

Regularisation by Gaussian rough path lifts of fractional Brownian motions

December 17, 2024

Konstantinos Dareiotis^{*}, Máté Gerencsér[†], Khoa Lê[‡], Chengcheng Ling[§]

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to show the probabilistically strong well-posedness of rough differential equations with distributional drifts driven by the Gaussian rough path lift of fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (1/3, 1/2)$. We assume that the noise is nondegenerate and the drift lies in the Besov-Hölder space \mathcal{C}^α for some $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$. The latter condition matches the one of the additive noise case, thereby providing a multiplicative analogue of Catellier-Gubinelli in the said regime.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020: 60H50; 60H07; 60L20; 60L90.

Keywords: Regularisation by noise; rough paths; stochastic sewing; Malliavin calculus.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	The overview of the strategy	2
1.2	Setup and notation	6
1.3	Formulation	10
2	Preliminaries	10
2.1	Stochastic sewing	10
2.2	Tools from Malliavin calculus	11
3	Partial Malliavin calculus and conditional estimates	13
4	Properties of the flow of the driftless equation	23
5	Emerging driving signal of the linearised equation	38
6	The iterated integral and the joint rough path	49
7	Closing the equation	53
8	Proof of the main result	61
A	Auxiliary lemmas	63

^{*}School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds, U.K., K.Dareiotis@leeds.ac.uk

[†]Institute of Analysis and Scientific Computing, TU Wien, Austria, mate.gerencser@asc.tuwien.ac.at

[‡]School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds, U.K., K.Le@leeds.ac.uk

[§]Institut für Mathematik, University of Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany. chengcheng.ling@uni-a.de

1 Introduction

Let B be a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (1/3, 1/2)$. Our goal is to solve equations of the form

$$X_t = \int_0^t b(X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s, \quad (1.1)$$

with *distributional* drift b . This is a natural continuation of the work [DG24], whose aim was to simultaneously treat two “sides” of the fractional Brownian motion. On the one hand, the sample paths of B are too irregular to have any canonical solution theories of differential equations driven by them (even without a drift component b), which makes them a prime example for Lyons’ theory of rough paths [Ly09, FV10]. On the other hand, when one avoids the issue of rough integration by taking σ to be constant, it is known [?, CG16] that the equation with nondegenerate σ behaves much better than the equation without the noise, in the sense that the regularity assumptions on b that are required for well-posedness are far below the ones of the classical Cauchy-Lipschitz theorem. This *regularisation by noise* phenomenon has been recently widely studied and extended in a variety of directions, see, e.g., [Lê20, HP21, GG22, ART23, GG24, BLM23, BM24]. A common theme is the rule of thumb “*the more irregular the noise, the more regularisation effect it has*”, having small parameters H is not only relevant for rough path theory, but also interesting from the regularisation perspective. In fact, the regime $H < 1/2$ is where the regularisation is strong enough so that equations with *distributional* b can be strongly well-posed. More precisely, in the Besov-Hölder scale the condition on the drift reads $b \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha$, $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$, and for negative exponents such spaces contain distributions.

In recent works [DG24, CD24] equations of the kind (1.1) with genuinely multiplicative noise (i.e. non-constant σ) have been considered. The approach of [DG24] yields in fact optimal results in the regime $H > 1/2$ in the sense that the requirement on b matches the one from the additive noise case. In the rough regime both works go well beyond the classical Cauchy Lipschitz condition but fail to include distributional drifts: strong well-posedness is shown in [DG24] under the condition $\alpha > 0$, $H \in (1/3, 1/2)$, while in [CD24] under the condition $\alpha > \max(0, 3/2 - 1/(2H))$, $H \in (1/4, 1/2)$. In the present paper, we prove strong well-posedness for equations with distributional drifts. Loosely speaking, the main result is that provided σ is smooth and nondegenerate, (1.1) is well-posed for any $b \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha$ under the “classical” condition $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ [CG16]. The precise formulation requires some setup and is stated in Theorem 1.6 below. As in [DG24], the present approach relies on the stochastic sewing lemma (SSL) from [Lê20], but with rather significant novelties that we outline below.

Remark 1.1. Our assumption of smooth σ is only for convenience, but the methods require at least $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^5$. We note that somewhat orthogonally to the direction of the present paper, significant progress has also been made recently in reducing the regularity requirements on σ compared to the conditions in the purely analytic Young/rough theories, see [MM23, MP24]. Combining their method with the present work seems to be challenging, given the several Malliavin derivatives we require on the flow of the driftless equation.

1.1 The overview of the strategy

Let us give an overall view on the strategy of the paper and highlight what novel difficulties have to be tackled. First of all, let us recall that (1.1) in fact employs an abuse of notation. Indeed, the integral

$$\int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s$$

is not an object that depends only on B and X , but also on other components: the second order iterated integrals of the coordinates of B and the so-called Gubinelli derivative of $\sigma(X)$, which in turn is obtained not only from X but also its Gubinelli derivative. To distinguish between standard processes and their enhancements with other components, we shall use colors (similar to, but not exactly the same convention as, in [FH20]), their precise meaning is defined in the notation section below. For example, the integral above will be denoted by

$$\int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s$$

to indicate that $\sigma(X)$, B are enhanced processes.

We start by recalling the standard rough Cauchy-Lipschitz argument. Take two strong solutions X and Y that are adapted to the same filtration $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}$, with respect to which B is a fractional Brownian motion. Their difference can be written as

$$X_t - Y_t = \int_0^t (b(X_s) - b(Y_s)) ds + \int_0^t (\sigma(X_s) - \sigma(Y_s)) dB_s.$$

If b were Lipschitz, then using that for sufficiently regular σ , the map $X \mapsto \sigma(X)$ is locally Lipschitz in the norm of controlled paths, one easily concludes that $X = Y$ by a Gronwall-type argument. To formulate slightly differently, one can write by Newton-Leibniz and “rough Newton-Leibniz” (see (1.17) below) formulae

$$\begin{aligned} X_t - Y_t &= \int_0^t \left(\int_0^1 \nabla b(\theta X_s + (1 - \theta)Y_s) d\theta \right) (X_s - Y_s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left(\int_0^1 \nabla \sigma(\theta' X_s + (1 - \theta')Y_s) d\theta' \right) (X_s - Y_s) dB_s. \end{aligned}$$

In this form, it is also clear that the Lipschitzness of b guarantees that the above is a well-defined linear rough equation for $Z = X - Y$ with initial condition 0, therefore the solution is identically 0. If b fails to be Lipschitz, the meaning of the integrand with respect to θ becomes unclear. Note that since σ is always assumed to be fairly regular, the integrand with respect to θ' is always well-defined and is henceforth denoted by Σ_s .

An attempt at Young formulation. To give a meaning to the above equation for Z , we first aim to *construct* the integral

$$L_t = \int_0^1 \int_0^t \nabla b(\theta X_s + (1 - \theta)Y_s) ds d\theta \tag{1.2}$$

by probabilistic methods. Such objects, i.e. integrals of distributions along stochastic processes play a key role in regularisation by noise, see [Davo7, FGP10, CG16, Lê20] for some prominent examples. On the first reading, one may also think of taking smooth b to avoid any confusion of meaning, but with the aim to control L in some norm using only the distributional norm of ∇b . Controlling such objects are easiest when the distribution of the process is exactly known, for example, when it is a Brownian motion, fractional Brownian motion, or Lévy process. It is more involved when the process is an additive perturbation of an exactly known process, see e.g. [GG24] for a general criterion when this is possible.

With the first goal being the construction of L , we have now created two new difficulties, which we address one by one below. First of all, the process in (1.2) along which we wish to integrate is not a perturbation of an exactly known process. Secondly, even if L is constructed, its regularity can be guessed (by replacing X and Y with B and recalling e.g. [CG16]): we can only expect¹

¹For the sake of readability in this introduction we omit the necessary $-\varepsilon$ -s in regularities.

$L \in \mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H}$. The condition $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ guarantees that this exponent is bigger than but arbitrarily close to $1/2$. Therefore rewriting the equation for $Z = X - Y$ as ²

$$Z_t = \int_0^t Z_s dL_s + \int_0^t \Sigma_s Z_s dB_s, \quad (1.3)$$

the first integral is a well-defined Young integral only if the regularity of Z is almost $1/2$. This would be the case, for example, if Σ were 0: then Z would inherit the regularity of L . Of course the case $\Sigma = 0$ corresponds precisely to the additive case so it is not in our focus. For the correct power counting, we first realise that Z in general inherits only regularity H from the rough integral, so to define the first integral in (1.3) as a Young integration, we would need $H + 1 + (\alpha - 1)H > 1$, that is, $\alpha > 0$. This excludes distributional drift and leads to the same threshold as in [DG24]. To resolve this issue, we will construct a joint rough path lift of (L, B) and treat (1.3) as a rough differential equation driven by such emerging joint lift.

Conditional densities of RDEs as input to SSL. Let us comment on the construction of L . In recent years the stochastic sewing lemma of [Lê20] has been rather successful in constructing such additive functionals. The lemma itself gives a simple criterion for when bounds on approximating increments $A_{s,t} \approx L_t - L_s$ transfer to bounds on L itself. The “art” is then choosing appropriate $A_{s,t}$, which on one hand can be analysed efficiently, and on the other hand fit in the stochastic sewing framework. In [DG24], for example, when dealing with L (or rather with an analogous but not completely identical object), the approximation

$$A_{s,t} = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \nabla b \left(\theta (X_s + \sigma(X_s)(B_r - B_s)) + (1 - \theta)(Y_s + \sigma(Y_s)(B_r - B_s)) \right) dr d\theta$$

is used, where \mathbb{E}_s denotes the conditional expectation given \mathcal{F}_s . Clearly this choice satisfies the first of the two aforementioned criterion: this $A_{s,t}$ is fairly easy to bound since the only randomness to be averaged out is Gaussian. It turns out, however, that this approximation can only be sewed when $\alpha > 0$. In the present paper we chose instead the approximation

$$A_{s,t} = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_s \nabla b (\theta \phi_r^{s, X_s} + (1 - \theta) \phi_r^{s, Y_s}) dr d\theta,$$

where ϕ is (the first component of) the flow of the driftless rough differential equation, i.e. of (1.1) with $b = 0$. Intuitively it is clear that this is a better approximation to $L_t - L_s$, since ϕ_r^{s, X_s} is a better approximation of X_r than $X_s + \sigma(X_s)(B_r - B_s)$ and similarly for Y . Indeed, it turns out that the approximating error for the first one is of order $|r - s|^{1+\alpha H}$ (see Proposition 4.3) while for the second one is of order $|r - s|^{2H}$. In the range $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ and $r - s$ is small, the first one is clearly better. However, estimating $A_{s,t}$ becomes much harder. Indeed, we now have to use information about the conditional distribution of the flow given \mathcal{F}_s .³

A detailed theory on the density of the solutions of rough differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motions has been developed in the articles [CF10, CLL13, Ina14, CHLT15, GOT20]. Although it is natural to expect that any such result also holds with the obvious modifications for conditional densities, making this rigorous is fairly nontrivial due to the lack of Markovianity. In Section 3 we approach this question by developing *partial Malliavin calculus*,

²Here we admit to being careless in how the indices of different matrix- and vector-valued processes are contracted. If this worries the reader, they may assume for the present exposition that we are in dimension 1.

³In fact, we consider convex combinations of the flow starting from different points, and a priori it is not even clear that the nondegeneracy of the two do not cancel each other.

as introduced in [KS84, NZ89], for rough differential equations. We comment on an alternative approach to this problem in [CD24] in Remark 3.1 below.

An equation driven by a joint rough path. As for the second difficulty above, we need another probabilistic construction that goes beyond an analytic threshold, this time for integrals against B and/or L : we need to give a meaning to the iterated integrals

$$\int_s^t (B_r - B_s) \otimes dL_r, \quad \int_s^t (L_r - L_s) \otimes dB_r. \quad (1.4)$$

The two integrals are essentially equivalent due to the “product rule”

$$\int_s^t (B_r^i - B_s^i) dL_r^{jk} + \int_s^t (L_r^{jk} - L_s^{jk}) dB_r^i = (L_t^{jk} - L_s^{jk})(B_t^i - B_s^i),$$

which needs to be enforced since L is a limit of smooth approximations. Constructing these iterated integrals is our second main step and is the content of Corollary 6.2 below. Putting it together with the rest of the objects, we therefore build a rough path of mixed regularity

$$\mathbf{G} = \left(B, L, \int B \otimes dB, \int L \otimes dB, \int B \otimes dL \right) \in \mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H} \times \mathcal{C}^H \times \mathcal{C}_2^{2H} \times \mathcal{C}_2^{1+\alpha H} \times \mathcal{C}_2^{1+\alpha H}.$$

Note that the iterated integral of L against itself is canonically given as a Young integral.

Remark 1.2. We are not aware of standard references concerning rough paths of mixed regularity, but one can easily transfer the tools from the usual theory without any difficulty. In any case, since regularity structures [Hai14] accommodate different regularities, viewing rough paths as a special case of regularity structures, one may take all standard results as valid also in such mixed regularity setting.

Having given a meaning to (1.3) as a rough differential equation above the rough path \mathbf{G} , it might seem that $Z \equiv 0$ follows.

Closing the equation. Unfortunately, the last sentence of optimism is misguided: from the preceding construction it does *not* follow that there is a controlled path above Z that solves (1.3) as a rough differential equation above \mathbf{G} ! Indeed, from (1.3) it is clear that Z is controlled by (B, L) with Gubinelli derivatives $(\Sigma Z, Z)$, so writing $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, Z, \Sigma Z)$, what the above optimistic sentence is really saying is that

$$Z_t = \int_0^t Z_s dL_s + \int_0^t \Sigma_s Z_s dB_s \quad (1.5)$$

implies $Z = 0$ (here Σ is the trivial extension of Σ from a controlled path by B to a controlled path by (B, L)). Although (1.5) indeed implies $Z = 0$, it is far less clear that (1.3) implies (1.5). Indeed, at this point the role of different colors starts being important, and it is in general not true that two integrals written in blue and purple (or in black and purple) coincide, even if both integrals are meaningful. On the other hand, there is one more resource not used so far: the “drift” part of Z does not merely have the regularity of L (i.e. $1 + (\alpha - 1)H$), but the regularity of the individual drifts of X and Y , which is of higher order, $1 + \alpha H$. The last main task of the proof is to show that this extra regularity can be leveraged to go from (1.3) to (1.5). This implies strong uniqueness, after which strong existence follows from the Gyöngy-Krylov lemma [GK96] and the weak existence result from [DG24].

1.2 Setup and notation

Classical function/distribution spaces. For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we set $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the space of continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} := [f]_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| := \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| < \infty.$$

Here, and often below, we write \mathcal{C}^α instead of $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for simplicity. For $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$, we define $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of all functions f defined on \mathbb{R}^d having bounded derivatives $\partial^k f$ for multi-indices $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|k| := |k_1| + \dots + |k_d| \leq \alpha$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} := \sum_{|k| \leq \alpha} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\partial^k f(x)| + \sum_{\alpha - 1 \leq |k| < \alpha} \|\partial^k f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha - |k|}} < \infty.$$

Note that the \mathcal{C}^α -norm always includes the supremum of the function. We also denote the space of bounded measurable functions equipped with the supremum norm by $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}^\infty = \bigcap_{\alpha > 0} \mathcal{C}^\alpha$ the space of smooth functions and by $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}$ the closure of \mathcal{C}^∞ in \mathcal{C}^α . It will often be more convenient to work with the $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}$ spaces, the fact that this is not a loss of generality is a consequence of the well known fact that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}$ (and that in the relevant assumptions strict inequality will be assumed). For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a Banach space V , the extension of the definition to functions $f : U \rightarrow V$ is straightforward and is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(U; V)$. If the target space V is obvious from the context, we simply write $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(U)$ and if the same is true for the domain we write simply \mathcal{C}^α , with some abuse of notation. Further, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $(S, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_2^\alpha([S, T]^2; V)$ the collection of all $f : [S, T]^2 \mapsto V$ such that

$$[f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^\alpha} := \sup_{(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2} \frac{|f_{s, t}|}{|t - s|^\alpha}.$$

For $\alpha < 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of all Schwarz distributions such that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} := \sup_{\gamma \in (0, 1]} \gamma^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|P_\gamma f\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} < \infty, \quad (1.6)$$

where $P_t f := p_t * f$ and $p_t(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}^d} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2t}}$. Recall the standard heat kernel bound

$$\|\partial^k p_t\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq N(d, k) t^{-|k|/2}. \quad (1.7)$$

Rough path spaces. Below V_1, V_2, V_3 are all finite dimensional Euclidean spaces and $\mathcal{L}(V_1; V_2)$ denotes the space of bounded linear operators from V_1 to V_2 . Recall that there is a canonical isometry between $\mathcal{L}(V_1; \mathcal{L}(V_2, V_3))$ and $\mathcal{L}(V_1 \otimes V_2; V_3)$. For a function f in 1 variable we denote $f_{s, t} = f_t - f_s$ and for a function g in 2 variables we denote $\delta g_{s, u, t} = g_{s, t} - g_{s, u} - g_{u, t}$. For an interval I we denote by π_I the set of partitions of I , that is, collections \mathcal{P} of closed subintervals of I whose union is I and whose interior is mutually disjoint. For $\mathcal{P} \in \pi_I$ we denote by $|\mathcal{P}|$ the length of the largest element of \mathcal{P} . We loosely follow the convention of [FH20] by denoting rough and controlled paths with colors. This will help distinguish between integrals that have different interpretations (e.g. Young and rough), which, as indicated in the introduction, is crucial in the final part of the proof Section 7.

Let $(S, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2 := \{(s, t) \in [0, 1]^2 : s \leq t\}$. For $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$ we denote by $\mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$ the set of γ -Hölder rough paths on $[S, T]$: the subset of $\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T], V_1) \times$

$\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T]^2, V_1 \otimes V_1)$ constrained by the nonlinear relation (*Chen's identity*) postulating that any $g = (g, \mathfrak{g}) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma$ satisfies

$$\mathfrak{g}_{s,t} - \mathfrak{g}_{s,u} - \mathfrak{g}_{u,t} = g_{s,u} \otimes g_{u,t} \quad (1.8)$$

for all $(s, u, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^3 := \{(s, u, t) \in [S, T]^3 : s \leq u \leq t\}$. Such $g = (g, \mathfrak{g}) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma$ is also called a *lift* of g . For $g = (g, \mathfrak{g}), h = (h, \mathfrak{h}) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} [g]_{\mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T])} &:= [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])} + [\mathfrak{g}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T]^2)}, \\ d_\gamma(g, h) &:= \|g - h\|_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])} + [\mathfrak{g} - \mathfrak{h}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T]^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The map d_γ is a metric on $\mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$ the set of geometric rough paths, that is, the closure in $\mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$ of the set

$$\left\{ (g, \mathfrak{g}) : g \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, 1]; V_1), \mathfrak{g}_{s,t} = \int_s^t g_{s,r} \otimes dg_r \right\}.$$

It is known that $(\mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1), d_\gamma)$ is a Polish space (see, e.g., [FH20, Exercice 2.8]).

Given $\gamma \in (1/3, 1/2]$ and $g = (g, \mathfrak{g}) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T]; V_1)$, we denote by $\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_2)$ the set of all functions $f = (f, f') : [S, T] \rightarrow V_2 \times \mathcal{L}(V_1; V_2)$ such that

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} := [R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + [f']_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])} < \infty,$$

where $R_{s,t}^f = f_{s,t} - f'_s g_{s,t}$. Moreover, let us set

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} = [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])} + \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])}.$$

Notice that by the triangle inequality we have

$$[f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])} \leq [R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} |T - S|^\gamma + \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])}. \quad (1.9)$$

Note that for $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq u_0 \leq u_1 \leq \dots \leq u_k$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([u_0, u_k])} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([u_{i-1}, u_i])} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} [f']_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([u_{i-1}, u_i])} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([u_i, u_k])} \\ &\leq 2(1 + [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([u_0, u_k])}) \sum_{i=1}^k [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([u_{i-1}, u_i])}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

Let V_3 be another finite dimensional Euclidean space. If $F \in \mathcal{C}^2(V_2; V_3)$, then it holds that $F(f) := (F(f), \nabla F(f)f') \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_3)$ and the following estimates holds (see, e.g., [DG24, equation (1.8) and the Appendix therein])

$$\begin{aligned} [R^{F(f)}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} &\leq N([R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])} [f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])}), \quad (1.11) \\ [F(f)]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} &\leq N(1 + \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])}^2 + [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])}^2) ([f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S, T])}). \quad (1.12) \end{aligned}$$

where N depends only on $\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$. From (1.11) and (1.9), we also have

$$[R^{F(f)}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} \leq N([R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + [R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}([S, T])} \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}_{S,T}^0} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])})$$

$$+ \|f'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])}^2 [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])}^2. \quad (1.13)$$

For $f = (f, f') \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_2)$ and $h = (h, h') \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; \mathcal{L}(V_2; V_3))$, we set

$$hf := \left(hf, v_1 \mapsto ((h'v_1)f + h(f'v_1)) \right). \quad (1.14)$$

When then has that $hf \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_3)$. Indeed, one has

$$R_{s,t}^{hf} = h_s R_{s,t}^f + R_{s,t}^h f_s + (h'_s g_{s,t}) f_{s,t},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} [R^{hf}]_{\mathcal{C}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} &\leq \|h\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} [R^f]_{\mathcal{C}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} + [R^h]_{\mathcal{C}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} \\ &\quad + \|h'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} [f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])} \\ [hf]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} &\leq \|h\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} + [h]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} \\ &\quad + \|h'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([S,T])} [f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])} [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.15)$$

The latter combined with (1.9) further implies that

$$\|hf\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \leq N \|h\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])})^2, \quad (1.16)$$

with a universal constant N .

For $f, h \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_2)$ and $F \in \mathcal{C}^3(V_2, V_3)$, by means of the usual fundamental theorem of calculus (FTC) and integration by parts, one has the following rough version of FTC

$$F(f) - F(h) = \int_0^1 \nabla F(\theta f + (1 - \theta)h) d\theta (f - h), \quad (1.17)$$

where the product is as in (1.14) and the composition with ∇F is as before.

For $f = (f, f') \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; \mathcal{L}(V_1; V_2))$ one can define the V_2 -valued rough integral of f with respect to g by setting for $t \in [S, T]$

$$\int_S^t f_r dg_r := \lim_{\substack{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[S,t]} \\ |\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}} A_{s,u},$$

where $A_{s,u} := f_s g_{s,u} + f'_s \mathfrak{Q}_{s,u}$. The fact that this limit exists is a standard consequence of the sewing lemma and the estimate for $(s, u, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta A_{s,u,t}| &= |(f_{s,u} - f'_s g_{s,u})g_{u,t} + f'_{s,u} \mathfrak{Q}_{u,t}| \\ &\leq 2[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s,t])} [g]_{\mathcal{R}^\gamma([s,t])} |t - s|^{3\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where Chen's identity has been used. Another consequence of the sewing lemma is that the following estimate holds for all $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r - f_s g_{s,t} - f'_s \mathfrak{Q}_{s,t} \right| \leq N [g]_{\mathcal{R}^\gamma([s,t])} [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s,t])} |t - s|^{3\gamma},$$

where $N = N(\gamma)$. In addition, the above estimate obviously implies that for all $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r - f_s g_{s,t} \right| \leq N[g]_{\mathcal{R}^\gamma([s,t])} ([f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s,t])} |t-s|^{3\gamma} + |f'_s| |t-s|^{2\gamma}), \quad (1.18)$$

with $N = N(\gamma)$. From (1.18) combined with (1.9) one can conclude that $\int_S^\cdot f_r dg_r := (\int_S^\cdot f_r dg_r, f) \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; V_2)$, and the following estimate holds

$$\left\| \int_S^\cdot f_r dg_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} \leq N(\|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} + 1)[g]_{\mathcal{R}^\gamma([S, T])}, \quad (1.19)$$

with $N = N(\gamma)$. For $\rho > 0$, we denote $\mathcal{V}^\rho([S, T])$ the collection of all finite ρ -variation paths $g : [S, T] \mapsto W$ so that

$$[g]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([S, T])} := \sup_{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[S, T]}} \left(\sum_{[s, u] \in \mathcal{P}} |g_{s,u}|^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} < \infty. \quad (1.20)$$

By $\mathcal{V}^\rho([S, T]^2)$ we denote the collection of all $g : [S, T]^2 \mapsto W$ such that

$$[g]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([S, T]^2)} := \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_1 \in \pi_{[S, T]} \\ \mathcal{P}_2 \in \pi_{[S, T]}}} \left(\sum_{\substack{[s_1, u_1] \in \mathcal{P}_1 \\ [s_2, u_2] \in \mathcal{P}_2}} |g_{s_1, s_2} + g_{u_1, u_2} - g_{s_1, u_2} - g_{u_1, s_2}|^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} < \infty. \quad (1.21)$$

Probabilistic setup. We fix a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a complete filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ carrying a d_0 -dimensional \mathbb{F} -Wiener process W . For $H \in (0, 1/2)$ we consider a fractional Brownian Motion B given by

$$B_t = \int_0^t K(t, s) dW_s,$$

with the kernel K given by

$$K(t, s) = c_H \left[\left(\frac{t}{s} \right)^{H-1/2} (t-s)^{H-1/2} - (H-1/2)s^{1/2-H} \int_s^t u^{H-3/2} (u-s)^{H-1/2} du \right] \mathbf{1}_{s < t} \quad (1.22)$$

where $c_H = (2H / ((1-2H)\beta(1-2H, H+1/2)))^{1/2} > 0$, and β is the Beta function. It is known (see also Remark 3.9 below) that B and W generate the same filtration, whose completion will be denoted by $\mathbb{F}^B = (\mathcal{F}_t^B)_{t \in [0, 1]}$. We clearly have $\mathcal{F}_t^B \subset \mathcal{F}_t$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. The conditional expectation given \mathcal{F}_s is denoted by \mathbb{E}_s while conditional expectation given \mathcal{F}_s^B will be denoted by \mathbb{E}_s^B .

