

## CONVERGENCE AND REGULARITY OF PROBABILITY LAWS BY USING AN INTERPOLATION METHOD

BY VLAD BALLY AND LUCIA CAMELLINO

*Université Paris-Est and Università di Roma Tor Vergata*

Fournier and Printems [*Bernoulli* **16** (2010) 343–360] have recently established a methodology which allows to prove the absolute continuity of the law of the solution of some stochastic equations with Hölder continuous coefficients. This is of course out of reach by using already classical probabilistic methods based on Malliavin calculus. By employing some Besov space techniques, Debussche and Romito [*Probab. Theory Related Fields* **158** (2014) 575–596] have substantially improved the result of Fournier and Printems. In our paper, we show that this kind of problem naturally fits in the framework of interpolation spaces: we prove an interpolation inequality (see Proposition 2.5) which allows to state (and even to slightly improve) the above absolute continuity result. Moreover, it turns out that the above interpolation inequality has applications in a completely different framework: we use it in order to estimate the error in total variance distance in some convergence theorems.

### CONTENTS

1. Introduction . . . . .	1111
2. Criterion for the regularity of a probability law . . . . .	1114
2.1. Notation . . . . .	1114
2.2. Orlicz spaces . . . . .	1114
2.3. Main results . . . . .	1118
2.4. The $L^p$ criterion . . . . .	1123
2.5. Convergence criteria in $W^{q,p}$ and $W^{q,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ . . . . .	1126
2.6. Random variables and integration by parts . . . . .	1129
3. Examples . . . . .	1131
3.1. Path dependent SDEs . . . . .	1131
3.2. Stochastic heat equation . . . . .	1134
3.3. Piecewise deterministic Markov processes . . . . .	1137
Appendix A: Hermite expansions and density estimates . . . . .	1146
Appendix B: Interpolation spaces . . . . .	1153
Appendix C: Super kernels . . . . .	1155
References . . . . .	1158

---

Received June 2015; revised October 2015.

*MSC2010 subject classifications.* Primary 46B70; secondary 60H07.

*Key words and phrases.* Regularity of probability laws, Orlicz spaces, Hermite polynomials, interpolation spaces, Malliavin calculus, integration by parts formulas.

**1. Introduction.** In this paper, we prove an interpolation type inequality which leads to three main applications. First, we give a criteria for the regularity of the law  $\mu$  of a random variable. This was the first aim of the integration by parts formulas constructed in the Malliavin calculus (in the Gaussian framework, and of many other variants of this calculus, in a more general case). But our starting point was the paper of N. Fournier and J. Printems [16] who noticed that some regularity of the law may be obtained even if no integration by parts formula holds for  $\mu$  itself: they just use a sequence  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  and assume that an integration by parts formula of type  $\int f' d\mu_n = \int f h_n d\mu_n$  holds for each  $\mu_n$ . If  $\sup_n \int |h_n| d\mu_n < \infty$ , we are close to Malliavin calculus. But the interesting point is that one may obtain some regularity for  $\mu$  even if  $\sup_n \int |h_n| d\mu_n = \infty$ —so we are out of the domain of application of Malliavin calculus. The key point is that one establishes an equilibrium between the speed of convergence of  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  and the blow up  $\int |h_n| d\mu_n \uparrow \infty$ . The approach of Fournier and Printems is based on Fourier transforms, and more recently, Debussche and Romito [10] obtained a much more powerful version of this type of criteria based on Besov space techniques. This methodology has been used in several recent papers (see [4–6, 9, 11] and [15]) in order to obtain the absolute continuity of the law of the solution of some stochastic equations with weak regularity assumptions on the coefficients: as a typical example, one proves that, under uniform ellipticity conditions, diffusion processes with Hölder continuous coefficients have absolute continuous law at any time  $t > 0$ . In the present paper, we use a different approach, based on an interpolation argument and on Orlicz spaces, which allows one to go further and to treat, for example, diffusion processes with log-Hölder coefficients.

The second application concerns the regularity of the density with respect to a parameter. We illustrate this direction by giving sufficient conditions in order that  $(x, y) \mapsto p_t(x, y)$  is smooth with respect to  $(x, y)$  where  $p_t(x, y)$  is the density of the law of  $X_t(x)$  which is a piecewise deterministic Markov process starting from  $x$ .

The third application concerns estimates of the speed of convergence  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  in total variation distance, and under some stronger assumptions, the speed of convergence of the derivatives of the densities of  $\mu_n$  to the corresponding derivative of the density of  $\mu$ . Such results appear in a natural way as soon as the suited interpolation framework is settled.

Let us give our main results. We work with the following weighted Sobolev norms on  $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ :

$$\|f\|_{k,m,p} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \left( \int (1 + |x|)^m |\partial_\alpha f(x)|^p dx \right)^{1/p}, \quad p > 1,$$

where  $\alpha$  is a multi-index,  $|\alpha|$  denotes its length and  $\partial_\alpha$  is the corresponding derivative. In the case  $m = 0$ , we have the standard Sobolev norm that we denote by

$\|f\|_{k,p}$ . We will also consider the weaker norm

$$\|f\|_{k,m,1+} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \int (1 + |x|)^m |\partial_\alpha f(x)| (1 + \ln^+ |x| + \ln^+ |f(x)|) dx,$$

with  $\ln^+(x) = \max\{0, \ln |x|\}$ . Moreover, for two measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  we consider the distances

$$d_k(\mu, \nu) = \sup \left\{ \left| \int \phi d\mu - \int \phi d\nu \right| : \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial_\alpha \phi\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}.$$

For  $k = 0$ , this is the total variation distance and for  $k = 1$  this is the Fortet–Mourier distance.

Our key estimate is the following. Let  $m, q, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p > 1$  be given and let  $p_*$  be the conjugate of  $p$ . We consider a function  $\phi \in C^{q+2m}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and a sequence of functions  $\phi_n \in C^{q+2m}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and we denote  $\mu(dx) = \phi(x) dx$  and  $\mu_n(dx) = \phi_n(x) dx$ . We prove that there exists a universal constant  $C$  such that

$$(1.1) \quad \|\phi\|_{q,p} \leq C \left( \sum_{n=0}^\infty 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} d_k(\mu, \mu_n) + \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{2^{2mn}} \|\phi_n\|_{q+2m,2m,p} \right)$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \|\phi\|_{q,1+} \leq C \left( \sum_{n=0}^\infty n 2^{n(q+k)} d_k(\mu, \mu_n) + \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{2^{2mn}} \|\phi_n\|_{q+2m,2m,1+} \right).$$

This is Proposition 2.5 and the proof is based on a development in Hermite series and on a powerful estimate for mixtures of Hermite kernels inspired from [26]. This inequality fits in the general theory of interpolation spaces (we thank to D. Elworthy for a useful remark in this sense). Many interpolation results between Sobolev spaces of positive and negative indexes are known but they are not relevant from a probabilistic point of view: convergence in distribution is characterized by the Fortet–Mourier distance and this amounts to convergence in the dual of  $W^{1,\infty}$ . So we are not concerned with Sobolev spaces associated to  $L^p$  norms but to  $L^\infty$  norms. This is a limit case which is more delicate and we have not found in the literature classical interpolation results which may be used in our framework.

Once we have (1.1) and (1.2), we obtain the following regularity criteria. Let  $\mu$  be a finite nonnegative measure. Suppose that there exists a sequence of functions  $\phi_n \in C^{q+2m}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad d_k(\mu, \mu_n) \times \|\phi_n\|_{q+2m,2m,p}^\alpha \leq C, \quad \alpha > \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{2m},$$

with  $\mu_n(dx) = \phi_n(x) dx$ . Then  $\mu(dx) = \phi(x) dx$  and  $\phi \in W^{q,p}$  (the standard Sobolev space).

In terms of  $\|\phi\|_{q,m,1+}$ , the statement is the following: suppose that there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(1.4) \quad d_1(\mu, \mu_n) \times \|\phi_n\|_{2m,2m,1+}^{1/2m} \leq \frac{C}{(\ln n)^{2+1/2m}}.$$

Then  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

The statement of the corresponding results are Theorem 2.10(A) and Theorem 2.9 respectively. These are two significant particular cases of a more general result stated in terms of Orlicz norms in Theorem 2.6. The proof is, roughly speaking, as follows: let  $\gamma_\varepsilon$  be the Gaussian density of variance  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $\mu^\varepsilon = \mu * \gamma_\varepsilon$  and  $\mu_n^\varepsilon = \mu_n * \gamma_\varepsilon$ . Then  $\mu^\varepsilon(dx) = \phi^\varepsilon(x) dx$  and  $\mu_n^\varepsilon(x) = \phi_n^\varepsilon(x) dx$ . Using (1.1) for  $\phi^\varepsilon$  and  $\phi_n^\varepsilon$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , one proves that  $\sup_\varepsilon \|\phi^\varepsilon\|_{q,p} < \infty$ . And then one employs an argument of relative compactness in  $W^{q,p}$  in order to produce the density  $\phi$  of  $\mu$ .

We give now the convergence result (see Theorem 2.11). Suppose that (1.3) holds for some  $\alpha > \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{m}$ . Then  $\mu(dx) = \phi(x) dx$  and, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(1.5) \quad \|\phi - \phi_n\|_{W^{q,p}} \leq C d_k^\theta(\mu, \mu_n) \quad \text{with } \theta = \frac{1}{\alpha} \wedge \left(1 - \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{\alpha m}\right).$$

Roughly speaking, this inequality is obtained by using (1.1) with  $\mu$  replaced by  $\mu - \mu_n$ .

In the statements of (1.3), we do not use  $d_k(\mu, \mu_n)$  and  $\|\phi_n\|_{q+2m,2m,p}$  directly, but some function  $\lambda$  having some nice properties such that  $\lambda(1/n) \geq \|\phi_n\|_{1+q+2m,2m,p}$ . But this is a technical point which we leave out in this **Introduction**.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the Orlicz spaces, we give the general result and the criteria concerning the absolute continuity and the regularity of the density. We also give in Section 2.5 the convergence criteria mentioned above. In Section 2.6, we translate the results in terms of integration by parts formulae. In Section 3.1 (resp., Section 3.2), we prove absolute continuity for the law of the solution to a SDE (resp., to a SPDE) with log-Hölder continuous coefficients. Moreover, in Section 3.3 we discuss an example concerning piecewise deterministic Markov processes: we assume that the coefficients are smooth and we prove existence of the density of the law of the solution together with regularity with respect to the initial condition. We also consider an approximation scheme and we use (1.5) in order to estimate the error. Finally, we add some appendices containing technical results: Appendix A is devoted to the proof of the main estimate (1.1) based on a development in Hermite series; in Appendix B we discuss the relation with interpolation spaces; in Appendix C we give some auxiliary estimates concerning super kernels.

**2. Criterion for the regularity of a probability law.**

2.1. *Notation.* We work on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and we denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the set of the finite signed measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the Borel  $\sigma$  algebra. Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}_a \subset \mathcal{M}$  is the set of the measures which are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. For  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_a$ , we denote by  $p_\mu$  the density of  $\mu$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure. And for a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  we denote by  $L^p_\mu$  the space of the measurable functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int |f|^p d|\mu| < \infty$ . For  $f \in L^1_\mu$ , we denote  $f\mu$  the measure  $(f\mu)(A) = \int_A f d\mu$ . For a bounded function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we denote  $\mu * \phi$  the measure defined by  $\int f d\mu * \phi = \int f * \phi d\mu = \iint \phi(x - y) f(y) dy d\mu(x)$ . Then  $\mu * \phi \in \mathcal{M}_a$  and  $p_{\mu * \phi}(x) = \int \phi(x - y) d\mu(y)$ .

We denote by  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  a multi-index and we put  $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$ . Here,  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  is the set of nonnegative integers and we put  $\mathbb{N}_* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ . For a multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = k$ , we denote  $\partial_\alpha$  the corresponding derivative that is  $\partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_d}^{\alpha_d}$  with the convention that  $\partial_{x_i}^{\alpha_i} f = f$  if  $\alpha_i = 0$ . In particular, if  $\alpha$  is the null multi-index then  $\partial_\alpha f = f$ .

We denote by  $\|f\|_p = (\int |f(x)|^p dx)^{1/p}$ ,  $p \geq 1$  and  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|$ . Then  $L^p = \{f : \|f\|_p < \infty\}$  are the standard  $L^p$  spaces with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

2.2. *Orlicz spaces.* In the following, we will work in Orlicz spaces, so we briefly recall the notation and the results we will use, for which we refer to [19].

A function  $\mathbf{e} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is said to be a Young function if it is symmetric, strictly convex, nonnegative and  $\mathbf{e}(0) = 0$ . In the following, we will consider Young functions having the two supplementary properties:

- (i) there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{e}(2s) \leq \lambda \mathbf{e}(s)$ ,
  - (ii)  $s \mapsto \frac{\mathbf{e}(s)}{s}$  is nondecreasing.
- (2.1)

The property (i) is known as the  $\Delta_2$  condition or doubling condition (see [19]). Throughout the whole paper, we work with Young functions which satisfy (2.1). We set  $\mathcal{E}$  the space of these functions:

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{e} : \mathbf{e} \text{ is a Young function satisfying (2.1)}\}.$$

For  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the norm

$$(2.3) \quad \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}} = \inf \left\{ c > 0 : \int \mathbf{e} \left( \frac{1}{c} f(x) \right) dx \leq 1 \right\}.$$

This is the so-called Luxembourg norm which is equivalent to the Orlicz norm (see [19], page 227, Theorem 7.5.4). It is convenient for us to work with this norm (instead of the Orlicz norm). The space  $L^{\mathbf{e}} = \{f : \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}} < \infty\}$  is the Orlicz space.

REMARK 2.1. Let  $u_l(x) = (1 + |x|)^{-l}$ . As a consequence of (2.1)(ii), for every  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $l > d$  one has  $u_l \in L^{\mathbf{e}}$ , and moreover,

$$(2.4) \quad \|u_l\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq (\mathbf{e}(1)\|u_l\|_1) \vee 1 < \infty.$$

Indeed, (2.1)(ii) implies that for  $t \leq 1$  one has  $\mathbf{e}(t) \leq \mathbf{e}(1)t$ . For  $c \geq (\mathbf{e}(1)\|u_l\|_1) \vee 1$ , one has  $\frac{1}{c}u_l(x) \leq u_l(x) \leq 1$  so that

$$\int \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}u_l(x)\right) dx \leq \frac{\mathbf{e}(1)}{c} \int u_l(x) dx = \frac{\mathbf{e}(1)}{c} \|u_l\|_1 \leq 1.$$

For  $a > 0$ , we define  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}(a) = \sup\{c : \mathbf{e}(c) \leq a\}$  and

$$(2.5) \quad \phi_{\mathbf{e}}(r) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{e}^{-1}(1/r)} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(R) = \frac{R}{\mathbf{e}^{-1}(R)} = R\phi_{\mathbf{e}}\left(\frac{1}{R}\right), \quad r, R > 0.$$

REMARK 2.2. The function  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}}$  is the ‘‘fundamental function’’ of  $L^{\mathbf{e}}$  equipped with the Luxembourgnorm (see [8], Lemma 8.17, page 276). In particular,  $\frac{1}{r}\phi_{\mathbf{e}}(r)$  is decreasing (see [8], Corollary 5.2, page 67). It follows that  $\beta_{\mathbf{e}}$  is increasing. For the sake of completeness, we give here the argument. By (2.1)(ii), if  $a > 1$  then  $\mathbf{e}(ax) \geq a\mathbf{e}(x)$  so that  $ax \geq \mathbf{e}^{-1}(a\mathbf{e}(x))$ . Taking  $y = \mathbf{e}(x)$ , we obtain  $a\mathbf{e}^{-1}(y) \geq \mathbf{e}^{-1}(ay)$  which gives

$$\beta_{\mathbf{e}}(ay) = \frac{ay}{\mathbf{e}^{-1}(ay)} \geq \frac{ay}{a\mathbf{e}^{-1}(y)} = \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(y).$$

One defines the conjugate of  $\mathbf{e}$  by

$$\mathbf{e}_*(s) = \sup\{st - \mathbf{e}(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

$\mathbf{e}_*$  is a Young function as well, so the corresponding Luxembourgnorm  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}$  is given by (2.3) with  $\mathbf{e}$  replaced by  $\mathbf{e}_*$ . And one has the following Hölder inequality:

$$(2.6) \quad \left| \int fg(x) dx \right| \leq 2\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}\|g\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}$$

(see Theorem 7.2.1, page 215 in [19]; we stress that the factor 2 does not appear in that reference but in the right-hand side of the inequality in the statement of Theorem 7.2.1 in [19] one has the Orlicz norm of  $g$  and by using the equivalence between the Orlicz and the Luxembourgnorm we can replace the Orlicz norm by  $2\|g\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}$ ).

We will now define Sobolev norms and Sobolev spaces associated to an Young function  $\mathbf{e}$ . Let us denote by  $L^1_{\text{loc}}$  the space of measurable functions which are integrable on compact sets and by  $W^{k,1}_{\text{loc}}$  the space of measurable functions which are  $k$  times weakly differentiable and have locally integrable derivatives. More precisely, this means that  $f \in W^{k,1}_{\text{loc}}$  if for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq k$  one may find a function  $f_{\alpha} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$  (determined  $dx$  almost surely) such that

$\int g(x) f_\alpha(x) dx = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int \partial_\alpha g(x) f(x) dx$  for every  $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ . In this case, we denote  $\partial_\alpha f = f_\alpha$ . Notice that

$$(2.7) \quad L^e \subset L^1_{\text{loc}}.$$

In order to prove this, we take  $R > 0$  and we notice that for  $|x| \leq R$  one has  $(1 + R)^{d+1} u_{d+1}(x) \geq 1$ . Then using (2.6) and (2.4), for every  $f \in L^e$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} |f(x)| dx &\leq (1 + R)^{d+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_{d+1}(x) |f(x)| dx \\ &\leq (1 + R)^{d+1} \|u_{d+1}\|_{e_*} \|f\|_e < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

For  $f \in W^{k,1}_{\text{loc}}$ , we introduce the norms

$$(2.8) \quad \|f\|_{k,e} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial_\alpha f\|_e \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_{k,\infty} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial_\alpha f\|_\infty$$

and we denote

$$W^{k,e} = \{f \in W^{k,1}_{\text{loc}} : \|f\|_{k,e} < \infty\} \quad \text{and} \quad W^{k,\infty} = \{f \in W^{k,1}_{\text{loc}} : \|f\|_{k,\infty} < \infty\}.$$

For a multi-index  $\gamma$ , we denote  $x^\gamma = \prod_{i=1}^d x_i^{\gamma_i}$  and for two multi-indexes  $\alpha, \gamma$  we denote  $f_{\alpha,\gamma}$  the function

$$f_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = x^\gamma \partial_\alpha f(x).$$

Then we consider the norms

$$(2.9) \quad \|f\|_{k,l,e} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \sum_{0 \leq |\gamma| \leq l} \|f_{\alpha,\gamma}\|_e \quad \text{and} \quad W^{k,l,e} = \{f : \|f\|_{k,l,e} < \infty\}.$$

We stress that in  $\|\cdot\|_{k,l,e}$  the first index  $k$  is related to the order of the derivatives which are involved while the second index  $l$  is connected to the power of the polynomial multiplying the function and its derivatives up to order  $k$ .

