

Longtime behaviors of θ -Euler–Maruyama method for stochastic functional differential equations

Chuchu Chen (chenchuchu@lsec.cc.ac.cn)

Tonghe Dang (dangth@lsec.cc.ac.cn)

Jialin Hong (hjl@lsec.cc.ac.cn)

Guoting Song (songgt606@lsec.cc.ac.cn)

LSEC, ICMSEC, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; School of Mathematical Sciences,
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

Abstract

This paper investigates longtime behaviors of the θ -Euler–Maruyama method for the stochastic functional differential equation with superlinearly growing coefficients. We focus on the longtime convergence analysis in mean-square sense and weak sense of the θ -Euler–Maruyama method, the convergence of the numerical invariant measure, the existence and convergence of the numerical density function, and the Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation principle of the method. The main contributions are outlined as follows. First, we obtain the longtime mean-square convergence of the θ -Euler–Maruyama method and show that the mean-square convergence rate is $\frac{1}{2}$. A key step in the proof is to establish the time-independent boundedness of high-order moments of the numerical functional solution. Second, based on the technique of the Malliavin calculus, we present the longtime weak convergence of the θ -Euler–Maruyama method, which implies that the invariant measure of the θ -Euler–Maruyama functional solution converges to the exact one with rate 1. Third, by the analysis of the test-functional-independent weak convergence and negative moment estimates of the determinant of the corresponding Malliavin covariance matrix, we derive the existence, convergence, and the logarithmic estimate of the density function of the θ -Euler–Maruyama solution. At last, utilizing the weak convergence method, we obtain the Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation principle for the θ -Euler–Maruyama solution on the infinite time horizon.

Keywords: Stochastic functional differential equation; θ -Euler–Maruyama method; longtime behaviors; mean-square and weak convergence; invariant measure; density function; large deviation principle

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Stochastic functional differential equation | 1 |
| 1.2 | θ -Euler–Maruyama method | 3 |
| 1.3 | Outline and notations | 5 |
| 1.3.1 | Outline | 5 |
| 1.3.2 | Notations | 8 |
| 1.4 | Acknowledgement | 11 |
| 2 | Mean-square convergence analysis | 13 |
| 2.1 | Time-independent moment boundedness of numerical solution | 13 |
| 2.1.1 | Time-independent boundedness of second moment | 13 |
| 2.1.2 | Time-independent boundedness of high-order moment | 24 |
| 2.2 | Attractiveness and stability of numerical solution | 39 |
| 2.3 | Mean-square convergence rate | 42 |
| 2.4 | Summary and outlook | 45 |
| 3 | Invariant measure and weak convergence analysis | 47 |
| 3.1 | Numerical invariant measure | 47 |
| 3.2 | Weak convergence rate | 50 |
| 3.2.1 | Preliminaries | 50 |
| 3.2.2 | Estimates of Malliavin derivatives and Gâteaux derivatives | 54 |
| 3.2.3 | Weak convergence rate | 67 |
| 3.3 | Summary and outlook | 78 |
| 4 | Approximation of density function | 79 |
| 4.1 | Existence of numerical density function | 79 |
| 4.2 | Convergence of numerical density function | 87 |
| 4.2.1 | Convergence on the finite time horizon | 87 |
| 4.2.2 | Convergence on the infinite time horizon | 90 |
| 4.3 | Summary and outlook | 107 |
| 5 | Large deviation principle of numerical solution | 109 |
| 5.1 | The Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation of numerical solution | 109 |
| 5.2 | Logarithmic estimate for numerical density function | 128 |
| 5.3 | Summary and outlook | 138 |
| | Bibliography | 141 |

Introduction

The stochastic functional differential equation (SFDE) is commonly used to model systems that depend not only on the present state but also on the past ones, which has wide applications in diverse fields such as biology, epidemiology, mechanics, neural networks, economics, finance and so on. The numerical method of the SFDE serves as a powerful tool to qualitatively and quantitatively study stochastic phenomena and time-lag effect prevalent in these fields. There is a growing interest in the study of longtime behaviors of numerical methods, which provides effective approaches for investigating the intrinsic properties of the exact solution. However, many problems on this topic remain unsolved. This paper focuses on the investigation of longtime behaviors for the θ -Euler–Maruyama (θ -EM) method of the SFDE.

1.1 Stochastic functional differential equation

In this paper, we consider the following SFDE on $t \in [-\tau, +\infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} dx^\xi(t) = b(x_t^\xi)dt + \sigma(x_t^\xi)dW(t), & t > 0, \\ x^\xi(t) = \xi(t), & t \in [-\tau, 0], \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where the delay $\tau > 0$, the initial datum $\xi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, the drift coefficient $b : \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, the diffusion coefficient $\sigma : \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ is globally Lipschitz continuous, $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$ is an m -dimensional standard Brownian motion on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, and $x_t^\xi : r \mapsto x^\xi(t+r)$ is the $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued functional solution for $t \geq 0$. The well-posedness of (1.1) has been deeply studied, see e.g. [51, 49, 61, 54] and references therein for details.

The longtime behavior of the SFDE on the infinite time horizon is a recent and ongoing research subject. There are now a certain number of papers devoted to this research. For instance, the stability of the exact solution has been established in e.g. [1, 46, 36, 55]; The theory on the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure of the functional solution has been well studied in e.g. [8, 4, 60, 5, 59]. We recall some results on the functional solution of (1.1), including the second moment boundedness, the exponential attractiveness, and the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure. Suppose that the coefficients satisfy the following two assumptions, which are globally Lipschitz condition of the diffusion coefficient σ and the dissipative condition of the drift coefficient b .

Assumption 1.1 *There exist a constant $L > 0$ and a probability measure ν_1 on $[-\tau, 0]$ such that for any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$|\sigma(\phi_1) - \sigma(\phi_2)|^2 \leq L \left(|\phi_1(0) - \phi_2(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi_1(r) - \phi_2(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right).$$

Assumption 1.2 *The drift coefficient b is continuous and there exist a probability measure ν_2 on $[-\tau, 0]$ and positive constants a_1, a_2 satisfying $a_1 > a_2 + L$ such that for any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\langle \phi_1(0) - \phi_2(0), b(\phi_1) - b(\phi_2) \rangle \leq -a_1 |\phi_1(0) - \phi_2(0)|^2 + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi_1(r) - \phi_2(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r).$$

Note that under Assumption 1.2, the drift coefficient b may grow superlinearly, in particular, the classical example $b(x) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^0 x(s) ds - |x(0)|^2 x(0) - x(0)$, $x \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is included.

Remark 1.1 *By Assumption 1.2, we obtain that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle \leq |\phi(0)| |b(0)| - a_1 |\phi(0)|^2 + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \quad (1.2)$$

Since $a_1 > a_2 + L$, by the Young inequality, we have

$$2|\phi(0)| |b(0)| \leq \frac{1}{a_1 - a_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)L} |b(0)|^2 + (a_1 - a_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)L) |\phi(0)|^2, \quad (1.3)$$

where the positive constant ε satisfies $a_1 - a_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)L > 0$. Inserting (1.3) into (1.2) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{a_1 - a_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)L} |b(0)|^2 - (a_1 + a_2 + (1 + \varepsilon)L) |\phi(0)|^2 \\ &\quad + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned}$$

This, along with Assumption 1.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &2\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle + |\sigma(\phi)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a_1 - a_2 - (1 + \varepsilon)L} |b(0)|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) |\sigma(0)|^2 - (a_1 + a_2) |\phi(0)|^2 \\ &\quad + (1 + \varepsilon)L \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon = \frac{a_1 - (a_2 + L)}{2L}$, we have

$$2\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle \leq K - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} |\phi(0)|^2 + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle + |\sigma(\phi)|^2 &\leq K - (a_1 + a_2) |\phi(0)|^2 + \frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \\ &\quad + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r), \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where the positive constant K depends on $a_1, a_2, L, b(0)$, and $\sigma(0)$.

Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, the SFDE (1.1) with the initial datum $\xi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ has a unique strong solution $x^\xi(\cdot)$ on $[-\tau, \infty)$ according to [54, Theorem 2.3]. Below, we list the second moment boundedness, the exponential attractiveness, and the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure for the functional solution of (1.1). The proofs are similar to [4, Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2, and Theorem 1.3], which are omitted.

Lemma 1.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, the functional solution of (1.1) satisfies*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t^\xi\|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_t^\xi - x_t^\eta\|^2] \leq K\|\xi - \eta\|^2 e^{-\lambda t} \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $K > 0$, and $\lambda > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant satisfying

$$c_\lambda := 2a_1 - L - (2a_2 + L)e^{\lambda\tau} - \lambda > 0. \quad (1.6)$$

For any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $t \geq 0$, denote by μ_t^ξ the probability measure generated by x_t^ξ , namely,

$$\mu_t^\xi(A) = \mathbb{P}\{\omega \in \Omega : x_t^\xi \in A\} \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)).$$

Define the bounded-Wasserstein distance \mathbb{W}_q ($q \in [1, \infty)$) as

$$\mathbb{W}_q(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2) := \left(\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)} \int_{\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)} 1 \wedge \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|^q \pi(d\phi_1, d\phi_2) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (1.7)$$

where $\Pi(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)$ denotes the collection of all probability measures on $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with marginal measures \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 ; see [58, Chapter 6] for details.

Lemma 1.2 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, the functional solution x^ξ is asymptotically stable in distribution and admits a unique invariant measure μ satisfying*

$$\mathbb{W}_2(\mu_t^\xi, \mu) \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|)e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}t}.$$

1.2 θ -Euler–Maruyama method

The numerical study of the SFDE on the infinite time horizon has attracted a great deal of attention in the past decades. For instance, authors in [62, 44] obtain the stability of the Euler–Maruyama (EM) method and the backward Euler–Maruyama (BEM) method for the linearly growing coefficients case and the superlinearly growing coefficients case, respectively; Authors in [4] present the existence, uniqueness, and convergence of the invariant measure of the EM method for the SFDE with Markov switching; [56] proves that for the SFDE with superlinearly growing coefficients, the numerical invariant measure of the BEM method converges to the exact one.

In this paper, we introduce a general class of numerical methods, namely, the θ -Euler–Maruyama (θ -EM) method ($\theta \in [0, 1]$), and investigate the longtime behaviors of numerical solutions for the SFDE. The θ -EM method includes the EM method (for which $\theta = 0$) and the BEM method (for which $\theta = 1$). Concerning that for the SFDE with superlinearly growing coefficients, the explicit method such as the EM method often fails to converge strongly or weakly to the exact solution; see e.g. [35]. To overcome the divergence, we consider the implicit case with $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ in this paper. We also remark that for the case

of $\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, results in this paper can also be obtained under a stronger condition on coefficients b and σ . Without loss of generality, we take a sufficiently large integer $N \geq \tau$ such that $\Delta = \frac{\tau}{N} \in (0, 1]$. Let $t_k = k\Delta$ for $k = -N, -N+1, \dots$. Define the θ -EM method as follows: for any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{cases} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), & k = -N, -N+1, \dots, 0, \\ y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1-\theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta + \theta b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})\delta W_k, & k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\delta W_k = W(t_{k+1}) - W(t_k)$, and $y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}$ is a $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued random variable defined by

$$y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(r) = \frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) \quad (1.9)$$

for $r \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$, $j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}$. We call $\{y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)\}_{k=-N}^{\infty}$ the θ -EM solution and $\{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ the θ -EM functional solution. Without particular clarifications, we always assume $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

The following lemma shows the solvability of the θ -EM method.

Lemma 1.3 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, the solution of the implicit method (1.8) exists uniquely for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$.*

Proof. Fix $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\theta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. For any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define continuous functions $\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta} : [-\tau, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, respectively, by

$$\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta}(r) = \begin{cases} \phi(r + \Delta), & r \in [-\tau, -\Delta), \\ \frac{-r}{\Delta}\phi(0) + \frac{\Delta+r}{\Delta}u, & r \in [-\Delta, 0] \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

and

$$F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta}(u) = u - \theta b(\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta})\Delta.$$

Moreover, by virtue of (1.4) and the convex property of $|\cdot|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle u, F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta}(u) \rangle}{|u|^2} &= 1 - \theta\Delta \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle \Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta}(0), b(\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta}) \rangle}{|u|^2} \\ &\geq 1 - \theta\Delta \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} |\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta}(0)|^2 + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\Phi_{\phi, u}^{\Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)}{2|u|^2} \\ &\geq 1 - \theta\Delta \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} |u|^2 + 2a_2(\|\phi\|^2 + |u|^2)}{2|u|^2} \\ &= 1 + \theta\Delta \frac{3(a_1 - a_2) + L}{4} > 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta}$ is coercive. In addition, for any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u_1 \neq u_2$, by Assumption 1.2 and (1.10), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle u_1 - u_2, F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta}(u_1) - F_{\theta, \phi}^{\Delta}(u_2) \rangle \\ &= |u_1 - u_2|^2 - \theta\Delta \langle \Phi_{\phi, u_1}^{\Delta}(0) - \Phi_{\phi, u_2}^{\Delta}(0), b(\Phi_{\phi, u_1}^{\Delta}) - b(\Phi_{\phi, u_2}^{\Delta}) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq |u_1 - u_2|^2 + \theta\Delta a_1 |\Phi_{\phi, u_1}^\Delta(0) - \Phi_{\phi, u_2}^\Delta(0)|^2 - \theta\Delta a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\Phi_{\phi, u_1}^\Delta(r) - \Phi_{\phi, u_2}^\Delta(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\
&= (1 + \theta\Delta a_1) |u_1 - u_2|^2 - \theta\Delta a_2 \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{\Delta + r}{\Delta} |u_1 - u_2|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\
&\geq (1 + \theta\Delta a_1 - \theta\Delta a_2) |u_1 - u_2|^2 > |u_1 - u_2|^2 > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows the monotone property of $F_{\theta, \phi}^\Delta$. Hence according to [50, Lemma 3.1], we arrive at that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the equation $F_{\theta, \phi}^\Delta(u) = v$ has a unique solution $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the inverse $(F_{\theta, \phi}^\Delta)^{-1}$ of $F_{\theta, \phi}^\Delta$ exists. For the fixed integer $k \geq 0$ and $y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}$, we observe

$$F_{\theta, y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}}^\Delta(y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - \theta b(\Phi_{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}, y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})}^\Delta) \Delta = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - \theta b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) \Delta.$$

Then (1.8) can be rewritten as

$$F_{\theta, y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}}^\Delta(y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \Delta + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \delta W_k.$$

By virtue of the existence of $(F_{\theta, y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}}^\Delta)^{-1}$, we derive that $y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})$ exists uniquely and satisfies

$$y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) = (F_{\theta, y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}}^\Delta)^{-1}(y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \Delta + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \delta W_k) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus, the proof is finished. \square

The following lemma shows the Markov property of the numerical functional solution, whose proof is similar to that of [56, Theorem 6.1] and is omitted.

Lemma 1.4 *The θ -EM functional solution is a time-homogenous Markov chain.*

1.3 Outline and notations

1.3.1 Outline

Our objective is to investigate longtime behaviors of the numerical solution of θ -EM method (1.8), including the longtime mean-square convergence and weak convergence, the convergence of the numerical invariant measure, the existence and convergence of the numerical density function, and the large deviation principle of the numerical solution. To be specific,

- (1) In Chapter 2, we obtain the longtime mean-square convergence of the θ -EM functional solution for the SFDE (1.1), and show that the mean-square convergence rate is $\frac{1}{2}$.
- (2) In Chapter 3, we present a quantitative estimate of the invariant measure of the θ -EM functional solution, based on the investigation of the time-independent weak convergence rate of the considered numerical method.

- (3) In Chapter 4, we show the existence of density functions of the exact solution and θ -EM solution for SFDE (1.1), and further establish the convergence of the numerical density function.
- (4) In Chapter 5, we investigate the Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation principle (LDP) of the θ -EM solution, and further present the logarithmic estimate of the numerical density function for the SFDE (1.1) with small noise.

We proceed with the main results obtained in this paper:

Chapter 2: The mean-square convergence is one of the crucial features for the accuracy of a stochastic numerical method. Over the past decades, much attention has been paid to this topic for SFDEs on the finite time horizon. For instance, for SFDE with the globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, when the delay argument is of the discrete type, authors in [33] develop a strong Milstein scheme and show that the strong convergence rate is 1; Authors in [9] use the Wong–Zakai approximation as an intermediate step to derive three numerical schemes and analyze their mean-square convergence. For the distributed type of delay argument, the author in [48] obtains the mean-square convergence of the EM method and further proves that the convergence rate is $\frac{1}{2}$; The author in [6] provides a systematic approach to investigating the mean-square convergence of drift-implicit one-step schemes. For the superlinear growing coefficients case, when the delay argument is of the discrete type, authors in [25] construct the tamed EM method and analyze its mean-square convergence. Recently, for the distributed type of delay argument, authors in [43] design a truncated EM method and show that the mean-square convergence rate is $\frac{1}{2}$. By contrast, the research on the longtime mean-square convergence for numerical methods of SFDEs remains rare. And we are aware of a recent paper [15], in which the mean-square convergence rate of the EM method for the SFDE on the infinite time horizon is proved to be $\frac{1}{2}$ under the globally Lipschitz condition. However, for the superlinearly growing coefficients case, how can one obtain the longtime mean-square convergence of numerical methods for the SFDE?

In Chapter 2, we focus on the θ -EM method of the SFDE (1.1) with superlinearly growing coefficients, and study the longtime mean-square convergence of the method. We first establish the time-independent boundedness of high-order moments of the θ -EM functional solution. Then we derive the inheritance of the exponential attractiveness and the exponential stability of the exact functional solution by the θ -EM method. Armed with these preparations, we prove that the mean-square convergence rate of the θ -EM method on the infinite time horizon is $\frac{1}{2}$. As applications, we derive the probabilistic limit behaviors, including the strong law of large numbers and the central limit theorem, for the θ -EM functional solution.

Chapter 3: Invariant measure is an important characteristic for describing longtime dynamical behaviors of Markov processes. For SFDEs with either discrete or distributed delay arguments, it is known that the solution is non-Markovian due to the dependence on the past. Hence, the functional solution, which is proved to be Markovian, becomes the objective to study the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure of the underlying SFDE. Numerical approximation of the unique invariant measure of the functional solution for SFDEs with different types of delay arguments has been studied in the existing literature. For example, for a kind of discrete delay arguments case, authors in [17] prove

that the numerical solution of the BEM method at integer time admits a unique invariant measure, and further prove that the convergence rate of the numerical invariant measure is 1. For the case of the distributed delay argument, authors in [4] demonstrate that the functional solution of the EM method of the SFDE with Markov switching admits a unique numerical invariant measure which converges to the exact one in the Wasserstein distance; Authors in [56] concern the approximation of invariant measure of the functional solution for the SFDE by the BEM method and reveal the convergence of the numerical invariant measure in the Wasserstein distance. Natural questions arise: For the distributed delay argument case, does the numerical invariant measure of a numerical method converge to the original one with rate 1? In particular, is this convergence result applicable to the superlinearly growing coefficients case? Less is known about these questions to our knowledge.

To take a step towards answering the above questions, in Chapter 3, we focus on the θ -EM method for the SFDE (1.1) with superlinearly growing coefficients, and investigate the existence, uniqueness, and the convergence rate of the invariant measure for the numerical functional solution. We first obtain the existence and uniqueness of the numerical invariant measure by means of the time-independent moment boundedness and the exponential attractiveness of the θ -EM functional solution. A common approach to obtaining the convergence rate of the numerical invariant measure is based on the longtime weak convergence of the numerical method, which can be established by means of the Malliavin calculus. The prerequisite is to derive the time-independent estimates for Malliavin derivatives and Gâteaux derivatives of both the exact and numerical functional solutions. We show that the moments of these derivatives decay exponentially in time. Based on these properties, we obtain the weak convergence rate with order 1 of the θ -EM method on the infinite time horizon, which is twice the mean-square one. As a by-product, the convergence rate for the numerical invariant measure of the θ -EM functional solution is derived, which is the same as the weak convergence rate.

Chapter 4: The density function of the solution of a stochastic differential equation, characterizing all the relevant probabilistic information, is one of the most essential characteristics that reveals the probabilistic behavior of the underlying solution. The Malliavin calculus, as a powerful tool to prove the existence and smoothness of density functions, was first introduced by P. Malliavin in [47] with the aim of giving a probabilistic proof of the Hörmander hypoellipticity theorem; see e.g. [19, 2, 53, 10, 52] and references therein for further development and application of the Malliavin calculus. In order to approximate the density function of the stochastic differential equation, the study on the numerical density function of a numerical method has received much attention recently. For instance, for the stochastic ordinary differential equation (SODE) with globally Lipschitz coefficients, the convergence of the density of the numerical solution is proved in e.g. [30, 3, 34, 41] based on Itô–Taylor type discretizations under the Hörmander condition, and in e.g. [39] based on the kernel density estimation and the Malliavin calculus. For the stochastic Langevin equation with non-globally coefficients, [23] proves the existence, smoothness, and convergence of the numerical density function of the splitting method. For the stochastic partial differential equation, authors in [13, 31] investigate the existence and convergence of the numerical density function for the stochastic heat equation and the stochastic Cahn–Hilliard equation, respectively. However, less is known about the case of SFDEs.

The main aim in Chapter 4 is to investigate the existence and convergence of the density function of the θ -EM method for the SFDE (1.1). We first present the nondegeneracy of the numerical solution and prove the existence of the corresponding numerical density function by means of the Malliavin calculus. For the SFDE driven by the multiplicative noise, combining the mean-square convergence result of the θ -EM method, the convergence of the numerical density function is proved. While for the case of the additive noise, the convergence rate of the numerical density function is derived, based on the test-functional-independent weak convergence analysis for the θ -EM method. The major obstacle in the proof lies in the estimates of the negative moments of the determinant of the corresponding Malliavin covariance matrix of the numerical solution, which is overcome by presenting a discrete comparison principle for the SFDE with additive noise. Combining the full use of the Malliavin integration by parts formula, the test-functional-independent weak convergence rate and further the convergence rate of numerical density function are both proved to be 1.

Chapter 5: The LDP for the stochastic differential equation with small noise is also called the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP, which characterizes the exponential decay probabilities that sample paths of the solution of the stochastic differential equation deviate from that of the corresponding deterministic equation as the intensity of the noise tends to zero. Fruitful results appear on the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for both the SODE and the stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE). In contrast, the research for the case of the numerical method is still at its infancy. We are aware of [18, 32] for the numerical study of the LDP for the SODE case and of [12, 14, 11, 38] for the SPDE case. The Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for SFDEs on the finite time horizon has received much attention in recent years; see e.g. [40, 5, 37] and references therein. To our knowledge, there are few results for both the SFDE (1.1) and its numerical method on the infinite time horizon case.

The main contribution of Chapter 5 is to present the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for the θ -EM method of the SFDE with small noise on the infinite time horizon. A well-known approach to presenting the LDP, through its equivalence to the Laplace principle, is proposed by [27], where the finite time horizon case is considered. Such method is also known as the weak convergence method, and has further been developed to prove the LDP on the infinite time horizon (see [29]). The key in the analysis lies in establishing the compactness of solutions for both the skeleton equation and the stochastic controlled equation in Banach space $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$. In this regard, by analyzing the time-independent moment estimates of the solution of the stochastic controlled equation, we prove that the θ -EM solution satisfies the LDP on $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the rate function given by the corresponding skeleton equation. Moreover, combining the technique of the Malliavin calculus, we present the logarithmic estimate of the numerical density function and establish the relation between the logarithmic limit and the rate function of the LDP.

1.3.2 Notations

| | |
|------|---|
| SFDE | Stochastic functional differential equation |
| EM | Euler–Maruyama |
| BEM | Backward Euler–Maruyama |

| | |
|---|--|
| θ -EM | θ -Euler–Maruyama |
| LDP | Large deviation principle |
| \mathbb{N} | Set of all non-negative integers |
| \mathbb{N}_+ | Set of all positive integers |
| \mathbb{R}^d | d -dimensional Euclidean space |
| $ x $ | Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ or $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ |
| $\langle x, y \rangle$ | Inner product for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ |
| $\text{Id}_{d \times d}$ | d -dimensional identity operator |
| \otimes | Kronecker inner product |
| $ \alpha $ | $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$ for a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ |
| $i!$ | factorial of $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ |
| $i!!$ | double factorial of $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$ |
| C_p^i | combinatorial number, i.e., $C_p^i = \frac{p!}{i!(p-i)!}$ |
| $a \vee b$ (resp. $a \wedge b$) | Maximum (resp. minimum) of $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}_A$ | \mathbb{R} -valued indicator function of a set A with $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 1$ for $x \in A$ and $\mathbf{1}_A(x) = 0$ for $x \in A^c$ |
| $\mathcal{C}^d := (\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d), \ \cdot\)$ | Space of continuous functions $\phi : [-\tau, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ equipped with the norm $\ \phi\ = \sup_{s \in [-\tau, 0]} \phi(s) $ |
| $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d))$ | Borel σ -algebra of $\mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ |
| \mathcal{P} | Space of probability measures on $(\mathcal{C}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}^d))$ |
| \mathcal{C}_b^k | Space of continuous functionals $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with bounded and continuous derivatives of orders up to k |
| $\mathcal{C}_{pol}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ | Space of smooth functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose partial derivatives have at most polynomial growth |
| $\mathcal{C}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ | Space of continuous functions $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ endowed with the norm $\ w\ _{\mathcal{C}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)} := \int_0^\infty w(t) e^{-\alpha_1 t} dt$ for some $\alpha_1 > 0$ |
| $\mathcal{C}_0([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ | Space of continuous functions $w : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ with initial value being 0 |
| $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ | Space of continuous functions $u : [-\tau, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u(r) = \xi(r)$ for $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, endowed with the norm |

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t_k} \left(\sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_k]} |u(t)| \right) \Delta$$

for some $\alpha > 0$, which is also written as \mathcal{C}_ξ for short

| | |
|---|--|
| $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ | Filtered probability space |
| $\mathbb{E}[u]$ | Expectation of a random variable u |
| $\mathbb{E}[u \mathcal{G}]$ | Conditional expectation of u with respect to a σ -algebra $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ |
| $\mathcal{N}(0, v^2)$ | Normal random variable with mean 0 and variance v^2 |
| Δ | Step size of the θ -EM method |
| K | A generic positive constant independent of Δ whose value may vary at different occurrences |
| $\lfloor t \rfloor$ | Maximal grid point that no larger than t , i.e., $\max\{t_k \leq t : t_k = k\Delta, k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ |
| μ | Invariant measure of the SFDE |
| μ^Δ | Invariant measure of the θ -EM method |
| ξ | Deterministic initial value in \mathcal{C}^d |
| $x^\xi(\cdot)$ (resp. x^ξ) | Solution (resp. functional solution) of the SFDE |
| $y^{\xi, \Delta}(\cdot)$ (resp. $y^{\xi, \Delta}$) | Solution (resp. functional solution) of the θ -EM method |
| $\varphi(t; t_i, \eta)$ | Solution of the SFDE at time t with initial value η at t_i |
| $\varphi^{Int}(\cdot; t_i, \eta)$ | Linear interpolation of $\varphi(\cdot; t_i, \eta)$ by grids $\{(t_k, \varphi(t_k; t_i, \eta)), k = i, i + 1, \dots\}$ |
| $\Phi(t_k; t_i, \eta^{Int})$ | Solution of the θ -EM method at time t_k with initial value η^{Int} at t_i |
| μ_t^ξ | Probability measure generated by x_t^ξ |
| P_t^ξ | Markov semigroup generated by μ_t^ξ |
| $\mu_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ | Probability measure generated by $y_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ |
| $P_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ | Markov semigroup generated by $\mu_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ |
| \mathfrak{p} | Density function of the solution of the SFDE |
| \mathfrak{p}^Δ | Density function of the solution of the θ -EM method |
| $L^p(\Omega, E)$ | Space of all E -valued random variables which are p -integrable with respect to \mathbb{P} |
| $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H, \ \cdot\ _H)$ | Hilbert space $L^2([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ |
| $L_\Delta^2([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ | Space of functions $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying that $v([\cdot])$ is square integrable, which is also written as L_Δ^2 for short |
| $\ \cdot\ _{L_\Delta^2}$ | Norm in L_Δ^2 |

| | |
|---|--|
| \mathcal{S}_M | Subspace of $L^2_{\Delta}([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ for functions v satisfying $\ v\ _{L^2_{\Delta}}^2 \leq M$ |
| \mathcal{P}_M | Space of \mathcal{F}_t -measurable functions $v : \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying that $v \in \mathcal{S}_M$ a.s. |
| $(\mathcal{L}(E_1; E_2), \ \cdot\ _{\mathcal{L}(E_1; E_2)})$ | Space of bounded linear operators from E_1 to E_2 with usual operator norm |
| \mathcal{D} | Gâteaux derivative operator |
| \mathcal{D}^{α} | Gâteaux derivative operator of order α |
| D | Malliavin derivative operator |
| D^{α} | Malliavin derivative operator of order α |
| $(\mathbb{D}^{\alpha, p}(\mathbb{R}^d), \ \cdot\ _{\alpha, p})$ | Malliavin Sobolev space consisting of all random variables $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ whose Malliavin derivatives up to orders α belong to $L^p(\Omega)$ |

1.4 Acknowledgement

This work is funded by the National key R&D Program of China under Grant (No. 2020YFA0713701), National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12031020, No. 12022118), and by Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS, China.

Mean-square convergence analysis

In this chapter, we analyze the longtime mean-square convergence of the θ -EM method (1.8) of the SFDE (1.1) with superlinearly growing coefficients. A prerequisite is to prove the time-independent moment boundedness of the numerical solution. Then we derive the exponential attractiveness and the exponential stability of the θ -EM method. With these preparations, the time-independent mean-square convergence rate of the θ -EM method is shown to be $\frac{1}{2}$.

2.1 Time-independent moment boundedness of numerical solution

In this section, we investigate the time-independent moment boundedness of the θ -EM functional solution, which is the key to obtain the longtime mean-square convergence rate of the considered numerical method.

2.1.1 Time-independent boundedness of second moment

This subsection is devoted to proving the time-independent boundedness of the second moment of the θ -EM functional solution. Before that, we show that the p th moment for any $p > 0$ of the numerical solution in any finite time horizon is bounded, which ensures that the stochastic integral with respect to the numerical solution is a martingale.

For this purpose, we define an auxiliary process as follows:

$$\begin{cases} z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), & k = -N, -N + 1, \dots, -1, \\ z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - \theta b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta, & k = 0, \\ z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k-1}) + b(y_{t_{k-1}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta + \sigma(y_{t_{k-1}}^{\xi, \Delta})\delta W_{k-1}, & k \in \mathbb{N}_+. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

The continuous version $\{z^{\xi, \Delta}(t)\}_{t \geq -\tau}$ is given by

$$z^{\xi, \Delta}(t) = \begin{cases} z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})(t - t_k) + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t) - W(t_k)), & t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \frac{t_{j+1} - t}{\Delta} z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j) + \frac{t - t_j}{\Delta} z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{j+1}), & t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}], \quad j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}. \end{cases}$$

We see clearly that

$$z^{\xi, \Delta}(t) = z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) + \int_0^t b(y_s^{\xi, \Delta}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(y_s^{\xi, \Delta}) dW(s), \quad t > 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$y_s^{\xi, \Delta} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}(s).$$

Denote by $\{z_t^{\xi,\Delta}\}_{t \geq 0}$ the segment process with respect to $\{z^{\xi,\Delta}(t)\}_{t \geq -\tau}$, namely, for any $t \geq 0$ and $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, we have $z_t^{\xi,\Delta}(r) = z^{\xi,\Delta}(t+r)$.

Proposition 2.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, for any $T > 0$ and integer $p \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t_k \in [0,T]} (|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}) \right] \leq K_T (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}),$$

where the positive constant K_T depends on p and T .