We denote by $B := (B, \mathbb{B})$ the Gaussian rough path lift of B (see, e.g., [FV10]) and recall that $B \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^\gamma([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^{d_0})$ with probability one, for all $\gamma \in (1/3, H)$. From now on, we fix $H_- < H$ and $H_+ > H$ sufficiently close to H , such that

$$3H_- > 1, \quad 1 + (\alpha - 1)H_+ > 1/2. \quad (1.23)$$

The existence of such H_+ is guaranteed under the assumption $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ which is in force (see Assumption 1.4 below).

1.3 Formulation

At this point we can formulate the definition of a solution, the main assumptions, and the main result on (1.1).

Definition 1.3. An \mathbb{F} -adapted stochastic process $(X_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ is called a solution of (1.1) if the following are satisfied:

- (i) There exists an \mathbb{F} -adapted stochastic process $(D_t^X)_{t \in [0,1]}$ such that $\int_0^\cdot b^n(X_s) ds \rightarrow D^X$ uniformly in time, in probability, whenever $(b^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty$ and $b^n \rightarrow b$ in $\mathcal{C}^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
- (ii) With probability one we have $X := (X, \sigma(X)) \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H^-}([0,1])$, and for all $p \geq 1$, we have

$$C_{S,p}^X := \|X\|_{L_p(\Omega; \mathcal{D}_B^{2H^-}([0,1]))} < \infty. \quad (1.24)$$

- (iii) For all $p \geq 1$, we have

$$C_{D,p}^X := [D^X]_{\mathcal{G}^{1+\alpha H}([0,1]; L_p(\Omega))} < \infty. \quad (1.25)$$

- (iv) With probability one, for all $t \in [0,1]$,

$$X_t = D_t^X + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dB_s.$$

If the above holds, we also say X is a solution with drift component D^X .

The initial condition is chosen as 0 purely for convenience and will play no role in the article. As for the coefficients, we impose the following.

Assumption 1.4. For some $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ one has $b \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Assumption 1.5. One has $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_1})$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma(x)\sigma^*(x) \geq \lambda \mathbb{1}_d$.

Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1.6. Let Assumption 1.4 and Assumption 1.5 hold. Then there exists a strong solution X to (1.1) and for any other solution Y , one has $\mathbb{P}(X = Y) = 1$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Stochastic sewing

We use the original version of Lê's stochastic sewing lemma (SSL) from [Lê20]. We start by introducing a few common notations for stochastic sewing. For $S < T$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $[S, T]_{\leq}^i := \{(t_0, \dots, t_{i-1}) \in [S, T]^i : t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_{i-1}\}$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $p \in [2, \infty)$. Let $(S, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and let $(A_{s,t})_{(s,t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2}$ be a family of \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables such that $A_{s,t}$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable for all $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$. Suppose that there exist constants $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \in [0, \infty)$, $\beta_1 > 1/2$, and $\beta_2 > 1$ such that the following holds:

- (i) $\|A_{s,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \Gamma_1 |t - s|^{\beta_1}$, $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$,

$$(ii) \quad \|\mathbb{E}_s \delta A_{s,u,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \Gamma_2 |t - s|^{\beta_2}, \quad (s, u, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^3.$$

Then there exists a unique continuous $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [S, T]}$ -adapted process $\mathcal{A} : [S, T] \mapsto L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathcal{A}_S = 0$ and the following bounds hold for some constants $K_1, K_2, K > 0$: $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$,

$$(I) \quad \|\mathcal{A}_t - \mathcal{A}_s - A_{s,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_1 |t - s|^{\beta_1} + K_2 |t - s|^{\beta_2},$$

$$(II) \quad \|\mathbb{E}_s(\mathcal{A}_t - \mathcal{A}_s - A_{s,t})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K_2 |t - s|^{\beta_2}.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $K = K(\beta_1, \beta_2, p, d)$ such that the above bounds hold with $K_1 = K\Gamma_1$, $K_2 = K\Gamma_2$, and one has for all $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$

$$(III) \quad \|\mathcal{A}_t - \mathcal{A}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K\Gamma_1 |t - s|^{\beta_1} + K\Gamma_2 |t - s|^{\beta_2}.$$

2.2 Tools from Malliavin calculus

We collect some basic results concerning Malliavin calculus for the fractional Brownian motion (see [Nua09, CHLT15, CF10, FV10]). In this section, we work on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1^B, \mathbb{P})$, that is, we consider random variables that are measurable functions of the underlying fractional Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$. On the basis of the d_0 -dimensional fractional Brownian motion $B_t = (B_t^1, \dots, B_t^{d_0})$ we construct an isonormal process on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} (see below). With some abuse of notation we will use B both for the d_0 -dimensional process $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto B_t$ and for the isonormal process $\mathcal{H} \ni h \mapsto B(h)$.

Let us denote by \mathcal{H} the completion of the set

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ t \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_k]}(t) : m \in \mathbb{N}_+, a_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}, t_k \in [0, 1] \right\}$$

with respect to the norm

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_k]} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \sum_{k, \ell=1}^m \langle a_k \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_k]}, a_\ell \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_\ell]} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} := \sum_{k, \ell=1}^m a_k \cdot a_\ell Q(t_k, t_\ell), \quad (2.1)$$

where $Q(s, t) = 2^{-1}(s^{2H} + t^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H})$ is the covariance function of the process $t \mapsto B_t^1$. It is evident from definition that \mathcal{H} is a separable Hilbert space. Next, we consider the linear map $B : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)$ defined by

$$B(a \mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_0} a^i B_t^i,$$

for $a = (a^1, \dots, a^{d_0})$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Keeping in mind (2.1) and the fact that $\mathbb{E} B_s^i B_t^j = \delta_{ij} Q(s, t)$, the map B extends to a linear isometry $B : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L_2(\Omega)$.

We denote by \mathcal{S} the collection of real random variables given by

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ f(B(h_1), \dots, B(h_n)) : n \in \mathbb{N}, f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), h_i \in \mathcal{H} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the set of smooth real functions on \mathbb{R}^n whose derivatives of any order grow at most polynomially. Similarly, for a separable Hilbert space $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$, let us denote by $\mathcal{S}(V)$ the collection of smooth V -valued random variables

$$\mathcal{S}(V) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n F_i v_i : n \in \mathbb{N}, F_i \in \mathcal{S}, v_i \in V \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The set $\mathcal{S}(V)$ is dense in $L_p(\Omega; V)$ for any $p \geq 1$. The *Malliavin derivative* is a linear operator $D : \mathcal{S}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ given by

$$DF = \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k f(B(h_1), \dots, B(h_n)) v \otimes h_k,$$

for $F = f(B(h_1), \dots, B(h_n))v$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $v \in V$. The operator D as a mapping from $\mathcal{S}(V)$ to $L_2(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ is closable and its domain, which we will denote by $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V)$, is given by the completion of $\mathcal{S}(V)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V)} := (\mathbb{E}\|F\|_V^2 + \mathbb{E}(\|DF\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2))^{1/2}.$$

For $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V)$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we denote by $D_h F$ the V -valued random variable

$$D_h F = \langle DF, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} := \sum_{i,k} \langle DF, q_k \otimes e_i \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \langle e_i, h \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k,$$

where $(q_k)_{k=1}^\infty, (e_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ are orthonormal bases of V, \mathcal{H} , respectively. Notice that it does not depend on the choice of the bases. The adjoint of D will be denoted by $\delta : \text{dom}(\delta) \subset L_2(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega; V)$. By definition, for $u \in \text{dom}(\delta)$, $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V)$, we have the following *integration by parts* formula

$$\mathbb{E}\langle DF, u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} = \mathbb{E}\langle F, \delta(u) \rangle_V. \quad (2.3)$$

If $u \in L_2(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ is of the form

$$u = \sum_{i=1}^n F_i v_i \otimes h_i, \quad F_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}), v_i \in V, h_i \in \mathcal{H},$$

then $u \in \text{dom}(\delta)$ and

$$\delta(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n (F_i B(h_i) - \langle DF_i, h_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) v_i. \quad (2.4)$$

For u as above, by virtue of (2.4), it is easy to verify that

$$D\delta(u) = u + \delta(\widehat{Du}), \quad (2.5)$$

where the map $\widehat{\cdot} : V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \rightarrow V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ is the linear isometry given by $v \otimes \widehat{h_1 \otimes h_2} = v \otimes h_2 \otimes h_1$ for $v \in V, h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, it is known ([Nua09]) that

$$\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V \otimes \mathcal{H}) \subset \text{dom}(\delta). \quad (2.6)$$

Next, notice that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, D^m maps $\mathcal{S}(V)$ into $\mathcal{S}(V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes m})$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \geq 2$, we denote by $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)$ the completion of $\mathcal{S}(V)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)} := (\mathbb{E}\|F\|_V^p + \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(\|D^k F\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}}^p))^{1/p}.$$

The space $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)$ is reflexive (since it can be identified with a closed subspace of $\prod_{k=0}^m L_p(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k})$). The following lemma, whose proof is in the Appendix, will be used often.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(e_i)_{i=1}^\infty, (q_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}, V , respectively. The collection*

$$\mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H}) = \left\{ \sum_{i,k=1}^n f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n)) q_k \otimes e_i : n \in \mathbb{N}, f_{ik} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \right\}$$

is dense in $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ for any $k \geq 0, p \geq 2$.

Clearly, $\mathbb{D}^{m',p'}(V) \subset \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)$ if $m' \geq m$ and $p' \geq p$. It is immediate that for all $F \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)$ we have

$$\|DF\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m-1,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})} \leq \|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)}.$$

In addition, it is known that there exists $C = C(p, m)$ such that for all $u \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ we have

$$\|\delta(u)\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m-1,p}(V)} \leq C \|u\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})}. \quad (2.7)$$

If $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$, then $g(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R})$ and the following *chain rule* holds

$$Dg(F) = \sum_{k=1}^m \partial_k g(F) DF^k. \quad (2.8)$$

3 Partial Malliavin calculus and conditional estimates

In this section, we continue to work on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1^B, \mathbb{P})$ (recall that the terminal time is 1). The concept of partial Malliavin calculus was first introduced in [KS84] and later further studied in [NZ89]. Its development was aimed at studying the conditional densities of diffusion processes appearing in filtering problems.

It turns out that this concept is very useful for our purposes as well. Recall from the introduction that, roughly speaking, for our sewing arguments, we need to estimate expressions of the form $\mathbb{E}_s^B \nabla f(\phi_t^{s,x})$ in terms of the function f but in relatively weak norms, say $\|f\|_{L_\infty}$ for now. In the case $H = 1/2$, one can use the Markov property to reduce the conditional expectation to a usual expectation, and then use tools from Malliavin calculus, such as the Malliavin integration by parts formula. Such an argument does not work in the non-Markovian setting. Nevertheless, it turns out that an integration by parts formula conditionally on \mathcal{F}_s^B is true, provided that one considers Malliavin derivatives with respect to $B_- - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_-$, which is independent of \mathcal{F}_s^B , rather than Malliavin derivatives with respect to B (see (3.1) below). In this context, derivatives with respect to $B_- - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_-$ are referred to as *partial Malliavin derivatives* since $B_- - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_-$ can be seen as a component of B via the decomposition $B_- = (B_- - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_-) + \mathbb{E}_s^B B_-$. In this section, we study the properties of these partial Malliavin derivatives and their adjoint operator.

Remark 3.1. In [CD24] a different way to estimate conditional densities is proposed. To our best judgment this approach has flaws that seem to be nontrivial to fix. For instance, one of the basic statements, Lemma 4.7 therein is not true and we provide a counterexample: $F = 1, G = W_a, h = 1_{[a,b]}$. Indeed, using notation therein (note that W in their notation is B in our notation), one then has $D_{[a,b]} F = 0, DG = 1_{[0,a]}$ and so $D_{[a,b]} G = 1_{[a,b]} DG = 0$, which means that the first two expectations in [CD24, Lemma 4.7] are 0, while the last is $\mathbb{E}(W_a(W_b - W_a)) \neq 0$. Although this lemma is not directly used in the paper, in the unconditioned setting it is an important ingredient in showing the continuity of the δ operator in the Malliavin norm. Since the conditional version of the continuity of δ is only stated but not proved in [CD24, Theorem 4.11], it is not clear how one can overcome the failure of [CD24, Lemma 4.7] in its proof.

For $s \in [0, 1]$, we define the subspace \mathcal{H}_s of \mathcal{H} by

$$\mathcal{H}_s = \overline{\text{span}\{\mathbf{1}_{[0,q]} : q \leq s\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}}.$$

We denote by \mathcal{H}_s^\perp the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{H}_s , so that one has the orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_s \oplus \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$. We denote by $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$ the orthogonal projection operator and with a slight abuse of notation, we also use the same notation for the projection operator from $V \otimes \mathcal{H}$ onto $V \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$. We have the following continuity property.

Lemma 3.2. *For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C = C(k, p)$ such that for all $F \in \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V)$ we have*

$$\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})} \leq C \|F\|_{\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})}.$$

Proof. Let $(e_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} consisting of eigenvectors of $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$, so that $(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ are orthogonal and let $(q_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of V . By Lemma 2.2, it suffices to show the desired inequality only for F of the form

$$F = \sum_{i,k=1}^n f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n)) q_k \otimes e_i,$$

with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_{ik} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By using orthogonality and that the norm of the projection operator is bounded by 1, we see that for $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} F\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i,k=1}^n \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_l} \partial_{j_1, \dots, j_l} f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n)) q_k \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i \otimes e_{j_1} \cdots \otimes e_{j_l} \right\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,k=1}^n \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_l} \|\partial_{j_1, \dots, j_l} f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n)) q_k \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i \otimes e_{j_1} \cdots \otimes e_{j_l}\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i,k=1}^n \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_l} |\partial_{j_1, \dots, j_l} f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n))|^2 = \|D^l F\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

From this, the claim follows. \square

Next, we define the operator $D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} : \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ by the formula

$$D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} F = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} DF.$$

We denote by $\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} : \text{dom}(\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}) \rightarrow L_2(\Omega; V)$ the adjoint of $D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$, where

$$\text{dom}(\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}) := \{u \in V \otimes \mathcal{H} : \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u \in \text{dom}(\delta)\}.$$

For $u \in \text{dom}(\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp})$ we have $\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u) = \delta(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u)$. Notice that by Lemma 3.2 and (2.6), for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \geq 2$, we have that $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ is contained in $\text{dom}(\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp})$. The following *conditional integration by parts formula* holds.

Proposition 3.3. *For $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V)$ and $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \langle F, \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u) \rangle_V = \mathbb{E}_s^B \langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} F, u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}, \quad a.s. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. For G of the form $g(B_{r_1}, \dots, B_{r_n})$ with a smooth g and $0 \leq r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_n \leq s$, we have by (2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}G \langle F, \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u) \rangle_V &= \mathbb{E} \langle GF, \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u) \rangle_V \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle D(GF), \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle F \otimes DG + GDF, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}G \langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} F, u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we have used the fact that $DG \in \mathcal{H}_s$, hence, $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(F \otimes DG) = 0$. \square

Remark 3.4. For $u \in \mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$, by virtue of (2.4), it is straightforward to verify that

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \delta(\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) = \delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) = \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}). \quad (3.2)$$

Indeed, let us verify the first equality. If u is of the form

$$u = \sum_{i,k=1}^n f_{ik}(B(e_1), \dots, B(e_n)) q_k \otimes e_i,$$

then we have that

$$\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n \partial_j f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) q_k \otimes e_j \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i.$$

Then, according to (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) &= \sum_{i,k,j=1}^n \partial_j f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) B(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i) q_k \otimes e_j \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,k,j,l=1}^n \partial_{lj}^2 f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) \langle e_l, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k \otimes e_j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} = \sum_{i,j,k=1}^n \partial_j f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) q_k \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_j \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) &= \sum_{i,k,j=1}^n \partial_j f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) B(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i) q_k \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_j \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,k,j,l=1}^n \partial_{lj}^2 f_{ik}(e_1, \dots, e_n) \langle e_l, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k \otimes \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} e_j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

By comparing (3.3) and (3.4), the first equality in (3.2) is obvious. The second equality holds since $\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}$ takes values in $V \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$, and on the latter, δ and $\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ coincide.

Finally, by (3.2) and (2.5), it follows that

$$D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u) = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u + \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}). \quad (3.5)$$

Lemma 3.5. For $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ we have with probability one

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp} Du\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 \right).$$

Proof. Let $(e_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} consisting of eigenvectors of $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$, let $(q_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ be an orthonormal basis of V and let u be of the form

$$u = \sum_{i,k=1}^n F_{ik} q_k \otimes e_i, \quad F_{ik} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (3.6)$$

By using (3.1) (with $F = \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)$), and (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^2 &= \mathbb{E}_s^B \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u, D\delta(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u) \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u, \delta(\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} \in V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$, so that we can use (3.1) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^2 &= \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u, \widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp} Du, \widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp} Du\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This shows the desired inequality for u of the form (3.6). For general $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ the result follows by a standard approximation argument upon using Lemma 2.2, Lemma 3.2 and the continuity of conditional expectation on $L_1(\Omega)$. \square

The proof of the next lemma is essentially a repetition of the proof of [Hai21, Proposition 3.9].

Lemma 3.6. For every $p \in [1, \infty)$, there exists $k = k(p) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a constant $C = C(p)$ such that for all separable Hilbert spaces V and all $u \in \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ we have with probability one

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^p \leq C \sum_{l=0}^k \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes (l+1)}}^{2p} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. The statement is clearly true for $p \in [1, 2]$ by virtue of by Lemma 3.5. Suppose now that it is true for all $p \in [1, 2(3/2)^n]$ for some $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and let us show that it is true also for $n+1$. Clearly, it suffices to show the result for $u \in \mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$. So let $p \in [2(3/2)^n, 2(3/2)^{n+1}]$. By the chain rule, (3.1), and (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^p &= (p-1) \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^{p-2} \langle D\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u), \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right) \\ &= (p-1) \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^{p-2} \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 + \langle \delta(\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}), \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u \rangle_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.4), one can easily see that

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \delta(\widehat{D\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) = \delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}).$$

Using the above together with the Young and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequalities and rearranging, gives

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^p \lesssim \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^p + \|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{p/2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{p/2} \right). \quad (3.7)$$

By Hölder's and Young's inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \left(\|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{p/2} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{p/2} \right) \\ \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p/3} \right)^{3/4} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p} \right)^{1/4} \\ \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p/3} \right)^{3/2} + \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.7), we get

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^p \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p/3} \right)^{3/2} + \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Next, notice that $\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u} \in V \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$, which means that $\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}) = \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})$. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $k' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p/3} &\lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{k'} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l \widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+2)}}^{4p/3} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{k'+1} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^{4p/3} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s^B \|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_V^p &\lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{k'+1} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^{4p/3} \right)^{3/4} + \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{k'+1} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(l+1)}}^{2p} \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Next, for $u \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V)$, let us define

$$\|u\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{m,p}(V)} = \left(\sum_{l=0}^m \mathbb{E}_s^B \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^l u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

We have the following continuity property for the operator $\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$.

Lemma 3.7. *For any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, there exists $n = n(p, m) \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq m$, and a constant $C = C(p, m)$, such that for any separable Hilbert space V , any $u \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$, and any $s \in [0, 1]$, we have with probability one*

$$\|\delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{m,p}(V)} \leq C \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,2p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})}.$$

Proof. Clearly it suffices to show the inequality for $u \in \mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$. The statement is true for $m = 0$, by virtue of Lemma 3.6. Suppose now that it holds for some $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ and let us show that it also holds for $m + 1$. By using (3.5), we see that

$$\mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^{m+1} \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(u)\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(m+1)}}^p \lesssim \mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^m \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(m+1)}}^p + \mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^m \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(m+1)}}^p,$$

and we only need to estimate the second term. By the induction hypothesis, we have for some $n' \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^m \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u})\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(m+1)}}^p &\lesssim \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n', 2p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})} \\ &= \|\widehat{D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n', 2p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H})} \\ &\lesssim \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} u\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n'+1, 2p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Our next task is the following. We want to obtain a lower bound for $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} f\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $f \in \mathcal{H}$. To achieve this, we first show that $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} f\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ can be written as a 2D Young integral against the covariance function of the process $t \mapsto B_t - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_t$. Then, given that the covariance function of the latter satisfies certain properties, the desired bound will follow from [CHLT15, Corollary 6.10]. Let us now be more precise.

Recall that the inner product on \mathcal{H} is given by means of the covariance function $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$ of the process B^1 . Let us set

$$\widetilde{B}_t^s := B_t - \mathbb{E}_s^B B_t = \int_s^t K(t, r) dW_r, \quad \overline{B}_t^s := \mathbb{E}_s^B B_t = \int_0^s K(t, r) dW_r \quad (3.9)$$

and let us denote by $\widetilde{B}^{s,1}$ and $\overline{B}^{s,1}$ the first of the d_0 components of \widetilde{B}^s and \overline{B}^s , respectively. Further, let us denote by $Q_s(\cdot, \cdot)$ the covariance function of $\widetilde{B}^{s,1}$. To study the covariance Q_s , let us recall some basic properties of the kernel K . The next lemma is a direct consequence of the definition of K (see, (1.2)).

Lemma 3.8. *The following hold:*

- (i) For all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_<^2$, we have $K(t, s) \geq 0$.
- (ii) For $s \in [0, 1)$, the map $(s, 1] \ni t \rightarrow K(t, s)$ is continuously differentiable and

$$\partial_t K(t, s) = c_H \left(H - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{H-1/2} (t-s)^{H-3/2}. \quad (3.10)$$

In particular, $(s, 1] \ni t \rightarrow K(t, s)$ is decreasing.

Let us continue with some properties of K . It is well known (see [Nua06, pp.281-284])

$$\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|K(t, \cdot)\|_{L_2([0, 1])} < \infty,$$

and that for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$Q(s, t) = \int_0^{s \wedge t} K(t, r) K(s, r) dr. \quad (3.11)$$

Further, the operator $K^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow L_2([0, 1])$ given by

$$(K^*h)(s) = K(1, s)h(s) + \int_s^1 (h(t) - h(s))\partial_t K(t, s) dt$$

satisfies

$$(K^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]})(r) = K(t, r)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(r), \quad r \in [0, 1], \quad (3.12)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Consequently, $K^* : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow L_2([0, 1])$ is an linear isometry, and therefore it extends to an isometry between \mathcal{H} and a closed subspace of $L_2([0, 1])$. It turns out that the map $K^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L_2([0, 1])$ is in fact surjective. Indeed, if f belongs to the orthogonal complement of $K^*(\mathcal{H})$, then for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$0 = \langle K^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}, f \rangle_{L_2([0,1])} = \int_0^t K(t, r)f(r) dr.$$

The right hand side of the above relation admits the following representation in terms of Liouville integrals (see [DU99, Theorem 2.1] and references therein):

$$0 = \int_0^t K(t, r)f(r) dr = I_{0^+}^{2H} \left((\cdot)^{1/2-H} I_{0^+}^{1/2-H} ((\square)^{H-1/2} f(\square))(\cdot) \right)(t).$$

Since for any $\alpha > 0$, the Liouville integrals $I_{0^+}^\alpha : L_1([0, 1]) \rightarrow L_1([0, 1])$ are injective, we conclude that $f \equiv 0$, which shows that K^* is surjective.

Remark 3.9. From this discussion, it follows that $(B((K^*)^{-1}\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}))_{t \in [0,1]}$ is a standard Brownian motion, it generates the same filtration as $(B_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$, and it coincides with the underlying Wiener process $(W_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$.

Lemma 3.10. *The process $(\tilde{B}_t^{s,1})_{t \in [s,1]}$ has negatively correlated increments. Moreover, for any $S \in [s, 1]$, and any partition $D = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $[s, S]$, the $n \times n$ matrix $(Q_{ij}^D)_{i,j=1}^n$ with entries*

$$Q_{ij}^D = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{B}_{t_{i-1}, t_i}^{s,1} \tilde{B}_{t_{j-1}, t_j}^{s,1})$$

is diagonally dominant.

Proof. We start by showing that $(\tilde{B}_t^{s,1})_{t \in [s,1]}$ has negatively correlated increments. A sufficient condition is that $\partial_{tt'}^2 Q_s(t, t') \leq 0$ for $t < t'$ (see [CHLT15, p. 205]). To see that this is the case, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_s(t, t') &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{B}_t^{s,1} \tilde{B}_{t'}^{s,1}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\int_s^t K(t, r) dW_r^1 \int_s^{t'} K(t', r) dW_r^1 \right) \\ &= Q(t, t') - \int_0^s K(t, r) K(t', r) dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

It is straightforward that $\partial_{tt'}^2 Q(t, t') \leq 0$ for $t < t'$. Moreover, from (3.10), it follows that

$$\int_0^s \partial_t K(t, r) \partial_{t'} K(t', r) dr > 0.$$

Consequently, we have that $\partial_{t'}^2 Q_s(t, t') \leq 0$ for $t < t'$.