Finally, we recall that if  $e$  satisfies the  $\Delta_2$  condition [that is (2.1)(i)] then  $L^e$  is reflexive (see [19], Theorem 7.7.1, page 234). In particular, in this case, any bounded subset of  $L^e$  is weakly relatively compact.

Let us propose two examples of Young functions that represent the leading ones in our approach.

EXAMPLE 1. If we take  $e_p(x) = |x|^p, p > 1$ , then  $\|f\|_{e_p}$  is the usual  $L^p$  norm and the corresponding Orlicz space is the standard  $L^p$  space on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Clearly,  $\beta_{e_p}(t) = t^{1/p_*}$  with  $p_*$  the conjugate of  $p$ .

EXAMPLE 2. Set  $e_{\log}(t) = (1 + |t|) \ln(1 + |t|)$ . Since the norm from  $e_{\log}$  is not explicit, we replace it by the following quantities:

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{p,1+} &= \int (1 + |x|)^p |f(x)| (1 + \ln^+ |x| + \ln^+ |f(x)|) dx, \\ \|f\|_{k,p,1+} &= \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \|\partial_\alpha f\|_{p,1+} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\ln^+(x) = \max\{0, \ln |x|\}$ . We stress that  $\|f\|_{p,1+}$  is not a norm.

We will need the following.

LEMMA 2.3. *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 0$ , there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $k, p$  only such that*

$$(2.11) \quad \|f\|_{k,p,\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq C(1 \vee \|f\|_{k,p,1+}).$$

Moreover,

$$(2.12) \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(t)}{\ln t} \leq 2.$$

PROOF. The inequality (2.11) is an immediate consequence of the following simpler one:

$$(2.13) \quad \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq 2 \left( 1 \vee \int |f(x)|(1 + \ln^+ |f(x)|) dx \right).$$

Let us prove it. We assume that  $f \geq 0$  and we take  $c \geq 2$  and we write

$$\int \mathbf{e}_{\log} \left( \frac{1}{c} f(x) \right) dx \leq \int_{\{f \leq c\}} \mathbf{e}_{\log} \left( \frac{1}{c} f(x) \right) dx + \int_{\{f > c\}} \mathbf{e}_{\log} \left( \frac{1}{c} f(x) \right) dx =: I + J.$$

Using the inequality  $\ln(1 + y) \leq y$ , we obtain  $I \leq 2 \int f \ln(1 + \frac{1}{c} f) \leq \frac{2}{c} \int f f$ . And if  $f \geq c \geq 2$ , then  $\frac{f}{c} + 1 \leq \frac{2}{c} f \leq f$ . Then  $\mathbf{e}_{\log}(\frac{1}{c} f(x)) \leq \frac{2}{c} f \ln f$ . It follows that  $J \leq \frac{2}{c} \int_{\{f > c\}} f \ln^+ f$ , and finally  $\int \mathbf{e}_{\log}(\frac{1}{c} f) \leq \frac{2}{c} \int_{\{f > c\}} (1 + f) \ln^+ f$ . We conclude that for  $c \geq 2 \int f f (1 + \ln^+ f)$  we have  $\int \mathbf{e}_{\log}(\frac{1}{c} f) \leq 1$  which by the very definition means that  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq 2 \int f f (1 + \ln^+ f)$ .

Let us prove (2.12). We denote  $e(t) = 2t \ln(2t)$  and we notice that for large  $t$  one has  $\mathbf{e}_{\log}(t) \leq e(t)$ . It follows that

$$\beta_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(t) \leq \frac{t}{e^{-1}(t)}.$$

Using the change of variable  $R = e(t)$ , we obtain

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R}{e^{-1}(R) \ln R} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e(t)}{t \ln e(t)} = 2.$$

So for large  $R$  we have  $\beta_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(R) \leq R/e^{-1}(R) \leq 2 \ln R$ .  $\square$

REMARK 2.4. We recall that the  $L \log L$  space of Zygmund is the space of the functions  $f$  such that  $\int |f(x)| \ln^+ |f(x)| dx < \infty$  (see [8]). Then  $L^{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} = L^1 \cap L \log L$ . The inequality (2.13) already gives one inclusion. The converse inclusion

is a consequence of the following inequalities. Let  $\varepsilon_* > 0$  be such that  $t \leq 2 \ln(1 + t)$  for  $0 < t \leq \varepsilon_*$  and let  $C_* = 2 + 1/\ln(1 + \varepsilon_*)$ . Then

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \int |f(x)| dx \leq C_* \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \quad \text{and} \\ (ii) \quad & \int |f(x)| \ln^+ |f(x)| dx \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} (1 + 2C_* \ln^+ \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}). \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove (i), we denote  $g = \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}^{-1} |f|$  and we write

$$\begin{aligned} \int g &= \int_{\{g \leq \varepsilon_*\}} g + \int_{\{g > \varepsilon_*\}} g \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\{g \leq \varepsilon_*\}} \ln(1 + g) + \frac{1}{\ln(1 + \varepsilon_*)} \int_{\{g > \varepsilon_*\}} g \ln(1 + g) \\ &\leq C_* \int (1 + g) \ln(1 + g) = C_* \int \mathbf{e}_{\log}(g) = C_*. \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove (ii), we notice that  $\int g \ln^+ g \leq \int \mathbf{e}_{\log}(g) = 1$  so that

$$\int |f| \ln^+ \frac{|f|}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}} \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}.$$

Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \int |f| \ln^+ |f| &= \int_{\{|f| \geq 1 \vee \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}\}} |f| \ln^+ |f| + \int_{\{|f| < 1 \vee \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}\}} |f| \ln^+ |f| \\ &=: I + J. \end{aligned}$$

If  $|f| \geq 1 \vee \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ , then  $\ln^+ |f| = \ln |f| = \ln^+ \left(\frac{|f|}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}}\right) + \ln \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ . So, by using the previous inequality,

$$I \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} + \ln \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \int |f| \leq \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} (1 + C_* \ln \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}})$$

the last inequality being a consequence of (i). And

$$J \leq \ln^+ \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \int |f| \leq C_* \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \ln^+ \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}.$$

**2.3. Main results.** We consider the following distances between two measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ : for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$(2.15) \quad d_k(\mu, \nu) = \sup \left\{ \left| \int \phi d\mu - \int \phi d\nu \right| : \phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \|\phi\|_{k, \infty} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Notice that  $d_0$  is the total variation distance and  $d_1$  is the bounded variation distance (also called Fortet–Mourier distance) which is related to the convergence in law of probability measures. The distances  $d_k$  with  $k \geq 2$  are less often used. We

mention however that people working in approximation theory (for diffusion process, e.g., [28] or [22]) use such distances in an implicit way: indeed, they study the speed of convergence of certain schemes but they are able to obtain their estimates for test functions  $f \in C^k$  with  $k$  sufficiently large—so  $d_k$  comes on. We also recall that for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $d_k$  plays an important role in the so-called Stein’s method for normal approximation (see, e.g., [23]).

We fix now a Young function  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  [see (2.2)], and we recall the function  $\beta_{\mathbf{e}}$  [see (2.5) and Remark 2.2, resp.].

Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ . For  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  and for a sequence  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_a, n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &\pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_n)_n) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n(q+k)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) d_k(\mu, \mu_n) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2nm}} \|p_{\mu_n}\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and in the sequel, we make the convention that  $\|p_{\mu_n}\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}} = \infty$  if  $p_{\mu_n} \notin W_{\text{loc}}^{2m+q,1}$ . Moreover, we define

$$(2.17) \quad \rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu) = \inf \pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_n)_n)$$

the infimum being over all the sequences of measures  $\mu_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  which are absolutely continuous. It is easy to check that  $\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}$  is a norm on the space  $\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}$  defined by

$$(2.18) \quad \mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}} = \{\mu \in \mathcal{M} : \rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu) < \infty\}.$$

The following result gives the key estimate in our paper. We prove it in Appendix A.

**PROPOSITION 2.5.** *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $q, k, m, d$  and  $\mathbf{e}$ ) such that for every  $f \in C^{2m+q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  one has*

$$(2.19) \quad \|f\|_{q,\mathbf{e}} \leq C \rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu),$$

where  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$ .

We state now our main theorem.

**THEOREM 2.6.** *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ .*

(i) *Take  $q = 0$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{S}_{0,k,m,\mathbf{e}} \subset L^{\mathbf{e}}$$

*in the sense that if  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}_{0,k,m,\mathbf{e}}$  then  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous and the density  $p_{\mu}$  belongs to  $L^{\mathbf{e}}$ . Moreover, there exists a universal constant  $C$  such that*

$$\|p_{\mu}\|_{L^{\mathbf{e}}} \leq C \rho_{0,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu).$$

(ii) Take  $q \geq 1$ . Then

$$\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}} \in W^{q,\mathbf{e}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|p_\mu\|_{q,\mathbf{e}} \leq C\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}.$$

PROOF. We consider a function  $\phi \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $0 \leq \phi \leq 1_{B_1}$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x) dx = 1$ . For  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we define  $\phi_\delta(x) = \delta^{-d}\phi(\delta^{-1}x)$ . For a measure  $\mu$ , we define  $\mu * \phi_\delta$  by  $\int f d\mu * \phi_\delta = \int f * \phi_\delta d\mu$ . Since  $\|f * \phi_\delta\|_{k,\infty} \leq \|f\|_{k,\infty}$ , it follows that  $d_k(\mu * \phi_\delta, \nu * \phi_\delta) \leq d_k(\mu, \nu)$ . We will also prove that

$$(2.20) \quad \|f * \phi_\delta\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}} \leq 2^{2m} \|f\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}}.$$

Suppose for a moment that (2.20) holds. Then

$$\pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu * \phi_\delta, (\mu_n * \phi_\delta)_n) \leq 2^{2m} \pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_n)_n) \leq 2^{2m} \rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu).$$

Let  $p_\delta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  be the density of the measure  $\mu * \phi_\delta$ . The above inequality and (2.19) prove that

$$\sup_{0 < \delta \leq 1} \|p_\delta\|_{q,\mathbf{e}} \leq C\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu) < \infty.$$

For each multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq q$ , the family  $\partial_\alpha p_\delta, \delta \in (0, 1)$  is bounded in  $L^\mathbf{e}$  which is a reflexive space, so it is weakly relatively compact. Then we may find  $p_\alpha \in L^\mathbf{e} \subset L^1_{\text{loc}}$  [see (2.7) for the above inclusion] and a sequence  $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$  such that  $\partial_\alpha p_{\delta_n} \rightarrow p_\alpha$  weakly, for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq q$  (in the same time). Since  $\int g \partial_\alpha p_{\delta_n} = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int p \partial_\alpha g$ , by passing to the limit, we obtain  $\int g p_\alpha = (-1)^{|\alpha|} \int p \partial_\alpha g$  so  $\partial_\alpha p = p_\alpha \in L^\mathbf{e}$  and this means that  $p \in W^{q,\mathbf{e}}$ . Since  $\mu * \phi_{\delta_n} \rightarrow \mu$  weakly, one has  $\mu(dx) = p(x) dx$ . And since  $\|\partial_\alpha p\|_\mathbf{e} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\partial_\alpha p_{\delta_n}\|_\mathbf{e} \leq C\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu)$  it follows that  $\|p\|_{q,\mathbf{e}} \leq C\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu)$ . So the proof is completed.

Let us check (2.20). For  $\lambda > 0$ , we denote  $g_\lambda(x) = (1 + |x|)^\lambda g(x)$ . Notice that for  $\delta \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} |(g * \phi_\delta)_\lambda(x)| &\leq (1 + |x|)^\lambda \int |g(x - y)| \phi_\delta(y) dy \\ &\leq \int (1 + |x - y| + \delta)^\lambda |g(x - y)| \phi_\delta(y) dy \\ &\leq 2^\lambda \int (1 + |x - y|)^\lambda |g(x - y)| \phi_\delta(y) dy = 2^\lambda |g_\lambda| * \phi_\delta(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (A.6)  $\|(g * \phi_\delta)_\lambda\|_\mathbf{e} \leq 2^\lambda \| |g_\lambda| * \phi_\delta \|_\mathbf{e} \leq 2^\lambda \|\phi_\delta\|_1 \| |g_\lambda| \|_\mathbf{e} = 2^\lambda \|g_\lambda\|_\mathbf{e}$ . Using this inequality (with  $\lambda = 2m$ ) for  $g = \partial_\alpha f$ , we obtain (2.20).  $\square$

We consider now a special class of Orlicz norms which verify a supplementary condition: given  $\alpha, \gamma \geq 0$  we define

$$(2.21) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,\gamma} = \left\{ \mathbf{e} : \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_\mathbf{e}(R)}{R^\alpha (\ln R)^\gamma} < \infty \right\}.$$

In this case, we have the following.

**THEOREM 2.7.** *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha, \gamma}$ . If  $2m > d, \gamma \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{2m+q+k}{d(2m-1)}$  then*

$$W^{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \subset \mathcal{S}_{q, k, m, \mathbf{e}} \subset W^{q, \mathbf{e}}$$

and there exists some constant  $C$  such that

$$(2.22) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|p_\mu\|_{q, \mathbf{e}} \leq \rho_{q, k, m, \mathbf{e}}(\mu) \leq C \|p_\mu\|_{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}}.$$

In particular, this is true for  $\mathbf{e}_{\log}$  and for  $\mathbf{e}_p$  with  $\frac{p-1}{p} < \frac{2m+q+k}{d(2m-1)}$ .

**PROOF.** The first inequality in (2.22) is proved in Theorem 2.6. As for the second, we use Lemma C.3 in Appendix C. Let  $f \in W^{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}}$  and  $\mu_f(dx) = f(x) dx$ . We have to prove that  $\rho_{q, k, m, \mathbf{e}}(\mu_f) < \infty$ . We consider a super kernel  $\phi$  [see (C.1)] and we define  $f_\delta = f * \phi_\delta$ . We take  $\delta_n = 2^{-\theta n}$  with  $\theta$  to be chosen in a moment and we choose  $n_*$  such that for  $n \geq n_*$  one has  $\beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) \leq C 2^{nd\alpha} n^\gamma$  because  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha, \gamma}$ . Using (C.3) with  $l = 2m$ , we obtain  $d_k(\mu_f, \mu_{f_{\delta_n}}) \leq C_{k, q} \|f\|_{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \delta_n^{q+k+1}$  and using (C.4) we obtain  $\|f_{\delta_n}\|_{2m+q, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \leq C_{2m+q, 2m} \times \|f\|_{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \delta_n^{-(2m-1)}$  (the constant  $C$  depends on  $k$  and  $q$ , which are fixed). Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{q, k, m, \mathbf{e}}(\mu_f, \mu_{f_{\delta_n}}) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n(q+k)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) d_k(\mu_f, \mu_{f_{\delta_n}}) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2nm}} \|f_{\delta_n}\|_{2m+q, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \\ &\leq C_{q, k, m} \|f\|_{q+1, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \\ &\quad \times \left( 1 + \sum_{n \geq n_*} 2^{n(q+k+d\alpha-\theta(q+k+1))} n^\gamma + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n(2m-\theta(2m-1))}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$C_{q, k, m} > 0$  denoting a constant depending on  $q, k, m$ . In order to obtain the convergence of the above series, we need to choose  $\theta$  such that

$$\frac{q+k+d\alpha}{q+k+1} < \theta < \frac{2m}{2m-1}$$

and this is possible under our restriction on  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

We give now a criterion in order to check that  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}_{q, k, m, \mathbf{e}}$ .

