Convergence of some random functionals of discretized semimartingales

ASSANE DIOP

Département de Mathématiques, Université Cheikh Anta Diop. B.P. 5005 Dakar-Fann, Dakar, Sénégal.
E-mail: assane.diop.math@gmail.com

In this paper, we study the asymptotic behavior of sums of functions of the increments of a given semi-martingale, taken along a regular grid whose mesh goes to 0. The function of the ith increment may depend on the current time, and also on the past of the semimartingale before this time. We study the convergence in probability of two types of such sums, and we also give associated central limit theorems. This extends known results when the summands are a function depending only on the increments, and this is motivated mainly by statistical applications.

Keywords: contrast functions; limit theorems; power variation; semimartingale

1. Introduction

In many practical situations, one observes a random process X at discrete times and one wants to deduce from these observations, some properties on X. Take for example the specific case of a 1-dimensional diffusion-type process $X = X^\theta$ depending on a real-valued parameter θ, that is:

$$\mathrm{d}X_s = \sigma(\theta, s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s + a(\theta, s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{1.1}$$

where σ and a are (known) predictable functions on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+$, and where W is a Brownian motion. We observe the values of X at times $i\Delta$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n\Delta$, and the aim is to estimate θ. There are two cases: in the first one the observation window is arbitrarily large. In the second case (which is our concern here), the observation window is fixed, and so $\Delta = \Delta_n$ goes to 0 and $T = n\Delta_n$ is fixed.

Most known methods rely upon minimizing some contrast functions, like minus the log-likelihood, and those are typically expressed as "functionals" of the form:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_n\big(\sigma\big(\theta', (i-1)\Delta_n\big), X^\theta_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X^\theta_{i\Delta_n} - X^\theta_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big), \tag{1.2}$$

with g_n possibly depending on n, see, for example, [5]. In other words, the asymptotic behavior (convergence, and if possible associated central limit theorems) of functionals like (1.2) is very important. This is why, for a function $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and a d-dimensional

semimartingale X, we study the asymptotic behavior of the following two sequences of process

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
V^n(f, X)_t = \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\big(\omega, (i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{i\Delta_n} - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big), \\[3mm]
V'^n(f, X)_t = \Delta_n \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\left(\omega, (i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \dfrac{X_{i\Delta_n} - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right),
\end{array}\right\} \tag{1.3}
$$

when $\Delta_n \to 0$. So, providing some basic tools for statistical problems is our main aim in this paper, although we do not study any specific statistical problem.

Another motivation for studying functionals like (1.3) is that they appear naturally in numerical approximations of stochastic differential equations like the Euler scheme or more sophisticated discretization schemes.

Let us now make two comments on the third argument of f in the processes in (1.3), namely $X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$:

1. The functionals (1.3) are not changed if we replace f by $g(\omega, t, x) = f(\omega, t, X_{t-}(\omega), x)$, so apparently one could dispense with the dependency of f upon its third argument. However, we will need some Hölder continuity of $t \mapsto g(\omega, t, x)$ which is *not* satisfied by g defined as just above: so it is more convenient to single out the third argument.
2. One could replace $X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ by $Y_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ for another semimartingale Y, say d'-dimensional. But those apparently more general functionals are like (1.3) with the $(d + d')$-dimensional pair $Z = (Y, X)$ instead of X.

When $f(\omega, s, z, x) \equiv f(x)$ (f is "deterministic"), (1.3) becomes:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
V^n(f, X) = \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\big(X_{i\Delta_n} - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big), \\[3mm]
V'^n(f, X) = \Delta_n \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\left(\dfrac{X_{i\Delta_n} - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right).
\end{array}\right\} \tag{1.4}
$$

If further $f(x) = |x|^r$, the processes $V^n(f, X)$ are known as the *realized power variations*, and of course $V'^n(f, X) = \Delta_n^{1-r/2} V^n(f, X)$.

The convergence of power variations is not new, see, for example, [10] an old paper by Lépingle. Recently, they have been the object of a large number of papers, due to their applications in finance. Those applications are essentially the estimation of the volatility and tests for the presence or absence of jumps.

An early paper is Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard [2], when X is a continuous Itô's semimartingale. Afterwards, many authors studied these type of processes: Mancini [11] studied the case where X is discontinuous with Lévy type jumps, in [6] Jacod studied the general case of a Lévy process, Corcuera, Nualart and Woerner in [3] studied the case of a fractional process, ..., the list is far from exhaustive. The results appear in their most general form for a continuous semimartingale in [1] and a discontinuous one in [7].

To give an idea of the expected results, let us mention that when X is a 1-dimensional Itô's semimartingale with diffusion coefficient σ and when f is continuous and "not too large near infinity" (depending on whether X is continuous or not) we have

$$V'^m(f, X)_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s}(f)\, ds$$

(see, e.g., [1]), where ρ_x is the law of the normal variable $\mathcal{N}(0, x^2)$ and $\rho_x(f)$ is the integral of f with respect to ρ_x.

In [2], Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard give a central limit theorem for $V'^m(f, X)$, using a result of Jacod and Protter about a central limit theorem (or: CLT) for the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations, see [8]. This CLT has been generalized in many papers, like [1] when X is continuous. If X is discontinuous, Jacod (in [7]) gives a CLT when the Blumenthal–Getoor index p of X is smaller than 1, and no CLT is known when $p > 1$.

Concerning $V^n(f, X)$, in the uni-dimensional case, Jacod extends some old results of Lépingle in [10]. In particular, if $f(x) \sim |x|^r$ near the origin and is continuous and X is an arbitrary semimartingale, then

$$V^n(f, X) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} D(f, X), \tag{1.5}$$

with

$$D(f, X)_t = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{s \le t} f(\Delta X_s) & \text{if } r > 2, \quad \text{or} \quad \text{if } r \in (1, 2) \text{ and } \langle X^c, X^c \rangle \equiv 0, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{s \le t} f(\Delta X_s) + \langle X^c, X^c \rangle_t, & \text{if } r = 2, \end{cases}$$

where ΔX_s is the jump of X at time s, and X^c denotes the continuous martingale part of X. Moreover, Jacod gives a central limit theorem for $V^n(f, X)$, first for Lévy processes in [6], second for semimartingales in [7].

The difficulty of the extended setting in the present paper is due to the fact that f is not any more deterministic and depends on all the variables (ω, s, z, x), as we have seen in the statistical problem. We want to know to which extent the earlier results remain valid in this setting, and especially the CLTs. Our concern is to exhibit reasonably general conditions on the test function f which ensure that the previously known results extend. Note also that for the CLT concerning $V'^m(f, X)$, and contrary to the existing literature, we do not always assume that $f(\omega, t, z, x)$ is even in x, although most applications concern the even case. The reader will also observe that in some cases there are additional terms due to the parameter z in $f(\omega, t, z, x)$.

The paper is organized as follows: in Sections 2 and 3 we state the Laws of large numbers and the CLT respectively, and in Sections 4 and 5 we give the proofs.

2. Laws of large numbers

2.1. General notation

The basic process X is a d-dimensional semimartingale on a fixed filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. We denote by $\Delta X_s = X_s - X_{s-}$ the jump of X at time s, and by I the set

$$I = \left\{ r \geq 0: \sum_{s \leq t} \|\Delta X_s\|^r < \infty \text{ a.s. for all } t \right\}.$$

Note that the set I always contains the interval $[2, \infty)$.

The optional and predictable σ-fields on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+$ are denoted by $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{P}$, and if g is a function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^l$ we call it optional (resp., predictable) if it is $\mathcal{O} \otimes \mathcal{R}^l$-measurable (resp., $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{R}^l$-measurable), where $\mathcal{R}^l$ is the Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{R}^l$.

The function f (unless otherwise stated) denotes a function from $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into $\mathbb{R}^q$, for some $q \geq 1$. When $f(\omega, t, z, x)$ admits partial derivatives in z or x, we denote by $\nabla_z f$ or $\nabla_x f$ the corresponding gradients.

If M is a matrix, its transpose is M^t. The set of all $p \times q$ matrices is $\mathcal{M}(p, q)$, and $\mathcal{T}(p, q, r)$ is the set of all $p \times q \times r$-arrays.

For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(d, m)$, we denote by ρ_σ the normal law $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma\sigma^t)$, and by $\rho_\sigma(f(\omega, s, z, \cdot))$ the integral of the function $x \mapsto f(\omega, s, z, x)$ with respect to ρ_σ.

We denote by $\mathcal{B}$ the set of all functions $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ bounded on compact.

A sequence (Z_t^n) of processes is said to converge u.c.p. (for: uniformly on compact sets and in probability) to Z_t, and written $Z^n \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\to} Z$ or $Z_t^n \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\to} Z_t$, if $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s \leq t} \|Z_s^n - Z_s\| > \varepsilon) \to 0$ for all $\varepsilon, t > 0$.

We write $Z^n \overset{\mathcal{L}-(s)}{\to} Z$ or $Z_t^n \overset{\mathcal{L}-(s)}{\to} Z_t$, if the process Z^n converge stably in law to Z, as processes (see [9] for details on the stable convergence).

We gather some important properties of f in the following definition.

Definition 2.1. (a) *We say that f is of (random) polynomial growth if there exist a locally bounded process Γ (meaning: $\sup_{s \leq T_n} \Gamma_s \leq n$ for a sequence T_n of stopping times increasing a.s. to ∞), a function $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$, and a real $p \geq 0$ such that*

$$\|f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \leq \Gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)(1 + \|x\|^p). \tag{2.1}$$

If we want to specify p, we say that f is at most of p-polynomial growth.

(b) *we say that f is locally equicontinuous in x (resp., (z, x)) if for all ω, all $T > 0$, and all compacts $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}'$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, the family of functions $(x \mapsto f(\omega, s, z, x))_{s \leq T, z \in \mathcal{K}'}$ (resp., $((z, x) \mapsto f(\omega, s, z, x))_{s \leq T}$) is equicontinuous on $\mathcal{K}$ (resp., $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}'$).*

2.2. Assumptions

Let us start with the assumptions on X. For $V^n(f, X)$ we only need X to be an arbitrary semimartingale. For $V'^n(f)$ we need X to be an Itô semimartingale and a little more. Recall first that

the property of X to be an Itô semimartingale is equivalent to the following: there are, possibly on an extension of the original probability space, an m-dimensional Brownian motion W (we may always take $m = d$) and a Poisson random measure $\underline{\mu}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ with intensity measure $\underline{v}(ds, dy) = F(dy) ds$ with F is a σ-finite measure on $\mathbb{R}$, such that X can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_t = X_0 &+ \int_0^t b_s \, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_{s-} \, dW_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(\delta(s, y))(\underline{\mu} - \underline{v})(ds, dy) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} h'(\delta(s, y))\underline{\mu}(ds, dy)
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.2}
$$

for suitable "coefficients" b (predictable d-dimensional), σ (optional $d \times m$-dimensional), δ (predictable d-dimensional function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$) and h is a truncation function from $\mathbb{R}^d$ into itself (continuous with compact support, equal to the identity on a neighborhood of 0), and $h'(x) := x - h(x)$.

