IMUB Institut de Matemàtica

A COURSE ON MALLIAVIN CALCULUS WITH APPLICATIONS TO STOCHASTIC PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Lecture Notes
Vol. 2 (2004)

UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA

IMUB, Institut de Matemàtica Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes 585, 08007 Barcelona, Spain

A Course on Malliavin Calculus with Applications to Stochastic Partial Differential Equations

Marta Sanz-Solé
Facultat de Matemàtiques
Universitat de Barcelona

17th December 2003

Research supported by the grant BMF2000-0607 from the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología, Spain

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Integration by parts and absolute continuity of probability laws **3**

3 Finite dimensional Malliavin calculus **7**
3.1 The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator 7
3.2 The adjoint of the differential 11
3.3 An integration by parts formula: Existence of density 12

4 The basic operators of Malliavin Calculus **15**
4.1 The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator 15
4.2 The derivative operator 18
4.3 The integral or divergence operator 21
4.4 Differential Calculus 22
4.5 Calculus with multiple Wiener integrals 26
4.6 Local property of the operators 30

5 Representation of Wiener Functionals **34**
5.1 The Itô integral and the divergence operator 34
5.2 The Clark-Ocone formula 36
5.3 Generalized Clark-Ocone formula 37
5.4 Application to option pricing 40

6 Criteria for absolute continuity and smoothness of probability laws **46**
6.1 Existence of density 46
6.2 Smoothness of the density 49

7 Stochastic partial differential equations driven by a Gaussian spatially homogeneous correlated noise **52**
7.1 Stochastic integration with respect to coloured noise 52
7.2 Stochastic Partial Differential Equations driven by a coloured noise 60

8 Malliavin regularity of solutions of SPDEs **72**

9 Analysis of the Malliavin matrix of solutions of SPDEs **95**
9.1 One dimensional case 95
9.2 Examples 106
9.3 Multidimensional case 115

10 Definition of spaces used along the course **120**

References **121**

1 Introduction

Malliavin Calculus is a stochastic calculus of variations on the Wiener space. Their foundations were set in the 70's mainly in the seminal work [32] in order to study the existence and smoothness of density for the probability laws of random vectors.

For diffusion processes this problem can be approached by applying Hörmander's theorem on hypoelliptic differential operators in square form to Kolmogorov's equation (see [17]). Thus, in its very first application Malliavin calculus provides a probabilistic proof of the above mentioned Hörmander's theorem. Actually the first developments of the theory consist of a probabilistic theory for second order elliptic and parabolic stochastic partial differential equations with the broad contributions by Kusuoka and Stroock, Ikeda and Watanabe, Bell and Mohammed, among others. As a sample of references and without aiming to be complete we mention [27], [28], [29], [18], [5].

Next developments in the analysis on the Wiener space led to contributions in many areas of probability theory. Let us mention for instance the theory of Dirichlet forms and applications to error calculus (see the monograph [7]) and the anticipating stochastic calculus with respect to Gaussian processes ([56], [44], [43]). At a more applied level, Malliavin calculus is used in probabilistic numerical methods in Financial Mathematics.

Many problems in probability theory have been and are being successfully approached with tools from Malliavin calculus. These are some samples together with basic references:

1. Small perturbations of stochastic dynamical systems ([10], [9], [30], [25], [26])
2. Weak results on existence of solution for parabolic stochastic partial differential equations and numerical approximations ([2], [3])
3. Time reversal for finite and infinite dimensional stochastic differential equations ([37], [38])
4. Transformation of measure on the Wiener space ([63])
5. Extension of Itô's formulae ([40], [4])
6. Potential theory ([12])

The aim of this lecture notes is to present applications of Malliavin calculus to the analysis of probability laws of solutions of stochastic partial differential equations driven by Gaussian noises which are white in time and coloured in space, in a comprehensive way. The first five chapters are devoted to the introduction of the calculus itself based on a general Gaussian space, going from the simple finite dimensional setting to the infinite dimensional one. The last three chapters are devoted to the applications to stochastic partial differential equations based on recent research. Each chapter ends with some comments concerning the origin of the work developed within and its references. Throughout the paper we denote by C a real positive constant which can vary from a line to another.

The course has been written at the occasion of a visit to the *Institut de Mathématiques* at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne in Fall 2003. I am deeply indebted to Professor Robert Dalang and to the institution for the invitation. My thanks are also due to Lluís Quer-Sardanyons for the careful reading of a previous version of the manuscript.

2 Integration by parts and absolute continuity of probability laws

In this chapter we give some general results on the existence of density for probability laws and properties of these densities. There are different approaches depending of weather one wish to compute the densities -and eventually their derivatives- or not. The criteria proved by Malliavin in [32] establish existence and smoothness of the density (see Proposition 2.2). The approach by Watanabe [65] yield -under stronger assumptions- a description of the densities and their derivatives.

We present here a review of these results, putting more emphasis in the second mentioned approach.

Let us first introduce some notation. Derivative multiindices are denoted by $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_r) \in \{1, \cdots, n\}^r$. Set $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i$. For any differentiable real valued function φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\partial_\alpha \varphi$ the partial derivative $\partial^{|\alpha|}_{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_r} \varphi$. If $|\alpha| = 0$, $\partial_\alpha \varphi = \varphi$, by convention.

Definition 2.1 *Let F be a $\mathbb{R}^n$-dimensional random vector and G be an integrable random variable defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Let α be a multiindex. The pair F, G satisfies an integration by parts formula of degree α if there exists a random variable $H_\alpha(F, G) \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$E\big((\partial_\alpha \varphi)(F) G\big) = E\big((\varphi)(F) H_\alpha(F, G)\big), \tag{2.1}$$

for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The property expressed in (2.1) is recursive in the following sense. Let $\alpha = (\beta, \gamma)$, with $\beta = (\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_a)$, $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_b)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E\big((\partial_\alpha \varphi)(F) G\big) &= E\big((\partial_\gamma \varphi)(F) H_\beta(F, G)\big) \\ &= E\big(\varphi(F) H_\gamma(F, H_\beta(F, G))\big) \\ &= E\big(\varphi(F) H_\alpha(F, G)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The interest of this definition in connection with the study of probability laws can be deduced from the next result.

Proposition 2.1 1. *Assume that (2.1) holds for $\alpha = (1, \cdots, 1)$ and $G = 1$. Then the probability law of F has a density $p(x)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover,*

$$p(x) = E\big(\mathbb{1}_{(x \le F)} H_{(1, \cdots, 1)}(F, 1)\big). \tag{2.2}$$

In particular, p is continuous.

2. *Assume that for any multiindex α the formula (2.1) holds true with $G = 1$. Then $p \in \mathcal{C}^{|\alpha|}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and*

$$\partial_\alpha p(x) = (-1)^{|\alpha|} E\big(\mathbb{1}_{(x \le F)} H_{\alpha+1}(F, 1)\big), \tag{2.3}$$

where $\alpha + 1 := (\alpha_1 + 1, \cdots, \alpha_d + 1)$.

Proof: We start by giving a non rigorous argument which leads to the conclusion of part 1. Heuristically $p(x) = E\big(\delta_0(F-x)\big)$, where δ_0 denotes the delta Dirac function. The primitive of this distribution on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}$. Thus by (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &= E\big(\delta_0(F-x)\big) = E\big(\partial_{1,\cdots,1}\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(F-x)\big) \\ &= E\big(\mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(F-x)H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Let us be more precise. Fix $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and set $\varphi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{x_n} f(y)dy$. Fubini's theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(f(F)\big) &= E\big((\partial_{1,\cdots,1}\varphi)(F)\big) = E\big(\varphi(F)H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)\big) \\ &= E\big((\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathbb{1}_{(x\le F)}(f)(x)dx)H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)\big) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(f)(x)E(\mathbb{1}_{(x\le F)}H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)). \end{aligned}$$

Let B be a bounded Borel set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Consider a sequence of functions $f_n \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ converging pointwise to $\mathbb{1}_B$. Owing to the previous identities (applied to f_n) and Lebesgue bounded convergence we obtain

$$E\big(\mathbb{1}_B(F)\big) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathbb{1}_B(x)E\big(\mathbb{1}_{(x\le F)}H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)\big). \tag{2.4}$$

