

Rough Stochastic Pontryagin Maximum Principle and an Indirect Shooting Method

Thomas Lew*

February 11, 2025

Abstract

We derive first-order Pontryagin optimality conditions for stochastic optimal control with deterministic controls for systems modeled by rough differential equations (RDE) driven by Gaussian rough paths. This Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP) applies to systems following stochastic differential equations (SDE) driven by Brownian motion, yet it does not rely on forward-backward SDEs and involves the same Hamiltonian as the deterministic PMP. The proof consists of first deriving various integrable error bounds for solutions to nonlinear and linear RDEs by leveraging recent results on Gaussian rough paths. The PMP then follows using standard techniques based on needle-like variations. As an application, we propose the first indirect shooting method for nonlinear stochastic optimal control and show that it converges $10\times$ faster than a direct method on a stabilization task.

Contents

1	Introduction and main results	2
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	Rough paths, controlled rough paths, and rough integration	5
2.2	The greedy partition and Gaussian rough paths	9
3	Rough differential equations (RDEs) and error bounds	10
3.1	Calculus with rough paths: controlled rough paths and rough integration	11
3.2	Rough differential equations: existence and unicity of solutions	12
3.3	Bounds on solutions to nonlinear RDEs	13
3.4	Bounds on solutions to linear RDEs and on the Jacobian flow	15
3.5	Integrability of solutions to nonlinear and linear RDEs	16
4	The Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP)	19
4.1	Needle-like variations	19
4.2	Proof of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle	23
5	Numerical example	27
6	Conclusion and outlook	29
A	Additional proofs	30

*Toyota Research Institute. Email: thomas.lew@tri.global

1 Introduction and main results

Stochastic optimal control has found numerous applications such as in finance [1], aerospace [2], robotics [3], automotive [4], and biology [5]. Stochastic optimal control problems typically involve a dynamical system described by a stochastic differential equation (SDE) in Itô or Stratonovich form

$$dx_t = b(t, x_t, u_t)dt + \sigma(t, x_t) \circ dB_t, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (1.1)$$

where x is the state trajectory, u is the control input trajectory, b is the drift, σ is the diffusion, B is a Brownian motion, T is the final time, and consist of optimizing an objective $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T f(t, x_t, u_t)dt + g(x_T)]$ over a set of control trajectories subject to state and control constraints.

By now, a rich literature on stochastic optimal control is available, with optimality conditions characterized by the dynamic programming principle as Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) partial differential equations (PDEs) [6–8], and by the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP) as forward-backward stochastic differential equations (FBSDEs) [8–10]. For problems with linear dynamics and linear-quadratic costs, both approaches lead to tractable solutions characterized by stochastic Riccati equations [7, 11, 12]. However, for general nonlinear problems, solving HJB-PDEs or FBSDEs remains computationally challenging for high-dimensional state spaces, despite recent progress [13–16]. In practice, an effective approach consists of optimizing over a class of solutions u_t^θ parameterized by finitely-many parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ [17, 18] (see [19, 20] for machine learning applications). However, restricting solutions to a finite-dimensional space may obscure the structure of solutions and lead to suboptimality. For example, in deterministic optimal control, the PMP can provide closed-form expressions for optimal controls, such as bang-bang controls [21], that drastically reduce the search space and guide the design of indirect methods [22, 23] for efficient and accurate numerical resolution. Thus, our main motivation is to derive a stochastic PMP that is as close as possible to the deterministic PMP. In particular, we seek optimality conditions that are interpreted pathwise and do not rely on FBSDEs, to guide the future development of efficient algorithms inspired by deterministic optimal control techniques.

Rough path theory [24–28] provides a deterministic framework of *pathwise* integration against irregular signals such as sample paths of Brownian motion and has been recognized as a robust tool for stochastic calculus. Pathwise stochastic optimal control [29–31] has been studied using rough path theory in [32, 33], but this formulation results in anticipative controls. In contrast, we focus on optimizing objectives averaged over random realizations of the driving rough path under deterministic open-loop controls, which is a more standard formulation in stochastic optimal control as open-loop controls are practical for implementation [2–5]. However, using rough path theory in this classical setting presents two main challenges. First, we cannot directly use the techniques for proving the PMP from [32] as state constraints are not accounted for. Second, the pathwise error bounds for solutions to RDEs in [32, 33] are too crude to be integrable in general, so they cannot be used in our setting that requires error bounds with integrable constants. To address the first challenge, we adapt standard arguments for proving the deterministic PMP via needle-like variations and Brouwer’s fixed point theorem [15, 34–36]. To address the second challenge, we derive finer error bounds by leveraging greedy partitions and favorable integrability properties of Gaussian rough paths [37, 38].

Problem setting. We consider stochastic optimal control problems (**OCP**) with deterministic control inputs

$$\begin{cases} \min_{u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T f(t, x_t, u_t)dt + g(x_T) \right] \\ \text{such that} & x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t b(s, x_s, u_s)ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x_s)d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ & \mathbb{E}[h(x_T)] = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{OCP})$$

where the differential equation $dx_t = b(t, x_t, u_t)dt + \sigma(t, x_t)d\mathbf{B}_t$ is a random rough differential equation (RDE) defined pathwise [24–28] as in Theorem 3.18, and the sample paths of the driving stochastic process \mathbf{B} are Gaussian rough paths [27, 37, 38] as in Theorem 2.10, see Assumption 4.1 for definitions. In particular, if $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ is the Stratonovich lift of a Brownian motion B , then the RDE in **OCP** is equivalent to the Stratonovich SDE in (1.1) [27, Theorem 9.1] and **OCP** is a classical optimal control problem.

Main contributions. First, we prove the well-posedness and various regularity and integrability results for solutions to (random) RDEs under regularity assumptions on (b, σ, \mathbf{B}) , see for example Proposition 3.12 and Theorem 3.18. Such RDEs fall outside the scope of classical results in rough path theory due to the

presence of the control u , and previous error bounds in [32, 33] that are derived pathwise for a deterministic rough path \mathbf{B} are not integrable in general, even if \mathbf{B} is the Stratonovich lift of a Brownian motion.

Second, we derive the first-order necessary optimality conditions for **OCP** stated below. Notations are described in Section 2. The assumptions are stated in Assumption 4.1 in Section 4.2.

Theorem 1.1 (Rough Stochastic Pontryagin Maximum Principle (**PMP**)). *Define $T, \ell, U, \Omega, \mathbb{P}, b, \sigma, f, g, h, x_0$ and the enhanced Gaussian process \mathbf{B} as in Assumption 4.1, and the Hamiltonian*

$$H : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (t, x, u, p, \mathbf{p}_0) \mapsto p^\top b(t, x, u) + \mathbf{p}_0 f(t, x, u). \quad (1.2)$$

Let $(x, u) \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)) \times L^\infty([0, T], U)$ be an optimal solution to **OCP**, where x solves the random RDE in **OCP** in the pathwise sense of Theorem 3.18.

Then, there exists a stochastic process $p \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$, called adjoint vector, and non-trivial Lagrange multipliers $(\mathbf{p}_0, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r) \in \{-1, 0\} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ such that:

- (i) **Adjoint equation:** for some initial conditions $p_0 \in L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, the adjoint vector solves the random RDE¹

$$p_t = p_0 - \int_0^t \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(s, x_s, u_s, p_s, \mathbf{p}_0) ds - \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, x_s)^\top p_s d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad t \in [0, T] \quad (1.3)$$

in the pathwise sense of Theorem 3.18.

- (ii) **Transversality condition:** almost surely, the final value of the adjoint vector satisfies

$$p_T = \mathbf{p}_0 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x_T) + \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbf{p}_i \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x}(x_T). \quad (1.4)$$

- (iii) **Maximality condition:** for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, the optimal control satisfies

$$u_t = \arg \max_{v \in U} \mathbb{E}[H(t, x_t, v, p_t, \mathbf{p}_0)]. \quad (1.5)$$

The similarity to the deterministic setting is striking. The Hamiltonian H remains unchanged, the adjoint equation is interpreted pathwise and has the same drift term $-\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}$, the transversality condition is identical (pathwise almost surely), and the only difference in the maximality condition is an expected value. The adjoint equation (1.3) is *not* an FBSDE, which is the key to unlocking a practical indirect shooting method.

Indirect shooting method. These optimality conditions inform the design of an indirect method for nonlinear stochastic optimal control. That is, if we approximate all expectations in **OCP** and **PMP** using sample average (Monte Carlo) estimates for a sample size M , the search for (approximate) solutions to **OCP** amounts to finding multipliers $(\mathbf{p}_j)_{j=1}^r \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and initial values of the adjoint vector $(p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \in \mathbb{R}^{Mn}$ satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M h(x_T^i) \\ \mathbf{p}_0 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x_T^1) + \sum_{j=1}^r \mathbf{p}_j \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial x}(x_T^1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{p}_0 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x_T^M) + \sum_{j=1}^r \mathbf{p}_j \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial x}(x_T^M) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ p_T^1 \\ \vdots \\ p_T^M \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} x_T^i = x_0^i + \int_0^T b(t, x_t^i, u_t^M) dt + \int_0^T \sigma(t, x_t^i) d\mathbf{B}_t^i, \\ p_T^i = p_0^i - \int_0^T \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(t, x_t^i, u_t^M, p_t^i, \mathbf{p}_0) dt - \int_0^T \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, x_t^i)^\top p_t^i d\mathbf{B}_t^i, \\ u_t^M = \arg \max_{v \in U} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M H(t, x_t^i, v, p_t^i, \mathbf{p}_0) \text{ for a.e. } t \in [0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Assuming that the maximality condition gives a closed-form expression of the control u_t^M as a function of $(x_t^i, p_t^i)_{i=1}^M$ (e.g., as is often the case for control-affine systems), the final values $(x_T^i, p_T^i)_{i=1}^M$ can be computed as a function of $(p_0^i)_{i=1}^M$ by integrating the corresponding RDEs pathwise. Then, solutions $((\mathbf{p}_j)_{j=1}^r, (p_0^i)_{i=1}^M) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+Mn}$ to this system of $(r+Mn)$ equations can be efficiently found via a Newton-type root-finding method.

This approach is commonly known as an indirect shooting method in deterministic optimal control [22], and is a natural extension to the stochastic setting using **PMP** and a sample average approximation [39–42]. To our knowledge, this method has not appeared in the literature yet, as previous optimality conditions rely

¹Each component of the term $\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, x)^\top p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ in the adjoint equation (1.3) is $[\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, x)^\top p]_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial \sigma_{kj}}{\partial x_i}(t, x)[p]_k$.

on FBSDEs that introduce greater complexity. Indeed, previous indirect methods use deep learning to solve the FBSDEs from the classical stochastic PMP [16, 43, 44]. While we do not derive guarantees for this method (e.g., asymptotic optimality or robustness to discretization) and therefore treat it as a heuristic inspired by **PMP**, we evaluate it on an example in Section 5 and show that it is substantially faster (10× speedup) than a direct method [41] solving the sample average approximation of **OCP** via sequential quadratic programming.

Connections to classical stochastic optimal control. If B is a Brownian motion with filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, the initial conditions x_0 are \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable, and \mathbf{B} is the Stratonovich lift of B , then **OCP** is equivalent to the classical stochastic optimal control problem

$$\min_{u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T f(t, x_t, u_t) dt + g(x_T) \right] \text{ s.t. } x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t b(s, x_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, x_s) \circ dB_s, \mathbb{E}[h(x_T)] = 0$$

with a Stratonovich SDE. Thus, Theorem 1.1 applies to this standard setting with the following observations.

- *Pathwise adjoint equation:* The adjoint equation (1.3) is still understood pathwise in the rough path sense, as the adjoint vector p is defined pathwise with initial conditions p_0 that depend on the entire path of \mathbf{B} (i.e., p_0 is not \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable, so (1.3) cannot be replaced by a Stratonovich SDE), see Section 4.2. Rough path theory is a natural framework to make sense of this equation. In contrast, the classical stochastic PMP [8–10] relies on Itô calculus and FBSDEs.
- *Gaussian rough paths:* Our results hold for a large class of Gaussian rough paths (see Assumption 2.1 and the many examples in [45]). For example, fractional Brownian motion (fBM) satisfies our assumptions [46] and has applications in finance [1], yet fBM (except for Brownian motion) is not a semimartingale [46] and thus cannot be handled via Itô (or Stratonovich) integration.
- *Regularity of the diffusion σ :* Our results rely on stronger regularity assumptions on σ than the classical PMP. Informally, rough path theory cannot distinguish between Itô and Stratonovich integration, and an Itô SDE can be written as a Stratonovich SDE with a correction term involving derivatives of σ , so we expect smoothness assumptions on σ to be stronger than if using Itô calculus [47, Section 4.1]. On the other hand, these assumptions unlock stronger pathwise regularity results with respect to the driving process \mathbf{B} (for example, Proposition 3.12) that may be of independent interest.
- *Independence of the diffusion σ on the control u :* Our results rely on the independence of σ on u , as allowing a dependence on the control u may lead to a degenerate formulation with irregular controls as described in [32, 33], and rough path theory relies on coefficients that are smooth-enough in time.
- *Feedback control:* We only optimize over deterministic open-loop controls u , which ensures that solutions are non-anticipative and can thus be implemented in applications. However, considering open-loop controls is more restrictive than optimizing over stochastic non-anticipative feedback controls. We leave this generalization to future work, e.g., via pathwise approaches [32, 33] or suitable non-anticipative parameterizations [17, 18, 48]. Note that solving open-loop stochastic optimal control problem remains computationally challenging today. In practice, a feedback controller is often pre-specified and open-loop controls are recomputed in real-time in a receding horizon via model predictive control [4, 49], which allows for feedback and is often effective. **PMP** still informs the search of optimal closed-loop controls with a fixed parameterization, see Section 5 for an example of feedback optimization.

Sketch of proof and paper outline. We adapt the proof of the deterministic PMP based on needle-like variations [15, 34–36] to the stochastic setting by leveraging recent results in rough path theory [37, 38] to enable a pathwise analysis. The main steps of the proof of **PMP** and the paper outline are described below.

- In Section 2, we review concepts in rough path theory and Gaussian rough paths. In particular, given a rough path \mathbf{X} , we will partition the interval $[0, T]$ with a greedy partition [37, 38] of $N_\alpha(\mathbf{X})$ increments whose size is a function of the p -variation of the rough path \mathbf{X} . Importantly, for Gaussian rough paths $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$, the number of increments $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})$ enjoys favorable integrability properties.
- In Section 3, we first prove existence and unicity of solutions to nonlinear and linear RDEs, used to describe the evolution of the dynamical system in **OCP** and the adjoint equation (1.3). Such results

are slightly outside the scope of classical results in rough path theory due to the presence of the control u (results in [32, 33] do not directly apply since (b, σ) are time-varying and the map $t \mapsto b(t, \cdot, u_t)$ is not smooth enough to append time t to the state x and use previous results). Then, we derive error bounds for RDEs using greedy partitions and the quantity $N_\alpha(\mathbf{B})$, and obtain the integrability of solutions to random RDEs driven by Gaussian rough paths and of their Jacobian (Theorem 3.18), and integrable error bounds for solutions to RDEs with different control inputs and initial conditions (Corollary 3.19).

- In Section 4, we state the assumptions for **PMP** (Assumption 4.1) and prove the result. The proof uses a standard technique based on needle-like variations and a separation hyperplane argument using Brouwer's fixed point theorem [34–36]. The main differences with classical proofs of the PMP of Itô type [15] are the pathwise use of Itô's Lemma for rough paths (Lemma 2.6) and defining the adjoint vector pathwise using a rough differential equation instead of an FBSDE.

We implement the indirect shooting method on an example in Section 5 and conclude in Section 6. Additional proofs are provided in Appendix A.

2 Preliminaries

Notations. We use the following standard notations [50]. Given $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, we write $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$. Given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $a^\top b = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i$ for the inner product. The Kronecker product is denoted by \otimes . Let E, \tilde{E}, F be Banach spaces (usually $E = \mathbb{R}^n$). The space of linear and continuous functions from E to F is denoted by $\mathcal{L}(E, F)$ and is endowed with the norm $\|A\| = \sup_{x \in E, \|x\| \leq 1} \|A(x)\|$ such that $\|Ax\| \leq \|A\| \|x\|$ for any $A \in \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ and $x \in E$. We use the usual identifications $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) \cong \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^m \cong \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ where $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the matrix space, and $\mathcal{L}(E \otimes \tilde{E}, F) \cong \mathcal{L}(E, \mathcal{L}(\tilde{E}, F)) \cong \mathcal{L}^2(E \times \tilde{E}, F)$ is the space of bilinear and continuous maps from $E \times \tilde{E}$ to F . Given a function $f : E \rightarrow F$, we write $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in E} \|f(x)\|$, and say that f is bounded if $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$. Given $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we write $f(x) = o(g(x))$ if $\|f(x)\|/\|g(x)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$. A function $f : E \rightarrow F$ is said to be continuously differentiable (in Fréchet sense) if there exists a continuous map $\nabla f : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(E, F)$ such that $f(y) - f(x) - \nabla f(x)(y - x) = o(\|y - x\|)$. Partial derivatives and higher order derivatives $\nabla^k f$ are defined as usual. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $C^n = C^n(E, F)$ denotes the space of continuous functions $f : E \rightarrow F$ that are n -times continuously differentiable, and $C_b^n = C_b^n(E, F)$ denotes the space of bounded functions $f \in C^n(E, F)$ with bounded derivatives. The space C_b^n is endowed with the norm

$$\|f\|_{C_b^n} := \|f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty + \cdots + \|\nabla^n f\|_\infty < \infty.$$

Any function $f \in C_b^n$ satisfies the mean value theorem:

$$f(x + h) = f(x) + \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \nabla^k f(x) h^{\otimes k} + \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_0^1 \nabla^n f(x + \theta h) h^{\otimes n} (1 - \theta)^{n-1} d\theta.$$

Let $T > 0$. For any interval $I = [s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$, we write $|I| = |t - s|$. Given a path $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, its increments are denoted by $X_{s,t} := X_t - X_s$ for any $s, t \in [0, T]$. We denote by $\Delta_{[0, T]} := \{(s, t) : 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$ the standard 2-simplex. Let $C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the set of continuous maps $x : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of random variables $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|x\|^\ell] < \infty$, and by $L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ the set of stochastic processes with continuous sample paths $x : \Omega \rightarrow C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|x\|_\infty^\ell] < \infty$. Given $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $L^\infty([0, T], U)$ the set of measurable maps $u : [0, T] \rightarrow U$ with $\|u\|_{L^\infty([0, T], U)} := \inf\{C : \|u_t\| \leq C \text{ for almost every } t \in [0, T]\} < \infty$. Throughout derivations, we denote by C_a a constant that depends only on a and can change line by line.

2.1 Rough paths, controlled rough paths, and rough integration

We recall concepts in rough path theory [26–28]. The main tool we use for quantifying the regularity of a path $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the notion of p -variation, which bounds the sum of increments $\|X_{s,t}\|^p$ of X over arbitrary partitions of $[0, T]$. For example, Lipschitz continuous paths X have finite 1-variation, and sample paths $B_{s,t}(\omega)$ of Brownian motion have finite p -variation for $p > 2$ almost surely. Rough path theory can also be studied using $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder continuity properties (note that a path that is $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder continuous has finite

p -variation), but the resulting analysis gives bounds that are generally not integrable (see Section 2.2 for further discussion), which motivates using a rough path analysis via p -variation properties.

Definition 2.1 (p -variation). *Let $p \geq 1$ and $T > 0$. The p -variation of a path $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as*

$$\|X\|_p := \|X\|_{p,[0,T]}, \quad \text{where} \quad \|X\|_{p,[s,t]} := \left(\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([s,t])} \sum_{[u,v] \in \pi} \|X_{u,v}\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \text{ for any } [s,t] \subseteq [0,T],$$

where $\mathcal{P}([s,t])$ denotes the set of all partitions of $[s,t]$, and the supremum is over all partitions π of $[s,t]$. The set $\mathcal{C}^p = \mathcal{C}^p([0,T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the space of \mathbb{R}^n -valued continuous paths of finite p -variation, that is, continuous paths $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|X\|_p < \infty$.

Lemma 2.1 (Stitching a partition of an interval [33, Lemma 2.3]). *Let $p \geq 1$, $T > 0$, $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T$ be a partition of $[0, T]$, and $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a path. Then, $\|X\|_{p,[0,T]} \leq n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|X\|_{p,[t_{i-1}, t_i]}^p \right)^{1/p}$.*

Lemma 2.2 (Inequalities for p -variations). *Let $T > 0$, $p \geq 1$, and $X \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then,*

$$\|X\|_\infty \leq \|X_0\| + \|X\|_p. \quad (2.1)$$

Let $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y^1, \dots, Y^n \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $c \geq 0$. Then, there exists a constant $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\|X_{s,t}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_{s,t}^i\| + c|t-s| \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T] \implies \|X\|_p \leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Y^i\|_p + cT \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $p \geq 2$, $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y^i, \tilde{Y}^i \in \mathcal{C}^p$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $Z^j \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Then, $\|X\|_p \leq \|X\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$, and there exists a constant $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\|X_{s,t}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_{s,t}^i\| \|\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^i\| + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z_{s,t}^j\| + c|t-s| \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T] \implies \|X\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Y^i\|_p \|\tilde{Y}^i\|_p + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + cT \right). \quad (2.3)$$

Let $p \geq 1$, $\sigma \in C_b^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, and $X \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, there exists $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, X)\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|X\|_p + T). \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, if $\sigma \in C_b^2$ and $X, \tilde{X} \in \mathcal{C}^p$, then there exists $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, X) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{X})\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p + T) (\|X_0 - \tilde{X}_0\| + \|X - \tilde{X}\|_p). \quad (2.5)$$

The results in Lemma 2.2 are standard and are proved in the appendix.

Definition 2.2 (Rough path). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$ and $T > 0$. A p -rough path is a pair $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X})$ that consists of a path $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and its enhancement $\mathbb{X} : \Delta_{[0,T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ that satisfy Chen's relation*

$$\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ij} = \mathbb{X}_{s,r}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{r,t}^{ij} + X_{s,r}^i X_{r,t}^j \quad (2.6)$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ and $0 \leq s \leq r \leq t \leq T$, and that has finite inhomogeneous p -variation rough path norm:

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_p := \|X\|_p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} < \infty, \quad \text{where} \quad \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} := \left(\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}([s,t])} \sum_{[u,v] \in \pi} \|\mathbb{X}_{u,v}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^2 \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \text{ for any } [s,t] \subseteq [0,T],$$

and $\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} := \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [0,T]}$. We also write $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,[s,t]} := \|X\|_{p,[s,t]} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}$ for any $[s,t] \subseteq [0,T]$.

A geometric p -rough path is a p -rough path $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X})$ that additionally satisfies

$$\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ji} = X_{s,t}^i X_{s,t}^j \quad (2.7)$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ and $(s,t) \in \Delta_{[0,T]}$.

The sets $\mathcal{C}^p = \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{C}_g^p = \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the sets of p -rough paths and of geometric p -rough paths, respectively.

Given two rough paths $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$, we define $\Delta X := X - \tilde{X}$, $\Delta \mathbb{X} := \mathbb{X} - \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$, and

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p := \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta \mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{C}_g^p \subset \mathcal{C}^p$. As an example, the sample paths $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$ of the Stratonovich lift $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ of a Brownian motion B , where \mathbb{B} is defined by the Stratonovich integrals $\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ij} := \int_s^t B_{s,u}^i \circ dB_u^j$, are geometric rough paths ($\mathbf{B}(\omega) \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$ almost surely). The sample paths of the Itô lift $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = (B, \tilde{\mathbb{B}})$ of B (with $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}$ defined by Itô integration $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}_{s,t}^{ij} := \int_s^t B_{s,u}^i dB_u^j$) are rough paths ($\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\omega) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ almost surely), but they are not geometric. A key property of geometric rough paths is the chain rule (see Lemma 2.6), as a consequence of Itô's lemma.

Definition 2.3 (Controlled rough paths). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, and $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a p -rough path. A controlled p -rough path (with respect to X) is a pair*

$$(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}),$$

where Y' is called the Gubinelli derivative of Y , such that the remainder term $R^Y : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$R_{s,t}^Y := Y_{s,t} - Y'_s X_{s,t} \quad (2.8)$$

satisfies $\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} < \infty$.

The set $\mathcal{D}_X^p = \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the set of controlled p -rough paths (with respect to X).

A controlled rough path $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ looks like X over short intervals: $Y_t \approx Y_s + Y'_s X_{s,t}$ for small $|t - s|$. For example, $(f(X), \nabla f(X))$ is a controlled rough path if $f \in C^2$. Controlled rough paths are sufficiently smooth (with respect to the rough path \mathbf{X}) to allow for a notion of *rough integral* against \mathbf{X} , defined below.

Proposition 2.3 (Rough integration [51, Proposition 2.6]). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a p -rough path, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$ be a controlled p -rough path. Then, the rough integral of (Y, Y') against \mathbf{X} , defined as the limit over all partitions π of $[0, T]$ with vanishing mesh size*

$$\int_0^T Y_r d\mathbf{X}_r := \lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} Y_s X_{s,t} + Y'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}, \quad (2.9)$$

exists². Moreover, for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, we have the estimate

$$\left\| \int_s^t Y_r d\mathbf{X}_r - Y_s X_{s,t} - Y'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right\| \leq C_p (\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} \|X\|_{p, [s,t]} + \|Y'\|_{p, [s,t]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}) \quad (2.10)$$

for a constant C_p that only depends on p .

For intuition, let X be a scalar-valued path that is sufficiently smooth so that $\mathbb{X}_{s,t} := \int_s^t (X_r - X_s) dX_r$ is well-defined and $(Y, Y') = (f(X), \nabla f(X))$ with $f \in C^2$ is a controlled path. Then, a Taylor approximation gives $\int_s^t f(X_r) dX_r \approx f(X_s) \int_s^t dX_r + \nabla f(X_s) \int_s^t (X_r - X_s) dX_r = Y_s X_{s,t} + Y'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}$, which is like the left hand side of (2.10). The rough integral generalizes this intuition to cases where X is too irregular for the integral $\int_s^t X_{s,r} dX_r$ to be well-defined (e.g., if X is a sample of Brownian motion): We first define the enhancement \mathbb{X} and then define the rough integral of (Y, Y') against (X, \mathbb{X}) by (2.9). The term $Y'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}$ is key to ensuring that (2.9) is well-posed and different choices of \mathbb{X} (e.g., via Itô vs Stratonovich integrals) give different results.

Next, we give a few useful results about rough integration and functions of controlled rough paths. Let $(X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ be two rough paths, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ be two controlled rough paths. We write $\Delta X = X - \tilde{X}$ and similarly for $\Delta Y, \Delta Y', \Delta R^Y$, and as in [51], we define

$$\begin{aligned} M_{Y'} &:= \|Y'_0\| + \|Y'\|_p, & K_Y &:= \|Y'_0\| + \|Y'\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} = M_{Y'} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}, \\ \Delta M_{Y'} &:= \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p, & \Delta K_Y &:= \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} = \Delta M_{Y'} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.4 (Stability of rough integration [51, Lemma 3.4]). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ be two p -rough paths, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ be two controlled p -rough paths. Then,*

$$(Z, Z') := \left(\int_0^\cdot Y_s d\mathbf{X}_s, Y \right) \in \mathcal{D}_X^p \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}') := \left(\int_0^\cdot \tilde{Y}_s d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \tilde{Y} \right) \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p.$$

²We use the identification $\mathbb{R}^{n \times d \times d} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to make sense of the last term $Y'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}$.