Then we set:

Hypothesis (N_0). *The process X is an Itô's semimartingale, and its coefficients in* (2.2) *satisfy the following*: b *and* $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 \wedge \|\delta(\omega, s, y)\|^2) F(dy)$ *are locally bounded, and* σ *is càdlàg.*

For the test function f, we introduce the following, where A is an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$:

Hypothesis ($K[A]$). $f(\omega, t, z, x)$ *is continuous in* (z, x) *on* $\mathbb{R}^d \times A$ *and if* $(t_n, z_n, x_n) \to (t, z, x)$ *with* $x \in A$ *and* $t_n < t$, *then* $f(\omega, t_n, z_n, x_n)$ *converges to a limit denoted by* $f(\omega, t-, z, x)$.

2.3. Results

The first two theorems concern the processes $V^n(f)$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let X be an arbitrary semimartingale, and let f satisfies ($K[\mathbb{R}^d]$). Suppose there exists a neighborhood V of 0 on $\mathbb{R}^d$, a real $p > 2$, and for any $K > 0$, a locally bounded process Γ^K such that:*

$$
\|z\| \le K, x \in V \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \le \Gamma_s^K(\omega)\|x\|^p.
\tag{2.3}
$$

Then $V^n(f)$ converges a.s. for the Skorokhod topology to the process

$$
D(f)_t = \sum_{s \le t} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s).
\tag{2.4}
$$

Remark 2.3. This is one of the rare situations where one has almost sure convergence; see Section 3.1 of [4] for some other ones.

Theorem 2.4. *Let X be an arbitrary semimartingale, and let f be optional, satisfying ($K[\mathbb{R}^d]$) and $f(\omega, s, z, 0) = 0$, and be C^2 in x on some neighborhood V of 0. Assume also that*

- *For any $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, the functions $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\omega, s, x, z)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(\omega, s, x, z)$ defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times V$ satisfy $(K[V])$.*
- *There is $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ and a locally bounded process Γ such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(s, z, 0) \right\| + \sum_{k=1}^{d} \left(\sup_{x \in V} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(s, z, x) \right\| \right) \right) \leq \Gamma_s \phi(z).$$

Then $V^n(f)$ converges in probability, in the Skorokhod sense, to the process

$$
D(f)_t = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \int_0^t \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(s-, X_{s-}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}X_s + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{d} \int_0^t \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}(s-, X_{s-}, 0) \, \mathrm{d}\langle X^{j,c}, X^{k,c} \rangle_s
$$
$$
+ \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \left(f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s) - \sum_{j=1}^{d} \Delta X_s^j \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(s-, X_{s-}, 0) \right),
$$

(2.5)

where X^c is the continuous martingale part of X.

The two versions (2.4) and (2.5) of $D(f)$ agree when f satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2, so Theorem 2.4 extends Theorem 2.2 and gives the results in a more complete form. This result was not known even in the case where f only depends on x.

Remark 2.5. Both theorems remain valid if the discretization grid is not regular, provided the successive discretization times are stopping times and the mesh goes to 0 (see Sections 3.5 and 4.5 of [4] for results of this type).

Now we state the result about $V'^n(f)$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let f be optional, satisfying $(K[\mathbb{R}^d])$, be locally equicontinuous in x and with p-polynomial growth. Assume further that one of the following two conditions is satisfied:*

1. *X satisfies (N_0) and $p < 2$.*
2. *X satisfies (N_0) and is continuous.*

Then

$$V'^n(f) \xrightarrow{u.c.p.} \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_{s-}}(f(s-, X_{s-}, \cdot)) \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

(2.6)

Remark 2.7. Comparing with [1] or [7], we see that there is no additional term due to the third argument z in $f(\omega, s, z, x)$.

In the discontinuous case (1 of Theorem 2.6), the condition $p < 2$ simplifies the computations but is not optimal. The result remains true valid if there exist $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that:

$$\phi'(x) \to 0, \quad \text{when } \|x\| \to \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \|f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \leq \Gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)\|x\|^2 \phi'(x).$$

2.4. Some examples

Statisticians recognize it, do not wait for this article to investigate in specific cases the convergence of the types of function studied here. Let us give some examples (the list is far from exhaustive).

1. Consider the following stochastic differential equation: $dZ_t = \phi(Z_t) \, dX_t$, where X is a Levy process, and ϕ is such that this equation has a nonexploding solution. The associated Euler scheme is written as follows:

$$Z_0^n = z; \qquad Z_{i\Delta_n}^n - Z_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^n = \phi\big(Z_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^n\big)\Delta_i^n X,$$

hence the last quantity is of the form $f(Z_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^n, \Delta_i^n X)$, where $f(\omega, s, z, x) = \phi(z)x$ (even if Z depends on n here).

   If we take the more general case where:

$$f(\omega, s, z, x) = \gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)g(x), \tag{2.7}$$

where γ is an adapted, càdlàg process, ϕ and g are continuous functions.

   (a) We can then apply Theorem 2.2 as soon as $g(x) = O(\|x\|^p)$ where $p > 2$, in a neighborhood of 0.
   (b) We can apply Theorem 2.4 if $g(0) = 0$ and g is C^2 in a neighborhood of 0.
   (c) At last, we can apply Theorem 2.6 if $\|g(x)\| \leq C(1 + \|x\|^p)$, with $p < 2$ if X is discontinuous.

2. Let us take now the example of the following model, studied in [5]:

$$dX_t^\theta = a(t, X_t) \, dt + \sigma(\theta, t, X_t) \, dW_t, \tag{2.8}$$

where a is a function: $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\sigma : \Theta \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to R^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$, and where Θ is a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^q$, and at last W is a m-dimensional Brownian motion.

   The goal is to estimate the unknown parameter θ from the observations: $X_{i\Delta_n}, i = 0, 1, \ldots, [t/\Delta_n]$.

   We suppose the hypothesis (H1) of [5] satisfied, which in particular implies that (2.8) has a unique weak solution (taken on the canonical space) that we denote by $\mathbb{P}^\theta$.

   Define

$$c(\theta, s, x) := \sigma(\theta, s, z)\sigma(\theta, s, z)^t, \tag{2.9}$$

and if $\mathcal{S}_d^+$ denote the set of all symmetric nonnegative $d \times d$ matrix, we set $\mathcal{S} := \{G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+, \det G \neq 0\}$. Clearly $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{R}^\star} \mathcal{S}_l$, where $\mathcal{S}_l = \{G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+, \|G\| \leq l, \frac{1}{l} \leq \det G \leq l\}$. Assume further that

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} \mathbb{P}^\theta\big(c(\theta', t, X_t) \in \mathcal{S}_l, \forall \theta', t\big) = 1$$

for all θ, then for each θ, the function

$$f^\theta(s, z, x) = \log(\det c(\theta, s, z)) + x^t \sigma(\theta, s, z)\sigma(\theta, s, z)^t x \tag{2.10}$$

(see [5] for details on the choice of this function), satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 2.6. In particular,

$$V'^n(f^{\theta'}) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} U(\theta, \theta')$$

under $\mathbb{P}^\theta$, where

$$U(\theta, \theta')_t = \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma(\theta, s, X_s^\theta)}(f^{\theta'}(s, X_s^\theta, \cdot)) \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Moreover, the convergence takes place uniformly in θ' here (because of Hypothesis 1 in [5]).

If further we have an identifiability hypothesis of the model (see (H4) of [5]), then the minimum contrast estimator $\theta^n := \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta'} V'^n(f^{\theta'})$ (where argmin is the argument of the minimum and which exists because the application $\theta' \to V'^n(f^{\theta'})$ is continuous on the compact Θ) converges in probability under $\mathbb{P}^\theta$ to θ. Hence, the consistency of the estimator.

3. Central limit theorems

In the framework of the CLT, one needs some additional assumptions both on X and on f, which depend on the problem at hand.

3.1. Assumptions on X

Hypothesis (N_1). (N_0) *is satisfied, and there exist a sequence* (S_k) *of stopping times increasing to ∞ and deterministic Borel functions* (γ_k) *such that*:

$$\|\delta(\omega, s, y)\| \le \gamma_k(y) \qquad \text{if } s \le S_k(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(1 \wedge \gamma_k(y)^2\right) F(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty.$$

The next assumption depends on a real $s \in [0, 2]$:

Hypothesis $(N_2(s))$. (N_1) *is satisfied, the mapping* $t \mapsto \delta(\omega, t, y)$ *is càglàd, and* $\int_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \wedge \gamma_k(y)^s) F(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty$. *Moreover, the process σ in (2.2) satisfies*:

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0 + \int_0^t \widetilde{b}_u \, \mathrm{d}u + \int_0^t \widetilde{\sigma}_u \, \mathrm{d}W_u + M_t + \sum_{u \le t} \Delta\sigma_u 1_{\{\|\Delta\sigma_u\| \ge 1\}}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

- $\widetilde{b}$ *is predictable and locally bounded.*
- $\widetilde{\sigma}$ *is càdlàg, adapted with values in* $\mathcal{T}(d, m, m)$.
- M *is an* $\mathcal{M}(d, m)$-*valued local martingale, orthogonal to W and satisfying* $\|\Delta M_t\| \le 1$ *for all t. Its predictable quadratic covariation is* $\langle M, M \rangle_t = \int_0^t a_u \, \mathrm{d}u$, *where a is locally bounded.*

- *The predictable compensator of $\sum_{u \leq t} 1_{\{\|\Delta\sigma_u\| \geq 1\}}$ is $\int_0^t \widetilde{a}_u \, \mathrm{d}u$, where $\widetilde{a}$ is locally bounded.*

Clearly, $(N_2(s)) \Rightarrow (N_2(s'))$, if $s < s'$.