Hence the law of F is absolutely continuous and its density is given by (2.2). Since $H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)$ is assumed to be in $L^1(\Omega)$, formula (2.2) implies the continuity of p, by bounded convergence, This finishes the proof of part 1. The proof of part 2 is done recursively. For the sake of simplicity we shall only give the details of the first iteration for the multiindex $\alpha = (1,\cdots,1)$. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{x_n} f(y)dy$, $\Psi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{x_n}\Phi(y)dy$. By assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(f(F)\big) &= E\big(\Phi(F)H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1)\big) \\ &= E\big(\Psi(F)H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,H_{(1,\cdots,1)}(F,1))\big) \\ &= E\big(\Psi(F)H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Fubini's Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} &E\big(\Psi(F)H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big) \\ &E\big(\int_{-\infty}^{F_1}dy_1\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{F_n}dy_n\big(\int_{-\infty}^{y_1}dz_1\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{y_n}dz_n f(z)\big)H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big) \\ &= E\big(\int_{-\infty}^{F_1}dz_1\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{F_n}dz_n f(z)\int_{z_1}^{F_1}dy_1\cdots\int_{z_n}^{F_n}dy_n H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n}dz f(z)E\big(\Pi_{i=1}^n(F^i-z_i)^+H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the density of F is given by

$$p(x) = E\big(\Pi_{i=1}^n (F^i - x_i)^+ H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1)\big),$$

by a limit argument, as in the first part of the proof. The function $x \to \Pi_{i=1}^n (F^i - x_i)^+$ is differentiable except at the point x, almost surely. Therefore by bounded convergence

$$\partial_{(1,\cdots,1)} p(x) = (-1)^n E\big(\mathbf{1}_{[x,\infty)}(F) H_{(2,\cdots,2)}(F,1).$$

□

Remark 2.1 *The conclusion in part 2 of the preceding Proposition is quite easy to understand by formal arguments. Indeed, roughly speaking φ should be such that its derivative ∂_α is the delta Dirac function δ_0. Since taking primitives makes functions smoother, the higher $|\alpha|$ is, the smoother φ must be. Thus, having (2.1) for any multiindex α yields infinite differentiability for $p(x) = E\big(\delta_0(F - x)\big)$.*

Malliavin, in the development of his theory, used the criteria given in the next Proposition for the existence and smoothness of density (see [32]).

Proposition 2.2

1. *Assume that for any $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ and every function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exist positive constants C_i, not depending on φ, such that*
$$|E((\partial_i \varphi)(F))| \le C_i ||\varphi||_\infty. \tag{2.5}$$
Then the law of F has a density.

2. *Assume that for any multiindex α and every function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exist positive constants C_α, not depending on φ, such that*
$$|E((\partial_\alpha \varphi)(F))| \le C_\alpha ||\varphi||_\infty. \tag{2.6}$$
Then the law of F has a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ density.

Remark 2.2 *Checking (2.5), (2.6) means that we have to get rid of the derivatives ∂_i, ∂_α and thus one is naturally lead to an integration by parts procedure.*

Remark 2.3 *Malliavin formulates Proposition 2.2 in a more general setting. Indeed, instead of considering probability laws $P \circ F^{-1}$ he deals with finite measures μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The reader interested in the proof of this result is referred to [32], [41]*

Comparing Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 lead to some comments:

1. Let $n = 1$. The assumption in part 1) of Proposition 2.1 implies (2.5). However, for $n > 1$ both hypothesis are not comparable. The conclusion in the former Proposition gives more information on the density than in the later one.

2. Let $n > 1$. Assume that (2.1) holds for any multiindex α with $|\alpha| = 1$. Then, by the recursivity of the integration by parts formula we obtain the validity of (2.1) for $\alpha = (1, \cdots, 1)$.

3. Since the random variable $H_\alpha(F, G)$ in (2.1) is assumed to belong to $L^1(\Omega)$, the identity (2.1) with $G = 1$ clearly implies (2.6). Therefore the assumption in part 2 of Proposition 2.1 is stronger than in Proposition 2.2. But, on the other hand, the conclusion is more precise.

3 Finite dimensional Malliavin calculus

In this chapter we shall consider random vectors defined on the probability space $(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^m), \mu_m)$, where μ_m is the standard Gaussian measure, that is

$$\mu_m(dx) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp -(\frac{|x|^2}{2}) dx.$$

We denote by E_m the expectation with respect to the measure μ_m. Consider a random vector $F : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$. The purpose is to find sufficient conditions ensuring the absolute continuity with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the probability law of F and the smoothness of the density. More precisely we would like to obtain expressions like (2.1). This will be done in a quite sophisticated way as a prelude of the methodology to be applied in the infinite dimensional case.
For the sake of simplicity we shall only deal with multiindices α of order one. That means, we shall only approach the problem of existence of density for the random vector F.

3.1 The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator

Let $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ be a standard $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued Brownian motion. Consider the linear stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t(x) = \sqrt{2} dB_t - X_t(x)dt, \tag{3.1}$$

with initial condition $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Using the Itô formula it is immediate to check that the solution to (3.1) is given by

$$X_t(x) = \exp(-t)x + \sqrt{2} \int_0^t \exp(-(t-s))dB_s. \tag{3.2}$$

The operators semigroup associated with the Markov process solution to (3.1) is defined by $P_t f(x) = E_m f(X_t(x))$. Notice that the law of $Z_t(x) = \sqrt{2} \int_0^t \exp(-(t-s))dB_s$ is Gaussian, mean zero and covariance $(1-\exp(-2t))I$. This fact, together with (3.2), yields

$$P_t f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(\exp(-t)x + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}y)\mu_m(dy) \tag{3.3}$$

We are going to precise for which class of functions f the right hand-side of (3.3) makes sense and also to compute the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup.

Lemma 3.1 *We have the following facts about the semigroup generated by $(X_t, t \geq 0)$:*

1. *$(P_t, t \geq 0)$ is a contraction semigroup on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$, for all $p \geq 1$.*

2. For any $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and every $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{t}\big(P_t f(x) - f(x)\big) = L_m f(x), \tag{3.4}$$

where $L_m = \Delta - x \cdot \nabla = \sum_{i=1}^m \partial^2_{x_i x_i} - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \partial_{x_i}$.

3. $(P_t, t \geq 0)$ is a symmetric semigroup on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$.

Proof. 1) Let X and Y be independent random variables with law μ_m. The law of $\exp(-t)X + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}Y$ is also μ_m. Therefore, $(\mu_m \times \mu_m) \circ T^{-1} = \mu_m$, where $T(x,y) = \exp(-t)x + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}y$. Then, the definition of $P_t f$ and this remark yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |P_t f(x)|^p \mu_m(dx) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |f(T(x,y))|^p \mu_m(dx)\mu_m(dy)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |f(x)|^p \mu_m(dx).\end{aligned}$$

2) It follows very easily applying the Itô formula to the process $f(X_t)$. 3) We must prove that for any $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} P_t f(x) g(x) \mu_m(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x) P_t g(x) \mu_m(dx),$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned}&E_m\big(f(\exp(-t)X + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}Y)g(X)\big)\\ &= E_m\big(g(\exp(-t)X + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}Y)f(X)\big),\end{aligned}$$

where X and Y are two independent standard Gaussian variables. This follows easily from the fact that the vector (Z, X),

$$Z = \exp(-t)X + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}Y,$$

has a Gaussian distribution and each component has law μ_m. □

The appropriate spaces to perform the integration by parts mentioned above are defined in terms of the eigenvalues of the operator L_m. We are going to compute these eigenvalues using the Hermite polynomials. In the next chapter we shall exploit this relationship in an stochastic framework.
The Hermite polynomials $H_n(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 0$ are defined as follows:

$$\exp(-\frac{t^2}{2} + tx) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} t^n H_n(x). \tag{3.5}$$

That is,

$$H_n(x) = \frac{1}{n!}\frac{d^n}{dt^n}\exp(-\frac{t^2}{2} + tx)\Big|_{t=0} = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!}\exp(\frac{x^2}{2})\frac{d^n}{dx^n}\exp(-\frac{x^2}{2}). \tag{3.6}$$

Notice that $H_0(x) = 1$ and $H_n(x)$ is a polynomial of degree n, for any $n \geq 1$. Hence any polynomial can be written as a sum of Hermite polynomials and therefore the set $(H_n, n \geq 0)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_1)$. Moreover,

$$E_1(H_n H_m) = \frac{1}{(n!m!)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \delta_{n,m},$$

where $\delta_{n,m}$ denotes the Kronecker symbol. Indeed, this is a consequence of the identity

$$E_1\big((\exp(sX - \frac{s^2}{2}) \exp(tX - \frac{t^2}{2})\big) = \exp(st),$$

whis is proved by a direct computation. Thus, $(\sqrt{n!} H_n, n \geq 0)$ is a complete orthonormal system of $L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_1)$. One can easily check that

$$H_n^{'}(x) = H_{n-1}(x)$$
$$(n+1)H_{n+1}(x) = xH_n(x) - H_n^{'}(x).$$

Thus,

$$L_1 H_n(x) := H_n^{''}(x) - xH_n^{'}(x) = -nH_n(x).$$

Therefore, the operator L_1 is non positive, $(H_n, n \geq 0)$ is the sequence of eigenfunctions and $(-n, n \geq 0)$ the corresponding sequence of eigenvalues.
The generalisation to any finite dimension $m \geq 1$ is not hard. Indeed, let $a = (a_1, a_2, \cdots,)$, $a_i \in \mathbb{N}$, be a multiindex. Assume that $a_i = 0$ for any $i > m$. We define the generalized Hermite polynomial $H_a(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ by

$$H_a(x) = \Pi_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{a_i}(x_i).$$

Set $|a| = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$ and define $L_m = \sum_{i=1}^m L_1^i$, with $L_1^i = \partial^2_{x_i x_i} - x_i \partial_{x_i}$. Then,

$$L_m\big(H_a(x)\big) = \sum_{i=1}^m \big(\Pi_{j \neq i} H_{a_j}(x_j)(-a_i) H_{a_i}(x_i)\big) = -|a| H_a(x).$$

Therefore, the eigenvalues of L_m are again $(-n, n \geq 0)$ and the corresponding sequence of eigenspaces are those generated by the sets

$$(\Pi_{i=1}^m \sqrt{a_i!} H_{\alpha_i}(x_i), \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = n, \alpha_i \geq 0).$$

Notice that if $|a| = n$ then $H_a(x)$ is a polynomial of degree n.
Denote by $\mathcal{P}_m$ the set of polynomials on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Fix $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $k \geq 0$. We define a seminorm on $\mathcal{P}_m$ as follows,

$$||F||_{k,p} = ||(I - L_m)^{\frac{k}{2}} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)}, \tag{3.7}$$

where for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the operator $(I - L_m)^s$ is defined using the spectral decomposition of L_m.

