

# On the mean field theory of Ensemble Kalman filters for SPDEs

Sebastian W. Ertel, TU Berlin

May 6, 2024

## Abstract

This paper is concerned with the mathematical analysis of continuous time Ensemble Kalman Filters (EnKBFs) and their mean field limit in an infinite dimensional setting. The signal is determined by a nonlinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equation (SPDE), which is posed in the standard variational setting. Assuming global one-sided Lipschitz conditions and finite dimensional observations we first prove the well posedness of both the EnKBF and its corresponding mean field version. We then investigate the quantitative convergence of the EnKBF towards its mean field limit, recovering the rates suggested by the law of large numbers for bounded observation functions. The main tool hereby are exponential moment estimates for the empirical covariance of the EnKBF, which may be of independent interest. In the appendix of the paper we investigate the connection of the mean field EnKBF and the Stochastic Filtering Problem. In particular we derive the Feedback Particle Filter for infinite dimensional signals and show that the mean field EnKBF can be viewed as its constant gain approximation.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Problem setting, assumptions and notations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Analysis of the EnKBF</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Well posedness	9
3.2	Exponential moment bounds for the gain term	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis of the mean field EnKBF</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Quantitative propagation of chaos</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>The Kushner-Stratonovich equation and the law of total variance</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>The Feedback Particle Filter</b>	<b>30</b>

## 1 Introduction

In recent years data driven methods have become increasingly relevant in scientific computing. In particular data assimilation, that is the (optimal) integration of real world data into mathematical models, has become a popular research topic for practitioners and mathematicians alike. As it shares similar objectives to stochastic filtering, which is essentially the discipline of Bayesian estimation of dynamic processes from noisy, potentially incomplete data, many algorithms originating

in filtering are used for data assimilation tasks. Vice versa, algorithms for data assimilation of dynamical processes can be viewed through the lens of filtering, the mathematical model is then referred to as the signal and the available data as the observations.

One such algorithm is the Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF), which was introduced by Geir Evensen in 94 [23] and employs an ensemble of interacting particles to estimate the state of a dynamical system. Since its inception many different variants of the EnKF have been introduced. For an overview and historical context we refer to [13], [24] or [47]. The EnKF has by now become one of the most widely used techniques for data assimilation in high dimensional settings, particularly popular amongst practitioners in the geosciences and numerical weather forecasting. Besides its usage for state estimation in dynamical systems, the EnKF and related algorithms have also been applied to parameter estimation in inverse problems [35],[43].

While the original EnKF is a discrete time recursion, continuous time counterparts referred to as Ensemble Kalman–Bucy Filters (EnKBFs), were first formulated in various works by Bergemann and Reich [5], and have by now been firmly established in the literature. In many cases they can also be shown to be the limit of their discrete time counterparts for vanishing step size, see e.g. [31] and the references found therein. In this paper we will only consider the basic continuous time framework in an infinite dimensional setting. The signal  $u$  shall be determined by a Stochastic Partial Differential Equation (SPDE)

$$du_t = \mathcal{A}(u_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t)dW_t \quad \text{with initial condition } u_0, \quad (\text{S})$$

posed in the standard variational framework found in e.g. [37],[39]. Hereby the noise  $W$  is assumed to be some (infinite dimensional) Wiener process and the drift term  $\mathcal{A}$  is a (differential) operator satisfying some global one-sided Lipschitz property, such as e.g.

- the Laplacian  $\mathcal{A}(v) := \Delta v$ , in this case (S) is a stochastic heat equation.
- the  $p$ -Laplacian  $\mathcal{A}(v) := \Delta(v|v|^{p-1})$  for any  $p > 1$ , in this case (S) is a stochastic porous medium equation.
- a semilinear reaction-advection-diffusion operator of the form  $\mathcal{A}(v) := \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{a}\nabla v) + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{b}v) + f(v) + g(v)$ , where  $f$  is globally Lipschitz continuous and  $g$  is a monotone decreasing function. In particular stochastic reaction-diffusion equations with double-well potentials such as Allen–Cahn equations are covered by our theory.

The observation data  $Y$  shall be a continuous time process and is assumed to depend on the signal in the following way

$$dY_t = H(u_t)dt + \Gamma_t dV_t, \quad Y_0 = 0. \quad (\text{O})$$

We only consider finite dimensional observations taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  for some  $d_y \in \mathbb{N}$ . This is the more practically relevant case and also avoids discussions of the regularity/degeneracy of the observation noise  $V$ , which is assumed to be white, i.e. some finite dimensional standard Brownian motion. A more thorough discussion of the setting we consider, and the assumptions we have to make, is found in section 2.

The EnKBF we consider in this paper is the following system of interacting SPDEs

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)dW_t^i \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N u_t^j \left( H(u_t^j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N H(u_t^k) \right)' R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N H(u_t^k)}{2} dt \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $(W^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$  are independent copies of the Wiener process  $\bar{W}$ . The EnKBF combines the signal SPDE (S) with measurement data  $Y$  in order to improve the predictive capabilities of the model. This is done by projecting the discrepancy  $dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N H(u_t^k)}{2} dt$

between the actual measured observation increment and the predicted increment onto the interacting ensemble  $(u^i)_{i=1,\dots,N}$ . This creates a reaction term that is added onto the signal SPDE and nudges it to better fit the observation data.

**Remark 1.** *The system (1) is often referred to as the deterministic EnKBF [7], which is the continuous time counterpart of the Ensemble Square Root Filter [32]/deterministic EnKF by Sakov and Oke [40]. Our main results can be generalized to other types of EnKBFs, in particular the more classical version which involves randomness in the innovation term.*

In this paper we investigate the mean field theory of the EnKBF (1) in the variational SPDE setting. The mean field perspective for Ensemble Kalman Filters has become a popular research topic in recent years as it provides a simplified framework for the derivation and mathematical analysis of such algorithms [13]. In particular the mean field limit of the EnKBF,

$$\begin{aligned} du_t = & \mathcal{A}(u_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t)dW_t \\ & + \text{Cov} \left[ u_t, H(u_t) \mid Y_s, s \leq t \right] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E} [H(u_t) \mid Y_s, s \leq t]}{2} dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

which is McKean–Vlasov equation that is henceforth just referred to as the mean field EnKBF, gives a connection to solutions of the filtering problem through what is known as the constant gain approximation [44] of the Feedback Particle Filter (FPF). First quantitative mean field limits of Ensemble Kalman Filters were obtained in the time discrete setting by [27] and [34]. For the continuous time equations a first quantitative propagation of chaos result was proven in the seminal work [19] in a finite dimensional linear Gaussian setting, i.e. when both the signal (S) is an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process and the observation function  $H$  is assumed to be linear. In this linear Gaussian setting the mean field limit plays a special role as it coincides with the optimal filter described by the classical Kalman–Bucy equations. Several works have expanded on the results of [19], proving time uniform propagation of chaos even in cases of unstable signal dynamics. For an overview of the theory of the EnKBF in the linear Gaussian setting we refer the reader to [7].

In nonlinear (continuous time) settings only a few convergence results for finite dimensional signals seem to have been obtained so far. The paper [32] proved a propagation of chaos result with a combination of synchronous coupling and stopping arguments. However they were not able to quantify the convergence rates and had to assume the existence and uniqueness of the mean field limit. The well posedness of the McKean–Vlasov equation describing the mean field limit of the EnKBF was shown in [16] and [22]. Both papers also showed propagation of chaos for the EnKBF. [22] proved a non quantitative convergence result, similar to the aforementioned [32]. On the other hand [16] were even able to prove a mean field limit with logarithmic rates. However they required bounded signal and observation functions, and assumed that the observation data was smoothed (Lipschitz continuous in time). Even though logarithmic convergence is far slower than the desired rates corresponding to the law of large numbers, the result of [16] seem to be the best estimate existing so far for nonlinear signals. For related sampling algorithms such as the Ensemble Kalman Sampler, Ensemble Kalman Inversion and mean field Langevin Dynamics various works [6][20][21][46]<sup>1</sup> have shown quantitative propagation of chaos. While such systems are related to the Ensemble Kalman methodology, the structural differences to the EnKBF seems to not let us simply carry over the employed techniques to prove convergence.

In the infinite dimensional continuous time setting the mean field theory seems to have not been covered by the existing literature, the mathematical analysis, which was initiated in [30], so far seems to have focussed only on the interacting particle system (1). The aim of this paper therefore is to bridge this gap and provide a rather complete mean field theory for EnKBFs in the case of SPDE signals. Throughout this work we shall assume that both the signal coefficients and the

<sup>1</sup>The preprints [6] and [46] actually were uploaded only shortly after the first version of this paper.

observation function satisfy some global Lipschitz conditions described in detail in section 2. In this setting our main contributions are the following:

- In section 3 we first show the well posedness of the EnKBF (1). While [30, Theorem 6.2] considered well posedness of EnKBFs, even without global Lipschitz conditions, they assumed the existence and uniqueness of solutions and showed a priori estimates, preventing blowups. Furthermore the EnKBF (1) falls outside the standard variational SPDE theory, as found e.g. in [33], due to missing growth conditions. We prove well posedness in Theorem 12. The main tool hereby are a priori estimates of the empirical variance akin to the law of total variance of conditional expectations. By also controlling the quadratic variation of the empirical variance we are able to prove some exponential moment bounds in Proposition (14). These bounds are crucial later on for quantitative propagation of chaos, but may also be of independent interest.
- Next, in section 4, we prove the well posedness of the McKean–Vlasov equation describing the mean field limit of the EnKBF in Theorem 17. Due to possible non-equivalence of norms in infinite dimensional spaces, we can not simply adapt the existing proofs of the finite dimensional setting, such as e.g. found in [22], and instead make a fixed point argument with respect to the observation function  $H$ .
- Finally, in section 5, we the convergence of the EnKBF towards the mean field limit. First, in Theorem 21, we extend the stopping arguments of [32] to our infinite dimensional setting to prove convergence with implicit rates. The main result of this paper is found in Theorem 24, where we use the exponential moment bounds of subsection 3.2 to prove convergence rates in accordance to the law of large numbers under the additional assumption of bounded observation functions. Even for finite dimensional signals this significantly improves on the at best logarithmic rates shown so far in the literature and actually does so under far less restricting assumptions regarding the signal coefficients and the observation process.