Next, since $(\widetilde{B}_t^{s,1})_{t \in [s,1]}$ is a centered Gaussian process with negatively correlated increments, starting at zero, a sufficient condition for the matrix $(Q_{ij}^D)_{i,j=1}^n$ to be diagonally dominant is that $\partial_t Q_s(t, t') \geq 0$ for $t < t'$ (see [CHLT15, p. 205]). The latter follows again by (3.13) combined with the fact that $\partial_t Q(t, t') \geq 0$ for $t < t'$ and that $\partial_t K(t, r) < 0$, $K(t', r) > 0$ for $r \in [0, s]$. This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.11. *There exists a constant $C = C(H)$ such that for all $(s, t, u, v, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^5$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{B}_{t,T}^{s,1} \widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}) \leq C|v - u|^{2H}. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. By orthogonality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{B}_{t,T}^{s,1} \widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}) = \mathbb{E}(B_{t,T}^1 B_{u,v}^1) - \mathbb{E}(\overline{B}_{t,T}^{s,1} \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}).$$

It follows from the covariance of B (see also [FVo6, p. 407]) that $|\mathbb{E}(B_{t,T}^1 B_{u,v}^1)| \lesssim |v - u|^{2H}$ so we only focus on bounding the second term on the right hand side of the above equality. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\overline{B}_{t,T}^{s,1} \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1})| &= \left| \int_0^s (K(T, r) - K(t, r))(K(v, r) - K(u, r)) dr \right| \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^s K(s, r)(K(u, r) - K(v, r)) dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 3.8, that is, the fact that K is non-negative and decreasing in the first variable. Consequently, by the above and (3.11) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\overline{B}_{t,T}^{s,1} \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1})| &\leq 2(Q(s, u) - Q(s, v)) \\ &= |u|^{2H} - |u - s|^{2H} - |v|^{2H} + |v - s|^{2H} \leq 2|u - v|^{2H}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Corollary 3.12. *For any $s \in [0, 1)$, the covariance function Q_s is uniformly of Hölder controlled 2-dimensional $1/(2H)$ -variation, that is, there exists a constant $C = C(H)$ such that for any $(s, u, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^3$ one has*

$$[Q_s]_{\mathcal{C}^{1/(2H)}([u,t]^2)} \leq C(t - u)^{1/(2H)}. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. Following the proof of [FV10, Proposition 15.5], (3.15) is a consequence of negatively correlated increments and (3.14). \square

Lemma 3.13. *Let $s \in [0, 1]$ and for $(u, v) \in [s, 1]_{\leq}^2$ set $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{u,v} = \sigma(\widetilde{B}_{u,r}^{s,1}, r \in [u, v])$. Then, there exists $\vartheta = \vartheta(H) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\substack{s \in [0,1] \\ s \leq u < v \leq 1}} \frac{1}{(v - u)^\vartheta} \mathbf{Var}(\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{s,u} \vee \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{v,1}) > 0.$$

Proof. For $(t, t') \in [0, 1]_{<}^2$, let us set $\mathcal{G}_{t,t'} = \sigma(B_{t,r}^1, r \in [t, t'])$. One can easily see that $\mathcal{G}_{0,s} = \sigma(W_r^1, r \leq s)$, from which it easily follows that for $(u, v) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_{0,u} \vee \mathcal{G}_{v,1} = \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{s,u} \vee \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{v,1} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}.$$

To ease the notation, let us set $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{0,u} \vee \mathcal{G}_{v,1}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{s,u} \vee \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{v,1}$. Hence, with this notation we have $\mathcal{G} = \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}$. Moreover, we have that \mathcal{G} is independent of $\mathcal{G}_{0,s}$.

Using the Gaussianity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Var}(\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{s,u} \vee \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{v,1}) &= \mathbf{Var}(\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Next, notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] = \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 - \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] = \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}],$$

where we have used that $\overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}$ is $\mathcal{G}_{0,s}$ -measurable, hence, independent of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and has zero mean. Hence,

$$\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] = B_{u,v} - \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} - \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}]. \quad (3.17)$$

Next, we claim that

$$\overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} + \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] = \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}].$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}] &= \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 - \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}] + \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 - \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] + \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] + \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the second equality we have used that $B_{u,v}^1 - \overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}_{0,s}$, and for the last equality we have used that $\overline{B}_{u,v}^{s,1}$ is independent of $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and has zero mean. By this combined with (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}] &= B_{u,v}^1 - \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}} \vee \mathcal{G}_{0,s}] \\ &= B_{u,v}^1 - \mathbb{E}[B_{u,v}^1 | \mathcal{G}_{0,u} \vee \mathcal{G}_{v,1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this in (3.16), we conclude that

$$\mathbf{Var}(\widetilde{B}_{u,v}^{s,1} | \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{s,u} \vee \widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{v,1}) = \mathbf{Var}(B_{u,v}^1 | \mathcal{G}_{0,u} \vee \mathcal{G}_{v,1}).$$

Finally, it is known that there exists constants $\vartheta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{0 \leq u \leq v \leq 1} \frac{1}{(v-u)^{\vartheta}} \mathbf{Var}(B_{u,v}^1 | \mathcal{G}_{0,u} \vee \mathcal{G}_{v,1}) = c > 0$$

(see [CHLT15, Lemmata 4.1 and 4.2]), from which the conclusion follows. \square

The following is from [Nua06, Proposition 5.2.1, p. 288]. In the statement, D^W denotes the usual Malliavin derivative with respect to the underlying Wiener process W , and $\mathbb{D}_W^{1,2}$ denotes the corresponding Sobolev of all random variables $X \in L_2(\Omega)$ for which $D^W X \in L_2(\Omega; L_2([0, 1]))$.

Proposition 3.14. *It holds that $\mathbb{D}_W^{1,2} = \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and that for any $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ we have*

$$K^*DF = D^WF.$$

Next, we see how the operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ can be characterised by means of K^* .

Lemma 3.15. *For any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ we have*

$$K^*\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}h = \mathbf{1}_{[s,1]}K^*h.$$

Proof. Suppose that $h = \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}$ and notice that $h = DB_t$. Recall that we have the decomposition $B_t = \widetilde{B}_t^s + \overline{B}_t^s$ (see (3.9)). By Proposition 3.14, it follows that both \widetilde{B}_t^s and \overline{B}_t^s belong to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and their Malliavin derivatives are deterministic elements of \mathcal{H} . Moreover, we have that $D\overline{B}_t^s \in \mathcal{H}_s$, while $D\widetilde{B}_t^s \in \mathcal{H}_s^\perp$. Indeed, the first claim follows from the fact that \overline{B}_t^s is \mathcal{F}_s^B -measurable, while the second follows from the fact that for any $g = \mathbf{1}_{[0,q]}$, with $q \leq s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D\widetilde{B}_t^s, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \mathbb{E}\langle D\widetilde{B}_t^s, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\widetilde{B}_t^s B_q) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.3) and the fact that \widetilde{B}_t^s is independent of \mathcal{F}_s^B . Consequently, we have

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}h = \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}DB_t = D\widetilde{B}_t^s.$$

By Proposition 3.14 again, we have

$$K^*\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}h = K^*D\widetilde{B}_t^s = D^W\widetilde{B}_t^s = K(t, \cdot)\mathbf{1}_{[s,t]}(\cdot) = \mathbf{1}_{[s,1]}K^*h,$$

where for the last equality we have used 3.12. By linearity the claim is true for all $h \in \mathcal{E}$ and by a standard density and continuity argument it also holds for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$. \square

Lemma 3.16. *Let $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and let $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$ such that they both have support in $[s, t]$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma([s, t])$ for some $\gamma > 1 - 2H$. Then we have*

$$\langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}f, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_s^t \int_s^t f(u)g(r)Q_s(du, dr).$$

Proof. For $u, v \in [s, t]$ and $f = \mathbf{1}_{[s,u]}$, $g = \mathbf{1}_{[s,v]}$, by using the fact that K^* is a linear isometry and Lemma 3.15, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}f, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}\mathbf{1}_{[s,u]}, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}\mathbf{1}_{[s,v]} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \langle K^*(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}\mathbf{1}_{[s,u]}), K^*(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}\mathbf{1}_{[s,v]}) \rangle_{L_2([0,1])} \\ &= \int_s^{u \wedge v} K(u, r)K(v, r) dr \\ &= Q_s(u, v) \\ &= \int_s^t \int_s^t f(r)g(r')Q_s(dr, dr'). \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

By linearity, the above relation holds for all $f, g \in \mathcal{C}$ which are supported in $[s, t]$. For a general f as in the statement one can argue as in [GOT20, Remark 2.16], let f^n be given by $f^n(x) = f(s + i(t - s)/n)$ for $x \in (s + i(t - s)/n, s + (i + 1)(t - s)/n]$, $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$. and let $f^n(x) = 0$ for $x \notin [s, t]$, and define g^n similarly. Obviously, we have

$$\langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} f^n, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} g^n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_s^t \int_s^t f^n(r) g^n(r') Q_s(dr, dr'). \quad (3.19)$$

Moreover, it follows (see, [Tow02]) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^t \int_s^t f^n(r) g^m(r') Q_s(dr, dr') &= \int_s^t \int_s^t f(r) g(r') Q_s(dr, dr') \\ \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_0^t f^n(r) g^m(r') Q(dr, dr') &= \int_0^t \int_0^t f(r) g(r') Q(dr, dr') \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

By the second equality above (with f^m in place of g^m) and (3.18) with $s = 0$ (in which case $\mathcal{H}_s^\perp = \mathcal{H}$), it follows that f^n is Cauchy in \mathcal{H} . Similarly for g^n . On the other hand $f^n \rightarrow f$ and $g^n \rightarrow g$ pointwise and by virtue of the embedding $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L_1([0, 1])$ (see, [CHLT15, Lemma 4.2]), it follows that $f^n \rightarrow f, g^n \rightarrow g$ in \mathcal{H} . Consequently, the left hand side of (3.19) converges to $\langle \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} f, \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$, which combined with (3.20) finishes the proof. \square

By Lemma 3.13 and Corollary 3.12, the conditions of [CHLT15, Corollary 6.10] are satisfied by the covariance function Q_s . That and Lemma 3.16 give the following (recall that ϑ is introduced in Lemma 3.13).

Corollary 3.17. *Let $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$. Let $\gamma > 1 - 2H$. Let $f \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\text{supp } f \subset [s, t]$ and the restriction of f to $[s, t]$ belongs to \mathcal{C}^γ . Then there exists a constant $c = c(H, \gamma) > 0$ such that the following bound holds:*

$$\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} f\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq c(t - s)^H \|f\|_{L^\infty([s, t])} \min\left(1, \frac{\|f\|_{L^\infty([s, t])}}{\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([s, t])}}\right)^{\vartheta/2\gamma}.$$

4 Properties of the flow of the driftless equation

In this section we derive properties of the flow of a driftless analogue to (1.1), that is, we consider

$$\phi_t^{s, x} = x + \int_s^t \sigma(\phi_r^{s, x}) dB_r, \quad t \in [s, 1]. \quad (4.1)$$

Recall that the flow $\phi_t^{s, x}$ exists and it is smooth and invertible in x (see [FH20, Theorem 8.15]). We will be denoting its inverse by $\overleftarrow{\phi}_t^{s, x}$. More precisely, building upon ideas introduced in [CLL13] and [Ina14], we obtain estimates for $\phi^{s, x}$, its Jacobian, the inverse of the Jacobian, and their Malliavin derivatives (see, Lemma 4.12, Lemma 4.13, and Lemma 4.14). One important feature is that these are almost sure estimates which hold uniformly in (s, x) .

Lemma 4.1. *There exist constants $C = C(H_-, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2})$ and $q = q(H_-)$ such that for all $s \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$[\phi^{s, x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])} \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^q. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Let $s \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $(u, v) \in [s, 1]_{\leq}^2$, we have

$$\phi_{u,v}^{s,x} = \int_u^v \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) dB_r,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{u,v}^{s,x} - \sigma(\phi_u^{s,x})B_{u,v}| &= \left| \int_u^v \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) dB_r - \sigma(\phi_u^{s,x})B_{u,v} \right| \\ &\lesssim [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}}([\sigma(\phi^{s,x})]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{3H_-} + |\nabla\sigma\sigma(\phi_u^{s,x})||u-v|^{2H_-}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.18). This now implies that

$$[R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{E}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} \lesssim [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}}([\sigma(\phi^{s,x})]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{H_-} + 1, \quad (4.3)$$

where we have used the fact that $\nabla\sigma\sigma(\phi_u^{s,x})$ is bounded by $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^1}^2$. Next by using (1.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma(\phi^{s,x})]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} &\lesssim (1 + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])}^2 + [B]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}}^2)([\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])}) \\ &\lesssim (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}}^2)([\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the boundedness of σ . By replacing this in (4.3), we get

$$[R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{E}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} \lesssim (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}}^3)([\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{H_-} + 1. \quad (4.4)$$

Next, by using the regularity of σ and (1.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma(\phi^{s,x})]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}([u,v])} &\lesssim [\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}([s,t])} \\ &\lesssim ([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{E}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{H_-} + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])}[B]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}} \\ &\lesssim ([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{E}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{H_-} + [B]_{\mathcal{E}^{H_-}}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding the above inequality to (4.4), gives

$$[\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}}^3)([\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])})|u-v|^{H_-} + 1,$$

where C depends only on H_- and $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$. The result now follows from Lemma A.1. \square

The next result follows immediately from Lemma 4.1 and (1.9).

Corollary 4.2. *There exist constants $C = C(H_-, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2})$ and $q = q(H_-)$ such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$|\phi_t^{s,x} - x| \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^q |t - s|^{H_-}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(\phi_t^{s,x})_{t \in [s,1]}$ be given by (4.1), let X be a solution to the SDE (1.1). Then, for any $p \geq 1$ there exists a constant $C = C(H_-, p, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2})$, such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ we have*

$$\|X_t - \phi_t^{s,X_s}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C|t - s|^{1+\alpha H_-}.$$

Proof. Let us fix $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and for $v \in [s, t]$ let us introduce the notation

$$Y_v := X_v - \phi_v^{s, X_s}, \quad Y'_v := \sigma(X_v) - \sigma(\phi_v^{s, X_s}), \quad Y''_v := \nabla \sigma \sigma(X_v) - \nabla \sigma \sigma(\phi_v^{s, X_s}),$$

and

$$Y = (Y, Y'), \quad Y' = (Y', Y'').$$

Notice that

$$Y_{s,t} = D_{s,t}^X - \int_s^t Y'_r dB_r,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_{s,t} - Y'_s B_{s,t}| &= |D_{s,t}^X| + \left| \int_s^t Y'_r dB_r - Y'_s B_{s,t} \right| \\ &\lesssim |D_{s,t}^X| + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}} ([Y']_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])}) |t-s|^{3H-} + |Y''_s| |t-s|^{2H-}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.18). Next, notice that $Y'_s = Y''_s = 0$, which combined with the inequality above gives

$$|Y_{s,t}| \lesssim |D_{s,t}^X| + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}} [Y']_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([u,v])} |t-s|^{3H-}. \quad (4.6)$$

By (1.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} [Y']_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])} &\leq [\sigma(X)]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])} + [\sigma(\phi^{s, X_s})]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])} \\ &+ \lesssim (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{Q}^{H-}}^2) (1 + [X]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])} + [\phi^{s, X_s}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that the Gubinelli derivatives of X and $\phi^{s,x}$ are bounded by $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{Q}^0}$. Replacing the above in (4.6), gives

$$|Y_{s,t}| \lesssim |D_{s,t}^X| + (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{Q}^{H-}}^3) (1 + [X]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])} + [\phi^{s, X_s}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])}) |t-s|^{3H-}.$$

By Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\|Y_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|D_{s,t}^X\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + (\|[X]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])}\|_{L_{2p}(\Omega)} + \|[\phi^{s, X_s}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s,t])}\|_{L_{2p}(\Omega)} + 1) |t-s|^{3H-}.$$

By (1.25), (1.24), and Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\|Y_{s,t}\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \lesssim |t-s|^{1+\alpha H} + |t-s|^{3H-}.$$

The claim now follows by the observations that $Y_{s,t} = X_t - \phi_t^{s, X_s}$ and $3H- > 1 > 1 + \alpha H$. \square

Next, we want to derive estimates for the jacobian matrix of the flow, that is, for $J_t^{s,x} := \nabla_x \phi_t^{s,x}$. It is known that with probability one, for all $s \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $J^{s,x} := (J^{s,x}, \nabla \sigma(\phi^{s,x}) J^{s,x}), (J^{s,x})^{-1} := ((J^{s,x})^{-1}, -\nabla \sigma(\phi^{s,x}) (J^{s,x})^{-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H-}([s, 1])$, and satisfy the following equations (see, e.g., [FH20, Theorem 8.15, p. 148])

$$J_t^{s,x} = \mathbb{1}_d + \int_s^t \nabla \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) J_r^{s,x} dB_r, \quad t \in [s, 1],$$

$$(J_t^{s,x})^{-1} = \mathbb{1}_d - \int_s^t \nabla \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) (J_r^{s,x})^{-1} dB_r, \quad t \in [s, 1],$$

where $\mathbb{1}_d$ is the identity matrix. It follows from the above (or simply by using the chain rule and the flow property $\phi_t^{s,x} = \phi_t^0, \overleftarrow{\phi_s^{0,x}}$) that

$$J_t^{s,x} = J_t^{0,y} (J_s^{0,y})^{-1} \Big|_{y=\overleftarrow{\phi_s^{0,x}}}. \quad (4.7)$$

To obtain estimates simultaneously for both $J^{s,x}$ and $(J^{s,x})^{-1}$, let E be a finite dimensional normed linear space, $F \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(E; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; E)))$ and $s \in [0, t]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; E))$ and consider the equation

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_s^t (F(\phi_r^{s,x})V_r + M_r) dB_r, \quad t \in [s, 1]. \quad (4.8)$$

Let us set $1/\rho = H_-$. We will first obtain estimates in ρ -variation norms by using some results by [CLL13] and those estimates will be upgraded to Hölder estimates at a second step. For this, let us recall some facts and some let us introduce some notation related to ρ -variation norms. For $X = (X, X') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}$, recall that one has the estimate

$$\left| \int_s^t X_r dB_r - X_s B_{s,t} - X'_s \mathbb{B}_{s,t} \right| \leq C([R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} + [X']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])}).$$

which implies

$$\left| \int_s^t X_r dB_r - X_s B_{s,t} \right| \leq C([R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} + ([X']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} + |X'_s|) [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])}), \quad (4.9)$$

for a constant $C = C(H_-)$. Further, let us set

$$[B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} := ([B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])}^\rho + [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])}^{\rho/2})^{1/\rho}, \quad (4.10)$$

and for $X = (X, X') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}$, let us set

$$\begin{aligned} [X]_{\mathcal{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,t])} &:= [R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} + [X']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} \\ \|X\|_{\mathcal{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,t])} &:= [X]_{\mathcal{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,t])} + \|X\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,t])} + \|X'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,t])} \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is quite standard and its proof is straightforward.

Lemma 4.4. *Set $\rho = 1/H_-$. There exists a constant $C = C(H_-)$ such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_\leq^2$, $X = (X, X') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, t])$, and $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$, we have*

$$[X]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} \leq C([R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} + \|X'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,t])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])}), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [R^{F(X)}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} &\leq C\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}([R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} + \|X'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,t])} [R^X]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([s,t])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])} \\ &\quad + \|X'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,t])}^2 [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([s,t])}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Next, we prove a variant of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.5. *Set $\rho = 1/H_-$. There exists a constant $\delta = \delta(H_-, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following holds: for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $(s, u, v) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^3$, if $[B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \leq \delta$, then $[R^{\phi^{s, x}}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} \leq 1$.*

Proof. To ease the notation, let set

$$Y_r := \phi_r^{s, X_s}, \quad Y'_r := \sigma(\phi_r^{s, X_s}), \quad Y''_r := \nabla \sigma \sigma(\phi_r^{s, X_s}), \quad Y = (Y, Y'), \quad Y' = (Y', Y'').$$

With the same arguments as in Lemma 4.1, this time using (4.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & [R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} \\ & \lesssim [R^{Y'}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} + ([Y']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} + \|Y'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u, v])}) [B]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Moreover, by (4.12) we have

$$[R^{Y'}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} \lesssim [R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + [R^{Y'}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])}^2. \quad (4.14)$$

Using the regularity and the boundedness of σ and its derivatives, we see that

$$[Y']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \lesssim [Y]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \lesssim [R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])}.$$

Plugging the above and (4.14) in (4.13), and keeping in mind that $\|Y'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u, v])} \leq \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^0}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & [R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} \\ & \leq C([R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + [R^{Y'}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])}^2) [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \\ & \quad + C(1 + [R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])}) [B]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant depending only on H_- and $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$ and can be assumed to be greater than 1. If $[B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \leq \delta := (10C)^{-1}$, then we can rearrange the above to get that $[R^Y]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} \leq 1$. This finishes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.6. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and set $\rho = 1/H_-$. There exists a random variable Θ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])$, if V is a solution of (4.8), then*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s, 1])} \leq \Theta(|V_s| + \|M\|_{\mathbf{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s, 1])}). \quad (4.15)$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(p, \|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, H_-)$, such that $\|\Theta\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C$.

