a long history dating back to [31] and [27]. An exhaustive account on change point problems is given in [11]. For a more recent exposition on the problem of locating univariate mean change points based on independent observations with piecewise constant mean, the reader may consult [32].

The paper is organised as follows. The theoretical foundation for the SPDE model is provided in Section 2. Section 3 derives our estimators and provides basic insight into their concentration analysis. The main convergence results are presented in Section 4. While the main steps in the proofs are presented together with the results, all more technical arguments are delegated to the Appendix. More specifically, Appendix A and Appendix B collect analytical results and proofs related to the concentration analysis, respectively. Appendix C contains the remaining proofs for results given in Section 3, while Appendix D collects proofs for Section 4.

2. General setting

Given observations of the SPDE (1.3), our interest is in estimating the parameters characterizing the diffusivity (1.1). This section provides the basis for our subsequent investigations by proving

the existence of a weak solution of (1.3) and discussing some basic probabilistic properties that will be needed for the estimation approach.

Recall that an $L^2((0, 1))$ -valued and predictable process $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is called *weak solution* of (1.3) if $t \mapsto X(t)$ is \mathbb{P} -a.s. Bochner integrable and if, for all $z \in D(\Delta_\vartheta^*)$ and all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\langle X(t), z \rangle = \langle X_0, z \rangle + \int_0^t \langle X(s), \Delta_\vartheta^* z \rangle ds + \langle W(t), z \rangle, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.1)$$

Let us start by recalling some essential facts on the divergence-form operator Δ_ϑ from the literature that are rooted in the theory of Dirichlet forms (cf. [16]). Denote by λ the Lebesgue measure on $((0, 1), \mathcal{B}((0, 1)))$, and let $L^2((0, 1))$ be the Hilbert space of square-integrable functions on $(0, 1)$, equipped with the scalar product $\langle u, v \rangle = \int_{(0,1)} uv \, d\lambda$. Denote by $H^k((0, 1))$ the L^2 -Sobolev spaces for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $H_0^1((0, 1))$ be the closure of $C_c^\infty((0, 1))$ in $H^1((0, 1))$. The elliptic divergence-form operator

$$\begin{cases} D(\Delta_\vartheta) = \{u \in H_0^1((0, 1)) : \Delta_\vartheta u \in L^2((0, 1))\}, \\ \Delta_\vartheta u = \vartheta \nabla u, \end{cases}$$

is induced by the Dirichlet form

$$\begin{cases} D(\mathcal{E}_\vartheta) = H_0^1((0, 1)), \\ \mathcal{E}_\vartheta(u, v) = \int_{(0,1)} \vartheta \nabla u \nabla v \, d\lambda, \end{cases}$$

via the relation

$$\mathcal{E}_\vartheta(u, v) = -\langle \Delta_\vartheta u, v \rangle, \quad (u, v) \in D(\Delta_\vartheta) \times D(\mathcal{E}_\vartheta).$$

Because of $\vartheta(x) \geq \underline{\vartheta} > 0$, $(\Delta_\vartheta, D(\Delta_\vartheta))$ is a negative definite self-adjoint operator on $L^2((0, 1))$ that generates a strongly continuous symmetric semigroup $(S_\vartheta(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ on $L^2((0, 1))$ via $S_\vartheta(t) = \exp(t\Delta_\vartheta)$, cf. [15, Theorem 2.1]. For each $t > 0$, $S_\vartheta(t)$ has an $L^2((0, 1) \times (0, 1))$ density kernel or Green function p_t^ϑ satisfying the classical off-diagonal Aronson estimate [6],

$$p_t^\vartheta(x, y) \leq \frac{c_{\underline{\vartheta}, \kappa}}{\sqrt{t}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4(1+\kappa)\underline{\vartheta}t}\right), \quad t > 0, \quad x, y \in (0, 1),$$

where $\kappa > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily, and $c_{\underline{\vartheta}, \kappa}$ is a constant that depends only on κ and $\underline{\vartheta}$, cf. [13, Corollary 3.2.8] for the near optimal constants above.

For any $t > 0$, the kernel p_t^ϑ is square-integrable and thus $S_\vartheta(t)$ is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator, [7, Section A.6]. This implies that $S_\vartheta(t)$ has a discrete spectrum $\sigma(S_\vartheta(t))$ and, since $\exp(-t\sigma(-\Delta_\vartheta)) \subset \sigma(S_\vartheta(t))$, see, e.g., [14, Theorem IV.3.6], it follows that the spectrum of $-\Delta_\vartheta$ is discrete as well. Therefore, we may choose an orthonormal basis $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $L^2((0, 1))$ consisting of eigenvectors of $-\Delta_\vartheta$ with corresponding non-negative sequence of eigenvalues $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. In fact, $(\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded from below by some $\underline{\lambda} > 0$, depending only on the parameter $\underline{\vartheta}$. To see this, note that, for any $u \in D(\Delta_\vartheta)$, by Poincaré’s inequality on the bounded domain $(0, 1)$,

$$\langle -\Delta_\vartheta u, u \rangle \geq \underline{\vartheta} \|\nabla u\|^2 \geq c \underline{\vartheta} \|u\|^2,$$

for some constant $c > 0$. We may therefore take $\underline{\lambda} = c \underline{\vartheta}$, which is independent of δ . In particular, Δ_ϑ^{-1} exists as a bounded linear operator from $L^2((0, 1))$ to $D(\Delta_\vartheta)$, and it holds $\|\Delta_\vartheta^{-1}\| \leq \underline{\lambda}^{-1}$. We apply functional calculus to Δ_ϑ . To this end, we note that, for any measurable function ψ on \mathbb{R}_+ ,

the operator $\psi(-\Delta_\vartheta)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(-\Delta_\vartheta)z &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \psi(\lambda_k) \langle e_k, z \rangle e_k, \\ z \in D(\psi(-\Delta_\vartheta)) &= \left\{ z \in L^2((0, 1)) : \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \psi(\lambda_k)^2 \langle e_k, z \rangle^2 < \infty \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

The following basic result clarifies the existence of a solution and provides a representation of the measurement process $X_{\delta,i}$ introduced in (1.4). Note that the functions $K_{\delta,i}$ are part of the observation scheme, and observe that $\text{supp}(K_{\delta,i}) \cap \text{supp}(K_{\delta,j}) = \emptyset$ holds for all $i \neq j$, i.e., the local observation windows do not overlap. Let us also define $k_\cdot = k_\cdot(\delta) := \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil$, implying that the change point $\tau \in \text{supp}(K_{\delta,k_\cdot})$.

2.1 Proposition. *The unique weak solution of (1.3) is given by the mild solution process*

$$X(t) = S_\vartheta(t)X_0 + \int_0^t S_\vartheta(t-s) dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T].\tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we have the P-a.s. representations

$$X_{\delta,i}(t) = \begin{cases} \langle X_0, K_{\delta,i} \rangle + \int_0^t \vartheta_-(\delta) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dt + B_{\delta,i}(t), & \text{if } x_i + \delta/2 \leq \tau, \\ \langle X_0, K_{\delta,i} \rangle + \int_0^t \vartheta_+(\delta) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dt + B_{\delta,i}(t), & \text{if } x_i - \delta/2 \geq \tau, \\ \langle S_\vartheta(t)X_0, K_{\delta,i} \rangle + \int_0^t \int_0^s \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u) K_{\delta,i}, dW(u) \rangle ds + B_{\delta,k_\cdot}(t), & \text{if } |x_i - \tau| < \delta/2 \end{cases}\tag{2.4}$$

where $(B_{\delta,i})_{i=1, \dots, n}$, with $B_{\delta,i}(\cdot) = \langle W(\cdot), K_{\delta,i} \rangle$, is a vector of independent scalar Brownian motions.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

3. Estimation approach and rate of convergence

We now turn to our main question of change point estimation from observations (1.4). The analysis in [4, 5] shows that the contribution of the initial condition to the statistics is asymptotically negligible. To avoid lengthy additional calculations without new structural insights, we consider a zero initial condition $X_0 \equiv 0$ in the sequel. Furthermore, to shorten notation, we will frequently use the convention $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

3.1. Motivation and specification of the estimator

To motivate our statistical approach and as a benchmark for our later results, we briefly discuss the situation in a simpler Gaussian signal plus white noise model that is treated in [17, Chapter VII, Section 2]. For a related discussion of spatial change point estimation in time-homogeneous SDE models we refer to [22, Chapter 3, Section 4].

3.1 Example (a related model problem). *Assume we observe*

$$dY(x) = \vartheta(x) dx + \sigma(x) dB(x), \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

with unknown ϑ of the form (1.1), known space-dependent noise level $\sigma \in L^2((0, 1))$, and a scalar Brownian motion B . The log-likelihood with respect to Brownian motion is given by

$$\ell(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \tau) = \vartheta_- \int_0^\tau \sigma^{-2}(x) dY(x) - \frac{\vartheta_-^2}{2} \int_0^\tau \sigma^{-2}(x) dx$$

$$+ \vartheta_+ \int_{\tau}^1 \sigma^{-2}(x) dY(x) - \frac{\vartheta_+^2}{2} \int_{\tau}^1 \sigma^{-2}(x) dx.$$

The MLE $(\hat{\vartheta}_-, \hat{\vartheta}_+, \hat{\tau})$ exists and yields the change point estimator

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \max_{\tau} \left\{ \frac{(\int_0^{\tau} \sigma^{-2}(x) dY(x))^2}{\int_0^{\tau} \sigma^{-2}(x) dx} + \frac{(\int_{\tau}^1 \sigma^{-2}(x) dY(x))^2}{\int_{\tau}^1 \sigma^{-2}(x) dx} \right\}.$$

In the case where ϑ_-, ϑ_+ are known and assuming $\eta := \vartheta_+ - \vartheta_- > 0$, we can subtract $\ell(\cdot, \cdot, \tau^0)$ from ℓ , resulting in

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \max_{\tau} \left\{ (\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-) \int_{\tau}^{\tau^0} \sigma^{-2}(x) dY(x) - \frac{\vartheta_+^2 - \vartheta_-^2}{2} \int_{\tau}^{\tau^0} \sigma^{-2}(x) dx \right\}.$$

Analyzing this estimator under the true τ^0 , we insert the specification of dY and obtain

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \max_{\tau} \left\{ \int_{\tau \wedge \tau^0}^{\tau \vee \tau^0} \frac{\eta}{\sigma(x)} dB(x) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tau \wedge \tau^0}^{\tau \vee \tau^0} \frac{\eta^2}{\sigma(x)^2} dx \right\}.$$

For the homoskedastic case $\sigma(x) = \delta n^{-1/2}$, scaling properties of Brownian motion show the identity in law

$$\eta^2 \delta^{-2} n(\hat{\tau} - \tau^0) \stackrel{d}{=} \arg \max_{h \in [-\eta^2 \delta^{-2} n \tau_0, \eta^2 \delta^{-2} n(1 - \tau_0)]} \left(B^{\leftrightarrow}(h) - \frac{|h|}{2} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left(B^{\leftrightarrow}(h) - \frac{|h|}{2} \right),$$

provided $\delta n^{-1/2} = o(\eta)$. In particular, for $n = \delta^{-1}$, we obtain convergence with rate $v_{\delta, \eta} = \eta^{-2} \delta^3$ for $\hat{\tau}$ in δ and η , provided $\delta^{3/2} = o(\eta)$.

We now turn to the problem of simultaneous estimation of the true model parameters $(\vartheta_-^0(\delta), \vartheta_+^0(\delta), \tau^0)$, marked with a superscript 0 in this section. In particular, the definition of the index k , implies that $k_*^0 = \lceil \tau^0 / \delta \rceil$. For $i, k \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1}\}$ and for given $(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_*) \in \Theta := [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]^3$, define

$$\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k) := \begin{cases} \vartheta_-, & \text{if } i < k, \\ \vartheta_*, & \text{if } i = k, \\ \vartheta_+, & \text{if } i > k, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta_{\delta, i}^0 := \begin{cases} \vartheta_-^0(\delta), & \text{if } i < k_*^0, \\ \vartheta_*^0(\delta), & \text{if } i = k_*^0, \\ \vartheta_+^0(\delta), & \text{if } i > k_*^0, \end{cases}$$

where $\vartheta_*^0(\delta)$, specified in Proposition 3.2 below, minimizes the error induced by the constant approximation of the discontinuous diffusivity in the modified log-likelihood on the change point interval. As a consequence, the expectation of a remainder term appearing in a convenient representation of our CUSUM estimator and which originates from this discontinuity is of smaller order than its L^1 -norm. This will turn out to be decisive for deriving sharp diffusivity estimation rates.

Consider the modified log-likelihood $\ell_{\delta, i}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_*, k)$, based on the local observation process $(X_{\delta, i}(t), X_{\delta, i}^{\Delta}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ introduced in (1.4) and given by

$$\ell_{\delta, i}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_*, k) := \vartheta_{\delta, i}(k) \int_0^T X_{\delta, i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta, i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k)^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta, i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt. \quad (3.1)$$

A detailed discussion of the motivation behind this modified local log-likelihood is contained in [4, Section 4.1]. Note here that the stochastic integrals are well-defined by the semimartingale nature of $X_{\delta, i}$, even at the change point, cf. Proposition 2.1. Based on these functionals, we follow a modified likelihood approach which yields a CUSUM-type estimator. For the vector $(B_{\delta, i})_{i=1, \dots, n}$

of independent Brownian motions as introduced in Proposition 2.1, define

$$M_{\delta,i} := \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t), \quad I_{\delta,i} := \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2 dt, \quad i = 1, \dots, \delta^{-1}, \quad (3.2)$$

and note that $M_{\delta,i}$ is a continuous martingale in T with quadratic variation $I_{\delta,i}$. In our subsequent investigation, we want to exploit these structures; hence, as in the model considered in Example 3.1, it will be convenient to rewrite (3.1). Using Proposition 2.1, we obtain that

$$\ell_{\delta,i}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) = (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)\vartheta_{\delta,i}^0 - \vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)^2/2)I_{\delta,i} + \vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)M_{\delta,i} + \mathbf{1}_{\{i=k^0\}}\vartheta_{\delta,k^0}(k)R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)),$$

where, for $\vartheta' \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$, we define

$$R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta') := \int_0^T X_{\delta,k^0}^\Delta(t) \left(\int_0^t \langle \Delta_{g^0} S_{g^0}(t-s) K_{\delta,k^0} - \vartheta' S_{g^0}(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, dW_s \rangle \right) dt. \quad (3.3)$$

For a continuous function $f : \Theta \times [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\overline{\arg \max}_{\chi \in \Theta \times [n]} f(\chi)$ be a measurable version of a minimizer of f , and also define $\overline{\arg \min}_{\chi \in \Theta \times [n]} f(\chi) := \overline{\arg \max}_{\chi \in \Theta \times [n]} (-f(\chi))$. We introduce the estimator

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\vartheta}_-, \widehat{\vartheta}_+, \widehat{\vartheta}_\circ, \widehat{k}^\delta) &:= \overline{\arg \max}_{(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \in \Theta \times [n]} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{\delta,i}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \\ &= \overline{\arg \max}_{(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \in \Theta \times [n]} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left((\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0) M_{\delta,i} - \frac{1}{2} (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 I_{\delta,i} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \vartheta_{\delta,k^0}(k) R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)) + \sum_{i=1}^n \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0 M_{\delta,i} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2}{2} I_{\delta,i} \right\} \\ &= \overline{\arg \max}_{(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \in \Theta \times [n]} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left((\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0) M_{\delta,i} - \frac{1}{2} (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 I_{\delta,i} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \vartheta_{\delta,k^0}(k) R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)) \right\} \\ &= \overline{\arg \min}_{(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \in \Theta \times [n]} \left\{ Z_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) - \vartheta_{\delta,k^0}(k) R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 I_{\delta,i} - \sum_{i=1}^n (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0) M_{\delta,i}.$$

The following result summarizes important estimates on the remainder R_{δ,k^0} .

3.2 Proposition. *For any $\vartheta' \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$, $R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta')$ given by (3.3) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[|R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta')|] \leq \delta^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta')) \leq \delta^{-2}.$$

In case $\vartheta' = \vartheta_-^0(\delta)$, we have the explicit bound in η ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_-^0(\delta))|] \leq \frac{T}{\sqrt{2}\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 |\eta| \delta^{-2}.$$

Moreover, for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$, there exists $\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta) \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}[R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta))]| \leq \delta^{-1}.$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Hence, if we define the estimator $\widehat{\chi}_\delta := (\widehat{\vartheta}_-^\delta, \widehat{\vartheta}_+^\delta, \widehat{\vartheta}_\circ^\delta, \widehat{\tau}^\delta)$ with $\widehat{\tau}^\delta := \widehat{k}^\delta \delta$ and let

$$\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) := Z_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, \lceil h/\delta \rceil), \quad h \in (0, 1],$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) &= Z_\delta(\widehat{\vartheta}_-^\delta, \widehat{\vartheta}_+^\delta, \widehat{\vartheta}_\circ^\delta, \widehat{k}^\delta) = \min_{(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) \in \Theta \times [n]} Z_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, k) + \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\delta^{-2}) \\ &= \min_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) + \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\delta^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

3.2. Concentration analysis

For an in-depth analysis of the convergence of $\widehat{\chi}_\delta$, it will be of central importance to understand the concentration properties of sums of the martingales and quadratic variations $M_{\delta,i}$ and $I_{\delta,i}$, introduced in (3.2). Although the Brownian motions $(B_{\delta,i})_{i \in [n]}$ appearing in the representation (2.4) are independent, the stochastic integrals $(M_{\delta,i})_{i \in [n]}$ are not. This makes concentration analysis of sums involving $M_{\delta,i}$ a delicate matter, which we resolve by employing a coupling approach based on the Dambis–Dubins–Schwarz theorem. Furthermore, techniques originating from Malliavin calculus allow us to obtain a Bernstein-type inequality. For notational convenience, we drop the superscript 0 for the true parameters in this subsection, i.e., $\vartheta_\pm(\delta) \equiv \vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)$, $\tau^0 \equiv \tau$. Recall that the choice $k_* = \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil$ guarantees that the change point τ belongs to the support of K_{δ,k_*} .