Furthermore we include an appendix which details the connections of the (mean field) EnKBF to the classical stochastic filtering problem. Therefore in section A we briefly recall the Kushner–Stratonovich equation, describing the posterior distribution  $(\eta)_{t \geq 0}$ , which for continuous time stochastic filtering problems is given by

$$\eta_t := \mathbb{P} ( u_t \in \cdot \mid Y_s, s \leq t ), \text{ for } t \geq 0. \quad (\text{P})$$

We also briefly recall the law of total variance in Bayesian statistics, which bounds the posterior variance by variance of the prior. Interestingly, even though generally the (time-)marginal distributions of the (mean field) EnKBF do not coincide with the posterior, except for the linear Gaussian case, it still satisfies similar variance bounds, which actually are the main tool we use for its analysis. Next, in section B, we derive the Feedback Particle Filter (FPF)[48][49][17], a McKean–Vlasov representation of the Kushner–Stratonovich equation and thus also the posterior, in our infinite dimensional setting. The method hereby is similar to what was done in [38] for finite dimensional signals dimensions. We then show that the mean field EnKBF is the constant gain approximation of the FPF, which was first noted in finite dimensions by [44]. This connection to the stochastic filtering problem is a strong motivation for the mean field perspective on Ensemble Kalman Filters, as it provides a path to compare them with the optimal Bayesian estimator. Indeed only recently such investigations were started by [14], estimating the statistical accuracy of discrete time mean field Ensemble Kalman Filters. Most of the results/methods of the appendix, in particular section B, are just simple generalisations of established results in finite dimensional settings. Nevertheless it provides a clear motivation for the importance of the mean field theory of EnKBFs discussed in the main part and shows how such equations can be derived from the Stochastic Filtering Problem.

## 2 Problem setting, assumptions and notations

For the signal (S) we consider SPDEs in a variational setting as they are found in e.g. [36],[39]. To fix notation and for the convenience of the reader we repeat some key concepts and results of this field in this section. For a more detailed introduction to this topic we refer the reader to [39].

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and  $\mathcal{V}$  be a Banach space that form a Gelfand triple [39, Section 4.1]  $\mathcal{V} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}'$ . We denote by  ${}_{\mathcal{V}'}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}$  the natural pairing of the Banach space  $\mathcal{V}$  and its dual space  $\mathcal{V}'$ . Similarly  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  denotes the inner product of the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . As usual the corresponding norms on  $\mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{V}'$  are denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}}$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{V}'}$ . The absolute value as well as the standard Euclidian norm on finite dimensional spaces are both denoted by  $|\cdot|$ . Furthermore we assume that there exists an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}$ , denoted by  $(\nu_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\nu_k \in \mathcal{V}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be some given separable real Hilbert space and let  $(\mathfrak{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be some given filtration on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}_{\infty}, \mathbb{P})$ . We consider the  $\mathcal{U}$ -valued and  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted  $\mathcal{Q}$ -Wiener process  $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with finite trace. To this end assume that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a self-adjoint, positive semidefinite linear operator on  $\mathcal{U}$ , with finite trace  $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{Q} < +\infty$  and Eigenvalues  $(q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with corresponding orthonormal Eigenbasis  $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exist independent  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted Brownian motions  $(w^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , such that

$$W_t = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sqrt{q_k} e_k w_t^k \text{ for all times } t \geq 0.$$

**Definition 2.** We will always identify the Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U}$  with their duals  $\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{U}'$ . For any operator  $B$  acting on Hilbert spaces we denote its adjoint by  $B'$ . The adjoint of an element  $u \in \mathcal{H}$  is just its image under the Riesz embedding, i.e.  $u' := \langle u, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ . This notation is consistent with finite dimensional settings. We note that therefore  $uu' \in \text{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H})$  defines a bounded linear operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ .

To rigorously formulate the signal (S) as a variational SPDE on the Gelfand triple  $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{V}')$ , we make the following standard assumptions [39, page 56] that shall hold throughout this paper.

**Assumption 3** (Signal assumptions). Denote by  $\text{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$  the space of Hilbert–Schmidt operators. That is the space of all linear operators  $B : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ , such that their Hilbert–Schmidt norm  $\|B\|_{\text{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|Be_k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$  is finite.

We assume that  $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$  and  $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \text{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$  satisfy the following conditions:

1. **Hemicontinuity:** For all  $u, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$  the mapping

$$r \rightarrow {}_{\mathcal{V}'}\langle \mathcal{A}(v + ru), w \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} \text{ is continuous.}$$

2. **Weak monotonicity/one-sided Lipschitz:** There exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that for all  $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$2 {}_{\mathcal{V}'}\langle \mathcal{A}(u) - \mathcal{A}(v), u - v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u) - \mathcal{B}(v)) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{\text{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq \lambda \|u - v\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (3)$$

3. **Coercivity:** There exist constants  $\alpha_V > 0, \alpha_H, \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\alpha_p \in (1, +\infty)$ , such that  $u \in \mathcal{V}$

$$2 {}_{\mathcal{V}'}\langle \mathcal{A}(u), u \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \left\| \mathcal{B}(u) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{\text{L}_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq -\alpha_V \|u\|_{\mathcal{V}'}^{\alpha_p} + \alpha_H \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \alpha_0. \quad (4)$$

4. **Boundedness:** There exists a constant  $c_A > 0$  such that

$$\|\mathcal{A}(u)\|_{\mathcal{V}'} \leq c_A (1 + \|u\|_{\mathcal{V}}) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Next let us briefly discuss which (S)PDEs can be treated in this variational framework.

**Remark 4** (Possible Signals). *As mentioned in the introduction a classical example of a differential operator that satisfies Assumptions 3 is the  $p$ -Laplacian*

$$\mathcal{A}(v) := \Delta(v|v|^{p-1}) \quad (5)$$

for any  $p \in [1, +\infty)$  on a given bounded domain  $\Lambda$  with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In this case  $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{W}_0^{1,p}(\Lambda)$  is the classical  $p$ -integrable, first order Sobolev space of functions that vanish on the boundary. The Hilbert space is then set to  $\mathcal{H} := L(\Lambda)$ . Neumann, or mixed boundary conditions can be treated as well. Thus we can allow for signals that are given by a (noisy) heat or porous media equation. Another differential operator satisfying our assumptions is given by

$$\mathcal{A}(v) := -\Delta v - \mathbf{a}v^3 + \mathbf{b}v + \mathbf{c},$$

where  $\mathbf{a} \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$ , for Dirichlet, Neumann or mixed boundary conditions on suitable domains. Therefore we can treat signals evolving by a stochastic reaction diffusion equation with a double well potential. In particular Allen–Cahn equations can be treated. For a more detailed discussion we refer to [39, Section 4.1].

Under Assumption 3 it can be shown [39, Theorem 4.2.4] that for a given (random) initial condition  $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ , measurable w.r.t.  $\mathfrak{F}_0$  and square-integrable  $\mathbb{E}[\|u_0\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] < +\infty$ , the signal SPDE (S) has a unique strong solution  $(u_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , meaning that

- $u$  is adapted to the filtration  $\mathfrak{F}$ .
- for any  $T < +\infty$  it holds that

$$u \in L^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{H}) \cap L^{\text{cp}}([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{V})$$

- for any  $t \geq 0$  and any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , it holds that

$$\langle u_t, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle u_t, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \int_0^t \langle \mathcal{A}(u_s), v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} ds + \left\langle \int_0^t \mathcal{B}(u_s) dW_s, v \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s..$$

This unique strong solution  $u$  will henceforth be referred to as the signal. In particular one can show that it is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -Markov process [39, Proposition 4.3.5] satisfying the following pathwise moment estimate  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \leq T} \|u_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] < +\infty$  holds for all  $T > 0$ .

An important tool to our analysis is Itô's lemma for variational SPDEs [36, page 136], first derived in [37]. For later reference let us specify here for which functions one can use Itô's lemma.

**Definition 5.** *Any function  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be an Itô function, if*

1.  $\phi$  is twice Fréchet differentiable, with the first two derivatives denoted by  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi$  and  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$ .
2. All of  $\phi$ ,  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi$  and  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$  are locally bounded.
3. For any operator  $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  that is of trace class, the functional  $v \mapsto \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}}[\mathcal{Q} D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi(v)]$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{H}$ .
4. For any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  it holds that  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v) \in \mathcal{V}$  and the map  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi|_{\mathcal{V}} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$  is continuous when the domain is equipped with the strong and the image is equipped with the weak topology.
5. There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\|D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v)\|_{\mathcal{V}} \leq C(1 + \|v\|_{\mathcal{V}})$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ .

If an Itô function  $\phi$  is twice continuously Fréchet differentiable with compact support, we refer to it as an Itô testfunction.

One important example of an Itô function is the squared norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ . Furthermore one can use Itô's lemma to show the following basic identities characterizing the distribution of the signal  $u$ .

- The signal mean  $m_t := \mathbb{E}[u_t]$  satisfies the differential equation

$$\partial_t m_t = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{A}(u_t)]. \quad (6)$$

- The signal covariance operator  $P_t := \text{Cov}[u_t] := \mathbb{E}[(u_t - m_t)(u_t - m_t)']$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \langle v, \text{Cov}[u_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \mathbb{E}[\langle v, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), w \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\langle w, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}}] \\ &\quad + \left\langle v, \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for all  $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ .

- The generator of the signal, denoted by  $\mathcal{L}$ , is given by

$$\mathcal{L}\phi = \langle \mathcal{A}(\cdot), D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ (D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) \mathcal{B}(\cdot) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(\cdot) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \quad (8)$$

for every Itô testfunction  $\phi$  as per Definition 5.

Let us address the observations next. As stated in the introduction we consider continuous,  $d_y$ -dimensional observations given by the differential equation (O). We make the following standard assumptions for the coefficients  $H$  and  $\Gamma$ .

**Assumption 6** (Observation assumptions). *The observation function  $H : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is assumed to be globally Lipschitz continuous and  $\Gamma \in C^0([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_v})$ . Furthermore  $V$  is a  $d_v$ -dimensional,  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted standard Brownian motion, independent of the signal  $u$  and its driving noise  $W$ . As usual we set  $R_t := \Gamma_t \Gamma_t^T$  and assume that  $R_t$  is invertible for all times  $t \geq 0$ , in particular  $\sup_{t \leq T} |R_t^{-1}| < +\infty$  for all  $T < +\infty$ .*

In the following, variance bounds for both the posterior (P) and the law of the EnKBF will play a crucial role in our analysis. This is why, besides the standard assumptions for the signal 3 and the observations 6, we make the following additional assumption, which will give us a priori bounds for the signal variance.

**Assumption 7** (Bounded signal diffusion). *There exists a constant  $\beta < +\infty$  such that*

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(v) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(v) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \leq \beta.$$

Note that for constant  $\mathcal{B}$ , i.e. for additive noise in the signal (S), this assumption is fulfilled, as by the Parseval lemma

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B} \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k \mathcal{B} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{B}' \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} q_l \langle e_l, \mathcal{B}' \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} q_l \|\mathcal{B} e_l\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ &\leq \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} q_l \|\mathcal{B}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq \text{tr}[\mathcal{Q}] \|\mathcal{B}\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to keep formulas short, let us make the following notational convention for conditional expectations that shall hold throughout this paper.

**Definition 8.** For any point in time  $t \geq 0$  and any (sufficiently integrable)  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted,  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued process  $(v_s)_{s \geq 0}$  we denote by

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[v_t] := \mathbb{E} \left[ v_t \mid Y_s, s \leq t \right]$$

its conditional expectation w.r.t. past observations.

