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ABSTRACT. — If a diffusion process has a diffusion coefficient which 
depends on a parameter \( \theta \), one can construct consistent sequences of 
estimators of \( \theta \) based on the observation of the process at only \( n \) times, 
as \( n \) goes to infinity. Here we construct such estimators, and study their 
asymptotic efficiency. Of special interest to us are the multi-dimensional 
case (for the process) and the consideration of rather general sampling 
schemes.
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RÉSUMÉ. — Soit un processus de diffusion dont le coefficient de diffusion 
dépend d’un paramètre \( \theta \). On construit ci-dessous des estimateurs de \( \theta \) 
basés sur l’observation du processus à \( n \) instants, et on étudie le comportement 
asymptotique de ces estimateurs lorsque \( n \) tend vers l’infini. La 
difficulté du problème tient d’une part à ce que le processus de diffusion
1. INTRODUCTION

We are considering here an estimation problem for the (d-dimensional) solution $X$ of a stochastic differential equation of the form

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t)dt + a(\theta, t, X_t)\,dW_t, \quad \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu,$$

where the diffusion coefficient $a$ is a known function of the parameter $\theta$ in $\mathbb{R}^q$ and the drift $b$ is a non-anticipative functional. Further, $b$ and the initial distribution $\nu$ (a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$) may depend or not on $\theta$, and may be known or not (parametric or semi-parametric estimation). We observe the process at $n$ distinct times $t(n, i), \ i = 1, \ldots, n$ in the interval $[0, 1]$ and we are looking for asymptotic properties of estimators of $\theta$ as $n$ goes to infinity.

When $X$ is 1-dimensional and $t(n, i) = i/n$ (regular sampling) and $b$ is of the form $b(t, X) = b(\theta, X_t)$ and $a(\theta, t, X_t) = a(\theta, X_t)$ (homogeneous Markov case) and furthermore $a(\theta, x)$ does not vanish, Dohnal [7] has shown the LAMN (local asymptotic mixed normality) property for the likelihoods as $n \to \infty$, under some smoothness assumptions on the coefficients. This allows for versions of the convolution theorem and the minimax theorem of Hajek: see Jeganathan [17], [18] or Le Cam and Yang [20] for a recent account on the subject. In particular asymptotic lower bounds for the variance of the estimators can be drawn.

This result has several drawbacks: 1. it does not give feasible asymptotically efficient estimators because the likelihood at stage $n$ is not explicitly known; 2. it can easily be extended to the non-homogeneous Markov case, but not to the non-Markovian situation where $b$ depends on the whole past of the process $X$; 3. even in the homogeneous Markov case, it cannot be extended in general to multi-dimensional processes $X$, because there is no accurate enough expansion of the density of the semi-group of the process: in fact if the diffusion coefficient $c = aa^T$ is non-degenerate and if the coefficients derive from a potential (in a suitable sense: see [13]) such good expansions are available, due to an explicit expression of the densities in terms of Brownian bridge (see e. g. Dacunha-Castelle and Florens-Zmirou [5]); under the sole non-degeneracy assumption on $c$ the classical...
expansions of Molchanov [22] and Azencott [2] are not sufficient, and in
the degenerate case there is no expansion at all available.

Here we propose a family of explicit estimators, based on the minimiza-
tion of suitable contrasts (see Dacunha-Castelle and Duflo [4] for a general
account on this notion, and Dorogovcev [6], Florens-Zmirou [9], Genon-
Catalot [11], [12], Kasonga [19], for examples of contrasts used in discretiz-
atation problems for diffusion processes, mainly for estimating the drift
coefficient). Our estimators \( \hat{\theta}_n \) have a “LAMN” property, in the sense
that \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \) converges in law when \( \theta \) is the true value of the parameter
to a variable \( S \) which, conditionally on the path of \( X \), is centered Gaussian.

When \( c = a a^T \) is everywhere invertible, we construct estimators \( \hat{\theta}_n \) which
are optimal in this family, in the sense that if \( \hat{\theta}_n' \) is another sequence
converging after normalization to \( S' \), then \( S' - S \) is independent of \( S \),
conditionally on the path of \( X \) (hence \( S' \) is more spread out than \( S \)): this
is a sort of convolution theorem.

Let us stress the fact that we do not consider only “regular samplings”
\( t(n, i) = i/n \). Indeed, the only properties which we require is that the \( t(n, i) \)'s
are distinct for different \( i \)'s, and that the “empirical sampling measures”
\( \mu_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \epsilon_{t(n, i)} \) weakly converge to a measure \( \mu \) on \([0, 1] \) (\( \mu \) is Lebesgue
measure for regular samplings), and this property is indeed necessary to
obtain limit theorems. Then, when \( c = a a^T \) is invertible and if we consider
the optimal estimators \( \hat{\theta}_n \) mentionned above, the covariance matrix of the
limit law of \( \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \), conditionally on the path of \( X \), is \( 2B(\theta)^{-1} \) where

\[
B(\theta) = \int B(\theta, s) \mu(ds), \quad \text{and} \quad B(\theta)_s
\]

is the random \( q \times q \) matrix whose \((i, j)\)th
entries is the trace of \( \frac{\partial c}{\partial \theta_i} c^{-1} \frac{\partial c}{\partial \theta_j} c^{-1} \), evaluated at \( (\theta, s, X_s) \).

Hence instead of taking equally spaced sampling times, it may be wiser
to concentrate all observations around some given time (\( \mu \) is then a Dirac
measure). In fact, we intend to describe in a further paper [13] an “optimal”
sampling scheme, based on “random” sampling schemes in the spirit of
[15] (it is then an adaptive sampling procedure). Let us also mention that
using irregular sampling schemes allows to deal with missing data.

All results are stated in Section 2, the proofs being given in sections
3-6, and some examples are displayed in Section 7. Let us add a few words
about these proofs: unlike many proofs of LAMN property or more
generally of convergence of triangular arrays of variables to a mixed
normal variable (see e. g. Hall and Heyde [14], Feigin [8], etc.) which
concern the asymptotic behaviour as the observation times goes to infinity,
we cannot use classical martingale limit theorems based on a nesting

condition of the filtrations involved. We use an ad-hoc proof (simpler than Dohnal's one) based on a "functional" martingale-type limit theorem. A sizeable portion of the difficulties is due to the fact that we consider general sampling schemes.

2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

2.1. Notation and assumptions. – We first describe the general setting. The parameter space is a compact subset $\Theta$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The basic $d$-dimensional process $X = (X_t)_{t \leq \tau}$ is a solution to the following equation

$$dX_t = b(t, X)dt + a(\theta, t, X_t)dW_t, \quad \mathcal{L} (X_0) = \nu,$$

where:

- $\nu$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, possibly unknown or possibly depending on the parameter $\theta$,
- $b$ is a non-anticipative $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued map, possibly unknown or possibly depending on the parameter $\theta$,
- $a$ is a map: $\Theta \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^m$,
- $W$ is an $m$-dimensional Brownian motion.

An important role is played by the "diffusion coefficient" $c = aa^T$ (where $a^T$ denotes the transpose of $a$): this is a function from $\Theta \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ into the set $\mathcal{S}_+^d$ of symmetric nonnegative $d \times d$ matrices.

Below we introduce two hypotheses on the model: $H 1$ will be in force throughout the paper, while $H 2$ will only be assumed occasionally.

**Hypothesis H1.** (i) $t \mapsto b(t, X)$ is continuous.

(ii) The partial derivatives $\nabla^2_x a$, $\nabla_x \nabla_\theta a$, $\nabla_\theta a$ exist and are continuous on $\Theta \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

(iii) Equation (1) admits a non-exploding strong solution on $[0, 1]$ ("strong" means that the solution is adapted to the filtration generated by the Wiener process $W$ and the initial value $X_0$).

Since $a$ is locally Lipschitz, if $b$ were identically 0 the strong solution (hence the weak solution as well) would be unique; then by Girsanov's Theorem, under $H 1$ Equation (1) has a unique weak solution $P_{v, b}^\theta$ (see Stroock and Varadhan [23] or Liptser and Shiryaev [21]): that is, $P_{v, b}^\theta$ is the law of the solution on the canonical space $\Omega = C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ equipped with the canonical filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ and the canonical process $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$. From the statistical point of view, it is more natural to work with these weak solutions.

**Hypothesis H2.** For all $\theta$, outside a $P_{v, b}^\theta$-null set, the matrices $c(\zeta, t, X_t)$ are invertible for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $\zeta \in \Theta$.  ■
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In most applications the initial distribution $v$ is the Dirac measure at some known point $x_0$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$, so that $X_0$ is known. If $v$ is unknown, we gain no insight on $\theta$ by observing $X_0$. However, in order to unify the presentation, we suppose that we observe the process at time $t(n, 0) = 0$ and at $n$ other times $t(n, 1) < \ldots < t(n, n)$ in $(0, 1]$ (asymptotically as $n \to \infty$, it makes no difference to have $n$ or $n + 1$ observations). In order to obtain limit results as $n \to \infty$, we obviously need some kind of nice behaviour for the sampling times. This is expressed by the

**Hypothesis H3.** The probability measures $\mu_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \epsilon_{t(n, i)}$ on $[0, 1]$ weakly converge to a limiting measure $\mu$. ■

Since we wish to have (at least) consistent estimators for $\theta$, we need an identifiability assumption on the model. Under H3, this can be expressed as

**Hypothesis H4.** For all $\theta \in \Theta$, for $P_{\theta, B}^\theta$-almost all $\omega$, for all $\zeta \neq \theta$ the two functions $t \mapsto c(\theta, t, X_t(\omega))$ and $t \mapsto c(\zeta, t, X_t(\omega))$ are not $\mu$-a. s. equal. ■

Denoting by $\mathcal{F}_n$ the $\sigma$-field generated by the observations $X_{t(n, i)}$ at stage $n$, Hypothesis H4 amounts to saying that, under H3, for all $\zeta \neq \theta$ the two sequences $\{P_{\zeta, B}^\zeta$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{P_{\theta, B}^\theta$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ are entirely separated: this is exactly the condition for having consistent estimators.

**Remarks on these hypotheses.** 1. The reason for stating H2 as above is that we want to accommodate linear coefficients: for example when $d = m = 1$, we want to consider $a(\theta, t, x) = A(\theta, t) x$ with $A$ never vanishing; then $c$ can take the value 0, however if $v((-, 0]) = 0$ the process takes its values in $(0, \infty)$ and H2 is satisfied (see § 7 b below).

2. The sequence $(\mu_n)$ is always tight. If H3 fails, this sequence has several limit points, and as we will see our sequences of estimators would have accordingly several limiting points (for convergence in law).

3. Assumption H4 is difficult to check in general, because it depends on the path of the process. However, it is satisfied in the following cases:

- $\mu$ is the Dirac measure $\mu = \epsilon_s$ (the observation times are concentrated around $s$) and $c(\theta, s, x) \neq c(\zeta, s, x)$ for all $x$ and $\zeta \neq \theta$,

- $\mu$ has a topological support equal to $[0, 1]$ and for all $x$ and $\theta \neq \zeta$, there is a $t \in [0, 1]$ with $c(\theta, t, x) \neq c(\zeta, t, x)$,

- $\mu$ has a topological support including 0, and $v$ is the Dirac measure $v = \epsilon_{x_0}$ and $c(\theta, 0, x_0) \neq c(\zeta, 0, x_0)$ for all $\theta \neq \zeta$. ■
2 b. The contrasts. – In order to ease the notation, we write \( t_i = t(n, i) \) if there is no ambiguity. Set also

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta(n, i) &= \delta_i = t_i - t_{i-1} \\
X^n_i &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_i}} (X_{t_i} - X_{t_{i-1}}) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.
\end{align*}
\]

Now we want to estimate \( \theta \) from the observation of the \( \sigma \)-field \( \mathcal{F}^n \). However we do not know explicitly the relative densities \( dP^\theta_{\nu, b}/dP^\theta_{\nu, b'} \) in restriction to \( \mathcal{F}^n \) (even in the Markov case, these densities are functions of the transition densities, which are unknown). Hence we are led to construct the estimators by minimizing suitable contrasts.