3.3 Lemma. (i) For any $i \neq k_*$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] = \frac{T}{2\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} + C(\delta),$$

where $C(\delta) \in [-1/(4\underline{\vartheta}^2), 0]$ for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$.

(ii) It holds

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k_*}] \in \left[\frac{2\lambda T - 1 + e^{-2\lambda T}}{4\lambda \bar{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}, \frac{T}{2\bar{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} \right]$$

and also

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k_*}] \in \left[\frac{T}{2\bar{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}, \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1}).$$

(iii) For any vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with the proviso that $\alpha_{k_*} = 0$, we have

$$\text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_{\delta,i} \right) \leq \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}^3} \delta^{-2} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^2}^2 \|K'\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (3.5)$$

(iv) With a constant only depending on $\underline{\vartheta}$, $\bar{\vartheta}$ and K , it holds

$$\text{Var}(I_{\delta,k_*}) \lesssim \delta^{-2}.$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

The variance bound stated in (3.5) demonstrates that the linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_{\delta,i}$ deviates around its mean with order $\delta^{-1} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^2}$, meaning that the terms $I_{\delta,i}$ are only weakly correlated. We strengthen this statement by establishing a mixed-tail concentration inequality for such linear

combinations. Noting that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}])$ lies in some second Wiener chaos, our proof relies on Malliavin calculus, based on the results from [25].

3.4 Proposition. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $\alpha_k = 0$. Then, for any $z > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \geq z \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\varrho^2}{4\|\alpha\|_\infty} \frac{z^2}{z + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]} \right).$$

In particular, it holds

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \geq z \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{\varrho^2}{2\|\alpha\|_\infty} \frac{z^2}{2z + \|\alpha\|_{\ell^1} T \varrho^{-1} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}} \right).$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

In order to give a fine analysis of deviations of sums of the martingale terms $M_{\delta,i}$, the following coupling construction will be crucial. Introduce the stopping times

$$\sigma_i = \sigma_i(\delta) := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \int_0^t X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(s)^2 ds > \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] \right\}, \quad i \in [\delta^{-1}],$$

as well as

$$\bar{M}_{\delta,i} := \int_0^{\sigma_i} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t), \quad \bar{I}_{\delta,i} := \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}], \quad i \in [\delta^{-1}]. \quad (3.6)$$

Here, we suppose that the cylindrical Brownian motion $W(t)$ and the SPDE solution $X(t)$ are extended to all $t \in [0, \infty)$ so that the σ_i are a.s. finite, noting the linear growth of $\int_0^t \mathbb{E}[X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(s)^2] ds$ in $t > 0$ and the strong concentration around the expectation, provided by Lemma 3.3. As the following result demonstrates, contrary to the vector $(M_{\delta,i})_{i \in [n]}$, the vector $(\bar{M}_{\delta,i})_{i \in [n]}$ is Gaussian with independent components. The deviation analysis of the sums $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i M_{\delta,i}$ may be broken down into easier to handle deviations of $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \bar{M}_{\delta,i}$ and the coupling error which is controlled by $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}|$.

3.5 Proposition. *The family of random variables $\{\bar{M}_{\delta,i}, i \in [\delta^{-1}]\}$ is independent with $\bar{M}_{\delta,i} \sim N(0, \bar{I}_{\delta,i})$. Moreover, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $z, L > 0$, it holds*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| \geq z, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| \leq L \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{z^2}{2L} \right).$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

3.3. Consistency and rate of convergence

As a first main result, we establish consistency of the estimator $(\hat{\vartheta}_-^\delta, \hat{\vartheta}_+^\delta, \hat{\tau}^\delta)$, or, in other words, consistency of $\hat{\chi}_\delta$ with respect to the pseudometric

$$\bar{d}(\chi, \tilde{\chi}) = |\vartheta_- - \tilde{\vartheta}_-| + |\vartheta_+ - \tilde{\vartheta}_+| + |h - \tilde{h}|, \quad \chi, \tilde{\chi} \in \Theta \times (0, 1]. \quad (3.7)$$

We are not concerned with the convergence of the estimator $\hat{\vartheta}_\circ^\delta$ of the balancing parameter $\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)$ because this is a nuisance parameter, introduced only for the technical reason to achieve optimal simultaneous estimation of the true physical parameters $(\vartheta_\pm^0(\delta), \tau^0)$. In fact, an M-estimation strategy without $\vartheta_\circ(\delta)$ would yield estimators $\hat{\vartheta}_\pm$ only converging with rate $\delta^{1/2}$ due to the contribution of the change point block to the overall criterion.

The proof combines an appropriate adaption of classical consistency proofs for M-estimators, cf. [21, Theorem 2.12], with uniform convergence of the centered empirical process $\delta^3(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\cdot)])$ that is derived based on the estimates from Section 3.2. Recalling that

$$\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) = \min_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) + \mathcal{O}_P(\delta^{-2}),$$

the analysis will rely on a convenient decomposition of \mathcal{Z}_δ . For $I_{\delta,i}$ and $M_{\delta,i}$ introduced in (3.2), let

$$\begin{aligned} I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} (\vartheta_{\delta,i}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 I_{\delta,i}, \\ M_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) &:= \sum_{i \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} (\vartheta_{\delta,i}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0) M_{\delta,i}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.2, we can write

$$\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) = I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) - M_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) + \mathcal{O}_P(\delta^{-2}), \quad (3.8)$$

where the $\mathcal{O}_P(\delta^{-2})$ -term is with respect to uniform convergence on $(\Theta \times (0, 1], d)$, for d denoting the restriction of the Euclidean metric to $\Theta \times (0, 1]$. For $\chi = (\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) \in \Theta \times (0, 1]$, define the restriction $\chi' := (\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, h) \in \Theta' \times (0, 1]$, where $\Theta' := [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]^2$. Furthermore, set

$$\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) := \vartheta_- \mathbf{1}_{(0,h)}(x) + \vartheta_+ \mathbf{1}_{[h,1)}(x), \quad x \in (0, 1), \chi' \in \Theta' \times (0, 1].$$

We have the following convergence result in expectation.

3.6 Lemma. *Suppose that*

$$(\chi^0(\delta))' = (\vartheta_-^0(\delta), \vartheta_+^0(\delta), \tau^0) \rightarrow (\vartheta_-^*, \vartheta_+^*, \tau^0) =: \chi^* \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Then, for

$$\mathcal{Z}(\chi') := \frac{T}{4} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{(\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) - \vartheta^*(x))^2}{\vartheta^*(x)} dx, \quad \chi' \in \Theta' \times (0, 1], \quad (3.10)$$

we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} \left| \delta^3 \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)] - \mathcal{Z}(\chi') \right| = 0.$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

The key step for proving consistency will consist in verifying that

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} \left| \delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \mathcal{Z}(\chi') \right| = o_P(1),$$

and in view of (3.8) and (3.10), this task can be broken down into separate investigations of the centered statistics $I_{T,\delta} - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}]$ and $M_{T,\delta}$. Exploiting the concentration properties established in Section 3.2, we obtain the following central auxiliary result.

3.7 Lemma. *It holds*

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| = o_P(\delta^{-3/2} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}), \quad (3.11)$$

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi)| = \mathcal{O}_P(\delta^{-3/2}). \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. □

We now state our first main result.

3.8 Theorem. *Suppose that, for some $\vartheta_{\pm}^* \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$ with $\vartheta_-^* \neq \vartheta_+^*$, we have (3.9). Then, $(\widehat{\chi}_\delta)' - (\chi^0(\delta))' \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Equivalently, $(\widehat{\chi}_\delta)'$ is a consistent estimator of χ^* .*

Proof. The assumption $(\chi^0(\delta))' \rightarrow \chi^*$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ implies that the statements $(\widehat{\chi}_\delta)' - (\chi^0(\delta))' \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ and $(\widehat{\chi}_\delta)' \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \chi^*$ are equivalent. We will prove the latter.

Since $\tau^0 \notin \{0, 1\}$ and $\vartheta_-^* \neq \vartheta_+^*$, if $\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} |\chi'_m - \chi^*| > 0$ for some sequence (χ'_m) in $\Theta' \times (0, 1]$, it clearly holds for \mathcal{Z} defined in (3.10) that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Z}(\chi'_m) > 0 = \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*).$$

As in the proof of [21, Theorem 2.12], this identification property guarantees the existence of a non-decreasing càdlàg function $f : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that $f(0) = 0$ and

$$|\chi' - \chi^*| \leq f(|\mathcal{Z}(\chi') - \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*)|), \quad \chi' \in \Theta' \times (0, 1]. \quad (3.13)$$

Using that χ^* minimizes \mathcal{Z} and taking into account (3.4), (3.8) and Lemma 3.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{Z}((\widehat{\chi}_\delta)') - \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*)| &= \mathcal{Z}((\widehat{\chi}_\delta)') - \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*) \\ &= \mathcal{Z}((\widehat{\chi}_\delta)') - \delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) + \delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) - \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*) \\ &\leq \mathcal{Z}((\widehat{\chi}_\delta)') - \delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) + \delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\vartheta_-^*, \vartheta_+^*, \underline{\vartheta}, \tau^0) - \mathcal{Z}(\chi^*) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |\delta^3 \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \mathcal{Z}(\chi')| + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |\delta^3 \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)] - \mathcal{Z}(\chi')| + 2\delta^3 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)]| + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta) \\ &\leq 2\delta^3 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |I_{T, \delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T, \delta}(\chi)]| + 2\delta^3 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |M_{T, \delta}(\chi)| + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta) + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

By (3.13) and the properties of f , the assertion already follows since Lemma 3.10 implies that

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |I_{T, \delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T, \delta}(\chi)]| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3}), \quad \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} |M_{T, \delta}(\chi)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3}).$$

□

The sharp uniform bounds in (3.11) and (3.12) motivate our approach to infer optimal convergence rates presented next. Define the empirical process $(\mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi))_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]}$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-3} \mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi) &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\delta^{-1}} (\vartheta_{\delta, i}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta, i}^0)^2 I_{\delta, i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\delta^{-1}} (\vartheta_{\delta, i}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta, i}^0) M_{\delta, i} \\ &\quad - \vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta_{\delta}^0(\delta)) \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta_{\delta}^0(\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

and notice that $\widehat{\chi}_\delta$ is the precise minimizer of \mathcal{L}_δ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) = \min_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1]} \mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi). \quad (3.15)$$

Define further

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) = \delta^3 \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)], \quad \chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1],$$

and observe that, according to Proposition 3.2, it holds

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi)] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2). \quad (3.16)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.3 and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) = 0$, we obtain the following lower bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0_\delta) &\simeq \delta \sum_{i=1}^{\delta^{-1}} (\vartheta_{\delta,i}([nh]) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 \\ &\geq \delta([nh] \wedge k^0 - 1)(\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2 + (1 - \delta([nh] \vee k^0))(\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 \\ &\quad + \delta(|k^0 - [nh]| - 1)^+ \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{k^0 < [nh]\}} (\vartheta_- - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 + \mathbf{1}_{\{k^0 > [nh]\}} (\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \delta(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\delta,k^0}([nh]))^2 + \delta(\vartheta_\circ - \vartheta_{\delta,[nh]}^0)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Suppose *for the moment* that we have additional information on the true parameters ϑ_\pm^0 and τ^0 in the sense that we know that

- (i) $\vartheta_\pm^0 \in \Theta_\pm$ for some disjoint intervals $\Theta_\pm \subset [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$ that are separated by a magnitude of $\underline{\eta} > 0$, i.e., for all $\vartheta_\pm \in \Theta_\pm$, it holds $|\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-| \geq \underline{\eta}$, and
- (ii) the change point τ^0 is separated from the boundary by at least $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, i.e., $\tau^0 \in [\kappa, 1 - \kappa]$.

We may then change the optimization domain of the estimator $\hat{\chi}_\delta$ accordingly, obtaining instead of (3.15)

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta(\hat{\chi}_\delta) = \min_{\chi \in \Theta_- \times \Theta_+ \times [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}] \times [\kappa, 1 - \kappa]} \mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi).$$

Then, for any $\chi \in \Theta_- \times \Theta_+ \times [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}] \times [\kappa, 1 - \kappa]$ and sufficiently small δ , it follows from (3.17)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) \geq \kappa(\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2 + \kappa(\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 + \underline{\eta}^2 (|[\tau^0]_\delta - [h]_\delta| - \delta)^+, \quad (3.18)$$

where we denote for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by $[x]_\delta = \delta \lceil x/\delta \rceil$ its (upper) δ -approximation. Similarly to (3.14), taking into account (3.15) and (3.16), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\hat{\chi}_\delta) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) &\leq 2\delta^3 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| + 2\delta^3 \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi)| \\ &\quad + \delta^3 \sqrt{\text{Var}(I_{\delta,k^0})} + \delta^3 \sqrt{\text{Var}(M_{\delta,k^0})} + \delta^3 \sqrt{\text{Var}(R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0))} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Using the uniform bounds (3.11) and (3.12) as well as the bounds from Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, it follows

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\hat{\chi}_\delta) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{3/2} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}).$$

In view of the lower bound (3.18), this translates to the following estimation rates for the parameters,

$$|\vartheta_\pm - \hat{\vartheta}_\pm^\delta| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{3/4} \log(\delta^{-1})^{1/4}) \quad \text{and} \quad |\tau^0 - \hat{\tau}^\delta| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta).$$

In order to get rid of the above separability assumption and to sharpen the convergence rate bound for the diffusivity estimators, a more careful analysis of the local fluctuations of the empirical process is necessary. To this end, on the basis of the consistency result stated in the previous theorem, we make use of a *peeling device*. Since the processes \mathcal{L}_δ do not have constant expectation, we need a slight generalization of such a classical convergence result from empirical process theory, given as Theorem 14.4 in [21].

3.9 Theorem. Let $(L_\delta(\chi))_{\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of stochastic processes, indexed by a pseudometric space (\mathcal{X}, d) , and, for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{L}_\delta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a deterministic function and $\chi_\delta^0 \in \mathcal{X}$. Assume that, for δ small enough, there exist some constants $\kappa, c_1 > 0$ independent of δ such that, for any $\chi \in B_d(\chi_\delta^0, \kappa)$, we have

$$\tilde{L}_\delta(\chi) - \tilde{L}_\delta(\chi_\delta^0) \geq c_1 \tilde{d}_\delta^2(\chi, \chi_\delta^0). \quad (3.19)$$

Here, $\tilde{d}_\delta : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon' > 0$ s.t. for all δ small enough, $d(\chi, \chi_\delta^0) \leq \varepsilon'$ implies $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi_\delta^0) \leq \varepsilon$ for any $\chi \in \mathcal{X}$. Suppose also that, for all $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^* \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi_\delta^0) < \varepsilon} |(L_\delta - \tilde{L}_\delta)(\chi) - (L_\delta - \tilde{L}_\delta)(\chi_\delta^0)| \right] \leq c_2 \psi_\delta(\varepsilon) \quad (3.20)$$

for some $c_2 > 0$ and functions ψ_δ such that $\varepsilon \mapsto \psi_\delta(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon^\alpha$ is decreasing for some $\alpha < 2$ not depending on δ . Let r_δ be such that, for all $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$ and some $c_3 > 0$, we have

$$r_\delta^2 \psi_\delta(r_\delta^{-1}) \leq c_3. \quad (3.21)$$

If the sequence $(\hat{\chi}_\delta)_{\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $L_\delta(\hat{\chi}_\delta) \leq \inf_{\chi \in \mathcal{X}} L_\delta(\chi) + \mathcal{O}_P(r_\delta^{-2})$ and $d(\hat{\chi}_\delta, \chi_\delta^0) \xrightarrow{P^*} 0$, then $\tilde{d}_\delta(\hat{\chi}_\delta, \chi_\delta^0) = \mathcal{O}_P(r_\delta^{-1})$.

The proof is a straightforward adaptation of the proof given in [21] and therefore omitted. We will apply this general result to the sequence of empirical processes $(\mathcal{L}_\delta)_{\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}}$ and the expectation proxys $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)_{\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}}$ introduced above, as well as the function

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{d}_\delta^2((x_-^{(1)}, x_+^{(1)}, x_\circ^{(1)}, h^{(1)}), (x_-^{(2)}, x_+^{(2)}, x_\circ^{(2)}, h^{(2)})) \\ &= |x_-^{(1)} - x_-^{(2)}|^2 + |x_+^{(1)} - x_+^{(2)}|^2 + (|[h^{(1)}]_\delta - [h^{(2)}]_\delta| - \delta)^+ + \delta |x_\circ^{(1)} - x_\circ^{(2)}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|[h^{(1)}]_\delta - [h^{(2)}]_\delta| = \delta\}} \\ & \quad + \delta (|x_+^{(1)} - x_\circ^{(2)}|^2 + |x_\circ^{(1)} - x_-^{(2)}|^2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|[h^{(1)}]_\delta - [h^{(2)}]_\delta| < \delta\}} + \delta (|x_+^{(2)} - x_\circ^{(1)}|^2 + |x_\circ^{(2)} - x_-^{(1)}|^2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|[h^{(1)}]_\delta - [h^{(2)}]_\delta| > \delta\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $[h]_\delta := \delta \lceil \delta^{-1} h \rceil$.

The following result is central to verifying condition (3.20) of the consistency theorem in our setting, cf. Corollary 3.11 below. Note that the involved supremum is measurable, allowing us to work with $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ instead of the outer expectation $\mathbb{E}^*[\cdot]$.

