# DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

# Robust Filtering: Correlated Noise and Multidimensional Observation

D. Crisan, J. Diehl, P.K. Friz, H. Oberhauser

# DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen"

## Robust Filtering: Correlated Noise and Multidimensional Observation

D. Crisan, J. Diehl, P.K. Friz, H. Oberhauser

**Preprint 134**

The consecutive numbering of the publications is determined by their chronological order.

The aim of this preprint series is to make new research rapidly available for scientific discussion. Therefore, the responsibility for the contents is solely due to the authors. The publications will be distributed by the authors.

# ROBUST FILTERING: CORRELATED NOISE AND MULTIDIMENSIONAL OBSERVATION

D. CRISAN, J. DIEHL, P. K. FRIZ AND H. OBERHAUSER

ABSTRACT. In the late seventies, Clark [7] pointed out that it would be natural for $\pi_t$, the solution of the stochastic filtering problem, to depend continuously on the observed data $Y = \{Y_s, s \in [0,t]\}$. Indeed, if the signal and the observation noise are independent one can show that, for any suitably chosen test function $f$, there exists a continuous map $\theta_t^f$, defined on the space of continuous paths $C([0,t], \mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed with the uniform convergence topology such that $\pi_t(f) = \theta_t^f(Y)$, almost surely (see, eg. [7, 8, 11, 12, 26]). As shown by Davis [13, 14, 15], this type of *robust* representation is also possible when the signal and the observation noise are correlated, provided the observation process is scalar. For a general correlated noise and multidimensional observations such a representation does not exist. By using the theory of rough paths we provide a solution to this deficiency: The observation process $Y$ is "lifted" to the process $\mathbf{Y}$ that consists of $Y$ and its corresponding Lévy area process and we show that there exists a continuous map $\theta_t^f$, defined on a suitably chosen space of Hölder continuous paths such that $\pi_t(f) = \theta_t^f(\mathbf{Y})$, almost surely.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space on which we have defined a two component diffusion process $(X, Y)$ solving a stochastic differential equation driven by a multidimensional Brownian motion. One assumes that the first component $X$ is unobservable and the second component $Y$ is observed. The filtering problem consists in computing the conditional distribution of the unobserved component, called the *signal* process, given the *observation* process $Y$. Equivalently, one is interested in computing

$$\pi_t(f) = \mathbb{E}[f(X_t, Y_t)|\mathcal{Y}_t],$$

where $\mathcal{Y} = \{\mathcal{Y}_t, t \geq 0\}$ is the observation filtration and $f$ is a suitably chosen test function. An elementary measure theoretic result tells us[1] that there exists a Borel-measurable map $\theta_t^f : C([0,t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}) \to \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$(1) \qquad\qquad \pi_t(f) = \theta_t^f(Y.) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where $d_Y$ is the dimension of the observation state space and $Y.$ is the path-valued random variable

$$Y. : \Omega \to C([0,t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}), \ Y.(\omega) = (Y_s(\omega), \ 0 \leq s \leq t).$$

Of course, $\theta_t^f$ is not unique. Any other function $\bar{\theta}_t^f$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \circ Y.^{-1}\left(\bar{\theta}_t^f \neq \theta_t^f\right) = 0,$$

where $\mathbb{P} \circ Y.^{-1}$ is the distribution of $Y.$ on the path space $C([0,t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y})$ can replace $\theta_t^f$ in (1). It would be desirable to solve this ambiguity by choosing a suitable representative from the class of functions that satisfy (1). A *continuous* version, if it exists, would enjoy the following uniqueness property: if the law of the observation $\mathbb{P} \circ Y.^{-1}$ positively charges all non-empty open sets in $C([0,t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y})$ then there exists a unique continuous function $\theta_t^f$ that satisfies (1). In this case, we call $\theta_t^f(Y.)$ the *robust version* of $\pi_t(f)$ and equation (1) is the robust representation formula for the solution of the stochastic filtering problem.

---

[1]See, for example, Proposition 4.9 page 69 in [5].

The need for this type of representation arises when the filtering framework is used to model and solve 'real-life' problems. As explained in a substantial number of papers (e.g. [7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 26]) the model chosen for the "real-life" observation process $\bar{Y}$ may not be a perfect one. However, if $\theta^f$ is continuous (or even locally Lipschitz, as in the setting of [8]), and as long as the distribution of $\bar{Y}_.$ is close in a weak sense to that of $Y_.$ (and some integrability assumptions hold), the estimate $\theta_t^f(\bar{Y}_.)$ computed on the actual observation will still be reasonable, as $\mathbb{E}[(f(X_t, Y_t) - \theta_t^f(\bar{Y}_.))^2]$ is close to the idealized error $\mathbb{E}[(f(X_t, Y_t) - \theta_t^f(Y_.))^2]$.

Moreover, even when $Y$ and $\bar{Y}$ actually coincide, one is never able to obtain and exploit a continuous stream of data as modelled by the continuous path $Y_.(\omega)$. Instead the observation arrives and is processed at discrete moments in time

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n = t.$$

However the continuous path $\hat{Y}_.(\omega)$ obtained from the discrete observations $(Y_{t_i}(\omega))_{i=1}^n$ by linear interpolation is close to $Y_.(\omega)$ (with respect to the supremum norm on $C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y})$); hence, by the same argument, $\theta_t^f(\hat{Y}_.)$ will be a sensible approximation to $\pi_t(f)$. To conclude the discussion on the un-correlated framework, let us also mention that Kushner introduces in [27] a robust computable approximation for the filtering solution.

In the following, we will assume that the pair of processes $(X, Y)$ satisfy the equation

$$(2) \qquad dX_t = l_0(X_t, Y_t)dt + \sum_k Z_k(X_t, Y_t)dW_t^k + \sum_j L_j(X_t, Y_t)dB_t^j,$$

$$(3) \qquad dY_t = h(X_t, Y_t)dt + dW_t,$$

with $X_0$ being a bounded random variable and $Y_0 = 0$. In (2) and (3), the process $X$ is the $d_X$-dimensional signal, $Y$ is the $d_Y$-dimensional observation, $B$ and $W$ are independent $d_B$-dimensional, respectively, $d_Y$-dimensional Brownian motions independent of $X_0$. Suitable assumptions on the coefficients $l_0, L_1, \ldots, L_{d_B} : \mathbb{R}^{d_X + d_Y} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_X}$, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_{d_Y} : \mathbb{R}^{d_X + d_Y} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_X}$ and $h = (h^1, \ldots, h^{d_Y}) : \mathbb{R}^{d_X + d_Y} \to \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ will be introduced later on. This framework covers a wide variety of applications of stochastic filtering (see, for example, [10] and the references therein) and has the added advantage that, within it, $\pi_t(f)$ admits an alternative representation that is crucial for the construction of its robust version. Let us detail this representation first.

Let $u = \{u_t, t > 0\}$ be the process defined by

$$(4) \qquad u_t = \exp\left[-\sum_{i=1}^{d_Y}\left(\int_0^t h^i(X_s, Y_s)dW_s^i - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t (h^i(X_s, Y_s))^2 ds\right)\right].$$

Then, under suitable assumptions[2], $u$ is a martingale which is used to construct the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_0$ equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$ on $\bigcup_{0 \le t < \infty} \mathcal{F}_t$ whose Radon–Nikodym derivative with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ is given by $u$, viz

$$\left.\frac{d\mathbb{P}_0}{d\mathbb{P}}\right|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = u_t.$$

Under $\mathbb{P}_0$, $Y$ is a Brownian motion independent of $B$. Moreover the equation for the signal process $X$ becomes

$$(5) \qquad dX_t = \bar{l}_0(X_t, Y_t)dt + \sum_k Z_k(X_t, Y_t)dY_t^k + \sum_j L_j(X_t, Y_t)dB_t^j.$$

Observe that equation (5) is now written in terms of the pair of Brownian motions $(Y, B)$ and the coefficient $\bar{l}_0$ is given by $\bar{l}_0 = l_0 + \sum_k Z_k h_k$. Moreover, for any measurable, bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_X + d_Y} \to \mathbb{R}$, we

---

[2]For example, if Novikov's condition is satisfied, that is, if $\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \|h^i(X_s, Y_s)\|^2 ds\right)\right] < \infty$ for all $t > 0$, then $u$ is a martingale. In particular it will be satisfied in our setting, in which $h$ is bounded.

have the following formula called the Kallianpur-Striebel's formula,

$$(6) \qquad \pi_t(f) = \frac{p_t(f)}{p_t(1)}, \qquad p_t(f) := \mathbb{E}_0[f(X_t, Y_t)v_t | \mathcal{Y}_t]$$

where $v = \{v_t, t > 0\}$ is the process defined as $v_t := \exp(I_t)$, $t \geq 0$ and

$$(7) \qquad I_t := \sum_{i=1}^{d_Y} \left( \int_0^t h^i(X_r, Y_r) dY_r^i - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (h^i(X_r, Y_r))^2 dr \right), \quad t \geq 0.$$

The representation (6) suggests the following three-step methodology to construct a robust representation formula for $\pi_t^f$:

**Step 1:** . We construct the triplet of processes $(X^y, Y^y, I^y)$ [3] corresponding to the pair $(y, B)$ where $y$ is now a *fixed* observation path $y. = \{y_s, s \in [0, t]\}$ belonging to a suitable class of continuous functions and prove that the random variable $f(X^y, Y^y) \exp(I^y)$ is $\mathbb{P}_0$-integrable.