In order to motivate our choice of contrasts, let us first assume that \( b = 0 \) and \( \nu = \varepsilon x_0 \) and \( c(\theta, t, x) = c(\theta, t) \) does not depend on \( x \) and is invertible. Then \( X \) is a continuous Gaussian process with independent increments, and the log-likelihood of the family \( (X_{t(n, i)})_{1 \leq i \leq n} \) w. r. t. Lebesgue measure on \( (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \), is given by

\[
- \frac{d}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\log \det c(\theta)^n_t + (X_{t_i} - X_{t_{i-1}})^T c(\theta)^n_t^{-1} (X_{t_i} - X_{t_{i-1}})],
\]

where \( c(\theta)^n_t = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} c(\theta, s) ds \). The MLE (maximum likelihood estimator) maximizes the above expression, and due to the continuity of \( t \rightarrow c(\theta, t) \) the asymptotic optimality of the MLE is shared by the estimator maximizing the same expression, but with \( c(\theta)^n_t \) replaced by \( \delta_i c(\theta, t_{i-1}) \). That is, the estimator minimizing the following contrast

\[
- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\log \det c(\theta, t_{i-1}) + (X^n_{t_i})^T c(\theta, t_{i-1})^{-1} X^n_{t_i}].
\]

has the same asymptotic properties than the MLE.

When \( c \) depends on \( x \), but remains invertible (i. e. under H2), it is thus natural to use the following contrast to minimize:

\[
- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\log \det c(\theta, t_{i-1}, X_{t_{i-1}}) + (X^n_{t_i})^T c(\theta, t_{i-1}, X_{t_{i-1}})^{-1} X^n_{t_i}].
\]

In general H2 does not hold. To mimick the previous approach we consider the class of all contrasts of the form

\[
U^n(\theta) = - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(c(\theta, t(n, i-1), X_{t(n, i-1)}), X^n_{t_i}).
\]

Here \( f \) should be a “nice” function of the pair \((G, x)\), where \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( G \) belongs to some subset \( \mathcal{S} \) of \( \mathcal{S}^+ \), such that the set

Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré - Probabilités et Statistiques
∪ \{ \omega : c(\zeta, t, X_t(\omega)) \notin \mathcal{P} \} is \mathbb{P}_{\nu, b}-null for all \theta. The biggest possible class of contrasts is obtained for \mathcal{S} as small as possible (for instance under H2, it is natural to take \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+, the set of all invertible matrices in \mathcal{S}_d^+, so that (3) is of the form (4) with \( f(G, x) = \log \det(G) + x^T G^{-1} x \). The regularity conditions on the pair (\mathcal{S}, f) are expressed by the following:

**Condition C1.** (i) \( \mathcal{S} = \bigcup \mathcal{S}_i \) where (\( \mathcal{S}_i \)) is an increasing sequence of compact subsets of \( \mathcal{S}_d^+ \) with \( \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_{\nu, b}[c(\zeta, t, X_t) \in \mathcal{S}_i \text{ for all } \zeta, t] = 1 \) for all \( \theta \).

(ii) \( f = f(G, x) \) is a function: \( \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) such that for \( i \) and \( j = 0, 1, 2 \) the partial derivatives \( \nabla_i \nabla_j f \) are continuous and satisfy \( |\nabla_i \nabla_j f(G, x)| \leq \gamma(G)(1 + |x|^4(\theta)) \) for some continuous function \( \gamma \) on \( \mathcal{S} \) (here \( \nabla \) denotes the gradient and \( |.| \) is the Euclidian norm).

One possible choice is \( \mathcal{S}_i = \{ G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+ : |G| \leq 1 \} \), so that \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+ \); under H2, we also have C1-(i) with \( \mathcal{S}_i = \{ G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+ : |G| \leq 1 \text{ and } 1/l \leq \det(G) \leq l \} \), so that \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+ \).

H1, H3 and C1 will insure the convergence of \( U^n(\theta) \) to a limit. To obtain consistency and asymptotic mixed normality for the related minimum contrast estimators, additional conditions are needed:

**Condition C2.** The function \( f \) in C1 is even in its second argument.

**Condition C3.** With \( \rho_G \) denoting the centered Gaussian law on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with covariance matrix \( G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+ \) for every \( G \in \mathcal{S} \) the function \( G' \to \int f(G', x) \rho_G(dx) \) on \( \mathcal{S} \) has a unique minimum at \( G' = G \).

**Remarks.**

1. For each value of \( \theta \), \( U^n(\theta) \) is observable. We do not want to include the function \( b \) in the contrast because it is unknown. Even when \( b \) is known, we cannot include it in the contrast since it is a function of the whole past of \( X \) and thus is not observable [except in the Markov case \( b(t, X) = b(t, X_t) \)].

2. It is possible to exhibit even more general contrasts of the form \( U^n(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \leq i \leq n} f(\theta, t_{i-1}, X_{t_{i-1}}, X_i) \) with similar results. But it is difficult to think of “natural” functions \( f \) other than depending on \( (\theta, t, X_t) \) through \( c(\theta, t, X_t) \).

2. **Convergence of contrasts.** — Introduce the following notation:

\[ \rho_{\theta, t} = \rho_{c(\theta, t, X_t)} \quad \text{(recall the notation } \rho_G \text{ in Condition C3)} \]

\[ F(\theta, t, x) = f(c(\theta, t, X_t), x), \]

\[ U_t(\theta, \zeta) = \int F(\zeta, t, x) \rho_{\theta, t}(dx). \]
THEOREM 1. — Under H1, H3, C1, and for each \( \theta \in \Theta \), \( U^n(\zeta) \) converges uniformly in \( \zeta \in \Theta \) in \( P^\theta_{v,b} \)-measure to the random variable

\[
U(\theta, \zeta) = \int U_t(\theta, \zeta) \mu(dt).
\]

Let \( \hat{\theta}_n \) be a minimum contrast estimator associated with \( U^n \), i.e., \( \hat{\theta}_n \) is any solution of the equation \( U^n(\hat{\theta}_n) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} U^n(\theta) \) (such a solution always exists, because \( \theta \to U^n(\theta) \) is continuous and \( \Theta \) is compact). In order to deduce the convergence \( \hat{\theta}_n \to \theta \) in \( P_{v,b}^\theta \)-measure from the above, it is enough that \( \zeta = \theta \) be the unique minimum of \( \zeta \to U(\theta, \zeta) \) \( P_{v,b}^\theta \)-a.s. This is clearly true under H4 and C3 (indeed H4 is necessary for that, in connection with the sequence of sampling times satisfying H3; on the other hand C3 is a bit too strong, in the sense that it works for all sequences of sampling times). Then we have:

COROLLARY 2. — Under H1, H3, H4, C1, C3, then \( \hat{\theta}_n \to \theta \) in \( P_{v,b}^\theta \)-measure.

We will see at the end of Section 4 (Remark 10) that we can substantially weaken the regularity assumption H1 for the two above results.

2. d. Asymptotic mixed normality. — We need still more notation:

\[
\begin{align*}
B(\theta)_t &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla^2 F(\theta, t, x) \rho_{\theta,t}(dx), \\
D(\theta)_t &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla F(\theta, t, x) \nabla F(\theta, t, x)^T \rho_{\theta,t}(dx),
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that \( B(\theta)_t \) and \( D(\theta)_t \) are processes taking values in the set of symmetric \( q \times q \) matrices, and \( D(\theta)_t \) is non-negative.

THEOREM 3. — Assume H1, H3, H4, C1, C2, C3. Let \( \theta \) be an interior point of \( \Theta \), such that \( B(\theta) \) is \( P^\theta_{v,b} \)-a.s. invertible. Then the random vectors \( S_n = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \) converge in law under \( P^\theta_{v,b} \) to a "mixed normal variable" \( S \) defined on an extension of the space \( (\Omega, F_1, P^\theta_{v,b}) \) and which, conditionally on \( F_1 \), is centered Gaussian with covariance matrix

\[
\Gamma(\theta) = B(\theta)^{-1} D(\theta) B(\theta)^{-1}.
\]

Remark. — If C2 fails, we do not know in general whether \( S_n \) converges. It does, however, when \( t(n, i) = i/n \); but, conditionally on \( F_1 \), the limit \( S \)
is a non-centered Gaussian vector, with a mean that depends on the coefficients $a$ and $b$.

**Remark.** — Even if the drift coefficient $b$ is a function of $\theta$, we cannot improve on this theorem.

**Remark.** — If the initial measure $v$ is a known function of $\theta$, say $v_\theta$, it may be possible to construct other estimators $\hat{\theta}_n$ (based on the observation of $X_0$ only, for example) which converge to $\theta$ faster than above (i.e. with smaller limiting variance, or even with a faster rate than $1/\sqrt{n}$): this depends on the structure of the statistical model $(\mathbb{R}^d, (v_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$; of course, if this model is regular (as it is the case when $v_\theta = \delta_{x_0}$), it is impossible to improve Theorem 3 in this way.

In order to compare two different contrasts, we prove also a bivariate version of this result, which reads as follows. Let $U''(\theta)$ be the contrast associated with another pair ($\mathcal{S}', f'$) and add a 'prime' to all related quantities: $B'(\theta)_t$, $\delta'_n$, $S'_n$, etc. Now let $B(\theta)_t$ and $D(\theta)_t$ be the $2q \times 2q$ symmetric matrix-valued processes defined by

$$B(\theta)_t = 
\begin{bmatrix}
B(\theta)_t & 0 \\
0 & B'(\theta)_t
\end{bmatrix},
D(\theta)_t = 
\begin{bmatrix}
D(\theta)_t & D''(\theta)_t \\
D''(\theta)_t^T & D'(\theta)_t
\end{bmatrix}.$$  

(9)

where

$$D''(\theta)_t = \int \nabla_\theta F(\theta, t, x) \nabla_\theta F'(\theta, t, x)^T \rho_{\theta, t}(dx),$$

$$B'(\theta)_t = \int_{[0, 1]} B(\theta)_t \mu(dt),$$

$$D'(\theta)_t = \int_{[0, 1]} D(\theta)_t \mu(dt).$$

(10)

**Proposition 4.** — Assume that all hypotheses of Theorem 3 are met, for both contrasts. Then the pair $(S_n, S'_n)$ converges in law under $P^\theta_{v, b}$ to a variable $S = (S, S')$ defined on an extension of the space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, P^\theta_{v, b})$, which conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_1$ is centered Gaussian with covariance matrix

$$\Gamma(\theta) = B(\theta)^{-1} D(\theta) B(\theta)^{-1}.$$  

(11)

**2e. Comparison of contrasts.** — Here we assume $H_2$, so that we may take $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+$ (the set of invertible matrices in $\mathcal{S}_d^+$) in $C_1$. The contrast (3) is of the form (4), with

$$f(G, x) = \log \det G + x^T G^{-1} x.$$  

(12)

Theorem 5 below shows that this contrast is best in the class of contrasts of type (4), the asymptotic conditional variance of minimum contrast estimators being minimal for $f$ given by (12). In fact we even have a form...
of Hajek’s convolution theorem [10], although we have not proved the LAMN property for the likelihoods (it is of course a strong indication that the LAMN property is true: in the 1-dimensional Markov case, the LAMN property has been proved by Dohnal [7], and the estimators associated with (12) achieve the asymptotic variance bound deduced from the LAMN property).