Lemma 3.2 *1. Let $k \leq k'$, $p \leq p'$, $k, k' \geq 0$, $p, p' \in [1, \infty)$. Then for any $F \in \mathcal{P}_m$,*

$$||F||_{k,p} \leq ||F||_{k',p'}. \tag{3.8}$$

2. The norms $||\cdot||_{k,p}$, $k \geq 0$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, are compatible in the following sense: If $(F_n, n \geq 1)$ is a sequence in $\mathcal{P}_m$ such that $\lim_{n\to 0} ||F_n||_{k,p} = 0$ and it is a Cauchy sequence in the norm $||\cdot||_{k',p'}$, then $\lim_{n\to 0} ||F_n||_{k',p'} = 0$.

Proof: 1) Clearly, by Hölder's inequality the statement holds true for $k = k'$. Hence it suffices to check that $||F||_{k,p} \leq ||F||_{k',p}$, for any $k \leq k'$. To this end we prove that for any $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$||(I - L_m)^{-\alpha} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)} \leq ||F||_{L^p(\mu_m)}. \tag{3.9}$$

Fix $F \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Consider its decomposition in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$ with respect to the orthonormal basis given by the Hermite polynomials, $F = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} J_n F$. Then $P_t F = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp(-nt) J_n F$. The obvious identity

$$(1+n)^{-\alpha} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \exp(-t(n+1)) t^{\alpha-1} dt,$$

valid for any $\alpha > 0$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(I - L_m)^{-\alpha} F &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1+n)^{-\alpha} J_n F \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \exp(-t) t^{\alpha-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp(-nt) J_n F dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \exp(-t) t^{\alpha-1} P_t F dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the contraction property of the semigroup P_t yields

$$\begin{aligned}
||(I - L_m)^{-\alpha} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)} &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty \exp(-t) t^{\alpha-1} ||P_t F||_{L^p(\mu_m)} \\
&\leq ||F||_{L^p(\mu_m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Fix $0 \leq k \leq k'$. Using (3.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
||(I - L_m)^{\frac{k}{2}} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)} &= ||(I - L_m)^{\frac{k-k'}{2}} (I - L_m)^{\frac{k'}{2}} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)} \\
&\leq ||(I - L_m)^{\frac{k'}{2}} F||_{L^p(\mu_m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

2) Set $G_n = (I - L)^{\frac{k'}{2}} F_n \in \mathcal{P}_m$. By assumption $(G_n, n \geq 1)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^{p'}(\mu_m)$. Let us denote by G its limit. We want to check that $G = 0$. Let $H \in \mathcal{P}_m$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} G H d\mu_m &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} G_n H d\mu_m \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} (I - L)^{\frac{k-k'}{2}} G_n (I - L)^{\frac{k'-k}{2}} H d\mu_m \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_m$ is dense in $L^q(\mu_m)$, for any $q \in [1,\infty)$, we conclude that $G = 0$. This ends the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

Let $\mathbb{D}_m^{k,p}$ be the completion of the set $\mathcal{P}_m$ with respect to the norm $||\cdot||_{k,p}$ defined in (3.7). Set

$$\mathbb{D}_m^\infty = \cap_{p\geq 1} \cap_{k\geq 0} \mathbb{D}_m^{k,p}.$$

Lemma 3.2 ensures that the set $\mathbb{D}_m^\infty$ is well defined. Moreover, it is easy to check that $\mathbb{D}_m^\infty$ is an algebra.

Remark 3.1 *Let $F \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty$. Consider a sequence $(F_n, n \geq 1) \subset \mathcal{P}_m$ converging to F in the topology of $\mathbb{D}_m^\infty$, that is*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} ||F - F_n||_{k,p} = 0,$$

for any $k \geq 0$, $p \in [1,\infty)$. Then $L_m F$ is defined as the limit in the topology of $\mathbb{D}_m^\infty$ of the sequence $F - (I - L_m)F_n$.

3.2 The adjoint of the differential

We are looking for an operator δ_m which can be considered as the adjoint of the gradient ∇ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mu_m)$. Such an operator must act on functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$, take values on the space of real-valued functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$ and satisfy the duality relation

$$E_m\langle \nabla f, \varphi\rangle = E_m(f\delta_m\varphi), \tag{3.10}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Assume first that $f, \varphi^i \in \mathcal{P}_m$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$. Then, an integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_m\langle \nabla f, \varphi\rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \partial_i f(x)\varphi^i(x)\mu_m(dx) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x)\big(x_i\varphi^i(x) - \partial_i\varphi^i(x)\big)\mu_m(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\delta_m\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^m (x_i\varphi^i - \partial_i\varphi^i). \tag{3.11}$$

Notice that $\delta_m \circ \nabla = -L_m$. The definition (3.11) yields the next useful formula

$$\delta_m(f\nabla g) = -\langle \nabla f, \nabla g\rangle - fL_m g, \tag{3.12}$$

for any $f, g \in \mathcal{P}_m$. We remark that the operator δ_1 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1 H_n(x) &= xH_n(x) - H_n^{'}(x) = xH_n(x) - H_{n-1}(x) \\ &= (n+1)H_{n+1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it increases the order of a Hermite polynomial by one.

Remark 3.2 *All the above identities make sense for $f, g \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty$. Indeed, it suffices to justify that one can extend the operator ∇ to $\mathbb{D}_m^\infty$. Here is a possible argument:*
Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be the set of Schwartz test functions. Consider the isometry $J : L^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \lambda_m) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mu_m)$ defined by $J(f)(x) = f(x)(2\pi)^{\frac{m}{4}} \exp(\frac{|x|^2}{4})$, where λ_m denotes the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$. Following [54] page 142, $\cap_{k\geq 0}\mathbb{D}_m^{2,k} = J(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m))$. Then, for any $F \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty$ there exist $\tilde{F} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $F = J(\tilde{F})$ and one can define $\nabla F = J(\nabla \tilde{F})$.
We will see in the next chapter that Meyer's result on equivalence of norms shows that the infinite-dimensional analogue of the spaces $\mathbb{D}_m^{k,p}$ are the suitable spaces where the Malliavin k-th derivative makes sense.

3.3 An integration by parts formula: Existence of density

Let $F : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector, $F = (F^1, \cdots, F^n)$. We assume that $F \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$; that means, $F^i \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty$, for any $i = 1, \cdots, n$. The *Malliavin matrix* of F -also called covariance matrix- is defined by $A(x) = \big(\langle \nabla F^i(x), \nabla F^j(x)\rangle\big)_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$. Notice that by its very definition $A(x)$ is a symmetric, non-negative definite matrix, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Clearly $A(x) = DF(x)DF(x)^T$, where $DF(x)$ is the Jacobian matrix at x and the superscript T means the transpose.
We want to give sufficient conditions ensuring existence of density for $P \circ F^{-1}$. We shall apply the criterium of part 1) of Proposition 2.2.
Let us perform some computations showing that $(\partial_i\varphi)(F)$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, satisfies a linear system of equations. Indeed, by the chain rule,

$$\begin{aligned} \big\langle \nabla\big(\varphi(F(x))\big), \nabla F^l(x)\big\rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n (\partial_k\varphi)(F(x))\partial_j F^k(x)\partial_j F^l(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \langle \nabla F^l(x), \nabla F^k(x)\rangle (\partial_k\varphi)(F(x)) \\ &= \big(A(x)(\nabla^T\varphi)(F(x))\big)_l, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

$l = 1, \cdots, n$. Assume that the matrix $A(x)$ is inversible μ_m-almost everywhere. Then one gets

$$(\partial_i\varphi)(F) = \sum_{l=1}^n \big\langle \nabla\big(\varphi(F(x))\big), A_{i,l}^{-1}(x)\nabla F^l(x)\big\rangle, \tag{3.14}$$

for every $i = 1, \cdots, n$, μ_m-almost everywhere.