**Step 2:** . We prove that the function $y. \to g_t^f(y.)$ defined as

$$(8) \qquad g_t^f(y.) = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ f(X_t^y, Y_t^y) \exp(I_t^y) \right]$$

is continuous.

**Step 3:** . We prove that $g_t^f(Y.)$ is a version of $p_t(f)$. Then, following (6), the function, $y. \to \theta_t^f(y.)$ defined as

$$(9) \qquad \theta_t^f = \frac{g_t^f}{g_t^1}$$

provides the robust version of of $\pi_t(f)$.

We emphasize that **Step 3** cannot be omitted from the methodology. Indeed one has to prove that $g_t^f(Y.)$ is a version of $p_t(f)$ as this fact is not immediate from the definition of $g_t^f$.

**Step 1** is immediate in the particular case when only the Brownian motion $B$ drives $X$ (i.e. the coefficient $Z = 0$) and $X$ is itself a diffusion, i.e., it satisfies an equation of the form

$$(10) \qquad dX_t = l_0(X_t)dt + \sum_j L_j(X_t)dB_t^j,$$

and $h$ does only depend on $X$. In this case the process $(X^y, Y^y)$ can be taken to be the pair $(X, y)$. Moreover, we can define $I^y$ by the formula

$$(11) \qquad I_t^y := \sum_{i=1}^{d_Y} \left( h^i(X_t)y_t^i - \int_0^t y_r^i dh^i(X_r) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (h^i(X_r, Y_r))^2 dr \right), \quad t \geq 0.$$

provided the processes $h^i(X)$ are semi-martingales. In (11), the integral $\int_0^t y_r^i dh^i(X_r)$ is the Itô integral of the non-random process $y^i$ with respect to $h^i(X)$. Note that the formula for $I_t^y$ is obtained by applying integration by parts to the stochastic integral in (7)

$$(12) \qquad \int_0^t h^i(X_r)dY_r^i = h^i(X_t)Y_r^i - \int_0^t Y_r^i dh^i(X_r),$$

and replacing the process $Y$ by the fixed path $y$ in (12). This approach has been successfully used to study the robustness property for the filtering problem for the above case in a number of papers ([7, 8, 26]).

The construction of the process $(X^y, Y^y, I^y)$ is no longer immediate in the case when $Z \neq 0$, i.e. when the signal is driven by both $B$ and $W$ (the correlated noise case). In the case when the observation is one dimensional one can solve this problem by using a method akin with Doss-Sussmann's "pathwise solution" of a stochastic differential equation (see [20],[32]). This approach has been employed by Davis to extend

---

[3] As we shall see momentarily, in the uncorrelated case the choice of $Y^y$ will trivially be $y$. In the correlated case we make it part of the *SDE with rough drift*, for (notational) convenience.

the robustness result to the correlated noise case with scalar observation (see, [11, 12, 13, 15]). In this case one constructs first a diffeomorphism which is a pathwise solution of the equation[4]

$$\phi(t, x) = x + \int_0^t Z(\phi(s, x)) \circ dY_t. \tag{13}$$

The diffeomorphism is used to express the solution $X$ of equation (5) as a composition between the diffeomorphism $\phi$ and the solution of a stochastic differential equation driven by $B$ only and whose coefficients depend continuously on $Y$. As a result, we can make sense of $X^y$. $I^y$ is then defined by a suitable (formal) integration by parts that produces a pathwise interpretation of the stochastic integral appearing in (7) and $Y^y$ is chosen to be $y$, as before. The robust representation formula is then introduced as per (9). Additional results for the correlated noise case with scalar observation can be found in [22]. The extension of the robustness result to special cases of the correlated noise and multidimensional observation has been tackled in several works. Robustness results in the correlated setting have been obtained by Davis in [11, 15] and Elliott and Kohlmann in [21], under a commutativity condition on the signal vector fields. Florchinger and Nappo [23] do not have correlated noise, but allow the coefficients to depend on the signal and the observation[5]. To sum up, all previous works on the robust representation problem either treat the uncorrelated case, the case with one-dimensional observation or the case where the Lie brackets of the relevant vector fields vanish. In parallel, Bagchi and Karandikar treat in [2] a different model with "finitely additive" state white noise and "finitely additive" observation noise. Robustness there is virtually built into the problem.

An alternative framework is that where the signal and the observation run in discrete time. In this case the filtering problem is well understood and has been studied in many works, including the monograph [16] and the articles [18, 17, 19]. These works include an analysis of discrete time filtering problems and their approximation models, including particle approximation, approximate Bayesian computation, filtering models, etc. We note that in this context the continuity of the filter with respect to the observation data holds true[6] provided very natural conditions are imposed on the model: for example, the likelihood functions is assumed to be continuous and bounded (which includes the Gaussian case).

To our knowledge, the general correlated noise and multidimensional observation case has not been studied and it is the subject of the current work. In this case it turns out that we cannot hope to have robustness in the sense advocated by Clark. More precisely, there may not exists a map continuous map $\theta_t^f :$ $C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}) \to \mathbb{R}$, such that the representation (1) holds almost surely. The following is a simple example that illustrates this.

**Example 1.** *Consider the filtering problem where the signal and the observation process solve the following pair of equations*

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t X_r d\left[Y_r^1 + Y_r^2\right] + \int_0^t X_r dr$$

$$Y_t = \int_0^t h(X_r)dr + W_t,$$

*where $Y$ is $2$-dimensional and $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = 0) = \mathbb{P}(X_0 = 1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Then with $f, h$ such that $f(0) = h_1(0) = h_2(0) = 0$ one can explicitly compute*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_t)|\mathcal{Y}_t] = \frac{f(\exp(Y_t^1 + Y_t^2))}{1 + \exp\left(-\sum_{k=1,2} \int_0^t h^k(\exp(Y_r))dY_r^k + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t ||h(\exp(Y_r))||^2 dr\right)}. \tag{14}$$

*Following the findings of rough path theory (see, eg, [24, 28, 29, 30]) the expression on the right hand side of (14) is not continuous in supremum norm (nor in any other metric on path space) because of*

---

[4]Here $d^Y = 1$ and Y is scalar.

[5]We thank the anonymous referee for these references.

[6]which can be easily seen using the representation of Lemma 2.1 in [19].

*the stochastic integral. Explicitly, this follows, for example, from Theorem 1.1.1 in [30] by rewriting the exponential term as the solution to a stochastic differential equation driven by $Y$.*

Nevertheless, we can show that a variation of the robustness representation formula still exists in this case. For this we need to "enhance" the original process $Y$ by adding a second component to it which consists of its iterated integrals (that, knowing the path, is in a one-to-one correspondance with the Levỳ area process). Explicitly we consider the process $\boldsymbol{Y} = \{\boldsymbol{Y}_t, t \geq 0\}$ defined as

$$(15) \qquad \boldsymbol{Y}_t = \left( Y_t, \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^t Y_r^1 \circ dY_r^1 & \cdots & \int_0^t Y_r^1 \circ dY_r^{d^Y} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \int_0^t Y_r^{d^Y} \circ dY_r^1 & \cdots & \int_0^t Y_r^{d^Y} \circ dY_r^{d^Y} \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad t \geq 0.$$

The stochastic integrals in (15) are Stratonovich integrals. The state space of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is $G^2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}) \cong \mathbb{R}^{d_Y} \oplus$ so$(d_Y)$, where so$(d_Y)$ is the set of anti-symmetric matrices of dimension $d_Y$.[7] Over this state space we consider not the space of continuous function, but a subspace $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ that contains paths $\eta : [0, t] \to G^2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y})$ that are $\alpha$-Hölder in the $\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$-component and somewhat "$2\alpha$-Hölder" in the so$(d_Y)$-component, where $\alpha$ is a suitably chosen constant $\alpha < 1/2$. Note that there exists a modification of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ such that $\boldsymbol{Y}(\omega) \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ for all $\omega$ (Corollary 13.14 in [24]).

The space $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ is endowed with the $\alpha$-Hölder rough path metric under which $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ becomes a complete metric space. The **main result of the paper** (captured in Theorem 6 and Theorem 7) is that there exists a continuous map $\theta_t^f : \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$(16) \qquad \pi_t(f) = \theta_t^f(\boldsymbol{Y}.) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Even though the map is defined on a slightly more abstract space, it nonetheless enjoys the desirable properties described above for the case of a continuous version on $C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d)$. Since $\mathbb{P} \circ \boldsymbol{Y}^{-1}$ positively charges all non-empty open sets of $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$,[8] the continuous version we construct will be unique. Also, it provides a certain model robustness, in the sense that $\mathbb{E}[(f(X_t) - \theta_t^f(\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}.))^2]$ is well approximated by the idealized error $\mathbb{E}[(f(X_t) - \theta_t^f(\boldsymbol{Y}.))^2]$, if $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}.$ is close in distribution to $\boldsymbol{Y}.$. The problem of discrete observation is a little more delicate. One one hand, it is true that the rough path lift $\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}}$ calculated from the linearly interpolated Brownian motion $\hat{Y}$ will converge to the true rough path $\boldsymbol{Y}$ in probability as the mesh goes to zero (Corollary 13.21 in [24]), which implies that $\theta_t^f(\hat{\boldsymbol{Y}})$ is close in probability to $\theta_t^f(\boldsymbol{Y})$ (we provide local Lipschitz estimates for $\theta^f$). Actually, most sensible approximations will do, as is for example shown in Chapter 13 in [24] (although, contrary to the uncorrelated case, not all interpolations that converge in uniform topology will work, see e.g. Theorem 13.24 ibid). But these are probabilistic statements, that somehow miss the pathwise stability that one wants to provide with $\theta_t^f$. If, on the other hand, one is able to observe at discrete time points not only the process itself, but also its second level, i.e. the area, one can construct an interpolating rough path using geodesics (see e.g. Chapter 13.3.1 in [24]) which is close to the true (lifted) observation path $\boldsymbol{Y}$ in the relevant metric *for all realizations* $\boldsymbol{Y} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$.