To prove the proposition above we will need a collection of estimates.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and set $\rho = 1/H_-$. There exists a constant $C = C(\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, H_-)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])$, if V is a solution of (4.8), then for all $(u, v) \in [s, 1]_{\leq}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} [R^{F(\phi^{s, x})V}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} & \leq C([R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u, v])} [R^{F(\phi^{s, x})}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])}) \\ & \quad + C[B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u, v])} \left([R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u, v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u, v])}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \Big), \\
[(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} & \leq C \left([R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times ([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])}) \right), \\
\|(F(\phi^{s,x})V)'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} & \leq C(\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start with the first inequality. Similarly to (1.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[R^{F(\phi^{s,x})V}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} & \lesssim \|F(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \\
& \quad + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [R^{F(\phi^{s,x})}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \\
& \quad + \|\nabla F(\phi^{s,x})\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}_{u,v}^\rho} [V]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \\
& \lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [R^{F(\phi^{s,x})}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \\
& \quad + [B]_{\mathcal{V}_{u,v}^\rho} [V]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \tag{4.16}
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[V]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} & \lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + \|F(\phi^{s,x})V + M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \\
& \lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}) [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining this with (4.16) gives the first desired inequality. For the second inequality, we have that

$$(F(\phi^{s,x})V)'_u z = (\nabla F(\phi_u^{s,x})\sigma(\phi_u^{s,x})z)V_u + F(\phi_u^{s,x})(F(\phi_u^{s,x})V_u + M_u)z, \tag{4.17}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$, from which, by using the boundedness of F and σ and their derivatives, we get

$$[(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \lesssim [V]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])})[\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])}.$$

The above inequality, combined with (4.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& [(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])} \\
& \lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])})([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{V}^\rho([u,v])}).
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, the third inequality follows trivially from (4.17). \square

Similarly, one can get the corresponding estimates in the Hölder scale.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$. There exists a constant $C = C(\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, H_-)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])$, if V is a solution of (4.8), then for all $(u, v) \in [s, 1]_{\leq}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
[R^{F(\phi^{s,x})V}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} & \leq C([R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [R^{F(\phi^{s,x})}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])}) \\
& \quad + C[B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} \left([R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}) [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} \right), \\
[(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} & \leq C([R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}) \\
& \quad \quad \quad ([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])})), \\
\|(F(\phi^{s,x})V)'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} & \leq C(\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])}).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.9. From the above lemma, (1.13), and the fact that the Gubinelli derivative of $\phi^{s,x}$ is bounded by $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{G}^0}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & [F(\phi^{s,x})V]_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H^-}([u,v])} \\ & \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{G}^{H^-}([u,v])})[R^V]_{\mathfrak{G}_2^{2H^-}([u,v])} \\ & \quad + C(\|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])})(1 + [R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathfrak{G}_2^{2H^-}([u,v])} + [B]_{\mathcal{G}^{H^-}([u,v])})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

where C is as in Lemma 4.8.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. By using the equation and (4.9) we have that any $(u, v) \in [s, 1]_{\leq}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} [R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} & \leq C([R^{F(\phi^{s,x})V+M}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} [B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])}) \\ & \quad + C([(F(\phi^{s,x})V + M)']_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} + |(F(\phi^{s,x})V + M)'_{ul}|]) [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \\ & \leq C([R^{F(\phi^{s,x})V}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} [B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])}) \\ & \quad + C([(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} + \|(F(\phi^{s,x})V)'\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])}]) [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \\ & \quad + C[R^M]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\frac{\rho}{2}}([u,v])} [B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathfrak{V}_B^{\rho/2}([u,v])} [\mathbb{B}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us assume that u, v are close enough so that $[B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} \leq \delta \wedge \tilde{\delta} =: \xi \in (0, 1)$, where $\tilde{\delta} \in (0, 1)$ will be determined later and δ is provided by Lemma 4.5. Then, the above simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} [R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} & \leq \tilde{\delta} C([R^{F(\phi^{s,x})V}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + [(F(\phi^{s,x})V)']_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} + \|(F(\phi^{s,x})V)'\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])}) \\ & \quad + C\|M\|_{\mathfrak{V}_B^{\rho/2}([u,v])}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by Lemma 4.7 combined with the fact that $[B]_{\mathfrak{V}_{s,t}^{\rho}} \leq \delta \wedge \tilde{\delta}$ and Lemma 4.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} [R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} & \leq \tilde{\delta} C([R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])} (1 + [R^{F(\phi^{s,x})}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])}) \\ & \quad + C\|M\|_{\mathfrak{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Moreover, again the fact that $[B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([s,t])} \leq \delta \wedge \tilde{\delta}$ combined with (4.12) and Lemma 4.5 implies that we can drop the term $[R^{F(\phi^{s,x})}]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])}$ in (4.19), to arrive at

$$[R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \leq \tilde{\delta} C([R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])}) + C\|M\|_{\mathfrak{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])}.$$

Provided that $\tilde{\delta}$ is sufficiently small, this gives

$$[R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} \leq \tilde{\delta} C\|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])} + C\|M\|_{\mathfrak{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])}.$$

In addition, by using (4.11) and the above inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])} & \leq |V_u| + [V]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])} \\ & \leq |V_u| + C([R^V]_{\mathfrak{V}_2^{\rho/2}([u,v])} + (\|V\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{G}^0([u,v])}) [B]_{\mathfrak{V}^{\rho}([u,v])}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq |V_u| + C(\tilde{\delta}C\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + C\|M\|_{\mathbf{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])} + \tilde{\delta}(\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])})),$$

which, provided again that $\tilde{\delta}$ is sufficiently small, gives

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \leq 2|V_u| + C\|M\|_{\mathbf{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])}. \quad (4.20)$$

We can now define inductively $\tau_0 = 0$, $\tau_{i+1} := \inf\{t \geq \tau_i : [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{\rho/2}([\tau_i, t])} \geq \delta \wedge \tilde{\delta}\}$ and set $N = \sup\{i : \tau_i \geq 1\}$ ($N = N(\omega)$ is an almost surely finite random variable, see, [CLL13, Lemma 4.9]). Further, let us set $u_0 = s$ and $u_i = \tau_{k+i}$, for $i \geq 1$, where $k = \inf\{i : \tau_i > s\}$. Then, by applying (4.20) with $u = u_i$ and $v = u_{i+1}$ and iterating, it follows that

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])} \leq C2^N(|V_s| + \|M\|_{\mathbf{V}_B^{\rho/2}([s,1])}).$$

This shows (4.15) with $\Theta = C2^N$. Finally, from [CLL13, Theorem 6.3] (by choosing $q = (1/p + 1/2)^{-1}$ in that theorem, see also Corollary 5.5 therein), it follows that there exist positive constants C_1, c_2 such that $\mathbb{P}(N > n) \leq C_1 \exp(-c_2 n^{1+2/p})$, which in particular implies that Θ has finite moments of any order. This finishes the proof. \square

Next, we show that the supremum estimates for V can be upgraded to estimates in the Hölder scale.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$. There exists a constants $C = C(\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, H_-)$ and $q = q(H_-)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])$, if V is a solution of (4.8), then*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^q (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])}).$$

Proof. As usual, by using (1.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & [R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} \\ & \lesssim [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}} \left([F(\phi_r^{s,x})V + M]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \right) \\ & \lesssim [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}} \left([F(\phi_r^{s,x})V]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Further, by using (4.18) we have

$$[R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} \lesssim (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^2 [R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + K_0,$$

where

$$K_0 = (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])}) (1 + [R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([s,1])} + [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([s,1])})^3.$$

Further, by Lemma 4.1 we see that

$$K_0 \lesssim K := (\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])} + \|M\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])}) (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^{(12+9/H_-)},$$

hence we conclude that

$$[R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} \lesssim (1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^2 [R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + K. \quad (4.21)$$

In addition, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [V']_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} &= [F(\phi^{s,x})V + M]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} \\
 &\leq \|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [V]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^1} [\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} + [M]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} \\
 &\lesssim [V]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} [\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} + [M]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}([u,v])} \\
 &\lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + \|F(\phi^{s,x})V + M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} \\
 &\quad + \|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([u,v])} ([R^{\phi^{s,x}}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([s,1])} + [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}}) \\
 &\quad + [R^M]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([s,1])} + \|M'\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])} [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}} \\
 &\lesssim [R^V]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + K,
 \end{aligned}$$

where for the third inequality we have used (1.9). From this and (4.21), we get that

$$[V]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^2 [V]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([u,v])} |u-v|^{H_-} + CK,$$

for some constant depending only on $\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$, $\|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$, and H_- . By A.1 we get some other constant C (with the same dependence) that

$$[V]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq C(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})^{1+(2/H_-)} K. \quad (4.22)$$

In addition, we clearly have that $\|V\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])}$ and $\|F(\phi^{s,x})V + M\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([s,1])}$ can be bounded by the right hand side of (4.22). Consequently, the claim follows. \square

The following is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.6, Proposition 4.10, and the fact that $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{V}^p} \leq [\cdot]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}}$ and $[\cdot]_{\mathcal{V}^{p/2}} \leq [\cdot]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}}$.

Corollary 4.11. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$. There exists a random variable Θ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $M = (M, M') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s, 1])$, if V is a solution of (4.8), then*

$$\|V\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \Theta(|V_s| + \|M\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])}).$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(p, \|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, H_-)$, such that $\|\Theta\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C$.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$. There exists a random variable Ψ such that for all $s \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|F(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} &+ \|J^{s,x}\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} + \|(J^{s,x})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \\
 &+ \|\nabla J^{s,x}\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} + \|\nabla (J^{s,x})^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \Psi.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(H_-, p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^4}, \|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2})$ such that $\|\Psi\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C$.

Proof. By (1.12) and by the boundedness of σ , there exists $N = N(\|F\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^0})$ such that for all $s \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$[F(\phi^{s,x})]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq N(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}}^2) ([\phi^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} + 1).$$

Moreover, it is straight forward that $\|F(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathbb{G}^0} \leq \|F\|_{\mathbb{G}^0}$ and $\|\nabla F(\phi^{s,x})\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathbb{G}^0} \leq \|F\|_{\mathbb{G}^1}\|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^0}$, which combined with the above and Lemma 4.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} &\leq N(1 + [B]_{\mathbb{G}^{H_-}}^2)(\|\phi^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} + 1) \\ &\leq N(1 + [B]_{\mathfrak{R}^{H_-}})^{6+(3/H_-)} =: \Psi_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

for some $N = N(H_-, \|F\|_{\mathbb{G}^2}, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^2})$. Next, notice that $J^{s,x}$ satisfies (4.8) with $F = \nabla\sigma$ and $M = 0$ and recall that $J_s^{s,x} = \mathbb{I}_d$. By Corollary 4.11, there exists a random variable Ψ_1 whose L_p -norm depends only on $p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^3}$, and H_- , such that for all $s \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\|J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \Psi_1. \quad (4.24)$$

Next, recall that $\nabla J^{s,x}$ satisfies (4.8) with $F = \nabla\sigma$ and $M = \nabla^2\sigma(\phi^{s,x})J^{s,x}$ ([FH20, Theorem 8.15, p. 148]) and notice that $\nabla J_s^{s,x} = 0$. Hence, by Corollary 4.11 again, there exists a random variable $\tilde{\Psi}_2$ whose L_p -norm depends only on $p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^3}$, and H_- , such that for all $s \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\|\nabla J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \tilde{\Psi}_2 \|\nabla^2\sigma(\phi^{s,x})J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])}.$$

Further, by using (1.16), the result obtained in (4.23) with $F = \nabla^2\sigma$, and (4.24), for some random variable $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ whose L_p -norm depends only on $p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^4}$, and H_- , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} &\leq \tilde{\Psi}_2 \|\nabla^2\sigma(\phi^{s,x})J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \\ &\leq \tilde{\Psi}_2 (1 + [B]_{\mathfrak{R}^{H_-}})^2 \|\nabla^2\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \|J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \\ &\leq \tilde{\Psi}_2 (1 + [B]_{\mathfrak{R}^{H_-}})^2 \|\nabla^2\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \|J^{s,x}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \\ &\leq \tilde{\Psi}_2 (1 + [B]_{\mathfrak{R}^{H_-}})^2 \tilde{\Psi}_0 \Psi_1 =: \Psi_2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, in exactly the same manner one shows the existence of random variables Ψ_3, Ψ_4 whose L_p -norm depends only on $p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^4}$, and H_- , and for all $s \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $\|(J^{s,x})^{-1}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \Psi_3$ and $\|\nabla(J^{s,x})^{-1}\|_{\mathfrak{D}_B^{2H_-}([s,1])} \leq \Psi_4$. Consequently, setting $\Psi = \sum_{i=0}^4 \Psi_i$ finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.13. *For all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $\phi_t^{s,x} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$. In addition, for any $n \geq 1$, there exists a random variable Λ_n such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability one, we have*

$$\|D^n \phi_t^{s,x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq \Lambda_n |t - s|^{H_-},$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(n, p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathbb{G}^{n+4}}, H_-)$, such that $\|\Lambda_n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C$. Finally, one has the identity

$$D_r \phi_t^{s,x} = J_t^{r,x} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) \mathbf{1}_{r \in [s,t]}. \quad (4.25)$$

Proof. The fact that $\phi_t^{s,x} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ would follow from [Ina14, Theorem 1.2] and (4.25) would follow from [GOT20, Proposition 2.26] if s would be zero. To see the general case, one can shift the whole problem as follows. One can easily see that the process $\tilde{\phi}_t^{u,x} = \phi_{s+t}^{s+u,x}, t \geq u \geq 0$, is the flow of the rough equation with coefficient σ starting at time zero, driven by the geometric rough path

\tilde{B} , given by the natural lift of the process $\tilde{B}_t := B_{s+t} - B_s, t \geq 0$. For brevity we denote $\tilde{\phi}_t = \tilde{\phi}_t^{0,x}$. Then, by [Ina14, Theorem 1.2] one has that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$, $\|\tilde{D}^l \tilde{\phi}_t\|_{L^p(\Omega; \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes l})} < \infty$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is the analogue of the space \mathcal{H} for the process \tilde{B} . It is not hard to see that the map $\Theta_s : \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by

$$(\Theta_s \tilde{h})(r) = \begin{cases} \tilde{h}(r-s) & \text{if } r \geq s \\ 0 & \text{if } r < s \end{cases}$$

is an isometry. Indeed, denote by $\hat{Q}(u, v) = \mathbb{E}(B_{u+s} B_{v+s})$ and note that $\hat{Q}(du, dv) = \tilde{Q}(du, dv)$. Therefore if \tilde{h} is a step function with support in $[0, T]$ for some $T > 0$ then by a simple change of variables we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta_s \tilde{h}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}^2 &= \int_s^{s+T} \int_s^{s+T} \tilde{h}(u-s) \tilde{h}(v-s) Q(du, dv) \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^T \tilde{h}(u) \tilde{h}(v) \hat{Q}(du, dv) = \int_0^T \int_0^T \tilde{h}(u) \tilde{h}(v) \tilde{Q}(du, dv) = \|\tilde{h}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is then clear that if a random variable X is measurable with respect to the σ -algebra generated by the increments of \tilde{B} it is also measurable with respect to the σ -algebra generated by the increments of B and for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $D^l X = \Theta_s^{\otimes l} \tilde{D}^l X$, whenever the right hand side is meaningful. Hence, indeed we have $\phi_t^{s,x} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$. Similarly, from $D\phi_t^{s,x} = \Theta_s \tilde{D}\phi_t^{s,x}$ we immediately get the $r < s$ case of (4.25), the $r > t$ case is trivial, while for $r \in [t, s]$ we invoke [GOT20, Proposition 2.26] for the process \tilde{B} to get

$$D_r \phi_t^{s,x} = \tilde{D}_{r-s} \tilde{\phi}_{t-s}^{0,x} = \tilde{J}_{t-s}^{r-s,x} \sigma(\tilde{\phi}_{r-s}^{0,x}) \mathbf{1}_{r-s \leq t-s} = J_t^{r,x} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) \mathbf{1}_{r \in [s,t]},$$

where \tilde{J} is the Jacobian of the flow $\tilde{\phi}$.

Next, the desired estimate can be shown again by following the arguments of [Ina14]: Let us consider an independent copy of B , denoted by \hat{B} , and (with a slight abuse of notation) consider $W = (W, \mathbb{W})$, the natural lift of $W = (B, \hat{B})$ to a geometric rough path (here W should not be confused with the underlying Wiener process). Then, if $X = (X, X') \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H^-}([0, 1])$ is controlled by B , it can also be seen as a path controlled by W , namely, with a slight abuse of notation, $X = (X, (X', 0)) \in \mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([0, 1])$, and similarly for $Y = (Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_{\hat{B}}^{2H^-}([0, 1])$. By this consideration, if $Z \in \mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([0, 1])$, $X \in \mathcal{D}_B^{2H^-}([0, 1])$, $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\hat{B}}^{2H^-}([0, 1])$, then integrals of the form $\int f(X, Y, Z) dB$ or $\int f(X, Y, Z) d\hat{B}$ can be defined as rough integrals against W . We then set

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_t^{(1),s,x} &= J_t^{0,x} \int_s^t (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) d\hat{B}_r, \\ \Xi_t^{(2),s,x} &= J_t^{0,x} \int_s^t (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \nabla^2 \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) (\Xi_r^{(1),s,x}, \Xi_r^{(1),s,x}, \cdot) d\hat{B}_r \\ &\quad + 2J_t^{0,x} \int_s^t (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \nabla \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) (\Xi_r^{(1),s,x}, \cdot) d\hat{B}_r \end{aligned}$$

and inductively, for $n \geq 3$

$$\Xi_t^{(n),s,x} = J_t^{0,x} \int_s^t (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sum_{l=2}^n \sum_{i_1+\dots+i_l=n} C_{i_1,\dots,i_l} \nabla^l \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) (\Xi_r^{(i_1),s,x}, \dots, \Xi_r^{(i_l),s,x}, \cdot) dB_r$$

$$+ J_t^{0,x} \int_s^t (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \sum_{i_1+\dots+i_l=n-1} \nabla^l \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x})(\Xi_r^{(i_1),s,x}, \dots, \Xi_r^{(i_l),s,x}, \cdot) d\hat{B}_r.$$

Then, it is shown in [Ina14] (Proposition 3.3, Lemma 4.8, and Section 4.3) that for any $n \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(n)$, such that almost surely, we have

$$\|D^n \phi_t^{s,x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq C_0 (\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\Xi_t^{(n),s,x}|^2)^{1/2}, \quad (4.26)$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ denotes the expectation with respect to \hat{B} . We derive estimates for the right hand side. We start for $n = 1$. By (1.16) and (1.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Xi^{(1),s,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} &\lesssim \|J^{0,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} \left\| \int_s^\cdot (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} (1 + [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}})^2 \\ &\lesssim \|J^{0,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} (\|(J^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{Q}_B^{2H-}([s,1])} + 1) (1 + [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}})^3. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (1.16) and Lemma 4.12 we get

$$\|\Xi^{(1),s,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} \leq P_1(\Psi_0, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}), \quad (4.27)$$

for some polynomial P_1 , where Ψ_0 is the random variable from the conclusion of Lemma 4.12 corresponding to the choice $F = \sigma$. By this bound, a repetition of the above argument gives

$$\|\Xi^{(2),s,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} \leq P_2(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}),$$

for some polynomial P_2 , where Ψ_1, Ψ_2 are the random variable from the conclusion of Lemma 4.12 corresponding to the choices $F = \nabla \sigma$ and $F = \nabla^2 \sigma$, respectively. By induction, one gets

$$\|\Xi^{(n),s,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} \leq P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_n, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}), \quad (4.28)$$

for some polynomial P_n , where Ψ_l is the random variable from the conclusion of Lemma 4.12 corresponding to the choice $F = \nabla^l \sigma$, $l = 0, \dots, n$. Then, by (1.9) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [\Xi^{(n),s,x}]_{\mathcal{G}^{H-}([s,1])} &\leq \|\Xi^{(n),s,x}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_W^{2H-}([s,1])} (1 + [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}) \\ &\leq P_n(\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_n, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}) (1 + [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}) =: \Lambda_n. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows from the above inequality combined with (4.26) and the fact that $\Xi_s^{(n),s,x} = 0$. \square

Lemma 4.14. *For all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $J_t^{s,x} \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$. In addition, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a random variable Θ_n such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability one, we have*

$$\|D^n J_t^{s,x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq \Theta_n.$$

Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(d, n, p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{G}^{n+s}, H-})$ such that $\|\Theta_n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C$.

Proof. Let us fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$. It follows again by [Ina14] (Proposition 3.3, Lemma 4.8, and Section 4.3) that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_0(n)$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability one, we have

$$\|D^n \phi_t^{s,x} - D^n \phi_t^{s,y}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq C_0 (\hat{\mathbb{E}}|\Xi_t^{(n),s,x} - \Xi_t^{(n),s,y}|^2)^{1/2}, \quad (4.29)$$

where $\Xi^{(n)}$ are as in the proof of Lemma 4.13. Next, we claim that there exists a polynomial P_n such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with probability one, we have

$$|\Xi_t^{(n),s,x} - \Xi_t^{(n),s,y}| \leq |x - y| P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n+1}, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}), \quad (4.30)$$

where Ψ_l , $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, n+1\}$, are the random variables from the conclusion of Lemma 4.12 corresponding to the choice $F = \nabla^l \sigma$. Indeed, for $n = 1$, similarly to the derivation of (4.27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\Xi^{(1),s,x} - \Xi^{(1),s,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \\ &= \left\| J^{0,x} \int_s^\cdot (J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) d\hat{B}_r - J^{0,y} \int_s^\cdot (J_r^{0,y})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \\ &\leq (1 + [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}})^2 \left(\|J^{0,x} - J^{0,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \left\| \int_s^\cdot (J_r^{0,y})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|J^{0,x}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \left\| \int_s^\cdot \left((J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) - (J_r^{0,y})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}) \right) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Then, by the fundamental theorem of calculus, it follows that

$$\|J^{0,x} - J^{0,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq |x - y| \int_0^1 \|\nabla J^{0,\theta x + (1-\theta)y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} d\theta \leq |x - y| \Psi_0,$$

where for the last inequality we have used Lemma 4.12. By (1.19), (1.16), and Lemma 4.12, we get

$$\left\| \int_s^\cdot (J_r^{0,y})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq G_1(\Psi_0, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}),$$

for some polynomial G_1 . Again by (1.19), the fundamental theorem of calculus, (1.16), and Lemma 4.12, one obtains

$$\left\| \int_s^\cdot \left((J_r^{0,x})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) - (J_r^{0,y})^{-1} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}) \right) d\hat{B}_r \right\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq |x - y| G_2(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}),$$

for some polynomial G_2 . Hence, by plugging the three estimates above back into (4.31) and using again Lemma 4.12, we get

$$\|\Xi^{(1),s,x} - \Xi^{(1),s,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq |x - y| P_1(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}),$$

for some polynomial P_1 . We can now go back to the definition of $\Xi^{(2),s,x}$, and by the above bound combined with (4.27), a repetition of the above argument one gets

$$\|\Xi^{(2),s,x} - \Xi^{(2),s,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq |x - y| P_2(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3 [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}).$$

From here, with the help of Lemma 4.12 and estimates (4.28), by using induction one obtains

$$\|\Xi^{(n),s,x} - \Xi^{(n),s,y}\|_{\mathcal{D}_W^{2H^-}([s,1])} \leq |x - y| P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n+1}, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H-}}),$$

which in particular implies (4.30). From this and (4.29), we get that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(m, p, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^{m+1}}, H_-)$ such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\|\phi_t^{s,x} - \phi_t^{s,y}\|_{\mathbb{D}^{m,p}} \leq C|x - y|. \quad (4.32)$$

By choosing $y = x + \ell^{-1}e_i$, with e_i being the standard unit vector in the i th direction in \mathbb{R}^d , we see that the sequence $\psi_\ell := \ell(\phi_t^{s,x} - \phi_t^{s,x+\ell^{-1}e_i})$ is bounded in $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}$ by C . Since $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}$ is reflexive, there is subsequence ψ_{ℓ_k} which converges weakly to some $\psi \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}$. On the other hand, by definition we know that $\psi_{\ell_k} \rightarrow \partial_i \phi_t^{s,x}$ almost surely, and by Lemma 4.12, also in L_p . Hence, we conclude that $\partial_i \phi_t^{s,x} = \psi \in \mathbb{D}^{m,p}$. Moreover, there exists a sequence $\bar{\psi}_k$ consisting of convex combinations of ψ_{n_k} such that $\bar{\psi}_k \rightarrow \partial_i \phi_t^{s,x}$ strongly in $\mathbb{D}^{m,p}$. In particular, for any $n \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we have $D^n \bar{\psi}_k \rightarrow D^n \partial_i \phi_t^{s,x}$ in probability. By (4.29) and (4.30), it follows that with probability one, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\|D^n \bar{\psi}_k\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq C_0 (\hat{\mathbb{E}} |P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n+1}, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})|^2)^{1/2},$$

and upon passing to a further subsequence which converges almost surely and using Fatou's lemma, with probability one, we have

$$\|D^n \partial_i \phi_t^{s,x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}} \leq C_0 (\hat{\mathbb{E}} |P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n+1}, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})|^2)^{1/2}.$$

We can now define $\Theta_n := dC_0 (\hat{\mathbb{E}} |P_n(\Psi_0, \Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n+1}, [W]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-}})|^2)^{1/2}$, and the claim follows. \square

Lemma 4.15. *Let $s \in [0, 1]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^{kd})$. Then, for each $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t_1, \dots, t_k \in [s, 1]$, with probability one, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_s f(\phi_{t_1}^{s,x_1}, \dots, \phi_{t_k}^{s,x_k}) = \mathbb{E}_s^B f(\phi_{t_1}^{s,x_1}, \dots, \phi_{t_k}^{s,x_k}). \quad (4.33)$$

Moreover, the random fields in (4.33) have continuous modifications in the variables x_1, \dots, x_k and t_1, \dots, t_k .

Proof. Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$ be sufficiently close to 1 so that $\beta - 1 + H + H_- > 2H_-$. Let us consider the space $\mathcal{C}_{H_-}^\beta([s, 1])$ of all functions $w : [s, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$ such that

$$\|w\|_{\mathcal{C}_{H_-}^\beta([s, 1])} := |w(s)| + \sup_{(u,t) \in (s, 1]_{\leq}^2} \frac{|w_t - w_u|}{|u - s|^{H_- - 1} |t - u|^\beta} < \infty. \quad (4.34)$$

Also, let $\mathcal{C}_{H_-}^{\beta+}([s, 1])$ be the closure of $\mathcal{C}^1([s, 1])$ in $\mathcal{C}_{H_-}^\beta([s, 1])$. Then, let us consider the map $T : \mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H_-}([s, 1]) \times \mathcal{C}_{H_-}^{\beta+}([s, 1]) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{H_-}([s, 1])$ defined as follows: for $g = (g, \mathfrak{g}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H_-}([s, 1])$ and $w \in \mathcal{C}_{H_-}^{\beta+}([s, 1])$, set

$$T(g, w) = \left(g + w, \mathfrak{g} + \int g \otimes dw + \int w \otimes dg + \int w \otimes dw \right),$$

where in the above, by virtue of Lemma A.3, the integrals $\int_s^t g_{s,r} \otimes dw_r$ and $\int_s^t w_{s,r} \otimes dw_r$ are canonically defined as (singular) Young integrals and as functions of (s, t) belong to $\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}$, while the ‘‘integral’’ $\int w \otimes dg$ is defined as follows

$$\int_s^t w_{s,r} \otimes dg_r := w_{s,t} \otimes g_{s,t} - \left(\int_s^t g_{s,r} \otimes dw_r \right)^*.$$

Moreover, again by Lemma A.3, it is easy to see that T is continuous.

Next, recall that we have the decomposition

$$B_t = \int_0^s K(t, r) dW_r + \int_s^t K(t, r) dW_r =: \bar{B}_t + \tilde{B}_t,$$

where we dropped the s dependence on the right hand side for notational convenience. Then clearly we have that the process \bar{B}_t is \mathcal{F}_s -measurable, while \tilde{B}_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_s . Moreover, the same properties hold for \mathcal{F}_s^B in place of \mathcal{F}_s , since the filtration generated by B coincides with the filtration generated by W .

It is known that $\bar{B} \in \mathcal{C}_{H-1}^{\beta+}([s, 1])$ with probability one (it follows, for example, by [Nua06, (5.46) p. 295] and Kolmogorov's continuity criterion). Moreover, since \bar{B}_t is \mathcal{F}_s -measurable for each $t \in [s, 1]$ and the Borel σ -algebra on $C([s, 1])$ coincides with the cylindrical one, it follows that \bar{B} is an \mathcal{F}_s -measurable $C([s, 1])$ -valued random variable. By the Lusin-Suslin theorem, since the embedding $\mathcal{C}_{H-1}^{\beta+}([s, 1]) \subset C([s, 1])$ is continuous, it follows that \bar{B} is an \mathcal{F}_s -measurable $\mathcal{C}_{H-1}^{\beta+}([s, 1])$ -valued random variable.