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1. We shall show that for any $T > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{t_k \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E} \left[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] < K \|\xi\|^{2p} e^{KT}. \quad (2.3)$$

Fix $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $M > \|\xi\|$, define a random time $\zeta_M^{\xi,\Delta}$ by

$$\zeta_M^{\xi,\Delta} = \inf\{i \in \mathbb{N} : |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)| \vee |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)| > M\}.$$

Obviously,

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : \zeta_M^{\xi,\Delta}(\omega) > i + 1\} = \{\omega \in \Omega : \zeta_M^{\xi,\Delta}(\omega) \leq i\}^c \in \mathcal{F}_{t_i} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To simplify notations, we introduce the following abbreviations

$$\begin{aligned} z(t_k) &= z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k), \quad z_{t_k} = z_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}, \\ y(t_k) &= y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k), \quad y_{t_k} = y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}, \\ b_k &= b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}), \quad \sigma_k = \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}), \quad \zeta_M = \zeta_M^{\xi,\Delta}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, it follows from (1.4) and (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} & |z(t_{k+1})|^2 \\ &= |z(t_k)|^2 + |b_k|^2 \Delta^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + 2\langle y(t_k) - \theta b_k \Delta, b_k \rangle \Delta \\ & \quad + 2\langle z(t_k), \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle + 2\langle b_k, \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle \Delta \\ & \leq |z(t_k)|^2 + (1 - 2\theta) |b_k|^2 \Delta^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K \Delta - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 \\ & \quad + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + 2\langle z(t_k), \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle + \frac{2}{\theta} \langle y(t_k) - z(t_k), \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

By $\theta \in (0.5, 1]$, we have

$$|z(t_{k+1})|^2 \leq |z(t_k)|^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K \Delta + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\{\mathcal{M}_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is a local martingale defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \frac{2(\theta - 1)}{\theta} \langle z(t_k), \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle + \frac{2}{\theta} \langle y(t_k), \sigma_k \delta W_k \rangle. \quad (2.6)$$

If $\zeta_M \geq k + 1$, we have $k \wedge \zeta_M = k$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & |z(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M})|^2 = |z(t_{k+1})|^2 \\ & \leq |z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k. \end{aligned}$$

If $\zeta_M < k + 1$, we have $\zeta_M \leq k$ and

$$|z(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M})|^2 = |z(t_{\zeta_M})|^2 = |z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^2.$$

The above two cases imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & |z(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M})|^2 \\ & \leq |z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^2 + \left(|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p}] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p}] + \sum_{l=1}^p C_p^l \mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2(p-l)} (|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k)^l \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right] \\ & =: \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p}] + \sum_{l=1}^p \mathcal{J}_l, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where the positive constant C_p^l is the binomial coefficient. Note that

$$\delta W_k \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} = W(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M}) - W(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M}).$$

By virtue of the Doob martingale stopping time theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[A(t_k) \delta W_k \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{k \wedge \zeta_M}}\right] = 0, \\ & \mathbb{E}\left[|A(t_k) \delta W_k|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{k \wedge \zeta_M}}\right] = |A(t_k)|^2 \Delta \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

where $A(t_k)$ is a $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ -valued \mathcal{F}_{t_k} -measurable random variable for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_1 & = C_p^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2(p-1)} (|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \mathcal{M}_k) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{k \wedge \zeta_M}}\right]\right] \\ & = C_p^1 \Delta \mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2(p-1)} (|\sigma_k|^2 + K + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Making use of Assumption 1.1 and applying the Young inequality, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_l & \leq C_p^1 \Delta \mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2(p-1)} (2L|y(t_k)|^2 + 2L \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + K \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K\Delta + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_1(r)\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.+ \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right]. \tag{2.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the elementary inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k)^l \\
&\leq K(|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^{2l} + \Delta^l + \Delta^l \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2l}d\nu_2(r) + |z(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^l + |y(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^l).
\end{aligned}$$

This, along with the following fact

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|A(t_k)\delta W_k|^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} | \mathcal{F}_{t_k \wedge \zeta_M}\right] \leq K|A(t_k)|^i \Delta^{\frac{i}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } i \geq 2$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=2}^p \mathcal{J}_l &\leq \sum_{l=2}^p K\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2(p-l)}(|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^{2l} + \Delta^l + \Delta^l \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2l}d\nu_2(r)\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.+ |z(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^l + |y(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k\delta W_k|^l)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}} | \mathcal{F}_{t_k \wedge \zeta_M}\right]\right] \\
&\leq K\Delta \sum_{l=2}^p \mathbb{E}\left[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2(p-l)}(|\sigma_k|^{2l} + 1 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2l}d\nu_2(r)\right. \\
&\quad \left.+ |z(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k|^l + |y(t_k)|^l|\sigma_k|^l)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Assumption 1.1 and the Young inequality again, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=2}^p \mathcal{J}_l &\leq K\Delta + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right]. \tag{2.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.9) and (2.10) into (2.7) and by the recursive calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k+1)\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y(t_{k\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq k+1\}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[|z(0)|^{2p}] + K(k+1)\Delta + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{i\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}[|y(t_{i\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}\right]. \tag{2.11}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1.9) and the convex property of $|\cdot|^{2p}$ that

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_1(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left| \frac{t_{j+1}-r}{\Delta} y(t_{i+j}) + \frac{r-t_j}{\Delta} y(t_{i+j+1}) \right|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \frac{t_{j+1}-r}{\Delta} d\nu_1(r) |y(t_{i+j})|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+j+1\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \frac{r-t_j}{\Delta} d\nu_1(r) |y(t_{i+j+1})|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+j+2\}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{l=-N}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \frac{t_{j+1}-r}{\Delta} d\nu_1(r) |y(t_l)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq l+1\}} \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{l=-N}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \frac{r-t_j}{\Delta} d\nu_1(r) |y(t_l)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq l+1\}} \\
&= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \sum_{l=-N}^k \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} d\nu_1(r) |y(t_l)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq l+1\}} \\
&\leq N \|\xi\|^{2p} + \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}. \tag{2.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \leq N \|\xi\|^{2p} + \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}. \tag{2.13}$$

Inserting (2.12) and (2.13) into (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k+1)\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|z(0)|^{2p}] + K(k+1)\Delta + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{i\wedge\zeta_M})|^{2p}] + K\tau \|\xi\|^{2p} \\
&\quad + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}[|y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}]. \tag{2.14}
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see from $z(t_i) = y(t_i) - \theta b_i \Delta$ and (1.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|z(t_i)|^2 &= |y(t_i)|^2 + \theta^2 \Delta^2 b_i^2 - 2\theta \Delta \langle y(t_i), b_i \rangle \\
&\geq -K\Delta + (1 + \theta \Delta \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2}) |y(t_i)|^2 - 2a_2 \theta \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \tag{2.15}
\end{aligned}$$

According to [49, Lemma 4.1], we know that for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $K_\varepsilon > 1$ such that

$$|u + v|^q \leq K_\varepsilon |u|^q + (1 + \varepsilon) |v|^q.$$

This, along with (2.15) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(1 + (\theta \Delta \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2})^p\right) \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \\
&\leq K_\varepsilon \sum_{i=0}^k (K\Delta + |z(t_i)|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}})^p
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ (1 + \varepsilon)(2a_2\theta\Delta)^p \sum_{i=0}^k \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}.$$

By (2.13), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + \left(\theta\Delta \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2}\right)^p\right) \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \\ & \leq KK_\varepsilon(k+1)\Delta + KK_\varepsilon \sum_{i=0}^k |z(t_{i \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p} + K\Delta^{p-1} \|\xi\|^{2p} \\ & \quad + (1 + \varepsilon)(2a_2\theta\Delta)^p \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2}\right)^p > (1 + \varepsilon)(2a_2)^p.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \leq K(k+1)\Delta + K \sum_{i=0}^k |z(t_{i \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p} + K\Delta^{p-1} \|\xi\|^{2p} \\ & \quad - \left(\left(\frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2}\right)^p - (1 + \varepsilon)(2a_2)^p\right) \theta^p \Delta^p \sum_{i=0}^k |y(t_i)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\zeta_M \geq i+1\}} \\ & \leq K(k+1)\Delta + K \sum_{i=0}^k |z(t_{i \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p} + K\|\xi\|^{2p}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Inserting this into (2.14) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k+1) \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p}] \leq K\|\xi\|^{2p} + K(k+1)\Delta + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{i \wedge \zeta_M})|^{2p}].$$

By the discrete Grönwall inequality, we have that for any $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k \wedge \zeta_M)|^{2p}] \leq K\|\xi\|^{2p} e^{KT}.$$

Letting $M \rightarrow \infty$, one has

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K\|\xi\|^{2p} e^{KT}.$$

Combining (2.15), we completes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. Similarly, by (2.5) and the recursive calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \\ & \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{i=0}^k C_p^1 |z(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \left(|\sigma_i \delta W_i|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=2}^p C_p^l |z(t_i)|^{2(p-l)} \left(|\sigma_i \delta W_i|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_i \right)^l \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=0}^k C_p^1 |z(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_i.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \left\{ C_p^1 \mathbb{E} \left[|z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{l=2}^p C_p^l \mathbb{E} \left[|z(t_k)|^{2(p-l)} (|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k)^l \right] \right\} \\ I_2 &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k C_p^1 \frac{2(\theta-1)}{\theta} |z(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \langle z(t_i), \sigma_i \delta W_i \rangle \right], \\ I_3 &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k C_p^1 \frac{2}{\theta} |z(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \langle y(t_i), \sigma_i \delta W_i \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By similar arguments to those in the proof of Step 1, we derive

$$I_1 \leq K\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + K\Delta + K\|\xi\|^{2p} + K\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}]. \quad (2.18)$$

Applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{4p-2} |\sigma_k|^2 \Delta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_i \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_i)|^{2p-1} \left(K\Delta \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} |\sigma_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Young inequality, Assumption 1.1, and (2.12), one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K\Delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} |\sigma_k|^2 \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K\Delta(T^{p-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_k|^{2p}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K(T^{p-1} + 1) \\ &\quad + K\Delta(T^{p-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E} \left[|y(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K\Delta(T^{p-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + K(T^{p-1} + 1)(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

Similarly, for $p \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\leq K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{4p-4} |y(t_k)|^2 |\sigma_k|^2 \Delta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} |y(t_k)|^2 |\sigma_k|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K \Delta (T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^p |\sigma_k|^p] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K \Delta (T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K \Delta (T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_k|^{2p}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq \lfloor T \rfloor} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K \Delta (T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K (T^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + 1) (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}). \tag{2.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (2.18)–(2.20) into (2.17), a direct computation derives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |z(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \\
&\leq 2 \left(K + K \Delta \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + K \Delta + K (T^{p-1} + 1) (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}) \right) \\
&\quad + K \Delta (T^{p-1} + 1) \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\leq K (T^{p-1} + 1) (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}) + K \Delta \left(\frac{T}{\Delta} + 1 \right) \sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + K \Delta (T^{p-1} + 1) \left(\frac{T}{\Delta} + 1 \right) \sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\leq K_T (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the positive constant K_T depends on T and p , but is independent of Δ . From the above inequality and (2.15), one obtains that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |y(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K_T (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p})$. Thus the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 2.2 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|z_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2 + \|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K (1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2).$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps.

Step 1. We shall prove

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} (\mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2]) \leq K (1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2).$$

By $a_1 > a_2 + L$, one can choose a sufficiently small $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{c}_\kappa := (a_1 + a_2 - (\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2)e^{\kappa\tau}) > 0.$$

For any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, according to (2.4) and $z(t_k) = y(t_k) - \theta b_k \Delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |z(t_{k+1})|^2 &\leq |z(t_k)|^2 + \frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} |y(t_k) - z(t_k)|^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta \\ &\quad - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k \\ &= \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} |z(t_k)|^2 + \frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} |y(t_k)|^2 + \frac{2(2\theta-1)}{\theta^2} \langle z(t_k), y(t_k) \rangle + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 \\ &\quad + K\Delta - \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k, \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Young inequality yields

$$2\langle z(t_k), y(t_k) \rangle \leq \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{c}_\kappa \Delta} |z(t_k)|^2 + (1 + \tilde{c}_\kappa \Delta) |y(t_k)|^2.$$

Recall that $\theta \in (0.5, 1]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |z(t_{k+1})|^2 &\leq \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} \right) |z(t_k)|^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + K\Delta \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} - \tilde{c}_\kappa \right) \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \mathcal{M}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \kappa]$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^2 &= |z(0)|^2 + \sum_{i=0}^k (e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 - e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2) \\ &\leq |z(0)|^2 + \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} - e^{-\varepsilon\Delta} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_i)|^2 + \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |\sigma_i \delta W_i|^2 \\ &\quad + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} - \left(\frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} - \tilde{c}_\kappa \right) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |y(t_i)|^2 \\ &\quad + 2a_2 \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathcal{M}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

According to Proposition 2.1 we obtain that \mathcal{M}_k is a martingale and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathcal{M}_i \right] = 0.$$

Taking expectation on both sides of (2.21) and using Remark 1.1, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^2] \\ &\leq |z(0)|^2 + \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} - e^{-\varepsilon\Delta} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_i)|^2] + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (a_1 + a_2 - \tilde{c}_\kappa) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_i)|^2] + \frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \times \\
& \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right] + 2a_2 \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right]. \tag{2.22}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (2.12), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + 2a_2 \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\varepsilon \tau} \tau \|\xi\|^2 + \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\varepsilon \tau} \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |y(t_i)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (2.22) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^2] \\
& \leq |z(0)|^2 + \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} - e^{-\varepsilon\Delta} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_i)|^2] + \frac{K}{\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \\
& \quad - \left(a_1 + a_2 - \tilde{c}_\kappa - \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\varepsilon \tau} \right) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_i)|^2] \\
& \quad + \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\varepsilon \tau} \tau \|\xi\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the definition of \tilde{c}_κ that

$$a_1 + a_2 - \tilde{c}_\kappa - \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\varepsilon \tau} \geq 0.$$

Moreover, using $e^{-\varepsilon\Delta} > 1 - \varepsilon\Delta$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} - e^{-\varepsilon\Delta} \\
& < \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} - (1 - \varepsilon\Delta) \\
& = - \frac{(2\theta-1)\tilde{c}_\kappa}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa\Delta)} \Delta + \varepsilon\Delta < \left(\varepsilon - \frac{(2\theta-1)\tilde{c}_\kappa}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa)} \right) \Delta. \tag{2.23}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting $\varepsilon = \frac{(2\theta-1)\tilde{c}_\kappa}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}_\kappa)} \wedge \kappa$ yields

$$e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^2] \leq K(\|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) + K e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}},$$

which implies

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2).$$

In addition, by (2.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(1 + \theta \Delta \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2} \right) \sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] \\
& \leq K \Delta + \sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + 2a_2 \theta \Delta \sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2]. \tag{2.24}
\end{aligned}$$

Together with $a_1 > a_2 + L$, we arrive at

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2).$$

Step 2. It follows from (2.21) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] \\ & \leq |z(0)|^2 + K \|\xi\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} |\sigma_l \delta W_l|^2 \right] + K \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathcal{M}_l \right] \\ & \leq |z(0)|^2 + K \|\xi\|^2 + \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} |\sigma_l|^2 \right] + \frac{K}{\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N) \vee 0}^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathcal{M}_l \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

Using Assumption 1.1 and Step 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} |\sigma_l|^2 \right] & \leq K \left(\Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[|y(t_l)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right] + e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \right) \\ & \leq K \left(\Delta \sup_{i \geq -N} \mathbb{E} [|y(t_i)|^2] \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} + e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \right) \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Similar to the estimates of I_2 and I_3 in Proposition 2.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N) \vee 0}^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathcal{M}_l \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\left(\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right) \left(K e^{\varepsilon \Delta} \Delta \sum_{l=(k-N) \vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} |\sigma_l|^2 \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\left(\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right) \left(K e^{\varepsilon \Delta} \Delta \sum_{l=(k-N) \vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} |\sigma_l|^2 \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + K \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=(k-N) \vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |\sigma_i|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right] \\ & \quad + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Note that

$$(1 + \theta \Delta \frac{3a_1 + a_2 + L}{2}) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K\Delta e^{\varepsilon t_k} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + 2a_2\theta\Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-2N)\vee (-N) \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right] \\
&\leq K\Delta e^{\varepsilon t_k} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + 2a_2\theta\Delta e^{\varepsilon t_k} \sum_{i=(k-2N)\vee (-N)}^k \mathbb{E}[|y(t_i)|^2] \\
&\leq K\Delta e^{\varepsilon t_k} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + 4a_2\theta\tau e^{\varepsilon t_k} \sup_{i \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_i)|^2] \\
&\leq K\Delta e^{\varepsilon t_k} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + e^{\varepsilon t_k} K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |y(t_i)|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + e^{\varepsilon t_k} K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2). \tag{2.28}
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.28) into (2.27) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathcal{M}_l \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_i} |z(t_i)|^2 \right] + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \\
&\quad + |z(0)|^2 + \mathbb{E}[e^{\varepsilon t_{k-N}} |z(t_{k-N})|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}. \tag{2.29}
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (2.26) and (2.29) into (2.25) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\varepsilon t_{k-N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z(t_{i+1})|^2 \right] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2).$$

Combining (2.28), we finishes the proof. \square

2.1.2 Time-independent boundedness of high-order moment

For the SFDE (1.1) with superlinearly growing coefficients, the time-independent boundedness of high-order moment of the numerical solution is required in the longtime mean-square convergence analysis of numerical method. We introduce the following assumptions on the coefficient b and the initial value ξ .

Assumption 2.1 *There exist positive constants K, a_3, a_4, ℓ , and a function $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d$,*

$$\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle \leq K - a_3 |\phi(0)|^{2+\ell} + a_4 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r).$$

Assumption 2.2 *There exist positive constants K and β such that for any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,*

$$|b(\phi_1) - b(\phi_2)| \leq K \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\| (1 + \|\phi_1\|^\beta + \|\phi_2\|^\beta).$$

Assumption 2.3 *There exist positive constants K and $\rho \geq 1/2$ such that*

$$|\xi(s_1) - \xi(s_2)| \leq K |s_1 - s_2|^\rho.$$

The following lemma shows that the moments of functional solution of (1.1) are bounded uniformly for $t \geq 0$, whose proof is similar to that of [46, Theorem 3] and is omitted.

Lemma 2.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 2.1, the following estimate holds: for integer $p \geq 2$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|x^\xi(t)\|^p] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^p). \quad (2.30)$$

Moreover, the invariant measure μ given in Lemma 1.2 satisfies

$$\mu(\|\cdot\|^p) := \int_{\mathcal{C}^d} \|\phi\|^p d\mu(\phi) \leq K. \quad (2.31)$$

Lemma 2.2 *Under Assumptions 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2, for integer $p \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} (\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^p] + \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^p]) \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)}).$$

Proof. We divide the proof into three steps.

Step 1. We shall show that there exists $\Delta^* \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^p] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)}) \quad \forall p \geq 2.$$

In fact, by Assumption 2.1, we obtain that for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |z(t_{k+1})|^2 &\leq A_{\theta, \Delta} |z(t_k)|^2 + 2K\Delta - 2a_3\Delta |y(t_k)|^{2+\ell} + 2a_4\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad + \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + |\sigma_k \Delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k \\ &\leq A_{\theta, \Delta} |z(t_k)|^2 + R_1\Delta - a_3\Delta |y(t_k)|^{2+\ell} + 2a_4\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad - R_2\Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where $A_{\theta, \Delta} := \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)}$, and R_1, R_2 are positive constants with $R_2 > 2L$. For any integer $p \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(|z(t_{k+1})|^2 + a_3\Delta |y(t_k)|^{2+\ell})^p \right] \leq A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + \sum_{i=1}^p C_p^i \mathbb{E}[I_i], \quad (2.33)$$

where

$$I_i := A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-i} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left(R_1 \Delta - R_2 \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 + 2a_4 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k \right)^i.$$

It follows from Assumption 1.1 and the Young inequality that for any $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_1] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (R_1 \Delta - (R_2 - 2L) \Delta |y(t_k)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2a_4 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + 2L \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r)) \right] \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta - (R_2 - 2L) \Delta \mathbb{E}[A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y(t_k)|^2] \\ &\quad + \frac{(2a_4)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + \frac{(2L)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

By (2.1) and Assumption 2.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t_k)|^2 &\leq |z(t_k)|^2 + 2K\theta\Delta - 2a_3\theta\Delta |y(t_k)|^{2+\ell} + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\ &\leq |z(t_k)|^2 + 2K\theta\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} |y(t_k)|^{2p} &\leq \left(|z(t_k)|^2 + 2K\theta\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1} |y(t_k)|^2 \\ &\leq 3^{p-1} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y(t_k)|^2 + (6K\theta\Delta)^{p-1} |y(t_k)|^2 \\ &\quad + (6a_4\theta\Delta)^{p-1} |y(t_k)|^2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2(p-1)} d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} -|z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y(t_k)|^2 &\leq -\frac{1}{3^{p-1}} |y(t_k)|^{2p} + (2K\theta\Delta)^{p-1} |y(t_k)|^2 \\ &\quad + (2a_4\theta\Delta)^{p-1} |y(t_k)|^2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2(p-1)} d\nu_2(r) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{3^{p-1}} |y(t_k)|^{2p} + (2K\Delta)^{p-1} + (2\Delta)^{p-1} (K^{p-1} + a_4^{p-1}) |y(t_k)|^{2p} \\ &\quad + (2a_4\Delta)^{p-1} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

Inserting (2.36) into (2.34) and using $A_{\theta,\Delta} \in (0, 1)$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_1] &\leq 3\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta - \frac{(R_2 - 2L) A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + (R_2 - 2L) 2^{p-1} (K^{p-1} + a_4^{p-1}) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + (R_2 - 2L) (2a_4)^{p-1} \Delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{(2a_4)^p}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + \frac{(2L)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

For the term I_i with $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_i] &\leq 6^i A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-i} \mathbb{E} \left[|z(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left(R_1 \Delta^i + R_2 \Delta^i |y(t_k)|^{2i} + (2i-1)!! |\sigma_k|^{2i} \Delta^i \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (2a_4)^i \Delta^i \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2i} d\nu_2(r) + 2^i (i-1)!! A_{\theta, \Delta}^{\frac{i}{2}} |z(t_k)|^i |\sigma_k|^i \Delta^{\frac{i}{2}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 4^i (i-1)!! |y(t_k)|^i |\sigma_k|^i \Delta^{\frac{i}{2}} \right) \right] \\
&\leq 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta + \frac{6^p i R_2^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta^2}{p \varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{i(12a_4)^p \Delta}{p \varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + \frac{6^p ((2i-1)!!)^{\frac{p}{i}} i \Delta}{p \varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_k|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{12^{2p} ((i-1)!!)^{\frac{2p}{i}} i \Delta}{2p \varepsilon_1^{2p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_k|^p |z(t_k)|^p] + \frac{24^p ((i-1)!!)^{\frac{p}{i}} i \Delta}{p \varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^p |\sigma_k|^p],
\end{aligned}$$

where $i!!$ represents the double factorial of i . Together with the Young inequality and Assumption 1.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_i] &\leq 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta + \frac{6^p R_2^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta^2}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{(12a_4)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + \frac{12^{2p} ((2i-1)!!)^{\frac{2p}{i}} \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{2p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_k|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{24^p ((i-1)!!)^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p} + |\sigma_k|^{2p}] \\
&\leq 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta + \frac{6^p R_2^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta^2}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{(12a_4)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
&\quad + B_i \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] + B_i \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right], \tag{2.38}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_i := \frac{(24L)^{2p} ((2i-1)!!)^{\frac{2p}{i}}}{\varepsilon_1^{2p-i}} + \frac{24^p (1 + (2L)^{2p}) ((i-1)!!)^{\frac{p}{i}}}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}}.$$

Plugging (2.38) and (2.37) into (2.33) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \\
&\leq \left(1 + 3\varepsilon_1 p \Delta + 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \right) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) \Delta + J_{k,1}(R_2) + J_{k,2}(R_2),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{k,1}(R_2) &= -\frac{p(R_2 - 2L) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] + \frac{p(2a_4)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{p(2L)^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \Delta \left(B_i \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{(12a_4)^p}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + B_i \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right], \\
J_{k,2}(R_2) & = p2^{p-1}(R_2 - 2L)(K^{p-1} + a_4^{p-1})\Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] + p(R_2 - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1}\Delta^p \\
& \times \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{6^p R_2^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta^2}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}].
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] - e^{\varepsilon t_k} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
& \leq ((1 + 2^p 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1) e^{\varepsilon t_k} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\varepsilon_1) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \Delta \\
& \quad + e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} J_{k,1}(R_2) + e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} J_{k,2}(R_2),
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] & \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k ((1 + 2^p 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1) e^{\varepsilon t_l} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_l)|^{2p}] \\
& \quad + \sum_{l=0}^k (R(\varepsilon_1) e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \Delta + e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,1}(R_2) + e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,2}(R_2)). \quad (2.39)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} & = (1 + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) \left(\frac{(1 - \theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2(1 + \Delta)} \right) e^{\varepsilon \Delta} \\
& = (1 + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) \left(1 - \frac{(2\theta - 1)\Delta}{\theta^2(1 + \Delta)} \right) e^{\varepsilon \Delta} \\
& \leq \left(1 - \frac{(2\theta - 1)\Delta}{2\theta^2} \right) e^{(2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon)\Delta} \\
& \leq e^{(-\frac{(2\theta-1)}{2\theta^2} + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon)\Delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting

$$2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon = \frac{(2\theta - 1)}{4\theta^2},$$

we derive

$$(1 + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} \leq 1. \quad (2.40)$$

This, along with (2.39) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \\
& \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k (R(\varepsilon_1) e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \Delta + e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,1}(R_2) + e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,2}(R_2)). \quad (2.41)
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $A_{\theta,\Delta}$ with $\theta \in (0.5, 1]$, we have

$$0 < A_\theta := \frac{(1 - \theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta - 1}{2\theta^2} < A_{\theta,\Delta} < 1.$$

Similar to (2.12), we deduce

$$\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,1}(R_2) \leq - \left(\frac{p(R_2 - 2L) A_\theta^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} - e^{\varepsilon \tau} \tilde{B} - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i B_i \right) \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p}]$$

$$+ e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tilde{B}\tau \|\xi\|^{2p},$$

where

$$\tilde{B} := \frac{p(2a_4)^p}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{p(2L)^p}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \left(\frac{(12a_4)^p}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} + B_i \right).$$

Choose a sufficiently large number $R_2^* > 0$ such that

$$\frac{p(R_2^* - 2L)A_\theta^{p-1}}{2 \cdot 3^{p-1}} - e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tilde{B} - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i B_i > 0.$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,1}(R_2^*) \\ & \leq -\frac{p(R_2^* - 2L)A_\theta^{p-1}}{2 \cdot 3^{p-1}} \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p}] + e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tilde{B}\tau \|\xi\|^{2p}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} J_{l,2}(R_2^*) \leq D_\Delta \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p}] + e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tau p(R_2^* - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1} \|\xi\|^{2p},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_\Delta & := p2^{p-1}(R_2^* - 2L)(K^{p-1} + a_4^{p-1})\Delta^{p-1} + e^{\varepsilon\tau} p(R_2^* - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1} \Delta^{p-1} \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{6^p (R_2^*)^{\frac{p}{i}} \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose a sufficiently small number $\Delta^* \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$D_{\Delta^*} \leq \frac{p(R_2^* - 2L)A_\theta^{p-1}}{2 \cdot 3^{p-1}}.$$

Together with (2.42), we obtain that for any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$,

$$\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} (J_{l,1}(R_2^*) + J_{l,2}(R_2^*)) \leq e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tau (\tilde{B} + p(R_2^* - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1}) \|\xi\|^{2p}. \quad (2.43)$$

Inserting (2.43) into (2.41) and using Assumption 2.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \\ & \leq |\xi - \theta b(\xi)\Delta|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k R(\varepsilon_1) e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \Delta + e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tau (\tilde{B} + p(R_2^* - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1}) \|\xi\|^{2p} \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) + \frac{R(\varepsilon_1) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}}{\varepsilon} + e^{\varepsilon\tau} \tau (\tilde{B} + p(R_2^* - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1}) \|\xi\|^{2p}, \end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof of step 1.

Step 2. We show that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\sup_{\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^p] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)}).$$

Similar to Step 1, we have that for any $\kappa_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_1] &\leq 3\kappa_1 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\kappa_1)\Delta - \frac{(R_2 - 2L)A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + (R_2 - 2L)2^{p-1}(K^{p-1} + a_4^{p-1})\Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \left((R_2 - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1} + \frac{(2a_4)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}} \right) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{(2L\Delta)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right], \tag{2.44}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[I_i] &\leq 6\kappa_1 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\kappa_1)\Delta + R(\kappa_1)\Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{(12a_4\Delta)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{(24L)^{2p}\Delta^p}{\kappa_1^{2p-i}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] + \frac{24^p\Delta}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} (1 + (2L)^{2p}) \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \frac{24^p(2L)^{2p}\Delta}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, p\}. \tag{2.45}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (2.44) and (2.45) into (2.33) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] + \frac{(a_3\Delta)^p}{2^p} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{(2+\ell)p}] \\
&\leq (1 + 3\kappa_1 p + 6\kappa_1 \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^{2p}] + R(\kappa_1)\Delta + J_{k,3} + J_{k,4},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{k,3} &:= - \left(\frac{p(R_2 - 2L)A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} (1 + (2L)^{2p}) \right) \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p(2L)^{2p}\Delta}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right], \\
J_{k,4} &:= R(\kappa_1)\Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] + \Delta^p \left(p(R_2 - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1} + p \frac{(2a_4)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}} \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{(12a_4)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \left. \right) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{p(2L)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}} + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{(24L)^{2p}}{\kappa_1^{2p-i}} \right) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that for any $\kappa > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\kappa t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \\
&\leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k \left((1 + 2^p 6\kappa_1) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\kappa \Delta} - 1 \right) e^{\kappa t_l} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_l)|^{2p}] + \sum_{l=0}^k \left(R(\kappa_1) e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \Delta \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,3} + e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,4} - \frac{(a_3\Delta)^p}{2^p} e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{(2+\ell)p}] \right). \tag{2.46}
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $A_{\theta,\Delta}$ again, we have that for any $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$A_\theta = \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{2\theta^2} < \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)} = A_{\theta,\Delta} \leq A_{\theta,\Delta^*} < 1.$$

Choose a sufficiently small number $\kappa_1 > 0$ such that

$$(1 + 2^p 6\kappa_1) A_{\theta,\Delta^*}^p < 1.$$

For such κ_1 , choose another sufficiently small number $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$(1 + 2^p 6\kappa_1) A_{\theta,\Delta^*}^p e^\kappa \leq 1. \quad (2.47)$$

This, along with (2.46) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\kappa t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] &\leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k \left(R(\kappa_1) e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \Delta + e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,4} - \frac{(a_3 \Delta)^p}{2^p} e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{(2+\ell)p}] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

Similar to (2.12), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,3} &\leq - \left(\frac{p(R_2 - 2L) A_\theta^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} (1 + (2L)^{2p}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p (2L)^{2p} e^{\kappa \tau}}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \right) \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \Delta \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p (2L)^{2p} e^{\kappa \tau}}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \|\xi\|^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $R_2 > 0$ be large sufficiently such that

$$\frac{p(R_2 - 2L) A_\theta^{p-1}}{3^{p-1}} - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} (1 + (2L)^{2p}) - \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p (2L)^{2p} e^{\kappa \tau}}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} > 0,$$

we obtain

$$\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,3} \leq \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{24^p (2L)^{2p} e^{\kappa \tau}}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \|\xi\|^{2p}. \quad (2.49)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l=0}^k \left(e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} J_{l,4} - \frac{(a_3 \Delta)^p}{2^p} e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{(2+\ell)p}] \right) \\ &\leq G \Delta^p \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p}] - \frac{(a_3 \Delta)^p}{2^p} \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\kappa t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{(2+\ell)p}] \\ &\quad + K \|\xi\|^{2p} \leq K \|\xi\|^{2p} + K e^{\kappa t_{k+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G &:= R(\kappa_1) + e^{\kappa \tau} \left(p((R_2 - 2L)(2a_4)^{p-1} + \frac{(2a_4)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}}) + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{(12a_4)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-i}} \right) \\ &\quad + e^{\kappa \tau} \left(\frac{p(2L)^p}{\kappa_1^{p-1}} + \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i \frac{(24L)^{2p}}{\kappa_1^{2p-i}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired result follows from (2.48)–(2.50).

Step 3. It follows from (2.35) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] + 2a_3\theta\Delta \left(\sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] \right)^{\frac{2+\ell}{2}} \\ & \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + 2K\theta\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2], \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] & \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + 2a_4\theta\Delta \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] - 2a_3\theta\Delta \left(\sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^2] \right)^{\frac{2+\ell}{2}} \\ & \quad + 2K\theta\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \|\xi\|^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

This, along with Lemma 2.2 leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^p] & \leq \sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \left(\sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_k)|^2] + K(1 + \|\xi\|^2) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(1+\beta)}) \quad \forall p \geq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

This proof is therefore completed. \square

Proposition 2.3 *Under Assumptions 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2, for any integer $p \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|z_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p + \|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)}). \quad (2.52)$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two cases. Recall that $\Delta^* \in (0, 1)$ and ε are defined in Step 1 of Lemma 2.2.

Case 1: $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$. By (2.32), we have that for any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \\ & \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k (A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1) e^{\varepsilon t_l} |z(t_l)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k \sum_{i=1}^p C_p^i e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{I}_{k,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

where

$$\tilde{I}_{k,i} := A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-i} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left(R_1 \Delta + 2a_4 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\sigma_k \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k \right)^i.$$

Applying the Young inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_{k,1} & \leq 3\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |z(t_k)|^{2p} + \frac{\Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-1}} \left(R_1^p + (2a_4)^p \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + \frac{|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^{2p}}{\Delta^p} \right) \\ & \quad + A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_k \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}_{k,i} &\leq 5^i \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-i} |z(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left(R_1^i + (2a_4)^i \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2i} d\nu_2(r) + \frac{|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^{2i}}{\Delta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{A_{\theta,\Delta}^{\frac{i}{2}} (2|z(t_k)| |\sigma_k \delta W_k|)^i}{\Delta} + \frac{(4|y(t_k)| |\sigma_k \delta W_k|)^i}{\Delta} \right) \\
&\leq 5\varepsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p |z(t_k)|^{2p} + \frac{5^p \Delta}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \left(R_1^p + (2a_4)^p \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + \frac{|\sigma_k \delta W_k|^{2p}}{\Delta^{\frac{p}{i}}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(4|y(t_k)| |\sigma_k \delta W_k|)^p}{\Delta^{\frac{p}{i}}} \right) + \frac{(10|\sigma_k \delta W_k|)^{2p}}{\varepsilon_1^{2p-i} \Delta^{\frac{2p}{i}}} \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, p\}, \tag{2.55}
\end{aligned}$$

where ε_1 is given in Step 1 of Lemma 2.2. Inserting (2.54) and (2.55) into (2.53), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \\
&\leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k \left((1 + 3p\varepsilon_1 \Delta + 5\varepsilon_1 \Delta \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1 \right) e^{\varepsilon t_l} |z(t_l)|^{2p} \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,1} + p \sum_{l=0}^k A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{J}_{l,1} &:= 5^p \Delta \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{C_p^i}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \left(R_1^p + (2a_4)^p \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right) + \frac{|\sigma_l \delta W_l|^{2p}}{(\varepsilon_1 \Delta)^{p-1}} \\
&\quad + 5^p \Delta \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{C_p^i}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \left(\frac{|\sigma_l \delta W_l|^{2p}}{\Delta^{\frac{p}{i}}} + \frac{(4|y(t_l)| |\sigma_l \delta W_l|)^p}{\Delta^{\frac{p}{i}}} \right) + \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{C_p^i (10|\sigma_l \delta W_l|)^{2p}}{\varepsilon_1^{2p-i} \Delta^{\frac{2p}{i}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.40) that

$$(1 + 3p\varepsilon_1 \Delta + 5\varepsilon_1 \Delta \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1 \leq (1 + 2^p \cdot 6\varepsilon_1 \Delta) A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\varepsilon \Delta} - 1 \leq 0,$$

which implies

$$e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,1} + p \sum_{l=0}^k A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l.$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p} \right] \\
&\leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,1} \right] + p \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^{(k-N) \vee 0} e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N) \vee 0}^j e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l \right] \\
&= |z(0)|^{2p} + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,1} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ p\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^j e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l\right]. \quad (2.56)$$

Similar to (2.42) and by (2.51), one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,1}\right] \\ & \leq K_{\varepsilon_1} \Delta \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \left(1 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + |\sigma_l|^{2p}\right)\right] \\ & \leq K_{\varepsilon_1} \Delta \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \left(1 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + |y(t_l)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r)\right)\right] \\ & \leq K_{\varepsilon_1} \|\xi\|^{2p} + K_{\varepsilon_1} \Delta \sup_{j \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_j)|^{2p}] \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \\ & \leq K_{\varepsilon_1} (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) \frac{e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}}{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.57)$$

Recalling the definition of \mathcal{M}_k , we apply the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & p\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^j e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l\right] \\ & \leq p\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (2e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-\frac{1}{2}} |z(t_l)|^{2p-1} |\sigma_l|)^2 \Delta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ & \quad + p\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (4e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} |y(t_l)| |\sigma_l|)^2 \Delta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using $A_{\theta,\Delta} \in (0, 1)$ and applying the Young inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & p\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^j e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l\right] \\ & \leq 2p\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} (e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}})^{\frac{2p-1}{2p}} |z(t_j)|^{2p-1}\right) \left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}})^{\frac{1}{p}} |\sigma_l|^2 \Delta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ & \quad + 4p\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} (e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}})^{\frac{(p-1)}{p}} |z(t_j)|^{2(p-1)}\right) \left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}})^{\frac{2}{p}} |y(t_l)|^2 |\sigma_l|^2 \Delta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2e^{\varepsilon \Delta}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_j)|^{2p}\right] + \frac{(2p)^{2p} e^{\varepsilon(2p-1)}}{4^{2p-1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}})^{\frac{1}{p}} |\sigma_l|^2 \Delta\right)^p\right] \\ & \quad + \frac{(4p)^p e^{\varepsilon(p-1)}}{4^{p-1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k (e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}})^{\frac{2}{p}} |y(t_l)|^2 |\sigma_l|^2 \Delta\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] \\ & \leq e^{\varepsilon t_{(k-N)\vee 0}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k-N)\vee 0})|^{2p}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] + K(N+1)^{p-1} \Delta^p \\ & \quad \times \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_l|^{2p}] + K(N+1)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^p |\sigma_l|^p] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq e^{\varepsilon t_{(k-N)\vee 0}} \mathbb{E}[|z(t_{(k-N)\vee 0})|^{2p}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \\ &\quad + K(\tau+1)^{p-1} \Delta \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma_l|^{2p}] + K(\tau+1)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \Delta \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p}]. \end{aligned}$$

According to Assumption 1.1, Lemma 2.2, and (2.51), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &p \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^j e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l\right] \\ &\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \\ &\quad + K \Delta \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_l)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r)] \\ &\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \\ &\quad + K \sup_{j \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y_{t_j}(r)|^{2p}] \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \Delta \\ &\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.58)$$

Inserting (2.57) and (2.58) into (2.56) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\varepsilon t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \leq K_{\varepsilon_1} (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}.$$

This implies that for any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] &\leq e^{-\varepsilon t_{(k-N)\vee 0+1}} K_{\varepsilon_1} (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}} \\ &\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$. Similar arguments to Case 1 yield that for any $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} &\leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k ((1 + 3p\kappa_1 + 5\kappa_1 \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\kappa \Delta} - 1) e^{\varepsilon t_l} |z(t_l)|^{2p} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,2} + p \sum_{l=0}^k A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l, \end{aligned} \quad (2.59)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_{l,2} &:= 5^p \Delta^p \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{C_p^i}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} \left(R_1^p + (2a_4)^p \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right) + 5^p \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{C_p^i}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} |\sigma_l \delta W_l|^{2p} \\ &\quad + 5^p \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{C_p^i}{\varepsilon_1^{p-i}} (4|y(t_l)| |\sigma_l \delta W_l|)^p + \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{C_p^i (10|\sigma_l \delta W_l|)^{2p}}{\varepsilon_1^{2p-i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (2.57) and (2.58), we derive

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{l+1}} \tilde{J}_{l,2}\right] \leq K_{\kappa_1} (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) \frac{e^{\varepsilon t_{k+2}}}{\kappa},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& p\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{l=(k-N)\vee 0}^j A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |z(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \mathcal{M}_l\right] \\
& \leq K\kappa_1(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) \frac{e^{\kappa t_{k+2}}}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\kappa t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these into (2.59), and combining (2.47), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\kappa t_{k+1}} |z(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \\
& \leq |z(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k (1 + 2^p \cdot 6\kappa_1) A_{\theta, \Delta^*}^p e^{\kappa \Delta} - 1) e^{\kappa t_l} |z(t_l)|^{2p} \\
& \quad + K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) \frac{e^{\kappa t_{k+2}}}{\kappa} + K e^{\kappa t_{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\kappa t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p} \right) \\
& \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) \frac{e^{\kappa t_{k+2}}}{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} e^{\kappa t_{j+1}} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}).$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0,1]} \sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{k-N \leq j \leq k} |z(t_{j+1})|^{2p}\right] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}). \quad (2.60)$$

In addition, by virtue of (2.35), (2.51), and (2.60), we obtain that for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} |y(t_j)|^{2p}\right] \\
& \leq K\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} |z(t_j)|^{2p}\right] + K\Delta + K\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq j \leq k} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_j}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2\right] \\
& \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) + K\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-2N)\vee (-N) \leq j \leq k} |y(t_j)|^{2p}\right] \\
& \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) + K\Delta \cdot (2N) \sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished. \square

Lemma 2.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2, 2.1–2.3 hold. Then for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $p \geq 1$,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \mathbb{E}[\|z_t^{\xi, \Delta} - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(1+\beta)^2}) \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{C}^d.$$

Proof. For any $t \geq 0$ and $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{-N, -N+1, \dots, -1\}$ such that $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ and $r \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$. It is straightforward to see that

$$t + r \in [t_{k+j}, t_{k+j+2}), \quad t_k + r \in [t_{k+j}, t_{k+j+1}).$$

Recall $z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) = z^{\xi, \Delta}(t+r)$ and $y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) = y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(r) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k+r)$. We first give estimates of $|z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|$, whose proof is divided into four cases.