**THEOREM 2.8.** *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha, \gamma}$ . We consider a non-negative finite measure  $\mu$  and we suppose that there exists a family of measures  $\mu_\delta(dx) = f_\delta(x) dx, \delta > 0$  which verifies the following assumptions. There exist*

$C, r > 0$  and a function  $\lambda_{q,m}(\delta), \delta \in (0, 1)$ , which is right-continuous and non-increasing such that

$$\|f\delta\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}} \leq \lambda_{q,m}(\delta) \leq C\delta^{-r}.$$

We consider some  $\eta > 0$  and  $\kappa \geq 0$  and we assume that

$$(2.23) \quad \lambda_{q,m}^\eta(\delta) d_k(\mu, \mu_\delta) \leq \frac{C}{(\ln(1/\delta))^\kappa}.$$

If (2.23) holds with

$$(2.24) \quad \eta > \frac{q+k+\alpha d}{2m}, \quad \kappa = 0$$

then

$$\mu \in \mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}} \subset W^{q,\mathbf{e}}.$$

The same conclusion holds if

$$(2.25) \quad \eta = \frac{q+k+\alpha d}{2m} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa > 1 + \gamma + \eta.$$

PROOF. Let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ . We define

$$\delta_n = \inf \left\{ \delta > 0 : \lambda_{q,m}(\delta) \leq \frac{2^{2mn}}{n^{1+\varepsilon_0}} \right\}.$$

Let  $0 < \theta < 2m/r$  where  $r$  is the one in the growth condition on  $\lambda_{q,m}$ . Since  $\delta^r \lambda_{q,m}(\delta) \leq C$ , we have

$$\lambda_{q,m}(2^{-\theta n}) \leq C2^{n\theta r} \leq \frac{2^{2mn}}{n^{1+\varepsilon_0}}$$

which means that  $\delta_n \leq 2^{-\theta n}$ . Since  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,\gamma}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_{\delta_n})_n) \\ & \leq C \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n(q+k+\alpha d)} n^\gamma d_k(\mu, \mu_{\delta_n}) + C \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{-2mn} \|f_{\delta_n}\|_{2m+q,2m,\mathbf{e}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda_{q,m}$  is right continuous,  $\lambda_{q,m}(\delta_n) = 2^{2mn} n^{-(1+\varepsilon_0)}$  so

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^{2mn}} \lambda_{q,m}(\delta_n) < \infty.$$

By recalling that  $\ln(1/\delta_n) \geq C\theta n$  and by using (2.23), we obtain

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} 2^{n(q+k+\alpha d)} n^\gamma d_k(\mu, \mu_{\delta_n}) & \leq 2^{n(q+k+\alpha d)} \frac{Cn^\gamma}{\lambda_{q,m}^\eta(\delta_n) (\ln(1/\delta_n))^\kappa} \\ & \leq C \times 2^{n(q+k+\alpha d-2m\eta)} n^{\gamma+\eta(1+\varepsilon_0)-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $q + k + \alpha d < 2\eta m$ , the series with the general term given in (2.26) is convergent. If  $q + k + \alpha d = 2\eta mn$ , we need that  $\kappa > 1 + \gamma + \eta(1 + \varepsilon_0)$  in order to obtain the convergence of the series. If  $\kappa > 1 + \gamma + \eta$ , then we may choose  $\varepsilon_0$  sufficiently small in order to have  $\gamma + \eta(1 + \varepsilon_0) - \kappa > 1$  and we are done.  $\square$

There are two important examples:  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_p$  that we discuss in a special subsection below and  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_{\log}$  which we discuss now. We recall that  $\mathbf{e}_{\log} \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,\gamma}$  with  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\gamma = 1$  and  $\|f_\delta\|_{2m,2m,\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq C1 \vee \|f_\delta\|_{2m,2m,1+}$  where  $\|f_\delta\|_{2m,2m,1+}$  is defined in (2.10). Then as a particular case of the previous theorem we obtain the following.

**THEOREM 2.9.** *We consider a nonnegative finite measure  $\mu$  and we suppose that there exists a family of measures  $\mu_\delta(dx) = f_\delta(x) dx, \delta > 0$  which verifies the following assumptions. There exist  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*, C, r, \varepsilon > 0$  and a function  $\lambda_m(\delta), \delta \in (0, 1)$ , which is right-continuous and nonincreasing such that*

$$(2.27) \quad \|f_\delta\|_{2m,2m,1+} \leq \lambda_m(\delta) \leq C\delta^{-r} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\lambda_m^{1/(2m)}(\delta)d_1(\mu, \mu_\delta) \leq \frac{C}{(\ln(1/\delta))^{2+1/(2m)+\varepsilon}}.$$

Then  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$  with  $f \in L^{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ .

**2.4. The  $L^p$  criterion.** In the case of the  $L^p$  norms, that is,  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_p$ , our result fits in the general theory of the interpolation spaces and we may give a more precise characterization of the space  $\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}_p} =: \mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,p}$ . We come back to the standard notation and we denote  $\|\cdot\|_p$  instead of  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{e}_p}$ ,  $W^{q,p}$  instead of  $W^{q,\mathbf{e}_p}$  and so on. In Appendix B, we prove that in this case the space  $\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,p}$  is related to the following interpolation space. Let  $X = W_*^{k,\infty}$  where  $W_*^{k,\infty}$  is the dual of  $W^{k,\infty}$  [notice that one may look to  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  as to an element of  $W_*^{k,\infty}$  and then  $d_k(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{W_*^{k,\infty}}$ ]. We also take  $Y = W^{q+2m,2m,p}$  and for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  we denote by  $(X, Y)_\gamma$  the real interpolation space of order  $\gamma$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  (see Appendix B for notation). Then we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,p} = (X, Y)_\gamma \quad \text{with } \gamma = \frac{q + k + d/p_*}{2m}.$$

So Theorem 2.7 reads

$$W^{q+1,2m,p} \subset (W_*^{k,\infty}, W^{q+2m,2m,p})_\gamma \subset W^{q,p}.$$

We go now further and we notice that if (2.24) holds then the convergence of the series in (2.26) is very fast. This allows us to obtain some more regularity.

**THEOREM 2.10.** *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*, p > 1$  and set*

$$(2.28) \quad \eta > \frac{q + k + d/p_*}{2m}.$$

We consider a nonnegative finite measure  $\mu$  and a family of finite nonnegative measures  $\mu_\delta(dx) = f_\delta(x) dx, \delta > 0$ .

(A) We assume that there exist  $C, r > 0$  and a right-continuous and nonincreasing function  $\lambda_{q,m}(\delta), \delta \in (0, 1)$ , such that

$$\|f_\delta\|_{2m+q,2m,p} \leq \lambda_{q,m}(\delta) \leq C\delta^{-r}$$

and moreover, with  $\eta$  given in (2.28),

$$(2.29) \quad \lambda_{q,m}(\delta)^\eta d_k(\mu, \mu_\delta) \leq C.$$

Then  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$  with  $f \in W^{q,p}$ .

(B) We assume that (2.29) holds with  $q + 1$  instead of  $q$ , that is,

$$\lambda_{q+1,m}(\delta)^\eta d_k(\mu, \mu_\delta) \leq C.$$

We denote

$$(2.30) \quad s_\eta(q, k, m, p) = \frac{2m\eta - (q + k + d/p_*)}{2m\eta} \wedge \frac{\eta}{1 + \eta}.$$

Then for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = q$  and every  $s < s_\eta(q, k, m, p)$  we have  $\partial_\alpha f \in \mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  where  $\mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  is the Besov space of index  $s$ .

PROOF. (A) The fact that (2.29) implies  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$  with  $f \in W^{q,p}$  is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.8.

(B) We prove the regularity property:  $g := \partial_\alpha f \in \mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  for  $|\alpha| = q$  and  $s < s_\eta(q, k, m)$ . In order to do it, we will use Lemma B.1 so we have to check (B.4).

Step 1. We begin with the point (i) in (B.4) so we have to estimate  $\|g * \partial_i \phi_\varepsilon\|_\infty$ . The reasoning is analogous with the one in the proof of Theorem 2.8 but we will use the first inequality in (2.22) with  $q$  replaced by  $q + 1$  and  $k$  replaced by  $k - 1$ . So we define  $\delta_n = \inf\{\delta > 0 : \lambda_{q+1,m}(\delta) \leq n^{-2}2^{2mn}\}$  and we have  $\delta_n \leq 2^{-\theta n}$  for  $\theta < 2m/r$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|g * \partial_i \phi_\varepsilon\|_p &= \|\partial_i \partial_\alpha (f * \phi_\varepsilon)\|_p \leq \|f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{q+1,p} \leq \rho_{q+1,k-1,m,p}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon, \mu_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{-2mn} \|f_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p}. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of  $\delta_n$ ,

$$\|f_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p} \leq \|f_{\delta_n}\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p} \leq \lambda_{q+1,m}(\delta_n) \leq \frac{1}{n^2} 2^{2nm}$$

so the second series is convergent. We estimate now the first sum. Since  $\|f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{k,\infty} \leq \varepsilon^{-1} \|f\|_{k-1,\infty}$ , one has  $d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon, \mu_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-1} d_k(\mu, \mu_{\delta_n})$ . Then, using (2.29) (with  $q = 1$  instead of  $q$ ) and the choice of  $\delta_n$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon, \mu_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon) &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} 2^{n(q+1+d/p_*)} d_k(\mu, \mu_{\delta_n}) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} 2^{n(q+1+d/p_*)} \lambda_{q+1,m}^{-\eta}(\delta_n) \\ &\leq \frac{C n^{2\eta}}{\varepsilon} 2^{n(q+1+d/p_*-2m\eta)}. \end{aligned}$$

We fix now  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we take some  $n_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  (to be chosen in the sequel) and we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon, \mu_{\delta_n} * \phi_\varepsilon) \\ &\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{n_\varepsilon} 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \sum_{n=n_\varepsilon+1}^\infty n^{2\eta} 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*-2m\eta)}. \end{aligned}$$

We take  $a > 0$  and we upper bound the above series by

$$2^{n_\varepsilon(q+k+d/p_*)} + \frac{C}{\varepsilon} 2^{n_\varepsilon(q+k+d/p_*+a-2\eta m)}.$$

In order to optimize, we take  $n_\varepsilon$  such that  $2^{2mn_\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ . With this choice, we obtain

$$2^{n_\varepsilon(q+k+d/p_*+a)} \leq C \varepsilon^{-(q+k+d/p_*+a)/(2m\eta)}.$$

We conclude that

$$\|g * \partial_i \phi_\varepsilon\|_p \leq C \varepsilon^{-(q+k+d/p_*+a)/(2m\eta)}$$

which means (B.4)(i) holds for  $s < 1 - \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{2m\eta}$ .

*Step 2.* We check now (B.4)(ii) so we have to estimate  $\|g * \phi_\varepsilon^i\|_p$  with  $\phi_\varepsilon^i(x) = x^i \phi_\varepsilon(x)$ . We take  $u \in (0, 1)$  (to be chosen in a moment) and we define

$$\delta_{n,\varepsilon} = \inf\{\delta > 0 : \lambda_{q+1,m}(\delta) \leq n^{-2} 2^{2mn} \times \varepsilon^{-(1-u)}\}.$$

Then we proceed as in the previous step:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_i(g * \phi_\varepsilon^i)\|_p &\leq \rho_{q+1,k-1,m,p}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon^i) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon^i, \mu_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}} * \phi_\varepsilon^i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{-2mn} \|f_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}} * \phi_\varepsilon^i\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that for every  $h \in L^p$  one has  $\|h * \phi_\varepsilon^i\|_p \leq \varepsilon \|h\|_p$  so that, by our choice of  $\delta_{n,\varepsilon}$  we obtain

$$\|f_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}} * \phi_\varepsilon^i\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p} \leq \varepsilon \|f_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}}\|_{2m+q+1,2m,p} \leq \varepsilon \times \frac{2^{2mn}}{n^2} \times \varepsilon^{-(1-u)}.$$

It follows that the second sum is upper bounded by  $C\varepsilon^u$ .

Since  $\|\partial_j h * \phi_\varepsilon^i\|_\infty \leq C \|h\|_\infty$ , it follows that

$$d_{k-1}(\mu * \phi_\varepsilon^i, \mu_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}} * \phi_\varepsilon^i) \leq C d_k(\mu, \mu_{\delta_{n,\varepsilon}}) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda_{q+1,m}^\eta(\delta_{n,\varepsilon})} = \frac{Cn^2}{2^{2mn}\eta} \varepsilon^{\eta(1-u)}.$$

Since  $2m\eta > q + k + d/p_*$  the first sum is convergent also and is upper bounded by  $C\varepsilon^{\eta(1-u)}$ . We conclude that

$$\|\partial_i(g * \phi_\varepsilon^i)\|_p \leq C\varepsilon^{\eta(1-u)} + C\varepsilon^u.$$

In order to optimize, we take  $u = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}$ .  $\square$

2.5. *Convergence criteria in  $W^{q,p}$  and  $W^{q,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ .* For a function  $f$ , we denote  $\mu_f(dx) = f(x) dx$ .

**THEOREM 2.11.** *Let  $\eta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a nondecreasing function and  $a \geq 1$  be such that*

$$(2.31) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta(n) = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(n+1) \leq a\eta(n), \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

*Let  $m, k, q \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. Let  $f_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , be a sequence of functions and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ .*

(i) *Let  $p \geq 1$ . If there exists  $\alpha > \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{m}$  such that*

$$(2.32) \quad \|f_n\|_{q+2m,2m,p} \leq \eta^{1/\alpha}(n) \quad \text{and} \quad d_k(\mu, \mu_{f_n}) \leq \frac{1}{\eta(n)},$$

*then  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$  for some  $f \in W^{q,p}$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $a, \alpha$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$(2.33) \quad \|f - f_n\|_{q,p} \leq C\eta^{-\theta}(n) \quad \text{with } \theta = \frac{1}{\alpha} \wedge \left(1 - \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{\alpha m}\right).$$

(ii) *If there exists  $\alpha > \frac{q+k}{m}$  such that*

$$(2.34) \quad \|f_n\|_{q+2m,2m,1+} \leq \eta^{1/\alpha}(n) \quad \text{and} \quad d_k(\mu, \mu_{f_n}) \leq \frac{1}{\eta(n)},$$

*then  $\mu(dx) = f(x) dx$  for some  $f \in W^{q,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}$ . Moreover, there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $a, \alpha$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$(2.35) \quad \|f - f_n\|_{q,\mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq C(\eta^{-1/\alpha}(n) + (\log_2 \eta(n))\eta^{-(1-(q+k)/(\alpha m))}(n)) \\ =: \varepsilon_n(\alpha).$$

And if  $\varepsilon_n(\alpha) \leq 1$  then

$$(2.36) \quad \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} \int |(\partial_\alpha f - \partial_\alpha f_n)(x)| (1 + \ln^+ |(\partial_\alpha f - \partial_\alpha f_n)(x)|) dx \leq 2C_* \varepsilon_n(\alpha).$$

PROOF. (i) *Step 1.* For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$n_r = \min\{n : \eta(n) \geq 2^{\alpha r m}\} \quad \text{and} \quad r_n = \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} : n_r \geq n\}.$$

Then we have

$$(2.37) \quad \frac{1}{a} \eta(n) \leq 2^{\alpha r_n m} \leq C \eta(n).$$

Since  $\{r \in \mathbb{N} : n_r \geq n\}$  is a discrete set, its minimum  $r_n$  belongs to this set, so  $n_{r_n} \geq n$ . Then  $\eta(n) \leq \eta(n_{r_n}) \leq a\eta(n_{r_n} - 1) \leq a2^{\alpha r_n m}$ . On the other hand, since  $r_n - 1 \notin \{r \in \mathbb{N} : n_r \geq n\}$  one has  $n > n_{r_n - 1}$  and then  $\eta(n) \geq \eta(n_{r_n - 1}) \geq 2^{\alpha(r_n - 1)m} = C^{-1}2^{\alpha r_n m}$  with  $C = 2^{\alpha m}$ . So, (2.37) holds.

*Step 2.* We fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

$$g_r = 0 \quad \text{if } r < r_n \quad \text{and} \quad g_r = f_{n_r} - f_n \quad \text{if } r \geq r_n$$

and  $\nu(dx) = \mu(dx) - f_n(x) dx$ ,  $\nu_r(dx) = g_r(x) dx$ . Using (2.19) (recall that  $\beta_{e_p} = t^{1/p_*}$ ) we get

$$\rho_{q,k,m,p}(\nu) \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{r(q+k+d/p_*)} d_k(\nu, \nu_r) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-2mr} \|g_r\|_{q+2m,2m,p} =: S_1 + S_2.$$

We estimate  $S_1$ . For  $r < r_n$ , we have  $\nu_r = 0$  so that  $d_k(\nu, \nu_r) = d_k(\nu, 0) = d_k(\mu, \mu_{f_n}) \leq \eta^{-1}(n)$ . And for  $r \geq r_n$  we have

$$d_k(\nu, \nu_r) = d_k(\mu, \mu_{f_{n_r}}) \leq \frac{1}{\eta(n_r)} \leq \frac{1}{2^{r m \alpha}}.$$

So, we obtain

$$S_1 \leq 2^{r_n(q+k+d/p_*)} \eta^{-1}(n) + \frac{C}{2^{r_n m \alpha (1 - (q+k+d/p_*)/(\alpha m))}}$$

and using (2.37),

$$S_1 \leq C \eta^{-(1 - (q+k+d/p_*)/(\alpha m))}(n).$$

We estimate now  $S_2$ . We have  $g_r = 0$  for  $r < r_n$  and for  $r \geq r_n$

$$\|g_r\|_{q+2m,2m,p} \leq \|f_{n_r}\|_{q+2m,2m,p} + \|f_n\|_{q+2m,2m,p} \leq \eta(n_r)^{1/\alpha} + \eta(n)^{1/\alpha}.$$

But  $\eta(n_r) \leq a\eta(n_r - 1) \leq a2^{\alpha r m}$ , so that

$$\|g_r\|_{q+2m,2m,p} \leq a^{1/\alpha} 2^{r m} + \eta(n)^{1/\alpha}.$$

It follows that

$$S_2 \leq a^{1/\alpha} \sum_{r \geq r_n} 2^{-rm} + \eta(n)^{1/\alpha} \sum_{r \geq r_n} 2^{-2rm} \leq C(2^{-r_n m} + \eta(n)^{1/\alpha} 2^{-2r_n m})$$

and using (2.37) we get

$$S_2 \leq C\eta(n)^{-1/\alpha}.$$

Then we obtain

$$\rho_{q,k,m,p}(v) \leq C(\eta^{-1/\alpha}(n) + \eta^{-(1-(q+k+d/p_*)/(\alpha m))}(n))$$

and Theorem 2.6 allows one to conclude.