Remark 3.1. It is well known that the assumptions on σ in $(N_2(s))$ may be replaced by the following one (up to modifying the Poisson measure $\underline{\mu}$):

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0 + \int_0^t \widetilde{b}_u \, \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \widetilde{\sigma}_u \, \mathrm{d}W_u + \int_0^t \widetilde{v}_u \, \mathrm{d}V_s + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^t k(\widetilde{\delta}(u, y)) \star (\underline{\mu} - \underline{v})(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y)$$

$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^t k'(\widetilde{\delta}(u, y)) \star \underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\widetilde{b}$ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ are like in $(N_2(s))$ and

- *V is a l-dimensional Brownian motion independent of W.*
- *$\widetilde{v}$ takes its values in $\mathcal{T}(d, m, l)$, is progressively measurable and locally bounded.*
- *$k(x)$ is a truncation function on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$ and $k'(x) := x - k(x)$.*
- *$\widetilde{\delta} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{M}(d, m)$ is predictable and is such that: $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 \wedge \|\widetilde{\delta}(u, y)\|^2) F(\mathrm{d}y)$ is locally bounded.*

Of course, $a, \widetilde{a}, \widetilde{v}$ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ are related, for example if $k(x) = x 1_{\{\|x\| < 1\}}$, one has $\widetilde{v}_u^2 + \int_{\{\|\widetilde{\delta}(u, y)\| \leq 1\}} \widetilde{\delta}^2(u, y) F(\mathrm{d}y) = a_u^2$ and $\widetilde{a}_u = \int_{\{\|\widetilde{\delta}(u, y)\| > 1\}} F(\mathrm{d}y)$.

3.2. Assumptions on the test function f

Hypothesis (M_1)**.** *f is optional and there exists a neighborhood V of 0 such that $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ is C^1 in (z, x), the functions $\nabla_x f$, $\nabla_z f$ are C^1 in x on V, and*

$$f(\omega, s, z, 0) = \nabla_x f(\omega, s, z, 0) \equiv 0.$$

Moreover, there are a locally bounded process Γ, a real $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$, and some functions ϕ, ε and θ belonging to $\mathcal{B}$, with $\varepsilon(x) \to 0$ as $\|x\| \to 0$ and $\theta(x) \leq \|x\|^2$ in the neighborhood of 0, such that:

$$\sum_{j, j'=1}^d \left(\left\| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}(\omega, s, z, x) \right\| + \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \, \partial z_{j'}}(\omega, s, z, x) \right\| \right) \leq \Gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)\|x\|\varepsilon(x),$$

and for all $T > 0$ and $s, t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|f(\omega, t, z, x) - f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \leq \Gamma_T(\omega)\phi(z)|t - s|^\alpha \theta(x). \tag{3.3}$$

Hypothesis (M_2)**.** *$f(\omega, t, z, x)$ is optional, C^1 in (z, x), with $\nabla_x f$ and $\nabla_z f$ of (random) polynomial growth and locally equicontinuous in (z, x), and there are Γ, ϕ, α as in (M_1) and some $p > 0$ such that for all $T > 0$ and $s, t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\|f(\omega, s, z, x) - f(\omega, t, z, x)\| \leq \Gamma_T(\omega)\phi(z)|t - s|^\alpha (1 + \|x\|^p). \tag{3.4}$$

Hypothesis (M_2'). (M_2) *is satisfied and moreover*

$$\|f(\omega, s, z, x)\| + \|\nabla_x f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \leq \phi(z)\Gamma_s(\omega).$$

Remark 3.2. The previous assumptions are fulfilled by most of the test functions used in statistic. For illustration, let us come back to the examples of Section 2.4.

(a) If f is written as in (2.7) where, γ is adapted and Hölderian in s with index $\alpha > 1/2$, where the function ϕ is C^1, while g is C^2 and satisfies $g(0) = \nabla_x g(0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_j^2}(x) = o(\|x\|)$ when $x \to 0$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, d$. Then (M_1) is satisfied.

(b) If now f satisfies the same conditions as in (a), except we just need here the function g to be C^1 and $\nabla_x g$ to be at polynomial growth. Then f satisfies (M_2).

(c) Under the hypothesis of example (3) of Section 2.4, if further c defined in (2.9) takes its values in $\mathcal{S}^l$ for some real $l > 0$, then for each θ, the function f^θ defined in (2.10) satisfies (M_2).

3.3. The results

In order to define the limiting processes, we need to expand the original space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$, what we do as follows:

Consider an auxiliary space $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$, which supports a q-dimensional Brownian motion $\overline{W}$ and some sequences $\{(U_p^k)_{1 \leq k \leq m}; (U_p'^k)_{1 \leq k \leq m}; (\kappa_p)\}_{p \geq 1}$ of random variables, where the U_p^k and $U_p'^k$ are normal $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and the (κ_p) are uniform on $(0, 1)$. We suppose all these variables and processes mutually independent.

Now set:

$$\widetilde{\Omega} = \Omega \times \Omega', \qquad \widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}', \qquad \widetilde{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'.$$

We then extend the variables and processes defined on Ω or Ω' on the space $\widetilde{\Omega}$, in the usual way.

Let (T_p) be an arbitrary sequence of stopping times exhausting the jumps of X (meaning: they are stopping times such that for all (ω, s) with $\Delta X_s(\omega) \neq 0$, there exists a unique p such that $T_p(\omega) = s$). We define on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ the filtration $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ which is the smallest one satisfying the following conditions:

- $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ is right continuous, and $\mathcal{F}_t \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$,
- $\overline{W}$ is adapted on $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$,
- the variables U_p^k, $U_p'^k$ and κ_p are $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{T_p}$ measurable.

Now we are ready to give the results. We start with $V^n(f)$:

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that X satisfies (N_1) and f satisfies (M_1), then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\left(V^n(f) - D(f)_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} F_t,$$

where the process F is

$$F_t = \sum_{p:T_p \le t} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left(\left(\sqrt{\kappa_p} \sigma_{T_p-}^{j,k} U_p^k + \sqrt{1-\kappa_p} \sigma_{T_p}^{j,k} U_p'^k \right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} (T_p-, X_{T_p-}, \Delta X_{T_p}) \right.$$

$$\left. - \sqrt{\kappa_p} \sigma_{T_p-}^{j,k} U_p^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j} (T_p-, X_{T_p-}, \Delta X_{T_p}) \right). \tag{3.5}$$

Remark 3.4. The last term in (3.5) is due to the third argument of f, and does not appear in [7]. One could show that the theorem remains valid if, in the formula (3.3), $\theta(x) \le \|x\|^p$ near the origin for some $p \in [0, 2] \cap I$.

It is useful to give some properties of the process F above. For this, under (M_1) and (N_1), one defines an $\mathcal{M}(q, q)$-valued process $C(f)$ as follows:

$$C(f)_t = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p:T_p \le t} \sum_{j,j'=1}^{d} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left\{ (\sigma_{T_p-}^{j,k} \sigma_{T_p-}^{j',k} + \sigma_{T_p}^{j,k} \sigma_{T_p}^{j',k}) \right.$$

$$\times \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{j'}} \right)^t \circ (T_p-, X_{T_p-}, \Delta X_{T_p})$$

$$- \sigma_{T_p-}^{j,k} \sigma_{T_p-}^{j',k} \left(\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{j'}} \right)^t + \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_{j'}} \right)^t \right) \tag{3.6}$$

$$\circ (T_p-, X_{T_p-}, \Delta X_{T_p})$$

$$\left. + \sigma_{T_p-}^{j,k} \sigma_{T_p-}^{j',k} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j} \right) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_{j'}} \right)^t \circ (T_p-, X_{T_p-}, \Delta X_{T_p}) \right\}.$$

The following lemma is given without proof, since it is an immediate generalization of Lemma 5.10 of [7].

Lemma 3.5. *If (M_1) and (N_1) are satisfied, then $C(f)$ is well defined and F is a semimartingale on the extended space $(\widetilde{\Omega}, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$. If further $C(f)$ is locally integrable, then F is a locally square-integrable martingale.*

Conditionally on $\mathcal{F}$, the process F is a square integrable centered martingale with independent increments, its conditional variance is $C(f)_t = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\{F_t^2 | \mathcal{F}\}$, its law is completely characterized by X and $\sigma\sigma^t$ and does not depend on the choice of the sequence (T_p).

Now we turn to $V^m(f)$. Under (M_2) or $(M_3(r))$, one defines a process a taking its value in $\mathcal{M}(q, q)$ and satisfying for any $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$:

$$\sum_{l=1}^{q} a_t^{j,l} a_t^{l,k} = \rho_{\sigma_t}((f^j f^k)(t, X_t, \cdot)) - \rho_{\sigma_t}(f^j(t, X_t, \cdot)) \rho_{\sigma_t}(f^k(t, X_t, \cdot)). \tag{3.7}$$

The process a, which may be chosen $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-adapted, is the square-root of the symmetric semi-definite positive element of $\mathcal{M}(m, m)$ whose components are given by the right side of (3.7).

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ even in x, and assume that one of the following hypotheses is satisfied*:

- *X is continuous and satisfies $(N_2(2))$ and f satisfies (M_2).*
- *one has $(N_2(s))$ for some $s \leq 1$ and (M_2').*

Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(V'^n(f)_t - \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s} f(s, X_s, \cdot) \, ds \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-(s)} L(f)_t,$$

where

$$L(f)_t = \int_0^t a_s \, d\overline{W}_s. \tag{3.8}$$

Remark 3.7. Some times, one wants to apply the theorem for functions of the type $f(\omega, s, z, x) = g(\omega, s, z)\|x\|^r$, which are not any more C^1 in x on $\mathbb{R}^d$ when $r \in (0, 1]$. Specifically, consider the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis $(M_3(r))$. $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ *is optional and there is a closed subset B of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with Lebesgue measure 0 such that the application $x \to f(\omega, t, z, x)$ is C^1 on B^c. Moreover, there are $p \geq 0$ and α, ϕ and Γ as in (M_1) such that for all $T > 0$ and $s, t \in [0, T]$,*

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \|f(\omega, s, z, x_1 + x_2) - f(\omega, s, z, x_1)\| &\leq \Gamma_T(\omega)\phi(z)(1 + \|x_1\|^p)\|x_2\|^r, \\ \|f(\omega, s, z, x) - f(\omega, t, z, x)\| &\leq \Gamma_T(\omega)\phi(z)|t - s|^\alpha (1 + \|x\|^p). \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{3.9}$$

Moreover,

- *if $r = 1$ then $\nabla_x f$ defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \times B^c$ is locally equicontinuous in (z, x) and is at most with polynomial growth.*
- *if $r \neq 1$, then for any element $C \in \mathcal{M}(d, d)$ which is positive definite and any $\mathcal{N}(0, C)$-random vector U, the distance from U to B has a density ψ_C on $\mathbb{R}_+$, satisfying $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+, \|C\| + \|C^{-1}\| < K} \psi_C(x) < \infty$ for all $K < \infty$. For any $x_1 \in B^c$,*

$$\|\nabla_x f(\omega, s, z, x_1)\| \leq \frac{\Gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)(1 + \|x_1\|^p)}{d(x_1, B)^{1-r}}, \tag{3.10}$$

and if $\|x_2\| < \frac{d(x_1, B)}{2}$, we have

$$\|\nabla_x f(\omega, s, z, x_1 + x_2) - \nabla_x f(\omega, s, z, x_1)\| \leq \frac{\Gamma_s(\omega)\phi(z)(1 + \|x_1\|^p)\|x_2\|}{d(x_1, B)^{2-r}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Then we can show that the results of Theorem 3.6 remain valid if f satisfies $(M_3(r))$ for some $r \in (0, 1]$ and X satisfies $(N_2(2))$ with $\sigma\sigma^t$ everywhere invertible, if further one of the following condition is satisfied:

- f satisfies $(M_3(r))$ and X is continuous,
- f satisfies $(M_3(r))$ and the real p in (3.9), (3.10) and (3.11) is always equal 0, while X satisfies $(N_2(s))$ and either $s \in [0, \frac{2}{3})$ and $r \in (0, 1)$ or $s \in (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$ and $r \in (\frac{1-\sqrt{3s^2-8s+5}}{2-s}, 1)$.