Taking expectations and using (3.14), (3.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_m\big((\partial_i\varphi)(F)\big) &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} E_m\langle\nabla\big(\varphi(F)\big), A_{i,l}^{-1}\nabla F^l\rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} E_m\big(\varphi(F)\delta_m(A_{i,l}^{-1}\nabla F^l)\big) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} E_m\big(\varphi(F)\big(-\langle\nabla A_{i,l}^{-1}, \nabla F^l\rangle - A_{i,l}^{-1} L_m F^l\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Let us take a pause for thought. Formula (3.15) says that

$$E_m\big(\partial_i\varphi(F)\big) = E_m\big(\varphi(F)H_i(F,1)\big), \tag{3.16}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(F,1) &= \sum_{l=1}^{n} \delta_m(A_{i.l}^{-1}\nabla F^l) \\ &= -\langle\nabla A_{i,l}^{-1}, \nabla F^l\rangle - A_{i,l}^{-1} L_m F^l. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

This is an integration by parts formula as in Definition 2.1.
If $n > 1$, things are a little bit more difficult but essentialy the same ideas would lead to the analogue of formula (2.1) with $\alpha = (1, \cdots, 1)$ and $G = 1$ (see Remark 2.3, part 2).
The preceding discussion and Proposition 2.2 yields the following result.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $F \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that:*

(1) The matrix $A(x)$ is inversible for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, μ_m-almost everywhere.

(2) $\det A^{-1} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$, $\nabla(\det A^{-1}) \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^m; \mu_m)$, for some $p, r \in (1, \infty)$.

Then, the law of F is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: The assumptions in (2) show that

$$C_i := \sum_{l=1}^{n} E_m\big(\big|\langle\nabla A_{i,l}^{-1}, \nabla F^l\rangle\big| + \big|A_{i,l}^{-1} L_m F^l\big|\big)$$

is finite. Therefore, one can take expectations in both sides of (3.14). It follows that

$$|E_m(\delta_i\varphi)(F)| \le C_i ||\varphi||_\infty.$$

This finishes the proof of the Proposition. □

Remark 3.3 *The proof of smooth properties for the density needs an iteration of the procedure presented in the proof of the preceeding Proposition.*

Comments Developing Malliavin Calculus on a finite dimensional Gaussian space is an stimulating exercise which gives a preliminary and useful insight in this very intricate topic and provides a good training, since computations can be made explicitely.
Stroock's course [61] insists in the finite dimensional setting before entering in the core of the Calculus; Ocone follows the same strategy in [46]. We have followed essentially his presentation. The proof of Lemma 3.2 can be found in [65] in the general infinite dimensional framework.

Exercises

3.1 Let $f, g \in \mathbb{D}_m^\infty$ and define

$$\Gamma(f,g) = L_m(fg) - fL_m g - gL_m f.$$

Show that

1. $\Gamma(f,g) = 2\langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle$.
2. $E_m\big(\Gamma(f,g)\big) = -E_m(fL_m g)$.

Identify the operator $\delta_m \circ \nabla$.
Hint: Apply the identity (3.12).

3.2 Prove that $P_t(H_n) = \exp(-nt)H_n$. *Hint:* Using the definition of P_t and the Laplace transform of the Gaussian measure check that

$$P_t\big(\exp(-\frac{t^2}{2} + tx)\big) = \exp\big(-\frac{(te^{-t})^2}{2} + te^{-t}x\big).$$

4 The basic operators of Malliavin Calculus

In this chapter we introduce the three basic operators needed to develop the intinite dimensional Malliavin calculus on a Gaussian space: The Malliavin derivative, its adjoint -the divergence operator- and the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator.

We start by describing the underlying probability space. Let H be a real separable Hilbert space. Denote by $||\cdot||_H$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H$ the norm and the scalar product, respectively. There exist a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{G},\mu)$ and a family $\mathcal{M} = \big(W(h), h\in H\big)$ of random variables defined on this space, such that the mapping $h\to W(h)$ is linear, each $W(h)$ is Gaussian, $EW(h)=0$ and $E\big(W(h_1)W(h_2)\big) = \langle h_1,h_2\rangle_H$ (see for instance, [55], Chapter 1, Proposition 1.3). Such family is constructed as follows. Let $(e_n, n\geq 1)$ be a complete orthonormal system in H. Consider the canonical probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{G},P)$ associated with a sequence $(g_n, n\geq 1)$ of standard independent Gaussian random variables. That means, $\Omega=\mathbb{R}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathcal{G}=\mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$, $\mu=\mu_1^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$ where, acording to the notations of Chapter 1, μ_1 denotes the standard Gaussian law on $\mathbb{R}$.

For each $h\in H$ the series $\sum_{n\geq 1}\langle h,e_n\rangle_H g_n$ converges in $L^2(\Omega,\mathcal{G},\mu)$ to a random variable that we denote by $W(h)$. Notice that the set $\mathcal{M}$ is a closed Gaussian subspace of $L^2(\Omega)$ isometric to H. In the sequel we shall assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is the σ-field generated by $\mathcal{M}$.

Here is an example of such Gaussian families. Let $H=L^2(A,\mathcal{A},m)$, where $(A,\mathcal{A},m)$ is a separable σ-finite, atomless measure space. For any $F\in\mathcal{A}$ with $m(F)<\infty$, set $W(F)=W(\mathbb{1}_F)$. The stochastic Gaussian process $\big(W(F), F\in \mathcal{A}, m(F)<\infty\big)$ satisfies that $W(F)$ and $W(G)$ are independent if F and G are disjoint sets. Moreover, $W(F\cup G)=W(F)+W(G)$. Following [64], we call such a process a *white noise based on* m. Then the random variable $W(h)$ coincides with the first order Itô stochastic integral $\int_A h(t)W(dt)$ with respect to W (see [19]).

For instance, if $A=\mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathcal{A}$ is the σ-field of Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}_+$ and m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$, then $W(h)=\int_0^\infty h(t)dW_t$ -the Itô integral of a deterministic integrand- where $\big(W_t, t\geq 0\big)$ is a standard Brownian motion.

In Chapter 5 we shall introduce another important class of Gaussian family indexed by two parameters representing time and space, respectively; the time covariance is given by Lebesgue measure while the space correlation is homogeneous and is given by some kind of measure. We will refer to these processes as *noises white in time and spatially correlated in space.*

4.1 The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator

We could introduce this operator following exactly the same approach as that used in Section 2.1 for the finite dimensional case. However we shall skip introducing infinite dimensional evolution equations. For this reason we shall start with the analogue of the formula (3.3) which is called in this context Mehler's formula.

For any $F \in L^p(\Omega;\mu)$, $p \geq 1$, set

$$P_tF(\omega) = \int_\Omega F(\exp(-t)\omega + \sqrt{1-\exp(-2t)}\omega')\mu(d\omega'), \tag{4.1}$$

$t \geq 0$.
We have the following

Proposition 4.1 *The above formula (4.1) defines a positive symmetric contraction semigroup on $L^p(\Omega;\mu)$ and satisfies $P_t 1 = 1$.*

Proof: The contraction property and the symmetry is proved following exactly the same arguments as in finite dimension, replacing the measure μ_m by μ (see Lemma 3.1).
Positivity is obvious, as well as the property $P_t 1 = 1$.
Let us now prove the semigroup property. Let $s, t \geq 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P_t(P_sF)(\omega) &= \int_\Omega \mu(d\omega')(P_sF)(e^{-t}\omega + \sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}\omega') \\ &= \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \mu(d\omega')\mu(d\omega'')F(e^{-(s+t)}\omega + e^{-s}\sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}\omega' + \sqrt{1-e^{-2s}}\omega'') \\ &\int_\Omega \mu(d\omega'')F(e^{-(s+t)}\omega + \sqrt{1-e^{-2(t+s)}}\omega'') \\ &= P_{t+s}F(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

Remark 4.1 *The operator semigroup $\{P_t, t \geq 0\}$ owns a stronger property than just contraction. Indeed, Nelson has proved that if $q(t) = e^{2t}(p-1)+1$, $t > 0, p \geq 1$, then*

$$||P_tF||_{q(t)} \leq ||F||_p.$$

where for any $q \geq 1$, the notation $||\cdot||_q$ means the $L^q(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ norm. Notice that $q(t) > p$. Such property is called hypercontractivity.

In order to describe L in an operational way, we give its spectral decomposition. To this end we shall introduce the Wiener chaos decomposition of a random variable in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$. This is the infinite dimensional analogue of the decomposition of a function in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^m), \mu_m)$ in the basis consisting of the Hermite polynomials.
Fix a multiindex $a = (a_1, a_2, \cdots)$, $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $a_i = 0$ except for a finite number of them. Set $|a| = \sum_i |a_i|$. We define the random variable

$$H_a = \sqrt{a!}\Pi_{i=1}^\infty H_{a_i}(W(e_i)), \tag{4.2}$$

where $a! = \Pi_{i=1}^\infty a_i!$ and H_{a_i} is the Hermite polynomial defined in (3.5). Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the class of random variables of the form

$$F = f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)), \tag{4.3}$$

$n \geq 1$, where f is a polynomial function. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{P}$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$.