(ii) We take  $n_r$  and  $r_n$  as in Step 1 above, giving (2.37), and we take  $g_r, v, v_r$  as in Step 2 above. Then, by using (2.19) we get

$$\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(v) \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{r(q+k)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(2^{rd}) d_k(v, v_r) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-2mr} \|g_r\|_{q+2m, 2m, \mathbf{e}_{\log}}.$$

By (2.11) and (2.12), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(v) &\leq C \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{r(q+k)} r d_k(v, v_r) + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-2mr} 1 \vee \|g_r\|_{q+2m, 2m, 1+} \\ &=: S_1 + S_2. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning  $S_1$ , for  $r < r_n$  we have  $d_k(v, v_r) = d_k(v, 0) = d_k(\mu, \mu_{f_n}) \leq \eta^{-1}(n)$  and for  $r \geq r_n$  we have  $d_k(v, v_r) \leq \frac{1}{\eta(n_r)} \leq \frac{1}{2^{r m \alpha}}$ . So, we obtain

$$S_1 \leq C \left( r_n 2^{r_n(q+k)} \eta^{-1}(n) + \frac{r_n}{2^{r_n m \alpha (1-(q+k)/(\alpha m))}} \right).$$

Using (2.37),

$$S_1 \leq C r_n \eta^{-(1-(q+k)/(\alpha m))}(n) \leq C(\log_2 \eta(n)) \eta^{-(1-(q+k)/(\alpha m))}(n).$$

As for  $S_2$ , we proceed as in Step 2 above and we obtain  $S_2 \leq C\eta(n)^{-1/\alpha}$ . Then

$$\rho_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}_{\log}}(v) \leq C(\eta^{-1/\alpha}(n) + \eta^{-(1-(q+k+d/p_*)/(\alpha m))}(n))$$

and the statement again follows from Theorem 2.6. So (2.35) is proved. In order to check (2.36), we use (2.14) [notice that, since  $\|f - f_n\|_{q, \mathbf{e}_{\log}} \leq \varepsilon_n(\alpha) \leq 1$ , we have  $\ln^+ \|f - f_n\|_{q, \mathbf{e}_{\log}} = 0$ ].  $\square$

2.6. *Random variables and integration by parts.* In this section, we work in the framework of random variables. For a random variable  $F$ , we denote by  $\mu_F$  the law of  $F$  and if  $\mu_F$  is absolutely continuous we denote by  $p_F$  its density. We will use Theorem 2.10 for  $\mu_F$  so we will look for a family of random variables  $F_\delta, \delta > 0$  such that  $\mu_{F_\delta}$  satisfy the hypothesis of this theorem. Sometimes it is easy to construct such a family with explicit densities  $p_{F_\delta}$  and then one may check (2.29) directly (this is the case in the examples in Sections 3.1 and 3.2). But sometimes one does not know  $p_{F_\delta}$  and then it is useful to use the integration by parts machinery in order to prove (2.29)—this is the case in the example given in Section 3.3 or the application to a kind of generalization of the Hörmander condition to general Wiener functionals developed in [2].

We briefly recall the abstract definition of integration by parts formulae and we give some useful properties (coming essentially from [1]). We consider two random variables  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_d)$  and  $G$ . Given a multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^k$  and for  $p \geq 1$ , we say that  $IP_{\alpha,p}(F, G)$  holds if we may find a random variable  $H_\alpha(F; G) \in L^p$  such that for every  $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  one has

$$(2.38) \quad \mathbb{E}(\partial_\alpha f(F)G) = \mathbb{E}(f(F)H_\alpha(F; G)).$$

The weight  $H_\alpha(F; G)$  is not uniquely determined: the one with the lowest variance is  $\mathbb{E}(H_\alpha(F; G) \mid \sigma(F))$ . This quantity is uniquely determined. So we denote

$$(2.39) \quad \theta_\alpha(F, G) = \mathbb{E}(H_\alpha(F; G) \mid \sigma(F)).$$

For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p \geq 1$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{R}_{m,p}$  the class of random variables  $F$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $IP_{\alpha,p}(F, 1)$  holds for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq m$ . We define

$$(2.40) \quad T_{m,p}(F) = \|F\|_p + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|\theta_\alpha(F, 1)\|_p.$$

Notice that by Hölder’s inequality  $\|\mathbb{E}(H_\alpha(F; 1) \mid \sigma(F))\|_p \leq \|H_\alpha(F; 1)\|_p$ . It follows that for every choice of the weights  $H_\alpha(F; 1)$  one has

$$(2.41) \quad T_{m,p}(F) \leq \|F\|_p + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|H_\alpha(F; 1)\|_p.$$

**THEOREM 2.12.** *Let  $m, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p > d$ . If  $F \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,p}$  then the law of  $F$  is absolutely continuous and the density  $p_F$  belongs to  $C^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Moreover, suppose that  $F \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,2(d+1)}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $d, l$  and  $m$  only) such that for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq m$*

$$(2.42) \quad |\partial_\alpha p_F(x)| \leq CT_{1,2(d+1)}^{d^2-1}(F)T_{m+1,2(d+1)}(F)(1 + \|F\|_l)(1 + |x|)^{-l}.$$

*In particular, for every  $q \geq 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $d, m, k, p$  and  $q$ ) such that*

$$(2.43) \quad \|p_F\|_{m,k,q} \leq CT_{1,2(d+1)}^{d^2-1}(F)T_{m+1,2(d+1)}(F)(1 + \|F\|_{d+k+1}).$$

PROOF. The proof is an immediate consequence of the results in [1] and [3]. In order to see this, we have to give the relation between the notation used in that paper and the notation used here: we work with the probability measure  $\mu_F(dx) = \mathbb{P}(F \in dx)$  and in [1] we use the notation  $\partial_\alpha^{\mu_F} g(x) = \mathbb{E}(H_\alpha(F; g(F)) \mid F = x)$ .

The fact that  $F \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,p}$  implies that  $F \sim p_F(x) dx$  with  $p_F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is proved in [1], Proposition 9. We consider now a function  $\psi \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $1_{B_1} \leq \psi \leq 1_{B_2}$ . In [1], Theorem 8, we have given the following representation formula:

$$\partial_\alpha p_F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}(\partial_i Q_d(F-x) \theta_{(\alpha,i)}(F; \psi(F-x)) 1_{B_2}(F-x)),$$

where  $B_r$  denotes the ball centered at 0 with radius  $r$ ,  $Q_d$  is the Poisson kernel on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and, if  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ , then  $(\alpha, i) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, i)$ . Using Hölder’s inequality, we obtain (with  $p_*$  the conjugate of  $p$ )

$$|\partial_\alpha p_F(x)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_i Q_d(F-x)\|_p \|\theta_{(\alpha,i)}(F; \psi(F-x)) 1_{B_2}(F-x)\|_{p_*}.$$

We take  $p = d + 1$  so that  $p_* = (d + 1)/d \leq 2$ . In [1] Theorem 5, we proved that

$$\|\partial_i Q_d(F-x)\|_p \leq CT_{1,2(d+1)}^{d^2-1}(F).$$

Moreover, we have the following computational rule (Lemma 9 in [1])

$$\theta_i(F, fg(F)) = f(F)\theta_i(F, g(F)) + (g\partial_i f)(F).$$

Since  $\psi \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we may use the above formula in order to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\theta_{(\alpha,i)}(F; \psi(F-x)) 1_{B_2}(F-x)\|_{p_*} \\ &\leq \|\theta_{(\alpha,i)}(F; \psi(F-x))\|_{2p_*} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(|F-x| \leq 2)} \\ &\leq C_\psi T_{|\alpha|+1,2p_*}(F) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(|F-x| \leq 2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $|x| \geq 4$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|F-x| \leq 2) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|F| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x|\right) \leq \frac{2^k}{|x|^k} \mathbb{E}(|F|^k)$$

so the proof of (2.42) is completed.  $\square$

We are now ready to rewrite Theorem 2.10.

THEOREM 2.13. *Let  $k, q \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*, p > 1$  and let*

$$\eta > \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{2m},$$

*$p_*$  denoting the conjugate of  $p$ . Let  $F, F_\delta, \delta > 0$ , be random variables and let  $\mu_F, \mu_{F_\delta}, \delta > 0$ , denote the associated laws.*

(A) Suppose that  $F_\delta \in \mathcal{R}_{2m+q+1,2(d+1)}$ ,  $\delta > 0$  are uniformly bounded in  $L^{2m+d+1}$  and that there exist  $C > 0$  and  $\theta > 0$  such that

$$(2.44) \quad T_{2m+q+1,2(d+1)}(F_\delta) \leq C\delta^{-\theta(2m+q+1)},$$

$$(2.45) \quad d_k(\mu_F, \mu_{F_\delta}) \leq C\delta^{\theta\eta d^2(2m+q+1)}.$$

Then  $\mu_F(dx) = p_F(x) dx$  with  $p_F \in W^{q,p}$ .

(B) Suppose that  $F_\delta \in \mathcal{R}_{2m+q+2,2(d+1)}$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , and (2.44) holds with  $q + 1$  instead of  $q$ . Then for every multi-index  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = q$  and every  $s < s_\eta(q, k, m, p)$  we have  $\partial_\alpha p_F \in \mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  where  $\mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  is the Besov space of index  $s$  and  $s_\eta(q, k, m, p)$  is given in (2.30).

PROOF. (A) Let  $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p > 1$  be fixed. By using (2.44) and (2.43), we obtain  $\|p_{F_\delta}\|_{2m+q,2m,p} \leq C\delta^{-\theta d^2(2m+q+1)}$ . So, as a consequence of (2.45) we obtain  $\|p_{F_\delta}\|_{2m+q,2m,p}^\eta d_k(\mu_F, \mu_{F_\delta}) \leq C$ . And we apply Theorem 2.10(A). Similarly, (B) follows by applying Theorem 2.10(B).  $\square$

### 3. Examples.

3.1. Path dependent SDEs. In this section, we look to the SDE

$$(3.1) \quad dX_t = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j(t, X) dW_t^j + b(t, X) dt,$$

where  $W = (W^1, \dots, W^n)$  is a standard Brownian motion and

$$\sigma_j, b : C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

For a function  $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we use the notation  $\sigma_j(t, \varphi) = \sigma_j(\varphi)(t)$  and  $b(t, \varphi) = b(\varphi)(t)$ . If  $\sigma_j$  and  $b$  satisfy some Lipschitz continuity property with respect to the sup-norm on  $C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , then this equation has a unique solution. But we do not want to make such an hypothesis here so we just consider an adapted process  $X_t, t \geq 0$  which verifies the above equation.

We set  $\Delta_{s,t}(w) := \sup_{s \leq u \leq t} |w_u - w_s|$ .

THEOREM 3.1. Let  $b$  and  $\sigma_j, j = 1, \dots, n$ , be bounded. Suppose that there exists  $\varepsilon, C > 0$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad |\sigma_j(t, w) - \sigma_j(s, w)| \leq C \left( \ln \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{s,t}(w)} \right) \right)^{-(2+\varepsilon)}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, n$$

and that there exists  $\lambda_* > 0$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma \sigma^*(t, w) \geq \lambda_* \quad \forall t \geq 0, w \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Then for every  $T > 0$  the law of  $X_T$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and the density belongs to  $L^{\mathbf{e} \log}$ .

REMARK 3.2. We note that in the particular case of standard SDEs we have  $\sigma_j(t, w) = \sigma_j(w_t)$  and a sufficient condition in order that (3.2) holds is  $|\sigma_j(x) - \sigma_j(y)| \leq C(\ln(\frac{1}{|x-y|}))^{-(2+\varepsilon)}$ . This is weaker than Hölder continuity.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1. During the proof, we set  $\lambda^* > 0$  a constant such that  $\lambda^* \geq \sigma \sigma^*(t, w)$ .

For  $\delta > 0$ , we construct

$$X_T^\delta = X_{T-\delta} + \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j(T - \delta, X)(W_T^j - W_{T-\delta}^j).$$

We will use Theorem 2.9 so we check the hypotheses there.

Step 1. We write  $X_T - X_T^\delta = \sum_{j=1}^n I_\delta^j + J_\delta$  with

$$I_\delta^j = \int_{T-\delta}^T (\sigma_j(t, X) - \sigma_j(T - \delta, X)) dW_t^j \quad \text{and} \quad J_\delta = \int_{T-\delta}^T b(t, W) dt.$$

Since  $b$  is bounded, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{E}(|J_\delta|) \leq C\delta.$$

Let  $\bar{a}_\delta = \sqrt{\delta} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}$  and  $A_\delta = \{\Delta_{T-\delta, T}(X) \leq \bar{a}_\delta\}$ . We write  $\mathbb{E}(|I_\delta^j|^2) = K_\delta + L_\delta$  with

$$K_\delta = \int_{T-\delta}^T \mathbb{E}(1_{A_\delta^c} |\sigma_j(t, X) - \sigma_j(T - \delta, X)|^2) dt,$$

$$L_\delta = \int_{T-\delta}^T \mathbb{E}(1_{A_\delta} |\sigma_j(t, X) - \sigma_j(T - \delta, X)|^2) dt.$$

By using the Bernstein's inequality, we obtain  $\mathbb{P}(A_\delta^c) \leq C \exp(-\frac{\bar{a}_\delta^2}{C'\delta})$ . And since  $\sigma_j$  is bounded, for any small  $\delta$  we get

$$K_\delta \leq C\delta \mathbb{P}(A_\delta^c) \leq C\delta \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{a}_\delta^2}{2C'\delta}\right) \leq C\delta^{3/2}.$$

Moreover, using (3.2) and again for  $\delta$  small enough,

$$L_\delta \leq \frac{C\delta}{(\ln 1/a_\delta)^{2(2+\varepsilon)}} \leq \frac{C'\delta}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2(2+\varepsilon)}}$$

[notice that  $\ln(\frac{1}{\delta})/\ln \frac{1}{a_\delta} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} > 0$  for  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ]. We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}(|I_\delta^j|^2) \leq \frac{C\delta}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2(2+\varepsilon)}}$$

so that, if  $\mu$  is the law of  $X_T$  and  $\mu_\delta$  is the law of  $X_T^\delta$  then for every  $\delta$  small,

$$(3.5) \quad d_1(\mu, \mu_\delta) \leq \mathbb{E}(|X_T - X_T^\delta|) \leq \frac{C\delta^{1/2}}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

Step 2. Given a positive definite matrix  $a$ , we denote

$$\gamma_{\delta,a}(y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\delta)^{d/2}(\det a)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\delta}(a^{-1}y, y)\right).$$

With  $\mu_\delta$  denoting the law of  $X_T^\delta$ , we have  $\mu_\delta(dy) = p_\delta(y) dy$  where

$$p_\delta(y) = \mathbb{E}(\gamma_{\delta,a_{T-\delta}(X)}(y - X_{T-\delta})) \quad \text{with } a_t(X) = \sigma\sigma^*(t, X).$$

Let  $\alpha$  denote a multi-index  $|\alpha| = q$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta \leq 1$ . By using (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\alpha p_\delta(y)| &\leq C\delta^{-q/2} \mathbb{E}\left(\left(1 + \frac{|y - X_{T-\delta}|}{\delta^{1/2}}\right)^q \gamma_{\delta,a_{T-\delta}(X)}(y - X_{T-\delta})\right) \\ (3.6) \quad &\leq C\delta^{-q/2} \mathbb{E}\left(\left(1 + \frac{|y - X_{T-\delta}|}{\delta^{1/2}}\right)^q \gamma_{\delta,\lambda^*I}(y - X_{T-\delta})\right). \end{aligned}$$

We use the fact that  $0 < x \mapsto (1+x)^q e^{-x^2}$  is bounded. This gives

$$|\partial_\alpha p_\delta(y)| \leq C\delta^{-(d+q)/2},$$

so that, for small values of  $\delta$ ,

$$(3.7) \quad \ln^+ |\partial_\alpha p_\delta(y)| \leq C\left(1 + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \leq C \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha p_\delta\|_{2m,1+} &= \int (1 + |y|)^{2m} |\partial_\alpha p_\delta(y)| (1 + \ln^+ |y| + \ln^+ |\partial_\alpha p_\delta(y)|) dy \\ &\leq C\delta^{-q/2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E}\left(\int (1 + |y|)^{2m+1} \left(1 + \frac{|y - X_{T-\delta}|}{\delta^{1/2}}\right)^q \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \gamma_{\delta,\lambda^*I}(y - X_{T-\delta}) dy\right) \\ &= C\delta^{-q/2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E}\left(\int (1 + |X_{T-\delta} + \delta^{1/2}z|)^{2m+q+1} \gamma_{1,\lambda^*I}(z) dz\right) \\ &\leq C\delta^{-q/2} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$(3.8) \quad \|p_\delta\|_{2m,2m,1+} = \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2m} \|\partial_\alpha p_\delta\|_{2m,1+} \leq C\delta^{-m} \ln \frac{1}{\delta}.$$

Step 3. We are now ready to check (2.27): there exists  $\delta_0 \leq 1$  such that for  $\delta < \delta_0$  one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_\delta\|_{2m,2m,1+}^{1/2m} d_1(\mu, \mu_\delta) &\leq C\delta^{-1/2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{1/2m} \times \frac{\delta^{1/2}}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2+\varepsilon}} \\ &= \frac{C}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2+\varepsilon-1/(2m)}} \leq \frac{C}{(\ln 1/\delta)^{2+1/(2m)+\varepsilon/2}} \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holding true as soon as  $\frac{1}{m} \leq \varepsilon/2$ . So (2.27) holds and the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.9.  $\square$

3.2. *Stochastic heat equation.* In this section, we investigate the regularity of the law of the solution to the stochastic heat equation introduced by Walsh in [33]. Formally, this equation is

$$(3.9) \quad \partial_t u(t, x) = \partial_x^2 u(t, x) + \sigma(u(t, x))W(t, x) + b(u(t, x)),$$

where  $W$  denotes a white noise on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1]$ . We consider Neumann boundary conditions that is  $\partial_x u(t, 0) = \partial_x u(t, 1) = 0$  and the initial condition is  $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$ . The rigorous formulation to this equation is given by the mild form constructed as follows. Let  $G_t(x, y)$  be the fundamental solution to the deterministic heat equation  $\partial_t v(t, x) = \partial_x^2 v(t, x)$  with Neumann boundary conditions. Then  $u$  satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad u(t, x) = \int_0^1 G_t(x, y)u_0(y) dy + \int_0^t \int_0^1 G_{t-s}(x, y)\sigma(u(s, y)) dW(s, y) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 G_{t-s}(x, y)b(u(s, y)) dy ds,$$

where  $dW(s, y)$  is the Itô integral introduced by Walsh. The function  $G_t(x, y)$  is explicitly known (see [33] or [7]) but here we will use just few properties that we list below (see the Appendix in [7] for the proof). More precisely, for  $0 < \varepsilon < t$  we have

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{t-\varepsilon}^t \int_0^1 G_{t-s}^2(x, y) dy ds \leq C\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, for  $0 < x_1 < \dots < x_d < 1$  there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $\min_{i=1,d}(x_i - x_{i-1})$  such that

$$(3.12) \quad C\varepsilon^{1/2} \geq \inf_{|\xi|=1} \int_{t-\varepsilon}^t \int_0^1 \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \xi_i G_{t-s}(x_i, y) \right)^2 dy ds \geq C^{-1}\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

This is an easy consequence of the inequalities (A2) and (A3) from [7].