### 3 Analysis of the EnKBF

For the sake of brevity in formulas we make the following definitions.

**Definition 9.** For any  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$ ,  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}] &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v^i, \quad \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(v^i) \\ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{v}] &:= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (v^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}]) (H(v^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}])'. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We use the normalization by  $1/N$  for the empirical covariance instead of the usual unbiased normalization by  $1/(N-1)$  just for notational convenience in the calculations that are to follow.

The EnKBF (1) can then be rewritten more compactly into

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &+ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt \right), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where  $(\bar{W}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$  are independent copies of the Wiener process  $W$ , driving the signal (S). The initial conditions  $u_0^i$  are independent copies of  $u_0$  and we denote  $\mathbf{u}_t^N := (u_t^1, \dots, u_t^N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$ .

While (10) is just a system of interacting ordinary SPDEs for which local one-sided Lipschitz conditions are enough to derive well posedness [33], it does not seem to satisfy the usual growth conditions for unbounded observation functions  $H$ . In [32] the well posedness was proven for the finite dimensional setting by showing that blow ups do not occur in finite times. This is of course not sufficient to conclude well posedness in infinite dimensions. Instead we employ a partial stopping argument. A priori bounds for the empirical ensemble variance will play a key role in our proof, and so, to keep formulas simple, we make the following definitions;

**Definition 10.** For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and any ensemble  $\mathbf{v} = (v^1, \dots, v^N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$  of  $N$  elements of  $\mathcal{H}$ , we define the empirical variance  $\sigma^N[\mathbf{v}]$  by

$$\sigma^N[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|v_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{v}]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

And similarly we define the empirical observed variance by

$$\sigma^{N,H}[\mathbf{v}] := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |H(v_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{v}]|^2.$$

### 3.1 Well posedness

Furthermore we make the following definition, which we will use to switch of parts of the dynamics of the (mean field) EnKBF.

**Definition 11.** For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote by  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k$  a smoothed version of the indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{[0,k]}$ , such that  $\mathbb{1}_{[0,k]} \leq \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \leq \mathbb{1}_{[0,k+1]}$ .

We are now in the position to formulate and prove the following well posedness result.

**Theorem 12.** If the conditions in Assumption 3 and 7 are satisfied, there exists a unique (strong) solution  $\mathbf{u}^N = (u^1, \dots, u^N)$  to the nonlinear EnKBF (10). I.e.  $\mathbf{u}^N$  is an  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted,  $\mathcal{H}^N$ -valued process, such that for any  $T > 0$  and any  $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$u^i \in L^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{H}) \cap L^{\alpha_p}([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{V})$$

and for any  $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_T^i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle u_0^i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t^i), v \rangle_{\mathcal{V}} dt + \left\langle \int_0^T \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i, v \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \left\langle \int_0^T \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \right) \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt \right), v \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First we note that for any fixed  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the system

$$\begin{aligned} du_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(u_t^i) dt + \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \right) \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , satisfies the standard local one-sided Lipschitz and growth conditions and thus has a unique solution, see [33]. To keep formulas simple we will omit the argument of  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \right)$  and instead simply write  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k$  in the rest of this proof.

We note that the ensemble mean  $\mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$  satisfies

$$d\mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j) dt + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j) d\bar{W}_t^j + \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt). \quad (12)$$

This gives us the evolution equation for the centered particles

$$\begin{aligned} d(u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) &= \left( \mathcal{A}(u_t^i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j) \right) dt + \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j) d\bar{W}_t^j \right) \\ &\quad - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \frac{H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]}{2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by Parseval one easily verifies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_k, \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} (H(u_t^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]^T \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Itô's formula, we derive the following equation for the average deviation from the ensemble mean

$$\begin{aligned}
d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] &= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle \left( \mathcal{A}(u_t^i) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j) \right), u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{V}} dt + d\mathbf{m}_t^N \\
&\quad - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]' \right] dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^3} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i} \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(u_t^j) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where  $\mathbf{m}^N$  denotes the local martingale given by

$$\begin{aligned}
d\mathbf{m}_t^N &:= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N], \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{B}(u_t^j) d\bar{W}_t^j \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) d\bar{W}_t^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \text{ with } \mathbf{m}_0^N = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We note that in (13) we can replace  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}(u_t^j)$  by  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N])$ . Thus by using the one-sided Lipschitz condition (3) and Assumption (7) as well as the positivity of the trace  $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]' \right]$ , we derive the inequality

$$d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \leq (2\lambda \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] + \beta) dt + d\mathbf{m}_t^N. \tag{15}$$

Since  $\mathbf{m}^N$  is a real valued local martingale we can deduce by the stochastic Grönwall Lemma [41, Theorem 4] that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_t^i - m_t^N\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]} \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \sqrt{\beta} e^{\lambda T}. \tag{16}$$

Due to the Lipschitz continuity of  $H$ , this also gives a uniform bound for  $\|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2$ . Since (11) coincide with (10) on  $\left\{ \|\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \leq k \right\}$  we have thus derived the well posedness of (10).  $\square$

**Remark 13** (Literature). *As already mentioned, in finite dimensions well posedness of the particle system (10) was proven in [32]. An extension of this proof to the correlated noise framework, which requires the control of singular terms can be found in [22].*

*In discrete time, EnKFs evolving in infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces were analysed in [15] and in the thesis [29].*

*Finally we mention that the seminal paper [30] considered the well posedness and accuracy of both discrete and continuous time EnKFs for a class of possibly infinite dimensional signals, which included the 2D Navier-Stokes equation. Existence of strong solutions to the continuous time EnKF (10) with complete observations ( $H = \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ ) was assumed and it was shown that solutions do not blow up.*

### 3.2 Exponential moment bounds for the gain term

The key identity in the proof of Theorem 12 was (15), which gave a priori bounds for the empirical covariance operator. Later on we will show that the (conditional) covariance of its mean field limit satisfies a similar differential inequality that does not include the random fluctuations caused by the martingale  $\mathbf{m}^N$ . If the EnKBF (10) is to be a good approximation of its mean field limit (19), one would expect these fluctuations to become small as the number of particles is increased sufficiently. This is indeed the case, as due to Assumption 7, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d[\mathbf{m}^N]_t &= \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N], \mathcal{B}(u_t^i) \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{B}(u_t^i)' (u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt \\ &\leq \frac{2\beta}{N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_t^i - \mathbb{E}^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 dt = \frac{2\beta}{N} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The last inequality is a consequence of the fact that the trace is invariant under the change of the orthonormal basis and that for every nonzero vector one can find an orthonormal basis that contains this vector. Since we were able to bound  $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$  uniformly in time, the quadratic variation of  $\mathbf{m}^N$  will decrease to zero for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . For our convergence proof in section 5 we will need exponential moment bounds of the empirical variance  $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$ . Such bounds are a delicate matter as the ensemble  $\mathbf{u}^N$  will likely show some Gaussian (tail) behaviour and thus  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \leq T} \exp(r\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N])]$  might not be finite for all values of  $r \geq 0$ . However, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  one would expect  $\sigma^N$  to become deterministic and as such any exponential moment should exist for  $N$  sufficiently large. We prove this fact in the following lemma by employing a Grönwall argument.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $q \geq 0$  be arbitrary. Then for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $N > 2\beta q e^{(2\lambda+1)T}$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \exp(q \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left( \frac{q(e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( 2q e^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right]. \quad (18)$$

In particular the  $q$ -th exponential moment of the path of  $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}^N]$  exists up to time  $T$ , if the  $(2q e^{(2\lambda+1)T})$ -th exponential moment of the initial empirical variance  $\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}^N]$  exists.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{a} := 2\lambda + 1$  (see Assumption 3) and  $\mathbf{b} := q e^{\mathbf{a}T}$ . We define the process  $\mathfrak{s}_t := 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N]$ . Then, using inequality (15), we derive the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathfrak{s}_t &= 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] - 2\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt \leq (2\lambda - \mathbf{a}) 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\mathbf{m}_t \\ &= (2\lambda - \mathbf{a}) \mathfrak{s}_t dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} d\mathbf{m}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we derive from (13) the form of the quadratic variation of  $\mathfrak{s}$ , and from (17) the estimate

$$d[\mathfrak{s}]_t = (2\mathbf{b})^2 e^{-2\mathbf{a}t} d[\mathbf{m}^N]_t \leq (2\mathbf{b})^2 e^{-2\mathbf{a}t} \frac{2\beta}{N} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] dt = 2 \frac{2\beta \mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t}}{N} \mathfrak{s}_t dt.$$

These inequalities, together with Itô's formula, give us the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) &= \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{s}_t + \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) \frac{1}{2} d[\mathfrak{s}]_t \\ &\leq (2\lambda - \mathbf{a}) \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathbf{m}_t + \frac{2\beta \mathbf{b} e^{-2\mathbf{a}t}}{N} \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt \\ &= \left( 2\lambda - \mathbf{a} + \frac{2\beta \mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t}}{N} \right) \mathfrak{s}_t \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathbf{m}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Due to our assumptions we have  $\mathbf{a} > 2\lambda + \frac{2\beta \mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t}}{N}$  and thus derive the stochastic inequality

$$d \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) \leq 2\mathbf{b}\beta e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) dt + 2\mathbf{b} e^{-\mathbf{a}t} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathbf{m}_t.$$

Since  $2be^{-at} \exp(\mathfrak{s}_t) d\mathfrak{m}_t$  defines a local martingale, the stochastic Grönwall inequality [41] gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \exp(q \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_t^N]) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \sqrt{\exp(\mathfrak{s}_t)} \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left( q/2e^{aT} \int_0^T e^{-as} ds \right) \mathbb{E} [\exp(\mathfrak{s}_0/2)] \\ &\leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left( \frac{q(e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( 2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 15.** *In the proof of Proposition 14 we used a standard testfunction for our Grönwall argument. Since we have good controls for the quadratic variation of  $\mathfrak{m}$ , we also could have just used the standard Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality in combination with a deterministic Grönwall Lemma. The usage of the stochastic Grönwall inequality is not necessary in our setting, however in [28] a similar testfunction and a novel stochastic Grönwall–Lyapunov inequality were used to derive uniform exponential moment bounds for SDEs satisfying an appropriate Lyapunov condition.*

## 4 Analysis of the mean field EnKBF

Using the notational convention for conditional expectations of Definition 8, the mean field EnKBF (2) can be written more compactly as

$$d\bar{u}_t = \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t + \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_t, H(\bar{u}_t)] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(\bar{u}_t) + \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_t)]}{2} dt \right). \quad (19)$$

When taking the (formal) mean field limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for the EnKBF (10), one would expect it to converge in an appropriate sense to (19). Before we show this convergence rigorously in the next section 5, let us first investigate the well posedness of the McKean–Vlasov equation (19).