Next, we lift \tilde{B} to a rough path $\tilde{B} = (\tilde{B}, \tilde{\mathbb{B}})$ by setting

$$\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{u,t} = \mathbb{B}_{u,t} - \int_u^t \bar{B}_{u,r} \otimes d\bar{B}_r - \int_u^t \bar{B}_{u,r} \otimes d\tilde{B}_r - \int_u^t \tilde{B}_{u,r} \otimes d\bar{B}_r. \quad (4.35)$$

Then, we have that $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H-}([s, 1])$ with probability one (see, e.g., [MM23, Lemma 2.12]). We claim that \tilde{B} is a $\mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H-}([s, 1])$ -valued random variable that is independent of \mathcal{F}_s . To see this, let us consider \tilde{B}^n and \bar{B}^n , given by linear interpolation of values \tilde{B}_t^n and \bar{B}_t^n , respectively, for $t \in \{s+k(1-s)/n : k = 1, \dots, n\}$. Further, let us set $B^n = \bar{B}^n + \tilde{B}^n$. Then, for each $(u, t) \in [s, 1]^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_u^t \tilde{B}_{u,r}^n \otimes d\tilde{B}_r^n \\ &= \int_u^t B_{u,r}^n dB_r^n - \int_u^t \bar{B}_{u,r}^n \otimes d\bar{B}_r^n - \int_u^t \bar{B}_{u,r}^n \otimes d\tilde{B}_r^n - \int_u^t \tilde{B}_{u,r}^n \otimes d\bar{B}_r^n. \end{aligned}$$

The left hand side is clearly independent of \mathcal{F}_s . On the other hand, each term on the right hand side converges in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to the corresponding term at the right hand side of (4.35). This shows that for $(u, t) \in [s, 1]^2$, $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{u,t}$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_s . Moreover, since the map $(u, t) \mapsto \tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{u,t}$ is continuous (can be shown by Chen's relation combined with the fact that $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{C}^{H-}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{B}} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{2H-}$), it follows that the pair $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{\mathbb{B}})$ is a $C([s, 1]) \times C([s, 1]^2)$ valued random variable, independent of \mathcal{F}_s . Moreover, the identity map from $\mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H-}([s, 1])$ to $C([s, 1]) \times C([s, 1]^2)$ is continuous, and since these are Polish spaces, it follows by the Lusin-Suslin theorem that \tilde{B} is a $\mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H-}([s, 1])$ -valued random variable, independent of \mathcal{F}_s .

Next notice that $B = T(\tilde{B}, \bar{B})$. Hence, we have that $(\phi_{t_1}^{s, x_1}, \dots, \phi_{t_k}^{s, x_k}) = \mathcal{J}(T(\tilde{B}, \bar{B}))$ with a map \mathcal{J} , where by the continuity of the Itô-Lyons map \mathcal{J} is also continuous. Consequently, by using [PR07, Proposition 2.2.2] we have

$$\mathbb{E}_s f(\phi_{t_1}^{s, x_1}, \dots, \phi_{t_k}^{s, x_k}) = \mathbb{E}_s f(\mathcal{J}(T(\tilde{B}, \bar{B}))) = \Phi(\bar{B}),$$

where $\Phi(\zeta) := \mathbb{E} f(\mathcal{J}(T(\tilde{B}, \zeta)))$ for $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_{H-1}^{\beta+}([s, 1])$. Notice that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}^B)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ could have been chosen as $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ from the beginning, so that we also get

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B f(\phi_{t_1}^{s, x_1}, \dots, \phi_{t_k}^{s, x_k}) = \Phi(\bar{B}),$$

which shows (4.33). The existence of continuous modifications follows easily by Kolmogorov's continuity criterion. \square

5 Emerging driving signal of the linearised equation

The goal of this section is to construct (a truncated version of) the object L anticipated in the introduction (1.2). Note that in (1.2) the distribution ∇b is integrated along the process $\theta X + (1-\theta)Y$, and a priori we do not know that such a convex combination of the nondegenerate processes (i.e. its Malliavin matrix is invertible) X and Y is also nondegenerate. One can only guarantee this as long as the two solutions do not separate too much. This will be formulated by an appropriate cutoff function.

Given σ satisfying Assumption 1.5, let

$$\rho = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{10^5 \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{G}^1}}. \quad (5.1)$$

One then has the property that if $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are such that $|x_1 - x_2|, |x_1 - x_3|, |x_1 - x_4| \leq 24\rho$, then for any $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_4 \in [0, 1]$ such that $\theta_1 + \dots + \theta_4 = 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 \theta_i \sigma(x_i) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 \theta_i \sigma(x_i) \right)^* \\ &= \left(\sigma(x_1) - \sum_{i=2}^4 \theta_i (\sigma(x_1) - \sigma(x_i)) \right) \left(\sigma(x_1) - \sum_{i=2}^4 \theta_i (\sigma(x_1) - \sigma(x_i)) \right)^* \\ &\geq \sigma(x_1) \sigma(x_1)^* - 2 \sum_{i=2}^4 (\sigma(x_1) - \sigma(x_i)) (\sigma(x_1) - \sigma(x_i))^* \geq \frac{1}{2} \lambda \mathbb{1}_d. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The seemingly arbitrary factor 24 is simply the constant that comes up in the relevant part of the proof. Furthermore, set Cut_d to be the set of smooth functions $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are identically 1 on the ball of radius $1/2$ around the origin and identically 0 on the complement of the ball of radius 2 around the origin. For $\chi \in \text{Cut}_d$ and $a > 0$ we then denote $\chi_a(x) = \chi(a^{-1}x)$. To reduce the many parameters to keep in mind, the reader may take $\alpha - 1$ in place of γ below as the main example.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumption 1.4 and Assumption 1.5 hold. Let $\chi \in \text{Cut}_d$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, and let X and Y be two solutions to (1.1). For $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ define the process*

$$J_t = \int_0^t \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) f(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) dr. \quad (5.3)$$

Then for any $\gamma \in (-1/(2H), 0)$ there exists a constant C such that for all $(s, t) \in [0, 1]^2$ one has

$$\|J_t - J_s\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma} |t - s|^{1+\gamma H} \quad (5.4)$$

and $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, p, d, \chi, \lambda, H, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{G}^5}, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, C_{D,p}^Y, C_{S,2p}^Y)$.

The theorem is proved after a preparatory lemma. The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 5.2. *Let Assumption 1.4 and Assumption 1.5 hold. Let $\chi \in \text{Cut}_d$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, and let X and Y be two solutions to (1.1). Then the map $f \mapsto \mathcal{F}f$ defined for $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ by*

$$(\mathcal{F}f)_t = \int_0^1 \int_0^t \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) \nabla f(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) dr d\theta$$

extends as a continuous linear map from $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H}([0, 1]; L_p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))$, whose norm depends only on $\alpha, p, d, \lambda, H, \chi, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^5}, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, C_{D,p}^Y, C_{S,2p}^Y$.

Proof. Apply (5.4) with ∇f in place of f and then integrate in θ . \square

The most important output of the present section is worth a separate notation: in the setting of Corollary 5.2 we define

$$L := \mathcal{F}b.$$

which is a truncated version of the object anticipated in the introduction (1.2).

To prepare for the proof of Theorem 5.1 we state a version of the integration by parts formula. Although this is a classical and central tool in Malliavin calculus, there are two aspects that complicate matters in the present context. First, for stochastic sewing we shall need *conditional* bounds, therefore the formalism of Section 3 is needed and used. Second, since we do not know if the random variable \mathcal{X} below (roughly corresponding to $\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r$ in (5.3)) is nondegenerate, the possible degeneracy is handled by the cutoff function.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $s \in [0, 1]$, $a > 0$, $d, d_1, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi' \in \text{Cut}_{d_1}$, and $h \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$. There exists $p^* = p^*(k) \in [1, \infty)$ and $k^* = k^*(k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following hold. Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables, \mathcal{Z} be an \mathbb{R}^{d_1} -valued random variable, all three belonging to $\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}$, and Γ, μ be $(0, \infty)$ -valued random variables such that μ is \mathcal{F}_s -measurable and one has $\mathbb{E}_s^B \Gamma^{-p^*} \leq \mu^{p^*}$ almost surely and on the event $\{|\mathcal{Z}| \leq 2^k a\}$ one has*

$$\mathcal{M}_s := (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}^i, D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}^j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp})_{i,j=1,\dots,d} \geq \Gamma \text{id}. \quad (5.5)$$

Then there exists a constant $N = N(k, d, d_1, a, \chi')$ such that for any $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ one has almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_s^B (\mathcal{Y} \chi'_a(\mathcal{Z}) \partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k} h(\mathcal{X})) \right| \\ & \leq N \|h\|_{L^\infty} \mu^{k/2} \|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}} \max(1, \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}})^{k^*} \max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}}^2)^{k^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. Denote, for any $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $\tilde{a} \in [a, 2^{k-1}a]$,

$$\Xi_{i, \tilde{a}} = \chi'_{\tilde{a}}(\mathcal{Z}) \sum_{j=1}^m (\mathcal{M}_s^{-1})_{i,j} D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}^j \in \mathcal{H}_s^\perp.$$

Notice that the presence of the cutoff $\chi'_{\tilde{a}}(\mathcal{Z})$ is essential, since we only assume control (or even, the existence) of \mathcal{M}^{-1} where this cutoff is nonzero. With this notation, we have $\chi'_a(\mathcal{Z}) \partial_i h(\mathcal{X}) = \langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} h(\mathcal{X}), \Xi_{i,a} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ as an immediate consequence of the chain rule. This implies

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B (\mathcal{Y} \chi'_a(\mathcal{Z}) \partial_i h(\mathcal{X})) = \mathbb{E}_s^B (h(\mathcal{X}) \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\Xi_{i,a} \mathcal{Y}))$$

by (3.1). However, in order to iterate this procedure, by the above remark, further cutoffs are needed. We claim that one can smuggle in a larger cutoff for free and one has in fact

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B (\mathcal{Y} \chi'_a(\mathcal{Z}) \partial_i h(\mathcal{X})) = \mathbb{E}_s^B (\chi'_{2a}(\mathcal{Z}) h(\mathcal{X}) \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\Xi_{i,a} \mathcal{Y})). \quad (5.7)$$

To this end, note the identities $(\nabla \chi'_{2a})\chi'_a = 0$ and $\chi'_{2a}\chi'_a = \chi'_a$. Then by the chain rule we have

$$\begin{aligned}\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})Dh(\mathcal{X}) &= \chi'_{2a}(\mathcal{X})\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})Dh(\mathcal{X}) + (\nabla \chi'_{2a})(\mathcal{X})\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})h(\mathcal{X})D\mathcal{X} \\ &= \chi'_a(\mathcal{X})D(\chi'_{2a}(\mathcal{X})h(\mathcal{X})).\end{aligned}$$

After applying $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$, the same holds with $D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ in place of D . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathcal{Y}\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})\partial_i h(\mathcal{X})) = \mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathcal{Y}\langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} h(\mathcal{X}), \Xi_{i,a} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}) = \mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathcal{Y}\langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\chi'_{2a}(\mathcal{X})h(\mathcal{X})), \Xi_{i,a} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}).$$

Integrating by parts by (3.1) again, we get (5.7) as claimed.

To treat $\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ in place of ∂_i , we iterate this procedure: define the random variables W_{i_1, \dots, i_ℓ} , $\ell = 1, \dots, k$, inductively by

$$W_{i_1} = \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\Xi_{i_1, a} \mathcal{Y}), \quad W_{i_1, \dots, i_\ell} = \delta_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}(\Xi_{i_\ell, 2^{\ell-1}a} W_{i_1, \dots, i_{\ell-1}}).$$

Then the above arguments yield

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathcal{Y}\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k} h(\mathcal{X})) = \mathbb{E}_s^B(h(\mathcal{X})W_{i_1, \dots, i_k}). \quad (5.8)$$

From (5.8) it is clear that

$$|\mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathcal{Y}\chi'_a(\mathcal{X})\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k} h(\mathcal{X}))| \leq \|h\|_{L^\infty} \|W_{i_1, \dots, i_k}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,1}}. \quad (5.9)$$

To bound the right-hand side, we apply Lemma 3.7 recursively. Let n_1, \dots, n_k be defined as follows. We set n_1 to be the n of Lemma 3.7 with the choice $m = 0$, $p = 1$. Then for $\ell > 1$ we set n_ℓ to be the n of Lemma 3.7 with the choice $m = n_{\ell-1}$, $p = 4^{\ell-1}$. We then write, by alternately applying Lemma 3.7 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\|W_{i_1, \dots, i_k}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,1}} &\lesssim \|\Xi_{i_k, 2^{k-1}a} W_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_1, 2}} \\ &\leq \|\Xi_{i_k, 2^{k-1}a}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_1, 4}} \|W_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_1, 4}} \\ &\lesssim \|\Xi_{i_k, 2^{k-1}a}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_1, 4}} \|\Xi_{i_{k-1}, 2^{k-2}a} W_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-2}}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_2, 8}} \\ &\vdots \\ &\lesssim \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^k \|\Xi_{i_\ell, 2^{\ell-1}a}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_{k+1-\ell}, 4^{k+1-\ell}}} \right) \|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n_k, 4^k}}.\end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

It remains to bound the terms in the above product. To simplify notation, we fix $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\tilde{a} \in [a, 2^{k-1}a]$, let $n = n_k$ and $p = 4^k$, and aim to bound $\|\Xi_{i, \tilde{a}}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n, p}}$. Starting with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\|\Xi_{i, \tilde{a}}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n, p}} \leq \|\chi'_{\tilde{a}}(\mathcal{X})\mathcal{M}_s^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n, 2p}} \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n, 2p}}. \quad (5.11)$$

So it remains to bound $\|\chi'_{\tilde{a}}(\mathcal{X})\mathcal{M}_s^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n, 2p}}$. As a warm-up, note that for $n = 0$ we have by assumption

$$\|\chi'_{\tilde{a}}(\mathcal{X})\mathcal{M}_s^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0, 2p}} \leq (\mathbb{E}_s \Gamma^{-2p})^{1/2p} \leq \mu,$$

provided p^* is chosen to be bigger than $2 \cdot 4^k$. We now bound the higher order Malliavin derivatives. To avoid the issues of the possible singularity of \mathcal{M}_s^{-1} , we add a small perturbation εid , $\varepsilon > 0$.

Note that from the identity $D((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}) = (\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1} D\mathcal{M}_s (\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}$ and Leibniz's rule we get

$$\begin{aligned} & D^\ell ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\ell-1} \binom{\ell-1}{j_1, j_2, j_3} D^{j_1} ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}) \otimes D^{j_2+1} (\mathcal{M}_s) \otimes D^{j_3} ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

One can iterate this formula for $D^{j_1} ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1})$ and $D^{j_3} ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1})$, and notice that at each step the number of Malliavin derivatives on $(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}$ strictly decreases. Therefore after at most ℓ steps one expresses $D^\ell ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1})$ as a sum, where both the number of terms and the coefficients of the terms only depend on ℓ , and each term is a product of m instances of $(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}$ and $m-1$ instances of Malliavin derivatives of \mathcal{M}_s of order q_1, \dots, q_{m-1} , respectively, where $2 \leq m \leq \ell+1$, $1 \leq q_i \leq \ell$, and $\sum q_i = \ell$. After applying $\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ in all ℓ variables, the same holds with $D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}$ in place of D . To treat the latter terms, note that

$$D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^j \mathcal{M}_s = \sum_{j'=0}^j \binom{j}{j'} \langle D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^j \mathcal{X}, D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^{j-j'+1} \mathcal{X} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp, 1},$$

where $\langle h_1 \otimes \dots \otimes h_k, \bar{h}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \bar{h}_m \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp, 1} = \langle h_1, \bar{h}_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} h_2 \otimes \dots \otimes h_k \otimes \bar{h}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \bar{h}_m$. In particular, for any $p' \in [1, \infty)$ one has

$$\|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^j \mathcal{M}_s\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,p'}} \lesssim \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{j,2p'}}^2.$$

We now write, with the sum over $q = (q_1, \dots, q_{m-1})$ understood as above,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^{\ell'} (\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,2p}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell'} \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^{\ell'-\ell} (\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})) \otimes D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^\ell ((\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,2p}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell'} \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{\ell'-\ell, 6p}} \sum_{m=2}^{\ell+1} \sum_q \|\mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2\bar{a}} |(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}|^m\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,6p}} \left\| \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^{q_j} \mathcal{M}_s \right\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{0,6p}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell'} \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{\ell'-\ell, 6p}} \sum_{m=2}^{\ell+1} (\mathbb{E}_s^B \Gamma^{-6mp})^{1/6p} \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{\ell, 12\ell p}}^{2(m-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing up over $\ell' = 0, \dots, n$, and taking $p^* \geq 12(n+1)p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,2p}} & \lesssim \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,6p}} \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \mu^m \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,12np}}^{2(m-1)} \\ & \lesssim \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,6p}} \mu \max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,12np}}^2)^n. \end{aligned}$$

By the lower semicontinuity of the conditional norm and the almost sure convergence $\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})(\mathcal{M}_s + \varepsilon \text{id})^{-1} \rightarrow \chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\mathcal{M}_s^{-1}$ we can pass to the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit and get

$$\|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\mathcal{M}_s^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,2p}} \lesssim \|\chi'_a(\mathcal{F})\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,6p}} \mu \max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{n,12np}}^2)^n. \quad (5.12)$$

Combining (5.9), (5.10), (5.11), and (5.12), the proof is finished. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Define the germ

$$A_{s,t} = \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) f(\theta \phi_r^{s,X_s} + (1-\theta)\phi_r^{s,Y_s}) dr \quad (5.13)$$

for $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$. We aim to verify the conditions of Lemma 2.1. Introduce a couple of shorthand notation: for $(s, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_r^{s,(x,y)} &= \theta \phi_r^{s,x} + (1-\theta)\phi_r^{s,y}, \\ \bar{\phi}_r^{s,(x,y)} &= \phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y}, \\ \mathbb{1}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} &= \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we can rewrite (5.13) as

$$A_{s,t} = \int_s^t \mathbb{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f(\psi_r^{s,(x,y)})) \Big|_{(x,y)=(X_s, Y_s)} dr.$$

For $(s, r) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, consider the linear operator on from \mathcal{C}^∞ to $L^p(\Omega)$ defined by

$$B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f = \mathbb{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f(\psi_r^{s,(x,y)})) = \mathbb{E}_s^B(\mathbb{1}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f(\psi_r^{s,(x,y)})),$$

using Lemma 4.15 in the second equality. Also from Lemma 4.15 we have that $B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f$ has a continuous modification in x, y . In the sequel we will need to estimate its supremum in x, y , for which therefore it suffices to take $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}^d$. One has first of all the trivial bound

$$|B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f| \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^0}.$$

Next we bound $B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f$ (and consequently of $A_{s,t} f$) through the norm of f in a negative regularity space. Consider first the case $f = \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g$. We apply Lemma 5.3 with the choices

$$k = 2, \quad h = g, \quad a = \rho, \quad d_1 = d, \quad \chi' = \chi, \quad \mathcal{Y} = 1, \quad \mathcal{X} = \bar{\phi}_r^{s,(x,y)}, \quad \mathfrak{X} = \psi_r^{s,(x,y)}.$$

Take the p^* and k^* obtained from therein. To find Γ such that (5.5) is satisfied, take $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and note that

$$z^* \mathcal{M}_s z = \|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} z^* D\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

By (4.25) we have

$$z^* D_\nu \mathcal{X} = \mathbf{1}_{\nu \in [s,r]} z^* (\theta J_r^{\nu,x} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) + (1-\theta) J_r^{\nu,y} \sigma(\phi_r^{s,y})).$$

The right-hand side is clearly continuous on (s, r) so its L^∞ norm is bounded from below by its left limit as $\nu \rightarrow r$. Therefore on the event $\{|\mathcal{X}| \leq 4\rho\}$ we can write, by (5.2),

$$\|z^* D\mathcal{X}\|_{L^\infty([s,r])}^2 \geq |z^* (\theta \sigma(\phi_r^{s,x}) + (1-\theta)\sigma(\phi_r^{s,y}))|^2 \geq (1/2)\lambda|z|^2,$$

and thus fixing $H > \gamma > 1 - 2H$, by Corollary 3.17 we have

$$\|\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} z^* D\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \geq c|z|^2 |r-s|^{2H} \min\left(1, \frac{|z|}{\|z^* D\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([s,r])}}\right)^{\theta/\gamma}$$

with some constant $c > 0$ such that $c^{-1} \lesssim 1$. We therefore take

$$\Gamma := |r - s|^{2H} \frac{c}{1 + \|D\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}^{\theta/\gamma}}.$$

Hence it is natural to choose $\mu = |t - s|^{-2H}(\bar{\mu}_x + \bar{\mu}_y)$, with

$$\bar{\mu}_x := c^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_s^B |1 + \|D\phi_r^{s,x}\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}^{\theta/\gamma}|^{p^*} \right)^{1/p^*}. \quad (5.14)$$

Next we bound the terms appearing on the right-hand side of (5.6), starting with $\bar{\mu}_x$. For the remainder of the proof we use the convention that p' denotes an exponent depending on α, γ, H . Further, Ξ' will denote a random variable which might depend on s and the usual parameters but not on x . In addition, $\|\Xi'\|_{L_m(\Omega)} \lesssim_m 1$ for all $m \geq 1$, that is, its L_m norms depend only on the parameters given in the statement of theorem and m .

Recalling (4.25) we can start with the straightforward bound

$$\bar{\mu}_x \lesssim \mathbb{E}_s^B |1 + \|J_r^{s,x}\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}|^{p'} \mathbb{E}_s^B |1 + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}|^{p'}. \quad (5.15)$$

From the boundedness of σ and $\nabla\sigma$ and (4.2) we have

$$|1 + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}| \lesssim |1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}H-}|^{p'}$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B |1 + \|\sigma(\phi^{s,x})\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma}|^{p'} \leq \Xi'.$$

As for the first term in (5.15), we have from Lemma 4.12 that almost surely

$$\mathbb{E}_s^B \sup_{u \in [s,r]} |J_r^{u,x}|^{p'} \leq \Xi'.$$

We emphasize that Ξ' can be chosen to not depend on $x \in \mathbb{Q}^d$. As for the seminorm, we have from (4.7) and the continuity of all of the random fields that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} [J_r^{s,x}]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])} &\lesssim \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |\nabla J_r^{0,y}| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |(J_s^{0,y})^{-1}| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} [\overleftarrow{\phi}^{0,y}]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])} \\ &\quad + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |J_r^{0,y}| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |\nabla (J_s^{0,y})^{-1}| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} [\overleftarrow{\phi}^{0,y}]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])} \\ &\quad + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |J_r^{0,y}| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} [(J_s^{0,y})^{-1}]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])} \\ &\leq \Xi' (1 + \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} [\overleftarrow{\phi}^{0,y}]_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma([s,r])}), \end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 4.12 again in the last inequality. As for the last term, notice that for $u < v$

$$|\overleftarrow{\phi}_u^{0,y} - \overleftarrow{\phi}_v^{0,y}| = |\overleftarrow{\phi}_v^{0,\phi_v^{u,y}} - \overleftarrow{\phi}_v^{0,y}| \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{Q}^d} |(J_v^{0,z})^{-1}| |\phi_v^{u,y} - y| \leq \Xi' |u - v|^\gamma$$

by the same arguments as above. So we can conclude

$$\mu \leq |t - s|^{-2H} \Xi'.$$

Moving forward in (5.6), since $\mathcal{Y} = 1$, the next nontrivial term is $\mathcal{Z} = \bar{\phi}_r^{s,(x,y)}$. Here we invoke Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.13 to conclude

$$\max(1, \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*,p^*}})^{k^*} \leq \Xi'.$$

Finally, applying Lemma 4.13 again we get

$$\|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*,p^*}}^2 \leq |t-s|^{2H} \Xi'$$

and therefore

$$\max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*,p^*}})^{k^*} \leq \Xi'.$$

Putting these bounds together, (5.6) yields

$$|B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} \partial_i \partial_j g| \leq \Xi' \|g\|_{L^\infty} |r-s|^{-2H}.$$

Since this holds uniformly in $(x,y) \in \mathbb{Q}^{2d}$, it also holds uniformly in $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, and thus after substituting $(x,y) = (X_s, Y_s)$ we get

$$\left\| (B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} \partial_i \partial_j g) \Big|_{(x,y)=(X_s, Y_s)} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty} |r-s|^{-2H}.$$

It remains to interpolate. That is, by applying Lemma A.2 (with $Tf = (B_{s,r}^{(x,y)} f) \Big|_{(x,y)=(X_s, Y_s)}$, $k = 2$, $\ell = 0$, $\Gamma_0 = 1$, and $\Gamma_{-2} = C|r-s|^{-2H}$, and $\beta = \gamma$) and integrating in r we get that

$$\|A_{s,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\alpha-1}} |t-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H}. \quad (5.16)$$

Since $1 + \gamma H > 1/2$ by our standing assumption $\gamma > -1/(2H)$, the condition Lemma 2.1 (i) is satisfied with $\beta_1 = 1 + \gamma H$ and $\Gamma_1 = C\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\alpha-1}}$.

