

# An estimation of Fisher information bound for distribution-dependent SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motion with small noise

Tongxuan Liu, Qian Yu

January 8, 2025

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider the following distribution-dependent SDE driven by fractional Brownian motion with small noise

$$X_{t,\varepsilon} = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) ds + \varepsilon^H \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) dB_s^H, t \in [0, T],$$

where the initial condition  $X_0$  is a real number,  $\mathcal{L}_{X_{t,\varepsilon}}$  denotes the law of  $X_{t,\varepsilon}$ ,  $\{B_H^t, t \geq 0\}$  is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon$  is a small parameter. We study the rate of Fisher information convergence in the central limit theorem for the solution of small noise SDE, then we show that the convergence rate  $\varepsilon^{2H}$  is of optimal order.

**Keywords:** Fisher information; distribution-dependent SDE; fractional Brownian motion; Malliavin calculus.

*Subject Classification:* 94A17; 60H07; 60H10.

## 1 Introduction

Given a random variable  $F$  with an absolutely continuous density  $p_F$ , the Fisher information of  $F$  is defined by

$$I(F) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{[p'_F(x)]^2}{p_F(x)} dx = \mathbb{E}[\rho_F^2(F)]$$

where  $p'_F$  denotes a Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $p_F$  and  $\rho_F = \frac{p'_F}{p_F}$  is the score function. Let  $N$  be a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , then the Fisher information distance of  $F$  to  $N$  can be defined by

$$I(F||N) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \rho_F(F) + \frac{F - \mu}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 \right].$$

Moreover, if the derivative  $p'_F$  does not exist, the Fisher information distance is defined to be infinite.

The research on Fisher's information convergence can be traced back to a paper published by Linnik [13] in 1959. This has aroused the research interest of many scholars and produced many research results on Fisher information convergence. However, most of the existing results are devoted to the sums of independent random variables (see [1], [6], [10], [11], [12] and references therein). Recently, Nourdin and Nualart [15] used Malliavin calculus method to obtain quantitative

Fisher information bounds for the multiple Wiener-Itô integrals. This provides a basis for Dung and Hang [2] to establish the bounds of the Fisher information distance to the class of normal distributions of Malliavin differentiable random variables. Furthermore, they study the rate of Fisher information convergence in the central limit theorem for the solution of small noise stochastic differential equations (SDEs):

$$X_{\varepsilon,t} = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_{\varepsilon,s})ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_{\varepsilon,s})dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where the initial condition  $X_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b, \sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are deterministic functions,  $W$  is a standard Brownian motion and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  is a small parameter.

The above SDEs consider the case of distribution independent and can be used to characterize linear Fokker-Planck equations. Generally, nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations can be characterised by distribution dependent SDEs, which are also named as McKean-Vlasov SDEs or mean field SDEs. A distinct feature of such systems is the appearance of probability laws in the coefficients of the resulting equations. Wang [19] established strong well-posedness of distribution dependent SDEs with one-sided Lipschitz continuous drifts and Lipschitz-continuous dispersion coefficients. Under integrability conditions on distribution dependent coefficients, Huang and Wang [9] obtained the existence and uniqueness for distribution dependent SDEs with non-degenerate noise. Recently, Fan *et al.* [4] proved the well-posedness of distributed dependent SDE driven by fractional Brownian motion (fBm) and then established the Bismut formulas for both non-degenerate and degenerate cases. Galeati *et al.* [7] studied distributed dependent SDEs with irregular, possibly distributional drift, driven by additive fBm and established strong well-posedness under a variety of assumptions on the drifts.

To our knowledge, there is a certain distance between distribution dependent SDE and distribution independent SDE, and also significant gap in the estimation of Fisher information bound for SDE in these two cases driven by fBm. Note that, the study of Fisher information convergence in the central limit theorem for the solution of distribution-dependent SDE driven by fBm with small noise has not been studied. Thus, in this paper we will consider the following distribution dependent SDE driven by fBm with small noise:

$$X_{t,\varepsilon} = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})ds + \varepsilon^H \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})dB_s^H, \quad X_0 = x, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (1.1)$$

where the initial condition  $X_0 = x_0$  is a real number,  $\mathcal{L}_{X_{t,\varepsilon}}$  denotes the law of  $X_{t,\varepsilon}$ ,  $B^H$  is a fBm with Hurst index  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  is a small parameter.

For some  $\theta \in [1, \infty)$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_\theta(\mathbb{R})$  be the space of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  with finite  $\theta$ -th moments. We define the  $L^\theta$ -Wasserstein distance of any two probability measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\mathbb{R})$  by

$$\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \ell(\mu, \nu)} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} |x - y|^\theta \pi(dx dy) \right)^{1/\theta}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\ell(\mu, \nu)$  is the set of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  with marginals  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . In order to ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution, we impose the following assumptions on the coefficients  $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_\theta(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathcal{F}_\theta(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{R}$ . Throughout this paper, we use  $|\cdot|$  and  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  for the Euclidean norm and inner product, respectively, and for a matrix,  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the operator norm.

Let  $f : \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f$  is called  $L$ -differentiable at  $\mu \in \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , if the functional  $L^2(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mu) \ni \phi \mapsto f(\mu \circ (Id + \phi)^{-1})$  is Fréchet differentiable at  $0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mu)$ . A function  $g$  is called differentiable on  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , if for any  $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $g(\cdot, \mu)$  is differentiable and

$g(x, \cdot)$  is  $L$ -differentiable. Furthermore, if  $\nabla g(\cdot, \mu)(x)$  and  $D^L g(x, \cdot)(\mu)(y)$  are jointly continuous in  $(x, y, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ , we denote  $g \in C^{1,(1,0)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R}))$ . More details of  $L$ -differentiable see in [4, 5].