Moreover,

$$\|R \int_0^\cdot Y_s d\mathbf{X}_s - R \int_0^\cdot \tilde{Y}_s d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p(1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p)(K_{\tilde{Y}}\|\Delta\mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p\Delta K_Y), \quad (2.11)$$

Lemma 2.5 ($(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y)Y')$ is a controlled path). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $\sigma \in C_b^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a p -rough path, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a controlled p -rough path. Then,*

$$(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, Y)') := \left(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)Y' \right) \in \mathcal{D}_X^p.$$

Moreover, there exists $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\|Y\|_p \leq C_p(\|Y'\|_\infty\|X\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \quad (2.12)$$

$$\leq C_p(1 + \|X\|_p)K_Y, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_p \leq C_p\|\sigma\|_{C_b^1}(M_{Y'}\|X\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + T), \quad (2.14)$$

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \leq C_p\|\sigma\|_{C_b^2}K_Y(1 + K_Y + T)(1 + \|X\|_p), \quad (2.15)$$

$$\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p\|\sigma\|_{C_b^2}(\|Y\|_p^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + T) \quad (2.16)$$

$$\leq C_p\|\sigma\|_{C_b^2}(K_Y(1 + K_Y)(1 + \|X\|_p)^2 + T). \quad (2.17)$$

We prove Lemma 2.5 in the appendix. For time-invariant maps $\sigma(t, x) = \sigma(x)$, these results are standard, see e.g. [51, Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6].

Remark 2.1 (Smoothness of σ). *The assumption $\sigma \in C_b^2$ implies that $\|\sigma\|_\infty + \|\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial t}\|_\infty + \|\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}\|_\infty + \|\frac{\partial\sigma^2}{\partial t^2}\|_\infty + \|\frac{\partial\sigma^2}{\partial x^2}\|_\infty + \|\frac{\partial^2\sigma}{\partial x\partial t}\|_\infty$ is bounded. It is stronger than assumptions on σ used for classical PMPs derived via Itô calculus due to the use of rough path theory, see Section 1 and [47, Section 4.1]. It can be relaxed to assuming that $\sigma(t, \cdot) \in C_b^2$ for almost every (a.e.) $t \in [0, T]$ and that $\sigma(\cdot, x)$ is uniformly $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous. Under this assumption and similar ones on derivatives $\frac{\partial^k\sigma}{\partial x^k}$, most results in this work still hold by replacing terms in T by terms in $T^{\frac{2}{p}}$. However, the assumption of $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuity in t is only barely weaker than assuming Lipschitz continuity (in particular, $\sigma(t, x) = B_t(\omega)$ with $X = B(\omega)$ a sample path of Brownian motion is not $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous), so we assume that $\sigma \in C_b^2$ to simplify notations and results. Assuming a controlled structure $\sigma_t(\cdot) \approx \sigma_s(\cdot) + \sigma'_s(\cdot)(X_t - X_s)$ [50, 52] could be considered in future work. See also Remark 3.1.*

The next result gives a chain rule for functions of controlled rough paths and geometric rough paths.

Lemma 2.6 (Itô's formula for geometric rough paths). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $f \in C^3$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a controlled p -rough path such that*

$$Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t Y'_s d\mathbf{X}_s + \Gamma_t \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T],$$

for a path of finite $\frac{p}{2}$ -variation $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p}{2}}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$, and a controlled p -rough path $(Y', Y'') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$. Then, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$f(Y_t) = f(Y_0) + \int_0^t \nabla f(Y_u)Y'_u d\mathbf{X}_u + \int_0^t \nabla f(Y_u)d\Gamma_u, \quad (2.18)$$

where the first integral is a rough integral, and the second integral is a Young integral.

Lemma 2.6 is standard. It is a particular case of [27, Theorem 7.7], assuming that the rough path \mathbf{X} is geometric so its bracket is zero. Although [27, Theorem 7.7] is formulated for $\frac{1}{p}$ - and $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous paths, the proof follows similarly for finite p - and $\frac{p}{2}$ -variation paths. We provide a proof in the appendix.

2.2 The greedy partition and Gaussian rough paths

To prove **PMP**, we use short variations around the optimal solution (the so-called needle-like variations, see Proposition 4.1), and show that the difference between the solutions to the corresponding rough differential equations is small *in expectation* over the driving signal $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$ and initial conditions x_0 . An immediate challenge with this approach is that classical error bounds in rough path theory depend on constants that are typically not integrable [46, 53], as they depend exponentially on the p -variation rough path norm $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p$ (see for example [51, Theorem 3.9]) or on the exponential of the $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder constant of \mathbf{X} (see e.g. the proof of [28, Theorem 7.9] or [27, Theorem 8.5]). Thus, we cannot use classical error bounds from rough path theory in the proof of **PMP**, as they may not be integrable.

A solution to this challenge was identified in [37] and refined in [38]. It consists of using a quantity $N_\alpha(\mathbf{X})$ that counts the number of α -increments of the homogeneous rough path norm of \mathbf{X} over an interval (Definition 2.4). Importantly, for particular *Gaussian rough paths* $\mathbf{B}(\omega)$, the exponential of $N_\alpha(\mathbf{B})$ is integrable (Theorem 2.10). Thus, in this work, we use ideas in [37, 38] (see also [46, 53–55]) and derive finer error bounds as a function of $N_\alpha(\mathbf{B})$ that are integrable for particular Gaussian rough paths.

Definition 2.4 (Control, greedy partition, and homogeneous p -variation rough path norm). *Let $T > 0$. A control is a continuous map $w : \Delta_{[0,T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $w(t, t) = 0$ and $w(s, t) + w(t, u) \leq w(s, u)$ for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq u \leq T$. Given a control w , a resolution $\alpha > 0$ and $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$, we define the sequence*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_0 &= s, \\ \tau_{i+1} &= \inf\{u : w(\tau_i, u) \geq \alpha, \tau_i < u \leq t\} \wedge t, \end{aligned}$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$, and

$$N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) := \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \tau_n < t\}.$$

The greedy partition of the interval $[s, t]$ is defined as the partition

$$\{\tau_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) + 1\}.$$

Given $p \in [2, 3)$ and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}^p$, the control $w_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(\mathbf{X})$ are defined using the homogeneous p -variation rough path norm $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p := \|X\|_p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$ as $w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) := \|X\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ and $N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(\mathbf{X}) := N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w_{\mathbf{X}})$.

The control w in Definition 2.4 should not be confused with the control input u in **OCP**. The distinction should be clear from context: w bounds variations of \mathbf{X} , whereas u steers the dynamical system in **OCP**.

Our error bounds for solutions to RDEs will depend on (1) the inhomogeneous rough path norm $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p$ due to oscillations of the driving signal \mathbf{X} (see (2.10) and (2.11) which contain terms in $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p$), and on (2) terms increasing linearly over time due to the drift $b(t, Y, u)$ and the time-varying diffusion $\sigma(t, Y)$ (see Lemma 3.5, and (2.14) and (2.16) which contain terms in $+T$). These terms relate to the control $w_{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot)$ and the number $N_\alpha(\mathbf{X})$ via Corollary 2.9 below, using two lemmas that are similar to [37, Lemma 4.9] and [46, Lemma 5]. The proofs of Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8 and of Corollary 2.9 below are provided in the appendix.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $T > 0$, $w : \Delta_{[0,T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a control, and $\alpha > 0$. Then, $\alpha N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w) \leq w(0, T)$.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let $T > 0$, $C \geq 1$ be a constant, $w_1, \dots, w_n : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be n controls, and $w : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the control defined by $w(s, t) = C \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(s, t)$ for any $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$. Then, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$,*

$$N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) \leq C \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^n N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w_j) + n \right). \quad (2.19)$$

Corollary 2.9. *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{C}^p$, $C_p = 6^p$, and define the control $w : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$w(s, t) = C_p(w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) + w_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s, t) + |t - s|).$$

Then, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$,

$$N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) \leq 5C_p(N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(\mathbf{X}) + N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + |t - s|/\alpha + 1). \quad (2.20)$$

Moreover, given $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and any interval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ small-enough so that $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,[s,t]} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,[s,t]} + |t - s| \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (2.21)$$

Finally, for $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and any interval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$, with $C_{p,\alpha} = 6e\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$,

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,[s,t]} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,[s,t]} + |t - s| \leq C_{p,\alpha} \exp(N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w)). \quad (2.22)$$

Next, we introduce *enhanced Gaussian processes*, a class of stochastic processes $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ that consist of a Gaussian process B and its enhancement \mathbb{B} defined so that the sample paths $\mathbf{B}(\omega) = (B(\omega), \mathbb{B}(\omega))$ are geometric rough paths. The sample paths $\mathbf{B}(\omega)$ are called *Gaussian rough paths*. An example of enhanced Gaussian process is the Stratonovich lift \mathbf{B} of a Brownian motion B , where \mathbb{B} is defined by the Stratonovich integrals $\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ij} := \int_s^t B_{s,u}^i \circ dB_u^j$. The next assumption ensures that a Gaussian process B can be lifted to an enhanced Gaussian process $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$, and that the exponential of $N_\alpha(\mathbf{B})$ (which will appear in our analysis through applications of (2.20) and (2.22)) is integrable. This assumption is considered in [45, 46], and is verified for a large number of Gaussian processes [45].

Assumption 2.1 (Gaussian process with regular covariance [46, Condition 10]). *Let $T > 0$ and $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$ be a centered, continuous, \mathbb{R}^d -valued Gaussian process with independent components. Assume that the covariance of every component has Hölder dominated finite mixed $(1, \rho)$ -variation for some $\rho \in [1, 2)$ on $[0, T]^2$, that is, there exists $K < \infty$ such that, for $k = 1, \dots, d$, uniformly over $0 \leq s < t \leq T$,*

$$\sup_{\substack{(t_i) \in \mathcal{P}([s,t]) \\ (t'_j) \in \mathcal{P}([s,t])}} \left(\sum_{t'_j} \left(\sum_{t_i} \mathbb{E} \left[B_{t_i, t_{i+1}}^k B_{t'_j, t'_{j+1}}^k \right] \right)^\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \leq K |t - s|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}.$$

Theorem 2.10 (Enhanced Gaussian process and Gaussian rough paths). *Let $T > 0$, $\rho \in [1, \frac{3}{2})$, $p \in (2\rho, 3)$, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, and B be a centered, continuous, \mathbb{R}^d -valued Gaussian process with independent components satisfying Assumption 2.1 for ρ . Then, there exists a unique stochastic process $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ that is the natural lift of B , and whose sample paths are geometric p -rough paths, that is, $\mathbf{B}(\omega) = (B(\omega), \mathbb{B}(\omega)) \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ almost surely. Moreover, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $D \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp(DN_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{B})) \right] < \infty. \quad (2.23)$$

\mathbf{B} is called *enhanced Gaussian process*, and its sample paths $\mathbf{B}(\omega)$ are called *Gaussian rough paths*.

The first claim of Theorem 2.10 is in [26, Theorem 15.33] (or [27, Theorem 10.4], see also [45, Corollary 2.3]), and the second follows from results in [38] (see also [46, Theorem 11]). Further details for the proof are provided in the appendix.

In Theorem 2.10, the enhancement \mathbb{B} in the “natural” lift $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ can be defined in various equivalent ways, see [27, Remark 10.7]. In [27, Theorem 10.4], the diagonal elements of \mathbb{B} are defined as $\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ii} = \frac{1}{2}(B_{s,t}^i)^2$, the off-diagonal terms \mathbb{B}^{ij} are defined as an L^2 limit $\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ij} := \lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[u,v] \in \pi} B_{s,u}^i B_{u,v}^j$, and the other terms \mathbb{B}^{ji} are defined as $\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ji} := -\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^{ij} + B_{s,t}^i B_{s,t}^j$, so that the algebraic conditions (2.6) and (2.7) are satisfied. See also other equivalent definitions in [27, Exercise 10.11] and in [26, Theorem 15.33].

3 Rough differential equations (RDEs) and error bounds

In this section, we study properties of solutions to the rough differential equations (RDE)

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.1)$$

$$V_t = v + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.2)$$

First, in Section 3.1, we provide additional results for controlled rough paths and rough integrals. In Section 3.2, we show that solutions to the RDEs (3.1) and (3.2) exist and are unique. In Sections 3.3 and 3.4, we derive bounds for solutions to RDEs by leveraging greedy partitions. Finally, in Section 3.5, we study solutions to random RDEs driven by Gaussian rough paths $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$ and derive integrable errors bounds. For conciseness, the proofs of various results are in the appendix.

3.1 Calculus with rough paths: controlled rough paths and rough integration

The lemmas in this section are variations of results in [51, Section 3.2] to highlight constants and to support a diffusion σ that is time-varying. Their long but straightforward proofs are provided in the appendix.

Lemma 3.1 (Products of controlled paths are controlled paths). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$, and $(Y, Y'), (Z, Z') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ be two controlled rough paths. Then, $(YZ, (YZ)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ with Gubinelli derivative $(YZ)' = ZY' + YZ'$. Moreover,*

$$\|YZ\|_p \leq C_p(\|Y\|_\infty \|Z\|_p + \|Z\|_\infty \|Y\|_p), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\|(YZ)'\|_p \leq C_p(\|Z\|_\infty \|Y'\|_p + \|Y'\|_\infty \|Z\|_p + \|Y\|_\infty \|Z'\|_p + \|Z'\|_\infty \|Y\|_p), \quad (3.4)$$

$$\|R^{YZ}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p(\|Y\|_\infty \|R^Z\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \|Z\|_\infty + \|Y\|_p \|Z\|_p). \quad (3.5)$$

Lemma 3.2 (Error bounds for controlled paths). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$, $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$, and $\sigma \in C_b^3$. Then,*

$$\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_p \leq C_p(\Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + M_{\tilde{Y}'} \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}')\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'})^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T) (\quad (3.7)$$

$$\|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y_0'\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p),$$

$$\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}')}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'})^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^2 (1 + T) (\quad (3.8)$$

$$\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p).$$

Remark 3.1 (Smoothness of σ). *As discussed in Remark 2.1, the assumption that σ is smooth in t can be relaxed to assuming that $\sigma(\cdot, x)$ is uniformly $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous. However, the proof of the inequality (3.8) for $\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}')}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$ breaks under weaker regularity assumptions. In particular, it breaks if we only assume that $\|\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(s, x)\| \leq C|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}$ (e.g., if $\sigma(t, x) = B_t(\omega)$ is a sample path of Brownian motion).*

Lemma 3.3 (The rough integral $\int \sigma(Y) d\mathbf{X}$ defines a controlled path). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$, $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, and $\sigma \in C_b^2$. Then, $(Z, Z') := (\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \sigma(\cdot, Y)) \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, and*

$$\|R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y)^2 (1 + \|X\|_p)^2 (1 + T) \|\mathbf{X}\|_p. \quad (3.9)$$

Lemma 3.4 (Error bounds for $(\int \sigma(Y) d\mathbf{X} - \int \sigma(\tilde{Y}) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \in \mathcal{C}^p$, $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$, and $\sigma \in C_b^3$. Then,*

$$(Z - \tilde{Z}, Z' - \tilde{Z}') := \left(\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s - \int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}') \right)$$

satisfies

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}')\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'})^2 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p + T) (\quad (3.10)$$

$$\|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta Y_0\| + (\|\Delta Y_0'\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}),$$

$$\|R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} - R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'} + T)^3 (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p)^4 (1 + T) (\quad (3.11)$$

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y_0'\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + (\|\Delta Y_0'\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p)).$$

3.2 Rough differential equations: existence and unicity of solutions

In this section, we study existence and unicity of solutions to the RDEs (3.1) and (3.2). Since these RDEs include a drift term $\int_0^\cdot b(t, Y_t, u_t)dt$, we use the following assumption and lemma to bound its $\frac{p}{2}$ -variation.

Assumption 3.1 (Regularity of b). *Let $T > 0$ and $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$. The map $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies:*

- $b(\cdot, x, u) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$,
- $b(t, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous for almost every $t \in [0, T]$,
- b is bounded and Lipschitz in x : There exists a constant $C_b \geq 0$ such that $\|b(t, x, u)\| \leq C_b$ and $\|b(t, x, u) - b(t, \tilde{x}, u)\| \leq C_b\|x - \tilde{x}\|$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $u \in U$.

Lemma 3.5 (p -variations of Lebesgue integrals). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.1, $Y, \tilde{Y} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be two continuous paths, and $u, \tilde{u} \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$. Then,*

$$\left\| \int_0^\cdot b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_{p,b}T, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \int_0^\cdot (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, u_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_{p,b}T\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_\infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, if b is also Lipschitz in u , so that $\|b(t, x, u) - b(t, x, \tilde{u})\| \leq C_b\|u - \tilde{u}\|$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and all $u, \tilde{u} \in U$, then

$$\left\| \int_0^\cdot (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_{p,b}T(\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_\infty + \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0, T], U)}). \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. By our assumptions, $\int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s)ds$ and $\int_0^t b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, u_s)ds$ are well-defined Lebesgue integrals. Given $s, t \in [0, T]$, we obtain $\|\int_s^t b(r, Y_r, u_r)dr\| \leq C_b|t - s|$ and $\|\int_s^t (b(r, Y_r, u_r) - b(r, \tilde{Y}_r, u_r))dr\| \leq C_b\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_\infty|t - s|$, and assuming that b is moreover Lipschitz in u , $\|\int_s^t (b(r, Y_r, u_r) - b(r, \tilde{Y}_r, \tilde{u}_r))dr\| \leq C_b(\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_\infty + \|u - \tilde{u}\|_\infty)|t - s|$. The desired inequalities then follow from (2.3) in Lemma 2.2. \square

Remark 3.2 (On the boundedness of the drift b). *We assume that b is bounded, which is stronger than making a linear growth assumption (LG) in x (i.e., $\|b(t, 0, u)\| \leq C_b$, so that $\|b(t, x, u)\| \leq C_b(1 + \|x\|)$), under which the bound in (3.12) becomes $\|\int_0^\cdot b(s, Y_s, u_s)ds\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_{p,b}(1 + \|Y\|_\infty)T$. However, the proof of Theorem 3.6 about existence and unicity of solutions to nonlinear RDEs breaks under LG, because it relies on a fixed point argument and on stitching solutions on intervals $[0, t]$ whose size is independent of the initial conditions, and the size of these intervals does depend on the initial conditions under LG. Similarly, our bounds for nonlinear RDEs (e.g., in Theorem 3.18) assume that b is bounded, as they rely on bounding p - and $\frac{p}{2}$ -variations of solutions to nonlinear RDEs over short intervals, and these p -variations would otherwise depend on the initial conditions under LG. For these reasons, the case where b is linear in x (which does not satisfy Assumption 3.1) is handled by a separate analysis for linear RDEs, see Theorems 3.7 and 3.18.*

3.2.1 Nonlinear rough differential equations

Theorem 3.6 (RDEs: existence and unicity of solutions). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.1, $\sigma \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, and $\mathbf{X} = (X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a p -rough path. Then, there exists a unique controlled p -rough path solution $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ to the RDE*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s)ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.1)$$

such that $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$, where $(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, Y)') = (\sigma(\cdot, Y), \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$.

The proof of Theorem 3.6 relies on a classical fixed point argument and is in the appendix. We adapt arguments in the proof of [33, Theorem 2.5] and [51, Theorem 3.8] for our different problem setting with time-varying coefficients (b, σ) and a control u that is not smooth but does not appear in the diffusion σ .

3.2.2 Linear rough differential equations

Existence and unicity of solutions to the linear RDE (3.2) does not follow from Theorem 3.6, since the coefficients of a linear RDE are not bounded a-priori. First, we prove the existence and unicity of solutions to generic linear RDEs with drift (Theorem 3.7). Then, we apply it to the linear RDE (3.2) (Corollary 3.8). Such a result can be considered standard, although we could not find a result with a proof in the literature that can handle a time-varying diffusion term and an irregular drift term.

Note that Theorem 3.7 for linear RDEs does not rely on Theorem 3.6, so Theorem 3.7 ensures that the RDE (3.1) has a unique solution if b is linear but is not bounded, see Remark 3.2.

Theorem 3.7 (Linear RDEs: existence and unicity of solutions). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an initial condition, $A \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ be an integrable map, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path, and $(\Sigma, \Sigma') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d \times n})$ be a controlled p -rough path. Then, there exists a unique solution $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $V' = \Sigma V$ to the linear RDE*

$$V_t = v + \int_0^t A_s V_s ds + \int_0^t \Sigma_s V_s d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.14)$$

The proof of Theorem 3.7 consists of rewriting the linear RDE (3.14) as a linear RDE with constant coefficients driven by a new geometric rough path and concluding with [26, Theorem 10.53], see the appendix.

Assumption 3.2 (Stronger regularity of b). *Let $T > 0$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, and $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that:*

- $b(\cdot, x, u) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$,
- $b(t, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous for almost every $t \in [0, T]$,
- $b(t, \cdot, u) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuously differentiable for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and all $u \in U$,
- $\|\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u)\| \leq C_b$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$ for some constant $C_b \geq 0$.

Corollary 3.8 (Linearized RDEs: existence and unicity of solutions). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.2, $\sigma \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a controlled p -rough path. Then, there exists a unique solution $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $V' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)V$ to the linear RDE*

$$V_t = v + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. By Assumption 3.2, $\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y, u) \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$. By Lemma 2.5, $(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y), \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(\cdot, Y)Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d \times n})$. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 3.7. \square

3.3 Bounds on solutions to nonlinear RDEs

In this section, we derive bounds for solutions to the nonlinear RDE (3.1) by leveraging greedy partitions and the quantity $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})$ in Definition 2.4. The first step consists of deriving bounds that are independent of $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p$ and T over intervals short-enough. The size α of these intervals is then used to define a greedy partition and derive finer bounds over the entire interval $[0, T]$ as a function of the quantity $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})$. Importantly, the final bounds in Lemma 3.11 and Proposition 3.12 are integrable for Gaussian rough paths $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$, see Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 3.18.

For conciseness, the proofs of multiple results in this section are in the appendix.

3.3.1 Error bounds on short intervals

Proposition 3.9 (Bounds for solutions to RDEs on short intervals). *Let $(p, T, y, U, u, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, Y, Y')$ be as in Theorem 3.6, where b satisfies Assumption 3.1, $\sigma \in C_b^3$, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ solves the RDE (3.1). Then,*

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \leq C_{p, \sigma} (\|Y\|_p + T). \quad (3.15)$$

Moreover, there exists two constants $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y\|_{p,I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$K_{Y,I} = \|Y'_{t_0}\| + \|Y'\|_{p,I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}. \quad (3.18)$$

for any interval $I = [t_0, t_1] \subseteq [0, T]$ small-enough so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

To show Proposition 3.9, we take inspiration from the proof of [33, Proposition 2.4]. The main differences are handling a time-varying diffusion $\sigma(\cdot, Y)$ and using an interval I small-enough so that the quantities in (3.16)-(3.18) are bounded by a constant that only depends on (p, b, σ) and not on (X, Y, I) .

Proposition 3.10 (Error bound for solutions to RDEs on short intervals). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $y, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u, \tilde{u} \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(t, x, u) \mapsto b(t, x, u)$ satisfy Assumption 3.1 and be Lipschitz in u , $\sigma \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be two p -rough paths, $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $(Y', \tilde{Y}') = (\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}))$ be the solutions to the RDEs*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{y} + \int_0^t b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, there exists two constants $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y\|_{p,I}, \|\tilde{Y}\|_{p,I}, \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I}, \|R^{\tilde{Y}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I}, K_{Y,I}, K_{\tilde{Y},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}, \quad \text{and} \quad (3.19)$$

$$\|Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{p,I} + \|R^Y - R^{\tilde{Y}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} (\|Y_{t_0} - \tilde{Y}_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(I,U)}), \quad (3.20)$$

for any interval $I = [t_0, t_1] \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

The proof of Proposition 3.10 takes similar steps as in the proofs of [33, Proposition 2.6] and [51, Theorem 3.9], and as when proving the contractivity of \mathcal{M}_t for Theorem 3.6. The main difference compared to prior work consists of using bounds with $\sigma(\cdot, Y)$ that is time-varying and working on short-enough intervals to obtain a bound with a constant $C_{p,b,\sigma}$ that only depends on (p, b, σ) , and not on $(X, \tilde{X}, Y, \tilde{Y}, I)$.

3.3.2 Error bounds on long intervals

Lemma 3.11 (Boundedness of solutions to RDEs). *Let $(p, T, y, U, u, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, Y, Y')$ be as in Theorem 3.6, where b satisfies Assumption 3.1, $\sigma \in C_b^3$, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ solves the RDE (3.1). Define $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})$ as in Definition 2.4. Then, there exist constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that*

$$\|Y\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|Y'\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})), \quad (3.21)$$

$$\|Y\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) + \|y\|. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. Define $N_{\alpha, I}(w)$ and w as in Definition 2.4 and Corollary 2.9, respectively. Let $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $\alpha_{p,b,\sigma} > 0$ be the constants in Proposition 3.9, and $I = [s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ be any interval such that $w(s, t) \leq \alpha := \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}$.

Then, by Corollary 2.9, $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \stackrel{(2.21)}{\leq} \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$, so Proposition 3.9 implies that

$$\|Y\|_{p,I} \stackrel{(3.16)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad \|Y'\|_{p,I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \stackrel{(3.18)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}.$$

Thus, as defined in Definition 2.4, with $N = N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)$, the partition $\{\tau_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, N+1\}$ of the interval $[0, T]$, which satisfies $w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$ for all i , is such that

$$\|Y\|_{p,[0,T]} \leq (N+1) \left(\sum_{i=0}^N \|Y\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq (N+1) \sum_{i=0}^N \|Y\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \leq (N+1)^2 C_{p,b,\sigma} \leq 2e \exp(N) C_{p,b,\sigma},$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 2.1. The same inequality holds for $\|Y'\|_{p,[0,T]}$ and $\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]}$ (note that Lemma 2.1 can also be used to bound $\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]}$). The desired first inequality (3.21) then follows from $\exp(N) \leq \exp(5C_p(N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}) + T/\alpha + 1)) \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,\alpha} \exp(C_p N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}))$ by (2.20). Finally, the desired inequality (3.22) follows from $\|Y\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq \|Y\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|Y_0\|$ by (2.1), and we conclude. \square

Proposition 3.12 below is the main result of this section. It is similar to [46, Theorem 4], but includes a drift term with a control input u and a diffusion σ that is time-varying. Its proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.11 by appropriately replacing inequalities but is slightly longer, so we provide it in the appendix.

Proposition 3.12 (Error bound for solutions to RDEs on long intervals). *Define $(p, T, y, \tilde{y}, U, u, \tilde{u}, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ as in Proposition 3.10, where b satisfies Assumption 3.1 and is Lipschitz in u and $\sigma \in C_b^3$, and let $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ with $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$ and $\tilde{Y}' = \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})$ be the solutions to the RDEs*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{y} + \int_0^t b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, there exist constants $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that for any interval $I = [t_0, t_1] \subseteq [0, T]$,

$$\|Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{p,I} + \|R^Y - R^{\tilde{Y}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},I}(w)) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}) \quad (3.23)$$

$$\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_{\infty,I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},I}(w)) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}) \quad (3.24)$$

where $\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I} = \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty(I,U)}$, and $N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},I}(w)$ and w are defined in Definition 2.4 and Corollary 2.9.

Moreover, if u and \tilde{u} only differ on a subinterval $J \subseteq I$, i.e., $u_t = \tilde{u}_t$ for almost all $t \in I \setminus J$, then

$$\|Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{p,I} + \|R^Y - R^{\tilde{Y}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},I}(w)) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |J| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}) \quad (3.25)$$

$$\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_{\infty,I} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},I}(w)) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |J| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}) \quad (3.26)$$

for some constants $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$.

3.4 Bounds on solutions to linear RDEs and on the Jacobian flow

Next, we derive bounds on solutions to linear RDEs and on the Jacobian flow of nonlinear RDEs, stated in Lemmas 3.14 and 3.15. For conciseness, the proofs of these results are provided in the appendix. The proof of Lemma 3.14 follows similar steps as the proof of Proposition 3.12 and additionally relies on the following Grönwall Lemma for rough paths.