**Remark 16** (Literature). *The mean field EnKBF (19) does not seem to fit the standard well posedness theory for McKean–Vlasov equations, as found e.g. in [2], due to only locally Lipschitz coefficients and missing growth conditions. In a finite dimensional setting well posedness of the mean field EnKBF (19) was shown in [16] for bounded signal dynamics and observation functions. For linear observation functions [22] showed well posedness of finite dimensional mean-field EnKBFs that may also include singular correction terms in the presence of correlated noise. This was done by a combination of a fixed point and a stopping argument with respect to the covariance  $\mathbb{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_t, H(\bar{u}_t)]$ . The main tool were a priori variance bounds, that were made robust with respect to the fixed point argument via stopping times.*

*In the infinite dimensional setting this argument does not work due to missing equivalence of norms. While using a Galerkin argument would thus seem tempting, it would also not imply the desired uniqueness of solutions, which is a property that is difficult to show, and sometimes does not even hold for McKean–Vlasov equations under local Lipschitz conditions [41].*

*So instead we use an adapted fixed point argument, that makes use of variance inequalities, similar to those used in the proof of Theorem 12.*

First we investigate the covariance structure in (19). We do this however in a more general form. Let  $(h_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a given  $R^{d_y}$ -valued,  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted stochastic process with finite second moments. Furthermore assume that  $\xi^Y$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ -valued semimartingale that is adapted to the natural filtration generated by  $Y$ , and thus also to  $\mathfrak{F}$ . Then for a  $\tilde{u}$  satisfying

$$d\tilde{u}_t = \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t + \mathbb{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \left( d\xi_t^Y - \frac{h_t + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_t]}{2} dt \right) \quad (20)$$

one can easily use Itô's formula to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \langle v, \tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle w, \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} + \langle w, \tilde{u}_t - \tilde{m}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle v, \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] dt \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\langle v, \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' w \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] - \langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [h_t, \tilde{u}_t] w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

for every  $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ . Thus by the positivity of  $\langle v, \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [h_t, \tilde{u}_t] v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  we immediately derive

$$\partial_t \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] \leq \lambda \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] + \beta, \quad (21)$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_t - \mathbb{E}_Y [\tilde{u}_t]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (22)$$

Thus the EnKBF satisfies the variance bound that is implied by the Bayesian filtering problem (see Appendix A), it does so even in a stronger sense, as taking the expectation is not required. As implied by the law of total variance for the optimal filter, this bound is robust with respect to perturbations of both the modelled observation function  $H$  and the actual observation data  $Y$ .

Next we show that the robust variance bound (22) can be used to show well posedness of the EnKBF via a Picard argument.

**Theorem 17.** *If the conditions in Assumption 3 and 7 are satisfied, there exists a unique strong solution to the nonlinear mean-field EnKBF (19)<sup>2</sup>.*

*Proof.* For proving well posedness it is enough to restrict ourselves to a small time frame  $[0, T]$  with  $T$  chosen later on. The extension to arbitrary time frames can then be easily achieved by standard glueing arguments

The proof is separated into two steps. First we introduce partially stopped dynamics and show their well posedness via a fixed point argument. Next we show that these stopped dynamics must always coincide with solutions to the EnKBF on events that cover the whole probability space almost surely.

In the following we will make use of the semimartingale decomposition of the observation process  $Y$ . For highlighting that the true signal process  $u$ , given by (S), plays the role of a parameter to the EnKBF and to easily distinguish it from other processes encountered in the proof we will denote it by  $u^{\text{ref}}$ . The observation process  $Y$  is thus given by

$$dY_t = H(u_t^{\text{ref}})dt + \Gamma_t dV_t. \quad (23)$$

Step 1: *Well posedness for partially stopped dynamics.*

Define for  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random variable  $v$  the stopped observation function  $H^k$  by

$$H^k(v) := \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[H(v)]|) H(v),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k$  is the smoothed indicator function of Definition 11. Furthermore define the stopped observation process  $Y^l$  by

$$dY_t^l := \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right) dY_t.$$

<sup>2</sup>Hereby the notion of strong solution is defined just as for the particle system (10) in Theorem 12.

In this step we show that there exists a unique solution  $\bar{u}^k$  of the (partially) stopped dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{u}_t^k &= \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k)dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t^k - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

via a fixed point argument with respect to the stopped modelled observations  $(H(\bar{u}_t^k))_{t \in [0, T]}$ .

To this end we consider for a given process  $h$ , which is assumed to be an  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted, square integrable semimartingale, the unique solution  $\tilde{u}$  of

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{u}_t &= \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t]|) \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t, h_t] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t^l - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t]|) \frac{h_t + \mathbb{E}_Y [h_t]}{2} dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Well posedness of (25) is assured by the standard (global) Lipschitz and growth conditions, which assure that a unique solution can be found by standard Picard fixed point arguments as found for example in [2] for finite dimensional McKean–Vlasov equations<sup>3</sup>. We define the map  $\Xi$  by

$$\Xi(h) := H(\tilde{u}).$$

Since  $H(\tilde{u})$  is an  $\mathfrak{F}$ -adapted, square integrable semimartingale, the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (24) corresponds to the existence and uniqueness of fixed points of  $\Xi$ . We prove this via a Banach fixed point argument and thus have to show the contractivity of  $\Xi$ . Due to the Lipschitz continuity of  $H$ , this further reduces to the problem of showing that the solution map  $h \mapsto \tilde{u}$  defined by the equation (20) is Lipschitz, with constant strictly smaller than  $1/\text{Lip}(H)$ .

Since (25) is of the form (20), the process  $\tilde{u}$  must also satisfy the uniform variance bound (22) corresponding to the law of total variance. Therefore, by the Lipschitz continuity of  $H$ , we can assume that any potential fixed point  $h$  satisfies

$$\text{Var}_Y [h_t] = \text{tr}_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}} \text{Cov}_Y [h_t] \leq \text{Lip}(\mathcal{H}) \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (26)$$

To show the contractivity of  $\Xi$ , let  $h^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  be two given processes and denote by  $\tilde{u}^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  the corresponding solutions to (25). Using the uniform variance bounds (26), as well as the Lipschitz continuity of  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k$  and its boundedness  $0 \leq \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \leq 1$ , we derive the following bound for the gain difference

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t^1, h_t^1] - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t^2, h_t^2] \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})} \\ & \leq \left| \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t^1]|) - \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_t^2]|) \right| \left\| \text{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_t^1, h_t^1] \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})} \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_t^2 - \mathbb{E}_Y [\tilde{u}_t^2]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_t^1 - h_t^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \\ & \leq \left( (\text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k) + 1) \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H)} + 1 \right) \beta e^{\lambda t} \left( \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right]} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

<sup>3</sup>One can also use the approach of [26], which showed well posedness of McKean–Vlasov SPDEs, but only consider deterministic coefficients.

Using Itô's formula for the squared norm, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{A}(\tilde{u}_s^2), \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} ds \\
&+ 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^1]|)) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_t^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} dY_s^k \\
&- 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|)) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\quad \left. R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \frac{h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]}{2} \right\rangle ds \\
&- 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \left. \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) (h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]) - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) (h_s^2 + \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2])}{2} \right\rangle ds \\
&+ 2 \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^t \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T ds \\
&+ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_0^t q_n \langle \nu_k, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) e_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we note that by Parseval and the onesided Lipschitz condition (3) we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} q_n \langle \nu_k, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) e_n \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u) - \mathcal{B}(v)) \circ \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 \leq \lambda \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2, \quad (28)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1} \\
&\quad \langle \nu_k, (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\
&= \left\| (\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \text{Cov}_Y[\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1/2} \right\|_{L(\mathbb{R}^{d_y}, \mathcal{H})}^2 \\
&\leq \left( (\text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) + 1) \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H) + 1} \right)^2 \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} \left| R_s^{-1/2} \right|^2 \left( \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right). \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) h_s^1 - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) h_s^2|^2 \right] \\
&\leq 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |h_s^2|^2 \right] |\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1]|) - \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|)|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right] + 2 \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k(|\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|) \left( |\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|^2 + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |h_s^2 - \mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^2]|^2 \right] \right) \text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) |\mathbb{E}_Y[h_s^1 - h_s^2]|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \left( 1 + ((k+1)^2 + \text{Lip}(H)\beta e^{\lambda t}) \text{Lip}(\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k) \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |h_s^1 - h_s^2|^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \leq \mathbb{1}_{[0, k+1]}$  and the variance bound (26) to derive the last inequality.

The variance bounds (22) and (26) also imply that

$$\|\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]\|_{L(R^{d_x}, \mathcal{H})} \leq \sqrt{\text{Lip}(H)} \beta e^{\lambda t}. \quad (30)$$

If we now take the supremum on the time interval  $[0, T]$  and the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_Y$ , standard Cauchy–Schwarz inequalities, together with (28), (29) and the one-sided Lipschitz condition (3), we derive that there exists a constant  $\kappa_1(T)$ , that only depends on the timeframe  $T$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \kappa_1(T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + \kappa_1(T) \int_0^t \left( \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \right) \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( |\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} dY_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (B(\tilde{u}_s^1) - B(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Note that due to (26) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( |\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 + \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] & \leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|h_s^1 - \mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + 8\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( |\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]| \right) \|\mathbb{E}_Y [h_s^1]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \\ & \leq 2\text{Lip}(H) \beta e^{\lambda t} + 8(k+1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus if we now use the specific form of the observations (23) and take the full expectation in (31) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \kappa_2(T, k) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \right) H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^1, h_s^1] - \mathbb{Cov}_Y [\tilde{u}_s^2, h_s^2]) R_s^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \right) \Gamma_s dV_s \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] ds \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \int_0^t \left\langle \tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2, (\mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^1) - \mathcal{B}(\tilde{u}_s^2)) dW_s \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $\kappa_2(T, k)$ , where we of course used that  $\mathbb{E} [ \mathbb{E}_Y [\cdot] ] = \mathbb{E} [\cdot]$ .

To dominate the second term on the right hand side of the inequality we use (27) together with the fact that  $\tilde{\mathbb{1}}_k \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \right) \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_s^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \leq (k+1)$ . For the other two terms we use the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality together with (28) and (29) to derive that there exists a constant  $\kappa_3(T, k, l) > 0$  we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \kappa_3(T, k, l) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\tilde{u}_s^1 - \tilde{u}_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds,$$

which by the (deterministic) Grönwall Lemma implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \|\tilde{u}_t^1 - \tilde{u}_t^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq \kappa_3(T, k, l) \exp(T \kappa_3(T, \|H\|_\infty)) \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \|h_s^1 - h_s^2\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] ds,$$

and thus for  $T$  small enough we indeed have the desired contraction property.

Step 2: The stopping argument.

