

Parameter Inference for Hypo-Elliptic Diffusions under a Weak Design Condition

Yuga Iguchi¹ and Alexandros Beskos¹

¹University College London, London, UK

December 8, 2023

Abstract

We address the problem of parameter estimation for degenerate diffusion processes defined via the solution of Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs) with diffusion matrix that is not full-rank. For this class of hypo-elliptic diffusions recent works have proposed contrast estimators that are asymptotically normal, provided that the step-size in-between observations $\Delta = \Delta_n$ and their total number n satisfy $n \rightarrow \infty$, $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$, and additionally $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. This latter restriction places a requirement for a so-called *rapidly increasing experimental design*. In this paper, we overcome this limitation and develop a general contrast estimator satisfying asymptotic normality under the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$ for general $p \geq 2$. Such a result has been obtained for elliptic SDEs in the literature, but its derivation in a hypo-elliptic setting is highly non-trivial. We provide numerical results to illustrate the advantages of the developed theory.

Keywords: Stochastic Differential Equation; hypo-elliptic diffusion; high-frequency observations; experimental design of observations.

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of parameter inference for multivariate Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs) determined via a degenerate diffusion matrix. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space and let $W = (W_t^1, \dots, W_t^d)$, $t \geq 0$, be the d -dimensional standard Brownian motion, $d \geq 1$, defined on such a space. We introduce N -dimensional SDE models, $N \geq 1$, of the following general form:

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t, \theta)dt + \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(X_t, \theta)dW_t^j, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.1)$$

with $\mu, A_j(\cdot, \theta) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, $1 \leq j \leq d$, for parameter θ . This work focuses on the case where the diffusion matrix $A = [A_1, \dots, A_d]$ is not of full-rank, i.e. the matrix $a = AA^\top$ is not positive definite. Also, the law of the solution to (1.1) is assumed to be absolutely continuous with respect to (w.r.t.) the Lebesgue measure. Such models are referred to as *hypo-elliptic diffusions* and constitute an important class of continuous-time Markovian processes, used in a wide range of applications. E.g., this model class includes the (underdamped) Langevin equation, the Synaptic-Conductance model (Ditlevsen and Samson, 2019), the NLCAR(p) model (Tsai and Chan, 2000; Stramer and Roberts, 2007), the Jansen-Rit neural mass model (Buckwar et al., 2020), the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) epidemiological model (Dureau et al., 2013; Spannaus et al., 2022) and the quasi-Markovian generalised Langevin equations (q -GLE) (Vroylandt et al., 2022). We investigate two (sub-)classes of hypo-elliptic SDEs which cover a wide range of models, including the ones mentioned in the above examples. The first model class is specified via the following SDE:

$$dX_t = \begin{bmatrix} dX_{S,t} \\ dX_{R,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_S(X_t, \beta_S) \\ \mu_R(X_t, \beta_R) \end{bmatrix} dt + \sum_{j=1}^d \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{N_S} \\ A_{R,j}(X_t, \sigma) \end{bmatrix} dW_t^j, \quad X_0 = x \equiv \begin{bmatrix} x_S \\ x_R \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (\text{Hypo-I})$$

The involved drift functions and diffusion coefficients are specified as follows:

$$\mu_S : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_{\beta_S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_S}, \quad \mu_R : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_R}, \quad A_{R,j} : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_R}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq d,$$

for positive integers N_S, N_R such that $N = N_S + N_R$. Here, the unknown parameter vector is

$$\theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta = \Theta_{\beta_S} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_S}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_R}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\sigma},$$

for positive integers $N_{\beta_S}, N_{\beta_R}, N_\sigma$ satisfying $N_{\beta_S} + N_{\beta_R} + N_\sigma = N_\theta$. The parameter space Θ is assumed to be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^{N_θ} . We will later on place a condition on **(Hypo-I)**, related to the so-called *Hörmander's condition*, so that indeed such an SDE gives rise to a hypo-elliptic process, i.e. finite-time transition distributions of the SDE admit a Lebesgue density. In brief, the condition will guarantee that randomness from the rough component $X_{R,t}$ propagates into the smooth component $X_{S,t}$ via the drift function μ_S . The second hypo-elliptic model class we treat in this work is specified via the following SDE:

$$dX_t = \begin{bmatrix} dX_{S_1,t} \\ dX_{S_2,t} \\ dX_{R,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{S_1}(X_{S,t}, \beta_{S_1}) \\ \mu_{S_2}(X_t, \beta_{S_2}) \\ \mu_R(X_t, \beta_R) \end{bmatrix} dt + \sum_{j=1}^d \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_1}} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_2}} \\ A_{R,j}(X_t, \sigma) \end{bmatrix} dW_t^j, \quad X_0 = x \equiv \begin{bmatrix} x_{S_1} \\ x_{S_2} \\ x_R \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (\text{Hypo-II})$$

where we have set $X_{S,t} = [X_{S_1,t}^\top, X_{S_2,t}^\top]^\top$. Also, we now have the parameter vector

$$\theta = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta = \Theta_{\beta_{S_1}} \times \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_{S_2}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_R}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\sigma},$$

with integers $N_{\beta_{S_1}}, N_{\beta_{S_2}}$ such that $N_{\beta_S} = N_{\beta_{S_1}} + N_{\beta_{S_2}}$, and the drift functions are now specified as:

$$\mu_{S_1} : \mathbb{R}^{N_S} \times \Theta_{N_{\beta_{S_1}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{S_1}}, \quad \mu_{S_2} : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_{N_{\beta_{S_2}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{S_2}},$$

with integers $1 \leq N_{S_1}, N_{S_2} \leq N_S$ satisfying $N_{S_1} + N_{S_2} = N_S$. Again, Θ is assumed to be compact. Notice that the drift function μ_{S_1} depends on the smooth component $X_{S,t}$ and not on the rough component $X_{R,t}$, thus randomness from $X_{R,t}$ does not directly propagate onto $X_{S_1,t}$. We refer to an SDE of the form **(Hypo-II)** as a *highly degenerate diffusion*. Throughout the paper, the second model class **(Hypo-II)** is treated separately from class **(Hypo-I)**. Later in the paper we will introduce a Hörmander-type condition guaranteeing that **(Hypo-II)** gives rise to hypo-elliptic SDEs.

We consider parameter estimation for the two hypo-elliptic classes **(Hypo-I)** and **(Hypo-II)**, given discrete-time observations of the full vector X_t at the instances $t_i = i\Delta_n$, for a step-size $\Delta_n > 0$. We will develop contrast estimators for models in **(Hypo-I)** and **(Hypo-II)**, and study their asymptotic properties under a *high-frequency complete observation* scenario. In particular, we assume the setting $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. Over the last two-three decades, numerous works have studied parametric inference for diffusion processes in a high-frequency setting. These works were initially focused on *elliptic* diffusions, i.e. SDEs in **(1.1)** with the matrix $a = AA^\top$ being positive definite. [Kessler \(1997\)](#) proposed a contrast estimator for one-dimensional elliptic diffusions and proved asymptotic normality (via a CLT) under the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$, equivalently $n\Delta_n^p \rightarrow 0$. [Uchida and Yoshida \(2012\)](#) extended such a result in the setting of multivariate elliptic diffusions and proposed an adaptive-type contrast estimator achieving a CLT under the same design condition as in [Kessler \(1997\)](#). In contrast, hypo-elliptic diffusions have been relatively under-explored until recently, even though an interesting empirical study, without analytical results, was provided by [Pokern et al. \(2009\)](#).

Extensions of asymptotic results obtained in the elliptic setting to the hypo-elliptic one must deal with a number of challenging issues. A standard Euler-Maruyama discretisation leads to a Dirac measure due to the involved degenerate diffusion matrix. This matter can be resolved by considering a higher-order Itô-Taylor expansion for $X_{S,t}$ that propagates additional Gaussian variates onto the smooth coordinates. For class **(Hypo-I)** such a direction leads to a time-discretisation scheme with Gaussian increments of size $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_n^{3/2})$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_n^{1/2})$) for the smooth component (resp. rough component). However, recent works ([Ditlevsen and Samson, 2019](#); [Gloter and Yoshida, 2021](#); [Iguchi et al., 2023](#)) have highlighted that introduction of higher-order Gaussian variates in the smooth components must be accompanied by an appropriate higher-order mean approximation of the rough components. If such a balance is not achieved, parameter estimation of

β_R becomes asymptotically biased. Within class (Hypo-I), Ditlevsen and Samson (2019) developed a non-degenerate discretisation scheme in the setting of $N_S = 1$ and of the diffusion matrix A essentially being diagonal. They proposed contrast estimators separately for β_S and (β_R, σ) by exploiting the marginal Gaussian density of smooth and rough components respectively and then proved a CLT under the condition that $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$, i.e. for a ‘rapidly increasing experimental design’ (Prakasa-Rao, 1988). Gloter and Yoshida (2020, 2021), always within (Hypo-I), addressed the issue of disjoint estimation by working with an approximate Gaussian density for the full vector X_t , and then providing a joint contrast estimator for the full parameter vector $(\beta_R, \beta_S, \sigma)$. They showed that the estimator is asymptotically normal under the same design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. Also, for bivariate hypo-elliptic models in class (Hypo-I), Melnykova (2020) exploited a local linearisation (Biscay et al., 1996) of the drift function to obtain a non-degenerate (conditionally) Gaussian time-discretisation scheme and construct a contrast estimator attaining a CLT under $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. For the highly degenerate diffusion class (Hypo-II), Iguchi et al. (2023) recently worked under general multivariate model settings and established a joint contrast estimator achieving the CLT under $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. However, the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ assumed in the above works can be very restrictive in practice. For instance, if a user tries to design a dataset with a large time interval $T_n = n\Delta_n$ and a large number of samples n to obtain an accurate estimation result, then the step-size Δ_n should be set to a quite small value so that the condition $n\Delta_n^2 = T_n\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ is satisfied, e.g. for $T_n = 1000$, Δ_n should be much less than 0.001. Datasets with an extremely small step-size are not always available in applications.

An apparent open question in the hypo-elliptic setting is the weakening of the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. Indicatively, Melnykova (2020) and Gloter and Yoshida (2020) required the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ to control terms of size $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_n^{-q})$, $q \geq 1/2$, when proving consistency for their contrast estimators. Thus, to arrive to a CLT under a weaker design condition, one needs to develop a different approach compared to previous works to prove consistency without requiring that $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. Furthermore, the construction of a general contrast function for degenerate SDEs is not straightforward due to the degenerate structure of the diffusion matrix. For class (Hypo-I), Iguchi et al. (2022) developed a contrast estimator achieving the CLT under the weaker condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/3})$ via a novel closed-form transition density expansion for SDEs within (Hypo-I). However, a general asymptotic theory under the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$, has yet to be established for degenerate SDEs.

The contribution of our work is to close the above described gap in the research of hypo-elliptic SDEs. We propose a general contrast estimator for a wide class of hypo-elliptic models and show its asymptotic normality under the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. Specifically, our contributions include the following:

- (a) We develop two contrast estimators for the two model classes (Hypo-I) and (Hypo-II), for the purposes of joint estimation of the unknown parameter vector $(\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma)$. The contrast functions are based on approximate log-likelihood terms which we construct by making use of Gaussian approximations with high-order mean and variance expansions, while at the same time dealing with the degenerate structure of the involved SDEs.
- (b) We show that under the high-frequency, complete observation regime, a CLT is obtained provided that the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, for $p \geq 2$, is satisfied. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to define a contrast estimator achieving a CLT under the weak design condition that $n\Delta_n^p \rightarrow 0$, for arbitrarily large $p \geq 2$, in the hypo-elliptic setting. For reference, Table 1 summarises existing works with corresponding design condition, including our contribution in this work.
- (c) We provide numerical experiments to demonstrate that the proposed contrast estimator is asymptotically unbiased under the high-frequency complete observation regime with the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 3$. The numerical results highlight that the estimators requiring $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ proposed in the literature can indeed suffer from bias when $n\Delta_n^2$ is not sufficiently small.
- (d) The developed methodology is relevant beyond the setting of high-frequency and/or complete observations. Indeed, the developed Gaussian approximation of the true transition density can be used as part of a broader data augmentation algorithm (e.g., Expectation-Maximisation or MCMC) given low-frequency and/or partial observations. Analytical results for such a setting are beyond the scope of this paper, but we provide a numerical result showcasing the advantage of the use of the developed approximate log-likelihood associated with the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 3$, under the setting of high-frequency partial observations.

Table 1: Contrast estimators for Hypo-elliptic SDEs (high-frequency, complete observation regime)

	Model Class	Design Condition on Δ_n for CLT	Joint estimation
Ditlevsen and Samson (2019)	(Hypo-I) with $N_S = 1$. Diffusion matrix is diagonal.	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$	×
Melnykova (2020)	(Hypo-I) with $N_S = N_R = 1$.	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$	○
Gloter and Yoshida (2020, 2021)	(Hypo-I)	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$	○
Iguchi et al. (2022)	(Hypo-I)	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/3})$	○
Iguchi et al. (2023)	(Hypo-II)	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$	○
This work	(Hypo-I) & (Hypo-II)	$\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$	○

To add to point (d) above, we stress that our analytical results are obtained for the complete observation regime. Many times in practical applications only smooth components are observed. However, [Ditlevsen and Samson \(2019\)](#) and [Iguchi et al. \(2023\)](#) have shown empirically that filtering procedures incorporating the developed approximate likelihood of the full state vector (within a data augmentation approach) can lead to asymptotically unbiased parameter estimation (and improved estimates in a practical non-asymptotic setting) also under a partial observation regime.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 prepares some conditions related to the hypo-ellipticity of the models (Hypo-I) and (Hypo-II). Section 3 develops the new contrast estimators and states their asymptotic properties, thus providing the main results of this work. Simulation studies (codes are available at <https://github.com/YugaIgu/Parameter-estimation-hypo-SDEs>) are shown in Section 4 and the proofs for the main results are collected in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

Notation.