The following is the outline of the paper: In the next section, we enumerate the common notation used throughout the paper. In Section 3 we introduce the notion of a stochastic differential equation with rough drift, which is necessary for our main result and correspond to Step 1 above. We present it separately of the filtering problem, since we believe this notion to be of independent interest. The proof of the existence of a solution of a stochastic differential equation with rough drifts and its properties is postponed to Section 5. Section 4 contains the main results of the paper and the assumptions under which they hold true. Step 2 and 3 of above mentioned methodology are carried out in Theorems 6 and 7.

---

[7]More generally, $G^{[1/\alpha]}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the "correct" state space for a geometric $\alpha$-Hölder rough path; the space of such paths subject to $\alpha$-Hölder regularity (in rough path sense) yields a complete metric space under $\alpha$-Hölder rough path metric. Technical details of geometric rough path spaces (as found e.g. in section 9 of [24]) are not required for understanding the results of the present paper.

[8]This fact is a consequence of the support theorem of Brownian motion in Hölder rough path topology [25], see also Chapter 13 in [24].

## 2. Nomenclature

$\mathrm{Lip}^\gamma$ is the set of $\gamma$-Lipschitz [9] functions $a : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ where $m$ and $n$ are chosen according to the context.

$G^2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}) \cong \mathbb{R}^d \oplus \mathrm{so}(d_Y)$ is the state space for a $d_Y$-dimensional Brownian motion (or, in general for an arbitrary semi-martingale) and its corresponding Lévy area.

$\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha} := C_0^{0,\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}([0,t], G^2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y}))$ is the set of geometric $\alpha$-Hölder rough paths $\eta : [0,t] \to G^2(\mathbb{R}^{d_Y})$ starting at 0. We shall use the non-homogenous metric $\rho_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}$ on this space.

In the following we will make use of an auxiliary filtered probability space $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, (\bar{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ carrying a $d_B$-dimensional Brownian motion $\bar{B}$. [10]

Let $\mathcal{S}^0 = \mathcal{S}^0(\bar{\Omega})$ denote the space of adapted, continuous processes in $\mathbb{R}^{d_S}$, with the topology of uniform convergence in probability.

For $q \geq 1$ we denote by $\mathcal{S}^q = \mathcal{S}^q(\bar{\Omega})$ the space of processes $X \in \mathcal{S}^0$ such that

$$||X||_{\mathcal{S}^q} := \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |X_t|^q] \right)^{1/q} < \infty.$$

## 3. SDE with rough drift

For the statement and proof of the main results we shall use the notion (and the properties) of an *SDE with rough drift* captured in the following theorems. The proofs are postponed to Section 5.

As defined above, let $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, (\bar{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ be a filtered probability space carrying a $d_B$-dimensional Brownian motion $\bar{B}$ and a bounded $d_S$-dimensional random vector $S_0$ independent of $\bar{B}$. In the following, we fix $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2+\epsilon}, \frac{1}{2})$. Let $\eta^n : [0,t] \to \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}$ be smooth paths, such that $\eta^n \to \boldsymbol{\eta}$ in $\alpha$-Hölder, for some $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ and let $S^n$ be a $d_S$-dimensional process which is the unique solution to the classical SDE

$$S_t^n = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r^n) dr + \int_0^t b(S_r^n) d\bar{B}_r + \int_0^t c(S_r^n) d\eta_r^n,$$

where we assume that [11]

**(a1):** $a \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, $b_1, \dots, b_{d_B} \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$ and $c_1, \dots, c_{d_Y} \in \mathrm{Lip}^{4+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$

**(a1'):** $a \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, $b_1, \dots, b_{d_B} \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$ and $c_1, \dots, c_{d_Y} \in \mathrm{Lip}^{5+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{d_S}))$.

**Theorem 2.** *Under assumption* **(a1)**, *there exists a $d_S$-dimensional process $S^\infty \in \mathcal{S}^0$ such that*

$$S^n \to S^\infty, \qquad in \ \mathcal{S}^0.$$

*In addition, the limit $\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) := S^\infty$ only depends on $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and not on the approximating sequence.*

*Moreover, for all $q \geq 1$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ it holds that $\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \in \mathcal{S}^q$ and the corresponding mapping $\Xi : \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha} \to \mathcal{S}^q$ is locally uniformly continuous (and locally Lipschitz under assumption* **(a1')**).

---

[9] In the sense of E. Stein, i.e. bounded $k$-th dervative for $k = 0, \dots, \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$ and $\gamma - \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$-Hölder continuous $\lfloor \gamma \rfloor$-th derivative.

[10] We introduce this auxiliary probability space, since in the proof of Theorem 7 it will be easier to work on a product space separating the randomness coming from $Y$ and $B$. A similar approach was followed in the proof of Theorem 1 in [3]

[11] In the forthcoming publication [9] we show existence of solutions to SDEs with rough drift under additional sets of assumptions. The corresponding proofs do not rely on the technique of flow decomposition used in the present work, but require more elements of rough path theory and would lead us too far astray from the topic of filtering.

Following Theorem 2, we say that $\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ is a solution of the *SDE with rough drift*

$$(17) \qquad \Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})_t = S_0 + \int_0^t a(\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})_r)dr + \int_0^t b(\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})_r)d\bar{B}_r + \int_0^t c(\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})_r)d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r.$$

The following result establishes some of the salient properties of solutions of SDEs with rough drift. Recall that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_0)$ carries, as above, the $d_Y$-dimensional Brownian motion $Y$ and let $\hat{\Omega} = \Omega \times \bar{\Omega}$ be the product space, with product measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P}_0 \otimes \bar{\mathbb{P}}$. Let $S$ be the unique solution on this probability space to the SDE

$$(18) \qquad S_t = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r)dr + \int_0^t b(S_r)d\bar{B}_r + \int_0^t c(S_r) \circ dY_r.$$

Denote by $\boldsymbol{Y}$ the rough path lift of $Y$ (i.e. the enhanced Brownian Motion over $Y$).

**Theorem 3.** *Under assumption* **(a1)** *we have that*

- *For every $R > 0, q \geq 1$*

$$(19) \qquad \sup_{||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} < R} \mathbb{E}[\exp(q|\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\infty;[0,t]})] < \infty.$$

- *For $\mathbb{P}_0 - a.e. \ \omega$*

$$(20) \qquad \bar{\mathbb{P}}[S_s(\omega, \cdot) = \Xi(\boldsymbol{Y}(\omega))_s(\cdot), \quad s \leq t] = 1.$$

## 4. Assumptions and main results

In the following we will make use of the Stratonovich version of equation (5), i.e. we will consider that the signal satisfies the equation

$$(21) \qquad \begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 + \int_0^t L_0(X_r, Y_r)dr + \sum_k \int_0^t Z_k(X_r, Y_r) \circ dY_r^k + \sum_j \int_0^t L_j(X_r, Y_r)dB_r^j, \\ Y_t &= \int_0^t h(X_r, Y_r)dr + W_t. \end{aligned}$$

where $L_0^j(x,y) = \bar{l}_0^j(x,y) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k\sum_i \partial_{x_i} Z_k^j(x,y)Z_k^i(x,y) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \partial_{y_k} Z_k^j(x,y)$. We remind that under $\mathbb{P}_0$ the observation $Y$ is a Brownian motion independent of $B$.

We will assume that $f$ is a bounded Lipschitz function and we fix $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2+\epsilon}, \frac{1}{2})$, $t > 0$ and $X_0$ is a bounded random vector independent of $B$ and $Y$. We will use one of the following assumptions

**(A1):** $Z_1, \ldots, Z_{d_Y} \in \text{Lip}^{4+\epsilon}$, $h^1, \ldots, h^{d_Y} \in \text{Lip}^{4+\epsilon}$ and $L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_{d_B} \in \text{Lip}^1$
**(A1'):** $Z_1, \ldots, Z_{d_Y} \in \text{Lip}^{5+\epsilon}$, $h^1, \ldots, h^{d_Y} \in \text{Lip}^{5+\epsilon}$ and $L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_{d_B} \in \text{Lip}^1$

**Remark 4.** *Assumption (A1) and (A1') lead to the existence of a solution of an SDEs with rough driver (Theorem 2). Under (A1) the solution mapping is locally uniformly continuous, under (A1') it is locally Lipschitz (Theorem 3).*

Assume either (A1) or (A1'). For $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ there exists by Theorem 2 a solution $(X^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, I^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ to the following *SDE with rough drift*

$$(22) \qquad \begin{aligned} X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= X_0 + \int_0^t L_0(X_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})dr + \int_0^t Z(X_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r + \sum_j \int_0^t L_j(X_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\bar{B}_r^j, \\ Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= \int_0^t d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r, \\ I_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= \int_0^t h(X_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r - \frac{1}{2}\sum_k \int_0^t D_k h^k(X_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})dr. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 5.** *Note that formally (!) when replacing the rough path $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with the process $Y$, $X^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ yields the solution to the SDE (21) and $\exp(I_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ yields the (Girsanov) multiplicator in (6). This observation is made precise in the statement of Theorem 2.*

We introduce the functions $g^f, g^1, \theta : \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$g^f(\boldsymbol{\eta}) := \bar{\mathbb{E}}[f(X_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \exp(I_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})], \quad g^1(\boldsymbol{\eta}) := \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\exp(I_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})], \quad \theta(\boldsymbol{\eta}) := \frac{g^f(\boldsymbol{\eta})}{g^1(\boldsymbol{\eta})}, \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}.$$

**Theorem 6.** *Assume that (A1) holds, then $\theta$ is locally uniformly continuous. Moreover if (A1') holds, then $\theta$ is locally Lipschitz.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 2 we know that for $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ the SDE with rough drift (22) has a unique solution $(X^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, I^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ belonging to $\mathcal{S}^2$.