**Theorem 5.** — Assume H1, H2, H3, H4.

(a) The pair \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+ \), \( f \) given by (12) satisfies C1, C2, C3, and

\[
D(\theta)_t = 2 \, B(\theta)_t, \quad B(\theta)_{ij} = \text{tr} \left( \frac{\partial c}{\partial \theta_i} c^{-1} \frac{\partial c}{\partial \theta_j} c^{-1} \right) (\theta, t, X_t) \]

and if \( B(\theta) \) is \( P_{v,b}^\theta \)-a.s. invertible the asymptotic conditional covariance matrix of the associated estimators is then

\[
\Gamma(\theta) = 2 \, B(\theta)^{-1}.
\]

(b) Let \( (\mathcal{S}', f') \) be another pair satisfying C1, C2, C3 (add a ‘prime’ to all quantities related to \( f' \)), and assume that both \( B(\theta) \) and \( B'(\theta) \) are \( P_{v,b}^\theta \)-a.s. invertible, where \( \theta \) is an interior point of \( \Theta \), and call \( (S, S') \) the limit of the pair \( (S_n, S'_n) \): see Proposition 4. Then conditionally on \( F_1 \), the variables \( S \) and \( S' - S \) are independent.

**Remark.** — It is worth noticing that if \( I(\theta, t, x) \) is the Fisher information matrix at \( \theta \) for the model \( (\mathbb{R}^d, (\mathbb{P}_{(\theta, t, x)})_{\theta \in \Theta}) \), then \( B(\theta)_t = 2 \int I(\theta, t, X_t) \mu(dt) \].

3. SOME ESTIMATES

In the remainder of the paper, we fix \( \theta, b \) and \( v \) and write \( P = P_{v,b}^\theta \).

Up to enlarging the space \( \Omega \), we can and will assume that there is a standard Wiener process \( W = (W_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m} \) on \( \Omega \) with respect to which the canonical process \( X \) is a solution to (1) and is adapted to the filtration \( (\mathcal{F}_t) \) generated by \( W \) (i.e. \( \mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}_t \)), because the solution is strong.

We complement our notation [recall that we have set \( t_i = t(n, i) \) when there is no ambiguity on the value of \( n \):]

\[
\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{G}_{t(n,i)} = \sigma(W_s : s \leq t_i),
\]

\[
Y_n^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_i}} a(\theta, t_{i-1}, X_{t_{i-1}})(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}),
\]

so that

\[
Y_{i-1}^n \text{ is centered Gaussian with covariance matrix } c(\theta, t_{i-1}, X_{t_{i-1}}).
\]
3a. The basic estimates. — Let us replace for a moment H1 by a stronger assumption:

**Hypothesis H1′.** H1 holds, and there is a constant K such that \(|b|, |a|, |\nabla_x a|, |\nabla_\theta a|, |\nabla_\theta^2 a|, |\nabla_x \nabla_\theta a|, |\partial a/\partial t|, |\nabla_x \partial a/\partial t| \leq K.**

Denote by \(\varepsilon(u) = \sup_{t \in [s, s+u]} |b(t, X) - b(s, X)|\) the (random) modulus of continuity of the function \(t \to b(t, X)\). Doob’s inequality applied to the \((\mathcal{F}_t^n)\)-martingale \(M_t = E[\varepsilon(u)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t^n]\) yields \(E(\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} M_t) \leq 2 E(\varepsilon(u)^4)^{1/2}\), which goes to 0 as \(u \to 0\) because \(\varepsilon(u) \to 0\) and \(\varepsilon(u) \leq 2 K\). Therefore

\[
(17) \quad \tau(u) = u + \sup_{0 \leq i \leq n} E[\varepsilon(u)^2 | \mathcal{F}_i^n] \to 0 \quad \text{as} \; u \to 0.
\]

Below, we consider a \(C^2\) function \(g\) on satisfying

\[
(18) \quad |g(x)| + |\nabla g(x)| + |\nabla^2 g(x)| \leq \gamma (1 + |x|^\gamma)
\]

for some constant \(\gamma\). Our aim is to prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.** — Assume H1′ and (18). There is a constant \(C\) depending on \(K\) and \(\gamma\) only, with [recall (2) for \(X^n_t\)]

\[
(19) \quad E[(g(X^n_t) - g(Y^n_t))^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^n] \leq C \delta(n, i)
\]

and, if \(g\) is an even function,

\[
(20) \quad |E[g(X^n_t) - g(Y^n_t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^n]| \leq C \sqrt{\delta(n, i)} \tau(\delta(n, i))
\]

The proof is broken into several steps, for which we use the following simplifying notation. We fix \(n, i\) and set \(s = t(n, i - 1)\) and

\[
b_u = b(s + u, X), \quad a_u = a(9, s + u, X_{s+u}), \quad W'_t = W_{s+t} - W_s, \quad X'_t = X_{s+t} - X_s, \quad Y_t = a_0 W'_t, \quad Z_t = X'_t - Y_t,
\]

\[
A_t = \int_0^t b_u du, \quad N_t = \int_0^t (a_u - a_0) dW'_u, \quad M_t = \int_0^t a_u dW_u.
\]

For any process \(V\) we also write \(V^*_t = \sup_{u \leq t} |V_u|\).

**Lemma 7.** — For each \(p \geq 1\) there is a constant \(K_p\) depending on \(K\) and \(p\) only, such that

\[
(21) \quad E(X^*_{t}^{n,p} | \mathcal{F}_t) \leq K_p t^{p/2},
\]

\[
(22) \quad E(Z^*_{t}^{p} | \mathcal{F}_t) \leq K_p t^p.
\]

**Proof.** — (a) Below, all constants depending on \(K\) and \(p\) are denoted by \(K_p\). From the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality we deduce

\[
E(M^*_{t}^{p} | \mathcal{F}_t) \leq K_p \left[ E\left(\int_0^t |a_u|^2 du \right)^{p/2} | \mathcal{F}_t\right] \leq K_p t^{p/2}
\]
(use H1'), and obviously $|A_t| \leq K t$. Since $X' = M + A$, (21) follows.

(b) From H1' again, we obtain $|a_u - a_0| \leq K (u + X''_u)$. Then as above,

$$
E(N_{t,p}^s | \mathcal{G}_s) \leq K_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \int_0^t (u^2 + X''_u) \, du \right\}^{p/2} | \mathcal{G}_s \right]
$$

$$
\leq K_p \left[ t^{3p/2 + 1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} (X''_{u,p} | \mathcal{G}_s) \, du \right]
$$

if $p \geq 2$ (use H"older's inequality for the last estimate), so (22) follows from (21) for $p \geq 2$. Finally (22) for $p \in [1, 2)$ follows from the Schwarz inequality applied to (22) with 2 $p$.

Set $X'_t = X'_t / \sqrt{t}$ and $Y_t = Y_t / \sqrt{t}$ and $Z_t = Z_t / \sqrt{t} = X'_t - Y_t$. Below, all constants depending only on $K$ and $\gamma$ are denoted by $C$. By Taylor's formula and (18) we get

$$
|g(X'_t) - g(Y_t) - \nabla g(Y_t)^T Z_t| \leq C (1 + |Y_t|^C + |Z_t|^C) |Z_t|^2.
$$

First, this yields (with a different $C$):

$$
|g(X'_t) - g(Y_t)|^2 \leq C (1 + |Y_t|^C + |Z_t|^C) |Z_t|^2,
$$

while (21) and (22) yield $E(\|Z_t\|^p | \mathcal{G}_s) \leq K_p t^{p/2}$ and $E(\|Y_t\|^p | \mathcal{G}_s) \leq K_p$ for all $p \geq 1$. Thus we readily deduce (19) (recall that $t \leq 1$).

Second, if we can prove that

$$
E[\nabla g(Y_t)^T Z_t | \mathcal{G}_s] \leq C \{ t + [t E(\varepsilon(t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s)]^{1/2} \},
$$

we will deduce (20) from (21), (22), (23). But if $g$ is even, then $\nabla g$ is odd. Hence (20) follows from the

**Lemma 8.** If $h$ is an odd function with $|h(x)| \leq \gamma (1 + |x|^\gamma)$, then (with $Z^i_t$ being the $i$th coordinate of $Z$):

$$
E(h(Y_t) Z^i_t | \mathcal{G}_s) \leq C \{ t + [t E(\varepsilon(t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s)]^{1/2} \}.
$$

**Proof.** (a) One of the key points of the proof is that $Y_t$ has, conditionally on $\mathcal{G}_s$, the same distribution than $a_0 W'_t$, which in particular does not depend on $t$. Hence with $I = \text{id}$ the identity $d \times d$ matrix, and recalling the notation $\rho_G$ of Condition C3,

$$
E[h(Y_t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s] = \int h(a_0 x)^2 \rho_1(dx) \leq C
$$

for some constant $C$, in virtue of $|h(x)| \leq \gamma (1 + |x|^\gamma)$.

(b) We write $A'^i_t = B_t + B'_t$ with $B_t = b_0 t$ and $B'_t = \int_0^t (b'_u - b'_0) \, du$. First, since $h$ is odd,

$$
E[h(Y_t) B_t | \mathcal{G}_s] = t b_0 \int h(a_0 x) \rho_1(dx) = 0.
$$
On the other hand, \(|B'_t| \leq t \varepsilon(t)|, so by Schwarz inequality and (a):
\[\left| E[h(Y_t) B'_t | \mathcal{G}_s] \right| \leq \left\{ E[h(Y_t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s] E(B'_t^2 | \mathcal{G}_s) \right\}^{1/2} \leq C t E[\varepsilon(t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s]^{1/2}.\]

Putting these together yields
\[|E[h(Y_t) A'_t]| \leq C t E[\varepsilon(t)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s]^{1/2}.\]

(c) Recall that \(i\) is fixed. Set
\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_u^{jk} &= (\partial a^{ij}/\partial x_k)(\theta, s + u, X_{s+u}), \\
\beta_v^{jk} &= (\partial^2 a^{ij}/\partial x_k \partial x_l)(\theta, s + u, X_{s+u}), \\
\delta_u^l &= (\partial a^{ij}/\partial t)(\theta, s + u, X_{s+u}), \\
c_u &= c(\theta, s + u, X_{s+u}).
\end{align*}
\]

By H1', we have
\[|\alpha_u|, |\beta_v|, |\delta_u|, |b_u|, |c_u| \leq K, \quad |\alpha_u - \alpha_0| \leq K(u + X_{u}^*).\]

Ito's formula yields
\[a_u^{ij} - a_0^{ij} = D_u^j + F_u^j + G_u^j,\]
where
\[
\begin{align*}
D_u^j &= \int_0^u \left[ \delta_v^l + \sum_k \alpha_v^{jk} b_v^k + \sum_{k,h} \frac{1}{2} \beta_v^{jk} c_v^{kh} \right] du, \\
F_u^j &= \int_0^u \sum_k (\alpha_v^{jk} - \alpha_0^{jk}) dW_v^k, \\
G_u^j &= \sum_k \alpha_0^{jk} W_u^k.
\end{align*}
\]
Using (24) and (21), we obtain (recall that \(C\) changes from line to line):
\[|D_u^j| \leq C u, \quad E[(F_u^j)^2 | \mathcal{G}_s] \leq C u^2.\]