Lemma 3.13 (Rough Grönwall Lemma [56, Lemma 2.12]). *Let $p \geq 1$, $T > 0$, $C_1, \alpha > 0$, $Y \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$, and w_1, w_2 be two controls on $[0, T]$ (see Definition 2.4) such that*

$$\|Y_{s,t}\| \leq C_1 \|Y\|_{\infty,[0,t]} w_1(s,t)^{\frac{1}{p}} + w_2(s,t) \quad \text{for any } [s,t] \subseteq [0,T] \text{ such that } w_1(s,t) \leq \alpha,$$

and define $C_2 = \min(1, 1/(\alpha(2C_1 \exp(2))^p))$. Then,

$$\|Y\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{w_1(0,T)}{C_2 \alpha}\right) \left(\|Y_0\| + \|w_2(0, \cdot) \exp(-w_1(0, \cdot)/(C_2 \alpha))\|_{\infty,[0,T]}\right).$$

Lemma 3.14 below is similar to [27, Proposition 8.13] stated for $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder continuous rough paths. The main differences are that the bounds in Lemma 3.14 are integrable for Gaussian rough paths $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$ (see Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 3.18) and that Lemma 3.14 handles time-varying vector fields.

Lemma 3.14 (Boundedness of solutions to linear RDEs). *Let $(p, T, y, A, \mathbf{X}, \Sigma, \Sigma')$ be as in Theorem 3.7, where $A \in L^\infty$, $(\Sigma, \Sigma') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, and $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ solves the linear RDE (3.14). Define $N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})$ as in Definition 2.4. Assume that there exists two constants $C_\Sigma \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_\Sigma < 1$ such that*

$$\|\Sigma\|_{\infty,I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p,I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{p,I} + \|R^\Sigma\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C_\Sigma$$

for any interval $I \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_\Sigma^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Then,

$$\|V\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|V'\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,A,\Sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,A,\Sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,A,\Sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|v\|, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\|V\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,A,\Sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,A,\Sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,A,\Sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|v\|, \quad (3.28)$$

where the constants $C_{p,T,A,\Sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,A,\Sigma} \leq \alpha_\Sigma$ only depend on $(p, T, \|A\|_\infty, C_\Sigma, \alpha_\Sigma)$.

Lemma 3.15 is similar to [37, Theorem 6.5] (see also [38, Proposition 5]), generalizing it to RDEs with drift b , control input u , and time-varying diffusion σ . Note that the bounds (3.29) and (3.30) do not depend on Y : This fact is used in the proof of Lemma 3.17 that gives the continuity of the map $(y, \mathbf{X}, u) \mapsto V$.

Lemma 3.15 (Boundedness of the Jacobian flow). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $y, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.2, $\sigma \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path, and $(Y, Y'), (V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$ and $V' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)V$. be the solutions to the RDEs (3.1) and (3.2)*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad V_t = v + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s d\mathbf{X}_s,$$

where $t \in [0, T]$. Then, there exists two constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|V\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|V'\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|v\|, \quad (3.29)$$

$$\|V\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|v\|, \quad (3.30)$$

where $N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})$ is defined in Definition 2.4.

3.5 Integrability of solutions to nonlinear and linear RDEs

Finally, we combine the results from the previous sections to show that pathwise solutions to nonlinear and linear RDEs driven by Gaussian rough paths $\mathbf{B}(\omega)$ are integrable. First, in Lemmas 3.16 and 3.17, we show the continuity of the Itô-Lyons map $(y, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto Y_{(y,\mathbf{X})}$, that is, that solutions to RDEs are continuous with respect to the initial conditions and the driving rough path. With this result follows the measurability of the map $\omega \mapsto Y_{(y(\omega), \mathbf{B}(\omega))}$ that assigns the pathwise solution to a random RDE driven by a Gaussian rough path $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{B}(\omega)$. Thanks to the favorable integrability properties of enhanced Gaussian processes \mathbf{B} in Theorem 2.10, we conclude that such solutions are integrable in Theorem 3.18. These results will be used throughout the proof of PMP, e.g., to make sense of the maximality condition (1.5) that involves $\mathbb{E}[H(t, x_t, v, p_t, \mathbf{p}_0)]$.

Lemma 3.16 (Continuity of solutions to RDEs). *Define $(p, T, y, \tilde{y}, U, u, \tilde{u}, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ as in Proposition 3.10, where b satisfies Assumption 3.1 and is Lipschitz in u and $\sigma \in C_b^3$, let $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ with $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$ and $\tilde{Y}' = \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})$ be the solutions to the RDEs*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{y} + \int_0^t b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and assume that there exists a constant $M \geq 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p, \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p \leq M$. Then,

$$\|Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|R^Y - R^{\tilde{Y}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,M} (\|y - \tilde{y}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,T]} + T\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,T],U)}), \quad (3.31)$$

$$\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,M} (\|y - \tilde{y}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,T]} + T\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,T],U)}) \quad (3.32)$$

for a constant $C_{p,T,b,\sigma,M} \geq 0$.

Proof. First, the RDEs have unique solutions $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ thanks to Theorem 3.6. Let $\alpha = \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}$ be as in Proposition 3.12, and $I = [0, T]$. By Lemma 2.7, $\alpha N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}) \leq w_{\mathbf{X}}(0, T) = \|X\|_p^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq M^p + M^{\frac{p}{2}}$. By (2.20) in Corollary 2.9, $N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(w) \leq 5C_p(N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}) + N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) + T/\alpha + 1)$. Thus, $N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(w) \leq C$ for a constant C that depends only on (p, T, b, σ, M) . Finally, the inequalities (3.31) and (3.32) follow from (3.23) and (3.24) for a new constant $C_{p,T,b,\sigma,M} \geq 0$. \square

The continuity of solutions to linearized RDEs is proved under the following stronger assumption.

Assumption 3.3 (Stronger regularity of b). *Let $T > 0$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, and $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. The map b satisfies Assumption 3.2 and is such that there exists a constant $C_b \geq 0$ such that $\|b(t, x, u)\| + \|\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u)\| \leq C_b$ and $\|\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, \tilde{x}, u)\| \leq C_b \|x - \tilde{x}\|$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and all $u \in U$.*

Lemma 3.17 (Continuity of the Jacobian flow). *Define $(p, T, y, \tilde{y}, u, \tilde{u}, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, Y, Y', \tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}', M)$ as in Lemma 3.16, and assume that b satisfies Assumption 3.3, that $(t, x, u) \mapsto \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u)$ is Lipschitz in u , and that $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$ are geometric. Let $v \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(\tilde{V}, \tilde{V}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $V' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y) \cdot V$ and $\tilde{V}' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, \tilde{Y}) \cdot \tilde{V}$. be the solutions to the linear RDEs*

$$V_t = v(y) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s d\mathbf{X}_s \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{V}_t = v(\tilde{y}) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s) \tilde{V}_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, \tilde{Y}_s) \tilde{V}_s d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s,$$

where $t \in [0, T]$. Then, for a constant $C_{p,T,b,\sigma,v,M} \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|V' - \tilde{V}'\|_{p,[0,T]} + \|R^V - R^{\tilde{V}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]} &\leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,v,M} (\|y - \tilde{y}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,T]} + T \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,T],U)}), \\ \|V - \tilde{V}\|_{\infty,[0,T]} &\leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,v,M} (\|y - \tilde{y}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,T]} + T \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,T],U)}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, the linear RDEs also have unique solutions $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{V}, \tilde{V}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ thanks to Corollary 3.8. Second, by Lemma 3.15, there exists two constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ (importantly, they do not depend on Y, \tilde{Y}) such that

$$\|V\|_{\infty,[0,T]} + \|V'\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|v(y)\|,$$

and similarly for $\|\tilde{V}\|_{\infty,[0,T]} + \|\tilde{V}'\|_{\infty,[0,T]}$. By Lemma 2.7, $\alpha_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma},[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}) \leq w_{\mathbf{X}}(0, T) = \|X\|_p^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq M^p + M^{\frac{p}{2}}$, since $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p = \|X\|_p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq M$. Thus,

$$\|V\|_{\infty,[0,T]} + \|V'\|_{\infty,[0,T]} + \|\tilde{V}\|_{\infty,[0,T]} + \|\tilde{V}'\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,v,M}.$$

Thus, we may assume that (V, V') and (\tilde{V}, \tilde{V}') solve the nonlinear RDEs

$$V_t = v(Y_0) + \int_0^t \hat{b}(s, (Y_s, V_s), u_s) ds + \int_0^t \hat{\sigma}(s, (Y_s, V_s)) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

(and similarly for \tilde{V}) for some bounded coefficients $(\hat{b}, \hat{\sigma})$, where $\hat{b} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies Assumption 3.1 and is Lipschitz in u , and $\hat{\sigma} \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$. Thus, the pair $((Y, V), (Y', V'))$ solves the RDE

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y_t \\ V_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y \\ v(y) \end{bmatrix} + \int_0^t \begin{bmatrix} b(s, Y_s, u_s) \\ \hat{b}(s, (Y_s, V_s), u_s) \end{bmatrix} ds + \int_0^t \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(s, Y_s) \\ \hat{\sigma}(s, (Y_s, V_s)) \end{bmatrix} d\mathbf{X}_s,$$

and similarly for (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{V}) . Then using (3.31) and (3.32) in Lemma 3.16,

$$\|(Y, V) - (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{V})\|_{\infty,[0,T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,v,M} (\|(y, v(y)) - (\tilde{y}, v(\tilde{y}))\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,T]} + T \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0,T],U)}),$$

and similarly for $\|(Y', V') - (\tilde{Y}', \tilde{V}')\|_p + \|R^{(Y,V)} - R^{(\tilde{Y},\tilde{V})}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$, from which we deduce the desired result. \square

Theorem 3.18 (Integrability of pathwise solutions to random RDEs). *Let $T > 0$, $\rho \in [1, \frac{3}{2})$, $p \in (2\rho, 3)$, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, B be a centered, continuous, \mathbb{R}^d -valued Gaussian process with independent components satisfying Assumption 2.1 for ρ , and \mathbf{B} be the associated enhanced Gaussian process in Theorem 2.10. Let $\ell \geq 1$, $y, \tilde{y} \in L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.1, $\sigma \in C_b^3([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$, and for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, define $(Y(\omega), Y'(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $Y'(\omega) = \sigma(\cdot, Y(\omega))$ as the solution to the nonlinear RDE*

$$Y_t(\omega) = y(\omega) + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s(\omega), u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s(\omega)) dB_s(\omega), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, $Y \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$.

Moreover, let $v \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, assume that b satisfies Assumption 3.3, and for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, define $(V(\omega), V'(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $V'(\omega) = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y(\omega))V(\omega)$ as the solution to the linear RDE

$$V_t(\omega) = v(\tilde{y}(\omega)) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s(\omega), u_s) V_s(\omega) ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s(\omega)) V_s(\omega) d\mathbf{B}_s(\omega), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, $V \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$.

Proof. We first prove that $Y \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$. The proof for V is identical. Note that the assumption that b is Lipschitz in the control input u is not needed, as Lemma 3.16 and other results used below still hold without this assumption since the control $u = \tilde{u}$ is fixed.

1) *Measurability:* As is standard in rough path theory, we express the solution map Y as a composition of the measurable map $(y, \mathbf{B}) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{C}_g^p$ and the pathwise solution to the RDE (3.1), which is continuous with respect to the initial condition and the driving signal. First, (\mathcal{C}_g^p, d_p) is a (complete) metric space (with Borel sets defined by its metric topology), where $d_p(\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) := \|\Delta X_0\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p$ denotes the inhomogeneous rough path metric. By Theorem 2.10, the map

$$\mathbf{B} : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d), d_p), \quad \omega \mapsto \mathbf{B}(\omega) = (B(\omega), \mathbb{B}(\omega))$$

is measurable. Also, by Theorem 3.6, for any initial conditions $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and geometric p -rough path $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$, the RDE (3.1) has a unique solution, denoted by $(\hat{Y}_{(\bar{y}, \mathbf{X})}, (\hat{Y}_{(\bar{y}, \mathbf{X})})) \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, so the map

$$\hat{Y}_{(\cdot, \cdot)} : (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d), \|\cdot\| \oplus d_p) \rightarrow (C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n), \|\cdot\|_\infty), \quad (\bar{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \hat{Y}_{(\bar{y}, \mathbf{X})}$$

is well-defined, where $\|\cdot\| \oplus d_p$ is the product metric. Moreover, if $\bar{y}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$ satisfy $\|\mathbf{X}\|_p, \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p \leq M$ for some $M \geq 0$, then $\|\hat{Y}_{(\bar{y}, \mathbf{X})} - \hat{Y}_{(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})}\|_\infty \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma,M} (\|\bar{y} - \tilde{y}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p)$ by (3.32) in Lemma 3.16, so the map $\hat{Y}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is continuous. Thus, the map

$$Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n), \|\cdot\|_\infty), \quad \omega \mapsto \hat{Y}_{(y(\omega), \mathbf{B}(\omega))}$$

is measurable, since it is the composition of the measurable map $(y(\cdot), \mathbf{B}(\cdot))$ and the continuous map $\hat{Y}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$.

2) *Integrability:* By Lemma 3.11, there exist constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \stackrel{(3.22)}{\leq} C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) + \|y\|$$

almost surely, where $N_{\alpha, I}(\mathbf{B})$ is defined in Definition 2.4. $\mathbb{E}[\|Y\|_\infty^\ell] < \infty$ then follows from Theorem 2.10.

Thus, $Y \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$.

The proof that $V \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ is identical, using Corollary 3.8 (instead of Theorem 3.6), Lemma 3.17 (instead of Lemma 3.16) and Lemma 3.15 (instead of Lemma 3.11). \square

Corollary 3.19 (Integrable error bound). *Define $(T, p, \Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbf{B}, \ell, y, \tilde{y}, U, \sigma)$ as in Theorem 3.18 with $\ell > 1$, let $u, \tilde{u} \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(t, x, u) \mapsto b(t, x, u)$ satisfy Assumption 3.1 and be Lipschitz in u , and $Y, \tilde{Y} \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ be the pathwise solutions to the random nonlinear RDEs*

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{y} + \int_0^t b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

as in Theorem 3.18. Then, there exist constants $C := C_{p,\ell,T,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha := \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y - \tilde{Y}\|_{\infty, [0, T]}] \leq C \mathbb{E}[\exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}))]^{\frac{\ell}{\ell-1}} (\mathbb{E}[\|y - \tilde{y}\|^\ell]^{\frac{1}{\ell}} + T\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\infty([0, T], U)}),$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}))] < \infty$.

Proof. First, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(DN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}))] < \infty$ for any $D \geq 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ by Theorem 2.10. Second, Hölder's inequality gives $\mathbb{E}[\exp(DN_\alpha)\|\Delta y\|] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{\ell}{\ell-1}DN_\alpha)]^{\frac{\ell-1}{\ell}} \mathbb{E}[\|\Delta y\|^\ell]^{\frac{1}{\ell}}$, and similarly for $\mathbb{E}[\exp(DN_\alpha)T\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty}]$. Finally, the desired inequality follows from (3.24) in Proposition 3.12 and $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w) \leq C_p(N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}) + T/\alpha + 1)$ by (2.20) in Corollary 2.9. \square

4 The Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP)

We now prove **PMP** (Theorem 1.1). First, in Section 4.1, we consider particular variations of solutions to RDEs, called *needle-like variations* [34–36, 57], and show that these variations can be approximated well using the solution to a linearized RDE (Lemma 4.3) along the optimal solution (x, u) to **OCF**. The use of needle-like variations is a standard method for deriving a PMP that can handle the control constraints $u_t \in U$. Finally, in Section 4.2, we state the main assumptions for **PMP** and prove the result.

4.1 Needle-like variations

The needle-like variations rely on the concept of a Lebesgue point, defined below.

Definition 4.1 (Lebesgue point). *Let $T > 0$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy Assumption 3.1, and $Y : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be continuous. We say that $t_1 \in [0, T]$ is a Lebesgue point of b for u if*

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_{t_1}^{t_1+h} b(t, Y_t, u_t) dt = b(t_1, Y_{t_1}, u_{t_1}).$$

Equivalently, $\left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_1+h} b(t, Y_t, u_t) dt - h b(t_1, Y_{t_1}, u_{t_1}) \right\| = o(h)$.

Proposition 4.1 (Needle-like variations and linearized RDEs). *Let $p \in [2, 3]$, $T > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, $u \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $(t, x, u) \mapsto b(t, x, u)$ satisfy Assumption 3.3 and be Lipschitz in u , $\sigma \in C_b^4([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path. Given a Lebesgue point $t_1 \in [0, T]$ of b for u , $\eta_1 \in [0, T - t_1]$, and $\bar{u}_1 \in U$, define the needle-like variation $\pi_1 = (t_1, \eta_1, \bar{u}_1)$ of u by*

$$u_t^{\pi_1} = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_1 & \text{if } t \in [t_1, t_1 + \eta_1], \\ u_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(Y^{\pi_1}, (Y^{\pi_1})') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ solve the RDEs

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad Y_t^{\pi_1} = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s^{\pi_1}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s^{\pi_1}) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and $(V^{\pi_1}, (V^{\pi_1})') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ solve the linear RDE

$$V_t^{\pi_1} = b(t_1, Y_{t_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(t_1, Y_{t_1}, u_{t_1}), \quad t \in [0, t_1], \quad (4.1a)$$

$$V_t^{\pi_1} = V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s^{\pi_1} ds + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s^{\pi_1} d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [t_1, T], \quad (4.1b)$$

with $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$, $(Y^{\pi_1})' = \sigma(\cdot, Y^{\pi_1})$ and $(V^{\pi_1})' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y) V^{\pi_1}$.

Then, there exists constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} > 0$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y^{\pi_1} - Y\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \eta_1, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\|Y^{\pi_1} - Y - \eta_1 V^{\pi_1}\|_{\infty, [t_1, T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \eta_1^2, \quad (4.3)$$

where $N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})$ is defined in Definition 2.4.

Proof. There exists unique solutions Y , Y_{π_1} and V_{π_1} to the RDEs thanks to Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.8.

The inequality (4.2) follows from (3.26) in Proposition 3.12 and $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w) \leq C_p(N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X}) + T/\alpha + 1)$ by (2.20) in Corollary 2.9, where $N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)$ and w are defined in Definition 2.4 and Corollary 2.9, respectively.

In the remainder of the proof, we show the inequality (4.3). For conciseness, we denote $\Delta Y = Y^{\pi_1} - Y$, $\Delta R^Y = R^{\Delta Y} = R^Y - R^{Y^{\pi_1}}$, $(b(x, u), \sigma(x))$ for $(b(t, x, u), \sigma(t, x))$, and similarly for derivatives and

$$\Delta := Y^{\pi_1} - Y - \eta_1 V^{\pi_1}.$$

Let $t \geq t_1 + \eta_1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_t &= \int_{t_1}^t b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s^{\pi_1}) ds - \int_{t_1}^t b(Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_{t_1}^t (\sigma(Y_s^{\pi_1}) - \sigma(Y_s)) d\mathbf{X}_s \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_1+\eta_1} b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, \bar{u}_1) ds + \int_{t_1+\eta_1}^t b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s) ds - \int_{t_1}^t b(Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_{t_1}^t (\sigma(Y_s^{\pi_1}) - \sigma(Y_s)) d\mathbf{X}_s \\ &= \int_{t_1}^{t_1+\eta_1} (b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s)) ds + \int_{t_1}^t (b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s) - b(Y_s, u_s)) ds + \int_{t_1}^t (\sigma(Y_s^{\pi_1}) - \sigma(Y_s)) d\mathbf{X}_s,\end{aligned}$$

so that, since $V_t^{\pi_1} = V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s, u_s) V_s^{\pi_1} ds + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(Y_s) V_s^{\pi_1} d\mathbf{X}_s$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_t &= \int_{t_1}^{t_1+\eta_1} (b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s)) ds - \eta_1 V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} + \int_{t_1}^t \left(b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s) - b(Y_s, u_s) - \eta_1 \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s, u_s) V_s^{\pi_1} \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^t \left(\sigma(Y_s^{\pi_1}) - \sigma(Y_s) - \eta_1 \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(Y_s) V_s^{\pi_1} \right) d\mathbf{X}_s.\end{aligned}$$

Next, by Taylor's Theorem [58], $b(Y^{\pi_1}, u) - b(Y, u) = \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y, u) \Delta Y + \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y + \theta \Delta Y, u) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y, u) \right) d\theta \Delta Y$, and similarly for $\sigma(Y^{\pi_1}) - \sigma(Y)$ by the mean value theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_t &= \int_{t_1}^{t_1+\eta_1} (b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s)) ds - \eta_1 V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} + \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^t \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s + \theta \Delta Y_s, u_s) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s, u_s) \right) d\theta \Delta Y_s ds \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^t \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(Y_s + \theta \Delta Y_s) (1 - \theta) d\theta \Delta Y_s^{\otimes 2} d\mathbf{X}_s \\ &\quad + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s, u_s) \Delta(s) ds + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(Y_s) \Delta_s d\mathbf{X}_s.\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Next, we show that the first three terms are $o(\eta_1)$ in the following sense:

$$A = o(\eta_1) \quad \text{if} \quad \|A\| \leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(w)) \eta_1^2.\tag{4.5}$$

First, since t_1 is a Lebesgue point and $Y_{t_1}^{\pi_1} = Y_{t_1}$,

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_1+\eta_1} (b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(Y_s^{\pi_1}, u_s)) ds - \eta_1 V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} = \eta_1 (b(Y_{t_1}, \bar{u}_1) - b(Y_{t_1}, u_{t_1})) - \eta_1 V_{t_1}^{\pi_1} + o(\eta_1) = o(\eta_1).\tag{4.6}$$

Second, $\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(x, u)$ is Lipschitz in x and $\|\Delta Y\|_\infty^2 = o(\eta_1)$ by (3.26), so

$$\int_{t_1}^t \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s + \theta \Delta Y_s, u_s) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(Y_s, u_s) \right) d\theta \Delta Y_s ds = o(\eta_1).\tag{4.7}$$

Third, we bound the last rough integral, noting that

$$\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_2^2 + \|\Delta Y\|_\infty + \|\Delta Y\|_p \stackrel{(3.25),(3.26),(2.12),(2.22)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(w)) \eta_1.\tag{4.8}$$

We define

$$W_t = \Delta Y_t \otimes \Delta Y_t \quad \text{and} \quad Z_t = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(Y_t + \theta \Delta Y_t) (1 - \theta) d\theta.$$

By Lemma 3.1, $(W, W') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ is a controlled path with Gubinelli derivative $W' = 2\Delta Y \otimes \Delta Y'$,

$$\|W'\|_p \stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} C_p(\|\Delta Y\|_\infty + \|\Delta Y\|_p + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta Y'\|_\infty)^2 \stackrel{(4.8)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.9a)$$

$$\|R^W\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} C_p(\|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|R^{\Delta Y}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y\|_p^2) \stackrel{(4.8)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.9b)$$

$$\|W\|_p \stackrel{(2.12)}{\leq} C_p(\|W'\|_\infty \|X\|_p + \|R^W\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \stackrel{(4.8),(2.22)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.9c)$$

$$\|W\|_\infty \stackrel{(3.26)}{=} o(\eta_1). \quad (4.9d)$$

By Lemma 2.5, $(Z, Z') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ is also a controlled path, since $\frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2} \in C_b^2$ as $\sigma \in C_b^4$. By Lemma 3.1, $(ZW, (ZW)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ is a controlled path with Gubinelli derivative $(ZW)' = WZ' + ZW'$, and

$$\|(ZW)'\|_p \stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} C_p(\|W\|_\infty \|Z'\|_p + \|Z'\|_\infty \|W\|_p + \|Z\|_\infty \|W'\|_p + \|W'\|_\infty \|Z\|_p) \stackrel{(4.9)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.10a)$$

$$\|R^{ZW}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} C_p(\|Z\|_\infty \|R^W\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|R^Z\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \|W\|_\infty + \|Z\|_p \|W\|_p) \stackrel{(4.9)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.10b)$$

$$\|(ZW)'\|_\infty \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} \|(ZW)'_0\| + \|(ZW)'\|_p \stackrel{(4.10a)}{=} o(\eta_1), \quad (4.10c)$$

where the quantities $\|Z\|_p, \|Z'\|_p, \|Z'\|_\infty, \|R^Z\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$ can be bounded by $C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha,p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(w))$ using (3.21) and (2.16). Thus, for any $s, t > t_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_s^t Z_s W_s d\mathbf{X}_s \right\| &\stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} \|Z_s W_s X_{s,t}\| + \|(ZW)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}\| + C_p(\|R^{ZW}\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]} \|X\|_{p,[s,t]} + \|(ZW)'\|_{p,[s,t]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]}) \\ &\leq C_p \|\mathbf{X}\|_p (\|Z\|_{\infty,[s,t]} \|W\|_{\infty,[s,t]} + \|(ZW)'\|_{\infty,[s,t]} + \|R^{ZW}\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]} + \|(ZW)'\|_{p,[s,t]}) \\ &\stackrel{(2.22),(4.9),(4.10)}{=} o(\eta_1), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\int_{t_1}^t \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(Y + \theta \Delta Y)(1 - \theta) d\theta \Delta Y^{\otimes 2} d\mathbf{X}_s = o(\eta_1). \quad (4.11)$$

Thus, using ((4.6),(4.7),(4.11)), (4.4) can be written as

$$\Delta t = o(\eta_1) + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) \Delta_s ds + \int_{t_1}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) \Delta_s d\mathbf{X}_s,$$

where

$$\|o(\eta_1)\| \stackrel{(4.5)}{=} C_{p,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha,p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(w)) \eta_1^2 \stackrel{(2.20)}{\leq} C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha,p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \eta_1^2.$$

Finally, by Lemma 3.15,

$$\|\Delta\|_{\infty,[t_1,T]} \stackrel{(3.30)}{\leq} C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha,p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \|o(\eta_1)\| \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha,p,b,\sigma,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X})) \eta_1^2,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.2 (Needle-like variations). *Define $(p, T, y, U, u, b, \sigma, \mathbf{X}, N_{\alpha,[0,T]}(\mathbf{X}), Y, Y')$ as in Proposition 4.1. Given $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_q < T$ be Lebesgue points of b for u (Definition 4.1), $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q \in U$, $0 \leq \eta_i < t_{i+1} - t_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, q-1$ and $0 \leq \eta_q < T - t_q$, and define the needle-like variation $\pi = \{t_1, \dots, t_q, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q\}$ of u as the control u^π defined by*

$$u_t^\pi = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_i & \text{if } t \in [t_i, t_i + \eta_i], \\ u_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $(Y^\pi, (Y^\pi)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(V^{\pi_i}, (V^{\pi_i})') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ for $i = 1, \dots, q$ be the unique solutions to the RDEs

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^\pi &= y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s^\pi, u_s^\pi) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s^\pi) d\mathbf{X}_s, & t \in [0, T], \\ V_t^{\pi_i} &= V_{t_i}^{\pi_i} + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s^{\pi_i} ds + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s^{\pi_i} d\mathbf{X}_s, & t \in [t_i, T], \\ V_t^{\pi_i} &= b(t_i, Y_{t_i}, \bar{u}_i) - b(t_i, Y_{t_i}, u_{t_i}), & t \in [0, t_i]. \end{aligned}$$

with $(Y^{\pi_1})' = \sigma(\cdot, Y^{\pi_1})$ and $(V^{\pi_1})' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y) V^{\pi_1}$. Then, there exists constants $C_{p,T,b,\sigma} > 0$ and $0 < \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y^\pi - Y\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\left\| Y^\pi - Y - \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i V^{\pi_i} \right\|_{\infty, [t_1, T]} \leq C_{p,T,b,\sigma} \exp(C_{p,T,b,\sigma} N_{\alpha_{p,b,\sigma}, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i,j=1}^q \eta_i \eta_j. \quad (4.13)$$

As in the deterministic case, Corollary 4.2 follows by induction, using Proposition 4.1 for the case $q = 1$ with one variation $\pi_1 = \{t_1, \eta_1, \bar{u}_1\}$. We provide the proof in the appendix.