(A1) There exists a non-decreasing function  $K(t)$ , such that for any  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{F}_\theta(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |b(t, x, \mu) - b(t, y, \nu)| &\leq K(t)(|x - y| + \mathbb{W}_\theta(\mu, \nu)), \\ \|\sigma(t, \mu) - \sigma(t, \nu)\| &\leq K(t)\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mu, \nu), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|b(t, 0, \delta_0)| + \|\sigma(t, \delta_0)\| \leq K(t),$$

where  $\delta_0$  denotes the initial experience distribution.

(A2) For every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $b(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^{1,(1,0)}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R}))$ , and there exists a non-decreasing function  $K_1(t)$  such that

(i) for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$|\nabla b(t, \cdot, \mu)(x)| + |D^L b(t, x, \cdot)(\mu)(y)| \leq K_1(t).$$

(ii) for any  $x, y, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $b(t, x, \mu)$  is twice differentiable in  $x$  and

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla b(t, \cdot, \mu)(x) - \nabla b(t, \cdot, \nu)(y)| + |D^L b(t, x, \cdot)(\mu)(z_1) - D^L b(t, y, \cdot)(\nu)(z_2)| \\ \leq K_1(t)(|x - y| + |z_1 - z_2| + \mathbb{W}_\theta(\mu, \nu)). \end{aligned}$$

By Fan et al. [5], under the assumption (A1), there exists a unique function  $\{x_t, t \in [0, T]\}$  such that  $x_t \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$  and  $x_t$  satisfies the deterministic equation

$$x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (1.3)$$

Under the assumption (A2), as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} = \frac{X_{t,\varepsilon} - x_t}{\varepsilon^H}$  converges in distribution to  $Z_t$ , for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $Z_t$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t = \int_0^t \nabla_{Z_s} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) ds + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}(D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) Z_s) |_{u=x_s}) ds \\ + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) dB_s^H, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E} [D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) Z_s] = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \frac{b(s, u, \mathcal{L}_{x_s + a Z_s}) - b(s, u, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})}{a}.$$

This result provides a foundation for our study of the convergence in Fisher information distance. In this paper, we mainly focus on the following two results. The first one (Theorem 3.1) is the order of convergence in Fisher information distance,

$$I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} || Z_t) \leq C_{upper}(t, H) \varepsilon^{2H};$$

The second one (Theorem 3.2) is that the rate  $O(\varepsilon^{2H})$  is optimal,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} || Z_t) \geq C_{lower}(t, H).$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminary properties of fBm, Malliavin calculus and some basic propositions. In Section 3, we impose our main results. The rate of Fisher information convergence for the solutions of (1.1) is given in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 proves that this rate is optimal. Section 4 and Section 5 provide detailed proofs for Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2, respectively.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present some preliminary properties and some basic propositions that will be used in the rest of our paper.

### 2.1 Fractional Brownian motion

Let  $\{B_t^H, t \geq 0\}$  be a fBm with Hurst parameter  $H \in (0, 1)$ . It is a centered Gaussian process with covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}(B_t^H B_s^H) = \frac{1}{2}(t^{2H} + s^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H}),$$

for all  $t, s \geq 0$ . This process was first introduced by Kolmogorov and studied by Mandelbrot and Van Ness [14] and it became an object of intense study due to its self-similarity, long range dependence and Gaussianity. Note that  $B_t^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is a standard Brownian motion. To ensure the existence and uniqueness of the solution in equation (1.1), we only consider fBm with Hurst index  $H > 1/2$ .

fBm admits the following Wiener integral representation

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

where  $W$  is a standard Brownian motion and  $K_H$  is the kernel function defined by

$$K_H(t, s) = C_H s^{\frac{1}{2}-H} \int_s^t (u - s)^{H-\frac{2}{3}} u^{H-\frac{1}{2}} du, \quad s \leq t,$$

with  $C_H = \left( \frac{H(2H-1)}{\beta(2-2H, H-\frac{1}{2})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\beta$  denotes a beta function. Moreover, we can see that

$$\frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s) = c_H \left( H - \frac{1}{2} \right) (t - s)^{H-\frac{3}{2}} \left( \frac{s}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}-H}.$$

Next, we will introduce the Cameron-Martin space (more details see in [8]). The Cameron-Martin space  $\mathcal{K}_H$  associated to the covariance  $\mathbb{E}[B_t^H B_s^H]$  is defined as the closure of the space of step functions with respect to the scalar product

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{K}_H} = c_H \int_0^T \int_0^T \phi(u) \psi(u) |u - v|^{2H-2} du dv.$$

For any  $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_H$ , we can define an operator  $K_H^*$ ,

$$K_H^*(\phi)(s) = \int_s^T \phi(t) \frac{\partial K_H}{\partial t}(t, s) dt. \quad (2.1)$$

Then  $(K_H^* 1_{[0,t]})(s) = K_H(t, s) 1_{[0,t]}(s)$  and we have an isometry between  $\mathcal{K}_H$  and  $L^2[0, T]$ ,

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{K}_H} = \langle K_H^*(\phi), K_H^*(\psi) \rangle_{L^2[0, T]}.$$

Thus, the Wiener integral with respect to fBm  $B^H$  can be rewritten as a Wiener integral with respect to Wiener process  $W$

$$\int_0^T \phi(s) dB_s^H = \int_0^T (K_H^* \phi)(s) dW_s. \quad (2.2)$$

## 2.2 Malliavin calculus

In this section, let us recall some elements of Malliavin calculus (for more details see [16]). We suppose that  $\{W_t, t \in [0, T]\}$  is defined on a complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ , where  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a natural filtration generated by the Brownian motion  $W$ .