First we define the stopping times which we use for our argument by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^k &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : |\mathbb{E}_Y [H(u_t^k)]|^2 > k \right\} \\ \tau_{\text{ref}}^l &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] > l \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and note that both are stopping times with respect to the filtration generated by  $Y$ . This implies that for any stochastic process  $(z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and any (suitably integrable) functions  $f, g$ , the identities

$$\begin{aligned} g \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [f(z_{\min\{\tau^k, t\}})] \right) &= g \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [f(z_s)] \Big|_{s=\min\{\tau^k, t\}} \right) \\ g \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [f(z_{\min\{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l, t\}})] \right) &= g \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [f(z_s)] \Big|_{s=\min\{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l, t\}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

hold and therefore  $\bar{u}^k$  is a solution to the EnKBF (19) on the random time interval  $[0, \min\{\tau^k, \tau_{\text{ref}}^l\}]$ . By the uniqueness of (25),  $\bar{u}^k$  and  $\bar{u}^{k+1}$  must even coincide on  $[0, \min\{\tau^k, \tau_{\text{ref}}^l\}]$ . Thus we can construct a solution to (19) using the solutions to (25). In order to conclude existence and uniqueness of the EnKBF, we just have to show that

$$\bigcup_{k, l \in \mathbb{N}} \{\tau^k > T\} \cap \{\tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T\}$$

defines a covering of the sample space almost surely.

To this end we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} d \|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \langle \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} dt + \langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) d\bar{W}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] dt \\ &\quad + 2 \left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t^l - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation thus gives us

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] &= 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \langle \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] dt + \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^k) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \right] dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t^l - \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} dt \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] dt \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathbb{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right] \right)^2 \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \text{Cov}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The first two terms on the right hand side can be bounded using the growth condition (4) and the diffusivity bound (7). The last term is just the squared shadow 2-norm of the operator

$\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1/2}$ , which we can estimate using Parseval and the robust variance bound (22) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]] &\leq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k), \bar{u}_t^k]] \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, H(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k), \langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \nu_j, \bar{u}_t^k - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k] \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^2] |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(\bar{u}_t^k) - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2 ] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k] \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(\bar{u}_t^k) - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2 ]^2 \leq \text{Lip}(H) |R_t^{-1}| \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can bound (33) by

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left( 2\alpha_H \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + 2\alpha_0 + \beta + \text{Lip}(H) |R_t^{-1}| \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} dY_t^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

We use (30) and  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k \leq 1$  to derive that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \frac{H^k(\bar{u}_t^k) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]}{2} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right] \right| \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_k (|\mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]|^2) \|\mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)]\|_{L(R^{d_x}; \mathcal{H})}^2 |R_t^{-1}| \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(\bar{u}_t^k)|^2 ] \\ &\leq (2 + \text{Lip}(H)^3 \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} |R_t^{-1}|) \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \text{Lip}(H) \beta^2 e^{2\lambda t} |R_t^{-1}| |H(0)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we note that there exist constants  $\kappa_4(T)$  and  $\kappa_5(T)$ , only depending on the timeframe  $T$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left( \kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \kappa_5(T) \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} dY_t^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}], \end{aligned}$$

which by using the explicit form of the observations  $Y$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] &= \left( \kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + \kappa_5(T) \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \right) H(u_t^{\text{ref}}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] dt \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y [\langle \bar{u}_t^k, \mathbb{C}\text{ov}_Y [\bar{u}_t^k, H^k(\bar{u}_t^k)] R_t^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_l \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 ] \right) \Gamma_t dV_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Again using (30) and the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality we derive that there exist constants  $\kappa_6(T)$ , depending solely on  $T$ , and  $\kappa_7(T, l)$ , depending on  $T$  and  $l$ , such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right] = \kappa_6(T) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] dt + \mathbb{E}_Y [\| u_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + T \kappa_7(T, l). \quad (36)$$

Thus, by the Grönwall Lemma, we derive that for fixed  $l$  and  $T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y [\| \bar{u}_t^k \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] \right] \leq \exp(T \kappa_6(T)) \left( \mathbb{E}_Y [\| u_0 \|_{\mathcal{H}}^2] + T \kappa_7(T, l) \right), \quad (37)$$

which, implies that almost surely there exists a  $k$  such that  $\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \leq k$ . By the Lipschitz continuity of  $H$  and the inequality  $|\mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^k)]| \leq |H(0)| + \text{Lip}(H) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \|\bar{u}_t^k\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]}$  this then in turn implies that

$$\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \tau^k > T \} \cap \{ \tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T \} = \{ \tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T \} \text{ almost surely.}$$

Since  $\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ |H(u_t^{\text{ref}})|^2 \right]$  is finite almost surely, we can thus indeed conclude that there exists a solution to the EnKBF (19), defined on every event  $\{ \tau^k > T \} \cap \{ \tau_{\text{ref}}^l > T \}$  by the sequence of  $\bar{u}^k$ .

Uniqueness follows from uniqueness of the stopped dynamics (24).  $\square$

**Remark 18.** *Note that even though in the proof above we used the specific form of the observations  $Y$ , it actually does not matter that the true observation function and the modelled observation function coincide, i.e. if  $dY_t = \mathfrak{C}(\bar{X}_t)dt + \Gamma_t dV_t$  with  $\mathfrak{C} \neq H$ , then the proof would still hold, as long as  $\mathfrak{C}$  is assumed to be Lipschitz. Therefore, as an immediate corollary of our chosen fixed point argument, one derives the continuity of the EnKBF with respect to perturbations of the modelled observations  $H$ . The continuous dependence on the signal parameters  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$  and the initial condition  $u_0$  can be shown as well. Only the robustness with respect to the observation stream  $Y$  is a delicate matter due to the discontinuity of the Itô–Lyons map.*

## 5 Quantitative propagation of chaos

Next we show propagation of chaos, i.e. that the system of interacting SPDEs (10) indeed converges (in an appropriate sense) to the McKean–Vlasov SPDE (19). For this we use a standard synchronous coupling approach, i.e. we compare (10) to a tensorized version of (19) defined on the same probability space. To this end we define conditionally<sup>4</sup> independent copies  $\bar{u}^i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  of the mean field process (19) to be the solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{u}_t^i &= \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_t^i)dt + \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_t^i)d\bar{W}_t^i \\ &+ \mathbb{C}_{\text{ov}Y} [\bar{u}_t^i, H(\bar{u}_t^i)] R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(\bar{u}_t^i) + \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_t^i)]}{2} dt \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{W}^i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  are the same Wiener processes that also drive the particle system (10). Furthermore we set  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^N := (\bar{u}^1, \dots, \bar{u}^N) \in \mathcal{H}^N$  and make the following definition.

**Definition 19.** *We define the empirical observed accuracy*

$$\mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N [u_s]}{2} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2.$$

*We also define the corresponding hitting times for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\sigma}^k &:= \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] > k \}, \quad \tau_{\sigma}^{k,H} := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \sigma^{N,H}[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_t^N] > k \}, \\ \tau_{\mathcal{R}}^k &:= \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_t^N) > k \}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 20.** *Furthermore we define the error of the law of large numbers by*

$$\text{LLN}_H^N(T) := \int_0^T \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ov}Y} [\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 + \left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 ds.$$

<sup>4</sup>Conditioned on  $Y$ .

Now we are able prove convergence of the particle system with implicit rates.

**Theorem 21.** *Assume that the conditions in Assumption 3 and 7 are satisfied, and let  $\tau^k := \min\{\tau_\sigma^k, \tau_{\bar{\sigma}}^k, \tau_{\mathcal{R}}^k\}$ . Then for any  $p \in (0, 1)$  there exists a constant  $\kappa(T, k, p)$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq \min\{T, \tau^k\}} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| r_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}^i \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, k, p) \mathbb{E} \left[ (\text{LLN}_H^N(\min\{T, \tau^k\}))^p \right]$$

*Proof.* We note that since  $u^i$  and  $\bar{u}^i$  share the same initial conditions we have for any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  that

$$\begin{aligned} r_t^i &= u_t^i - \bar{u}_t^i = \int_0^t d(u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i) \\ &= \int_0^t \mathcal{A}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_s^i) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i) d\bar{W}_s^i \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \left( dY_t - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} ds \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] R_s^{-1} (H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by using the concrete form of the observation process  $dY_t = H(u_t^{\text{ref}})dt + \Gamma_t dV_t$  we derive from Itô's Lemma

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &= 2 \int_0^t \gamma' \langle \mathcal{A}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_s^i), u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} ds + 2 \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i)) d\bar{W}_s^i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left\| (\mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i)) \circ \sqrt{Q} \right\|_{L_2(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})}^2 ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \Gamma_s dV_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \left\langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) R_s^{-1} \left( H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left| \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, (\mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_s^{-1/2} \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] R_s^{-1} (H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s^i)]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by forming the average and using the Lipschitz assumptions (3), as well as elementary Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, we derive that there exists a constant  $\kappa_1(T) > 0$ , only depending on time, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_1(T) \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds + \text{Im}_t \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_Y}}^2 \left( \left\| H(u_s^{\text{ref}}) - \frac{H(u_s^i) + \mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]}{2} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2|R_s^{-1}| \right) ds \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \text{Cov}_Y[\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_Y}}^2 \left( |H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i)|^2 + |\mathbb{E}_H^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s^i)]|^2 \right) ds, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathfrak{m}_t &:= \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, \left( \mathcal{B}(u_s^i) - \mathcal{B}(\bar{u}_s^i) \right) d\bar{W}_s^i \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i, \left( \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right) R_s^{-1} \Gamma_s dV_s \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned}$$

is a local martingale. Its concrete form will not matter to our further calculations as we intend to use the stochastic Grönwall Lemma [41].

First we note that the (conditional) covariance operator  $\mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] = \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)]$  is independent of  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and that it can be uniformly bounded on any finite time interval  $[0, T]$  due to the variance bound (22), which helps us ignore the quadratic covariation of  $\mathfrak{m}$  and is thus especially suited for the one-sided Lipschitz conditions we encounter.

Next we note that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 \leq 2\text{Lip}(H)^2 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2 \left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2.$$

Finally we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} + \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N]) \left( H(u_s^i) - H(\bar{u}_s^i) \right)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} + \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (u_s^i - \bar{u}_s^i) \left( H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \right)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}} \\ &\leq \left( \sqrt{\frac{\text{Lip}(H)}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|u_s^i - \mathbb{E}^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N]\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]|^2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2} \\ &\quad + \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the notation of Definition 19 this allows us to further estimate inequality (38). Thus there exists a constant  $\kappa_2(T) > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t \left( 1 + \left( \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_s^N] + \sigma^{N,H} [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \right) \mathcal{R}_H^N (\mathbf{u}_s^N) \right) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t \mathcal{R}_H^N (\mathbf{u}_s^N) \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{C}_{\text{ovY}} [\bar{u}_s^i, H(\bar{u}_s^i)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_2(T) \int_0^t \left| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 ds + \mathfrak{m}_t. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Using the stopping time  $\tau^k$  we thus derive that there exists a constant  $\kappa_3(T, k)$  only depending on time-frame  $T$  and the stopping level  $k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 &\leq \kappa_3(T, k) \int_0^{\min\{t, \tau^k\}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds \\ &\quad + \kappa_3(T, k) \text{LLN}_H^N (\min\{t, \tau^k\}) + \mathfrak{m}_{\min\{t, \tau^k\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the stochastic Grönwall Lemma [41, Theorem 4, equation (4)], the claim of this lemma follows immediately.  $\square$

From this theorem one can also deduce the convergence in probability [32].