Case 1: $t + r \in [t_{k+j}, t_{k+j+1}] \in [0, \infty)$. By (1.9) and (2.2), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) &= z^{\xi, \Delta}(t + r) - y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(r) \\
&= z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) + b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(t + r - t_{k+j}) + \sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j})) \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) \right) \\
&= \frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} (z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j})) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} (z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1})) \\
&\quad + b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(t + r - t_{k+j}) + \sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j})).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining $z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_l) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_l) - \theta b(y_{t_l}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) &= -\frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} \theta b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta - \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} \theta b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} (z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1})) \\
&\quad + b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(t + r - t_{k+j}) + \sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j})) \\
&= -\frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} \theta b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta - \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} \theta b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})\Delta + b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(t - t_k) \\
&\quad + \sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j})) - \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} (W(t_{k+j+1}) - W(t_{k+j})).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^p \\
&\leq K \Delta^p (|b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})|^p + |b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})|^p) + K |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j}))|^p \\
&\quad + K |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t_{k+j+1}) - W(t_{k+j}))|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $t + r \in [t_{k+j}, t_{k+j+1}] \in [-\tau, 0]$. It is obvious that $y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) = y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
|z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^p &= \left| \frac{t_{k+j+1} - (t + r)}{\Delta} \xi(t_{k+j}) + \frac{t + r - t_{k+j}}{\Delta} \xi(t_{k+j+1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} \xi(t_{k+j}) - \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} \xi(t_{k+j+1}) \right|^p \\
&= \frac{t - t_k}{\Delta} |\xi(t_{k+j+1}) - \xi(t_{k+j})|^p \leq K^p \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 2.3.

Case 3: $t + r \in [t_{k+j+1}, t_{k+j+2}] \in [0, \infty)$. Similar to Case 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|z_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^p \\
&= |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) + b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})(t + r - t_{k+j+1}) + \sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j+1})) \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) \right)|^p \\
&\leq K \Delta^p |b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})|^p + K |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j+1}))|^p + K |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) \\
&\quad - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1})|^p + K |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j})|^p + K |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j})|^p \\
&\leq K \Delta^p (|b(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi, \Delta})|^p + |b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})|^p) + K |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi, \Delta})(W(t + r) - W(t_{k+j+1}))|^p
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+j+1}) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+j})|^p (\mathbf{1}_{\{t_{k+j+1}>0\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{t_{k+j+1}=0\}}) \\
\leq & K\Delta^p (|b(y_{t_{k+j}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})|^p + |b(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi,\Delta})|^p + |b(\xi)|^p) + K|\sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}}^{\xi,\Delta})(W(t+r) - W(t_{k+j+1}))|^p \\
& + K|\sigma(y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi,\Delta})(W(t_{k+j+1}) - W(t_{k+j}))|^p \mathbf{1}_{\{t_{k+j+1}>0\}} + K\Delta^{\frac{p}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 2.3.

Case 4: $t + r \in [t_{k+j+1}, t_{k+j+2}) \in [-\tau, 0)$. It can be calculated that

$$|z_t^{\xi,\Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^p \leq K\Delta^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Together with the above cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [-\tau, 0]} |z_t^{\xi,\Delta}(r) - y_t^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^p \right] \\
& \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(1+\beta)})\Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} + K(I_1 + I_2 + I_3),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.61}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & := \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}} (|b(y_{t_{k+j}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})|^p \Delta^p + |b(y_{t_{k+j+1}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})|^p \Delta^p) \right], \\
I_2 & := \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}} \sup_{r \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]} |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})(W(t+r) - W(t_{k+j+1}))|^p \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbf{1}_{\{t+r \in [t_{k+j+1}, t_{k+j+2})\}} \right], \\
I_3 & := \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}} |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})(W(t_{k+j+1}\vee 0) - W(t_{k+j}\vee 0))|^p \right].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Assumption 2.2 that

$$I_1 \leq 2\Delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, 0\}} |b(y_{t_{k+j}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})|^p \right] \leq K\Delta^p \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, 0\}} (1 + \|y_{t_{k+j}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta}\|^{p(\beta+1)}) \right].$$

Since

$$\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, 0\}} \|y_{t_{k+j}}^{\xi,\Delta}\| \leq \|y_{t_{k-N}}^{\xi,\Delta}\| + \|y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}\|,$$

by (2.52), we have

$$I_1 \leq K\Delta^p \mathbb{E} [1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)} + \|y_{t_{k-N}}^{\xi,\Delta}\|^{p(1+\beta)} + \|y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}\|^{p(1+\beta)}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(1+\beta)^2})\Delta^p. \tag{2.62}$$

Applying the Hölder inequality yields

$$I_2 \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}} |\sigma(y_{t_{k+j+1}\vee 0}^{\xi,\Delta})|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s_1 - s_2 \in [0, \Delta]} |W(s_1) - W(s_2)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Similar to (2.62), by virtue of Assumption 1.1 and (2.52), we arrive at

$$I_2 \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)}) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s_1 - s_2 \in [0, \Delta]} |W(s_1) - W(s_2)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we obtain

$$I_2 \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)})\Delta^{\frac{p}{2}}. \tag{2.63}$$

Similarly,

$$I_3 \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{p(\beta+1)})\Delta^{\frac{p}{2}}. \tag{2.64}$$

The desired argument follows from (2.61)–(2.64). The proof is completed. \square

2.2 Attractiveness and stability of numerical solution

In this subsection, we reveal that numerical solutions of the θ -EM method can inherit the the exponential attractiveness and the exponential stability of the exact ones.

Proposition 2.4 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one has*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} - y_{t_k}^{\eta, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K \left(|b(\xi) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2 \right) e^{-\lambda_0 t_k} \quad \forall \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{C}^d,$$

where $\lambda_0 \in (0, \frac{(2\theta-1)c_\lambda}{\theta^2} \wedge \lambda)$.

Proof. Fix $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lambda_0 \in (0, \lambda]$, where λ satisfies (1.6). Similar to Step 1 in Proposition 2.2, and using Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\lambda_0 t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2] \\ & \leq |z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + (L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau} \|\xi - \eta\|^2 \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda \Delta)} - e^{-\lambda_0 \Delta} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\lambda_0 t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_i)|^2] \\ & \quad - (2a_1 - L - c_\lambda - (L + 2a_2)e^{\lambda_0 \tau}) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\lambda_0 t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_i)|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1.6) that

$$2a_1 - L - c_\lambda - (L + 2a_2)e^{\lambda_0 \tau} > 0.$$

Similar to (2.23), we obtain

$$\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda \Delta)} - e^{-\lambda_0 \Delta} < \left(\lambda_0 - \frac{(2\theta-1)c_\lambda}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda)} \right) \Delta.$$

Letting $\lambda_0 \in (0, \frac{(2\theta-1)c_\lambda}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda)} \wedge \lambda]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.65)$$

Next, we shall show that $\{y^{\cdot, \Delta}(t_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ has the similar property by the induction argument. In fact, it follows from $z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - \theta b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \Delta$ and Assumption 1.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 2a_1 \theta \Delta) |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 \\ & \leq |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 + 2a_2 \theta \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(r) - y_{t_k}^{\eta, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r). \end{aligned} \quad (2.66)$$

By virtue of (1.9), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 2a_1 \theta \Delta) \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] + 2a_2 \theta \Delta \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r) \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ 2a_2\theta\Delta\left(\nu_2([- \tau, -\Delta]) + \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{-r}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right) \sup_{k-N \leq l \leq k-1} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_l) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_l)|^2]. \quad (2.67)$$

For $k = 1$, according to $a_2 e^{\lambda_0 \tau} < a_1$ and (2.66), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta\left(1 - \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right)\right) \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_1) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_1)|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_1) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_1)|^2] + 2a_2\theta\Delta\left(\nu_2([- \tau, -\Delta]) + \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{-r}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right) \|\xi - \eta\|^2 \\ & \leq \left(1 + 2a_2\theta\Delta\left(1 - \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right)\right) \left(1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})\right) \\ & \quad \times (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_1}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_1) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_1)|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.68)$$

Assume that for some integer $k > 1$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_l) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_l)|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.69)$$

Then for $k + 1$, taking into account (2.65), (2.67), and (2.69), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta\left(1 - \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right)\right) \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2] + 2a_2\theta\Delta\left(1 - \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right) \\ & \quad \times \sup_{k-N+1 \leq l \leq k} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_l) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_l)|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) \left(1 + 2a_2\theta e^{\lambda_0 \tau} \Delta\left(1 - \int_{-\Delta}^0 \frac{r + \Delta}{\Delta} d\nu_2(r)\right)\right) \\ & \quad \times (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_{k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.70)$$

Hence, we conclude from (2.68)–(2.70) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - y^{\eta, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] \\ & \leq (1 \vee ((L + 2a_2)\tau e^{\lambda_0 \tau})) (|z^{\xi, \Delta}(0) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.71)$$

Furthermore, by similar arguments to those in Step 2 of Proposition 2.2, we use (2.65) and (2.71) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N) \vee 0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\lambda_0 t_{i+1}} |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{i+1}) - z^{\eta, \Delta}(t_{i+1})|^2\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K(|z^{\xi,\Delta}(0) - z^{\eta,\Delta}(0)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\lambda_0 t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2] \\
&\quad + 2a_2\theta\Delta \sum_{i=(k-2N)\vee(-N)}^k e^{\lambda_0 t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2] \\
&\leq K(|b(\xi) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2)(1 + t_k).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \lambda_0)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{i+1}) - z^{\eta,\Delta}(t_{i+1})|^2\right] \leq K(|b(\xi) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2)e^{(\lambda_0 - \varepsilon)t_k}. \quad (2.72)$$

Without loss of generality, we redefine $\lambda_0 \in (0, \frac{(2\theta-1)c_\lambda}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda)} \wedge \lambda)$. Then, it follows from (2.71) that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{i+1}) - z^{\eta,\Delta}(t_{i+1})|^2\right] \leq K(|b(\xi) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2)e^{-\lambda_0 t_k}. \quad (2.73)$$

Using (2.66) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta)\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - z^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 2a_2\theta\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-2N)\vee(-N) \leq i \leq k} |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(k-N)\vee 0 \leq i \leq k} |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - z^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 4a_2\theta\tau \sup_{(k-2N)\vee(-N) \leq i \leq k} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i) - y^{\eta,\Delta}(t_i)|^2]. \quad (2.74)
\end{aligned}$$

Then the desired argument follows from (2.71) and (2.73). We finish the proof. \square

Numerical stability is an important characteristic to measure the reliability of numerical methods in long-term computation. Below, we present the exponential stability of the trivial solution of (1.1). We propose the following condition to ensure the existence of the trivial solution.

Assumption 2.4 *The drift and diffusion coefficients satisfy $b(\mathbf{0}) = \sigma(\mathbf{0}) = 0$.*

It follows from Assumption 2.4 that $x^{\mathbf{0}}(t) \equiv 0$, which implies $x_t^{\mathbf{0}} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. By virtue of Lemma 1.1, it is straightforward to obtain the exponential stability of the functional solution of (1.1).

Theorem 2.1 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 2.4 hold. Then the functional solution of (1.1) with the initial datum $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^d$ is mean-square exponential stable and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|x_t^\xi\|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2)e^{-\lambda t},$$

where the constant λ satisfies (1.6).

Similarly, by virtue of Proposition 2.4, we can deduce that the θ -EM method inherits the mean-square exponential stability.

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 2.4 hold. Then for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, the numerical functional solution is mean-square exponential stable and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K(1 + |b(\xi)|^2 + \|\xi\|^2)e^{-\lambda_0 t_k},$$

where the constant λ_0 is defined in Proposition 2.4.

Remark 2.1 *In fact, if the coefficients b and σ are locally Lipschitz continuous, and Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 are relaxed as*

$$2\langle \phi(0), b(\phi) \rangle + |\sigma(\phi)|^2 \leq -d_1 |\phi(0)|^2 + d_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu(r),$$

we can also deduce the above stability results of the exact functional solution and the numerical one, where d_1 and d_2 are positive constants with $d_1 > d_2$, and ν is a probability measure on $[-\tau, 0]$. The proof is similar to those of Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 2.4.

2.3 Mean-square convergence rate

In this subsection, we aim to prove the mean-square convergence rate of θ -EM method, based on the estimates of high-order moments.

Lemma 2.4 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2, 2.1–2.3 hold. Then,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t^\xi - z_t^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})\Delta \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{C}^d.$$

Proof. It follows from (1.1) and (2.2) that

$$x^\xi(t) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t) = \theta b(\xi)\Delta + \int_0^t b(x_s^\xi) - b(y_s^{\xi, \Delta}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi, \Delta}) dW(s).$$

By the Itô formula and the Young inequality, we obtain that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\varepsilon t} |x^\xi(t) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t)|^2 \\ &= \theta^2 |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2 + \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \left(\varepsilon |x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s)|^2 + 2 \langle x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s), b(x_s^\xi) - b(y_s^{\xi, \Delta}) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + |\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi, \Delta})|^2 \right) ds + \mathcal{N}_t \\ &\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})\Delta^2 + \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \left(\varepsilon |x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s)|^2 + 2 \langle x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s), b(x_s^\xi) - b(z_s^{\xi, \Delta}) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (1 + \varepsilon) |\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(z_s^{\xi, \Delta})|^2 \right) ds + \int_0^t \varepsilon e^{\varepsilon s} |x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s)|^2 ds + \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{N}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_t := \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} |b(z_s^{\xi, \Delta}) - b(y_s^{\xi, \Delta})|^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) |\sigma(z_s^{\xi, \Delta}) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi, \Delta})|^2 \right) ds,$$

and \mathcal{N}_t is a martingale defined by

$$\mathcal{N}_t := 2 \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \langle x_s^\xi - z_s^{\xi, \Delta}, (\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi, \Delta})) dW(s) \rangle.$$

According to Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\varepsilon t} |x^\xi(t) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t)|^2 \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})\Delta^2 + \int_0^t \left(- (2a_1 - 2\varepsilon - (1 + \varepsilon)L)e^{\varepsilon s} |x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s)|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\varepsilon s} |x_s^\xi(r) - z_s^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + (1 + \varepsilon)L \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\varepsilon s} |x_s^\xi(r) - z_s^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right) ds \\ & \quad + \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{N}_t \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})\Delta^2 - (2a_1 - 2\varepsilon - (1 + \varepsilon)L - (2a_2 + (1 + \varepsilon)L)e^{\varepsilon\tau}) \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} |x^\xi(s) \\ & \quad - z^{\xi, \Delta}(s)|^2 ds + (2a_2 + (1 + \varepsilon)L)e^{\varepsilon\tau} \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\varepsilon s} |x_s^\xi - z_s^{\xi, \Delta}|^2 ds + \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{N}_t. \end{aligned}$$

In view of $a_1 > a_2 + L$, choose a sufficiently small number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$2a_1 - 2\varepsilon - (1 + \varepsilon)L - (2a_2 + (1 + \varepsilon)L)e^{\varepsilon\tau} \geq 0.$$

By Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3, we have

$$(2a_2 + (1 + \varepsilon)L)e^{\varepsilon\tau} \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\varepsilon s} |x_s^\xi - z_s^{\xi, \Delta}|^2 ds \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})\Delta.$$

Thus,

$$e^{\varepsilon t} |x^\xi(t) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t)|^2 \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})\Delta + \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{N}_t. \quad (2.75)$$

By virtue of Assumptions 1.1 and 2.2, we apply the Hölder inequality to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t] & \leq K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} \|z_s^{\xi, \Delta} - y_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2 (1 + \|z_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^{2\beta} + \|y_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^{2\beta}) ds \right] \\ & \leq K \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} (\mathbb{E}[\|z_s^{\xi, \Delta} - y_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E}[1 + \|z_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^{4\beta} + \|y_s^{\xi, \Delta}\|^{4\beta}])^{\frac{1}{2}} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Making use of (2.52) and Lemma 2.3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t] & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)^2})(1 + \|\xi\|^{2\beta(1+\beta)})\Delta \int_0^t e^{\varepsilon s} ds \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t} \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

This, along with (2.75) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|x^\xi(t) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(t)|^2] & \leq e^{-\varepsilon t} (K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)})\Delta + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t]) \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})\Delta, \end{aligned} \quad (2.76)$$

where the positive constant K is independent of Δ and t . Furthermore, according to (2.75), we apply the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality to derive

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t-\tau) \vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u} |x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi, \Delta}(u)|^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)})\Delta + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_t] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} \mathcal{N}_u\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta \\
&\quad + K\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{2\varepsilon s}|x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(s)|^2|\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta + K\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right)\right.\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left.\times \int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}|\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of the Young inequality and Assumption 1.1, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\quad + K\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}|\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 ds\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\quad + K\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}|\sigma(x_s^\xi) - \sigma(z_s^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 ds\right] \\
&\quad + K\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}|\sigma(z_s^{\xi,\Delta}) - \sigma(y_s^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 ds\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\quad + K\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}\mathbb{E}[|x^\xi(s) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(s)|^2]ds + K\int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}\mathbb{E}[|z_s^{\xi,\Delta} - y_s^{\xi,\Delta}|^2]ds \\
&\quad + \int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}\int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|x_s^\xi(r) - z_s^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^2]d\nu_1(r)ds.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2.76) and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}e^{\varepsilon(t-\tau)\vee 0}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} |x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} e^{\varepsilon u}|x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta + K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})\Delta \int_{(t-\tau)\vee 0}^t e^{\varepsilon s}ds \\
&\leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})e^{\varepsilon t}\Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(t-\tau)\vee 0 \leq u \leq t} |x^\xi(u) - z^{\xi,\Delta}(u)|^2\right] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})\Delta.$$

The proof is completed. \square

Utilizing Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we conclude the following mean-square convergence rate of the θ -EM functional solution.

Theorem 2.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2, 2.1–2.3 hold. Then for $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^d$,*

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{t_k}^\xi - y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(1+\beta)(2\beta+2)})\Delta.$$

In view of Proposition 2.3, Proposition 2.4, Theorem 2.3, and [15, Theorems 3.1–3.2], we present the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) and the central limit theorem (CLT) of the θ -EM method. Define the empirical measure as $\Pi^{m, \Delta} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \delta_{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}}$ with δ being the Dirac function. $\Pi^{m, \Delta}(f) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})$ is called the time-average of the θ -EM functional solution.

Corollary 2.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1–1.2 and 2.1–2.3, the numerical functional solution $\{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k \geq 0}$ fulfills the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) and the central limit theorem (CLT), namely, for any $p \geq 1, \gamma \in (0, 1]$, and $f \in \mathcal{C}_{p, \gamma}$,*

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{m_1 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{k=0}^{m_1-1} f(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) = \mu(f) \quad a.s., \quad (\text{SLLN})$$

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_2 \Delta}} \sum_{k=0}^{m_2-1} (f(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) - \mu(f))\Delta = \mathcal{N}(0, v^2) \quad \text{in distribution}, \quad (\text{CLT})$$

where $m_2 = \lceil \Delta^{-1-2\lambda} \rceil$ with $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\gamma)$, $v^2 = 2\mu((f - \mu(f)) \int_0^\infty (P_t f - \mu(f)))$. Here, $\mathcal{C}_{p, \gamma} := \mathcal{C}_{p, \gamma}(\mathcal{C}^d; \mathbb{R})$ is the space of continuous functions f satisfying

$$\sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \frac{|f(\phi)|}{1 + \|\phi\|^\frac{p}{2}} + \sup_{\substack{\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d \\ \phi_1 \neq \phi_2}} \frac{|f(\phi_1) - f(\phi_2)|}{(1 \wedge \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|^\gamma)(1 + \|\phi_1\|^p + \|\phi_2\|^p)^\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

2.4 Summary and outlook

In this chapter, we present the longtime mean-square convergence analysis for the θ -EM method for the SFDE (1.1) with the superlinearly growing drift coefficient. The mean-square convergence rate is proved to be $\frac{1}{2}$. The time-independent boundedness of high-order moment of the numerical solution is the key to obtain the desired mean-square convergence result. There are some rooms to loose the conditions proposed in this chapter. For example, if we weaken Assumption 2.2 to

$$\langle b(\phi), \phi(0) \rangle \leq K - a_3 |\phi(0)|^{\alpha+\epsilon} + a_4 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^\alpha d\nu_2(r), \quad \phi \in \mathcal{C}^d,$$

the mean-square convergence result still holds based on the approach used in this chapter, where $\epsilon > 0, \alpha \geq 2, a_3, a_4 > 0$. When both the drift and the diffusion coefficients are superlinearly growing, there are some longtime mean-square convergence results of numerical methods for stochastic ordinary differential equations (for BEM method see [45]). However, less is known for the SFDE case.

As applications of the longtime mean-square convergence result, we present in Corollary 2.1 the SLLN and the CLT of the time-average of the θ -EM functional solution. Following this line, it is interesting to further study the probabilistic asymptotics that the empirical measure deviates from the invariant measure. We leave this as our future work.

Invariant measure and weak convergence analysis

In this chapter, we investigate the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure of the θ -EM method. In order to give a quantitative estimate between the numerical invariant measure and the exact one, we analyze the longtime weak convergence of the θ -EM method. Finally, it is shown that the convergence rate of the invariant measure of the θ -EM method is 1, which is twice the mean-square convergence rate.

3.1 Numerical invariant measure

In this section, we show that the θ -EM functional solution admits a unique invariant measure. Recall

$$y_t^{\xi, \Delta} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}(t)$$

and define the measure $\mu_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ by

$$\mu_t^{\xi, \Delta}(A) := \mathbb{P}\{\omega \in \Omega : y_t^{\xi, \Delta} \in A\} \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{C}^d).$$

Denote by $P_t^{\xi, \Delta}$ the Markov semigroup associated to $\mu_t^{\xi, \Delta}$. According to Propositions 2.2 and 2.4, we can obtain the tightness of the sequence $\{\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$.

Lemma 3.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, for $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^d$ and $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, the family $\{\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is tight.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{C}^d is a Polish space and

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2),$$

and by virtue of [58, Lemma 6.14], it suffices to prove that the family $\{\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the space $(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{W}_1)$. In fact, for any $k, i \in \mathbb{N}$, applying [58, Remark 6.5] leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{W}_1(\mu_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \\ &= \sup_{\|\Psi\|_{Lip} \vee \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathcal{C}^d} \Psi(\phi) d\mu_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}(\phi) - \int_{\mathcal{C}^d} \Psi(\phi) d\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(\phi) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi : \mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition and norms $\|\cdot\|_{Lip}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ are defined, respectively, by

$$\|\Psi\|_{Lip} = \sup_{\substack{\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d \\ \phi_1 \neq \phi_2}} \frac{|\Psi(\phi_1) - \Psi(\phi_2)|}{\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Psi\|_{\infty} = \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \frac{|\Psi(\phi)|}{\|\phi\|}.$$

By the definition of $\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}$ and the time-homogeneous Markov property of $\{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_1(\mu_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) &= \sup_{\|\Psi\|_{Lip} \vee \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} |\mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta})] - \mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})]| \\ &= \sup_{\|\Psi\|_{Lip} \vee \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_i}] \right] - \mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})] \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|\Psi\|_{Lip} \vee \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})]_{\zeta=y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}} \right] - \mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})] \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|\Psi\|_{Lip} \vee \|\Psi\|_{\infty} \leq 1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) - \Psi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})]_{\zeta=y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}} \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Lipschitz property of Ψ and Proposition 2.4 that for any constant $M > \|\xi\|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_1(\mu_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [2 \wedge \|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} - y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\| |_{\zeta=y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}}] \right] \\ &\leq K \mathbb{E} \left[(|b(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) - b(\xi)| + \|y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta} - \xi\|) \mathbf{1}_{\{\|y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}\| \leq M\}} \right] e^{-\frac{\lambda_0 t_k}{2}} + 2\mathbb{P}\{\|y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}\| > M\}. \end{aligned}$$

According to the Chebyshev inequality and Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_1(\mu_{t_{k+i}}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) &\leq K \sup_{\|\phi\| \leq M} (|b(\phi)| + \|\phi\|) e^{-\frac{\lambda_0 t_k}{2}} + 2 \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^2]}{M^2} \\ &\leq K \sup_{\|\phi\| \leq M} (|b(\phi)| + \|\phi\|) e^{-\frac{\lambda_0 t_k}{2}} + \frac{K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2)}{M^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose a sufficiently large number $M > 0$ such that

$$\frac{K(1 + \|\xi\|^2 + |b(\xi)|^2 \Delta^2)}{M^2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By virtue of the continuity of $b(\cdot)$, choose a sufficiently large number $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$K \sup_{\|\phi\| \leq M} (|b(\phi)|^2 + \|\phi\|^2) e^{-\frac{\lambda_0 t_k}{2}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Hence, the family $\{\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{W}_1)$. The proof is finished. \square

Taking advantage of Proposition 2.4 and Lemma 3.1, we give the existence and uniqueness of the numerical invariant measure of the θ -EM functional solution.

Theorem 3.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, for $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, the θ -EM functional solution admits a unique invariant measure μ^Δ . Furthermore, for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ the numerical invariant measure μ^Δ satisfies*

$$\sup_{\Delta \in (0, 1]} \mu^\Delta(\|\cdot\|^p) := \sup_{\Delta \in (0, 1]} \int_{\mathcal{C}^d} \|\phi\|^p d\mu^\Delta(\phi) \leq K. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. We divide the proof of the existence and uniqueness of the numerical invariant measure into two steps.

Step 1. We present the existence of numerical invariant measure based on the Krylov–Bogoliubov theorem [24, Theorem 3.1.1]. For any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that the family $\{\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ is tight. Hence we only need to prove that $P_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}$ is Feller, i.e., to show that the mapping

$$\xi \rightarrow P_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(\Phi) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})]$$

is continuous for any bounded continuous functional $\Phi : \mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In fact, for $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, by Proposition 2.4, we have

$$y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \rightarrow y_{t_k}^{\eta, \Delta} \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$$

as $\xi \rightarrow \eta$. By [57, pp.256, Theorem 2], we derive

$$y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \rightarrow y_{t_k}^{\eta, \Delta} \quad \text{in distribution}$$

as $\xi \rightarrow \eta$, which implies the Feller property. Hence, for any $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^d$ and $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, the θ -EM functional solution admits an invariant measure μ^Δ .

Step 2. We shall show that for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$, the numerical invariant measure is unique. Assume that there exist two numerical invariant measures μ_1^Δ and μ_2^Δ . Then in view of the convex property of \mathbb{W}_2 and Proposition 2.4, we obtain that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu_1^\Delta, \mu_2^\Delta) \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{C}^d \times \mathcal{C}^d} \mathbb{W}_2^2(\mu_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mu_{t_k}^{\eta, \Delta}) d\mu_1^\Delta(\xi) d\mu_2^\Delta(\eta) \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{C}^d \times \mathcal{C}^d} 1 \wedge \left(K(|b(\xi) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\xi - \eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_k} \right) d\mu_1^\Delta(\xi) d\mu_2^\Delta(\eta). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

It follows from the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_1^\Delta, \mu_2^\Delta) = 0,$$

which finishes the proof of Step 2.

In addition, by means of Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_C \|\phi\|^p d\mu^\Delta(\eta) &= \lim_{M \rightarrow +\infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[M \wedge \|y_{t_k}^{0, \Delta}\|^p] \\ &\leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_k}^{0, \Delta}\|^p] \leq K. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is therefore finished. \square

Taking advantage of Theorem 2.3, we estimate the error between the numerical invariant measure and the exact one.

Theorem 3.2 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1–2.3 hold. Then for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \mu^\Delta) \leq K \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. For any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by virtue of Lemma 1.2 and Theorem 2.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \mu^\Delta) &\leq \mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}}) + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}}, \mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}) + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}, \mu^\Delta) \\ &\leq K e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2} t_k} + (\mathbb{E}[\|x_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}} - y_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}\|^2])^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}, \mu^\Delta) \\ &\leq K e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2} t_k} + K \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}, \mu^\Delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where the positive constant λ satisfies (1.6). Similar to the proof of (3.2), and by Assumption 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{W}_2(\mu_{t_k}^{\mathbf{0}, \Delta}, \mu^\Delta) &\leq \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}^d} K (|b(\mathbf{0}) - b(\eta)|^2 + \|\eta\|^2) e^{-\lambda_0 t_k} d\mu^\Delta(\eta) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq K e^{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2} t_k} \left(\int_{\mathcal{C}^d} (1 + \|\eta\|^{2(\beta+1)}) d\mu^\Delta(\eta) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq K e^{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2} t_k}. \end{aligned}$$

This, along with (3.3) implies that

$$\mathbb{W}_2(\mu, \mu^\Delta) \leq K e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2} t_k} + K \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + K e^{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2} t_k}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the desired argument. \square

3.2 Weak convergence rate

In this section, we present the longtime weak convergence analysis of the θ -EM method based on the Malliavin calculus, and show that the convergence rate of the numerical invariant measure is 1. The key in the analysis is to present time-independent estimates of the Malliavin derivatives and the Gâteaux derivatives of both the exact solution and the numerical solution.

3.2.1 Preliminaries

This subsection is devoted to giving a brief introduction to the Malliavin calculus and presenting the decomposition of the weak error for the θ -EM method.

3.2.1.1 Brief introduction to Malliavin calculus

Let H be the Hilbert space $L^2([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ endowed with the inner product $\langle g, h \rangle_H := \int_0^\infty g(t)^\top h(t) dt$ for $g, h \in H$. By identifying $W(t, \omega)$ with the value $\omega(t)$ at time t of an element $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_0([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$, we take $\Omega = \mathcal{C}_0([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ as the Wiener space and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ as the Wiener measure. For $g = (g^1, \dots, g^m) \in H$, we set

$$W(g) := \sum_{k=1}^m \int_0^\infty g^k(t) dW^k(t).$$

Denote by \mathcal{S} the class of smooth random variables such that $G \in \mathcal{S}$ has the form $G = f(W(g_1), \dots, W(g_n))$, where $f \in \mathcal{C}_{pol}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$, $g_i \in H$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here, $\mathcal{C}_{pol}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ is the space of all real-valued smooth functions on \mathbb{R}^n whose partial derivatives have at most polynomial growth. The Malliavin derivative of a smooth random variable G is an H -valued random variable given by

$$DG = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(W(g_1), \dots, W(g_n))g_i,$$

which is also an m -dimensional stochastic process $DG = \{D_r G, r \geq 0\}$ with

$$D_r G = \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i f(W(g_1), \dots, W(g_n))g_i(r).$$

For any $p \geq 1$, we denote the domain of D in $L^p(\Omega)$ by $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}$, meaning that $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ is the closure of \mathcal{S} with respect to the norm $\|G\|_{1,p} := (\mathbb{E}[|G|^p + \|DG\|_H^p])^{\frac{1}{p}}$. For $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the Malliavin covariance matrix is the symmetric nonnegative random matrix defined by

$$\gamma_F := (\langle DF^i, DF^j \rangle_H)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}.$$

The iterated derivative $D^\alpha G$ is a random variable with values in $H^{\otimes \alpha}$. Precisely, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $D^\alpha G = \{D_{r_1, \dots, r_\alpha} G, r_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, \alpha\}$ is a measurable function on the product space $[0, +\infty)^\alpha \times \Omega$. For any $p \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_+$, denote by $\mathbb{D}^{\alpha,p}$ the completion of \mathcal{S} with respect to the norm

$$\|G\|_{\alpha,p} := \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|G|^p + \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} \|D^j G\|_{H^{\otimes j}}^p \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

For $G \in \mathbb{D}^{\alpha,p}$ and $g \in H$, define the directional derivative by $D^g G := \langle DG, g \rangle_H$ and by induction, $D^{g_1, \dots, g_j} G := \langle DD^{g_1, \dots, g_{j-1}} G, g_j \rangle_H$, $j = 2, \dots, \alpha$, where $g_i \in H$, $i = 1, \dots, \alpha$.

Define $L^{\infty-}(\Omega) := \cap_{p \geq 1} L^p(\Omega)$, $\mathbb{D}^{\alpha, \infty} := \cap_{p \geq 1} \mathbb{D}^{\alpha,p}$, $\mathbb{D}^\infty := \cap_{p \geq 1} \cap_{\alpha \geq 1} \mathbb{D}^{\alpha,p}$. Similarly, let V be a real separable Hilbert space and define the space $\mathbb{D}^{\alpha,p}(V)$ as the completion of V -valued smooth random variables with respect to the norm

$$\|G\|_{\alpha,p,V} = \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|G\|_V^p + \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} \|D^j G\|_{H^{\otimes j} \otimes V}^p \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In this case, the corresponding spaces are denoted by $L^{\infty-}(\Omega; V)$, $\mathbb{D}^{\alpha, \infty}(V)$ and $\mathbb{D}^\infty(V)$, respectively.

Let D^* be the adjoint operator of D . If an H -valued random variable $\phi \in L^2(\Omega; H)$ satisfies $|\mathbb{E}[\langle \phi, DX \rangle_H]| \leq K(\phi) \|X\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for all $X \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, then $\phi \in \text{Dom}(D^*)$ and $D^*(\phi) \in L^2(\Omega)$ is characterized by

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \phi, DX \rangle_H] = \mathbb{E}[XD^*(\phi)]. \quad (3.4)$$

We refer to [52, Definition 1.3.1] for more details.

We introduce the functional version of the chain rule for Malliavin derivatives, see e.g. [28] for details.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $G : \mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a map with bounded continuous Fréchet derivatives of first and second order. Let $x_t(r) = x(t+r)$, $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, $t \geq 0$ be a d -dimensional continuous \mathcal{F}_t -adapted process such that $x_t(r) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. If $\mathbb{E} \left[|G(x_t)|^2 + \|\mathcal{D}G(x_t)(Dx_t)\|_H^2 \right] < \infty$, then $G(x_t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and*

$$D_{t_1}[G(x_t)] = \mathcal{D}G(x_t)(D_{t_1}x_t(\cdot)),$$

where $D_{t_1}x_t(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^d$ denotes the mapping $r \rightarrow D_{t_1}x_t(r) = D_{t_1}x(t+r)$ and $\mathcal{D}G$ is the Fréchet derivative of G .