For the case of the model class (Hypo-II) we write:

$$\beta_S = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}) \in \Theta_{\beta_S} = \Theta_{\beta_{S_1}} \times \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}}, \quad \mu_S(x, \beta_S) = [\mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1})^\top, \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2})^\top]^\top,$$

for $x = (x_S, x_R) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_S} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_R} = \mathbb{R}^N$. Thus, we can now use the following notation, covering both (Hypo-I) and (Hypo-II):

$$\mu(x, \theta) = [\mu_S(x, \beta_S)^\top, \mu_R(x, \beta_R)^\top]^\top, \quad A_j(x, \theta) = [\mathbf{0}_{N_S}^\top, A_{R,j}(x, \sigma)^\top]^\top, \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad (1.2)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta$. For a test function $\varphi(\cdot, \theta) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\theta \in \Theta$, which is bounded up to second order derivatives, we introduce differential operators \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_j , $1 \leq j \leq d$, so that:

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi(x, \theta) := \sum_{i=1}^N \mu^i(x, \theta) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}(x, \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1, i_2=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^d A_k^{i_1}(x, \theta) A_k^{i_2}(x, \theta) \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_{i_1} \partial x_{i_2}}(x, \theta); \quad (1.3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_j \varphi(x, \theta) := \sum_{i=1}^N A_j^i(x, \theta) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}(x, \theta), \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad (1.4)$$

for $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$. We denote by \mathbb{P}_θ the probability law of process $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ under the parameter $\theta \in \Theta$. We also write

$$\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\theta \dagger}, \quad \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_\theta \dagger}$$

to denote convergence in probability and distribution under the true parameter θ^\dagger . The latter is assumed to be unique and to belong in the interior of Θ . We denote by \mathcal{S} the space of functions $f : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that there exist constants $C, q > 0$ such that $|f(\Delta, x, \theta)| \leq C(1 + |x|^q)\Delta$ for any $(\Delta, x, \theta) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$. We denote by $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \Theta; \mathbb{R}^m)$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that f is infinitely differentiable w.r.t $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and f and its derivatives of any order are of at most polynomial growth in $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$. $C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ represents the set of smooth functions such that the function and its derivatives of any order are bounded. For a sufficiently smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write its higher order partial derivative as follows. For $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}^l$, $l \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\partial_\alpha^u f(u) := \frac{\partial^l}{\partial u_{\alpha_1} \dots \partial u_{\alpha_l}} f(u), \quad \partial_{u,i} f(u) := \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} f(u).$$

We also write

$$\partial_u = [\partial_{u,1}, \dots, \partial_{u,n}]^\top, \quad \partial_u^2 = \partial_u \partial_u^\top,$$

for the standard differential operators acting upon maps $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 1$. Finally, for a matrix A , we write its (i, j) -th element as $[A]_{ij}$.

2 Model Assumptions and Contrast Estimators

We start by stating some basic assumptions for the classes of SDEs in [\(Hypo-I\)](#) and [\(Hypo-II\)](#). In particular, [Section 2.1](#) provides Hörmander-type conditions that imply that the models of interest are indeed hypo-elliptic, thus their transition distribution admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. The stated conditions also highlight that classes [\(Hypo-I\)](#) and [\(Hypo-II\)](#) are separate. We proceed to develop our contrast estimators in [Section 2.2](#). Hereafter, we will often denote by $X_t^{(I)}$ and $X_t^{(II)}$ the solution to the SDE [\(Hypo-I\)](#) and [\(Hypo-II\)](#) respectively.

2.1 Conditions for Hypo-Ellipticity

We first introduce some notation. We write the drift function of the Stratonovich-type SDE corresponding to the Itô-type one, given in [\(Hypo-I\)](#) or [\(Hypo-II\)](#), as follows

$$A_0(x, \theta) := \mu(x, \theta) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k A_k(x, \theta), \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta.$$

We will often treat vector fields $V : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ as differential operators via the relation $V \leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^N V^i \partial_{x,i}$. For two vector fields $V, W : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, their Lie bracket is defined as $[V, W] = VW - WV$. That is, for the SDE vector fields A_k, A_l , $0 \leq k, l \leq d$, we have that

$$[A_k, A_l](x, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N A_k^i(x, \theta) \partial_{x,i} A_l(x, \theta) - \sum_{i=1}^N A_l^i(x, \theta) \partial_{x,i} A_k(x, \theta), \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq N$, we define the projection operator $\text{proj}_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{j-i+1}$ as

$$x = [x_1, \dots, x_N]^\top \mapsto \text{proj}_{i,j}(x) = [x_i, \dots, x_j]^\top.$$

We impose the following conditions on classes [\(Hypo-I\)](#) and [\(Hypo-II\)](#).

[H1] (i). For class [\(Hypo-I\)](#), for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span}\{A_{R,k}(x, \sigma), 1 \leq k \leq d\} &= \mathbb{R}^{N_R}; \\ \text{span}\{A_k(x, \sigma), [A_0, A_k](x, \theta), 1 \leq k \leq d\} &= \mathbb{R}^N. \end{aligned}$$

(ii). In the case of class (**Hypo-II**), for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$, it holds that:

$$\text{span}\{A_{R,k}(x, \sigma), 1 \leq k \leq d\} = \mathbb{R}^{N_R};$$

$$\text{span}\{\text{proj}_{N_{S_1+1}, N}\{A_k(x, \sigma)\}, \text{proj}_{N_{S_1+1}, N}\{[A_0, A_k](x, \theta)\}, 1 \leq k \leq d\} = \mathbb{R}^{N_{S_2} + N_R};$$

$$\text{span}\{\{A_k(x, \sigma), [A_0, A_k](x, \theta), [A_0, [A_0, A_k]](x, \theta)\}, 1 \leq k \leq d\} = \mathbb{R}^N.$$

[H2] $\mu, A_j \in C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta; \mathbb{R}^N), 1 \leq j \leq d$.

Remark 2.1. We introduce condition [H1] to impose some standard structure upon the degenerate SDE models (**Hypo-I**) and (**Hypo-II**) and so that contrast functions developed later on are well-defined. Condition [H1] is stronger than the standard Hörmander's condition. The latter states that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$,

$$\text{span}\{V(x, \theta) : V(x, \theta) \in \bigcup_{m=1}^M \mathbf{V}_m\} = \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where we have set,

$$\mathbf{V}_0 = \{A_1, \dots, A_d\}, \quad \mathbf{V}_k = \{[A_l, A] : A \in \mathbf{V}_{k-1}, 0 \leq l \leq d\}, \quad 1 \leq k.$$

Given $\theta \in \Theta$, if $\mu(\cdot, \theta), A_j(\cdot, \theta) \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^N)$ then Hörmander's condition implies the existence of a smooth Lebesgue density for the law of $X_t, t > 0$, for any initial condition $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (see e.g. [Nualart \(2006\)](#)). Thus, (**Hypo-I**) and (**Hypo-II**) belong to the class of hypo-elliptic SDEs. We stress that condition [H1] is satisfied for most hypo-elliptic SDEs used in applications, as for instance is the case for the models cited in [Section 1](#). Condition [H2] allows the SDE coefficients to lie in the larger class $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^N)$ rather than in $C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^N)$.

Example 1. We provide some examples of degenerate SDEs satisfying the above conditions in applications.

i. Underdamped (standard) Langevin equation for one-dimensional particle with a unit mass:

$$\begin{aligned} dq_t &= p_t dt; \\ dp_t &= (-U'(q_t) + \gamma p_t) dt + \sigma dW_t, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\theta = (\gamma, \sigma)$ is the parameter vector and $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is some smooth potential with polynomial growth. The values of q_t and p_t represent the position and momentum of the particle, respectively. This model belongs in the class (**Hypo-I**) and indeed satisfies condition [H1] (i).

ii. Quasi-Markovian Generalised Langevin Equation (q-GLE) for the case of an one-dimensional particle with an one-dimensional auxiliary variable:

$$\begin{aligned} dq_t &= p_t dt; \\ dp_t &= (-U'(q_t) + \lambda s_t) dt; \\ ds_t &= (-\lambda p_t - \alpha s_t) dt + \sigma dW_t, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\theta = (\lambda, \alpha, \sigma)$ is the parameter vector and U is as in (2.1). Note that component s_t is now introduced as an auxiliary variable to capture the non-Markovianity of the memory kernel. The q-GLE class has been recently actively studied as an effective model in physics (see e.g. [Leimkuhler and Matthews \(2015\)](#)) and parameter estimation of the model also has been investigated in [Kalliadasis et al. \(2015\)](#). The drift function of the smooth component q_t is now independent of the rough component s_t . Model (2.2) belongs in the SDE class (**Hypo-II**) and satisfies condition [H1] (ii). Details can be found, e.g., in [Iguchi et al. \(2023\)](#).

2.2 Contrast Estimators for Degenerate SDEs

Under [H1]-[H2], we define contrast functions for the hypo-elliptic SDEs (Hypo-I) and (Hypo-II), so that the corresponding parameter estimators attain a CLT under the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. The development of our contrast functions is related to the approaches of (Kessler, 1997; Uchida and Yoshida, 2012) where, in an elliptic setting, contrast functions delivering CLTs with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$ are obtained. However, carrying forward such earlier approaches to the hypo-elliptic diffusion is far from straightforward, mainly due to the degeneracy of the diffusion matrix. After a brief review of the construction of contrast functions that deliver a CLT with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$ in the elliptic case, we proceed to the treatment of the hypo-elliptic class of models.

2.2.1 Review of Contrast Estimators for Elliptic SDEs

We review the construction of contrast estimators for elliptic SDEs in Kessler (1997); Uchida and Yoshida (2012), where the diffusion matrix $a(x, \sigma) = A(x, \sigma)A(x, \sigma)^\top$ for the SDE in (1.1) is now assumed to be positive definite for any $(x, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_\sigma$.

Step 1. Via an Itô-Taylor expansion, one obtains high-order approximations for the mean and variance of X_{t_i} given $X_{t_{i-1}}$, that is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\theta[X_{t_i} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &= r_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^{j_p+1}); \\ \text{Var}_\theta[X_{t_i} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &= \Delta \cdot \Xi_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^{j_p+1}),\end{aligned}$$

where $j_p = [p/2]$, with $r_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Xi_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ determined as follows, for $K \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$r_K(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) = X_{t_{i-1}} + \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta^k \cdot \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta), \quad \Xi_K(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) = \sum_{k=0}^K \Delta^k \cdot \Sigma_k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma).$$

In the above expression for Ξ_K , we have $\Sigma_0 = a = AA^\top$, and Σ_k , $k \geq 1$, are matrices available in closed-form and which include high-order derivatives of the SDE coefficients.

Step 2. Kessler (1997); Uchida and Yoshida (2012) make use of a Gaussian density with mean $r_{j_p}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ and variance $\Delta_n \cdot \Xi_{j_p}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ as a proxy for the intractable transition density of X_{t_i} given $X_{t_{i-1}}$. Furthermore, to ensure that the approximation is well-defined (notice that Ξ_K is not guaranteed to be positive-definite) and avoid cumbersome technicalities, they apply a formal Taylor expansion on $\Xi_{j_p}^{-1}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ and $\log \det \Xi_{j_p}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ around $\Delta_n = 0$ so that the positive definiteness of the matrix $a(x, \sigma)$ is exploited. Thus, they define the estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{\text{Elliptic}} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell_{p,n}^{\text{Elliptic}}(\theta), \quad p \geq 2,$$

for the contrast function:

$$\ell_{p,n}^{\text{Elliptic}}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{j_p} \Delta_n^k \cdot \mathbf{L}_{i,k}^p(\Delta_n, \theta), \quad (2.3)$$

with:

$$\mathbf{L}_{i,k}^p(\Delta, \theta) = \frac{1}{\Delta} (X_{t_i} - r_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta))^\top \mathbf{G}_k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) (X_{t_i} - r_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)) + \mathbf{H}_k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta),$$

where $\mathbf{G}_k : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and $\mathbf{H}_k : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are analytically available and correspond to the coefficients of the Δ^k -term in the formal Taylor expansion of $\Xi_{j_p}^{-1}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ and of $\log \det \Xi_{j_p}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ at $\Delta = 0$, respectively.

Remark 2.2. Due to the fact that $j_p = [p/2]$, $p \geq 2$, the contrast function/estimator has the same form for $p = 2k, 2k+1$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. However, as Kessler (1997); Uchida and Yoshida (2012) remarked in their works, when

$p = 2$, a simpler estimator based upon the Euler-Maruyama discretisation is asymptotically normal under the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$, with a contrast function given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_n^{\text{EM}}(\theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\Delta_n} (X_{t_i} - X_{t_{i-1}} - \Delta_n \mu(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta))^\top a^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma) (X_{t_i} - X_{t_{i-1}} - \Delta_n \mu(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \log \det a(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

The above is different from $\ell_{2,n}^{\text{Elliptic}}(\theta)$ in the sense that term $\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_n \cdot \mathbf{L}_{i,1}^2(\Delta_n, \theta)$ is not required in $\ell_n^{\text{EM}}(\theta)$.

2.2.2 Contrast Estimator for SDE Class (**Hypo-I**)

We will adapt the strategy of Kessler (1997); Uchida and Yoshida (2012) to construct contrast functions for degenerate SDEs, starting from the hypo-elliptic class (**Hypo-I**). However, the extension is not straightforward because now the diffusion matrix $a(x, \sigma)$ is not positive definite. Another important difference between the hypo-elliptic and the elliptic setting is that an Itô-Taylor expansion for moments of the SDE can involve Δ with varying orders across smooth and rough components.

Example 2. We consider the following two-dimensional underdamped Langevin SDE with potential function $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (assumed sufficiently regular):

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^1 &= X_t^2 dt; \\ dX_t^2 &= (-U'(X_t^1) - X_t^2) dt + \sigma dW_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is a diffusion parameter. For the above model, the Itô-Taylor expansion gives:

$$\text{Var}_\theta[X_{t_{i+1}} | \mathcal{F}_{t_i}] = \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta^3}{3} & \frac{\Delta^2}{2} \\ \frac{\Delta^2}{2} & \Delta \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}(\Delta^4) & \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3) \\ \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3) & \mathcal{O}(\Delta^2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the order of Δ is larger for the smooth component. Note that the leading term $\sigma^2 \Delta^3/3$ in the variance of X_Δ^1 derives from the Gaussian variate $\sigma \int_0^\Delta W_s ds$ arising in the Itô-Taylor expansion of X_Δ^1 .

One must now find a positive definite matrix instead of $a(x, \theta)$ to obtain a general contrast function in the form of (2.3) in a hypo-elliptic setting while dealing with such structure of varying scales amongst the components of degenerate SDEs. We thus begin by considering a standardisation of $X_\Delta^{(1)}$ (conditionally on $X_0^{(1)} = x$) via subtracting high-order mean approximations from smooth/rough components and dividing with appropriate Δ -terms. In particular, we introduce the \mathbb{R}^N -valued random variables as:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)} &:= m_p^{(1)}(\Delta, x, X_\Delta^{(1)}, \theta) \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^3}} \left(X_{S,\Delta}^{(1)} - r_{S,K_p+1}^{(1)}(\Delta, x; \theta) \right)^\top, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \left(X_{R,\Delta}^{(1)} - r_{R,K_p}^{(1)}(\Delta, x; \theta) \right)^\top \right]^\top, \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $K_p = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$ and for $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} r_{S_1,q}^{(1)}(\Delta, x, \theta) \\ r_{R,q}^{(1)}(\Delta, x, \theta) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_S \\ x_R \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{k=1}^q \frac{\Delta^k}{k!} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu_S(x, \theta) \\ \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu_R(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad x = [x_R^\top, x_S^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_S} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_R},$$

with this latter quantity obtained from an Itô-Taylor expansion of $\mathbb{E}_\theta[X_\Delta^{(1)}]$. Note here that different orders (by one) of mean approximation are used for smooth and rough components in the above standardisation. We will provide some more details on this in Remark 2.3 later in the paper. We denote the Lebesgue density of the distribution of $X_\Delta^{(1)}$ given $X_0^{(1)} = x$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ as

$$y \mapsto \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_\Delta^{(1)} \in dy) / dy = p^{X_\Delta^{(1)}}(x, y; \theta).$$

Transformation of random variables gives that, for $(x, y, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$,

$$p^{X_\Delta^{(1)}}(x, y; \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^{3N_S+N_R}}} p^{Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)}}(\xi; \theta) \Big|_{\xi=m_p^{(1)}(\Delta, x, y, \theta)},$$

where $\xi \mapsto p^{Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)}}(\xi; \theta)$ is the Lebesgue density of the law of $Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)}$. Following the standarisation, an Itô-Taylor expansion now gives:

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)} (Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)})^\top \right] = \Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^J \Delta^j \cdot \Sigma_j^{(1)}(x, \theta) + R^{(1)}(\Delta^{J+1}, x, \theta),$$

where $J \in \mathbb{N}$, $R^{(1)} \in \mathcal{S}$, for some analytically available $N \times N$ matrices $\Sigma_j^{(1)}(x, \theta)$. In particular, matrix $\Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta)$ has the following block expression:

$$\Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{SS}^{(1)}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{SR}^{(1)}(x, \theta) \\ \Sigma_{RS}^{(1)}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{RR}^{(1)}(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have set:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{RR}^{(1)}(x, \theta) &= \sum_{k=1}^d A_{R,k}(x, \sigma) A_{R,k}(x, \sigma)^\top \equiv a_R(x, \sigma), \\ \Sigma_{SR}^{(1)}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mu_S(x, \theta) A_{R,k}(x, \sigma)^\top, \quad \Sigma_{RS}^{(1)}(x, \theta) = \Sigma_{SR}^{(1)}(x, \theta)^\top, \\ \Sigma_{SS}^{(1)}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mu_S(x, \theta) \mathcal{L}_k \mu_S(x, \theta)^\top \equiv \frac{1}{3} a_S(x, \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Matrix $\Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta)$ plays a role similar to $a(x, \theta)$ in the elliptic setting due to the following result.