Lemma 4.3 (Needle-like variation formula for random RDEs). *Let $T > 0$, $\rho \in [1, \frac{3}{2}]$, $p \in (2\rho, 3)$, and $\ell \geq 1$. Let (U, u, b, σ) and u^π be the control associated to the needle-like variation $\pi = \{t_1, \dots, t_q, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q\}$ of u as in Corollary 4.2. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, B, \mathbf{B}, y, Y, Y')$ be as in Theorem 3.18, with $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ an enhanced Gaussian process and $(Y(\omega), Y'(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ the pathwise solution to the RDE*

$$Y_t(\omega) = y(\omega) + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s(\omega), u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s(\omega)) d\mathbf{B}_s(\omega), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.1)$$

As in Theorem 3.18, let $(Y^\pi(\omega), (Y^\pi(\omega))') \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the pathwise solution to the RDE

$$Y_t^\pi(\omega) = y(\omega) + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s^\pi(\omega), u_s^\pi) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s^\pi(\omega)) d\mathbf{B}_s(\omega), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and for $i = 1, \dots, q$, let $(V^{\pi_i}(\omega), (V^{\pi_i}(\omega))') \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ be the pathwise solutions to the RDEs

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^{\pi_i}(\omega) &= V_{t_i}^{\pi_i}(\omega) + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s(\omega), u_s) V_s^{\pi_i}(\omega) ds + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s(\omega)) V_s^{\pi_i}(\omega) d\mathbf{B}_s(\omega), & t \in [t_i, T], \\ V_t^{\pi_i}(\omega) &= b(t_i, Y_{t_i}(\omega), \bar{u}_i) - b(t_i, Y_{t_i}(\omega), u_{t_i}), & t \in [0, t_i], \end{aligned}$$

with $Y, Y^\pi, V^{\pi_1}, \dots, V^{\pi_q} \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\bar{q}}$ be continuously differentiable and satisfy $\|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(x)\| \leq C_\varphi$ and $\|\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(x) - \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(\tilde{x})\| \leq C_\varphi \|x - \tilde{x}\|$ for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for some constant $C_\varphi < \infty$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\varphi(Y^\pi) - \varphi(Y)\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \right] \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i, \quad (4.15)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \varphi(Y^\pi) - \varphi(Y) - \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y) V^{\pi_i} \right\|_{\infty, [t_q, T]} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \right] \sum_{i,j=1}^q \eta_i \eta_j, \quad (4.16)$$

where $0 < C < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ are constants that depend only on $(p, T, b, \sigma, \varphi)$, and $\mathbb{E}[\exp(CN(\mathbf{B}))] < \infty$.

Proof. For conciseness, we only prove the case $q = 1$ corresponding to one variation $\pi_1 := \{t_1, \eta_1, \bar{u}_1\}$ of the control input u , as the case $q \geq 2$ follows by using Corollary 4.2 instead of Proposition 4.1. Also, Theorem 3.18 ensures that the pathwise solutions to the RDEs are well-defined and integrable.

By Proposition 4.1, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ that depend on (p, T, b, σ) such that

$$\|Y^\pi - Y\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \stackrel{(4.2)}{\leq} C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \eta_1, \quad \|Y^\pi - Y - \eta_1 V^{\pi_1}\|_{\infty, [t_1, T]} \stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \eta_1^2$$

almost surely, and where $\mathbb{E}[\exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}))] < \infty$ by Theorem 2.10. Also, with $\Delta Y := Y^\pi - Y$, by the mean value theorem and Taylor's Theorem [58], since $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}$ is Lipschitz,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(Y^\pi) - \varphi(Y)\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y + \theta \Delta Y) d\theta \Delta Y \right\| \leq C_\varphi \|\Delta Y\|. \\ \left\| \varphi(Y^\pi) - \varphi(Y) - \eta_1 \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y) V^{\pi_1} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y) (\Delta Y - \eta_1 V^{\pi_1}) + \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y + \theta \Delta Y) - \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}(Y) \right) d\theta \Delta Y \right\| \\ &\leq C_\varphi (\|\Delta Y - \eta_1 V^{\pi_1}\| + \|\Delta Y\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

The desired inequalities (4.15) and (4.16) follow from the previous inequalities. \square

4.2 Proof of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle

In this section, we prove the necessary optimality conditions in **PMP** under the following assumptions.

Assumption 4.1 (Assumptions for **OCF** and **PMP** (Theorem 1.1)). *Let $T > 0$, $\rho \in [1, \frac{3}{2})$, $p \in (2\rho, 3)$, $\ell \geq 2$, $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space.*

- *The drift $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and cost $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy Assumption 3.3 and are Lipschitz in u for a constant $C_{b, f} \geq 0$, that is:*
 - $b(\cdot, x, u) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$,
 - $b(t, \cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous for almost every $t \in [0, T]$,
 - $b(t, \cdot, u) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuously differentiable for almost every $t \in [0, T]$ and all $u \in U$,
 - $\|b(t, x, u)\| + \|\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u)\| \leq C_{b, f}$ and $\|\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, x, u) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(t, \tilde{x}, u)\| \leq C_{b, f} \|x - \tilde{x}\|$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and all $u \in U$,
 - $\|b(t, x, u) - b(t, x, \tilde{u})\| \leq C_{b, f} \|u - \tilde{u}\|$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and all $u, \tilde{u} \in U$,

and similarly for f .

- *The diffusion $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ satisfies $\sigma \in C_b^4([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times d})$.*
- *The terminal cost $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and constraints $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ are continuously differentiable and satisfy $\|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x)\| + \|\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(x)\| \leq C_{g, h}$ and $\|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x) - \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(\tilde{x})\| + \|\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(x) - \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(\tilde{x})\| \leq C_{g, h} \|x - \tilde{x}\|$ for all $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for a constant $C_{g, h} > 0$.*
- *The initial conditions x_0 satisfy $x_0 \in L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$.*
- *$B : \Omega \rightarrow C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a centered, continuous, \mathbb{R}^d -valued Gaussian process with independent components satisfying Assumption 2.1 for ρ , and the driving signal $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B}) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ is the enhanced Gaussian process in Theorem 2.10 associated to B that satisfies (2.23).*

These assumptions on (b, f) are reasonable, see for instance [15, 32, 33] that make similar assumptions. The boundedness assumption on b holds for control-affine drifts $b(t, x, u) = b_0(t, x) + b_1(t, x)u$ if (b_0, b_1) satisfy Assumption 3.3 and U is bounded, and similarly for f if it is quadratic in u and U is bounded. See also Remark 3.2 for technical considerations. Assuming boundedness is reasonable in applications, as dynamical systems are often constrained to operate in a bounded set of conditions representing physical constraints (i.e., $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ a compact set). The assumption $\sigma \in C_b^4$ is discussed in Remarks 2.1 and 3.1: It is stronger than assumptions used in standard PMPs using Itô calculus due to the use of rough path theory. As discussed in Sections 1 and 2, the class of enhanced Gaussian processes $\mathbf{B} = (B, \mathbb{B})$ from Theorem 2.10 is large (see the examples in [45]) and covers scenarios where B is not a semimartingale (e.g., with fractional Brownian motion) that cannot be tackled via Itô calculus. In particular, the Stratonovich lift of Brownian motion satisfies this assumption.

Proof sketch: We now prove Theorem 1.1 in the following steps:

- *Augmented state, needle-like variations, and end-point mapping:* We define an augmented state $\tilde{x} = (x, x^0)$ that contains the state x and its associated cost x^0 , the needle-like variations u^π around the optimal control u , and the end-point mapping F^q that evaluates variations of the expected terminal cost and constraints as the needle-like variation π changes.
- *Variational linearization and separation argument:* We argue by contradiction by evaluating the end-point mapping F^q around the optimal control u , and deduce the existence of the non-trivial Lagrange multiplier (p_0, \dots, p_r) using a hyperplane separation theorem based on Brouwer's fixed point theorem.
- *Adjoint RDE dynamics (1.3) and transversality condition (1.4):* We define the adjoint vector p as the solution to the random linear RDE (1.3), leveraging the backward representation of rough integrals in [27, Proposition 5.12] to ensure that the terminal value p_T satisfies the transversality condition (1.4).
- *Maximality condition (1.5):* We use a contradiction argument by combining the inequality from the previous hyperplane separation theorem with Itô's lemma to deduce the maximality condition (1.5).

The main differences with standard proofs of previous stochastic PMPs [8, 9, 15] are

- using random linear RDEs to evaluate the effect of needle-like variations (here, the integrability of our bounds using greedy partitions and the integrability properties of Gaussian rough paths is key),
- defining the adjoint vector using a random RDE instead of FBSDEs (switching between forward and backward integration is done via [27, Proposition 5.12], noting that rough path theory does not rely on non-anticipativity or martingale arguments), and
- deducing the maximality condition using a pathwise use of Itô's lemma to mimic the proof of the deterministic PMP (i.e., the chain rule of Itô's lemma gives us $\tilde{p}_t^\top \tilde{v}_t = \tilde{p}_T^\top \tilde{v}_T$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ almost surely (4.24) as in the deterministic setting, e.g., see [34, page 254] or [36, page 161]).

Preliminary step – Augmented state, needle-like variations, and end-point mapping. For any control $v \in L^\infty([0, T], U)$, consider the cost-augmented state $\tilde{x}_t = (x_t, x_t^0)$ and the random RDE

$$\tilde{x}_t = \tilde{x}_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{b}(s, \tilde{x}_s, v_s) ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}(s, \tilde{x}_s) d\mathbf{B}_s = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \int_0^t \begin{bmatrix} b(s, x_s, v_s) \\ f(s, x_s, v_s) \end{bmatrix} ds + \int_0^t \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(s, x_s) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.17)$$

which has a well-defined solution $\tilde{x}^v = (x^v, x^{0,v}) \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}))$ by Theorem 3.18 with almost surely $(\tilde{x}^v(\omega), (\tilde{x}^v(\omega))') \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. The first n components x^v of \tilde{x}^v is the state trajectory associated to the control v , and the last component $x^{0,v}$ of \tilde{x}^v is the accumulated cost over the trajectory (x^v, v) . Given the optimal control u that solves **OCP**, $\tilde{x} := \tilde{x}^u$ denotes the optimal cost-augmented state trajectory.

Next, we define the needle-like variations of the optimal control u as in Lemma 4.3. Given $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_q < T$ be Lebesgue points of b for u (Definition 4.1), $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q \in U$, $0 \leq \eta_i < t_{i+1} - t_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, q-1$ and $0 \leq \eta_q < T - t_q$, and define the needle-like variation $\pi = \{t_1, \dots, t_q, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q\}$ of u as the control u^π defined by

$$u_t^\pi = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_i & \text{if } t \in [t_i, t_i + \eta_i], \\ u_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{x}^\pi := \tilde{x}^{u^\pi}$ be the solution to the random RDE (4.17) associated to the control u^π . As shown in Lemma 4.3, the difference $x^\pi - x$ can be approximated using the pathwise solutions $\tilde{v}^{\pi_i} \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([t_i, T], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}))$ to the random linear RDEs

$$\tilde{v}_t^{\pi_i} = \tilde{b}(t_i, \tilde{x}_{t_i}, \bar{u}_i) - \tilde{b}(t_i, \tilde{x}_{t_i}, u_{t_i}) + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \tilde{x}_s, u_s) \tilde{v}_s^{\pi_i} ds + \int_{t_i}^t \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \tilde{x}_s) \tilde{v}_s^{\pi_i} d\mathbf{B}_s, \quad t \in [t_i, T], \quad (4.18)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, q$ and $(\tilde{v}^{\pi_i}(\omega), (\tilde{v}^{\pi_i}(\omega))') \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p$ almost surely. Next, we define the map

$$\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r+1}, \quad \tilde{x} = (x, x^0) \mapsto (h(x), x^0 + g(x)),$$

which evaluates the terminal constraint and total cost associated to **OCP** for an augmented state \tilde{x} . Also, with $\mathbb{R}_+^q = \{\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_q) \in \mathbb{R}^q : \eta_1 \geq 0, \dots, \eta_q \geq 0\}$, $\delta = \min\{t_{i+1} - t_i, T - t_q, i = 1, \dots, q\}$ and $B_\delta^q = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^q : \|\eta\| < \delta\}$, we define the end-point mapping $F^q : B_\delta^q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ by

$$F^q(\eta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_T^\pi) - \tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_T) \right] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E} [h(x_T^\pi) - h(x_T)] \\ \mathbb{E} [x_T^{\pi,0} + g(x_T^\pi) - (x_T^0 + g(x_T))] \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.19)$$

which satisfies $F^q(0) = 0$, and the linear map $dF_0^q : \mathbb{R}_+^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ by

$$dF_0^q(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_i} \right]. \quad (4.20)$$

The map dF_0^q is the Gateaux differential of F^q at 0 in the direction η :

$$\lim_{\alpha > 0, \alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{F^q(\alpha\eta)}{\alpha} = dF_0^q(\eta) \quad \text{for any } \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+^q. \quad (4.21)$$

Indeed, by Lemma 4.3 and Jensen's inequality, for a constant $C > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ small-enough,

$$\|F^q(\alpha\eta) - dF_0^q(\alpha\eta)\| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_T^\pi) - \tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{x}_T) - \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha \eta_i \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_i} \right\| \right] \stackrel{(4.16)}{\leq} C \sum_{i,j=1}^q \alpha^2 \eta_i \eta_j,$$

so (4.21) follows after dividing by α and taking the limit as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

Note also that multiple derivatives in $(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\Phi})$ are zero as they do not depend on x^0 , so

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(t, x, u)^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial x}(t, x, u) & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t, x, u) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(t, x)^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(x) & 0 \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x) & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.22)$$

Step 1) – Variational linearization and separation argument. The first step of the proof of **PMP** proceeds by contradiction, using the end-point mapping F^q and a Brouwer fixed point argument. We start by defining the closed convex cone

$$K = \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_i} \right] : \alpha_i \geq 0, \pi_i \text{ is a needle-like variation of } u(\cdot), q \in \mathbb{N} \right\}},$$

and note that $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$. Indeed, by contradiction, if $K = \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$, then $dF_0^q(\mathbb{R}_+^q) = K = \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$, so $0 \in \text{Int}(F^q(B_\delta^q \cap \mathbb{R}_+^q))$ by [35, Lemma 12.4] (whose proof relies on Brouwer's fixed point theorem). In particular, there exists another feasible trajectory (x^π, u^π) with a strictly lower cost $\mathbb{E}[x_T^{\pi,0} + g(x_T^\pi)] < \mathbb{E}[x_T^0 + g(x_T)]$, so (x, u) is not optimal, which is a contradiction.

Thus, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$. By the hyperplane separation theorem, there exists a non-zero vector $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_r, \mathbf{p}_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq 0$ and $\mathbf{p}^\top z \leq 0$ for all $z \in K$. By renormalizing \mathbf{p} , we may assume that $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \{0, -1\}$. The condition $\mathbf{p}^\top z \leq 0$ for all $z \in K$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{p}^\top \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_1} \right] \leq 0 \quad \text{for all needle-like variations } \pi_1 = (t_1, \eta_1, \tilde{u}_1) \text{ of } u. \quad (4.23)$$

Step 2) – Adjoint equation (1.3) and transversality condition (1.4). Define the reversed processes $(\overleftarrow{x}_t, \overleftarrow{u}_t, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{B}}_t) := (\tilde{x}_{T-t}, \overleftarrow{u}_{T-t}, \mathbf{B}_{T-t})$. Then, using Theorem 3.18 (with minor modifications, noting with [27, Proposition 5.12] that \overleftarrow{x} is the pathwise solution to an RDE driven by $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{B}}$, and since including a drift term in [27, Proposition 5.12] poses no difficulty as linear RDEs with drift can be rewritten as driftless linear RDEs along a new geometric rough path as in the proof of Theorem 3.7), we define the pathwise solution $\overleftarrow{p} \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}))$ to the random linear RDE

$$\overleftarrow{p}_t = \mathbf{p}^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \overleftarrow{x}_s, \overleftarrow{u}_s)^\top \overleftarrow{p}_s ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \overleftarrow{x}_s)^\top \overleftarrow{p}_s d\overleftarrow{\mathbf{B}}_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$




Figure 4.1: Separation hyperplane argument at the optimal trajectory (x, u) . The blue region is the reachable set $\{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{x}^v)], v \in L^\infty([0, T], U)\}$. The cone $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$, otherwise we would be able to find a feasible trajectory (x^v, v) with lower cost, so (x, u) would not be optimal.

where $(\overleftarrow{p}(\omega), \overleftarrow{p}'(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p$ almost surely. Next, we define the adjoint vector $\tilde{p} \in L^\ell(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ by $(\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{p}'_t) := (\overleftarrow{p}_{T-t}, \overleftarrow{p}'_{T-t})$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ almost surely. By [27, Proposition 5.12], the sample paths satisfy $(\tilde{p}(\omega), \tilde{p}'(\omega)) \in \mathcal{D}_{B(\omega)}^p$ almost surely and solve the linear RDE

$$\tilde{p}_t(\omega) = \tilde{p}_0(\omega) - \int_0^t \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \tilde{x}_s(\omega), u_s)^\top \tilde{p}_s(\omega) ds - \int_0^t \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(s, \tilde{x}_s(\omega))^\top \tilde{p}_s(\omega) d\mathbf{B}_s(\omega), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

with $\tilde{p}_0 = \overleftarrow{p}_T \in L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, which gives the adjoint equation (1.3), since multiple derivatives in $(\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma})$ are zero, see (4.22). Also, $\tilde{p}_T = \overleftarrow{p}_0 = \mathbf{p}^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T)$ gives the transversality condition (1.4)

$$\tilde{p}_T = \mathbf{p}^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \stackrel{(4.22)}{=} \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \mathbf{p}_i \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x}(x_T) + \mathbf{p}_0 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x_T), \mathbf{p}_0 \right) \text{ almost surely.}$$

Also $dp_t^0 = 0$ by (4.22), so $p_t^0 = \mathbf{p}_0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Step 3) – Maximality condition (1.5). We observe that $\tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1 \top} \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}^\top \tilde{p}_t = \sum_{j=1}^n [\tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}]_j \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \tilde{b}_i}{\partial \tilde{x}_j} [\tilde{p}_t]_i = \tilde{p}_t^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}} \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}$ and $\tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1 \top} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}^\top \tilde{p}_t = \sum_{i=1}^n [\tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}]_i \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_k}{\partial \tilde{x}_i} [\tilde{p}_t]_k = \tilde{p}_t^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}} \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}$, where $(\frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}, \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}) := (\frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(t, \tilde{x}_t, u_t), \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(t, \tilde{x}_t))$ for conciseness. Then, by Itô's lemma (Lemma 2.6), almost surely, for any $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\tilde{p}_t^\top \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1} = \tilde{p}_s^\top \tilde{v}_s^{\pi_1} + \int_s^t \tilde{v}_r^{\pi_1 \top} \left(-\frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}}^\top \tilde{p}_r dr - \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}}^\top \tilde{p}_r d\mathbf{B}_r \right) + \int_s^t \tilde{p}_r^\top \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{b}}{\partial \tilde{x}} \tilde{v}_r^{\pi_1} dr + \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}}{\partial \tilde{x}} \tilde{v}_r^{\pi_1} d\mathbf{B}_r \right) = \tilde{p}_s^\top \tilde{v}_s^{\pi_1}. \quad (4.24)$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_t^\top \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_T^\top \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_1}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}^\top \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}_T) \tilde{v}_T^{\pi_1}]$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, with $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_t^\top \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}] < \infty$ by Hölder's inequality since $\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{v}_t \in L^\ell(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with $\ell \geq 2$. We combine this result with (4.23) and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_t^\top \tilde{v}_t^{\pi_1}] \leq 0 \text{ for a.e. } t \in [0, T], \text{ for any needle-like variations } \pi_1 = (t_1, \eta_1, \bar{u}_1) \text{ of } u. \quad (4.25)$$

Finally, by contradiction, suppose that (1.5) does not hold. Then, there exists a control $u^1(\cdot)$ and a subset of $[0, T]$ of positive measure on which

$$\mathbb{E}[H(t, x_t, p_t, \mathbf{p}_0, u_t)] < \mathbb{E}[H(t, x_t, p_t, \mathbf{p}_0, u_t^1)].$$

Let t_1 be a Lebesgue point of this subset of $[0, T]$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_{t_1}^\top \tilde{b}(t_1, x_{t_1}, u_{t_1})] < \mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_{t_1}^\top \tilde{b}(t_1, x_{t_1}, \bar{u}_1)]$$

for some $\bar{u}_1 \in U$. Then, if we define the needle-like variation $\pi_1 = (t_1, 1, \bar{u}_1)$ with associated variation vector \tilde{v}^{π_1} , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_{t_1}^\top (\tilde{b}(t_1, x_{t_1}, \bar{u}_1) - \tilde{b}(t_1, x_{t_1}, u_{t_1}))] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{p}_{t_1}^\top \tilde{v}_{t_1}^{\pi_1}] > 0,$$

which contradicts (4.25). Thus, the maximality condition (1.5) holds, which concludes the proof of **PMP**.

5 Numerical example

As a brief application of **PMP**, we implement the indirect shooting method presented in the introduction (Section 1) for a regulation task. We consider the open-loop (OL) optimal control problem (OCP)

$$\begin{cases} \min_{u \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^m)} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{2} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) dt \right] \\ \text{such that} & x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t (A(x_s) x_s + \bar{B} u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s) \circ dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \end{cases} \quad (\mathbf{OL-OCP})$$

where $n = m = 3$, $A(x) = -J^{-1}S(x)J$ with $S(x) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -x_3 & x_2 \\ x_3 & 0 & -x_1 \\ -x_2 & x_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $J = \text{diag}(J_1, J_2, J_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{B} = J^{-1}$, $\sigma(x) = 0.4 \text{diag}(x)$, $R = \text{diag}(R_1, R_2, R_3) = 3I_{3 \times 3}$, $Q = 10I_{3 \times 3}$, $x_0 = \frac{\pi}{180}(-1, -4.5, 4.5)$, and B is a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion. This problem may represent a stabilization task for the angular velocity of a spacecraft with nonlinear rigid body dynamics. By composing all functions in **OL-OCP** with a smooth cut-off function, we may assume that Assumption 4.1 holds, so candidate optimal solutions are described by **PMP**:

$$\begin{cases} H(x, u, p, \mathbf{p}_0) = p^\top (A(x)x + \bar{B}u) - \frac{1}{2} (x^\top Q x + u^\top R u), \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = p^\top B - u^\top R \stackrel{(1.5)}{\implies} u_t = R^{-1} \bar{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[p_t], \\ p_T \stackrel{(1.4)}{=} 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{p}_0 = -1$ since there are no final state constraints.

Numerical resolution: We consider two algorithms that use $M \in \mathbb{N}$ independent samples B^i of B .

- **Direct method (Direct):** We search for the control $u \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^m)$ and the sample paths $(x^i)_{i=1}^M \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{Mn})$ that solve the sample average approximation

$$\min_u \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \int_0^T \frac{1}{2} (x_t(\omega^i)^\top Q x_t(\omega^i) + u_t^\top R u_t) dt \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x_t^i = x_0 + \int_0^t (A(x_s^i) x_s^i + \bar{B} u_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s^i) \circ dB_s^i.$$

Numerically, we discretize the problem with $(N+1) \in \mathbb{N}$ nodes by optimizing over $\hat{u} = (\hat{u}_0, \dots, \hat{u}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+1)m}$ and $(\hat{x}^i)_{i=1}^M = ((\hat{x}_0^i, \dots, \hat{x}_N^i))_{i=1}^M \in \mathbb{R}^{M(N+1)n}$ and discretizing the SDE with a Milstein scheme. We solve the resulting finite-dimensional optimization problem via sequential quadratic programming (SQP) [59, Chapter 18]. We do not enforce trust region constraints nor use a linesearch and thus always take full steps at each SQP iteration. We return a solution once the difference between SQP iterates $\Delta := (\Delta \hat{u}, (\Delta \hat{x}^i)_{i=1}^M)$ satisfies $\|\Delta\|_\infty < \epsilon$. This method is presented in [41, Section 6.2].

- **Indirect shooting method (Indirect):** We search for the initial adjoint values $(p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \in \mathbb{R}^{Mn}$ satisfying

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_T^1 \\ \vdots \\ p_T^M \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} x_t^i = x_0 + \int_0^t (A(x_s^i) x_s^i + \bar{B} u_s^i) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s^i) dB_s^i, \\ p_T^i = p_0^i - \int_0^T \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(x_t^i, u_t^i, p_t^i, \mathbf{p}_0) dt - \int_0^T \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(x_t^i)^\top p_t^i dB_t^i, \\ u_t^i = R^{-1} \bar{B}^\top \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M p_t^i \right) \text{ for a.e. } t \in [0, T], \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where the B^i 's are the Stratonovich lifts of the B^i 's. We define the map

$$F : \mathbb{R}^{Mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{Mn}, \quad (p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \mapsto (p_T^i)_{i=1}^M$$

that solves the coupled RDE in (5.1) and returns $(p_T^i)_{i=1}^M$. Numerically, we integrate the RDE in (5.1) using the estimate (2.10) for rough integrals, see the appendix for details. Then, starting from an initial guess $((0) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M$, we solve the equation $F((p_0^i)_{i=1}^M) = 0$ via Newton's method by iteratively defining

$$((\ell+1) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M = ((\ell) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M - \left(\nabla F \left(((\ell) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \right) \right)^{-1} F \left(((\ell) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \right) \quad \ell = 0, 1, \dots,$$

We return a solution $((\ell) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M$ once $\|F((\ell) p_0^i)_{i=1}^M\|_\infty < \epsilon$.




Figure 5.2: Solutions to the open-loop (**OL-OCP**, Top) and feedback (**FB-OCP**, Bottom) optimal control problems computed using the **Indirect** method. For **FB-OCP**, we plot the closed-loop control trajectories $u_t^i = K_t x_t^i$.




Figure 5.3: **Left:** Median computation time for the **Direct** and **Indirect** methods. **Right:** Median cost with \pm one median absolute deviation intervals of the solution returned by the **Indirect** method for different sample sizes for $N = 40$, evaluated using 10^4 Monte Carlo samples.

The two methods are implemented in Python using **JAX** [60]. The quadratic programs at each SQP iteration of **Direct** are solved using **OSQP** [61]. The tolerance threshold is set to $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$. We use zero initial guesses for both methods. Computation times are measured on a laptop with an 1.10GHz Intel Core i7-10710U CPU. We checked that solutions returned by the **Direct** and **Indirect** methods are close to each other.

Results: A solution to **OL-OCP** is reported in Figure 5.2. The state and control trajectories converge to zero over time (in average for the state trajectories). The adjoint vector trajectories p^i start from different initial conditions p_0^i and are all zero at the final time ($p_T^i = 0$) to satisfy the transversality condition of **PMP**.

We report median results over 20 runs of each method in Figure 5.3. The proposed **Indirect** method is about $10\times$ faster than the **Direct** method. Also, the costs associated to the solutions to the sampled problems decrease as the sample size M increases. Solutions are sensitive to the sample size, and computing low-cost solutions with high certainty over the sampling procedure is achievable with a reasonable sample size ($M = 10$) for this problem.