3.10 Lemma. For sufficiently small $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$, we have, for any $\varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\delta^3 (\mathcal{Z}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta])(\chi) - \delta^3 (\mathcal{Z}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta])(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \\ & \leq \delta^3 + \delta^{1/2} \varepsilon^3 + \delta \varepsilon^2 + \delta^{3/2} \varepsilon =: \tilde{\psi}_\delta(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

3.11 Corollary. For sufficiently small $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$, we have, for any $\varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\gamma \in [0, 3], \varrho \in [0, 2]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |(\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi) - (\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \leq \delta^3 + \delta^{1/2} \varepsilon^\gamma + \delta \varepsilon^\varrho + \delta^{3/2} \varepsilon =: \psi_\delta^{\gamma, \varrho}(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Having identified the function $\psi_\delta(\cdot)$ determining the rate r_δ via (3.21) and given our previous findings, we are now in a position to derive the following result on the convergence rate of the estimators $\hat{\chi}_\delta$.

3.12 Theorem. *Grant the assumptions of Theorem 3.8. Then, $\delta^{-3/2}\tilde{d}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta, \chi^0(\delta)) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. In particular, (1.5) holds true, i.e.,*

$$|\widehat{\vartheta}_\pm^\delta - \vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{3/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad |\widehat{\tau}^\delta - \tau^0| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta).$$

Proof. We verify the conditions of Theorem 3.9. Note first that, for $r_\delta := \delta^{-3/2}$, $\varepsilon \leq 1$, $\gamma := 5/3$, $\varrho = 4/3$ and $\bar{\psi}_\delta := \psi_\delta^{\gamma, \varrho}$, we have

$$\bar{\psi}_\delta(r_\delta^{-1}) = 4\delta^3 = 4r_\delta^{-2},$$

and, by Corollary 3.11,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |(\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi) - (\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \lesssim \bar{\psi}_\delta(\varepsilon).$$

Note also that $\varepsilon \mapsto \bar{\psi}_\delta(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon^\gamma$ is decreasing, and that we know from (3.15) that

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta) = \min_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} \mathcal{L}_\delta(\chi).$$

Moreover, our consistency result in Theorem 3.8 shows that, for the pseudometric \bar{d} defined in (3.7), we have $\bar{d}(\widehat{\chi}_\delta, \chi^0(\delta)) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Given Lemma 3.10, it thus only remains to verify (3.19), i.e., we need to show that, for δ small enough and some $c_1, \kappa > 0$ independent of δ , we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) \geq c_1 \tilde{d}_\delta^2(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)), \quad \chi \in B_{\bar{d}}(\chi^0(\delta), \kappa). \quad (3.22)$$

Note here that, using boundedness of Θ ,

$$\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta))^2 \lesssim |\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0|^2 + |\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0|^2 + |[h]_\delta - [\tau^0]_\delta| + \delta,$$

whence clearly, for any given $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $\varepsilon' > 0$ such that, for all δ small enough, $\bar{d}(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon'$ implies $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) \leq \varepsilon$. Also observe that because of $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_-^0(\delta) = \vartheta_-^* \neq \vartheta_+^* = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_+^0(\delta)$, we can find $\underline{\eta} > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that for $\delta \leq 1/M$ it holds $|\eta^0(\delta)| = |\vartheta_+^0(\delta) - \vartheta_-^0(\delta)| \geq \underline{\eta}$. Let now $\kappa := \min\{1 - \tau^0, \tau^0, \underline{\eta}\}/2$, which is strictly positive since $\tau^0 \notin \{0, 1\}$. By Lemma 3.3 and picking up the calculation in (3.17), for any $(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_\circ, h) = \chi \in B_d(\chi^0(\delta), \kappa)$, we find for $\delta < \kappa/8 \wedge 1/M$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) &\geq \frac{\kappa}{4}(\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2 + \frac{\kappa}{4}(\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 + \frac{\underline{\eta}^2}{4}(|[\tau^0]_\delta - [h]_\delta| - \delta)^+ \\ &\quad + \delta(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\delta, \kappa^0}([nh]))^2 + \delta(\vartheta_\circ - \vartheta_{\delta, [nh]}^0)^2 \\ &\geq \tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\eta^0(\delta) \pm (\vartheta_\pm - \vartheta_\pm^0(\delta))| \geq \underline{\eta}/2$ by our choice of κ . Thus, (3.22) is satisfied, and Theorem 3.9 yields

$$\delta^{-3/2}\tilde{d}_\delta(\widehat{\chi}_\delta, \chi^0(\delta)) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

By definition of \tilde{d}_δ , this implies $|\widehat{\vartheta}_\pm^\delta - \vartheta_\pm^0(\delta)| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{3/2})$ and $(|[\tau^0]_\delta - [\widehat{\tau}^\delta]_\delta| - \delta)^+ = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^3)$. Since

$$|\widehat{\tau}^\delta - \tau^0| \leq \delta + |[\tau^0]_\delta - \widehat{\tau}^\delta| = \delta + |[\tau^0]_\delta - [\widehat{\tau}^\delta]_\delta| \leq 2\delta + (|[\tau^0]_\delta - [\widehat{\tau}^\delta]_\delta| - \delta)^+,$$

the latter conclusion now also yields $|\widehat{\tau}^\delta - \tau^0| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta)$. \square

Theorem 3.12 demonstrates that the change point τ^0 is estimated at the rate $\delta = n^{-1}$, while the

diffusivity constants ϑ_{\pm}^0 are estimated at rate $\delta^{3/2}$, provided that $\eta \rightarrow 0$. The former is analogous to the classical rate of convergence for scalar change point problems with independent observations, cf. [21, Section 14.5.1]. It is, however, much slower than the rate δ^3 obtained in the model problem 3.1 for η fixed. This is due to the discrete observations at distance δ . Yet, the diffusivity parameter estimation rate $\delta^{3/2}$ matches the minimax rate for a stochastic heat equation without change point based on multiple local measurements, recently determined in [5]. This rate is much faster than the classical rate $\delta^{1/2}$ in i.i.d. change point models.

4. Change point limit theorem

Our consistency results from the previous section require that the jump height η of the diffusivity does not converge to zero, which simplifies the change point identification task. Under a vanishing jump size asymptotics $\eta = \eta(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ we can attain the optimal rate $\eta^{-2}\delta^3$ in the model problem, provided that rate is larger than the observation distance δ , i.e. in the regime $\eta = o(\delta)$. We obtain precise weak convergence properties of the change point estimator in the vanishing jump height regime

$$\eta = \eta(\delta) := \vartheta_+(\delta) - \vartheta_-(\delta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Throughout this section, we work in the setting where the diffusivity constants $\vartheta_{\pm}(\delta)$ are known, $\vartheta_+(\delta) > \vartheta_-(\delta)$ holds and where $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_-(\delta) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_+(\delta) = \vartheta^*$ for some $\vartheta^* \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$. Note that, compared to the previous section, we drop the 0-superscripts in the notation of the true parameters in the following as no confusion will arise from this. Based on the modified local log-likelihoods

$$\ell_{\delta,i} := \vartheta_{\delta}(x_i) \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_{\delta}(x_i)^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt,$$

we employ the same estimation approach as before, but using the known diffusivity parameters. Hence, we estimate τ by $\hat{\tau} = \hat{\tau}^{\delta} := \hat{k}\delta$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{k} = \hat{k}(\delta) := \overline{\arg \max}_{k=1, \dots, n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\vartheta_-(\delta) \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_-(\delta)^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \left(\vartheta_+(\delta) \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_+(\delta)^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

As in the model problem and in Section 3, it will be convenient to rewrite the estimator. Recall that $k_* = k_*(\delta) := \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil$.

4.1 Lemma. *We have*

$$\hat{k} = \overline{\arg \max}_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} Z_k, \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$Z_k = \begin{cases} 0, & k = k_*, \\ \eta \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_*} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_*} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt + \eta R_{\delta,k}, & k < k_*, \\ -\eta \sum_{i=k_*+1}^k \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{i=k_*+1}^k \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt, & k > k_*, \end{cases}$$

with $R_{\delta,k}$, from (3.3).

Proof. See Appendix D. □

Our final main result is the following limit theorem that was announced in (1.6). Its proof at the

end of the section relies on a functional limit theorem, but we need some preparatory technical results first.

4.2 Theorem. *Assume that $\eta = o(\delta)$ and $\delta^{3/2} = o(\eta)$ such that $v_\delta := \delta^3/\eta^2 \rightarrow 0$. Then, for a two-sided Brownian motion $(B^{\leftrightarrow}(h), h \in \mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$v_\delta^{-1} \frac{T \|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*} (\hat{\tau} - \tau) \xrightarrow{d} \arg \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ B^{\leftrightarrow}(h) + \frac{|h|}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.3)$$

The cornerstones of the proof of Theorem 4.2 are provided by the argmax theorem presented in Section 3.2.1 in [30], but considerable effort is needed to fit the underlying idea into our context. Let us describe the objects which are at the heart of the analysis. Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.2, $v_\delta \rightarrow 0$ and $v_\delta/\delta \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In analogy to the piecewise constant processes $M_{T,\delta}(\chi), I_{T,\delta}(\chi)$ from the previous section, introduce

$$M'_{T,\delta}(h) := \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil} M_{\delta,i}, \quad I'_{T,\delta}(h) := \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil} I_{\delta,i}, \quad h \in [0, 1],$$

with $M_{\delta,i}$ and $I_{\delta,i}$ as defined in (3.2). For $h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta} := [-\tau/v_\delta, (1-\tau)/v_\delta]$, let

$$M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) := M'_{T,\delta}(\tau + hv_\delta) - \left(M'_{T,\delta}(\tau) - \int_0^T X_{\delta,k}^\Delta(t) dB_{\delta,k}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil - \lceil (\tau + hv_\delta)/\delta \rceil > 0\}} \right), \quad (4.4)$$

$$I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) := \left| I'_{T,\delta}(\tau + hv_\delta) - \left(I'_{T,\delta}(\tau) - \int_0^T X_{\delta,k}^\Delta(t)^2 dt \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil - \lceil (\tau + hv_\delta)/\delta \rceil > 0\}} \right) \right|. \quad (4.5)$$

For $h \notin \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$, we simply set $M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) = I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) = 1$. Note that no term involving an observation block around the change point is present in the processes $M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)$ and $I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)$ and that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k=1,\dots,\delta^{-1}} Z_k &= \max_{h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}} \left\{ - \left(\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \right) + \left(\eta M_{\delta,k} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{\delta,k} + \eta R_{\delta,k} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{h < 0\}} \right\} \\ &= - \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \right\} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}) \\ &= - \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \right\} + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}) \\ &=: - \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{Z}_\delta(h) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}$ term is with respect to uniform convergence and follows from the facts that $I_{\delta,k} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-2})$ and $\eta R_{\delta,k} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2})$ according to Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.2, respectively. For the second equality, we used that $M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) = I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) = 1$ for $h \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$ and $M_{T,\delta}^\tau(0) = I_{T,\delta}^\tau(0) = 0$, which guarantees that the minimum is attained in $\mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$.

The argmax theorem requires to establish weak convergence of the sequence $(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(h), h \in \mathbb{R})$ to a limit process $(\mathcal{Z}(h), h \in \mathbb{R})$ with respect to the topology of uniform convergence on compacts. For doing so, we will exploit the fact that $M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)$ is a continuous martingale in T with quadratic variation $I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)$. Regarding convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions, we might therefore refer to a classical martingale CLT [23, Theorem 5.5.4] which asserts that, for fixed $h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$,

$$\frac{M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)}{I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)}{\mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)]^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

provided that

$$\frac{I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)}{\mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)]} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Applying the moment bounds from Lemma 3.3, we employ the analogue of the Kolmogorov–Chentsov criterion in Skorokhod topology to prove tightness of the suitably scaled processes. Based on these observations, we obtain, as a first ingredient, the following functional limit theorem for the martingale part.

4.3 Proposition. *Assume that $\eta = o(\delta)$ and $\delta^{3/2} = o(\eta)$. Then, for a two-sided Brownian motion $(B^{\leftrightarrow}(h))_{h \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $v_\delta = \delta^3 \eta^{-2}$, we have*

$$(\delta^{3/2} v_\delta^{-1/2} M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h), h \in \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{d} \left(\sqrt{T/(2\vartheta^*)} \|K'\|_{L^2} B^{\leftrightarrow}(h), h \in \mathbb{R} \right), \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

in the Skorokhod space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R})$, which in view of the continuous limiting law is equivalent to uniform convergence on compacts.

Proof. From Lemma 3.3, we know that, for fixed $h > 0$ and δ small enough,

$$\text{Var}(I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)) \leq \delta^{-2} |[(\tau + hv_\delta)/\delta] - [\tau/\delta]|,$$

while $\mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)]^2 \sim (\delta^{-2} |[(\tau + hv_\delta)/\delta] - [\tau/\delta]|)^2$ is of much larger order since $v_\delta/\delta = \delta^2 \eta^{-2} \rightarrow \infty$. This implies for all $h \neq 0$ (note that $h = 0$ will be trivial in the sequel) that (4.7) holds true. For δ small enough and fixed $h \neq 0$, we have the representation

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta^3 v_\delta^{-1} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)] = \frac{T}{2} \left| \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]}^{[(\tau + hv_\delta)/\delta]} \frac{\delta}{v_\delta} \frac{\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{\vartheta(x_i)} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \neq [\tau/\delta]\}} \right| + o(1),$$

which, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, converges to $T/(2\vartheta^*) \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 |h|$. By the martingale CLT stated as Theorem 5.5.4 in [23], we therefore obtain

$$\delta^{3/2} v_\delta^{-1/2} M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{T}{2\vartheta^*} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 |h|\right).$$

For $-\infty < h_0 < h_1 < \dots < h_J < \infty$ and $\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}$, all fixed, it follows similarly

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\delta^3 v_\delta^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \beta_j (I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h_j) - I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h_{j-1})) \right] \rightarrow \frac{T}{2\vartheta^*} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \sum_{j=1}^J \beta_j (h_j - h_{j-1}), \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left(\delta^3 v_\delta^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J \beta_j (I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h_j) - I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h_{j-1})) \right) &\leq \delta^4 v_\delta^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^J \beta_j^2 (h_j v_\delta / \delta - h_{j-1} v_\delta / \delta) \\ &\leq \delta^3 v_\delta^{-2} = \delta^{-3} \eta^4, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero. By the Cramér–Wold device, we thus deduce the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions to a Gaussian process:

$$(\delta^{3/2} v_\delta^{-1/2} M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h), h \in \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\text{f.d.}} \left(\sqrt{T/(2\vartheta^*)} \|K'\|_{L^2} B^{\leftrightarrow}(h), h \in \mathbb{R} \right), \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

where B^{\leftrightarrow} denotes a two-sided Brownian motion.

The limiting process has continuous trajectories. Consequently, it suffices to prove distributional convergence in the Skorokhod topology, that is weak convergence in $\mathbb{D}([-m, m])$ for any $m > 0$, cf. [9, Theorem 16.7]. Given the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions, it remains to prove tightness of the law of

$$(\delta^{3/2}v_\delta^{-1/2}M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h), h \in [-m, m]) \quad (4.8)$$

in $\mathbb{D}([-m, m])$ for any $m > 0$. The standard criterion [9, Theorem 13.5] tells us that tightness will follow from verifying that, for $-m \leq x \leq y \leq z \leq m$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta^6 v_\delta^{-2} (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(z) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y))^2 (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(x))^2] \lesssim (z - x)^2. \quad (4.9)$$

Note first that, for $z - x < \delta v_\delta^{-1}$, the left-hand side is zero because one of the factors in the argument of the expectation vanishes by the piecewise constant nature of $M_{T,\delta}$. Generally, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yields for the term on the left-hand side the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta^6 v_\delta^{-2} (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(z) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y))^4]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\delta^6 v_\delta^{-2} (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(x))^4]^{1/2}.$$

By the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality and the bounds from Lemma 3.3, we obtain for any δ which is small enough to ensure $[-m, m] \subset \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(x))^4] &\leq \mathbb{E}[(I_{T,\delta}^\tau(y) - I_{T,\delta}^\tau(x))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=\lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil+1}^{\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil} I_{\delta,i} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \neq \lceil\tau/\delta\rceil\}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=\lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil+1}^{\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil} \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] \mathbf{1}_{\{i \neq \lceil\tau/\delta\rceil\}} \right)^2 + \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=\lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil+1}^{\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil} I_{\delta,i} \mathbf{1}_{\{i \neq \lceil\tau/\delta\rceil\}} \right) \\ &\leq (\delta^{-2}(\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil - \lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil))^2 \\ &\quad + \delta^{-2}(\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil - \lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil) \\ &\sim \delta^{-4}(\lceil(\tau+yv_\delta)/\delta\rceil - \lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to both factors and using $x \leq y \leq z$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta^6 v_\delta^{-2} (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(z) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y))^2 (M_{T,\delta}^\tau(y) - M_{T,\delta}^\tau(x))^2] \\ \lesssim (\lceil(\tau+zv_\delta)/\delta\rceil \delta v_\delta^{-1} - \lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil \delta v_\delta^{-1})^2. \end{aligned}$$

For $z - x \geq \delta v_\delta^{-1}$, we have

$$\lceil(\tau+zv_\delta)/\delta\rceil - \lceil(\tau+xv_\delta)/\delta\rceil \leq (z-x)v_\delta/\delta + 1 \leq 2(z-x)v_\delta/\delta.$$

This establishes the moment criterion (4.9) and hence tightness of the law of the restricted process (4.8) for any $m > 0$, as desired. \square

Let Z_k be the random variables from the statement of Lemma 4.1. Since

$$\widehat{\tau} = \widehat{k}\delta = \left(\overline{\arg \max}_{k=1,\dots,\delta^{-1}} Z_k \right) \delta,$$

we obtain from (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}_\delta(v_\delta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau} - \tau)) &= \eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(v_\delta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau} - \tau)) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(v_\delta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau} - \tau)) = -Z_{\widehat{k}} + \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}) \\ &= \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{Z}_\delta(h) + o_\mathbb{P}(1).\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

As a second main ingredient to the proof of Theorem 4.2, we must verify the tightness criterion stated in [30, Theorem 3.2.2] for the change point estimator, which, in view of the above representation, boils down to studying the sequence

$$(v_\delta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau} - \tau), \delta \in 1/\mathbb{N})\tag{4.11}$$

For this purpose, the coupling technique for the martingale terms presented in Section 3.2 plays a central role.