We say the convergence rates derived in Theorem 21 are implicit, as they require the processes to be stopped and the stopping times depend on the converging particle system itself. However on the stopped time intervals the rates are optimal in the sense that they correspond to the rates of convergence given by the law of large numbers. This is certainly far from the convergence result one would ultimately desire, but, for general signals and observation functions, nevertheless seems to be the current state of the art, even in the finite dimensional setting, where the same coupling method was used by [32] to obtain similar results for Lipschitz signals and linear observation functions. For bounded signal and observation functions, as well as observation data  $Y$  that is given by a Lipschitz continuous (w.r.t. time) rough path<sup>5</sup>, [16] were able to prove explicit convergence rates. They used a similar stopping argument as above, together with tail bounds for higher order empirical moments of the interacting ensemble. With this they were able to derive a logarithmic decay  $\mathcal{O}(\log(N)^{-1})$  of the error w.r.t. ensemble size  $N$  without stopping, which is still far from the desired convergence rates corresponding to the law of large numbers.

Also assuming the boundedness of the observation function  $H$ , we are able to prove the asymptotically, (almost) optimal convergence rate based on our exponential moment bounds in Proposition 14 and the following additional assumption on the initial distribution.

**Assumption 22.** *We assume that for any  $q > 0$  there exists an  $N_0(q) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\sup_{N \geq N_0(q)} \mathbb{E} [\exp(q \sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_0^N])] < +\infty.$$

**Remark 23.** *This assumption is always satisfied for deterministic initial conditions, as for  $u_0 \sim \delta_{v_0}$  for some  $v_0 \in \mathcal{H}$  one has  $\sigma^N [\mathbf{u}_0^N] = 0$  for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . For Gaussian initial conditions this relates to the domain of the moment generating function of  $\chi^2$ -distributions and for general random variables to large deviations of the empirical covariance matrix.*

We will not investigate further when this assumption is satisfied and just assume it holds. Then we are able to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 24.** *Besides the conditions in Assumption 3 and 7, we assume that  $H$  is bounded and that Assumption 22 hold. Then for any  $T < +\infty$ ,  $p \in (0, 1)$  and any  $\nu \in (1, 1/p)$  there exists an  $N_0(T, p, \nu) \in \mathbb{N}$  and a  $\kappa(T, p, \nu) < +\infty$ , such that for all  $N \geq N_0(T, p, \nu)$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, p, \nu) \mathbb{E} \left[ (\text{LLN}_H^N(T))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu}. \quad (40)$$

As a consequence we have for  $\kappa(T, p) := \inf_{\nu \in (1, 1/p)} \kappa(T, p, \nu)$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \kappa(T, p) \mathbb{E} [\text{LLN}_H^N(T)]^p, \quad (41)$$

which in turn implies that for some constant  $C(T, p, \|H\|_{\infty}) > 0$  that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq C(T, p, \|H\|_{\infty}) N^{-p}. \quad (42)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Thus excluding Brownian observation noise that we treat here.

*Proof.* First we note that inequality (39), which was derived in the proof of Theorem 21, can be further simplified when the observation function  $H$  is assumed to be bounded, as then both  $\sigma^{N,H}[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N]$  and  $\mathcal{R}_H^N(\mathbf{u}_s^N)$  are uniformly bounded and thus there exists a constant  $\kappa_4(T)$ , such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \leq \kappa_4(T) \int_0^t (1 + \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_s^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 ds + \kappa_4(T) \text{LLN}_H^N(t) + \mathfrak{m}_t.$$

The stochastic Grönwall inequality [41] thus tells us that for any  $p \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mu, \nu > 1$  with  $\frac{1}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\nu} = 1$  and such that  $p\nu < 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq (c_{p\nu} + 1)^{1/\nu} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( p\mu \kappa_4(T) \int_0^T (1 + \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_s^N]) ds \right) \right] \kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E} \left[ (\text{LLN}_H^N(t))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where

$$c_{p\nu} := \min \{4, 1/(p\nu)\} \frac{\pi p\nu}{\sin(\pi p\nu)} \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1/p} +\infty.$$

Now we first note that  $\mu = \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}$ . Due to the exponential moment bounds in Proposition 14 we have that for  $q := \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( p\mu \kappa_4(T) \int_0^T \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_t^N] \right) \right] \leq (\pi + 1) \exp \left( \frac{q (e^{(2\lambda+1)T} - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( 2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right]$$

and by Assumption 22 there exists an

$$\mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu) := N_0(q) = N_0 \left( 2qe^{(2\lambda+1)T} \right) = N_0 \left( 2 \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T e^{(2\lambda+1)T} \right)$$

such that

$$\kappa_5(T, p\mu) := \sup_{N \geq \mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( 2 \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T e^{(2\lambda+1)T} \sigma^N[\mathbf{u}_0^N] \right) \right] < +\infty$$

and therefore for any  $N \geq \mathcal{N}_0(T, p, \nu)$  we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq T} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|r_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^p \right] \leq \underbrace{(c_{p\nu} + 1)^{1/\nu} e^{(\frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \kappa_4(T) T)}}_{:= \kappa_5(T, p, \nu)} \kappa_5 \left( T, \frac{p\nu}{\nu-1} \right) \kappa_4(T) \mathbb{E} \left[ (\text{LLN}_H^N(t))^{p\nu} \right]^{1/\nu},$$

which proves our first claim. From this one can directly deduce (41) via the Hölder inequality and using the fact that for  $\nu \rightarrow 1$  both  $\mathcal{N}(T, p, \nu)$  and  $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$  blow up, i.e.

$$\mathcal{N}(T, p, \nu), \kappa(T, p, \nu) \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1} +\infty,$$

as well the blow up  $\kappa(T, p, \nu) \xrightarrow{\nu \rightarrow 1/p} +\infty$ , which in turn implies that the minimizer of  $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$  for every fixed  $T$  and  $P$  must lie inside the interval  $(1, 1/p)$  and therefore (41) is proven. Finally we are left to show (42). By Definition 20 the term  $\text{LLN}_H^N(T)$  consists of an error of the empirical mean and an error of the empirical covariance. First we estimate the error of the empirical mean. Using the conditional independence of  $(\bar{u}^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$  and the law of total variance we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_H^N[\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 \right] ds = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N H(\bar{u}_s^i) - \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s)] \right|^2 \right] ds \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \frac{\text{Var}_Y[H(\bar{u}_s)]}{N} ds \right] \leq \int_0^T \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N} ds = \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta (e^{\lambda T} - 1)}{\lambda N}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Next we aim to dominate the error of the covariance. To this end we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \mathbb{C}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \text{Cov}_Y [\bar{u}_s, H(\bar{u}_s)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Again we use the conditional independence of  $(\bar{u}_s^i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$  to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right]}{N} \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \right]}{N} \leq \frac{\|H\|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \bar{u}_s \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]}{N} \end{aligned}$$

By using the bound (37) with  $k, l \geq \|H\|_\infty$  that was derived in the proof of Theorem 17 for the second absolute moments of  $\bar{u}$ , we can show that there exists a constant  $C_1(T, \|H\|_\infty) > 0$  such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{u}_s^i H(\bar{u}_s^i)' - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] ds \leq \frac{C_1(T, \|H\|_\infty)}{N} \quad (45)$$

Finally we note that similar to (44) one can easily deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \left\| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \right\|^2 \right] + 2\|\mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\|H\|_\infty^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N} + \|\mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s]\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \frac{\text{Lip}(H)^2 \beta e^{\lambda s}}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we can thus derive by the boundedness (37) of the second absolute moment of  $\bar{u}$ , that there exists a constant  $C_2(T, \|H\|_\infty) > 0$  such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \mathbb{E}^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] \mathbb{E}_H^N [\bar{\mathbf{u}}_s^N] - \mathbb{E}_Y [\bar{u}_s] \mathbb{E}_Y [H(\bar{u}_s)]' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{d_y}}^2 \right] ds \leq \frac{C_2(T, \|H\|_\infty)}{N} \quad (46)$$

By the definition of  $\text{LLN}_H^N$  (in Definition 20), combining the inequalities (44),(45),(46) with (41) concludes our proof.  $\square$

**Remark 25.** *Since the constant  $\kappa(T, p, \nu)$  blows up for  $\nu \rightarrow 1$  or  $\nu \rightarrow 1/p$ , we can not simply take the limit  $p \rightarrow 1$  in (41). As  $p < 1$ , the  $p$ -th power is concave and thus we can not deduce that (41) would also hold if the power on the left-hand-side of the inequality would be written outside! We thus say that (41) gives almost optimal rates in the sense that this inequality holds for all  $p < 1$ , but not for the optimal value  $p = 1$ , where the the expectations on both sides are indeed of the same nature. In a similar sense the stronger inequality (40) shows almost optimal rates, in the sense that it holds for all  $\nu > 1$  but not for  $\nu = 1$ , the case where the moments on both sides are of the same order.*

Besides blowing up when  $p \rightarrow 1$ , the constant  $\kappa(T, p)$  also grows hyperexponentially in  $T$ ! While Theorem 24 thus provides us with (almost) optimal convergence rates, the constants involved are far too large to give useful a priori error estimates even on moderate time intervals.

**Remark 26** (Literature). *In the finite dimensional and linear Gaussian setting this problem has been tackled by a large number of papers. In this setting a first propagation of chaos result was achieved by [19], even showing uniform in time convergence for stable signals. This result has by now been followed up by several works [8],[9],[10] treating unstable signals by making use of the Riccati equation that appears in this setting. An alternative extension of the EnKBF to nonlinear signals using a Taylor-inspired linearization around the mean, similar to the extended Kalman–Bucy filter, was considered in [18]. The linearization there also allowed for the use of a decoupled Riccati equation. While an extension of these uniform in time results to our nonlinear setting is certainly highly desirable, we do not investigate it in this paper.*

## Acknowledgements and funding

Sebastian Ertel is supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through IRTG 2544 - *Stochastic Analysis in Interaction*.