Discussion: First, results in Figure 5.3 (right) suggest that the proposed method may be asymptotically optimal, since the cost and its variance decrease as the sample size M increases. Proving such asymptotic optimality properties of the method for certain classes of problems is of interest for future work. Second, the **Indirect** method is significantly faster than the **Direct** method, thanks to leveraging the structure of the problem encoded in **PMP** to optimize over only the Mn variables p_0^i for the **Indirect** method versus optimizing over the $M(N+1)n + (N+1)m$ variables (\hat{x}^i, \hat{u}^i) for the **Direct** method. However, indirect methods typically have higher numerical sensitivity to the choice of initial guess. This tradeoff is well-known in the deterministic optimal control literature, motivating the development of multiple shooting and homotopy methods for stochastic optimal control.

Feedback optimization: Next, we consider the feedback (FB) optimal control problem (OCP)

$$\begin{cases} \min_{k \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^m)} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{2} (x_t^\top Q x_t + x_t^\top K_t^\top R K_t x_t) dt \right] \\ \text{such that} & x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t (A(x_s) + \bar{B} K_s) x_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s) \circ dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \end{cases} \quad (\text{FB-OCP})$$

where we optimize over the diagonal feedback gain $K_t = \text{diag}(k_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. The problem **FB-OCP** derives from **OL-OCP** by considering the feedback control $u = Kx$ and optimizing over the gains K . Since the gains k are deterministic, the resulting feedback control law $u = Kx$ is causal and this formulation fits within our framework. Candidate optimal solutions are described by **PMP**:

$$\text{FB-OCP} : \begin{cases} H(x, k, p, \mathbf{p}_0) = p^\top (A(x) + \bar{B} K) x - \frac{1}{2} (x^\top Q x + x^\top K^\top R K x), \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial k} = (1/J_j) p_j x_j - k_j R_j x_j^2 \stackrel{(1.5)}{\implies} k_{j,t} = (J_j R_j)^{-1} \mathbb{E} [p_{j,t} x_{j,t}] / \mathbb{E} [(x_{j,t})^2], \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \\ p_T \stackrel{(1.4)}{=} 0. \end{cases}$$

Using these necessary conditions, we implement the **Indirect** shooting method presented previously and solve **OL-OCP** and **FB-OCP** for $(T, M, N, R) = (2, 10, 40, 3I_{n \times n})$ starting from a zero initial guess $({}^{(0)}p_0^i)_{i=1}^M$. We find that solving **FB-OCP** is numerically sensitive to the choice of initial guess. Thus, using a homotopy method, we solve **FB-OCP** for $R_j \in \{100, 99.9, \dots, 3\}$, using the solution $({}^{(0)}p_0^i)_{i=1}^M$ computed for the previous value of R as an initial guess for each solve via Newton's method.

Results in Figure 5.2 show that state trajectories solving **FB-OCP** have slightly lower variance than those solving **OL-OCP**, which is the result of optimizing over a state feedback control trajectory.

6 Conclusion and outlook

The optimality conditions in **PMP** provide new insights onto the structure of solutions to stochastic optimal control problems when optimizing over deterministic open-loop controls or parameterized feedback controls. By leveraging rough path theory, our optimality conditions rely on a pathwise analysis instead of FBSDEs, and can handle Gaussian processes B that are not semimartingales that cannot be tackled via Itô calculus, at the expense of stronger regularity assumptions on the diffusion σ . The main motivation for deriving **PMP** is the development of new algorithms for stochastic optimal control that can more easily borrow ideas from the deterministic optimal control literature, such as indirect shooting methods.

The following directions of future research are interesting. First, extending our results to the case where the diffusion σ depends on the control is non-trivial, as it may lead to a degenerate formulation with irregular controls as described in [32, 33], and rough path theory relies on coefficients that are smooth-enough in time. Second, extending **PMP** to tackle more general settings such as risk-averse optimal control problems [4, 10] would provide valuable insights and be useful in applications. Finally, while the proposed indirect shooting method works well on the example in Section 5, proving theoretical properties for the method such as asymptotic optimality [39–42] or robustness to discretization [62] remains an open problem. As the unknown initial value of the adjoint vector p_0 is a random variable (i.e., the search space is infinite-dimensional, as opposed to the deterministic setting where $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$), future analysis of the proposed indirect method may require innovative proof techniques and inspire faster and more robust algorithms.

Acknowledgements

T.L. would like to thank Riccardo Bonalli for many stimulating discussions on the deterministic and stochastic PMPs and his helpful feedback.

A Additional proofs

Contents

A.1 Preliminary remarks	30
A.2 Proofs of preliminary results (Section 2)	30
A.3 Proofs of rough differential equation results (Section 3)	34
A.4 Additional proofs for the PMP (Section 4)	50
A.5 Additional details for the indirect shooting method (Section 5)	51

A.1 Preliminary remarks

This appendix contains additional proofs for results in the main manuscript. Throughout, we use the inequalities $(|a_1| + |a_2|)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq |a_1|^{\frac{1}{p}} + |a_2|^{\frac{1}{p}}$ and $|\sum_{i=1}^N a_i|^p \leq N^p \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i|^p$ for any $p \geq 1$, $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

A.2 Proofs of preliminary results (Section 2)

A.2.1 Rough paths, controlled rough paths, and rough integration (Section 2.1)

Proof of Lemma 2.2

Proof of Lemma 2.2. To show (2.1), we write

$$\|X\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t\| \leq \|X_0\| + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t - X_0\| \leq \|X_0\| + \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|X_t - X_0\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|X_0\| + \|X\|_p.$$

To show (2.3), given an arbitrary partition π of $[0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|X_{s, t}\|^{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_{s, t}^i\| \|\tilde{Y}_{s, t}^i\| + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z_{s, t}^j\| + c|t - s| \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq (n + m + 1)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|Y_{s, t}^i\|^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\tilde{Y}_{s, t}^i\|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|Z_{s, t}^j\|^{\frac{p}{2}} + c^{\frac{p}{2}} \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} |t - s|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|Y_{s, t}^i\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|\tilde{Y}_{s, t}^i\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|^{\frac{p}{2}} + (cT)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Y^i\|_p^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\tilde{Y}^i\|_p^{\frac{p}{2}} + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}} + (cT)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\sum_{i=1}^N a_i|^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq N^{\frac{p}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i|^{\frac{p}{2}}$ and Hölder's inequality $\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i b_i| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} (\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^n (|a_i|^{\frac{p}{2}} |b_i|^{\frac{p}{2}}) \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^p)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The bound above is independent of the choice of partition π . Thus, (2.3) follows after taking the supremum over all partitions π of $[0, T]$ and using the inequality $(\sum_i |a_i|)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq \sum_i |a_i|^{\frac{2}{p}}$ for $p \geq 2$. (2.2) is shown similarly.

To show $\|X\|_p \leq \|X\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$, we write $\|X\|_p^p = \sup_{\pi} \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} (\|X_{s, t}\|^{\frac{p}{2}})^2 \leq (\sup_{\pi} \sum_{[s, t] \in \pi} \|X_{s, t}\|^{\frac{p}{2}})^2 = \|X\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^p$ since $\sum_i a_i^2 \leq (\sum_i a_i)^2$ for $a_i \geq 0$.

To show (2.4), we use the smoothness of σ :

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, X)_{s, t}\| \leq \|\sigma(t, X_t) - \sigma(t, X_s)\| + \|\sigma(t, X_s) - \sigma(s, X_s)\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|X_{s, t}\| + |t - s|) \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T], \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and conclude with (2.2).

To show (2.5), for any $s, t \in [0, T]$, we write

$$\|(\sigma(\cdot, X) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{X}))_{s,t}\| \leq \|(\sigma(t, X) - \sigma(t, \tilde{X}))_{s,t}\| + \|(\sigma(\cdot, X_s) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{X}_s))_{s,t}\|. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We bound the first term in (A.2) next. Denoting $\Delta X = X - \tilde{X}$ and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, \tilde{X}_t + \theta \Delta X_t) = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s) + \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(t, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s + \zeta(\tilde{X}_{s,t} + \theta \Delta X_{s,t})) d\zeta((1-\theta)\tilde{X}_{s,t} + \theta X_{s,t})$$

so that by denoting $Z_{\theta, \zeta} = \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s + \zeta(\tilde{X}_{s,t} + \theta \Delta X_{s,t})$ and using the mean value theorem again,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(t, X)_{s,t} - \sigma(t, \tilde{X})_{s,t}\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla \sigma(t, \tilde{X}_t + \theta \Delta X_t) d\theta \Delta X_t - \int_0^1 \nabla \sigma(t, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s) d\theta \Delta X_s \right\| \\ &= \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla \sigma(t, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s) d\theta (\Delta X_t - \Delta X_s) + \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \nabla^2 \sigma(t, Z_{\theta, \zeta}) d\zeta ((1-\theta)\tilde{X}_{s,t} + \theta X_{s,t}) d\theta \Delta X_t \right\| \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} \left(\|\Delta X_{s,t}\| + (\|X_{s,t}\| + \|\tilde{X}_{s,t}\|) \|\Delta X\|_\infty \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second term in (A.2) is bounded similarly:

$$\|(\sigma(\cdot, X_s) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{X}_s))_{s,t}\| = \left\| \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(t, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s) - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, \tilde{X}_s + \theta \Delta X_s) \right) d\theta \Delta X_s \right\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} |t - s| \|\Delta X\|_\infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus, (A.2) can be bounded as

$$\|(\sigma(\cdot, X) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{X}))_{s,t}\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|\Delta X_{s,t}\| + (\|X_{s,t}\| + \|\tilde{X}_{s,t}\| + |t - s|) \|\Delta X\|_\infty). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The conclusion follows from (2.2) and $\|\Delta X\|_\infty \leq \|\Delta X_0\| + \|\Delta X\|_p$ in (2.1). \square

Proof of Lemma 2.5

Proof of Lemma 2.5. To show (2.12) and (2.13), we write

$$\|Y_{s,t}\| \stackrel{(2.8)}{\leq} \|Y'_s\| \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| \leq \|Y'\|_\infty \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} (\|Y'_0\| + \|Y'\|_p) \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\|$$

for any $s, t \in [0, T]$. Then, (2.12) and (2.13) follow from (2.2) and $\|R^Y\|_p \leq \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$ in Lemma 2.2.

To show (2.14), for any $s, t \in [0, T]$, we write

$$\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)_{s,t}\| \stackrel{(A.1), (2.8)}{\leq} \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|Y'_s\| \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| + |t - s|) \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (M_{Y'} \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| + |t - s|^{\frac{2}{p}}),$$

where we used $\|Y'\|_\infty \leq \|Y'_0\| + \|Y'\|_p = M_{Y'}$ in the second inequality. Then, (2.14) follows from (2.2).

To show (2.15), denoting $\nabla_x \sigma = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}$, for any $s, t \in [0, T]$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'_{s,t}\| &= \|\nabla_x \sigma(t, Y_t) Y'_t - \nabla_x \sigma(t, Y_t) Y'_s + \nabla_x \sigma(t, Y_t) Y'_s - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_t) Y'_s + \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_t) Y'_s - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s) Y'_s\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla_x \sigma(t, Y_t)\| \|Y'_t - Y'_s\| + \|\nabla_x \sigma(t, Y_t) - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_t)\| \|Y'_s\| + \|\nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_t) - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s)\| \|Y'_s\| \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y'_{s,t}\| + (|t - s| + \|Y_{s,t}\|) \|Y'_s\|) \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y'_{s,t}\| + (|t - s| + M_{Y'} \|X_{s,t}\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\|) M_{Y'}), \\ \implies \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'_{s,t}\|_p &\stackrel{(2.2)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y'\|_p + M_{Y'} (T + M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}})) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} M_{Y'} (1 + T + M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} K_Y (1 + K_Y + T) (1 + \|X\|_p). \end{aligned} \quad (K_Y = M_{Y'} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}})$$

To show (2.16) and (2.17), for any $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_{s,t}^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\| &\stackrel{(2.8)}{=} \|\sigma(s, Y_t) - \sigma(s, Y_s) - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s) Y_s' X_{s,t} + \sigma(t, Y_t) - \sigma(s, Y_t)\| \\
&\stackrel{(2.8)}{=} \|\sigma(s, Y_t) - \sigma(s, Y_s) - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s) Y_{s,t} - \nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s) R_{s,t}^Y + \sigma(t, Y_t) - \sigma(s, Y_t)\| \\
&\leq \left\| \int_0^1 \nabla_x^2 \sigma(s, Y_s + \theta Y_{s,t}) Y_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} (1 - \theta) d\theta \right\| + \|\nabla_x \sigma(s, Y_s) R_{s,t}^Y\| + \|\sigma(t, Y_t) - \sigma(s, Y_t)\| \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y_{s,t}\|^2 + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| + |t - s|), \\
\implies \|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\stackrel{(2.3)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y\|_p^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + T) \\
&\stackrel{(2.13)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} ((1 + \|X\|_p)^2 K_Y^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + T) \\
&\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (K_Y (K_Y (1 + \|X\|_p)^2 + 1)) + T \leq (2.17).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from the last three inequalities, $(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, Y)') \in \mathcal{C}^p \times \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} < \infty$, so we conclude that $(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, Y)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.6

Proof of Lemma 2.6. This result is a particular case of [27, Theorem 7.7], assuming that the rough path \mathbf{X} is geometric, so that its bracket is zero. The proof below is standard. We may assume that $f \in C_b^3$ since it is only evaluated on the image of the path Y which is bounded.

First, the rough integral in (2.18) is well-defined, since $(\nabla f(Y)Y', (\nabla f(Y)Y')') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ with $(\nabla f(Y)Y')' = (\nabla f(Y)Y'' + \nabla f^2(Y)(Y' \otimes Y'))$ by Lemma 3.1 (note that Lemma 2.6 is not used in the proof of Lemma 3.1). The Young integral in (2.18) is also well-defined since $\nabla f(Y) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ so that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} > 1$ (see for example [26, Theorem 6.8] or [28, Proposition 5.2]).

Next, we show (2.18). Let $s, t \in [0, T]$. Then,

$$Y_{s,t} \stackrel{(2.10)}{=} Y_s' X_{s,t} + Y_s'' \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + \Gamma_{s,t} + K_{s,t}, \text{ with } \|K_{s,t}\| \leq C_p (\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} \|X\|_{p, [s,t]} + \|Y'\|_{p, [s,t]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}),$$

and by the mean value theorem, with $Z_{s,t} := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \nabla^3 f(Y_s + \theta Y_{s,t}) Y_{s,t}^{\otimes 3} (1 - \theta)^2 d\theta$,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(Y)_{s,t} &= \nabla f(Y_s) Y_{s,t} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) Y_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} + Z_{s,t} \\
&= \nabla f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} + Y_s'' \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + \Gamma_{s,t}) + \nabla f(Y_s) K_{s,t} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y)^{\otimes 2} + Z_{s,t} \\
&= \nabla f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} + Y_s'' \mathbb{X}_{s,t}) + \nabla f(Y_s) \Gamma_{s,t} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' \otimes Y_s') (X_{s,t} \otimes X_{s,t}) + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} \otimes R_{s,t}^Y + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes Y_s' X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes R_{s,t}^Y) + \nabla f(Y_s) K_{s,t} + Z_{s,t},
\end{aligned}$$

Next, define $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t})$ as the symmetric part of $\mathbb{X}_{s,t}$, with $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t})^{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ji})$. Since \mathbf{X} is geometric, $X_{s,t}^{ij} X_{s,t}^{ji} = \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ji} = 2\text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t})^{ij}$, so $\frac{1}{2} (X_{s,t} \otimes X_{s,t}) = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t})$. Also, $\nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' \otimes Y_s')$ is symmetric, so $\nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' \otimes Y_s') \mathbb{X}_{s,t} = \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' \otimes Y_s') \text{Sym}(\mathbb{X}_{s,t})$, since “the contraction of a symmetric matrix with an antisymmetric matrix is zero” [28, Proof of Proposition 6.9]. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(Y)_{s,t} &= \nabla f(Y_s) Y_s' X_{s,t} + (\nabla f(Y_s) Y_s'' + \nabla f^2(Y_s) (Y_s' \otimes Y_s')) \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + \nabla f(Y_s) \Gamma_{s,t} + \\
&\quad \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} \otimes R_{s,t}^Y + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes Y_s' X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes R_{s,t}^Y) + \nabla f(Y_s) K_{s,t} + Z_{s,t} \\
&= (\nabla f(Y) Y')_s X_{s,t} + (\nabla f(Y) Y')'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + \nabla f(Y_s) \Gamma_{s,t} + W_{s,t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $W_{s,t} := \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 f(Y_s) (Y_s' X_{s,t} \otimes R_{s,t}^Y + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes Y_s' X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y \otimes R_{s,t}^Y) + \nabla f(Y_s) K_{s,t} + Z_{s,t}$ can be bounded as

$$\|W_{s,t}\| \leq C_{p,f, \|Y\|_\infty, \|Y'\|_\infty} \left(\|X\|_{p, [s,t]} \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}^2 + \|Y'\|_{p, [s,t]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} + \|Y\|_{p, [s,t]}^3 \right),$$

Since X, Y, Y' have finite p -variation and \mathbb{X}, R^Y have finite $\frac{p}{2}$ -variation, up to a time reparameterization, we may assume that X, Y, Y' are $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder continuous and \mathbb{X}, R^Y are $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous [26, Proposition 5.14], so that

$$\|W_{s,t}\| \leq C_{p,f,X,\mathbf{X},Y,Y',R^Y} |t-s|^{\frac{3}{p}}.$$

Thus, for an arbitrary partition π of $[0, T]$, we obtain

$$f(Y_T) - f(Y_0) = \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} (\nabla f(Y)Y')_s X_{s,t} + (\nabla f(Y)Y')'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \nabla f(Y_s) \Gamma_{s,t} + \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} W_{s,t}.$$

The conclusion follows after taking the limit over all partitions π of $[0, T]$ with vanishing mesh size in the above: The first sum is a rough integral, the second is a Young integral, which is well-defined by [26, Theorem 6.8], since $\nabla f(Y) \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ so that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} > 1$, and the third is zero, since

$$\sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \|W_{s,t}\| \leq C_{p,f,X,\mathbf{X},Y,Y',R^Y} \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} |t-s|^{\frac{p}{2}} |\pi|^{\frac{3-p}{p}} = C_{p,f,X,\mathbf{X},Y,Y',R^Y} T |\pi|^{\frac{3-p}{p}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |\pi| \rightarrow 0,$$

so that $\lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} W_{s,t} = 0$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2.6. \square

A.2.2 The greedy partition and Gaussian rough paths (Section 2.2)

Proofs of Lemma 2.7 and of Lemma 2.8

Proof of Lemma 2.7. The proof follows [37, Lemma 4.9]. Consider the greedy partition $\{\tau_i\}_{i=0}^{N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w)+1}$ of the interval $[0, T]$. Since w is a control, $w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) + w(\tau_{i+1}, \tau_{i+2}) \leq w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+2})$, so

$$\alpha N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w) = \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w)-1} w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq w(0, \tau_{N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w)}) \leq w(0, T),$$

and the conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.8. The proof is inspired from the proof of [38, Lemma 3]. First, we define the accumulated α -local w -variations [37, Definition 4.1]

$$w_\alpha(s, t) = \sup_{\substack{\pi = \{t_i\} \subset [s,t] \\ w(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} w(t_i, t_{i+1}), \quad w_{j,\alpha}(s, t) = \sup_{\substack{\pi = \{t_i\} \subset [s,t] \\ w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where the supremums are over all partitions $\pi = \{s = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = t\}$ of $[s, t]$ such that $w(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$ (or $w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$, respectively) for all $i = 0, \dots, N-1$. We have

$$\frac{w_\alpha(s, t)}{C} \leq \sup_{\substack{\pi = \{t_i\} \subset [s,t] \\ w(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{\substack{\pi = \{t_i\} \subset [s,t] \\ w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{j,\alpha}(s, t).$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $w_j(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$ for all j if $w(t_i, t_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$. Then,

$$\alpha N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w) = \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w)-1} w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq w_\alpha(s, t) \leq C \sum_{j=1}^n w_{j,\alpha}(s, t).$$

Finally, from [37, Proposition 4.11] (see also the proof of [38, Lemma 3]), $w_{j,\alpha}(s, t) \leq \alpha(2N_{\alpha,[s,t]}(w_j) + 1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and the conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.9

Proof of Corollary 2.9. First, w is continuous, $w(t, t) = 0$, and $w(s, t) + w(t, u) \leq w(s, u)$ for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq u \leq T$, so w is a control. Second, consider the control w_T defined by $w_T(s, t) = |t - s|$, so that $w(s, t) = C_p(w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) + w_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s, t) + w_T(s, t))$. Any interval $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ can be partitioned into intervals of size at most α , so $N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w_T) \leq 1 + |t - s|/\alpha$. The inequality (2.20) then follows from (2.19) in Lemma 2.8.

To show (2.21), let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ be an interval small-enough to satisfy $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$, so that

$$\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) \leq w(s, t) \leq \alpha \leq 1, \quad |t - s| \leq w(s, t) \leq \alpha \leq 1.$$

Then, $|t - s|^p \leq |t - s|$ and $\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^p \leq \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}}$, so that

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [s, t]}^p = (\|X\|_{p, [s, t]} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}})^p \leq 2^p (\|X\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^p) \leq 2^p (\|X\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}}) = 2^p w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Thus,

$$(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [s, t]} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p, [s, t]} + |t - s|)^p \leq 3^p (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + |t - s|^p) \leq 6^p (w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) + w_{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}}(s, t) + |t - s|) = w(s, t),$$

and (2.21) follows with $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$.

To show (2.22), consider the greedy partition $\{\tau_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) + 1\}$, which is such that (2.21) holds on any subinterval $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$ of this partition since $w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$, so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$, $\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$, and $|\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i| \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, with $N := N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [s, t]} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p, [s, t]} + |t - s| &\leq (N + 1) \left(\left(\sum_{i=0}^N \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{i=0}^N \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^N |\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i| \\ &\leq (N + 1) ((N + 1)\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}} + (N + 1)\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}) + (N + 1)\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 3\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}(N + 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $p \geq 1$ in the second inequality. Thus, using $3\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}(N + 1)^2 \leq 3\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}2! \exp(N + 1) \leq 6e\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}} \exp(N)$, we conclude that (2.22) holds with $C_{p, \alpha} = 6e\alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.10

Proof of Theorem 2.10. The first claim follows from [26, Theorem 15.33] (or [27, Theorem 10.4], see also [45, Corollary 2.3]). Then, following the proof of [46, Theorem 11], for $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2p} + \frac{1}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$, by [38, Lemma 5 and Corollary 2], for a constant $C > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}) \geq r) \leq \exp(-C\alpha^{\frac{2}{p}} r^{\frac{2}{q}})$ for every $r > 0$. Thus, for $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\exp(DN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}))] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\exp(DN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \geq s) ds \\ &\leq R + \int_R^\infty \mathbb{P}(\exp(DN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B})) \geq s) ds \\ &= R + \int_{\frac{\log(R)}{D}}^\infty \mathbb{P}(N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{B}) \geq r) D \exp(Dr) dr \quad (r = \log(s)/D) \\ &\leq R + D \int_{\frac{\log(R)}{D}}^\infty \exp\left(-C\alpha^{\frac{2}{p}} r^{\frac{2}{q}} + Dr\right) dr, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded since $\frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{2}$. \square

A.3 Proofs of rough differential equation results (Section 3)

A.3.1 Calculus with rough paths: controlled rough paths and rough integration (Section 3.1)

Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The first inequality (3.3) follows from $\|(YZ)_{s, t}\| \leq \|Y_s Z_{s, t}\| + \|Z_s Y_{s, t}\| \leq \|Y\|_\infty \|Z_{s, t}\| + \|Z\|_\infty \|Y_{s, t}\|$ and (2.2) in Lemma 2.2. The second inequality (3.4) follows similarly from

$$\|(YZ)'_{s, t}\| \leq \|(ZY)'_{s, t}\| + \|(YZ)'_{s, t}\| \leq \|Z\|_\infty \|Y'_{s, t}\| + \|Y'\|_\infty \|Z_{s, t}\| + \|Y\|_\infty \|Z'_{s, t}\| + \|Z'\|_\infty \|Y_{s, t}\|$$

and (2.2) in Lemma 2.2. To show the third inequality (3.5), we write

$$\begin{aligned} R_{s,t}^{YZ} &= (YZ)_{s,t} - (YZ)'_s X_{s,t} = Y_t Z_t - Y_s Z_s - (Y_s Z'_s + Z_s Y'_s) X_{s,t} \\ &= Y_s Z_{s,t} + Y_{s,t} Z_s + Y_{s,t} Z_{s,t} - (Y_s Z'_s + Z_s Y'_s) X_{s,t} \\ &= Y_s R_{s,t}^Z + R_{s,t}^Y Z_s + Y_{s,t} Z_{s,t} \end{aligned}$$

so that $\|R_{s,t}^{YZ}\| \leq \|Y\|_\infty \|R_{s,t}^Z\| + \|R_{s,t}^Y\| \|Z\|_\infty + \|Y_{s,t}\| \|Z_{s,t}\|$, and we conclude with (2.3) in Lemma 2.2. Thus, $(YZ, (YZ)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ with $(YZ)' = Y'Z + YZ'$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Throughout the proof, we write $\nabla\sigma := \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}$ and $\nabla^2\sigma := \frac{\partial^2\sigma}{\partial x^2}$ for conciseness.

To show (3.6), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y_{s,t}\| &= \|Y'_s X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y - \tilde{Y}'_s \tilde{X}_{s,t} - R_{s,t}^{\tilde{Y}}\| && (Y_{s,t} = Y'_s X_{s,t} + R_{s,t}^Y) \\ &\leq \|\Delta Y'\|_\infty \|X_{s,t}\| + \|\tilde{Y}'\|_\infty \|\Delta X_{s,t}\| + \|\Delta R_{s,t}\| \\ &\leq \Delta M_{Y'} \|X_{s,t}\| + M_{\tilde{Y}'} \|\Delta X_{s,t}\| + \|\Delta R_{s,t}\|, && (\|\tilde{Y}'\|_\infty \leq \|\tilde{Y}'_0\| + \|\tilde{Y}'\|_p = M_{\tilde{Y}'}) \end{aligned}$$

so (3.6) follows from applying (2.2) in Lemma 2.2.

To show (3.7), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})')_{s,t}\| &= \|(\nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y)Y' - \nabla\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\tilde{Y}')_{s,t}\| \\ &\leq \|(\nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y)\Delta Y')_{s,t}\| + \|((\nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \nabla\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}))\tilde{Y}')_{s,t}\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla\sigma(t, Y_t)\Delta Y'_{s,t}\| + \|\nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y)_{s,t}\Delta Y'_{s,t}\| + \|(\nabla\sigma(t, Y_t) - \nabla\sigma(t, \tilde{Y}_t))\tilde{Y}'_{s,t}\| + \|(\nabla\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \nabla\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}))_{s,t}\tilde{Y}'_{s,t}\| \\ &\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} \|\Delta Y'_{s,t}\| + (\|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} \|Y_{s,t}\| + |t-s|) \|\Delta Y'\|_\infty + \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|\tilde{Y}'_{s,t}\| + \\ &\quad + \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (\|\Delta Y_{s,t}\| + (\|Y_{s,t}\| + \|\tilde{Y}_{s,t}\| + |t-s|) \|\Delta Y\|_\infty) \|\tilde{Y}'\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used (A.1) to bound the second term and (A.4) to bound the fourth term. Thus, by (2.2) in Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'\|_p &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|Y\|_p \|\Delta Y'\|_\infty + \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|\tilde{Y}'\|_p \\ &\quad + (\|\Delta Y\|_p + (\|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p) \|\Delta Y\|_\infty) \|\tilde{Y}'\|_\infty + T(\|\Delta Y'\|_\infty + \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|\tilde{Y}'\|_\infty)) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + \|\tilde{Y}'_0\| + \|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}'\|_p)^2 (1 + T) (\|\Delta Y\|_p + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\|), \end{aligned}$$

using $\|\Delta Y\|_\infty \leq \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y\|_p$ by (2.1) in the last inequality. Next, by (3.6), $\|\Delta Y\|_p \leq C_p (\Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + M_{\tilde{Y}'} \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \leq C_p (1 + M_{\tilde{Y}'}) (1 + \|X\|_p) (\Delta M_{Y'} + \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}})$ with $\Delta M_{Y'} = \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'\|_p &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + \|\tilde{Y}'_0\| + \|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}'\|_p)^2 (1 + M_{\tilde{Y}'}) (1 + \|X\|_p) (1 + T) (\| \Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.13), $\|Y\|_p \leq C_p (1 + \|X\|_p) K_Y$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'\|_p &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'})^2 (1 + M_{\tilde{Y}'}) (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T) (\| \Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p), \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain (3.7).