3.2.1.2 Decomposition of the weak error

Without loss of generality, let T be a multiple of τ , i.e., there exists a number $N^\Delta \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $T = t_{N^\Delta}$. For any $Y(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}([t_i, t_k]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with $i, k \in \{-N, \dots, N^\Delta\}$, by $Y^{Int}(\cdot)$ we denote the linear interpolation with respect to $Y(t_i), \dots, Y(t_k)$. Let $\varphi(t; t_i, \eta)$ and $\varphi_t(t_i, \eta)$ denote the solution and functional solution of the SFDE at time t with initial value $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$ at t_i , $\Phi(t_k; t_i, \eta^{Int})$ and $\Phi_{t_k}(t_i, \eta^{Int})$ denote the solution and functional solution of the θ -EM method at time t_k with initial value η^{Int} at t_i . Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$. We have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(x(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T))] = \mathbb{E}[f(\varphi(T; 0, \xi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; 0, \Phi_0))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; 0, \Phi_0))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; 0, \Phi_0))]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

We split the term $\mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; 0, \Phi_0))]$ further as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N^\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; 0, \Phi_0))] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_i, \varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f(\Phi(T; t_i, \varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - f(\Phi(T; t_i, \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i} \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)) \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left(\varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t_i} \right] \right] d\varsigma \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)) \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left(\varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \right] d\varsigma, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$Y_i^\varsigma = \varsigma \varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) + (1 - \varsigma) \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)). \quad (3.7)$$

It follows from $\varphi^{Int}(t_j; 0, \Phi_0) = \varphi(t_j; 0, \Phi_0)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \\
&= \sum_{j=-N}^0 I^j \left(\varphi_{t_i}^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(t_j) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))(t_j) \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=-N}^0 I^j \left(\varphi^{Int}(t_i + t_j; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi(t_i + t_j; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} I^j \left(\varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) - \varphi^{Int}(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) \right) \\
&\quad + I^0 \left(\varphi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \\
&= I^0 \left(\varphi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \right), \tag{3.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where $I^j(s) = \frac{N}{\tau}(s - t_{j-1})\mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{j-1}}(s) + \frac{N}{\tau}(t_{j+1} - s)\mathbf{1}_{\Delta_j}(s)$ with $\Delta_j = [t_j, t_{j+1})$ for $j = -N + 1, \dots, -1$, and $I^{-N}(s) = \frac{N}{\tau}(t_{-N+1} - s)\mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{-N}}(s)$, and $I^0(s) = \frac{N}{\tau}(s - t_{-1})\mathbf{1}_{\Delta_{-1}}(s)$ with $\Delta_{-N} = [-t_{-N}, t_{-N+1})$ and $\Delta_{-1} = [-t_{-1}, 0]$.

Note that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \Phi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \\
&= \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} b(\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)))dr + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sigma(\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)))dW(r) \\
&\quad - \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} [(1 - \theta)b(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) + \theta b(\Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))]dr \\
&\quad - \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sigma(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))dW(r) = \mathcal{I}_b^i + \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}^i + \mathcal{I}_\sigma^i, \tag{3.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_b^i &:= \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} [b(\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) - b(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))]dr, \\
\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}^i &:= \theta \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} [b(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) - b(\Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))]dr, \\
\mathcal{I}_\sigma^i &:= \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} [\sigma(\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) - \sigma(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))]dW(r).
\end{aligned}$$

According to (3.5)–(3.9), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[f(x(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi)))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))] \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta)) \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta) \left(I^0(\mathcal{I}_b^i + \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}^i + \mathcal{I}_\sigma^i) \right) \right] d\zeta \\
&= \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi)))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))] \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta)), \mathcal{I}_b^i + \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}^i + \mathcal{I}_\sigma^i \right\rangle \right] d\zeta
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathcal{I}_0 + \mathcal{I}_b + \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta} + \mathcal{I}_\sigma, \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_0 &:= \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi)))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))] \\ \mathcal{I}_b &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)), \mathcal{I}_b^i \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)), \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}^i \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_\sigma &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)), \mathcal{I}_\sigma^i \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma. \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2 Estimates of Malliavin derivatives and Gâteaux derivatives

In this subsection, we show some time-independent estimates of Malliavin derivatives and Gâteaux derivatives of both the exact solution and the numerical solution.

Assumption 3.1 *Assume that coefficients b and σ have continuous Gâteaux derivatives.*

For any $\phi, \phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows from Assumption 3.1 and the definition of the Gâteaux derivative that $b(\phi_1 + t\phi) - b(\phi_1) = t\mathcal{D}b(\phi_1)\phi + o(t)$. Then based on Assumptions 1.1–1.2, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{D}b(\phi_1)\phi, \phi(0) \rangle \leq -a_1 |\phi(0)|^2 + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r), \quad (3.11)$$

$$|\mathcal{D}\sigma(\phi_1)\phi|^2 \leq L(|\phi(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r)), \quad (3.12)$$

where $\phi, \phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d$; see [16, Eq. (2.4)] for a similar proof.

The following lemmas give some regularity estimates of both the exact solution and the numerical solution.

Lemma 3.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2 with $a_1 - a_2 - (2p - 1)L > 0$ hold for some $p \geq 1$. And let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then for any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq K \|\eta\|^{2p} e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p t}, \\ \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq K \|\eta\|^{2p} e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p t}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$, $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, and constants $K, \hat{\lambda}_1 > 0$.

Proof. For $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta$ satisfies

$$d\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta = \mathcal{D}b(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta dt + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta dW(t), \quad t > 0$$

with the initial datum $\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r) \cdot \eta = \eta(r)$ for $r \in [-\tau, 0]$. Let $\hat{\lambda}_1 \in (0, 1)$ be determined later. Applying the Itô formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & d(e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}) \\ &= \hat{\lambda}_1 p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p} dt + 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \left(\langle \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \rangle dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \langle \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta dW(t) \rangle \right) \\ & \quad + 2p(p-1) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p-4} |(\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta)^\top \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^2 dt \\ & \quad + p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.11)–(3.12), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p} \\ & \leq |\eta(0)|^{2p} + \int_0^t \hat{\lambda}_1 p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds + \int_0^t 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \left[-a_1 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right] ds + \int_0^t 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \times \\ & \quad \langle \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta dW(s) \rangle + \int_0^t p(2p-1) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \times \\ & \quad L \left[|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) ds \\ & \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds + \frac{1}{p} \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) ds \\ & = \frac{p-1}{p} \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds + \frac{1}{p} \int_{-\tau}^0 \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds d\nu_2(r) \\ & \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds + \frac{1}{p} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \int_{-\tau}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p z} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(z) \cdot \eta|^{2p} dz \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p} \tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|\eta\|^{2p} + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} ds. \end{aligned}$$

We derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] & \leq |\eta(0)|^{2p} + p \left(\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau}) \right) \times \\ & \quad \int_0^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] ds + (2a_2 + (2p-1)L)\tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|\eta\|^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

Take a sufficiently small number $\hat{\lambda}_1 > 0$ such that $\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)L + (2p-1)L e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} < 0$. This gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq K \|\eta\|^{2p}$. Moreover, applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \vee (t-\tau) \leq r \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p r} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} \right] \leq |\eta(0)|^{2p} + (2a_2 + (2p-1)L)\tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|\eta\|^{2p} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \vee (t-\tau) \leq r \leq t} \int_0^r 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \langle \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta dW(s) \rangle \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-\tau)\leq r\leq t}\int_{0\vee(t-\tau)}^r 2pe^{\hat{\lambda}_1 ps}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^{2p-2}\langle\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta, \right. \\
&\quad \left.\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\cdot\eta dW(s)\rangle\right] \\
&\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + K\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{0\vee(t-\tau)}^t e^{2\hat{\lambda}_1 ps}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^{4p-2}|\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\cdot\eta|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\
&\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + K\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-\tau)\leq s\leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1(p-\frac{1}{2})s}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^{2p-1}\times \right. \\
&\quad \left.\left(\int_{0\vee(t-\tau)}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 s}|\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\cdot\eta|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

According to the Young inequality, (3.12), and the Hölder inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-\tau)\leq r\leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 pr}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)\cdot\eta|^{2p}\right] \\
&\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-\tau)\leq s\leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 ps}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^{2p}\right] \\
&\quad + K\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{0\vee(t-\tau)}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 s}(|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r)\cdot\eta|^2 d\nu_1(r)) ds\right)^p\right] \\
&\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-\tau)\leq s\leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 ps}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)\cdot\eta|^{2p}\right] \\
&\quad + \tau^{p-1}K\int_{0\vee(t-\tau)}^t \sup_{-\tau\leq r\leq s} \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 pr}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)\cdot\eta|^{2p}] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $\mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 pt}|\mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)\cdot\eta|^{2p}] \leq K\|\eta\|^{2p}$ that

$$e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p(0\vee(t-\tau))}\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}\cdot\eta|^{2p}] \leq K\|\eta\|^{2p},$$

which gives

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}\cdot\eta|^{2p}] \leq K\|\eta\|e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 pt}.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Lemma 3.4 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2 with $a_1 - a_2 - (2p - 1)L > 0$ hold for some $p \geq 1$. And let Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1 hold. Then for any $t \geq 0$ and $u \geq -\tau$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\|D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^2|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p(t-u)}(1 + \mathbb{E}[|\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^2|^{2p}]),$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$ and $D_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)$, $K > 0$, and $\hat{\lambda}_1 > 0$ is given in Lemma 3.3.

Proof. When $0 \leq u \leq t$, $D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) &= \int_u^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} ds + \int_u^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} dW(s) \\
&\quad + \sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(u) + D_u \tilde{\xi}(0).
\end{aligned}$$

By the Itô formula, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d(e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}) &\leq \hat{\lambda}_1 p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p} dt + 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p-2} \times \\ &\quad \left(\langle D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \mathcal{D}b(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \rangle dt + \langle D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t), \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} dW(t) \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + p(2p-1) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p-2} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}] &\leq K \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (|\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})|^{2p} + |D_u \tilde{\xi}(0)|^{2p})] \\ &\quad + p(\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau}) \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p}] ds \\ &\quad + (2a_2 + (2p-1)L)\tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p} \\ &\leq K \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (|\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})|^{2p} + |D_u \tilde{\xi}(0)|^{2p})] + (2a_2 + (2p-1)L)\tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts $D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) = 0$ for $u \geq s$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_u^t \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_i(r) ds &= \int_0^t \int_{-\tau}^0 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_i(r) ds \\ &\leq \tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p} + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p} ds, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

This, along with Assumption 1.1 and Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[|D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p(t-u)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq r \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p r} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} \mathbb{E}[|\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})|^{2p} + |D_u \tilde{\xi}(0)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{[-\tau, 0]}(u)] + (2a_2 + (2p-1)L)\tau e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} \|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq r \leq t} \int_u^r 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \langle |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p-2} D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s), \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} dW(s) \rangle \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]) + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{u \vee (t-\tau)}^t e^{2\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{4p-2} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]) \\ &\quad + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq s \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 (p-\frac{1}{2})s} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p-1} \right) \left(\int_{u \vee (t-\tau)}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 s} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Young inequality, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq r \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p r} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq s \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\quad + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{u \vee (t-\tau)}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 s} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}|^2 ds \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \vee (t-\tau) \leq s \leq t} e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s)|^{2p} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \tau^{p-1} K \int_{u \vee (t-\tau)}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \left(\sup_{s-\tau \leq r \leq s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(r)|^{2p}] \right) ds \\
& \leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]) + \tau^p K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p (t-\tau)} \mathbb{E}[\|D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p}] \leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]),$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\|D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p}] \leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p (u-t)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]).$$

We complete the proof. \square

Lemma 3.5 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2, 2.2, and 3.1 hold. Then for $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a number $a_1^*(L, a_2, \theta, p) > 0$ such that for $a_1 > a_1^*$ and $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}\|^{2p\beta}]),$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p\beta}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$, $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, and $K, \hat{\lambda}_2 > 0$.

Proof. For the case of $p = 1$, one can obtain the result by using the similar technique to that in Lemma 2.2. We are in the position to show the proof of $p > 1$.

Step 1: Case of $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$ with some $\Delta^* \in (0, 1]$. We have that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta &= \mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta + \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k, \\
\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(0) \cdot \eta &= \eta(0) - \theta \Delta \mathcal{D}b(\tilde{\xi}) \eta,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta = \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta - \theta \Delta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta. \quad (3.13)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
&= |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + |\mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 \Delta^2 + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 \\
&+ \mathcal{M}_k + 2 \langle \mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \rangle \Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_k := 2 \langle \mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta + \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \Delta, \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k \rangle$. It follows from (3.11) and (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^2 &= \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + \frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
&+ \frac{2(2\theta-1)}{\theta^2} \langle \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta \rangle + 2 \langle \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \rangle \Delta \\
&+ |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq A_{\theta,\Delta} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \Delta |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \langle \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta \rangle \Delta + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k \\
&\leq A_{\theta,\Delta} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \Delta |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 - 2\Delta a_1 |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
&\quad + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_{\theta,\Delta} := \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \sum_{i=1}^p C_p^i \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_i],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_i &= A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-i} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-i)} \left(-\Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \right) |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 + \mathcal{M}_k \right)^i.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term \mathcal{I}_1 , by (3.12) and the property of the conditional expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_1] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1)} \left(-\Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} - L \right) |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) + L \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right) \right] \\
&\leq -\Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} - L \right) A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1)} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{L\Delta}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_1(r) + \frac{2a_2\Delta}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_2(r) \\
&\quad + (2a_2 + L) \epsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}], \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the Young inequality. (3.11) and the relation (3.13) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 &\leq |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + 2\theta \Delta \langle \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta \rangle \\
&\leq |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + 2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r), \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} &\leq |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1)} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
&\quad + |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} C_{p-1}^j |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1-j)} \left(2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^j \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon_1) |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1)} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + K(\epsilon_1) |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \times \\
&\quad \left(2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$-|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-1)} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \leq -(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}$$

$$+ K(\epsilon_1)(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \left(2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1}. \quad (3.16)$$

Inserting (3.16) into (3.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_1] &\leq \Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L \right) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[- (1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + K(\epsilon_1)(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \left(2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1} \right] \\ &\quad + (2a_2 + L)\epsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \frac{2a_2}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_1(r) \\ &\leq -\Delta (1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L \right) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + (2a_2 + L)\epsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K(\epsilon_1) \Delta^p \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad + K(\epsilon_1) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \frac{2a_2}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad + \frac{L}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_1(r). \end{aligned}$$

For the term \mathcal{I}_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-2} |\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-2)} \left(-\Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} \right) |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2 \left\langle \mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta + \frac{1}{\theta} (\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta - \mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta), \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k \right\rangle \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-2} |\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2(p-2)} \left(8A_{\theta, \Delta} |\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 \Delta \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{8}{\theta^2} |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 \Delta + \left(-\Delta \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} \right) |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \delta W_k|^2 \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &\leq 16\epsilon_1 \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K \Delta^2 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{8}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{4}{\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \theta^p} \right) L \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \theta^p} \Delta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the term \mathcal{I}_i with $i \in \{3, \dots, p\}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_i] &\leq K \Delta^2 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right] + K \Delta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \leq A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + p\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_1] + \frac{p(p-1)}{2}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_2] + \sum_{i=3}^p C_p^i \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_i] \\
& \leq (1 + p(2a_2 + L)\epsilon_1\Delta + \frac{16p(p-1)}{2}\epsilon_1\Delta + K\Delta^2)A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \quad - \Delta p(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1}(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L)A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \quad + \frac{2pa_2}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}}\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]d\nu_2(r) + \frac{pL}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}}\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]d\nu_1(r) \\
& \quad + \frac{p(p-1)L}{2}(\frac{8}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{4}{\frac{p-2}{\theta^2}}\frac{1}{\theta^p})\Delta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_1(r)] \\
& \quad + \frac{2p(p-1)}{\theta^p\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}}}\Delta \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + (K\Delta^2 + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^p)\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \quad + K\Delta^2 \mathbb{E}[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_1(r)] \\
& \quad + (K\Delta^2 + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^p)\mathbb{E}[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)] \\
& \leq (1 + K(\epsilon_1 + \Delta)\Delta)A_{\theta,\Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \Delta J_{1,k} + \Delta^2 J_{2,k},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,k} & := -p(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1}(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L)A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \quad + \frac{2pa_2}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]d\nu_2(r) + \frac{pL}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]d\nu_1(r) \\
& \quad + \frac{p(p-1)L}{2}(\frac{8}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{4}{\frac{p-2}{\theta^2}}\frac{1}{\theta^p})\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_1(r)] \\
& \quad + \frac{2p(p-1)}{\theta^p\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}}}\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}], \\
J_{2,k} & := (K + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^{p-2})\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K\mathbb{E}[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_1(r)] \\
& \quad + (K + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^{p-2})\mathbb{E}[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)].
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\lambda_2 pt_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& = \sum_{l=0}^k (e^{\lambda_2 pt_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_{l+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] - e^{\lambda_2 pt_l} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]) \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(0) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\lambda_2 pt_{l+1}} (\Delta J_{1,l} + \Delta^2 J_{2,l}) \\
& \quad + \left((1 + K(\epsilon_1 + \Delta)\Delta)A_{\theta,\Delta}^p e^{\lambda_2 p\Delta} - 1 \right) \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\lambda_2 pt_l} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]. \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to (2.12), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{l+1}} J_{1,l} &\leq -R(\epsilon_1, a_1) \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + K(\epsilon_1) e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau} \tau \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{l+1}} J_{2,l} &\leq \Delta^2 (K + K(\epsilon_1) \Delta^{p-2}) \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + K(\epsilon) e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau} \tau \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^{2p}], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R(\epsilon_1, a_1, \hat{\lambda}_2) &:= p(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L \right) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} - \frac{2pa_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} - \frac{pLe^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \\ &\quad - \frac{p(p-1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau})}{2} \left(\frac{8}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{4}{\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \theta^p} \right) - \frac{2p(p-1)}{\theta^p \epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$A_{\theta, \Delta} = 1 - \frac{(2\theta - 1)\Delta}{\theta^2(1 + \Delta)} \leq e^{-\frac{(2\theta - 1)}{\theta^2(1 + \Delta)}\Delta}$$

implies

$$(1 + K(\epsilon_1 + \Delta)\Delta) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\epsilon p \Delta} - 1 \leq e^{K(\epsilon_1 + \Delta + \hat{\lambda}_2 p - \frac{p(2\theta - 1)}{\theta^2(1 + \Delta)})\Delta} - 1.$$

Let $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \frac{p(2\theta - 1)}{2\theta^2})$ and denote

$$\begin{aligned} R^*(\epsilon_1, a_1, \hat{\lambda}_2) &:= p(1 + \epsilon_1)^{-1} \left(2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L \right) \left(\frac{(1 - \theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta - 1}{2\theta^2} \right)^{p-1} - \frac{2pa_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} \\ &\quad - \frac{pLe^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} - \frac{p(p-1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau})}{2} \left(\frac{8}{\epsilon_1^{p-1}} + \frac{4}{\epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \theta^p} \right) - \frac{2p(p-1)}{\theta^p \epsilon_1^{\frac{p-2}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Take a sufficiently large number a_1^* such that $R^*(\epsilon_1, a_1^*, 0) < 0$. Choose a sufficiently small number $\hat{\lambda}_2$ such that $\epsilon_1 + \hat{\lambda}_2 p < \frac{p(2\theta - 1)}{2\theta^2}$ and $R^*(\epsilon_1, a_1^*, \hat{\lambda}_2) < 0$. Furthermore, there exists a number $\Delta^* \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$, $\epsilon_1 + \Delta + \hat{\lambda}_2 p - \frac{p(2\theta - 1)}{2\theta^2} < 0$ and $R(\epsilon_1, \hat{a}_1^*, \hat{\lambda}_2) + \Delta(K + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^{p-2}) < 0$. Hence, combining (3.13) we have that for $a_1 > a_1^*$, $\hat{\lambda}_2 \in (0, \hat{\lambda}_2]$, and $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(0) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + Ke^{\hat{\lambda}_2 \tau} \tau \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &\leq K\|\eta\|^{2p} + K\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}b(\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}]. \end{aligned}$$

According to Assumptions 2.2 and 3.1, we have

$$\|\mathcal{D}b(\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \eta\| \leq (1 + \|\tilde{\xi}\|^\beta) \|\eta\|,$$

which implies

$$e^{\lambda_2 p t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq K \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}\|^{2p\beta}]).$$

It follow from (3.13) that

$$e^{\lambda_2 p t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq K \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}\|^{2p\beta}]).$$

Step 2: Case of $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$. Similarly, we have that for any $\epsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_1] &\leq -\Delta(1 + \epsilon_2)^{-1} (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + (2a_2 + L) \times \\ &\epsilon_2 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K(\epsilon_2)(1 + \epsilon_2)^{-1} \Delta^p (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} \times \\ &\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + (K(\epsilon_2)(1 + \epsilon_2)^{-1} + \frac{2a_2}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}}) \Delta^p \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_2(r) \\ &+ \frac{L}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} \Delta^p \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] d\nu_1(r), \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_2] \leq 17\epsilon_2 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + (\frac{8}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} \Delta^p + \frac{4}{\epsilon_2^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \frac{1}{\theta^p} \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}}) L \times$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r)\right] \\ &+ \frac{4}{\epsilon_2^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \frac{1}{\theta^p} \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p} + K(\epsilon_2) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &+ K(\epsilon_2) \Delta^p \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_2(r)\right] \end{aligned}$$

and for $i \in \{3, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_i] &\leq K\epsilon_2 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K(\epsilon_2) \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\ &+ K(\epsilon_2) \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(r) \cdot \eta|^{2p} d\nu_2(r)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda_2 p t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(0) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + [(1 + K\epsilon_2) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\lambda_2 p \Delta} - 1] \times \\ &\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\lambda_2 p t_l} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] - \left(p(1 + \epsilon_2)^{-1} (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L) A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} - \left(\frac{2pa_2 e^{\lambda_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}}\right.\right. \\ &\left.\left.+ \frac{pLe^{\lambda_2 \tau}}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}}\right) \Delta^{p-1} - \frac{p(p-1)L(1 + e^{\lambda_2 \tau})}{2} \left(\frac{8}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} \Delta^{p-1} + \frac{4}{\epsilon_2^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \frac{1}{\theta^p} \Delta^{\frac{p-2}{2}}\right)\right) \\ &- K(\epsilon_2) \Delta^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \Delta \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\lambda_2 p t_{l+1}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_l) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + Ke^{\lambda_2 \tau} \tau \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}y_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^{2p}]. \end{aligned}$$

Noting

$$(1 + K\epsilon_2) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\lambda_2 p \Delta} \leq e^{K\epsilon_2 + \lambda_2 p \Delta - \frac{p(2\theta-1)\Delta^*}{2\theta^2}},$$

choose a sufficiently small number $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that $K\epsilon_2 < \frac{p(2\theta-1)\Delta^*}{2\theta^2}$. Letting a_1^* be sufficiently large such that

$$\begin{aligned} & p(1 + \epsilon_2)^{-1} \left(2a_1^* - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - L \right) \left(\frac{(1 - \theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta - 1}{2\theta^2} \right)^{p-1} - \left(\frac{2pa_2}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} + \frac{pL}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} \right) (\Delta^*)^{p-1} \\ & - p(p-1)L \left(\frac{8}{\epsilon_2^{p-1}} (\Delta^*)^{p-1} + \frac{4}{\epsilon_2^{\frac{p-2}{2}}} \frac{1}{\theta^p} (\Delta^*)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} \right) - K(\epsilon_2) (\Delta^*)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\hat{\lambda}_2 \in (0, \hat{\lambda}_2]$ be sufficiently small, we obtain that for $a_1 \geq a_1^*$ and $\Delta \in (\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\hat{\lambda}_2 p t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}z_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] & \leq K(\|\mathcal{D}z_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p} + \|\mathcal{D}y_0^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}) \\ & \leq K\|\eta\|^{2p}(1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}\|^{2p\beta}]). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, similar to the proof of Proposition 2.3, the desired argument follows from Steps 1–2 and (3.15). The proof is completed. \square

Lemma 3.6 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2 and 3.1 hold. Then for $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $a_1 > a_1^*$, and $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_2 p(t_k - u)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}b(\tilde{\xi}) \mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi}|^{2p}]),$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$, $\mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)$, $\mathcal{D}b(\tilde{\xi}) \mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $K > 0$, and a_1^* , $\hat{\lambda}_2 > 0$ are given in Lemma 3.5.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.5 and is omitted. \square

Assumption 3.2 *Assume that coefficients b and σ have continuous derivatives up to order 2 satisfying that for any $\phi, \phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}^2 b(\phi)(\phi_1, \phi_2)| & \leq K(1 + \|\phi\|^{(\beta-1)\vee 0}) \|\phi_1\| \|\phi_2\|, \\ |\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(\phi)(\phi_1, \phi_2)| & \leq K \|\phi_1\| \|\phi_2\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $K > 0$, the constant $\beta > 0$ is given in Assumption 2.2.

Lemma 3.7 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2 with $a_1 - a_2 - (2p-1)L > 0$ hold for some $p \geq 1$. And let Assumptions 2.1–2.2 and 3.1–3.2 hold. Then for any $t \geq 0$ and $u \geq -\tau$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] & \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]), \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] & \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p((2\beta-2)\vee 1)}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$ and $\mathcal{D}_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{8p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)$, $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $K > 0$, and $\hat{\lambda}_1 > 0$ is given in Lemma 3.3.

Proof. For $u \leq t$, $\mathcal{D}_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{D}_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta = \int_u^t \left(\mathcal{D}^2 b(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})(\mathcal{D}_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta) + \mathcal{D}b(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}_u \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \right) ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_u^t \left(\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta) + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \right) dW(s) \\
& + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(u).
\end{aligned}$$

By the Itô formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}) \leq \hat{\lambda}_1 p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p} dt + 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \times \\
& \left[\left\langle D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}^2 b(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta) + \mathcal{D}b(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \right\rangle dt \right. \\
& \left. + \left\langle D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta, \left(\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta) + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \right) dW(t) \right\rangle \right] \\
& + p(2p-1)e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} |\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta) \\
& + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on both sides, and using Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, and the Young inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + \int_u^t \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{\lambda}_1 p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p} \right. \\
& \left. + 2p e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \left(-a_1 |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^2 + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) \right. \\
& \left. + K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-1} (1 + \|x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{\beta-1}) \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\| \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \| \right. \\
& \left. + p(2p-1)e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \left((1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_1}) |\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}, \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta)|^2 \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (1 + \gamma_1) L (|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s+r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_1(r)) \right) \right] ds \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + p(\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)(1 + \gamma_1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau})) \times \\
& \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] ds + K \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-1} \times \\
& (1 + \|x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{\beta-1}) \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\| \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \|] ds + p(2p-1)(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_1}) \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p-2} \\
& \times |\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^2] ds \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + p(\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)(1 + \gamma_1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau})) \times \\
& \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] ds + \int_u^t \left(p\gamma_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + pK(\gamma_2) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[(1 \right. \\
& \left. + \|x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2(\beta-1)p}) \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p} \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \|^{2p}] \right) ds + \int_u^t p(2p-1)\gamma_3 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(s) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \\
& \left. + p(2p-1)K(\gamma_3) e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[\|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p} \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \|^{2p}] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ sufficiently small such that

$$\hat{\lambda}_1 - 2a_1 + 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau} + (2p-1)(1 + \gamma_1)L(1 + e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p \tau}) + \gamma_2 + (2p-1)\gamma_3 \leq 0,$$

and combining Lemmas 3.3-3.4, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}})\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[(1 \\
& + \|x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p((\beta-1) \vee 0)}) \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p} \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \|^{2p} + \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p} \| \mathcal{D}x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta \|^{2p}] ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}}) \mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] + K \int_u^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p s - \hat{\lambda}_1 p (s-u)} \|\eta\|^{2p} \times \\
&\quad (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]) ds \\
&\leq K e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p u} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] + K \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]) \\
&\leq K \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[|D_u \mathcal{D}x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) \cdot \eta|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]).$$

Similar to the proof of Lemmas 3.3–3.4, by using the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we finish the proof. \square

Lemma 3.8 *Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2 with $a_1 - a_2 - (2p - 1)L > 0$ hold for some $p \geq 1$. And let Assumptions 2.1–2.2 and 3.1–3.2 hold. Then for $t \geq 0$, $u \geq -\tau$, and $w \geq -\tau$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|D_w D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p (t-u \vee w)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \xi\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]), \\
\mathbb{E}[|D_w D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p (t-u \vee w)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \xi\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p((2\beta-2)\vee 1)}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$, $D_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{8p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m)$, $D_w D_u \tilde{\xi} \in L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$, $K > 0$, and $\hat{\lambda}_1$ is given by Lemma 3.1.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.7. We only give the sketch of the proof. $D_w D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
D_w D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t) &= \int_{u \vee w}^t \left(\mathcal{D}^2 b(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_w x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}, D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) + \mathcal{D}b(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_w D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \right) ds \\
&+ \int_{u \vee w}^t \left(\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}})(D_w x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}, D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_w D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}} \right) dW(s) + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_w^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_w^{\tilde{\xi}} \mathbf{1}_{[u,t]}(w) \\
&+ \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_w x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \mathbf{1}_{[w,t]}(u) + D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Itô formula, (3.11)–(3.12), and Assumption 3.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p t} |D_w D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p (u \vee w)} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_w^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_u x_w^{\tilde{\xi}} \mathbf{1}_{[u, u \vee w]}(w) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_u^{\tilde{\xi}}) D_w x_u^{\tilde{\xi}} \mathbf{1}_{[w, u \vee w]}(u) + D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}(0) \right]^{2p} \\
&+ K \int_{u \vee w}^t e^{\hat{\lambda}_1 p s} \mathbb{E}[(1 + \|x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p((\beta-1)\vee 0)}) \|D_w x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p} \|D_u x_s^{\tilde{\xi}}\|^{2p}] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemmas 2.1 and 3.4 that

$$\mathbb{E}[|D_w D_u x^{\tilde{\xi}}(t)|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p (t-u \vee w)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \xi\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]).$$

Similarly, one can derive

$$\mathbb{E}[|D_w D_u x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}|^{2p}] \leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_1 p (t-u \vee w)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \xi\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]).$$

The proof is completed. \square

In order to derive estimates of high-order derivatives of the numerical solution, we give the following assumption on the third order derivative of coefficients b and σ .

Assumption 3.3 Assume that coefficients b and σ have continuous derivatives up to order 3 satisfying that for any $\phi, \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}^3 b(\phi)(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)| &\leq K(1 + \|\phi\|^{(\beta-2)\vee 0})\|\phi_1\|\|\phi_2\|\|\phi_3\|, \\ |\mathcal{D}^3 \sigma(\phi)(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)| &\leq K\|\phi_1\|\|\phi_2\|\|\phi_3\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $K > 0$, the constant $\beta > 0$ is given in Assumption 2.2.

Similarly, we have the following estimates of the numerical solution.

Lemma 3.9 Let Assumptions 1.1–1.2, 2.1–2.2, 3.1–3.2 hold. Then for $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, there exists a number $a_1^{**}(L, a_2, \theta, p) > 0$ such that for $a_1 > a_1^{**}$ and $\Delta \in (0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \mathcal{D} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_2 t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{16p}]), \\ \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_2(t_k - u \vee w)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{16p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \tilde{\xi}\|^{16p}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]), \\ \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \mathcal{D} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_2 t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{32p}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w \tilde{\xi}\|^{32p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_w D_u \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}]), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in L^{p'}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}^d)$ with some $p' > 0$, $\eta \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $K > 0$, and $\hat{\lambda}_2 > 0$ is a sufficiently small number given in Lemma 3.5.

3.2.3 Weak convergence rate

For the SFDE with the distributed delay argument, under the globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients condition, there have been some works devoted to the weak convergence of numerical methods on the finite time horizon. For instance, authors in [7] investigate the weak convergence of the EM method by using the infinite-dimensional version of the Kolmogorov equation; Authors in [20] obtain the weak convergence rate of the EM method by developing a dual approach. To deepen the study, this subsection is devoted to presenting the weak convergence rate on the infinite time horizon of the θ -EM method for the SFDE with superlinearly growing coefficients. Before that, we propose the following assumption on the coefficients b and σ .

Assumption 3.4 Assume that there exist constants $n_b, n_\sigma \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and probability measures ν_3^i, ν_4^j on $[-\tau, 0]$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n_b\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n_\sigma\}$, such that coefficients b and σ satisfy that for any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}b(\phi_1)\phi_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_b} \int_{-\tau}^0 k_b^i(\phi_1(s))\phi_2(s) d\nu_3^i(s), \\ \mathcal{D}\sigma(\phi_1)\phi_2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_\sigma} \int_{-\tau}^0 k_\sigma^j(\phi_1(s))\phi_2(s) d\nu_4^j(s), \end{aligned}$$

where $k_b^i, k_\sigma^j : \mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{D}k_b^i(\phi_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}^d; \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))} + \|k_b^i(\phi_1)\| &\leq K(1 + \|\phi_1\|^\beta), \\ \left\| \mathcal{D}k_\sigma^j(\phi_1) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}^d; \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))} + \|k_\sigma^j(\phi_1)\| &\leq K. \end{aligned}$$

Examples satisfying Assumption 3.4 are given as follows.

Example 3.1 Coefficients b and σ considered in [7, 20] satisfy Assumption 3.4, where the coefficients have the forms: $b(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_3(r))$ and $\sigma(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_4(r))$. In fact, it can be calculated that for $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}b\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_3(r)\right)\phi_1 &= \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathcal{D}b\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_3(r)\right)\phi_1(s) d\nu_3(s), \\ \mathcal{D}\sigma\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_4(r)\right)\phi_1 &= \int_{-\tau}^0 \mathcal{D}\sigma\left(\int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(r) d\nu_4(r)\right)\phi_1(s) d\nu_4(s). \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.2 Let $b(\phi) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^0 \phi(s) ds - |\phi(0)|^2 \phi(0) - \phi(0)$, $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d$. Then it can be verified that Assumption 3.4 is satisfied: for $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,

$$\mathcal{D}b(\phi)\phi_1 = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^0 \phi_1(s) ds - 2\phi(0)^\top \phi_1(0)\phi(0) - |\phi(0)|^2 \phi_1(0) - \phi_1(0).$$

In this example, $n_b = 2$, $k_b^1(\phi) = \text{Id}_{d \times d}$, $k_b^2(\phi) = -2\phi\phi^\top - \text{Id}_{d \times d}$, $\nu_3^1(ds) = \frac{1}{\tau} ds$, $\nu_3^2(ds) = \delta_0(ds)$.

Theorem 3.3 Let conditions in Lemma 3.9, Assumption 2.3 with $\rho \geq 1$, and Assumption 3.4 hold. Then for $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(x^\xi(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T))]| \leq K\Delta,$$

where K is independent of T .

Proof. To simplify the proof, we take parameters n_b, n_σ in Assumption 3.4 to be $n_b = n_\sigma = 1$. The case of $n_b > 1$, $n_\sigma > 1$ can be proved similarly.

Estimate of term \mathcal{I}_0 . Term \mathcal{I}_0 is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_0 &= \mathbb{E}[f(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \xi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \Phi_0))] \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)) \mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)(\xi - \Phi_0)\right] d\varsigma \\ &\leq K \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)(\xi - \Phi_0)\|_{0,2} d\varsigma \\ &\leq K\Delta \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)\|_{0,2} d\varsigma \\ &\leq K\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f'(\phi)| \leq K$ and Assumption 2.3.

Estimate of term \mathcal{I}_b . By the Taylor formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_b &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle\right] d\varsigma =: \mathcal{I}_{b,1} + \mathcal{I}_{b,2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1} = \beta_1 \varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) + (1 - \beta_1) \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{b,1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_{b,2} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate of term $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$. We first decompose $\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)$ for $r \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$. For $s \in [t_j, t_{j+1}] \subset [-\tau, 0]$, we have $t_{i-1} + s \in [t_{i+j-1}, t_{i+j}]$, which implies

$$\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)(s) = \frac{t_{j+1} - s}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) + \frac{s - t_j}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0). \quad (3.18)$$

We also have $r + s \in [t_{i+j-1}, t_{i+j+1}]$, which leads to the following two cases.