Lemma 2.1. *Under condition [H1](i), the matrices $a_R(x, \sigma)$, $a_S(x, \theta)$ and $\Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta)$ are positive definite for all $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$.*

Proof. It is immediate from condition [H1](i) that the matrix $a_R(x, \sigma)$ is positive definite for any $(x, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta_\sigma$. The condition also implies that

$$\text{span} \left\{ \text{proj}_{N_R+1, N} \{ [A_0, A_k](x, \theta) \}, 1 \leq k \leq d \right\} = \text{span} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_k \mu_S(x, \theta), 1 \leq k \leq d \right\} = \mathbb{R}^{N_S},$$

for all $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$. Thus, the matrix $a_S(x, \theta)$ is also positive definite for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$. Finally, since it holds that

$$\det \Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta) = 12 \det a_R(x, \sigma) \det a_S(x, \theta) > 0, \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta,$$

the proof is now complete. ■

We form a Gaussian approximation for $p^{Y_{p,\Delta}^{(1)}}(\xi; \theta)$ to obtain a contrast function that will be well-defined due to the positive definiteness of matrix $\Sigma^{(1)}(x, \theta)$. We introduce some notation. For $h > 0$, $\theta \in \Theta$, $0 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq K$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(1)}(h, \theta) &:= m_p^{(1)}(h, X_{t_{i-1}}^{(1)}, X_{t_i}^{(1)}, \theta), \quad \Sigma_i^{(1)}(\theta) := \Sigma^{(1)}(X_{t_i}, \theta), \quad \Sigma_{i,j}^{(1)}(\theta) := \Sigma_j^{(1)}(X_{t_i}, \theta); \\ \Xi_{K,i}^{(1)}(h, \theta) &:= \Sigma_i^{(1)}(\theta) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq K} h^j \cdot \Sigma_{i,j}^{(1)}(\theta), \quad \Lambda_i^{(1)}(\theta) := (\Sigma_i^{(1)}(\theta))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We write the formal Taylor expansion of $(\Xi_{K,i}^{(I)}(h, \theta))^{-1}$ and of $\log \det \Xi_{K,i}^{(I)}(h, \theta)$ up to the level $K \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} h^k \cdot \mathbf{G}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta), \quad \sum_{0 \leq k \leq K} h^k \cdot \mathbf{H}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta),$$

respectively, where

$$\mathbf{G}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{k!} \partial_h^k (\Xi_{K,i}^{(I)}(h, \theta))^{-1} \Big|_{h=0}, \quad \mathbf{H}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{k!} \partial_h^k (\log \det \Xi_{K,i}^{(I)}(h, \theta)) \Big|_{h=0}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq K.$$

For instance, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{i,0}^{(I)}(\theta) &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta), & \mathbf{H}_{i,0}^{(I)}(\theta) &= \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_i^{(I)}(\theta), \\ \mathbf{G}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) &= -\mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta), & \mathbf{H}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) &= \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) \right], \\ \mathbf{G}_{i,2}^{(I)}(\theta) &= -(\mathbf{G}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) + \mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,2}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta)), & \mathbf{H}_{i,2}^{(I)}(\theta) &= \text{Tr} \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{G}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,1}^{(I)}(\theta) + \mathbf{\Lambda}_i^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i,2}^{(I)}(\theta) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the terms $\mathbf{G}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta)$ and $\mathbf{H}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\theta)$ involve the inverse of the matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_i^{(I)}(\theta)$, and are well-defined following Condition [H1](i) and Lemma 2.1. We now construct the contrast function $\ell_{p,n,\Delta}^{(I)}(\theta)$, $\theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta$, for the hypo-elliptic class (Hypo-I) as follows:

(i) For $p = 2$,

$$\ell_{2,n}^{(I)}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{2,i}^{(I)}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{2,i}^{(I)}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}^{(I)}(\theta) \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

(ii) For $p \geq 3$,

$$\ell_{p,n}^{(I)}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(I)}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}^{(I)}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(I)}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}^{(I)}(\theta) \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus, the contrast estimator $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(I)} = (\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$, $p \geq 2$, is defined as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(I)} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell_{p,n}^{(I)}(\theta).$$

2.2.3 Contrast Estimator for SDE Class (Hypo-II)

To construct the contrast function and corresponding estimator for the highly degenerate diffusion class defined via (Hypo-II), we proceed as above, that is we consider an appropriate standardisation that takes under consideration the scales of the three components $(X_{S_1,\Delta}, X_{S_2,\Delta}, X_{R,\Delta})$, $\Delta > 0$. Note that the first smooth component $X_{S_1,\Delta}$ has a variance of size $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^5)$ due to the largest (as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$) variate in the Itô-Taylor expansion being $\int_0^\Delta \int_0^s W_u du ds$, where we have made use of the fact that the drift μ_{S_1} is a function only of the smooth components. Thus, we introduce

$$\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(II)}(\Delta, \theta) := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^5}} (X_{S_1,t_i}^{(II)} - r_{S_1,K_p+2}^{(II)}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}^{(II)}, \theta)) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta^3}} (X_{S_2,t_i}^{(II)} - r_{S_2,K_p+1}^{(II)}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}^{(II)}, \theta)) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}} (X_{R,t_i}^{(II)} - r_{R,K_p}^{(II)}(\Delta, X_{t_{i-1}}^{(II)}, \theta)) \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have set, for $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\Delta, x, \theta) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$,

$$\begin{bmatrix} r_{S_1,q}^{(II)}(\Delta, x, \theta) \\ r_{S_2,q}^{(II)}(\Delta, x, \theta) \\ r_{R,q}^{(II)}(\Delta, x, \theta) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{S_1} \\ x_{S_2} \\ x_R \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{k=1}^q \frac{\Delta^k}{k!} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) \\ \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu_{S_2}(x, \theta) \\ \mathcal{L}^{k-1} \mu_R(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will explain the choice of the truncation levels used above in the mean approximation $r^{(\text{II})}$ in Remark 2.3. Via an Itô-Taylor expansion, we obtain that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\mathbf{m}_{p,i+1}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta, \theta)^\top \mathbf{m}_{p,i+1}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i}] = \Sigma_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta) + \sum_{j=1}^{K_p} \Delta^j \cdot \Sigma_{i,j}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) + R(\Delta^{K_p+1}, X_{t_i}^{(\text{II})}, \theta), \quad (2.6)$$

for some analytically available matrices $\Sigma_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta), \Sigma_{j,i}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \mathbb{N}$, and a residual $R(\cdot)$, such that $[R(\cdot)]_{k_1 k_2} \in \mathcal{S}$, $1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N$. In particular, the matrix $\Sigma_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta) \equiv \Sigma^{(\text{II})}(X_{t_i}^{(\text{II})}, \theta)$ admits the following block expression:

$$\Sigma^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{S_1 S_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{S_1 S_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{S_1 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) \\ \Sigma_{S_2 S_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{S_2 S_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{S_2 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) \\ \Sigma_{RS_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{RS_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) & \Sigma_{RR}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta, \quad (2.7)$$

where we have set:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{RR}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \sum_{k=1}^d A_{R,k}(x, \sigma) A_{R,k}(x, \sigma)^\top \equiv a_R(x, \sigma), \\ \Sigma_{S_2 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mu_{S_2}(x, \theta) A_{R,k}(x, \sigma)^\top, \quad \Sigma_{RS_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) = \Sigma_{S_2 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)^\top, \\ \Sigma_{S_1 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) A_{R,k}(x, \sigma)^\top, \quad \Sigma_{RS_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) = \Sigma_{S_1 R}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)^\top, \\ \Sigma_{S_2 S_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mu_{S_2}(x, \theta) \mathcal{L}_k \mu_{S_2}(x, \theta)^\top \equiv \frac{1}{3} a_{S_2}(x, \theta), \\ \Sigma_{S_1 S_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) \mathcal{L}_k \mu_{S_2}(x, \theta)^\top, \quad \Sigma_{S_2 S_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) = \Sigma_{S_1 S_2}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)^\top, \\ \Sigma_{S_1 S_1}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{20} \sum_{k=1}^d \mathcal{L}_k \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) \mathcal{L}_k \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(x, \theta)^\top \equiv \frac{1}{20} a_{S_1}(x, \theta). \end{aligned}$$

As is the case with the matrix $\Sigma^{(\text{I})}(x, \theta)$, $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$, for the matrix $\Sigma^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)$, we have the following result whose proof is provided in Appendix B in [Iguchi et al. \(2023\)](#).

Lemma 2.2. *Under condition [H1](ii), the matrices $a_R(x, \theta)$, $a_{S_2}(x, \theta)$, $a_{S_1}(x, \theta)$ and $\Sigma^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)$ are positive definite for all $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$.*

For $h > 0$, $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq K$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta) &= (\Sigma_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta))^{-1}, \quad \Xi_{K,i}^{(\text{II})}(h, \theta) = \Sigma_i^{(\text{II})}(\theta) + \sum_{j=1}^K h^j \cdot \Sigma_{i,j}^{(\text{II})}(\theta); \\ \mathbf{G}_{i,k}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{k!} \partial_h^k (\Xi_{K,i}^{(\text{II})}(h, \theta))^{-1} \Big|_{h=0}, \quad \mathbf{H}_{i,k}^{(\text{II})}(t, \theta) = \frac{1}{k!} \partial_h^k (\log \det \Xi_{K,i}^{(\text{II})}(h, \theta)) \Big|_{h=0}. \end{aligned}$$

We now obtain our contrast function $\ell_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}(\theta)$, $p \geq 2$, for the hypo-elliptic class ([Hypo-II](#)):

(i) For $p = 2$,

$$\ell_{2,n}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{2,i}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \Lambda_{i-1}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{2,i}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \log \det \Sigma_{i-1}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) \right\}.$$

(ii) For $p \geq 3$,

$$\ell_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \cdot \{\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}^{(\text{II})}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(\text{II})}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}^{(\text{II})}(\theta)\}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $K_p = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$.

Thus, the contrast estimator for the class ([Hypo-II](#)) is defined as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{II})} = (\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}^{(\text{II})}, \hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}^{(\text{II})}, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}^{(\text{II})}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}(\theta), \quad p \geq 2, \quad \theta \in \Theta.$$

Remark 2.3. In the definition of contrast estimator, we make use of mean approximations with different number of terms for the various components, so that it holds that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $p \geq 2$ and $1 \leq k \leq N$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{(w),k}(\Delta_n, \theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}} \right] = R_k(\sqrt{\Delta_n^{2K_p+1}}, X_{t_{i-1}}^{(w)}, \theta), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad w \in \{\text{I}, \text{II}\}, \quad (2.9)$$

with some $R_k \in \mathcal{S}$. This is one of the key developments to obtain the CLT under the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. Notice that we divide the smooth components by smaller quantities in terms of powers of Δ_n , e.g., $\sqrt{\Delta_n^5}$ and $\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}$ for the components $X_{S_1}^{(\text{II})}$ and $X_{S_2}^{(\text{II})}$, respectively, thus we require more accurate mean approximations for those components to obtain (2.9).

3 Asymptotic Properties of the Contrast Estimators

To state our main results, we introduce a set of additional conditions for the two hypo-elliptic classes ([Hypo-I](#)) and ([Hypo-II](#)). Recall that we write the true value of the parameter as $\theta^\dagger = (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma^\dagger)$, under the interpretation that $\beta_S^\dagger = (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger)$ for class ([Hypo-II](#)), and that θ^\dagger is assumed to be unique and to lie in the interior of Θ .

[H3] For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and any multi-index $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, N\}^l$, $l \geq 0$, the functions

$$\theta \mapsto \partial_\alpha^x \mu^i(x, \theta), \quad \theta \mapsto \partial_\alpha^x A_j^i(x, \theta), \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

are three times differentiable. Additionally, for any multi-index $\beta \in \{1, \dots, N_\theta\}^l$, $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the functions

$$x \mapsto \partial_\beta^\theta \partial_\alpha^x \mu^i(x, \theta), \quad x \mapsto \partial_\beta^\theta \partial_\alpha^x A_j^i(x, \theta), \quad 1 \leq j \leq d, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

have a polynomial growth, uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$.

[H4] The diffusion process $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined via ([Hypo-I](#)) or ([Hypo-II](#)) is ergodic under $\theta = \theta^\dagger$, with invariant distribution denoted by ν_{θ^\dagger} . Furthermore, all moments of ν_{θ^\dagger} are finite.

[H5] It holds that for all $r \geq 1$, $\sup_{t > 0} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [|X_t|^r] < \infty$.

[H6] If it holds

$$\mu_S(x, \beta_S) = \mu_S(x, \beta_S^\dagger), \quad \mu_R(x, \beta_R) = \mu_R(x, \beta_R^\dagger), \quad A_R(x, \sigma) = A_R(x, \sigma^\dagger),$$

for x in set of probability 1 under ν_{θ^\dagger} , then $\beta_S = \beta_S^\dagger$, $\beta_R = \beta_R^\dagger$, $\sigma = \sigma^\dagger$.

We first show that the proposed contrast estimators $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{I})}$, $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}$ are consistent in the high-frequency, complete observation regime:

Theorem 3.1 (Consistency). *Let $p \geq 2$ be an arbitrary integer. Assume that conditions [\[H1\]](#)–[\[H6\]](#) hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{I})} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \theta^\dagger, \quad \hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{II})} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \theta^\dagger.$$

Furthermore, the proposed estimators are asymptotically normal under the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$.