4.4 Proposition. *Suppose that $\eta = o(\delta)$ and $\delta^{3/2} = o(\eta)$. Then, the sequence (4.11) is tight.*

Proof. See Section D. □

We are finally ready to prove Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Note first that, for any $m > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ small enough to ensure that $[-m, m] \subset \mathcal{J}_{\tau,\delta,\eta}$, an application of Proposition 3.4 and a union bound using

$$|\{\tau + hv_\delta/\delta : h \in [-m, m]\}| \leq (2m + 1)v_\delta/\delta$$

show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{h \in [-m, m]} |I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)]| \geq z\right) \leq (2m + 1) \frac{v_\delta}{\delta} \exp\left(-\frac{\vartheta^2}{2} \frac{z^2}{2z + (2m + 1)v_\delta \delta^{-3} T \vartheta^{-1} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2}\right),$$

implying that

$$\max_{h \in [-m, m]} |I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)]| = \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\delta^{-3/2} (v_\delta \log(v_\delta/\delta))^{1/2}) = \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\eta^{-1} (\log(\delta/\eta))^{1/2}).$$

Thus, for \mathcal{Z}_δ defined in (4.6),

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(h), h \in \mathbb{R}) &= (\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)], h \in \mathbb{R}) + \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(\eta \log(\delta/\eta)^{1/2}) \\ &= (\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)], h \in \mathbb{R}) + o_\mathbb{P}(1),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}$ and $o_\mathbb{P}$ are with respect to uniform convergence on compacts. Using Lemma 3.3, one obtains

$$\eta^2 \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h)] = \eta^2 \delta^{-3} v_\delta T |h| \frac{\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*} + o(1) = T |h| \frac{\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*} + o(1),$$

where $o(\cdot)$ is with respect to uniform convergence on compacts. Moreover, Proposition 4.3 yields that, for some two-sided Brownian motion $\widetilde{B}^{\leftrightarrow}$,

$$(\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h), h \in \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{d} \left(\sqrt{\frac{T \|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*}} \widetilde{B}^{\leftrightarrow}(h), h \in \mathbb{R}\right), \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0,$$

uniformly on compacts. Thus, it follows

$$(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(h), h \in \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{d} \left(\sqrt{\frac{T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*}} \tilde{B}^{\leftrightarrow}(h) + \frac{T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{4\vartheta^*} |h|, h \in \mathbb{R} \right),$$

uniformly on compacts. In addition, Proposition 4.4 demonstrates that $(v_\delta^{-1}(\hat{\tau} - \tau), \delta \in 1/\mathbb{N})$ is tight and, by [33, Theorem 2.1] (see also [8, Remark 1.2]), the limiting process of \mathcal{Z}_δ almost surely has a unique (random) minimizer $\hat{h} \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, taking into account (4.10), the argmin continuous mapping theorem ([30, Theorem 3.2.2]) implies that

$$v_\delta^{-1}(\hat{\tau} - \tau) \xrightarrow{d} \arg \min_{h \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^*}} \tilde{B}^{\leftrightarrow}(h) + \frac{T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{4\vartheta^*} |h| \right\}, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Substituting $\bar{h} = T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2 h / (2\vartheta_*)$, we arrive with a new two-sided Brownian motion $B^{\leftrightarrow}(\bar{h}) := \sqrt{\bar{h}/h} \tilde{B}^{\leftrightarrow}(h)$ at the asserted limit result, i.e.,

$$\delta^{-3} \eta^2 \frac{T\|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta_*} (\hat{\tau} - \tau) \xrightarrow{d} \arg \min_{\bar{h} \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ B^{\leftrightarrow}(\bar{h}) + \frac{1}{2} |\bar{h}| \right\}, \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0.$$

□

One should not be misled by the relative shortness of the above proof. The derivation of the limit theorem is based on a whole range of tools from different fields, including various of the results presented in the previous sections: In order to obtain an explicit representation of the estimator \hat{k} introduced in (4.2), we resort to the basic Proposition 2.1. The proof of the functional CLT for the martingale part uses classical martingale arguments, which, however, only work in combination with the (SPDE-specific) evaluations of expectation and concentration of the quadratic variations stated in Lemma 3.3. The rather complex proof of uniform tightness, given in Appendix D, again relies on a combination of stochastic analysis methods, in particular coupling via Knight's Theorem, the martingale Bernstein inequality, the exponential concentration via Malliavin calculus and exponential martingales via Girsanov's Theorem.

A. Analytical results

This section comprises analytical results that are essential for the subsequent statistical analysis.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Selfadjointness and the semigroup property imply

$$\|S_\vartheta(t)\|_{\text{HS}(L^2((0,1)))}^2 = \int_{(0,1)^2} p_t^\vartheta(x, y)^2 dx dy = \int_{(0,1)} p_{2t}^\vartheta(x, x) dx \leq \frac{C_1(\vartheta)}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_0^T \|S_\vartheta(t)\|_{\text{HS}(L^2((0,1)))}^2 dt < \infty,$$

such that Theorem 5.4 in [12] yields that (2.3) determines the unique weak solution to (1.3). Thus, by self-adjointness of Δ_ϑ , for any $z \in D(\Delta_\vartheta^*) = D(\Delta_\vartheta)$ and all $t \in [0, T]$, it holds that

$$\langle X(t), z \rangle = \langle X_0, z \rangle + \int_0^t \langle X(s), \Delta_\vartheta z \rangle ds + \langle W(t), z \rangle, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The normalized kernel function $K_{\delta,i}$ is twice continuously differentiable and supported on $[x_i - \delta/2, x_i + \delta/2]$. It thus follows for $i \in [n]$ with $|x_i - \tau| \geq \delta/2$ that $K_{\delta,i} \in D(\Delta_\vartheta)$ and $\Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta,i} =$

$\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k.)\Delta K_{\delta,i}$. Therefore, (2.1) yields

$$X_{\delta,i}(t) = \begin{cases} \langle X_0, K_{\delta,i} \rangle + \int_0^t \vartheta_-(\delta) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dt + B_{\delta,i}(t), & \text{if } x_i + \delta/2 \leq \tau, \\ \langle X_0, K_{\delta,i} \rangle + \int_0^t \vartheta_+(\delta) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dt + B_{\delta,i}(t), & \text{if } x_i - \delta/2 \geq \tau, \end{cases}$$

where $B_{\delta,i}(\cdot) = \langle W(\cdot), K_{\delta,i} \rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent Brownian motions because of $\langle K_{\delta,i}, K_{\delta,j} \rangle = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $\|K_{\delta,i}\| = \|K\|_{L^2} = 1$. Finally, the expression for $X_{\delta,k}$ follows from Lemma A.1 below. \square

A.1 Lemma. *Let X be the mild solution process (2.3). For any $z \in H_0^1((0, 1))$, it P-a.s. holds*

$$\langle X(t), z \rangle = \langle X(0), z \rangle + \int_0^t \int_0^s \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z, dW(u) \rangle ds + \langle W(t), z \rangle, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. Let us first show that $\int_0^s \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z, dW(u) \rangle$ is well-defined. Since the eigenvalues (λ_k) of $-\Delta_\vartheta$ are nonnegative, it follows from (2.2) that, for any $s > 0$ and $z \in L^2((0, 1))$, we have $S_\vartheta(s)z \in D(-\Delta_\vartheta)$. Therefore, $\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s)z$ is well-defined, and we have

$$\int_0^t \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s)z\|^2 ds = \int_0^t \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k^2 e^{-2\lambda_k s} \langle e_k, z \rangle^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \langle e_k, z \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2} z\|^2.$$

Thus, $\int_0^t \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s)z\|^2 ds < \infty$ if $z \in D((-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2}) = D(\mathcal{E}_\vartheta) = H_0^1((0, 1))$. Consequently, for any $z \in H_0^1((0, 1))$, $\int_0^s \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z, dW(u) \rangle$ is well-defined. Let now, for fixed $z \in H_0^1$,

$$\Phi_{s,u}(x) = \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z, x \rangle \mathbf{1}_{[0,s]}(u), \quad u, s \in [0, t], x \in L^2((0, 1)).$$

Then, using Fubini's theorem,

$$\int_0^t \int_0^t \|\Phi_{s,u}\|_{\text{HS}(L^2((0,1)), \mathbb{R})}^2 du ds = \int_0^t \int_0^s \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z\|^2 du ds \leq \frac{t}{2} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2} z\|^2 < \infty.$$

This allows us to apply the stochastic Fubini theorem ([12, Theorem 4.33]), and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_0^s \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z, dW(u) \rangle ds &= \int_0^t \left(\int_0^t \Phi_{s,u} dW(u) \right) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \left(\int_0^t \Phi_{s,u} ds \right) dW(u) \\ &= \int_0^t \left\langle \int_u^t \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s-u)z ds, dW(u) \right\rangle \\ &= \int_0^t \langle (S_\vartheta(t-u) - I)z, dW_u \rangle \\ &= \langle X(t), z \rangle - \langle W(t), z \rangle - \langle S_\vartheta(t)X(0), z \rangle \end{aligned}$$

almost surely. \square

A.2 Lemma. *If $u \in C^2((0, 1))$, we have $\Delta_\vartheta u = \vartheta \Delta u + \eta u'(\tau) \delta_\tau$ in the sense of distributions, where δ_τ is the δ -distribution at τ .*

Proof. Let $z \in C_c^\infty((0, 1))$. Integration by parts shows that

$$\langle \Delta_\vartheta u, z \rangle = - \left(\vartheta_-(\delta) \int_0^\tau u'(x) z'(x) dx + \vartheta_+(\delta) \int_\tau^1 u'(x) z'(x) dx \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \eta u'(\tau)z(\tau) + \int_0^1 \vartheta(x)u''(x)z(x) dx \\
&= \langle \vartheta \Delta u + \eta u'(\tau)\delta_\tau, z \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.3 Lemma. For $f \in C_0^2((0, 1))$ and $x \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}(f'')(x) &= \frac{1}{\vartheta_-} \left(f(x) - \frac{\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-}{\tau\vartheta_+ + (1-\tau)\vartheta_-} f(\tau)x \right) \mathbf{1}_{(0,\tau)}(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\vartheta_+} \left(f(x) + \frac{\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-}{\tau\vartheta_+ + (1-\tau)\vartheta_-} f(\tau)(1-x) \right) \mathbf{1}_{[\tau,1)}(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

In particular,

$$\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta, [\tau/\delta]}\| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}. \tag{A.3}$$

Proof. Let g be the unique function in $D(\Delta_\vartheta)$ such that $\Delta_\vartheta g = f''$. Such g must satisfy

$$\vartheta g' = f' + c,$$

for some constant c , that is,

$$\nabla g(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\vartheta_-}(f'(x) + c), & x \in (0, \tau), \\ \frac{1}{\vartheta_+}(f'(x) + c), & x \in [\tau, 1). \end{cases}$$

Setting $g(x) = \int_0^x g'(y) dy$, the constant c is identified via $\int_0^1 g'(y) dy = 0$ due to the Dirichlet boundary conditions of the operator Δ_ϑ , and we obtain $c = \frac{\vartheta_- - \vartheta_+}{\tau\vartheta_+ + (1-\tau)\vartheta_-} f(\tau)$. Straightforward calculations then establish that $g = (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}(f'')$ is given by (A.2). For $f = K_{\delta,k}$, we have $|f(\tau)| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}$ and $\|f\| = 1$, such that (A.3) follows. □

A.4 Lemma. For $f \in C_0^2((0, 1))$, we have

$$\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4}\Delta f\| \lesssim \|f\|^{1/2}\|f\|_{H^1((0,1))}^{1/2} + \|f\|_\infty,$$

for a constant only depending on $\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}$. In particular, with a constant only depending on K and $\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}$,

$$\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4}\Delta K_{\delta,k}\| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. By $(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2} \leq \bar{\vartheta}^{1/2}(-\Delta)^{1/2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4}\Delta f\|_{L^2}^2 &= \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/4}(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta f\|^2 \\
&\leq \bar{\vartheta}^{1/2}\|(-\Delta)^{1/4}(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta f\|^2 \\
&\leq \bar{\vartheta}^{1/2}\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta f\|_{H^{1/2}((0,1))}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The exact representation of Lemma A.3 yields an H^1 -function $(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta f$ for $f \in C_0^2((0, 1))$. By the inner description of the $H^{1/2}((0, 1))$ -norm in terms of first order differences, cf. [29, Section 3.4.2], we have

$$\forall g \in H^{1/2}((0, 1)) : \|g\|_{H^{1/2}((0,1))}^2 \sim \|g|_{(0,\tau)}\|_{H^{1/2}((0,\tau))}^2 + \|g|_{(\tau,1)}\|_{H^{1/2}((\tau,1))}^2.$$

We obtain the straightforward bounds for the representation in Lemma A.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|((-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-1}\Delta f)|_{(0,\tau)}\|_{H^{1/2}((0,\tau))} \\ & \leq \vartheta_-^{-1}\|f|_{(0,\tau)}\|_{H^{1/2}((0,\tau))} + \frac{\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-}{\tau\vartheta_+ + (1-\tau)\vartheta_-}|f(\tau)|\|x|_{(0,\tau)}\|_{H^{1/2}((0,\tau))} \\ & \lesssim \|f|_{(0,\tau)}\|_{H^{1/2}((0,\tau))} + \|f\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & \|((-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-1}\Delta f)|_{(\tau,1)}\|_{H^{1/2}((\tau,1))} \\ & \leq \vartheta_+^{-1}\|f|_{(\tau,1)}\|_{H^{1/2}((\tau,1))} + \frac{\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_-}{\tau\vartheta_+ + (1-\tau)\vartheta_-}|f(\tau)|\|(1-x)|_{(\tau,1)}\|_{H^{1/2}((\tau,1))} \\ & \lesssim \|f|_{(\tau,1)}\|_{H^{1/2}((\tau,1))} + \|f\|_{\infty} \end{aligned}$$

with uniform constants, depending on $\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}$ only. We thus conclude

$$\|(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-3/4}\Delta f\| \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{1/2}((0,1))} + \|f\|_{\infty} \leq \|f\|^{1/2}\|f\|_{H^1((0,1))}^{1/2} + \|f\|_{\infty}.$$

In view of $\|K_{\delta,k}\|_{\infty} = \delta^{-1/2}\|K\|_{\infty}$ and $\|K_{\delta,k}\|_{H^1((0,1))} = \delta^{-1}\|K\|_{H^1}$, this yields

$$\|(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-3/4}\Delta K_{\delta,k}\| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}.$$

□

B. Proofs for the concentration analysis

Proof of Lemma 3.3. (i) It follows from the variation of constants formula that

$$X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) = \int_0^t \langle S_{\vartheta}(t-s)\Delta K_{\delta,i}, dW(s) \rangle.$$

Let $i, j \in [n]$ with $i, j \neq k_*$. Then, $\vartheta \equiv \vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)$ on $\text{supp}(K_{\delta,i})$ and, using the selfadjointness of $(S_{\vartheta}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, we obtain for $s, t > 0$ the covariance

$$\begin{aligned} c_{ij}(t, s) & := \text{Cov}(X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t), X_{\delta,j}^{\Delta}(s)) \\ & = \frac{1}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)\vartheta_{\delta,j}(k_*)} \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle S_{\vartheta}(t-u)\Delta_{\vartheta}K_{\delta,i}, S_{\vartheta}(s-u)\Delta_{\vartheta}K_{\delta,j} \rangle du \\ & = \frac{1}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)\vartheta_{\delta,j}(k_*)} \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle S_{\vartheta}(t+s-2u)\Delta_{\vartheta}K_{\delta,i}, \Delta_{\vartheta}K_{\delta,j} \rangle du \\ & = \frac{1}{2\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)\vartheta_{\delta,j}(k_*)} \langle (S_{\vartheta}(|t-s|) - S_{\vartheta}(t+s))K_{\delta,i}, (-\Delta_{\vartheta})K_{\delta,j} \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Therefore, for $i \neq k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] &= \int_0^T c_{ii}(t, t) dt \\
&= \frac{1}{2\vartheta_i^2} \int_0^T \langle (\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2t))K_{\delta,i}, (-\Delta_\vartheta)K_{\delta,i} \rangle dt \\
&= \frac{T}{2\vartheta_i^2} \int_0^1 \vartheta(x)K'_{\delta,i}(x)^2 dx - \frac{1}{4\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)^2} \langle (\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2T))K_{\delta,i}, K_{\delta,i} \rangle \\
&= \frac{T}{2\vartheta_i} \delta^{-2} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 + \mathcal{O}(1),
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where, as can be seen from the last but one line, $\mathcal{O}(1) \leq 0$ and $|\mathcal{O}(1)| \leq 1/(4\underline{\vartheta}^2)$.