To show (3.8), we first decompose $\|R_{s,t}^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R_{s,t}^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}\|$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_{s,t}^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R_{s,t}^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}\| &= \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)_{s,t} - \nabla\sigma(s, Y_s)Y'_s X_{s,t} - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})_{s,t} + \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)\tilde{Y}'_s \tilde{X}_{s,t}\| \\
&\leq \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)_{s,t} - \nabla\sigma(s, Y_s)Y_{s,t} - (\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})_{s,t} - \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)\tilde{Y}_{s,t})\| + \|\nabla\sigma(s, Y_s)R_{s,t}^Y - \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)R_{s,t}^{\tilde{Y}}\| \\
&\leq \|\sigma(s, Y)_{s,t} - \nabla\sigma(s, Y_s)Y_{s,t} - (\sigma(s, \tilde{Y})_{s,t} - \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)\tilde{Y}_{s,t})\| + \|\nabla\sigma(s, Y_s)R_{s,t}^Y - \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)R_{s,t}^{\tilde{Y}}\| + \\
&\quad \|(\sigma(\cdot, Y_t) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y}_t))_{s,t}\| \\
&=: \|A_{s,t}\| + \|B_{s,t}\| + \|C_{s,t}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the three terms. First, denoting $\nabla^2\sigma(y) = \nabla^2\sigma(s, y)$ and $Y_{s,t}^\theta = \tilde{Y}_s + \theta\tilde{Y}_{s,t}$ for conciseness,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_{s,t}\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 \left(\nabla^2\sigma(Y_s + \theta Y_{s,t})Y_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} - \nabla^2\sigma(\tilde{Y}_s + \theta\tilde{Y}_{s,t})\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} \right) (1-\theta) d\theta \right\| \\
&= \left\| \int_0^1 \left(\nabla^2\sigma(Y_{s,t}^\theta)(Y_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} - \tilde{Y}_{s,t}^{\otimes 2}) + (\nabla^2\sigma(Y_{s,t}^\theta) - \nabla^2\sigma(\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^\theta))\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} \right) (1-\theta) d\theta \right\| \\
&= \left\| \int_0^1 \left(\nabla^2\sigma(Y_{s,t}^\theta)(Y_{s,t} \otimes \Delta Y_{s,t} - \Delta Y_{s,t} \otimes \tilde{Y}_{s,t}) + (\nabla^2\sigma(Y_{s,t}^\theta) - \nabla^2\sigma(\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^\theta))\tilde{Y}_{s,t}^{\otimes 2} \right) (1-\theta) d\theta \right\| \\
&\leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (\|Y_{s,t}\| + \|\tilde{Y}_{s,t}\|) \|\Delta Y_{s,t}\| + \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|\tilde{Y}_{s,t}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Second,

$$\|B_{s,t}\| = \|(\nabla\sigma(s, Y_s) - \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s))R_{s,t}^Y + \nabla\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s)(R_{s,t}^Y - R_{s,t}^{\tilde{Y}})\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (\|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|R_{s,t}^Y\| + \|\Delta R_{s,t}^Y\|).$$

Third, by (A.3), $\|C_{s,t}\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} |t-s| \|\Delta Y\|_\infty$. Thus, by (2.3) in Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq C_p (\|A\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|B\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|C\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\
&\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} \left((\|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p) \|\Delta Y\|_p + \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \|\tilde{Y}\|_p^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \|\Delta Y\|_\infty + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + T \|\Delta Y\|_\infty \right) \\
&\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} \left(\|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + 1 + T \right) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\
&\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}} + 1)^2 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^2 (1 + T) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|Y\|_p \leq C_p(1 + \|X\|_p)K_Y$ from (2.13) in the last inequality. Combining this inequality with

$$\|\Delta Y\|_p \stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} C_p (\Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + M_{\tilde{Y}'}, \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \leq C_p (1 + K_{\tilde{Y}}) (\Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}),$$

we obtain the desired inequality (3.8). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof of Lemma 3.3. First, by Lemma 2.5, $(\sigma(\cdot, Y), \sigma(\cdot, Y)') = (\sigma(\cdot, Y), \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)Y')$ is a controlled path, so by Proposition 2.3, the rough integral $\int_s^t \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r$ is well-defined. Thus, for any $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| (R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r})_{s,t} \right\| &= \left\| \int_s^t \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r - \sigma(s, Y_s) X_{s,t} \right\| \\
&\stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} C_p (\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_{p, [s,t]} \|X\|_{p, [s,t]} + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_{p, [s,t]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}) \\
&\leq C_p (\|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} \|Y'\|_\infty \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} + \|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} \|X\|_{p, [0, T]} + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_{p, [0, T]} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}).
\end{aligned}$$

To continue, we need the following lemma, which is similar to (2.3) in Lemma 2.2.

Lemma A.1. Let $p \geq 2$, $T > 0$, $c \geq 0$, $X : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y^i, \tilde{Y}^i \in \mathcal{C}^p$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $Z^j \in \mathcal{C}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Then, there exists a constant $C_p \geq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{s,t}\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y^i\|_{p,[s,t]} \|\tilde{Y}^i\|_{p,[s,t]} + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]} + c|t-s| \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T] \\ \implies \|X\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|Y^i\|_p \|\tilde{Y}^i\|_p + \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + cT \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof of Lemma A.1. We only prove the particular case $n = 0$ (i.e., without (Y^i, \tilde{Y}^i)) and $c = 0$. The general case follows with minor modifications, see the proof of (2.3) in Lemma 2.2. Given any partition π of $[0, T]$,

$$\sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \|X_{s,t}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq m^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]}^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \leq C_p \sum_{j=1}^m \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2}}^{\frac{p}{2}},$$

where we used $|\sum_{i=1}^N a_i|^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq N^{\frac{p}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i|^{\frac{p}{2}}$ for $p \geq 2$ in the second inequality, and $\sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]}^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[0,T]}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ in the third inequality, since $w(s, t) = \|Z^j\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ is a control, so that $\sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} w(s, t) \leq w(0, T)$. The bound above is independent of the choice of partition π . Thus, (A.6) follows after taking the supremum over all partitions π of $[0, T]$ and using the inequality $(\sum_i |a_i|)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq \sum_i |a_i|^{\frac{2}{p}}$ for $p \geq 2$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3 (continued). Thus, by Lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq C_p (\|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} \|Y'\|_{\infty} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \|X\|_p + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (K_Y (\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + (1 + K_Y)(1 + \|X\|_p)^2 (\|X\|_p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}})) + T (\|X\|_p + K_Y(1 + \|X\|_p) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}})) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y)^2 (1 + \|X\|_p)^2 (1 + T) (\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|X\|_p), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|Y'\|_{\infty} \leq \|Y_0'\| + \|Y'\|_p = M_{Y'} \leq K_Y$, and the inequalities from Lemma 2.5 $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} K_Y (1 + K_Y + T) (1 + \|X\|_p)$ and $\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (K_Y (1 + K_Y) (1 + \|X\|_p)^2 + T)$. This concludes the proof of (3.9). Note also that $\|\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s\|_p < \infty$, since

$$\left\| \int_s^t \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r \right\| \leq \left\| \int_s^t \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r - \sigma(s, Y_s) X_{s,t} \right\| + \|\sigma(s, Y_s) X_{s,t}\| = \|R_{s,t}^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r}\| + \|\sigma(s, Y_s) X_{s,t}\|.$$

Also, $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_p < \infty$ by (2.14). Together, $\|\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s\|_p, \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_p, \|R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} < \infty$ imply that $(Z, Z') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4

Proof of Lemma 3.4. To show (3.10), we combine $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + \|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p + T) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y\|_p)$ in (2.5), $\|Y\|_p \leq C_p (1 + \|X\|_p) K_Y$ in (2.13), $\|\Delta Y\|_p \leq C_p (\Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + M_{\tilde{Y}'}, \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}})$ in (3.6), and $M_{\tilde{Y}'} \leq K_{\tilde{Y}'}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_p &\stackrel{(2.5)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + \|Y\|_p + \|\tilde{Y}\|_p + T) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y\|_p) \\ &\stackrel{(2.13), (3.6)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p + T) (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'}) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_p + M_{\tilde{Y}'}, \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p + T) (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}'})^2 (\|\Delta Y_0\| + (\|\Delta Y_0'\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired inequality (3.10).

To show (3.11), we observe from (2.11) in Lemma 2.4 that it suffices to bound $K_{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}$ and $\Delta K_{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}$. First, we bound $K_{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}$ as follows. By (2.15) and (2.17) in Lemma 2.5, $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} K_Y (1 + K_Y + T) (1 +$

$\|X\|_p$) and $\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (K_Y(1+K_Y)(1+\|X\|_p)^2 + T)$. Also, $\|\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'_0\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} \|\tilde{Y}'_0\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} K_{\tilde{Y}}$. By combining these inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})} &= \|\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'_0\| + \|\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'\|_p + \|R^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_{\tilde{Y}} + T)^2 (1 + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^2 \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}} + T)^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Second, using (3.7) and (3.8) in Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)' - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})'\|_p &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T) (\\ &\quad \|\Delta X\|_p + \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p), \\ \|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} - R^{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T) (\\ &\quad \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + (\|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p). \end{aligned}$$

By combining these two inequalities with $\|\Delta\sigma(\cdot, Y)'_0\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + M_{Y'}) (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\|)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta K_{\sigma(\cdot, Y)} &= \|\Delta\sigma(\cdot, Y)'_0\| + \|\Delta\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p + \|\Delta R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^3 (1 + \|X\|_p + \|\tilde{X}\|_p)^3 (1 + T) (\\ &\quad \|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + (\|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Finally, combining the last inequalities (A.7) and (A.8) using (2.11) in Lemma 2.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} - R^{\int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\stackrel{(2.11)}{\leq} C_p (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p) (K_{\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})} \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p \Delta K_{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A.7}), (\text{A.8})}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_p)^4 (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}} + T)^3 (1 + T) (\\ &\quad \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_p + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p (\|\Delta Y_0\| + \|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \|\Delta Y'\|_p + (\|\Delta Y'_0\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_p) \|X\|_p + \|\Delta X\|_p)), \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired inequality (3.11). \square

A.3.2 Rough differential equations: existence and unicity of solutions (Section 3.2)

Nonlinear rough differential equations (Section 3.2.1)

Proof of Theorem 3.6

Proof of Theorem 3.6. First, for any $t \in (0, T]$, we define the map

$$\mathcal{M}_t : \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, t], \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, t], \mathbb{R}^n), (Y, Y') \mapsto \left(y + \int_0^\cdot b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds + \int_0^\cdot \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s, \sigma(\cdot, Y) \right).$$

For $\delta \geq 1$, we define the ball

$$\mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta)} = \left\{ (Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, t], \mathbb{R}^n) : Y_0 = y, Y'_0 = \sigma(0, y), \|Y, Y'\|_{X, p, [0, t]}^{(\delta)} \leq 1 \right\} \subset \mathcal{D}_X^p.$$

with

$$\|Y, Y'\|_{X, p, [0, t]}^{(\delta)} = \|Y'\|_{p, [0, t]} + \delta \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [0, t]}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The set $\mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta)}$ is a closed subset of the Banach space \mathcal{D}_X^p (when equipped with the metric induced by the norm $\|\cdot, \cdot\|_{X, p}^{(\delta)}$, and when we restrict \mathcal{D}_X^p to controlled paths with fixed initial condition $(Y_0, Y'_0) = (y, \sigma(0, y))$), so $\mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta)}$ is itself a complete metric space. Also, $\mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta)}$ is nonempty, since $s \mapsto (y + \sigma(0, y)X_{0,s}, \sigma(0, y)) \in \mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta)}$.

Invariance. We claim that $\mathcal{M}_{t_1} : \mathcal{B}_{t_1}^{(\delta)} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{t_1}^{(\delta)}$ for $t_1 > 0$ small enough, i.e., that $\mathcal{B}_{t_1}^{(\delta)}$ is invariant under \mathcal{M}_{t_1} . Let $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{B}_{t_1}^{(\delta)}$. Since $\|Y, Y'\|_{X, p, [0, t_1]}^{(\delta)} \leq 1$, $K_Y = \|Y'_0\| + \|Y'\|_{p, [0, t_1]} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [0, t_1]}$ and $K_{\tilde{Y}}$ satisfy $K_Y, K_{\tilde{Y}} \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^0} + 1 + \frac{1}{\delta}$. Thus, for $\delta \geq 1$, there exists $C_\sigma \geq 0$ such that

$$K_Y, K_{\tilde{Y}} \leq \tilde{C}_\sigma (1 + \delta^{-1}) \leq C_\sigma, (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^2 \leq C_\sigma, (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^3 \leq C_\sigma. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Next, $R_{s,t}^{y+\int_0^s b(s,Y_s,u_s)ds+\int_0^s \sigma(s,Y_s)d\mathbf{X}_s} = \int_s^t b(r,Y_r,u_r)ds + \int_s^t \sigma(r,Y_r)d\mathbf{X}_r - \sigma(s,Y_s)X_{s,t} = \int_s^t b(r,Y_r,u_r)dr + R_{s,t}^{\int_0^s \sigma(s,Y_s)d\mathbf{X}_s}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{t_1}(Y, Y')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta)} &= \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_p + \delta \|R^{y+\int_0^s b(s,Y_s,u_s)ds+\int_0^s \sigma(s,Y_s)d\mathbf{X}_s}\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\leq \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_p + C_p \delta \left(\left\| \int_0^{\cdot} b(s, Y_s, u_s) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \left\| R^{\int_0^{\cdot} \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \quad (2.3) \\ &\leq C_p (\|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|Y\|_p + t_1) + \delta (C_{p,b} t_1 + C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y)^2 (1 + \|X\|_p)^2 (1 + t_1) \|\mathbf{X}\|_p)) \quad (2.4), (3.12), (3.9) \\ &\leq C_p (\|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + K_Y \|X\|_p + t_1) + \delta C_{p,b,\sigma,\|X\|_p,T} (1 + K_Y)^2 (t_1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p)) \quad (2.12), t_1 \leq T \\ &\leq C_1 \left(\frac{1}{\delta} + \|X\|_p + t_1 + \delta (t_1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p) \right), \quad (A.10), \|Y, Y'\|_{X,p}^{(\delta)} \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

for a constant $C_1 := C_{p,b,\sigma,\|X\|_p,T} > \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\delta = \delta_1 := 2C_1 \geq 1$. Then,

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{t_1}(Y, Y')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta_1)} \leq \frac{1}{2} + C_1 (\|X\|_{p,[0,t_1]} + t_1 + 2C_1 (t_1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,[0,t_1]})).$$

Then, by taking t_1 small-enough, $\|\mathcal{M}_{t_1}(Y, Y')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta_1)} \leq 1$, so $\mathcal{M}_{t_1}(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{B}_{t_1}^{(\delta_1)}$. Invariance is proved.

Contraction. Let $(Y, Y'), (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{B}_t^{(\delta_1)}$ for some $t \in (0, t_1]$. For any $\delta \geq 1$, by (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_t(Y, Y') - \mathcal{M}_t(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta)} &\leq \\ &\|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_p + C_p \delta \left(\left\| \int_0^{\cdot} (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, u_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \left\| R^{\int_0^{\cdot} \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} - R^{\int_0^{\cdot} \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $(\Delta X, \Delta Y_0, \Delta Y'_0) = (0, 0, 0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_p &\stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}})^2 (1 + \|X\|_p + t) (\|\Delta Y'\|_p \|X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &\stackrel{(A.10)}{\leq} C_{p,\sigma,\|X\|_p,T} (\|\Delta Y'\|_p \|X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}), \\ \left\| R^{\int_0^{\cdot} \sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} - R^{\int_0^{\cdot} \sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\mathbf{X}_s} \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\stackrel{(3.11)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_Y + K_{\tilde{Y}} + t)^3 (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_p)^5 (1 + t) \|\mathbf{X}\|_p (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &\stackrel{(A.10)}{\leq} C_{p,\sigma,\|X\|_p,T} \|\mathbf{X}\|_p (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}), \\ \left\| \int_0^{\cdot} (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, u_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2}} &\stackrel{(3.12)}{\leq} C_{p,b} t \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty} \stackrel{(2.1),(3.6)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\|X\|_p} t (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\delta \geq 1$ and a constant $C_2 := C_{p,b,\sigma,\|X\|_p,T} > \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{M}_t(Y, Y') - \mathcal{M}_t(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta)} \leq C_2 \left(\|\Delta Y'\|_p \|X\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \delta (\|\mathbf{X}\|_p + t) (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \right).$$

Next, choose $\delta = \delta_2 := 2C_2 > 1$, so that $C_2 = \frac{\delta_2}{2}$, and choose $t = t_2 \leq t_1$ small-enough so that $C_2 \delta (\|\mathbf{X}\|_p + t) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, so that in particular $C_2 \|X\|_p \leq \frac{1}{2\delta}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{t_2}(Y, Y') - \mathcal{M}_{t_2}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta_2)} &\leq \frac{1}{2\delta_2} \|\Delta Y'\|_p + \frac{\delta_2}{2} \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}) \\ &= \frac{1 + \delta_2}{2\delta_2} (\|\Delta Y'\|_p + \delta_2 \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_2 > 1$, we obtain $\|\mathcal{M}_{t_2}(Y, Y') - \mathcal{M}_{t_2}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}')\|_{X,p}^{(\delta_2)} < \|\Delta Y'\|_p + \delta_2 \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}} = \|Y - \tilde{Y}, Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{X,p}^{(\delta_2)}$, so \mathcal{M}_{t_2} is a contraction.

To conclude, $\mathcal{M}_{t_2} : \mathcal{B}_{t_2}^{(\delta_2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{t_2}^{(\delta_2)}$ is invariant and a contraction. Thus, there exists a unique fixed point $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, t_2], \mathbb{R}^n)$ of the map \mathcal{M}_{t_2} , which is the solution to the RDE (3.1) satisfying $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$ over the time interval $[0, t_2]$. Since t_2 was chosen independently of the initial conditions, we can stitch together solutions over time intervals $[kt_2, (k+1)t_2]_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and deduce that the RDE (3.1) admits a unique solution over the entire interval $[0, T]$. \square

Linear rough differential equations (Section 3.2.2)

In this section, we prove existence and unicity of solutions to linear RDEs with drift (3.14) in Theorem 3.7. The proof consists of rewriting the linear RDE with drift (3.14) as a driftless linear RDE with constant coefficients driven by a new geometric rough path by also interpreting the Lebesgue integral $\int A_s V_s ds$ as a rough integral, and concluding with [26, Theorem 10.53]. The results in this section may be considered standard, although we could not find them in the literature.

Preliminaries for the proof of Theorem 3.7

Lemma A.2 (Connections between the Lebesgue and rough integrals). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $b \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d})$.*

1) Define $\mathcal{T} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{T} : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the Lebesgue integrals

$$\mathcal{T}_t := \int_0^t b_r dr, \quad \mathcal{T}_{s,t} := \int_s^t \mathcal{T}_{s,r} b_r dr = \int_s^t \int_s^r b_v dv b_r dr.$$

Then, $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{C}_g^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, i.e., \mathcal{T} is a geometric 1-rough path.

Moreover, for any Gubinelli derivative $\hat{Y}' \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d \times d})$ (in particular, for $\hat{Y}' = 0$), the rough integral of (Y, \hat{Y}') against \mathcal{T} , defined as the limit in (2.9), is well-defined, and is equal to the Lebesgue integral $\int Y b dt$: for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\int_0^t Y_r d\mathcal{T}_r = \int_0^t Y_r b_r dr. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

2) Define $Z : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Z} : \Delta_{[0, T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the rough integrals

$$Z_t := \int_0^t Y_r d\mathbf{X}_r, \quad \mathbb{Z}_{s,t} := \int_s^t Z_{s,r} Y_r d\mathbf{X}_r.$$

Then, $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, i.e., \mathbf{Z} is a p -rough path.

Moreover, \mathbf{Z} is geometric if \mathbf{X} is geometric, i.e., $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p \implies \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$.

The pair $(Z, Z') := (\int_0^\cdot Y d\mathbf{X}, Y)$ is a controlled path by Lemma 2.4. The rough path \mathbf{Z} as defined in Lemma A.2 is called the canonical rough path lift of (Z, Z') , see [28, Sections 6.1-6.2]. Also, the equality $\int Y b dt = \int Y d\mathcal{T}$ in (A.11) (where, on the right hand side, the Gubinelli derivative \hat{Y} of Y can be defined arbitrarily since \mathcal{T} is smooth-enough for $\int Y d\mathcal{T}$ to be equivalent to a Young integral) will allow us to rewrite the linear RDE with drift (3.14) as a driftless linear RDE driven by a new rough path.

Proof of Lemma A.2. 1) First, $|\mathcal{T}_{s,t}| = \left| \int_s^t b_r dr \right| \leq \left| \int_s^t \|b\|_\infty dr \right| = \|b\|_\infty |t - s|$, so $\|\mathcal{T}\|_1 \leq \|b\|_\infty T < \infty$, and

$$|\mathcal{T}_{s,t}| = \left| \int_s^t \int_s^r b_v dv b_r dr \right| \leq \left| \int_s^t \left\| \int_s^\cdot b_v dv \right\|_{\infty, [s,r]} b_r dr \right| \leq \|b\|_\infty \left| \int_s^t (r - s) b_r dr \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_\infty^2 (t - s)^2, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

so $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|b\|_\infty^2 T^2 / 2 < \infty$, and $\|\mathcal{T}\|_1 < \infty$. Moreover, for any $0 \leq s \leq r \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{s,r} &= \int_s^r \int_s^u b_v dv b_u du = \int_s^t \int_s^u b_v dv b_u du - \int_r^t \int_s^u b_v dv b_u du = \mathcal{T}_{s,t} - \left(\int_r^t \left(\int_s^r b_v dv b_u du + \int_r^u b_v dv b_u du \right) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{T}_{s,t} - \left(\int_s^r b_v dv \int_r^t b_u du + \int_r^t \int_r^u b_v dv b_u du \right) = \mathcal{T}_{s,t} - \mathcal{T}_{r,t} - \mathcal{T}_{s,r} \mathcal{T}_{r,t}, \end{aligned}$$

so \mathcal{T} satisfies Chen's relation (2.6). The condition in (2.7) follows the integration by parts formula

$$\mathcal{T}_{s,t} = \int_s^t \int_s^r b_v dv b_r dr = \left[\int_s^\cdot b_v dv \int_s^\cdot b_r dr \right]_s^t - \int_s^t b_v \int_s^v b_r dr dv = \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^2 - \mathcal{T}_{s,t} \implies \mathcal{T}_{s,t} = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^2,$$

so we conclude that \mathcal{T} is a geometric 1-rough path.

Moreover, given any $\hat{Y}' \in \mathcal{C}^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n \times d \times d})$ and any partition π of $[0, T]$,

$$\left\| \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} \hat{Y}'_s \mathcal{T}_{s,t} \right\| \stackrel{(A.12)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_\infty^2 \|\hat{Y}'\|_\infty \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} (t-s)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_\infty^2 \|\hat{Y}'\|_\infty \sup_{[s,t] \in \pi} |t-s| \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} |t-s| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_\infty^2 \|\hat{Y}'\|_\infty T |\pi| \rightarrow 0 \quad (A.13)$$

as $|\pi| \rightarrow 0$. Thus,

$$\int_0^T Y_t d\mathcal{T}_t \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} \lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} Y_s \mathcal{T}_{s,t} + \hat{Y}'_s \mathcal{T}_{s,t} = \lim_{|\pi| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{[s,t] \in \pi} Y_s \mathcal{T}_{s,t} = \int_0^T Y_t d\mathcal{T}_t,$$

where the last integral is a well-defined Young integral since $Y \in \mathcal{C}^p$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{C}^1$ with $\frac{1}{p} + 1 > 1$ [26, Theorem 6.8]. Thus, the rough integral of (Y, \hat{Y}') against \mathcal{T} is well-defined. The last integral is also the Lebesgue integral of Y with respect to \mathcal{T} . Finally, since $\mathcal{T}_t = \mathcal{T}_s + \int_s^t b_r dr$, \mathcal{T} is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, so $\int_0^T Y_t d\mathcal{T}_t = \int_0^T Y_t b_t dt$, and we obtain the desired result (A.11).

2) Second, $(Z, Z') := (\int_0^\cdot Y_s d\mathbf{X}_s, Y)$ is a controlled path by Lemma 2.4. \mathbb{Z} is also well-defined, since ZY is a controlled path by Lemma 3.1, and $\|\mathbb{Z}\|_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$ thanks to (2.10). The pair $\mathbf{Z} = (Z, \mathbb{Z})$ satisfies Chen's relation (2.6), which can be shown via identical computations as for the proof that \mathcal{T} satisfies Chen's relation. Thus, \mathbf{Z} is a p -rough path ($\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{C}^p$).

Moreover, the statement that \mathbf{Z} is geometric if and only if \mathbf{X} is geometric is a consequence of $[\mathbf{Z}] = \int_0^\cdot (Y_r \otimes Y_r) d[\mathbf{X}]_r$ from [28, Lemma 6.8], where $[\mathbf{Z}]_t := Z_{0,t}^2 - 2\mathbb{Z}_{0,t}$ and $[\mathbf{X}]_t^{ij} := X_{0,t}^i X_{0,t}^j - (\mathbb{X}_{0,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{0,t}^{ji})$ denote the brackets of \mathbf{Z} and of \mathbf{X} and satisfy $[\mathbf{Z}]_{s,t} = Z_{s,t}^2 - 2\mathbb{Z}_{s,t}$ and $[\mathbf{X}]_{s,t}^{ij} = X_{s,t}^i X_{s,t}^j - (\mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^{ji})$ [28, Lemma 6.5], so that $\{[\mathbf{Z}] = 0 \iff \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p\}$ if $\{[\mathbf{X}] = 0 \iff \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p\}$. \square

The next result allows us to combine multiple rough paths as a joint rough path.