Theorem 3.2 (CLT). *Let $p \geq 2$ be an arbitrary integer. Assume that conditions [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then:*

I. *For the hypo-elliptic class (Hypo-I),*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n}}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}^{(I)} - \beta_S^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n\Delta_n}(\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}^{(I)} - \beta_R^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{\sigma}_{R,p,n}^{(I)} - \sigma^\dagger) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_{\theta^\dagger}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{N_\theta}, \Gamma^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger)^{-1}),$$

where the asymptotic precision matrix $\Gamma^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger)$ is defined as:

$$\Gamma^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger) = \text{Diag} \left[\Gamma_{\beta_S}^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger), \Gamma_{\beta_R}^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger), \Gamma_\sigma^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger) \right]$$

with the involved block matrices specified as:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma_{\beta_S}^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= 12 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_{\beta_S,i} \mu_S(y, \beta_S^\dagger)^\top a_S^{-1}(y, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\beta_S,j} \mu_S(y, \beta_S^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{\beta_S}; \\ [\Gamma_{\beta_R}^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_{\beta_R,i} \mu_R(y, \beta_R^\dagger)^\top a_R^{-1}(y, \sigma^\dagger) \partial_{\beta_R,j} \mu_R(y, \beta_R^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{\beta_R}; \\ [\Gamma_\sigma^{(I)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \text{Tr}[\partial_{\sigma,i} \Sigma^{(I)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \Lambda^{(I)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\sigma,j} \Sigma^{(I)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \Lambda^{(I)}(y, \theta^\dagger)] \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

II. *For the hypo-elliptic class (Hypo-II),*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n^3}}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}^{(II)} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n}}(\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}^{(II)} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n\Delta_n}(\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}^{(II)} - \beta_S^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{\sigma}_{R,p,n}^{(II)} - \sigma^\dagger) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_{\theta^\dagger}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{N_\theta}, \Gamma^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)^{-1}),$$

where the asymptotic precision matrix $\Gamma^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)$ is defined as:

$$\Gamma^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger) = \text{Diag} \left[\Gamma_{\beta_{S_1}}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger), \Gamma_{\beta_{S_2}}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger), \Gamma_{\beta_R}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger), \Gamma_\sigma^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger) \right]$$

with the involved block matrices specified as:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma_{\beta_{S_1}}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= 720 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_{\beta_{S_1,i}} \mu_{S_1}(y, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)^\top a_{S_1}^{-1}(y, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\beta_{S_1,j}} \mu_{S_1}(y, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{\beta_{S_1}}; \\ [\Gamma_{\beta_{S_2}}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= 12 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_{\beta_{S_2,i}} \mu_{S_2}(y, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger)^\top a_{S_2}^{-1}(y, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\beta_{S_2,j}} \mu_{S_2}(y, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{\beta_{S_2}}; \\ [\Gamma_{\beta_R}^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_{\beta_R,i} \mu_R(y, \beta_R^\dagger)^\top a_R^{-1}(y, \sigma^\dagger) \partial_{\beta_R,j} \mu_R(y, \beta_R^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_{\beta_R}; \\ [\Gamma_\sigma^{(II)}(\theta^\dagger)]_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \text{Tr}[\partial_{\sigma,i} \Sigma^{(II)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \Lambda^{(II)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\sigma,j} \Sigma^{(II)}(y, \theta^\dagger) \Lambda^{(II)}(y, \theta^\dagger)] \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dy), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N_\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

The proofs are given in Section 5.

Remark 3.1. The design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$, i.e. $n\Delta_n^p \rightarrow 0$, appears in the CLT result (Theorem 3.2). As we explain later in the proof in Section 5.2, the condition is required so that the expectation of the score function, specifically, the gradient of the contrast function $\ell_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger)$, tends to 0. This is relevant for the mean of the asymptotic Gaussian distribution to converge to 0. If the given design condition is not satisfied, the distribution of estimators will tend to concentrate on an area that deviates from the true value, thus the estimators will suffer from bias. We observe this issue in the numerical experiments in Section 4, where the standard contrast estimator $\hat{\theta}_{2,n}$ exhibits the described bias when $n\Delta_n^2$ is not sufficiently small, while $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}$ for $p \geq 3$ avoids such a bias.

4 Numerical Applications

In the numerical examples shown below, for given choices of Δ_n and n , we observe gradual improvements in the behaviour of the estimates when moving from $p = 2$ to $p = 3$ and then to $p = 4$. Indicatively, discrepancies are stronger in the experiment that contrasts $p = 2$ with $p = 4$.

4.1 Quasi-Markovian Generalised Langevin Equation

We study numerically the properties of the proposed contrast estimator for the quasi-Markovian Generalised Langevin Equation (q -GLE) defined via (2.2) in Example 1. This is an SDE process that belongs in the class (Hypo-II). We consider the following two choices of potential function U , leading to a linear/non-linear system of degenerate SDEs:

Case I. Quadratic potential: $\mathbb{R} \ni q \mapsto U(q) = Dq^2/2$ with some parameter $D > 0$.

Case II. Double-well potential: $\mathbb{R} \ni q \mapsto U(q) = (q^2 - D)^2/4$, with some parameter $D > 0$.

For the above two cases, we generate $M = 100$ independent trajectories of observations by applying the locally Gaussian (LG) discretisation scheme defined in Iguchi et al. (2023) with a small step-size $\Delta = 10^{-4}$. We treat these trajectories as obtained from the true model (Hypo-II) in the understanding that the discretisation bias is negligible. We then obtain the synthetic complete observations by sub-sampling from the above LG trajectories with coarser time increments. For the two choices of potential above, we consider the designs of high-frequency observations given in Table 2. We specify the true values for the parameter $\theta = (D, \lambda, \alpha, \sigma)$ for each model as shown in Table 3. We compute the contrast estimators $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} (= \hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(\text{II})}) = (\hat{D}_{p,n}, \hat{\lambda}_{p,n}, \hat{\alpha}_{p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$ for $p = 2, 3$. To obtain the minima of the contrast functions we used the adaptive moments (Adam) optimiser with the following algorithmic specifications: (step-size) = 0.1, (exponential decay rate for the first moment estimates) = 0.9, (exponential decay rate for the second moment estimates) = 0.999, (additive term for numerical stability) = 10^{-8} and (number of iterations) = 8,000. Table 4 summarises the means and standard deviations of $M = 100$ realisations of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$, with $p = 2, 3$, for model Cases I & II, and Figure 1 shows boxplots of the individual discrepancies. Remarkably, in all four designs, when $p = 2$ we observe that the estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{2,n}$ suffers from a severe bias, as its realisations do not cover the true value σ^\dagger (see the boxplots at the bottom of Figure 1). In contrast, when $p = 3$ the 100 realisations of $\hat{\sigma}_{3,n}$ are concentrated around σ^\dagger . We observe that the estimators of the parameters D, λ in the drift functions of the smooth components converge quickly to the true values for both $p = 2, 3$. This agrees with the theoretical finding that the asymptotic variances tend to 0 with the fast convergence rate of $\sqrt{\Delta_n/n}$, obtained in the CLT result (Theorem 3.2).

Table 2: Designs of experiment

	Case I.	Case II.
Design A	$(\Delta_n, T_n) = (0.008, 1000)$	$(\Delta_n, T_n) = (0.01, 1000)$
Design B	$(\Delta_n, T_n) = (0.005, 500)$	$(\Delta_n, T_n) = (0.005, 1000)$

Table 3: True value of parameters

	D	λ	α	σ
Case I.	2.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
Case II.	2.0	1.0	4.0	4.0




Figure 1: Boxplots of $M = 100$ independent realisations of (maximum likelihood estimate) – (true value) for the models Case I (left panel) and Case II (right panel). The black points indicate the individual realisations.

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of (maximum likelihood estimate) – (true value) from $M = 100$ independent sets of complete observations.

	Case I.		Case II.	
	Design A	Design B	Design A	Design B
$\hat{D}_{2,n} - D^\dagger$	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0002)
$\hat{D}_{3,n} - D^\dagger$	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0006)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0002)
$\hat{\lambda}_{2,n} - \lambda^\dagger$	0.0001 (0.0005)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0000 (0.0003)	0.0000 (0.0002)
$\hat{\lambda}_{3,n} - \lambda^\dagger$	-0.0001 (0.0005)	0.0000 (0.0004)	-0.0002 (0.0003)	-0.0001 (0.0002)
$\hat{\alpha}_{2,n} - \alpha^\dagger$	-0.0588 (0.0795)	-0.0381 (0.1194)	-0.0795 (0.0907)	-0.0445 (0.0784)
$\hat{\alpha}_{3,n} - \alpha^\dagger$	0.0633 (0.0808)	0.0392 (0.1234)	0.0718 (0.0952)	0.0334 (0.0814)
$\hat{\sigma}_{2,n} - \sigma^\dagger$	-0.0208 (0.0043)	-0.0127 (0.0049)	-0.0258 (0.0053)	-0.0124 (0.0034)
$\hat{\sigma}_{3,n} - \sigma^\dagger$	0.0005 (0.0043)	0.0007 (0.0049)	0.0008 (0.0055)	0.0009 (0.0034)

4.2 FitzHugh-Nagumo Model

We consider the FitzHugh-Nagumo (FHN) model belonging in class (Hypo-I), and specified via the following bivariate SDE:

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(X_t - (X_t)^3 - Y_t - s)dt; \\ dY_t &= (\gamma X_t - Y_t + \alpha)dt + \sigma dW_t^1, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

with $\theta = (\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha, \sigma)$ being the parameter vector to be estimated. We consider parameter estimation of the FHN model in both complete and partial observation regimes where only the component X_t is observed in the latter case.

4.2.1 Complete Observation Regime

We consider the estimator $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} (= \hat{\theta}_{p,n}^{(1)}) = (\hat{\varepsilon}_{p,n}, \hat{\gamma}_{p,n}, \hat{\alpha}_{p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$ when $p = 2, 4$. Following Melnykova (2020), we fix $s = 0.01$ and set the true values to $\theta^\dagger = (0.10, 1.50, 0.30, 0.60)$. We generate $M = 50$ independent observation trajectories by using the local Gaussian discretisation for the (Hypo-I) class defined in (Gloter and Yoshida, 2020; Iguchi et al., 2022) with a step-size $\Delta = 10^{-4}$. Then, we obtain $M = 50$ synthetic datasets of complete observations for the FHN model by sub-sampling from the above trajectories so that the data design uses $n = 250,000$, $T_n = 5,000$ and $\Delta_n = 0.02$. To obtain the minima of the contrast functions we used the Adam optimiser with the same setting as the experiments with the q -GLE earlier, except for (step-size) = 0.01. Table 5 summarises the mean and standard deviation from the 50 realisations of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$ for $p = 2, 4$ and Figure 2 shows boxplots of the corresponding 50 realisations of relative discrepancies $(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^j - \theta^{\dagger,j})/\theta^{\dagger,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq 4$. We observe that the means of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$ with $p = 4$ are closer to 0 than those with $p = 2$ for all coordinates of θ while both estimators attain similar standard deviations. Importantly, when $p = 2$, we see in Figure 2 that $\hat{\varepsilon}_{2,n}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{2,n}$ are severely biased since the true values are not covered by the 50 realisations. In contrast, when $p = 4$, the realisations of $\hat{\theta}_{4,n}$ are spread on areas close to the true parameter values.

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of (contrast estimate) – (true value) from $M = 50$ sets of complete observations for the FHN model, under the design $n = 250,000$, $T_n = 5,000$, $\Delta_n = 0.02$.

	$\hat{\varepsilon}_{p,n} - \varepsilon^\dagger$	$\hat{\gamma}_{p,n} - \gamma^\dagger$	$\hat{\alpha}_{p,n} - \alpha^\dagger$	$\hat{\sigma}_{p,n} - \sigma^\dagger$
$p = 2$	0.00068 (0.00002)	-0.01760 (0.00858)	-0.00435 (0.01045)	-0.01607 (0.00067)
$p = 4$	0.00002 (0.00002)	-0.00838 (0.00860)	-0.00227 (0.01051)	-0.00126 (0.00068)

4.2.2 Partial Observation Regime

We exploit the proposed contrast function, and the corresponding approximate log-likelihood, under the partial observation regime where only the smooth component $\{X_{t_i}\}$ is observed. In particular, we compute maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) based upon a closed-form marginal likelihood constructed from the Gaussian approximation corresponding to the contrast function $\ell_{p,n}^{(1)}(\theta)$ for $p = 2, 3$. To be precise, we use the high-order expansions for the mean and the variance, but do not make use of the Taylor expansions for the inverse of the covariance and of its log-determinant, so that we obtain quantities that correspond to proper density functions. Here, we mention that due to the structure of the FHN model, the obtained one-step Gaussian approximation corresponding to the developed contrast function for $p = 2, 3$ is a linear Gaussian model w.r.t. the hidden component Y_{t_i} given the observation X_{t_i} . Thus, one can make use of the Kalman Filter (KF) and calculate the marginal likelihood of the partial observations. For instance, see Iguchi et al. (2023) where a marginal likelihood is built upon KF for the q -GLE model belonging in the class (Hypo-II). We provide the details of the Gaussian approximation and the marginal likelihood for the FHN model in Appendix D. Then, the MLE for partial observation is defined as:

$$\hat{\theta}_{p,n} (= (\hat{\varepsilon}_{p,n}, \hat{\gamma}_{p,n}, \hat{\alpha}_{p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \log f_{p,n}(\{X_{t_i}\}_{i=0,\dots,n}; \theta), \quad p = 2, 3, \quad (4.2)$$




Figure 2: Boxplots of the $M = 50$ realisations of $(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)/\theta^\dagger$ for the FHN model, under the design $n = 250,000$, $T_n = 5,000$, $\Delta_n = 0.02$. The black points show the individual values.

where $f_{p,n}(\{X_{t_i}\}_{i=0,\dots,n}; \theta)$, $p = 2, 3$, is the marginal likelihood. As with the experiment under complete observations, we fix $s = 0.01$ and set the true values to $\theta^\dagger = (0.10, 1.50, 0.30, 0.60)$. We generate $M = 50$ independent observation trajectories from the LG discretisation with a step-size $\Delta = 10^{-4}$. Then, we obtain 50 synthetic datasets of partial observation $\{X_{t_i}\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$ with $n = 200,000$, $T_n = 1,000$ and $\Delta_n = 0.005$ by sub-sampling from the above trajectories and removing the rough component $\{Y_{t_i}\}_{i=0,\dots,n}$. The Nelder-Mead method is applied to optimise the log-marginal likelihood for $p = 2, 3$ with the initial guess $\theta_0 = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$.

Table 6: Mean and standard deviation (in parenthesis) of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$ from $M = 50$ sets of partial observations for the FHN model, under the design $n = 200,000$, $T_n = 1,000$ and $\Delta_n = 0.005$.