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denotes a dense subset of  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  that consists of smooth random variables of the form

$$F = f(W(h_1), W(h_2), \dots, W(h_n)), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_n \in L^2[0, T]$ . If  $F$  has the form (2.3), we define its Malliavin derivative as the process  $DF := D_t F$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$  given by

$$D_t F = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k}(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_n)) h_k(t).$$

More generally, for each  $k \geq 1$ , we can define the iterated derivative operator on a cylindrical random variable by setting

$$D_{t_1, \dots, t_k}^k F = D_{t_1} \cdots D_{t_k} F = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k=1}^n \frac{\partial^k f}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_k}}(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_n)) h_{i_1}(t_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes h_{i_k}(t_k),$$

where  $h_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes h_{i_k}$  denotes the  $k$ -fold tensor product of  $h_{i_1}, \dots, h_{i_k}$ .

For any  $1 \leq p, k \leq \infty$ , we denote by  $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}$  the closure of  $\mathcal{S}$  with respect to the norm

$$\|F\|_{k,p}^p := \mathbb{E}|F|^p + \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}(\|D^i F\|_{(L^2[0,T])^{\otimes i}}^p).$$

Observe that, by computing the Malliavin derivative of  $X_{t,\varepsilon}$ , combining (2.1) and (2.2), we can easily get:

$$D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} = \int_r^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(X_{s,\varepsilon}) D_r X_{s,\varepsilon} ds + \int_r^t \varepsilon^H \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} = \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \left( \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(X_{s,\varepsilon}) D_\theta D_r X_{s,\varepsilon} + \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(X_{s,\varepsilon}) D_r X_{s,\varepsilon} D_\theta X_{s,\varepsilon} \right) ds. \quad (2.5)$$

For any  $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ , the Clark-Ocone formula says that

$$F - \mathbb{E}[F] = \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[D_s F | \mathcal{F}_s] dW_s.$$

An important operator in the Malliavin calculus theory is the divergence operator  $\delta$ . It is defined as the adjoint of the derivative operator  $D$  in the following manner. The domain of  $\delta$  denoted by  $Dom \delta$  which is the set of all functions  $u \in L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$  such that

$$|\mathbb{E}(\langle DF, u \rangle_{L^2[0,T]})| \leq C(u) \|F\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where  $C(u)$  is some positive constant depending on  $u$ . In particular, if  $u \in \text{Dom}\delta$ , then  $\delta(u)$  is characterized by following relationships

$$\delta(uF) = F\delta(u) - \langle DF, u \rangle_{L^2[0,T]}, \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle DF, u \rangle_{L^2[0,T]}] = \mathbb{E}[F\delta(u)], \quad \forall F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}.$$

### 2.3 Some propositions

In this section, we will introduce some propositions that will be used in the proof of our main results.

**Proposition 2.1** ([5], Lemma 4.1) *Suppose that  $\sigma$  satisfies (A1) and  $\mu \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{R}^d))$  with  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ . Then there is a constant  $C \geq 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mu_s) dB_s^H \right|^p \right) \leq C \int_0^T \|\sigma(s, \mu_s)\|^p ds. \quad (2.7)$$

The next proposition is a general bound of Fisher information which is very important to the proofs of our main results.

**Proposition 2.2** ([2], Theorem 3.1) *Let  $F \in \mathbb{D}^{2,4}$  and  $N$  be a normal random variable and  $N \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . Define*

$$\Theta := \langle DF, u \rangle_{L^2[0,T]},$$

where  $u_t := \mathbb{E}[D_t F | \mathcal{F}_t]$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ . Assume that  $\Theta \neq 0$  a.s. Then, we have

$$I(F|N) \leq c \left( \frac{1}{\sigma^4} (\mathbb{E}[F] - \mu)^2 + A_F |\text{Var}(F) - \sigma^2|^2 + C_F \left( \mathbb{E} \|D\Theta\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4 \right) \right),$$

where  $c$  is an absolute constant and  $A_F, C_F$  are positive constants given by

$$A_F := \frac{1}{\sigma^4} \left( \mathbb{E} \|u\|_{L^2[0,T]}^8 \mathbb{E} |\Theta|^{-8} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

$$C_F := A_F + \left( \mathbb{E} \|u\|_{L^2[0,T]}^8 \mathbb{E} |\Theta|^{-16} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Throughout this paper,  $C$  denotes some positive constant which may change from line to line.

## 3 Main results

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $\{X_{t,\varepsilon}, t \in [0, T]\}$  and  $\{x_t, t \in [0, T]\}$  be the solutions to the equations (1.1) and (1.3), respectively. Define*

$$\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} = \frac{X_{t,\varepsilon} - x_t}{\varepsilon^H}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold and that for some  $p_0 > 16$ ,

$$\left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} < \infty, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad t \in (0, T]. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, for all  $\varepsilon$  is a small number and  $t \in (0, T]$ , we have

$$I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||Z_t) \leq C(t, H) \left( \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} + \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p_0}} \right. \\ \left. + \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{4}{p_0}} \right) \varepsilon^{2H}.$$

where  $C(t, H)$  is a positive constant only depending on  $t$  and  $H$ ,  $Z_t$  satisfies

$$Z_t = \int_0^t \nabla_{Z_s} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) ds + \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}(D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) Z_s)|_{u=x_s}) ds \\ + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) dB_s^H, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that, if  $\sigma = 1$ , the condition (3.1) degenerates to  $\left( \int_0^t K_H^2(t, r) dr \right)^{-p_0} = t^{-2p_0 H} < \infty$ . Therefore, condition (3.1) is feasible.