- (ii) Let \mathcal{E} be the Dirichlet form associated to the Laplacian Δ with Dirichlet boundary conditions, i.e., $D(\mathcal{E}) = H_0^1((0, 1))$ and $\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \int_{(0,1)} \nabla u \nabla v d\lambda$ for $u, v \in H_0^1((0, 1))$. Then, $D(\mathcal{E}) = D(\mathcal{E}_\vartheta)$ and $\bar{\vartheta}(-\Delta) \geq -\Delta_\vartheta \geq \underline{\vartheta}(-\Delta)$ in the sense that

$$\bar{\vartheta}\mathcal{E}(u, u) \geq \mathcal{E}_\vartheta(u, u) \geq \underline{\vartheta}\mathcal{E}(u, u) \quad \text{for any } u \in H_0^1((0, 1)).$$

Thus, by the argument given in Theorem VI.2.21 of [20], see also p. 333 of the same reference, it follows that $\bar{\vartheta}^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1} \leq (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \leq \underline{\vartheta}^{-1}(-\Delta)^{-1}$. Consequently, recalling that $\lambda_k \geq \underline{\lambda} > 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k}] &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[X_{\delta,k}^\Delta(t)^2] dt = \int_0^T \int_0^t \|S_\vartheta(u)\Delta K_{\delta,k}\|^2 du dt \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \langle (\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2t))(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta,k}, \Delta K_{\delta,k} \rangle dt \\
&\in \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(T - \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda T}}{2\underline{\lambda}} \right) \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta,k}, \Delta K_{\delta,k} \rangle, T \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta,k}, \Delta K_{\delta,k} \rangle \right] \\
&\in \left[\frac{2\underline{\lambda}T - 1 + e^{-2\lambda T}}{4\underline{\lambda}\bar{\vartheta}} \|\nabla K_{\delta,k}\|^2, \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|\nabla K_{\delta,k}\|^2 \right] \\
&= \left[\frac{2\underline{\lambda}T - 1 + e^{-2\lambda T}}{4\underline{\lambda}\bar{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}, \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

An alternative bound is obtained using Lemma A.3, namely

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq \int_0^T \langle S_\vartheta(2t)(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta,k}, \Delta K_{\delta,k} \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-2}\Delta K_{\delta,k}, \Delta K_{\delta,k} \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1}\Delta K_{\delta,k}\|^2 \leq \delta^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k}] \in \left[\frac{T}{2\bar{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}, \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1}).$$

- (iii) Since $(X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t))_{t \geq 0, i=1, \dots, n}$ is a centered Gaussian process, it follows from Wick's formula ([19, Theorem 1.28]) that

$$\text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_{\delta,i} \right) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \int_0^T \int_0^T 2c_{ij}(t, s)^2 ds dt.$$

In the sequel, we employ tensor products $f^{\otimes 2}(x, y) := f(x)f(y)$ and $A^{\otimes 2} f^{\otimes 2} := (Af)^{\otimes 2}$ for $f \in L^2((0, 1))$ and $A : L^2((0, 1)) \rightarrow L^2((0, 1))$. Using (B.1) and the assumption $\alpha_k = 0$, we obtain by Bochner integration and spectral calculus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i I_{\delta, i} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_0^T \sum_{i, j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i \alpha_j}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2 \vartheta_{\delta, j}(k.)^2} \langle ((-\Delta_\vartheta)(S_\vartheta(|t-s|) - S_\vartheta(t+s)))^{\otimes 2} K_{\delta, i}^{\otimes 2}, K_{\delta, j}^{\otimes 2} \rangle_{L^2([0, 1]^2)} dt ds \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \int_0^T \int_0^T ((-\Delta_\vartheta)(S_\vartheta(|t-s|) - S_\vartheta(t+s)))^{\otimes 2} dt ds \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} K_{\delta, i}^{\otimes 2}, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} K_{\delta, i}^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle_{L^2([0, 1]^2)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \int_0^T \int_0^T \lambda_k \lambda_l (e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_k(t+s)}) (e^{-\lambda_l |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_l(t+s)}) dt ds \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \int_0^T \int_0^T \lambda_k \lambda_l e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} (e^{-\lambda_l |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_l(t+s)}) dt ds \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \int_0^T \int_0^T \lambda_k \lambda_l e^{-(\lambda_k + \lambda_l) |t-s|} dt ds \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq T \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \frac{\lambda_k \lambda_l}{\lambda_k + \lambda_l} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{T}{2} \sum_{k, l \geq 1} \lambda_k^{1/2} \lambda_l^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{T}{2} \left(\sum_{k, l \geq 1} \lambda_k \lambda_l \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k, l \geq 1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta, i}, e_l \rangle \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{T}{2} \left(\sum_{i, j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i \alpha_j}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2 \vartheta_{\delta, j}(k.)^2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{\delta, i}, (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{\delta, j} \rangle^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{i, j=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i \alpha_j}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^2 \vartheta_{\delta, j}(k.)^2} \langle K_{\delta, i}, K_{\delta, j} \rangle^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \frac{T}{2} \delta^{-2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i^2}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^4} \left(\int \vartheta(x_i + \delta y) K'(y)^2 dy \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i^2}{\vartheta_{\delta, i}(k.)^4} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{T}{2\vartheta^3} \delta^{-2} \|\alpha\|_{\ell^2}^2 \|K'\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(iv) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{k, k.}(t, s) &= \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle S_\vartheta(t+s-2u) \Delta K_{\delta, k.}, \Delta K_{\delta, k.} \rangle du \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle (S_\vartheta(|t-s|) - S_\vartheta(t+s)) (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta K_{\delta, k.}, \Delta K_{\delta, k.} \rangle \\
&\in \frac{1}{2} \left[0, \langle S_\vartheta(|t-s|) (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta K_{\delta, k.}, \Delta K_{\delta, k.} \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(I_{\delta,k.}) &= \int_0^T \int_0^T 2c_{k.,k.}(t,s)^2 ds dt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \int_0^T \langle S_{\vartheta}(|t-s|)(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-1} \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, \Delta K_{\delta,k.} \rangle^2 ds dt \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k \lambda_l} \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, e_k \rangle^2 \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, e_l \rangle^2 \int_0^T \int_0^T e^{-(\lambda_k + \lambda_l)|t-s|} ds dt \\
&\leq \frac{T}{2} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k \lambda_l (\lambda_k + \lambda_l)} \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, e_k \rangle^2 \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, e_l \rangle^2 \\
&\leq \frac{T}{4} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k^{-3/2} \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k.}, e_k \rangle^2 \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{T}{4} \|(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-3/4} \Delta K_{\delta,k.}\|^4.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.4, $\|(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-3/4} \Delta K_{\delta,k.}\| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}$ holds, implying the result. \square

We now turn to the proof of the concentration inequality for linear combinations of $(I_{\delta,i})_{i=1,\dots,\delta-1}$ stated in Proposition 3.4. It relies on the following result given in [25]. For details on Malliavin calculus, we refer to the standard references [24, 26].

B.1 Theorem (Theorem 4.1 in [25]). *Let $X = (X(h))_{h \in \mathfrak{H}}$ be an isonormal Gaussian process on a real separable Hilbert space \mathfrak{H} , and let $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ be the domain of the Malliavin derivative operator D associated to X . Let $Z \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ have zero mean, and define*

$$g_Z(z) := \mathbb{E} [\langle DZ, -DL^{-1}Z \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \mid Z = z], \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where L^{-1} is the pseudoinverse of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck generator $L := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} -mJ_m$, J_m being the projection onto the m -th Wiener chaos. Assume that, for some $\alpha \geq 0, \beta > 0$,

- (i) $g_Z(Z) \leq \alpha Z + \beta$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.;
- (ii) the law of Z has a density ρ .

Then, for all $z > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z \geq z) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2\alpha z + 2\beta}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(Z \leq -z) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2\beta}\right).$$

In order to apply this result, we must first construct an appropriate Hilbert space for our specific setting. Let \mathcal{E} be the set of \mathbb{R} -valued stepfunctions on $[0, T]^n \setminus \{0\}^n$ that can be expressed as linear combinations of indicator functions $\mathbf{1}_{[0,t_1] \times \dots \times [0,t_n]}$, $t_i \in [0, T]$ and $t_j \neq 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let \mathfrak{H} be the separable Hilbert space obtained by closing \mathcal{E} with respect to the inner product determined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L a_k b_l \sum_{i,j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t_{k,i}) X_{\delta,j}^{\Delta}(s_{l,j})] = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L a_k b_l c_{i,j}(t_{k,i}, s_{l,j})$$

for $f = \sum_{k=1}^K a_k \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_{k,1}] \times \dots \times [0,t_{k,n}]} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $g = \sum_{l=1}^L b_l \mathbf{1}_{[0,s_{l,1}] \times \dots \times [0,s_{l,n}]} \in \mathcal{E}$. For

$$h = \sum_{k=1}^K c_k \mathbf{1}_{[0,t_{k,1}] \times \dots \times [0,t_{k,n}]} \in \mathcal{E}$$

we set $X(h) = \sum_{k=1}^K c_k \sum_{i=1}^n X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t_{k,i})$ and, for any $h \in \mathfrak{H}$, let $X(h)$ be the L^2 limit of $(X(h_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for some sequence $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{E}$ converging to h in $(\mathfrak{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}})$, then $(X(h))_{h \in \mathfrak{H}}$ is an isonormal Gaussian process (cf. [4, Proposition 2.1]) over \mathfrak{H} . In particular, since $X_0 \equiv 0$ by assumption, this implies that, for any $t > 0$, $X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) = X(\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)})$, where $\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}_{\prod_{j=1}^n A_j}$ for $A_i = [0, t]$ and $A_j = \{0\}$ for $i \neq j$.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. The Malliavin derivative of $\varphi(X(\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)})) = X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2$ is $D\varphi(X(\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)})) = 2X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)}$. Introduce

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \int_0^T (X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2 - \mathbb{E}[X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2]) dt,$$

which is an element of the second Wiener chaos associated with $(X(h))_{h \in \mathfrak{H}}$ since for the second Hermite polynomial $H_2(x) = x^2 - 1$ and $h_{k,i}^N = \mathbf{1}_{[0,kT/N]}^{(i)}$ we can write Z as the L^2 limit

$$Z = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \frac{T \|h_{k,i}^N\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2}{N} H_2(X(h_{k,i}^N / \|h_{k,i}^N\|_{\mathfrak{H}})).$$

This implies that the law of Z has a Lebesgue density, $Z \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and its Malliavin derivative is given by

$$DZ = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)} dt.$$

Then, $L^{-1}Z = -\frac{1}{2}Z$ and, therefore, for the orthonormal eigensystem (e_k, λ_k) of $-\Delta_{\mathfrak{H}}$, it follows for $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $\alpha_k = 0$ by similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle DZ, -DL^{-1}Z \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|DZ\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \int_0^T \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) X_{\delta,j}^\Delta(s) \langle \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}^{(i)}, \mathbf{1}_{[0,s]}^{(j)} \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} dt ds \\ &= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j \int_0^T \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) X_{\delta,j}^\Delta(s) c_{i,j}(t,s) dt ds \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \int_0^T \lambda_k (e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_k (t+s)}) \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) K_{\delta,i}, e_k \rangle \sum_{j=1}^n \langle \frac{\alpha_j}{\vartheta_{\delta,j}(k)} X_{\delta,j}^\Delta(s) K_{\delta,j}, e_k \rangle dt ds \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \int_0^T \lambda_k (e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} - e^{-\lambda_k (t+s)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) K_{\delta,i}, e_k \rangle \right)^2 dt ds \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) K_{\delta,i}, e_k \rangle \right)^2 \int_0^T \lambda_k e^{-\lambda_k |t-s|} ds dt \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle \frac{\alpha_i}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k)} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) K_{\delta,i}, e_k \rangle \right)^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_0^T \frac{\alpha_i \alpha_j}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*) \vartheta_{\delta,j}(k_*)} X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) X_{\delta,j}^\Delta(t) \langle K_{\delta,i}, K_{\delta,j} \rangle dt \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i^2}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k_*)^2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2 dt \\
&\leq 2 \frac{\|\alpha\|_\infty}{\underline{\vartheta}^2} \left(Z + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] \right),
\end{aligned}$$

whence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|Z| \geq z) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}])\right| \geq z\right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\underline{\vartheta}^2}{4\|\alpha\|_\infty} \frac{z^2}{z + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

follows from Theorem B.1. In particular, since by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] \leq \|\alpha\|_{\ell^1} \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2},$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}])\right| \geq z\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\underline{\vartheta}^2}{2\|\alpha\|_\infty} \frac{z^2}{2z + \|\alpha\|_{\ell^1} T \underline{\vartheta}^{-1} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2}}\right).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.5. For $i \neq j$, $B_{\delta,i}$ and $B_{\delta,j}$ are independent Brownian motions with respect to the same filtration. Hence, the quadratic covariations satisfy $\langle M_{\delta,i}, M_{\delta,j} \rangle \equiv 0$ a.s., and by Knight's multivariate extension of the Dambis–Dubins–Schwarz construction [28, Theorem V.1.9], $(\overline{M}_{\delta,i})_i$ has the law of a vector of independent Brownian motions at times $\overline{I}_{\delta,i}$ in coordinate i , that is, $\overline{M}_{\delta,i} \sim N(0, \overline{I}_{\delta,i})$ and $(\overline{M}_{\delta,i})_{i=1, \dots, \delta-1}$ are independent. Define the continuous martingale $(\mathcal{M}_{\delta,i}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{M}_{\delta,i}(t) := \int_0^t (\mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq T\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq \sigma_i\}}) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(s) dB_{\delta,i}(s), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, the process $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_t := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathcal{M}_{\delta,i}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, is a continuous martingale with

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (M_{\delta,i} - \overline{M}_{\delta,i}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \int_0^\infty (\mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq T\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq \sigma_i\}}) X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t) = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_\infty, \\
\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 |I_{\delta,i} - \overline{I}_{\delta,i}| &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 \int_0^\infty (\mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq T\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq \sigma_i\}})^2 X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(t)^2 dt = \langle \overline{\mathcal{M}} \rangle_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the representation of the second sum as the limit of the quadratic variations of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_t$ follows from the independence of the Brownian motions $B_{\delta,i}$. Thus, for any $z, L > 0$, we infer by the continuous martingale Bernstein inequality (see, e.g., [28, Exercise 3.16])

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (M_{\delta,i} - \overline{M}_{\delta,i}) \geq z, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^2 |I_{\delta,i} - \overline{I}_{\delta,i}| \leq L\right) = \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\infty \geq z, \langle \overline{\mathcal{M}} \rangle_\infty \leq L) \leq e^{-\frac{z^2}{2L}}.$$

Repeating the argument for the continuous martingale $-\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ then yields the second claim. \square

Next, we provide the proof for the uniform orders of the empirical processes $I_{T,\delta}(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\cdot)]$ and $M_{T,\delta}(\cdot)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. We start with verifying (3.11). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_0, h) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_0, h)]| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left| \left(\sum_{i=1, i \neq k_0}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k_0} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \neq k_0\}} \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k_0 + 1, i \neq k_0}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k_0} + \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k_0 + 1, i \neq k_0}^n \right) (\vartheta_{\delta,i}(\lceil h/\delta \rceil) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2 (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \\
&\leq (\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2 \left| \sum_{i=1, i \neq k_0}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k_0 - 1} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| + \max \{ (\vartheta_0 - \vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta))^2 \} |I_{\delta, \lceil h/\delta \rceil} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, \lceil h/\delta \rceil}]| \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \neq k_0\}} \\
&\quad + \max \{ (\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta))^2 \} \left| \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k_0 + 1, i \notin \{k_0, \lceil h/\delta \rceil\}}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k_0} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \neq k_0\}} \\
&\quad + (\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 \left| \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k_0 + 1, i \neq k_0}^n (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \\
&\lesssim_{\vartheta, \bar{\vartheta}} \max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k_0\}} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| + \max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - 1} \left| \sum_{i=k+1, i \neq k_0}^n (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \\
&\quad + \max_{k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - 1\}, k_1 \leq k_2} \left| \sum_{i=k_1+1, i \neq k_0}^{k_2} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| + \max_{k \in [\delta]^{-1}} |I_{\delta,k} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k}]|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on ϑ and $\bar{\vartheta}$, first using a union bound and then Proposition 3.4, we obtain, for any $z > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1]} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \geq z \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k_0\}} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \geq z/(4C) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=k+1, i \neq k_0}^n (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \geq z/(4C) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - 1\}, k_1 \leq k_2} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=k_1+1, i \neq k_0}^{k_2} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]) \right| \geq z/(4C) \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in [n] \setminus \{k_0\}} \mathbb{P} \left(|I_{\delta,k} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k}]| \geq z/(4C) \right) \\
&\leq (3\delta^{-1} + \delta^{-2}/4) \exp \left(- \frac{\vartheta^2}{32} \frac{z^2}{Cz/4 + C^2 T \vartheta^{-1} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-3}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which establishes (3.11). It remains to verify (3.12). Let

$$\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\chi) := \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} \vartheta_{\delta,i}([h/\delta]) \bar{M}_{\delta,i}, \quad \bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(2)}(\chi) := \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0 \bar{M}_{\delta,i}.$$

Then,

$$\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, h) = \vartheta_- \sum_{i \in [h/\delta-1] \setminus \{k^0\}} \bar{M}_{\delta,i} + \vartheta_+ \sum_{i \geq [h/\delta]+1, i \neq k^0} \bar{M}_{\delta,i} + \vartheta_c \bar{M}_{\delta, [h/\delta]} \mathbf{1}_{\{[h/\delta] \neq k^0\}},$$

implying that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} |\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\chi)| \\ & \leq \bar{\vartheta} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} \bar{M}_{\delta,i} \right| + \max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{n-k^0+1\}} \bar{M}_{\delta, n-(i-1)} \right| + \max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} |\bar{M}_{\delta,k}| \right) \\ & =: \bar{\vartheta} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} |Y_k| + \max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} |\tilde{Y}_k| + \max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} |\bar{M}_{\delta,k}| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (Y_k) and (\tilde{Y}_k) are martingales in k , due to the independence of the zero mean summands provided by Proposition 3.5. Since $\bar{M}_{\delta,k} \sim N(0, \bar{I}_{\delta,k})$ with $\bar{I}_{\delta,k} = \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k}] \lesssim \delta^{-2}$ for $k \neq k^0$, a union bound immediately yields

$$\max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} |\bar{M}_{\delta,k}| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-1} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}).$$

Using moreover that Lemma 3.3 implies

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_n^2] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Y}_n^2] = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}] \lesssim \delta^{-3},$$

we obtain from Doob's (sub)martingale inequality that

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} |\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\chi)| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}).$$

The same arguments give

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} |\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(2)}(\chi)| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}),$$

such that (3.12) will follow once we show that

$$\sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi) - (\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\chi) - \bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(2)}(\chi))| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Similarly to the calculations above, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi) - (\bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(1)}(\chi) - \bar{M}_{T,\delta}^{(2)}(\chi))| \\ & \lesssim \bar{\vartheta} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| + \max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{n-k^0+1\}} (M_{\delta, n-(i-1)} - \bar{M}_{\delta, n-(i-1)}) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} |M_{\delta,k} - \bar{M}_{\delta,k}| \right). \end{aligned}$$

For any $L, z > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| \geq z \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| \geq z, \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} |I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]| \leq L \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} |I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]| > L \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\delta^{-1}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| \geq z, \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} |I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}]| \leq L \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \{k^0\}} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}])^2 > L^2 \right) \\
& \leq 2\delta^{-1} e^{-\frac{z^2}{L}} + \frac{\delta^{-4} T \|K'\|_{L^2}^2}{2\vartheta^3 L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality was used for the sum in the second probability, while the final inequality is a consequence of Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.3, combined with Markov’s inequality. Thus, for the choice $L = R_L \delta^{-2}$ with $R_L \rightarrow \infty$ and $z_L = R_L \delta^{-1} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| \geq z_L \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } R_L \rightarrow \infty,$$

whence

$$\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{k^0\}} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \right| = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-1} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}).$$

The same arguments also yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \left| \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{n-k^0+1\}} (M_{\delta, n-(i-1)} - \bar{M}_{\delta, n-(i-1)}) \right| &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}), \\
\max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} |M_{\delta, k} - \bar{M}_{\delta, k}| &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^{-3/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

which establishes (B.4) and therefore proves (3.12). \square

C. Remaining proofs for Section 3

We start by proving the upper bound for the error term R_{δ, k^0} arising in the representation of our simultaneous M-estimator $(\hat{\vartheta}_{-}^{\delta}, \hat{\vartheta}_{+}^{\delta}, \hat{\vartheta}_{\circ}^{\delta}, \hat{\tau}^{\delta})$.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $\vartheta = \vartheta^0(\delta)$, $\vartheta_{-} = \vartheta_{-}^0(\delta)$ and $\tau = \tau^0$. Let us first treat the case (i) concerning the L^1 -bound of R_{δ, k^0} , then (ii) the variance bound on R_{δ, k^0} and finally prove (iii) the existence of $\vartheta^0 \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$ such that $|\mathbb{E}[R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta^0)]| \leq \delta^{-1}$.