Let now $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}' \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$. Denote $X = X^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, Y = Y^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, I = I^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and analogously for $\boldsymbol{\eta}'$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|g^f(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - g^f(\boldsymbol{\eta})| &\leq \mathbb{E}[|f(X_t, Y_t) \exp(I_t) - f(X_t', Y"_t) \exp(I_t')|] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[|f(X_t, Y_t)|| \exp(I_t) - \exp(I_t')|] + \mathbb{E}[|f(X_t, Y_t) - f(X_t', Y_t')| \exp(I_t')] \\
&\leq |f|_\infty \mathbb{E}[|\exp(I_t) - \exp(I_t')|] + \mathbb{E}[|f(X_t, Y_t) - f(X_t', Y_t')|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|\exp(I_t')|^2]^{1/2} \\
&\leq |f|_\infty \mathbb{E}[|\exp(I_t) + \exp(I_t')|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|I_t - I_t'|]^{1/2} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[|f(X_t, Y_t) - f(X_t', Y_t')|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|\exp(I_t')|^2]^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using from Theorems 2+3 the continuity statements as well as the boundedness of exponential moments, we see that $g^f$ is locally uniformly continuous under (A1) and it is locally Lipschitz under (A1').

The same then holds true for $g^1$ and moreover $g^1(\boldsymbol{\eta}) > 0$. Hence $\theta$ is locally uniformly continuous under (A1) and locally Lipschitz under (A1'). $\square$

Denote by $\boldsymbol{Y}_.$, as before, the canonical rough path lift of $Y$ to $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$. We then have

**Theorem 7.** *Assume either (A1) or (A1'). Then $\theta(\boldsymbol{Y}_.) = \pi_t(f)$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$*

*Proof Of Theorem 7.* To prove the statement it is enough to show that

$$g^f(\boldsymbol{Y}_.) = p_t(f) \qquad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

which is equivalent to

$$g^f(\boldsymbol{Y}_.) = p_t(f) \qquad \mathbb{P}_0 - a.s.$$

For that, it suffices to show that

$$(23) \qquad\qquad \mathbb{E}_0[p_t(f) \Upsilon(Y_.)] = \mathbb{E}_0[g^f(\boldsymbol{Y}_.) \Upsilon(Y_.)],$$

for an arbitrary continuous bounded function $\Upsilon : C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^{d_Y}) \to \mathbb{R}$.

Let $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$ be the auxiliary probability space from before, carrying an $d_B$-dimensional Brownian motion $\bar{B}$. Let $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) := (\Omega \times \bar{\Omega}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \mathbb{P}_0 \otimes \bar{\mathbb{P}})$. By $Y$ and $X_0$ we denote also the 'lift' of $Y$ to $\hat{\Omega}$, i.e. $Y(\omega, \bar{\omega}) = Y(\omega)$, $X_0(\omega, \bar{\omega}) = X_0(\omega)$. Then $(Y, B)$ (on $\Omega$ under $\mathbb{P}_0$) has the same distribution as $(Y, \bar{B})$ (on $\hat{\Omega}$ under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$).

Denote by $(\hat{X}, \hat{I})$ the solution on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{F}, \hat{\mathbb{P}})$ to the SDE

$$\hat{X}_t = X_0 + \int_0^t L_0(\hat{X}_r, Y_r)dr + \sum_k \int_0^t Z_k(\hat{X}_r, Y_r) \circ dY_r^k + \sum_j \int_0^t L_j(\hat{X}_r, Y_r)d\bar{B}_r^j,$$

$$\hat{I}_t = \sum_k \int_0^t h^k(\hat{X}_r, Y_r) \circ dY_r^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_0^t D_k h^k(\hat{X}_r, Y_r)dr.$$

Then

$$(Y, \hat{X}, \hat{I})_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}} \sim \left( Y, X, \sum_k \int_0^{\cdot} h^k(X_r, Y_r) \circ dY_r^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_0^{\cdot} D_k h^k(X_r, Y_r)dr \right)_{\mathbb{P}_0}.$$

Hence, for the left hand side of (23),

$$\mathbb{E}_0[p_t(f)\Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})] = \mathbb{E}_0[f(X_t, Y_t) \exp\left( \sum_k \int_0^t h^k(X_r, Y_r) \circ dY_r^k - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_0^t D_k h^k(X_r, Y_r)dr \right) \Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})]$$

$$= \hat{\mathbb{E}}[f(\hat{X}_t, Y_t) \exp\left( \hat{I}_t \right) \Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})]$$

On the other hand, from Theorem 3 we know that for $\mathbb{P}_0 - a.e\ \omega$

$$X^{\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot}(\omega)}(\bar{\omega})_t = \hat{X}_t(\omega, \bar{\omega}), \ Y^{\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot}(\omega)}(\bar{\omega})_t = \hat{Y}_t(\omega, \bar{\omega}), \ I^{\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot}(\omega)}(\bar{\omega})_t = \hat{I}_t(\omega, \bar{\omega}), \qquad \bar{\mathbb{P}} - a.e.\ \bar{\omega}.$$

Hence, for the right hand side of (23) we get (using Fubini for the last equality)

$$\mathbb{E}_0[g^f(\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot})\Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})] = \mathbb{E}_0[\bar{\mathbb{E}}[f(X_t^{\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot}}, Y_t^{\mathbf{Y}}) \exp\left( I_t^{\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot}} \right)]\Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_0[\bar{\mathbb{E}}[f(\hat{X}_t, Y_t) \exp\left( \hat{I}_t \right)]\Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})]$$

$$= \hat{\mathbb{E}}[f(\hat{X}_t, Y_t) \exp\left( \hat{I}_t \right)\Upsilon(Y_{\cdot})],$$

which yields (23). □

## 5. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ be the lift of a smooth path $\eta$. Let $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ be the unique solution of the SDE

$$S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})dr + \int_0^t b(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\bar{B}_r + \int_0^t c(S_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\eta_r.$$

Define $\tilde{S}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} := (\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{-1}(t, S_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$, where $\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ is the ODE flow

$$(24) \qquad \phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t, x) = x + \int_0^t c(\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(r, x))d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r.$$

By Lemma 9, we have that $\tilde{S}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ satisfies the SDE

$$(25) \qquad \tilde{S}_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = S_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(r, \tilde{S}_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})dr, + \int_0^t \tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(r, \tilde{S}_r^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})d\bar{B}_r$$

with $\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ defined as in Lemma 9.

This equation makes sense, even if $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is a generic rough path in $\mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$, (in which case (24) is now really an RDE). Indeed, since the first two derivatives of $\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and its inverse are bounded (Proposition 11.11 in [24]) we have that $\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t, \cdot), \tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t, \cdot)$ are also in $\text{Lip}^1$. Hence by Theorem V.7 in [31], there exists a unique strong solution to (25).

We define the mapping introduced in Theorem 2 as

$$\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta})_t := \phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t, \tilde{S}_t^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}).$$

To show continuity of the mapping we restrict ourselves to the case $q = 2$. Moreover we shall assume $c_1, \ldots, c_{d_Y} \in \mathrm{Lip}^{5+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, and we will hence prove the local Lipschitz property of the respective maps.

Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2 \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ with $|\boldsymbol{\eta}^1|_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}, |\boldsymbol{\eta}^2|_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}} < R$. By Lemma 12 we have

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\tilde{S}_s^1 - \tilde{S}_s^2|^2]^{1/2} \leq C_{Lem12}(R) \rho_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1)_s - \Xi(\boldsymbol{\eta}^2)_s|^2]^{1/2} &= \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^1) - \phi^2(s, \tilde{S}_s^2)|^2]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^1) - \phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^2)|^2]^{1/2} + \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^2) - \phi^2(s, \tilde{S}_s^2)|^2]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^1) - \phi^1(s, \tilde{S}_s^2)|^2]^{1/2} + \sup_{s \leq t, x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_S}} |\phi^1(s, x) - \phi^1(s, x)| \\
&\leq K(R) \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\tilde{S}_s^1 - \tilde{S}_s^2|^2]^{1/2} + C_{Lem13}(R) \rho_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2) \\
&\leq C_1 \rho_{\alpha-\mathrm{Höl}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

as desired, where

$$C_1 = K_{Lem13}(R) C_{Lem12}(R) + C_{Lem13}(R),$$

where $K_{Lem13}(R)$ and $C_{Lem13}(R)$ are the constants from Lemma 13. $\qquad \square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* In order to show (19), pick $k \in 1, \ldots, d_S$. We first note that by simply scaling (the coefficients of) $S^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ it is sufficient to argue for $q = 1$. And consider the $k$-th component of $\Xi$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\exp(|\Xi^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\eta})|_{\infty;[0,t]})] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \left( |\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(0, S_0)| + |\tilde{S}^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty;[0,t]} \right))] \\
&\leq \exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{|x| \leq |S_0|_{L^\infty}} |\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(0, x)|) \mathbb{E}[\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{s \leq t} |\tilde{S}_t^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}|)] \\
&\leq \exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{|x| \leq |S_0|_{L^\infty}} |\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(0, x)) \\
&\quad \times \left( \mathbb{E}[\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{s \leq t} \tilde{S}_s^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})] + \mathbb{E}[-\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{s \leq t} \tilde{S}_s^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})] \right) \\
&= \exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \sup_{|x| \leq |S_0|_{L^\infty}} |\phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(0, x)) \\
&\quad \times \left( \mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \leq t} \exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \tilde{S}_s^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})] + \mathbb{E}[-\sup_{s \leq t} \exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} \tilde{S}_s^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})] \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, only the boundedness of the last two terms remains to be shown, for $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ bounded.