Theorem 3.1 tells us, the rate of Fisher information convergence in the central limit theorem for the solution of (1.1) is  $O(\varepsilon^2)$ . Moreover, the next theorem will prove that this rate is optimal.

**Theorem 3.2** *Under the assumptions (A1) and (A2), for each  $t \in (0, T]$ , we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||Z_t) \geq \frac{1}{4\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4} (\mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}[\delta(V_t DU_t)|U_t]_t|)^2. \quad (3.3)$$

where  $Z_t$  is defined as in Theorem 3.1,  $(U_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $(V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  are stochastic processes defined by

$$U_t = \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s ds - \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} \int_0^t (b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) dB_s^H, \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$V_t = \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s^2 + \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) V_s ds \\ + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H. \quad (3.5)$$

Note that, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , there exist some  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{F}_2(\mathbb{R})$  and  $c_1, c_2$ , such that

$$\varepsilon^{-H} (b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) \rightarrow c_1 D^L b(s, x, \cdot)(\mu)$$

and

$$\varepsilon^{-H} (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) \rightarrow c_2 D^L \sigma(s, \cdot)(\nu),$$

since (4.5) and assumption (A1). This ensures the rationality of the definitions of  $U$  and  $V$ .

## 4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

By the Proposition 2.2, we can see that the estimate of Fisher information distance between  $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}$  and  $Z_t$  can be divided into three parts, that is the estimation of  $(\mathbb{E}[F] - \mu)^2$ ,  $Var(F) - \sigma^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|D\Theta\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4$ . So that, our proof of Theorem 3.1 can be divided into three estimates for each part. Here are some lemmas we need in our proof.

**Lemma 4.1** *Under the assumption (A1), the equation (1.1) has a unique solution  $\{X_{t,\varepsilon}, t \in [0, T]\}$  satisfying for each  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}|X_{t,\varepsilon}|^p \leq C_1(t, p, H), \quad (4.1)$$

where  $C_1(t, p, H)$  is a positive constant only depending on  $t$ ,  $p$  and  $H$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.1 in [4], under the assumption (A1), the equation (1.1) has a unique solution  $\{X_{t,\varepsilon}, t \in [0, T]\}$  with the form

$$X_{t,\varepsilon} = X_0 + \int_0^t b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) ds + \varepsilon^H \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) dB_s^H.$$

Then, by (2.7) and the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_{t,\varepsilon}|^p &\leq C + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) ds \right|^p + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) dB_s^H \right|^p \\ &\leq C + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})|^p ds + C \int_0^t \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})\|^p ds \\ &\leq C + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}(1 + |X_{s,\varepsilon}|^p + |\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \delta_0)|^p) ds + C \int_0^t (1 + |\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \delta_0)|^p) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the assumption (A1) in the last inequality. By (1.2), since  $p \geq \theta$ , we can use the Hölder inequality to obtain that

$$|\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \delta_0)|^p \leq (\mathbb{E}|X_{s,\varepsilon}|^\theta)^{\frac{p}{\theta}} \leq \mathbb{E}|X_{s,\varepsilon}|^p.$$

So that

$$\mathbb{E}|X_{t,\varepsilon}|^p \leq C + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_{s,\varepsilon}|^p ds.$$

Then, by Gronwall's inequality, we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|X_{t,\varepsilon}|^p \leq C e^{ct} \leq C.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Note that, by the assumption (A1) and the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(t, \mathcal{L}_{X_{t,\varepsilon}})\| &\leq \|\sigma(t, \mathcal{L}_{X_{t,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(t, \delta_0)\| + \|\sigma(t, \delta_0)\| \\ &\leq K(t)(1 + \mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{t,\varepsilon}}, \delta_0)) \leq K(t)(1 + (\mathbb{E}|X_{t,\varepsilon}|^\theta)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Combine (4.2) and (4.1),  $\sigma$  is a bounded function. In the rest of our paper, we put the boundedness of  $\sigma$  into assumption (A1).



**Lemma 4.2** *Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold. Then, for each  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} |D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p \leq C_2(t, p, H) \varepsilon^{pH} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p \leq C_3(t, p, H) \varepsilon^{2pH}, \quad (4.4)$$

for any  $\varepsilon$  is a small number, where  $C_2(t, p, H)$ ,  $C_3(t, p, H)$  are positive constants only depending on  $t$ ,  $p$  and  $H$ .