Our next objective is to generalize the CLT for $V'^n(f)$ in the case where f is not even. For this, we need some additional notation.

Let U be an $\mathcal{N}(0, Id_m)$ random vector, where Id_m is the identity matrix of order m (recall that m is the dimension of the Brownian motion W in $(N_2(s))$). We then denote by ρ', the law of U and by $\rho'(g_1(\cdot))$ the integral of any function $g_1 : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^q$ with respect to ρ' if it exists. If now $g_2 : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^q$ and $x \in \mathcal{M}(d, m)$, we set: $\rho'(g_2(x\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}\{g_2(xU)\}$.

For any $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, we define the projection P_j on $\mathbb{R}^m$ by:

$$P_j(u) := u_j \qquad \text{if } u = (u_1, \ldots, u_m).$$

Under (M_2), we define $w(1)$ and $w(2)$, two adapted processes taking their values respectively in the spaces $\mathcal{M}(q, m)$ and $\mathcal{M}(q, q)$, and such that for all $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$ and $j' \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ we have

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
w(1)_s^{j,j'} &= \rho'(f^j(s, X_s, \sigma_{s\cdot}) P_{j'}(\cdot)), \\
\sum_{l=1}^q w(2)_t^{j,l} w(2)_t^{l,k} &= \rho'((f^j f^k)(s, X_s, \sigma_{s\cdot})) \\
&\quad - \rho'(f^j(s, X_s, \sigma_{s\cdot}))\rho'(f^k(s, X_s, \sigma_{s\cdot})) - \sum_{l'=1}^m w(1)_t^{j,l'} w(1)_t^{l',k}.
\end{aligned}\right\} \quad (3.12)$$

The process $w(2)$ is the square-root of the matrix whose components are given by the right side of the second equality in (3.12). Finally, under $(N_2(2))$ set

$$b' = b - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(\delta(s, y)) F(dy). \qquad (3.13)$$

Theorem 3.8. *Assume either one of the following two assumptions*:

- *X satisfies $(N_2(2))$ and is continuous and f satisfies (M_2).*
- *We have $(N_2(s))$ for some $s \le 1$ and f satisfies (M_2').*

If further $b' \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{\sigma} \equiv 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\left(V'^n(f)_t - \int_0^t \rho' f(s, X_s, \sigma_{s\cdot}) \, ds\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-(s)} L(f)_t,$$

where

$$L(f)_t := \int_0^t w(1)_s \, dW_s + \int_0^t w(2)_s \, d\overline{W}_s. \qquad (3.14)$$

Remark 3.9. Clearly, when f is even in x, the two versions of the process $L(f)$ in Theorems 3.6 and 3.8, agree. If X satisfies $(N_2(s))$ with $s \leq 1$, the hypotheses $b' = 0$ and $\widetilde{\sigma} = 0$ yield that X has the form:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \sigma_s \, dW_s + \sum_{s \leq t} \Delta X_s. \tag{3.15}$$

4. Proof of the laws of large numbers

4.1. Theorems 2.2 and 2.4

We start by stating two important lemmas, without proof. The first one is a (trivial) extension of what is done in Section 3.1 of [7], and the Hypothesis $(K[\mathbb{R}])$ plays a crucial role. The second one is a generalization of Itô's formula, and its proof can be found for example in [4] (see Lemma 3.4.2).

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be an arbitrary semimartingale, and f be a function satisfying $(K[\mathbb{R}])$ and such that $f(s, z, x) = 0$ if $\|x\| \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Then*

$$V^n(f)_t - \sum_{s \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s)$$

converges in variation to 0 when $n \to \infty$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be a semimartingale and $f(\omega, u, z, x)$ be an optional function, C^2 in x. Then for any u, for almost all ω and for any $t \geq u$, one has:*

$$f(u, X_u, X_t) = f(u, X_u, X_u) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{u+}^t \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(u, X_u, X_{s-}) \, dX_s$$

$$+ \sum_{j,j'=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \int_{u+}^t \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}(u, X_u, X_{s-}) \, d\langle X^{j,c}, X^{j',c}\rangle_s$$

$$+ \sum_{u < s \leq t} \left(f(u, X_u, X_s) - f(u, X_u, X_{s-}) - \sum_{j=1}^d \Delta X_s^j \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(u, X_u, X_{s-}) \right).$$

Now we are ready to prove the two theorems about $V^n(f)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We have:

$$V^n(f)_t = Z^n(f)_t + \sum_{s \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s),$$

where

$$Z^n(f)_t = \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \Delta_i^n X\big) - \sum_{s \le [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s). \tag{4.1}$$

It is well known that

$$\sum_{s \le [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s) \longrightarrow \sum_{s \le t} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s)$$

for the Skorokhod Topology. Thus, in order to prove the theorem, it is sufficient to prove that the processes $Z^n(f)$ converge for the Skorokhod Topology to 0. We go to show something stronger, that is $Z^n(f)$ converge uniformly on compact sets to 0.

We suppose first that $\|X_t\| \le C$ identically for some constant C. According to Theorem 4 of [10], one has:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} |\Delta_i^n X^j|^p + \big|X_t^j - X_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}^j\big|^p \longrightarrow \sum_{s \le t} |\Delta X_s^j|^p \qquad \text{a.s.}$$

for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$, where X^j is the jth component of X and $\Delta_i^n X^j$, the increment $X_{i\Delta_n}^j - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^j$.

Since the mappings $t \mapsto \sum_{s \le t} |\Delta X_s^j|$ and $t \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} |\Delta_i^n X^j|^p$ are increasing, we deduce that for almost all ω and for any real $t > 0$,

$$\limsup_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \|\Delta_i^n X\|^p \le d^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{s \le t} |\Delta X_s^j|^p. \tag{4.2}$$

Let now $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C^∞ function such that $1_{[-1,1]}(y) \le \psi(y) \le 1_{[-2,2]}(y)$. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we set:

$$\psi_\varepsilon(y) = \begin{cases} \psi\left(\dfrac{y}{\varepsilon}\right), & \text{if } \varepsilon < \infty, \\ 1, & \text{if } \varepsilon = \infty, \end{cases} \qquad \Psi_\varepsilon(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \psi_\varepsilon(x_j), \tag{4.3}$$

then

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \|x\| \le \varepsilon, \\ 0, & \text{if } \|x\| > 2d\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Next

$$Z^n(f) = Z^n(f\Psi_\varepsilon) + Z^n\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big), \tag{4.4}$$

hence

$$\limsup_n \sup_{t \le T} \|Z^n(f)_t\| \le \limsup_n \sup_{t \le T} \|Z^n(f\Psi_\varepsilon)_t\| + \limsup_n \sup_{t \le T} \big\|Z^n\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big)_t\big\| \tag{4.5}$$

for any $T > 0$. By Lemma 4.1, one has

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_n \sup_{t \le T} \left\| Z^n \left(f (1 - \Psi_\varepsilon) \right)_t \right\| = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Otherwise by (2.3), (4.2) and since $\|X\| \le C$, one has if $q \in (2, p)$ and ε small enough:

$$\limsup_n \sup_{s \le t} \| Z^n (f \Psi_\varepsilon)_t \|$$

$$\le \limsup_n (2d\varepsilon)^{p-q} \Gamma_t^{2C} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \| \Delta_i^n X \|^q + \sum_{s \le t} \| \Delta X_s \|^q \right)$$

$$\le 2d^{p-1} (2d\varepsilon)^{p-q} \Gamma_t^{2C} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{s \le t} |\Delta X_s^j|^q.$$

Since $\sum_{s \le t} |\Delta X_s^j|^q < \infty$, by letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we conclude

$$\limsup_n \sup_{s \le t} \| Z^n (f \Psi_\varepsilon)_s \| = 0,$$

which ends the proof in the case where X is bounded.

The general case is deduced by a classical method of "localization," for which we refer to Section 3 of [1] for details. $\qquad \square$

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We use the previous notation, with $Z^n(f)$ as in (4.1) and $D(f)$ as in (2.5). Since (2.4) and (2.5) give the same process $D(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon))$, we still have (4.6). This, combined with the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.2 implies that it is enough here to prove the following:

$$Z^n (f \Psi_\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Set $f_\varepsilon := f \Psi_\varepsilon$. By the hypotheses on f, the function f_ε is C^2 in x as soon as ε small enough. We then apply Lemma 4.2 to each $f_\varepsilon((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \Delta_i^n X)$, which gives $Z^n(f_\varepsilon)_t = \sum_{l=1}^3 Z^n(f_\varepsilon, l)_t$, where with the notation $Y_s^n = X_s - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ and $\phi^n(s) := (i-1)\Delta_n$ for $s \in ((i-1)\Delta_n, i\Delta_n]$, we have

$$Z^n(f_\varepsilon, 1)_t = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \left(\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j} \left(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_s^n \right) - \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j} (s-, X_{s-}, 0) \right) dX_s^j,$$

$$Z^n(f_\varepsilon, 2)_t = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j \partial x^k} \left(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_s^n \right) \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j \partial x^k} (s-, Z_{s-}, 0) \right) d\langle X^{c,j}, X^{c,k} \rangle_s,$$

$$Z^n(f, 3)_t = \sum_{s \le t} \Bigg(f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_s^n\big) - f_\varepsilon(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s) - f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^{d} \Delta X_s^j \bigg(\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) - \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}(s-, X_{s-}, 0) \bigg) \Bigg).$$

Observe now that $\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}(\phi^n(s), Z_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n) \to \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}(s-, Z_{s-}, 0)$ when $n \to \infty$. Since $\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}$ is dominated by a locally bounded processes, Lebesgue's theorem gives:

$$Z^n(f_\varepsilon, 1) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\to} 0.$$

The proof of $Z^n(f_\varepsilon, j) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\to} 0$ for $j = 2, 3$ is similar, and we thus have (4.7).   □

4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.6

Let us start by strengthening the hypothesis (N_0):

Hypothesis (LN_0). (N_0) is satisfied, and the processes $b_s, \sigma_s, \int_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \wedge \|\delta(\omega, s, y)\|^2)F(dy)$ and X_s are bounded by a constant.