In [25], one gives sufficient conditions in order to obtain the absolute continuity of the law of  $u(t, x)$  for  $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$  and in [7], under appropriate hypotheses, one obtains a  $C^\infty$  density for the law of the vector  $(u(t, x_1), \dots, u(t, x_d))$  with  $(t, x_i) \in (0, \infty) \times \{\sigma \neq 0\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . The aim of this section is to obtain the same type of results but under much weaker regularity hypothesis on the coefficients. One may first discuss the absolute continuity of the law and further, under more regularity hypothesis on the coefficients, one may discuss the regularity of the density. Here, in order to avoid technicalities, we restrict ourselves to the absolute continuity property. We assume global ellipticity, that is,

$$(3.13) \quad \sigma(x) \geq c_\sigma > 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in [0, 1].$$

A local ellipticity condition may also be used, but again this gives more technical complications that we want to avoid. This is somehow a benchmark for the efficiency of the method developed in the previous sections.

We assume the following regularity hypothesis:  $\sigma, b$  are measurable and bounded functions and there exists  $h > 0$  such that

$$(3.14) \quad |\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)| \leq |\ln|x - y||^{-(2+h)}, \quad \text{for every } x, y \in [0, 1].$$

This hypothesis is not sufficient in order to ensure existence and uniqueness for the solution to (3.10) (one needs  $\sigma$  and  $b$  to be globally Lipschitz continuous in order to obtain it)—so in the following we will just consider a random field  $u(t, x), (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$  which is adapted to the filtration generated by  $W$  (see Walsh [33] for precise definitions) and which solves (3.10).

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** *Suppose that (3.13) and (3.14) hold. Then for every  $0 < x_1 < \dots < x_d < 1$  and  $T > 0$ , the law of the random vector  $U = (u(T, x_1), \dots, u(T, x_d))$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.*

**PROOF.** Given  $0 < \varepsilon < T$ , we decompose

$$(3.15) \quad u(T, x) = u_\varepsilon(T, x) + I_\varepsilon(T, x) + J_\varepsilon(T, x)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u_\varepsilon(T, x) &= \int_0^1 G_t(x, y)u_0(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x, y)\sigma(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)) dW(s, y) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{T-\varepsilon} \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x, y)b(u(s, y)) dy ds, \\ I_\varepsilon(T, x) &= \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x, y)(\sigma(u(s, y)) - \sigma(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y))) dW(s, y), \\ J_\varepsilon(T, x) &= \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x, y)b(u(s, y)) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 1.* We prove that

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbb{E}|I_\varepsilon(T, x)|^2 + \mathbb{E}|J_\varepsilon(T, x)|^2 \leq C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-2(2+h)}\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

Let  $\mu$  be the law of  $U = (u(T, x_1), \dots, u(T, x_d))$  and let  $\mu_\varepsilon$  be the law of  $U_\varepsilon = (u_\varepsilon(T, x_1), \dots, u_\varepsilon(T, x_d))$ . Using the above estimate, one easily obtains

$$(3.17) \quad d_1(\mu, \mu_\varepsilon) \leq C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-(2+h)}\varepsilon^{1/4}.$$

Using the isometry property,

$$\mathbb{E}|I_\varepsilon(T, x)|^2 = \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}^2(x, y) \mathbb{E}(\sigma(u(s, y) - \sigma(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)))^2) dy ds.$$

We consider the set  $\Lambda_{\varepsilon, \eta}(s, y) = \{|u(s, y) - u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)| \leq \eta\}$  and we split the above term as  $\mathbb{E}|I_\varepsilon(T, x)|^2 = A_{\varepsilon, \eta} + B_{\varepsilon, \eta}$  with

$$A_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}^2(x, y) \mathbb{E}(\sigma(u(s, y) - \sigma(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)))^2 1_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon, \eta}(s, y)}) dy ds,$$

$$B_{\varepsilon, \eta} = \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}^2(x, y) \mathbb{E}(\sigma(u(s, y) - \sigma(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)))^2 1_{\Lambda_{\varepsilon, \eta}^c(s, y)}) dy ds.$$

Using (3.14)

$$A_{\varepsilon, \eta} \leq C |\ln \eta|^{-2(2+h)} \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}^2(x, y) dy ds \leq C |\ln \eta|^{-2(2+h)} \varepsilon^{1/2}$$

the last inequality being a consequence of (3.11). Moreover, coming back to (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_{\varepsilon, \eta}^c(s, y)) &\leq \frac{1}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E}|u(s, y) - u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\eta^2} \int_{T-\varepsilon}^s \int_0^1 G_{s-r}^2(y, z) dz dr \leq \frac{C\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\eta^2} \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$B_{\varepsilon, \eta} \leq \frac{C\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\eta^2} \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}^2(x, y) dy ds \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{\eta^2}.$$

Taking  $\eta = \varepsilon^{1/16}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|I_\varepsilon(T, x)|^2 \leq C(|\ln \varepsilon|^{-2(2+h)} + \varepsilon^{1/4})\varepsilon^{1/2} \leq C|\ln \varepsilon|^{-2(2+h)}\varepsilon^{1/2}.$$

We estimate now

$$|J_\varepsilon(T, x)| \leq \|b\|_\infty \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x, y) dy ds = \|b\|_\infty \varepsilon$$

so (3.16) is proved.

*Step 2.* Conditionally to  $\mathcal{F}_{T-\varepsilon}$ , the random vector  $U_\varepsilon = (u_\varepsilon(T, x_1), \dots, u_\varepsilon(T, x_d))$  is Gaussian of covariance matrix

$$\Sigma^{i, j}(U_\varepsilon) = \int_{T-\varepsilon}^T \int_0^1 G_{T-s}(x_i, y) G_{T-s}(x_j, y) \sigma^2(u(s \wedge (T - \varepsilon), y)) dy ds,$$

for  $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ . By (3.12)

$$C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \geq \Sigma(U_\varepsilon) \geq \frac{1}{C}\sqrt{\varepsilon},$$

where  $C$  is a constant which depends on the upper bounds of  $\sigma$  and on  $c_\sigma$ .

We use now the criterion given in Theorem 2.9 . Let  $p_{U_\varepsilon}$  be the density of the law of  $U_\varepsilon$ . Conditionally to  $\mathcal{F}_{T-\varepsilon}$  this is a Gaussian density and the same reasoning as in the proof of (3.8) gives

$$\|p_{U_\varepsilon}\|_{2m,2m,1+} \leq C(\varepsilon^{-1/4})^{2m} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

So (2.27) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{U_\varepsilon}\|_{2m,2m,1+}^{1/2m} d_1(\mu, \mu_\varepsilon) &\leq C\varepsilon^{-1/4} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/2m} \times |\ln \varepsilon|^{-(2+h)} \varepsilon^{1/4} \\ &= C \frac{1}{(\ln 1/\varepsilon)^{2+h-1/2m}} \leq C \frac{1}{(\ln 1/\varepsilon)^{2+1/2m}} \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality being true as soon as  $h > \frac{1}{m}$ .  $\square$

3.3. *Piecewise deterministic Markov processes.* In this section, we deal with a jump type stochastic differential equation which has already been considered in [4]: it is an example of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. We consider a Poisson point process  $p$  with state space  $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$ , where  $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . We refer to [17] for the notation. We denote by  $N$  the counting measure associated to  $p$ , that is,  $N([0, t) \times A) = \#\{0 \leq s < t; p_s \in A\}$  for  $t \geq 0$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ . We assume that the associated intensity measure is given by  $\widehat{N}(dt, dz, du) = dt \times dz \times 1_{[0, \infty)}(u) du$  where  $(z, u) \in E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . We are interested in the solution to the  $d$  dimensional stochastic equation

$$(3.18) \quad X_t = x + \int_0^t \int_E c(z, X_{s-}) 1_{\{u < \gamma(z, X_{s-})\}} N(ds, dz, du) + \int_0^t g(X_s) ds.$$

The coefficients  $c, g, \gamma$  are smooth functions [see the hypothesis  $(H_i), i = 0, 1, 2$  below]. We remark that the infinitesimal generator of the Markov process  $X_t$  is given by

$$L\psi(x) = g(x)\nabla\psi(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\psi(x + c(z, x)) - \psi(x))\gamma(z, x) dz.$$

See [14] for the proof of existence and uniqueness of the solution to (3.18). We will deal with two problems related to this equation.

First, we give sufficient conditions in order that  $\mathbb{P}(X_t(x) \in dy) = p_t(x, y) dy$  where  $X_t(x)$  is the solution to (3.18) which starts from  $x$ , so  $X_0(x) = x$ . And we prove that, if the coefficients of the equation are smooth, then  $(x, y) \mapsto p_t(x, y)$  is smooth. Notice that the methodology from [9, 10, 14] and [15] seems difficult to

implement in order to prove the regularity with respect to the initial condition  $x$ . So this is the main point here.

The second result concerns convergence. In [4], it is constructed an approximation scheme which allows one to compute  $\mathbb{E}(f(X_t(x)))$  using a Monte Carlo method. And it is proved that the convergence takes place in total variation distance. We use here the method developed in our paper in order to prove that the density functions and their derivatives converge as well and to estimate the error.

In [4], one gives a Malliavin-type approach to equation (3.18) which we recall and which we will heavily use here. We describe first the approximation procedure. We consider a nonnegative and smooth function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\varphi(z) = 0$  for  $|z| > 1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(z) dz = 1$ . And for  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote  $\Phi_M = \varphi * 1_{B_M}$  with  $B_M = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : |z| < M\}$ . Then  $\Phi_M \in C_b^\infty$  and we have  $1_{B_{M-1}} \leq \Phi_M \leq 1_{B_{M+1}}$ . We denote by  $X_t^M$  the solution of the equation

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} X_t^M &= x + \int_0^t \int_E c(z, X_{s-}^M) 1_{\{u < \gamma(z, X_{s-}^M)\}} \Phi_M(z) N(ds, dz, du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t g(X_s^M) ds. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we will assume that  $|\gamma(z, x)| \leq \bar{\gamma}$  for some constant  $\bar{\gamma}$ . Let  $N_M(ds, dz, du) := 1_{B_{M+1}}(z) \times 1_{[0, 2\bar{\gamma}]}(u) N(ds, dz, du)$ . Since  $\{u < \gamma(z, X_{s-}^M)\} \subset \{u < 2\bar{\gamma}\}$  and  $\Phi_M(z) = 0$  for  $|z| > M + 1$ , we may replace  $N$  by  $N_M$  in the above equation, and consequently  $X_t^M$  is solution to the equation

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^M &= x + \int_0^t \int_E c_M(z, X_{s-}^M) 1_{\{u < \gamma(z, X_{s-}^M)\}} N_M(ds, dz, du) + \int_0^t g(X_s^M) ds, \\ &\quad \text{with } c_M(z, x) = \Phi_M(z) c(z, x). \end{aligned}$$

Since the intensity measure  $\hat{N}_M$  is finite we may represent the random measure  $N_M$  by a compound Poisson process. Let  $\lambda_M = 2\bar{\gamma} \times \mu(B_{M+1}) = t^{-1} \mathbb{E}(N_M(t, E))$  (with  $\mu$  the Lebesgue measure) and let  $J_t^M$  a Poisson process of parameter  $\lambda_M$ . We denote by  $T_k^M, k \in \mathbb{N}$  the jump times of  $J_t^M$ . We also consider two sequences of independent random variables  $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $(U_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  which are independent of  $J^M$  and such that

$$Z_k \sim \frac{1}{\mu(B_{M+1})} 1_{B_{M+1}}(z) dz \quad \text{and} \quad U_k \sim \frac{1}{2\bar{\gamma}} 1_{[0, 2\bar{\gamma}]}(u) du.$$

To simplify the notation, we omit the dependence on  $M$  for the variables  $(T_k^M)$ . Then equation (3.19) may be written as

$$(3.20) \quad X_t^M = x + \sum_{k=1}^{J_t^M} c_M(Z_k, X_{T_k^-}^M) 1_{(U_k, \infty)}(\gamma(Z_k, X_{T_k^-}^M)) + \int_0^t g(X_s^M) ds.$$

Now  $X_t^M$  is an explicit functional of the  $Z_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$  but, because of the indicator function, this functional is not differentiable. In order to overcome this difficulty,

following [4], we consider an alternative representation of the law of  $X_t^M$ . Let  $z_M^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $|z_M^*| = M + 3$ . We define

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} q_M(x, z) &:= \varphi(z - z_M^*)\theta_{M,\gamma}(x) + \frac{1}{2\bar{\gamma}\mu(B_{M+1})}1_{B_{M+1}}(z)\gamma(z, x), \quad \text{with} \\ \theta_{M,\gamma}(x) &:= \frac{1}{\mu(B_{M+1})} \int_{\{|z| \leq M+1\}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\bar{\gamma}}\gamma(z, x)\right) dz. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that  $\varphi$  is a nonnegative and smooth function with  $\int \varphi = 1$  and which is null outside the unit ball. Moreover, since  $0 \leq \gamma(z, x) \leq \bar{\gamma}$  one has  $1 \geq \theta_{M,\gamma}(x) \geq 1/2$ . By construction, the function  $q_M$  satisfies  $\int q_M(x, z) dz = 1$ . Hence, we can easily check (see [4] for the proof) that

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbb{E}(f(X_{T_k}^M) | X_{T_k}^- = x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x + c_M(z, x))q_M(x, z) dz.$$

From the relation (3.22), we construct a process  $(\bar{X}_t^M)$ , equal in law to  $(X_t^M)$ , in the following way. We denote by  $\Psi_t(x)$  the solution of  $\Psi_t(x) = x + \int_0^t g(\Psi_s(x)) ds$ . We assume that the times  $T_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$  are fixed and we consider a sequence  $(z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $z_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then we define  $x_t, t \geq 0$  by  $x_0 = x$  and, if  $x_{T_k}$  is given, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= \Psi_{t-T_k}(x_{T_k}) \quad T_k \leq t < T_{k+1}, \\ x_{T_{k+1}} &= x_{T_{k+1}}^- + c_M(z_{k+1}, x_{T_{k+1}}^-). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that for  $T_k \leq t < T_{k+1}, x_t$  is a function of  $z_1, \dots, z_k$ . Notice also that  $x_t$  solves the equation

$$(3.23) \quad x_t = x + \sum_{k=1}^{J_t^M} c_M(z_k, x_{T_k}^-) + \int_0^t g(x_s) ds.$$

We consider now a sequence of random variables  $(\bar{Z}_k), k \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and we denote  $\mathcal{G}_k = \sigma(T_p, p \in \mathbb{N}) \vee \sigma(\bar{Z}_p, p \leq k)$  and  $\bar{X}_t^M = x_t(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_{J_t^M})$ . We assume that the law of  $\bar{Z}_{k+1}$  conditionally on  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{Z}_{k+1} \in dz | \mathcal{G}_k) = q_M(x_{T_{k+1}}^-(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_k), z) dz = q_M(\bar{X}_{T_{k+1}}^-, z) dz.$$

Clearly,  $\bar{X}_t^M$  satisfies the equation

$$(3.24) \quad \bar{X}_t^M = x + \sum_{k=1}^{J_t^M} c_M(\bar{Z}_k, \bar{X}_{T_k}^M) + \int_0^t g(\bar{X}_s^M) ds.$$

And by (3.22) the law of  $\bar{X}_t^M$  coincides with the law of  $X_t^M$ . So now on we work with  $\bar{X}_t^M$  which is a smooth functional of  $\bar{Z}_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . But one more difficulty remains: if  $T_1 > t$  then  $\bar{X}_t^M$  is deterministic, so this functional is not nondegenerated. In order to bypass this last difficulty, we add a small noise. We define

$$F_t^M(x) = \bar{X}_t^M(x) + \sqrt{TU_M} \times \Delta, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where  $\overline{X}_t^M(x)$  is the solution to (3.24) which starts from  $x$ ,  $\Delta$  is a standard normal random variable which is independent of  $T_k$  and  $\overline{Z}_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$(3.25) \quad U_M = \underline{\gamma} \int_{B_{M-1}^c} \underline{c}^2(z) dz$$

with  $\underline{\gamma}$  and  $\underline{c}$  from (3.26) and (3.28) below. The approximation scheme for  $X_t(x)$  is given by  $F_t^M(x)$ .

Let us give our hypotheses.

(H<sub>0</sub>) We assume that  $\gamma, g$  and  $c$  are infinitely differentiable functions in both variables  $z$  and  $x$ . Moreover, we assume that  $g$  and its derivatives are bounded.

(H<sub>1</sub>) There exist  $\overline{\gamma} \geq \underline{\gamma}$ , such that

$$(3.26) \quad \overline{\gamma} \geq \gamma(z, x) \geq \underline{\gamma} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

and, for every  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\overline{\gamma}_l$  and  $\overline{\gamma}_{\ln,l}$  such that for  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq l$

$$(3.27) \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_z^\beta \gamma(x, z)| \leq \overline{\gamma}_l, \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_z^\beta \ln \gamma(x, z)| \leq \overline{\gamma}_{\ln,l}.$$

(H<sub>2</sub>) Setting, for  $0 < a < b$  and  $r > 0$ ,

$$\underline{c}(z) = \frac{a}{1 + |z|^r}, \quad \overline{c}(z) = \frac{b}{1 + |z|^r},$$

we assume that, for every  $z, x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$(3.28) \quad \|\nabla_x c \times (I + \nabla_x c)^{-1}(z, x)\| + |c(z, x)| + |\partial_z^\beta \partial_x^\alpha c(z, x)| \leq \overline{c}(z),$$

$$(3.29) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d \langle \partial_{z_j} c(z, x), \xi \rangle^2 \geq \underline{c}^2(z) |\xi|^2.$$

REMARK 3.4. The above hypotheses represent a particular case of the hypotheses from [4], corresponding to Example 1(ii), page 634 in that paper. More general hypotheses may be considered (see [4]) but our aim is just to give an example in order to illustrate our method, so we restrict ourself to this case.

The basic estimate in our approach is the following.