Next we move on to the treatment of $\mathbb{E}_s \delta A_{s,u,t}$. For this part we introduce the further cutoff function

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{s,u,r}^{(x,y,z,w)} = \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{u,z}) \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s,y} - \phi_r^{u,w}).$$

To help the reader's intuition, let us remark that, with the choices $(z,w) = (X_u, Y_u)$ and $(x,y) = (X_s, Y_s)$ that we make below, one expects $\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{s,u,r}^{(z,w,x,y)}$ to be mostly 1 regardless of whether the two solutions are close. The purpose of this cutoff, similarly to the previous argument, is to ensure the invertability of a certain Malliavin matrix. In fact, both in this function and in others we often use the rewriting

$$\tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{s,u,r}^{(x,y,z,w)} = \tilde{\mathbb{I}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,y)} \Big|_{(a,b)=(\phi_u^{s,x}, \phi_u^{s,y})}.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_s \delta A_{s,u,t} &= \mathbb{E}_s \int_u^t \mathbb{I}_{s,r}^{(X_s, Y_s)} f(\psi_r^{s, (X_s, Y_s)}) - \mathbb{I}_{u,r}^{(X_u, Y_u)} f(\psi_r^{u, (X_u, Y_u)}) dr \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s \int_u^t \mathbb{I}_{u,r}^{(\phi_u^{s, X_s}, \phi_u^{s, Y_s})} f(\psi_r^{u, (\phi_u^{s, X_s}, \phi_u^{s, Y_s})}) - \mathbb{I}_{u,r}^{(X_u, Y_u)} f(\psi_r^{u, (X_u, Y_u)}) dr \\ &=: \mathbb{E}_s \int_u^t C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f \Big|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s, X_s}, \phi_u^{s, Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)} dr, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality serves as the definition of the linear map $f \mapsto C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f$. Define furthermore

$$\tilde{C}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f = C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f \mathbb{1}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)}, \quad \hat{C}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f = C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f - \tilde{C}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f.$$

By conditional Jensen's inequality and "taking out what is known" we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E}_s \left(C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f \Big|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbb{E}_u \left(C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f \Big|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ & = \left\| \mathbb{E}_u \left(C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f \Big|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)} \right) \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The main objects of interests are therefore

$$B_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f := \mathbb{E}_u C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f = \mathbb{E}_u^B C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f$$

and the analogous objects with tilde and hat.

The main steps will be bounding $\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f$ and $\hat{B}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f$ by a random variable uniformly in the parameters (a, b, z, w) , whose $L^p(\Omega)$ norm behaves in the expected way in terms of $|r - u|$ once the above substitutions are performed. As before, since it is clear that continuous modifications (in a, b, z, w) exist, we assume all coordinates to be rational.

For the two terms we use different decompositions of C . For $\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} C_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f &= C_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} f + C_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)} f \\ &:= \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} (f(\psi_r^{u,(a,b)}) - f(\psi_r^{u,(z,w)})) + (\mathbb{1}_r^{(a,b)} - \mathbb{1}_r^{(z,w)}) f(\psi_r^{u,(z,w)}). \end{aligned}$$

With the corresponding \tilde{C}^i and \tilde{B}^i , we now estimate \tilde{B}^1 .

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} f &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_u \left(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \nabla f(\theta' \psi_r^{u,(a,b)} + (1 - \theta') \psi_r^{u,(z,w)}) (\psi_r^{u,(a,b)} - \psi_r^{u,(z,w)}) \right) d\theta'. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the above quantity for each coordinate (denote by j) of ∇ and each θ' separately, that is, we bound the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}_u^B \left(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} \partial_j f(\theta' \psi_r^{u,(a,b)} + (1 - \theta') \psi_r^{u,(z,w)}) (\psi_r^{u,(a,b)} - \psi_r^{u,(z,w)}) \right)$$

using Lemma 5.3. Let us assume $f = \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g$. The the objects in Lemma 5.3 are chosen as

$$\mathcal{X} = \theta' \psi_r^{u,(a,b)} + (1 - \theta') \psi_r^{u,(z,w)},$$

$$k = 3, \quad h = g, \quad a = \rho, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \psi_r^{u,(a,b)} - \psi_r^{u,(z,w)},$$

$$d_1 = 3d, \quad \chi'(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \chi(x_1)\chi(x_2)\chi(x_3), \quad \mathcal{Z} = (\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}, \phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}, \phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,b}).$$

Take the corresponding k^* and p^* from the lemma. By the same argument as in the previous case, by (5.2) we have that on the event $\{|\mathcal{Z}| < 8\rho\}$

$$\|z^* D\mathcal{X}\|_{L^\infty([u,r])}^2 \geq (1/2)\lambda|z|^2.$$

Therefore we can again take

$$\Gamma := |r - u|^{2H} \frac{c}{1 + \|D\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{E}^\gamma([u,r])}^{\alpha/\gamma}},$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant and $c^{-1} \lesssim 1$. Similarly to the previous case, we choose $\mu = |r - u|^{-2H}(\bar{\mu}_a + \bar{\mu}_b + \bar{\mu}_z + \bar{\mu}_w)$, where we recall the definition (5.14) (with s therein replaced by u). As already argued in the previous case, we have

$$\mu \leq |r - u|^{-2H} \Xi'. \quad (5.17)$$

The estimates on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Z} are also very analogous to the previous case, yielding

$$\max(1, \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}})^{k^*}, \max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{Z}_u^\perp} \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}}^2)^{k^*} \leq \Xi'. \quad (5.18)$$

What is different compared to the previous case is the bound on \mathcal{Y} , since this time it allows us to gain a factor that is small when $a - z$ and $b - w$ are small. We group terms like

$$\mathcal{Y} = \theta(\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}) + (1 - \theta)(\phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}),$$

and estimate the two terms in an identical way, so we focus on the first one. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} &= \left\| \int_0^1 (a - z) J_r^{u, \theta'' a + (1 - \theta'')z} d\theta'' \right\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} \\ &\leq |a - z| \int_0^1 \|J_r^{u, \theta'' a + (1 - \theta'')z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} d\theta''. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

By Lemma 4.14 for each θ'' , one has $\|J_r^{u, \theta'' a + (1 - \theta'')z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} \leq \Xi'$ almost surely and therefore

$$\|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} \leq (|a - z| + |b - w|) \Xi' \quad (5.20)$$

almost surely (the nullset may depend on a, b, z, w but that doesn't bother us). By Lemma 5.3, (5.17), (5.18), (5.20) we get

$$|\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g| \leq \|g\|_{L^\infty} |r - u|^{-3H} (|a - z| + |b - w|) \Xi'$$

almost surely for all a, b, z, w . By continuity, this in fact holds for all a, b, z, w simultaneously almost surely, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|g\|_{L^\infty} |r - u|^{-3H} \|(|\phi_u^{s,X_s} - X_u| + |\phi_u^{s,Y_s} - Y_u|)\Xi'\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|g\|_{L^\infty} |r - u|^{-3H} |s - u|^{1+\alpha H} \end{aligned}$$

using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Proposition 4.3 to get the last line.

A much simpler bound can be obtained by simply writing

$$|\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} g| \leq \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{0,1}} \leq \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} (|a - z| + |b - w|) \Xi',$$

which, by the same argument as before, yields

$$\|(\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} g)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty} |s - u|^{1+\alpha H}.$$

Interpolation, i.e. Lemma A.2 with $Tf = (\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} g)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}$, $k = 2$, $\ell = 1$, $\Gamma_{-2} = C|r-u|^{-3H}|s-u|^{1+\alpha H}$, $\Gamma_1 = C|s-u|^{1+\alpha H}$, $\beta = \gamma$, yields

$$\|(\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} f)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma} |r-u|^{(\gamma-1)H} |s-u|^{1+\alpha H}.$$

Since $(\gamma-1)H > -1/2 - H > -1$, $|r-u|^{(\gamma-1)H}$ is integrable in r , and we get

$$\int_u^t \|(\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{1,(a,b,z,w)} f)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} dr \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^{\alpha-1}} |t-s|^{2+(\gamma+\alpha-1)H}.$$

Moving on to the next term $\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)} f$, observe that

$$(\mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} - \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(z,w)}) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} = (\mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} - \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(z,w)}) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} \chi_{6\rho}(\phi_r^{u,z} - \phi_r^{u,w}).$$

Indeed, on the set where $\chi_{6\rho}(\phi_r^{u,z} - \phi_r^{u,w})$ is not 1, that is, $|\phi_r^{u,z} - \phi_r^{u,w}| > 6\rho$, at least one of $|\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}|$, $|\phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}|$, or $|\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,b}|$ is bigger than 2ρ , and thus $(\mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} - \mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(z,w)}) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} = 0$. With this observation, we can rewrite $\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)} f$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)} f &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_u \left(\mathbb{1}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} \chi_{6\rho}(\phi_r^{u,z} - \phi_r^{u,w}) f(\psi_r^{u,(z,w)}) \right. \\ &\quad \times \nabla \chi_\rho(\theta' \phi_r^{u,a} - \theta' \phi_r^{u,b} + (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,z} - (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,w}) \\ &\quad \left. \times (\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,z} + \phi_r^{u,w}) \right) d\theta'. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the integrand, we follow the previous steps. First we replace f by $\partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g$ and use Lemma 5.3 once again, now with the choices

$$k = 2, \quad h = g, \quad a = 6\rho, \quad \mathfrak{X} = \psi_r^{u,(z,w)};$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y} &= \partial_j \chi_\rho(\theta' \phi_r^{u,a} - \theta' \phi_r^{u,b} + (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,z} - (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,w})(\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,z} + \phi_r^{u,w}); \\ d_1 &= 3d, \quad \chi'(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \chi_{1/6}(x_1) \chi_{1/6}(x_2) \chi(x_3), \quad \mathfrak{X} = (\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}, \phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}, \phi_r^{u,z} - \phi_r^{u,w}). \end{aligned}$$

We have already seen in the treatment of $A_{s,t}$, choosing Γ and μ analogously to therein, one has

$$\mu \lesssim |r-u|^{-2H} \Xi' \tag{5.21}$$

and

$$\max(1, \|\mathfrak{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}})^{k^*}, \max(1, \mu \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} \mathfrak{X}\|_{\mathbb{D}_s^{k^*, p^*}}^2)^{k^*} \leq \Xi'. \tag{5.22}$$

As for the bound on \mathcal{Y} , it follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.13 that

$$\|\partial_j \chi_\rho(\theta' \phi_r^{u,a} - \theta' \phi_r^{u,b} + (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,z} - (1-\theta') \phi_r^{u,w})\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, q}} \leq \Xi'(q).$$

Combined with (5.19), this yields

$$\|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*, p^*}} \leq (|a-z| + |b-w|) \Xi'$$

for all $q \in [1, \infty)$. So in fact we are in a very similar setting as before, but with even one less derivative hitting f . Repeating the previous arguments therefore yields

$$\int_u^t \|(\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)} f)|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} dr \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma} |t-s|^{2+(\alpha+\gamma)H}.$$

At this point the only remaining term that is left to bound is

$$\hat{B}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f = \mathbb{E}_u^B \left(\mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(a,b)} f(\psi_r^{u,(a,b)})(1 - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)}) \right) - \mathbb{E}_u^B \left(\mathbb{1}_{u,r}^{(z,w)} f(\psi_r^{u,(z,w)})(1 - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_{u,u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)}) \right).$$

The two terms are completely identical under the relabeling $a \leftrightarrow z, b \leftrightarrow w$, so we bound using the notation of the first one. Rather unsurprisingly, we use Lemma 5.3 once again. Take $f = \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} g$ and make the choices

$$k = 2, \quad h = g, \quad a = \rho, \quad d_1 = d, \quad \chi' = \chi, \quad \mathcal{E} = \bar{\phi}_r^{s,(a,b)}, \quad \mathcal{X} = \psi_r^{s,(a,b)},$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = 1 - \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z})\chi_\rho(\phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}).$$

This is in fact almost the same setup as in the treatment of $A_{s,t}$, the only difference is the choice of \mathcal{Y} . Note that since $1 - \chi_\rho$ is smooth and bounded and is 0 on a neighborhood of the origin, one has $|1 - \chi_\rho(x)\chi(y)| \lesssim |x| + |y|$, and so by the chain rule there exists q^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{Y}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*,p^*}} &\lesssim \max(1, \|\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*,q^*}}^{q^*}, \|\phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*,q^*}}^{q^*}) \\ &\quad \times (\|\phi_r^{u,a} - \phi_r^{u,z}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*,q^*}} + \|\phi_r^{u,b} - \phi_r^{u,w}\|_{\mathbb{D}_u^{k^*,q^*}}) \\ &\leq (|a - z| + |b - w|)\Xi', \end{aligned}$$

using (5.19) in the last inequality. Therefore in the application of Lemma 5.3 we have precisely the same bounds as for the term $\tilde{B}_{u,r}^{2,(a,b,z,w)}$ before. Hence, just as for that term, we can conclude

$$\int_u^t \left\| (\hat{B}_{u,r}^{(a,b,z,w)} f) \Big|_{(a,b,z,w)=(\phi_u^{s,X_s}, \phi_u^{s,Y_s}, X_u, Y_u)} \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} dr \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma} |t - s|^{2+(\alpha+\gamma)H}.$$

We have bounded all components of $\mathbb{E}_s \delta A_{s,u,t}$. We can conclude

$$\|\mathbb{E}_s \delta A_{s,u,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma} |t - s|^{2+(\alpha+\gamma-1)H}.$$

From the assumptions $\alpha > 1 - 1/(2H)$ and $\gamma > -1/(2H)$ it follows that the exponent is larger than 1, and so the condition Lemma 2.1 (ii) is satisfied with $\beta_2 = 2 + (\alpha + \gamma - 1)H$ and $\Gamma_2 = C\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\gamma}$.

We now claim that with the process J playing the role of \mathcal{A} , the inequalities Lemma 2.1 (I)-(II) are satisfied. Note that this concludes the proof, since Lemma 2.1 (III) is precisely the claim of Theorem 5.1.

The inequality Lemma 2.1 (I) trivially holds with $K_1 = \|f\|_{L^\infty}$. As for Lemma 2.1 (II), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbb{E}_s (J_t - J_s - A_{s,t})\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &= \left\| \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) f(\theta X_r + (1 - \theta)Y_r) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) f(\theta \phi_r^{s,X_s} + (1 - \theta)\phi_r^{s,Y_s}) dr \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^1}) |t - s| \sup_{r \in [s,t]} (\|X_r - \phi_t^{s,X_s}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|Y_r - \phi_t^{s,Y_s}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}) \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^1}) |t - s|^{2+\alpha H}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore inequality Lemma 2.1 (II) also holds with $K_2 = C(1 + \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^1})$. The proof is finished. \square

6 The iterated integral and the joint rough path

We now move on to the construction of (a truncated version of) the rough path lift above (L, B) . For this, we construct the integral of B against L anticipated in the introduction (1.4). Note that by imposing geometricity, this also gives a meaning to the integral of L against B (which is therefore an integral against B that is neither rough nor Young).

Theorem 6.1. *Let Assumption 1.4 and Assumption 1.5 hold. Let $\chi \in \text{Cut}_d$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and let X and Y be two solutions to (1.1). For $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ define the two-parameter process*

$$K_{s,t} = \int_s^t (B_r^\ell - B_s^\ell) \left(\chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) f(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) \right) dr. \quad (6.1)$$

Then there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha, p, d, \lambda, H, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^5}, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, C_{D,p}^Y, C_{S,2p}^Y)$ such that

$$\|K_{s,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq N \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}} |t-s|^{1+\alpha H}. \quad (6.2)$$

Comparing (5.3) and (6.1), note that $K_{s,t} = \int_s^t (B_u^\ell - B_s^\ell) dJ_u$. Before we move on with the proof, the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 6.2. *Let Assumption 1.4 and Assumption 1.5 hold. Let $\chi \in \text{Cut}_d$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, and let X and Y be two solutions to (1.1). Then the map $f \mapsto \mathcal{K}f$ defined for $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ by*

$$(\mathcal{K}f)_{s,t} = \int_0^1 \int_s^t (B_r - B_s) \otimes \left(\chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) \nabla f(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) \right) dr d\theta$$

extends as a continuous linear map from $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{C}_2^{1+\alpha H}([0, 1]; L_p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d_0} \otimes \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))$, whose norm depends only on $\alpha, p, d, d_1, \lambda, H, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^5}, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, C_{D,p}^Y, C_{S,2p}^Y$. Moreover, one has the identity

$$\delta(\mathcal{K}f)_{s,u,t} = B_{s,u} \otimes (\mathcal{J}f)_{u,t}. \quad (6.3)$$

Proof. Apply (6.2) for each coordinate of B and with each coordinate of ∇f in place of f and then integrate in θ . The identity (6.3) is elementary for $f \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and therefore holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}$ by continuity. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We fix some $S, T \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and all other time points in the rest of the proof will be taken from $[S, T]$. Define the germ

$$A_{s,t} = \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t (B_r^\ell - B_s^\ell) \left(\chi_\rho(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s}) f(\theta \phi_r^{s, X_s} + (1-\theta)\phi_r^{s, Y_s}) \right) dr \quad (6.4)$$

for $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$. We aim to verify the conditions of Lemma 2.1. The steps are very similar to the proof of Theorem 5.1, with $\gamma = \alpha - 1$. In fact, there is only one difference in each of the steps: in the application of Lemma 5.3 one gains an extra factor of an increment of $B_r^\ell - B_s^\ell$ in the term \mathcal{Y} . To estimate the Malliavin norm of this extra factor, notice that clearly $D^k \mathcal{Y} = 0$ for $k \geq 2$, while for any $q_1, q_2 \geq 1$

$$\|(\mathbb{E}_s |B_r^\ell - B_s^\ell|^{q_1})^{1/q_1}\|_{L^{q_2}(\Omega)} \leq |r-S|^H, \quad \|D(B_r^\ell - B_s^\ell)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim |r-S|^H.$$

It follows that in the application of Lemma 2.1 one can gain an extra factor $|T-S|^H$ in both Γ_1 and Γ_2 . That is, one has

$$\|A_{s,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}} |T-S|^H |t-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H}, \quad (6.5)$$

$$\|E_s \delta A_{s,u,t}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}} |T-S|^H |t-s|^{2+2\alpha H-2H}. \quad (6.6)$$

It is also clear as before that the process $(\mathcal{A}_t)_{t \in [S,T]}$ has to coincide with $(K_{S,t})_{t \in [S,T]}$, and therefore Lemma 2.1 (III) with the choice $s = S, t = T$, yields the bound,

$$\|K_{S,T}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^{\alpha-1}} |T-S|^H |T-S|^{1+(\alpha-1)H}$$

as desired. \square

The integral constructed above enables one to lift the pair (B, L) to a rough path. Unlike a usual path, however, here the components have different regularities. The extension of the usual definitions is rather straightforward and is summarised below. As before, the distinction between B as a path, B as the first component of the rough path B , and B as a component of the mixed rough path above (B, L) is crucial, so we distinguish mixed rough paths with a new color.

For the remainder of the section we fix finite dimensional Euclidean spaces V, E, K and exponents $\beta \in (1/2, 1), \gamma \in (1/3, 1/2)$. For later applications one may keep in mind β to stand for the regularity of L and γ to stand for the regularity of B . More precisely, β will be $1 + (\alpha - 1)H_+$ and γ will be H_- (see (1.23)).

Definition 6.3 (Rough paths of mixed regularity). We denote by $\mathcal{R}^{\gamma, \beta}([0, 1]; V \times E)$ the collection of all elements $g = (g^\bullet, g^\circ, \mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\bullet}, \mathfrak{g}^{\circ\circ}, \mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\circ})$, such that $(g^\bullet, \mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\bullet}) \in \mathcal{R}^\gamma([0, 1]; V), g^\circ \in \mathcal{C}^\beta([0, 1]; E), (\mathfrak{g}^{\circ\circ}, \mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\circ}) \in \mathcal{C}_2^{\beta+\gamma}([0, 1]^2; (V \otimes E) \times (E \otimes V))$, and that the Chen's relations

$$\mathfrak{g}_{s,t}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathfrak{g}_{s,u}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathfrak{g}_{u,t}^{\bullet\circ} = g_{s,u}^\bullet \otimes g_{u,t}^\circ, \quad \mathfrak{g}_{s,t}^{\circ\circ} - \mathfrak{g}_{s,u}^{\circ\circ} - \mathfrak{g}_{u,t}^{\circ\circ} = g_{s,u}^\circ \otimes g_{u,t}^\bullet \quad (6.7)$$

hold for all $(s, u, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^3$. Moreover, we set

$$[g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\gamma, \beta}} = [g^\bullet]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma} + [g^\circ]_{\mathcal{C}^\beta} + [\mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\bullet}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2\gamma}} + [\mathfrak{g}^{\circ\circ}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma+\beta}} + [\mathfrak{g}^{\bullet\circ}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{\gamma+\beta}}.$$

As before, the set $\mathcal{R}^{\gamma, \beta}$ is equipped with the metric

$$d_{\gamma, \beta}(g, h) := \|g^\bullet - h^\bullet\|_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma} + \|g^\circ - h^\circ\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta} + [g - h]_{\mathcal{R}^{\gamma, \beta}}.$$

Remark 6.4. For $i, j \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$, the process \mathfrak{g}^{ij} stands for the iterated integral of g^i against g^j . Since the iterated integral of g° against itself is canonically well-defined as a Young integral, it is not included separately in the definition.

Given $g = (g^\bullet, g^\circ) \in \mathcal{C}^\gamma([0, 1]; V) \times \mathcal{C}^\beta([0, 1]; E)$ we denote by $\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; K)$ the set of all functions $f = (f, \partial_\bullet f, \partial_\circ f) : [0, 1] \rightarrow K \times \mathcal{L}(V; K) \times \mathcal{L}(E; K)$, such that

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} := \sup_{s \neq t} \frac{|f_{s,t} - \partial_\bullet f_s g_{s,t}^\bullet - \partial_\circ f_s g_{s,t}^\circ|}{|t-s|^\gamma} + [\partial_\bullet f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([0,1])} + [\partial_\circ f]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([0,1])} < \infty.$$

For $f = (f, \partial_\bullet f, \partial_\circ f) \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; K)$ and $h = (h, \partial_\bullet h, \partial_\circ h) \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(K, K'))$, we set

$$hf := (hf, e \mapsto (\partial_\bullet h e) f + h(\partial_\bullet f e), v \mapsto (\partial_\circ h v) f + h(\partial_\circ f v)). \quad (6.8)$$

Then, one has $hf \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; K')$, and similarly to (1.16) we have

$$\|hf\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \leq C \|h\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S,T])} (1 + [g^\bullet]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S,T])} + [g^\circ]_{\mathcal{C}^\beta([S,T])})^2, \quad (6.9)$$

for a universal constant C .

Then for $g \in \mathcal{R}^{\gamma, \beta}([0, 1]; V \times E)$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(E; K))$ we can define the K -valued rough integral with respect to g° as

$$\int_0^t f_r dg_r^\circ := \lim_{|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s, u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0, t]}} A_{s, u},$$

where $A_{s, u} := f_s g_{s, u}^\circ + \partial_\bullet f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, u}^{\bullet \circ}$. Indeed, by (6.7), for $0 \leq s \leq v \leq u \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{s, v, u} &= -(f_{s, v} - \partial_\bullet f_s g_{s, v}^\circ) g_{v, u}^\circ - \partial_\bullet f_{s, v} \mathfrak{G}_{v, u}^{\bullet \circ} \\ &= -(f_{s, v} - \partial_\circ f_s g_{s, v}^\circ - \partial_\bullet f_s g_{s, v}^\circ) g_{v, u}^\circ - \partial_\bullet f_{s, v} \mathfrak{G}_{v, u}^{\bullet \circ} - (\partial_\circ f_s g_{s, v}^\circ) g_{v, u}^\circ, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta A_{s, v, u}| &\leq 2[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}}[g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}} |u - s|^{2\gamma + \beta} + \|\partial_\circ f_s\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}^2 |u - s|^{2\beta} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}^2) |t - s|^\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta = (2\gamma + \beta) \wedge 2\beta > 1$. By the sewing lemma the above limit exists and satisfies the bound

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r^\circ - f_s g_{s, t}^\circ - \partial_\bullet f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, t}^{\bullet \circ} \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}^2) |t - s|^\delta,$$

which in turn implies that

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r^\circ - f_s g_{s, t}^\circ \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}^2) |t - s|^{2\gamma}.$$

As a consequence, for any $0 \leq S \leq T \leq 1$,

$$\int_S^T f_r dg_r^\circ := \left(\int_S^T f_r dg_r^\circ, 0, f \right) \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; K).$$

Similarly, for $f \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(V; K))$ we can define the K -valued rough integral with respect to g^\bullet as

$$\int_0^t f_r dg_r^\bullet := \lim_{|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s, u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0, t]}} A'_{s, u},$$

where

$$A'_{s, u} := f_s g_{s, u}^\bullet + \partial_\circ f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, u}^{\circ \bullet} + \partial_\bullet f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, u}^{\bullet \bullet}.$$

Indeed, as before, one can compute

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta A'_{s, v, u}| &= |-(f_{s, v} - \partial_\circ f_s g_{s, v}^\circ - \partial_\bullet f_s g_{s, v}^\circ) g_{v, u}^\bullet - \partial_\circ f_{s, v} \mathfrak{G}_{v, u}^{\circ \bullet} - \partial_\bullet f_{s, v} \mathfrak{G}_{v, u}^{\bullet \bullet}| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}) |t - s|^{3\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

(recall that $3\gamma \wedge (2\gamma + \beta) = 3\gamma > 1$). By the sewing lemma the above limit exists and satisfies the bound

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r^\bullet - f_s g_{s, t}^\bullet - \partial_\circ f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, t}^{\circ \bullet} + \partial_\bullet f_s \mathfrak{G}_{s, t}^{\bullet \bullet} \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta, \gamma}}) |t - s|^{3\gamma},$$

which implies that

$$\left| \int_s^t f_r dg_r^\bullet - f_s g_{s,t}^\bullet \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}} (1 + [g]_{\mathcal{R}^{\beta,\gamma}}) |t - s|^{2\gamma}.$$

As a consequence, for any $0 \leq S \leq T \leq 1$,

$$\int_S^\cdot f_r dg_r^\bullet := \left(\int_S^\cdot f_r dg_r^\bullet, f, 0 \right) \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T]; K).$$

The following two lemmata are straightforward extensions of the standard Kolmogorov criterion for paths to rough paths to rough paths of mixed regularity. They can be proved in the same way as [FH20, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3].