We also suppose that the process Γ which intervenes in (2.1) is uniformly bounded. Below, we denote all constants by K. Set

$$\beta_i^n = \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \frac{\Delta_i^n W}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}. \tag{4.8}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose* (LN_0) *satisfied and* f *optional, satisfying* $(K[\mathbb{R}])$ *and at most with polynomial growth. Then*

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} E\big\{ f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \big\} \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} \int_0^t H_{s-}\, ds, \tag{4.9}$$

when $n \to \infty$, *where* $H_s = \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))$.

Proof. The left side of (4.9) is almost surely equal to $\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} H_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$. This is a Riemann sum which therefore converges to $\int_0^t H_{s-}\, ds$ locally uniformly in t, because H is a càdlàg process.   □

Lemma 4.4. *Let* f *be optional, locally equicontinuous in* x *and with at most* p-*polynomial growth. Assume further that* X *satisfies* (LN_0) *and either is continuous or* $p < 2$. *Then*

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} E\bigg(\bigg\| f\bigg((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\bigg) - f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) \bigg\| \bigg) \to 0.$$

Proof. We reproduce the proof of Lemma 4.4(2) of [4] with some relevant changes. For any $A, T, \varepsilon > 0$, we define the variables

$$G_T(\varepsilon, A) = \sup_{s \leq T; \|x\| \leq A; \|z\| \leq K; \|y\| \leq \varepsilon} \|f(s, z, x + y) - f(s, z, x)\|,$$

$$\zeta_i^n = \left\| f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right) \right\|.$$

Then

$$\|\zeta_i^n\| \leq G_t(\varepsilon, A) + \|\zeta_i^n\| \left(1_{\{\|\beta_i^n\| > A\}} + 1_{\{\|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\| > \varepsilon\}}\right). \tag{4.10}$$

Let q be a real such that $q > p$ if X is continuous and $q = 2$ if not. Then (2.1) (with Γ a constant here) yields, for all $B > 1$:

$$\|f(\omega, s, z, x)\| \leq K\phi(z)(B^{p-q}\|x\|^q + B^p).$$

Also under (LN_0) one knows that:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\right\|^q + \|\beta_i^n\|^q\right\} \leq K.$$

Hence, by (4.10):

$$\|\zeta_i^n\| \leq G_t(\varepsilon, A) + K B^p \left(1_{\{\|\beta_i^n\| > A\}} + 1_{\{\|\Delta X_i^n / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\| > \varepsilon\}}\right)$$
$$+ K B^{p-q}\left(\|\beta_i^n\|^q + \left\|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\right\|^q\right).$$

It follows that

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\{\|\zeta_i^n\|\} \leq t\left(\mathbb{E}\{G_t(\varepsilon, A)\} + \frac{K B^p}{A} + K B^{p-q}\right)$$
$$+ K B^p \varepsilon^{-2} \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\left\{1 \wedge \left\|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\right\|^2\right\}. \tag{4.11}$$

Next by Lemma 4-1 of [7]

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\left\{1 \wedge \left\|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\right\|^2\right\} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Then coming back to (4.11) and letting successively $n \to \infty$, $\varepsilon \to 0$, $A \to \infty$ and $B \to \infty$, we obtain the result. □

Proof of Theorem 2.6. We first prove the theorem under the stronger assumptions (LN_0) and Γ_t in (2.1) bounded. Set

$$U_t'^n := \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s-, X_s, \cdot))\, ds.$$

Then $U_t'^n = \sum_{j=1}^3 U_t'^n(j)$, where

$$U_t'^n(1) = \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left(f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)\right),$$

$$U_t'^n(2) = \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \big(f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)$$
$$- \mathbb{E}\big\{ f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\}\big),$$

$$U_t'^n(3) = \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{ f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} - \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s-, X_s, \cdot))\, ds.$$

Observe first that $U_t'^n(2)$ is a martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n})_{t\geq 0}$, and its predictable quadratic variation is given by:

$$\langle U'^n(2)\rangle_t = \Delta_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \big(\mathbb{E}\big\{ f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)^2|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\}$$
$$- \big(\mathbb{E}\big\{ f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\}\big)^2\big),$$

which satisfies $\langle U'^n(2)\rangle_t \leq K t \Delta_n$. It follows by Doob's inequality, that $U_t'^n(2) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\to} 0$. We have the same results for $U_t'^n(1)$ and $U_t'^n(3)$, respectively, by Lemmas 4.4 and 4.3.

At this stage, the theorem is proved under the stronger assumptions announced at the beginning of the proof, and as said in Theorem 2.2, the general case ensues by a classical localization method. $\qquad\square$

5. Proof of the central limit theorems

5.1. Proof of Theorem 3.3

We start again by strengthening our hypotheses:

Hypothesis (LN_1)***.*** (N_1) *is satisfied, and the processes* b, σ *and* X *are bounded. The functions* $\gamma_k = \gamma$ *do not depend on* k *and are bounded.*

Hypothesis (LM_1). *We have (M_1) and the process Γ is bounded.*

Under (LN_1), we have:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b_s' \, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s \, dW_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta(s, y)(\underline{\mu} - \underline{v})(ds, dy), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$b_s' := b_s + \int_{\mathbb{R}} h'(\delta(s, y)) F(dy). \tag{5.2}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, set:

$$E = \{y \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma(y) > \varepsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_t = 1_E \star \underline{\mu}_t, \tag{5.3}$$

and let $T_1', \ldots, T_p', \cdots$ be the successive jump times of N.

We state two important lemmas, the first of which is due to Jacod and Protter (Lemma 5.6 of [8]), and the second one is Lemma 5.9 of [7].

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose (LN_1) satisfied, and for each T_p', denote by i_p^n the integer such that $(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n < T_p' \le i_p^n \Delta_n$. Then the sequence of random variables*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(\sigma_{(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n} \left(W_{T_p'} - W_{(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n} \right), \sigma_{T_p'} (W_{i_p^n \Delta_n} - W_{T_p'}) \right)_{p \ge 1}$$

converges stably in law to

$$\left(\sqrt{\kappa_p} \sigma_{T_p'^-} U_p, \sqrt{1 - \kappa_p} \sigma_{T_p'} U_p' \right)_{p \ge 1},$$

where U_p is such that $U_p^t = (U_p^1, \ldots, U_p^m)$ and $U_p'^t = (U_p'^1, \ldots, U_p'^m)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 5.1, one has:*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(X_{i_p^n \Delta_n} - X_{T_p'} - \sigma_{T_p'} (W_{i_p^n \Delta_n} - W_{T_p'}) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(X_{T_p'^-} - X_{(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n} - \sigma_{(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n} \left(W_{T_p'} - W_{(i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

We are now ready to give the proof of the theorem.
The processes

$$W^n(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(V^n(f)_t - \sum_{s \le [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s) \right) \tag{5.4}$$

satisfy $W^n(f) = W^n(f, 1) + W^n(f, 2)$, where with $\phi^n(s)$ as in the proof of Theorem 2.4:

$$W^n(f, 1)_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\left(V^n(f)_t - \sum_{s \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} f(\phi^n(s), X_{s-}, \Delta X_s)\right),$$

$$W^n(f, 2)_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{s \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \left(f(\phi^n(s), X_{s-}, \Delta X_s) - f(s-, X_{s-}, \Delta X_s)\right).$$

Now (3.3) yields that $W^n(f, 2) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$W^n(f, 1) = W^n\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon), 1\big) + W^n(f\Psi_\varepsilon, 1), \tag{5.5}$$

where Ψ_ε is as in (4.3). Then the rest of the proof of Theorem 3.3 is divided in three steps.

Step 1: Here we study the convergence of the process $W^n(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon), 1)$. By Section 3.1 of [7], for n large enough one has:

$$W^n\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{p:T'_p \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big((i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n, X_{(i_p^n-1)\Delta_n}, \Delta_i^n X\big)$$
$$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad - f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big((i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n, X_{T'_p-}, \Delta X_{T'_p}\big)\big)$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{p:T'_p \leq [t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{d}(\Delta_{i_p^n}^n X^j - \Delta X_{T'_p}^j)\frac{\partial f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)}{\partial x_j}\big((i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n, \overline{X}_p^{\prime n}, \overline{X}_p^n\big)\right.$$
$$\left. + \sum_{j=1}^{d}(X_{(i_p^n-1)\Delta_n}^j - X_{T'_p-}^j)\frac{\partial f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)}{\partial z_j}\big((i_p^n - 1)\Delta_n, \overline{X}_p^{\prime n}, \overline{X}_p^n\big)\right),$$

where $(\overline{X}_p^{\prime n}, \overline{X}_p^n)$ is between $(X_{(i_p^n-1)\Delta_n}, \Delta_i^n X)$ and $(X_{T'_p-}, \Delta X_{T'_p})$. Then by Lemma 5.2 and 5.1, $W^n(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon))$ converge stably in law to the process

$$F'\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big)_t$$
$$:= \sum_{p:T'_p \leq t} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left(\left(\sqrt{\kappa_p}\sigma_{T'_p-}^{j,k}U_p^k + \sqrt{1 - \kappa_p}\sigma_{T'_p}^{j,k}U_p^{\prime k}\right)\frac{\partial f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)}{\partial x_j}(T'_p-, X_{T'_p-}, \Delta X_{T'_p})\right.$$
$$\left. - \sqrt{\kappa_p}\sigma_{T'_p-}^{j,k}U_p^k\frac{\partial f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)}{\partial z_j}(T'_p-, X_{T'_p-}, \Delta X_{T'_p})\right),$$

which has the same $\mathcal{F}$-conditional law than the process $F(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon))$ associated with the function $f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)$ by (3.5).