Case 1: $r + s \in [t_{i+j-1}, t_{i+j}]$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) \\ &= \frac{t_{i+j} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) + \frac{(r + s) - t_{i+j-1}}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)(s) \\ &= \frac{t_{i-1} - r}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) + \frac{r - t_{i-1}}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) \\ &= \frac{r - t_{i-1}}{\Delta} (\varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) - \varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $r + s \in [t_{i+j}, t_{i+j+1}]$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) \\ &= \frac{t_{i+j+1} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j+1}; 0, \Phi_0) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{i+j+1} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \left[\varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left[\varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j=0\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{i+j+1} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \xi(0) + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left[\xi(0) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_0^{t_1} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_0^{t_1} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \leq -1\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{i+j+1} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \xi(t_{i+j}) + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \xi(t_{i+j+1}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)(s) \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{j+1} - s}{\Delta} \left[\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left[\int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j=0\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{j+1} - s}{\Delta} (\xi(0) - \xi(-\Delta)) + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left[\int_0^{t_1} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \int_0^{t_1} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\} + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \leq -1\}} \left\{ \frac{t_{j+1} - s}{\Delta} (\xi(t_{i+j}) - \xi(t_{i+j-1})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{s + r - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} (\xi(t_{i+j+1}) - \xi(t_{i+j})) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Cases 1-2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0) \\
&= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \left[\frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \left(\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) + \frac{r + \cdot - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left(\int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) \right] + \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-1-r}, t_{i+j-r})}(\cdot) \frac{r - t_{i-1}}{\Delta} \left(\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) \right\} + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j=0\}} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-1-r}, t_{i+j-r})}(\cdot) \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{r - t_{i-1}}{\Delta} (\xi(0) - \xi(-\Delta)) + \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \left[\frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} (\xi(0) - \xi(-\Delta)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{r + \cdot - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left(\int_0^{t_1} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_0^{t_1} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \leq -1\}} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-1-r}, t_{i+j-r})}(\cdot) \frac{r - t_{i-1}}{\Delta} (\xi(t_{i+j}) - \xi(t_{i+j-1})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \left(\frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} (\xi(t_{i+j}) - \xi(t_{i+j-1})) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\cdot + r - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} (\xi(t_{i+j+1}) - \xi(t_{i+j})) \right) \right\} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above equality into $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$, we proceed to estimate sub-terms in $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$ one-by-one. It follows from Assumption 3.4 that $|\mathcal{D}b(x)y| \leq K(1 + \|x\|^\beta)\|y\|$. This, along with Lemmas 2.1 and 3.5, and $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] ds \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N^\Delta} \int_0^1 \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dud\beta_1 dr \Big\|_{0,2} d\varsigma \\
& \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \left(e^{-\lambda_2(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dud\beta_1 dr \right\|^2 (1 + \|Y_i^\varsigma\|^{2\beta}) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\varsigma \\
& \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 e^{-\frac{\lambda_2(T-t_i)}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 (1 + \|Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}\|^\beta) \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} (1 \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \|\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)\|^{\beta+1}) dud\beta_1 dr \right]^4 \left(1 + \sup_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_i^\varsigma\|^{4\beta}] \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} d\varsigma \\
& \leq K \Delta^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} e^{-\frac{\lambda_2(T-t_i)}{2}} \left(1 + \sup_{u \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)\|^{4(2\beta+1)}] \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sup_{i \geq 0} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|Y_i^\varsigma\|^{4\beta}])^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
& \leq K \Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that

$$\sup_{T > 0} \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} e^{-\frac{\lambda_2(T-t_i)}{2}} = \sup_{N\Delta > 0} \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} e^{-\frac{\lambda_2 \Delta(N\Delta - i)}{2}} < \infty.$$

For a term with the Brownian motion, by (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{b,1}^1 & := \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right\rangle \right] d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u [(\mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. (D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0))) \right\rangle \right] \right\} \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f''(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)) \right. \right.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate of term $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$. We first decompose the term $\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))$ for $r \in [t_{i-1}, t_i)$. For $s \in [t_j, t_{j+1}] \subset [-\tau, 0]$, we have $r + s \in [t_{i+j-1}, t_{i+j+1})$, which leads to the following two cases.

Case 1: $r + s \in [t_{i+j-1}, t_{i+j})$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) \\ &= \varphi(r + s; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \left[\frac{t_{i+j} - (r + s)}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{r + s - t_{i+j-1}}{\Delta} \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \left\{ \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{r+s} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) - \frac{r + s - t_{i+j-1}}{\Delta} \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left[\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $r + s \in [t_{i+j}, t_{i+j+1})$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))(s) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 0\}} \left\{ \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) - \frac{r + s - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left[\int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining Cases 1–2 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) \\ &= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-1}-r, t_{i+j}-r)}(\cdot) \left[\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{r+\cdot} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{r+\cdot} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) - \frac{r + \cdot - t_{i+j-1}}{\Delta} \left(\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right] + \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 0\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j}-r, t_{i+j+1}-r)}(\cdot) \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left[\int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{r + \cdot - t_{i+j}}{\Delta} \left(\int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j}}^{t_{i+j+1}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above equality into $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$, we are in the position to estimate $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$. We only give the estimate of the term with

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j}-r, t_{i+j+1}-r)}(\cdot) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u),$$

since estimates of other terms are similar to those in $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$. Based on Assumption 3.4, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_{b,2,1} := \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right\rangle^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\beta_1 dr \Big] d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau}^0 k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(s) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))^* \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right\rangle \right] d\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u [k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))^* \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] du d\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} D_u k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f''(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)) D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] \Big\} du d\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \left\{ \|\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} D_u k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))\| \right. \\
&\quad \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0))\|_{0,2} + \|D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0))\|_{0,2} \\
&\quad + \|D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \|\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))\| \\
&\quad \left. \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0))\|_{0,2} \right\} du d\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&\leq K\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the property

$$\sup_{u \in [t_{i+j}, t_{i+j+1}]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [-\tau, 0]} |D_u k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))|^{2p_0} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [-\tau, 0]} |k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))|^{2p_0} \right] \leq K$$

for some p_0 , which is an application of Assumption 3.4, and Lemmas 2.1 and 3.4.

Hence, the term $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$ is estimated as $\mathcal{I}_{b,2} \leq K\Delta$.

Estimate of $\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}$. We rewrite $\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}$ as

$$\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)), \theta \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_i^{\beta_2}) \right. \right.$$

$$(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))d\beta_2 dr \Big] d\varsigma,$$

where $Z_{i,r}^{\beta_2} = \beta_2 \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0) + (1 - \beta_2) \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))$.

It follows from definitions of $\varphi_{t_i}^{Int}$ and Φ_{t_i} that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0) - \Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \\ &= \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} I^j [\varphi(t_{i+j-1}; 0, \Phi_0) - \varphi(t_{i+j}; 0, \Phi_0)] + I^0 [\varphi(t_{i-1}; 0, \Phi_0) \\ & \quad - \Phi(t_i; t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))] \\ &= - \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} I^j \left(\int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du + \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \leq 0\}} I^j (\xi(t_{i+j-1}) - \xi(t_{i+j})) - I^0 \left((1 - \theta) b(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \Delta \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \theta b(\Phi_{t_i}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0))) \Delta + \sigma(\varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) \delta W_{i-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, similar to the estimate of \mathcal{I}_b , we can derive that $\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta} \leq K \Delta$.

Estimate of \mathcal{I}_σ . We split \mathcal{I}_σ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\sigma &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma = \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,1} + \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,2}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,1} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,2} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma. \end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of $\mathcal{I}_{\sigma,1}$, we only give the estimate of the term

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,1,1} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \end{aligned}$$

since other terms can be estimated similarly. By (3.4), we derive

$$\mathcal{I}_{\sigma,1,1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S))], \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \Big\rangle] d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u \left((\mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right)^* D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma))] \right\rangle, \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle] dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma))] \right\rangle, \mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \right\rangle] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma))] \right\rangle, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle] dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \left\| D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right) \right\|_{0,2} + \|D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \right. \\
& \quad \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_u D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \|D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \times \\
& \quad \left\| D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \|D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \left\| D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} \\
& \quad + \|D_u D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \|D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma)\|_{0,2} \\
& \quad \times \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\varsigma) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} \Big\} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \leq K\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

For the estimate of $\mathcal{I}_{\sigma,2}$, we only give the estimate of the term

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,2,1} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}\sigma(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Assumption 3.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\sigma,2,1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \int_{-\tau}^0 k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(s) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) d\nu_4^1(s) d\beta_1 dW(r) \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{(t_{i+j-r}) \vee -\tau}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)) \right], k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dW(u) \right\rangle \right] d\nu_4^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{(t_{i+j-r}) \vee -\tau}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u \left(k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right)^* \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S))] \right], \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] du d\nu_4^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{(t_{i+j-r}) \vee -\tau}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S))] \right], D_u k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle D_u D_r [(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S))] \right], k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\rangle \right] du d\nu_4^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\ &\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{(t_{i+j-r}) \vee -\tau}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \left\{ \left\| D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| D_u k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{0,2} \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| D_u k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_u D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{0,2} \left\| D_r \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{0,2} \left\| D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_u D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{0,2} \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\| \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} + \left\| D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) D_r \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{0,2} \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \sigma(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \right\|_{0,2} \right\} du d\nu_4^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \leq K\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the property

$$\sup_{u \in [t_{i+j}, t_{i+j+1}]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [-\tau, 0]} |D_u k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))|^{2p_0} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [-\tau, 0]} |k_\sigma^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s))|^{2p_0} \right] \leq K$$

for some p_0 .

Combining estimates of terms $\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{I}_b, \mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}$, and \mathcal{I}_σ , we complete the proof. \square

Based on Theorem 3.3, we can derive the convergence rate of the numerical invariant measure, which is stated in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1 *Under conditions in Theorem 3.3, it holds that for $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^3$,*

$$|\mu(f) - \mu^\Delta(f)| \leq K\Delta.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\xi}, \bar{\xi}$ be initial values with distributions being μ, μ^Δ , respectively. It follows from (2.31) and (3.1) that for any $p \geq 2$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\xi}\|^p + \|\bar{\xi}\|^p] \leq K$. Then for any $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(f) - \mu^\Delta(f)| &= |\mathbb{E}[f(x^{\tilde{\xi}}(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\Delta, \bar{\xi}}(T))]| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}[f(x^{\tilde{\xi}}(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(x^{\bar{\xi}}(T))]| + |\mathbb{E}[f(x^{\bar{\xi}}(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\Delta, \bar{\xi}}(T))]| \\ &\leq K(\mathbb{E}[|x^{\tilde{\xi}}(T) - x^{\bar{\xi}}(T)|^2])^{\frac{1}{2}} + K\Delta \\ &\leq Ke^{-KT} + K\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the result by letting $T \rightarrow \infty$. \square

3.3 Summary and outlook

In this chapter, we investigate the numerical approximation of the invariant measure of the SFDE (1.1) with the superlinearly growing drift coefficient. We first prove the existence and uniqueness of the invariant measure of the θ -EM functional solution. Then based on the Malliavin calculus, we analyze the longtime weak convergence of the SFDE (1.1), and further prove that the convergence rate of the numerical invariant measure is 1. We remark that in our analysis, Assumption 3.4 is proposed for technical reason to pave a way for making use of the dual property of the Malliavin derivative operator (i.e., (3.4), which is usually called the integration by parts formula). In fact, there are still some problems associated with these topics that are challenging and far from being well understood:

- (i) How to weaken or even eliminate Assumption 3.4 to include more general class of SFDEs?
- (ii) Can we obtain the same weak convergence rate if the diffusion coefficient grows superlinearly?
- (iii) For the SFDE driven by the rough path, does the invariant measure of the numerical method exist uniquely?
- (iv) If (iii) holds, does the numerical invariant measure converge to the exact one?

Approximation of density function

In this chapter, we first study the existence of the density function for the solution of the θ -EM method with multiplicative noise. Then we investigate the convergence of the numerical density function. For the SFDE (1.1) with the multiplicative noise, the numerical density function is shown to converge to the exact one in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ based on the localization argument. For the case of the additive noise, the convergence rate in the point-wise sense of the numerical density function is proved to be 1 based on the test-functional-independent weak convergence analysis.

4.1 Existence of numerical density function

In this section, we investigate the existence of density functions of solutions for (1.1) and the θ -EM method based on the technique of the Malliavin calculus. The deterministic initial value ξ is fixed in this section. We focus on the superlinearly growing coefficients case on the finite time horizon. Consider the following assumptions in this section.

Assumption 4.1 *Assume that there exists a constant $a_5 > 0$ such that for any $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,*

$$\langle b(\phi_1) - b(\phi_2), \phi_1(0) - \phi_2(0) \rangle \leq a_5 \left(|\phi_1(0) - \phi_2(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi_1(r) - \phi_2(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right).$$

Assumption 4.2 *Assume that the coefficient b has continuous Gâteaux derivative, and that there exists a constant $\tilde{\beta} \geq 0$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{D}b(\phi_1)\phi_2| \leq K(1 + \|\phi_1\|^{\tilde{\beta}})\|\phi_2\|,$$

where $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $K > 0$.

Assumption 4.3 *Assume that the coefficient σ has continuous Gâteaux derivative, and that there exists some $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \sigma(\phi) \sigma(\phi)^\top u \geq \sigma_0.$$

Under Assumptions 1.1 and 4.1, the existence and uniqueness of the global solution of (1.1) can be obtained by using [46, Theorem 2]. In addition, the functional solution of (1.1) has the following estimates.

Lemma 4.1 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 4.1–4.2 hold. Assume that the coefficient σ has continuous Gâteaux derivative. Then for any $p \geq 2$ and $T > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|x_t^\xi\|^p \right] \leq K_T, \quad \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [r, T]} \|D_r x_t^\xi\|^p \right] \leq K_T.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of [46, Theorem 2], we can obtain the first inequality. For the second inequality, when $u \leq t$, $D_u x^\xi(t)$ satisfies

$$D_u x^\xi(t) = \int_u^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_u x_s^\xi ds + \int_u^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_u x_s^\xi dW(s) + \sigma(x_u^\xi) \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(u).$$

By the Itô formula, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d(|D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p}) &\leq p|D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p-2} \left(2\langle D_u x^\xi(t), \mathcal{D}b(x_t^\xi) D_u x_t^\xi \rangle dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2p-1)|\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^\xi) D_u x_t^\xi|^2 dt + 2\langle D_u x^\xi(t), \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_t^\xi) D_u x_t^\xi dW(t) \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

It follows from Assumptions 1.1 and 4.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} &\leq |\sigma(x_u^\xi)|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(u) + K \int_u^t \left(|D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p} + |D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p-2} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) ds \\ &\quad \left. + 2p \int_u^t |D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p-2} \langle D_u x^\xi(s), \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_u x_s^\xi dW(s) \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\sigma(x_u^\xi)|^{2p}] + K \int_u^T \mathbb{E} \left[|D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p} + |D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p-2} \left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) ds + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_u^T |D_u x^\xi(s)|^{4p-2} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_u x_s^\xi|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

According to Assumption 1.1 and the Young inequality, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq K_T + K \int_u^T \mathbb{E} \left[|D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right] + K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_u^T |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_u x_s^\xi|^{2p} ds \right] \\ &\leq K_T + K \int_u^T \mathbb{E} \left[|D_u x^\xi(s)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^\xi(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq K_T + K \int_u^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq r \leq s} |D_u x^\xi(r)|^{2p} \right] ds + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the Grönwall inequality, one has

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} |D_u x^\xi(t)|^{2p} \right] \leq K_T.$$

The proof is completed.

□

Based on Lemma 4.1 and $D_r x^\xi(t) = 0$ for $r > t$, we derive that $x^\xi(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ for all $p \geq 1$. Hence, according to [52, Theorem 2.1.2], in order to obtain the existence of the density function of the solution of (1.1), it suffices to show that the Malliavin covariance matrix $\gamma^E(t) := \int_0^t D_r x^\xi(t) (D_r x^\xi(t))^\top dr$ of $x^\xi(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ is a.s. invertible. To this end, by virtue of [22, Section 3.3], we first prove that for some $q > 0$, there exists a small number $\epsilon_0(q)$ such that for any $\epsilon < \epsilon_0(q)$, $\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} \mathbb{P}(u^\top \gamma^E(t) u \leq \epsilon) \leq \epsilon^q$, $t \in [0, T]$. This is stated as follows.

Proposition 4.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1, 4.1–4.3, there exists some $\epsilon_0(q)$ such that for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0(q)$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} \mathbb{P}(u^\top \gamma^E(t) u \leq \epsilon) \leq \epsilon, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. For any $r \leq t$,

$$D_r x^\xi(t) = \int_r^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi ds + \int_r^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi dW(s) + \sigma(x_r^\xi) \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(r).$$

Fixing $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and letting $\epsilon_1 := \frac{2\epsilon}{\sigma_0}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top \gamma^E(t) u &\geq \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top D_r x^\xi(t) (D_r x^\xi(t))^\top u dr \geq \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \sigma(x_r^\xi) (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \left(\int_r^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi ds + \int_r^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi dW(s) \right) (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Assumption 4.3 that

$$\int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \sigma(x_r^\xi) (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr \geq \epsilon_1 \sigma_0 = 2\epsilon.$$

This, along with the Chebyshev inequality, the Hölder inequality, and the Bukerholder–Davis–Gundy inequality implies that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|u| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(u^\top \gamma^E(t) u \leq \epsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2 \left| \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \left(\int_r^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi ds + \int_r^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi dW(s) \right) (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr \right| \geq \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq 8\epsilon^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \int_r^t \mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi ds (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 8\epsilon^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t u^\top \int_r^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi dW(s) (\sigma(x_r^\xi))^\top u dr \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 8\epsilon^{-2} \epsilon_1 \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s \leq T} |\mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi|^2 |\sigma(x_r^\xi)|^2 \right] (t-r)^2 dr \\ &\quad + 8\epsilon^{-2} \epsilon_1 \int_{t-\epsilon_1}^t \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_r^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi dW(s) \right|^4 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} [|\sigma(x_r^\xi)|^4] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dr \\ &\leq K\epsilon^2 \left(\sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s \leq T} |\mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi|^4 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \mathbb{E} [|\sigma(x_r^\xi)|^4] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K\epsilon \left(\sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s \leq T} |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi|^4 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \mathbb{E} [|\sigma(x_r^\xi)|^4] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \epsilon K_T,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used

$$|\mathcal{D}b(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi| \leq K(1 + \|x_s^\xi\|^{\bar{\beta}}) \|D_r x_s^\xi\|, \quad |\mathcal{D}\sigma(x_s^\xi) D_r x_s^\xi| \leq K \|D_r x_s^\xi\|,$$

Assumption 1.1, and Lemma 4.1. The proof is finished. \square

The existence of the density function of the solution of (1.1) is stated as follows.

Theorem 4.1 *Under Assumptions 1.1, 4.1–4.3, for any $T > 0$, the law of $x^\xi(T)$ admits a density function.*

Proof. Based on Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} \mathbb{P}(u^\top \gamma^E(T) u = 0) \leq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} \mathbb{P}(u^\top \gamma^E(T) u \leq \epsilon) \leq \epsilon \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, 1),$$

which shows the a.s. invertibility of $\gamma^E(T)$ due to the arbitrary of ϵ . This, together with $x^\xi(T) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ and [52, Theorem 2.1.2], completes the proof. \square

Now we are in the position to present the existence of the density function of the θ -EM solution. We first show the estimates on the θ -EM functional solution.

Lemma 4.2 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 4.1, and 4.2 hold. Assume that the coefficient σ has continuous Gâteaux derivative. Then for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$, $p \geq 2$, and $T > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p \right] \leq K_T, \quad \sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p \right] \leq K_T.$$

Proof. The proof of $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p] \leq K_T$ is similar to that of Proposition 2.1 and thus is omitted. Below we prove $\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{u \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}\|^p] \leq K_T$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq k\Delta \leq T$ and $u \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2 &= |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 + |\mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}|^2 \Delta^2 + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k|^2 \\
&+ |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u)|^2 + 2 \langle D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - \theta \Delta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta \rangle \\
&+ 2 \langle D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta, \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u) \rangle + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k \\
&\leq |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k|^2 + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u)|^2 + 2 \langle D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k), \\
&\quad \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta \rangle + \left\langle \frac{2(\theta-1)}{\theta} D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + \frac{2}{\theta} D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k), \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u) \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k := 2 \langle D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u), \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k \rangle.$$

By Assumptions 1.1 and 4.1, one has that for any $\phi, \phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d$,

$$\langle \phi(0), \mathcal{D}b(\phi_1) \phi \rangle \vee |\mathcal{D}b(\phi_1) \phi|^2 \leq K(|\phi(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)).$$

This implies that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} = |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=1}^p C_p^l I_{k,l} = \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=1}^p C_p^l I_{i,l}, \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{i,l} := & |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2(p-l)} \left(|\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_i|^2 + |\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)|^2 \right. \\ & + K\Delta (|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) + \left\langle \frac{2(\theta-1)}{\theta} D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{2}{\theta} D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i), \sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \right\rangle + \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_i \right)^l. \end{aligned}$$

For the term $I_{i,1}$, by the Young inequality and the property of the conditional expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_{i,1}] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \left(|\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}|^2 \Delta + |\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)|^2 \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + K\Delta (|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \left\langle \frac{2(\theta-1)}{\theta} D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) + \frac{2}{\theta} D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i), \sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \right\rangle \right) \right] \\ & \leq (K\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\ & \quad + K\Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + K_T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u), \quad (4.3) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Assumptions 1.1 and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t_i \leq T} |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \leq K_T$. For the term $I_{i,2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_{i,2}] & = \mathbb{E} \left[|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2(p-2)} \left(|\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k|^2 + |\sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)|^2 \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + K\Delta (|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)) + \left\langle \frac{2(\theta-1)}{\theta} D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \frac{2}{\theta} D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i), \sigma(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \right\rangle \right)^2 + |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2(p-2)} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_i^2 \Big] \\ & \leq (K\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\ & \quad + K\Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + K_T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u). \quad (4.4) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we deduce that for any $l \in \{3, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_{i,l}] & \leq (K\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\ & \quad + K\Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] + K_T \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u). \quad (4.5) \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (4.3)–(4.5) into (4.2), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \\ & \leq K \sum_{i=0}^k (\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K_T \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\
& \leq K \sum_{i=0}^k (\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K_T. \tag{4.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we used

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_j(r) \leq \sum_{i=0}^k |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

whose proof is similar to (2.12). It follows from

$$D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) = D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i) - \theta \Delta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}
|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 & \geq |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 - 2\theta \Delta \langle D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i), \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta} \rangle \\
& \geq |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 - 2\theta \Delta a_5 (|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\Delta_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$. Then for $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1-2\theta a_5 \Delta_1}{2\theta a_5 \Delta_1} - 1)$ and $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - 2\theta a_5 \Delta)^p |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\
& \leq K(\epsilon) |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + (1 + \epsilon) (2\theta a_5 \Delta)^p \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r). \tag{4.7}
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^k |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} & \leq \frac{K(\epsilon)}{(1 - 2\theta a_5 \Delta_1)^p - (1 + \epsilon)(2\theta a_5 \Delta_1)^p} \sum_{i=0}^k |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\
& \leq K(\epsilon) \sum_{i=0}^k |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}. \tag{4.8}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \mathbb{E} [|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\
& \leq K \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\
& \leq K(\epsilon) \sum_{i=0}^k (\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}]. \tag{4.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (4.8) and (4.9) into (4.6) and applying discrete Grönwall inequality, we derive

$$\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq \sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} K_T e^{K t_{k+1} + 1} \leq K_T. \tag{4.10}$$

It follows from (4.7) that

$$\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \mathbb{E} [|D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K_T. \tag{4.11}$$

In addition, by (4.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_{k+1} \leq T} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k (C_p^1 I_{i,1} + C_p^2 I_{i,2}) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=3}^p C_p^l |I_{i,l}| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k (C_p^1 I_{i,1} + C_p^2 I_{i,2}) \right] + \sum_{i=0}^k (K\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \times \\
& \quad \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K_T \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k (C_p^1 I_{i,1} + C_p^2 I_{i,2}) \right] + K_T. \tag{4.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Utilizing the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, (4.10), and (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k I_{i,1} \right] \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor / \Delta} (K\Delta + \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u)) \mathbb{E} [|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\
& \quad + K_T \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor T \rfloor / \Delta} \mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}(u) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2(p-1)} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_i \right] \\
& \leq K_T + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=\lfloor u \rfloor / \Delta}^{\lfloor T \rfloor / \Delta} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{4(p-1)} (|D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)| + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)| \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})| \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u))^2 |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}|^2 \Delta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
& \leq K_T + \frac{1}{4C_p^1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] + K \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=\lfloor u \rfloor / \Delta}^{\lfloor T \rfloor / \Delta} \left(|\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})|^{2p} \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(u) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + |\mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_u y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}|^{2p} \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} + |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} \Delta^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \right] \\
& \leq K_T + \frac{1}{4C_p^1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} \right]. \tag{4.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} \sum_{i=0}^k I_{i,2} \right] \leq K_T + \frac{1}{4C_p^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_k \leq T} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p} \right].$$

This, along with (4.12) and (4.13) gives that

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_{k+1} \leq T} |D_u z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \right] \leq K_T.$$

It follows from (4.7) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{u \leq t_{k+1} \leq T} |D_u y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \right] \leq K_T.$$

The proof is completed. \square

As a consequence, we obtain $y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}$. Below we show the existence of the numerical density function.

Theorem 4.2 Under Assumptions 1.1, 4.1–4.3, for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the law of $y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)$ admits a density function.

Proof. Simialr to the proof of Theorem 4.1, it suffices to show that the Malliavin covariance matrix of $y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)$, defined by $\gamma_k := \int_0^{t_k} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) (D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k))^\top dr$, is a.s. invertible.

Taking the Malliavin derivative on both sides of the θ -EM solution, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) &= D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r \delta W_k. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (3.8), we have

$$y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta} = \sum_{j=-N}^0 I^j y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j),$$

where $I^j(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}([-\tau, 0]; \mathbb{R})$, $j = -N, \dots, 0$ are given in (3.8). This implies

$$D_r y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta} = D_r \left(\sum_{j=-N}^{-1} I^j y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j) \right) + D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) I^0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) I^0 \Delta \\ &= D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \Delta + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r \delta W_k \\ &\quad + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) \left(\sum_{j=-N}^{-1} I^j D_r y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}(s_j) \right) \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta} \delta W_k \\ &= D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r \left(\sum_{j=-N}^0 I^j y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j) \right) \Delta + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^{-1} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) \Delta \\ &\quad + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-2} I^j D_r y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j) \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r \left(\sum_{j=-N}^0 I^j y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}(t_j) \right) \delta W_k \\ &\quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) D_r \delta W_k. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\text{Id}_{d \times d} - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \Delta \right) D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=-N}^0 A_{j,k} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}(r), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{0,k} &:= \text{Id}_{d \times d} + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \Delta + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^{-1} \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \delta W_k, \\ A_{-N,k} &:= (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^{-N} \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^{-N} \delta W_k, \\ A_{j,k} &:= (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^j \Delta + \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^{j-1} \Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^j \delta W_k \end{aligned}$$

for $j = -1, \dots, -N + 1$. It follows from Assumption 4.1 that for any $0 \neq u \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$u^\top \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 u \leq 2a_5 |u|^2.$$

Then for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$,

$$u^\top \left(\text{Id}_{d \times d} - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \Delta \right) u \geq (1 - 2\theta a_5 \Delta) |u|^2 > 0,$$

which implies that $\text{Id}_{d \times d} - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \Delta$ is invertible. Denoting $A_{1,k} := (\text{Id}_{d \times d} - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\xi, \Delta}) I^0 \Delta)^{-1}$, we derive $\|A_{1,k}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \in (0, \frac{1}{1-2\theta a_5 \Delta})$. According to (4.14), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{k+1} &= \int_0^{t_{k+1}} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) (D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1}))^\top dr \\ &= \int_0^{t_k} A_{1,k} \sum_{j=-N}^0 A_{j,k} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) \left(\sum_{j=-N}^0 A_{j,k} D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+j}) \right)^\top (A_{1,k})^\top dr \\ &\quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} A_{1,k} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})^\top (A_{1,k})^\top dr, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where we used $D_r y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = 0$ for $r > t_k$. Since $\sigma(x) \sigma(x)^\top$ is positive definite, we deduce

$$u^\top \gamma_{k+1} u \geq \Delta u^\top A_{1,k} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}) \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})^\top (A_{1,k})^\top u > 0 \quad a.s.$$

Moreover, utilizing again the invertibility of $\sigma \sigma^\top$, we have that

$$\gamma_1 = \int_0^{t_1} A_{1,0} \sigma(\xi) \sigma(\xi)^\top (A_{1,0})^\top dr$$

is also a.s. invertible. This finishes the proof. \square

4.2 Convergence of numerical density function

In this section, we investigate the convergence of the numerical density function of the θ -EM method on the finite and infinite time horizons, respectively. We first give the convergence of the numerical density function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ on the finite time horizon for the superlinearly growing drift coefficient case. Then we show that the longtime convergence rate of the numerical density function is 1 for the linear growing drift coefficient case.

4.2.1 Convergence on the finite time horizon

Assumption 4.4 *Assume that coefficients b and σ have continuous Gâteaux derivatives up to order 2 satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}^2 b(\phi_1)(\phi_2, \phi_3)| &\leq K(1 + \|\phi_1\|^{(\tilde{\beta}-1) \vee 0}) \|\phi_2\| \|\phi_3\|, \\ |\mathcal{D}^2 \sigma(\phi_1)(\phi_2, \phi_3)| &\leq K \|\phi_2\| \|\phi_3\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3 \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $K > 0$, and $\tilde{\beta}$ is given in Assumption 4.2.

Theorem 4.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 2.3, 4.1–4.4 hold. Then for any $T > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{p}^\Delta(t_k, x) - \mathbf{p}(t_k, x)| dx = 0,$$

where $\mathbf{p}(t_k, \cdot)$, $\mathbf{p}^\Delta(t_k, \cdot)$ are density functions of $x^\xi(t_k)$ and $y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)$, respectively.

Proof. The proof is based on the localization argument and is divided into two steps.

Step 1. Introduce the smooth cut-off functional $\Theta_R : \mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with continuous derivatives and compact support. For $R > \|\xi\|$, let $\Theta_R(x) = 1$ for $\|x\| \leq R$ and $\Theta_R(x) = 0$ for $\|x\| > R + 1$. Then we consider the truncated version of (1.1) on $[0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} dx^{\xi, R}(t) &= b^R(x_t^{\xi, R})dt + \sigma^R(x_t^{\xi, R})dW(t), \quad t \in (0, T], \\ x^{\xi, R}(t) &= \xi, \quad t \in [-\tau, 0], \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where $b^R = \Theta_R b$ and $\sigma^R = \Theta_R \sigma$ are globally Lipschitz continuous for each R . Moreover, the coefficients b^R and σ^R satisfy

$$|\mathcal{D}b^R(\phi_1)\phi_2|^2 \vee |\mathcal{D}\sigma^R(\phi_1)\phi_2|^2 \leq K_R \left(|\phi_2(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi_2(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi_2(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right),$$

where $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^d$. In addition, the numerical solution, the numerical functional solution, and the auxiliary process of the θ -EM method for (4.16) are denoted by $\{y^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t_k)\}_{k \geq -N}$, $\{y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta, R}\}_{k \geq 0}$, and $\{z^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t_k)\}_{k \geq -N}$, respectively. We need to estimate the error between $x^{\xi, R}(t)$ and $y^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t)$ in $\|\cdot\|_{1,2}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.3, using Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we deduce from Assumptions 1.1, 2.2, 4.1, and 4.2 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |x^\xi(t_k) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^4 \right] \leq K_T \Delta^2. \quad (4.17)$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |x^{\xi, R}(t_k) - y^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t_k)|^4 \right] \leq K_{T, R} \Delta^2. \quad (4.18)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|D_u x^{\xi, R}(t) - D_u z^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t)|^2] \\ & \leq K(t-u) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_u^t |\mathcal{D}b^R(x_s^{\xi, R})D_u x_s^{\xi, R} - \mathcal{D}b^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R}|^2 ds \right] \\ & \quad + K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_u^t |\mathcal{D}\sigma^R(x_s^{\xi, R})D_u x_s^{\xi, R} - \mathcal{D}\sigma^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R}|^2 ds \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[|\sigma^R(x_u^{\xi, R})\mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}(u) - \sigma^R(y_{[u]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})\mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}(u)|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

It follows from the Taylor formula that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{D}b^R(x_s^{\xi, R})D_u x_s^{\xi, R} - \mathcal{D}b^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R} \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}^2 b^R(\varsigma x_{[s]}^{\xi, R} + (1-\varsigma)y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})(x_s^{\xi, R} - y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R}, D_u x_s^{\xi, R}) d\varsigma \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \mathcal{D}b^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R})(D_u x_s^{\xi, R} - D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi, \Delta, R}) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq K_R \|x_s^{\xi,R} - y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}\| \|D_u x_s^{\xi,R}\| + K_R \left(|D_u x^{\xi,R}(s) - D_u y^{\xi,\Delta,R}(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^{\xi,R}(r) - D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the boundedness of operators $\mathcal{D}b^R(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{D}^2b^R(\cdot)$ on their compact support $\{x \in \mathcal{C}^d : \|x\| \leq R + 1\}$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$\sup_{u \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\|D_u y_{[t]}^{\xi,\Delta,R} - D_u z_t^{\xi,\Delta,R}\|^2] \leq K_{T,R}\Delta.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[|\mathcal{D}b^R(x_s^{\xi,R})D_u x_s^{\xi,R} - \mathcal{D}b^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R})D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}|^2\right] \\ &\leq K_R \mathbb{E}[\|x_s^{\xi,R} - y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}\|^2 \|D_u x_s^{\xi,R}\|^2] + K_R \mathbb{E}\left[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(s) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(s)|^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^{\xi,R}(r) - D_u z_s^{\xi,\Delta,R}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)\right] + K_{T,R}\Delta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

Similarly, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathcal{D}\sigma^R(x_s^{\xi,R})D_u x_s^{\xi,R} - \mathcal{D}\sigma^R(y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R})D_u y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}\right| \\ &\leq K_R \mathbb{E}[\|x_s^{\xi,R} - y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}\|^2 \|D_u x_s^{\xi,R}\|^2] + K_R \mathbb{E}\left[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(s) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(s)|^2\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \int_{-\tau}^0 |D_u x_s^{\xi,R}(r) - D_u z_s^{\xi,\Delta,R}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)\right] + K_{T,R}\Delta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Inserting (4.20) and (4.21) into (4.19), and then using Assumption 1.1, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, and (4.18), we obtain that for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(t) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(t)|^2\right] \\ &\leq K_{T,R}\Delta + K_{T,R} \int_u^T (\mathbb{E}[\|x_{[s]}^{\xi,R} - y_{[s]}^{\xi,\Delta,R}\|^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} ds + K_{T,R} \int_u^T (\mathbb{E}[\|x_{[s]}^{\xi,R} - x_s^{\xi,R}\|^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &\quad + K_{T,R} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_u^T |D_u x^{\xi,R}(s) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(s)|^2 ds\right] + K \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E}[\|x_{[s]}^{\xi,R} - x_s^{\xi,R}\|^2] \\ &\leq K_{T,R}\Delta + K_{T,R} \int_u^T \mathbb{E}[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(s) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(s)|^2] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Grönwall inequality, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(t) - D_u z^{\xi,\Delta,R}(t)|^2\right] \leq K_{T,R}\Delta,$$

which implies

$$\int_0^T \mathbb{E}\left[|D_u x^{\xi,R}(t_k) - D_u y^{\xi,\Delta,R}(t_k)|^2\right] du \leq K_{T,R}\Delta. \quad (4.22)$$

It follows from (4.18) and (4.22) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|y^{\xi,\Delta,R}(t_k) - x^{\xi,R}(t_k)\|_{1,2} \leq K_{T,R}\Delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore, similar to [31, Lemma A.5], combining Proposition 4.1, we obtain that for any $\varrho \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{E}[(\int_0^T |D_u x^{\xi, R}(t)|^2 du)^{-\varrho}] \leq K_{T, R, \varrho}$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1, it follows from Assumptions 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4 that $x_t^\xi \in \mathbb{D}^{2,4}(\mathcal{C}^d)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Then, by [31, Lemma A.1], we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{p}^{\Delta, R}(t_k, x) - \mathbf{p}^R(t_k, x)| dx = \sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} d_{TV}(y^{\Delta, \xi, R}(t_k), x^{\xi, R}(t_k)) \\ & \leq K_{T, R} \sup_{0 \leq k\Delta \leq T} \|y^{\Delta, \xi, R}(t_k) - x^{\xi, R}(t_k)\|_{1,2}^{\frac{2\rho}{2\rho+2}} \\ & \leq K_{T, R} \Delta^{\frac{\rho}{2\rho+2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

where $d_{TV}(X, Y)$ denotes the total variation distance between two \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables X and Y , and $\mathbf{p}^R(t_k, \cdot)$, $\mathbf{p}^{\Delta, R}(t_k, \cdot)$ are density functions of $x^{\xi, R}(t_k)$ and $y^{\xi, \Delta, R}(t_k)$, respectively.