THEOREM 3.5. *Suppose that Hypotheses (H<sub>i</sub>), i = 0, 1, 2 hold. Consider a function  $\psi \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $1_{B_1} \leq \psi \leq 1_{B_2}$ . Then for every  $t, R > 0, q \in \mathbb{N}$  and every multi-indexes  $\alpha, \beta$  with  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq q$ , one has*

$$(3.30) \quad \sup_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq R} |\partial_x^\alpha \mathbb{E}((\partial^\beta \phi)(F_t^M(x)) \psi(F_t^M(x) - y))| \leq C \|\phi\|_\infty M^{dq}.$$

Here,  $C$  is a constant which depends on  $t, R, q$  but not on  $M$ . In particular, the density  $p_t^M(x, y)$  of the law of  $F_t^M(x)$  verifies

$$(3.31) \quad \sup_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq R} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta p_t^M(x, y)| \leq C M^{d(q+d)}.$$

The above theorem is an extension of estimate (42) in Proposition 4, page 640, in [4] and the proof is similar, except for one point: here, we consider derivatives  $\partial_x^\alpha$  also (while in [4]  $\partial_y^\beta$  only appears). So we just sketch the proof and focus on this supplementary difficulty.

We use an integration by parts formula based on  $\bar{Z}_k, k \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and on  $\bar{Z}_0 = \Delta$  which is constructed as follows (we follow [4]). Here,  $J = J_t^M$  and  $T_k$  are fixed, so they appear as constants. A simple functional is a random variable of the form  $F = f(\bar{Z}_0, \bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_J)$  where  $f$  is a smooth function. We use the weights  $\pi_k = \Phi_M(\bar{Z}_k), k \in \mathbb{N}_*, \pi_0 = 1$  and the Malliavin derivative is defined as

$$D_{k,j} = \pi_k \partial_{\bar{Z}_k}^j.$$

For a multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q)$  with  $\alpha_i = (k_i, j_i)$ , one defines the iterated derivative

$$D_\alpha = D_{\alpha_q} \cdots D_{\alpha_1}.$$

Then one defines the Sobolev norms:

$$|F|_q^2 = |F|^2 + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq q} |D_\alpha F|^2, \quad \|F\|_{q,p} = (\mathbb{E}(|F|_q^p))^{1/p}.$$

For  $F = (F^1, \dots, F^d)$ , the Malliavin covariance matrix is given by

$$\sigma_F^{i,j} = \langle DF^i, DF^j \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^J \sum_{l=1}^d D_{k,l} F^i \times D_{k,l} F^j.$$

We introduce now the operator  $L$ . Notice that the law of  $\bar{Z} = (\bar{Z}_0, \bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_J)$  is absolutely continuous and has the density

$$(3.32) \quad p_{J,x}(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_J) = N(z_0) \prod_{k=1}^J q_M(x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}), z_k),$$

where  $N$  is the density of the standard normal law (so of  $\Delta$ ),  $q_M$  is defined in (3.21) and  $x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1})$  is the solution of (3.23) which starts from  $x$ . Then we define

$$LF = \sum_{k=0}^J \sum_{j=1}^d D_{k,j} D_{k,j} F + D_{k,j} F \times D_{k,j} \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z}_k).$$

The basic duality relation is the following: for two simple functionals  $F, G$

$$\mathbb{E}(FLG) = \mathbb{E}(GLF) = \mathbb{E}(\langle DF, DG \rangle).$$

Having these objects at hand, one proves the following integration by parts formula. Let  $F = (F^1, \dots, F^d)$  and  $G$  be simple functionals and let  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^q$  be multi-index of length  $q$ . Then for every  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$(3.33) \quad \mathbb{E}(\partial_\beta \phi(F)G) = \mathbb{E}(\phi(F)H_\beta(F, G)),$$

where  $H_\beta(F, G)$  is a random variable which verifies

$$(3.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \|H_\beta(F, G)\|_p &\leq C \|(\det \sigma_F)^{-1}\|_{4p}^{3q-1} \\ &\quad \times (1 + \|F\|_{q+1,4p}^{(6d+1)q})(1 + \|LF\|_{q-1,4p}^q) \|G\|_{q,4p}. \end{aligned}$$

This result is proved in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 in [4]. Before going on, we need the following estimates.

LEMMA 3.6. *For every multi-index  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^q$  and every  $p, R, T \geq 1$ ,*

$$(3.35) \quad \sup_{|x| \leq R} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \leq T} |\partial_x^\beta F_t^M(x)|_l^p \right) \leq C$$

and

$$(3.36) \quad \sup_{|x| \leq R} \|\partial_x^\beta \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z})\|_{l,q} \leq CM^d.$$

PROOF. The proof of (3.35) is analogous to the proof of Lemmas 7 and 9 in [4] so we leave it out. Let us prove (3.36). Notice first that

$$\partial_x^\beta \ln p_{J,x}(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_J) = \sum_{k=1}^J \partial_x^\beta \ln q_M(x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}), z_k).$$

On the set  $\{q_M > 0\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^\beta \ln q_M(x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}), z_k) &= 1_{B_{M+1}}(z_k) \partial_x^\beta \ln \gamma(x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}), z_k) \\ &\quad + 1_{B_{M+1}^c}(z_k) \partial_x^\beta \ln \theta_{M,\gamma}(x_{T_k}(x, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1})). \end{aligned}$$

We will use the following easy inequality: for any function  $f \in C_b^l$  and every simple functional  $F$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  one has  $|f(F)|_l \leq C \|f\|_{l,\infty} |F|_l$  where  $\|f\|_{l,\infty} = \sup_x \max_{|\alpha| \leq l} |\partial^\alpha f(x)|$ . Notice that for every multi-index  $\alpha$  one has

$$\partial_x^\beta \theta_{M,\gamma}(x) = -\frac{1}{2\bar{\gamma}\mu(B_{M+1})} \int_{B_{M+1}} \partial_x^\beta \gamma(x, z) dz$$

and moreover  $\theta_{M,\gamma}(x) \geq 1/2$ . It follows that  $\|\ln \theta_{M,\gamma}\|_{l,\infty} \leq C\bar{\gamma}_l/\bar{\gamma}$ . One also has  $\|\partial_x^\beta \ln \gamma\|_{l,\infty} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{l+|\beta|}$  so finally  $\|\ln q_M(\cdot, z)\|_{l,\infty} \leq C$  with  $C$  a constant which depends on  $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}_l, \bar{\gamma}_{\ln l}$ . Then, using the above remark we obtain

$$|\partial_x^\beta \ln q_M(x_{T_k}(x, \bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_{k-1}), \bar{Z}_k)|_l \leq C |F_{T_k}^M(x)|_l.$$

Consequently,

$$|\partial_x^\beta \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_{J_t^M})|_l \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{J_t^M} |F_{T_k}^M(x)|_l \leq J_t^M \times \sup_{s \leq t} |F_s^M(x)|_l.$$

Since  $(\mathbb{E}(|J_t^M|^2))^{1/2} = CM^d$  this, together with (3.35), gives

$$\|\partial_x^\beta \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_{J_t^M})\|_{l,p} \leq CM^d. \quad \square$$

We are now ready to proceed to the following.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3.5.** In order to avoid notational complications, we just look to a particular case (the general case is obviously similar). We assume that we are in the one-dimensional case  $d = 1$  and  $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$ . Then we look to

$$\partial_x^\alpha \mathbb{E}((\partial^\beta \phi)(F_t^M(x))\psi(F_t^M(x) - y)) = \partial_x \mathbb{E}(\phi'(F_t^M(x))\psi(F_t^M(x) - y)).$$

Let  $\nu(du)$  be the standard normal law and  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_J)$ . Then, with  $\delta = \sqrt{TU_M}$  and  $J = J_t^M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_x \mathbb{E}(\phi'(F_t^M(x))\psi(F_t^M(x) - y)) \\ &= \partial_x \mathbb{E} \int \nu(du) \int \phi'(\delta u + x_t(x, z))\psi(\delta u + x_t(x, z) - y) p_{J,x}(z) dz \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \mathbb{E} \int \nu(du) \int \phi''(\delta u + x_t(x, z))\partial_x x_t(x, z)\psi(\delta u + x_t(x, z) - y) p_{J,x}(z) dz, \\ I_2 &= \mathbb{E} \int \nu(du) \int \phi'(\delta u + x_t(x, z))\psi'(\delta u + x_t(x, z) - y)\partial_x x_t(x, z) p_{J,x}(z) dz, \\ I_3 &= \mathbb{E} \int \nu(du) \int \phi'(\delta u + x_t(x, z))\psi(\delta u + x_t(x, z) - y)\partial_x p_{J,x}(z) dz. \end{aligned}$$

We stress that  $x_t(x, z)$  is defined as the solution of equation (3.23) and so it depends on  $T_k, k \leq J_t^M$ . This is why  $\mathbb{E}$  appears in the previous expressions. Let us treat  $I_1$ . Using the integration by parts formula (3.33),

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \mathbb{E}(\phi''(F_t^M(x))\partial_x F_t^M(x)\psi(F_t^M(x) - y)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\phi(F_t^M(x))H_2(F_t^M(x), \partial_x F_t^M(x)\psi(F_t^M(x) - y))). \end{aligned}$$

We use now some results from [4]: according to Lemma 13 from we have

$$(3.37) \quad \|LF_t^M(x)\|_{l,p} \leq CM;$$

according to Lemma 9 we have

$$(3.38) \quad \|F_t^M(x)\|_{l,p} \leq C;$$

Lemma 16 gives

$$(3.39) \quad \mathbb{E}((\det \sigma_{F_t^M(x)})^{-p}) \leq C$$

(notice that in Lemma 16 one asks that  $2dp/t < \theta$  with  $\theta$  defined in Hypothesis 3.2(iii), page 630 in [4]; but as said in Example 1(ii) from the above paper, under our hypothesis we have  $\theta = \infty$  so our inequality holds for every  $t > 0$ ). Moreover, taking a look to the proofs of the above results, one can see that the estimates (3.37), (3.38), (3.39) are uniform with respect to  $x \in B_R$ . Then, using (3.34)

$$|I_1| \leq C \|\phi\|_\infty M^2$$

and the estimate is uniform with respect to  $x, y \in B_R$ . A similar reasoning gives the same inequality for  $I_2$ .

We come now to  $I_3$ . We write  $\partial_x p_{J,x}(z) = \partial_x \ln p_{J,x}(z) \times p_{J,x}(z)$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \mathbb{E}(\phi'(F_t^M(x))\psi(F_t^M(x) - y)\partial_x \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_J)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\phi(F_t^M(x))H_1(F_t^M(x), \psi(F_t^M(x) - y)\partial_x \ln p_{J,x}(\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_J))). \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.34) and (3.36), we obtain

$$|I_3| \leq C \|\phi\|_\infty M^2. \quad \square$$

We will use the following approximation result.

LEMMA 3.7. *Let  $(H_2)$  holds with  $r > d$ . For every Lipschitz continuous function  $f$  with Lipschitz constant less or equal to one, one has*

$$(3.40) \quad |\mathbb{E}(f(F_t^M(x))) - \mathbb{E}(f(X_t(x)))| \leq CM^{-(r-d)},$$

where  $C$  is a constant which is independent of  $M$ .

PROOF. We have

$$|\mathbb{E}(f(F_t^M(x))) - \mathbb{E}(f(\bar{X}_t^M(x)))| \leq \sqrt{TU_M}\mathbb{E}(|\Delta|) \leq CM^{-(r-d/2)},$$

in which we have used  $(H_2)$  in order to estimate  $U_M$  in (3.25).

Since the law of  $\bar{X}_t^M(x)$  and  $X_t^M(x)$  coincide, we use Lemma 4 from [4] and  $(H_2)$ . So, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(f(F_t^M(x)) - \mathbb{E}(f(X_t(x))))| &\leq CM^{-(r-d/2)} + |\mathbb{E}(f(X_t^M(x)) - \mathbb{E}(f(X_t(x))))| \\ &\leq CM^{-(r-d/2)} + C\bar{\gamma} \int_{\{|z|>M\}} \bar{c}(z) dz \\ &\leq CM^{-(r-d)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We are now able to present our main result.

THEOREM 3.8. *Assume Hypotheses  $(H_i)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , hold. Let  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $p > 1$  be such that  $d + 2d(q + 1 + d/p_*) < r$ , where  $r$  is the constant in  $(H_2)$ . Then, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $t > 0$  the law of  $X_t(x)$  is absolutely continuous with*

respect to the Lebesgue measure. We denote by  $p_t(x, y)$  the density. Moreover, for every  $R > 0$ ,  $(x, y) \mapsto p_t(x, y)$  belongs to  $W^{q,p}(B_R \times B_R)$  and there exists a constant  $C$  (depending on  $R$ ) such that, for every  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\|p_t - p_t^M\|_{W^{q,p}(B_R \times B_R)} \leq \frac{C}{M^{r-d-2d(q+1+d/p_*)-\varepsilon}}.$$

REMARK 3.9. If  $r > 3d + 2d^2$  then Sobolev embedding theorem ensures that  $(x, y) \mapsto p_t(x, y)$  is a continuous function. Moreover, for every  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  one may find  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $p_t(x_0, y_0) > 0$  [because  $p_t(x_0, y)$  is a probability density, so may not be identically null], and consequently one may find  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{|y-y_0| \leq \delta} \inf_{|x-x_0| \leq \delta} p_t(x, y) > 0.$$

This property is crucial in order to use Nummelin’s splitting method in order to prove convergence to equilibrium; see, for example, [20, 31] and [32].

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8. We will use Theorem 2.11 for the following measures. Given  $R > 0$  we denote by  $\Psi_R(x)$  a smooth function which verifies  $1_{B_R} \leq \Psi_R \leq 1_{B_{R+1}}$  and we define

$$f_{R,M}(x, y) = \Psi_R(x)\Psi_R(y)p_t^M(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad f_R(x, y) = \Psi_R(x)\Psi_R(y)p_t(x, y).$$

We note that

$$\|p_t - p_t^M\|_{W^{q,p}(B_R \times B_R)} \leq \|f_R - f_{R,M}\|_{W^{q,p}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

We will use Theorem 2.11 to estimate the term in the above right-hand side. Let

$$\mu_{R,M}(dx, dy) = f_{R,M}(x, y) dx dy \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_R(dx, dy) = f_R(x, y) dx dy.$$

For a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant  $\leq 1$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int g d\mu_R - \int g d\mu_R^M \right| \\ &= \left| \int \Psi_R(x) (\mathbb{E}(g(x, X_t(x))\Psi_R(X_t(x))) - \mathbb{E}(g(x, X_t^M(x))\Psi_R(X_t^M(x))) dx \right| \\ &\leq CM^{-(r-d)}, \end{aligned}$$

in which we have used (3.40). Then  $d_1(\mu_R, \mu_R^M) \leq CM^{-(r-d)}$ . By (3.31), we also have

$$\|f_{R,M}\|_{2m+q, 2m, p} \leq CM^{d(2m+q+d)}.$$

Now, we fix  $m$  and we apply Theorem 2.11(i) with

$$\alpha = \alpha(m) = \frac{r-d}{d(q+2m+d)}$$

and  $\eta(M) = M^{r-d}$ . So, we obtain that  $\mu_R$  is absolutely continuous and if  $f_R$  denotes its density, we also get

$$\|f_R - f_{R,M}\|_{W^{q,p}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \frac{1}{M^{(r-d)\theta}} \quad \text{with } \theta = \frac{1}{\alpha} \wedge \left(1 - \frac{q+1+d/p_*}{\alpha m}\right).$$

Since  $\lim_m m\alpha(m) = \frac{r-d}{2d}$ , we obtain

$$(r-d) \left(1 - \frac{q+1+d/p_*}{\alpha m}\right) \rightarrow r-d-2d(q+1+d/p_*)$$

and

$$\frac{r-d}{\alpha} = d(q+2m+d) \rightarrow \infty.$$

So, taking  $m$  sufficiently large we obtain, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\|f_R - f_{R,M}\|_{W^{q,p}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \frac{C}{M^{r-d-2d(q+1+d/p_*)-\varepsilon}}. \quad \square$$

**COROLLARY 3.10.** *Suppose that  $r \geq 3d + 2d^2$  and set  $k = \lfloor (r - 3d - 2d^2)/2d \rfloor$ . Then for every  $R > 0$  and every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $C_{R,\varepsilon} \geq 1$  such that for every multi-indexes  $\alpha, \beta$  with  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq k$*

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq R} \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta p_t(x, y) - \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta p_t^M(x, y) \right| \leq \frac{C_{R,\varepsilon}}{M^{r-d-2d(q+1+d/p_*)-\varepsilon}}.$$

**PROOF.** We take  $p > 1$  very close to 1 (so that  $p_*$  is very large) and

$$q = \frac{r-d}{2d} - 1 - \frac{d}{p_*}, \quad k = \left\lfloor q - \frac{d}{p} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{r-3d-d^2}{2d} \right\rfloor.$$

Then Sobolev embedding theorem says that for  $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq k$

$$\sup_{|x| \leq R, |y| \leq R} \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta f(x, y) \right| \leq C_R \|f\|_{W^{q,p}(B_R \times B_R)}$$

and we are done. □

### APPENDIX A: HERMITE EXPANSIONS AND DENSITY ESTIMATES

The aim of this section is to give the proof of Proposition 2.5. We recall that for  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu_n(x) = f_n(x) dx, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_n)_n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{n(q+k)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) d_k(\mu, \mu_n) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{2nm}} \|f_n\|_{2m+q, 2m, \mathbf{e}}.$$

Our proposal for this section is to prove the following.

PROPOSITION A.1. *Let  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $q, k, m, d$  and  $e$ ) such that for every  $f, f_n \in C^{2m+q}(\mathbb{R}^d), n \in \mathbb{N}$ , one has*

$$(A.1) \quad \|f\|_{q,\mathbf{e}} \leq C\pi_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}}(\mu, (\mu_n)_n),$$

where  $\mu(x) = f(x) dx$  and  $\mu_n(x) = f_n(x) dx$ .

The proof of Proposition A.1 will follow from the next results and properties of Hermite polynomials, so we postpone it until the end of this section.