## References

- [1] N.U. Ahmed, M. Fuhrman, *On Filtering Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Journal of Functional Analysis 143, 180–204, 1997.
- [2] R. Carmona, F. Delarue, *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I. Mean Field FBSDEs, Control, and Games*. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling 83, Springer, 2018.
- [3] A. Bain, D. Crisan, *Fundamentals of stochastic filtering*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability 60, Springer, 2009.
- [4] A. Bensoussan, *Filtrage optimal des systemes lineaires*. Dunod (1971).
- [5] K. Bergemann, S. Reich, *An ensemble Kalman-Bucy filter for continuous data assimilation*. Meteorologische Zeitschrift, Vol. 21, No. 3, 213–219, 2012.
- [6] D. Bhandari, J. Pidstrigach, S. Reich, *Affine Invariant Ensemble Transform Methods to Improve Predictive Uncertainty in ReLU Networks*. arXiv: 2309.04742.
- [7] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, *On the Mathematical Theory of Ensemble (Linear-Gaussian) Kalman-Bucy Filtering*. Math. Control Signals Syst. (2023).
- [8] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, *On the stability of matrix-valued Riccati diffusions*. Electronic Journal of Probability. Vol. 24, paper No. 24, 2019.
- [9] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, K. Kamatani, B. Remillard, *On one-dimensional Riccati diffusions*. Ann. Appl. Probab. 29 (2), pp. 1127 – 1187, 2019.
- [10] A. Bishop, P. Del Moral, A. Niclas, *A perturbation analysis of stochastic matrix Riccati diffusions*. Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques. Vol. 56, No. 2., 884–916, 2020.
- [11] C. Boullanger, J. Schiltz, *Nonlinear filtering with an infinite dimensional signal process*. PORTUGALIAE MATHEMATICA, Vol. 56 Fasc. 3, 1999.
- [12] V. I. Bogachev, *DIFFERENTIABLE MEASURES AND THE MALLIAVIN CALCULUS*. Journal of Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 87, No. 4. 1997.
- [13] E. Calvillo, S. Reich, A. M. Stuart, *Ensemble Kalman Methods: A Mean Field Perspective*. arxiv 2209.11371

- [14] J. A. Carrillo, F. Hoffmann, A. M. Stuart, U. Vaes, *The Ensemble Kalman Filter in the Near-Gaussian Setting*. arxiv 2212.13239
- [15] A. Chernov, H. Hoel, K.J.H. Law, F. Nobile, R. Tempone, *Multilevel ensemble Kalman filtering for spatio-temporal processes*. Numer. Math. 147, 71–125 (2021).
- [16] M. Coghi, T. Nilssen, N. Nüsken, S. Reich, *Rough McKean–Vlasov dynamics for robust ensemble Kalman filtering*. arXiv:2107.06621, 2021.
- [17] D. Crisan, J. Xiong *Approximate McKean–Vlasov representations for a class of SPDEs*. Stochastics, Vol. 82, 2010.
- [18] P. Del Moral, A. Kurtzmann, J. Tugaut, *On the Stability and the Uniform Propagation of Chaos of a Class of Extended Ensemble Kalman–Bucy Filters*. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, Vol. 55, No.1., 119–155, 2017
- [19] P. Del Moral, J. Tugaut, *On the stability and the uniform propagation of chaos properties of Ensemble Kalman–Bucy filters*. Annals of Applied Probability. Vol. 28, No. 2., 790–850 2018.
- [20] Z. Ding, Q. Li, *Ensemble Kalman inversion: mean-field limit and convergence analysis*. Stat. Comput., 31(1):Paper No. 9, 21, 2021.
- [21] Z. Ding, Q. Li, *Ensemble Kalman sampler: mean-field limit and convergence analysis*. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 53(2):1546–1578, 2021.
- [22] S. W. Ertel, W. Stannat, *Analysis of the Ensemble Kalman–Bucy Filter for correlated observation noise*. arxiv 2205.14253
- [23] G. Evensen, *Sequential data assimilation with a non-linear quasi-geostrophic model using Monte Carlo methods to forecast error statistics*. J. Geophys. Res 99(C5), Vol.10, 143–162, 1994
- [24] G. Evensen, *Data assimilation : The ensemble Kalman filter*. Springer, Berlin, 2007
- [25] S. Hobbs, S. S. Sritharan, *Nonlinear Filtering of Stochastic Reacting and Diffusing Systems*. Probability and Modern Analysis. Gritsky, N., Goldstein, J., and Uhl, J.J. eds., Marcel Dekker, New York, 1996.
- [26] W. Hong, S.-S. Hu, W. Liu, *McKean–Vlasov SDEs and SPDEs with Locally Monotone Coefficients*. arXiv:2205.04043, 2022.
- [27] F. Le Gland, V. Monbet, V.D. Tran, *Large sample asymptotics for the ensemble Kalman filter*. The Oxford Handbook of Nonlinear Filtering, chapter 22, pp. 598–631, 2011.
- [28] A. Hudde, M. Hutzenthaler, S. Mazzonetto, *A stochastic Gronwall inequality and applications to moments, strong completeness, strong local Lipschitz continuity, and perturbation*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 57(2): 603-626 (May 2021). DOI: 10.1214/20-AIHP1064
- [29] I. Kusanický, *Ensemble Kalman filter on high and infinite dimensional spaces*. PhD-thesis at Charles University, 2016.
- [30] D. T.B. Kelly, K. J. H. Law, A. M. Stuart, *Well-Posedness And Accuracy Of The Ensemble Kalman Filter In Discrete And Continuous Time*. Nonlinearity. Vol. 27, No. 10.,2579–2603, 2014
- [31] T. Lange, *Derivation of ensemble Kalman–Bucy filters with unbounded nonlinear coefficients*. Nonlinearity 35 (2), 1061–1092, 2021.
- [32] T. Lange, W. Stannat, *Mean field limit of Ensemble Square Root filters - discrete and continuous time*. Foundations of Data Science, Vol. 3, no. 3, 563–588, 2021.

- [33] Wei Liu, Michael Röckner, *SPDE in Hilbert space with locally monotone coefficients*. Journal of Functional Analysis, Vol. 259, Issue 11, pages 2902–2922, 2010.
- [34] J. Mandel, L. Cobb, J.D. Beezeley, *On the convergence of the ensemble Kalman filter*. Applications of Mathematics, Vol. 56, pp. 533–541, 2011.
- [35] D. Oliver, A. Reynolds, N. Liu, *Inverse Theory for Petroleum Reservoir Characterization and History Matching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2008.
- [36] E. Pardoux, *Stochastic partial differential equations and filtering of diffusion processes*. Stochastics, 1979, Vol. 3. pp. 127-167
- [37] E. Pardoux, *Equations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques non linéaires monotones*. Thèse, Université Paris XI, 1975.
- [38] S. Pathiraja, W. Stannat, S. Reich, *McKean-Vlasov SDEs in nonlinear filtering*. SIAM J. Control Optim., Vol. 59 , no. 6, 4188—4215, 2021.
- [39] C. Prévôt, M. Röckner, *A concise course on stochastic partial differential equations*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1905. Springer, Berlin (2007).
- [40] P. Sakov, P. R. Oke, *A deterministic formulation of the ensemble Kalman filter: an alternative to ensemble square root filters*. Tellus A. Vol. 60, No. 2., 361–371, 2008.
- [41] M. Scheutzwow, *A stochastic Gronwall lemma*. Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top., Vol. 16, no. 2, 4 pp., 2013.
- [42] M. Scheutzwow, *Uniqueness and non-uniqueness of solutions of Vlasov-McKean equations*. Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, Vol. 43, Iss. 2, 1987.
- [43] C. Schillings, A. M. Stuart, *Analysis of the Ensemble Kalman Filter for Inverse Problems*. SIAM J Numerical Analysis 55(3), 1264-1290, 2017.
- [44] A. Taghvaei, J. de Wiljes, P. G. Mehta, S. Reich, *Kalman Filter and its Modern Extensions for the Continuous-time Nonlinear Filtering Problem*. ASME. J. Dyn. Sys., Meas., Control., 140, 030904–030904–11, 2017.
- [45] A. Taghvaei, P. G. Mehta, *A survey of feedback particle filter and related controlled interacting particle systems (CIPS)*. Annual Reviews in Control, 2023.
- [46] U. Vaes, *Sharp Propagation of Chaos for the Ensemble Langevin Sampler*. arXiv:2404.06456, 2024.
- [47] P. J. van Leeuwen, *A consistent interpretation of the stochastic version of the Ensemble Kalman filter*. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 146, 2815–2825, 2020.
- [48] T. Yang, P. G. Mehta, S. P. Meyn *Feedback particle filter with mean-field coupling*. Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 7909–7916, 2011.
- [49] T. Yang, P. G. Mehta, S. P. Meyn, *Feedback particle filter*. IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, Vol. 58, 2465–2480, 2013.
- [50] W. Yu, *Infinite dimensional affine term structure models under incomplete information*. PhD-thesis at Universitaet Freiburg, DOI: 10.6094/UNIFR/14218

# Appendices

## A The Kushner-Stratonovich equation and the law of total variance

In this section we recall the Kushner–Stratonovich equation (KSE), which describes the evolution of the posterior distribution (P), and the law of total variance.

For the sake of brevity let us denote the (Bochner-)integral of a testfunction  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  w.r.t. the posterior  $\eta_t$ ,  $t \geq 0$  by

$$\eta_t[\phi] := \int_{\mathcal{H}} \phi(v) \eta_t(dv).$$

With this notation in mind one can show that the posterior  $\eta$  satisfies the Kushner–Stratonovich equation (KSE)

$$d\eta_t[\phi] = \eta_t[\mathcal{L}\phi]dt + (\eta_t[\phi H] - \eta_t[\phi]\eta_t[H]) R_t^{-1} (dY_t - \eta_t[H]dt), \quad (47)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the generator of  $u$  defined in (8) and  $\phi$  is an arbitrary Itô testfunction (see Definition 5).

**Remark 27.** *In finite dimensional settings this is the weak form of the KSE, also referred to as the Fujisaki–Kallianpur–Kunita equation. The strong form of the KSE is a nonlinear and nonlocal Fokker–Planck equation describing the evolution of the posterior density. However in our infinite dimensional setting the density (w.r.t. the Lebesgue-measure) does not exist and thus one has to work with the weak formulation (47). The derivation of such equations for infinite dimensional filtering problems is a classical subject in stochastic analysis, studied in e.g. [1],[11], [25], [50]. However, due to the observations being finite dimensional in our case, the derivation of the KSE can also be done with classical approaches for the finite dimensional setting such as the Innovation Process Approach [3].*

A key tool in our analysis of the EnKBF and its mean field limit were upper variance bounds. These upper bounds only depended on the coefficients of the signal and in particular were independent of the observation function  $H$  and the actual observation data  $Y$ . This is a property that is shared by the posterior distribution (P), as the projection properties of the conditional expectation imply, for  $\text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}]$  denoting the covariance operator of the posterior, the inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}] \right] \leq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}[u_t]. \quad (48)$$

Now we note that by the covariance dynamics (7) and Parseval<sup>6</sup> we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}[u_t] &= 2 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle \nu_k, u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left\langle \nu_k, \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \nu_k \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ 2 \langle \mathcal{A}(u_t) - \mathcal{A}(m_t), u_t - m_t \rangle_{\mathcal{Y}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left[ \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \left( \mathcal{B}(u_t) \sqrt{\mathcal{Q}} \right)' \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the first term we use the one-sided Lipschitz condition (3) and for the second term we use Assumption 7. This gives us

$$\partial_t \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}[u_t] \leq \lambda \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}[u_t] + \beta.$$

---

<sup>6</sup>One could have also directly looked at the dynamics of  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|u_t - m_t\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right]$  and proved this via the well known Itô formula for the norm.