Step 2. Denoting two sequences of events by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_R & := \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |x^\xi(t)| \leq R\}, \\ \Omega_{R, y} & := \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t_k \in [0, T]} |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)| \leq R\}, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_R) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{R, y}) = 1$. According to [31, Section 6] and [31, (6.3)], we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{p}^\Delta(t_k, x) - \mathbf{p}(t_k, x)| dx = d_{TV}(y^{\Delta, \xi}(t_k), x^\xi(t_k)) \\ & \leq 4\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{R-1}^c) + 2\mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |x^\xi(t_k) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)| \geq 1) + d_{TV}(y^{\Delta, \xi, R}(t_k), x^{\xi, R}(t_k)) \\ & \leq 4 \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |x^\xi(t)|^2]}{(R-1)^2} + 2\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |x^\xi(t_k) - y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^2] + K_{T, R} \Delta^{\frac{\rho}{2\rho+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.17), (4.23), and Lemma 4.1, and letting $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, $R \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the desired argument. \square

Remark 4.1 *It follows from the proof of Theorem 4.3 that when the coefficients b and σ are globally Lipschitz continuous, the convergence rate of the numerical density function is almost $1/4$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

4.2.2 Convergence on the infinite time horizon

In this subsection, we focus on the additive noise case and study the longtime convergence of the numerical density function based on the test-functional-independent weak convergence of the θ -EM method.

Assumption 4.5 *Assume that the noise of (1.1) is of additive type, i.e., there exists some matrix $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that for any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d$, $\sigma(\phi) \equiv \tilde{\sigma}$.*

Assumption 4.6 Assume that the coefficient b has continuous and bounded derivatives up to order 4 satisfying

$$\sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \|\mathcal{D}^k b(\phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}((\mathcal{C}^d)^{\otimes k}; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \leq 4$. In addition, assume that b satisfies the following form

$$|b(\phi)|^2 \leq K(1 + |\phi(0)|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |\phi(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r)), \quad (4.24)$$

where $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d$.

The longtime convergence rate of the numerical density function is stated as follows.

Theorem 4.4 Let Assumption 1.2 with $2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} - 2a_2 > 0$, Assumption 3.4 with $L_b := \sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, n_b\}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \|k_b^i(\phi)\| < \infty$, Assumptions 4.5 and 4.6 hold. In addition, assume that b satisfies

$$\sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, n_b\}} \sup_{l \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \|D^l k_b^i(\phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}((\mathcal{C}^d)^{\otimes l}; \mathcal{C}([- \tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))} \leq K.$$

Then there exists a constant $\tilde{\Delta} \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $\Delta \in (0, \tilde{\Delta}]$,

$$\sup_{T \geq T_0, z \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{p}(T, z) - \mathbf{p}^\Delta(T, z)| \leq K\Delta,$$

where $T_0 = \frac{\ln(\frac{3}{2})}{2L_b n_b (\theta+2)}$.

Remark 4.2 Theorem 4.4, together with the Scheffé lemma, indicates that

$$\sup_{T \geq T_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbf{p}(T, z) - \mathbf{p}^\Delta(T, z)| dz \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \Delta \rightarrow 0;$$

see also [13, Section 3.1] for details.

According to [39, 13], we have the following approximation of density functions for both the exact solution and the numerical solution: for fixed $T > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}(T, z) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{n-1}(y - z) \mathbf{p}(T, y) dy = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{n-1}(x^\xi(T) - z)], \\ \mathbf{p}^\Delta(T, z) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_{n-1}(y - z) \mathbf{p}^\Delta(T, y) dy = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_{n-1}(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T) - z)], \end{aligned}$$

where g_ζ denotes the Gaussian density function with mean 0 and covariance matrix $\zeta \text{Id}_{d \times d}$. This gives that

$$|\mathbf{p}(T, z) - \mathbf{p}^\Delta(T, z)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}[g_{n-1}(x^\xi(T) - z)] - \mathbb{E}[g_{n-1}(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T) - z)]|. \quad (4.25)$$

Note that the function $\{g_{n-1}(\cdot - z)\}_{n \geq 1, z \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ belongs to

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \in \mathcal{C}_{pol}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}), \exists F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ with } 0 \leq F \leq 1 \text{ such that} \right.$$

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{x_d} f(y_1, \dots, y_d) dy_d \cdots dy_1 \Big\}.$$

To obtain the convergence rate of the numerical density function, it suffices to estimate the error $|\mathbb{E}[f(x^\xi(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\xi,\Delta}(T))]|$ for any $f \in \mathcal{C}$.

We begin with giving some estimates of the exact solution and numerical solution as well as their high-order derivatives.

Lemma 4.3 *Let Assumptions 1.2 and 4.5, and (4.24) hold. Then for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $p \geq 2$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|x_t^\xi\|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}). \quad (4.26)$$

In addition, there exists a constant $\tilde{\Delta}_p \in (0, 1]$ such that for any $\Delta \in (0, \tilde{\Delta}_p]$,

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[\|y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p}). \quad (4.27)$$

Proof. The proof of (4.26) is similar to that of [46, Theorem 3] and is omitted. Below we show the proof of (4.27). By virtue of (2.1), we have that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+1})|^2 &= |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})\Delta + \tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k|^2 \\ &= |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^2 + (1 - \theta)^2 |b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 \Delta^2 + |\tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k|^2 + 2(1 - \theta)\Delta \langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k), b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})\Delta, \tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $p \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] = \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \sum_{i=1}^p C_p^i \mathbb{E}[I_i], \quad (4.28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_i &:= |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left((1 - \theta)^2 |b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 \Delta^2 + |\tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k|^2 + 2(1 - \theta)\Delta \langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k), b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})\Delta, \tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k \rangle \right)^i. \end{aligned}$$

For the term I_1 , it follows from the property of the conditional expectation, Assumption 1.2, and (4.24) that for $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_1] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} \left((1 - \theta)^2 |b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 \Delta^2 + |\tilde{\sigma}|^2 \Delta + K\Delta \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - 2a_1(1 - \theta)\Delta |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^2 + 2a_2(1 - \theta)\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (K\Delta + (1 - \theta)^2 |b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2 \Delta^2) \right] - 2(a_1 - \frac{a_2(p-1)}{p}) \times \\ &\quad (1 - \theta)\Delta \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \frac{2a_2}{p}(1 - \theta)\Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \\ &\leq K(\varepsilon_1)\Delta + K\Delta^2 \left(\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right] \right) - 2(a_1 - \frac{a_2(p-1)}{p}) \end{aligned}$$

$$- \varepsilon_1)(1 - \theta)\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \frac{2a_2}{p}(1 - \theta)\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right], \quad (4.29)$$

where we used the Young inequality. For the term I_2 , using (4.24) and the Young inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_2] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-2)}\left((1-\theta)^2|b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2\Delta^2+|\tilde{\sigma}|^2\Delta+2(1-\theta)\Delta\langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k), \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})\rangle\right)^2 + |y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-2)}\left(2\langle y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k) + (1-\theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})\Delta, \tilde{\sigma}\delta W_k\rangle\right)^2\right] \\ &\leq K\Delta^2\left(1 + \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right]\right) \\ &\quad + K\left(\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)}] + \Delta^2\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2(p-2)}|b(y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta})|^2]\right) \\ &\leq K(\varepsilon_1)\Delta + K\Delta^2\left(\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right]\right) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon_1\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Similarly, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[I_i] &\leq K(\varepsilon_1)\Delta + K\Delta^2\left(\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right]\right) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon_1\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}], \quad i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } 3 \leq i \leq p. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Inserting (4.29)–(4.31) into (4.28), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] + K(\varepsilon_1)\Delta - \left(2p(1-\theta)\left(a_1 - \frac{a_2(p-1)}{p}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - K\Delta - K\varepsilon_1\right)\Delta\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + \left(2a_2(1-\theta) + K\Delta\right)\Delta\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}}\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] &= \sum_{i=0}^k \left(e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_{i+1})|^{2p}] - e^{\varepsilon t_i}\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}]\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] - \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_i}\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K(\varepsilon_1)\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}} \\ &\quad - \left(2p(1-\theta)\left(a_1 - \frac{a_2(p-1)}{p}\right) - K\Delta - K\varepsilon_1\right)\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\ &\quad + \left(2a_2(1-\theta) + K\Delta\right)\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}^{\xi,\Delta}(r)|^{2p}d\nu_2(r)\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] - \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_i}\mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon)e^{\varepsilon t_{k+1}} + K\|\xi\|^{2p} \\ &\quad - \left(2p(1-\theta)(a_1 - a_2e^{\varepsilon\tau}) - K\Delta - K\varepsilon_1\right)\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\varepsilon t_{i+1}}\mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi,\Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

According to $z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - \theta \Delta b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})$ and Assumption 1.2, we obtain

$$|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 \geq -K\Delta + (1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta)|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^2 - 2a_2\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta)^p \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_i} |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_i} \left(|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^2 + 2a_2\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^p + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta^p \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_i} \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_2\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\ & \quad + (1 + \epsilon_1) \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_2\theta\Delta)^l l}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_i}^{\xi, \Delta}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta e^{\epsilon t_k} \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_2\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\ & \quad + (1 + \epsilon_1) e^{\epsilon \tau} \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_2\theta\Delta)^l l}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} + K\|\xi\|^{2p}\Delta + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta e^{\epsilon t_k}. \quad (4.33) \end{aligned}$$

Owing to $a_1 > a_2$, choose sufficiently small numbers $\epsilon_1, \epsilon > 0$ such that $a_1 > a_2(1 + \epsilon_1)e^{\epsilon \tau}$. Combining (4.33), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_1\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} |y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon_1) \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{l=0}^p \frac{C_p^l (2a_2\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{p} e^{\epsilon t_i} |z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p} \\ & \quad + K\|\xi\|^{2p} + K(\epsilon_1)\Delta e^{\epsilon t_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging above inequality into (4.32), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] & \leq \left(e^{\epsilon \Delta} - \frac{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2a_1\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2a_2(1 + \epsilon_1)\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)} \right) \times \\ & \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_i} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] + K(\epsilon_1, \epsilon) e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} + K\|\xi\|^{2p} - \left(2p(1 - \theta)(a_1 - a_2 e^{\epsilon \tau}) \right. \\ & \left. - K\Delta - K\epsilon_1 \right) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2a_1\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2a_2(1 + \epsilon_1)\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)} \\ & \geq 1 + \frac{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2(a_1 - a_2(1 + \epsilon_1))\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)}{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (2a_2(1 + \epsilon_1)\theta\Delta)^l (p-l)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq 1 + \frac{C_p^0 p}{\sum_{l=0}^p C_p^l (4a_2\theta)^l p} = 1 + \frac{1}{(4a_2\theta + 1)^p},$$

it is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] &\leq \left(e^{\epsilon \Delta} - 1 - \frac{1}{(4a_2\theta + 1)^p} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_i} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}] \\ &+ K(\epsilon_1, \epsilon) e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} + K\|\xi\|^{2p} - \left(2p(1 - \theta)(a_1 - a_2 e^{\epsilon \tau}) - K\Delta - K\epsilon_1 \right) \Delta \times \\ &\sum_{i=0}^k e^{\epsilon t_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_i)|^{2p}]. \end{aligned}$$

There exists a constant $\tilde{\Delta}_p \in (0, 1]$ such that $2p(1 - \theta)(a_1 - a_2) - K\tilde{\Delta}_p > 0$. Let $\epsilon_1, \epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\epsilon \Delta} - 1 - \frac{1}{(4a_2\theta + 1)^p} &< 0, \\ 2p(1 - \theta)(a_1 - a_2 e^{\epsilon \tau}) - K\tilde{\Delta}_p - K\epsilon_1 &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for any $\Delta \in (0, \tilde{\Delta}_p]$,

$$e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_{k+1})|^{2p}] \leq K(\epsilon_1, \epsilon) e^{\epsilon t_{k+1}} + K\|\xi\|^{2p},$$

which yields $\sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p})$. This, along with $z^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) = y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k) - \theta \Delta b(y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta})$, implies that $\sup_{k \geq -N} \mathbb{E}[|y^{\xi, \Delta}(t_k)|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p})$. Furthermore, similar to Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we conclude that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[|y_{t_k}^{\xi, \Delta}|^{2p}] \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p})$. The proof is completed. \square

Lemma 4.4 *Under Assumptions 1.2, 4.5 and 4.6, there exists a constant $\hat{\lambda}_3 > 0$ such that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $p \geq 2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_3 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p}, \quad t > 0, \\ \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_3 p (t - r_1)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}|^{2p}]), \quad t > r_1, \\ \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_3 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}|^{4p}]), \quad t > 0, \\ \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1, r_2} x_t^{\tilde{\xi}}|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_3 p (t - r_1 \vee r_2)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1, r_2} \tilde{\xi}|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}|^{4p}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_2} \tilde{\xi}|^{4p}]), \quad t > r_1 \vee r_2, \\ \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1, r_2} \mathcal{D}x_t^{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \eta|^{2p}] &\leq K e^{-\hat{\lambda}_3 p t} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1, r_2} \tilde{\xi}|^{4p}] + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}|^{8p}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[|D_{r_2} \tilde{\xi}|^{8p}]), \quad t > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathbb{D}^{2, 8p}(\mathcal{C}^d)$.

Proof. The proofs are similar to those of Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, 3.7 and 3.8, and hence are omitted. \square

Lemma 4.5 *Let Assumption 1.2 with $2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} - 2a_2 > 0$, Assumptions 4.5 and 4.6 hold. Then there exists a constant $\hat{\lambda}_4 > 0$ such that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\Delta \in (0, \tilde{\Delta}_p]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\|\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p}, \quad t_k > 0, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p(t_k - r_1)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}]), \quad t_k > r_1, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}]), \quad t_k > 0, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p(t - r_1 \vee r_2)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}]), \quad t_k > r_1 \vee r_2, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2} \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]), \quad t_k > 0, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p(t_k - r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3)} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3} \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_3} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_2, r_3} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_2} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_3} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}]), \quad t_k > r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3} \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p t_k} \|\eta\|^{2p} \left(1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{i_1, i_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\} \\ i_1 < i_2}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_{i_1}, r_{i_2}} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, 3\}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_i} \tilde{\xi}\|^{16p}]\right), \quad t_k > 0, \\
& \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4} y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}\|^{2p}] \leq Ke^{-\hat{\lambda}_4 p(t_k - r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3 \vee r_4)} \left(1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4} \tilde{\xi}\|^{2p}] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{1, \dots, 4\} \\ i_1 < i_2 < i_3}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_{i_1}, r_{i_2}, r_{i_3}} \tilde{\xi}\|^{4p}] + \sum_{\substack{i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \dots, 4\} \\ i_1 < i_2}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_{i_1}, r_{i_2}} \tilde{\xi}\|^{8p}] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_i} \tilde{\xi}\|^{16p}]\right), \quad t_k > r_1 \vee \dots \vee r_4,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathbb{D}^{4, p''}(\mathcal{C}^d)$ with some $p'' > 0$.

Proof. We only show the estimate of $\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta$, since estimates of other terms are similar. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5, by Assumptions 1.2 and 4.5, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^2 = |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 + |\mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 \Delta^2 \\
& \quad + 2\langle \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta - \theta \Delta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta, \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta \rangle \Delta \\
& \leq A_{\theta, \Delta} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 - (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2}) \Delta |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 \\
& \quad + 2a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_k+r}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r),
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_{\theta, \Delta} = \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)}$. For $\hat{\lambda}_4 > 0$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_{k+1}} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^2 \leq \|\eta\|^2 + (A_{\theta, \Delta} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \Delta} - 1) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
& \quad - (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2}) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_{i+1}} |\mathcal{D}y_{t_i}^{\tilde{\xi}, \Delta} \cdot \eta|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2a_2\Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_{i+1}} \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i + r) \cdot \eta|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\
& \leq K\|\eta\|^2 + (A_{\theta,\Delta} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \Delta} - 1) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
& \quad - (2a_1 - \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2} - 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \tau}) \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_{i+1}} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $A_{\theta,\Delta} = 1 - \frac{(2\theta-1)\Delta}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)} \leq e^{-\frac{(2\theta-1)\Delta}{2\theta^2}}$. Choose a sufficiently small number $\hat{\lambda}_4 > 0$ such that $A_{\theta,\Delta} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \Delta} < 1$ and $2a_1 - \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} - 2a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \tau} > 0$. Then

$$e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_{k+1}} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_{k+1}) \cdot \eta|^2 \leq K\|\eta\|^2, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.34)$$

According to $\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta = \mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_k) \cdot \eta - \theta\Delta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}) \mathcal{D}y_{t_k}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta} \cdot \eta$ and Assumption 1.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 + 2a_1\theta\Delta) \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2 \\
& \leq \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2 + 2a_2\theta\Delta \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} \int_{-\tau}^0 |\mathcal{D}y_{t_i}^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \\
& \leq K\|\eta\|^2 + \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}z^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2 + 2a_2\theta e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \tau} \Delta \sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This, along with $a_2 e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 \tau} < a_1$ and (4.34), implies that

$$\sup_{0 \leq i \leq k} e^{\hat{\lambda}_4 t_i} |\mathcal{D}y^{\tilde{\xi},\Delta}(t_i) \cdot \eta|^2 \leq K\|\eta\|^2, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The desired argument follows by taking expectations.

□

Lemma 4.6 *Let Assumption 3.4 with $L_b = \sup_{i \in \{1, \dots, n_b\}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \|k_b^i(\phi)\| < \infty$ and Assumption 4.5 hold. Then for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|u| = 1$ and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2L_b n_b \theta}]$,*

$$|u^\top \gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)} u| \geq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\sigma}(T \wedge T_0), \quad (4.35)$$

where $T_0 = \frac{\ln(\frac{3}{2})}{2L_b n_b (\theta+2)}$ is given in Theorem 4.4, and Y_j^S is given in (3.7). In particular, we have $(\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)})^{-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Proof. We first prove (4.35) for the case of $d = 1$. For $r \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$ with $j \leq k \leq i - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S) & = \sum_{n=k}^{i-1} \left[(1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(\Phi_{t_n}(t_j, Y_j^S)) D_r \Phi_{t_n}(t_j, Y_j^S) \Delta \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \theta \mathcal{D}b(\Phi_{t_{n+1}}(t_j, Y_j^S)) D_r \Phi_{t_{n+1}}(t_j, Y_j^S) \Delta \right] + \tilde{\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with $D_r \Phi_{t_n}(t_j, Y_j^S) = \sum_{l=-N}^0 I^l D_r \Phi(t_{n+l}; t_j, Y_j^S)$ and Assumption 3.4, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S) \\ &= \sum_{n=k}^{i-1} \left[(1-\theta) \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \int_{-\tau}^0 k_b^\ell(\Phi_{t_n}(t_j, Y_j^S)(s)) I^l(s) d\nu_3^\ell(s) D_r \Phi(t_{n+l}; t_j, Y_j^S) \Delta \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \int_{-\tau}^0 k_b^\ell(\Phi_{t_{n+1}}(t_j, Y_j^S)(s)) I^l(s) d\nu_3^\ell(s) D_r \Phi(t_{n+l+1}; t_j, Y_j^S) \Delta \right] + \tilde{\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

Step 1. To derive a lower bound of $D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)$, we need to present a discrete comparison principle. Define a two-parameter nonnegative sequence $\{A_i^k\}_{0 \leq k, i \leq N\Delta}$ as follows: when $i \leq k$, define $A_i^k = 0$; when $0 \leq k \leq i-1$, define

$$A_i^k = L_b \Delta \sum_{n=k}^{i-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) ((1-\theta) A_{n+l}^k + \theta A_{n+l+1}^k) + \tilde{\sigma},$$

where we let $\nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{-N-1}) = \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_0) = 0$ and $L_b = \sup_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, n_b\}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} |k_b^\ell(\phi)|$. It follows from the definition that when $i_1 - k_1 = i_2 - k_2 > 0$, $A_{i_1}^{k_1} = A_{i_2}^{k_2} =: \mathcal{A}_{i_1 - k_1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i-k} &= A_i^k = L_b \Delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) ((1-\theta) A_{i-1+l}^k + \theta A_{i+l}^k) \\ & \quad + L_b \Delta \sum_{n=k}^{i-2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) ((1\theta) A_{n+l}^k + \theta A_{n+1+l}^k) + \tilde{\sigma} \\ &= L_b \Delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) ((1-\theta) A_{i-1+l}^k + \theta A_{i+l}^k) + \mathcal{A}_{i-k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives that for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{L_b \theta n_b})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i-k} &= (1 - L_b \Delta \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{-1}))^{-1} \left\{ \mathcal{A}_{i-k-1} + L_b \Delta \left[(1-\theta) \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \times \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \mathcal{A}_{i-1-k+l} + \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N+1}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-2} + \Delta_{l-1}) \mathcal{A}_{i-k+l-1} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the relation $(1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} = 1 + \frac{L_b \theta \Delta n_b}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b}$ and by iteration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i-k} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{L_b \theta \Delta n_b}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right) \mathcal{A}_{i-k-1} + (1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} L_b \Delta \left[(1-\theta) \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \right. \\ & \quad \left. \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \times \mathcal{A}_{i-1-k+l} + \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N+1}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-2} + \Delta_{l-1}) \mathcal{A}_{i-k+l-1} \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_1 + \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \frac{L_b \theta \Delta n_b}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \mathcal{A}_n + (1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} L_b \Delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \left[(1-\theta) \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \mathcal{A}_{n+l} + \theta \sum_{l=-N+1}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-2} + \Delta_{l-1}) \mathcal{A}_{n+l} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \mathcal{A}_{n+l} &= \sum_{l=-N}^0 \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \mathcal{A}_{n+l} \\ &\leq \sum_{l=-N}^0 \sum_{m=-N}^{i-k-1} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) \mathcal{A}_m \leq 2 \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \mathcal{A}_n \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{A}_1 = (1 - L_b \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{-1}) \Delta \theta)^{-1} \tilde{\sigma} \leq (1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} \tilde{\sigma}$, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{A}_{i-k} \leq (1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} \tilde{\sigma} + \frac{L_b n_b (\theta + 2)}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \sum_{n=1}^{i-k-1} \mathcal{A}_n \Delta.$$

Combining the discrete Grönwall inequality, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i-k} &\leq (1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b)^{-1} \tilde{\sigma} \exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta + 2) \Delta (i - k - 1)}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} \\ &=: K_0 \exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta + 2) \Delta (i - k - 1)}{1 - L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

We claim that

$$|D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)| \leq A_i^k, \text{ for any } r \in (t_k, t_{k+1}], j \leq k \leq i-1. \quad (4.38)$$

We prove the claim by the induction argument on $i - k$. In fact, when $j \leq i_1 \leq k_1$ and $r \in (t_{k_1}, t_{k_1+1}]$, we have $D_r \Phi(t_{i_1}; t_j, Y_j^S) = 0 = A_{i_1}^{k_1}$. This gives $|D_r \Phi(t_{i_1}; t_j, Y_j^S)| \leq A_{i_1}^{k_1}$ for $i_1 - k_1 \leq 0$. Suppose that (4.38) holds for integers k, i satisfying $0 \leq i - k \leq i - k' - 1$. Then we show (4.38) holds for $i - k = i - k'$. By (4.36) and the induction assumption $|D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)| \leq A_n^{k'}$, $n \leq i - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=k'}^{i-2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 L_b \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) ((1 - \theta) A_{n+l}^{k'} \Delta + \theta A_{n+l+1}^{k'} \Delta) + \tilde{\sigma} \\ &\quad + (1 - \theta) \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 L_b \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) A_{i-1+l}^{k'} \Delta + \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^{-1} L_b \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) A_{i+l}^{k'} \Delta \\ &\quad + L_b \theta \Delta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{-1}) |D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)|, \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} |D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)| &\leq (1 - L_b \Delta \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{-1}))^{-1} \left[A_{i-1}^{k'} + L_b \Delta (1 - \theta) \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta_l) A_{i-1+l}^{k'} + L_b \Delta \theta \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^{-1} \nu_3^\ell(\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) A_{i+l}^{k'} \right] = A_i^{k'}, \quad r \in (t_{k'}, t_{k'+1}]. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the claim (4.38).

Step 2. From (4.36) and (4.37), we obtain

$$|D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \tilde{\sigma} - L_b \Delta \left[\sum_{n=k}^{i-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \left((1-\theta) \nu_3^\ell (\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) A_{n+l}^k + \theta \nu_3^\ell (\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) A_{n+l+1}^k \right) \right] \\
&\geq \tilde{\sigma} - L_b \Delta \left[\sum_{n=k}^{i-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_b} \sum_{l=-N}^0 \left((1-\theta) \nu_3^\ell (\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) K_0 e^{-\frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b}} + \theta \nu_3^\ell (\Delta_{l-1} + \Delta_l) K_0 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta (n+l-k)}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} \right] \\
&\geq \tilde{\sigma} - 2L_b n_b \Delta \left((1-\theta) K_0 e^{-\frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b}} + \theta K_0 \right) \frac{\exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta (i-k)}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} - 1}{\exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} - 1} \\
&\geq \tilde{\sigma} - \frac{2}{\theta+2} \left(\exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta (i-k)}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} - 1 \right) \tilde{\sigma} \\
&\geq \tilde{\sigma} - \left(\exp \left\{ \frac{L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta (i-k)}{1-L_b \Delta \theta n_b} \right\} - 1 \right) \tilde{\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $e^x \geq x+1, x \geq 0$. Then,

$$|D_r \Phi(t_i; t_j, Y_j^S)| \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma},$$

when $\Delta \leq \frac{1}{2L_b \theta n_b}$ and $i-k \leq \frac{\ln(\frac{3}{2})}{2L_b n_b (\theta+2) \Delta}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)} &:= \int_0^T D_r \Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S) (D_r \Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S))^\top dr \\
&\geq \int_{(T-T_0) \vee 0}^T |D_r \Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)|^2 dr \geq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\sigma}^2 (T \wedge T_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $T_0 := \frac{\ln(\frac{3}{2})}{2L_b n_b (\theta+2)}$. This finishes the proof of (4.35) for $d=1$.

For the case of $d \geq 2$, by replacing $D_r \Phi$ with $u^\top D_r \Phi$ in the above argument, one can obtain (4.35).

Moreover, it follows from (4.35) that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)}) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)} u \geq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\sigma}^2 (T \wedge T_0),$$

which implies

$$|(\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)})^{-1}| \leq K |\det(\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_j, Y_j^S)})^{-1}| \leq K \left[\frac{1}{4} \tilde{\sigma}^2 (T \wedge T_0) \right]^{-d}.$$

Thus the proof is completed. \square

As a consequence, one can obtain the following Malliavin integration by parts formula.

Lemma 4.7 *Let $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, d\}^4$ be the multi-index, $f \in \mathcal{C}$, and $G_1 \in \mathbb{D}^{\alpha+1, \infty}$. Then under conditions in Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2L_b n_b \theta}]$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i\Delta \leq [T - \Delta]$, there exists a random variable $H_{|\alpha|+1}(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S), G_1)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial_\alpha f(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)) G_1] = \mathbb{E}[F(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)) H_{|\alpha|+1}(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S), G_1)]. \quad (4.39)$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{T \geq T_0} |\mathbb{E}[\partial_\alpha f(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta)) G_1]| \leq K \|G_1\|_{|\alpha|+1,2}, \quad (4.40)$$

where T_0 is given in Theorem 4.4, and Y_i^ζ is given in (3.7).

Proof. According to the definition of \mathcal{C} , and applying [52, Proposition 2.1.4, (2.29)–(2.32)] give (4.39). Moreover, for $q > q_1 \geq 1$, there exist constants $\eta_1, \eta_2 > 0$ and integers $n_1, n_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_{|\alpha|+1}(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta), G_1)\|_{q_1} \\ & \leq K(q_1, q) \|\gamma_{\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta)}^{-1}\|_{0, \eta_1}^{n_1} \|D\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^\zeta)\|_{|\alpha|+1, \eta_2}^{n_2} \|G_1\|_{|\alpha|+1, q} \\ & \leq K \left[\frac{1}{4} \tilde{\sigma}(T \wedge T_0) \right]^{-dn_1} \|G_1\|_{|\alpha|+1, q}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6. Taking $q_1 = 1, q = 2$ and supremum for $T \geq T_0$, we finishes the proof. \square

Now we give the test-functional-independent weak convergence rate of the θ -EM method.

Theorem 4.5 *Let conditions in Theorem 4.4 hold. Then for $\Delta \in (0, \tilde{\Delta}]$,*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{T \geq T_0} |\mathbb{E}[f(x^\xi(T))] - \mathbb{E}[f(y^{\xi, \Delta}(T))]| \leq K\Delta,$$

where T_0 is given in Theorem 4.4.

Proof. In order to obtain the test-functional-independent weak convergence rate, we need to reestimate the sub-terms in Theorem 3.3 one-by-one by means of the Malliavin integration by parts formula (4.39) and the inequality (4.40).

Recalling (3.10), for the term

$$\mathcal{I}_0 = \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi)))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))],$$

it follows from (4.40) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \xi)))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\Phi(T; t_{N\Delta}, \varphi_{t_{N\Delta}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)))] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[f(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \xi))] - \mathbb{E}[f(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \Phi_0))] \\ & = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)) \mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)(\xi - \Phi_0) \right] d\varsigma \\ & \leq K \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)(\xi - \Phi_0)\|_{2,2} d\varsigma \\ & \leq K\Delta \int_0^1 \|\mathcal{D}\varphi^{Int}(t_{N\Delta}; 0, \varsigma\xi + (1-\varsigma)\Phi_0)\|_{2,2} d\varsigma \\ & \leq K\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

where K is independent of T , and we used Assumption 2.3 with $\rho \geq 1$.

Reestimate of term \mathcal{I}_b . Recall

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{b,1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma, \\ \mathcal{I}_{b,2} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. (\varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) - \varphi_r^{Int}(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0))) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma,\end{aligned}$$

and $Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1} = \beta_1 \varphi_r(t_{i-1}, \varphi_{t_{i-1}}(0, \Phi_0)) + (1 - \beta_1) \varphi_{t_{i-1}}^{Int}(0, \Phi_0)$.

Reestimate of term $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$. We only reestimate the sub-term

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma\end{aligned}$$

and the sub-term with the Brownian motion

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{b,1}^1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \tilde{\sigma} dW(u) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma,\end{aligned}$$

since other sub-terms in $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$ can be estimated similarly. It follows from (4.39) and (4.40) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma \\ \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \\ \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du d\beta_1 dr \right\|_{2,2} d\varsigma.\end{aligned}\quad (4.41)$$

According to Lemma 4.5, $\sup_{\phi_1 \in \mathcal{C}^d} |\mathcal{D}b(\phi_1)\phi_2| \leq K \|\phi_2\|$, (4.24), and (4.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \\ \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) du d\beta_1 dr \right\|_{0,2}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K \left(e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \text{d}u \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K e^{-\frac{\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)}{2}} \Delta^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

In addition, using Lemma 4.5 and Assumption 4.6, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1} \left[\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \text{d}u \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 \right] \text{d}r_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K \left\{ \int_{t_i}^T \left(e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \text{d}u \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 (1 + \|D_{r_1} Y_i^c\|^4) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) (D_{r_1} Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}}) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \text{d}u \right) \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \mathcal{D}b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) D_{r_1} \varphi_u(0, \Phi_0) \text{d}u \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 \right] \text{d}r_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K \left\{ \int_{t_i}^T \left(\Delta^4 e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} (1 + \sup_{u \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)\|^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} Y_i^c\|^8])^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \Delta^3 e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}\|^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r (1 + \sup_{u \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)\|^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \Delta^3 e^{-\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \mathbb{E}[\|D_{r_1} \varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)\|^2] \text{d}u \right) \text{d}r_1 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K e^{-\frac{\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)}{2}} (T - t_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{ \int_{t_i}^T \int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1, r_2} \left(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) \text{d}u \text{d}\beta_1 \text{d}r \right\|^2 \right] \text{d}r_1 \text{d}r_2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq K e^{-\frac{\hat{\lambda}_4(T-t_i)}{2}} (T - t_i) \Delta^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

Inserting (4.42)–(4.44) into (4.41), one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^c)), \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \right. \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} b(\varphi_u(0, \Phi_0)) dud\beta_1 dr \Big] d\varsigma \\
& \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} e^{-\frac{\lambda_4(T-t_i)}{2}} \Delta^2 (1 + (T-t_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} + (T-t_i)) \\
& \leq K\Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact

$$\sup_{T>0} \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} e^{-\frac{\lambda_4}{2}(T-t_i)} (T-t_i)^l \leq \sup_{T \geq 0} \int_0^T e^{-\frac{\lambda_4 \Delta}{2}} e^{-\frac{\lambda_4}{2}(T-s)} (T-s)^l ds < \infty \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For the sub-term with the Brownian motion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{b,1}^1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \right. \\
& \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \Big] \Big] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)), D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \\
& \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \Big] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f''(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S)) \right. \right. \\
& D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \\
& \left. \left. \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right] \Big] \right\} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma.
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (4.39) and (4.40), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{b,1}^1 &\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{2,2} \right. \\
& + \left\| D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \right. \\
& \left. \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{2,2} + \left\| \left\langle D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{3,2} \right\} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma =: \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,1}^1 + \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,2}^1 + \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,3}^1.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 4.6, Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, and (4.26), the term $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,1}^1$ is estimated as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,1}^1 \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \left(e^{-\lambda_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \Big\| \Big\|^2 \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left(\int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1} \left(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. \left. \left. \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \right\| \right]^2 \right) dr_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left(\int_{t_i}^T \int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1, r_2} \left(\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}^2 b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \left(D_u Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}, \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \right\| \right]^2 \right) dr_1 dr_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
& \leq K\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

For the term $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,2}^1$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,2}^1 & \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\{ \left(e^{-\lambda_4(T-t_i)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \right. \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. \left. \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right\| \right]^2 (1 + \|D_u Y_i^S\|^4) \right) \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& + \left(\int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1} \left(D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \right\| \right]^2 dr_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{t_i}^T \int_{t_i}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| D_{r_1, r_2} \left(D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right) \right\| \right]^2 \\
& \left. dr_1 dr_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big\} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \leq K\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to estimates of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,1}^1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,2}^1$, for the term $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,3}^1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{b,1,3}^1 & \leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i+j-1}}^{t_{i+j}} \left\| D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) \right\|_{3,4} \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^S) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \\
& \left. \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \frac{t_{j+1} - \cdot}{\Delta} \right. \\
& \left. \text{Id}_{d \times d} \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{3,4} dud\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \leq K\Delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Other terms can be estimated similarly as above. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{I}_{b,1} \leq K\Delta$.

Reestimate of term $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$. We still only estimate the sub-term with

$$\sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+\cdot} \tilde{\sigma} dW(u),$$

since other sub-terms in $\mathcal{I}_{b,2}$ can be estimated similarly to those in $\mathcal{I}_{b,1}$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{b,2,1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle (\mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d})^* f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s)), \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}b(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_{i+j-r}, t_{i+j+1-r})}(\cdot) \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+} \tilde{\sigma} dW(u) d\beta_1 dr \right\rangle \right] d\varsigma \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s)), \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} D_u k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \tilde{\sigma} \left. \left. \right\rangle \right] dud\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f'(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s)), D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \tilde{\sigma} \right\rangle \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle f''(\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s)) D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \tilde{\sigma} \right\rangle \right] \left. \right\} dud\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.26), (4.39), (4.40), and Lemma 4.5, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{b,2,1} &\leq K \sum_{i=1}^{N\Delta} \sum_{j=-N}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{i+j \geq 1\}} \int_0^1 \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \int_0^1 \int_{-\tau \vee (t_{i+j-r})}^{(t_{i+j+1-r}) \wedge 0} \int_{t_{i+j}}^{r+s} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} D_u k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{2,2} + \left\| D_u \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{2,2} + \left\| \left\langle D_u \Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s), \mathcal{D}\Phi(T; t_i, Y_i^s) I^0 \text{Id}_{d \times d} k_b^1(Z_{i,r}^{\beta_1}(s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \tilde{\sigma} \right\rangle \right\|_{3,2} \left. \right\} dud\nu_3^1(s) d\beta_1 dr d\varsigma \leq K\Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption

$$\sup_{l \in \{1,2,3\}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \left(\|D^l k_b^1(\phi)\|_{\mathcal{L}((\mathcal{C}^d)^{\otimes l}; \mathcal{C}([- \tau, 0]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}))} + \|k_b^1(\phi)\| \right) \leq K.$$

Hence, we have $\mathcal{I}_{b,2} \leq K\Delta$.

Reestimate of $\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta}$. Similar to the proof of \mathcal{I}_b , we can derive that $\mathcal{I}_{b,\theta} \leq K\Delta$.

Reestimate of \mathcal{I}_σ . When the noise of (1.1) is additive, the term $\mathcal{I}_\sigma \equiv 0$.