Step 2: Here we show that

$$F\big(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)\big) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} F(f) \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Recall the process $C(f)$ defined in (3.6), and set $f\Psi_\varepsilon = f_\varepsilon$. Under (LN_1) there exists a process A such that:

$$\forall T > 0, \qquad C(f_\varepsilon)_T \le A_T, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(A_t) < \infty.$$

Since $C(f_\varepsilon)_T \to 0$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$, by Lebesgue's convergence theorem we have $\mathbb{E}(C(f_\varepsilon)_T) \to 0$. Furthermore by Lemma 3.5, the process $F(f_\varepsilon)_t$ is a locally square integrable martingale and Doob's inequality yields that:

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sup_{t \le T} \|F(f_\varepsilon)\| > \eta\right) \le \frac{4}{\eta}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}(F(f_\varepsilon)_t^2) = \frac{4}{\eta}\mathbb{E}(C(f_\varepsilon)_T)$$

hence, $F(f\Psi_\varepsilon) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} 0$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$. Since $F(f) = F(f(1 - \Psi_\varepsilon)) + F(f\Psi_\varepsilon)$, this implies (5.6).

Step 3: In this last step, we show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_n \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t \le T} \|W^n(f\Psi_\varepsilon, 1)\| > \eta\right\} = 0 \qquad \forall \eta, T > 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Using Itô's formula of Lemma 4.2, in a similar way than in the proof of Theorem 2.4 (and keeping the same notation for Y_s^n and $\phi^n(s)$), we have $W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1) = \sum_{l=1}^5 W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1, l)$, where:

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1, 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} b_s'^j \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) \, ds,$$

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1, 2)_t = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{j,j'=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^m \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \sigma_s^{j,k} \sigma_s^{j',k} \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) \, ds,$$

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 2, 3)_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^m \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \sigma_s^{j,k} \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) \, dW_s^k,$$

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1, 4)_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \int_0^{\mathbb{R}} \delta^j(s, y) \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x^j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)(\underline{\mu} - \underline{\nu})(ds, dy),$$

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 1, 5)_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \int_0^{\mathbb{R}} \Bigg(f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n + \delta(s, y)\big)$$

$$- f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^d \delta^j(s, y) \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)$$

$$- f_\varepsilon(\phi^n(s), X_{s-}, \delta(s, y)) \Bigg) \underline{\mu}(ds, dy).$$

Under (LN_1) and (LM_1), we have:

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\|X_t - X_s\|^p) &\leq K|t - s|^{p/2} \qquad \forall p \in [0, 2], \\
\sum_{j=1}^{d} \left\| \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial z_j}(s, z, x) \right\| &\leq \alpha_\varepsilon \big(\|x\| \wedge (2d\varepsilon)\big)^2, \\
\sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{j'=1}^{d} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial z_{j'}}(s, z, x) \right\| &\leq \alpha_\varepsilon \big(\|x\| \wedge (2d\varepsilon)\big), \\
\sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{j'=1}^{d} \left\| \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2} f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j^{k_1} \, \partial x_{j'}^{k_2}}(s, z, x) \right\| &\leq \alpha_\varepsilon \big(\|x\| \wedge (2d\varepsilon)\big)^{3-(k_1+k_2)},
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{5.8}$$

where $\alpha_\varepsilon \to 0$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$, $k_1 + k_2 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and $\frac{\partial^0 (f_\varepsilon)}{\partial x_j^0} = f_\varepsilon$. We also have

$$\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) = \sum_{j'=1}^{d} Y_{s-}^{n, j'} \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, \overline{Y}_s^n\big),$$

where $\overline{Y}_s^n$ belongs to the segment joining Y_{s-}^n and 0, thus

$$\int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left\| \frac{\widehat{b}_s^j Y_{s-}^{n, j'}}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}\big(X_{\phi^n(s)}, \overline{Y}_s^n\big) \right\| \right\} \mathrm{d}s$$

$$\leq K \int_0^t \left[\left(\mathbb{E}\left\{ \frac{\|Y_{s-}^{n, j'}\|^2}{\Delta_n} \right\} \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}\left\{ \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}\big(\phi^n(s), Z_{\phi^n(s)}, \overline{Y}_s^n\big) \right\|^2 \right\} \right)^{1/2} \right] \mathrm{d}s \quad (5.9)$$

$$\leq K \int_0^t \left(\mathbb{E}\left\{ \left\| \frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}\big(\phi^n(s), Z_{\phi^n(s)}, \overline{Y}_s^n\big) \right\|^2 \right\} \right)^{1/2} \mathrm{d}s.$$

Since $\frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}(\omega, s, z, 0) = 0$, and $\frac{\partial^2 f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j \, \partial x_{j'}}(\omega, s, z, x)$ satisfies $(K[V])$, one deduces by Lebesgue's theorem that (5.9) converge to 0, and thus

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 2, 1) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Similarly, we show that

$$W^n(f_\varepsilon, 2, 2) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Next, the processes

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big) \sigma_s^{j,k} \, \mathrm{d}W_s^k$$

are martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n})$, hence by Doob's inequality and (5.8) one has:

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\leq T}\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)\sigma_s^{j,k}\,\mathrm{d}W_s^k\right\|>\eta\right\}$$

$$\leq\frac{1}{\eta^2\Delta_n}\int_0^T\mathbb{E}\left\{\left\|\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)\sigma_s^{j,k}\right\|^2\right\}\mathrm{d}s\leq\frac{KT\alpha_\varepsilon^2}{\eta^2},$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_n\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\leq T}\|W^n(f_\varepsilon,1,3)_t\|>\eta\right\}=0.$$

Similarly, we have:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_n\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\leq T}\|W^n(f_\varepsilon,1,4)_t\|>\eta\right\}=0.$$

Now under (LM_1), separating the cases where $\|x\|\leq\|x'\|$ and $\|x'\|\leq\|x\|$, one shows that:

$$\left\|f_\varepsilon(\omega,s,z_1,x+x')-f_\varepsilon(s,z_1,x')-\sum_{j=1}^d x_j\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x_j}(\omega,s,z_1,x')-f_\varepsilon(\omega,s,z_2,x)\right\|$$

$$\leq K\alpha_\varepsilon\|x\|^2(\|z_1-z_2\|+\|x'\|).$$

Then $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{t\leq T}|W^n(f_\varepsilon,1,5)_t|>\eta)$ is smaller than

$$\frac{1}{\eta}\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left\|f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n+\delta(s,y)\big)\right.\right.$$

$$-f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, \delta(s,y)\big)-f_\varepsilon\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)$$

$$\left.\left.-\delta(s,y)\frac{\partial f_\varepsilon}{\partial x}\big(\phi^n(s), X_{\phi^n(s)}, Y_{s-}^n\big)\right\|\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}s,\mathrm{d}y)\right\}$$

$$\leq K\alpha_\varepsilon\left(\int_0^t\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\|Y_{s-}^n\|+\|Z_{\phi^n(s)}-Z_{s-}\|}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right\}\mathrm{d}s\right)\leq K\alpha_\varepsilon t$$

and thus

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_n\mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{t\leq T}\|W^n(f_\varepsilon,1,5)_t\|>\eta\right\}=0.$$

This ends the proof under the reinforced assumptions (LN_1) and (LM_1). One finishes the proof by a classical localization procedure.

5.2. Proof of Theorems 3.6 and 3.8

As for the previous proofs, we first strengthen the hypotheses, and thanks to Remark 3.1, we adopt the form (3.2) for σ.

Hypothesis $(LN_2(s))$. *We have* $(N_2(s))$ *and the processes* X_t, b_t, $\widetilde{b}_t$, $\widetilde{\sigma}_t$, $\widetilde{v}_t$, $\Delta\sigma_t$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}}(1 \wedge \|\widetilde{\delta}(t, y)\|^2)F(\mathrm{d}y)$ *are bounded. The functions* $\gamma_k = \gamma$ *do not depend on k and are also bounded.*

We denote (LM_2) (resp., (LM_2')) the hypothesis (M_2) (resp., (M_2')) with the additional condition that the process Γ is bounded.

Under $(LN_2(s))$ with $s \leq 1$, X can be write as:

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b_u' \, \mathrm{d}u + \int_0^t \sigma_u \, \mathrm{d}W_u + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^t \delta(u, y)\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y), \tag{5.10}$$

where $b_u' = b_u - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(\delta(u, y))F(\mathrm{d}y)$, and under $(LN_2(2))$ the process σ is written:

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0 + \int_0^t \widetilde{b}_u' \, \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \widetilde{\sigma}_u \, \mathrm{d}W_u + \int_0^t \widetilde{v}_u \, \mathrm{d}V_u + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\delta}(u, y)(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y), \tag{5.11}$$

with $\widetilde{b}_u' = \widetilde{b}_u + \int_{\mathbb{R}} k'(\widetilde{\delta}(u, y))F(\mathrm{d}y)$.

Let us now give some useful lemmas.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose* $(LN_2(2))$ *satisfied and assume that* f *is optional, locally equicontinuous in x and at most with p-polynomial growth. If further, either X is continuous or* $p < 1$, *then*:

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} E\left(\left\|f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)\right\|^2\right) \to 0. \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is the same as for Lemma 4.4, the condition $p < 1$ come in because of the the square in (5.12). □

Set

$$U_t^n := \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\left\{\left(f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right)\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)\right)\Big|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right\}. \tag{5.13}$$

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose* $(LN_2(2))$ *and* (M_2) *satisfied and X continuous. Assume further that one of the following two conditions is satisfied*:

A. *The application* $x \mapsto f(\omega, s, z, x)$ *is even in x.*
B. *We have* $b' = 0$ *and* $\widetilde{\sigma} = 0$.

Then $U^n \xrightarrow{u.c.p.} 0$.