Lemma A.3 (Joint geometric rough path). *Let $p \in [2, 3)$, $T > 0$, $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a geometric p -rough path, $b^i \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $(Y^j, (Y^j)') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, define $\mathcal{T}^i = (\mathcal{T}^i, \mathcal{T}^i) \in \mathcal{C}_g^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ with $\mathcal{T}_t^i = \int_0^t b_s^i ds$ and $\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^i = \int_s^t \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^i b_r^i dr$, and for $j = 1, \dots, n$, define $\mathbf{Z}^j = (Z^j, \mathbb{Z}^j) \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ with $Z_t^j = \int_0^t Y_s^j d\mathbf{X}_s$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{s,t}^j = \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^j Y_r^j d\mathbf{X}_r$, as in Lemma A.2.*

Then, the pair $\mathbf{J} := (J, \mathbb{J})$ defined with $J_t := (\mathcal{T}_t^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_t^m, Z_t^1, \dots, Z_t^n)$ and

$$\mathbb{J}_{s,t} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 & \cdots & \int_s^t \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 d\mathcal{T}_r^m & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^1 d\mathcal{T}_r^1 & \cdots & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^n - \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^n d\mathcal{T}_r^1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \int_s^t \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^m d\mathcal{T}_r^1 & \cdots & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^m & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^m Z_{s,t}^1 - \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^1 d\mathcal{T}_r^m & \cdots & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^m Z_{s,t}^n - \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^n d\mathcal{T}_r^m \\ \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^1 d\mathcal{T}_r^1 & \cdots & \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^1 d\mathcal{T}_r^m & \mathbb{Z}_{s,t}^1 & \cdots & Z_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^n - \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^1 Y_r^1 d\mathbf{X}_r \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^n d\mathcal{T}_r^1 & \cdots & \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^n d\mathcal{T}_r^m & \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^n Y_r^1 d\mathbf{X}_r & \cdots & \mathbb{Z}_{s,t}^n \end{bmatrix} \quad (A.14)$$

is a (joint) geometric p -rough path, i.e., $\mathbf{J} = (J, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m+n})$.

Proof. Assume that $m = n = 2$ without loss of generality, and denote $J = (\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2, Z^1, Z^2) = (J^1, J^2, J^3, J^4)$, and similarly for \mathbb{J} . First, $\|\mathbf{J}\|_p < \infty$ follows after bounding each term in $J_{s,t}$ and $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}$ and using Lemma 2.2.

Next, we show Chen's relation (2.6):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{12} &= \int_s^r \mathcal{T}_{s,u}^1 d\mathcal{T}_u^2 \stackrel{(A.11)}{=} \int_s^r \int_s^u b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du = \int_s^t \int_s^u b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du - \int_r^t \int_s^u b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{12} - \left(\int_r^t \left(\int_s^r b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du + \int_r^u b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du \right) \right) = \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{12} - \left(\int_s^r b_v^1 dv \int_r^t b_u^2 du + \int_r^t \int_r^u b_v^1 dv b_u^2 du \right) \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{12} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{12} - J_{s,r}^1 J_{r,t}^2, \\
\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{31} &= \int_s^r Z_{s,u}^1 d\mathcal{T}_u^1 \stackrel{(A.11)}{=} \int_s^r \int_s^u Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du = \int_s^t \int_s^u Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du - \int_r^t \int_s^u Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} - \left(\int_r^t \left(\int_s^r Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du + \int_r^u Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du \right) \right) = \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} - \left(\int_s^r Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v \int_r^t b_u^1 du + \int_r^t \int_r^u Y_v^1 d\mathbf{X}_v b_u^1 du \right) \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - Z_{s,r}^1 \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - J_{s,r}^3 J_{r,t}^1, \\
\mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{13} &= \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{s,r}^1 - \int_s^r Z_{s,u}^1 d\mathcal{T}_u^1 = \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{s,r}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,r}^{31} = \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{s,r}^1 - (\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{s,r}^1) \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1)(Z_{s,t}^1 - Z_{r,t}^1) - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} + \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{s,r}^1 \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) + \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 + \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{s,r}^1 \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) + \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 (Z_{s,t}^1 - Z_{s,r}^1) \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) + \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1) Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) + \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31} - \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 \\
&= (\mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31}) - (\mathcal{T}_{r,t}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{31}) - \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{13} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{13} - \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^1 Z_{r,t}^1 \\
&= \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{13} - \mathbb{J}_{r,t}^{13} - J_{s,r}^1 J_{r,t}^3,
\end{aligned}$$

and similar derivations show that Chen's relation (2.6) hold for other pairs of indices (i, j) . Thus, $\mathbf{J} \in \mathcal{C}^p$, i.e., \mathbf{J} is a p -rough path.

Finally, to show that \mathbf{J} is geometric, we need to show that $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{ij} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{ji} = J_{s,t}^i J_{s,t}^j$ in (2.7) holds for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. For $i = j$, (2.7) clearly holds since \mathcal{T} and \mathbf{Z} are geometric. For $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$, (2.7) follows from the integration by parts formula that holds for the Lebesgue integral. For other pairs of indices (i, j) , (2.7) holds by definition, e.g., $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{13} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{31} = \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^1 Z_{s,t}^1 = J_{s,t}^1 J_{s,t}^3$. To conclude, $\mathbf{J} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We rewrite the linear RDE (3.14) as a linear RDE with constant coefficients driven by a new geometric rough path, and conclude with [26, Theorem 10.53]. First, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}^{ij} &= (\mathcal{T}^{ij}, \mathcal{T}^{ij}), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T}_t^{ij} := \int_0^t A_s^{ij} ds, & \mathcal{T}_{s,t}^{ij} &:= \int_s^t \mathcal{T}_{s,r}^{ij} A_r^{ij} dr, \\
\mathbf{Z}^{ij} &= (Z^{ij}, Z^{ij}), \quad \text{where} \quad Z_t^{ij} := \int_0^t \Sigma_s^{i,j} d\mathbf{X}_s, & Z_{s,t}^{ij} &:= \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^{ij} \Sigma_r^{i,j} d\mathbf{X}_r.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.2, each \mathcal{T}^{ij} and \mathbf{Z}^{ij} is a geometric rough path ($\mathcal{T}^{ij}, \mathbf{Z}^{ij} \in \mathcal{C}_g^p$). As in Lemma A.3, define the joint geometric p -rough paths $\mathbf{J} = (J, \mathbb{J}) \in \mathcal{C}_g^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{2n^2})$ with

$$J = (J^1, \dots, J^{n^2}, J^{n^2+1}, \dots, J^{2n^2}) = (\mathcal{T}^{11}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{1n}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{n1}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{nn}, Z^{11}, \dots, Z^{1n}, \dots, Z^{n1}, \dots, Z^{nn}),$$

so that $J^{(i-1)n+j} = \mathcal{T}^{ij}$ and $J^{n^2+(i-1)n+j} = Z^{ij}$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and define $\mathbb{J} : \Delta_{[0,T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n^2 \times 2n^2}$ as in (A.14) in Lemma A.3, with in particular $\mathbb{J}^{ii} = \mathcal{T}^{ii}$ for $i \leq n^2$ and $\mathbb{J}^{ii} = Z^{ii}$ for $i > n^2$.

Then, we define the tensor $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2n^2 \times n}$ with

$$F^{i\cdot\cdot} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(i-1)n \times n} \\ I_n \times n \\ 0_{(n-1)n \times n} \\ I_n \times n \\ 0_{(n-i)n \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ so that } FV_t = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} V_t^1 & \dots & V_t^n & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & V_t^1 & \dots & V_t^n & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & V_t^1 & \dots & V_t^n & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & V_t^1 & \dots & V_t^n \end{bmatrix}}_{n \times 2n^2}$$

for any $V_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the linear RDE $V_t = v + \int_0^t FV_r d\mathbf{J}_r$, which is a linear RDE with constant-in-time linear vector fields $F^\ell(V) = F^\ell V$ driven by the geometric rough path \mathbf{J} . Thus, by [26, Theorem 10.53], there exists a unique solution $(V, FV) \in \mathcal{D}_J([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ to the linear RDE $V_t = v + \int_0^t FV_r d\mathbf{J}_r$.

This concludes the proof, because $(V, \Sigma V)$ is also a solution to the original linear RDE (3.14), since

$$\int_s^t FV_r d\mathbf{J}_r = \int_s^t A_r V_r dr + \int_s^t \Sigma_r V_r d\mathbf{X}_r \quad (\text{A.15})$$

for any $s, t \in [0, T]$. The last result (A.15) follows from long but straightforward computations with integrals, noting that each component on the left hand side of (A.15) satisfies

$$\left(\int_s^t FV_r d\mathbf{J}_r \right)^i \approx (FV_s)^i J_{s,t} + (FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J}_{s,t}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $a_{s,t} \approx b_{s,t}$ means $a_{s,t} = b_{s,t} + o(|t-s|^{\frac{3}{p}})$ and the estimate comes from (2.10) in Proposition 2.3 (up to a time reparameterization [26, Proposition 5.14], we may assume that J, FV, FFV are $\frac{1}{p}$ -Hölder continuous and that \mathbb{J}, R^{FV} are $\frac{2}{p}$ -Hölder continuous, and similarly for X, \mathbb{X}). Also, for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (FV_s)^i J_{s,t} &= \sum_{j=1}^n V_s^j \left(J_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+j} + J_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+j} \right) = \left[\underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{(i-1)n} \underbrace{V_t^1 \dots V_t^n}_n \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{(n-1)n} \underbrace{V_t^1 \dots V_t^n}_n \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{(n-i)n} \right] J_{s,t}, \\ (FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J}_{s,t} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n V_s^j \left(\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+k, (k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, (k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} \right) \\ &\approx \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n V_s^j \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and, for $i, j, k = 1, \dots, n$,

$$J_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+j} = \int_s^t \Sigma_r^{i,j} d\mathbf{X}_r \approx \Sigma_s^{i,j} X_{s,t} + (\Sigma^{i,j})'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}, \quad \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} \approx \Sigma_s^{i,k} \Sigma_s^{k,j} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Additional details on the computation of $(FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J}_{s,t}$ and $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j}$ are provided at the end of this section. Then, writing $V' = \Sigma V$, the right hand side of (A.15) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t (A_r V_r)^i dr &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_s^t A_r^{ij} V_r^j dr \stackrel{(\text{A.11})}{=} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_s^t V_t^j d\mathcal{T}_t^{ij} \approx \sum_{j=1}^n \left(V_s^j J_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+j} + (V^j)'_s \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+j, (i-1)n+j} \right) \\ &\approx \sum_{j=1}^n V_s^j J_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+j}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t (\Sigma_r V_r)^i d\mathbf{X}_r &\approx \sum_{j=1}^n \left(V_s^j \Sigma_s^{i,j} X_{s,t} + (\Sigma^{i,j})'_s (V^j)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} + V_s^j (\Sigma^{i,j})'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(V_s^j \left(\Sigma_s^{i,j} X_{s,t} + (\Sigma^{i,j})'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right) + \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \Sigma_s^{i,j} \Sigma_s^{j,k} V_s^k \right) \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right) \\ &\approx \sum_{j=1}^n \left(V_s^j Z_{s,t}^{ij} + V_s^j \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \Sigma_s^{i,k} \Sigma_s^{k,j} \right) \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A.18})}{=} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(V_s^j J_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+j} + V_s^j \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Thus, by comparing (A.19)+(A.20) with (A.16) using (A.17), and after taking the sum over any partition $\pi \in \mathcal{P}([s, t])$ with vanishing meshsize, we conclude that (A.15) holds. We conclude using (A.15) that the RDE (3.14) can be written as $V_t = v + \int_0^t A_t V_t dt + \int_0^t \Sigma_t V_t d\mathbf{X}_t = v + \int_0^t FV_t d\mathbf{J}_t$ and the RDE on the right hand side has a unique solution by [26, Theorem 10.53], so the linear RDE (3.14) has a unique solution. \square

Additional details on computing $(FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J}_{s,t}$ and $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j}$

For any $V_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2n^2 \times n}$, $FFV_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2n^2}$, and $FFV_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2n^2 \times 2n^2}$. Then, denoting by $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{a:b,c:d} \in \mathbb{R}^{(b-a+1) \times (d-c+1)}$ the block of the matrix $\mathbb{J}_{s,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n^2 \times 2n^2}$ containing the rows a to b and columns c to d , and using the identification $(FFV_s)^i \in \mathbb{R}^{2n^2 \times 2n^2} \cong \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^{2n^2 \times 2n^2}, \mathbb{R})$ with $(FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J} = \sum_{a=1}^{2n^2} \sum_{b=1}^{2n^2} ((FFV_s)^i)^{a,b} \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{a,b}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(FFV_s)^i \mathbb{J}_{s,t} &= F^i FFV_s \mathbb{J}_{s,t} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 0^{(i-1)n \times n} \\ I_{n \times n} \\ 0^{(n-1)n \times n} \\ I_{n \times n} \\ 0^{(n-i)n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n \end{bmatrix}}_{=FFV_s \text{ (} n \times 2n^2 \text{ matrix)}} \mathbb{J}_{s,t} \\
&= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0^{(i-1)n \times 2n^2} \\ FFV_s \\ 0^{(n-1)n \times 2n^2} \\ FFV_s \\ 0^{(n-i)n \times 2n^2} \end{bmatrix}}_{=F^i FFV_s} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \star & \star \\ \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+1:in, 1:n^2} & \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+1:in, n^2+1:2n^2} \\ \star & \star \\ \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+1:n^2+in, 1:n^2} & \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+1:n^2+in, n^2+1:2n^2} \\ \star & \star \end{bmatrix}}_{=\mathbb{J}_{s,t}} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & V_s^1 & \dots & V_s^n \end{bmatrix} \left(\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+1:in, 1:n^2} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+1:in, n^2+1:2n^2} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+1:n^2+in, 1:n^2} + \right. \\
&\quad \left. \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+1, n^2+1} & \dots & \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+1, n^2+n} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+n, n^2+(n-1)n+1} & \dots & \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+n, 2n^2} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n V_s^j \left(\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+k, (k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, (k-1)n+j} + \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first three terms involve the Lebesgue integral (thus, they are $o(|t-s|^{\frac{3}{p}})$) and do not play a role after summing over all partitions $\pi \in \mathcal{P}[s, t]$ and taking the limit as $|\pi| \rightarrow 0$ (see for example the computation in (A.13)), so we obtain (A.17).

Next, we compute $\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j}$ for $i, j, k = 1, \dots, n$. For the case $(i-1)n+k \geq (k-1)n+j$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} &= \int_s^t Z_{s,r}^{ik} \Sigma_r^{k \cdot j} d\mathbf{X}_r = \int_s^t Z_r^{ik} \Sigma_r^{k \cdot j} d\mathbf{X}_r - \int_s^t Z_s^{ik} \Sigma_r^{k \cdot j} d\mathbf{X}_r \\
&\approx Z_s^{ik} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} X_{s,t} + ((Z^{ik})'_s \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} + Z_s^{ik} (\Sigma^{k \cdot j})'_s) \mathbb{X}_{s,t} - (Z_s^{ik} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} X_{s,t} + Z_s^{ik} (\Sigma^{k \cdot j})'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}) \\
&= (Z^{ik})'_s \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \\
&= \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, for the case $(i-1)n+k < (k-1)n+j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k, n^2+(k-1)n+j} &\stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(i-1)n+k} \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(k-1)n+j} - \mathbb{J}_{s,t}^{n^2+(k-1)n+j, n^2+(i-1)n+k} & (\mathbf{J} \text{ is geometric}) \\
&\approx \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} (X_{s,t} \otimes X_{s,t}) - \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \\
&= \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} (X_{s,t} \otimes X_{s,t} - \mathbb{X}_{s,t}) \\
&\stackrel{(2.7)}{=} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} \mathbb{X}_{s,t}^\top & (\mathbf{X} \text{ is geometric}) \\
&= \Sigma_s^{i \cdot k} \Sigma_s^{k \cdot j} \mathbb{X}_{s,t},
\end{aligned}$$

so we obtain (A.18).

A.3.3 Bounds on solutions to nonlinear RDEs (Section 3.3)

Error bounds on short intervals (Section 3.3.1)

Proof of Proposition 3.9

Proof of Proposition 3.9. To show (3.15), note that $\sigma(\cdot, Y)' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)Y' = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)\sigma(\cdot, Y)$, so $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_p \leq C_p \|\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} \sigma\|_{C_b^1} (\|Y\|_p + T)$ by (2.4). Next, for $s, t \in I$ with $I \subseteq [0, T]$ an arbitrary interval,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_{s,t}^Y\| &= \|Y_{s,t} - Y_s' X_{s,t}\| \leq \left\| \int_s^t \sigma(r, Y_r) d\mathbf{X}_r - \sigma(s, Y_s) X_{s,t} - \sigma(\cdot, Y)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t} \right\| + \left\| \int_s^t b(r, Y_r, u_r) dr \right\| + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s,t}\| \\
&\stackrel{(2.10), (3.12)}{\leq} C_p (\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]} \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_{p,I} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}) + C_{p,b} |t-s| + C_\sigma \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s,t]}.
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_\infty = \|\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)\sigma(\cdot, Y)\|_\infty \leq C_\sigma$ in the last inequality. Thus, by (A.6) in Lemma A.1 (which is similar to (2.3) in Lemma 2.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \left(\|R^{\sigma(\cdot, Y)}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\sigma(\cdot, Y)'\|_{p,I} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(2.16), (3.15)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma} \left((\|Y\|_{p,I}^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I|) \|X\|_{p,I} + (\|Y\|_{p,I} + |I|) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \right) \\
&\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \left((\|Y\|_{p,I}^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \|X\|_{p,I} + (1 + \|Y\|_{p,I}) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + |I| (\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \right) \\
&\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \left((\|Y\|_{p,I}^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \|X\|_{p,I} + (1 + \|Y\|_{p,I}^2) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + |I| (\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \right) \quad (|x| \leq 1 + x^2) \\
&\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \left(\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + |I| (\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) + \|Y\|_{p,I}^2 (\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 := C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$. Let $\alpha_1 := \left(\frac{1}{2C_1}\right)^p$. Then, for I small-enough so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}}$, we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{2C_{p,b,\sigma}} < 1,$$

so that $C_{p,b,\sigma} \|X\|_{p,I} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} < 1$, and $|I| + |I| (\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) < 2|I|$. Thus,

$$\|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \leq 4C_{p,b,\sigma} \left(\|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + \|Y\|_{p,I}^2 \right). \tag{A.21}$$

Thus, since $\|Y\|_p \leq C_{p,\sigma} (\|X\|_p + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}})$ by (2.12), we obtain

$$\|Y\|_{p,I} \leq C_2 \left(\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| + \|Y\|_{p,I}^2 \right)$$

for a new constant $C_2 := C_{p,b,\sigma} > 4C_1 > 1$. Note that if $C_2 \|Y\|_{p,I} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\|Y\|_{p,I} \leq 2C_2 \left(\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I| \right) \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}, \tag{A.22}$$

and (3.16) is proven. If not and $C_2\|Y\|_{p,I} > \frac{1}{2}$, let $|I|$ be smaller so that $\|Y\|_{p,I} = \frac{1}{2C_2}$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2C_2} = \|Y\|_{p,I} \stackrel{(A.22)}{\leq} 2C_2 \left(\|X\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + |I| \right) \leq 2C_2\alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then, we obtain $\alpha_1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{4C_2^2}\right)^p =: \alpha_2$. Thus, it suffices to make I smaller so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_2^{\frac{1}{p}}$, and $\|Y\|_{p,I} = \frac{1}{2C_2} =: C_{p,b,\sigma}$, which concludes the proof of (3.16). The inequality (3.17) follows from (A.21) and (3.16). The inequality (3.18) follows from the previous inequalities. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.10

Proof of Proposition 3.10. First, Theorem 3.6 ensures that there exists two unique solutions $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}') \in \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{X}}^p$ to the RDEs. Second, let $I = [t_0, t_1] \subseteq [0, T]$ be an interval, and $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $\alpha_1 := \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}$ be two constants from Proposition 3.9 such that the inequalities in (3.19) hold and

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

By choosing I small-enough so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_1^{\frac{1}{p}}$ holds, we have shown (3.19).

Next, we show (3.20) (for an interval I that is perhaps shorter). First,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_{p,I} &\stackrel{(3.10)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^2} (1 + K_{Y,I} + K_{\tilde{Y},I})^2 (1 + \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|) \left(\|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + (\|\Delta Y'_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I}) \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \right) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} (\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I}), \\ \|R^{f_0^{\sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s}} - R^{f_0^{\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s}}\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} &\stackrel{(3.11)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma\|_{C_b^3} (1 + K_{Y,I} + K_{\tilde{Y},I} + |I|)^3 (1 + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,I})^4 (1 + |I|) \left(\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I}) + (\|\Delta Y'_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I}) \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} \right) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} \left(\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} (\|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I}) \right), \\ \left\| \int_0^\cdot (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, u_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} &\stackrel{(3.13)}{\leq} C_{p,b} |I| (\|\Delta Y\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}) \stackrel{(2.1)}{\leq} C_{p,b} |I| (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}) \\ &\stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} C_{p,b} |I| (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \Delta M_{Y'} \|X\|_{p,I} + M_{\tilde{Y}'} \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} |I| (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma} (\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I} + |I| (\|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I})), \end{aligned}$$

where we also used $\|\Delta Y'_{t_0}\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\|$ and $\|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} = \|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_{p,I}$.

Then, for a constant $C = C_{p,b,\sigma} > 1$ and any $\delta > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \delta \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \\ &\leq \|\sigma(\cdot, Y) - \sigma(\cdot, \tilde{Y})\|_{p,I} + \delta \left\| \int_0^\cdot (b(s, Y_s, u_s) - b(s, \tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{u}_s)) ds \right\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + \delta \left\| R^{f_0^{\sigma(s, Y_s) d\mathbf{X}_s}} - R^{f_0^{\sigma(s, \tilde{Y}_s) d\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_s}} \right\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \\ &\leq C \left[\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} \|X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \delta \left(|I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I} + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|) (\|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq C \left[(1 + \delta) (\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\|X\|_{p,I} + \delta (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|)) \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + (1 + \delta (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|)) \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \right], \end{aligned}$$

Next, we choose $\delta := 2C > 2$, so that $C = \frac{\delta}{2}$, and I small-enough so that

$$\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \frac{1}{4C\delta}, \quad (\text{A.24})$$

so that $C\delta(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and $C\|X\|_p \leq \frac{1}{4\delta} \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Then, after rearranging, the previous inequality becomes

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \left(\delta - \frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\right) \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq C(1 + \delta)(\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}),$$

Thus, since $\delta > 2$ and $(1 + \delta) \leq 2\delta = 4C$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} &\leq \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,I} + \left(\delta - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},I} \leq 2C(1 + \delta)(\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}). \\ &\leq 8C^2(\|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by choosing $\alpha_{p,b,\sigma} = \min(\alpha_1, 1/(4C\delta)^p)$ and I small-enough so that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{p,I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$ holds (and in particular, (A.23) and (A.24) hold), we obtain (3.20) and conclude the proof. \square

Error bounds on long intervals (Section 3.3.2)

Proof of Proposition 3.12

Proof of Proposition 3.12. By (2.21) in Corollary 2.9 and by Proposition 3.10, there exists constants $C_{p,b,\sigma} \geq 1$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{p,b,\sigma} > 0$ such that (3.19) holds and

$$\|Y' - \tilde{Y}'\|_{p,[s,t]} + \|R^Y - \tilde{R}^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[s,t]} \stackrel{(3.20)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_s\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[s,t]} + |t - s|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,[s,t]})$$

for any $[s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$. Thus, as defined in Definition 2.4, the greedy partition $\{\tau_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, N_{\alpha,I}(w) + 1\}$ of the interval I , which satisfies $w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$ for all i , is such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + |\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

for all i , and $\|X\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \stackrel{(2.21)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}$, and $M_{Y',[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} = \|Y'_{\tau_i}\| + \|Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \stackrel{(3.19)}{\leq} K_{Y,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \leq C_{p,b,\sigma}$. Next, with $\Delta M_{Y',[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} = \|\Delta Y'_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}$, and since $\|\Delta Y'_{\tau_i}\| \leq \|\sigma\|_{C_b^1} \|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} &\stackrel{(3.6)}{\leq} C_p(\Delta M_{Y',[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \|X\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + M_{\tilde{Y}',[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \|\Delta X\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \\ &\stackrel{(3.19)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y'_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta X\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \\ &\leq C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

so that, since $\|\Delta Y_{\tau_{i+1}}\| \leq \|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta Y\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}$ by (2.1),

$$\|\Delta Y_{\tau_{i+1}}\| \stackrel{(2.1), (A.26)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \quad (\text{A.27})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} &\stackrel{(2.1), (A.26)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta X\|_{p,I} + \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}) \\ &\stackrel{(A.25)}{\leq} C_{p,b,\sigma}(\|\Delta Y_{\tau_i}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

By sequentially combining (A.25), (A.27) and (A.28) over the intervals $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$, we obtain for all i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y'\|_{p,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2},[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} &\stackrel{(A.25), (A.27)}{\leq} (C_{p,b,\sigma})^{i+1} (i+1) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}), \\ \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty,[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} &\stackrel{(A.28)}{\leq} (C_{p,b,\sigma})^{i+1} (i+1) (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p,I} + |I|\|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty,I}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $N := N_{\alpha, I}(w)$, using Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta Y'\|_{p, I} + \|\Delta R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} &\leq (N+1) \left(\left(\sum_{j=0}^N \|\Delta Y'\|_{p, [\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}]}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}]}^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \right) \\ &\leq (N+1) \left(\sum_{j=0}^N \|\Delta Y'\|_{p, [\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}]} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [\tau_j, \tau_{j+1}]} \right) \\ &\leq (C_{p, b, \sigma})^{N+1} (N+1)^3 (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}), \\ \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty, I} &\leq (C_{p, b, \sigma})^{N+1} (N+1)^3 (\|\Delta Y_{t_0}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} + |I| \|\Delta u\|_{L^\infty, I}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\|\Delta Y\|_{\infty, I} \leq \max_i \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]} \leq (N+1) \max_i \|\Delta Y\|_{\infty, [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]}$ in the last inequality. The desired inequalities (3.23) and (3.24) then follow using $(C_{p, b, \sigma})^{N+1} (N+1)^3 \leq \exp((N+1) \log(C_{p, b, \sigma})) 3! \exp(N+1) = 6e C_{p, b, \sigma} \exp((\log(C_{p, b, \sigma}) + 1)N)$.