	$\hat{\varepsilon}_{p,n} - \varepsilon^\dagger$	$\hat{\gamma}_{p,n} - \gamma^\dagger$	$\hat{\alpha}_{p,n} - \alpha^\dagger$	$\hat{\sigma}_{p,n} - \sigma^\dagger$
$p = 2$	0.00114 (0.00049)	0.01509 (0.02432)	0.00194 (0.02063)	-0.00053 (0.00294)
$p = 3$	0.00027 (0.00048)	0.00221 (0.02425)	-0.00073 (0.02044)	0.00334 (0.00286)




Figure 3: Boxplots of $(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)/\theta^\dagger$ from $M = 50$ sets of partial observations for the FHN model, under the design $n = 200,000$, $T_n = 1,000$ and $\Delta_n = 0.005$. The black points show the individual values.

Table 6 summarises the mean and standard deviation from the 50 realisations of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$ for $p = 2, 3$ and Figure 3 shows boxplots of the corresponding 50 realisations of relative discrepancies $(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}^j - \theta^{\dagger,j})/\theta^{\dagger,j}$, $1 \leq j \leq 4$. First, we observe that both estimators share almost the same standard deviations. Secondly, the bias in $\hat{\varepsilon}_{2,n}$ is clear from the boxplot in the sense that the true value ε^\dagger is not included in the interval between the minimum and the maximum of the 50 realisations of $\hat{\varepsilon}_{2,n}$. Finally, the square of the mean of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger$ (eq. bias) is reduced in the drift parameters (ε , γ and α) for $p = 3$.

5 Proof of Main Results

We provide the proof for our main results, i.e. Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, which demonstrate the asymptotic normality of the proposed contrast estimators under the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. We show all details of the proof for the degenerate class (Hypo-II) as the proof for the class (Hypo-I) follows from similar arguments. Throughout this section, for simplicity of notation, we frequently omit the subscript (II) appearing in the estimator and the functions introduced in Section 2.2.3. A number of technical results are collected in an Appendix. Throughout the proof, we make use of the notation $o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\cdot)$: for a sequence of random variables $\{F_n\}$ and a numerical sequence $\{\alpha_{n,\Delta_n}\}$ depending on n or Δ_n , we write $F_n = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\alpha_{n,\Delta_n})$ if

$$F_n/\alpha_{n,\Delta_n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1 (Consistency)

We show the consistency of the contrast estimator via the following procedure:

Step 1. We show that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\hat{\beta}_{S_{1,p,n}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \beta_{S_1}^\dagger$. In particular,

$$\hat{\beta}_{S_{1,p,n}} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}). \quad (5.1)$$

Step 2. Making use of the rate of convergence found in (5.1), we show that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \beta_{S_2}^\dagger$. In particular,

$$\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}). \quad (5.2)$$

Step 3. Using the rates obtained in (5.1)-(5.2), we show that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then $(\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} (\beta_R^\dagger, \sigma^\dagger)$.

In the sequel, we express the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta) = (\mathbf{\Sigma}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta))^{-1}$, $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$ as:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_2}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 R}(x, \theta) \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 R}(x, \theta) \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{R S_1}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{R S_2}(x, \theta) & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{R R}(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix},$$

for block matrices $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\iota_1 \iota_2}(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\iota_1} \times N_{\iota_2}}$, $\iota_1, \iota_2 \in \{S_1, S_2, R\}$. In particular, from Lemma 13 in (Iguchi et al., 2023) we have:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) = 720 a_{S_1}^{-1}(x, \theta), \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta,$$

where $a_{S_1}(x, \theta)$ is specified in the definition of the matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{(\text{II})}(x, \theta)$ in (2.7).

Remark 5.1. *The strategy of the proof outlined above is technically different from proofs in Melnykova (2020) and Gloter and Yoshida (2020), where they require the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ to prove consistency. Our proof of consistency proceeds without relying on the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$, and such an approach then leads to a CLT under the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. More details on this point can be found later in Remark 5.2.*

5.1.1 Step 1.

The consistency of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}$ is deduced from the following result.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume [H1]–[H5] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) - \mathbf{Y}_1(\theta) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{Y}_1(\theta) = \int (\mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) - \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) (\mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) - \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx), \quad \theta \in \Theta.$$

The proof is given in Appendix B.1. Lemma 5.1 indeed implies the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}$ via the following arguments. We first notice that the matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) = 720 a_{S_1}^{-1}(x, \theta)$ is positive definite for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$ under [H1] due to Lemma 2.2. From the identifiability condition [H6] and the positive definiteness of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}$, the term $\mathbf{Y}_1(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta$, should be positive if $\beta_{S_1} \neq \beta_{S_1}^\dagger$. Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(|\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger| > \varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\mathbf{Y}_1(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) > \delta).$$

From the definition of the estimator and Lemma 5.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\mathbf{Y}_1(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) > \delta) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}\left(\frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) - \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) + \mathbf{Y}_1(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) > \delta\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}\left(\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) - \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) + \mathbf{Y}_1(\theta) \right| > \delta\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, thus $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}$ is a consistent estimator.

We now prove convergence (5.1). A Taylor expansion of $\partial_{\beta_{S_1}} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n})$ at $(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$ gives

$$\mathbf{A}_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) = \mathbf{B}_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger),$$

where we have set, for $\theta = (\beta_{S_1}, \theta^{S_2,R}) \in \Theta$, $\theta^{S_2,R} \equiv (\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$,

$$\mathbf{A}_{p,n}(\theta) = -\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}} \ell_{p,n}(\theta), \quad \mathbf{B}_{p,n}(\theta) = \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \int_0^1 \partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger + \lambda(\beta_{S_1} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger), \theta^{S_2,R}) d\lambda.$$

The convergence (5.1) holds from the following result whose proof is given in Appendix B.2.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume [H1]–[H6]. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{A}_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \quad (5.4)$$

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{B}_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) - 2\mathbf{B}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad (5.5)$$

where for $(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$,

$$\mathbf{B}(\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma) = 720 \int (\partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}))^\top a_{S_1}^{-1}(x, (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma)) \partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx).$$

Remark 5.2. *We point here to a key fact to obtain (5.4) leading to the rate $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$. The term $\mathbf{A}_{p,n}$ is given in the form of*

$$\mathbf{A}_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n F(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) + R(\Delta_n, (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)), \quad (5.6)$$

where $F = [F^k]_{1 \leq k \leq N_{\beta_{S_1}}}$ with $F^k \in \mathcal{S}$, and the second term is a residual such that

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} |R(\Delta_n, (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma))| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0.$$

The first term of the right hand side of (5.6) includes $\Delta_n^{-1/2}$, however $F^k(1, x, \theta)$ is identically 0 for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$ following some matrix algebra (as indicated in Lemma B.1 in the Appendix) and then (5.4) holds. A similar argument related with matrix algebra (see, e.g., Lemmas B.2, B.3) is also used in the proofs of other technical lemmas below to deal with terms of size $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_n^{-1/2})$, and then the proof of consistency proceeds without requiring that $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$.

5.1.2 Step 2

Making use of convergence (5.1), we obtain the following result whose proof is postponed to Appendix B.3.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{\Delta_n}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) - \mathbf{Y}_2(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

where

$$\mathbf{Y}_2(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) = 12 \int (\mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) - \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger))^\top a_{S_2}^{-1}(x, (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma)) (\mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) - \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger)) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx).$$

Lemma 5.3 leads to the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}$ following arguments similar to the ones used in Section 5.1.1 to show the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}$.

To obtain the rate of convergence in (5.2), we consider the Taylor expansion of $\partial_{\beta_S} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n})$ at $(\beta_S^\dagger, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger, \hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}(\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.7)$$

where we have set for $\theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta$ with $\beta_S = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}) \in \Theta_{\beta_S}$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) \\ -\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_2}} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{p,n}(\theta) = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_n \left(\int_0^1 \partial_{\beta_S}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\beta_S - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma) d\lambda \right) \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_n^\top,$$

for the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_n = \text{Diag}(v_n)$, where

$$v_n = \left[\underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_n^3}{n}}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_n^3}{n}}}_{N_{\beta_{S_1}}}, \underbrace{\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_n}{n}}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_n}{n}}}_{N_{\beta_{S_2}}} \right]^\top.$$

The convergence (5.2) is immediately deduced from equation (5.7) given the following result whose proof is provided in Appendix B.4.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \quad (5.8)$$

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{p,n}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) - 2\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \quad (5.9)$$

where we have set for $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\theta) = \text{Diag} \left[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_1}(\theta), \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}(\theta) \right]$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_1}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}} \times N_{\beta_{S_1}}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\beta_{S_2}} \times N_{\beta_{S_2}}}$ defined as:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_1}(\theta) = 720 \int (\partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}))^\top a_{S_1}^{-1}(x, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx); \quad (5.10)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}(\theta) = 12 \int (\partial_{\beta_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}))^\top a_{S_2}^{-1}(x, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx). \quad (5.11)$$

5.1.3 Step 3

Finally, we show the consistency of estimators $(\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n})$. Working with the rates of convergence obtained in (5.1) and (5.2), we prove the following result leading to the consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,n}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Assume [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \sigma) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

where we have set for $\sigma \in \Theta_\sigma$,

$$\mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) = \int \left\{ \text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma)) \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma))) + \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma)) \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx).$$

We provide the proof in Appendix B.5. We will show that Lemma 5.5 indeed leads to the consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,n}$. We have

$$\mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma^\dagger) = \int \Phi(x, \sigma) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx), \quad \sigma \in \Theta,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x, \sigma) &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma)) \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma^\dagger))) - N - \log \frac{\det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma^\dagger))}{\det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma))} \\ &= 2 \times \int \varphi(y; x, \sigma^\dagger) \log \frac{\varphi(y; x, \sigma)}{\varphi(y; x, \sigma^\dagger)} dy, \end{aligned}$$

with $y \mapsto \varphi(y; x, \sigma)$, $(x, \sigma) \in \mathbf{R}^N \times \Theta$ being the density of the distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_N, \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma)))$. Thus, under condition [H6], $\mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma^\dagger)$ should be positive if $\sigma \neq \sigma^\dagger$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(|\hat{\sigma}_{p,n} - \sigma^\dagger| > \varepsilon) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\mathbf{Y}_3(\hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma^\dagger) > \delta) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}\left(\frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{p,n}, \sigma^\dagger) - \frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) + \mathbf{Y}_3(\hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma^\dagger) > \delta\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}\left(\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \sigma^\dagger) - \frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \sigma) + \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma^\dagger) \right| > \delta\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$.

To show the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}$, we consider:

$$\mathbf{K}(\theta) := \frac{1}{n\Delta_n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) - \frac{1}{n\Delta_n} \ell_{p,n}(\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma), \quad \theta = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta. \quad (5.12)$$

The consistency of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n}$ follows from the following result whose proof is given in Appendix B.6.

Lemma 5.6. *Assume [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}} \left| \mathbf{K}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}, \hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n}, \beta_R, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) - \mathbf{Y}_4(\beta_R) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

where we have set for $\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}$,

$$\mathbf{Y}_4(\beta_R) = \int (\mu_R(x, \beta_R) - \mu_R(x, \beta_R^\dagger))^\top a_R^{-1}(x, \sigma^\dagger) (\mu_R(x, \beta_R) - \mu_R(x, \beta_R^\dagger)) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx).$$

Thus, the proof of consistency for the proposed estimator is now complete.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2 (CLT)

We define the $N_\theta \times N_\theta$ matrix \mathbf{M}_n as:

$$\mathbf{M}_n = \text{Diag} \left[\underbrace{\left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n^3}}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n^3}} \right]}_{N_{\beta_{S_1}}}, \underbrace{\left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n}}, \dots, \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n}} \right]}_{N_{\beta_{S_2}}}, \underbrace{\left[\sqrt{n\Delta_n}, \dots, \sqrt{n\Delta_n} \right]}_{N_{\beta_R}}, \underbrace{\left[\sqrt{n}, \dots, \sqrt{n} \right]}_{N_\sigma} \right].$$

Noting that $\partial_\theta \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n}) = \mathbf{0}_{N_\theta}$, a Taylor expansion of $\partial_\theta \ell_{p,n}(\hat{\theta}_{p,n})$ at the true parameter θ^\dagger gives:

$$\mathbf{I}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger) = \int_0^1 \mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)) d\lambda \times \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n^3}} (\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{\Delta_n}} (\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n\Delta_n} (\hat{\beta}_{R,p,n} - \beta_R^\dagger) \\ \sqrt{n} (\hat{\sigma}_{p,n} - \sigma^\dagger) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.13)$$

where we have set for $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\mathbf{I}_{p,n}(\theta) \equiv -\mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \partial_\theta \ell_{p,n}(\theta), \quad \mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta) \equiv \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \partial_\theta^2 \ell_{p,n}(\theta) \mathbf{M}_n^{-1}.$$

To prove the asymptotic normality, we obtain the following two results.

Lemma 5.7. Let $p \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume that [H1]–[H6] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \left| \mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)) - 2\Gamma(\theta^\dagger) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0.$$

Proposition 5.1. Assume that [H1]–[H5] hold. If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, with the additional design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then

$$\mathbf{I}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_{\theta^\dagger}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{N_\theta}, 4\Gamma(\theta^\dagger)).$$

We provide the proof of Lemma 5.7 in Appendix C.1. We show the proof of Proposition 5.1 in the next subsection where we highlight the manner in which we make use of the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. By applying these two results to equation (5.13), the proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete.

5.2.1 Proof of Proposition 5.1

For simplicity of notation, we write $\partial_{\theta,k} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^k(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta$, $1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$, where

$$\xi_i^k(\theta) = [\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}]_{kk} \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \times \partial_{\theta,k} \{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta) \}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (5.14)$$

Due to Theorems 4.2 & 4.4 in Hall and Heyde (1980), Proposition 5.1 holds once we prove the following convergences:

(i) If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\xi_i^k(\theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta. \quad (5.15)$$

(ii) If $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\xi_i^{k_1}(\theta^\dagger) \xi_i^{k_2}(\theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 4[\Gamma(\theta^\dagger)]_{k_1 k_2}, \quad 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta; \quad (5.16)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [(\xi_i^{k_1}(\theta^\dagger) \xi_i^{k_2}(\theta^\dagger))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta. \quad (5.17)$$

Notice that the design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$ is used in the proof that the expectation of the score function converges to 0, i.e., for convergence (5.15). We provide the proof of the two convergences (5.16) and (5.17) in Appendix C.2 and focus on the proof of (5.15) in this section.