*Proof.* Since the assumption (A1) and the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon}) D_r X_{s, \varepsilon} ds \right|^p \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left| \left( \int_r^t \varepsilon^H \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right) \right|^p \\ &\leq C \int_r^t \mathbb{E} [|\nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon})|^p |D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p] ds + C \varepsilon^{pH} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right|^p \\ &\leq C \int_r^t \mathbb{E} |D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p ds + C \varepsilon^{pH} |K_H(t, r)|^p \\ &\leq C \int_r^t \mathbb{E} |D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p ds + C \varepsilon^{pH}, \end{aligned}$$

Then by Gronwall's inequality, we can obtain (4.3). It remains to prove (4.4). Recall the form of  $D_\theta D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}$ , that is (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon}) D_\theta D_r X_{s, \varepsilon} ds \right|^p \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon}) D_r X_{s, \varepsilon} D_\theta X_{s, \varepsilon} ds \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the assumptions (A1)-(A2) and the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p &\leq C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} [|\nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon})|^p |D_\theta D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p] ds \\ &\quad + C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} [|\nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(X_{s, \varepsilon})|^p |D_r X_{s, \varepsilon} D_\theta X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p] ds \\ &\leq C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p ds + C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} [|D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p |D_\theta X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p] ds \\ &\leq C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p ds + C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \sqrt{\mathbb{E} |D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^{2p} \mathbb{E} |D_\theta X_{s, \varepsilon}|^{2p}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we can use the estimate (4.3) to get

$$\mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{t, \varepsilon}|^p \leq C \int_{r \vee \theta}^t \mathbb{E} |D_\theta D_r X_{s, \varepsilon}|^p ds + C \varepsilon^{2pH}.$$

Thus, (4.4) is obtained by Gronwall's inequality.  $\blacksquare$

The following lemma characterizes the distance relationship between  $X_{t, \varepsilon}$  and  $x_t$ , which has been proven in [5], so we directly present this result here.

**Lemma 4.3** ([5], Lemma 4.2) Under the assumptions (A1), for each  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_{t, \varepsilon} - x_t|^p \right) \leq C_4(t, p, H) \varepsilon^{pH} \left( 1 + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |x_t|^p \right), \quad (4.5)$$

for  $\varepsilon$  is a small number and  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $C_4(t, p, H)$  is a positive constant depending on  $t$ ,  $p$  and  $H$ .

**Lemma 4.4** Let  $\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} = \frac{X_{t, \varepsilon} - x_t}{\varepsilon^H}$ . Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold, then we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right|^2 \leq C_5(t, H) \varepsilon^{2H}, \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\left| \text{Var}(\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon}) - \text{Var}(Z_t) \right| \leq C_6(t, H) \varepsilon^H, \quad (4.7)$$

for  $\varepsilon$  is a small number and  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $Z_t$  is defined as that in Theorem 3.1,  $C_5(t, H)$  and  $C_6(t, H)$  are positive constants only depending on  $t$  and  $H$ .

*Proof.* We first verify the estimate (4.6). By (1.1) and (3.2) together with the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} - Z_t|^p \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} (b(s, X_{s, \varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) - \nabla_{Z_s} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) \right) ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_0^t \mathbb{E} (D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) Z_s) \Big|_{u=x_s} ds + \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H \right|^p \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} (b(s, X_{s, \varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) - \nabla_{\tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon}} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(x_s) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{E} (D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) \tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon}) \Big|_{u=x_s} \right|^p ds \\ & \quad + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \nabla_{\tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon}} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}})(x_s) - \nabla_{Z_s} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) \right|^p ds \\ & \quad + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| D^L b(s, u, \cdot)(\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) (\tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon} - Z_s) \Big|_{u=x_s} \right|^p ds + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s, \varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Then by repeating the proof of Theorem 3.9 in [5], we can get that

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} - Z_t|^p \leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon} - Z_s|^p ds + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |X_{s, \varepsilon} - x_s|^p ds.$$

Thus, by the Lemma 4.3

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} - Z_t|^p \leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{s, \varepsilon} - Z_s|^p ds + C \varepsilon^{pH}.$$

Next, we can use Gronwall's inequality to obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} - Z_t|^p \leq C \varepsilon^{pH}. \quad (4.8)$$

We take  $p = 2$  in (4.8), we can get

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right|^2 \leq \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t, \varepsilon} - Z_t|^2 \leq C \varepsilon^{2H}.$$

It remains to prove (4.7).

$$\left| \text{Var} \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) - \text{Var} \left( Z_t \right) \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}^2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t^2] \right| + \left| \left( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}] \right)^2 - \left( \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right)^2 \right| =: G_1 + G_2. \quad (4.9)$$

Let us consider the estimate of  $G_1$ ,

$$G_1 = \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}^2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t^2] \right| \leq \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} + Z_t| |\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - Z_t|.$$

Then, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}^2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t^2] \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} + Z_t|^2 \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - Z_t|^2}.$$

Recall the definitions of  $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}$  and  $Z_t$ , then by the assumptions (A1)–(A2) and (4.5) (take  $p = 2$ ) combining the Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} + Z_t|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} (b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) + \nabla_{Z_s} b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) \right) ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} (D^L b(s, u, \cdot) (\mathcal{L}_{x_s})(x_s) Z_s) ds + \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) + \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} (b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) ds \right|^2 + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) + \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H \right|^2 + C \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} \mathbb{E} |b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})|^2 ds + C \int_0^t \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) + \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})\|^2 ds + C \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} \left( \mathbb{E} |X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^2 + \mathbb{W}_\theta (\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})^2 \right) ds + C \int_0^t (\|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})\|^2 + \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})\|^2) ds + C \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} \mathbb{E} |X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^2 ds + C \leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Hence, by (4.8) (take  $p = 2$ ) together with (4.10),

$$G_1 = \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}^2] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t^2] \right| \leq C\varepsilon^H. \quad (4.11)$$

Next, we consider  $G_2$ . By (4.8) and the Hölder inequality, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= \left| \left( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}] \right)^2 - \left( \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right)^2 \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right| \left| \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}] + \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - Z_t|^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} + Z_t|^2} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^H. \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

Combining (4.9), (4.11) and (4.12), we can obtain (4.7). This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 4.5** Let  $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} = \frac{X_{t,\varepsilon} - x_t}{\varepsilon^H}$ . Define

$$\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} := \int_0^t D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[ D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r \right] dr.$$

Then, under the assumptions (A1) and (A2) and the condition (3.1), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}|^{-p} \leq C_7(t, p, H) \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{p}{p_0}}, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $C_7(t, p, H)$  is a positive constant only depending on  $t$ ,  $p$  and  $H$ .