Now, we set \(N^i = N' + N''\) with
\[N'_i = \int_0^t \sum_j G_u^j dW_u^j, \quad N''_i = \int_0^t \sum_j (D_u^j + F_u^j) dW_u^j.\]

From what precedes,
\[E(N'_{i''}^2 | \mathcal{G}_s) = E\left( \int_0^t \sum_j (D_u^j + F_u^j)^2 du | \mathcal{G}_s \right) \leq C t^3,\]
and thus by (a) and Schwarz inequality,
\[|E[h(Y_t) N''_i | \mathcal{G}_s]| \leq C t^{3/2}.\]

(d) We have
\[E[h(Y_t) N'_i | \mathcal{G}_s] = E\left[ h(a_0 W'_t / \sqrt{t}) \sum_j \alpha_0^{jk} \int_0^t W_u^k dW_u^j | \mathcal{G}_s \right].\]

But, conditionally on \(\mathcal{G}_s\), the distributions of the processes \(W'\) and \(-W'\) are the same; since \(h\) is odd, we deduce
\[E[h(Y_t) N'_i | \mathcal{G}_s] = 0.\]
(e) It remains to observe that \( Z_i = (A_i + N_i + N_i')/\sqrt{i} \) then (b), (c) and (d) prove the claim. ■

3 b. Applications. — Here we show how to apply the previous results when \( H_1' \) does not hold. We suppose that the pair \((\mathcal{S}, f)\) satisfies \( C_1\), and set

\[
R_i = \inf(t : |X_t| \geq i \text{ or } b(t, X_t) \geq i \text{ or } c(\zeta, t, X_t) \notin \mathcal{S}_1 \text{ for some } \zeta \in \Theta)
\]

(with \( \inf(\mathcal{S}) = \infty \)): then \( R_i \) is a stopping time taking its values in \([0, 1] \cup \{ \infty \}\) and \( C_1-(i) \) implies

\[
P(\Omega_i) \to 1 \text{ as } i \to \infty, \quad \text{where } \Omega_i = \{ R_i = \infty \}.
\]

With \( \varphi_t \) being a \( C^\infty \) function: \( \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[
1_{\{1 \leq |x| \leq i\}} \leq \varphi_t(x) \leq 1_{\{1 \leq |x| \leq i + 1\}},
\]

we set

\[
a_i(\zeta, t, x) = a(\zeta, t, x) \varphi_t(x), \quad b_i(t, X) = b(t, X_t), \quad X_{i \wedge X_t}.
\]

We can consider the following equation, on the space \((\Omega, (\mathcal{G}_t), P)\) and with respect to the Wiener process \( W \) (recall that here \( \mathcal{G} \) is fixed):

\[
dX_i = b_i(t, X_i) dt + a_i(\zeta, t, X_t) dW_t, \quad X_{i \wedge X_0} = X_0.
\]

Clearly, it has a unique strong solution, which satisfies \( X_i = X_t \) if \( t \leq R_i \). In accordance with (2) and (15), we set

\[
X^s_i(l) = \frac{1}{\delta_l} (X(l)_{t_i} - X(l)_{t_{i-1}}),
\]

\[
Y^s_i(l) = \frac{1}{\delta_l} a_i(\zeta, t_{i-1}, X(l)_{t_{i-1}})(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}),
\]

so that

\[
X^s_i(l) = X^s_i \text{ if } t_i \leq R_i, \quad Y^s_i(l) = Y^s_i \text{ if } t_{i-1} \leq R_i.
\]

Further, \( (a_i, b_i) \) satisfies \( H_1' \). Then (21) yields constants \( K_{t, p} \) such that

\[
E[|X^s_i(l)|^p | \mathcal{G}^s_{t_{i-1}}] \leq K_{t, p}.
\]

Next, let \((\mathcal{S}, f)\) be a pair satisfying \( C_1\), and \( F \) associated with \( f \) by (5). Let \( H \) be any of the following functions:

\( H \) is the \( k \)th power for \( k = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) of any component of \( F \), \( \nabla^2 F \) or \( \nabla^4 \).

If \( \gamma(\cdot) \) is the function appearing in \( C_1 \), \( \gamma_1 = \sup(\gamma(G) : G \in \mathcal{S} \) is finite and \( |H(\zeta, t, x)| \leq \gamma_t(1 + |x|^4) \) on the set \( \{ R_i \geq t \} \) for all \( H \) as above, with \( \gamma_t = 8(1 + \gamma_t)^4 \). It is obvious that Proposition 6 can be applied for the process \( X(l) \), not only to \( \gamma(\zeta, t_{i-1}, x) 1_{\{R_i > t_{i-1}\}} \) which, as a function of \( \omega \), is \( \mathcal{G}^s_{t_{i-1}} \)-measurable and, as a function of \( x \), satisfies (18) for \( \gamma = \gamma_t \). Then if \( C_t \) below denotes
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a constant depending only on \( l \) and on the functions \( a, b, f \), (19) and (28) yield

\[
(30) \quad E\left[ (H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, X^n_t(l)) - H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, Y^n_t) )^2 1_{\{t_{i-1} < R_I\}} | \mathcal{G}_{t_{i-1}} \right] \leq C_i \delta_i.
\]

Applying Schwarz inequality gives

\[
(31) \quad \left| E\left[ (H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, X^n_t(l)) - H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, Y^n_t) ) 1_{\{t_{i-1} < R_I\}} | \mathcal{G}_{t_{i-1}} \right] \right| \leq \sqrt{C_i \delta_i}.
\]

Since \( \sup_{t \leq R_I, \zeta \in \Theta, \omega \in \Omega} \left| c(\zeta, t, X_t) \right| < \infty \), we get

\[
(32) \quad E\left[ \left| H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, Y^n_t) \right| 1_{\{t_{i-1} < R_I\}} | \mathcal{G}_{t_{i-1}} \right] \leq C_i.
\]

Finally, apply (20) and (28) to obtain, under C2 (which implies that \( H \) is even in \( x \)) and if \( \tau_i \) denotes the function \( \tau \) of (17) for the coefficients \( (a_l, b_l) \):

\[
(33) \quad \left| E\left[ H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, X^n_t(l)) - H(\zeta, t_{i-1}, Y^n_t) | \mathcal{G}_{t_{i-1}} \right] \right| \leq C_i \sqrt{\delta_i \tau_i(\delta_i)}.
\]

4. CONVERGENCE OF CONTRASTS

Recall once more that \( \varrho, b, v \) are fixed and \( P = P_{\varrho, b}^B \). Let us first prove a more or less well-known result about triangular arrays of random variables.

**Lemma 9.** Let \( \chi^n_1, U \) be random variables, with \( \chi^n_i \) being \( \mathcal{G}_i^n \)-measurable. The following two conditions imply \( \sum_{i=1}^n \chi^n_i \to U \):

\[
(33) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n E(\chi^n_i | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n) \to U,
\]

\[
(34) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n E((\chi^n_i)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n) \to 0.
\]

**Proof.** Set

\[
\xi^n_i = \chi^n_i - E(\chi^n_i | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n), \quad B_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \xi^n_i,
\]

\[
C_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} E[(\xi^n_i)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n], \quad \text{and} \quad D_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} E((\chi^n_i)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n).
\]

By (33) it is enough to prove \( B_n \to 0 \). But \( E(\xi^n_i | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n) = 0 \) by construction, so \( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\xi^n_i)^2 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} E[(\xi^n_i)^2 | \mathcal{G}_{i-1}^n] \) is a local martingale w. r. t. \( (\mathcal{G}_i^0 \leq i \leq n) \).

Hence we can apply Lenglart inequality (see e. g. [16], I-3.30), which gives
P(B_n^2 > a) \leq b/a + P(C_n > b) \text{ for all } a, b > 0. \text{ Since } C_n \leq D_n, (34) \text{ yields } P(C_n > b) \to 0 \text{ for all } b > 0, \text{ hence the result.} \]

**Proof of Theorem 1.** \(\bullet\) For each \(l \in \mathbb{N}\) we set \(V^n_l(\zeta) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \chi^n_i(l)\), with \(\chi^n_i(l) = \frac{1}{n} \left[ F(\zeta, t_{i-1}, X_i^\zeta(l)) - U_{t_{i-1}}(\emptyset, \zeta) \right] 1_{\{t_{i-1} < \infty\}}\). Observe that by (6) and (16) we have \(U_{t_{i-1}}(\emptyset, \zeta) = E[F(\zeta, t_{i-1}, Y_l^n) \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{t_{i-1}}]\), hence (31) gives

\[
|E(\chi^n_i(l) \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{t_{i-1}})| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{C_i} \delta_l
\]

similarly (30) and \(\delta_l \leq 1\) and (32) applied to \(H = F^2\) yield for some constant \(C_i\):

\[
E[\chi^n_i(l)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{t_{i-1}}] \leq C_i n^{-2}.
\]

Since \(\sum \sqrt{\delta_l} \leq \sqrt{n}\) we deduce from Lemma 9 that \(V^n_l(\zeta) \to 0\).

(b) Further, if \(\gamma_l\) is the constant showing in § 3 b and if we apply (32) to \(H = V \circ F\) and (6), we have \(|V \chi^n_i(\zeta)| \leq \frac{1}{n} [\gamma_l(1 + |X_i^\zeta(l)|^n) + C_i]\). Then (29) yields \(\sup \limits_{\zeta} E[\sup \limits_n |V \chi^n_i(\zeta)|] < \infty\): hence the convergence in (a) is uniform in \(\zeta\), i.e., \(\sup \limits_{\zeta} |V^n(\zeta)| \to 0\).

(c) Set \(V^n(\zeta) = U^n(\zeta) - \bar{U}^n(\zeta)\), where \(\bar{U}^n(\zeta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} U_{t_{i-1}}(\emptyset, \zeta)\). In view of (4) and (28), \(V^n(\zeta) = V^n_l(\zeta)\) on the set \(\Omega_l\), so (b) and (26) imply \(\sup \limits_{\zeta} |V^n(\zeta)| \to 0\). Hence it remains to prove that \(U^n(\zeta)\) converges to \(U(\emptyset, \zeta)\) (see Theorem 1) uniformly in \(\zeta\), for each \(\omega\). To see this, it is enough to notice first that \(\sup \limits_{\zeta} |\nabla U^n(\zeta)| < \infty\) and \(\sup \limits_{\zeta} U(\emptyset, \zeta) < \infty\), and second that since \(\bar{U}^n(\zeta) = \int U(\emptyset, \zeta) \mu_s(\zeta) - \frac{1}{n} \left( (U(\emptyset, \zeta))_{n} - U(\emptyset, \zeta)_{0} \right)\) and \(t \to U(t, \zeta)\) is continuous, then \((\bar{U}^n(\zeta)) \to U(\emptyset, \zeta)\) for every \(\zeta\). \(\blacksquare\)

**Remark 10.** It will be useful for a forthcoming paper on random sampling to observe that we have not used here the full force of H1: if \(\Omega'_l = \{ \sup \limits_{t} |X_t| \leq l \}\) (hence \(P(\Omega'_l) \to 1\)), it would be enough to have \(E[(X^n)^p \mid \Omega'_l] \leq K_{l, \rho}\) and also (30) and (32) on each \(\Omega'_l\) for \(H = F\) and \(H = V \circ F\), with \(X^n\) instead of \(X^\zeta_l(\zeta)\), and without the indicator \(1_{\{t_{i-1} \leq R_i\}}\). Moreover,
in (30) and (32) one could replace $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ by $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}^n = \mathcal{F}_{i(n, i-1)}$, hence we do not need $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$.