Proof of convergence (5.15). Let $1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$. We write for $\theta \in \Theta$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) \equiv v_{p,k}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta).$$

Note that the \mathbb{R}^N -valued function $v_{p,k}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ is independent of X_{t_i} . It then follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\xi_i^k(\theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] = \sum_{i=1}^n \{ F_{i-1}^{(1),k}(\theta^\dagger) + F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) \},$$

where we have set:

$$F_{i-1}^{(1),k}(\theta^\dagger) = 2[\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}]_{kk} \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \sum_{l_1, l_2=1}^N \Delta_n^j v_{p,k}^{l_1}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) [\mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger)]_{l_1 l_2} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{l_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}];$$

$$F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) = [\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}]_{kk} \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \left\{ \sum_{l_1, l_2=1}^N [\partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger)]_{l_1 l_2} \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{l_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{l_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] + \partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger) \right\}.$$

For the first term, it follows from (2.9) that

$$F_{i-1}^{(1),k}(\theta^\dagger) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} R^{(1),k}(\sqrt{n\Delta_n^{2K_p+1}}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), & 1 \leq k \leq N_\beta; \\ \frac{1}{n} R^{(1),k}(\sqrt{n\Delta_n^{2K_p+2}}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), & N_\beta + 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta, \end{cases}$$

for some $R^{(1),k} \in \mathcal{S}$, under condition [H2]. Thus, it follows from Lemmas A.1-A.2 in the Appendix that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n F_{i-1}^{(1),k}(\theta^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta.$$

For the term $F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger)$, we show that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta. \quad (5.18)$$

To prove (5.18), we introduce the following subsets in the event space Ω :

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\varepsilon &:= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \left| \sum_{i=1}^n F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) \right| > \varepsilon \right\}, \quad \varepsilon > 0; \\ D_{\Delta_n, i} &:= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \det \Xi_{K_p, i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) > 0 \right\}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n-1. \end{aligned}$$

We also set $D_{\Delta_n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n D_{\Delta_n, i-1}$. We then have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon \cap D_{\Delta_n}) + \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon \cap D_{\Delta_n}^c). \quad (5.19)$$

For the first term of the right hand side of (5.19), we have the following result whose proof is provided in the end of this section.

Lemma 5.8. *Assume that conditions [H1]–[H6] hold. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon \cap D_{\Delta_n}) \rightarrow 0.$$

We next consider the second term of the right hand side of (5.19). We have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon \cap D_{\Delta_n}^c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(D_{\Delta_n, i-1}^c) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \det \Xi_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) = 0\}).$$

Since it follows that

$$\det \Xi_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) - \det \Sigma_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) = R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger)$$

for $R \in \mathcal{S}$, and $\det \Sigma_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, under condition [H1]-(ii) due to Lemma 2.2, we have that as $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}(\Omega_\varepsilon \cap D_{\Delta_n}^c) \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, we obtain (5.18) and the proof of the convergence (5.15) is now complete.

5.2.2 Proof of Lemma 5.8

Let $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p \geq 2$. Making use of

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger}[\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{l_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{l_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] = [\Xi_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)]_{l_1 l_2} + [\mathbf{C}(\Delta_n^{K_p+1}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger)]_{l_1 l_2}, \quad 1 \leq l_1, l_2 \leq N,$$

for some $[\mathbf{C}]_{l_1 l_2} \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) = F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\theta^\dagger) + F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{II}),k}(\theta^\dagger)$ with

$$F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\theta^\dagger) = [\mathbf{M}_n^{-1}]_{kk} \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \left\{ \text{Tr} \left[(\partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger)) \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p,i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \right] + \partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger) \right\};$$

$$F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{II}),k}(\theta^\dagger) = \frac{1}{n} R^{(2,\text{II}),k}(\sqrt{n \Delta_n^{2K_p+2}}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger),$$

where $R^{(2,\text{II}),k} \in \mathcal{S}$. We will show that under the event $D_{\Delta_n, i-1} = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \det \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) > 0\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \left\{ \text{Tr} \left[(\partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger)) \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \right] + \partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger) \right\} = R(\Delta_n^{K_p+1}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), \quad (5.20)$$

where $R \in \mathcal{S}$. Due to the invertibility of the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)$ under the event $D_{\Delta_n, i-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta,k} \log \det \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) &= \text{Tr} \left[(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^{-1} \partial_{\theta,k} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right] \\ &= -\text{Tr} \left[\partial_{\theta,k} (\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right], \quad 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where in the last equality we have exploited $N = \text{Tr}[(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)]$. Taylor expansion of $(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^{-1}$ and $\log \det \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)$ at $\Delta_n = 0$ yield:

$$\left[(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^{-1} \right]_{l_1 l_2} = \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j [\mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger)]_{l_1 l_2} + R_{l_1 l_2}^1(\Delta_n^{K_p+1}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), \quad 1 \leq l_1, l_2 \leq N; \quad (5.22)$$

$$\log \det \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{K_p, i-1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) = \sum_{j=0}^{K_p} \Delta_n^j \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta^\dagger) + R^2(\Delta_n^{K_p+1}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), \quad (5.23)$$

where $R_{l_1 l_2}^1, R^2 \in \mathcal{S}$ so that they are continuously differentiable w.r.t. $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\partial_{\theta,k} R_{l_1 l_2}^1, \partial_{\theta,k} R^2 \in \mathcal{S}$ for $1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$. Hence, (5.20) immediately follows from (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23).

Thus, (5.20) gives

$$F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\theta^\dagger) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} R^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\sqrt{n \Delta_n^{2K_p+2}}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), & 1 \leq k \leq N_{\beta_S}, N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta; \\ \frac{1}{n} R^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\sqrt{n \Delta_n^{2K_p+1}}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger), & N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k \leq N_\beta, \end{cases}$$

where $R^{(2,\text{I}),k} \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, under the event $D_{\Delta_n} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n D_{\Delta_n, i-1}$, if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n \Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n F_{i-1}^{(2),k}(\theta^\dagger) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{I}),k}(\theta^\dagger) + F_{i-1}^{(2,\text{II}),k}(\theta^\dagger)\} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

and now the proof of Lemma 5.8 is complete.

6 Conclusions

We have proposed general contrast estimators for a wide class of hypo-elliptic diffusions specified in (Hypo-I) and (Hypo-II), and showed that the estimators achieve consistency and asymptotic normality in a high-frequency complete-observation regime under the weakened design condition of $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 2$. We have thus closed a gap between elliptic and hypo-elliptic diffusion classes over availability of analytic results in such a context, as general contrast estimators for elliptic diffusions under similarly weak design conditions have

been investigated in early works, see e.g. [Kessler \(1997\)](#); [Uchida and Yoshida \(2012\)](#). Before the present work, established results for hypo-elliptic diffusions typically relied on a condition of ‘rapidly increasing experimental design’, i.e. the requirement that $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$. The numerical experiments in Section 4 illustrated cases where for a given step-size Δ_n in-between observations and given n , estimators requiring the condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/2})$ can induce unreliable biased parametric inference procedures. In contrast, the bias was removed upon consideration of estimators which required the weaker design condition $\Delta_n = o(n^{-1/p})$, $p \geq 3$. We stress here that computations w.r.t. the contrast function that delivers estimators under the weakened design condition can be fully automated via use of symbolic programming and automatic differentiation, so that that users need only specify the drift and diffusion coefficients of the given SDE model.

One of the potential future directions of research is the development and analytical study of estimators under alternative observation designs, such as partially observed coordinates and/or low-frequency observation settings. Such designs are important from a practical perspective but have yet to be investigated analytically even for elliptic diffusions. The results in this paper are already relevant for such different observation designs as they can be regarded as providing a minimum requirement on the step-size Δ_n (for given n) that needs to be used when considering smaller amounts of data compared to the complete observation regime treated in this work. E.g., in a low-frequency setting where *data augmentation* procedures (within an Expectation-Maximisation or MCMC setting) will introduce latent SDE values, the user-specified step-size Δ_n will need to satisfy the weakened design conditions obtained in our work (i.e. if the likelihood-based method is not supported in the case where imputed variables were indeed observations, there is absolutely no basis for the method that uses imputed values to provide reliable estimates). In general, it is of interest to explore the type of convergence rates and step-size conditions obtained and required, respectively, in CLTs under such different observation designs.

Acknowledgements

Yuga Iguchi is supported by the Additional Funding Programme for Mathematical Sciences, delivered by EPSRC (EP/V521917/1) and the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research.

A Auxiliary Results

We introduce two auxiliary lemmas used in the proof of technical results required by the main statements, Theorems 3.1 & 3.2.

Lemma A.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable w.r.t. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, with derivatives of polynomial growth in $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$. Under conditions [H1]–[H5], if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) - \int f(x, \theta) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0.$$

Proof. This is a multivariate version of Lemma 8 in [Kessler \(1997\)](#), and we omit the proof. ■

Lemma A.2. *Let $p \geq 2$, $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N$, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the same assumption as in the statement of Lemma A.1. Under conditions [H1]–[H5], if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) - \int f(x, \theta) [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \\ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We define

$$\mathcal{F}_i^{(1)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger), \quad \mathcal{F}_i^{(2)}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger).$$

Due to Lemma A.1, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\mathcal{F}_i^{(1)}(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) [\Sigma_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x, \theta) [\Sigma(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx); \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [(\mathcal{F}_i^{(1)}(\theta))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{R}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $R, \tilde{R} \in \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, we have, if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\mathcal{F}_i^{(2)}(\theta) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [(\mathcal{F}_i^{(2)}(\theta))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &= \frac{1}{n\Delta_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $R \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, due to Lemma 9 in Genon-Catalot and Jacod (1993), we have for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \int f(x, \theta) [\Sigma(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx); \\ \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. Uniform convergence w.r.t. θ is shown by the same arguments as in the proofs of Lemmas 9, 10 in Kessler (1997) and now the proof is complete. \blacksquare

B Proof of Technical Results for Theorem 3.1

This section is devoted in the proof of Lemmas 5.1–5.6 stated in Section 5.1, i.e. in the context of the proof of consistency of the proposed contrast estimators (Theorem 3.1). We note that the proof below proceeds with the second class of hypo-elliptic SDEs (Hypo-II) and makes use of the notations of the contrast function (2.8) with the subscript (II) being dropped. Throughout the proofs, we assume $p \geq 3$ and use often the following notation:

$$d(x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} d_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) \\ d_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) \\ d_R(x, \beta_R) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) - \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) \\ \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) - \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \\ \mu_R(x, \beta_R) - \mu_R(x, \beta_R^\dagger) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta.$$

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

It holds that

$$\frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^4 \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) &\equiv d_{S_1}(X_{S_1, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_1}(X_{S_1, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}); \\ \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta) &\equiv \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N R_{j_1 j_2}(\Delta_n^3, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger); \\ \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta) &\equiv \sum_{j=1}^N R_j(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta, \theta^\dagger), \quad \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) \equiv R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta),\end{aligned}$$

for some functions $R_{j_1 j_2}, R_j, R \in \mathcal{S}$. From Lemmas A.1 and A.2, we immediately have that if $n \rightarrow \infty, \Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) d_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \\ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 2 \leq k \leq 4.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the limit (5.3) and the proof is now complete.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

B.2.1 Proof of limit (5.4)

It holds that for $(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$ and $1 \leq k \leq N_{\beta_{S_1}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A}_{p,n}^k(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} F^k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) + \sqrt{\Delta_n} \cdot R^k(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) + \sum_{j=1}^N R_j^k(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N R_{j_1 j_2}^k(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)},\end{aligned}$$

where $R^k, R_j^k, R_{j_1 j_2}^k \in \mathcal{S}$ and

$$F^k(x, \theta) \equiv -(\partial_{\beta_{S_1}, k} \mu_{S_1}(x, \beta_{S_1}))^\top M(x, \theta) d_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}), \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta,$$

with the $\mathbb{R}^{N_{S_1} \times N_{S_2}}$ -valued function M being defined as:

$$M(x, \theta) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) + 2\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_2}(x, \theta). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In the derivation of $F_{i-1}^k(\theta)$, we used:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(x, \theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) \Big|_{\theta=(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)} &= (\partial_{x_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) + (\partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}^\dagger) \\ &\quad - (\partial_{x_{S_1}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger) - (\partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) \\ &= -(\partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}^\dagger)) d_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}).\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Indeed, it holds that $F^k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) = 0$ due to the following result (Lemma 6 in Iguchi et al. (2023)).

Lemma B.1. For any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$, $M(x, \theta) = \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_1} \times N_{S_2}}$.

Thus, Lemmas A.1 and A.2 yield

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{A}_{p,n}^k(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty, \Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof of convergence (5.4) is now complete.

B.2.2 Proof of limit (5.5)

We define

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{p,n}(\theta) \equiv \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \Theta.$$

Then, it holds that

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{p,n}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^2 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta),$$

where we have set, for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N_{\beta_{S_1}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(0)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= 2 (\partial_{\beta_{S_1, j_1}} \mu_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_1, j_2}} \mu_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}); \\ [\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= 2 d_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})^\top \partial_{\beta_{S_1, j_1}} \partial_{\beta_{S_1, j_2}} \{ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \}; \\ [\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N} R_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}(\Delta_n^3, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^{k_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^{k_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq N} R_k^{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^k(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + R^{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}, R_k^{j_1 j_2}, R^{j_1 j_2} \in \mathcal{S}$. Due to the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}$, we have

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(1)}((\beta_{S_1}^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger), \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

and also obtain from Lemma A.2 that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(2)}((\beta_{S_1}^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger), \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0.$$

Thus, Lemmas A.1 and A.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{B}_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) - 2\mathbf{B}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{B}_{p,n}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(0)}((\beta_{S_1}^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger), \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \\ & \quad + \sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{i-1}^{(0)}((\beta_{S_1}^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger), \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) - 2\mathbf{B}(\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \sigma) \right| \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) = 720 a_{S_1}^{-1}(x, \theta), \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta.$$

The proof of limit (5.5) is now complete.

B.3 Proof of Lemma 5.3

It holds that

$$\frac{\Delta_n}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^5 S_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$

where we have set:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) &= \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(1)}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{j_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}} \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{j_2}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}; \\
S_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_j^{(1)}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^j(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}; \\
S_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta) &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq N_{S_1} \\ 1 \leq j_2 \leq N}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{j_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}; \\
S_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{4} (\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) (\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) (\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) - \mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)) \\
&\quad + d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&= d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \tilde{S}_{i-1}^{(4)}(x, \theta) d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}), \\
S_{i-1}^{(5)}(\theta) &= \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N R_{j_1 j_2}^{(3)}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \sum_{j=1}^N R_j^{(2)}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\
&\quad + R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta),
\end{aligned}$$

for some functions $R_j^{(\cdot)}, R_{j_1 j_2}^{(\cdot)}, R \in \mathcal{S}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{S}_{i-1}^{(4)}(x, \theta) &= \frac{1}{4} (\partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(x, \theta) \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_2}(x, \theta) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(x, \theta) \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(x, \theta) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(x, \theta) \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) + \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(x, \theta) \\
&= 12 a_{S_2}^{-1}(x, \theta). \tag{B.3}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, we made use of the equation (B.2) in the first equation, Lemma B.1 in the second equation and the following result (Lemma 13 in Iguchi et al. (2023)) in the last equation.