Lemma 6.5. *Let $(G^\bullet, G^\circ) : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow V \times E$ and $(\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\bullet}, \mathbb{G}^{\circ\circ}, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}) : \Omega \times [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow (V \otimes V) \times (E \otimes V) \times (V \otimes E)$. Assume that for all $(s, u, t) \in [0, 1]^3$, $(G^\bullet, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\bullet})$ satisfies (1.8) and $(G^\bullet, G^\circ, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}, \mathbb{G}^{\circ\circ})$ satisfy (6.7). Let $p \geq 2$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_\bullet, \tilde{\gamma}_\circ \in (0, 1)$ with $\tilde{\gamma}_\bullet, \tilde{\gamma}_\circ > 1/p$. Assume further that there exist constants K_{ij} , $i, j \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$, such that for all (s, t)*

$$\|G_{s,t}^i\|_{L_p} \leq K_i |t - s|^{\tilde{\gamma}_i}, \quad \|\mathbb{G}_{s,t}^{ij}\|_{L_{p/2}} \leq K_{ij} |t - s|^{\tilde{\gamma}_i + \tilde{\gamma}_j}$$

for $i, j \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$ with $(i, j) \neq (\circ, \circ)$. Then for any $\gamma_\bullet < \tilde{\gamma}_\bullet - 1/p$, $\gamma_\circ < \tilde{\gamma}_\circ - 1/p$, there exists a modification of $\mathbf{G} := (G^\bullet, G^\circ, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\bullet}, \mathbb{G}^{\circ\circ}, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ})$ such that with probability one, we have $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{R}^{\gamma_\bullet, \gamma_\circ}$. Moreover, there is a constant $C = C(\gamma_\bullet, \tilde{\gamma}_\bullet, \gamma_\circ, \tilde{\gamma}_\circ, p)$ such that

$$\|[\mathbf{G}^i]_{\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_i}}\|_{L_p} \leq CK_i, \quad \|[\mathbb{G}^{ij}]_{\mathcal{G}_2^{\gamma_i + \gamma_j}}\|_{L_p} \leq C(K_{ij} + K_i K_j).$$

Lemma 6.6. *Let $p \geq 2$, $\tilde{\gamma}_\bullet, \tilde{\gamma}_\circ > 1/p$, and $\gamma_\bullet < \tilde{\gamma}_\bullet - 1/p$, $\gamma_\circ < \tilde{\gamma}_\circ - 1/p$. Let $\mathbf{G} = (G^\bullet, G^\circ, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\bullet}, \mathbb{G}^{\circ\circ}, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ})$, $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} = (\tilde{G}^\bullet, \tilde{G}^\circ, \tilde{\mathbb{G}}^{\bullet\bullet}, \tilde{\mathbb{G}}^{\circ\circ}, \tilde{\mathbb{G}}^{\bullet\circ})$ random variables with values in $\mathcal{R}^{\gamma_\bullet, \gamma_\circ}$. Assume further that there exist constants K_{ij} , $i, j \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$, such that for all (s, t)*

$$\|G_{s,t}^i - \tilde{G}_{s,t}^i\|_{L_p} \leq K_i |t - s|^{\tilde{\gamma}_i}, \quad \|\mathbb{G}_{s,t}^{ij} - \tilde{\mathbb{G}}_{s,t}^{ij}\|_{L_{p/2}} \leq K_{ij} |t - s|^{\tilde{\gamma}_i + \tilde{\gamma}_j}$$

for $i, j \in \{\bullet, \circ\}$ with $(i, j) \neq (\circ, \circ)$. Then, there exists a constant $C = C(\gamma_\bullet, \tilde{\gamma}_\bullet, \gamma_\circ, \tilde{\gamma}_\circ, p)$, such that

$$\|[\mathbf{G}^i - \tilde{\mathbf{G}}^i]_{\mathcal{G}^{\gamma_i}}\|_{L_p} \leq NK_i, \quad \|[\mathbb{G}^{ij} - \tilde{\mathbb{G}}^{ij}]_{\mathcal{G}_2^{\gamma_i + \gamma_j}}\|_{L_{p/2}} \leq N(K_{ij} + K_i K_j).$$

The following is a direct consequence of the previous two lemmata combined with Corollary 5.2 and Corollary 6.2. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, set $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,t}^{jki} f = (\mathcal{F}_{s,t}^{jk} f) B_{s,t}^i - \mathcal{H}_{s,t}^{ijk}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d_0$ and $j, k = 1, \dots, d$.

Corollary 6.7. *The map $f \mapsto \mathbf{G}f$ defined for $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ by*

$$\mathbf{G}f = (B, \mathcal{F}f, \mathbb{B}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}f, \mathcal{H}f)$$

extends uniquely to a continuous map from $\mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{R}^{H_-, 1+(\alpha-1)H_+}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C = C(\alpha, p, d, d_0, \lambda, H, H_-, \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{G}^5}, C_{D,p}^X, C_{S,2p}^X, C_{D,p}^Y, C_{S,2p}^Y)$ such that for all $f, \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{C}^{\alpha+}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|[\mathbf{G}f]_{\mathcal{R}^{H_-, 1+(\alpha-1)H_+}}\|_{L_p} &\leq C(1 + \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha}), \\ d_{H_-, 1+(\alpha-1)H_+}(\mathbf{G}f, \mathbf{G}\tilde{f}) &\leq C\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

From now on, we set

$$G = (G^\bullet, G^\circ, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\bullet}, \mathbb{G}^{\circ\circ}, \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}) := Gb,$$

that is

$$G \text{ " = " } \left(B, L, \int B \otimes dB, \int L \otimes dB, \int B \otimes dL \right).$$

7 Closing the equation

Throughout this section, we fix two solutions X, Y of (1.1) and we set $Z = X - Y$. Moreover, we introduce an operator $I \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$ and an operator valued process $\Sigma : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d))$, defined as follows: for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we set

$$IZ := \left((c^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d \mapsto \left(\sum_{j=1}^d z^j c^{ij} \right)_{i=1}^d \right), \quad \Sigma_t z = \left((\xi^\varrho)_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \mapsto \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \Sigma_t^{li\varrho} z_t^l b \xi^\varrho \right)_{i=1}^d \right), \quad (7.1)$$

where

$$\Sigma_t^{li\varrho} := \int_0^1 \partial_l \sigma^{i\varrho}(\theta X_t + (1-\theta)Y_t) d\theta.$$

We will see below that Z is controlled by G and that its Gubinelli derivatives with respect to G^\bullet and G° are given by ΣZ and IZ , respectively.

Next, we define processes which will play the role of Gubinelli derivatives of IZ and ΣZ . Let us start with IZ . For this, let us define two processes $\partial_\bullet(IZ) : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$ and $\partial_\circ(IZ) : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$ as follows: for $\xi = (\xi^\varrho)_{\varrho=1}^{d_0}$

$$\partial_\bullet(IZ)_t \tilde{b} = \left((c^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d \mapsto \left(\sum_{j,l=1}^d \sum_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \Sigma_t^{lj\varrho} Z_t^l c^{ij} \xi^\varrho \right)_{i=1}^d \right)$$

and for $\tilde{c} = (\tilde{c}^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$

$$\partial_\circ(IZ)_t \tilde{c} = \left((c^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d \mapsto \left(\sum_{j,l=1}^d Z_t^{jl} \tilde{c}^{il} c^{ij} \right)_{i=1}^d \right).$$

We also set $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z)$. Notice that by the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have that $\sigma(X) - \sigma(Y) = \Sigma Z$, which in particular implies that

$$Z = (Z, \Sigma Z) = X - Y = (X - Y, \sigma(X) - \sigma(Y)) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d),$$

with probability one. Moreover, we set $I := (I, 0) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$. Consequently, IZ as defined in (1.14) belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$. In addition, it is straightforward that IZ coincides with $(Z, \partial_\bullet(IZ))$. Similarly, we set $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \partial_\circ \Sigma)$, where $\partial_\circ \Sigma : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$, is defined as follows: for $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\partial_\circ \Sigma_t \tilde{\xi} = \left((z^l)_{l=1}^d \mapsto \left((\xi^\varrho)_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \mapsto \left(\sum_{l,q=1}^d \sum_{\varrho,\tilde{\varrho}=1}^{d_0} \hat{\Sigma}_t^{li\varrho\tilde{\varrho}} \tilde{\xi}^l z^q \xi^\varrho \right)_{i=1}^d \right) \right),$$

where

$$\hat{\Sigma}_t^{qli\varrho\tilde{\varrho}} = \int_0^1 \partial_{ql} \sigma^{i\varrho}(\theta X_t + (1-\theta)Y_t)(\theta \sigma^{q\tilde{\varrho}}(X_t) + (1-\theta)\sigma^{q\tilde{\varrho}}(Y_t)) d\theta.$$

Then, we have that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$, which follows from the fact that $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Consequently, we also have that ΣZ (as defined by (1.14)) belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d))$. In fact, ΣZ is nothing but $\sigma(X) - \sigma(Y)$ but it will be convenient to have it in this linear in Z form.

For the next lemma, recall that ρ is defined in (5.1)

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\tau = \inf\{t \in [0, 1] : |Z_t| > \rho\} \wedge 1$ and set $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z, IZ)$ and $I = (I, 0, 0)$. The following hold.*

- (i) *We have $Z \in \mathcal{D}_G^{2H^-}([0, \tau], \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $I \in \mathcal{D}_G^{2H^-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$, with probability one.*
- (ii) *We have that $IZ \in \mathcal{D}_G^{2H^-}([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$ and $IZ = (IZ, \partial_\bullet(IZ), \partial_\circ(IZ))$.*
- (iii) *With probability one, for all $t \in [0, \tau]$, we have*

$$D_t^X - D_t^Y = \int_0^t IZ_s dG_s^\circ. \quad (7.2)$$

Proof. First, let us set

$$A_{s,t} := (IZ_s)G_{s,t}^\circ + \partial_\bullet(IZ)_s \mathbb{G}_{s,t}^{\bullet\circ}. \quad (7.3)$$

We claim that with probability one, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, the limit

$$Q_t := \lim_{\substack{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[0,t]} \\ |\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}} A_{s,u} \quad (7.4)$$

exists and defines a process Q such that almost surely $Q \in \mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}([0, 1])$, and

$$|Q_{s,t} - (IZ)_s G_{s,t}^\circ| \lesssim |t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+ + H_-}. \quad (7.5)$$

Indeed, for $0 \leq s < u < v \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{s,u,v} &= -(IZ_{s,u})G_{u,t}^\circ + \partial_\bullet(IZ)_s \delta \mathbb{G}_{s,u,t}^{\bullet\circ} - \partial_\bullet(IZ)_{s,u} \mathbb{G}_{u,t}^{\bullet\circ} \\ &= -((IZ_{s,u}) - \partial_\bullet(IZ)_s G_{s,u}^\bullet)G_{u,t}^\circ - \partial_\bullet(IZ)_{s,u} \mathbb{G}_{u,t}^{\bullet\circ} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Chen's relation (6.7). Consequently, we have

$$|\delta A_{s,u,v}| \lesssim ([IZ]_{\mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}}[G^\circ]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\partial_\bullet(IZ)]_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}}[\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+ + H_-}})|v - s|^{3H_-},$$

where we have used that $1 + (\alpha - 1)H_+ + 2H_- \geq 1/2 + 2H_- \geq 3H_-$. Since $3H_- > 1$, the claims follows from Gubinelli's sewing lemma, and the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{s,v}| &\lesssim \|IZ\|_{\mathcal{C}^0}[G^\circ]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}}|t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+} \\ &\quad + \|\partial_\bullet(IZ)\|_{\mathcal{C}^0}[\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+ + H_-}}|t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+ + H_-} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \left(\|Z\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [G^\circ]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + \|\sigma\|_{\mathcal{C}^1} \|Z\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}} \right) |t-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+} \\ &\lesssim |t-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let $b \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$, such that $\|b^n - b\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} \leq 2^{-2n}$. Let us define

$$G_t^{\circ,n} := \int_0^t \int_0^1 \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) \nabla b^n(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) d\theta dr, \quad \mathbb{G}_{s,t}^{\bullet\circ,n} := \int_s^t G_{s,r}^\bullet \otimes dG_r^{\circ,n},$$

where the last one is a Riemann integral, since $G^{\circ,n} \in \mathcal{C}^1([0,1])$, and notice that $\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n} \in \mathcal{C}_2^{1+H_-}([0,1]^2)$. It follows then that with probability one, for all $t \in [0,1]$, we have

$$\int_0^t IZ_r dG_r^{\circ,n} = \lim_{\substack{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[0,t]} \\ |\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}} (IZ_s) G_{s,u}^{\circ,n} = \lim_{\substack{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[0,t]} \\ |\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}} A_{s,t}^n,$$

where $A_{s,u}^n := (IZ_s) G_{s,u}^{\circ,n} + \partial_\bullet (IZ)_s \mathbb{G}_{s,u}^{\bullet\circ,n}$. Consequently,

$$Q_t - \int_0^t Z_r dG_r^{\circ,n} = \lim_{\substack{\mathcal{P} \in \pi_{[0,t]} \\ |\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}} (A_{s,u} - A_{s,u}^n).$$

As before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{s,v} - A_{s,v}^n| &\leq \|IZ\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} |v-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+} \\ &\quad + \|\partial_\bullet (IZ)\|_{\mathcal{C}^0} [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}} |v-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-} \\ &\lesssim ([G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}}) |v-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}, \\ |\delta(A - A^n)_{s,u,v}| &= |(IZ_{s,u} - \partial_\bullet (IZ)_s G_{s,u}^\bullet)(G_{u,t}^\circ - G_{u,t}^{\circ,n}) + \partial_\bullet (IZ)_{s,u} (\mathbb{G}_{u,t}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}_{u,t}^{\bullet\circ,n})| \\ &\lesssim ([IZ]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{2H_-}} [G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + \\ &\quad + \|\partial_\bullet (IZ)\|_{\mathcal{C}^{H_-}} [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}}) |v-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+2H_-} \\ &\lesssim ([G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}}) |v-s|^{3H_-}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by Gubinelli's sewing lemma we get that with probability one, for all $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|Q_{s,t} - \int_s^t Z_r dG_r^{\circ,n}| \\ &\lesssim ([G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}}) |v-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

Next we derive an almost sure bound for the right hand side of the above relation. By (6.10) from Corollary 6.7, we have

$$\|([G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}})\|_{L_2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|b - b^n\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} \lesssim 2^{-2n}.$$

Hence, by Markov's inequality we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left([G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+H_-}} \geq 2^{-n}\right) \lesssim 2^{2n} 2^{-4n} = 2^{-2n}.$$

Consequently, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, there exists a random variable ξ such that with probability one, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$[G^\circ - G^{\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} + [\mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ} - \mathbb{G}^{\bullet\circ,n}]_{\mathcal{C}_2^{1+(\alpha-1)H_++H_-}} \leq \xi 2^{-n}.$$

Combining the above with (7.6), we get that with probability one

$$\left\| Q - \int_0^\cdot IZ_r dG_r^{\circ,n} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^{1+(\alpha-1)H_+}} \lesssim \xi 2^{-n}. \quad (7.7)$$

Next, notice that by the fundamental theorem of calculus we have that

$$\int_0^t b^n(X_r) - b^n(Y_r) dr = \int_0^t IZ_r dG^{\circ,n}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \tau].$$

By the above combined with (7.7) and (i) of Definition 1.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^X - D^Y - Q\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([0, \tau])} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| D^X - D^Y - \int_0^\cdot IZ_r dG_r^{\circ,n} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([0, \tau])} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| D^X - D^Y - \int_0^\cdot b^n(X_r) - b^n(Y_r) dr \right\|_{\mathcal{C}^0([0, \tau])} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

where the limits are taken in probability. Consequently, for any $0 \leq s < t < \tau$, we have

$$Z_{s,t} = Q_{s,t} + \int_s^t \Sigma Z_r dG_r^\bullet,$$

which in turn gives

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_{s,t} - (IZ_s)G_{s,t}^\circ - (\Sigma Z_s)G_{s,t}^\bullet| &\leq |Q_{s,t} - (IZ_s)G_{s,t}^\circ| + \left| \int_s^t \Sigma Z_r dG_r^\bullet - (\Sigma Z_s)G_{s,t}^\bullet \right| \\ &\lesssim |t-s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H_++H_-} + |t-s|^{2H_-} \lesssim |t-s|^{2H_-}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (7.5) and the fact that $\Sigma Z \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H_-}([0, 1])$. The above together with the fact that $IZ, \Sigma Z \in \mathcal{C}^{H_-}$ shows that $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z, IZ)$ belongs to the space $\mathcal{D}_G^{2H_-}([0, \tau], \mathbb{R}^d)$, with probability one. The fact that $I = (I, 0, 0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H_-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$ is trivial. Hence, we are done with (i).

Moving to (ii), the fact that IZ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_G^{2H_-}([0, \tau], \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}; \mathbb{R}^d))$ is a direct consequence of (i). The fact that $IZ := (IZ, \partial_\bullet(IZ), \partial_\circ(IZ))$ simply follows from the definition of the processes $\partial_\bullet(IZ)$ and $\partial_\circ(IZ)$.

Finally, (iii) follows from (7.8) and the fact that

$$Q_t = \int_0^t IZ_s dG_s^\circ,$$

which in turn simply follows from the definition of Q , that is, from (7.3) and (7.4). This finishes the proof. \square

Next, let us set $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \partial_\bullet \Sigma, 0)$, which clearly belongs to $\mathcal{D}_G^{2H_-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$, since $\Sigma = (\Sigma, \partial_\bullet \Sigma) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H_-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d)))$. Consequently, we have that $\Sigma Z \in \mathcal{D}_G^{2H_-}([0, 1]; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d_0}; \mathbb{R}^d))$.

Our main focus is the following.

Lemma 7.2. *With probability one, for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we have*

$$\int_0^t \Sigma_r Z_r dG_r^\bullet = \int_0^t \Sigma_r Z_r dG_r^\bullet. \quad (7.9)$$

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma Z &= (\Sigma Z, \Sigma(\Sigma Z)(\cdot) + \partial_\bullet \Sigma(\cdot) Z), \\ \Sigma Z &= (\Sigma Z, \Sigma(\Sigma Z)(\cdot) + \partial_\bullet \Sigma(\cdot) Z, \Sigma(IZ)(\cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

By recalling the definition of the integrals appearing in (7.9), it is clear that to have (7.9) it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} (\Sigma_s(IZ_s)) \mathbb{G}_{s,u}^{\circ\bullet} = 0. \quad (7.10)$$

Notice that by definition of the two integrals appearing in (7.9), it follows that with probability one, the limit appearing on the left hand side exists. Moreover, in terms of indices, (7.10) is written as follows: for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\lim_{|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} C_{s,u}^i = 0, \quad (7.11)$$

where,

$$C_{s,u}^i := \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \Sigma_s^{li\varrho} \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{s,u}^{lq\varrho} b).$$

Further, notice that by definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ (see Corollary 6.7), we have that $C_{u,s}^i = C_{u,s}^{i,1} + C_{u,s}^{i,2}$, where

$$C_{s,u}^{i,1} := \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \Sigma_s^{li\varrho} \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{F}_{s,u}^{lq\varrho} b) B_{s,u}^{\varrho}, \quad C_{s,u}^{i,2} := \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{\varrho=1}^{d_0} \Sigma_s^{li\varrho} \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{H}_{s,u}^{\varrho lq} b)$$

We next show that the terms above are of order $|s - u|^{3H^-}$.

Lemma 7.3. *For each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, with probability one we have*

$$\sup_{(s,t) \in [0,1]_{\leq}^2} \frac{|C_{s,t}^{i,1}|}{|t - s|^{3H^-}} < \infty.$$

Proof. By the boundedness of Σ , we have

$$|C_{s,t}^{i,1}| \lesssim \sum_{l=1}^d \left| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{F}_{s,t}^{lq\varrho} b) B_{s,t}^{\varrho} \right| \lesssim |t - s|^{H^-} \sum_{l=1}^d \left| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{F}_{s,t}^{lq\varrho} b) \right|. \quad (7.12)$$

Next, recall that by Definition 1.3, it is immediate that $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z) \in \mathcal{D}_{G^\bullet}^{2H^-}$, which in particular gives that

$$Z_{s,t} = (\Sigma_s Z_s) G_{s,t}^\bullet + O(|t - s|^{2H^-}). \quad (7.13)$$

On the other hand, in Lemma 7.1 we showed that $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z, IZ) \in \mathcal{D}_G^{2H^-}$, which in particular implies that

$$Z_{s,t} = (IZ_s)G_{s,t}^\circ + (\Sigma_s Z_s)G_{s,t}^\bullet + O(|t-s|^{2H^-}). \quad (7.14)$$

Subtracting (7.13) from (7.14) gives that $(IZ_s)G_{s,t}^\circ = O(|t-s|^{2H^-})$. Keeping in mind the definition of I (see, (7.1)) and the fact that again by definition $G^\circ = (\mathcal{J}^{lq}b)_{l,q=1}^d$, we have that

$$\sum_{l=1}^d \left| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{J}_{s,t}^{lq} b) \right| \lesssim |t-s|^{2H^-}.$$

Replacing the above in (7.12) gives the desired result. \square

Lemma 7.4. *For any $p \geq 1$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ we have*

$$\sup_{(s,t) \in [0,1]_{\leq}^2} \frac{\|C_{s,t}^{i,2}\|_{L_p}}{|t-s|^{3H^-}} < \infty.$$

Proof. By the boundedness of Σ , it suffices to show that for each $l \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\varrho \in \{1, \dots, d_0\}$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{K}_{s,t}^{\varrho lq} b) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim |t-s|^{3H^-}.$$

To this end, let $b_n \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$ such that $b_n \rightarrow b$ in \mathcal{C}^α and $\|b_n\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} \leq 2\|b\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Corollary 6.2 we have that

$$\left\| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{K}_{s,t}^{\varrho lq} b) \right\|_{L_p} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{K}_{s,t}^{\varrho lq} b_n) \right\|_{L_p}. \quad (7.15)$$

For fixed n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{K}_{s,t}^{\varrho lq} b_n) &= \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{s,r}^\varrho \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) Z_r \nabla b_n^l(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{s,r}^\varrho \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) Z_{s,r} \nabla b_n^l(\theta X_r + (1-\theta)Y_r) d\theta dr \\ &=: \Gamma_1^n(s, t) + \Gamma_2^n(s, t). \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

By the fundamental theorem of calculus we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_1^n(s, t)| &= \left| \int_s^t B_{s,r}^\varrho \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) (b_n^l(X_r) - b_n^l(Y_r)) dr \right| \\ &= \left| \int_s^t B_{s,r}^\varrho dD_r^n \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D_t^n = \int_0^t \chi_\rho(X_r - Y_r) (b_n^l(X_r) - b_n^l(Y_r)) dr.$$

Consequently,

$$|\Gamma_1^n(s, t)| \lesssim [B]_{\mathbb{G}^{H_-}} [D^n]_{\mathbb{G}^{1+\alpha H_+}} |t - s|^{H_- + 1 + \alpha H_+}.$$

By Theorem 5.1 (with the choice $\gamma = \alpha$, $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 1$) we see that $\|D^n\|_{\mathbb{G}^{1+\alpha H}([0,1];L_{2p})} \lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha}$. Moreover, by Kolmogorov's continuity criterion, for p sufficiently large and ε' sufficiently small, we have $\|D^n\|_{L_{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{G}^{1+\alpha H_+})} \lesssim \|D^n\|_{\mathbb{G}^{1+\alpha H - \varepsilon'}([0,1];L_{2p})}$, hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_1^n(s, t)\|_{L_p} &\lesssim \|B\|_{L_{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{G}^{H_-})} \|D^n\|_{L_{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{G}^{1+\alpha H_+})} |t - s|^{H_- + 1 + \alpha H_+} \\ &\lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{3H_-}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $1 + \alpha H_+ > 2H_-$, which follows by the choice of H_- , H_+ (see, also (1.23)). Consequently, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Gamma_1^n(s, t)\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{3H_-}. \quad (7.17)$$