Combining the above terms, we complete the proof. \square

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 4.4] Based on the combination of Theorem 4.5 and (4.25), we complete the proof. \square

4.3 Summary and outlook

This chapter presents the numerical approximation of the density function of the SFDE. We first prove the existence of the density function for the θ -EM solution. For the SFDE with the multiplicative noise, we show the convergence of the numerical density function by the localization argument. Then by establishing the test-functional-independent weak convergence, we show that for the additive noise case, the numerical density function converges to the exact one with the convergence rate 1. There are some problems that remain to be solved, for example,

- (i) can we obtain the convergence rate with order 1 of the numerical density function for the multiplicative noise case?
- (ii) For the SFDE driven by the rough path, does the density function of the exact solution exist, and further is it smooth?
- (iii) If (ii) holds, can we obtain the approximation result for the underlying density function?

These problems are challenging. We would like to mention that authors in [10] prove the existence of the density function for the rough stochastic differential equation under the Hörmander condition. But there is no work for the case of the SFDE. We leave them as open problems and attempt to solve them in the future.

Large deviation principle of numerical solution

In this chapter, we focus on the θ -EM method of the SFDE (1.1) with small noise and investigate the LDP of the underlying numerical solution. By the weak convergence approach, we deduce the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP of the θ -EM solution on the infinite time horizon under the superlinearly growing drift coefficient condition. Based on the estimates of negative moments of the determinant of the corresponding Malliavin covariance matrix, we prove the existence and smoothness of the numerical density function for the θ -EM method of (1.1) with small noise. Combining the technique of the Malliavin calculus, we present the logarithmic estimates of the numerical density function and reveal the relation between the logarithmic limit and the rate function of the LDP.

5.1 The Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation of numerical solution

In this section, we consider the SFDE (1.1) with small noise on the infinite time horizon, which is written as follows

$$\begin{cases} dx^{\xi, \epsilon}(t) = b(x_t^{\xi, \epsilon})dt + \sqrt{\epsilon}\sigma(x_t^{\xi, \epsilon})dW(t), & t > 0, \\ x_0^{\xi, \epsilon} = \xi \in \mathcal{C}^d, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. The aim is to study the Freidlin–Wentzell large deviation of the θ -EM method of (5.1) by means of the weak convergence approach. The θ -EM method of (5.1) reads as

$$\begin{cases} y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_{k+1}) = y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon})\Delta + \theta b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})\Delta + \sqrt{\epsilon}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon})\delta W_k, & k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), & k = -N, \dots, 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

We denote

$$L_{\Delta}^2([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m) := \left\{ v : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \text{ is measurable} \mid \int_0^{+\infty} |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds < \infty \right\}.$$

For any $M \in (0, +\infty)$, set

$$\mathcal{S}_M := \left\{ v \in L_{\Delta}^2([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \mid \int_0^{+\infty} |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds \leq M \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_M := \{ v : \Omega \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \mid v \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-measurable and } v \in \mathcal{S}_M \text{ a.s.} \}.$$

It follows from [42, Chapter III, Section 28, Theorem 1'] that \mathcal{S}_M is a Polish space endowed with the weak topology. Introduce the space $\mathcal{C}_{\xi} := \mathcal{C}_{\xi}([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ consisting of

continuous functions $u : [-\tau, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u(r) = \xi(r)$, $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, which is a polish space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-\mathfrak{a}t_k} \left(\sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_k]} |u(t)| \right) \Delta$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{a} > 0$.

Denote $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot)\}$ by the linear interpolation with respect to $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(-t_N), \dots, y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k), \dots$. We will prove in Lemma 5.2 that $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot)\}$ belongs to \mathcal{C}_ξ .

In order to present the LDP for the solution of (5.2), we consider the following stochastic controlled equation

$$\begin{cases} y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) = y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})\Delta + \theta b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})\Delta \\ \quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta W_k + v^\epsilon(t_k)\Delta), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), \quad k = -N, \dots, 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

and the skeleton equation

$$\begin{cases} w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}) = w^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\Delta + \theta b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v})\Delta + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})v(t_k)\Delta, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ w^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), \quad k = -N, \dots, 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

where $v^\epsilon, v \in L^2_\Delta([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$, and $y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}$ and $w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}$ are defined by : for $r \in [t_j, t_{j+1}]$, $j \in \{-N, \dots, -1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) &:= \frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+j}) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+j+1}), \\ w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}(r) &:= \frac{t_{j+1} - r}{\Delta} w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+j}) + \frac{r - t_j}{\Delta} w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+j+1}). \end{aligned}$$

The continuous versions for solutions of (5.3) and (5.4) are defined by the linear interpolations of the solutions, respectively. Define measurable maps $\mathcal{G}^{\Delta, \epsilon}, \mathcal{G}^\Delta : \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively, by

$$\mathcal{G}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\sqrt{\epsilon}W + \int_0^\cdot v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds) = y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}, \quad \mathcal{G}^\Delta\left(\int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds\right) = w^{\Delta, v}.$$

Introduce the auxiliary process

$$\begin{cases} z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), \quad k = -N, \dots, -1, \\ z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = w^{\Delta, v}(t_k) - \theta b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\Delta, \quad k = 0, \\ z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k-1}) + b(w_{t_{k-1}}^{\Delta, v})\Delta + \sigma(w_{t_{k-1}}^{\Delta, v})v(t_{k-1})\Delta, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_+ \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

and the continuous version $\{z^{\Delta, v}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ as follows: for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$z^{\Delta, v}(t) = z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})(t - t_k) + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})v(t_k)(t - t_k),$$

for $t \in [-\tau, 0]$, $z^{\Delta, v}(t) = \xi(t)$.

Theorem 5.1 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Then for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_2}]$, the family of random variables $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ satisfies the LDP in $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e.,*

(i) for each closed subset F of $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot) \in F) \leq - \inf_{x \in F} I(x);$$

(ii) for each open subset O of $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \log \mathbb{P}(y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot) \in O) \geq - \inf_{x \in O} I(x),$$

where the good rate function is given by

$$I(f) = \inf_{\{v \in L^2_\Delta([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m) : f = \mathcal{G}^\Delta(\int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds)\}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds.$$

According to the contraction principle (see e.g. [26, Theorem 4.2.1]), we obtain the following LDP for the family $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ for each $t > 0$.

Corollary 5.1 *Under conditions in Theorem 5.1, for any $t > 0$, the family of random variables $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ satisfies the LDP in \mathbb{R}^d with the good rate function given by*

$$\tilde{I}(z) = \inf\{I(f) : f \in \mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d), z = f(t)\},$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is given in Theorem 5.1.

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is based on the equivalence of the LDP and the Laplace principle. According to [29, Condition 2.1, Theorem 2.10], it suffices to prove the compactness of solutions of the skeleton equation and the stochastic controlled equation (i.e., Propositions 5.1 and 5.2). We first give the *a priori* estimates of $w^{\Delta, v}$ and $z^{\Delta, v}$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $M > 0$ and $v \in \mathcal{S}_M$. Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2, it holds that for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_2}]$,*

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} |w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)| + \sup_{k \geq 0} |z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)| \leq (1 + \|\xi\|^{\beta+1})K(M).$$

Proof. By the definition of $z^{\Delta, v}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} d|z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 = \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt + \langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt \\ & = \left\langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \theta b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})\Delta + b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) + \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor)(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \right\rangle dt \\ & \quad + \left\langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) + b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) + \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor)(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \right\rangle dt \\ & = \left[(t - \lfloor t \rfloor - \theta\Delta) |b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})|^2 + \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle + 2 \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. v(\lfloor t \rfloor)(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle + |\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) + \langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$|z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 = |z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 + 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})|^2 (t - t_k - \theta\Delta) dt + 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \rangle dt + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle 4b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})(t-t_k) + 2z^{\Delta,v}(t_k), \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k) \rangle dt \\
& + 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k)|^2 (t-t_k) dt \\
= & |z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 + \frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} |w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 + 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v}), w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \rangle dt \\
& + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle \frac{1}{\theta} (w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)) + z^{\Delta,v}(t_k), \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k) \rangle dt \\
& + \Delta \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k)|^2 dt \\
\leq & \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}\Delta)} \right) |z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 + \left(\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} (1+\tilde{c}\Delta) + \frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} \right) |w^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& + 2 \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v}), w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \rangle dt + \Delta \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k)|^2 dt \\
& + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle \frac{1}{\theta} (w^{\Delta,v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)) + z^{\Delta,v}(t_k), \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})v(t_k) \rangle dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used $z^{\Delta,v}([t]) = w^{\Delta,v}([t]) - \theta b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v})\Delta$ and $\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t-t_k) dt = \frac{1}{2}\Delta^2$, and in the last step we used the inequality $2\langle a, b \rangle \leq (1+\tilde{c}\Delta)|a|^2 + \frac{1}{1+\tilde{c}\Delta}|b|^2$ for $\tilde{c} > 0$. Therefore, by iterating, we arrive at that for $\iota \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\iota t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 = |z^{\Delta,v}(0)|^2 + \sum_{i=0}^k \left(e^{\iota t_{i+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_{i+1})|^2 - e^{\iota t_i} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_i)|^2 \right) \\
\leq & |z^{\Delta,v}(0)|^2 + \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}\Delta)} - e^{-\iota\Delta} \right) \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\iota t_{i+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_i)|^2 \\
& + \Delta \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\iota t_{i+1}} \left[\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \tilde{c} |w^{\Delta,v}(t_i)|^2 + 2\langle b(w_{t_i}^{\Delta,v}), w^{\Delta,v}(t_i) \rangle + \Delta |\sigma(w_{t_i}^{\Delta,v})|^2 |v(t_i)|^2 \right. \\
& \left. + 2 \langle \frac{1}{\theta} (w^{\Delta,v}(t_i) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_i)) + z^{\Delta,v}(t_i), \sigma(w_{t_i}^{\Delta,v})v(t_i) \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

On account of (2.23), take sufficiently small numbers $\iota, \tilde{c} > 0$ independent of Δ such that $\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\tilde{c}\Delta)} - e^{-\iota\Delta} \leq 0$. Then, utilizing the Hölder inequality, (1.5), and Assumption 2.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\iota t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \leq |z^{\Delta,v}(0)|^2 + \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} \left[\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \tilde{c} |w^{\Delta,v}([t])|^2 + 2\langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v}), \right. \\
& \left. w^{\Delta,v}([t]) \rangle + \Delta |\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v})|^2 |v([t])|^2 + \left| \frac{1}{\theta} w^{\Delta,v}([t]) + \frac{\theta-1}{\theta} z^{\Delta,v}([t]) \right|^2 |v([t])|^2 \right. \\
& \left. + |\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v})|^2 \right] dt \\
\leq & |\xi(0) - \theta \Delta b(\xi)|^2 + \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} \left[K + \left(\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \tilde{c} - a_1 - a_2 \right) |w^{\Delta,v}([t])|^2 \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right] dt \\
& + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} \left(|w^{\Delta,v}([t])|^2 + |z^{\Delta,v}([t])|^2 + \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{[t]}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right) |v([t])|^2 dt \\
\leq & (1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)}) + \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} \left[\left(\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \tilde{c} - a_1 - a_2 \right) + \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\iota\tau} \right] \times
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2] dt + K e^{t_{k+1}} + \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\iota\tau} \|\xi\|^2 \\
& + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \left(\sup_{r \in [-\tau, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right) |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Here in the last step we used

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_i(r) dt \\
& \leq e^{\iota\tau} \|\xi\| e^{\iota\tau} + e^{\iota\tau} \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2,
\end{aligned}$$

whose proof is similar to that of (2.12). Analogously to the proof of Proposition 2.2, parameters \tilde{c} and ι can further be taken such that $\frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \tilde{c} - a_1 - a_2 + \left(\frac{a_1 - a_2 + L}{2} + 2a_2 \right) e^{\iota\tau} \leq 0$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{t_{k+1}}) + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \left(\sup_{r \in [-\tau, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right) |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt. \tag{5.6}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (1.2) and (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|z^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 & \geq |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - 2\theta\Delta \langle w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1}), b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta,v}) \rangle \\
& \geq |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - \theta\Delta \left(K - 2a_1 |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 + 2a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) \\
& \geq |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - K\theta\Delta - 2\theta a_2 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta,v}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \geq e^{t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - K\theta\Delta e^{t_{k+1}} - 2\theta a_2 e^{\iota\tau} \Delta \sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta,v}(t_{k+1})|^2 & \leq K\theta\Delta e^{t_{k+1}} + 2\theta a_2 e^{\iota\tau} \Delta \sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\
& \quad + K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{t_{k+1}}) + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \left(\sup_{r \in [-\tau, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right) |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Choose a sufficiently small number ι such that $e^{\iota\tau} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Then for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_2}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\
& \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{t_{k+1}}) + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \left(\sup_{r \in [-\tau, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right) |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.6) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{\iota t_{k+1}}) + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \left(\sup_{r \in [-\tau, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} e^{\iota[r]} |z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 \right) |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Grönwall inequality and using $v \in \mathcal{S}_M$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [-\tau, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\iota[t]} |z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\ & \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{\iota t_{k+1}}) e^{K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} |v(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 dt} \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)} + e^{\iota t_{k+1}}) e^{KM}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\sup_{k \geq 0} |w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)| + \sup_{k \geq 0} |z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)| \leq (1 + \|\xi\|^{\beta+1})K(M)$. The proof is finished. \square

Proposition 5.1 *Let $M > 0$. Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, and 2.2, for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_2}]$, $\mathcal{K}_M := \{\mathcal{G}^\Delta(\int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds) | v \in \mathcal{S}_M\}$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{S}_M is compact with respect to the weak topology, it suffices to show that the mapping $\mathcal{G}^\Delta \circ F$ is continuous, where $F : L^2_\Delta([0, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$ is defined by $F(v)(\cdot) := \int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds$. Namely, letting $v^\epsilon \rightarrow v$ in \mathcal{S}_M , we shall prove $w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon} \rightarrow w^{\Delta, v}$ in $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, +\infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$. First, we show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)| \rightarrow 0$. By (5.5) and the continuous version of $z^{\Delta, v}(\cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} d|z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 \\ & = \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt \\ & = \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) dt \\ & \quad + \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) dt \\ & \quad + \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle dt \\ & \quad - \theta \Delta \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\ & = |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 + (1 - 2\theta)\Delta^2 |b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})|^2 \\ & \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle (\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor)), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt \\
& + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) = \frac{1}{\theta \Delta} (w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - (w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t]))) . \quad (5.7)$$

Taking into account $1 - 2\theta \leq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - 2\theta) \Delta^2 |b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})|^2 \\
& \leq \frac{(1 - 2\theta)}{\theta^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1 + c_\lambda \Delta)}\right) |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{(1 - 2\theta)}{\theta^2} (1 - (1 + c_\lambda \Delta)) |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \leq \left(\frac{(1 - \theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta - 1}{\theta^2(1 + c_\lambda \Delta)} \right) |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 + c_\lambda \Delta |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t]) \rangle dt \\
& \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle (\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t]), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])), \\
& \quad z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt, \quad (5.8)
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant c_λ is defined by (1.6). Utilizing (5.5) and the continuous version of $z^{\Delta, v}(\cdot)$ again, and applying the Young inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle (\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t]), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt \\
& = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2 \langle (\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t]), z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t]) \\
& \quad + \frac{\Delta}{2} \langle b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |(\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t])|^2 \Delta dt \\
& \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle (\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t]), \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])) \rangle \Delta dt \\
& \leq \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})|^2 dt + K \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |v^\epsilon([t])|^2 (|z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 \\
& \quad + |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2) dt + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |(\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t])|^2 \Delta dt \\
& \quad + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \langle (\sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon([t]), \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])) \rangle \Delta dt, \quad (5.9)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t - \lfloor t \rfloor) dt = \frac{1}{2} \Delta^2$. Inserting (5.9) into (5.8), and then by iterating, we obtain that for $\gamma \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k \left(e^{\gamma t_{i+1}} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{i+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{i+1})|^2 - e^{\gamma t_i} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_i) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_i)|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\gamma t_{i+1}} \left[\left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda \Delta)} - e^{-\gamma \Delta} \right) |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_i) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_i)|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + c_\lambda \Delta |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_i) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_i)|^2 \right] + \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} \left[2 \langle b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}), w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle + |\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})|^2 \right] dt + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \times \\
&\quad \left[|z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 + |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \right] dt + \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} |\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \\
&\quad - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})|^2 |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \Delta dt + J(t_{k+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where J is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
J(s) &:= \int_0^s 2e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} \left\langle \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - v(\lfloor t \rfloor)), \frac{1}{2} \Delta (\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta (b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})) \right\rangle dt.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^k e^{\gamma t_{i+1}} \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda \Delta)} - e^{-\gamma \Delta} \right) |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_i) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_i)|^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^k -(2a_1 - L - c_\lambda - (L + 2a_2)e^{\gamma \tau}) \Delta e^{\gamma t_{i+1}} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_i) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_i)|^2 \\
&\quad + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \left[|z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 + |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \right] dt \\
&\quad + 2Le^{\gamma \Delta} \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \sup_{s \in [0, t]} e^{\gamma \lfloor s \rfloor} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor s \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \Delta dt + J(t_{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Proposition 2.4, one can take a sufficiently small number γ independent of Δ such that $\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+c_\lambda \Delta)} - e^{-\gamma \Delta} \leq 0$ and $2a_1 - L - c_\lambda - (L + 2a_2)e^{\gamma \tau} \geq 0$. Then, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
&\leq K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left[e^{\gamma \lfloor s \rfloor} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor s \rfloor) - z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + e^{\gamma \lfloor s \rfloor} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor s \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 \right] dt + J(t_{k+1}). \tag{5.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $E^\epsilon(t) = \int_0^t \sigma(w_{\lfloor s \rfloor}^{\Delta, v}) (v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor) - v(\lfloor s \rfloor)) ds$. Applying the integration by parts formula, $v^\epsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_M$, Assumptions 1.1 and 2.2, and Lemma 5.1, we arrive at

$$J(t_{k+1}) = 2e^{\gamma \lfloor t \rfloor} \left\langle E^\epsilon(t), \frac{1}{2} \Delta (\sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta, v})) v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) + z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \right\rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \Delta (b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})) \Big|_{t=0}^{t=t_{k+1}} - 2 \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma[t]} \langle E^\epsilon(t), (z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t))' \rangle dt \\
& \leq e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |E^\epsilon(t_{k+1})| |\sigma(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v})| \int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_{k+2}} |v^\epsilon([t])| dt + K e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |E^\epsilon(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 \\
& \quad - 2 \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma[t]} \langle E^\epsilon(t), b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) + \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon([t]) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) v([t]) \rangle dt \\
& \leq K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{k \geq -N} (1 + |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)| + |w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|) |E^\epsilon(t_{k+1})| + K e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |E^\epsilon(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 \\
& \quad + K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} e^{\gamma[t]} |E^\epsilon(t)| \left[1 + \sup_{k \geq -N} (|w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{\beta+1} + |w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{\beta+1}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + (1 + \sup_{k \geq -N} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|) |v^\epsilon([t])| + (1 + \sup_{k \geq -N} |w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|) |v([t])| \right] dt \\
& \leq K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |E^\epsilon(t_{k+1})| + K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) \\
& \quad - z^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2, \tag{5.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Young inequality and the Hölder inequality. Inserting (5.11) into (5.10) and together with

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \geq e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - 2\theta e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \Delta \langle w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}), \\
& \quad b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle \\
& \geq e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 - 2\theta e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \Delta \left(-a_1 |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right) \\
& \geq e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \quad - 2\theta a_2 e^{\gamma(\tau+\Delta)} \Delta \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4a_2\theta}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\
& \leq K \int_0^{t_{k+1}} |v^\epsilon([t])|^2 \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \left[e^{\gamma[s]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([s]) - z^{\Delta, v}([s])|^2 + e^{\gamma[s]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([s]) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - w^{\Delta, v}([s])|^2 \right] dt + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{t \in (0, t_{k+1})} e^{\gamma[t]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 dt \\
& \quad + \frac{7}{8} \sup_{t \in (0, t_{k+1})} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 dt \\
& \quad + K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)| + K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we chose γ sufficiently small such that $e^{\gamma(\tau+1)} \leq \frac{5}{4}$. It follows from the Grönwall inequality and $v^\epsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_M$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma[t]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\ & \leq K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)| + K(M) e^{\gamma t_{k+1}} \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

By virtue of

$$\left| \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor) - v(\lfloor s \rfloor)) ds \right| \leq K(M) \sqrt{|r_2 - r_1|},$$

we deduce the equicontinuity of $\{E^\epsilon(t), t \in [0, +\infty)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$. According to Assumption 1.1, Lemma 5.1, $v^\epsilon(\cdot), v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_M$, and the Hölder inequality, one has

$$\sup_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)} \sup_{t \in [0, +\infty)} \left| \int_0^{+\infty} \sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor) - v(\lfloor s \rfloor)) ds \right| \leq K(M)(1 + \|\xi\|^{\beta+1}),$$

which implies the uniform boundedness of $\{E^\epsilon(\cdot)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$. Hence, according to the Ascoli–Arzela theorem, we obtain that $\{E^\epsilon(\cdot)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}([0, t_{k+1}]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that

$$\sigma(w_{[\cdot]}^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon([\cdot]) - v([\cdot])) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0$$

with respect to the weak topology of $\mathcal{S}_{M'}$ for $M' = MK(M)(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)})$. By [21, Chapter VI, Proposition 3.3], we conclude that $\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |E^\epsilon(t)| \rightarrow 0$. This, together with (5.12) implies that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, by the monotone convergence theorem, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon} - w^{\Delta, v}\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi} &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-at_k} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)| \right) \Delta \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-at_k} \left(\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |w^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)| \right) \Delta = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. \square

In order to obtain the boundedness of the moments of y^{Δ, v^ϵ} , we introduce the auxiliary process

$$\begin{cases} Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), & k = -N, \dots, -1, \\ Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) = y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - \theta b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta, & k = 0, \\ Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) = Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k-1}) + b(y_{t_{k-1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{t_{k-1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_{k-1} \\ \quad + \sigma(y_{t_{k-1}}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon(t_{k-1}) \Delta, & k \in \mathbb{N}_+. \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

Define the continuous version $Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\cdot)$ as follows: for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) &:= Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(t - t_k) + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W(t_k)) \\ &\quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon(t_k)(t - t_k), \end{aligned}$$

and for $t \in [-\tau, 0]$, $Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) := \xi(t)$.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $M > 0$ and $\{v^\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \subset \mathcal{P}_M$. Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.2, for any $\Delta \in (0, 1]$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq K(M)(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)})e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}K(M)t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\cdot)$ and $y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\cdot)$ belong to $L^{2p}(\Omega; \mathcal{C}_\epsilon)$.

Proof. Step 1. We show that for $\Delta \in (0, \Delta^*]$ with some sufficiently small $\Delta^* \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq K(M)(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)})e^{\sqrt{\epsilon}K(M)t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the definition of Z^{Δ, v^ϵ} and the Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^2 = |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + |b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \Delta^2 + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 \\ & + 2 \langle y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - \theta \Delta b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}), b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta \rangle + 2 \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k), \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k \rangle \\ & + 2 \sqrt{\epsilon} \langle b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta, \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k \rangle + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \Delta^2 \\ & + 2 \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k, \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon(t_k) \Delta \rangle \\ & \leq \left(\frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)} \right) |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + \left(\frac{1-2\theta}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2}(1+\Delta) \right) |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \\ & + 2\Delta \langle y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k), b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \rangle + \Delta |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 + \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \Delta \right) + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{M}_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{M}_k := \langle \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k, \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) v^\epsilon(t_k) \Delta + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta \rangle$. Recalling the notation $A_{\theta, \Delta} := \frac{(1-\theta)^2}{\theta^2} + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2(1+\Delta)}$ and using Assumptions 1.1 and 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^2 \leq A_{\theta, \Delta} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + \frac{2\theta-1}{\theta^2} \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + K \Delta \\ & - 2a_3 \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2+\ell} + 2L \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + 2L \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \\ & + 2a_4 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta|^2 \right. \\ & \left. + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \Delta \right) + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{M}_k \\ & \leq A_{\theta, \Delta} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + K \Delta - a_3 \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2+\ell} - R \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \\ & + 2L \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) + 2a_4 \Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 \\ & + \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \Delta|^2 + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \Delta \right) + 2\widetilde{M}_k, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where R is positive constant with $R > 2L$. From this, we obtain that for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p > 1$,

$$\left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^2 + a_3 \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2+\ell} \right)^p \leq A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \sum_{i=1}^p C_p^i \mathcal{I}_i^\epsilon,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_i^\epsilon &= A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-i} |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} \left[K\Delta - R\Delta |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + 2L\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_1(r) \right. \\ &\quad + 2a_4\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 \\ &\quad \left. + \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})\Delta|^2 + |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})|^2 \Delta \right) + 2\widetilde{M}_k \right]^i. \end{aligned}$$

For the term \mathcal{I}_1^ϵ , applying the Young inequality yields that for $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1^\epsilon &\leq \gamma_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1)\Delta - R\Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \\ &\quad + K(\gamma_1)\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + K(\gamma_1)\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \\ &\quad + K\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\ &\quad + A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{M}_k). \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + 2a_3\theta\Delta |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2+\ell} \\ &\leq |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r), \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} &= (|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + K\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r))^{2(p-1)} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \\ &\leq 2|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \\ &\quad + K|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \left(K\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} -|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 &\leq -\frac{1}{2} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \\ &\quad + K|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \left(K\Delta + 2a_4\theta\Delta \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right)^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above inequality into \mathcal{I}_1^ϵ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1^\epsilon &\leq \gamma_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1)\Delta - \frac{1}{2} R\Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \\ &\quad + K(\gamma_1)\Delta \left(|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right) \\ &\quad + K\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\ &\quad + A_{\theta,\Delta}^{p-1} |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{M}_k). \end{aligned}$$

For the term \mathcal{I}_i^ϵ with $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$,

$$\mathcal{I}_i^\epsilon \leq \gamma_1 \Delta A_{\theta,\Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1)\Delta^2 \left(1 + |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + K(M)\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) + K A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-i} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k|^i),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \leq M$. Combining the estimates of the terms $\mathcal{I}_i^\epsilon, i = 1, \dots, p$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} & \leq (1 + K\gamma_1\Delta) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1)\Delta + \mathcal{J}_{k1}(R) + \mathcal{J}_{k2} \\
& + K(M)\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\
& + K |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k) \\
& + K \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k|^i),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{k1}(R) & := -\left(\frac{p}{2} R A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} - K(\gamma_1)\right) \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \\
& \quad + K(\gamma_1)\Delta \left(\int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right), \\
\mathcal{J}_{k2} & := K(\gamma_1)\Delta^2 \left(|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then for $\gamma_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} & \leq |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(0)|^{2p} + \sum_{l=0}^k \left((1 + K\gamma_1\Delta) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\gamma_2 \Delta} - 1 \right) e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2p} \\
& + K(\gamma_1) e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} (\mathcal{J}_{l1}(R) + \mathcal{J}_{l2}) + K(M) \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_l)|^2 \times \\
& \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\
& + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) \\
& + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i).
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.2, take sufficiently small γ_1 and γ_2 independent of Δ such that $(1 + K\gamma_1\Delta) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p e^{\gamma_2 \Delta} - 1 \leq 0$. Choose R sufficiently large and further choose Δ^* sufficiently small. We obtain that for $\Delta \leq \Delta^*$,

$$\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} (\mathcal{J}_{l1}(R) + \mathcal{J}_{l2}) \leq K \|\xi\|^{2p}.$$

Hence,

$$e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \leq |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(0)|^{2p} + K e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} + K(M) \int_0^{t_{k+1}} |v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 \times$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_2 [r]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_2 [r]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} \right) ds \\
& + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) \\
& + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (5.15) that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \leq K e^{\gamma_2 t_k} + \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p}.$$

We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \\
& \leq K e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} + K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) + K(M) \int_0^{t_{k+1}} |v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 \times \\
& \quad \left(\sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_2 [r]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_2 [r]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} \right) dt \\
& \quad + K \sup_{j \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^j e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) \\
& \quad + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i), \tag{5.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(0)| \leq K(1 + \|\xi\|^{\beta+1})$, which was deduced by using Assumption 2.2. By virtue of the Grönwall inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 [t]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \\
& \leq e^{K(M)M} \left(K(1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) + K e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} + K \sup_{j \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^j e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i) \right). \tag{5.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality and the Young inequality, we arrive at that for $\gamma_3 \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \leq k} \sum_{l=0}^j e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) \right] \\
& \leq \epsilon \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \right] + K \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{l=0}^k e^{2\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{4(p-1)} \times \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \left(|\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 M + |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^2 \right) \Delta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
& \leq \sqrt{\epsilon} K(M, \gamma_3) \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_3 [r]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_3 [r]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \gamma_3 K(M) \left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor t \rfloor} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor t \rfloor} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right) + K \|\xi\|^{2p}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i) \right] \\ & \leq \epsilon K(M) \int_0^{t_{k+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor r \rfloor} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{r \in [0, s]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor r \rfloor} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] ds \\ & \quad + \gamma_3 K(M) \left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor t \rfloor} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} + \sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_3 \lfloor t \rfloor} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right) + K \|\xi\|^{2p}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation on both sides of (5.17), inserting the above two inequalities into (5.17), letting $\gamma_3 > 0$ be sufficiently small, and using the Grönwall inequality again, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 \lfloor t \rfloor} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} e^{\gamma_2 \lfloor t \rfloor} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq K e^{K(M)M} (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)} + e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}}) e^{\sqrt{\epsilon} K(M) t_{k+1}} e^{K(M)M}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq K(M) (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\sqrt{\epsilon} K(M) t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We finishes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. We show that for $\Delta \in [\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_{k+1}]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq K(M) (1 + \|\xi\|^{2p(\beta+1)}) e^{\sqrt{\epsilon} K(M) t_{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is similar to that of Step 2 in Lemma 2.2, and thus we only give the sketch of the proof.

Similar to the estimate of \mathcal{I}_i^ϵ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1^\epsilon & \leq \gamma_1 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1) \Delta - \frac{1}{2} R \Delta A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \\ & \quad + K(\gamma_1) \Delta^p \left(|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\ & \quad + K(M) \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\ & \quad + A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k), \end{aligned}$$

and for $i \in \{2, \dots, p\}$,

$$\mathcal{I}_i^\epsilon \leq \gamma_1 A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K(\gamma_1) \Delta^p \left(|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r) + K(M)\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \right. \\
& \left. + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) + KA_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-i} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k|^i).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from $(|a| + |b|)^p \geq |a|^p + |b|^p$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} + a_3^p \Delta^p |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{p(2+l)} \\
& \leq (1 + K\gamma_1) A_{\theta, \Delta}^p |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + K\Delta + \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{k1}(R) + \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{k2} \\
& \quad + K\Delta |v^\epsilon(t_k)|^2 \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\
& \quad + K |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^2 + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k) \\
& \quad + K \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_k|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k|^i),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{k1}(R) &= -\frac{1}{2} R A_{\theta, \Delta}^{p-1} \Delta |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p}, \\
\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{k2} &= K(\gamma_1)(R) \Delta^p (|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_2(r)).
\end{aligned}$$

By taking γ_1 and γ_2 sufficiently small such that $(1 + K\gamma_1) A_{\theta, \Delta^*}^p e^{\gamma_2} - 1 \leq 0$, we obtain that for $\Delta \in (\Delta^*, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_{k+1})|^{2p} \leq |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(0)|^{2p} + K e^{\gamma_2 t_{k+1}} + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l1}(R) \\
& \quad + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} (\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l2} - a_3^p \Delta^p |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{p(2+l)}) + K(M) \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} \Delta |v^\epsilon(t_l)|^2 \times \\
& \quad \left(|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2p} + |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2p} + \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r)|^{2p} d\nu_1(r) \right) \\
& \quad + K \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_l} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-1)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^2 + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l) \\
& \quad + K \sum_{l=0}^k \sum_{i=2}^p C_p^i |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{2(p-i)} (\epsilon |\sigma(y_{t_l}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) \delta W_l|^{2i} + |\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_l|^i).
\end{aligned}$$

Then by the similar procedure to the proofs of (2.49) and (2.50), and choosing a sufficiently large number R independent of Δ , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l1}(R) + \sum_{l=0}^k e^{\gamma_2 t_{l+1}} (\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_{l2} - a_3^p \Delta^p |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_l)|^{p(2+l)}) \\
& \leq K(\|\xi\|^{2p} + 1).
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining proof is similar to that of Step 1 and is omitted.