Lemma 4.1 *The family (H_a) is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$.*

Proof: By the definition of H_a and the independence of the random variables $W(e_i)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega H_a(\omega)H_b(\omega)\mu(d\omega) &= \Pi_{i=1}^\infty \sqrt{a!}\sqrt{b!}\int_\Omega H_{a_i}(W(e_i))H_{b_i}(W(e_i))\mu(d\omega)\\ &= \Pi_{i=1}^\infty \sqrt{a!}\sqrt{b!}\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{a_i}(x)H_{b_i}(x)\mu_1(dx)\\ &= \Pi_{i=1}^\infty \delta_{a_i,b_i} = \delta_{a,b}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ we have completeness. □

Let $\mathcal{H}_n$ be the closed subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ generated by $(H_a, |a| = n)$. It is called the n-th Wiener chaos. By the previous lemma, the spaces $\mathcal{H}_n$ are orthogonal for different values of n. The following decomposition holds:

$$L^2(\Omega) = \oplus_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{H}_n.$$

We will denote by J_n the orthogonal projection from $L^2(\Omega)$ into $\mathcal{H}_n$.

Remark 4.2 *If $H = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$ then $J_n(F)$ can be written as a multiple Itô integral (see [19])*

Proposition 4.2 *Let $F \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$. Then*

$$P_t(F) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nt} J_n(F). \tag{4.4}$$

Proof: It suffices to prove (4.4) for random variables of the kind $F = \exp(\lambda W(h) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2})$, where $h \in H$, $||h||_H = 1$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, once the result is proved for such random variables we obtain $P_t H_n(W(h)) = e^{-nt}H_n(W(h))$, for any $n \geq 0$, $h \in H$ and this suffices to identify the action of P_t on any Wiener chaos. By the definition of P_tF we have

$$\begin{aligned}P_tF &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(e^{-t}\lambda W(h) + \sqrt{1-e^{-2t}}\lambda x - \frac{\lambda^2}{2})\right)\mu_1(dx)\\ &= \exp\left(e^{-t}\lambda W(h) - \frac{e^{-2t}\lambda^2}{2})\right).\end{aligned}$$

In terms of the Hermite polynomials this last expresion is equal to

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nt}\lambda^n H_n(W(h)) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nt} J_n F.$$

But $J_n(F) = \lambda^n H_n(W(h))$.Therefore the Proposition is proved. □

Definition 4.1 *The Ornstein -Uhlenbeck operator L is the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup $(P_t, t \geq 0)$.*

We are going to prove that

$$\mathrm{Dom}\, L = \{F \in L^2(\Omega) : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 ||J_n F||_2^2 < \infty\},$$

where $||\cdot||_2$ denotes the $L^2(\Omega)$ norm, and

$$LF = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} -nJ_n(F). \tag{4.5}$$

Indeed, assume first that F satisfies the condition $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2||J_nF||_2^2 < \infty$. Then, the operator L defined by (4.5) makes sense and satisfies

$$E\big(\big|\frac{1}{t}(P_tF - F) - LF\big|^2\big) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\big(\frac{1}{t}(e^{-nt} - 1) + n\big)^2||J_nF||_2^2,$$

This last expresion tends to zero as $t \to 0$. In fact, $\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}(e^{-nt} - 1) + n = 0$ and $\frac{1}{t}(e^{-nt} - 1) \le n$. Thus the result follows by bounded convergence. This shows that L is the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup $(P_t, t \ge 0)$.
Conversely, assume that $\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}(P_tF - F) = G$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Then clearly,

$$J_nG = \lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}(P_tJ_nF - J_nF) = -nJ_nF.$$

Therefore, F satisfies $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2||J_nF||_2^2 < \infty$ and $LF = G$.
For any $F \in \mathcal{P}$, $p \in [1,\infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, consider the seminorm

$$||F||_{k,p} = ||(I - L)^{\frac{k}{2}}F||_p. \tag{4.6}$$

Remember that $(I - L)^{\frac{k}{2}}F = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(1 + n)^{\frac{k}{2}}J_nF$.
Definition (4.6) is the infinite dimensional analogue of (3.7). The results stated in Lemma 3.2 also hold in our setting. Actually the proofs are exactly the same changing μ_m into μ (see [65]).
Let $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}$ be the completion of the set $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to the norm $||\cdot||_{k,p}$ defined in (4.6). Set

$$\mathbb{D}^{\infty} = \cap_{p\ge 1}\cap_{k\ge 0}\mathbb{D}^{k,p}$$

This set is an algebra. Notice that, similarly as we did in the finite dimensional case (see Remark 3.1), we can extend the definition of the operator L to any random variable of $\mathbb{D}^{\infty}$.

4.2 The derivative operator

In this section we introduce the infinite dimensional version of the gradient operator. The idea shall be to start with *finite dimensional* random variables in a sense to be made precise and then, by a density argument, to extend the definition to a larger class of random variables.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of random variables of the form

$$F = f\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big), \tag{4.7}$$

with $f \in \mathcal{C}_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $h_1, \cdots, h_n \in H$, $n \geq 1$. Sometimes, we shall take $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$; in this case we shall write $\mathcal{S}_b$ instead of $\mathcal{S}$. The elements of $\mathcal{S}$ are called *smooth functionals*. We define the operator D on $\mathcal{S}$ as the H-valued random variable

$$DF = \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_i f\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big)h_i. \tag{4.8}$$

Fix $h \in H$ and set

$$F^{\epsilon h} = f\big(W(h_1) + \epsilon\langle h, h_1\rangle_H, \cdots, W(h_n) + \epsilon\langle h, h_n\rangle_H\big),$$

$\epsilon > 0$. Then it is immediate to check that $\langle DF, h\rangle_H = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}F^{\epsilon h}\big|_{\epsilon=0}$. Therefore, for smooth functionals, D is a directional derivative. It is also routine to prove that if F, G are smooth functionals, $D(FG) = FDG + GDF$.
Our next aim is to prove that D is closable as an operator from $L^p(\Omega)$ to $L^p(\Omega; H)$, for any $p \geq 1$. That means, if $\{F_n, n \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is a sequence converging to zero in $L^p(\Omega)$ and the sequence $\{DF_n, n \geq 1\}$ converges to G in $L^p(\Omega; H)$, then $G = 0$. The tool for this is a simple version of the *integration by parts formula*.

Lemma 4.2 *For any $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $h \in H$ we have*

$$E\big(\langle DF, h\rangle_H\big) = E\big(FW(h)\big). \tag{4.9}$$

Proof: Without loss of generality we shall assume that

$$F = f\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big),$$

$h_1, \cdots, h_n$ being orthonormal elements of H and $h_1 = h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(\langle DF, h\rangle_H\big) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_1 f(x)\mu_n(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)x_1\mu_n(dx) = E\big(FW(h_1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Let $F, G \in \mathcal{S}$. Applying formula (4.9) to the smooth functional FG yields,

$$E\big(G\langle DF, h\rangle_H\big) = -E\big(F\langle DG, h\rangle_H\big) + E\big(FGW(h)\big). \tag{4.10}$$

Owing to this result we can now prove that D is closable. Indeed, consider a sequence $\{F_n, n \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{S}$ satisfying the properties stated before. Let $h \in H$ and $F \in \mathcal{S}_b$ such that $FW(h)$ is bounded. Then, using (4.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(F\langle G, h\rangle_H\big) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E\big(F\langle DF_n, h\rangle_H\big) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E\big(-F_n\langle DF, h\rangle_H + F_nFW(h)\big) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the sequence $(F_n, n \geq 1)$ converges to zero in L^p and $\langle DF, h\rangle_H$, $FW(h)$ are bounded. This yields $G = 0$. $\square$

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{1,p}$ be the closure of the set $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to the seminorm

$$||F||'_{1,p} = \big(E(|F|^p) + E(||DF||_H^p)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{4.11}$$

The set $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{1,p}$ is the domain of the operator D in $L^p(\Omega)$. Notice that $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{1,p}$ is dense in $L^p(\Omega)$. The above procedure can be iterated, as follows. Clearly one can define recursively the operator D^k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ on the set $\mathcal{S}$. This yields an $H^{\otimes k}$-valued random vector. As for D one proves that D^k is closable. Then we can introduce the seminorms

$$||F||'_{k,p} = \big(E(|F|^p) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} E(||D^j F||_{H^{\otimes j}}^p)\big)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{4.12}$$

$p \in [1, \infty)$, and define the sets $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{k,p}$ as the closure of $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to the seminorm (4.12). Notice that, by definition, $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{j,q} \subset \mathbb{D}^{\tilde{k},p}$ for $k \leq j$ and $p \leq q$. A natural question is wether the spaces $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}^{k,p}$ and $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}$, defined in Section 3.1 by means of the operator L do coincide. The answer is positive. This fact is a consequence of Meyer's inequalities -a deep mathematical result proved by Meyer in [36].
For the sake of completeness we quote here this result. However we do not give a proof of it. The reader interested in the details is addressed to [36] (see also [42]).