By applying Itô's formula we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp(\tilde{S}_t^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) &= 1 + \int_0^t \exp(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) d\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}} + \int_0^t \exp(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) d\langle \tilde{S}^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}} \rangle_r \\
&= 1 + \int_0^t \exp(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \tilde{a}_k^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) dr + \sum_{i=1}^{d_B} \int_0^t \exp(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \tilde{b}_{ki}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) d\bar{B}_r^i \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{d_B} \int_0^t \exp(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}}) |\tilde{b}_{ki}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\tilde{S}_r^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})|^2 dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the process $\exp(\tilde{S}^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ satisfies a SDE with Lipschitz coefficients and by an application of Gronwalls Lemma and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (see also Lemma V.2 in [31]) one arrives at

$$(26) \qquad \sup_{|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-\text{Höl}}<R} \sup_{s \leq t} \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty}\tilde{S}_t^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})] \leq C \exp(C_2),$$

where $C$ is universal and

$$C_2 := \sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}:||\boldsymbol{\eta}||_{\alpha-\text{Höl}}<R} |\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty} + |\tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty}^2,$$

which is finite because of Lemma 10. One argues analogously for $\sup_{s\leq t} \bar{\mathbb{E}}[-\exp(|D\psi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\infty}\tilde{S}_t^{(k);\boldsymbol{\eta}})]$, which then gives (19).

Now, for the correspondence to an SDE solution let $\Omega$ be the additional probability space as given in the statement. Let $S$ be the solution to the SDE (18).

In Section 3 in [6] it was shown (see also Theorem 2 in [1]), that if we let $\Theta$ be the stochastic (Stratonovich) flow

$$\Theta(\omega;t,x) = x + \int_0^t c(\Theta(\omega;r,x)) \circ dY_r(\omega),$$

then with $\hat{S}_t := \Theta^{-1}(t,S_t)$ we have $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.

$$(27) \qquad \hat{S}_s(\omega,\omega^{\bar{B}}) = S_0 + \int_0^s \hat{a}(r,\hat{S}_r)dr + \int_0^s \hat{b}(r,\hat{S}_r)d\bar{B}_r, \qquad s \in [0,t], \qquad \hat{\mathbb{P}} \; a.e. \; (\omega,\omega^{\bar{B}}).$$

Here, componentwise,

$$\hat{a}(t,x)_i := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\Theta_i^{-1}(t,\Theta(t,x))a_k(\Theta(t,x)) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k}\partial_{x_jx_k}\Theta_i^{-1}(t,\Theta(t,x))\sum_l b_{jl}(\Theta(t,x))b_{kl}(\Theta(t,x)),$$

$$\hat{b}(t,x)_{ij} := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\Theta_i^{-1}(t,x)b_{kj}(\Theta(t,x)).$$

Especially, by a Fubini type theorem (e.g. Theorem 3.4.1 in [4]), there exists $\Omega_0$ with $\mathbb{P}_0(\Omega_0) = 1$ such that for $\omega \in \Omega_0$ equation (27) holds true $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ a.s..

Let $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ be the enhanced Brownian motion over $Y$. We can then construct $\omega$-wise the rough flow $\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}$ as given in (24). By the very definition of $\Xi$ we know that $\tilde{S}_t^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(\omega) := (\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})^{-1}(\omega;t,\Xi(\omega)_t)$ satifies the SDE

$$(28) \qquad \tilde{S}_t^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)} = S_0 + \int_0^t \hat{b}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(r,\tilde{S}_r^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})dr + \int_0^t \hat{b}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(r,\tilde{S}_r^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})d\bar{B}_r, \qquad \bar{\mathbb{P}}a.e. \; \omega^{\bar{B}},$$

where

$$\tilde{a}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x)_i := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}(\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})_i^{-1}(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x))a_k(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x))$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k}\partial_{x_jx_k}(\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})_i^{-1}(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x))\sum_l b_{jl}(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x))b_{kl}(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x)),$$

$$\tilde{b}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x)_{ij} := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}(\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)})_i^{-1}(t,x)b_{kj}(t,\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(t,x)).$$

It is a classical rough path result (see e.g. section 17.5 in [24]), that there exists $\Omega_1$ with $\mathbb{P}^Y(\Omega_1) = 1$ such that for $\omega \in \Omega_1$, we have

$$\phi^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(\cdot,\cdot) = \Theta(\omega;\cdot,\cdot).$$

Hence for $\omega \in \Omega_1$ we have that $\hat{a} = \tilde{a}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}, \hat{b} = \tilde{b}^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}$. Hence for for $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1$ the processes $\hat{S}_t(\omega,\cdot), \tilde{S}_t^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(\cdot)$ satisfy the same Lipschitz SDE (with respect to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$). [12] By strong uniqueness we hence

---

[12] Here one has to argue, that fixing $\omega$ in equation (28) gives ($\mathbb{P}_0$-a.s.) the solution to the respective SDE on $\Omega^{\bar{B}}$.

have for $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1$ that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ a.s.

$$\hat{S}_s(\omega, \cdot) = \tilde{S}_s^{\mathbf{Y}(\omega)}(\cdot), \quad s \leq t.$$

Hence for $\omega \in \Omega_0 \cap \Omega_1$

$$S_s(\omega, \cdot) = \Xi(\mathbf{Y}(\omega))(\cdot)_s, \quad s \leq t, \qquad \bar{\mathbb{P}} \text{ a.s.}$$

$\square$

**Remark 8.** *We remark that the above idea of a flow decomposition is also used in the work by Davis [11, 12, 13, 15]. Without rough path theory this approach is restricted to one dimensional observation, since one for multidimensional flows one cannot hope for continuous dependence on the driving signal in supremum norm.*

**Lemma 9.** *Let $\eta$ be a smooth $d_Y$-dim path $\eta$ and $S$ be the solution of the the following classical SDE*

$$S_t = S_0 + \int_0^t a(S_r)dr + \int_0^t b(S_r)d\bar{B}_r + \int_0^t c(S_r)d\eta_r$$

*where $\bar{B}$ is a $d_B$-dimensional Brownian motion, $\int_0^t c(S_r)d\eta_r := \sum_{i=1}^{d_S} \int_0^t c_i(S_r)\dot{\eta}_r^i dr$, $a \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, $b_1, \ldots, b_{d_B} \in \mathrm{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, $c_1, \ldots, c_{d_Y} \in \mathrm{Lip}^{4+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}^{d_S})$, and $S_0 \in L^\infty(\bar{\Omega}; \mathbb{R}^{d_S})$ independent of $\bar{B}$. Consider the flow*

$$(29) \qquad \qquad \phi(t, x) = x + \int_0^t c(\phi(r, x))d\eta_r.$$

*Then $\tilde{S}_t := \phi^{-1}(t, S_t)$ satisfies the following SDE*

$$\tilde{S}_t = S_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{a}(r, \tilde{S}_r)dr + \int_0^t \tilde{b}(r, \tilde{S}_r)d\bar{B}_r,$$

*where we define componentwise*

$$\tilde{a}(t, x)_i := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t, \phi(t, x))a_k(\phi(t, x)) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k} \partial_{x_j x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t, \phi(t, x))\sum_l b_{jl}(\phi(t, x))b_{kl}(\phi(t, x)),$$

$$\tilde{b}(t, x)_{ij} := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t, \phi(t, x))b_{kj}(\phi(t, x)).$$

*Proof.* Denote $\psi(t, x) := \phi^{-1}(t, x)$. Then

$$\psi(r, x) = x - \int_0^t \partial_x\psi(r, x)c(x)d\eta_r.$$

By Itô's formula

$$\psi_i(t, S_t) - \psi_i(0, S_0) = \int_0^t \partial_t\psi_i(r, S_r)dr + \sum_j \int_0^t \partial_{x_j}\psi_i(r, S_r)dS_j(r) + \sum_{j,k}\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \partial_{x_j x_k}\psi_i(r, S_r)d\langle S_k, S_j\rangle_r$$

$$= \sum_j \int_0^t \partial_{x_j}\psi_i(r, S_r)a_j(S_r)dr + \sum_j \int_0^t \partial_{x_j}\psi_i(r, S_r)\sum_k b_{jk}(S_r)d\bar{B}_k(r)$$

$$+ \sum_{j,k}\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \partial_{x_j x_k}\psi_i(S_r)\sum_l b_{kl}(S_r)b_{jl}(S_r)dr.$$

$\square$

**Lemma 10.** *Consider for a rough path* $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ *the analogously to Lemma 9 transformed coefficients,* $\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}},$ *i.e. consider the rough flow*

$$(30) \qquad \phi(t,x) = \phi^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t,x) = x + \int_0^t c(\phi(r,x))d\boldsymbol{\eta}_r.$$