*Proof.* First, let us recall the form of  $D_r X_{t,\varepsilon}$ . Solving the equation (2.4), we can obtain

$$D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^H \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} ds. \quad (4.14)$$

By (4.14) and the assumption (A1),

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} \int_0^t D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] dr \\ &= \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} ds \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} ds \right) | \mathcal{F}_r \right] dr \\ &\geq \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-CT} ds \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-CT} ds \right) | \mathcal{F}_r \right] dr \\ &= C \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds | \mathcal{F}_r \right] dr \\ &= C \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the Hölder inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}|^{-p} &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p} \\ &= C \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p} \\ &\leq C \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{p}{p_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

**Lemma 4.6** Let  $\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}$  be given in Lemma 4.5. Under the assumptions (A1) and (A2), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \|D\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4 \leq C_8(t, H) \varepsilon^{4H}, \quad (4.15)$$

for  $\varepsilon$  is a small number and  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $C_8(t, H)$  is a positive constant only depending on  $t$  and  $H$ .

*Proof.* Write the Malliavin derivative of  $\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}$ :

$$D\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2H}} \int_0^t (D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] + D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r]) dr.$$

Hence, we have

$$\|D\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \left( \int_0^T \left( \int_0^t (D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] + D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r]) dr \right)^2 d\theta \right)^2.$$

By the Hölder inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|D\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4 &\leq \frac{T}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] + D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r]) dr \right|^4 d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^T \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] + D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] \right|^4 dr d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^T \int_0^t \left( \mathbb{E} \left| D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] \right|^4 + \mathbb{E} \left| D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}[D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r] \right|^4 \right) dr d\theta \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^T \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|D_\theta D_r X_{t,\varepsilon}|^8 \mathbb{E}|D_r X_{t,\varepsilon}|^8} dr d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, use (4.3) and (4.4), we can complete this proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Theorem 3.1:** Let  $u = \mathbb{E}[D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r]$  for  $0 \leq r \leq T$ . Then, by Proposition 2.2 ( $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{D}^{2,4}$  is implied by Lemma 4.2),

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} | Z_t) &\leq c \left( \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} \left( \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_t] \right)^2 + A_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} |\text{Var}(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}) - \text{Var}(Z_t)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} \left( \mathbb{E}\|D\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}\|_{L^2[0,T]}^4 \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where  $c$  is an absolute constant and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} &:= \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} \left( \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^2[0,T]}^8 \mathbb{E}|\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}|^{-8} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \\ C_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} &:= A_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} + \left( \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^2[0,T]}^8 \mathbb{E}|\Theta_{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}}|^{-16} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Hölder inequality and the estimate (4.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^2[0,T]}^8 &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}[D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_r]|^8 dr \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{8H}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|D_r X_{t,\varepsilon}|^8 dr \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.6), (4.7), (4.13), (4.15) and (4.16), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} | Z_t) &\leq C(t, H) \left( \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} + \frac{1}{\text{Var}(Z_t)^2} \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{p_0}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \left| \int_0^t \left( \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right)^2 dr \right|^{-p_0} \right)^{\frac{4}{p_0}} \right) \varepsilon^{2H}. \end{aligned}$$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

It is well known that the Fisher information and total variation distance satisfy the following relation (see in [17] and [18])

$$\sqrt{I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||Z_t)} \geq d_{TV}(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}, Z_t) := \frac{1}{2} \sup_g \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}[g(Z_t)] \right|, \quad (5.1)$$

where the supremum is running over all measurable function  $g$  bounded by one. Thus our main task is to find a lower bound for  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} d_{TV}(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}, Z_t)$ . We use the same idea as Section 4.3 in [2], so that our proof can be divided into several lemmas.

**Lemma 5.1** *Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold. Then, for each  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t|^p \leq C_9(t, p, H) \varepsilon^{pH}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} |U_t|^p \leq C_{10}(t, p, H) \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} |V_t|^p \leq C_{11}(t, p, H), \quad (5.4)$$

for any  $\varepsilon$  is a small number, where  $C_9(t, p, H)$ ,  $C_{10}(t, p, H)$ ,  $C_{11}(t, p, H)$  are positive constants only depending on  $t$ ,  $p$  and  $H$ ,  $U_t, V_t$  are defined in (3.4) and (3.5).

*Proof.* Recall the definitions of  $\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}$  in Theorem 3.1 and  $U_t$  in (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon H} \int_0^t (b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H - \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Then by the Taylor's expansion

$$\begin{aligned} &b(s, X_{s,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \\ &= \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) (X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) (X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

we can see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) (\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s) ds \right|^p \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) (X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)^2 ds \right|^p \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the Hölder inequality and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t|^p &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [|\nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s)|^p |\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s|^p] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [|\nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s))|^p |X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + C \int_0^t \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})\|^p ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by assumptions (A1)–(A2), (4.5) and (1.2) combining the Hölder inequality, for any  $p \geq \theta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t|^p &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s|^p] ds + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^{2p}] + C \int_0^t |\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})|^p ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s|^p] ds + C\varepsilon^{pH}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can use Gronwall's inequality to obtain (5.2).