Which, by Grönwall, implies  $\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}[u_t] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}$ . Together with the variance bound for the posterior this gives us

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \eta_t(\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2) - \|\eta_t(\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}})\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{Cov}_{\eta_t}[\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}] \right] \leq \beta e^{\lambda t}, \quad (49)$$

which is the same bound that was shown for the empirical variance of the EnKBF in (16) and for the (conditional) variance of the mean field EnKBF (22). Note in particular that this bound is independent of, and thus robust in, both the observation data  $Y$  and the observation function  $H$ . In probability theory the identity

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Var}[X|Y]] + \text{Var}[\mathbb{E}[X|Y]] = \text{Var}[X]$$

for any two random variables  $X, Y$ , which implies inequality (48), is often referred to as the law of total variance. As we have seen, inequality (49) is a direct consequence of this identity and thus the EnKBF (and its mean field limit) also satisfies a form of law of total variance.

This is not the only connection of the EnKBF to the filtering problem, as in the linear Gaussian setting (see Definition 28 below) the law of its mean field limit (2) is a solution to the KSE and thus coincides with the posterior (P) (assuming that solutions to the KSE are unique).

**Definition 28.** [*Linear Gaussian Setting*] When we speak of the linear Gaussian setting we mean that

- $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'$  is linear
- $\mathcal{B} \in \text{L}(\mathcal{U}; \mathcal{H})$  is a constant linear operator, i.e. it is independent of the state  $u$ .
- $H \in \text{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{R}^{d_y})$  is a linear operator
- the initial condition (of the signal and posterior)  $u_0$  is a Gaussian on  $\mathcal{H}$ , i.e.

$$u_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(m_0, P_0) \text{ with } m_0 \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } P_0 \in \text{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}) \text{ is symmetric positive semidefinite.}$$

In this linear Gaussian setting one can show (see e.g. [50]) that the solution of the KSE is a Gaussian  $\mathcal{N}(m_t, P_t)$ , with mean  $m$  and covariance  $P$  given by the famous Kalman–Bucy equation

$$dm_t = \mathcal{A}m_t dt + P_t H' R_t^{-1} (dY_t - Hm_t dt) \quad (50a)$$

$$\frac{dP_t}{dt} = \mathcal{A}P_t + P_t \mathcal{A}' - P_t H' R_t^{-1} H P_t + (\mathcal{B}\sqrt{Q})(\mathcal{B}\sqrt{Q})'. \quad (50b)$$

In our infinite dimensional variational setting these equations (50) were first studied by Bensoussan [4, Théorème 3.1], proving existence and uniqueness of solutions. Now note that one can easily show that in the linear Gaussian setting of Definition 28, the mean field EnKBF (2), which we write here again as

$$d\bar{u}_t = \mathcal{A}\bar{u}_t dt + \mathcal{B}d\bar{W}_t + \bar{P}_t H' R_t^{-1} \left( dY_t - H \frac{\bar{u}_t + \bar{m}_t}{2} dt \right), \quad (51)$$

defines an (infinite dimensional) Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process. As one can easily verify with Itô's formula, its (conditional) mean  $\bar{m}$  and covariance  $\bar{P}$  satisfy the Kalman–Bucy equations (50). Thus by the uniqueness of (50), the (conditional) law  $\bar{\eta}_t$  of  $\bar{u}_t$  has to coincide with the posterior (P)!

## B The Feedback Particle Filter

In the linear Gaussian setting (Definition 28) the mean field EnKBF (51) describes a diffusion process with the remarkable property, that its (conditional) time-marginal laws are given by the desired posterior distribution. In the general setting this attribute is achieved by the Feedback Particle Filter (FPF). It is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{u}_t &= \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}_t)dt + \mathcal{B}(\hat{u}_t)d\bar{W}_t \\ &+ \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \left( dY_t - \frac{H(\hat{u}_t) + \mathbb{E}_Y[H(\hat{u}_t)]}{2} dt \right) + \frac{1}{2}\xi(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t)dt, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where  $\hat{\eta}_t$  denotes the conditional distribution of  $\hat{u}_t$ . The so called gain term  $\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is (not uniquely) determined by the weak differential equation

$$\hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] = \hat{\eta}_t [\phi(H - \hat{\eta}_t[H])] R_t^{-1} \text{ for all It\^o testfunctions } \phi. \quad (53)$$

Just as in section 2 we denote by  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi$  and  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi$  the first and second order Fréchet derivatives on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . The correctional drift term  $\xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) &:= \left( \langle \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t), \nabla \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \right)' \\ &:= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \nu_j, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\partial_{\nu_k}$  denotes the derivative in direction of the basis vector  $\partial_{\nu_k}$ .

In the finite dimensional setting the FPF was first derived in [48] with an optimal control approach, independently and prior to this work a similar mean-field optimal filter for smoothed noise and finite dimensional signals has been found in [17]. In [38] various finite dimensional consistent mean field filters, among them the original FPF, have been derived by matching the strong Fokker–Planck equation of a diffusion process to the strong form of the KSE (47). Building on this work we now extend the FPF to infinite dimensions by showing that it describes the optimal filter, in the sense that the (conditional) law of (52) propagates in time exactly according to the KSE (47). However, since we are working in the infinite setting, we do so by matching the weak Fokker–Planck equation to the weak KSE (47).

**Remark 29.** *The well posedness of the FPF (52) is an open problem, even in the much simpler finite dimensional case, and is thus just assumed in the following.*

**Lemma 30.** *Denote by  $(\hat{\eta}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  the law of the FPF  $(\hat{u}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , given by (52). We assume that for all times  $t \geq 0$  both  $\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$  and  $\xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$  are well defined functions from  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{H}$ , that are integrable with respect to  $\hat{\eta}_t$ .*

*Then  $\hat{\eta}$  satisfies the KSE (47) for all It\^o testfunctions (according to Definition 5)  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with the following properties*

- $\phi$  is integrable with respect to  $\hat{\eta}_t$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .
- For all  $v \in H$  the Hessian  $D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi(v)$  is a self adjoint operator on  $\mathcal{H}$ .
- The map  $\hat{\Phi} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , defined by  $\hat{\Phi}(v) := \langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi(v), \mathfrak{K}(v, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t$ , is an It\^o function (componentwise) that is also integrable with respect to  $\hat{\eta}_t$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be arbitrary, satisfying the properties specified above. We note by It\^o's

formula, that the Kolmogorov forward equation describing the evolution of  $\hat{\eta}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{\eta}_t[\phi] &= \hat{\eta}_t [\mathcal{L}\phi] dt + \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] (dY_t - \hat{\eta}_t[H]dt) \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{\eta}_t [\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] + \hat{\eta}_t [\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)']]}{2} dt \\ &\quad - \frac{\hat{\eta}_t [\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)(H - \hat{\eta}_t(H)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}]}{2} dt \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Due to (53), the first line of (54) is exactly the KSE and thus, to show consistency, we only have to prove that the second line is zero. To this end we note that by Parseval we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)' \nu_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, (D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \end{aligned}$$

Next we note that since  $D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi$  is self adjoint and by Parseval we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_k, D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \langle D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \langle \partial_{\nu_k} D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us by again using Parseval

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_j, \partial_{\nu_k} D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_j, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \partial_{\nu_k} \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \partial_{\nu_k} D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T. \end{aligned}$$

Using the product formula in Hilbert spaces<sup>7</sup>, we thus derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \partial_{\nu_k} \langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T. \end{aligned}$$

The map  $\hat{\Phi}$ , defined in the statement of the Lemma, then allows us to again use Parseval to derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D^2_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)'] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (\partial_{\nu_k} \hat{\Phi}) \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \nu_k, D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\Phi} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \langle \nu_k, D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\Phi} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \delta_i \delta_i^T \langle \nu_k, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}^T = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \langle D^1_{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\Phi} \delta_i, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \delta_i, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>7</sup>More precisely the formula for the directional derivative of the scalar product of two differentiable functions.

where  $\delta_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d_y$  denotes the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Thus, by the assumed regularity of  $\hat{\Phi}$ , we derive by using (53)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \xi(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] + \hat{\eta}_t [\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [(D_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \phi) \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) R_t \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)']] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \hat{\Phi} \delta_i, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t [\hat{\Phi} \delta_i (H - \hat{\eta}[H])'] R_t^{-1} \delta_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \delta_i (H - \hat{\eta}[H])'] R_t^{-1} \delta_i \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_y} \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} R_t \delta_i \delta_i^T R_t^{-1} (H - \hat{\eta}[H])'] \\
&= \hat{\eta}_t [\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) (H - \hat{\eta}[H]) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}],
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn lets us conclude that (54) coincides with the KSE (47) and thus the FPF is indeed consistent.  $\square$

The FPF is a true generalization of the EnKBF to general filtering problems and it even provides a connection between the EnKBF and the true posterior even in inconsistent setting as the following Lemma shows.

**Lemma 31.** *Let again  $(\hat{\eta})_{t \geq 0}$  be the (conditional) marginal laws to the FPF (52). Assuming integrability of  $\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)$ , then it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_Y [\mathfrak{K}(\hat{u}_t, \hat{\eta}_t)] = \hat{\eta}_t (\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)) = \mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}, H] R_t^{-1} = \mathbb{C}_Y [\hat{u}_t, H(\hat{u}_t)] R_t^{-1}. \quad (55)$$

If  $H$  is linear and  $\hat{\eta}_t$  is Gaussian, one can even choose the gain term  $K$  such that  $\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) = \mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}_t} [\text{id}_{\mathcal{H}}, H] R_t^{-1}$ . In the linear Gaussian setting the EnKBF is thus just a special case of the FPF.

*Proof.* For any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  we set  $\phi_i(v) := \langle \nu_i, v \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  as a testfunction in the gain equation (53), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nu_i, \hat{\eta}_t (\mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} &= \hat{\eta}_t (\langle D_{\mathcal{H}}^1 \phi_i, \mathfrak{K}(\cdot, \hat{\eta}_t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) = \hat{\eta}_t (\phi_i (H - \hat{\eta}[H])') R_t^{-1} \\
&= \langle \nu_i, \mathbb{C}_{\hat{\eta}_t} [\text{id}_H, H] R_t^{-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  this indeed shows the validity of (55). The second claim follows from Gaussian integration by parts as in [12].  $\square$

Identity (55) is the reason why the mean field EnKBF is sometimes referred to as the constant gain approximation (to the FPF) [44]. It may be of interest for the statistical analysis of the EnKBF, as it provides a link to the Bayesian filtering problem. However such an analysis is out of the scope of this paper and has so far only been attempted in [14] in finite and time discrete settings under restrictive assumptions.