*and define*

$$\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t,x)_i := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t,\phi(t,x))a_k(\phi(t,x)) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k}\partial_{x_j x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t,\phi(t,x))\sum_l b_{jl}(\phi(t,x))b_{kl}(\phi(t,x)),$$

$$\tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(t,x)_{ij} := \sum_k \partial_{x_k}\phi_i^{-1}(t,\phi(t,x))b_{kj}(\phi(t,x)).$$

*Then for every* $R > 0$ *there exists* $K_{Lem10} = K_{Lem10}(R) < \infty$ *such that*

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}:|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}<R} |\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_\infty \leq K_{Lem10},$$

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}:|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}<R} |\tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_\infty \leq K_{Lem10},$$

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}:|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}<R} \sup_{s\leq t} |D\tilde{a}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(s,\cdot)|_\infty \leq K_{Lem10},$$

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\eta}:|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}<R} \sup_{s\leq t} |D\tilde{b}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(s,\cdot)|_\infty \leq K_{Lem10},$$

*and such that if* $\boldsymbol{\eta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ *are two rough paths with* $|\boldsymbol{\eta}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, |\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l} < R$ *we have*

$$\sup_{t,x} |\tilde{a}^1(t,x) - \tilde{a}^2(t,x)| \leq K_{Lem10}(R)\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1,\boldsymbol{\eta}^2),$$

$$\sup_{t,x} |\tilde{b}^1(t,x) - \tilde{b}^2(t,x)| \leq K_{Lem10}(R)\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1,\boldsymbol{\eta}^2).$$

*Proof.* This is a straightforward calculation using Lemma 13 and the properties of $a, b$. □

The following is a standard result for continuous dependence of SDEs on parameters.

**Lemma 11.** *Let* $\tilde{a}^i(t,x), \tilde{b}^i(t,x), i = 1,2$ *be bounded and uniformly Lipschitz in* $x$.
*Let* $\tilde{S}^i$ *be the corresponding unique solutions to the SDEs*

$$\tilde{S}_t^i = S_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{a}^i(r, \tilde{S}_r^i)dr + \int_0^t \tilde{b}^i(r, \tilde{S}_r^i)d\bar{B}_r, \qquad i = 1,2.$$

*Assume*

$$\sup_{s\leq t} |D\tilde{a}^1(s,\cdot)|_\infty, \sup_{s\leq t} |D\tilde{b}^1(s,\cdot)|_\infty < K < \infty,$$

$$\sup_{r,x} \left(\tilde{a}^1(r,x) - \tilde{a}^2(r,x)\right), \sup_{r,x} \left(\tilde{b}^1(r,x) - \tilde{b}^2(r,x)\right) < \varepsilon < \infty.$$

*Then there exists* $C_{Lem11} = C_{Lem11}(K)$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{s\leq t} |\tilde{S}_s^1 - \tilde{S}_s^2|^2]^{1/2} \leq C_{Lem11}\,\varepsilon,$$

*Proof.* This is a straightforward application of Ito's formula and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality. □

We now apply the previous Lemma to our concrete setting.

**Lemma 12.** *Let* $\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2 \in \mathcal{C}^{0,\alpha}$ *and let* $\tilde{S}^1, \tilde{S}^2$ *be the corresponding unique solutions to the SDEs*

$$\tilde{S}_t^i = S_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{a}^i(r, \tilde{S}_r^i)dr + \int_0^t \tilde{b}^i(r, \tilde{S}_r^i)d\bar{B}_r, \qquad i = 1, 2,$$

*where* $\tilde{a}^i, \tilde{b}^i$ *are given as in Lemma 10.*

*Assume* $R > \max\{|\boldsymbol{\eta}^1|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}, |\boldsymbol{\eta}^2|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}\}$. *Then there exists* $C_{Lem12} = C_{Lem12}(R)$.

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \leq t} |\tilde{S}_s^1 - \tilde{S}_s^2|^2]^{1/2} \leq C_{Lem12}\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2).$$

*Proof.* Fix $R > 0$. Let $||\boldsymbol{\eta}^1||_{\alpha-\text{Höl}}, ||\boldsymbol{\eta}^2||_{\alpha-\text{Höl}} < R$.

From Lemma 10 we know that

$$\sup_{t,x} |\tilde{b}^1(t,x) - \tilde{b}^2(t,x)| \leq K_{Lem10}(R)\rho_{\alpha-\text{Höl}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2),$$

Analogously, we get

$$\sup_{t,x} |\tilde{a}^1(t,x) - \tilde{a}^2(t,x)| \leq L_2\rho_{\alpha-\text{Höl}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^1, \boldsymbol{\eta}^2),$$

for a $L_2 = L_2(R)$. $\qquad\qquad\square$

**Lemma 13.** *Let* $\alpha \in (0,1)$. *Let* $\gamma > \frac{1}{\alpha} \geq 1$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ *and assume that* $V = (V_1, \dots, V_d)$ *is a collection of* $\text{Lip}^{\gamma+k}$-*vector fields on* $\mathbb{R}^e$. *Write* $n = (n_1, \dots, n_e) \in \mathbb{N}^e$ *and assume* $|n| := n_1 + \cdots + n_e \leq k$. *Then, for all* $R > 0$ *there exist* $C = C(R, |V|_{\text{Lip}^{\gamma+k}}), K = K(R, |V|_{\text{Lip}^{\gamma+k}}))$ *such that if* $\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2 \in C^{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}([0,t], G^{[p]}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *with* $\max_i ||\mathbf{x}^i||_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l;[0,t]} \leq R$ *then*

$$\sup_{y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^e} \left|\partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^1) - \partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^2)\right|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l;[0,t]} \leq C\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2),$$

$$\sup_{y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^e} \left|\partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^1)^{-1} - \partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^2)^{-1}\right|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l;[0,t]} \leq C\rho_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l}(\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{x}^2),$$

$$\sup_{y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^e} \left|\partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^1)\right|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l;[0,t]} \leq K,$$

$$\sup_{y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^e} \left|\partial_n \pi_{(V)}(0, y_0; \mathbf{x}^1)^{-1}\right|_{\alpha-H\ddot{o}l;[0,t]} \leq K.$$

*Proof.* The fact that $V \in \text{Lip}^{\gamma+k}$ (instead of just $\text{Lip}^{\gamma+k-1}$) entails that the derivatives up to order $k$ are unique non-explosive solutions to RDEs with $\text{Lip}_{loc}^\gamma$ vector fields (see Section 11 in [24]). Localisation (uniform for driving paths bounded in $\alpha$-Hölder norm) then yields the desired results. $\qquad\square$

## REFERENCES

[1] G.B. Arous and F. Castell. Flow decomposition and large deviations. *Journal of functional analysis*, 140(1):23–67, 1996.

[2] A. Bagchi and R. Karandikar. White noise theory of robust nonlinear filtering with correlated state and observation noises. *Systems & control letters*, 23(2):137–148, 1994.

[3] A. Bain and D. Crisan. *Fundamentals of stochastic filtering*. Springer Verlag, 2008.

[4] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure theory. Vol. I*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[5] Leo Breiman. *Probability*. Classics in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1992.

[6] R. Buckdahn and J. Ma. Pathwise stochastic control problems and stochastic HJB equations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 45(6):2224–2256 (electronic), 2007.

[7] J. M. C. Clark. The design of robust approximations to the stochastic differential equations of nonlinear filtering. In *Communication systems and random process theory (Proc. 2nd NATO Advanced Study Inst., Darlington, 1977)*, pages 721–734. NATO Advanced Study Inst. Ser., Ser. E: Appl. Sci., No. 25. Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1978.

[8] J. M. C. Clark and D. Crisan. On a robust version of the integral representation formula of nonlinear filtering. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 133(1):43–56, 2005.

[9] D. Crisan, J. Diehl, P. Friz, and H. Oberhauser. Stochastic differential equations with rough drift.

[10] D. Crisan and B. Rozovskiĭ (eds). *The Oxford handbook of nonlinear filtering*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. xiv, 1063 p. , 2011.

[11] M. H. A. Davis. On a multiplicative functional transformation arising in nonlinear filtering theory. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 54(2):125–139, 1980.

[12] M. H. A. Davis. A pathwise solution of the equations of nonlinear filtering. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 27(1):160–167, 1982.

[13] M. H. A. Davis and M. P. Spathopoulos. Pathwise nonlinear filtering for nondegenerate diffusions with noise correlation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 25(2):260–278, 1987.

[14] M.H.A. Davis. Pathwise nonlinear filtering. Stochastic systems: the mathematics of filtering and identification and applications, Proc. NATO Adv. Study Inst., Les Arcs/Savoie/ France 1980, 505-528 (1981)., 1981.

[15] M.H.A. Davis. Pathwise nonlinear filtering with correlated noise. Crisan, Dan (ed.) and Rozovskiĭ, Boris (ed.), The Oxford handbook of nonlinear filtering. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 403-424 (2011)., 2011.

[16] P. Del Moral. *Feynman-Kac formulae: genealogical and interacting particle systems with applications*. Springer Verlag, 2004.

[17] P. Del Moral, P. Hu, and L. Wu. On the concentration properties of interacting particle processes. *Machine Learning*, 3(3-4):225–389, 2010.

[18] P. Del Moral, J. Jacod, and P. Protter. The monte-carlo method for filtering with discrete-time observations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 120(3):346–368, 2001.

[19] P. Del Moral and L. Miclo. Branching and interacting particle systems approximations of feynman-kac formulae with applications to non-linear filtering. *Seminaire de Probabilites XXXIV*, pages 1–145, 2000.