(i) By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$|R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta')| \leq \left(\int_0^T X_{\delta, k^0}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^T \left(\int_0^t \langle \Delta_{\vartheta} S_{\vartheta}(t-s) K_{\delta, k^0} - \vartheta' S_{\vartheta}(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}, dW_s \rangle \right)^2 dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Hence, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Fubini’s theorem show

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta')|] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k^0}]} \sqrt{\int_0^T \int_0^t \|\Delta_{\vartheta} S_{\vartheta}(t-s) K_{\delta,k^0} - \vartheta' S_{\vartheta}(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}\|^2 ds dt} \\ &=: \sqrt{\mathcal{J}_1} \sqrt{\mathcal{J}_2(\vartheta')}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The crux of the problem is now that in general K_{δ,k^0} does not belong to the domain $D(\Delta_{\vartheta})$, which prevents us from swapping the order of application of Δ_{ϑ} and $S_{\vartheta}(t-s)$. To resolve this problem, we construct an appropriate approximation of K_{δ,k^0} within the domain $D(\Delta_{\vartheta})$. Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset [-1/2, 1/2]$ and $\varphi'(0) = 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon \varphi((x - \tau)/\varepsilon), \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

It is easily seen that $\varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in $H^1((0, 1))$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus, $K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon := K_{\delta,k^0} - \delta^{-3/2} K'((\tau - x_{k^0})/\delta) \varphi_\varepsilon$ converges to K_{δ,k^0} in $H^1((0, 1))$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty((0, 1))$ since $\tau \notin \{0, 1\}$, and since $\varphi'(0) = 1$ it follows that $\nabla K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(\tau) = 0$. Therefore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, Lemma A.2 implies that $K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon \in D(\Delta_{\vartheta})$ and $\Delta_{\vartheta} K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon = \vartheta \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon$. In particular, $\Delta_{\vartheta} S_{\vartheta}(s) K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon = S_{\vartheta}(s) \Delta_{\vartheta} K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon$. Let now \mathcal{E} be the Dirichlet form given by $\mathcal{E}(u, v) = \int_0^1 \nabla u \nabla v d\lambda$ for u, v belonging to the domain $D(\mathcal{E}) = \{u \in H^1((0, 1)) : u(0) = 0\}$. The associated self-adjoint operator on $L^2((0, 1))$ is the Laplacian subject to mixed homogeneous Dirichlet–Neumann boundary conditions, i.e., $u(0) = 0$ and $\nabla u(1) = 0$ for any $u \in D(\Delta)$. Moreover, it is well-known that the spectrum of the positive self-adjoint operator $-\Delta$ is discrete and bounded from below by some strictly positive constant, whence $(-\Delta)^{-1}$ exists as a bounded operator from $L^2((0, 1))$ to $D(-\Delta)$. Since for any

$$u \in D((-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{1/2}) = D(\mathcal{E}_{\vartheta}) \subset D(\mathcal{E}) = D((-\Delta)^{1/2}),$$

we have $\mathcal{E}_{\vartheta}(u, u) \geq \underline{\vartheta} \mathcal{E}(u, u)$, it now follows from the argument in the proof of Theorem VI.2.21 in [20] that $(-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-1} \leq \underline{\vartheta}^{-1} (-\Delta)^{-1}$. Letting $\tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon := K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon - K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(\tau)$ and $\varphi \in C_c((0, 1))$, integration by parts shows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon, \varphi'' \rangle &= \int_\tau^1 \tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(x) \varphi''(x) dx \\ &= - \int_\tau^1 \nabla K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(x) \varphi'(x) dx \\ &= \int_\tau^1 K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(x) \varphi(x) dx \\ &= \langle \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon, \varphi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where for the second line we used $\tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(\tau) = 0 = \varphi'(1)$ and the third line follows from $\nabla K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon(\tau) = 0 = \varphi(1)$. Thus, $\mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon$ solves the Poisson equation $\Delta f = \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon$ subject to the mixed Dirichlet–Neumann boundary conditions (note here that $f := \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon \in D(\Delta)$ since $f(0) = 0$ and $f'(1) = 0$). From above, we know that the solution is unique, whence $\Delta^{-1}(\mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon) = \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \tilde{K}_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon$. Thus, in case $\vartheta' = \vartheta_-$, for any $0 < t \leq T$ we can calculate as follows for small $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \|\Delta_{\vartheta} S_{\vartheta}(s) K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon - \vartheta_- S_{\vartheta}(s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 ds &= \int_0^t \|S_{\vartheta}(s) (\Delta_{\vartheta} - \vartheta_- \Delta) K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_{\vartheta})^{-1} (\text{Id} - S_{\vartheta}(2t)) (\vartheta - \vartheta_-) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta_-) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} (\vartheta - \vartheta_-) \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta_-) \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&= \frac{\eta^2}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} (\mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon), \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{\eta^2}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \langle (-\Delta)^{-1} (\mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon), \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&= -\frac{\eta^2}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \langle \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \widetilde{K}_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, \mathbf{1}_{[\tau, 1)} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{\eta^2}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from an integration by parts using $\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon(\tau) = \nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon(1) = 0$. Due to $\|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon - \nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, for

$$\mathcal{J}_2^\varepsilon(\vartheta') := \int_0^T \int_0^t \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t-s) K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon - \vartheta' S_\vartheta(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 ds dt,$$

we now arrive at

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}_2^\varepsilon(\vartheta_-) \leq \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \eta^2 \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 = \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \eta^2 \delta^{-2}.$$

For general $\vartheta' \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \overline{\vartheta}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(s) K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon - \vartheta' S_\vartheta(s) \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 ds &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} (\vartheta - \vartheta') \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta') \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, \Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle - \vartheta' \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{(\vartheta')^2}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta \nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 + \frac{(\vartheta')^2}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\overline{\vartheta}^2 (1 + \underline{\vartheta}^{-1})}{2} \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\overline{\vartheta}^2 (1 + \underline{\vartheta}^{-1})}{2} \delta^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to relate $\mathcal{J}_2^\varepsilon(\vartheta')$ to \mathcal{J}_2 . Let

$$\mathcal{J}_3^\varepsilon := \int_0^T \|\Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t) (K_{\delta, k^0} - K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon)\|^2 dt, \quad \mathcal{J}_4^\varepsilon := \int_0^T \|S_\vartheta(t) \Delta (K_{\delta, k^0} - K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon)\|^2 dt,$$

and recall that $(\lambda_k, e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes an eigenbasis of $-\Delta_\vartheta$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_3^\varepsilon &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_k \langle K_{\delta, k^0} - K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, e_k \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2} (K_{\delta, k^0} - K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon)\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\overline{\vartheta}^2}{2} \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0} - \nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since

$$K_{\delta, k^0} - K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon = \delta^{-3} K'((\tau - x_{k^0})/\delta) \varphi_\varepsilon,$$

following the steps from the proof of Lemma 3.3.(ii), we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}_4^\varepsilon \lesssim \delta \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \|\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon\|^2 = \frac{T}{2\underline{\vartheta}} \varepsilon \|\varphi'\|_{L^2}^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{J}_2(\vartheta') \leq 2\mathcal{J}_2^\varepsilon(\vartheta') + 4(1 \vee \bar{\vartheta}^2)T(\mathcal{J}_3^\varepsilon + \mathcal{J}_4^\varepsilon)$, it now follows from the above estimates by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ that $\mathcal{J}_2(\vartheta_-) \leq \frac{T}{\bar{\vartheta}}\|K'\|_{L^2}^2\eta^2\delta^{-2}$ and, in general, $\mathcal{J}_2(\vartheta') \lesssim \delta^{-2}$. Combining these estimates with Lemma 3.3, the assertion follows from (C.1).

(ii) We now proceed with the variance bound. Let $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ be the Gaussian process defined by $Y(t) := \int_0^t \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t-u)K_{\delta, k^0} - \vartheta' S_\vartheta(t-u)\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}, dW_u \rangle$. Since $R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta') = \langle X_{\delta, k^0}^\Delta, Y \rangle_{L^2[0, T]}$ and both X_{δ, k^0}^Δ and Y are centered $L^2([0, T])$ -valued jointly Gaussian processes we use Lemma C.1 below and Lemma 3.3 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(R_{\delta, k^0}) &\leq \sqrt{\text{Var}(\|X_{\delta, k^0}^\Delta\|_{L^2[0, T]}^2)} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\|Y\|_{L^2([0, T])}^2)} = \sqrt{\text{Var}(I_{\delta, k^0})} \sqrt{\text{Var}\left(\int_0^T Y(t)^2 dt\right)} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-1} \sqrt{\text{Var}\left(\int_0^T Y(t)^2 dt\right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

By Wick's formula and Itô-isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\left(\int_0^T Y(t)^2 dt\right) &= \int_0^T \int_0^T \text{Cov}(Y(t), Y(s))^2 ds dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^T \int_0^T \left(\int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle F_{t-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}), F_{s-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}) \rangle du\right)^2 ds dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we denoted $F_r(g) := \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(r)g - \vartheta' S_\vartheta(r)\Delta g$. As above, we first bound the ε -approximation

$$\mathcal{J}^\varepsilon := \int_0^T \int_0^T \left(\int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle F_{t-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon), F_{s-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon) \rangle du\right)^2 ds dt.$$

Since $K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \in D(\Delta_\vartheta)$ with $\Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon = \vartheta \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle F_{t-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon), F_{s-u}(K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon) \rangle du &= \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle S_\vartheta(t-u)(\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, S_\vartheta(s-u)(\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle du \\ &= \int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle S_\vartheta(t+s-2u)(\vartheta - \vartheta_-)\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} S_\vartheta(|t-s|)(\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Calculating as in Lemma 3.3.(iv) and part (i), we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon &\leq \int_0^T \int_0^T \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} S_\vartheta(|t-s|)(\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon, (\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon \rangle^2 ds dt \\ &\leq \frac{T}{2} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4}(\vartheta - \vartheta')\Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4 \\ &\leq \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4} \Delta_\vartheta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4 + \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4 \\ &= \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/4} K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4 + \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4} \Delta K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/4} K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^4 \leq \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{1/2} K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \|K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \leq \bar{\vartheta} \|\nabla K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \|K_{\delta, k^0}^\varepsilon\|^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2},$$

and Lemma A.4 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-3/4} \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\| &\lesssim \|K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\|^{1/2} \|K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\|_{H^1((0,1))}^{1/2} + \|K_{\delta,k^0}^\varepsilon\|_\infty \\ &\xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|K_{\delta,k^0}\|^{1/2} \|K_{\delta,k^0}\|_{H^1((0,1))}^{1/2} + \|K_{\delta,k^0}\|_\infty \sim \delta^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon \lesssim \delta^{-2}$, and analogously to part (i), we therefore obtain

$$\text{Var}(\|Y\|_{L^2([0,T])}^2) = \int_0^T \int_0^T \left(\int_0^{t \wedge s} \langle F_{t-u}(K_{\delta,k^0}), F_{s-u}(K_{\delta,k^0}) \rangle du \right)^2 ds dt \lesssim \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{J}^\varepsilon \lesssim \delta^{-2}.$$

Thus, (C.2) implies $\text{Var}(R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta')) \lesssim \delta^{-2}$.

(iii) We have

$$R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta') = \int_0^T \int_0^t \langle S_\vartheta(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, dW_s \rangle \int_0^t \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t-s) K_{\delta,k^0}, dW_s \rangle dt - \vartheta' I_{\delta,k^0}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

By now familiar calculations give

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \int_0^t \langle S_\vartheta(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, dW_s \rangle \int_0^t \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t-s) K_{\delta,k^0}, dW_s \rangle dt \right] \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^t \langle S_\vartheta(t-s) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(t-s) K_{\delta,k^0} \rangle ds dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^t \langle \Delta_\vartheta S_\vartheta(2s) K_{\delta,k^0}, \Delta K_{\delta,k^0} \rangle ds dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^T (e^{-2\lambda_k t} - 1) \langle \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, e_k \rangle \langle K_{\delta,k^0}, e_k \rangle dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \langle -\Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, K_{\delta,k^0} \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} (\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2T)) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, K_{\delta,k^0} \rangle \\ &= \frac{T}{2} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where for the last line we used that by self-adjointness, Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.3,

$$|\langle (-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} (\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2T)) \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}, K_{\delta,k^0} \rangle| \leq \|(-\Delta_\vartheta)^{-1} \Delta K_{\delta,k^0}\| \|(\text{Id} - S_\vartheta(2T)) K_{\delta,k^0}\| \lesssim \delta^{-1/2}.$$

Since by Lemma 3.3 it holds

$$\frac{T}{2\vartheta} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1}) \leq \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k^0}] \leq \frac{T}{2\vartheta} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1}),$$

it therefore follows from (C.3) that there exists $\vartheta_\circ^0 \in [\underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}]$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[R_{\delta,k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0)] = \mathcal{O}(\delta^{-1}).$$

□

C.1 Lemma. *For two centred, jointly Gaussian random variables X, Y with values in a real separable Hilbert space we have*

$$\text{Var}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \leq \text{Var}(\|X\|^2)^{1/2} \text{Var}(\|Y\|^2)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Let us decompose $Y = LX + Z$ with a bounded linear operator L such that $LX := \mathbb{E}[Y | X]$, $Z := Y - \mathbb{E}[Y | X]$ and Z is independent of X . We denote by Q_X, Q_Z the trace-class covariance operators of X and Z . Then using an orthonormal eigensystem (e_i, λ_i) of Q_X we find

$$\text{Var}(\|X\|^2) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \text{Var}(\langle X, e_i \rangle^2) = \sum_{i \geq 1} 2\lambda_i^2 = 2\|Q_X\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

The same argument with orthonormal systems of Q_Z and $Q_X^{1/2}L^*LQ_X^{1/2}$, respectively, yields

$$\text{Var}(\|Z\|^2) = 2\|Q_Z\|_{\text{HS}}^2, \quad \text{Var}(\|LX\|^2) = 2\|Q_X^{1/2}L^*LQ_X^{1/2}\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

If $L_\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(L + L^*)$ denotes the symmetrisation of L , this argument also yields

$$\text{Var}(\langle X, LX \rangle) = \text{Var}(\langle X, L_\sigma X \rangle) = 2\|Q_X^{1/2}L_\sigma Q_X^{1/2}\|_{\text{HS}}^2.$$

Due to the independence of X and Z , we may disintegrate to obtain

$$\text{Var}(\langle X, Z \rangle) = \mathbb{E}[\langle Q_Z X, X \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\langle Q_Z, XX^* \rangle_{\text{HS}}] = \langle Q_X, Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}}$$

as well as

$$\text{Var}(\langle LX, Z \rangle) = \text{Var}(\langle L_\sigma X, Z \rangle) = \mathbb{E}[\langle Q_Z, L_\sigma XX^* L_\sigma \rangle_{\text{HS}}] = \langle Q_X, L_\sigma Q_Z L_\sigma \rangle_{\text{HS}}.$$

Using these identities, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\langle X, Y \rangle) &= \text{Var}(\langle X, LX \rangle + \langle X, Z \rangle) \\ &= \text{Var}(\langle X, LX \rangle) + \text{Var}(\langle X, Z \rangle) + 2\text{Cov}(\langle X, LX \rangle, \langle X, Z \rangle) \\ &= 2\|Q_X^{1/2}L_\sigma Q_X^{1/2}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \langle Q_X, Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}} + 0 \\ &= \langle Q_X, 2L_\sigma Q_X L_\sigma + Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the covariance vanishes since the product of the arguments is linear in Z , which is centered and independent of X . By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the identity $\|T^*T\|_{\text{HS}} = \|TT^*\|_{\text{HS}}$ for $T = Q_X^{1/2}L_\sigma$, we obtain further

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\langle X, Y \rangle)^2 &\leq \|Q_X\|_{\text{HS}}^2 \left(\|2L_\sigma Q_X L_\sigma\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \|Q_Z\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + 2\langle 2L_\sigma Q_X L_\sigma, Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(\|X\|^2) \left(4\|Q_X^{1/2}L_\sigma Q_X^{1/2}\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \|Q_Z\|_{\text{HS}}^2 + 4\langle L_\sigma Q_X L_\sigma, Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}} \right) \\ &\leq \text{Var}(\|X\|^2) \left(\text{Var}(\|LX\|^2) + \frac{1}{4} \text{Var}(\|Z\|^2) + 2\text{Var}(\langle LX, Z \rangle) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the partial ordering $L_\sigma^2 =: \text{Re}(L)^2 \leq |L|^2 =: L^*L$ and from $\langle L_\sigma Q_X L_\sigma, Q_Z \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \langle Q_X, L_\sigma Q_Z L_\sigma \rangle_{\text{HS}}$. Finally, note

$$\text{Var}(\|Y\|^2) = \text{Var}(\|LX + Z\|^2) = \text{Var}(\|LX\|^2) + \text{Var}(\|Z\|^2) + \text{Var}(2\langle LX, Z \rangle),$$

since all covariances between $\|LX\|^2, \|Z\|^2$ and $\langle LX, Z \rangle$ vanish due to independence or symmetry in Z (use $Z \stackrel{d}{=} -Z$), such that the asserted inequality follows. \square

We now provide the proof of the expectation result needed for the application of the consistency theorem for M-estimators.