We begin with a review of some basic properties of Hermite polynomials and functions. The Hermite polynomials on  $\mathbb{R}$  are defined by

$$H_n(t) = (-1)^n e^{t^2} \frac{d^n}{dt^n} e^{-t^2}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

They are orthogonal with respect to  $e^{-t^2} dt$ . We denote the  $L^2$  normalized Hermite functions by

$$h_n(t) = (2^n n! \sqrt{\pi})^{-1/2} H_n(t) e^{-t^2/2}$$

and we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} h_n(t) h_m(t) dt = (2^n n! \sqrt{\pi})^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_n(t) H_m(t) e^{-t^2} dt = \delta_{n,m}.$$

The Hermite functions form an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . For a multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  we define the  $d$ -dimensional Hermite function

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(x) := \prod_{i=1}^d h_{\alpha_i}(x_i), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_d).$$

The  $d$ -dimensional Hermite functions form an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . This corresponds to the chaos decomposition in dimension  $d$  (but the notation we gave above is slightly different from the one used in probability; see [24, 27] and [21], where Hermite polynomials are used. One may come back by a renormalization). The Hermite functions are the eigenvectors of the Hermite operator  $D = -\Delta + |x|^2$ ,  $\Delta$  denoting the Laplace operator, and one has

$$(A.2) \quad D\mathcal{H}_\alpha = (2|\alpha| + d)\mathcal{H}_\alpha \quad \text{with } |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_d.$$

We denote  $W_n = \text{Span}\{\mathcal{H}_\alpha : |\alpha| = n\}$  and we have  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty W_n$ .

For a function  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we use the notation

$$\Phi \diamond f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(x, y) f(y) dy.$$

We denote by  $J_n$  the orthogonal projection on  $W_n$  and we have

$$(A.3) \quad J_n v(x) = \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n \diamond v(x) \quad \text{with } \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n(x, y) := \sum_{|\alpha|=n} \mathcal{H}_\alpha(x) \mathcal{H}_\alpha(y).$$

Moreover, we consider a function  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose support is included in  $[\frac{1}{4}, 4]$  and we define

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^\infty a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j(x, y) = \sum_{j=4^{n-1}+1}^{4^n-1} a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j(x, y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

the last equality being a consequence of the support property of the function  $a$ .

The following estimate is a crucial point in our approach. It has been proved in [12, 13] and then in [26]. We refer to Corollary 2.3, inequality (2.17), in [26] (we thank to G. Kerkycharian who signaled us this paper).

**THEOREM A.2.** *Let  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a nonnegative  $C^\infty$  function with the support included in  $[\frac{1}{4}, 4]$ . We denote  $\|a\|_l = \sum_{i=0}^l \sup_{t \geq 0} |a^{(i)}(t)|$ . For every multi-index  $\alpha$  and every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $C_k$  (depending on  $k, \alpha, d$ ) such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$(A.4) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial x^\alpha} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a(x, y) \right| \leq C_k \|a\|_k \frac{2^{n(|\alpha|+d)}}{(1 + 2^n|x - y|)^k}.$$

Following the ideas in [26], we consider a function  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  of class  $C_b^\infty$  with the support included in  $[\frac{1}{4}, 4]$  and such that  $a(t) + a(4t) = 1$  for  $t \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1]$ . We may construct  $a$  in the following way: we take a function  $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $a(t) = 0$  for  $t \leq \frac{1}{4}$  and  $a(1) = 1$ . We may choose  $a$  such that  $a^{(l)}(\frac{1}{4}) = a^{(l)}(1-) = 0$  for every  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then we define  $a(t) = 1 - a(\frac{t}{4})$  for  $t \in [1, 4]$  and  $a(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq 4$ . This is the function we will use in the following. Notice that  $a$  has the property:

$$(A.5) \quad \sum_{n=0}^\infty a\left(\frac{t}{4^n}\right) = 1 \quad \forall t \geq 1.$$

In order to check the above equality, we fix  $n_t$  such that  $4^{n_t-1} \leq t < 4^{n_t}$  and we notice that  $a(\frac{t}{4^n}) = 0$  if  $n \notin \{n_t - 1, n_t\}$ . So  $\sum_{n=0}^\infty a(\frac{t}{4^n}) = a(4s) + a(s) = 1$  with  $s = t/4^{n_t} \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1]$ . In the following, we fix a function  $a$  and the constants in our estimates will depend on  $\|a\|_l$  for some fixed  $l$ . Using this function, we obtain the following representation formula:

**PROPOSITION A.3.** *For every  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$f = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f$$

*the series being convergent in  $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .*

PROOF. We fix  $N$  and we denote

$$S_N^a = \sum_{n=1}^N \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f, \quad S_N = \sum_{j=1}^{4^N} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f \quad \text{and} \quad R_N^a = \sum_{j=4^{N+1}}^{4^{N+1}} (\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f) a\left(\frac{j}{4^{N+1}}\right).$$

Let  $j \leq 4^{N+1}$ . For  $n \geq N + 2$ , one has  $a(\frac{j}{4^n}) = 0$ . So using (A.5), we obtain  $\sum_{n=1}^N a(\frac{j}{4^n}) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a(\frac{j}{4^n}) - a(\frac{j}{4^{N+1}}) = 1 - a(\frac{j}{4^{N+1}})$ . And for  $j \leq 4^N$  one has  $a(\frac{j}{4^{N+1}}) = 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S_N^a &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=0}^\infty a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=0}^{4^{N+1}} a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{4^{N+1}} (\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f) \sum_{n=1}^N a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{4^{N+1}} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f - \sum_{j=4^{N+1}}^{4^{N+1}} (\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f) a\left(\frac{j}{4^{N+1}}\right) = S_{N+1} - R_N^a. \end{aligned}$$

One has  $S_N \rightarrow f$  in  $L^2$  and  $\|R_N^a\|_2 \leq \|a\|_\infty \sum_{j=4^{N+1}}^{4^{N+1}} \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond f\|_2 \rightarrow 0$  so the proof is completed.  $\square$

We will need the following lemma concerning properties of the Luxembourg norms.

LEMMA A.4. *Let  $\rho \geq 0$  be a measurable function. Then for every measurable function  $f$  one has*

$$(A.6) \quad \|\rho * f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \|\rho\|_1 \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}.$$

PROOF. Let  $c = m\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}$  with  $m = \|\rho\|_1 = \int \rho(x - y) dy$ . Since  $\mathbf{e}$  is convex, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}(\rho * f)(x)\right) dx &= \int \mathbf{e}\left(\int \frac{\rho(x - y)}{m} \times \frac{m}{c} f(y) dy\right) dx \\ &\leq \int dx \int \frac{\rho(x - y)}{m} \times \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{m}{c} f(y)\right) dy \\ &= \int \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{m}{c} f(y)\right) \int \frac{\rho(x - y)}{m} dx dy = \int \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{m}{c} f(y)\right) dy \\ &= \int \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}} f(y)\right) dy \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and this means that  $\|\rho * f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq c = \|\rho\|_1 \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}$ .  $\square$

LEMMA A.5. *Let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $\rho_{n,p}(z) = (1 + 2^n |z|)^{-p}$ , with  $p > d$ . There exists a constant  $C_p$  depending on  $p$  and  $d$  such that*

$$(A.7) \quad \|\rho_{n,p}\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbf{e}^{-1}((1/C_p)2^{nd})}.$$

*In particular, for  $p = d + 1$  there exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $d$  and on the doubling constant of  $\mathbf{e}$  such that [with  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}}$  defined in (2.5)]*

$$(A.8) \quad \|\rho_{n,d+1}\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \frac{C}{\mathbf{e}^{-1}(2^{nd})} = C2^{-nd} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) = C\phi_{\mathbf{e}}\left(\frac{1}{2^{nd}}\right).$$

PROOF. Let  $c > 0$ . By passing in polar coordinates and by using the change of variable  $s = 2^n r$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}\rho_{n,p}(z)\right) dz &= A_d \int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c} \times \frac{1}{(1 + 2^n r)^p}\right) dr \\ &= 2^{-nd} A_d \int_0^\infty s^{d-1} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c} \times \frac{1}{(1 + s)^p}\right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_d$  is the surface of the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Using the property (2.1)(ii), we upper bound the above term by

$$2^{-nd} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}\right) A_d \int_0^\infty s^{d-1} \times \frac{1}{(1 + s)^p} ds = C_p 2^{-nd} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}\right).$$

In order to prove that  $\|\rho_{n,p}\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq c$  we have to check that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}\rho_{n,p}(z)\right) dz \leq 1$ . In view of the above inequalities, it suffices that  $\mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{c}\right) \leq 2^{nd}/C_p$ , that is,  $c \geq 1/\mathbf{e}^{-1}(2^{nd}/C_p)$ .  $\square$

PROPOSITION A.6. *Let  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_*$  be the conjugate of  $\mathbf{e}$ . Set  $\alpha$  as a multi-index.*

(i) *There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $\alpha, d$  and  $\mathbf{e}$ ) such that*

$$(A.9) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) \quad &\|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} \times 2^{n|\alpha|} \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}}, \\ (b) \quad &\|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f\|_{\infty} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} \times 2^{n|\alpha|} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ . There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $\alpha, m, d$  and  $\mathbf{e}$ ) such that*

$$(A.10) \quad \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \frac{C \|a\|_{d+1}^2}{4nm} \|f\|_{2m+|\alpha|, 2m, \mathbf{e}}.$$

(iii) *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C$  (depending on  $\alpha, k, d$  and  $\mathbf{e}$ ) such that*

$$(A.11) \quad \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha (f - g)\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} \times 2^{n(|\alpha|+k)} \beta(2^{nd}) d_k(\mu_f, \mu_g).$$

PROOF. (i) By using (A.4) with  $k = d + 1$ , we get

$$(A.12) \quad |\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f(x)| \leq C 2^{n(|\alpha|+d)} \|a\|_{d+1} \int \rho_{n,d+1}(x-y) |f(y)| dy.$$

Since  $\mathbf{e}$  is symmetric, that is,  $\mathbf{e}(|x|) = \mathbf{e}(x)$ , one has  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}} = \| |f| \|_{\mathbf{e}}$ . Moreover, if  $0 \leq f(x) \leq g(x)$  then  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \|g\|_{\mathbf{e}}$ . Using these properties in addition to (A.12) and (A.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f\|_{\mathbf{e}} &= \|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C 2^{n(|\alpha|+d)} \|a\|_{d+1} \|\rho_{n,d+1} * |f|\|_{\mathbf{e}} \\ &\leq C 2^{n(|\alpha|+d)} \|a\|_{d+1} \|\rho_{n,d+1}\|_1 \| |f| \|_{\mathbf{e}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (A.8) with  $\mathbf{e}(x) = |x|$ , we obtain  $\|\rho_{n,d+1}\|_1 \leq C/2^{nd}$ . So we conclude that

$$\|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} 2^{n|\alpha|} \| |f| \|_{\mathbf{e}}$$

so (a) is proved. Again by (A.12)

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond f(x)| &\leq C \|a\|_{d+1} 2^{n(|\alpha|+d)} \int \rho_{n,d+1}(x-y) |f(y)| dy \\ &\leq C \|a\|_{d+1} 2^{n(|\alpha|+d)} \|\rho_{n,d+1}\|_{\mathbf{e}} \|f\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}, \end{aligned}$$

the second inequality being a consequence of the Hölder inequality (2.6). Using (A.8), (b) is proved as well.

(ii) We define the functions  $a_m(t) = a(t)t^{-m}$ . Since  $a(t) = 0$  for  $t \leq \frac{1}{4}$  and for  $t \geq 4$ , we have  $\|a_m\|_{d+1} \leq C_{m,d} \|a\|_{d+1}$ . Moreover,  $D\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v = (2j + d)\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v$  so we obtain

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v = \frac{1}{2j} (D - d)\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v.$$

We denote  $L_{m,\alpha} = (D - d)^m \partial_\alpha$  and we notice that

$$L_{m,\alpha} = \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2m} \sum_{|\gamma| \leq 2m+|\alpha|} c_{\beta,\gamma} x^\beta \partial_\gamma,$$

where  $c_{\beta,\gamma}$  are universal constants. It follows that there exists some universal constant  $C$  such that

$$(A.13) \quad \|L_{m,\alpha} f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|f\|_{2m+|\alpha|, 2m, \mathbf{e}}.$$

We take now  $v \in L^{\mathbf{e}_*}$  and we write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond (\partial_\alpha f) \rangle &= \langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v, \partial_\alpha f \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^\infty a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v, \partial_\alpha f \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^\infty a\left(\frac{j}{4^n}\right) \frac{1}{(2j)^m} \langle (D - d)^m \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v, \partial_\alpha f \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{2^m} \times \frac{1}{4^{nm}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_m \left( \frac{j}{4^n} \right) \langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \diamond v, L_{m,\alpha} f \rangle \\
 &= \frac{1}{2^m} \times \frac{1}{4^{nm}} \langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^{a_m} \diamond v, L_{m,\alpha} f \rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

By using the decomposition in Proposition A.3, we write  $L_{m,\alpha} f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j^a \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f$ . For  $|j - n| \geq 2$ , by the support property of  $a$ , one has  $a(\frac{k}{4^n})a(\frac{k}{4^j}) = 0$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . One also has  $\langle \mathcal{H}_\alpha \diamond v, \mathcal{H}_\beta \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f \rangle = 0$  if  $|\alpha| \neq |\beta|$ . Then a straightforward decomposition gives  $\langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^{a_m} \diamond v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j^a \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f \rangle = 0$ . So using Hölder’s inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\langle v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond (\partial_\alpha f) \rangle| &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} \times \frac{1}{4^{nm}} \sum_{j=n-1}^{n+1} |\langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^{a_m} \diamond v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_j^a \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f \rangle| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} \times \frac{1}{4^{nm}} \sum_{j=n-1}^{n+1} \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^{a_m} \diamond v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j^a \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f\|_{\mathbf{e}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using point (i) (a) with  $\alpha$  equal to the void index, we obtain  $\|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^{a_m} \diamond v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \leq C \|a_m\|_{d+1} \|v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \leq C \times C_{m,d} \|a\|_{d+1} \|v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*}$ . Moreover, we have

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j^a \diamond L_{m,\alpha} f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} \|L_{m,\alpha} f\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|a\|_{d+1} \|f\|_{2m+|\alpha|, 2m, \mathbf{e}},$$

the last inequality being a consequence of (A.13). We obtain

$$|\langle v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond (\partial_\alpha f) \rangle| \leq \frac{C \|a\|_{d+1}^2}{4^{nm}} \|v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \|f\|_{2m+|\alpha|, 2m, \mathbf{e}}$$

and, since  $L^{\mathbf{e}}$  is reflexive, (A.10) is proved.

(iii) We write

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\langle v, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond (\partial_\alpha(f - g)) \rangle| &= |\langle \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v, \partial_\alpha(f - g) \rangle| = |\langle \partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v, f - g \rangle| \\
 &= \left| \int \partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v d\mu_f - \int \partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v d\mu_g \right|.
 \end{aligned}$$

We use the definition of  $d_k$  and (A.9)(b) and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \int \partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v d\mu_f - \int \partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v d\mu_g \right| \\
 &\leq \|\partial_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v\|_{k,\infty} d_k(\mu_f, \mu_g) \\
 &\leq \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond v\|_{k+|\alpha|,\infty} d_k(\mu_f, \mu_g) \\
 &\leq C \|a\|_{d+1} 2^{n(k+|\alpha|)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) \|v\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} d_k(\mu_f, \mu_g)
 \end{aligned}$$

which implies (A.11).  $\square$

We are now ready for the following.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION A.1. Let  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| \leq q$ . Using Proposition A.3,

$$\partial_\alpha f = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha f = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha (f - f_n) + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha f_n$$

and using (A.11) and (A.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_\alpha f\|_{\mathbf{e}} &\leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha (f - f_n)\|_{\mathbf{e}} + \sum_{n=1}^\infty \|\bar{\mathcal{H}}_n^a \diamond \partial_\alpha f_n\|_{\mathbf{e}} \\ &\leq C \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n(|\alpha|+k)} \beta_{\mathbf{e}}(2^{nd}) d_k(\mu_f, \mu_{f_n}) + C \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^{2nm}} \|f_n\|_{2m+|\alpha|, 2m, \mathbf{e}} \end{aligned}$$

so (A.1) is proved.  $\square$

### APPENDIX B: INTERPOLATION SPACES

In this section, we prove that, in the case of the  $L^p$  norms, (i.e.,  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_p$ ) the space  $\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,\mathbf{e}_p}$  is an interpolation space between  $W_*^{k,\infty}$  (the dual of  $W^{k,\infty}$ ) and  $W^{q,2m,p}$ . A similar interpretation holds for  $\mathbf{e}_{\log}$  but this case is more exotic and we do not enter into details here.