[20] H. Doss. Liens entre équations différentielles stochastiques et ordinaires. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.)*, 13(2):99–125, 1977.

[21] R.J. Elliott and M. Kohlmann. Robust filtering for correlated multidimensional observations. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 178(4):559–578, 1981.

[22] P. Florchinger. Zakai equation of nonlinear filtering with unbounded coefficients. the case of dependent noises. *Systems & control letters*, 21(5):413–422, 1993.

[23] P. Florchinger and G. Nappo. Continuity of the filter with unbounded observation coefficients. *Stochastic analysis and applications*, (29):612630, 2011.

[24] P. K. Friz and N. B. Victoir. *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths*, volume 120 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. Theory and applications.

[25] P.K. Friz. Continuity of the Ito-map for Hoelder rough paths with applications to the support theorem in Hoelder norm. *Probability and Partial Differential Equations in Modern Applied Mathematics, IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol 140 (2005) 117-135*, 2005.

[26] H. J. Kushner. A robust discrete state approximation to the optimal nonlinear filter for a diffusion. *Stochastics*, 3(2):75–83, 1979.

[27] H.J. Kushner. A robust discrete state approximation to the optimal nonlinear filter for a diffusiont. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 3(1-4):75–83, 1980.

[28] T. J. Lyons. Differential equations driven by rough signals. I. An extension of an inequality of L. C. Young. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 1(4):451–464, 1994.

[29] T. J. Lyons, M. Caruana, and T. Lévy. *Differential equations driven by rough paths*, volume 1908 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 2007. Lectures from the 34th Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–24, 2004.

[30] T. J. Lyons and Z. Qian. *System Control and Rough Paths*. Oxford University Press, 2002. Oxford Mathematical Monographs.

[31] P.E. Protter. *Stochastic integration and differential equations*. Springer Verlag, 2004.

[32] H. J. Sussmann. On the gap between deterministic and stochastic ordinary differential equations. *Ann. Probability*, 6(1):19–41, 1978.

DC is affiliated to Imperial College London. JD and HO are affiliated to TU Berlin. PKF is affiliated to TU and WIAS Berlin.

# Preprint Series DFG-SPP 1324

**http://www.dfg-spp1324.de**

# Reports

[1] R. Ramlau, G. Teschke, and M. Zhariy. A Compressive Landweber Iteration for Solving Ill-Posed Inverse Problems. Preprint 1, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.

[2] G. Plonka. The Easy Path Wavelet Transform: A New Adaptive Wavelet Transform for Sparse Representation of Two-dimensional Data. Preprint 2, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.

[3] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Optimal Order of Convergence and (In-) Tractability of Multivariate Approximation of Smooth Functions. Preprint 3, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.

[4] M. Espig, L. Grasedyck, and W. Hackbusch. Black Box Low Tensor Rank Approximation Using Fibre-Crosses. Preprint 4, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.

[5] T. Bonesky, S. Dahlke, P. Maass, and T. Raasch. Adaptive Wavelet Methods and Sparsity Reconstruction for Inverse Heat Conduction Problems. Preprint 5, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.

[6] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation of Infinitely Differentiable Multivariate Functions Is Intractable. Preprint 6, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.

[7] J. Ma and G. Plonka. A Review of Curvelets and Recent Applications. Preprint 7, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2009.

[8] L. Denis, D. A. Lorenz, and D. Trede. Greedy Solution of Ill-Posed Problems: Error Bounds and Exact Inversion. Preprint 8, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[9] U. Friedrich. A Two Parameter Generalization of Lions' Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Linear Elliptic PDEs. Preprint 9, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[10] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Minimization of Non-smooth, Non-convex Functionals by Iterative Thresholding. Preprint 10, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[11] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Regularization with Non-convex Separable Constraints. Preprint 11, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[12] M. Döhler, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Nonequispaced Hyperbolic Cross Fast Fourier Transform. Preprint 12, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[13] C. Bender. Dual Pricing of Multi-Exercise Options under Volume Constraints. Preprint 13, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

[14] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable Subspace Sampling and Multi-level Algorithms. Preprint 14, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.

[15] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimally Sparse Image Representation by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 15, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.

[16] S. Dahlke, E. Novak, and W. Sickel. Optimal Approximation of Elliptic Problems by Linear and Nonlinear Mappings IV: Errors in $L_2$ and Other Norms. Preprint 16, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[17] B. Jin, T. Khan, P. Maass, and M. Pidcock. Function Spaces and Optimal Currents in Impedance Tomography. Preprint 17, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[18] G. Plonka and J. Ma. Curvelet-Wavelet Regularized Split Bregman Iteration for Compressed Sensing. Preprint 18, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.

[19] G. Teschke and C. Borries. Accelerated Projected Steepest Descent Method for Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 19, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[20] L. Grasedyck. Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors. Preprint 20, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[21] D. Rudolf. Error Bounds for Computing the Expectation by Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 21, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.

[22] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best m-term Approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel Spaces. Preprint 22, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[23] F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Preprint 23, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[24] S. Dereich and F. Heidenreich. A Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lévy Driven Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 24, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[25] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier, and T. Raasch. Multilevel Preconditioning for Adaptive Sparse Optimization. Preprint 25, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[26] S. Dereich. Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithms for Lévy-driven SDEs with Gaussian Correction. Preprint 26, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

[27] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and D. Roşca. A New Hybrid Method for Image Approximation using the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 27, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2009.

[28] O. Koch and C. Lubich. Dynamical Low-rank Approximation of Tensors. Preprint 28, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[29] E. Faou, V. Gradinaru, and C. Lubich. Computing Semi-classical Quantum Dynamics with Hagedorn Wavepackets. Preprint 29, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[30] D. Conte and C. Lubich. An Error Analysis of the Multi-configuration Time-dependent Hartree Method of Quantum Dynamics. Preprint 30, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[31] C. E. Powell and E. Ullmann. Preconditioning Stochastic Galerkin Saddle Point Problems. Preprint 31, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[32] O. G. Ernst and E. Ullmann. Stochastic Galerkin Matrices. Preprint 32, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[33] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak Order for the Discretization of the Stochastic Heat Equation Driven by Impulsive Noise. Preprint 33, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.

[34] L. Kämmerer and S. Kunis. On the Stability of the Hyperbolic Cross Discrete Fourier Transform. Preprint 34, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2009.

[35] P. Cerejeiras, M. Ferreira, U. Kähler, and G. Teschke. Inversion of the noisy Radon transform on $SO(3)$ by Gabor frames and sparse recovery principles. Preprint 35, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.

[36] T. Jahnke and T. Udrescu. Solving Chemical Master Equations by Adaptive Wavelet Compression. Preprint 36, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.

[37] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Irregular Shearlet Frames: Geometry and Approximation Properties. Preprint 37, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.

[38] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets are Optimally Sparse. Preprint 38, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.

[39] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best $m$-Term Approximation and Tensor Products of Sobolev and Besov Spaces – the Case of Non-compact Embeddings. Preprint 39, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[40] B. Niu, F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. Deterministic Multilevel Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Preprint 40, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[41] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Construction of Compactly Supported Shearlet Frames. Preprint 41, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.

[42] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Error Criteria for Numerical Solutions of Backward SDEs. Preprint 42, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[43] L. Grasedyck. Polynomial Approximation in Hierarchical Tucker Format by Vector-Tensorization. Preprint 43, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[44] M. Hansen und W. Sickel. Best $m$-Term Approximation and Sobolev-Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness - the Case of Compact Embeddings. Preprint 44, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.

[45] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and P. Lamby. Fast High-Dimensional Approximation with Sparse Occupancy Trees. Preprint 45, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[46] J. Ballani and L. Grasedyck. A Projection Method to Solve Linear Systems in Tensor Format. Preprint 46, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[47] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Convergence Rates for Greedy Algorithms in Reduced Basis Methods. Preprint 47, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.

[48] S. Kestler and K. Urban. Adaptive Wavelet Methods on Unbounded Domains. Preprint 48, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[49] H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions Multiplied by Explicit Correlation Factors. Preprint 49, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[50] H. Yserentant. On the Complexity of the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 50, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[51] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. Curvature Analysis of Frequency Modulated Manifolds in Dimensionality Reduction. Preprint 51, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.

[52] E. Herrholz and G. Teschke. Compressive Sensing Principles and Iterative Sparse Recovery for Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems. Preprint 52, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[53] L. Kämmerer, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Interpolation Lattices for Hyperbolic Cross Trigonometric Polynomials. Preprint 53, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[54] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Shearlets on Bounded Domains. Preprint 54, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[55] A. Zeiser. Wavelet Approximation in Weighted Sobolev Spaces of Mixed Order with Applications to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 55, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[56] G. Kutyniok, J. Lemvig, and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets. Preprint 56, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[57] A. Zeiser. On the Optimality of the Inexact Inverse Iteration Coupled with Adaptive Finite Element Methods. Preprint 57, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

[58] S. Jokar. Sparse Recovery and Kronecker Products. Preprint 58, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[59] T. Aboiyar, E. H. Georgoulis, and A. Iske. Adaptive ADER Methods Using Kernel-Based Polyharmonic Spline WENO Reconstruction. Preprint 59, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[60] O. G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff, and E. Ullmann. On the Convergence of Generalized Polynomial Chaos Expansions. Preprint 60, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.

[61] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. On Manifolds of Tensors of Fixed TT-Rank. Preprint 61, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2010.