For example, suppose that we take for $f(G, x)$ a polynomial in $x$, with coefficients being $C^1$-functions of $G$. Then Theorem 1 and its Corollary 2 are still valid if $H_1$ is replaced by the much weaker requirements that
(a) $\partial_G c$ exists and is locally bounded on $\Theta \times [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (hence $c$ as well),
(b) there is a unique non-exploding weak solution,
(c) \begin{align*}
\left| E \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{d} (X^n_{t, j})^{k_j} - \prod_{j=1}^{d} (Y^n_{t, j})^{k_j} \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}^n \right] \right| & \leq C_l(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \sqrt{\delta_t} \\
onumber
& \text{on } \Omega_t
\end{align*}
for some constant $(C_l(k_1, \ldots, k_d)$ depending only on the integers $l, k_1, \ldots, k_d$.

\section{5. ASYMPTOTIC MIXED NORMALITY}

5a. Here we assume $H_1$, $H_3$, $H_4$, $C_1$, $C_2$ and $C_3$, and as before $P = P_{v, b}$.

The proof of Theorem 3 goes along a traditional route. We assume that $\theta$ is an interior point of $\Theta$, and that $\hat{\theta}_n$ minimizes $U^*(\cdot)$. Let $A_n$ be the set where $\hat{\theta}_n$ belongs to the interior of $\Theta$, so that Corollary 2 yields
\begin{equation}
P(A_n) \to 1.
\end{equation}
Recall also that $S_n = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta)$. On $A_n$ we have $\nabla U^*(\hat{\theta}_n) = 0$, hence by Taylor's formula
\begin{align*}
B_n S_n = -L_n & \text{ on } A_n,
\end{align*}
where
\begin{align*}
B_n &= \int_0^1 \nabla^2 U^*(\theta + u(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta)) \, du \\
L_n &= \sqrt{n} \nabla U^*(\theta).
\end{align*}

\textbf{Lemma 11.} - If $B(\theta)$ is a.s. invertible, the following two properties imply the claim of Theorem 3:
\begin{equation}
B_n \stackrel{P}{\to} B(\theta),
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
(B_n, L_n) \stackrel{\mathcal{G}}{\to} (B(\theta), L) \text{ where } L \text{ is defined on an extension of the space } \Omega \text{ and is } \mathcal{N}(0, D(\theta)), \text{ conditionally on } \mathcal{G}_t.
\end{equation}

\textbf{Proof.} - $S = -B(\theta)^{-1}L$ has the specifications given in Theorem 3, because $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1$ and $\Gamma(\theta)$ is $\mathcal{F}_1$-measurable. So we only have to prove that $S_n \not\to S$.

Let $A'_n = (\omega \in A_n : B_n(\omega) \text{ is invertible })$, and $B'_n = B_n$ on $A'_n$, and $B'_n = I_q$ (the $q \times q$ identity matrix) on $A''_n$. Then (35) and (36) yield $P(A'_n) \to 1$ so (37) implies $(B'_n, L_n) \to (B(9), L)$. This in turn implies $B'_n \to L_n \to S$, and since $S_n = B'_n \to L_n$ on $A'_n$ the result follows from $P(A'_n) \to 1$.

**LEMMA 12.** - Property (36) holds.

*Proof.* - (a) First we remark that $V^2 U^n(9) \to B(9)$: this is proved like in parts (a) and (c) of the proof of Theorem 1, upon substituting $F(9, .)$ with each component of $V^n F(9, .)$ with $\zeta \in [1, \xi] \leq \varepsilon$.

(b) Since $\delta_n \to 9$ it remains to show that $N_n(\varepsilon_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for any sequence $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, where $N_n(\varepsilon) = \sup_{|\zeta| \leq \varepsilon} |V^2 U^n(9 + \zeta) - V^2 U^n(9)|$.

Let $\gamma_i$ be as in § 3 b. Set $\gamma_i' = \gamma_i + 1$ and $f(G, x) = f(G, x)/(1 + |x|^{\gamma_i})$. The functions $f^2, V_G f$ and $V_G^2 f$ are smaller than $3 \gamma_i'(1 + |x|^{\gamma_i})$, hence by C1(ii) the families of functions $G \to f(G, x)$, $G \to V_G f(G, x)$ and $G \to V_G^2 f(G, x)$ (indexed by $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$) are uniformly equi-continuous on $\Sigma$. By H1 the functions $c, V_9 c, V_9^2 c$ are uniformly continuous on $\Theta \times [0, 1] \times \{ x : |x| \leq L \}$. Then

$$\eta_l(\varepsilon) = \sup_{|\zeta| \leq \varepsilon, t \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \omega \in \Omega_l} \left| V_9^2 F(9 + \zeta, t, x, \omega) - V_9^2 F(9, t, x, \omega) \right|/(1 + |x|^{\gamma_i})$$

has $\eta_l(\varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Now $N_n(\varepsilon) \leq \eta_l(\varepsilon) Z_n^l$ on $\Omega_l$, where $Z_n^l = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + |X_n^l(i)|^{\gamma_i})$. By (29) each sequence $(Z_n^l)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^1(P)$, hence if $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ we have $N_n(\varepsilon_n) 1_{\Omega_l} \to \eta_l(\varepsilon_n) Z_n^l \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The result follows from (26).

As a first step to obtain (37), we set

$$L'_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi^n_{li}, \quad \text{where} \quad \xi^n_{li} = n^{-1/2} V_9 F(9, t_{i-1}, Y^n_{li}).$$

**LEMMA 13.** - We have $L'_n - L_n \to 0$.

*Proof.* - Fix $j \leq q$. For each $l \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $V^n_l = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \chi^n_l(i)$, with

$$\chi^n_l(i) = n^{-1/2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta_j} (9, t_{i-1}, X^n_l(i)) - \frac{\partial F}{\partial \theta_j} (9, t_{i-1}, Y^n_l) \right) 1_{\{l_{i-1} < \omega_l\}}.$$
By (28) we have \( V^n_l = L^n_l - L'^n_l \) on \( \Omega_l \). Hence by (26) it is enough to prove that \( V^n_l \rightarrow 0 \) for each \( l \). Since \( C_2 \) holds, we can apply (30) and (33) to obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
|E(\chi^n_l(l) | \mathscr{F}^n_{l-1})| &\leq n^{-1/2} C_l \sqrt{\delta_l \tau_l(\delta_l)}, \\
E[\chi^n_l(l)^2 | \mathscr{F}^n_{l-1}] &\leq C_l \frac{1}{n} \delta_l.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \sum \delta_l \leq 1 \), we can apply Lemma 9 to obtain \( V^n_l \rightarrow 0 \), provided

\[
(39) \quad \alpha_n := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\delta_i \tau_i(\delta_i)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.
\]

We have

\[
\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\delta_i)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{card}\{i: \delta_i > n^{-1/4}\} \leq n^{1/4}.
\]

Then the left-hand side of (39) is smaller than \( n^{-1/4} \tau_l(1)^{1/2} + \tau_l(n^{-1/4})^{1/2} \), so that (39) follows from (17) and the Lemma is proved.

\( \blacksquare \)

5. At this point, and in view of Lemmas 11, 12, 13, it remains to prove:

\[
(40) \quad (B_n, L'_n) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{D}} (B(\mathfrak{g}), L) \quad \text{where} \quad L \quad \text{is defined on an extension of the space} \quad \Omega \quad \text{and is} \quad \mathscr{N}(0, D(\mathfrak{g})), \quad \text{conditionally on} \quad \mathscr{F}_1.
\]

To get an idea about how to get (40), let us first note that by \( C_3 \), the first partial derivatives of \( G' \rightarrow \int f(G', x) \rho_G(dx) \) vanish at \( G' = G \). Using notation (5), this writes as

\[
\int \nabla \mathfrak{g} F(\mathfrak{g}, t, x) \rho_{\mathfrak{g}, t}(dx) = 0.
\]

Then, recalling (7), we deduce from (16) and (32) applied to \( H = |\nabla \mathfrak{g} F|^4 \) that

\[
\begin{align*}
E(\xi^n_l | \mathscr{F}^n_{l-1}) &= 0 \\
E(\xi^n_{l,j} | \mathscr{F}^n_{l-1}) &= \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{D}(\mathfrak{g})_{l-1}^{jk} \\
E(\xi^n_l | \mathscr{F}^n_{l-1}) &\leq n^{-2} C_l \quad \text{on} \quad \Omega_t,
\end{align*}
\]

and thus [recall H3 and (26)]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} E \left( \xi^n_i \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{i-1} \right) & \to 0 \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} E \left( \xi^n_i \xi^n_j \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{i-1} \right) & \to D(9) \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} E \left( |\xi^n_i|^2 1_{\{|\xi^n_i| > \varepsilon\}} \mid \mathcal{F}^n_{i-1} \right) & \to 0.
\end{align*}
\]

(42)

Then we are under the conditions for the convergence of \( L'_n \) to an \( \mathcal{N}(0, D(9)) \) vector, except that \( D(9) \) is random. Further, we do not have the "nesting" condition of Hall and Heyde \([14]\) on the filtrations \( \mathcal{F}^n_t \) which are necessary to accomodate random limits in (42). So we need a different sort of proof, which goes as follows:

Suppose that \( \tau^n_t = i/n \). Consider the process \( \mathcal{V}^n_t = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq [nt]} \xi^n_i \), where \([.]\]
denotes the integer part. Then summing up to \([nt]\) in (42) we get convergence for all \( t \): this does not \textit{a priori} imply the convergence of the processes \( \mathcal{V}^n \), but it does \textit{imply their tightness}. Taking a convergent subsequence, we can identify the limit through some martingale characterization. The same idea works if \( \tau^n_t \) is not \( i/n \), provided the distribution function of the limiting measure \( \mu \) in H3 is continuous and strictly increasing.

In general, the measure \( \mu \) in H3 is arbitrary. So we need first to add (fictitious) observation times, and then change the time-scale, so as to obtain a suitable modification of \( \mu \). This is a bit complicated, so for the reader interested only in regular sampling we first give the proof in this simple case: then § 5c can be skipped.

5c. The regular sampling case. — In this subsection we assume that \( t(n, i) = i/n \). For consistency with the proof in the general case, we use here slightly complicated notation, to be presently introduced [recall (38) for \( \xi^n_i \)]:

\[
\Phi_n (t) = \left[ \frac{nt}{n} \right], \quad \mathcal{H}^n_t = \mathcal{F}_{\Phi_n (t)}, \quad \alpha^n_t = W_{i/n} - W_{(i-1)/n},
\]

\[
W^n_t = \sum_{i=1}^{[nt]} \alpha^n_i = W_{\Phi_n (t)}, \quad V^n_t = \sum_{i=1}^{[nt]} \xi^n_i.
\]

The processes \( W^n \) and \( V^n \) are clearly martingales relatively to the piecewise constant filtration \( \mathcal{H}^n_t \): use (41) for \( V^n \). We introduce their brackets:

\[
\begin{align*}
G^n_{jk} = \langle W^n, j, W^n, k \rangle, & \quad H^n_{jk} = \langle V^n, j, V^n, k \rangle, \\
K^n_{jk} = \langle W^n, j, V^n, k \rangle.
\end{align*}
\]

(43)
and write

\[ G^n = (G^{n,jk})_{1 \leq j, k \leq m} \]
\[ H^n = (H^{n,jk})_{1 \leq j, k \leq q} \]
\[ K^n = (K^{n,jk})_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq q} \]

Observe that (with \( I_m \) the identity \( m \times m \) matrix):

\[ \text{[the first equality is trivial, the second one follows from (41), the third one comes from } E(\alpha^{n, j \leq n, k | \xi_t}) = 0, \text{ which in turn comes out from the fact that } \alpha^{n, j \leq n, k} \text{ is an odd function of } \alpha^n, \text{ since } f \text{ is an even function of } x.] \]

Therefore

\[ W^n, G^n, H^n, K^n \text{ converge uniformly in time on } [0, 1] \text{ (for all } \omega) \text{ to } \]
\[ W', G, H, K, \text{ where } W' = W, G_t = I_m, H_t = \int_0^t D(\theta)_s ds, K = 0. \]

We consider the terms \( W'^n, G^n, H^n, K^n, V^n \), taking their values in \( \Omega' = \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times q} \times \mathbb{R}^q \); this space is endowed with the product topology, with \( \mathcal{D}(\cdot) \) equipped with the Skorohod topology. Below, convergence in law refers to this topology. We also denote by \( (B, W', G, H, K, V) \) the canonical variable on this space \( \Omega' \).