To estimate Γ_2^n , let $(S, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and for $q \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ consider the process $(\mathbb{Q}_t)_{t \in [S, T]}$ given by

$$\mathbb{Q}_t = \int_S^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\theta} \chi_{\rho}(X_r - Y_r) Z_{S,r} \nabla b_n^l(\theta X_r + (1 - \theta)Y_r) d\theta dr.$$

It is easy to see that the process \mathbb{Q} is reconstructed by the germs

$$Q_{s,t} = \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\theta} \chi_{\rho}(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s})(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s} - Z_s) \nabla b_n^l(\theta \phi_r^{s, X_s} + (1 - \theta)\phi_r^{s, Y_s}) d\theta dr.$$

First, we want to obtain that

$$\|Q_{s,t}\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H} |T - S|^{2H_-}. \quad (7.18)$$

For this, we decompose Q as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{s,t} &= Z_{S,s} \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\theta} \chi_{\rho}(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s}) \nabla b_n^l(\theta \phi_r^{s, X_s} + (1 - \theta)\phi_r^{s, Y_s}) d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\theta} \chi_{\rho}(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s})(\phi_r^{s, X_s} - \phi_r^{s, Y_s} - Z_s) \nabla b_n^l(\theta \phi_r^{s, X_s} + (1 - \theta)\phi_r^{s, Y_s}) d\theta dr \\ &=: Q_{s,t}^1 + Q_{s,t}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.19)$$

Notice that $Q_{s,t}^1 = Z_{S,s} A'_{s,t}$, where $A'_{s,t}$ is the integral over $\theta \in (0, 1)$ of the germ in (6.4), with the choice $f = \nabla b_n^l$. By using then (6.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{s,t}^1\|_{L_p} &\leq \|Z_{S,s}\|_{L_{2p}} \|A'_{s,t}\|_{L_{2p}} \\ &\lesssim \|[Z]_{\mathbb{G}^{H_-}}\|_{L_{2p}} |T - S|^{H_-} \|b_n\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H} |T - S|^H \\ &\lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathbb{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H} |T - S|^{2H_-}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

The estimate for $Q_{s,t}^2$ is essentially a repetition of the arguments for the bound (5.16) in proof of Theorem 5.1. One has

$$Q_{s,t}^2 = \int_s^t \mathbb{E}_s (\mathbb{I}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} \mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} \nabla b_n^l(\psi_r^{s,(x,y)}))|_{(x,y)=(X_s, Y_s)} dr,$$

where $\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)}$ and $\psi_r^{s,(x,y)}$ are as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, while the extra term $\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)} := B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}}(\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y} - x + y).$$

One can repeat then the arguments that lead to (5.16), with the following modification: in the application of Lemma 5.3 instead of $\mathcal{Y} = 1$ we choose $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)}$, whose conditional Malliavin norm needs to be estimated to gain the extra factor of $|T - S|^{2H_-}$. First, notice that for $q \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}_s |B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}}|^q)^{1/q} &\leq (\mathbb{E}_s [B]_{\mathcal{G}H_-}^q)^{1/q} |T - S|^{H_-}, \\ (\mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp} B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^q)^{1/q} &\leq \|DB_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim |T - S|^H, \end{aligned}$$

while for $k \geq 2$, we have $D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^k B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}} = 0$. Moreover, by Corollary 4.2 we have

$$(\mathbb{E}_s |\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y} - x + y|^q)^{1/q} \lesssim (\mathbb{E}_s |(1 + [B]_{\mathcal{R}H_-})^{q(1+(4H_-+3)/H_-)}|)^{1/q} |T - S|^{H_-}$$

and for $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}_s \|D_{\mathcal{H}_s^\perp}^k (\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y} - x + y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}}^q)^{1/q} &\leq (\mathbb{E}_s \|D^k (\phi_r^{s,x} - \phi_r^{s,y})\|_{\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}}^q)^{1/q} \\ &\leq 2(\mathbb{E}_s |\Lambda_n|^q)^{1/q} |T - S|^{H_-}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 4.13. By these considerations it follows that for $s \in [S, T]$, $k^* \in \mathbb{N}$, $p^* \geq 2$ there exists a random variable Ξ'_s which satisfies the following: for any $p \geq 1$, $\|\Xi'_s\|_{L_p} \leq C = C(k^*, p^*, p) < \infty$ (but independent of s) and for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $r \in [s, T]$, with probability one, we have

$$\|\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{(x,y)}\|_{D_s^{k^*, p^*}} \leq \Xi'_s |T - S|^{2H_-}.$$

With this estimate in hand, one can repeat the arguments that lead to (5.16) and conclude that

$$\|Q_{s,t}^2\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} |T - S|^{2H_-} |t - s|^{1+(\alpha-1)H},$$

which combined with (7.20) and the fact that $\|b_n\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} \leq \|b\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha}$ gives (7.18).

To bound $\delta Q_{s,u,t}$, we decompose Q in a different manner. Namely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{s,t} &= \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}} \chi_\rho (\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) (\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) \nabla b_n^l (\theta \phi_r^{s,X_s} + (1-\theta) \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) d\theta dr \\ &\quad - Z_S \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}} \chi_\rho (\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) \nabla b_n^l (\theta \phi_r^{s,X_s} + (1-\theta) \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) d\theta dr \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}} \chi_\rho (\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) (b_n^l (\phi_r^{s,X_s}) - b_n^l (\phi_r^{s,Y_s})) dr \\ &\quad - Z_S \mathbb{E}_s \int_s^t \int_0^1 B_{S,r}^{\mathcal{O}} \chi_\rho (\phi_r^{s,X_s} - \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) \nabla b_n^l (\theta \phi_r^{s,X_s} + (1-\theta) \phi_r^{s,Y_s}) d\theta dr \\ &= \tilde{Q}_{s,t}^1 - \tilde{Q}_{s,t}^2 - Z_S \tilde{Q}_{s,t}^3, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Q}_{s,t}^1$ is the germ in (6.4) with the choice $\theta = 1$ and $f = b^l$, $\tilde{Q}_{s,t}^2$ is the germ in (6.4) with the choice $\theta = 0$ and $f = b^l$, and $\tilde{Q}_{s,t}^3$ is the integral over $\theta \in (0, 1)$ of the germ in (6.4) with the choice $f = \nabla b^l$. Consequently, by using (6.6), it is easy to see that

$$\|\mathbb{E}_s \delta Q_{s,u,t}\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} |T - S|^H |t - s|^{2+2\alpha H - 2H}.$$

We can apply Lemma 2.1 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{Q}_{S,T}\|_{L_p} &\lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} \left(|T - T|^{1+(\alpha-1)H} |T - S|^{2H_-} + |T - S|^H |T - S|^{2+2\alpha H - 2H} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|b_n\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} |T - S|^{3H_-}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that by definition $\Gamma_2^n(S, T) = \mathbb{Q}_{S,T}$, and since in the above S, T were arbitrary, we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Gamma_2^n(s, t)\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{3H_-}. \quad (7.21)$$

Finally, by (7.15), (7.16), (7.17), and (7.21), we conclude that

$$\left\| \sum_{q=1}^d Z_s^q (\mathcal{K}_{s,t}^{elq} b) \right\|_{L_p} \lesssim \|b\|_{\mathcal{G}^\alpha} |t - s|^{3H_-},$$

which brings the proof to an end. \square

We can now proceed with the proof of Lemma 7.2.

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Recall that according to the discussion after the statement of the lemma, we know that, with probability one, the limit of $\sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} C_{s,u}^i$ as $|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0$ exists and we only have to show that it is equal to zero. Recall also that

$$\sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} C_{s,u}^i = \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} C_{s,u}^{i,1} + \sum_{[s,u] \in \mathcal{P}_{[0,t]}} C_{s,u}^{i,2}.$$

By Lemma 7.3, since $3H_- > 1$, the limit as $|\mathcal{P}| \rightarrow 0$ of the first term on the right hand side exists with probability one and it is zero. This implies that the second term on the right hand side also converges with probability one. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.4 it follows that it converges to zero in L_p . Hence, the almost sure limit is also zero. This shows that with probability one we have (7.11), which in turn implies (7.9). This finishes the proof. \square

8 Proof of the main result

We now have all the tools to complete the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let X, Y be solutions of (1.1). Then, by Definition 1.3, for the difference $Z := X - Y$, with probability one, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$Z_t = D_t^X - D_t^Y + \int_0^t \Sigma_r Z_r dG_r^\bullet.$$

From this equality, by Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.2 we obtain that with probability one, for all $t \in [0, \tau]$ (recall the definition of τ in Lemma 7.1),

$$Z_t = \int_0^t IZ_s dG_s^\circ + \int_0^t \Sigma_r Z_r dG_r^\bullet.$$

The above is a linear rough differential equation for the controlled path $Z = (Z, \Sigma Z, IZ)$, starting at $Z_0 = 0$. Consequently, the only solution of the above equation is identically zero, which shows

that $X_t = Y_t$ for $t \in [0, \tau]$. Taking into account now the definition of τ , it follows that $\tau = 1$ almost surely, which shows the uniqueness.

Next we move to the existence part. Since in [DG24] weak existence was shown (under an even weaker condition $\alpha > 1/2 - 1/(2H)$) and above we have shown strong uniqueness, it is classical (going back originally to [YW71]) that these imply strong existence. Here we provide a sketch based on a characterisation of convergence in probability from [GK96].

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $b^n \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|b^n - b\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} = 0$, and consider X^n given by the unique solution of the equation

$$dX_t^n = b^n(X_t^n) dt + \sigma(X_t^n) dB_t, \quad X_0^n = x,$$

and let us set

$$D^n = \int_0^t b^n(X_s^n) ds.$$

Let $X^{k(n)}, X^{k'(n)}$ be arbitrary subsequences and consider the sequence

$$Z_n = (X^{k(n)}, D^{k(n)}, X^{k'(n)}, D^{k'(n)}, B, W) \in \mathcal{X}$$

where \mathcal{X} is the Polish space $\mathcal{C}^{H-+} \times \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha H+} \times \mathcal{C}^{H-+} \times \mathcal{C}^{1+\alpha H+} \times \mathcal{R}_{\text{geo}}^{H-} \times \mathcal{C}^{H+}$. Then, following the arguments on [DG24, Proof of Theorem 3], the following can be shown:

- (i) there exists subsequence of Z_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$ and a probability space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ carrying \mathcal{X} -valued random variables $\bar{Z}_n, \bar{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}_2$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}_n &= (\bar{X}^{k(n)}, \bar{D}^{k(n)}, \bar{X}^{k'(n)}, \bar{D}^{k'(n)}, \bar{B}^n, \bar{W}^n), \\ \bar{Z} &= (\bar{X}^1, \bar{D}^1, \bar{X}^2, \bar{D}^2, \bar{B}, \bar{W}), \end{aligned}$$

such that $\bar{Z}_n \stackrel{d}{=} Z_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$ and $Z_n \rightarrow Z$ $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely as $\mathbb{N}_1 \ni n \rightarrow \infty$.

- (ii) \bar{W} is an $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$ -Brownian motion, where $\bar{\mathbb{F}} = (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\bar{W}_s, \bar{X}_s^i, \bar{D}_s^i, i = 1, 2, s \leq t)$ and $\bar{\mathbb{F}} = (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$.

- (iii) \bar{B} is the Gaussian rough path lift of the fractional Brownian motion

$$\bar{B}_t = \int_0^t K(t, r) d\bar{W}_r.$$

- (iv) For each $i = 1, 2$, \bar{X}^i is a solution with drift component \bar{D}^i , driven by the same noise \bar{B} and with respect to the same filtration $\bar{\mathbb{F}}$.

Consequently, by the uniqueness part $\bar{X}^1 = \bar{X}^2$ (hence $\bar{D}^1 = \bar{D}^2$), and the characterisation of convergence in probability of Gyöngy and Krylov ([GK96]), we have that the original sequence (X^n, D^n) converges in probability to some (X, D) . From this, again by using the arguments of the [DG24, Proof of Theorem 3], it is easy to see that X is a strong solution to Definition 1.3 with drift component D . \square

Appendix A Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma A.1. *Let $(S, T) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s, t])$. Suppose that there exist constants C_1, C_2 such that for all $(s, t) \in [S, T]_{\leq}^2$ we have*

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s, t])} \leq C_1 [f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s, t])} |t - s|^\gamma + C_2.$$

Then, it holds that

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} \leq 2(1 + [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])})(2C_1)^{1/\gamma} C_2.$$

Proof. Let us take a partition $\phi = \{s_0, \dots, s_m\}$ of $[S, T]$ such that $|\pi| \leq (2C_1)^{-1/\gamma}$ and $m \leq (2C_1)^{1/\gamma}$. It then follows by assumption that

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([s_i, s_{i+1}])} \leq 2C_2$$

Next, by (1.10), we get

$$[f]_{\mathcal{D}_g^{2\gamma}([S, T])} \leq 2(1 + [g]_{\mathcal{C}^\gamma([S, T])})mC_2.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 2.2. First, it follows from the definitions of $\mathcal{S}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ and $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ that linear combinations of elements of the form $Fv \otimes h$ with $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $v \in V$, and $h \in \mathcal{H}$ are dense in $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$. In addition, $\mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$ is a linear space and therefore it suffices to show that $Fv \otimes h$ can be approximated by elements from $\mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$. Notice that for some $h_1, \dots, h_m \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{pol}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta := Fv \otimes h &= f(B(h_1), \dots, B(h_m)) \sum_{i,k=1}^{\infty} \langle v, q_k \rangle_V \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k \otimes e_i \\ &= f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle h_1, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle h_m, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i)\right) \sum_{i,k=1}^{\infty} \langle v, q_k \rangle_V \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k \otimes e_i, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that B is an isonormal process. Then, we set

$$\zeta_n := F_n \sum_{i,k=1}^n \langle v, q_k \rangle_V \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} q_k \otimes e_i,$$

where

$$F_n := f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \langle h_1, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^n \langle h_m, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i)\right).$$

We clearly have $\zeta_n \in \mathcal{S}_{ON}(V \otimes \mathcal{H})$. By the triangle inequality and Parseval's identity we have

$$\|\zeta - \zeta_n\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}}^2 \leq 2|F - F_n|^2 \sum_{i,k=1}^{\infty} \langle v, q_k \rangle_V^2 \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2|F_n|^2 \sum_{i \vee k > n} \langle v, q_k \rangle_V^2 \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2,$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta - \zeta_n\|_{L_p(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H})} &\leq 2\|F - F_n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \|v \otimes h\|_{V \otimes \mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + 2\|F_n\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \left(\sum_{i \vee k > n} \langle v, q_k \rangle_V^2 \langle h, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Next, notice that since f has polynomial growth, for any $q \geq 2$, there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|F_n|^q &\lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle h_j, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i) \right|^l \lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \langle h_j, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} B(e_i) \right\|_{L_2(\Omega)}^l \\ &\lesssim 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle h_j, e_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^{l/2} \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have used Gaussianity. This shows that F_n are bounded uniformly in n in L_q for any $q \geq 1$. Consequently, the second summand in (A.1) converges to zero with $n \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, by using the continuity of f , we see that $|F - F_n| \rightarrow 0$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which combined with the boundedness of F_n in L_q for any $q \geq 1$ shows that the first summand in (A.1) also converges to zero. Consequently, we get that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\zeta - \zeta_n\|_{L_p(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H})} = 0$. Finally, to check that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|D^\kappa(\zeta - \zeta_n)\|_{L_p(\Omega; V \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes(\kappa+1)})} = 0$ for $\kappa \leq k$, it suffices to Malliavin differentiate the expressions for ζ and ζ_n and repeat the above argument. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, k even. Take a linear map $T : \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mapsto L^p(\Omega)$ such there exist positive constants $\Gamma_\ell \leq \Gamma_{-k}$ so that the following holds: for any $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the following bounds hold*

$$\|Tf\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \Gamma_\ell \|\nabla^\ell f\|_\infty, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\|T(\nabla^k f)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \Gamma_{-k} \|f\|_\infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Suppose furthermore that $Tf_n \rightarrow Tf$ in $L^p(\Omega)$ whenever $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly on compacts. Then for any $\beta \in [-k, 0)$ there exists a constant $C = C(d, \ell, k, \beta)$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ one has

$$\|Tf\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \Gamma_\ell^{1-\theta} \Gamma_{-k}^\theta \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\beta}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\theta \in [0, 1]$ is uniquely defined by $\beta = (1 - \theta)\ell - \theta k$.

Proof. By continuity, it suffices to show (A.4) with $P_t f$ in place of f on the left-hand side, uniformly in $t \in (0, 1]$. First we have, by definition of the Hölder norm (1.6)

$$\|TP_t f\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq \Gamma_\ell \|\nabla^\ell P_t f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \Gamma_\ell t^{-\ell/2} \|P_{t/2} f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \Gamma_\ell t^{-\ell/2} t^{\beta/2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{G}^\beta}.$$

On the other hand, if k is even, so that $k = 2m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|TP_t f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &= \|TP_{t/m} \cdots P_{t/m} f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &= \|T \int_0^{t/m} \cdots \int_0^{t/m} \partial_t P_{s_1} \cdots \partial_t P_{s_m} f \, ds_1 \cdots ds_m\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\ &= \left\| \int_0^{t/m} \cdots \int_0^{t/m} T \Delta^m P_{s_1 + \cdots + s_m} f \, ds_1 \cdots ds_m \right\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \Gamma_{-k} \int_0^{t/m} \cdots \int_0^{t/m} \|P_{s_1+\dots+s_m} f\|_{L^\infty} ds_1 \cdots ds_m \\
 &\leq \Gamma_{-k} \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta} \int_0^{t/m} \cdots \int_0^{t/m} (s_1 + \dots + s_m)^{\beta/2} ds_1 \cdots ds_m \\
 &\lesssim \Gamma_{-k} \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^\beta} t^{k/2+\beta/2},
 \end{aligned}$$

using $\beta/2 > -k/2 = -m$ in the last step. Raising the first estimate to the $(1 - \theta)$ power and the second to θ , the factors involving t cancel exactly, and we get the desired bound. \square

The following lemma follows directly by [BFG22, Proposition 2.2, Lemma 2.3] and standard Young integration. For the notation \mathcal{C}_γ^β therein, recall (4.34).

Lemma A.3. *Let $s \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\alpha + \beta > 1$ and let $\gamma \in (0, \beta)$. Then, for all $f \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([s, 1])$, $g \in \mathcal{C}_\gamma^\beta([s, 1])$ and $(u, t) \in [0, 1]_{\leq}^2$, we have*

$$\left| \int_u^t f_{u,r} dg_r \right| \lesssim [f]_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} [g]_{\mathcal{C}_\gamma^\beta} |t - u|^{\beta+\alpha-\gamma}.$$

Acknowledgment

KD and KL have been supported by the Engineering & Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) [grant number EP/Y016955/1]. MG and CL acknowledge funding from the FWF: This research was funded in whole or in part by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) [10.55776/P34992]. For open access purposes, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to any authors accepted manuscript version arising from this submission.

References

- [ART23] L. ANZELETTI, A. RICHARD, and E. TANRÉ. Regularisation by fractional noise for one-dimensional differential equations with distributional drift. *Electron. J. Probab.* **28**, (2023), Paper No. 135, 49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/23-ejp1010>.
- [BFG22] C. BELLINGERI, P. FRIZ, and M. GERENCSÉR. Singular paths spaces and applications. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* **40**, no. 6, (2022), 1126–1149. <http://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1080/07362994.2021.1988641>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07362994.2021.1988641>.
- [BLM23] O. BUTKOVSKY, K. LÊ, and L. MYTNIK. Stochastic equations with singular drift driven by fractional brownian motion, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11937>.
- [BM24] O. BUTKOVSKY and L. MYTNIK. Weak uniqueness for singular stochastic equations. *arXiv e-prints* arXiv:2405.13780. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13780>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.13780>.
- [CD24] R. CATELLIER and R. DUBOSCQ. Regularization by noise for rough differential equations driven by gaussian rough paths, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.04251>.
- [CF10] T. CASS and P. FRIZ. Densities for rough differential equations under Hörmander’s condition. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **171**, no. 3, (2010), 2115–2141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2010.171.2115>.
- [CG16] R. CATELLIER and M. GUBINELLI. Averaging along irregular curves and regularisation of odes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **126**, no. 8, (2016), 2323–2366. <http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2016.02.002>.

- [CHLT15] T. CASS, M. HAIRER, C. LITTERER, and S. TINDEL. Smoothness of the density for solutions to Gaussian rough differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **43**, no. 1, (2015), 188–239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/13-AOP896>.
- [CLL13] T. CASS, C. LITTERER, and T. LYONS. Integrability and tail estimates for Gaussian rough differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **41**, no. 4, (2013), 3026–3050. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-AOP821>.
- [Dav07] A. M. DAVIE. Uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, no. 24, (2007), Art. ID rnm124, 26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnm124>.
- [DG24] K. DAREIOTIS and M. GERENCSÉR. Path-by-path regularisation through multiplicative noise in rough, Young, and ordinary differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **52**, no. 5, (2024), 1864–1902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/24-aop1686>.
- [DU99] L. DECREUSEFOND and A. S. ÜSTÜNEL. Stochastic analysis of the fractional Brownian motion. *Potential Anal.* **10**, no. 2, (1999), 177–214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1008634027843>.
- [FGP10] F. FLANDOLI, M. GUBINELLI, and E. PRIOLA. Well-posedness of the transport equation by stochastic perturbation. *Inventiones mathematicae* **180**, no. 1, (2010), 1–53.
- [FH20] P. K. FRIZ and M. HAIRER. *A Course on Rough Paths*. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [FVo6] P. FRIZ and N. VICTOIR. A variation embedding theorem and applications. *J. Funct. Anal.* **239**, no. 2, (2006), 631–637.
- [FV10] P. K. FRIZ and N. B. VICTOIR. *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths*, vol. 120 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. Theory and applications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511845079>.
- [GG22] L. GALEATI and M. GUBINELLI. Noiseless regularisation by noise. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **38**, no. 2, (2022), 433–502. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4171/rmi/1280>.
- [GG24] L. GALEATI and M. GERENCSÉR. Solution theory of fractional sdes in complete subcritical regimes, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.03475>.
- [GK96] I. GYÖNGY and N. KRYLOV. Existence of strong solutions for Itô’s stochastic equations via approximations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **105**, no. 2, (1996), 143–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01203833>.
- [GOT20] B. GESS, C. OUYANG, and S. TINDEL. Density bounds for solutions to differential equations driven by Gaussian rough paths. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **33**, no. 2, (2020), 611–648. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10959-019-00967-0>.
- [Hai14] M. HAIRER. A theory of regularity structures. *Invent. Math.* **198**, no. 2, (2014), 269–504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00222-014-0505-4>.
- [Hai21] M. HAIRER. Introduction to malliavin calculus. *Unpublished notes* (2021).
- [HP21] F. A. HARANG and N. PERKOWSKI. C^∞ -regularization of ODEs perturbed by noise. *Stoch. Dyn.* **21**, no. 8, (2021), Paper No. 2140010, 29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0219493721400104>.
- [Ina14] Y. INAHAMA. Malliavin differentiability of solutions of rough differential equations. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **267**, no. 5, (2014), 1566–1584. <http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2014.06.011>.
- [KS84] S. KUSUOKA and D. STROOCK. The partial malliavin calculus and its application to non-linear filtering. *Stochastics* **12**, no. 2, (1984), 83–142. <http://arxiv.org/abs/https://doi.org/10.1080/17442508408833296>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17442508408833296>.
- [Lê20] K. LÊ. A stochastic sewing lemma and applications. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **25**(2020). <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1214/20-EJP442>.

- [Ly098] T. J. LYONS. Differential equations driven by rough signals. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* **14**, no. 2, (1998), 215–310.
- [MM23] T. MATSUDA and A. MAYORCAS. Pathwise uniqueness for multiplicative young and rough differential equations driven by fractional brownian motion (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.06473>.
- [MP24] T. MATSUDA and N. PERKOWSKI. An extension of the stochastic sewing lemma and applications to fractional stochastic calculus. *Forum Math. Sigma* **12**, (2024), Paper No. e52, 52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/fms.2024.32>.
- [NO04] D. NUALART and Y. OUKNINE. Regularization of quasilinear heat equations by a fractional noise. *Stoch. Dyn.* **4**, no. 2, (2004), 201–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0219493704001012>.
- [Nua06] D. NUALART. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 2006.
- [Nua09] D. NUALART. *Malliavin calculus and its applications*, vol. 110 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/cbms/110>.
- [NZ89] D. NUALART and M. ZAKAI. The partial malliavin calculus. In J. AZÉMA, M. YOR, and P. A. MEYER, eds., *Séminaire de Probabilités XXIII*, 362–381. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989.
- [PR07] C. PRÉVÔT and M. RÖCKNER. *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*, vol. 1905 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [Tow02] N. TOWGHI. Multidimensional extension of L. C. Young’s inequality. *JIPAM. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.* **3**, no. 2, (2002), Article 22, 13.
- [YW71] T. YAMADA and S. WATANABE. On the uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **11**, (1971), 155–167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/kjm/1250523691>.