Proof of Lemma 3.6. It is enough to show

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} \left| \delta^3 \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)] - \mathcal{Z}(\chi') \right| = 0,$$

since $\mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k^0}] \lesssim \delta^{-2}$. By Lemma 3.3, it holds

$$\delta^3 \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, h)] = \frac{T}{4} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \delta \sum_{i=1}^{\delta^{-1}} \frac{(\vartheta_{\delta,i}([nh]) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0)^2}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}^0} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2),$$

and we always have

$$\frac{|\vartheta_{\delta,i}(k) - \vartheta_{\delta,i}^0|^2}{\vartheta_{\delta,i}^0} \leq \frac{(\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2}{\underline{\vartheta}}, \quad i, k \in [n]$$

It is thus easily verified that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \delta^3 \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)] - \frac{T}{4} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{(\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) - \vartheta_{\delta}^0(x))^2}{\vartheta_{\delta}^0(x)} dx \right| \\ & \leq \frac{(\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2}{\vartheta_-^0(\delta)} |\delta([\tau^0/\delta] \wedge [h/\delta] - 1) - \tau^0 \wedge h| + \frac{(\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2}{\vartheta_+^0(\delta)} |\delta([\tau^0/\delta] \vee [h/\delta]) - \tau^0 \vee h| \\ & \quad + |\delta(|[\tau^0/\delta] - [h/\delta]| - 1)^+ - |\tau^0 - h| | \frac{(\vartheta_+ - \vartheta_+^0(\delta))^2 + (\vartheta_- - \vartheta_-^0(\delta))^2}{\vartheta_+^0(\delta) \wedge \vartheta_-^0(\delta)} + \delta \frac{(\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2}{\underline{\vartheta}} + \delta^2 \\ & \leq \delta \frac{(\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2}{\underline{\vartheta}}. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain the uniform convergence

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} \left| \delta^3 \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, h)] - \frac{T}{4} \|K'\|_{L^2}^2 \int_0^1 \frac{(\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) - \vartheta_{\delta}^0(x))^2}{\vartheta_{\delta}^0(x)} dx \right| = 0. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Moreover, for $\vartheta^* := \vartheta_-^* \mathbf{1}_{(0,\tau^0)} + \vartheta_+^* \mathbf{1}_{[\tau^0,1]}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\vartheta_{\pm}^*(\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta))^2 - \vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta)(\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\pm}^*)^2|}{\vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta)\vartheta_{\pm}^*} \\ & \leq \frac{\vartheta_{\pm}^* |(\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta))^2 - (\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\pm}^*)^2| + (\vartheta_{\pm} - \vartheta_{\pm}^*)^2 |\vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\pm}^*|}{\underline{\vartheta}^2} \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{\vartheta} + (\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2}{\underline{\vartheta}^2} ((\vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\pm}^*)^2 + |\vartheta_{\pm}^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\pm}^*|) \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\frac{|\vartheta_{\pm}^*(\vartheta_{\mp} - \vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta))^2 - \vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta)(\vartheta_{\mp} - \vartheta_{\mp}^*)^2|}{\vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta)\vartheta_{\pm}^*} \leq \frac{\bar{\vartheta} + (\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2}{\underline{\vartheta}^2} ((\vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\mp}^*)^2 + |\vartheta_{\mp}^0(\delta) - \vartheta_{\mp}^*|) \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

By the piecewise constant nature of $\vartheta_{\chi'}$, ϑ_{δ}^0 , ϑ^* , it is therefore straightforward to show that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\chi \in \Theta \times (0,1)} \left| \int_0^1 \frac{(\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) - \vartheta_{\delta}^0(x))^2}{\vartheta_{\delta}^0(x)} dx - \int_0^1 \frac{(\vartheta_{\chi'}(x) - \vartheta^*(x))^2}{\vartheta^*(x)} dx \right| = 0.$$

The claim then follows by using (C.4) and the triangle inequality. \square

Finally, we give the proofs for the local fluctuation bounds on the centered empirical processes $\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\cdot)]$ and $\mathcal{L}_\delta(\cdot) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_\delta(\cdot)]$ around the true parameter $\chi^0(\delta)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. Due to $\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi^0(\delta)) = 0$, the assertion is equivalent to the claim that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\delta^3(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)])| \right] \lesssim \delta^3 + \delta^{1/2}\varepsilon^3 + \delta\varepsilon^2 + \delta^{3/2}\varepsilon.$$

Let $\varepsilon \leq 1$. With the notation from the proof of Theorem 3.8, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\delta^3(\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta(\chi)])| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} \delta^3 |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \right] \\ &\quad + \delta^3 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi)| \right] \\ &\quad + \delta^2(\delta \wedge \varepsilon^2) \mathbb{E}[|I_{\delta,k^0} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,k^0}]|] \\ &\quad + \delta^{5/2}(\delta^{1/2} \wedge \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[|M_{\delta,k^0}|], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where for the last two summands we used that $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) \leq \varepsilon$ implies

$$|\vartheta_{\delta,k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta,k^0}^0|^2 \lesssim 1 \wedge \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\delta}.$$

We also observe that $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon$ implies $(\lceil \tau^0 \rceil_\delta - [h]_\delta - \delta)^+ < \varepsilon^2$, giving

$$\lceil \tau^0 \rceil_\delta - [h]_\delta \leq 1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Consequently, $\{|[h/\delta] : (\lceil \tau^0 \rceil_\delta - [h]_\delta - \delta)^+ < \varepsilon^2\} \lesssim 1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}$. Moreover, if $\varepsilon^2 < \delta/2$, then $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon$ implies $[h/\delta] = \lceil \tau^0 \rceil_\delta \pm 1 = k^0 \pm 1$, i.e.,

$$[h/\delta] \wedge k^0 + 1 < [h/\delta] \vee k^0 \implies \delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Thus, for the first term, using (B.3) and Proposition 3.4, it follows with a union bound that, for any $z > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\delta^3 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \geq z \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^3 \varepsilon^2 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} \left| \sum_{i=1, i \neq k^0}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k^0 - 1} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}(I_{\delta,i})) \right| \geq z/5 \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^3 \varepsilon^2 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} \left| \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k^0 + 1, i \neq k^0}^n (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}(I_{\delta,i})) \right| \geq z/5 \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^3 ((\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta})^2 + 2\varepsilon^2) \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} \left| \sum_{i=\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k^0 + 1, i \neq k^0}^{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k^0 - 1} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}(I_{\delta,i})) \right| \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ \frac{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \wedge k^0 + 1}{\lceil h/\delta \rceil \vee k^0} < 1 \right\}} \geq z/5 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2\}} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^2(\delta \wedge \varepsilon^2) \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |I_{\delta, [h/\delta]} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, [h/\delta]}]| \geq z/5 \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \left(\exp \left(-\frac{\delta^{-3} \varepsilon^{-4} z^2}{C(1 + \varepsilon^{-2} z)} \right) + \exp \left(-\frac{\delta^{-3} z^2}{C(\varepsilon^2 + z)} \right) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2\}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^{-2}(\delta^{-1} \vee \varepsilon^{-2})z^2}{C(\delta \wedge \varepsilon^2 + z)}\right) \\
& \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^{-3}z^2}{C(\varepsilon^2 + z)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^{-3}z^2}{C(\varepsilon^2 + z)}\right) dz \\
& \leq (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \int_0^\infty \left(\exp\left(-\frac{\delta^{-3}\varepsilon^{-2}z^2}{2C}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^{-3}z}{2C}\right) \right) dz \leq \delta^{3/2}\varepsilon + \delta^{1/2}\varepsilon^3 + \delta^3,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain for $\varepsilon \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} \delta^3 |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \right] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\delta^3 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |I_{T,\delta}(\chi) - \mathbb{E}[I_{T,\delta}(\chi)]| \geq z \right) dz \\
&\leq \delta^{3/2}\varepsilon + \delta^{1/2}\varepsilon^3 + \delta^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.8}$$

We now treat the second summand on the right hand side of (C.5). We first observe that, similarly to (B.3), we may write for any $(\vartheta_-, \vartheta_+, \vartheta_0, h) \in \{\chi \in \Theta \times (0, 1) : \tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon\}$, with $k = \lceil h/\delta \rceil$,

$$|M_{T,\delta}(\chi)| \leq \varepsilon \left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_1(k)} M_{\delta,i} \right| + \varepsilon \left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_2(k)} M_{\delta,i} \right| + ((\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta}) + 2\varepsilon) \left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_3(k)} M_{\delta,i} \right| + (1 \wedge \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\delta}}) |M_{\delta,k}|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_1(k) &:= \{i \in [\delta^{-1}] : i \neq k^0, i \leq k \wedge k^0 - 1\}, \quad \Lambda_2(k) := \{i \in [\delta^{-1}] : i \neq k^0, i \geq (k \vee k^0) + 1\} \\
\Lambda_3(k) &:= \{i \in [\delta^{-1}] : i \neq k^0, (k \wedge k^0) + 1 \leq i \leq k \vee k^0 - 1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (C.6) and (C.7), we therefore obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\delta^3 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |M_{T,\delta}(\chi)| \right] &\leq \sum_{l=1}^2 \sum_{k \in \Lambda(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon \delta^3 \left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_l(k)} M_{\delta,i} \right| \right] \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \Lambda(\varepsilon)} \delta^3 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in \Lambda_3(k)} M_{\delta,i} \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2\}} \right] \\
&+ (\delta^3 \wedge \varepsilon \delta^{5/2}) \sum_{k \in \Lambda(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{E} [|M_{\delta,k}|],
\end{aligned} \tag{C.9}$$

where $\Lambda(\varepsilon) := \{k \in [\delta^{-1}] : (|k^0 - k| - 1)^+ \leq \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}\}$, whose size is bounded by a multiple of $1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}$. For any k, l , $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}(t) := \sum_{i \in \Lambda_l(k)} \int_0^t X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(s) dB_{\delta,i}(s)$ is a martingale in t , and, by independence of $(B_{\delta,i})_{i \in [\delta^{-1}]}$, its quadratic variation is given by

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{k,l} \rangle_t = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_l(k)} \int_0^t X_{\delta,i}^\Delta(s)^2 ds, \quad k \in [\delta^{-1}], l \in \{1, 2, 3\}, t \geq 0.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{M}_{k,l}(T) = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_l(k)} M_{\delta,i}$ and $\langle \mathcal{M}_{k,l} \rangle_T = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_l(k)} I_{\delta,i}$. Hence, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 3.3 and the fact that for $\delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2$ and $k \in \Lambda(\varepsilon)$, $|\Lambda_3(k)| \leq \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}$, we obtain from

(C.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\delta^3 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |M_{T, \delta}(\chi)| \right] \\
& \leq \delta^3 (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \varepsilon \left(\sum_{i \in [\delta^{-1}]} \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, i}] \right)^{1/2} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\delta \leq 2\varepsilon^2\}} \delta^3 \sum_{k \in \Lambda(\varepsilon)} \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_3(k)} \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, i}] \right)^{1/2} \\
& \quad + (\delta^3 \wedge \varepsilon \delta^{5/2}) (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \max_{k \in [\delta^{-1}] \setminus \{k^0\}} \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, k}]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \delta^3 \varepsilon (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \delta^{-3/2} + \delta^3 \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1} (\varepsilon^2 \delta^{-3})^{1/2} + \varepsilon \delta^{3/2} (1 + \varepsilon^2 \delta^{-1}) \leq \delta^{3/2} \varepsilon + \varepsilon^3 \delta^{1/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.10}$$

Finally, using Lemma 3.3, Itô isometry and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta^2 (\delta \wedge \varepsilon^2) \mathbb{E}[|I_{\delta, k^0} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, k^0}]|] + \delta^{5/2} (\delta^{1/2} \wedge \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[|M_{\delta, k^0}|] \\
& \leq \delta^2 (\delta \wedge \varepsilon^2) (\text{Var}(I_{\delta, k^0}))^{1/2} + \delta^{5/2} (\delta^{1/2} \wedge \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, k^0}]^{1/2} \\
& \leq \delta \varepsilon^2 + \delta^{3/2} \varepsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.11}$$

Thus, inserting (C.8), (C.10) and (C.11) into (C.5), the assertion follows. \square

Proof of Corollary 3.11. Using Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.10, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |(\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi) - (\mathcal{L}_\delta - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\delta)(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |(\mathcal{L}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_\delta])(\chi) - (\mathcal{L}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_\delta])(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \\
& \quad + \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)| \delta^3 |\mathbb{E}[R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta))]| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |(\mathcal{Z}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta])(\chi) - (\mathcal{Z}_\delta - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_\delta])(\chi^0(\delta))| \right] \\
& \quad + \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)| \delta^3 (\text{Var}(R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta))))^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)| \delta^3 |\mathbb{E}[R_{\delta, k^0}(\vartheta_\circ^0(\delta))]| \\
& \leq \tilde{\psi}_\delta(\varepsilon) + \delta^2 \sup_{\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon} |\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)| \\
& \leq \delta^3 + \delta^{1/2} \varepsilon^\gamma + \delta \varepsilon^\rho + \delta^{3/2} \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality, we used that $\tilde{d}_\delta(\chi, \chi^0(\delta)) < \varepsilon$ implies

$$|\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_{\delta, k^0}^0| = |\vartheta_{\delta, k^0}([h/\delta]) - \vartheta_\circ^0(\delta)| \leq \varepsilon / \sqrt{\delta}.$$

 \square

D. Remaining proofs of Section 4

We start with verifying the representation of the estimator $\hat{k} = \hat{k}(\delta)$ defining the change point estimator via the relation $\hat{\tau} = \hat{k}\delta$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Write $\vartheta_{\pm} = \vartheta_{\pm}(\delta)$. First subtracting

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\vartheta_+ \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_+^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right)$$

from the maximum in the definition of \widehat{k} in (4.1) and then adding

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_{\cdot}} \left(\eta \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,i}(t) + \frac{\vartheta_-^2 - \vartheta_+^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right),$$

it follows that $\widehat{k} = \overline{\arg \max}_{k=1, \dots, \delta-1} \widetilde{Z}_k$, where

$$\widetilde{Z}_k = \begin{cases} 0, & k = k_{\cdot}, \\ -\eta \sum_{i=k_{\cdot}+1}^k \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta} dX_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\vartheta_-^2 - \vartheta_+^2}{2} \sum_{i=k_{\cdot}+1}^k \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt, & k > k_{\cdot}, \\ \eta \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta} dX_{\delta,i}(t) + \frac{\vartheta_-^2 - \vartheta_+^2}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt, & k < k_{\cdot}. \end{cases}$$

Using Proposition 2.1 and $\eta\vartheta_- - \frac{\vartheta_-^2 - \vartheta_+^2}{2} = -\eta^2/2$, one obtains that, for $k < k_{\cdot}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{Z}_k &= \mathbf{1}_{\{k \neq k_{\cdot}-1\}} \left(\eta \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}-1} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}-1} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \right) \\ &\quad + \eta \int_0^T X_{\delta,k_{\cdot}}^{\Delta}(t) dX_{\delta,k_{\cdot}}(t) + \frac{\vartheta_-^2 - \vartheta_+^2}{2} \int_0^T X_{\delta,k_{\cdot}}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \\ &= \eta \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t) dB_{\delta,i}(t) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^{k_{\cdot}} \int_0^T X_{\delta,i}^{\Delta}(t)^2 dt \\ &\quad + \eta \int_0^T X_{\delta,k_{\cdot}}^{\Delta}(t) \left(\int_0^t \langle \Delta_{\vartheta} S_{\vartheta}(t-s) K_{\delta,k_{\cdot}} dW_s \rangle - \vartheta_-(\delta) X_{\delta,k_{\cdot}}^{\Delta}(t) \right) dt \\ &= Z_k. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, Proposition 2.1 together with $-\eta\vartheta_+ + \frac{\vartheta_+^2 - \vartheta_-^2}{2} = -\eta^2/2$ yields $\widetilde{Z}_k = Z_k$ for $k > k_{\cdot}$ as well. \square

Finally, we give the proof for tightness, which involves most of the previous technical considerations in the paper.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. We will verify that $\widehat{\tau} - \tau = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(v_{\delta}) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\delta^3 \eta^{-2})$. As was shown in Section 4 (cf. (4.10)), we have

$$v_{\delta}^{-1}(\widehat{\tau} - \tau) \in \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau, \delta, \eta}} \left\{ \eta M_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(h) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}) \mathbf{1}_{\{h < 0\}} \right\},$$

where the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}$ -term is independent of h and comes from the expectation bounds from Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.2 on the quantities $I_{\delta, [\tau/\delta]}, R_{[\tau/\delta]}$ associated to the observation block around the change point τ . Since $\eta = o(\delta)$, it therefore suffices to show that

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists R_{\varepsilon} > 0 : \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{|h| > R_{\varepsilon}, h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau, \delta, \eta}} \left\{ \eta M_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(h) \right\} \leq M_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(0) + \frac{\eta}{2} I_{T, \delta}^{\tau}(0) + 1 \right) \leq \varepsilon,$$

with R_ε only depending on ε , not on δ, η . To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{|h| > R_\varepsilon, h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau, \delta, \eta}} \left\{ \eta M_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(\eta^2 \delta^{-2}) \mathbf{1}_{\{h < 0\}} \right\} \leq M_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) + \frac{\eta}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{|h| > R_\varepsilon, h \in \mathcal{J}_{\tau, \delta, \eta}} \left\{ \eta M_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) \right\} \leq M_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) + \frac{\eta}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) + 1 \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{o}_{\mathbb{P}}(1) < -1) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \delta^{-3} \eta^2 > R_\varepsilon\}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the second term converges to 0 as $R_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$. Since $M_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) = I_{T, \delta}^\tau(0) = 0$, the required statement will follow from

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists R_\varepsilon > 0 : \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{a_\pm^\delta(h) \geq \pm h > R_\varepsilon} \left\{ -\eta M_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) \right\} \geq -1 \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

where we set $a_+^\delta(h) = (1-\tau)/v_\delta$ and $a_-^\delta(h) = \tau/v_\delta$ and, moreover, use the convention $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$. We only consider the case $h > 0$, the case $h < 0$ is similar.