Lemma B.2. *For any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$, it holds that*

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(x, \theta) = 12 a_{S_2}^{-1}(x, \theta) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(x, \theta) \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}).$$

Notice that for any $x_S \in \mathbb{R}^{N_S}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d_{S_1}^j(x_S, \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}}} \frac{\mu_{S_1}^j(x_S, (\beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, 1}, \dots, \beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, \ell}, \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^{\ell+1}, \dots, \beta_{S_1, p, n}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}}})) - \mu_{S_1}^j(x_S, (\beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, 1}, \dots, \beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, \ell-1}, \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^\ell, \dots, \beta_{S_1, p, n}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}}}))}{\beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, \ell} - \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^\ell} \cdot \frac{\beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, \ell} - \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^\ell}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we interpret

$$(\beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, 1}, \dots, \beta_{S_1}^{\dagger, \ell}, \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^{\ell+1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}^{N_{\beta_{S_1}}}) = \begin{cases} \hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n}, & \ell = 0; \\ \beta_{S_1}^{\dagger}, & \ell = N_{\beta_{S_1}}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, due to condition [H3] and the convergence rate $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$, it follows from Lemmas A.1 and A.2 that

$$\sup_{(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_1}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_{i-1}^{(k)}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, 5,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, for the fourth term, we apply Lemma A.1 to obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n S_{i-1}^{(4)}(\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n}, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} d_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2})^\top \tilde{S}^{(4)}(x, (\beta_{S_1}^\dagger, \beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma)) d_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $(\beta_{S_2}, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_{S_2}} \times \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$. The proof of Lemma 5.3 is now complete.

B.4 Proof of Lemma 5.4

B.4.1 Proof of limit (5.8)

We have shown in Section B.2.1 that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}} \ell_{p,n}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0.$$

Thus, we here focus on the term

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}^j(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) = \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j} \ell_{p,n}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma), \quad N_{\beta_{S_1}} + 1 \leq j \leq N_{\beta_S}.$$

Noticing that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r_{S_1, K_p+2}(x, \theta^\dagger) - r_{S_1, K_p+2}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma))}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^5}} &= R(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)); \\ \frac{r_{S_2, K_p+1}(x, \theta^\dagger) - r_{S_2, K_p+1}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma))}{\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}} &= \tilde{R}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)), \end{aligned}$$

for some $R, \tilde{R} \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}^j(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^N R_{k_1 k_2}^j(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{k_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{k_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{k=1}^N R_k^j(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{k_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + R^j(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{k_1 k_2}^j, R_k^j, R^j \in \mathcal{S}$. From Lemmas A.1 and A.2, we immediately obtain that

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{p,n}^j(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, and the proof of the limit (5.8) is now complete.

B.4.2 Proof of limit (5.9)

We define

$$\mathbf{U}_n(\theta) := \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_n \partial_{\beta_S}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\theta) \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_1}(\theta) & \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_2}(\theta) \\ \mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_1}(\theta) & \mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_2}(\theta) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$

where we have set:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_1}(\theta) &= \frac{\Delta_n^3}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\theta), \quad \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_2}(\theta) = \frac{\Delta_n^2}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_1}} \partial_{\beta_{S_2}}^\top \ell_{p,n}(\theta); \\ \mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_1}(\theta) &= \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_2}(\theta)^\top, \quad \mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_2}(\theta) = \frac{\Delta_n}{n} \partial_{\beta_{S_2}}^2 \ell_{p,n}(\theta),\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Lemma 5.2 in Appendix B.2 and the consistency of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}$, we have that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_1}((\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma)) - 2\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_1}((\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_1}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)$ is defined in (5.10). We will next show in detail that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_2}((\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_2}((\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma)) - 2\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}((\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)$ is defined in (5.11). It holds that

$$\mathbf{U}_{S_1 S_2}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^4 Q_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta),$$

where we have set for $1 \leq j_1 \leq N_{\beta_{S_1}}$, $1 \leq j_2 \leq N_{\beta_{S_2}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}[Q_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \partial_{\beta_{S_1, j_1}} \mu_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})^\top M(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2, j_2}} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}); \\ [Q_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_1}^{k_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \frac{d_{S_1}^{k_2}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\Delta_n}; \\ [Q_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k_1 \leq N_{S_1} \\ 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_{S_2}}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_1}^{k_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) d_{S_2}^{k_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}); \\ [Q_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^N \tilde{R}_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{k_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{k_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{R}_{j_1 j_2}^k(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^k(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + R_{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta),\end{aligned}$$

for some functions $R_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}$, $\tilde{R}_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}$, $R_{j_1 j_2}^{k_1 k_2}$, $\tilde{R}_{j_1 j_2}^k$, $R_{j_1 j_2} \in \mathcal{S}$ and $M : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_{S_1} \times N_{S_2}}$ being defined as (B.1). From Lemmas A.1, A.2, B.1 and the consistency of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}$ with the rate of convergence $\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$, we have that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Q_{i-1}^{(k)}((\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq 4,$$

and now the proof of (B.4) is complete.

We next consider the term $\mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_2}(\theta)$. It holds that

$$\mathbf{U}_{S_2 S_2}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^4 T_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta),$$

where we have set, for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N_{\beta_{S_2}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[T_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{k_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{k_2}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_k^{j_1 j_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^k(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\Delta_n}; \\
[T_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= 2\partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&\quad + \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&\quad + \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_1 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S); \\
[T_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_{S_2}} \tilde{R}_k^{j_1 j_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) d_{S_2}^k(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k_1 \leq N_{S_1} \\ 1 \leq k_2 \leq N^1}} \bar{R}_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \cdot \frac{d_{S_1}^{k_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^{k_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\
[T_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^N \tilde{R}_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^{k_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}^{k_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \sum_{k=1}^N \bar{R}_k^{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p, i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger); \\
&\quad + R(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta),
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}, R_k^{j_1 j_2}, \tilde{R}_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}, \tilde{R}_k^{j_1 j_2}, \bar{R}_{k_1 k_2}^{j_1 j_2}, \bar{R}_k^{j_1 j_2}, R \in \mathcal{S}$. From Lemmas A.1, A.2, B.1 and the consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{S, p, n}$ with the convergence rate $\beta_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$, we obtain that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{i-1}^{(k)}((\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S, p, n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad k = 1, 3, 4.$$

Similarly to the computation of $\tilde{S}_{i-1}^{(4)}$ in (B.3), we obtain from Lemmas B.1 and B.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
[T_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta)]_{j_1 j_2} &= 2\partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&\quad + \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S_2 S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\
&= 24 \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_1} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top a_{S_2}^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\beta_{S_2}, j_2} \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Lemma A.1 yields

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{i-1}^{(2)}(\beta_S^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\beta}_{S, p, n} - \beta_S^\dagger), \beta_R, \sigma) - 2\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{S_2}(\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

and the proof of convergence (B.5) is now complete.

B.5 Proof of Lemma 5.5

We make use of the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{S, i-1}(\Delta, \beta_S) &= \left[\frac{d_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1})^\top}{\sqrt{\Delta^3}}, \frac{d_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2})^\top}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \right]^\top; \\
\tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}(\Delta, \beta_S) &= \frac{\mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S^\dagger) - \mathcal{L} \mu_{S_1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S)}{\sqrt{\Delta}}, \quad \Delta > 0, \quad \beta_S = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}),
\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$. It holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \ell_{p,n}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^4 V_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \Theta,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} V_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) &\equiv \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{N_S} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(1)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \nu_{S, i-1}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \nu_{S, i-1}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \\ &+ \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{N_{S_1}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq N_{S_1} \\ 1 \leq j_2 \leq N_S}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(3)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \nu_{S, i-1}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \beta_S); \\ V_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq N_S \\ 1 \leq j_2 \leq N}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(4)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \nu_{S, i-1}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N_S} R_j^{(1)}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \nu_{S, i-1}^j(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq N_{S_1} \\ 1 \leq j_2 \leq N}} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(5)}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \beta_S) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N_{S_1}} R_j^{(2)}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}^j(\Delta_n, \beta_S); \\ V_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta) &\equiv \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta); \\ V_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) &\equiv \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N} R_{j_1 j_2}^{(6)}(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} R_j^{(3)}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &+ R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{j_1 j_2}^{(\cdot)}, R_j^{(\cdot)}, R \in \mathcal{S}$. Due to condition [H3] and the rates of convergence $\hat{\beta}_{S_1, p, n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$ and $\hat{\beta}_{S_2, p, n} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n})$, we have:

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\nu_{S, i-1}(\Delta_n, \hat{\beta}_{S, p, n})| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\tilde{d}_{S_1, i-1}(\Delta_n, \hat{\beta}_{S, p, n})| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, Lemmas A.1 and A.2 yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i-1}^{(k)}((\hat{\beta}_{S, p, n}, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad k = 1, 2, 4; \\ \sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V_{i-1}^{(3)}((\hat{\beta}_{S, p, n}, \beta_R, \sigma)) - \mathbf{Y}_3(\sigma) \right| &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof is now complete.

B.6 Proof of Lemma 5.6

We first emphasise that $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}$ indeed depend on parameters $\beta_S = (\beta_{S_1}, \beta_{S_2}) \in \Theta_{\beta_S}$ and $\sigma \in \Theta_\sigma$ but not on $\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}$. Then, the term $\mathbf{K}(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta$, defined in (5.12) is expressed as:

$$\mathbf{K}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^4 Z_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta),$$

where we have set:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\Delta_n} (\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma)))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}((\beta_S, \sigma)) (\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma))); \\
Z_{i-1}^{(2)}(\theta) &= \frac{2}{\Delta_n} (\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma)) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger))^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}((\beta_S, \sigma)) (\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma))); \\
Z_{i-1}^{(3)}(\theta) &= \frac{2}{\Delta_n} \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}((\beta_S, \sigma)) (\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma))); \\
Z_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) &= \sum_{j=1}^{K_p} \Delta_n^{j-1} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \tilde{\theta})^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\tilde{\theta}) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \tilde{\theta}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta) - \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\tilde{\theta}) \right\} \Big|_{\tilde{\theta}=(\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will study the terms $Z_{i-1}^{(k)}(\theta)$, $1 \leq k \leq 4$. Noticing that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) - \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, (\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma)) \\
&= \sqrt{\Delta_n} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{6} \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ I_{N_R \times N_R} \end{bmatrix} d_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R) + R(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)
\end{aligned}$$

with the residual $R = [R^j]_{1 \leq j \leq N}$ such that $R^j \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$Z_{i-1}^{(1)}(\theta) = d_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R)^\top a_R^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma) d_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R) + R(\Delta_n, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$$

with $R \in \mathcal{S}$, where we exploited the following result whose proof is postponed to the end of this subsection.

Lemma B.3. *For any $\theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, it follows under condition [H1] that*

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\beta_S, \sigma) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{6} \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(X_{S, t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ I_{N_R \times N_R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_1} \times N_R} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_2} \times N_R} \\ a_R^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, we apply Lemma A.1 to obtain:

$$\sup_{\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{i-1}^{(1)}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) - \mathbf{Y}_4(\beta_R) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. For the terms $Z_{i-1}^{(k)}$, $k = 2, 3$, we again make use of Lemmas A.1, A.2, B.3 with the rates of convergence $\hat{\beta}_{S_1,p,n} - \beta_{S_1}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n^3})$ and $\hat{\beta}_{S_2,p,n} - \beta_{S_2}^\dagger = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(\sqrt{\Delta_n})$ to obtain that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{i-1}^{(k)}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad k = 2, 3.$$

Finally, we consider the term $Z_{i-1}^{(4)}$. We have

$$Z_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) = \bar{Z}_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) - \bar{Z}_{i-1}^{(4)}((\beta_S, \beta_R^\dagger, \sigma)), \quad \theta = (\beta_S, \beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta,$$

where we have set:

$$\bar{Z}_{i-1}^{(4)}(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{K_p} \Delta_n^{j-1} \cdot \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta)^\top \mathbf{G}_{i-1,j}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta) + \mathbf{H}_{i-1,j}(\theta) \right\}.$$

From the same argument as used in the proof of Lemma 5.5 in Section B.5 and Lemma A.1, we get:

$$\sup_{(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{Z}_{i-1}^{(4)}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \sigma) - \mathbf{Z}(\beta_R, \sigma) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, where we have set for $(\beta_R, \sigma) \in \Theta_{\beta_R} \times \Theta_\sigma$,

$$\mathbf{Z}(\beta_R, \sigma) = \int \left\{ -\text{Tr}[\mathbf{G}_1(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \sigma^\dagger))] + \mathbf{H}_1(x, (\beta_S^\dagger, \beta_R, \sigma)) \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx),$$

with

$$\mathbf{G}_1(x, \theta) = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1(x, \theta) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, (\beta_S, \sigma)), \quad \mathbf{H}_1(x, \theta) = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1(x, \theta)], \quad (x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta.$$

In the above definition of $\mathbf{G}_1(x, \theta)$ and $\mathbf{H}_1(x, \theta)$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1(x, \theta) \in \mathbf{R}^{N \times N}$ is determined by the Itô-Taylor expansion (2.6) with $X_{t_{i-1}}$ replaced by $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. In particular, we notice from the consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_{p,n}$ that

$$\sup_{\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}} \left| \mathbf{Z}(\beta_R, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

thus,

$$\sup_{\beta_R \in \Theta_{\beta_R}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{i-1}^{(4)}(\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n}, \beta_R, \hat{\sigma}_{p,n}) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof of Lemma 5.6 is now complete.

Proof of Lemma B.3. Making use of the invertibility of the matrix $a_R(x, \theta)$ for any $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$ under condition [H1], we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{6} \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(X_{S,t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ I_{N_R \times N_R} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{S_1 R}(X_{t_{i-1}}, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{S_2 R}(X_{t_{i-1}}, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \\ a_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma) \end{bmatrix} a_R^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Thus, (B.6) leads to the assertion by noticing that

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\beta_S, \sigma) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{S_1 R}(X_{t_{i-1}}, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{S_2 R}(X_{t_{i-1}}, (\beta_S, \sigma)) \\ a_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \sigma) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_1} \times N_R} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_{S_2} \times N_R} \\ I_{N_R \times N_R} \end{bmatrix}.$$

C Proof of Technical Results for Theorem 3.2

C.1 Proof of Lemma 5.7

We have already shown in the proof of Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4 that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \left| [\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} - 2[\boldsymbol{\Gamma}(\theta^\dagger)]_{k_1 k_2} \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

for $1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_{\beta_S}$. We then check the above convergence for other cases of k_1, k_2 . For simplicity of notation, we introduce:

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{i-1}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{6} \partial_{x_{S_2}}^\top \mu_{S_1}(X_{S,t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_1}) \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_R}^\top \mu_{S_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_{S_2}) \\ I_{N_R \times N_R} \end{bmatrix}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Since the matrix $\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta$ is symmetric, we study the following 4 cases.

Case (i). $1 \leq k_1 \leq N_{\beta_S}, N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\beta$. Due to the rate of convergence $\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger$ and the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \partial_{\theta, k_1} \mu_S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_S) \\ \mathbf{0}_{N_R} \end{bmatrix}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{i-1}(\theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \mu_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)} + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1) \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1)$ is uniform w.r.t. $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Notice that the first term in the right hand side of the first equation becomes 0 due to Lemma B.3. Thus, from Lemma A.1, the limit (C.1) holds for $1 \leq k_1 \leq N_{\beta_S}, N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\beta$.

Case (ii). $1 \leq k_1 \leq N_\beta, N_\beta + 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\theta$. Again, making use of the rate of convergence $\hat{\beta}_{S,p,n} - \beta_S^\dagger$ and the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_{p,n}$, we obtain

$$[\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} = o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1),$$

thus the limit (C.1) holds for $1 \leq k_1 \leq N_\beta, N_\beta + 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\theta$.