Now we are ready to give the essential steps for proving Theorem 3:

\( a \) Because of (44) we can apply Aldous' tightness criterion to the \( V^n \)'s: the sequence \( (V^n) \) is tight (cf. Aldous [1], or Theorem VI.4.13 of [16]). Furthermore, the last property in (42) is a Lindeberg condition which, translated in terms of \( V^n \), asserts that the supremum of the jumps of \( V^n \) goes to 0 as \( n \to \infty \): then the sequence \( (V^n) \) is even C-tight.

Combining this with (44) and Lemma 11, we obtain that the sequence \( (\tau_n) \) is tight. Then, up to taking a subsequence,

\[ \text{(45) The laws of } \tau_n \text{ weakly converge to a probability measure } P' \text{ on } \Omega', \text{ such that: } \]

(i) \( (B, W', G, H, K) \) has under \( P' \) the same law as \( (B(\theta), W', G, H, K) \) (recall that \( K = 0 \));

(ii) \( W', G, H, K, V \) are \( P' \)-a.s. continuous in time.

\( b \) Denote by \( (\mathcal{F}_t') \) the filtration generated by \( (W', G, H, K, V) \) on \( \Omega' \).

**Lemma 14.** - On the space \( (\Omega', (\mathcal{F}_t'), P') \), \( W' \) and \( V \) are local martingales with brackets

\[ \langle W'^j, W'^k \rangle = G^j k, \quad \langle V^j, V^k \rangle = H^j k, \quad \langle W'^j, V^k \rangle = K^j k = 0 \text{ a.s.}. \]
Proof. — We have to prove that all processes $\tilde{W}^i$, $\tilde{W}^i\tilde{W}^k - \tilde{G}^k$, etc. are local martingales. We prove this for $\tilde{M} = \tilde{V}^i\tilde{V}^k - \tilde{H}^k$ (for the others it is the same, or simpler).

Let $M^n = V^n, V^n - H^n$ and also $A^n_t = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}(\xi^n_t | A^n_{t-1})$, and $S(n, y) = \inf(t : |M^n_t|^2 + |V^n_t|^2 > y)$, $S(n, y) = \inf(t : |M^n_t|^2 + |V^n_t|^2 > y)$, $T(n, y) = \inf(t : A^n_t > y)$.

Observe that $R(n, y) = S(n, y) \wedge \left[ T(n, y) - \frac{1}{n} \right]^+$ is a stopping time and that $|M^n_t| \leq y$ if $t < S(n, y)$ and

$$|M^n_{S(n, y)}| \leq y + 2y^2 + 2|\xi^n_t|^2 + \mathbb{E}(\xi^n_t^2 | A^n_{t-1})$$

if $S(n, y) = i/n$. Thus $\mathbb{E}[|M^n_t R(n, y)|^2] \leq y^2 + 16y^4 + 20y$, from which we deduce the uniform integrability of each sequence $(M^n_t R(n, y))_{n \geq 1}$.

Set $\tilde{\tau} = (\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}', \tilde{G}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{V})$. Combining (45) and the last inequality in (41) yields the convergence in law of $(\tau_n, M^n, A^n)$ to $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{M}, 0)$. Then (see e.g. Propositions VI-2.11 and VI-2.12 of [16]) for all $y$ in a dense subset of $\mathbb{R}_+$ we have first that $\omega' \rightarrow M_{\tau \wedge S(y)}(\omega')$ is $\mathcal{P}$-a.s. continuous for the Skorohod topology and second that $(\tau_n, M^n_{\tau \wedge R(n, y)}, R(n, y))$ converges in law as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{M}_{\tau \wedge S(y)}, S(y))$. From the uniform integrability above and from the fact that $M^n$ is a local martingale on $(\Omega, (\mathcal{H}_t^n), \mathcal{P})$, we then deduce (see Proposition IX-1.12 of [16]) that for $y$ in our above dense set, $M_{\tau \wedge S(y)}$ is a martingale for the filtration generated by $(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{M}_{\tau \wedge S(y)}$, $S(y))$, i.e. for $(\mathcal{F}_t^n)$. Since $S(y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $\tilde{M}$ is a local martingale.

(c) To fit once more our notation with the general case to be studied later, we introduce the measure $\eta$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ having $\eta([0, t]) = t \wedge 1$ (so here it is the Lebesgue measure restricted to $[0, 1]$).

We can always enlarge the space $\Omega'$ and the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^n)$ so that there is a continuous Gaussian martingale $Z = (Z_t^n)_{1 \leq j \leq q}$ with $Z_0 = 0$ and $\langle Z^n, Z^n \rangle_t = \delta_{[0, t]} \eta ([0, t])$ (so here it is a Wiener process), which is independent of $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}', \tilde{G}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{V})$. We denote by $(\mathcal{G}_t^n)$ the filtration on $\Omega'$ generated by $\tilde{W}'$. Due to (44) and (45) and to the $(\mathcal{G}_t^n)$-predictability of $(D(\theta))_{t \geq 0}$, we have $\tilde{H}_t = \int_0^t h_z ds$ up to $\mathcal{P}$-null sets for some $\mathcal{G}_t^n$-valued process $h$ which is predictable w.r.t. the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_t^n)$ on $\Omega'$ [Remark: this is the only place where we use the fact that the solution to (1) is strong].
Now we diagonalize \( h \), writing \( h_t = \pi_t^T \lambda_t \pi_t \), where \( \pi_t \) is an orthogonal \( q \times q \) matrix-valued process and \( \lambda_t \) is a diagonal \( q \times q \) matrix-valued process, both predictable w. r. t. \( (\mathcal{F}^t) \). Set

\[
Z^{(i)}_t = \int_0^t 1_{\rho^j_{s,t} > 0} (\lambda^j_{s,t})^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^q \pi^j_s d\mathbb{V}^j_s + \int_0^t 1_{\rho^j_{s,t} = 0} d\mathbb{Z}^j_s.
\]

By standard calculations, we check that

\[
\langle Z^{(i)}, Z^{(j)} \rangle_t = \delta_{ij} t, \quad \langle Z^{(i)}, \mathbb{W}^{(j)} \rangle_t = 0,
\]

so that on \( (\Omega', (\mathcal{F}^t'), \mathbb{P}') \):

\[
Z' = (Z^{(i)})_{1 \leq i, j \leq q}
\]

is a Gaussian continuous martingale, independent from \( \mathbb{W}' \).

We also easily get

\[
\mathbb{V}^i_t = \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^q \pi^j_s (\lambda^j_{s,t})^{1/2} d\mathbb{Z}^j_s.
\]

Since \( \pi_s \) and \( \lambda_s \) are \( (\mathcal{F}^t) \)-adapted, if follows from (46) and \( \pi_t^T \lambda_t \pi_t = h_t \) that

(47) Conditionally on \( \mathcal{F}^t \), \( \mathbb{V} \) is a Gaussian continuous martingale with (deterministic) bracket \( \mathbb{H} \).

(d) Now we are almost finished: the same argument as above shows us that \( \mathbb{B} \) is \( \mathcal{F}^t \)-measurable, and of course \( \mathbb{G}, \mathbb{K} \) are the same. Then, using (47) and (45)-(i), we see that the measure \( \mathbb{P}' \) is uniquely determined. That is, the laws of \( \tau_n \), converge to this unique \( \mathbb{P}' \). In particular, since \( H_1 = D \) (9) and \( \mathbb{V}^n_1 = L'_n \), we deduce (40) from (45) and (47): that is, Theorem 3 is proved in the regular sampling case.

5d. Proof of Theorem 3 in the general case. – Our first task is to add observation points outside the support of the limiting measure \( \mu \) in \( H_3 \) and change time. For this we change the time interval from \([0, 1]\) to \( \mathbb{R}_+ \), and all measures below (\( \mu_n, \mu, \) etc.) are considered as defined on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \).

Let \( D \) be the support of \( \mu \) and \( D^\varepsilon = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}_+: d(x, D) \geq \varepsilon \} \). Since \( \mu(D^\varepsilon) = 0 \) we have \( \mu_n(D^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \) for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \), hence there is a sequence \( \left( n_p \right) \) increasing to \( + \infty \), such that \( \mu_n(D^{1/p}) \leq 1/p \) for \( n \geq n_p \). Set

\[
p_n = \sup (p : n_p \leq n) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(n) = n^{-1/2} + 1/p_n,
\]

and denote by \( (u_k, v_k) \) the intervals contiguous to \( D \), in \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). Set

\[
C_n = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \{ s = u_k + i/n \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } u_k - \alpha(n) \leq s \leq v_k - \alpha(n) \}
\]

\[
J_n = \{ i : 1 \leq i \leq n, C_n \cap [t(n, i-1), t(n, i)] = \emptyset \}, \quad J_n' = \{ 1, \ldots, n \} \setminus J_n.
\]

\[
C_n = \{ t(n, i) : 1 \leq i \leq n \}, \quad C_n'' = \{ t(n, i) : i \in J_n \}.
\]
If \( i \in J'_n \), then either \( \delta(n, i) \geq \alpha(n) \) [the number of these being smaller than \( \sqrt{n} \) because \( \sum_i \delta(n, i) \leq 1 \)], or \( t(n, i) \in D^{1/p_n} \). Thus

\[
\text{card}(J'_n) \leq \sqrt{n + n \mu_n(D^{1/p_n})} \leq \sqrt{n + n/p_n}
\]

and so

\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{n} \text{ card}(J'_n) & \to 0, \\
\frac{1}{n} \text{ card}(J_n) & \to 1.
\end{align*}

Next, set \( t'(n, 0) = 0 \) and call \( t'(n, 1) < \ldots < t'(n, i) < \ldots \) the points of \( C_n \cup C''_n \). Set

\[
\delta'(n, i) = t'(n, i) - t'(n, i - 1), \quad t''(n, i) = t'(n, i) + \frac{i}{n},
\]

\[
\Sigma(n, i) = \{ i : t''(n, i) \leq t \}, \quad \sigma(n, i) = \text{card}(\Sigma(n, i)),
\]

(49) \( K_n = \{ i : \text{there exists } j(n, i) \in J_n \text{ with } t'(n, i) = t(n, j(n, i)) \}, \)

\[
\Phi_n(t) = \sum_{i \in \Sigma(n, i)} \delta'(n, i) = t'(n, \sigma(n, i)).
\]

The next two lemmas gather all necessary results on the changes of time.