Proof. A. Set

$$L_i^n := f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right). \tag{5.14}$$

Then $L_i^n = L_i'^n + L_i''^n$, where

$$L_i'^n = \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \bar{\gamma}_i^n\right) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)\right)$$
$$\times \left(\frac{\Delta_i^n X^j}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \beta_i^{n,j}\right),$$

$$L_i''^n = \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{\Delta_i^n X^j}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \beta_i^{n,j}\right)\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)$$

for some random variable $\bar{\gamma}_i^n$ between $\frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}$ and β_i^n. For any $\varepsilon, A > 0$, set

$$G_t^A(\omega, \varepsilon) = \sup_{s \le t; \|y\| \le \varepsilon; z \in \mathcal{K}; \|x\| \le A} \left\{\sum_{j=1}^d \left\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\omega, s, z, x+y) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\omega, s, z, x)\right\|\right\}.$$

Then:

$$\|L_i'^n\| \le K\left(G_t^A(\varepsilon) + \left(1 + \|\beta_i^n\|^p + \left\|\frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \beta_i^n\right\|^p\right)\left(\frac{\|\beta_i^n\|}{A} + \frac{\|\Delta_i^n X/\sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\|}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$$
$$\times \left\|\frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \beta_i^n\right\|.$$

Next, under the assumption $(N_2(s))$ (in particular the properties of σ), one shows that for all $q \ge 2$:

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\beta_i^n\|^q) \le K; \qquad E\left\{\left\|\Delta_i^n X/\sqrt{\Delta_n} - \beta_i^n\right\|^q\right\} \le K\Delta_n. \tag{5.15}$$

Thus, by a repeated use of Hölder inequality:

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} E\{\|L_i'^n\|\} \le Kt\left[(E\{(G_t^A(\varepsilon))^2\})^{1/2} + \frac{\Delta_n^{1/4}}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{A}\right]. \tag{5.16}$$

Letting successively $n \to \infty$, then $\varepsilon \to 0$ and then $A \to \infty$, we obtain

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} E\{\|L_i'^n\|\} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{5.17}$$

Let us now turn to $L_i''^n$. Under $(LN_2(s))$ we have: $\frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \beta_i^n = \widetilde{\xi}_i^n + \widehat{\xi}_i^n$, where

$$\widehat{\xi}_i^n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}(b_s' - b_{(i-1)\Delta_n}')\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s}\widetilde{b}_u'\,\mathrm{d}u\right.\right.$$

$$\left.\left. + \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s}(\widetilde{\sigma}_u - \widetilde{\sigma}_{(i-1)\Delta_n})\,\mathrm{d}W_u\right)\mathrm{d}W_s\right),$$

$$\widetilde{\xi}_i^n = \sqrt{\Delta_n}b_{(i-1)\Delta_n}' + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}\left(\widetilde{\sigma}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}(W_s - W_{(i-1)\Delta_n})\right.$$

$$+ \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\widetilde{\delta}(u,y)(\underline{\mu}-\underline{v})(\mathrm{d}u,\mathrm{d}y)$$

$$\left.+ \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s}\widetilde{v}_u\,\mathrm{d}V_u\right)\mathrm{d}W_s.$$

(1) Here we show that for any $j \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\widetilde{\xi}_i^{n,j}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n)\big|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right\} = 0. \tag{5.18}$$

Since the function $x \to \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\omega, s, z, x)$ is odd, one clearly has:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{b_{(i-1)\Delta_n}'^{j}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n)\big|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right\} = 0, \tag{5.19}$$

and for any $k, k' \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\widetilde{\sigma}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{j,k,k'}\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}(W_s^{k'} - W_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{k'})\,\mathrm{d}W_s^k\right)\right.$$

$$\left.\times \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n)\big|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right\} = 0. \tag{5.20}$$

Next, consider the σ-field:

$$\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}' = \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \vee \sigma\left(W_s - W_{(i-1)\Delta_n} : (i-1)\Delta_n \le s \le i\Delta_n\right).$$

Since W is independent of $\underline{\mu}$ and of V, for any j, k as above one has:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\widetilde{\delta}^{j,k}(u,y)(\underline{\mu}-\underline{v})(\mathrm{d}u,\mathrm{d}y)\right)\mathrm{d}W_s^k\right)\right.$$

$$\left.\times \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n)\big|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right\} = 0, \tag{5.21}$$

and for any $j' \in \{1, \dots, l\}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Bigg\{ &\left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s} \widetilde{v}_u^{j,k,j'} \, dV_u^{j'} \right) dW_s^k \right) \\
&\times \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) \big| \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \Bigg\} = 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.22}
$$

From (5.19), (5.20), (5.21) and (5.22) we deduce (5.18).

(2) In this step, we show that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$
\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left\| \widehat{\xi}_i^{n,j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) \right\| \big| \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \right\} \longrightarrow 0.
\tag{5.23}
$$

By Hölder and Doob inequalities, we have:

$$
\mathbb{E}\{\|\widehat{\xi}_i^n\|^2\} \leq K \left(\Delta_n^3 + \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left(\|b_s' - b_{(i-1)\Delta_n}'\|^2 + \|\widetilde{\sigma}_s - \widetilde{\sigma}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\|^2 \right) ds \right).
$$

Since $\mathbb{E}\{\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n)\|^2\} \leq K$, it follows from a repeated use of Holdër inequality that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left\| \widehat{\xi}_i^{n,j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) \right\| \big| \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \right\} \\
&\leq Kt\Delta_n + Kt^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}\left\{ \int_0^{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n} \left(\|b_s' - b_{[s/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}'\|^2 + \|\widetilde{\sigma}_s - \widetilde{\sigma}_{[s/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}\|^2 \right) ds \right\} \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since b' and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ have some continuity properties in s, we deduce by Lebesgue theorem that the last quantity tends to 0 when $n \to \infty$, hence (5.23).

B. The proof is the same than for A, except that we have (5.19) and (5.20) because $b' = \widetilde{\sigma} = 0$. $\qquad \square$

We give now another version of Lemma 5.4, in the case where X is discontinuous.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose X satisfies* $(LN_2(s))$ *with $s \leq 1$ and f satisfies* (LM_2'). *Assume further that either $f(\omega, t, z, x)$ is even in x or $b' = \widetilde{\sigma} = 0$. Then*

$$
U^n \xrightarrow{u.c.p.} 0, \qquad \text{when } n \to \infty.
$$

Proof. Recall that under $(LN_2(s))$ with $s \leq 1$, X is written as in (5.10). Set

$$
X_t' := X_0 + \int_0^t b_u' \, du + \int_0^t \sigma_u \, dW_u.
$$

Let (ε_n) be a sequence such that: $\varepsilon_n \in \,]0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$, and set $E_n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma(x) > \varepsilon_n\}$. Then

$$\frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} = \frac{\Delta_i^n X'}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \int_{E_n^c} \delta(u, x)\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}x)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \int_{E_n} \delta(u, x)\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}x).$$

Set

$$\zeta_i^n(1) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \int_{E_n} \delta(u, y)\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y),$$

$$\zeta_i^n(2) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \int_{E_n^c} \delta(u, y)\underline{\mu}(\mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}y).$$

Then using the notation (5.14), one has $L_i^n = \sum_{j=1}^3 L_i^n(j)$, where

$$L_i^n(1) = f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \zeta_i^n(1)\right),$$

$$L_i^n(2) = f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} - \zeta_i^n(1)\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X'}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right),$$

$$L_i^n(3) = f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \frac{\Delta_i^n X'}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\right) - f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right).$$

The hypothesis (LM_2') involves the existence of a sequence of reals (K^m) such that

$$\|z\| \le m \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|f(\omega, s, z, x_1) - f(\omega, s, z, x_1 + x_2)\| \le K^m(1 \wedge \|x_2\|).$$

Hence,

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{\|L_i^n(1)\|\,|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} \le K\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{\big(1 \wedge \|\zeta_i^n(1)\|\big)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\}.$$

By the inequality (5.9) of Lemma 5.3 of [7], we deduce:

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\{\|L_i^n(1)\|\} \le Kt\Delta_n^{1/2}\varepsilon_n^{-1}. \tag{5.24}$$

Next, set $\theta(y) = \int_{\{|\gamma(x)| \le y\}} |\gamma(x)|F(\mathrm{d}x)$, which goes to 0 as $y \to 0$, then

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\{\|L_i^n(2)\|\} \le K\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\{\|\zeta_i^n(2)\|\} \le Kt\theta(\varepsilon_n). \tag{5.25}$$

Otherwise, Lemma 5.5 implies:

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left\| \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n(3)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} \right\| \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0, \qquad \text{when } n \to \infty. \tag{5.26}$$

Combining (5.24), (5.25) and (5.26), we have:

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left\| \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} \right\| \leq Kt\big(\Delta_n^{1/2}\varepsilon_n^{-1} + \theta(\varepsilon_n)\big) + \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left\| \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n(3)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} \right\|.$$

If we choose $\varepsilon_n = (1 \wedge \Delta_n^{1/4})$, we conclude:

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left\| \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} \right\| \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0,$$

what ends the proof. □

Set now

$$U_t'^n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \left(\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{ f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} \right.$$
$$\left. - \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))\, \mathrm{d}s \right). \tag{5.27}$$

Lemma 5.6. *If X satisfies* $(LN_2(2))$ *and f satisfies* (LM_2), *we have* $U'^n \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$.

Proof. We can assume without loss of generality that f is 1-dimensional. We also write the proof when the dimensions of X and σ are 1, since the multidimensional case is more cumbersome but similar to prove. We have $U_t'^n = U_t'^n(1) + U_t'^n(2) + U_t'^n(3)$, where

$$U_t'^n(1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \big(\rho_{\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}\big(f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \cdot\big)\big)$$
$$- \rho_{\sigma_s}\big(f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_s, \cdot\big)\big)\big)\, \mathrm{d}s,$$

$$U_t'^n(2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \big(\rho_{\sigma_s}\big(f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_s, \cdot\big)\big) - \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))\big)\, \mathrm{d}s,$$

$$U_t'^n(3) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}^{t} \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Since f is at most with polynomial growth,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \int_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n}^{t} |\rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))| \, ds \leq K\sqrt{\Delta_n},$$

hence $U_t'^n(3) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$. Otherwise Hypothesis (M_2), and in particular (3.4), implies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left| \rho_{\sigma_s}\big(f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_s, \cdot\big)\big) - \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot))\right| \, ds \leq Kt\Delta_n^{\alpha-1/2},$$

hence $U_t'^n(2) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$.