Theorem 4.1 *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist positive constants $c_{k,p}$, $C_{k,p}$, such that for any $F \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$c_{k,p} E\big(||D^k F||_{H^{\otimes k}}^p\big) \leq ||F||_{k,p}^p \leq C_{k,p}(||F||'_{k,p})^p. \tag{4.13}$$

Our next purpose is to know the action of the operator D on each Wiener chaos. First let us make an observation. The Wiener chaos expansion developed in Section 3.1 can be extended to the more general setting of $L^2(\Omega; V)$, where V is a Hilbert space. Indeed, it holds that

$$L^2(\Omega; V) = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_n(V),$$

with $\mathcal{H}_n(V) = \mathcal{H}_n \otimes V$.

Proposition 4.3 *A random variable $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ if and only if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n||J_n F||_2^2 < \infty$. In this case*

$$D(J_n(F)) = J_{n-1}(DF)$$

and

$$E\big(||DF||_H^2\big) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n||J_n F||_2^2.$$

Proof: Consider the multiple Hermite polynomials H_a defined in (4.2). Then,

$$DH_a = \sqrt{a!}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Pi_{j\neq i} H_{a_i}(W(e_i))H_{a_j-1}(W(e_j))e_j,$$

because $H'_n = H_{n-1}$.
Notice that if $|a| = n$ then $DH_a \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}(H)$. Moreover,

$$E\big(||DH_a||_H^2\big) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a!}{\Pi_{j\neq i} a_i!(a_j-1)!} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j = |a|.$$

This proves the result for $F = H_a$, which suffices to finish the proof. □

The following extension of the spaces $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}$ will be needed later on.
Let $\mathcal{S}_V$ be the set of smooth random vectors taking values in V of the kind

$$F = \sum_{j=1}^{n} F_j v_j,$$

$v_j \in V, F_j \in \mathcal{S},\ j = 1, \cdots, n$. By definition the k-th derivative of F is given by $D^kF = \sum_{j=1}^n D^kF_j \otimes v_j$. As before, one can prove that D^k is a closable operator from $\mathcal{S}_V \subset L^p(\Omega; V)$ into $L^p(\Omega; H^{\otimes k} \otimes V)$, $p \geq 1$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$ we introduce the seminorms on $\mathcal{S}_V$ given by

$$||F||_{k,p,V}^p = E(||F||_V^p) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} E(||D^jF||_{H^{\otimes j}\otimes V}^p).$$

Then, $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V)$ is the completion of the set $\mathcal{S}_V$ with respect to this norm. We define $\mathbb{D}^{\infty} = \cap_{k\geq 1} \cap_{p\geq 1} \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V)$.

4.3 The integral or divergence operator

We introduce in this section an operator which plays a fundamental rôle in establishing the criteria for existence and uniqueness of density for random vectors. As it shall be clarified, it corresponds to the infinite dimensional analogue of the operator δ_m defined in (3.11).
The Malliavin derivative D introduced in the previous section is an unbounded operator from $L^2(\Omega)$ into $L^2(\Omega; H)$. Moreover, the domain of D in $L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, is dense in $L^2(\Omega)$. Then, by an standard procedure (see for instance [66]) one can define its *adjoint* δ. Indeed, the domain of the adjoint, denoted by $\operatorname{Dom}\delta$, is the set of random vectors $u \in L^2(\Omega; H)$ such that for any $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$,

$$\big|E\big(\langle DF, u\rangle_H\big)\big| \leq c||F||_2,$$

where c is a constant depending on u.

If $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$, then δu is the element of $L^2(\Omega)$ characterized by the identity

$$E\big(F\delta(u)\big) = E\big(\langle DF, u\rangle_H\big). \tag{4.14}$$

Equation (4.14) expresses the duality between D and δ. It is called the *integration by parts formula.*
The analogy between δ and δ_m defined in (3.11) can be easily established on *finite dimensional* random vectors of $L^2(\Omega; H)$, as follows. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the set of random vectors of the type

$$u = \sum_{j=1}^n F_j h_j,$$

where $F_j \in \mathcal{S}$, $h_j \in H$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Let us prove that $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$. Indeed, owing to formula (4.10) for any $F \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big|E\big(\langle DF, u\rangle_H\big)\big| = \big|\sum_{j=1}^n E\big(F_j\langle DF, h_j\rangle_H\big)\big| \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^n \big(\big|E\big(F\langle DF_j, h_j\rangle_H\big| + \big|E\big(FF_jW(h_j)\big)\big|\big) \\
&\le C||F||_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$. Moreover, by the same computations,

$$\delta(u) = \sum_{j=1}^n F_j W(h_j) - \sum_{j=1}^n \langle DF_j, h_j\rangle_H. \tag{4.15}$$

Hence, the gradient operator in the finite dimensional case is replaced by the Malliavin *directional* derivative and the coordinate variables x_i by the *random coordinates* $W(h_j)$.
We have seen in Proposition 4.3 that the operator D decreases by one the Wiener chaos order. Its adjoint, δ, do the oposite. We shall come back to this fact later on.

Remark 4.3 *The divergence operator coincides with a stochastic integral introduced by Skorohod in [60]. One of the interesting features of this integral is that it allows non adapted integrands. We shall see in the next chapter that actually, it is an extension of Itô's integral.*

4.4 Differential Calculus

In this section we prove several basic calculus rules based on the three operators defined so far. The first result is a chain rule.

Proposition 4.4 *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuously differentiable function with bounded partial derivatives. Let $F = (F^1, \cdots, F^m)$ be a random vector* *whose components belong to $\mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then $\varphi(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ and*

$$D(\varphi(F)) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \partial_i \varphi(F) DF^i. \tag{4.16}$$

The proof of this result is strightforward. First we assume that $F \in \mathcal{S}$; in this case the formula (4.16) follows by the classical rules of differential calculus. The proof for $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}$ is done by an approximation procedure.
The preceding chain rule can be improved to φ Lipschitz. The tool for this extension is given in the next proposition.

Proposition 4.5 *Let $(F_n, n \geq 1)$ be a sequence of random variables in $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ converging to F in $L^2(\Omega)$ and such that*

$$\sup_n E\big(||DF_n||_H^2\big) < \infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Then F belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and the sequence of derivatives $(DF_n, n \geq 1)$ converges to DF in the weak topology of $L^2(\Omega; H)$.

Proof: The assumption (4.17) yields the existence of a subsequence $(F_{n_k}, k \geq 1)$ such that the corresponding sequence of derivatives $(DF_{n_k}, k \geq 1)$ converges in the weak topology of $L^2(\Omega; H)$ to some element $\eta \in L^2(\Omega; H)$. The action of the operator D is determined on each Wiener chaos. Hence, by Proposition (4.3), F belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $\eta = DF$.
By the preceding argument, any weakly convergent subsequence of $DF_n, n \geq 1$, must converge to the same limit. Hence, the whole sequence converges. □

Proposition 4.6 *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a globally Lipschitz function and $F = (F^1, \cdots, F^m)$ be a random vector with components in $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. Then $\varphi(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. Moreover, there exists a bounded random vector $G = (G_1, \cdots, G_m)$ such that*

$$D(\varphi(F)) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} G_i DF^i. \tag{4.18}$$

Proof: The idea of the proof is as follows. First we regularize the function φ by convolution with an approximation of the identity. We apply Proposition 4.4 to the sequence obtained this way. Then we conclude by means of Proposition 4.5. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ nonnegative, with compact support and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \alpha(x)dx = 1$. Define $\alpha_n(x) = n^m \alpha(nx)$ and $\varphi_n = \varphi * \alpha_n$. It is well known that $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$, the sequence $(\varphi_n, n \geq 1)$ converges to φ uniformly. In addition $\nabla \varphi_n$ is bounded by the Lipschitz constant of φ. By Proposition 4.4,

$$D(\varphi_n(F)) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \partial_i \varphi_n(F) DF^i. \tag{4.19}$$

Now we apply Proposition 4.5 to the sequence $F_n = \varphi_n(F)$. It is clear that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_n(F) = \varphi(F)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, by the boundedness property

on $\nabla\varphi_n$, the sequence $D(\varphi_n(F)), n \geq 1$, is bounded in $L^2(\Omega; H)$. Hence $\varphi(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $D(\varphi_n(F)), n \geq 1$ converges in the weak topology of $L^2(\Omega; H)$ to $D(\varphi(F))$.
The sequence $\nabla\varphi_n(F), n \geq 1$, is bounded. Thus, there exists a subsequence that converges to some random bounded vector G in the weak topology of $L^2(\Omega; H)$. Passing to the limit (4.19) we finish the proof of the Proposition. $\square$

Remark 4.4 *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ and $F = (F^1, \cdots, F^m)$ be a random vector whose components belong to $\cap_{p\in[1,\infty)}\mathbb{D}^{1,p}$. Then the conclusion of Proposition 4.4 also holds. Moreover, $\varphi(F) \in \cap_{p\in[1,\infty)}\mathbb{D}^{1,p}$.*
The chain rule (4.16) can be iterated; we obtain Leibniz's rule for Malliavin's derivatives. For example, if F is one-dimensional then

$$D^k(\varphi(F)) = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \sum_{\mathcal{P}_m} c_m \varphi^{(m)}(F) \Pi_{i=1}^m D^{|p_i|}F, \tag{4.20}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_m$ denotes the set of partitions of $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ consisting of m disjoint sets $p_1, \cdots, p_m$, $m = 1, \cdots, k$, $|p_i|$ denotes the cardinal of the set p_i and c_m are positive coefficients.