**Lemma 15.** \( \Phi_n \) converges to a continuous non-decreasing function \( \Phi \).

**Proof.** \( (a) \) Consider the following measures on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \):

\[
\begin{aligned}
\mu'_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \geq 1} \varepsilon_{t'(n, i)}, \\
\mu''_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \geq 1} \varepsilon_{t''(n, i)}, \\
\lambda_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in C_n} \varepsilon_s, \\
v_n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in C''_n} \varepsilon_s.
\end{aligned}
\]

(50)

In view of (48) and H3, we have \( v_n \to \mu \) weakly, while \( \lambda_n \to 1_{D^\infty} \cdot \lambda \) weakly (\( \lambda \) denotes the Lebesgue measure on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \)) by definition of \( C_n \). Then \( \mu'_n = v_n + \lambda_n \to \mu : = \mu + 1_{D^\infty} \cdot \lambda \).

Denote by \( F'_n, F''_n, F' \) the distribution functions of \( \mu'_n, \mu''_n, \mu \) respectively, and by \( F'^{-1}, \ldots \) their right-continuous inverses.

(\( b \)) From \( \mu'_n \to \mu' \) we have \( F'_n(t) \to F'(t) \) for all continuity points \( t \) of \( F' \). Since \( F' \) is strictly increasing, we deduce \( F'_n^{-1}(t) \to F'^{-1}(t) \) for all \( t \). Now, \( F'^{-1}_n(t) = t'(n, [nt] + 1) \) and

\[
F'^{-1}_n(t) = t''(n, [nt] + 1) = t'(n, [nt] + 1) + ([nt] + 1)/n;
\]

thus \( F'^{-1}_n(t) \to F'^{-1}(t) = F^{-1}(t) + t \) for all \( t \). The function \( F'^{-1} \) is strictly increasing and continuous, so its right-continuous inverse \( F'' \) has the same properties, and \( F''_n(t) \to F''(t) \) for all \( t \) (then \( \mu''_n \to \mu'' \) weakly, if \( \mu'' \) is the measure having distribution function).
(c) It remains to observe that \( F''(t) = \sigma(n, t)/n \), so that
\[
\Phi_n(t) = F_n^{-1}\left( F''(t) - \frac{1}{n} \right)^{+}.
\]
Since the convergence \( F_n^{-1} \to F^{-1} \) is locally uniform (because \( F^{-1} \) is continuous), it follows that \( \Phi_n(t) \to \Phi(t) \), where \( \Phi(t) = F^{-1}(F''(t)) \) is clearly continuous and non-decreasing.

Next, consider the measures
\[
\eta_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{K}_n} \delta_{i, \sigma''(n, i)}.
\]
We have \( \eta_n(\mathbb{R}_+) \leq 1 \) and the support of \( \eta_n \) is included in \([0,3]\); then the sequence \((\eta_n)\) is tight for the narrow topology. We could prove that \( \eta_n \) does converge, but the following will be enough:

**Lemma 16.** Consider a subsequence \( \eta_{n_i} \) converging to \( \eta \). Then \( \eta \) has no atom, and if \( f \) is a continuous bounded function on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \), we have
\[
\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{K}_n \cap \mathbb{Z}(n, i)} f(t'(n, i-1)) - \int_{0}^t f(s) \mu(ds),
\]
\[
\int_{0}^\infty f(\Phi(s)) \eta(ds) = \int_{0}^\infty f(s) \mu(ds).
\]

**Proof.** (a) The measure \( \eta_n \) is smaller than the measure \( \mu'' \) of (50); since \( \mu'' \to \mu'' \) where \( \mu'' \) has no atom, we deduce that \( \eta \) has no atom.

In order to prove (51) we can of course replace \( t'(n, i-1) \) by \( t'(n, i) \) in the left-hand side, because \( \sup_{i} \delta'(n, 1) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Then this left-hand side becomes
\[
\int_{0}^t f(\Phi_n(s)) \eta_n(ds).
\]
Since \( \Phi_n \to \Phi \) locally uniformly and \( \eta_n \to \eta \) weakly, (51) is obvious. Further the above integral is the same for all \( t \geq 3 \), in which case it also equals \( \int f(s) \nu_n(ds) \) [see again (50)]. Since \( \nu_n \to \mu \), we deduce (52) from (51).

Now we can start proving Theorem 3. We will simply indicate the modifications which should be done with respect to § 5 b.

Without loss of generality we can assume that the Wiener process \( W \) is defined on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). Set
\[
\alpha_i^n = W_{i^n} - W_{i_{-1}^n}, \quad \beta_i^n = \begin{cases} \xi_i^n & \text{if } i \in \mathbb{K}_n \\ 0 & \text{if not} \end{cases}
\]

Consider also the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_{\Phi_n(t)}$. The processes $W^n$ and $V^n$ are still martingales relatively to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^n)$: for $V^n$, use again (41), and also the following fact [cf (49)]: if $i \in K_n$ and $t = t''(n, i)$, then $\Phi_n(t) = t'(n, i)$ and $\mathcal{F}_t^n = \mathcal{F}_{f_j(n, i) - 1}$ and $\Delta V^n_t = \xi^n_t$. The brackets defined by (43) are now

$$G^n_t = I_m \Phi_n(t), \quad H^n_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in K_n \cap \Sigma(n, t)} D(\Phi'_t(n, i-1), \quad K^n_t = 0;$$

In view of Lemma 16, and up to taking a subsequence, we can assume that the sequence $\eta_n$ converges weakly to a limit $\eta$.

All the above processes being constant after time 3, we can proceed, replacing everywhere the time 1 by 3. We have (44) with $G_t = I_m \Phi(t)$,

$$H_t = \int_0^t D(\Phi(\eta))(ds) \text{ (see Lemma 16), } K = 0. \text{ Aldous’ tightness criterion still applies here, so up to taking a further subsequence we still have (45). Then Lemma 16 holds. Part (c) of § 5 b applies [except that } \text{Z is no longer a Wiener process, and that } \langle Z^t, Z^t \rangle = \delta_{ij} \eta([0, t])].$$

As in Part (d), we arrive at $(B_n, V^3_3) \rightarrow (B(9), L)$, but $V'_3 = L'_3$ is no longer true. However, $L'_n - V'_3 = \sum_{i \in I_n} \xi^n_t$, and (41) and (48) readily allow to apply Lemma 9 with $U = 0$, so that $L'_n - V'_3 \rightarrow 0$ and (40) follows.

5. Proof of Proposition 4. — Up to considering $\mathcal{F}'' = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{F}'$ and $\mathcal{F}_t'' = \mathcal{F}_t \cap \mathcal{F}_t'$, which meet $C_1(i)$, we can assume that both $f, f'$ are defined on the same product $\mathcal{F} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We add a “prime” to all quantities relative to $f'$.

Then, it is enough to reproduce the proof of Theorem 3, with the following modifications: in (35) replace $A_n$ by the set $\tilde{A}_n$ where both $\tilde{\Phi}_n$ and $\tilde{\Phi}'_n$ are in the interior of $\Theta$. Then $B_n S_n = -L_n$ on $\tilde{A}_n$, with the following vectors and matrices:

$$B_n = \begin{bmatrix} B_n & 0 \\ 0 & B'_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad S_n = \begin{bmatrix} S_n \\ S'_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad L_n = \begin{bmatrix} L_n \\ L'_n \end{bmatrix}.$$ 

Lemme 12 applied to $B_n$ and $B'_n$ separately yields $\bar{B}_n \rightarrow B(9)$, and the rest of the proof is exactly similar, with $q$ replaced by $2q$ and $D(9)$ by $D(9)_t$, and $V_9 F$ by the vector

$$\overline{V_9 F} = \begin{bmatrix} V_9 F \\ V_9 F' \end{bmatrix}.$$
6. COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTRASTS

Our aim here is to prove Theorem 5. Below, we assume H2. We take \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+ \), which is the union of all \( \mathcal{S}_i = \{ G \in \mathcal{S}_d^+ : 1/l \leq \text{det}(G) \leq l \} \), so that by H1 and H2 we obviously have C1(i). It is also evident that the function \( f \) of (12) satisfies C1(ii), relative to these \( \mathcal{S}_i \) and C2.

Let \( G \) be a C2 function on \( \Theta \), with values in \( \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_d^+ \), and write \( H(\theta) = G(\theta)^{-1} \). For each \( \theta \) write \( \rho_\theta = \rho_{G(\theta)} \). Let \( f \) be given by (12), and set

\[
F(\theta, x) = f(G(\theta), x) = \log \text{det } G(\theta) + x^T H(\theta) x,
\]

(53)
\[
v(\theta, \zeta) = \int F(\zeta, x) \rho_\theta(dx).
\]

If \( \lambda \) denotes Lebesgue measure on \( \mathbb{R}^d \), then \( Z(\theta) = d\rho_\theta/d\lambda \) has the following form:

(54)
\[
Z(\theta, x) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-F(\theta, x)/2}.
\]

**Lemma 17.** — The function \( f \) of (12) satisfies C3.

**Proof.** — Let \( U = Z(\zeta)/Z(\theta) \). Then (53) and (54) yield

\[
\int \log U(x) \rho_\theta(dx) = \frac{1}{2} [v(\theta, \theta) - v(\theta, \zeta)].
\]

Now, \( \int U(x) \rho_\theta(dx) = 1 \); hence by Jensen’s inequality \( v(\theta, \theta) \leq v(\theta, \zeta) \), with equality iff \( U = 1 \) \( \rho_\theta \)-a.s., that is iff \( \rho_\theta = \rho_\zeta \), that is iff \( G(\zeta) = G(\theta) \). Applying this to \( G(\theta) = G \) and \( g(\zeta) = G' \) in C3 gives the result.

**Remark.** — With a slightly different formulation, this lemma is well known since \( \int \log U(x) \rho_\theta(dx) \) is indeed the Kullback information of \( \rho_\zeta \) w.r.t. \( \rho_\theta \). Accordingly, the next lemma reduces in fact to the explicit computation of the Fisher information matrix \( I(\theta) \) of the model \( (\rho_{\zeta})_{\zeta \in \Theta} \) at \( \theta \), which is \( I(\theta) = \beta/2 = \delta/4 \) with the notation below.

Lemma 17 implies in particular \( \nabla_\zeta v(\theta, \zeta) = 0 \) for \( \zeta = \theta \), that is

(55)
\[
\int \nabla_\theta F(\theta, x) Z(\theta, x) dx = 0.
\]

Differentiating in \( \theta \) and using (54), we obtain

(56)
\[
\int \left[ \nabla_\theta^2 F(\theta, x) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\theta F(\theta, x) \nabla_\theta F(\theta, x)^T \right] \rho_\theta(dx) = 0.
\]
Now we fix $\vartheta$ and we set
\begin{equation}
\beta = \int \nabla_\vartheta^2 F(\vartheta, x) \rho_\vartheta(dx), \quad \delta = \int \nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x)^T \rho_\vartheta(dx).
\end{equation}

**Lemma 18.** We have $\delta = 2 \beta$ and
\[ \beta^{uv} = \text{tr} \left[ \frac{\partial G}{\partial \theta_u}(\vartheta) \frac{\partial G}{\partial \theta_v}(\vartheta) \frac{H(\vartheta)}{H(\vartheta)} \right]. \]

**Proof.** That $\delta = 2 \beta$ follows from (56) and (57). We can also write (56) as $\int \{ Z(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta^2 F(\vartheta, x) + \nabla_\vartheta Z(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x)^T \} dx = 0$, hence
\[ \beta = - \int \nabla_\vartheta Z(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x)^T dx. \]

Now $\int \nabla_\vartheta Z(\vartheta, x) g(x) dx$ is the gradient of $\vartheta \rightarrow \rho_\vartheta(g)$. In particular,
\[ \int \nabla_\vartheta Z(\vartheta, x) dx = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int \nabla_\vartheta Z(\vartheta, x) x^T K x dx = \text{tr} \{ K \nabla G(\vartheta) \} \]
for every $d \times d$ matrix $K$. Observing that $\nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x) = \nabla_\vartheta (\log \det G(\vartheta)) + x^T \nabla_\vartheta H(\vartheta) x$, we get
\[ \beta^{uv} = - \text{tr} \left[ \frac{\partial G}{\partial \theta_u}(\vartheta) \frac{\partial H}{\partial \theta_v}(\vartheta) \right]. \]
But $G(\zeta) H(\zeta) = I_d$, hence $\partial H/\partial \theta_v = - H \partial G/\partial \theta_v H$ and the result follows. \qed

Next, we consider a second function $f'$ satisfying C1, C2 and C3. As above, we write $F'(\vartheta, x) = f'(G(\vartheta), x)$, and we set
\begin{align}
\beta' &= \int \nabla_\vartheta^2 F'(\vartheta, x) \rho_\vartheta(dx), \\
\delta' &= \int \nabla_\vartheta F'(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta F'(\vartheta, x)^T \rho_\vartheta(dx) \\
\delta'' &= \int \nabla_\vartheta F(\vartheta, x) \nabla_\vartheta F'(\vartheta, x)^T \rho_\vartheta(dx).
\end{align}

Since $f'$ meets C3, we see that (55) is satisfied with $F'$ instead of $F$. Differentiating in $\vartheta$ gives $\delta'' = 2 \beta'$.