It remains to prove (5.3) and (5.4).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|U_t|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s ds \right|^p \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t (b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) ds \right|^p + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) dB_s^H \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

By the assumptions (A1)–(A2) and (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|U_t|^p &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s|^p ds \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - b(s, x_s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})|^p ds + C \int_0^t \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})\|^p ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|U_s|^p ds + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{W}_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})|^p ds + C \int_0^t \|\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})\|^p ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (1.2) and the Hölder inequality, for any  $p \geq \theta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|U_t|^p &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|U_s|^p ds + \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{pH}} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^p ds + C \\ &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|U_s|^p ds + C. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can use Gronwall's inequality to obtain (5.3).

Note that, by using the similar method as the proof of (5.3), we can easily get that for any  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}|V_t|^p \leq C(t, p, H)$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 5.2** *Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold. Then, we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - D_r U_t|^2 dr \leq C_{12}(t, H) \varepsilon^{2H},$$

where  $C_{12}(t, H)$  is a positive constant only depending on  $t$ ,  $U_t$  is defined as (3.4).

*Proof.* Compute the Malliavin derivative of  $U_t$

$$D_r U_t = \int_r^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) D_r U_s ds + \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds.$$

By solving this equation, we can get

$$D_r U_t = \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(x_u) du} ds.$$

Recall the solution of  $D_r X_{t,\varepsilon}$  in (4.14), and the definition of  $D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}$ ,

$$D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} D_r X_{t,\varepsilon} = \int_r^t \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} ds.$$

Then, by the Hölder inequality and the assumptions (A1)–(A2)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} |D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - D_r U_t|^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} \left[ (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s}) \left( e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} - e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(x_u) du} \right) \right] ds \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) ds \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} \left( e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(X_{u,\varepsilon}) du} - e^{-\int_s^t \nabla b(u, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{u,\varepsilon}})(x_u) du} \right) ds \right|^2 \right\} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \sup_s (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right|^2 + C \mathbb{E} \left| \sup_u (X_{u,\varepsilon} - x_u) \int_r^t \frac{\partial K_H(s, r)}{\partial s} ds \right|^2 ds \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_s |X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s|^p \right] + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_u |X_{u,\varepsilon} - x_u|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (4.5),

$$\mathbb{E} |D_r \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - D_r U_t|^2 \leq C \varepsilon^{2H}.$$

■

**Lemma 5.3** *Under the assumptions (A1) and (A2), for each  $p \geq \theta$  and  $p > \frac{1}{H}$ , we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t}{\varepsilon^H} - V_t \right|^p = 0, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $U_t$  and  $V_t$  are defined as (3.4) and (3.5), respectively.

*Proof.* By (5.5) and (5.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t}{\varepsilon^H} &= \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) \left( \frac{\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s}{\varepsilon^H} \right) ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) \tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon}^2 ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} \int_0^t (\sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}}) - \sigma(s, \mathcal{L}_{x_s})) dB_s^H. \end{aligned}$$

Then, recall the definition of  $V_t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t}{\varepsilon^H} - V_t \right|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \nabla b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) \left( \frac{\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s}{\varepsilon^H} - V_s \right) ds \right|^p \\ & \quad + C \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t \left( \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) \tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon}^2 - \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s) U_s^2 \right) ds \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$



By the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t}{\varepsilon^H} - V_t \right|^p &\leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s}{\varepsilon^H} - V_s \right|^p ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) (\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon}^2 - U_s^2) \right|^p ds \\
&\quad + C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| (\nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) - \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s)) U_s^2 \right|^p ds \\
&=: C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s}{\varepsilon^H} - V_s \right|^p ds + R_1 + R_2.
\end{aligned}$$

By the assumption (A2), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.2) and (5.3), we have

$$R_1 \leq C \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left| \tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon}^2 - U_s^2 \right|^p ds \leq C \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| \tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} + U_s \right|^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left| \tilde{X}_{s,\varepsilon} - U_s \right|^{2p}} ds \leq C \varepsilon^{pH}. \quad (5.8)$$

Also, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$R_2 \leq C \int_0^t \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left| (\nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s + \eta(X_{s,\varepsilon} - x_s)) - \nabla^2 b(s, \cdot, \mathcal{L}_{X_{s,\varepsilon}})(x_s)) \right|^{2p} \mathbb{E} |U_s|^{4p}} ds.$$

So that, by (5.3) and the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain that

$$R_2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.9)$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - U_t}{\varepsilon^H} - V_t \right|^p \leq C(R_1 + R_2). \quad (5.10)$$

Combining (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10), we can obtain (5.7). ■

**Lemma 5.4** *Suppose the assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold, then for each continuous and bounded function  $g$  and each  $t \in [0, t]$ , we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ g(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}) \right] - \mathbb{E} [g(U_t)]}{\varepsilon^H} = \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} [g(U_t) \delta(V_t DU_t)], \quad (5.11)$$

where  $U_t$  and  $V_t$  are defined as (3.4) and (3.5) respectively.

*Proof.* According to the proof of Proposition 4.8 in [2], we can see that this proof does not use the exact form of  $U_t$  and  $V_t$ . Thus, by combining Lemmas 5.2–5.3, then repeating the deduction of Proposition 4.8 in [2], we can easily get this result. Here we give a sketch of this proof.