It remains to show that:

$$U_t'^n(1) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0. \tag{5.28}$$

The function $(z, x) \mapsto f(\omega, s, z, x)$ being C^1, so is the application $(w, z) \mapsto \rho_w(f(s, z, \cdot))$. Set $F_{n,i}(\omega, w, z) := \rho_w(f(\omega, (i-1)\Delta_n, z, \cdot))$ and $X_t'' = X_t - \int_0^t b_s \, ds$ and $\sigma_t'' = \sigma_t - \int_0^t \tilde{b}_s' \, ds$. Then we have $U_t'^n(1) = -\sum_{j=1}^{3} U_t'^n(1, j)$, where

$$U_t'^n(1, 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{s} \left(\tilde{b}_u' \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial w}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right. \right.$$
$$\left. \left. + b_u' \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial z}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right) du \right) ds,$$

$$U_t'^n(1, 2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left(\big(\sigma_s'' - \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}''\big) \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial w}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right.$$
$$\left. + \big(X_s'' - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}''\big) \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial z}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right) ds,$$

$$U_t'^n(1, 3) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \left(F_{n,i}(\sigma_s, X_s) - F_{n,i}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right.$$
$$- \big(X_s - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial z}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big)$$
$$\left. - \big(\sigma_s - \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial w}\big(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big) \right) ds.$$

Since $\tilde{b}'$, b' are bounded we have $\sup_{s \leq t} |U_t'^n(1, 1)| \leq Kt\Delta_n^{1/2}$, hence $U_t'^n(1, 1) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$.

Next, the process $U'^n(1, 2)$ is a martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n})$ and the expectation of its predictable bracket is smaller than $Kt\Delta_n$. Hence, Doob's inequality yields $U_t^n(1, 2) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$.

Finally, if $\zeta_i^n(s)$ denotes the integrand in the definition of $U_t'^n(1, 3)$, we have

$$
\zeta_i^n(s) := \left(\sigma_s - \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right)\left(\frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial w}(\overline{\sigma}(i, n, s), \overline{X}(i, n, s)) - \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial w}\left(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right)\right)
$$
$$
+ \left(X_s - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right)\left(\frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial z}(\overline{\sigma}(i, n, s), \overline{X}(i, n, s)) - \frac{\partial F_{n,i}}{\partial z}\left(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right)\right),
$$
(5.29)

where $(\overline{\sigma}(i, n, s), \overline{X}(i, n, s))$ in between $(\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n})$ and (σ_s, X_s). For $A, \varepsilon > 0$, set:

$$
G_t(\varepsilon, A) = \sup\left\{\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(s, z_1, x_1) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(s, z_2, x_2)\right| + \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(s, z_1, x_1) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(s, z_2, x_2)\right| : \right.
$$
$$
\left. s \le t; |x_1|, |x_2| \le A; |x_1 - x_2| \le \varepsilon; |z_1|, |z_2| \le K; |z_1 - z_2| \le \varepsilon\right\},
$$

then by the properties of f, we have $G_t(\varepsilon, A) \to 0$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$. Therefore, it follows from (5.29) that

$$
|\zeta_i^n(s)| \le K\left((1 + A)G_t(A\varepsilon, KA) + \frac{|\sigma_s - \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}| + |X_s - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}|}{\varepsilon}\right.
$$
$$
\left. + \left(\mathbb{P}(|U| > A/K)\right)^{1/2}\right) \times \left(\left|\sigma_s - \sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right| + \left|X_s - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\right|\right),
$$

where U is a $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ Gaussian variable.

Since under $(LN_2(2))$, $\mathbb{E}\{|\sigma_t - \sigma_s|^2 + |Z_t - Z_s|^2\} \le K|t - s|$, we deduce:

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n} \mathbb{E}\{|\zeta_i^n(s)|\} \, ds \le Kt\left((1 + A)(\mathbb{E}\{G_t(A\varepsilon, KA)^2\})^{1/2}\right.
$$
$$
\left. + \mathbb{P}(|U| > A/K)^{1/2} + \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{\varepsilon}\right).
$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, then $\varepsilon \to 0$, and $A \to \infty$, we obtain $U_t'^n(1, 3) \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\longrightarrow} 0$, hence (5.28). $\qquad\square$

The next lemmas are very important because they deal with the part of the processes having a nontrivial limit. We use the notation of Section 3.3. The first one is about the "even case" for f. Set

$$
\overline{U}_t^n = \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \left(f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)\right.
$$
$$
\left. - \mathbb{E}\{f\left((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\right)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\}\right).
$$
(5.30)

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose $(LN_2(2))$ satisfied and $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ even in x with at most polynomial growth. Then $\overline{U}_t^n \overset{\mathcal{L}-(s)}{\longrightarrow} L(f)_t$, where $L(f)_t = \int_0^t a_s \, d\overline{W}_s$, and a is given by (3.7).*

Proof. Set

$$\xi_i^n = \sqrt{\Delta_n}\big(f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big) - \mathbb{E}\big\{f\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n\big)|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\}\big),$$

then

$$E\big\{\xi_i^n|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} = 0. \tag{5.31}$$

For any $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big\{\xi_i^{n,j}\xi_i^{n,k}|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} = \Delta_n\big(&\rho_{\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}\big((f^j f^k)\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \cdot\big)\big) \\
&- \rho_{\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}\big(f^j\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \cdot\big)\big) \\
&\times \rho_{\sigma_{(i-1)\Delta_n}}\big(f^k\big((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \cdot\big)\big)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Then as in Lemma 4.3, one shows that:

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{(\xi_i^{n,j}\xi_i^{n,k})|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} \qquad \text{converges u.c.p. to the process} \\
&\int_0^t \big(\rho_{\sigma_s}((f^j f^k)(s, X_s, \cdot)) - \rho_{\sigma_s}(f^j(s, X_s, \cdot))\rho_{\sigma_s}(f^k(s, X_s, \cdot))\big)\, ds.
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{5.32}$$

Next for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{\|\xi_i^n\|^2 1_{\{\|\xi_i^n\|>\varepsilon\}}|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} \le \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big\{\|\xi_i^n\|^4|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} \le \frac{Kt}{\varepsilon^2}\Delta_n. \tag{5.33}$$

Since f is even in x: $\forall j' \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{\xi_i^n \Delta_i^n W^{j'}|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} = 0. \tag{5.34}$$

If now N is a martingale orthogonal to W, by the proof of Proposition 4.1 (see (4.13)) of [1],

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{\xi_i^n \Delta_i^n N|\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\big\} = 0. \tag{5.35}$$

By (5.31), (5.32), (5.33), (5.34) and (5.35) we can apply Theorem IX-7-28 of [7] which gives our lemma. □

Remark 5.8. In the previous lemma, the hypothesis on f is more than what we need, having $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ to be optional even in x, satisfying $(K[\mathbb{R}^d])$ and with at most polynomial growth would be enough.

Now we deal with the case where $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ is not even in x.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose that X and f satisfy, respectively, (LN_2(2)) and (LM_2), then*

$$\overline{U}_t^n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-(s)} L(f)_t, \qquad \textit{where } L(f)_t = \int_0^t w(1) \, dW_s + \int_0^t w(2) \, d\overline{W}_s,$$

$w(1)$, $w(2)$ *given by* (3.12).

Proof. The proof goes as for Lemma 5.7, except that (5.34) fails here since $f(\omega, s, z, x)$ is not even in x. However, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\xi_i^{n,j} \Delta_i^n W^k | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} = \sqrt{\Delta_n} \mathbb{E}\{f^j((i-1)\Delta_n, X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \beta_i^n) \Delta_i^n W^k | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\},$$

and (as in the proof of Lemma 4.3) one has:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\{\xi_i^{n,j} \Delta_i^n W^k | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\} \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} \int_0^t w(1)_s^{j,k} \, ds. \tag{5.36}$$

Then taking account (5.36), and using once more Theorem IX-7-28 of [7], we get this time Lemma 5.9. □

5.2.1. *Proof of Theorems 3.6 and 3.8*

We first prove the theorems under the strong hypotheses stated at the beginning of the Section 5.2. Set

$$W_t^n := \sqrt{\Delta_n} \left(V_t'^n - \int_0^t \rho_{\sigma_s}(f(s, X_s, \cdot)) \, ds \right).$$

Then, using the notation (5.13), (5.14), (5.27) and (5.30), we have:

$$W_t^n = \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} (L_i^n - \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\}) + \overline{U}_t^n + U_t^n + U_t'^n.$$

The process $\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]}(L_i^n - \mathbb{E}\{L^n i | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\})$ is a martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{[t/\Delta_n]\Delta_n})$, whose predictable bracket is smaller than $\Delta_n \mathbb{E}\{\|L_i^n\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\}$. Hence, Lemma 5.3 and Doob's inequality yield that

$$\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} (L_i^n - \mathbb{E}\{L_i^n | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\}) \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0.$$

Moreover, $U^n \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$ by Lemmas 5.4 or 5.5, depending on the case. Next, Lemma 5.6 yields $U'^n \xrightarrow{\text{u.c.p.}} 0$. Finally Lemma 5.7 for Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 5.9 for Theorem 3.8 give that $\overline{U}^n$ converges stably in law to the process $L(f)$ given respectively by (3.8) and (3.14).

At this stage, we have proved the theorems under the strong assumptions mentioned above. The general case is deduced by a "localization" procedure.

Acknowledgement

References

[1] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., Graversen, S.E., Jacod, J., Podolskij, M. and Shephard, N. (2006). A central limit theorem for realised power and bipower variations of continuous semimartingales. In *From Stochastic Calculus to Mathematical Finance* (Yu. Kabanov, R. Liptser and J. Stoyanov, eds.) 33–68. Berlin: Springer. MR2233534

[2] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E. and Shephard, N. (2003). Realized power variation and stochastic volatility models. *Bernoulli* **9** 243–265. MR1997029

[3] Corcuera, J.M., Nualart, D. and Woerner, J.H.C. (2006). Power variation of some integral fractional processes. *Bernoulli* **12** 713–735. MR2248234

[4] Diop, A. (2009). Sur la convergence de certaines fonctionnelles de semimartingales discrétisées. Thèse, Univ. Paris 6. Available at http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/40/48/94/PDF/these.pdf.

[5] Genon-Catalot, V. and Jacod, J. (1993). On the estimation of the diffusion coefficient for multidimensional diffusion processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **29** 119–151. MR1204521

[6] Jacod, J. (2007). Asymptotic properties of power variations of Lévy processes. *ESAIM Probab. Stat.* **11** 173–196. MR2320815

[7] Jacod, J. (2008). Asymptotic properties of realized power variations and related functionals of semimartingales. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **118** 517–559. MR2394762

[8] Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (1998). Asymptotic error distributions for the Euler method for stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Probab.* **26** 267–307. MR1617049

[9] Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A.N. (2003). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, 2nd ed. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften* [*Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences*] **288**. Berlin: Springer. MR1943877

[10] Lépingle, D. (1976). La variation d'ordre *p* des semi-martingales. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **36** 295–316. MR0420837

[11] Mancini, C. (2007). Estimating the integrated volatility in stochastic volatility models with Lévy type jumps. Technical report, Univ. Firenze.