To begin, we recall the framework of interpolation spaces (for details, see e.g. [29]). We are given two Banach spaces  $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$  and  $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$  with  $X \subset Y$  (with continuous embedding). We denote  $\mathcal{L}(X, X)$  the space of the linear bounded operators from  $X$  into itself and we denote by  $\|L\|_{X,X}$  the operator norm. A Banach space  $(W, \|\cdot\|_W)$  such that  $X \subset W \subset Y$  is called an interpolation space for  $X$  and  $Y$  if  $\mathcal{L}(X, X) \cap \mathcal{L}(Y, Y) \subset \mathcal{L}(W, W)$ . Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . If there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\|L\|_{W,W} \leq C \|L\|_{X,X}^\gamma \|L\|_{Y,Y}^{1-\gamma}$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{L}(X, X) \cap \mathcal{L}(Y, Y)$  then  $W$  is an interpolation space of order  $\gamma$ . And if one may take  $C = 1$ , then  $W$  is an exact interpolation space of order  $\gamma$ . There are several methods for constructing interpolation spaces. We focus here on the so called  $K$ -method. For  $y \in Y$  and  $t > 0$ , one defines  $K(y, t) = \inf_{x \in X} (\|y - x\|_Y + t\|x\|_X)$  and

$$\|y\|_\gamma = \int_0^\infty t^{-\gamma} K(y, t) \frac{dt}{t}, \quad (X, Y)_\gamma = \{y \in Y : \|y\|_\gamma < \infty\}.$$

Then one proves that  $(X, Y)_\gamma$  is an exact interpolation space of order  $\gamma$ . One may also use the following discrete variant of the above norm. Let  $\gamma \geq 0$ . For  $y \in Y$  and for a sequence  $x_n \in X, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$(B.1) \quad \pi_\gamma(y, (x_n)_n) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2^{n\gamma} \|y - x_n\|_Y + \frac{1}{2^n} \|x_n\|_X$$

and

$$\rho_Y^{X,Y}(y) = \inf \pi_\gamma(y, (x_n)_n)$$

with the infimum taken over all the sequences  $x_n \in X, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then a standard result in interpolation theory (the proof is elementary) says that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$(B.2) \quad \frac{1}{C} \|y\|_Y \leq \rho_Y^{X,Y}(y) \leq C \|y\|_Y$$

so that

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma(X, Y) =: \{y : \rho_Y^{X,Y}(y) < \infty\} = (X, Y)_\gamma.$$

Take now  $q, k \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_*$  and  $p > 1$  and set  $Y = W_*^{k,\infty}$  and  $X = W^{q,2m,p}$ . Then with the notation from (2.17) and (2.18)

$$(B.3) \quad \rho_{q,k,m,e_p}(\mu) = \rho_Y^{X,Y}(\mu) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,e_p} = \mathcal{S}_\gamma(X, Y), \quad \text{with } \gamma = \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{2m}.$$

Notice that in the definition of  $\mathcal{S}_{q,k,m,e_p}$  one does not use  $\pi_\gamma(y, (x_n)_n)$  but  $\pi_\gamma^{(m)}(y, (x_n)_n)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\gamma^{(m)}(y, (x_n)_n) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n(q+k+d/p_*)} \|y - x_n\|_Y + \frac{1}{2^{2mn}} \|x_n\|_X \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{2mn\gamma} \|y - x_n\|_Y + \frac{1}{2^{2mn}} \|x_n\|_X \end{aligned}$$

with  $\gamma = \frac{q+k+d/p_*}{2m}$ . The fact that one uses  $2^{2mn}$  instead of  $2^n$  has no impact except that it changes the constants in (B.2). So the spaces are the same.

We turn now to a different point. For  $p > 1$  and  $0 < s < 1$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{B}^{s,p}$  the Besov space and by  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}^{s,p}}$  the Besov norm (see Triebel [30] for definitions and notation). Our aim is to give a criterion which guarantees that a function  $f$  belongs to  $\mathcal{B}^{s,p}$ . We will use the classical equality  $(W^{1,p}, L^p)_s = \mathcal{B}^{s,p}$ .

LEMMA B.1. *Let  $p > 1$  and  $0 < s' < s < 1$ . Consider a function  $\phi \in C^\infty$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x) dx = 1$  and let  $\phi_\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\delta^d} \phi(\frac{x}{\delta})$  and  $\phi_\delta^i(x) = x^i \phi_\delta(x)$ . We assume that  $f \in L^p$  verifies the following hypothesis: for every  $i = 1, \dots, d$*

$$(B.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^{1-s} \|\partial_i(f * \phi_\delta)\|_p < \infty, \\ (ii) \quad & \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta^{-s} \|\partial_i(f * \phi_\delta^i)\|_p < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $f \in \mathcal{B}^{s',p}$  for every  $s' < s$ .

PROOF. Let  $f \in C^1$ . We use a Taylor expansion of order one and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f * \phi_\varepsilon(x) &= \int (f(x) - f(x - y))\phi_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \int_0^1 d\lambda \int \langle \nabla f(x - \lambda y), y \rangle \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \int_0^1 d\lambda \int \langle \nabla f(x - z), z \rangle \frac{1}{\lambda} \phi_\varepsilon\left(\frac{z}{\lambda}\right) \frac{dz}{\lambda^d} \\ &= \int_0^1 d\lambda \int \langle \nabla f(x - z), z \rangle \phi_{\varepsilon\lambda}(z) \frac{dz}{\lambda} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 \partial_i (f * \phi_{\varepsilon\lambda}^i)(x) \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\|f - f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_p \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^1 \|\partial_i (f * \phi_{\varepsilon\lambda}^i)\|_p \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \leq d\varepsilon^s \int_0^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^{1-s}} = C\varepsilon^s.$$

We also have  $\|f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq C(1 + \|f\|_\infty)\varepsilon^{-(1-s)}$  so that

$$K(f, \varepsilon) \leq \|f - f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_p + \varepsilon \|f * \phi_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq C\varepsilon^s.$$

We conclude that for  $s' < s$  we have

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{s'}} K(f, \varepsilon) \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \leq C \int_0^1 \frac{\varepsilon^s}{\varepsilon^{s'}} \frac{d\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} < \infty$$

so  $f \in (W^{1,p}, L^p)_{s'} = \mathcal{B}^{s',p}$ .  $\square$

APPENDIX C: SUPER KERNELS

A super kernel  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function which belongs to the Schwartz space  $\mathcal{S}$  (infinitely differentiable functions which decrease in a polynomial way to infinity),  $\int \phi(x) dx = 1$ , and such that for every nonnull multi-index  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  one has

$$(C.1) \quad \int y^\alpha \phi(y) dy = 0, \quad y^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^d y_i^{\alpha_i}.$$

See [18], Section 3, Remark 1 for the construction of a super kernel. The corresponding  $\phi_\delta, \delta \in (0, 1)$ , is defined by

$$\phi_\delta(y) = \frac{1}{\delta^d} \phi\left(\frac{y}{\delta}\right).$$

For a function  $f$ , we denote  $f_\delta = f * \phi_\delta$ . We will work with the norms  $\|f\|_{k,\infty}$ ,  $\|f\|_{k,1}$  and  $\|f\|_{q,l,e}$  defined in (2.8) and in (2.9). And we have the following.

LEMMA C.1. *Let  $k, q \in \mathbb{N}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C_{k,q}$  (depending on  $k + q$ ) such that for every  $f \in W^{q,1}$  one has*

$$(C.2) \quad \|f - f_\delta\|_{W_*^{k,\infty}} \leq C_{k,q} \|f\|_{q,1} \delta^{q+k}.$$

PROOF. Since  $C_b^\infty \subset W^{q,1}$  is dense, we may suppose without loss of generality that  $f \in C_b^\infty$ . Using Taylor expansion of order  $q + k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f_\delta(x) &= \int (f(x) - f(y))\phi_\delta(x - y) dy \\ &= \int I(x, y)\phi_\delta(x - y) dy + \int R(x, y)\phi_\delta(x - y) dy \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} I(x, y) &= \sum_{i=1}^{q+k-1} \frac{1}{i!} \sum_{|\alpha|=i} \partial^\alpha f(x)(x - y)^\alpha, \\ R(x, y) &= \frac{1}{(q+k)!} \sum_{|\alpha|=q+k} \int_0^1 \partial^\alpha f(x + \lambda(y - x))(x - y)^\alpha \lambda^{k+q} d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Using (C.1), we obtain  $\int I(x, y)\phi_\delta(x - y) dy = 0$  and by a change of variable we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int R(x, y)\phi_\delta(x - y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{(q+k)!} \sum_{|\alpha|=q+k} \int_0^1 \int dz \phi_\delta(z) \partial^\alpha f(x + \lambda z) z^\alpha \lambda^{k+q} d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

We consider now  $g \in W^{k,\infty}$  and we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\int (f(x) - f_\delta(x))g(x) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{(q+k)!} \sum_{|\alpha|=q+k} \int_0^1 \lambda^{k+q} d\lambda \int dz \phi_\delta(z) z^\alpha \int \partial^\alpha f(x + \lambda z)g(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote  $f_a(x) = f(x + a)$ . We have  $(\partial^\alpha f)(x + a) = (\partial^\alpha f_a)(x)$ . Let  $\alpha$  with  $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i = q + k$ . We split  $\alpha$  into two multi-indexes  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  such that  $|\beta| = k$ ,  $|\gamma| = q$  and  $\partial^\beta \partial^\gamma = \partial^\alpha$  (this may be done in several ways but any one of them

is good for us). Then using integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \partial^\alpha f(x + \lambda z)g(x) dx \right| &= \left| \int \partial^\beta \partial^\gamma f_{\lambda z}(x)g(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq \int |\partial^\gamma f_{\lambda z}(x)| |\partial^\beta g(x)| dx \leq \|g\|_{k,\infty} \int |\partial^\gamma f_{\lambda z}(x)| dx \\ &= \|g\|_{k,\infty} \int |\partial^\gamma f(x)| dx \leq \|g\|_{k,\infty} \|f\|_{q,1}. \end{aligned}$$

For a multi-index with  $|\alpha| = q + k$ , we have

$$\int |\phi_\delta(z)| |z^\alpha| dz \leq \delta^{q+k} \int |\phi(z)| |z|^{q+k} dz$$

so the proof is completed.  $\square$

REMARK C.2. It is clear from the above proof that if  $q + k$  is fixed then we do not need to work with a “super” kernel  $\phi$  verifying (C.1) for every  $\alpha$  but only with a kernel  $\phi_{q+k}$  of order  $q + k$ , that is verifying (C.1) for  $|\alpha| \leq q + k$ . The reason to use super kernels (and not a kernel of a given fixed order) is just to avoid to precise each time which is the order of the kernel we need. And this simplifies the already heavy notation.

LEMMA C.3. (i) Let  $k, q \in \mathbb{N}, l > d$  and  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C_{k,q}$  (depending on  $q + k$ ) such that for every  $f \in W^{q,l,\mathbf{e}}$  one has

$$(C.3) \quad \|f - f_\delta\|_{W_*^{k,\infty}} \leq C_{k,q} \|f\|_{q,l,\mathbf{e}} \delta^{q+k}.$$

(ii) Let  $l > d, n, q \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $n \geq q$ , and  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ . There exists a universal constant  $C_{l,q}$  (depending on  $l, q, d$ ) such that

$$(C.4) \quad \|f_\delta\|_{n,l,\mathbf{e}} \leq C_{l,q} \|f\|_{q,l,\mathbf{e}} \delta^{-(n-q)}.$$

PROOF. (i) Let  $\gamma$  with  $|\gamma| \leq q$ . We write  $\partial^\gamma f(x) = u_l(x)v_\gamma(x)$  with  $u_l(x) = (1 + |x|)^{-l}$  and  $v_\gamma(x) = (1 + |x|)^l \partial^\gamma f(x)$ . Using Hölder inequality,

$$\int |\partial^\gamma f(x)| dx \leq C \|u_l\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \|v_\gamma\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq C \|u_l\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} \|f\|_{q,l,\mathbf{e}}.$$

By Remark 2.1,  $\|u_l\|_{\mathbf{e}_*} < \infty$ . This gives  $\|f\|_{q,1} \leq C \|f\|_{q,l,\mathbf{e}}$  and (C.3) follows from (C.2).

(ii) Let  $\alpha$  be a multi-index with  $|\alpha| = n$  and let  $\beta, \gamma$  be a splitting of  $\alpha$  with  $|\beta| = q$  and  $|\gamma| = n - q$ . Using the triangle inequality, for every  $y$  we have  $1 + |x| \leq (1 + |y|)(1 + |x - y|)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &:= (1 + |x|)^l |\partial^\alpha f_\delta(x)| = (1 + |x|)^l |\partial^\beta f * \partial^\gamma \phi_\delta(x)| \\ &\leq \int (1 + |x|)^l |\partial^\beta f(y)| |\partial^\gamma \phi_\delta(x - y)| dy \leq \alpha * \beta(x) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\alpha(y) = (1 + |y|)^l |\partial^\beta f(y)|, \quad \beta(z) = (1 + |z|)^l |\partial^\gamma \phi_\delta(z)|.$$

Using (A.6), we obtain

$$\|u\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \|\alpha * \beta\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \|\beta\|_1 \|\alpha\|_{\mathbf{e}} \leq \frac{C}{\delta^{n-q}} \|\alpha\|_{\mathbf{e}} = \frac{C}{\delta^{n-q}} \|f_{\beta,l}\|_{\mathbf{e}}. \quad \square$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] BALLY, V. and CARAMELLINO, L. (2011). Riesz transform and integration by parts formulas for random variables. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **121** 1332–1355. [MR2794979](#)
- [2] BALLY, V. and CARAMELLINO, L. (2013). Regularity of Wiener functionals under a Hörmander type condition of order one. Preprint. Available at [arXiv:1307.3942](#).
- [3] BALLY, V. and CARAMELLINO, L. (2014). On the distances between probability density functions. *Electron. J. Probab.* **19** no. 110, 33. [MR3296526](#)
- [4] BALLY, V. and CLÉMENT, E. (2011). Integration by parts formula and applications to equations with jumps. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **151** 613–657. [MR2851695](#)
- [5] BALLY, V. and CLÉMENT, E. (2011). Integration by parts formula with respect to jump times for stochastic differential equations. In *Stochastic Analysis 2010 7–29*. Springer, Heidelberg. [MR2789077](#)
- [6] BALLY, V. and FOURNIER, N. (2011). Regularization properties of the 2D homogeneous Boltzmann equation without cutoff. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **151** 659–704. [MR2851696](#)
- [7] BALLY, V. and PARDOUX, E. (1998). Malliavin calculus for white noise driven parabolic SPDEs. *Potential Anal.* **9** 27–64. [MR1644120](#)
- [8] BENNETT, C. and SHARPLEY, R. (1988). *Interpolation of Operators. Pure and Applied Mathematics* **129**. Academic Press, Boston, MA. [MR0928802](#)
- [9] DEBUSSCHE, A. and FOURNIER, N. (2013). Existence of densities for stable-like driven SDE's with Hölder continuous coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.* **264** 1757–1778. [MR3022725](#)
- [10] DEBUSSCHE, A. and ROMITO, M. (2014). Existence of densities for the 3D Navier–Stokes equations driven by Gaussian noise. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **158** 575–596. [MR3176359](#)
- [11] DE MARCO, S. (2011). Smoothness and asymptotic estimates of densities for SDEs with locally smooth coefficients and applications to square root-type diffusions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **21** 1282–1321. [MR2857449](#)
- [12] DZIUBAŃSKI, J. (1997). Triebel–Lizorkin spaces associated with Laguerre and Hermite expansions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **125** 3547–3554. [MR1403122](#)
- [13] EPPERSON, J. (1997). Hermite and Laguerre wave packet expansions. *Studia Math.* **126** 199–217. [MR1475919](#)
- [14] FOURNIER, N. (2002). Jumping SDEs: Absolute continuity using monotonicity. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **98** 317–330. [MR1887538](#)
- [15] FOURNIER, N. (2015). Finiteness of entropy for the homogeneous Boltzmann equation with measure initial condition. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **25** 860–897. [MR3313757](#)
- [16] FOURNIER, N. and PRINTEMS, J. (2010). Absolute continuity for some one-dimensional processes. *Bernoulli* **16** 343–360. [MR2668905](#)
- [17] IKEDA, N. and WATANABE, S. (1989). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, 2nd ed. *North-Holland Mathematical Library* **24**. North-Holland, Amsterdam. [MR1011252](#)

- [18] KEBAIER, A. and KOHATSU-HIGA, A. (2008). An optimal control variance reduction method for density estimation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **118** 2143–2180. [MR2474346](#)
- [19] KOSMOL, P. and MÜLLER-WICHARDS, D. (2011). *Optimization in Function Spaces: With Stability Considerations in Orlicz Spaces. De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications* **13**. de Gruyter, Berlin. [MR2760903](#)
- [20] LÖCHERBACH, E., LOUKIANOVA, D. and LOUKIANOV, O. (2011). Polynomial bounds in the ergodic theorem for one-dimensional diffusions and integrability of hitting times. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **47** 425–449. [MR2814417](#)
- [21] MALLIAVIN, P. (1997). *Stochastic Analysis. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]* **313**. Springer, Berlin. [MR1450093](#)
- [22] NINOMIYA, S. and VICTOIR, N. (2008). Weak approximation of stochastic differential equations and application to derivative pricing. *Appl. Math. Finance* **15** 107–121. [MR2409419](#)
- [23] NOURDIN, I. and PECCATI, G. (2012). *Normal Approximations with Malliavin Calculus: From Stein's Method to Universality. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics* **192**. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. [MR2962301](#)
- [24] NUALART, D. (2006). *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*, 2nd ed. Springer, Berlin. [MR2200233](#)
- [25] PARDOUX, É. and ZHANG, T. S. (1993). Absolute continuity of the law of the solution of a parabolic SPDE. *J. Funct. Anal.* **112** 447–458. [MR1213146](#)
- [26] PETRUSHEV, P. and XU, Y. (2008). Decomposition of spaces of distributions induced by Hermite expansions. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **14** 372–414. [MR2399106](#)
- [27] SANZ-SOLÉ, M. (2005). *Malliavin Calculus with Applications to Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*. EPFL Press, Lausanne. [MR2167213](#)
- [28] TALAY, D. and TUBARO, L. (1990). Expansion of the global error for numerical schemes solving stochastic differential equations. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* **8** 483–509 (1991). [MR1091544](#)
- [29] TRIEBEL, H. (1995). *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*, 2nd ed. Johann Ambrosius Barth, Heidelberg. [MR1328645](#)
- [30] TRIEBEL, H. (2006). *Theory of Function Spaces. III. Monographs in Mathematics* **100**. Birkhäuser, Basel. [MR2250142](#)
- [31] VERETENNIKOV, A. YU. (1997). On polynomial mixing bounds for stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **70** 115–127. [MR1472961](#)
- [32] VERETENNIKOV, A. YU. and KLOKOV, S. A. (2004). On the subexponential rate of mixing for Markov processes. *Teor. Veroyatn. Primen.* **49** 21–35. [MR2141328](#)
- [33] WALSH, J. B. (1986). An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In *École D'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV—1984. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1180** 265–439. Springer, Berlin. [MR0876085](#)

LAMA (UMR CNRS, UPEMLV, UPEC), INRIA  
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-EST  
F-77454 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE  
FRANCE  
E-MAIL: [bally@univ-mlv.fr](mailto:bally@univ-mlv.fr)

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA  
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA TOR VERGATA  
VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA 1  
I-00133 ROMA  
ITALY  
E-MAIL: [caramell@mat.uniroma2.it](mailto:caramell@mat.uniroma2.it)