By using the formula (3.2) in [3],

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} [g(U_t)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{U_t}^{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} g(z) dz \delta \left( \frac{DU_t}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) \left\langle D\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - DU_t, DU_t \right\rangle_{L^2[0,T]}}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ U_t \int_{U_t}^{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} g(z) dz \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) \left\langle D\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - DU_t, DU_t \right\rangle_{L^2[0,T]} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by (2.6)

$$\delta(V_t DU_t) = V_t U_t + \langle DV_t, DU_t \rangle_{L^2[0,T]}.$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} [g(U_t)]}{\varepsilon^H} - \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} [g(U_t) \delta(V_t DU_t)] \\
&= \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} \int_{U_t}^{\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}} g(z) dz - g(U_t) V_t \right) U_t \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( g \left( \tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} \right) - g(U_t) \right) \left\langle \frac{D\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - DU_t}{\varepsilon^H}, DU_t \right\rangle_{L^2[0,T]} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ g(U_t) \left\langle \frac{D\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon} - DU_t}{\varepsilon^H} - DV_t, DU_t \right\rangle_{L^2[0,T]} \right] \\
&=: A_{1,\varepsilon} - A_{2,\varepsilon} - A_{3,\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof of (5.11) can be transformed into the proof of convergence for  $A_{1,\varepsilon}$ ,  $A_{2,\varepsilon}$  and  $A_{3,\varepsilon}$ .

Hence, by repeating the deduction of Proposition 4.8 in [2], we can see  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} A_{i,\varepsilon} = 0$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , under the results in Lemmas 5.2–5.3.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Theorem 3.2:** Note that, by Theorem 3.9 in [5] combining (5.2), for each  $t \in (0, T]$ ,  $U_t$  can be regarded as  $Z_t$ . So that, we have  $I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||Z_t) = I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||U_t)$ . Hence, by (5.1) and Lemma 5.4, we can get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^H} \sqrt{I(\tilde{X}_{t,\varepsilon}||Z_t)} \geq \frac{1}{2\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} |\mathbb{E}[g(U_t)\delta(V_t DU_t)]| = \frac{1}{2\|DU_t\|_{L^2[0,T]}^2} |\mathbb{E}[g(U_t)\mathbb{E}[\delta(V_t DU_t)|U_t]]|.$$

for any continuous function  $g$  bounded by 1. Then, by the routine approximation argument, we can choose  $g(x) = \text{sgn}(\mathbb{E}[\delta(V_t DU_t)|U_t = x])$ . Hence we obtain (3.3).

**Declaration of interests** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## References

- [1] S. G. Bobkov, G. P. Chistyakov, F. Götze, Berry-Esseen bounds in the entropic central limit theorem. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **159**, 435–478 (2014)
- [2] N. T. Dung, N. T. Hang, Fisher information bounds and applications to SDEs with small noise. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **178**, 104468 (2024).
- [3] N. T. Dung, T. C. Son, Lipschitz continuity in the Hurst index of the solutions of fractional stochastic volterra integro-differential equations. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, **41**, 693–712 (2023).
- [4] X. Fan, X. Huang, Y. Suo, C. Yuan, Distribution dependent SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **151**, 23–67 (2022)
- [5] X. Fan, T. Yu, C. Yuan, Asymptotic behaviors for distribution dependent SDEs driven by fractional Brownian motions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **164**, 383–415 (2023)
- [6] M. I. Freidlin, A. D. Wentzell, Random perturbations of dynamical systems. Translated from the 1979 Russian original by Joseph Szücs. Third edition. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 260. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [7] L. Galeati, F. A. Harang, A. Mayorcas, Distribution dependent SDEs driven by additive fractional Brownian motions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **185**, 251–309 (2023)
- [8] Y. Hu, Analysis on Gaussian Spaces, World Scientific Publishing, 2017.
- [9] X. Huang, F.-Y. Wang, Distribution dependent SDEs with singular coefficients. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **129**, 4747–4770 (2019)
- [10] O. Johnson, Information theory and the central limit theorem. Imperial College Press, London, 2004.
- [11] O. Johnson, Maximal correlation and the rate of Fisher information convergence in the central limit theorem. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **66**, 4992–5002 (2020)
- [12] O. Johnson, A. R. Barron, Fisher information inequalities and the central limit theorem. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **129**, 391–409 (2004)
- [13] J. V. Linnik, An information-theoretic proof of the central limit theorem with Lindeberg conditions. (Russian) *Theor. Probability Appl.*, **4**, 288–299 (1959)
- [14] B. B. Mandelbrot, J. W. Van Ness, Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications. *SIAM Rev.*, **10**, 422–437 (1968)
- [15] I. Nourdin, D. Nualart, Fisher information and the fourth moment theorem. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **52**, 849–867 (2016).
- [16] D. Nualart, The Malliavin calculus and related topics. Probability and its Applications. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2006.
- [17] M. S. Pinsker, *Information and information stability of random variables and processes*. Translated and edited by Amiel Feinstein Holden-Day, Inc., San Francisco, Calif. London-Amsterdam 1964.

- [18] A. J. Stam, Some inequalities satisfied by the quantities of information of Fisher and Shannon. *Information and Control*, **2**, 101–112 (1959).
- [19] F.-Y. Wang, Distribution dependent SDEs for Landau type equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **128**, 595–621 (2018)

**Tongxuan Liu**

School of Mathematics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 211106,  
China  
18061750781@163.com

**Qian Yu**

School of Mathematics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 211106,  
China  
qyumath@163.com