**Proof of Theorem 5.** For the claim (a) it remains to prove (13). To this effect, we apply Lemma 18 to each family $G(\vartheta) = c(\vartheta, t, X_t)$, for which $\beta = B(\vartheta)$, and $\delta = D(\vartheta)$.
(b) Use again $G(\theta) = c(\theta, t, X_t)$, and add the subscript "t" to all above quantities: $\beta_t, \delta_t, \beta'_t, \delta'_t$. Then we write $\beta, \delta, \beta', \delta'$ etc. for the integrals of these functions w. r. t. the measure $\mu$. Comparing (57) and (58) with (9) (10), we get
\[
\bar{B}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta' \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{D}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta & \delta'' \\ \delta'^T & \delta' \end{bmatrix},
\]
which yields [see (13) and use $\delta'' = 2\beta'$ and $\delta = 2\beta$]:
\[
\Gamma(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \beta^{-1} \delta \beta^{-1} & \beta^{-1} \delta'' \beta'^{-1} \\ \beta'^{-1} \delta'^{-1} \beta^{-1} & \beta'^{-1} \delta^T \beta^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\beta^{-1} & 2\beta^{-1} \\ 2\beta^{-1} & 2\beta^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.
\]
This is the conditional covariance of the pair $(S, S')$, and a simple computation shows that the conditional covariance of the pair $(S, S' - S)$ is the following block-diagonal matrix, which yields the claim (b) and Theorem 5:
\[
\begin{bmatrix} 2\beta^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \beta'^{-1} \delta' \beta'^{-1} - 2\beta^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

7. EXAMPLES

7a. The one-dimensional case. – Here we quickly study the case where $d = m = 1$; for simplicity (but it is not essential), we also assume that $q = 1$, and we write $\hat{c}, \ldots$ for the partial derivatives w. r. t. $\theta$.

We have $\mathcal{S}_1^+ = [0, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{1+} = (0, \infty)$. If $H2$ holds, we can use the contrast based on the function $f(G, x) = \log G + x^2/G$ of (12), and (13) writes as
\[
D(\theta) = 2B(\theta), \quad B(\theta) = (\hat{c}/c)^2(\theta, t, X_t).
\]
In general (i. e. when $H2$ does not hold), we cannot use this $f$, but we can always use the following function:
\[
f'(G, x) = (x^2 - G)^2.
\]
Clearly, $f'$ satisfies $C1, C2$ and $C3$, with $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1^+$. Moreover, elementary computations yield [by (7) and (8)]:
\[
D'(\theta) = 8((c\hat{c})^2(\theta, t, X_t), \quad B'(\theta) = 2\hat{c}^2(\theta, t, X_t).
\]
If $\mu$ in $H3$ is a Dirac measure and if $H2$ holds, we deduce from (59) and (61) that the asymptotic conditional variances $\Gamma(\theta)$ and $\Gamma'(\theta)$ of the estimators $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\theta}'_n$ based on $f$ and $f'$ respectively are equal. In view of Theorem 5 b, the following readily follows:

**Proposition 19.** – When $d = m = q = 1$ and $H2$ holds, and if the limiting measure $\mu$ in $H3$ is a Dirac measure, then (with the above notation)
Sn = \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}_n - \theta) and S'_n = \sqrt{n}(\bar{S}'_n - \theta) have the same limiting distribution, and even S_n - S'_n tends to 0 in P_{\theta,0} measure.

The heuristic conclusion that can be drawn from the above is that, even when \mu is not a Dirac measure, the estimators based on f' cannot be drastically bad. Hence if H2 fails, we have reasonable estimators.

7b. One-dimensional linear equation. — Suppose here that d=m=q=1 and that a has the form a(\theta, t, x) = A(\theta, t)x, and that v = \varepsilon_{x_0} for x_0 \neq 0, that is we consider the equation:

$$dX_t = b(t, X_t)dt + A(\theta, t)X_t dW_t \quad X_0 = x_0 \neq 0.$$  

Then c(\zeta, t, x) = C(\zeta, t)x^2 were C = A^2. Suppose also that A \neq 0 identically. First P_{\theta, b} and P_{\theta, 0} (for b=0) are equivalent, second under P_{\theta, b} the solution X_t a.s. never hits 0. Then this property is true also under P_{\theta, b} and H2 holds. Therefore we can use the optimal contrast associated with f in (12): f(G, x) = \log G + x^2/G, and (59) yields

$$B(\theta)_t = (\dot{C}/C)(\theta, t)^2, \quad \Gamma(\theta) = 2/\int B(\theta)_t \mu(dt),$$

which are non-random. Then the estimators based on this contrast are asymptotically normal (instead of mixed normal).

We can observe here that, since we should have the asymptotic variance \Gamma(\theta) as small as possible, the best choice of the observation times t(n, i) are those leading to a limiting \mu measure which maximizes \int B(\theta)_t \mu(dt).

(Note however that we do not know the true value of \theta.)

In particular if A(\theta, t) = A(\theta) does not depend on t (if further b = 0, we have a so-called multiplicative model), B(\theta)_t does not depend on t either, and all sampling schemes are thus equivalent.

7c. A truly non invertible situation. — Here d = m = q = 1 and we consider the equation

$$dX_t = b(t) dt + a(\theta, X_t) dW_t, \quad \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu,$$

where b > 0, and a(\theta, x) \geq 0, and a(\theta, x) = 0 iff x \geq \alpha, and x_0 < \alpha. Then c is not invertible, but the non-invertibility set does not depend on \theta.

We use the contrasts based on the function f' of (60). If \dot{c}(\theta, 0, x_0) \neq 0, and provided 0 belongs to the support of \mu. \dot{B}(\theta) is a.s. invertible and the asymptotic conditional variance of the estimators is

$$\Gamma(\theta) = 2 \frac{\int (\dot{c})^2 (\theta, t, X_t) \mu(dt)}{\left( \int \dot{c}^2 (\theta, t, X_t) \mu(dt) \right)^2}.$$  
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The integrals above can be restricted to the subset of [0, 1] where \( X_t < \alpha \).

7d. Here is our first 2-dimensional example, where \( d=2 \), \( m=1 \), \( q=1 \).

We consider the equation (with \( \nu \) a Dirac measure):

\[
\begin{align*}
    dX_t^1 &= b^1(t, X_t) \, dt + \alpha(\vartheta, X_t) \, dW_t, & X_0^1 &= x_0^1 \\
    dX_t^2 &= b^2(t, X_t) \, dt, & X_0^2 &= x_0^2
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) identically. Setting \( \beta = \alpha^2 \) we have \( c = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \) and H2 cannot be satisfied. We take for \( \mathcal{G} \) the set of matrices \( G = \begin{bmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \) with \( g > 0 \). Set \( f(G, x) = \log g + (x^1)^2/g \) if \( G = \begin{bmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \).

Then the estimators \( \hat{\theta}_n \) minimizing the contrasts based on \( f \) have the following asymptotic conditional variance

\[
\Gamma(\vartheta) = 2/B(\vartheta), \quad B(\vartheta) = \int B(\vartheta) \, \mu(dt), \quad B(\vartheta) = (\hat{\beta}/\beta)(\vartheta, X_t).
\]

In fact, these estimators are even optimal in the sense of Theorem 5b, which can be seen as follows: the asymptotic properties of all our contrasts do not depend on the drift \( b \), so that we can take \( b^1 = b^2 = 0 \); then \( X_t^2 = x_0^2 \) for all \( t \), so we are actually looking at a 1-dimensional problem and we can apply Theorem 5.

7e. An example coming from mathematical finance. – This example is borrowed to Courtadon [3]. We have \( m = d = 2 \) and we consider the linear equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
    dX_t^1 &= \gamma (X_t^2 - X_t^1) \, dt + \beta X_t^1 \, dW_t^1, \\
    dX_t^2 &= \alpha X_t^2 \, dt + \rho \sigma X_t^2 \, dW_t^1 + \sigma X_t^2 \, dW_t^2,
\end{align*}
\]

where all parameters \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \sigma, \rho \) are unknown, but where we are really interested in estimating \( \beta, \sigma, \rho \) only, and we know that the triple \( \vartheta = (\beta, \sigma, \rho) \) takes its values in \( \Theta = (0, \infty)^2 \times \mathbb{R} \); this is not a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), but it is easily seen that the previous results apply nevertheless here.

The same discussion as in § 7-b shows that H2 holds, so we can take the function \( f \) of (12). The associated contrast at stage \( n \) is

\[
U^n(\vartheta) = \log (\beta^2 \sigma^2) + \frac{1 + \rho^2}{\beta^2} \Sigma_{11}^n - \frac{2 \rho}{\beta \sigma} \Sigma_{12}^n + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \Sigma_{22}^n
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log (X_{i-1}^1 - X_{i-1}^1)^2 (X_i^2 - X_i^2)^2
\]

where
\[ \Sigma_{jk}^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(X_i^j - X_{i-1}^j)(X_i^k - X_{i-1}^k)}{\delta_i X_{i-1}^j X_{i-1}^k}. \]

Then the minimum contrast estimator is \( \tilde{\delta}_n = (\hat{\beta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n, \hat{\sigma}_n) \), where
\[ \hat{\beta}_n = (\Sigma_{11}^n)^{1/2}, \quad \hat{\rho}_n = \Sigma_{12}^n (\Sigma_{11}^n)^{-1} (\Sigma_{12}^n)^{1/2}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_n = [(\Sigma_{11}^n)^{-1} (\Sigma_{12}^n)^2 (\Sigma_{11}^n)^{-1/2}]. \]

Finally, the asymptotic conditional covariance matrix for these estimators at point \( \delta = (\beta, \rho, \sigma) \) is given by
\[
\Gamma(\delta) = \begin{bmatrix}
\beta^2/2 & \rho \beta/2 & 0 \\
\rho \beta/2 & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho \sigma/2 \\
0 & -\rho \sigma/2 & \sigma^2/2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

In particular, it is deterministic: that is, as for all linear models (see § 7b above), the normalized estimators converge to a normal (and not mixed normal) distribution. Further, \( \Gamma(\delta) \) does not depend on \( \mu \), that is all sampling schemes are equivalent: this comes from the fact that the model is homogeneous in time.
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