The next propositions give important calculus rules.

Proposition 4.7 *Let $u \in \mathcal{S}_H$. Then*

$$D_h(\delta(u)) = \langle u, h\rangle_H + \delta(D_h u). \tag{4.21}$$

Proof: Fix $u = \sum_{j=1}^n F_j h_j$, $F_j \in \mathcal{S}$, $h_j \in H$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. By virtue of (4.15) we have,

$$D_h(\delta(u)) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \big((D_h F_j)W(h_j) + F_j\langle h_j, h\rangle - \langle D(D_h F_j), h_j\rangle_H\big).$$

Notice that by (4.15),

$$\delta(D_h u) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \big((D_h F_j)W(h_j) - \langle D(D_h F_j), h_j\rangle_H\big). \tag{4.22}$$

Hence (4.21) holds. $\square$

Proposition 4.8 *Let $u, v \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$. Then*

$$E\big(\delta(u)\delta(v)\big) = E(\langle u, v\rangle_H) + E(\mathrm{tr}(Du \circ Dv)). \tag{4.23}$$

Consequently,

$$E\big(\delta(u)\big)^2 \leq E(||u||_H^2) + E(||Du||_{H\otimes H}^2). \tag{4.24}$$

Hence, if $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$ then $u \in \mathrm{Dom}\delta$ and (4.23) holds.

Proof: Assume first that $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_H$. Consider a complete orthonormal system of H, $(e_i, i \geq 1)$. The duality relation between D and δ yields

$$E(\delta(u)\delta(v)) = E\big(\langle v, D(\delta(u))\rangle_H\big) = E\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle v, e_i\rangle_H D_{e_i}(\delta(u))\Big).$$

Owing to (4.21) this last expression is equal to

$$E\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle v, e_i\rangle_H (\langle u, e_i\rangle_H + \delta(D_{e_i} u)\Big).$$

The duality relation between D and δ implies

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(\langle v, e_i\rangle_H \delta(D_{e_i} u)\big) &= E\big(\langle D_{e_i} u, D\langle v, e_i\rangle_H\rangle_H\big) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E\big(\langle D_{e_i}\langle u, e_j\rangle_H e_j, D\langle v, e_i\rangle_H\big) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E\big(D_{e_i}\langle u, e_j\rangle_H D_{e_j}\langle v, e_i\rangle_H\big). \end{aligned}$$

This shows (4.23).
Let now $u = v$. By Schwarz inequality we clearly obtain (4.24). The extension to $u, v \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$ is done by a limit procedure. $\square$

Remark 4.5 *Proposition 4.8 can be used to extend the validity of (4.21) to $u \in \mathbb{D}^{2,2}(H)$. Indeed, let $u_n \in \mathcal{S}_H$ be a sequence of processes converging to u in $\mathbb{D}^{2,2}(H)$. Formula (4.21) holds true for u_n. We can take limits in $L^2(\Omega; H)$ as n tends to infinity and conclude, because the operators D and δ are closed.*

Proposition 4.9 *Let $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$, $Fu \in L^2(\Omega; H)$. Then if $F\delta(u) - \langle DF, u\rangle_H \in L^2(\Omega)$ we have*

$$\delta(Fu) = F\delta(u) - \langle DF, u\rangle_H. \tag{4.25}$$

Proof: Assume first that $F \in \mathcal{S}$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}_H$. Let $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Then by the duality relation between D and δ and calculus rules on the derivatives we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(G\delta(Fu)) &= E(\langle DG, Fu\rangle_H) \\ &= E(\langle u, (D(FG) - GDF)\rangle_H) \\ &= E(G(F\delta(u) - \langle u, DF\rangle_H)). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the operator δ, (4.24) holds under the assumptions of the proposition. $\square$

Proposition 4.10 *Let $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then $F \in \operatorname{Dom} L$ if and only if $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $DF \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$. In this case*

$$\delta(DF) = -L \tag{4.26}$$

Proof: Let $G \in \mathcal{S}$. Using the duality relation, Proposition 4.3 and (4.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E(G\delta(DF)) &= E(\langle DG, DF\rangle_H) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} nE(J_nGJ_nF) \\ &= E\big(G\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} nJ_nF\big) = -E(GLF). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

As a consequence of this proposition and Proposition 4.3 we have that the divergence operator increses by one degree the Wiener chaos order.
The next result shows that L is a kind of second order differential operator.

Proposition 4.11 *Let $F = (F^1, \cdots, F^m)$ be a random vector with components in $\mathbb{D}^{2,4}$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with bounded partial derivatives up to the second order. Then $\varphi(F) \in \operatorname{Dom} L$ and*

$$L\big(\varphi(F)\big) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} (\partial^2_{i,j}\varphi)(F)\langle DF^i, DF^j\rangle_H + \sum_{i=1}^{m}(\partial_i\varphi)(F)LF^i. \tag{4.27}$$

Proof: For the sake of simplicity we shall give the proof for $m = 1$. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $F = f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n))$. Then, by virtue of Proposition 4.10, (4.16), (4.8) and (4.15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L\varphi(F) &= -\delta\big(D(\varphi(F))\big) = -\delta\big(\varphi^{'}(F)DF\big) \\ &= -\delta\big(\varphi^{'}(F)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\partial_i f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n))h_i \\ &= -\delta\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varphi^{'}(f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)))\partial_i f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n))h_i\big) \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^{n}\partial_i(\varphi\circ f)(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n))W(h_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\partial_{i,j}(\varphi\circ f)(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n))\langle h_i.h_j\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.27) holds for smooth random variables. The extension to $F \in \mathbb{D}^{2,4}$ follows by an standard approximation procedure. □

4.5 Calculus with multiple Wiener integrals

In the previous sections we have introduced three fundamental operators defined on spaces related with a Gaussian space. We have given its action on any Wiener chaos. In this section we aim to go a little bit further in this direction considering

the special case $H = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$. The particular feature of this example is that the Wiener chaos can be described in terms of stochastic integrals -the Itô multiple stochastic integrals. Therefore, the action of the operators and their domains can be described in terms of conditions on these integrals. We gain in operativeness because additional tools of stochastic calculus become available.
For the sake of completeness we start with a very short account on multiple Itô-Wiener integrals and their rôle in the Wiener chaos decomposition. For complete details on the topic we refer the reader to the original work by Itô [19] (see also [41]).
The framework here consists of a separable σ-finite measure space $(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$, the Hilbert space $H = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$ and the white noise $W = (W(F), F \in \mathcal{A})$ based on m. We assume that the measure m has no atoms.
The multiple Itô-Wiener integrals are defined as follows. Let $\mathcal{E}_n$ be the set of deterministic elementary functions of the type

$$f(t_1, \cdots, t_n) = \sum_{j_1, \cdots, j_n = 1}^{k} a_{j_1, \cdots, j_n} \mathbb{1}_{A_{j_1} \times \cdots \times A_{j_n}}(t_1, \cdots, t_n),$$

where $A_{j_1}, \cdots, A_{j_n}$ are pairwise-disjoint elements of $\mathcal{A}$ with finite measure; the coefficients $a_{j_1, \cdots, j_n}$ are null whenever two of the indices $j_1, \cdots, j_n$ coincide.
For this kind of functions we define

$$I_n(f) = \sum_{j_1, \cdots, j_n = 1}^{k} a_{j_1, \cdots, j_n} W(A_{j_1}) \cdots W(A_{j_n}).$$

For any function f defined on A^n we denote by $\tilde{f}$ its symmetrization.
I_n defines a linear map from $\mathcal{E}_n$ into $L^2(\Omega)$ which verifies the following properties:

(1) $I_n(f) = I_n(\tilde{f})$,

(2)
$$E(I_n(f) I_m(g)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \neq m, \\ n! \langle \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \rangle_{L^2(A^m)} & \text{if } n = m. \end{cases}$$

The set $\mathcal{E}_n$ is dense in $L^2(A^n)$. Then I_n extends to a linear continuous functional defined on $L^2(A^n)$, taking values on $L^2(\Omega)$.
Assume that $A = \mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathcal{A}$ is the corresponding Borel set and m the Lebesgue measure. Let $f \in L^2(A^n)$ be a symmetric function. The multiple Itô-Wiener integral $I_n(f)$ coincides in this case with an iterated Itô integral. That is,

$$I_n(f) = n! \int_0^\infty \int_0^{t_n} \cdots \int_0^{t_2} f_n(t_1, \cdots, t_n) dW_{t_1} \cdots dW_{t_n}. \tag{4.28}$$

Indeed, this is clear for elementary functions of the type described above. For general f we use a density argument. Notice that Itô's integral satisfies the same isometry property than the multiple Itô-Wiener integral.