Finally, if u and \tilde{u} only differ on an interval $J = [s_0, s_1] \subseteq I$, then (3.25) and (3.26) follow from sequentially applying (3.23) and (3.24) on $[t_0, s_0] \cup J \cup [s_1, t_1] = I$, noting that $\Delta u_t = 0$ for almost every $t \in [t_0, s_0] \cup [s_1, t_1]$. \square

A.3.4 Bounds on solutions to linear RDEs and on the Jacobian flow (Section 3.4)

Proof of Lemma 3.14

Proof of Lemma 3.14. By Theorem 3.7, there exists a unique solution $(V, V') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ with $V' = \Sigma V$ to the linear RDE. Let $I = [s, t] \subseteq [0, T]$ be an interval. By Lemma 3.1, with $(\Sigma V)' = \Sigma V' + V\Sigma'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|V'\|_{p, I} &\stackrel{(3.3)}{\leq} C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \|V\|_{p, I} + \|V\|_{\infty, I} \|\Sigma\|_{p, I}) \leq C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I})(\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I}), \quad (\text{A.29}) \\ \|(\Sigma V)'\|_{p, I} &\stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} C_p(\|V\|_{\infty, I} \|\Sigma'\|_{p, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{\infty, I} \|V\|_{p, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \|V'\|_{p, I} + \|V'\|_{\infty, I} \|\Sigma\|_{p, I}) \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A.29})}{\leq} C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{p, I})^2 (\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I}), \\ \|R^{\Sigma V}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} &\stackrel{(3.5)}{\leq} C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + \|R^{\Sigma}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I} \|V\|_{p, I}) \\ &\leq C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I} + \|R^{\Sigma}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I})(\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}). \end{aligned}$$

Let I be small-enough to satisfy $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then, by Proposition 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{s, t}^V\| &= \|V_{s, t} - \Sigma_s V_s X_{s, t}\| \leq \left\| \int_s^t A_r V_r dr \right\| + \left\| \int_s^t \Sigma_r V_r d\mathbf{X}_r - \Sigma_s V_s X_{s, t} - (\Sigma V)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s, t} \right\| + \|(\Sigma V)'_s \mathbb{X}_{s, t}\| \\ &\stackrel{(2.10)}{\leq} \|A\|_{\infty, I} \|V\|_{\infty, I} |I| + C_p(\|R^{\Sigma V}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \|X\|_{p, I} + \|(\Sigma V)'\|_{p, I} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) + \|(\Sigma V)'\|_{\infty, I} \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (A.6) in Lemma A.1 (which is similar to (2.3) in Lemma 2.2) and the previous inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} &\leq C_p(\|A\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{p, I} + \|R^{\Sigma}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I})^2 (\\ &\quad \|V\|_{\infty, I} |I| + (\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \|X\|_{p, I} + (\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I}) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \\ &\leq C_{p, A, \Sigma} (\|V\|_{\infty, I} |I| + (\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \|X\|_{p, I} + (\|V\|_{\infty, I} + \|V\|_{p, I}) \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we choose I small-enough to remove $\|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}$ in the inequality above. Let $\alpha_1 := (1/(2C_{p, A, \Sigma}))^p \leq 1$ and choose I small-enough so that $\|X\|_{p, I}^p \leq \alpha_1$. Then, $C_{p, A, \Sigma} \|X\|_{p, I} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and we obtain

$$\|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \leq C_{p, A, \Sigma} (\|V\|_{p, I} + \|V\|_{\infty, I}) (|I| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I}) \quad (\text{A.30})$$

for a new constant $C_{p, A, \Sigma}$. Using the equation above, $V_{s, t} = \Sigma_s V_s X_{s, t} + R_{s, t}^V$, and $\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \leq C_{\Sigma}$, we obtain

$$\|V\|_{p, I} \stackrel{(2.2)}{\leq} C_p(\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \|V\|_{\infty, I} \|X\|_{p, I} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I}) \stackrel{(\text{A.30})}{\leq} C_{p, A, \Sigma} (\|V\|_{p, I} + \|V\|_{\infty, I}) (|I| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I}).$$

Define the control w by $w(s, t) = C_p(|t - s| + w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t))$ with $w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t) = \|X\|_{p, [s, t]}^p + \|\mathbb{X}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, [s, t]}^{\frac{p}{2}}$ and $C_p = 6^p$ as in Corollary 2.9, and let $\alpha := (1/(2C_{p, A, \Sigma}))^p \leq \alpha_1 \leq 1$. Then, by choosing I small-enough so that $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$, we have $|I| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} \stackrel{(2.21)}{\leq} \alpha^{\frac{1}{p}}$, so that $C_{p, A, \Sigma}(|I| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{p, I} &\leq C_{p, A, \Sigma} \|V\|_{\infty, I} (|I| + \|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I}) \stackrel{(A.5)}{\leq} C_{p, A, \Sigma} \|V\|_{\infty, I} (|I| + w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}}) \\ &\leq C_{p, A, \Sigma} \|V\|_{\infty, I} (|I|^{\frac{1}{p}} + w_{\mathbf{X}}(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}}) \leq C_{p, A, \Sigma} \|V\|_{\infty, I} w(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned} \quad (A.31)$$

for a new constant $C_{p, A, \Sigma} \geq 0$, where we used $|I| \leq |I|^{\frac{1}{p}}$ since $|I| \leq 1$ and $p \geq 1$, and $(|a| + |b|)^p \leq 2^p(|a|^p + |b|^p)$ in the last line. Then, by applying the rough Grönwall Lemma (Lemma 3.13), we obtain

$$\|V\|_{\infty, I} \leq 2 \exp(w(s, t)/(C\alpha)) \|V_s\| \leq 2 \exp(1/C) \|V_s\|, \quad (A.32)$$

for any interval $I \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$, and where $C > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ only depend on (p, A, Σ) . By sequentially using this inequality on the greedy partition $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^{N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)+1}$ of $[0, T]$ (which satisfies $w(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}) \leq \alpha$ for all i , see Definition 2.4) as in the end of the proof of Proposition 3.12, we obtain

$$\|V\|_{\infty, [0, T]} \leq (2 \exp(1/C))^{N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)+1} \|v\| \leq \tilde{C} \exp(\tilde{C} N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)) \|v\|$$

for a new constant $\tilde{C} > 0$. Finally, $N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(w) \leq C_p(N_{\alpha, [s, t]}(\mathbf{X}) + T/\alpha + 1)$ by (2.20) in Corollary 2.9, and the desired inequality (3.28) follows.

To show the inequality (3.27), from the previous inequalities, we have

$$\|V\|_{p, I} + \|V'\|_{p, I} + \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \stackrel{(A.31), (A.29), (A.30)}{\leq} C \|V\|_{\infty, I} (w(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}} + (1 + w(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}}) + (w(s, t)^{\frac{1}{p}} + 1)) \stackrel{(A.32)}{\leq} C \|V_s\|$$

for any interval $I \subseteq [0, T]$ with $w(s, t) \leq \alpha$. Again, by sequentially using this inequality on the greedy partition $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^{N_{\alpha, [0, T]}(w)+1}$ as in the end of the proof of Proposition 3.12, the inequality (3.27) follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.15

Proof of Lemma 3.15. By Theorem 3.6 and Corollary 3.8, there exists unique solutions to the two RDEs. First, by Proposition 3.9, there exists two constants $C_{p, b, \sigma} \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha_{p, b, \sigma} < 1$ such that

$$\|Y\|_{p, I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + \|Y'\|_{\infty, I} + \|Y'\|_{p, I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \leq C_{p, b, \sigma}.$$

for any interval $I = [t_0, t_1] \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p, b, \sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$, noting that $Y' = \sigma(\cdot, Y)$ with $\sigma \in C_b^3$.

Second, let $A = \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y, u)$, $\Sigma = \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(\cdot, Y)$ and $\Sigma' = \frac{\partial^2 \sigma}{\partial x^2}(\cdot, Y)Y'$. By Lemma 2.5, since $\sigma_x := \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} \in C_b^2$, $(\Sigma, \Sigma') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$, $K_{Y, I} = \|Y'_{t_0}\| + \|Y'\|_{p, I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \leq C_{p, b, \sigma}$, $M_{Y', I} \leq K_{Y, I} \leq C_{p, b, \sigma}$, and $\|X\|_{p, I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p, b, \sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$,

$$\|\Sigma\|_{p, I} \stackrel{(2.14)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma_x\|_{C_b^1} (M_{Y', I} \|X\|_{p, I} + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I|) \leq C_{p, b, \sigma},$$

$$\|\Sigma'\|_{p, I} \stackrel{(2.15)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma_x\|_{C_b^2} K_{Y, I} (1 + K_{Y, I} + |I|) (1 + \|X\|_{p, I}) \leq C_{p, b, \sigma},$$

$$\|R^{\Sigma}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \stackrel{(2.16)}{\leq} C_p \|\sigma_x\|_{C_b^2} (\|Y\|_{p, I}^2 + \|R^Y\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} + |I|) \leq C_{p, b, \sigma}.$$

Also, $\|A\|_{\infty} \leq C_b$ and $\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} \leq C_{\sigma}$. Thus, for a constant $C_{p, b, \sigma} \geq 1$,

$$\|\Sigma\|_{\infty, I} + \|\Sigma\|_{p, I} + \|\Sigma'\|_{p, I} + \|R^{\Sigma}\|_{\frac{p}{2}, I} \leq C_{p, b, \sigma}$$

for any interval $I \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{p, I} + |I| \leq \alpha_{p, b, \sigma}^{\frac{1}{p}}$. The conclusion follows from Lemma 3.14. \square

A.4 Additional proofs for the PMP (Section 4)

A.4.1 Needle-like variations (Section 4.1)

Proof of Corollary 4.2

Proof of Corollary 4.2. As in Proposition 4.1, the first inequality (4.12) follows from sequentially applying (3.25) and (3.26) on $[0, t_1] \cup [t_1, t_1 + \eta_1] \cup [t_1 + \eta_1, t_2] \cup \dots \cup [t_q, t_q + \eta_q] \cup [t_q + \eta_q, T] = [0, T]$, and concluding with (2.20) in Corollary 2.9.

Next, we show the second inequality (4.13). The case $q = 1$ is in Proposition 4.1, so we prove (4.13) for $q \geq 2$ by induction, assuming that it holds for q and proving it for $q + 1$ for a needle-like variation $\pi = \pi_{q+1} = \{t_1, \dots, t_{q+1}, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{q+1}, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_{q+1}\}$ with associated control u^π . Define the needle-like variation

$$\pi_q = \{t_1, \dots, t_q, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_q, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_q\} \subset \pi_{q+1} = \pi,$$

of u as the controls u^{π_q} defined by $u_t^{\pi_q} = \bar{u}_i$ if $t \in [t_i, t_i + \eta_i]$ for $i = 1, \dots, q$, and $u_t^{\pi_q} = u_t$ otherwise, and let $(Y^{\pi_q}, (Y^{\pi_q})') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ be the unique solution to the RDE

$$Y_t^{\pi_q} = y + \int_0^t b(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s^{\pi_q}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) d\mathbf{X}_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Let $(\tilde{V}, (\tilde{V})') \in \mathcal{D}_X^p$ be the unique solution to the RDE

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_t &= \tilde{V}_{t_{q+1}} + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) \tilde{V}_s ds + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) \tilde{V}_s d\mathbf{X}_s, & t \in [t_{q+1}, T], \\ \tilde{V}_t &= b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, \bar{u}_{q+1}) - b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, u_{t_{q+1}}), & t \in [0, t_{q+1}], \end{aligned}$$

see Figure 1.4 (corresponding to $q + 1 = 2$). Then, the error $Y^\pi - Y - \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \eta_i V^{\pi_i}$ can be decomposed as

$$Y^\pi - Y - \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \eta_i V^{\pi_i} = (Y^\pi - Y^{\pi_q} - \eta_{q+1} \tilde{V}) + \eta_{q+1} (\tilde{V} - V^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \left(Y^{\pi_q} - Y - \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i V^{\pi_i} \right)$$

For $C = C_{p,T,b,\sigma}$ and $\alpha = \alpha_{p,b,\sigma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| Y^\pi - Y^{\pi_q} - \eta_{q+1} \tilde{V} \right\|_{\infty, [t_{q+1}, T]} &\stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \eta_{q+1}^2 && \text{(base case } q = 1), \\ \left\| Y^{\pi_q} - Y - \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i V^{\pi_i} \right\|_{\infty, [t_{q+1}, T]} &\stackrel{(4.13)}{\leq} C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i,j=1}^q \eta_i \eta_j && \text{(induction step for } q), \end{aligned}$$

so to conclude, it suffices to show that $\|\tilde{V} - V^{\pi_{q+1}}\|_{\infty, [t_{q+1}, T]} \leq C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i$. Indeed, for




Figure 1.4: Needle-like variations with two spikes.

any $t \geq t_{q+1}$, the error can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V}_t - V_t^{\pi_{q+1}} &= (\tilde{V}_{t_{q+1}} - V_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) \tilde{V}_s - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} \right) ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) \tilde{V}_s - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} \right) d\mathbf{X}_s \\
&= (\tilde{V}_{t_{q+1}} - V_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) (\tilde{V}_s - V_s^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) \right) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} \right) ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) (\tilde{V}_s - V_s^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) \right) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} \right) d\mathbf{X}_s \\
&= (\tilde{V}_{t_{q+1}} - V_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) - \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s, u_s) \right) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} ds \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) - \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s) \right) V_s^{\pi_{q+1}} d\mathbf{X}_s \\
&\quad + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) (\tilde{V}_s - V_s^{\pi_{q+1}}) + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) (\tilde{V}_s - V_s^{\pi_{q+1}}) d\mathbf{X}_s.
\end{aligned}$$

By following similar arguments as in Proposition 4.1, the first three terms in the equation above can be bounded by $C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i$, for example,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{V}_{t_{q+1}} - V_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_{q+1}}\| &= \|(b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, \bar{u}_{q+1}) - b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, u_{t_{q+1}})) - (b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}, \bar{u}_{q+1}) - b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}, u_{t_{q+1}}))\| \\
&\leq \|b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, \bar{u}_{q+1}) - (b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}, \bar{u}_{q+1}))\| + \|b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q}, u_{t_{q+1}}) - b(t_{q+1}, Y_{t_{q+1}}, u_{t_{q+1}})\| \\
&\leq C_b \|Y_{t_{q+1}}^{\pi_q} - Y_{t_{q+1}}\| \stackrel{(4.12)}{\leq} C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i,
\end{aligned}$$

and the other two integrals can be bounded as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 using the bounds (3.29) and (3.30) for $\|V\|_\infty, \|V\|_p, \|V'\|_p, \|R^V\|_{\frac{p}{2}}$ in Lemma 3.15. Finally, by defining $\Delta := \tilde{V} - V^{\pi_{q+1}}$ and looking at the linear RDE $\Delta_t = \Delta_{t_{q+1}} + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial b}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}, u_s) \Delta_s + \int_{t_{q+1}}^t \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(s, Y_s^{\pi_q}) \Delta_s d\mathbf{X}_s$ whose initial value satisfies $\|\Delta_{t_{q+1}}\| \leq C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i$, we conclude that $\|\Delta\|_{\infty, [t_{q+1}, T]} = \|\tilde{V} - V^{\pi_{q+1}}\|_{\infty, [t_{q+1}, T]} \leq C \exp(CN_{\alpha, [0, T]}(\mathbf{X})) \sum_{i=1}^q \eta_i$ using (3.30) in Lemma 3.15, and the conclusion follows. \square

A.5 Additional details for the indirect shooting method (Section 5)

We provide additional details for the integration schemes used for the Stratonovich SDE and the coupled RDE used in the **Direct** method and the **Indirect** shooting method in Section 5. We only describe the case for the open-loop problem **OL-OCP**, as the feedback problem **FB-OCP** only has a different drift term.

1) **Direct** method: We discretize the Stratonovich SDE in the **Direct** problem using a Milstein scheme. Since σ is diagonal and each $\frac{\partial \sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^\ell} = 0$ for $\ell \neq j$, each j -th component $[\hat{x}^i]^j$ of \hat{x}^i is approximated as

$$[\hat{x}_{k+1}^i]^j = [\hat{x}_k^i + (A(\hat{x}_k^i) \hat{x}_k^i + \bar{B} \hat{u}_k) \Delta t + \sigma(\hat{x}_k^i) \Delta B_k^i]^j + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^j} (\hat{x}_k^i) \sigma^{jj} (\hat{x}_k^i) ([\Delta B_k^i]^j)^2, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{A.33})$$

where $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N}$, and $\Delta B_k^i = B_{(k+1)\Delta t}^i - B_{k\Delta t}^i$, see [63, equation (3.12), Chapter 10.3].

2) **Indirect** method: To implement the map $F : \mathbb{R}^{Mn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{Mn}$, $(p_0^i)_{i=1}^M \mapsto (p_T^i)_{i=1}^M$, we numerically integrate the RDE in (5.1) using the estimate (2.10) for rough integrals as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{k+1}^i \\ \hat{p}_{k+1}^i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i \\ \hat{p}_k^i \end{bmatrix} + \bar{b} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i \\ \hat{p}_k^i \end{bmatrix}, u_k^M \right) \Delta t + \bar{\sigma} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i \\ \hat{p}_k^i \end{bmatrix} \right) B_{k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t}^i + \nabla \bar{\sigma} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i \\ \hat{p}_k^i \end{bmatrix} \right) \bar{\sigma} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i \\ \hat{p}_k^i \end{bmatrix} \right) \mathbb{B}_{k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t}^i, \quad (\text{A.34})$$

where $\bar{b}((x, u), u) = (b(x, u), -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(x, u, p, \mathbf{p}_0))$ and $\bar{\sigma}(x, p) = (\sigma(x), \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p)$ denote the augmented drift and diffusion, $k = 0, \dots, N-1$, and $\Delta t = \frac{T}{N}$. Because $\sigma(x) \propto \text{diag}(x)$ is diagonal, only the diagonal elements

$[\mathbb{B}_{k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t}^i]^{jj} = \frac{1}{2}([\mathbb{B}_{k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t}^i]^j)^2$ are required to evaluate (A.34), and one observes that the integration rule (A.34) for \hat{x}^i coincides with (A.33), as we show next. The tensor $\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times n \times n}$ is given by

$$\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)\sigma(x) + \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial p}(x)\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p \\ -\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right)\sigma(x) - \frac{\partial}{\partial p}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right)\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\sigma(x) \propto \text{diag}(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)\sigma(x)\right]^{ijk} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial\sigma^{ij}}{\partial x^\ell}(x)\sigma^{\ell k}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial\sigma^{ii}}{\partial x^i}(x)\sigma^{ii}(x) & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial p}(x)\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p &= 0. \\ \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right)\sigma(x)\right]^{ijk} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\ell}\left(\sum_{q=1}^n \frac{\partial\sigma^{qj}}{\partial x^i}(x)p^q\right)\sigma^{\ell k}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2\sigma^{ii}}{\partial^2 x^i}(x)p^i\sigma^{ii}(x) & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right)\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right]^{ijk} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\ell}\left[\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right)\right]^{ij}\left[\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial x}(x)^\top p\right]^{\ell k} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\ell}\left(\sum_{q=1}^n \frac{\partial\sigma^{qj}}{\partial x^i}(x)p^q\right)\left(\sum_{q=1}^n \frac{\partial\sigma^{qk}}{\partial x^\ell}(x)p^q\right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\ell}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^i}(x)p^j\right)\left(\frac{\partial\sigma^{kk}}{\partial x^\ell}(x)p^k\right) = \frac{\partial\sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^i}(x)\frac{\partial\sigma^{kk}}{\partial x^j}(x)p^k \\ &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\partial\sigma^{ii}}{\partial x^i}(x)\right)^2 p^i & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the tensor $\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)$ is such that only the entries $[\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)]^{j,j,j}$ and $[\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)]^{n+j,j,j}$ are non-zero, and each j th index of the right hand side of (A.34) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^j &= [\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)]^{j,j,j} [\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^{j,j} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial\sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^j}(x)\sigma^{jj}(x)([\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^j)^2, \\ [\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^{n+j} &= [\nabla\bar{\sigma}(x, p)\bar{\sigma}(x, p)]^{n+j,j,j} [\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^{j,j} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2\sigma^{jj}}{\partial^2 x^j}(x)\sigma^{jj}(x) + \left(\frac{\partial\sigma^{jj}}{\partial x^j}(x)\right)^2 \right) p^j ([\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^j)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

where we used $[\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^{jj} = (\int_s^t B_{s,u}^j \circ dB_u^j)^i = \frac{1}{2}([\mathbb{B}_{s,t}^i]^j)^2$, where $\int_s^t B_{s,u}^j \circ dB_u^j$ is the Stratonovich integral of the $B_{s,\cdot}^j$ against B^j .

Thus, only the squared increments $[B_{s,t}^i]^j$ are required to evaluate (A.34). Using (A.35), we also observe that the integration rule (A.34) for x coincides with the Milstein integration scheme in (A.33).

References

- [1] P. Guasoni, “No arbitrage under transaction costs, with fractional Brownian motion and beyond,” *Mathematical Finance*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 569–582, 2006.
- [2] C. Leparoux, R. Bonalli, B. Hérissé, and F. Jean, “Statistical linearization for robust motion planning,” *System and Control Letters*, vol. 189, p. 105825, 2024.
- [3] L. Blackmore, M. Ono, and B. C. Williams, “Chance-constrained optimal path planning with obstacles,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1080–1094, 2011.
- [4] T. Lew, M. Greiff, F. Djeumou, M. Suminaka, M. Thompson, and J. Subosits, “Risk-averse model predictive control for racing in adverse conditions,” in *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, 2025.

- [5] B. Berret and F. Jean, “Stochastic optimal open-loop control as a theory of force and impedance planning via muscle co-contraction,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2020.
- [6] P. L. Lions, “Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations part I: the dynamic programming principle and applications,” *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 1101–1174, 1983.
- [7] S. Peng, “Stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 284–304, 1992.
- [8] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*. Springer New York, 1999.
- [9] S. Peng, “A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 966–979, 1990.
- [10] R. Bonalli and B. Bonnet, “First-order Pontryagin maximum principle for risk-averse stochastic optimal control problems,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1881–1909, 2023.
- [11] J.-M. Bismut, “Linear quadratic optimal stochastic control with random coefficients,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 419–444, 1976.
- [12] S. Tang, “General linear quadratic optimal stochastic control problems with random coefficients: Linear stochastic Hamilton systems and backward stochastic Riccati equations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 53–75, 2003.
- [13] H. J. Kushner and P. Dupuis, *Numerical Methods for Stochastic Control Problems in Continuous Time*. Springer New York, 2001.
- [14] E. Gobet, *Monte-Carlo Methods and Stochastic Processes: From Linear to Non-Linear*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2016.
- [15] R. Bonalli, T. Lew, and M. Pavone, “Sequential convex programming for non-linear stochastic optimal control,” *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation & Calculus of Variations*, vol. 28, no. 64, 2022.
- [16] W. E, J. Han, and A. Jentzen, “Deep learning-based numerical methods for high-dimensional parabolic partial differential equations and backward stochastic differential equations,” *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 349–380, 2017.
- [17] E. Gobet and E. Munos, “Sensitivity analysis using Itô-Malliavin calculus and martingales, and application to stochastic optimal control,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1676–1713, 2005.
- [18] S. Massaroli, M. Poli, S. Peluchetti, J. Park, A. Yamashita, and H. Asama, “Learning stochastic optimal policies via gradient descent,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 1094–1099, 2022.
- [19] X. Li, T.-K. Wong, R. T. Q. Chen, and D. Duvenaud, “Scalable gradients for stochastic differential equations,” in *AI & Statistics*, 2020.
- [20] P. Kidger, “On neural differential equations,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oxford, 2022.
- [21] C. Leparoux, B. Hérissé, and F. Jean, “Structure of optimal control for planetary landing with control and state constraints,” *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation & Calculus of Variations*, vol. 28, 2022.
- [22] E. Trélat, “Optimal control and applications to aerospace: Some results and challenges,” *Journal of Optimization Theory & Applications*, vol. 154, no. 3, pp. 713–758, 2012.
- [23] R. Bonalli, “Optimal control of aerospace systems with control-state constraints and delays,” Ph.D. dissertation, Sorbonne Université & ONERA - The French Aerospace Lab, 2018.
- [24] T. Lyons and Z. Qian, *System Control and Rough Paths*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

- [25] T. Lyons, M. Caruana, and T. Lévy, *Differential Equations Driven by Rough Paths: Lectures from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
- [26] P. K. Friz and N. B. Victoir, *Multidimensional Stochastic Processes as Rough Paths: Theory and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [27] P. K. Friz and M. Hairer, *A course on rough paths: with an introduction to regularity structures*. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [28] A. Allan, “Lecture notes on rough path theory,” ETH Zürich, 2021.
- [29] H. A. M. Davis and G. Burstein, “A deterministic approach to stochastic optimal control with application to anticipative control,” *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, vol. 40, pp. 203–256, 1992.
- [30] L. C. G. Rogers, “Pathwise stochastic optimal control,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 1116–1132, 2007.
- [31] N. Bhauryal, A. B. Cruzeiro, and C. Oliveira, “Pathwise stochastic control and a class of stochastic partial differential equations,” *Journal of Optimization Theory & Applications*, vol. 203, no. 2, pp. 1967–1990, 2024.
- [32] J. Diehl, P. K. Friz, and P. Gassiat, “Stochastic control with rough paths,” *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 285–315, 2016.
- [33] A. L. Allan and S. N. Cohen, “Pathwise stochastic control with applications to robust filtering,” *The Annals of Applied Probability*, vol. 30, no. 5, 2020.
- [34] E. B. Lee and L. Markus, *Foundations of Optimal Control Theory*. John Wiley, 1967.
- [35] A. A. Agrachev and Y. L. Sachkov, *Control Theory from the Geometric Viewpoint*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [36] B. Bonnard, L. Faubourg, and E. Trélat, *Mécanique céleste et contrôle des véhicules spatiaux*. Springer, 2006, in French.
- [37] T. Cass, C. Litterer, and T. Lyons, “Integrability and tail estimates for Gaussian rough differential equations,” *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 3026–3050, 2013.
- [38] P. Friz and S. Riedel, “Integrability of (non-)linear rough differential equations and integrals,” *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 336–358, 2013.
- [39] C. Phelps, J. O. Royset, and Q. Gong, “Optimal control of uncertain systems using sample average approximations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 1–29, 2016.
- [40] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*, 3rd ed. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2021.
- [41] T. Lew, R. Bonalli, and M. Pavone, “Sample average approximation for stochastic programming with equality constraints,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 3506–3533, 2024.
- [42] O. Melnikov and J. Milz, “Convergence rates for ensemble-based solutions to optimal control of uncertain dynamical systems,” 2024, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.18182>.
- [43] Z. Pereira, M. A. Wang, I. Exarchos, and E. A. Theodorou, “Learning deep stochastic optimal control policies using forward-backward SDEs,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2019.
- [44] R. Carmona and M. Laurière, “Deep learning for mean field games and mean field control with applications to finance,” 2021, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.04568>.
- [45] P. K. Friz, B. Gess, A. Gulisashvili, and S. Riedel, “The Jain-Monrad criterion for rough paths and applications to random Fourier series and non-Markovian Hörmander theory,” *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2016.

- [46] C. Bayer, P. K. Friz, S. Riedel, and J. Schoenmakers, “From rough path estimates to multilevel Monte Carlo,” *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 1449–1483, Jan. 2016.
- [47] N. Perkowski and D. J. Prömel, “Pathwise stochastic integrals for model free finance,” *Bernoulli*, vol. 22, no. 4, 2016.
- [48] P. Bank, C. Bayer, P. P. Hager, S. Riedel, and T. Nauen, “Stochastic control with signatures,” 2024, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01585>.
- [49] B. Houska and M. E. Villanueva, “Robust optimization for MPC,” in *Handbook of Model Predictive Control*. Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 413–443.
- [50] F. Bugini, P. K. Friz, and W. Stannat, “Parameter dependent rough SDEs with applications to rough PDEs,” 2024, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.11330>.
- [51] P. K. Friz and H. Zhang, “Differential equations driven by rough paths with jumps,” *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 264, no. 10, pp. 6226–6301, 2018.
- [52] P. K. Friz, A. Hocquet, and K. Lê, “Rough stochastic differential equations,” 2024, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.10340>.
- [53] T. Cass and M. Ogrodnik, “Tail estimates for Markovian rough paths,” *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2017.
- [54] S. Riedel and M. Scheutzow, “Rough differential equations with unbounded drift term,” *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 262, no. 1, pp. 283–312, 2017.
- [55] T. Cass and N. Lim, “A Stratonovich-Skorohod integral formula for Gaussian rough paths,” *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2019.
- [56] A. Deya, M. Gubinelli, M. Hofmanová, and S. Tindel, “A priori estimates for rough PDEs with application to rough conservation laws,” *Journal of Functional Analysis*, vol. 276, no. 12, pp. 3577–3645, 2019.
- [57] L. S. Pontryagin, V. G. Boltyanskii, R. V. Gamkrelidze, and E. F. Mishchenko, *Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*. Taylor & Francis, 1986.
- [58] G. B. Folland, “Remainder estimates in Taylor’s theorem,” *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 97, no. 3, pp. 233–235, 1990.
- [59] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*. Springer New York, 2006.
- [60] J. Bradbury, R. Frostig, P. Hawkins, M. J. Johnson, C. Leary, D. Maclaurin, G. Necula, A. Paszke, J. VanderPlas, S. Wanderman-Milne, and Q. Zhang, “JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs,” 2018.
- [61] B. Stellato, G. Banjac, P. Goulart, A. Bemporad, and S. Boyd, “OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs,” *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 637–672, 2020.
- [62] A. L. Allan, A. P. Kwosek, C. Liu, and D. J. Prömel, “Pathwise convergence of the Euler scheme for rough and stochastic differential equations,” 2023, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16489>.
- [63] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.