Let R_ε be large enough to ensure that $R_\varepsilon v_\delta / \delta > 1$ for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$. Inserting the definitions (4.4) and (4.5) yields

$$\sup_{a_+^\delta(h) \geq h > R_\varepsilon} \left\{ -\eta M_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T, \delta}^\tau(h) \right\} = \max_{k=\lceil (\tau+R_\varepsilon v_\delta)/\delta \rceil, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^k \left(-\eta M_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{\delta, i} \right). \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Here and in the following, for a vector $b_\delta = (b_\delta(k))_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}}$, we set $\max_{k=K, \dots, \delta^{-1}} b_\delta(k) := -\infty$ if $K > \delta^{-1}$.

Let the independent coupled random variables $(\bar{M}_{\delta, i})_{i=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}}$ be given as in (3.6) and note that, by Proposition 3.5, $(\sum_{i=k, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \bar{M}_{\delta, i})_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1}}$ is a martingale. For $\alpha > 0$, introduce $\bar{N}_{\delta, \alpha}$ given by

$$\bar{N}_{\delta, \alpha}(k) := \exp \left(\sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+k} \left(-\alpha \bar{M}_{\delta, i} - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \bar{I}_{\delta, i} \right) \right), \quad k \in \{1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - k\},$$

which is again a martingale since $\bar{M}_{\delta, i} \sim N(0, \bar{I}_{\delta, i})$. Note that $\bar{N}_{\delta, \eta/2}$ is positive and has constant expectation 1. Thus, for any $\kappa > 0$, Doob's maximal martingale inequality [28, Proposition II.1.5] yields, for any $k^\circ \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k^\circ, \dots, \delta^{-1}-\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil} \bar{N}_{\delta, \eta/2}(k) > \exp \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+k^\circ} \bar{I}_{\delta, i} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \right) \right) \leq \exp \left(\frac{\kappa}{2} - \frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+k^\circ} \bar{I}_{\delta, i} \right).$$

Let $k^\circ := \lceil R_\varepsilon \delta^2 / \eta^2 \rceil - 1 \geq 1$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \max_{k=\lceil (\tau+R_\varepsilon v_\delta)/\delta \rceil, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^k \left(-\eta \bar{M}_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \bar{I}_{\delta, i} \right) > -\kappa \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \max_{k=k^\circ, \dots, \delta^{-1}-\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil} \bar{N}_{\delta, \eta/2}(k) > \exp \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil+k^\circ} \bar{I}_{\delta, i} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and we know from (B.2) that

$$\eta^2 \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k^\circ} \bar{I}_{\delta,i} \geq \frac{T}{2\delta} \eta^2 \delta^{-2k^\circ} \|K'\|^2 + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Using $\eta^2 \delta^{-2k^\circ} \sim R_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$, we thus conclude that, for any fixed $\kappa > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ choosing $R_\varepsilon = R_\varepsilon(\kappa)$ large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=[(\tau+R_\varepsilon v_\delta)/\delta], \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^k \left(-\eta \bar{M}_{\delta,i} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \bar{I}_{\delta,i} \right) > -\kappa - 1 \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We proceed to studying the difference $\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^k (\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2} (\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i}))$. Proposition 3.5 gives, for any $z, L > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \geq z, \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| \leq L \right) \leq e^{-z^2/(2L)}.$$

For $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \delta^{-1} - [\tau/\delta]$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_1, \dots, k_2} \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \geq z \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k_2} |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| > L \right) + \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} (M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i}) \geq z, \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| \leq L \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k_2} |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| > L \right) + (k_2 - k_1 + 1) e^{-z^2/(2L)}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequalities $\text{Var}(I_{\delta,i}) \leq T\delta^{-2}$, $(\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i)^2 \leq k \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i^2$ and Markov's inequality show that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k_2} |I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i}| > L \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(k_2 \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k_2} (I_{\delta,i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta,i}])^2 > L^2 \right) \leq \frac{k_2^2 T \delta^{-2}}{L^2}.$$

The term in the upper bound tends to zero for $L = R_L k_2 \sqrt{T} \delta^{-1}$ with $R_L \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, with this choice of L , we find for

$$z_L = R_L \sqrt{k_2 \delta^{-1} \log(\delta^{-1})} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_1, \dots, k_2} \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} (\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2} (\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i})) \geq 2z_L + \eta L \right) \\ & \leq \delta^{-1} e^{-z_L^2 \delta / (2R_L k_2 \sqrt{T})} + 2R_L^{-2} \xrightarrow{R_L \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Noting $\eta L \leq \eta \sqrt{T} R_L k_2^{1/2} \delta^{-3/2} = o(z_L)$ due to $\eta = o(\delta)$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_1, \dots, k_2} \sum_{i=[\tau/\delta]+1}^{[\tau/\delta]+k} (\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2} (\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i})) \geq 3z_L \right) \xrightarrow{R_L \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

By our assumption $\eta(1/n) = o(1/n)$, there are (possibly empty) subsequences $(n_k^{(i)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, such that $\{n_k^{(1)} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{n_k^{(2)} : k \in \mathbb{N}\} = \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta(1/n_k^{(1)}) \sqrt{\log n_k^{(1)}/n_k^{(1)}} = 0, \quad \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta(1/n_k^{(2)}) \sqrt{\log n_k^{(2)}/n_k^{(2)}} > 0,$$

while still $\eta(1/n_k^{(i)}) = o(1/n_k^{(i)})$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus, by analysing along these subsequences if necessary, it is sufficient to consider the two following cases: (a) $\eta = o(\delta/\sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})})$, and (b) $\eta \gtrsim \delta/\sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})}$, while still $\eta = o(\delta)$.

Case (a): Choose $k_1 = 1$ and $k_2 = \delta^{-1} - \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil$ maximally. Combining this with the definition of z_L in (D.3), we obtain $z_L \leq R_L \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})} \delta^{-1} \leq c R_L \eta^{-1}$ for some $c > 0$. Hence, (D.4) implies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + k} \eta(\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2}(\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i})) \geq 3cR_L \right) \xrightarrow{R_L \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\kappa = \kappa(\varepsilon) > 1$ such that, for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + k} \eta(\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2}(\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i})) \geq \kappa \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

Using (D.1) and (D.2), we therefore obtain for $R_\varepsilon = R_\varepsilon(\kappa)$ large enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{h > R_\varepsilon} \left\{ -\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \right\} \geq -1 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=\lceil (\tau + R_\varepsilon v_\delta)/\delta \rceil, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^k \left(-\eta \bar{M}_{\delta,i} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \bar{I}_{\delta,i} \right) > -\kappa - 1 \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, \delta^{-1} - \lceil \tau/\delta \rceil} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + k} \eta(\bar{M}_{\delta,i} - M_{\delta,i} + \frac{\eta}{2}(\bar{I}_{\delta,i} - I_{\delta,i})) \geq \kappa \right) \\ & \leq \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Case (b): Choose $k_1 = 1$ and $k_2 = \min\{\lfloor R_L \delta^{-1} / \log(\delta^{-1}) \rfloor, \delta^{-1} - k\}$. Then, $z_L \leq R_L^{3/2} \delta^{-1} \leq c R_L^{3/2} \eta^{-1}$ for some $c > 0$ thanks to $\eta = o(\delta)$. From (D.4), we thus obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_1, \dots, k_2} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^{\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + k} \eta(M_{\delta,i} - \bar{M}_{\delta,i} - \frac{\eta}{2}(I_{\delta,i} - \bar{I}_{\delta,i})) \geq 3cR_L^{3/2} \right) \xrightarrow{R_L \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Consequently, arguing as before, given $\varepsilon > 0$, choosing $R_L > 0$ and $R_\varepsilon = R_\varepsilon(R_L^{3/2})$ large enough yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{h > R_\varepsilon} \left\{ -\eta M_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} I_{T,\delta}^\tau(h) \right\} \geq -1 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=\lceil (\tau + R_\varepsilon v_\delta)/\delta \rceil, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=k, +1}^k \left(-\eta \bar{M}_{\delta,i} - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \bar{I}_{\delta,i} \right) > -3cR_L^{3/2} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, k_2} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k} \eta (\bar{M}_{\delta, i} - M_{\delta, i} + \frac{\eta}{2} (\bar{I}_{\delta, i} - I_{\delta, i})) \geq 3cR_L^{3/2} \right) \\
& + \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_2+1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k} \eta (-M_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta}{2} I_{\delta, i}) \geq -1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k, \}} \\
& \leq \varepsilon/2 + \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_2+1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k} \eta (-M_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta}{2} I_{\delta, i}) \geq -1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k, \}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that the second term becomes small for any $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$ as $R_L \rightarrow \infty$. Assume $k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k$. Using a union bound, we obtain directly via Girsanov's theorem, for any $L' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_2+1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k} \eta (-M_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta}{2} I_{\delta, i}) \geq -1 \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k_2+1} I_{\delta, i} \leq L' + 1 \right) + \sum_{k=k_2+1}^{\delta^{-1}} \mathbb{P} \left(\exp \left(\sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k} (-\frac{\eta}{2} M_{\delta, i} - \frac{\eta^2}{8} I_{\delta, i}) \right) \geq e^{L'} \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k_2+1} I_{\delta, i} < L' + 1 \right) + \delta^{-1} e^{-L'}. \tag{D.5}
\end{aligned}$$

Yet, in order to apply Girsanov, we have to check the Novikov condition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{\delta^{-1}} I_{\delta, i} \right) \right] < \infty.$$

From Proposition 3.4, we know for some $c > 0$, independent of δ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{\delta^{-1}} (I_{\delta, i} - \mathbb{E}[I_{\delta, i}]) \geq z \right) \leq \exp \left(-c\eta^{-4} z^2 / (\eta^{-1} z + \delta^{-3}) \right) = e^{-cz^2 / (\eta^3 z + \eta^4 \delta^{-3})}.$$

Since $\eta = o(\delta)$, it therefore follows that, for δ sufficiently small, the right hand side is $o(e^{-2z})$, whence, $\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=\lceil \tau/\delta \rceil + 1}^{\delta^{-1}} I_{\delta, i}$ has an exponential moment of order 1, as needed. Having verified the validity of (D.5), it remains to bound the first term. By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\eta^2 \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k_2+1} I_{\delta, i} \right] \geq \frac{T}{2} \eta^2 \delta^{-2} (k_2 + 1) \|K'\|^2 \underline{\varrho} + \mathcal{O}(1) \sim R_L \eta^2 \delta^{-3} / \log(\delta^{-1})$$

and

$$\text{Var} \left(\eta^2 \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k_2+1} I_{\delta, i} \right) \leq T \eta^4 \delta^{-2} (k_2 + 1) \sim R_L \eta^4 \delta^{-3} / \log(\delta^{-1}).$$

Hence, choosing $L' \sim R_L \eta^2 \delta^{-3} / \log(\delta^{-1})$ in case $k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k$, Chebyshev's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\eta^2}{8} \sum_{i=k, +1}^{k, +k_2+1} I_{\delta, i} < L' + 1 \right) \leq \delta^3 R_L^{-1} \log(\delta^{-1}) \leq e^{-R_L} R_L^{-1},$$

where we used that $k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k$, implies $R_L < \log(\delta^{-1}) + 1$ and hence $\delta \leq e^{-R_L}$. Hence, by (D.5), using also the fact that in our case (b), $L' \geq R_L \delta^{-1} / (\log(\delta^{-1}))^2$, it follows

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=k_2+1, \dots, \delta^{-1}} \sum_{i=k_*+1}^{k_*+k} \eta(-M_{\delta,i} - \frac{\eta}{2} I_{\delta,i}) \geq -1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{k_2 < \delta^{-1} - k_*\}} \leq e^{-R_L} R_L^{-1} + \delta^{-1} e^{-R_L \delta^{-1} / (\log(\delta^{-1}))^2},$$

and the right hand side converges to 0 uniformly over $\delta \in 1/\mathbb{N}$ as $R_L \rightarrow \infty$, as desired. Putting everything together, we have proved tightness. \square

Acknowledgements MR is grateful for financial funding by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) - SFB1294/2 - 318763901. CS and LT gratefully acknowledge financial support of Carlsberg Foundation Young Researcher Fellowship grant CF20-0640 “Exploring the potential of nonparametric modelling of complex systems via SPDEs”.

References

- [1] R. Altmeyer, T. Bretschneider, J. Janák, and M. Reiß. “Parameter estimation in an SPDE model for cell repolarization”. In: *SIAM/ASA J. Uncertain. Quantif.* 10.1 (2022), pp. 179–199.
- [2] R. Altmeyer, I. Cialenco, and G. Pasemann. “Parameter estimation for semilinear SPDEs from local measurements”. In: *Bernoulli* 29.3 (2023), pp. 2035–2061.
- [3] R. Altmeyer, I. Cialenco, and M. Reiß. *Statistics for SPDEs*. 2023. URL: <https://sites.google.com/view/stats4spdes>.
- [4] R. Altmeyer and M. Reiß. “Nonparametric estimation for linear SPDEs from local measurements”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 31.1 (2021), pp. 1–38.
- [5] R. Altmeyer, A. Tiepner, and M. Wahl. *Optimal parameter estimation for linear SPDEs from multiple measurements*. 2022. arXiv: 2211.02496.
- [6] D. G. Aronson. “Non-negative solutions of linear parabolic equations”. In: *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)* 22 (1968), pp. 607–694.
- [7] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*. Vol. 348. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, Cham, 2014, pp. xx+552.
- [8] P. K. Bhattacharya and P. J. Brockwell. “The minimum of an additive process with applications to signal estimation and storage theory”. In: *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* 37.1 (1976/77), pp. 51–75.
- [9] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Second. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1999, pp. x+277.
- [10] I. Cialenco. “Statistical inference for SPDEs: an overview”. In: *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* 21.2 (2018), pp. 309–329.
- [11] M. Csörgő and L. Horváth. *Limit theorems in change-point analysis*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997, pp. xvi+414.
- [12] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Second. Vol. 152. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014, pp. xviii+493.
- [13] E. B. Davies. *Heat kernels and spectral theory*. Vol. 92. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. x+197.

- [14] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel. *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*. Vol. 194. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, pp. xxii+586.
- [15] P. Étoré. “On random walk simulation of one-dimensional diffusion processes with discontinuous coefficients”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 11 (2006), no. 9, 249–275.
- [16] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, and M. Takeda. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*. extended. Vol. 19. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2011, pp. x+489.
- [17] I. A. Ibragimov and R. Z. Has'minskiĭ. *Statistical estimation*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981, pp. vii+403.
- [18] J. Janák and M. Reiß. *Parameter estimation for the stochastic heat equation with multiplicative noise from local measurements*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.00074](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.00074).
- [19] S. Janson. *Gaussian Hilbert spaces*. Vol. 129. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. x+340.
- [20] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Reprint of the 1980 edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, pp. xxii+619.
- [21] M. R. Kosorok. *Introduction to empirical processes and semiparametric inference*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2008, pp. xiv+483.
- [22] Y. A. Kutoyants. *Statistical inference for ergodic diffusion processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2004, pp. xiv+481.
- [23] R. S. Liptser and A. N. Shiriyayev. *Theory of martingales*. Vol. 49. Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series). Translated from the Russian by K. Dzjaparidze. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989, pp. xiv+792.
- [24] I. Nourdin and G. Peccati. *Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus*. Vol. 192. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012, pp. xiv+239.
- [25] I. Nourdin and F. G. Viens. “Density formula and concentration inequalities with Malliavin calculus”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 14 (2009), no. 78, 2287–2309.
- [26] D. Nualart. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*. Second. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. xiv+382.
- [27] E. S. Page. “Continuous inspection schemes”. In: *Biometrika* 41 (1954), pp. 100–115.
- [28] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*. 3rd ed. Vol. 293. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, pp. xiv+602.
- [29] H. Triebel. *Theory of function spaces*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2010, p. 285.
- [30] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996, pp. xvi+508.
- [31] A. Wald. “Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses”. In: *Ann. Math. Statistics* 16 (1945), pp. 117–186.
- [32] D. Wang, Y. Yu, and A. Rinaldo. “Univariate mean change point detection: penalization, CUSUM and optimality”. In: *Electron. J. Stat.* 14.1 (2020), pp. 1917–1961.
- [33] D. Williams. “Path decomposition and continuity of local time for one-dimensional diffusions. I”. In: *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* 28 (1974), pp. 738–768.