Combining Steps 1–2 finishes the proof. \square

Proposition 5.2 *Let $M > 0$ and $\{v^\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \subset \mathcal{P}_M$ such that $v^\epsilon \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{d} v$ as \mathcal{S}_M -valued random variables. Under Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2, it holds that for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4a_2\theta}]$,*

$$\mathcal{G}^{\Delta,\epsilon} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon}W + \int_0^\cdot v^\epsilon(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds \right) \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{d} \mathcal{G}^\Delta \left(\int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds \right).$$

Proof. To show $y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon} \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{d} w^{\Delta,v}$ as $v^\epsilon \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{d} v$, by the duality formula for the Kantorovich–Rubinstein distance (see e.g. [58, Remark 6.5]), it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{E}[\|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon} - w^{\Delta,v}\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi} \wedge 1] \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\|y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon} - w^{\Delta,v}\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi} \wedge 1] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\Delta e^{-\Delta t_k} \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - w^{\Delta,v}(t)| \right) \wedge 1 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta e^{-\Delta t_k} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - w^{\Delta,v}(t)| \right) \wedge (e^{\Delta t_k} \Delta^{-1}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we only need to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - w^{\Delta,v}(t)| \wedge (e^{\Delta t_k} \Delta^{-1}) \right] = 0.$$

It follows from definitions of Z^{Δ,v^ϵ} and $z^{\Delta,v}$, and the Itô formula that

$$\begin{aligned} d|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t)|^2 &= \left[2\langle Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t), b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}) \rangle \right. \\ &+ \epsilon |\sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})|^2 + 2\langle Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t), \sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle \Big] dt \\ &+ 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \langle Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t), \sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

On account of

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t) &= Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) + (b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}))(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \\ &+ \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)) + (\sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor))(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - z^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) = y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \theta \Delta (b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v})),$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} d|Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t)|^2 &= \left[2\langle y^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor t \rfloor), b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}) \rangle \right. \\ &- 2\theta \Delta |b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v})|^2 + 2\langle (b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}))(t - \lfloor t \rfloor), b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}) \rangle \\ &+ 2\langle \sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v})v(\lfloor t \rfloor), (b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}))(t - \lfloor t \rfloor) \rangle \\ &+ Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t) \rangle + \epsilon |\sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})|^2 \Big] dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \langle b(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v}), \\ &\sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)) \rangle dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \langle Z^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta,v}(t), \sigma(y_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\Delta,v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the Young inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(s) - z^{\Delta, v}(s)|^2 = \int_0^s 2\langle y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t]), b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}) \rangle \\
& + 2(t - [t] - \theta\Delta) |b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v})|^2 dt + \int_0^s 2\langle \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})v^\epsilon([t]) \\
& - \sigma(w^{\Delta, v})v([t]), (b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}))(t - [t]) + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle \\
& + \epsilon |\sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W([t])) \rangle dt \\
& + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle \\
& \leq \int_0^s 2\langle y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t]), b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}) \rangle + |\sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w^{\Delta, v})|^2 \\
& + \epsilon |\sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + K \int_0^s |v^\epsilon([t])|^2 \left| \frac{1}{\theta} (y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t]) \right. \\
& + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - z^{\Delta, v}([t])) + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \Big|^2 dt \\
& + \int_0^s 2\langle \sigma(w^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])), (b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}))(t - [t]) + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) \\
& - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W([t])) \rangle dt \\
& + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used $\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} 2(t - [t] - \theta\Delta) dt = (1 - \theta)\Delta^2 \leq 0$. It follows from Assumptions 1.1–1.2 and

$$\int_0^s \int_{-\tau}^0 |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - w^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 dv_i(r) dt \leq \int_0^s |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 dt \quad \forall i = 1, 2$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(s) - z^{\Delta, v}(s)|^2 \\
& \leq \int_0^s \left[-2(a_1 - a_2 - L) |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 + \epsilon |\sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 \right] dt \\
& + K \int_0^s |v^\epsilon([t])|^2 \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} (|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^2 + |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2) \right) dt \\
& + E_1(s) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W([t])) \rangle dt \\
& + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $E_1(s) := \int_0^s 2\langle \sigma(w^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon([t]) - v([t])), (b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}))(t - [t]) + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t) \rangle dt$. By $a_1 > a_2 + L$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(s) - z^{\Delta, v}(s)|^2 \\
& \leq \int_0^s (K |v^\epsilon([t])|^2 + \gamma) \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^2 + \sup_{r \in [0, t]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) \right. \\
& \left. - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 \right) dt + \int_0^s \epsilon |\sigma(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + E_1(s) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle b(y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w^{\Delta, v}),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W([t]))dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})dW(t) \rangle.$$

Denote $E^\epsilon(t) := \int_0^t \sigma(w_{[r]}^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon([r]) - v([r]))dr$. By virtue of the integration by parts formula, one has

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(s) &= 2\langle E^\epsilon(s), (b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}))(s - [s]) + (Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(s) - z^{\Delta, v}(s)) \rangle \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^s \langle E^\epsilon(t), d((b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}))(t - [t]) + Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)) \rangle \\ &\leq K|E^\epsilon(s)|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([s]) - w^{\Delta, v}([s])|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([s]) - z^{\Delta, v}([s])|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(s) - z^{\Delta, v}(s)|^2 - 4 \int_0^s \langle E^\epsilon(t), b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle dt \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^s \langle E^\epsilon(t), (\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}))v^\epsilon([t]) \rangle dt - 2 \int_0^s \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})(v^\epsilon([t]) \\ &\quad - v([t])) \rangle dt - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s e^{\gamma t} \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})dW(t) \rangle \\ &\leq K \sup_{r \in [0, s]} |E^\epsilon(r)|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([s]) - w^{\Delta, v}([s])|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 \\ &\quad + K \int_0^s (|v^\epsilon([t])|^2 + 1) \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} (|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^2 + |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) \\ &\quad - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2) \right) dt - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^s \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})dW(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \\ &\geq |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 - 2\theta\Delta \langle y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k), b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle \\ &\geq |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 - 2\theta\Delta \left(-a_1|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a_2 \int_{-\tau}^0 |y_{t_k}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 d\nu_2(r) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} &|Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \\ &\geq |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 - 2a_2\theta\Delta \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \leq 2a_2\theta\Delta \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([t]) - w^{\Delta, v}([t])|^2 \\ &\quad + K \int_0^{t_k} (|v^\epsilon([t])|^2 + 1) \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} (|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^2 + |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) \\ &\quad - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2) \right) dt + \int_0^{t_k} \epsilon |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^{t_k} \langle b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}), \\ &\quad \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W([t])) \rangle dt + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^{t_k} \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})dW(t) \rangle \\ &\quad + K \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} |E^\epsilon(r)|^2 + \frac{1}{4}|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$- 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^{t_k} \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} e^{\gamma t} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{8} \sup_{t \in \{0, \dots, t_k\}} e^{\gamma t} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - w^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 \\ & \leq K \int_0^{t_k} (1 + |v^\epsilon(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2) \left(\sup_{r \in [0, t]} (|y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^2 + |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(r) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - z^{\Delta, v}(r)|^2) \right) dt + 2\epsilon \int_0^{t_k} |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + 4\sqrt{\epsilon} \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} \left(\int_0^r \langle b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}), \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)) \rangle dt + \int_0^r \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle \right) \\ & \quad + K \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 + 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} \int_0^r \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Grönwall inequality and $v^\epsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_M$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 + \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \\ & \leq K e^{K(M+1)t_k} \left[\epsilon \int_0^{t_k} |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} \left(\int_0^r \langle b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v}), \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})(W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)) \rangle dt + \int_0^r \langle Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sup_{r \in [0, t_k]} \int_0^r \langle E^\epsilon(t), \sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) dW(t) \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Utilizing Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, and the Young inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |y^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(\lfloor t \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor t \rfloor)|^2 \wedge (e^{at_k} \Delta^{-1}) \right] \\ & \leq K e^{K(M+1)t_k} \left\{ \epsilon \int_0^{t_k} \mathbb{E} [1 + \|y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}\|^2] dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^{t_k} \mathbb{E} \left[|b(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}) - b(w_{[t]}^{\Delta, v})| \times \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})| |W(t) - W(\lfloor t \rfloor)| \right] dt + \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{t_k} |Z^{\Delta, v^\epsilon}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^2 |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} \mathbb{E} [|E^\epsilon(t)|^2 \wedge (e^{at_k} \Delta^{-1})] + \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t_k} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 |\sigma(y_{[t]}^{\Delta, v^\epsilon})|^2 dt \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \\ & \leq K(M) e^{K(M+1)t_k} \left[(1 + \|\xi\|^{2(\beta+1)}) (\epsilon + \sqrt{\epsilon}) + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 \wedge (e^{at_k} \Delta^{-1}) \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from $v^\epsilon \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{d} v$ that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} [\sup_{t \in [0, t_k]} |E^\epsilon(t)|^2 \wedge (e^{at_k} \Delta^{-1})] = 0$. Consequently, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ finishes the proof. \square

5.2 Logarithmic estimate for numerical density function

This section is devoted to the logarithmic estimate on the finite time horizon for the density function of the θ -EM method (5.2) of (5.1), based on the smoothness of the numerical

density function and the technique of the Malliavin calculus. The constant $T > 0$ is fixed in this section. For the numerical solution $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}$, under Assumptions 1.1, 4.1–4.3, it follows from Theorem 4.2 that for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)$ admits a density function denoted by $\mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k, \cdot)$. We introduce the following assumption to ensure the smoothness of $\mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k, \cdot)$.

Assumption 5.1 *Assume that coefficients b and σ are smooth with bounded derivatives of arbitrary orders.*

The proof of the smoothness of the density $\mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k, \cdot)$ depends on the estimate of the Malliavin covariance matrix γ_k^ϵ of the numerical solution $y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon}$ and the result that $y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 5.3 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 4.1, 4.3 and 5.1 hold. Then for any $p \geq 1$ and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5}) \wedge (0, \frac{1}{4\theta \|Db\|_{\mathcal{L}(C^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}]$,*

$$\|\det(\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K\epsilon^{-d}\Delta^{-d}.$$

Proof. Since $\det(\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon)^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^{-1} \leq (\lambda_{\min}^{-1})^d$, where $\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ are the eigenvalues of $\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon$ and $\lambda_{\min} := \min\{\lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, d\}$, it suffices to estimate the smallest eigenvalue of $\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon$. For the Malliavin covariance matrix γ_k^ϵ of the numerical solution $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)$, similar to the recursive relation (4.15), for any $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$, using the equality

$$A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon := (\text{Id}_{d \times d} - \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta)^{-1} = \text{Id}_{d \times d} + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta, \quad (5.18)$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min}(\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon) &= \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon u \\ &\geq \epsilon \Delta \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top (A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon)^\top u \\ &= \epsilon \Delta \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \left[\sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top \Delta + \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top (A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta)^\top \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top (A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta)^\top \right] u \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \Delta \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top u \\ &\quad + \epsilon \Delta \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \left[\left(\frac{1}{4} \text{Id}_{d \times d} + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta \right) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top \left(\frac{1}{4} \text{Id}_{d \times d} + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta \right)^\top \right] u \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \Delta \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) \sigma(y_{t_{N\Delta-1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon})^\top u + \epsilon \Delta \sigma_0 \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Id}_{d \times d} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 \Delta + (A_{1, N\Delta-1}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0)^\top \Delta \right) u \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \Delta \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{C}^d} \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} u^\top \sigma(\phi) \sigma(\phi)^\top u \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \epsilon \Delta \sigma_0 \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^d, |u|=1} \left(\frac{1}{2} |u|^2 - 2|u|^2 |A_{1, N^{\Delta-1}}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 | \Delta \right) \quad (5.19)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \Delta \sigma_0, \quad (5.20)$$

where we used Assumption 4.3, the fact $\|A_{1, N^{\Delta-1}}^\epsilon\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1$ showed in the proof of Theorem 4.2, and the inequality $2|A_{1, N^{\Delta-1}}^\epsilon \theta \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_{N^\Delta}}^{\Delta, \epsilon}) I^0 | \Delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5}) \wedge (0, \frac{1}{4\theta \|\mathcal{D}b\|_{\mathcal{L}(C^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}]$. This gives that $\det(\gamma_{N^\Delta}^\epsilon)^{-1} \leq (\frac{1}{2} \sigma_0 \epsilon \Delta)^{-d}$.

□

Similar to proofs of Lemmas 4.2 and 5.1 with $\iota = 0$, we obtain the following regularity estimates of $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}$ and $w^{\Delta, v}$.

Proposition 5.3 *Under the conditions in Lemma 5.3, for any $T > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5})$,*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |w^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \leq K_T, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \leq K_T.$$

Moreover, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\sup_{r_1, \dots, r_n \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r_1 \vee \dots \vee r_n \leq t_k \leq T} |D_{r_1, \dots, r_n} y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)|^p \right] \leq K_T.$$

Therefore, $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k) \in \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N^\Delta$.

Proposition 5.4 *Under the conditions in Lemma 5.3, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4\theta a_5}) \wedge (0, \frac{1}{4\theta \|\mathcal{D}b\|_{\mathcal{L}(C^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}]$, $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)$ admits a smooth density $\mathfrak{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k, \cdot)$.*

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 5.3, Proposition 5.3, and [52, Theorem 2.1.4]. □

The limit of the logarithmic estimate on the finite time horizon of the numerical density function is closed related to the rate function of the LDP of $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$. To proceed, we list the LDPs of $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ and $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ in the following proposition, whose proofs are similar to those of Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.1 and thus are omitted. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of all continuous functions $u : [-\tau, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u(r) = \xi(r)$ for $r \in [-\tau, 0]$, endowed with the norm $\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)} := \sup_{t \in [-\tau, T]} |u(t)|$.

Proposition 5.5 *Under the conditions in Lemma 5.3, it holds that:*

(i) *The family of random variables $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(\cdot)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ satisfies the LDP in $\mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the good rate function given by*

$$I_T(f) = \inf_{\{v \in L^2_\Delta([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) : f = \mathcal{G}^\Delta(\int_0^\cdot v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds)\}} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds.$$

(ii) *For any $t \in [0, T]$, the family of random variables $\{y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t)\}_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)}$ satisfies the LDP in \mathbb{R}^d with the good rate function given by*

$$\tilde{I}_t(z) = \inf \{I_T(f) : f \in \mathcal{C}_\xi([-\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d), z = f(t)\}. \quad (5.21)$$

Now we state our main result as follows.

Theorem 5.2 *Under the conditions in Lemma 5.3, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and sufficiently small $\Delta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \ln \mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t, y) = -\tilde{I}_t(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We prove Theorem 5.2 by introducing the following equation

$$\begin{cases} y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) = y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\Delta + \theta b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\Delta + \sqrt{\epsilon}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\delta W_k \\ \quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})v(t_k)\Delta, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), \quad k = -N, \dots, 0, \end{cases}$$

where $y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}$ is the linear interpolation with respect to $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_{k-N}), \dots, y^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t_k)$, and $v \in L^2_\Delta$. Define $\mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}) = \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + (1 - \theta)\mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}\Delta + \theta\mathcal{D}b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v}\Delta \\ \quad + \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}v(t_k)\Delta + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\delta W_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = 0, \quad k = -N, \dots, 0, \end{cases}$$

where $w^{\Delta, v}$ is the solution of (5.4).

Introduce the auxiliary processes associated to $y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}$, respectively as

$$\begin{cases} Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) = \xi(t_k), \quad k = -N, \dots, -1, \\ Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) = y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - \theta b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\Delta, \quad k = 0, \\ Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) = Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\Delta + \sqrt{\epsilon}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})\delta W_k \\ \quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})v(t_k)\Delta, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = 0, \quad k = -N, \dots, -1, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) = \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) - \theta\mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}\Delta, \quad k = 0, \\ \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}\Delta + \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}v(t_k)\Delta \\ \quad + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\delta W_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, define the continuous versions $Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(\cdot)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) &:= Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) + b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})(t - t_k) + \sqrt{\epsilon}\sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})(W(t) - W(t_k)) \\ &\quad + \sigma(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v})v(t_k)(t - t_k), \\ \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t) &:= \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}(t - t_k) + \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}v(t_k)(t - t_k) \\ &\quad + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v})(W(t) - W(t_k)) \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) := \xi(t)$, $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t) := 0$ for $t \in [-\tau, 0]$.

Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2, we obtain the following regularity estimates of $y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}$.

Proposition 5.6 *Let Assumptions 1.1, 4.1, 4.3 and 5.1 hold. Then for any $T > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{a\theta a_5})$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t_k \leq T} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \leq K_T.$$

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 5.2.] We first give the proof of

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \ln \mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t, y) \leq -\tilde{I}_t(y). \quad (5.22)$$

By Lemma 5.3 and the boundedness of the p th moment of $y^{\Delta, \epsilon}$, we obtain

$$\|(\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq K \|\det(\gamma_{N\Delta}^\epsilon)^{-1}\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} \leq K \epsilon^{-d} \Delta^{-d}.$$

This, combining (5.21), Proposition 5.3, and [28, Proposition 4.1] finishes the proof of (5.22).

Next, we show that $\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \ln \mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t, y) \geq -\tilde{I}_t(y)$, whose proof is divided into the following five steps.

Step 1. Prove that for any $p \geq 1$ and $\Delta \in (0, \frac{1}{8\theta a_5}] \wedge (0, \frac{1}{4\theta \|\mathcal{D}b\|_{\mathcal{L}(C^d; \mathbb{R}^d)}}]$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] = 0.$$

By the definitions of $Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}$ and $z^{\Delta, v}$, we have that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^p &\leq K \left| \int_0^t b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) ds \right|^p + K \left| \int_0^t \sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) v([s]) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) v([s]) ds \right|^p + K \left| \sqrt{\epsilon} \int_0^t \sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) dW(s) \right|^p. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the boundedness of derivatives of b , σ , and the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)|^p \right] &\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p] ds + K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} \\ &\quad - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p] ds \left(\int_0^T |v([s])|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^T (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p]) ds \\ &\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}([r]) - w^{\Delta, v}([r])|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^T (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p]) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 &\leq |Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\theta \Delta \langle y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}), b(y_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v}) \rangle \\ &\leq |Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_{k+1}) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1})|^2 + 4\theta a_5 \Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By $\Delta \leq \frac{1}{8\theta a_5}$, we obtain

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 \leq 2 \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2, \quad (5.23)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] &\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, s]} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - w^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds \\ &\quad + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^T (1 + \sup_{s \in [0, T]} E[\|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p]) ds. \end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 5.6 and the Grönwall inequality, one has

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] \leq K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}},$$

which finishes the proof of Step 1 by taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Step 2. Prove that for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - Z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] = 0,$$

where $Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k))$.

By the definitions of $Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t)$, $z^{\Delta, v}(t)$, and $\tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t)$, we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)) - \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t) = \mathcal{A}_1(t) + \mathcal{A}_2(t) + \mathcal{A}_3(t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(t) &:= \int_0^t \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})) - \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \right] ds, \\ \mathcal{A}_2(t) &:= \int_0^t \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) v(\lfloor s \rfloor) - \sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) v(\lfloor s \rfloor)) - \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} v(\lfloor s \rfloor) \right] ds, \\ \mathcal{A}_3(t) &:= \int_0^t [\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - \sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})] dW(s) =: \mathcal{A}_1(t) + \mathcal{A}_2(t) + \mathcal{A}_3(t). \end{aligned}$$

For the term \mathcal{A}_3 , utilizing the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, we deduce that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\mathcal{A}_3(t)|^p \right] &\leq K_T \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p ds \right] \\ &\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] ds \leq K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used Step 1.

For the term \mathcal{A}_1 , by the Taylor formula, we obtain

$$b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) = \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) + \int_0^1 (1 - \varsigma) \mathcal{D}^2 b((1 - \varsigma)w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})$$

$$+ \varsigma y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) d\varsigma (y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}, y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})) - \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) \mathbb{Z}_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \\ &= \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathbb{Z}_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) + \int_0^1 (1 - \varsigma) \mathcal{D}^2 b((1 - \varsigma) w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \\ & \quad + \varsigma y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) d\varsigma (Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}, y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

It follows from the Hölder inequality, Assumption 5.1, and Step 1 that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\mathcal{A}_1(t)|^p \right] \leq K_T \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathbb{Z}_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p + \|Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p \|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p ds \right] \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the term \mathcal{A}_2 , by virtue of the Taylor formula and the Hölder inequality, we have that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\mathcal{A}_2(t)|^p \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^T \left| \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathbb{Z}_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) + \int_0^1 (1 - \varsigma) \times \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \mathcal{D}^2 \sigma((1 - \varsigma) w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} + \lambda y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) d\varsigma (Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}, y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) \right| |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)| ds \right)^p \right] \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds \left(\int_0^T |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \quad + K \left(\int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] ds \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^T |v(\lfloor s \rfloor)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining estimates of terms \mathcal{A}_1 , \mathcal{A}_2 , and \mathcal{A}_3 , we arrive at that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - z^{\Delta, v}(t)) - \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t) \right|^p \right] \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)) - \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\ & \geq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 - 2\theta \Delta \left\langle \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)) \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$- \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(t_k), \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}) - b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})) - \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta,v})\mathbb{Z}_{t_k}^{\Delta,v}\rangle,$$

we derive from (5.24), Assumption 5.1, and the Young inequality that for $\Delta \leq \frac{1}{8\theta a_5}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta,v}(t_k)) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)) - \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \right|^2 + 5\theta a_5 \Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) \\ & \quad - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 + K \Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k)|^2 |y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This indicates

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2 \\ & \leq 3 \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}(Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - z^{\Delta,v}(t_k)) - \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta,v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\ & \quad + K \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k)|^2 |y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.25), and Propositions 5.3 and 5.6, yields that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^p \right] \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ & \quad + K \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta,v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |Y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta,v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Gröwall inequality completes the proof of Step 2.

Step 3. Prove that for any $p \geq 1$, $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\alpha \leq t_k \leq T} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t_k)|^p \right] = 0$.

It follows from the definition of $Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}$ that $D_\alpha Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t) &= \int_0^t \mathcal{D}b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v} ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{\epsilon} \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v} dW(s) \\ & \quad + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v} v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds + \sqrt{\epsilon} \sigma(y_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}) \mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}(\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

We obtain from the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality and the Hölder inequality that for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |D_\alpha Z^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}(t)|^p \right] \\ & \leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [\|D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}\|^p] ds + K_T \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [\|D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}\|^p] ds + K \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} (1 + \mathbb{E} [\|y_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta,\epsilon,v}\|^p]) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor)|^p \right] ds + K \epsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} (1 + \mathbb{E}[\|y_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p]).$$

Moreover, similar to the proof of (5.23), we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 \leq 2 \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N^\Delta} |D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2,$$

which together with the Grönwall inequality finishes the proof of Step 3.

Step 4. Prove that for any $p \geq 1$ and sufficiently small $\Delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\alpha \leq t_k \leq T} |D_\alpha Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] = 0.$$

Since $D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t) &= \int_0^t \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds \\ &\quad + \sigma(w_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta, v}) \mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

we derive from (5.26) that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(t) + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2(t) + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_3(t) + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_4(t),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(t) &:= \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \mathcal{D}b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \right) ds, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2(t) &:= \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \right) v(\lfloor s \rfloor) ds, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_3(t) &:= (\sigma(y_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - \sigma(w_{[\alpha]}^{\Delta, v})) \mathbf{1}_{[0, t]}(\alpha), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_4(t) &:= \int_0^t \mathcal{D}\sigma(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} dW(s). \end{aligned}$$

By the Taylor formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{D}b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} &= \mathcal{D}^2 b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}, D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) \\ &\quad + \int_0^1 \mathcal{D}^3 b((1 - \varsigma)w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} + \varsigma y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) d\varsigma (y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}, y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}, D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $p \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1(t)|^p \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} (\mathcal{D}b(y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) - \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v})) D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \mathcal{D}b(w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \right) ds \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\|Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p \|D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p + \|Y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p \|y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - w_{[s]}^{\Delta, v}\|^p \|D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}\|^p \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y_{[s]}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - D_\alpha Z_{[s]}^{\Delta, v} \right\|^p \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\quad + K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) \right|^p \right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_2(t)|^p \right] &\leq K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad + K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\quad + K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) \right|^p \right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \leq T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t) - D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.27) \\
&\quad + K_T \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^{4p} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} + K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r \leq s} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(\lfloor r \rfloor) \right|^p \right] ds + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] \\
&\quad + K_T \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^p \right] ds. \quad (5.28)
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\theta \Delta \left| \mathcal{D}b(y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y_{t_k}^{\Delta, \epsilon, v} - \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}) D_\alpha Z_{t_k}^{\Delta, v} \right|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

According to the Taylor formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha \tilde{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K\Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& + K\Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& + 4\theta\Delta \|\mathcal{D}b\|_{\mathcal{L}(C^d; \mathbb{R}^d)} \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, for sufficiently small Δ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\
& \leq K \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} D_\alpha Z^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_\alpha \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}^{\Delta, v}(t_k) \right|^2 \\
& \quad + K\Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 \\
& \quad + K\Delta \sup_{0 \leq k \leq N\Delta} |Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2 |y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - w^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^2 |D_\alpha y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Making use of (5.27), the Grönwall inequality and Steps 1–3 finishes the proof of Step 4.

Step 5. Prove that for any $p \geq 1$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and sufficiently small $\Delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\alpha_1 \vee \dots \vee \alpha_l \leq t_k \leq T} |D_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_l} Y^{\Delta, \epsilon, v}(t_k) - D_{K \dots \alpha_l} \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta, v}(t_k)|^p \right] = 0.$$

The case of $l = 1$ is proved in Step 4, and the case of $l > 1$ can be proved by the induction argument on l . We omit the proof.

Combining Steps 1–5, and according to [28, Proposition 5.1], we obtain

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \epsilon \ln \mathbf{p}^{\Delta, \epsilon}(t, y) \geq -\tilde{d}_t(y)$$

with $\tilde{d}_t(y) := \inf \{ I_T(f) : f \in \mathcal{C}_\xi([- \tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d), y = f(t), \det(\bar{\gamma}_{w^{\Delta, v}(t)}) > 0 \}$, where $\bar{\gamma}_{\Phi(v)} = (\langle \mathcal{D}(\Phi(v))^i, \mathcal{D}(\Phi(v))^j \rangle_H)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ with functional $\Phi : L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

At last, we show that $\tilde{I}_t = \tilde{d}_t$, which is equivalent to prove that $\det(\bar{\gamma}_{w^{\Delta, v}(t)}) > 0$ for each $t \in (0, T]$. Noticing

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_\alpha w^{\Delta, v}(t_{k+1}) & = \mathcal{D}_\alpha w^{\Delta, v}(t_k) + (1 - \theta) \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v} \Delta + \theta \mathcal{D}b(w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v}) \mathcal{D}_\alpha w_{t_{k+1}}^{\Delta, v} \Delta \\
& \quad + \mathcal{D}\sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}) v(t_k) \Delta + \sigma(w_{t_k}^{\Delta, v}) \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}(\alpha) \Delta,
\end{aligned}$$

the proof of $\det(\bar{\gamma}_{w^{\Delta, v}(t)}) > 0$ is similar to that of Theorem 4.2 and is omitted. Hence the proof of Theorem 5.2 is finished. \square

5.3 Summary and outlook

This chapter investigates the LDP for the θ -EM method of the SFDE. For the SFDE with small noise, under the superlinearly growing drift coefficient condition, we first present

the Freidlin–Wentzell LDP for the θ -EM solution on the infinite time horizon. In fact, the exact solution of the considered equation can also be proved to satisfy the LDP by the approach used in this chapter. Natural questions arise: What is the relation between rate functions for the numerical solution case and the exact solution case? How to apply the result on the LDP of the θ -EM method to solving some problems in statistics, engineering, statistical mechanics, and applied probability?

Another result obtained in this chapter is the logarithmic estimate for the density function of the θ -EM solution provided that drift and diffusion coefficients of the SFDE are smooth and have arbitrary order bounded derivatives. The relation between the logarithmic limit and the rate function of the LDP is given. It would be interesting to further study the logarithmic estimate for the numerical density function for the SFDE with superlinearly growing coefficients.

Bibliography

- [1] Baños, D.R., Di Nunno, G., Haferkorn, H., Proske, F.N.: Stochastic Functional Differential Equations and Sensitivity to Their Initial Path. In: *Computation and Combinatorics in Dynamics, Stochastics and Control, Abel Symp.*, vol. 13, pp. 37–70. Springer, Cham (2018)
- [2] Bally, V., Pardoux, E.: Malliavin calculus for white noise driven parabolic SPDEs. *Potential Anal.* **9**(1), 27–64 (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008686922032>, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008686922032>
- [3] Bally, V., Talay, D.: The law of the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations. II. Convergence rate of the density. *Monte Carlo Methods Appl.* **2**(2), 93–128 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1515/mcma.1996.2.2.93>, <https://doi.org/10.1515/mcma.1996.2.2.93>
- [4] Bao, J., Shao, J., Yuan, C.: Invariant probability measures for path-dependent random diffusions. *Nonlinear Anal.* **228**, Paper No. 113201 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2022.113201>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2022.113201>
- [5] Bao, J., Yin, G., Yuan, C.: *Asymptotic Analysis for Functional Stochastic Differential Equations*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46979-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46979-9>
- [6] Buckwar, E.: One-step approximations for stochastic functional differential equations. *Appl. Numer. Math.* **56**(5), 667–681 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2005.05.001>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2005.05.001>
- [7] Buckwar, E., Shardlow, T.: Weak approximation of stochastic differential delay equations. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **25**(1), 57–86 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drh012>, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drh012>
- [8] Butkovsky, O., Scheutzow, M.: Invariant measures for stochastic functional differential equations. *Electron. J. Probab.* **22**, Paper No. 98 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-EJP122>, <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-EJP122>
- [9] Cao, W., Zhang, Z., Karniadakis, G.E.: Numerical methods for stochastic delay differential equations via the Wong–Zakai approximation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **37**(1), A295–A318 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1137/130942024>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/130942024>
- [10] Cass, T., Friz, P.: Densities for rough differential equations under Hörmander’s condition. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **171**(3), 2115–2141 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2010.171.2115>, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2010.171.2115>
- [11] Chen, C.: A symplectic discontinuous Galerkin full discretization for stochastic Maxwell equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **59**(4), 2197–2217 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1368537>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1368537>

- [12] Chen, C., Chen, Z., Hong, J., Jin, D.: Large deviations principles of sample paths and invariant measures of numerical methods for parabolic SPDEs, arXiv: 2106.11018 (2021)
- [13] Chen, C., Cui, J., Hong, J., Sheng, D.: Accelerated exponential Euler scheme for stochastic heat equation: convergence rate of the density. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.* **43**(2), 1181–1220 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drac011>, <https://doi.org/10.1093/imanum/drac011>
- [14] Chen, C., Dang, T., Hong, J.: An adaptive time-stepping fully discrete scheme for stochastic NLS equation: strong convergence and numerical asymptotics, arXiv: 2212.01988 (2022)
- [15] Chen, C., Dang, T., Hong, J., Song, G.: Probabilistic limit behaviors of numerical discretizations for time-homogeneous Markov processes, arXiv: 2310.08227 (2023)
- [16] Chen, C., Dang, T., Hong, J., Zhou, T.: CLT for approximating ergodic limit of SPDEs via a full discretization. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **157**, 1–41 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2022.11.015>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2022.11.015>
- [17] Chen, C., Hong, J., Lu, Y.: Stochastic differential equation with piecewise continuous arguments: Markov property, invariant measure and numerical approximation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **28**(1), 765–807 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2022098>, <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2022098>
- [18] Chen, C., Hong, J., Jin, D., Sun, L.: Asymptotically-preserving large deviations principles by stochastic symplectic methods for a linear stochastic oscillator. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **59**(1), 32–59 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1306919>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1306919>
- [19] Chen, L., Hu, Y., Nualart, D.: Regularity and strict positivity of densities for the nonlinear stochastic heat equation. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **273**(1340) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1340>, <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1340>
- [20] Clément, E., Kohatsu-Higa, A., Lamberton, D.: A duality approach for the weak approximation of stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **16**(3), 1124–1154 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1214/105051606000000060>, <https://doi.org/10.1214/105051606000000060>
- [21] Conway, J.B.: *A Course in Functional Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 96. Springer-Verlag, New York (1985). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3828-5>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3828-5>
- [22] Cui, J., Hong, J.: Absolute continuity and numerical approximation of stochastic Cahn-Hilliard equation with unbounded noise diffusion. *J. Differential Equations* **269**(11), 10143–10180 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2020.07.007>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2020.07.007>
- [23] Cui, J., Hong, J., Sheng, D.: Density function of numerical solution of splitting AVF scheme for stochastic Langevin equation. *Math. Comp.* **91**(337), 2283–2333 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3752>, <https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3752>

- [24] Da Prato, G., Zabczyk, J.: Ergodicity for Infinite-dimensional Systems, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 229. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511662829>, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511662829>
- [25] Dareiotis, K., Kumar, C., Sabanis, S.: On tamed Euler approximations of SDEs driven by Lévy noise with applications to delay equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **54**(3), 1840–1872 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1137/151004872>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/151004872>
- [26] Dembo, A., Zeitouni, O.: Large Deviations Techniques and Applications, Applications of Mathematics, vol. 38. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edn. (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5320-4>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5320-4>
- [27] Dupuis, P., Ellis, R.S.: A Weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118165904>, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118165904>
- [28] Ferrante, M., Rovira, C., Sanz-Solé, M.: Stochastic delay equations with hereditary drift: estimates of the density. *J. Funct. Anal.* **177**(1), 138–177 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1006/jfan.2000.3631>, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jfan.2000.3631>
- [29] Gao, P., Liu, Y., Sun, Y., Zheng, Z.: Large deviations principle for stationary solutions of stochastic differential equations with multiplicative noise, arXiv: 2206.02356 (2022)
- [30] Guyon, J.: Euler scheme and tempered distributions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **116**(6), 877–904 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2005.11.011>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2005.11.011>
- [31] Hong, J., Jin, D., Sheng, D.: Density convergence of a fully discrete finite difference method for stochastic Cahn–Hilliard equation. *Math. Comp.* (Published electronically: 2023). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3928>
- [32] Hong, J., Jin, D., Sheng, D., Sun, L.: Numerically asymptotical preservation of the large deviations principles for invariant measures of Langevin equations, arXiv: 2009.13336 (2020)
- [33] Hu, Y., Mohammed, S.E.A., Yan, F.: Discrete-time approximations of stochastic delay equations: the Milstein scheme. *Ann. Probab.* **32**(1A), 265–314 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1078415836>, <https://doi.org/10.1214/aop/1078415836>
- [34] Hu, Y., Watanabe, S.: Donsker’s delta functions and approximation of heat kernels by the time discretization methods. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **36**(3), 499–518 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1215/kjm/1250518506>, <https://doi.org/10.1215/kjm/1250518506>
- [35] Hutzenthaler, M., Jentzen, A., Kloeden, P.E.: Strong and weak divergence in finite time of Euler’s method for stochastic differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys.*

- Eng. Sci. **467**(2130), 1563–1576 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2010.0348>, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2010.0348>
- [36] Jiang, J., Lv, X.: Global stability of stationary solutions for a class of semilinear stochastic functional differential equations with additive white noise. *J. Differential Equations* **367**, 890–921 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2023.05.035>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2023.05.035>
- [37] Jin, D., Chen, Z., Zhou, T.: Large deviations principle for stochastic delay differential equations with super-linearly growing coefficients, arXiv: 2201.00143 (2022)
- [38] Jin, D., Sheng, D.: Asymptotics of large deviations of finite difference method for stochastic Cahn–Hilliard equation, arXiv: 2304.11916 (2023)
- [39] Kebaier, A., Kohatsu-Higa, A.: An optimal control variance reduction method for density estimation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **118**(12), 2143–2180 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2008.01.006>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2008.01.006>
- [40] Kitagawa, A., Takeuchi, A.: Asymptotic behavior of densities for stochastic functional differential equations. *Int. J. Stoch. Anal.* p. Art.ID 537023 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/537023>, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/537023>
- [41] Kohatsu-Higa, A.: High order Itô–Taylor approximations to heat kernels. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **37**(1), 129–150 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1215/kjm/1250518401>, <https://doi.org/10.1215/kjm/1250518401>
- [42] Kolmogorov, A.N., Fomin, S.V.: *Elements of the Theory of Functions and Functional Analysis. Vol. 1. Metric and Normed Spaces.* Graylock Press, Rochester, NY, russian edn. (1957)
- [43] Li, X., Mao, X., Song, G.: An explicit approximation for super-linear stochastic functional differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **169**, Paper No. 104275 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2023.104275>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2023.104275>
- [44] Liu, L., Deng, F.: Complete backward Euler numerical scheme for general SFDEs with exponential stability under the polynomial growth condition. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **386**, Paper No. 113242 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2020.113242>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2020.113242>
- [45] Liu, W., Mao, X., Wu, Y.: The backward Euler–Maruyama method for invariant measures of stochastic differential equations with super-linear coefficients. *Appl. Numer. Math.* **184**, 137–150 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2022.09.017>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2022.09.017>
- [46] Luo, Q., Mao, X., Shen, Y.: Generalised theory on asymptotic stability and boundedness of stochastic functional differential equations. *Automatica J. IFAC* **47**(9), 2075–2081 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2011.06.014>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2011.06.014>
- [47] Malliavin, P.: Stochastic calculus of variation and hypoelliptic operators. In: *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Stochastic Differential Equations (Res. Inst. Math. Sci., Kyoto Univ., Kyoto, 1976)*. pp. 195–263. Wiley-Intersci. Publ., John Wiley & Sons, New York-Chichester-Brisbane (1978)

- [48] Mao, X.: Numerical solutions of stochastic functional differential equations. *LMS J. Comput. Math.* **6**, 141–161 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1112/S146115700000425>, <https://doi.org/10.1112/S146115700000425>
- [49] Mao, X.: *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*. Horwood Publishing Limited, Chichester, second edn. (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1533/9780857099402>, <https://doi.org/10.1533/9780857099402>
- [50] Mao, X., Szpruch, L.: Strong convergence rates for backward Euler-Maruyama method for non-linear dissipative-type stochastic differential equations with super-linear diffusion coefficients. *Stochastics* **85**(1), 144–171 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17442508.2011.651213>, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17442508.2011.651213>
- [51] Mohammed, S.E.A.: *Stochastic Functional Differential Equations*, Research Notes in Mathematics, vol. 99. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA (1984)
- [52] Nualart, D.: *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*. Probability and its Applications, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edn. (2006)
- [53] Nualart, D., Quer-Sardanyons, L.: Existence and smoothness of the density for spatially homogeneous SPDEs. *Potential Anal.* **27**(3), 281–299 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11118-007-9055-3>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11118-007-9055-3>
- [54] von Renesse, M.K., Scheutzow, M.: Existence and uniqueness of solutions of stochastic functional differential equations. *Random Oper. Stoch. Equ.* **18**(3), 267–284 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ROSE.2010.015>, <https://doi.org/10.1515/ROSE.2010.015>
- [55] Shaikhet, L.: *Lyapunov Functionals and Stability of Stochastic Functional Differential Equations*. Springer, Cham (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00101-2>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00101-2>
- [56] Shi, B., Wang, Y., Mao, X., Wu, F.: Approximation of invariant measures of a class of backward Euler–Maruyama scheme for stochastic functional differential equations. *J. Differential Equations* **389**, 415–456 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2024.01.025>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2024.01.025>
- [57] Shiryaev, A.N.: *Probability*. “Nauka”, Moscow, second edn. (1989)
- [58] Villani, C.: *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 338. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9>
- [59] Wang, Y., Wu, F., Mao, X.: Stability in distribution of stochastic functional differential equations. *Systems Control Lett.* **132**, 104513 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2019.104513>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2019.104513>

- [60] Wu, F., Yin, G., Mei, H.: Stochastic functional differential equations with infinite delay: existence and uniqueness of solutions, solution maps, Markov properties, and ergodicity. *J. Differential Equations* **262**(3), 1226–1252 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2016.10.006>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2016.10.006>
- [61] Xu, D., Yang, Z., Huang, Y.: Existence-uniqueness and continuation theorems for stochastic functional differential equations. *J. Differential Equations* **245**(6), 1681–1703 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2008.03.029>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2008.03.029>
- [62] Zhou, S.: Exponential stability of numerical solution to neutral stochastic functional differential equation. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **266**, 441–461 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2015.05.041>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2015.05.041>

This figure "lion_large.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2404.08891v1>