Case (iii). $N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\beta$. Similarly to the early cases, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \partial_{\theta, k_1} \mu_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R)^\top \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{i-1}(\theta)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta) \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{i-1}(\theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \mu_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)} + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \partial_{\theta, k_1} \mu_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R)^\top a_R^{-1}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \mu_R(X_{t_{i-1}}, \beta_R) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)} + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma B.3 in the last equation. Thus, from Lemma A.1, the convergence (C.1) holds for $N_{\beta_S} + 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\beta$.

Case (iv). $N_\beta + 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)^\top \partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger)} + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying Lemma A.1, we have that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\lambda \in [0, 1]} [\mathbf{J}_{p,n}(\theta^\dagger + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_{p,n} - \theta^\dagger))]_{k_1 k_2} \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \int \left\{ \text{Tr}[\partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)] + \partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) = 2[\Gamma(\theta^\dagger)]_{k_1 k_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied the following formulae in the above equation. For $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta) &= -\text{Tr}[\partial_{\theta, k_1} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta)] - \text{Tr}[\partial_{\theta, k_1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta)]; \\ \text{Tr}[\partial_{\theta, k_1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta)] &= -\text{Tr}[\partial_{\theta, k_1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(x, \theta) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(x, \theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.7 is now complete.

C.2 Proof of limits (5.16) & (5.17)

C.2.1 Proof of (5.16)

We write for $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \Theta$,

$$r(x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{S_1}(x_S, \beta_{S_1}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_1}(x, \beta_S) + \frac{1}{6}\mathcal{L}^2\mu_{S_1}(x, \theta) \\ \mu_{S_2}(x, \beta_{S_2}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}\mu_{S_2}(x, \theta) \\ \mu_R(x, \beta_R) \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the definition of $\xi_i^k(\theta^\dagger)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$, given in (5.14), we have:

- For $1 \leq k \leq N_\beta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i^k(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ -2 \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \partial_{\theta,k} r(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N R_k^{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^N R_k^j(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + R_k(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $R_k^{j_1 j_2}, R_k^j, R_k \in \mathcal{S}$.

- For $N_\beta + 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i^k(\theta) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger)^\top \partial_{\theta,k} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + \partial_{\theta,k} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N R_k^{j_1 j_2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^N R_k^j(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^j(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) + R_k(\sqrt{\Delta_n}, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where $R_k^{j_1 j_2}, R_k^j, R_k \in \mathcal{S}$.

To simplify the notation, we write

$$\mathbf{P}_{k_1 k_2}(\theta^\dagger) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [\xi_i^{k_1}(\theta^\dagger) \xi_i^{k_2}(\theta^\dagger) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}], \quad 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta,$$

and then check its limit in the high-frequency observation regime. We note that from a similar argument used in the proof of Lemma A.2, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3=1}^N R^{j_1 j_2 j_3}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_3}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0; \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N R^{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}(1, X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_3}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_4}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N \int R^{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}(1, x, \theta^\dagger) \left\{ [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} + [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_3} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_4} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_4} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_3} \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, where $R^{j_1 j_2 j_3}$, $R^{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4} \in \mathcal{S}$. For $1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\beta$, we apply Lemmas A.1, A.2 and the limits (C.4) and (C.5) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}_{k_1 k_2}(\theta^\dagger) \\
&= \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\theta^\dagger) [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \partial_{\theta, k_1} r^{j_2}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_3}(\theta^\dagger) [\mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} \partial_{\theta, k_2} r^{j_4}(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta^\dagger) + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 4 \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N \int [\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \partial_{\theta, k_1} r^{j_2}(x, \theta^\dagger) [\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_3} \partial_{\theta, k_2} r^{j_4}(x, \theta^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&= 4 \int \partial_{\theta, k_1} r(x, \theta^\dagger)^\top [\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)] \partial_{\theta, k_2} r(x, \theta^\dagger) \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) = 4[\Gamma(\theta^\dagger)]_{k_1 k_2},
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular in the last equation above, we used Lemmas B.1, B.2 and B.3. For $N_\beta + 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta$, we have that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}_{k_1 k_2}(\theta^\dagger) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N [\partial_{\theta, k_1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\partial_{\theta, k_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_3}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_4}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N [\partial_{\theta, k_1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N \partial_{\theta, k_1} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) [\partial_{\theta, k_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_1}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \mathbf{m}_{p,i}^{j_2}(\Delta_n, \theta^\dagger) \\
&\quad \left. + \partial_{\theta, k_1} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}_{i-1}(\theta^\dagger) \right\} + o_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}}(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N \int \left\{ [\partial_{\theta, k_1} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\partial_{\theta, k_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} \times ([\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_3} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_4} + [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_4} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_3} \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N \int \left\{ [\partial_{\theta, k_1} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N \int \left\{ \partial_{\theta, k_1} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) [\partial_{\theta, k_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&\quad + \int \left\{ \partial_{\theta, k_1} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) \partial_{\theta, k_2} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&= \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^N \int \left\{ [\partial_{\theta, k_1} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\partial_{\theta, k_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} ([\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_3} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_4} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_4} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_3} \right\} \nu_{\theta^\dagger}(dx) \\
&= 4[\Gamma(\theta^\dagger)]_{k_1 k_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second and third equality, we made use of the following formulae. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{\theta, k} \log \det \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger) &= - \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^N [\partial_{\theta, k} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} [\mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_2 j_1}; \\
[\partial_{\theta, k} \mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_2} &= - \sum_{j_3, j_4=1}^N [\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_1 j_3} [\partial_{\theta, k} \mathbf{\Sigma}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_3 j_4} [\mathbf{\Lambda}(x, \theta^\dagger)]_{j_4 j_2},
\end{aligned}$$

for $N_\beta + 1 \leq k \leq N_\theta$ and $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N$. Finally, for the cases $1 \leq k_1 \leq N_\beta$, $N_\beta + 1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\theta$ or $1 \leq k_2 \leq N_\beta$, $N_\beta + 1 \leq k_1 \leq N_\theta$, we have from (C.2), (C.3) Lemmas A.1-A.2 and the limit (C.4) that

$$\mathbf{P}_{k_1 k_2}(\theta^\dagger) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof of limit (5.16) is now complete.

C.2.2 Proof of limit (5.17)

From the similar argument in the proof of (5.16), it is shown that if $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\Delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $n\Delta_n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\theta^\dagger} [(\xi_i^{k_1}(\theta^\dagger)\xi_i^{k_2}(\theta^\dagger))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\theta^\dagger}} 0, \quad 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq N_\theta,$$

by noticing that the left hand side contains $1/n^2$. We omit the detailed proof.

D Supporting Material for Numerical Experiments

We provide the details to construct the marginal likelihood used in the numerical experiment of parameter estimation of FHN model (4.1) under a partial observation regime in Section 4.2.2 in the main text.

To construct the marginal likelihood used in the computation of the MLE (4.2), we introduce (locally) Gaussian approximations associated with the contrast function $\ell_{p,n}^{(1)}(\theta)$, $p = 2, 3$, defined in (2.4) and (2.5). We note that when $p = 2$, the scheme corresponds to the local Gaussian (LG) scheme developed in Gloter and Yoshida (2020, 2021). The one-step Gaussian approximations for $p = 2, 3$ are written in the following form:

$$Z_{t_{i+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} X_{t_{i+1}} \\ Y_{t_{i+1}} \end{bmatrix} = a(\Delta_n, X_{t_i}, \theta) + b(\Delta_n, X_{t_i}, \theta)Y_{t_i} + c_p(\Delta_n, X_{t_i}, \theta)w_{i+1}, \quad p = 2, 3, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where $a, b, c_p : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ are explicitly determined and $\{w_{i+1}\}_{i=0, \dots, n-1}$ is i.i.d. sequence of standard normal random variables. In particular, we have:

$$a(\Delta, x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} x + \frac{\Delta}{\varepsilon}(x - x^3 - s) + \frac{\Delta^2}{2\varepsilon^2}(1 - 3x^2)(x - x^3 - s) - \frac{\Delta^2}{2\varepsilon}(\gamma x + \beta) \\ (\gamma x + \beta)\Delta \end{bmatrix};$$

$$b(\Delta, x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{\Delta}{\varepsilon} + \{-(1 - 3x^2) + \varepsilon\} \frac{\Delta^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \\ 1 - \Delta \end{bmatrix},$$

for $\Delta > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta = (\varepsilon, \gamma, \alpha, \sigma)$. Also, the covariance matrix $\Sigma_p \equiv c_p c_p^\top$, $p = 2, 3$, is defined as follows:

$$\Sigma_2(\Delta, x, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta^3}{3} \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon^2} & -\frac{\Delta^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon} \\ -\frac{\Delta^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{\varepsilon} & \Delta \sigma^2 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$\Sigma_3(\Delta, x, \theta) = \Sigma_2(\Delta, x, \theta) + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta^4}{4} L_1(x, \theta) L_2(x, \theta) & \Delta^3 (\frac{1}{6} \sigma L_2(x, \theta) + \frac{1}{3} L_1(x, \theta) L_3(x, \theta)) \\ \Delta^3 (\frac{1}{6} \sigma L_2(x, \theta) + \frac{1}{3} L_1(x, \theta) L_3(x, \theta)) & \Delta^2 \sigma L_3(x, \theta) \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have set:

$$L_1(x, \theta) = -\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon}, \quad L_2(x, \theta) = \frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon^2} \times \{-(1 - 3x^2) + \varepsilon\}, \quad L_3(x, \theta) = -\sigma.$$

Thus, given the observation X_{t_i} , the scheme (D.1) is interpreted as a linear Gaussian model w.r.t. the hidden component Y_{t_i} . For the linear Gaussian state space model (D.1), the Kalman Filter (KF) recursion formula can

be obtained. We recall Δ_n is the step-size of the observation and n is the number of data. For the simplicity of notation, we write $Z_k = (X_k, Y_k)$, $0 \leq k \leq n$ instead of $Z_{t_k} = (X_{t_k}, Y_{t_k})$ and $Z_{0:n} \equiv \{(X_k, Y_k)\}_{k=0, \dots, n}$. Then, it holds that

$$Y_k | X_{0:k} \sim \mathcal{N}(m_{p,k}, Q_{p,k}), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, \quad p = 2, 3,$$

where the filtering mean $m_{p,k}$ and variance $Q_{p,k}$ is defined as follows (the derivation can be found in Appendix F in [Iguchi et al. \(2023\)](#)):

$$m_{p,k} = \mu_{p,k-1}^Y + \frac{\Lambda_{p,k-1}^{YX}}{\Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XX}} (X_k - \mu_{p,k-1}^X), \quad Q_{p,k} = \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{YY} - \frac{\Lambda_{p,k-1}^{YX} \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XY}}{\Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XX}},$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu_{p,k-1}^X \\ \mu_{p,k-1}^Y \end{bmatrix} = a(\Delta_n, X_{k-1}, \theta) + b(\Delta_n, X_{k-1}, \theta) m_{p,k-1};$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XX} & \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XY} \\ \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XY} & \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{YY} \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma_p(\Delta_n, X_{k-1}, \theta) + b(\Delta_n, X_{k-1}, \theta) Q_{p,k-1} b(\Delta_n, X_{k-1}, \theta)^\top.$$

Since it holds that $X_k | X_{0:k-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{p,k-1}^X, \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XX})$, the marginal likelihood $f_{p,n}(X_{0:n}; \theta)$, $p = 2, 3$, is obtained as:

$$f_{p,n}(X_{0:n}; \theta) = \varphi_0(X_0) \times \prod_{k=1}^n \varphi(X_k; \mu_{p,k-1}^X, \Lambda_{p,k-1}^{XX}),$$

where φ_0 is the density of X_0 and $\varphi(\cdot; \mu, v)$ is the density of (scalar) Gaussian random variable with the mean μ and the variance v .

References

- Biscay, R., Jimenez, J., Riera, J. and Valdes, P. (1996) Local Linearization Method for the Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **48**, 631–644.
- Buckwar, E., Tamborrino, M. and Tubikanec, I. (2020) Spectral density-based SDEs and measure-preserving ABC for partially observed diffusion processes. an illustration on Hamiltonian SDEs. *Statistics and Computing*, **30**, 627–648.
- Ditlevsen, S. and Samson, A. (2019) Hypocoelliptic diffusions: filtering and inference from complete and partial observations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **81**, 361–384.
- Dureau, J., Kalogeropoulos, K. and Baguelin, M. (2013) Capturing the time-varying drivers of an epidemic using stochastic dynamical systems. *Biostatistics*, **14**, 541–555.
- Genon-Catalot, V. and Jacod, J. (1993) On the estimation of the diffusion coefficient for multi-dimensional diffusion processes. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, vol. 29, 119–151.
- Gloter, A. and Yoshida, N. (2020) Adaptive and non-adaptive estimation for degenerate diffusion processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10164*.
- (2021) Adaptive estimation for degenerate diffusion processes. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **15**, 1424–1472.
- Hall, P. and Heyde, C. C. (1980) *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Academic press.
- Iguchi, Y., Beskos, A. and Graham, M. M. (2022) Parameter Estimation with Increased Precision for Elliptic and Hypo-elliptic Diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.16384*.
- (2023) Parameter Inference for Degenerate Diffusion Processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16485*.

- Kalliadasis, S., Krumscheid, S. and Pavliotis, G. A. (2015) A new framework for extracting coarse-grained models from time series with multiscale structure. *Journal of Computational Physics*, **296**, 314–328.
- Kessler, M. (1997) Estimation of an ergodic diffusion from discrete observations. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **24**, 211–229.
- Leimkuhler, B. and Matthews, C. (2015) Molecular Dynamics. *Interdisciplinary applied mathematics*, **39**, 443.
- Melnykova, A. (2020) Parametric inference for hypoelliptic ergodic diffusions with full observations. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes*, **23**, 595–635.
- Nualart, D. (2006) *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*, vol. 1995. Springer.
- Pokern, Y., Stuart, A. M. and Wiberg, P. (2009) Parameter estimation for partially observed hypoelliptic diffusions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **71**, 49–73.
- Prakasa-Rao, B. (1988) Statistical inference from sampled data for stochastic processes. *Contemp. Math.*, **80**, 249–284.
- Spannaus, A., Papamarkou, T., Erwin, S. and Christian, J. B. (2022) Inferring the spread of COVID-19: the role of time-varying reporting rate in epidemiological modelling. *Scientific Reports*, **12**, 1–12.
- Stramer, O. and Roberts, G. (2007) On bayesian analysis of nonlinear continuous-time autoregression models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, **28**, 744–762.
- Tsai, H. and Chan, K. (2000) Testing for nonlinearity with partially observed time series. *Biometrika*, **87**, 805–821.
- Uchida, M. and Yoshida, N. (2012) Adaptive estimation of an ergodic diffusion process based on sampled data. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **122**, 2885–2924.
- Vroylandt, H., Goudenège, L., Monmarché, P., Pietrucci, F. and Rotenberg, B. (2022) Likelihood-based non-Markovian models from molecular dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **119**, e2117586119.