[62] J. Ballani, L. Grasedyck, and M. Kluge. Black Box Approximation of Tensors in Hierarchical Tucker Format. Preprint 62, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[63] M. Hansen. On Tensor Products of Quasi-Banach Spaces. Preprint 63, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[64] S. Dahlke, G. Steidl, and G. Teschke. Shearlet Coorbit Spaces: Compactly Supported Analyzing Shearlets, Traces and Embeddings. Preprint 64, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.

[65] W. Hackbusch. Tensorisation of Vectors and their Efficient Convolution. Preprint 65, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[66] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Spatial Besov Regularity for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 66, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[67] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. On the Power of Function Values for the Approximation Problem in Various Settings. Preprint 67, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[68] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. The Curse of Dimensionality for Monotone and Convex Functions of Many Variables. Preprint 68, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[69] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Image Separation Using Shearlets. Preprint 69, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

[70] B. Jin and P. Maass. An Analysis of Electrical Impedance Tomography with Applications to Tikhonov Regularization. Preprint 70, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[71] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. The Alternating Linear Scheme for Tensor Optimisation in the TT Format. Preprint 71, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[72] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. A Local Refinement Strategy for Constructive Quantization of Scalar SDEs. Preprint 72, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[73] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. An Analysis for the DIIS Acceleration Method used in Quantum Chemistry Calculations. Preprint 73, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[74] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Least-Squares Monte Carlo for Backward SDEs. Preprint 74, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[75] C. Bender. Primal and Dual Pricing of Multiple Exercise Options in Continuous Time. Preprint 75, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[76] H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and R. Schneider. On the Low-rank Approximation by the Pivoted Cholesky Decomposition. Preprint 76, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.

[77] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Adaptive Wavelet Methods for Elliptic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 77, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[78] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimal Representation of Piecewise Hölder Smooth Bivariate Functions by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 78, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[79] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients. Preprint 79, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[80] T. Müller-Gronbach, K. Ritter, and L. Yaroslavtseva. A Derandomization of the Euler Scheme for Scalar Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 80, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[81] W. Dahmen, C. Huang, C. Schwab, and G. Welper. Adaptive Petrov-Galerkin methods for first order transport equations. Preprint 81, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[82] K. Grella and C. Schwab. Sparse Tensor Spherical Harmonics Approximation in Radiative Transfer. Preprint 82, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[83] D.A. Lorenz, S. Schiffler, and D. Trede. Beyond Convergence Rates: Exact Inversion With Tikhonov Regularization With Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 83, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[84] S. Dereich, M. Scheutzow, and R. Schottstedt. Constructive quantization: Approximation by empirical measures. Preprint 84, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[85] S. Dahlke and W. Sickel. On Besov Regularity of Solutions to Nonlinear Elliptic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 85, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[86] S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, P. Maass, T. Raasch, and R.A. Ressel. An adaptive wavelet method for parameter identification problems in parabolic partial differential equations. Preprint 86, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[87] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and G. Welper. Adaptivity and Variational Stabilization for Convection-Diffusion Equations. Preprint 87, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[88] T. Jahnke. On Reduced Models for the Chemical Master Equation. Preprint 88, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

[89] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, P. Lamby, D. Savu, and R. Sharpley. Compressed Sensing and Electron Microscopy. Preprint 89, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.

[90] P. Binev, F. Blanco-Silva, D. Blom, W. Dahmen, P. Lamby, R. Sharpley, and T. Vogt. High Quality Image Formation by Nonlocal Means Applied to High-Angle Annular Dark Field Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy (HAADF-STEM). Preprint 90, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.

[91] R. A. Ressel. A Parameter Identification Problem for a Nonlinear Parabolic Differential Equation. Preprint 91, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[92] G. Kutyniok. Data Separation by Sparse Representations. Preprint 92, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[93] M. A. Davenport, M. F. Duarte, Y. C. Eldar, and G. Kutyniok. Introduction to Compressed Sensing. Preprint 93, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

[94] H.-C. Kreusler and H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions in Fractional Order and Weighted Sobolev Spaces. Preprint 94, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[95] E. Ullmann, H. C. Elman, and O. G. Ernst. Efficient Iterative Solvers for Stochastic Galerkin Discretizations of Log-Transformed Random Diffusion Problems. Preprint 95, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[96] S. Kunis and I. Melzer. On the Butterfly Sparse Fourier Transform. Preprint 96, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[97] T. Rohwedder. The Continuous Coupled Cluster Formulation for the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 97, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[98] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. Error Estimates for the Coupled Cluster Method. Preprint 98, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.

[99] P. A. Cioica and S. Dahlke. Spatial Besov Regularity for Semilinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Bounded Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 99, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2011.

[100] L. Grasedyck and W. Hackbusch. An Introduction to Hierarchical (H-) Rank and TT-Rank of Tensors with Examples. Preprint 100, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2011.

[101] N. Chegini, S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, and R. Stevenson. Piecewise Tensor Product Wavelet Bases by Extensions and Approximation Rates. Preprint 101, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[102] S. Dahlke, P. Oswald, and T. Raasch. A Note on Quarkonial Systems and Multilevel Partition of Unity Methods. Preprint 102, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[103] A. Uschmajew. Local Convergence of the Alternating Least Squares Algorithm For Canonical Tensor Approximation. Preprint 103, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[104] S. Kvaal. Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions. Preprint 104, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[105] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. On Groupoid C*-Algebras, Persistent Homology and Time-Frequency Analysis. Preprint 105, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[106] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. Discontinuous information in the worst case and randomized settings. Preprint 106, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[107] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, A. Litvinenko, H. Matthies, and E. Zander. Efficient Analysis of High Dimensional Data in Tensor Formats. Preprint 107, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

[108] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, S. Handschuh, and R. Schneider. Optimization Problems in Contracted Tensor Networks. Preprint 108, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.

[109] S. Dereich, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. On the Complexity of Computing Quadrature Formulas for SDEs. Preprint 109, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.

[110] D. Belomestny. Solving optimal stopping problems by empirical dual optimization and penalization. Preprint 110, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.

[111] D. Belomestny and J. Schoenmakers. Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives. Preprint 111, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.

[112] T. Rohwedder and A. Uschmajew. Local convergence of alternating schemes for optimization of convex problems in the TT format. Preprint 112, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.

[113] T. Görner, R. Hielscher, and S. Kunis. Efficient and accurate computation of spherical mean values at scattered center points. Preprint 113, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.

[114] Y. Dong, T. Görner, and S. Kunis. An iterative reconstruction scheme for photoacoustic imaging. Preprint 114, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2011.

[115] L. Kämmerer. Reconstructing hyperbolic cross trigonometric polynomials by sampling along generated sets. Preprint 115, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.

[116] H. Chen and R. Schneider. Numerical analysis of augmented plane waves methods for full-potential electronic structure calculations. Preprint 116, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.

[117] J. Ma, G. Plonka, and M.Y. Hussaini. Compressive Video Sampling with Approximate Message Passing Decoding. Preprint 117, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.

[118] D. Heinen and G. Plonka. Wavelet shrinkage on paths for scattered data denoising. Preprint 118, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2012.

[119] T. Jahnke and M. Kreim. Error bound for piecewise deterministic processes modeling stochastic reaction systems. Preprint 119, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2012.

[120] C. Bender and J. Steiner. A-posteriori estimates for backward SDEs. Preprint 120, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2012.

[121] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, A. Litvinenkoy, H.G. Matthiesy, and P. Wähnert. Efficient low-rank approximation of the stochastic Galerkin matrix in tensor formats. Preprint 121, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2012.

[122] O. Bokanowski, J. Garcke, M. Griebel, and I. Klompmaker. An adaptive sparse grid semi-Lagrangian scheme for first order Hamilton-Jacobi Bellman equations. Preprint 122, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2012.

[123] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On the convergence of the stochastic Galerkin method for random elliptic partial differential equations. Preprint 123, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2012.

[124] P.A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, U. Friedrich, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R.L. Schilling. On the convergence analysis of Rothe's method. Preprint 124, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.

[125] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. DeVore. Classification Algorithms using Adaptive Partitioning. Preprint 125, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.

[126] C. Lubich, T. Rohwedder, R. Schneider, and B. Vandereycken. Dynamical approximation of hierarchical Tucker and Tensor-Train tensors. Preprint 126, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2012.

[127] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and K. Urban. On Wavelet-Galerkin methods for semilinear parabolic equations with additive noise. Preprint 127, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.

[128] M. Bachmayr, H. Chen, and R. Schneider. Numerical analysis of Gaussian approximations in quantum chemistry. Preprint 128, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.

[129] D. Rudolf. Explicit error bounds for Markov chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 129, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2012.

[130] P.A. Cioica, K.-H. Kim, K. Lee, and F. Lindner. On the $L_q(L_p)$-regularity and Besov smoothness of stochastic parabolic equations on bounded Lipschitz domains. Preprint 130, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.

[131] M. Hansen. $n-$term Approximation Rates and Besov Regularity for Elliptic PDEs on Polyhedral Domains. Preprint 131, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.

[132] R. E. Bank and H. Yserentant. On the $H^1$ -stability of the $L_2$ -projection onto finite element spaces. Preprint 132, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.

[133] M. Gnewuch, S. Mayer, and K. Ritter. On Weighted Hilbert Spaces and Integration of Functions of Infinitely Many Variables. Preprint 133, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2012.

[134] D. Crisan, J. Diehl, P.K. Friz, and H. Oberhauser. Robust Filtering: Correlated Noise and Multidimensional Observation. Preprint 134, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2013.