One of the basic results in Itô's paper states that the n-th Wiener chaos $\mathcal{H}_n$ coincides with the image by I_n of $L^2(A^n)$. That means, for any $F \in L^2(\Omega)$, the projection $J_n(F)$ can be written as $I_n(f_n)$, for some $f_n \in L^2(A^n)$. This leads to the following form of the Wiener chaos decomposition:

$$F = E(F) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n(f_n), \tag{4.29}$$

with $f_n \in L^2(A^n)$ symmetric and uniquely determined by F.
Owing to (4.5) and (4.29) we have the following result

Proposition 4.12 *A random vector $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ belongs to the domain of L if and only if*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 n! ||\tilde{f}_n||^2_{L^2(A^m)} < \infty$$

and in this case,

$$LF = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} -nI_n(f_n).$$

The corresponding result for the derivative operator is as follows.

Proposition 4.13 *A random vector $F \in L^2(\Omega)$ belongs to the domain of D if and only if*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nn! ||\tilde{f}_n||^2_{L^2(A^m)} < \infty.$$

In this case we have

$$D_t F = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nI_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot, t)), \tag{4.30}$$

$t \in A$.

Proof: The characterization of the domain follows trivially from Proposition 4.3. Hence only (4.30) must be checked. Clearly it suffices to prove that

$$D_t I_n(f_n) = nI_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot, t)). \tag{4.31}$$

Assume first that f_n is an elementary symmetric function. Then

$$D_t I_n(f_n) = \sum_{l=1}^{n} \sum_{j_1, \cdots, j_n = 1}^{k} a_{j_1, \cdots, j_n} W(A_{j_1}) \cdots \mathbb{1}_{A_{j_l}}(t) \cdots W(A_{j_n}) = nI_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot, t)).$$

For a general $f_n \in L^2(A^n)$, the result follows easily by an obvious approximation argument. $\square$

We recall that for $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ the derivative DF belongs to $L^2(\Omega; H)$. In the setting of this section $L^2(\Omega; H) \simeq L^2(\Omega \times A)$; thus DF is a function of two variables, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in A$. As usually we shall not write the dependence on ω. We note $DF(t) = D_t F$.
Finally we study the divergence operator.

Proposition 4.14 *Let $u \in L^2(\Omega \times A)$ with Wiener chaos decomposition*

$$u(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n(f_n(\cdot, t)).$$

We assume that for each $n \geq 1$, $f_n \in L^2(A^{n+1})$ is a symmetric function in the first n varibles. Then u belongs to $\operatorname{Dom} \delta$ if and only if the series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_{n+1}(f_n) \tag{4.32}$$

converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in this case

$$\delta(u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_{n+1}(f_n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_{n+1}(\tilde{f}_n), \tag{4.33}$$

where $\tilde{f}_n$ denotes the symmetrisation of f_n in its $n+1$ variables.

Proof: It is based on the duality relation between D and δ. Let $F = I_n(f)$, with f symmetric. The orthogonality of the Itô integrals yields

$$\begin{aligned} E(\langle u, DF\rangle_H) &= \int_A E(I_{n-1}(f_{n-1}(\cdot, t)) n I_{n-1}(f(\cdot, t))) m(dt) \\ &= n(n-1)! \int_A \langle f_{n-1}(\cdot, t), f(\cdot, t)\rangle_{L^2(A^{n-1})} m(dt) \\ &= n! \langle f_{n-1}, f\rangle_{L^2(A^n)} = n! \langle \tilde{f}_{n-1}, f\rangle_{L^2(A^n)} \\ &= E\big(I_n(\tilde{f}_{n-1}) I_n(f)\big) = E\big(I_n(\tilde{f}_{n-1}) F\big). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that u belongs to $\operatorname{Dom} \delta$. The preceding equalities show that on the Wiener chaos of order n, $n \geq 1$, $\delta(u) = I_n(\tilde{f}_{n-1})$. Thus the series (4.32) converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ and (4.33) holds true.
Assume now that the series (4.32) converges. Then, by the arguments before we obtain

$$|E(\langle u, DF\rangle_H)| \leq ||F||_2 ||I_n(\tilde{f}_{n-1})||_2 \leq C||F||_2.$$

Hence $u \in \operatorname{Dom} \delta$ and the formula (4.33) holds. □

We mentioned in Remark 4.5 that the formula (4.21) can be extended to random vectors $u \in \mathbb{D}^{2,2}(H)$. We are going to show that in the context of this section (4.21) holds in the less restrictive situation $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$. This is the goal of the next statement.

Proposition 4.15 *Let $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$. Assume that for almost every $t \in A$, the process $(D_t u(s), s \in A)$ belongs to $\operatorname{Dom}\delta$ and there is a version of the process $\big((\delta(D_t u(s)), t \in A\big)$ which is in $L^2(\Omega \times A)$. Then δu belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and we have*

$$D_t(\delta(u)) = u(t) + \delta(D_t u), \tag{4.34}$$

$t \in A$.

Proof: Let $u(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n(f_n(\cdot, t))$. Then, Propositions 4.14 and 4.13 yield

$$\begin{aligned} D_t(\delta(u)) &= D_t\big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_{n+1}(\tilde{f}_n)\big) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+1) I_n(\tilde{f}_n(\cdot, t)) \\ &= u(t) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_n(t_1, \cdots, \hat{t}_i, \cdots, t_n, t, t_i)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$I_n\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_n(t_1, \cdots, \hat{t}_i, \cdots, t_n, t, t_i)\big) = n I_n(\varphi_n(\cdot, t, \cdot)),$$

where $\varphi_n(\cdot, t, \cdot)$ denotes the symmetrization of the function

$$(t_1, \cdots, t_n) \to f_n(t_1, \cdots, t_{n-1}, t, t_n).$$

Let us now compute $\delta(D_t u)$. By virtue of Propostions 4.14 and 4.15 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(D_t u) &= \delta\big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n I_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot, t, s)\big) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n I_n(\varphi_n(\cdot, t, \cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the formula (4.34) is completely proved. □

4.6 Local property of the operators

In this section we come back to the general context described at the begining of the chapter. Let $A \in \mathcal{G}$. An operator $\mathcal{O}$ defined on some space of random variables possess the *local property* if for any random variable F such that $F = 0$, a.s. on A, one has $\mathcal{O}(F) = 0$ a.s. on A.
We shall prove that the derivative operator D owns this property. By duality the property is transferred to the adjoint δ. Finally, Proposition 4.10 yields that L is also a local operator.
The results of this section won't be used in the remaining of the course. However they deserve to be known by the reader. The local property of these operators allow to formulate weak versions of Malliavin criteria for existence and smoothness of density specially suitable for some classes of SPDE's.

Proposition 4.16 *The derivative operator D has the local property on the space $\mathbb{D}^{1,1}$.*

Proof: Let $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,1} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, $A \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $F = 0$, a.s. on A. Consider a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty$, $\varphi \geq 0$, $\varphi(0) = 1$, with support included in $[-1, 1]$. Set $\varphi_\epsilon(x) = \varphi(\frac{x}{\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$. Let

$$\Psi_\epsilon(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \varphi_\epsilon(y) dy.$$

The chain rule yields $\Psi_\epsilon(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,1}$ and $D\Psi_\epsilon(F) = \varphi_\epsilon(F)DF$. Let u be an H-valued random variable of the type

$$u = \sum_{j=1}^{n} F_j h_j,$$

with $F_j \in \mathcal{S}_b$. We notice that the duality relation between D and δ holds for $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,1} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and u of the kind described before. Moreover, u is total in $L^1(\Omega; H)$, that means if $v \in L^1(\Omega; H)$ satisfies $E(\langle v, u\rangle_H) = 0$ for any u in the class, then $v = 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E(\varphi_\epsilon(F)\langle DF, u\rangle_H)| &= |E(\langle(D(\Psi_\epsilon(F)), u\rangle_H)| \\ &= |E(\Psi_\epsilon(F)\delta(u))| \leq \epsilon ||\varphi||_\infty E(|\delta(u)|). \end{aligned}$$

Taking limits as ϵ tends to zero we obtain

$$E\big(\mathbb{1}_{(F=0)}\langle DF, u\rangle_H\big) = 0.$$

Finally we notice that replacing F by $\arctan F$ the restriction $F \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ can be removed.
Actually, instead of the function arctan one could take any bounded function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(0) = 0$.
The proof is complete. $\square$

We now study the corresponding property for the divergence operator.

Proposition 4.17 *The operator δ is local on $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$.*

Proof: Let φ be a function defined as in the previous proposition and F be a smooth functional of the form

$$F = f(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)),$$

with $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then for any $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$, $F\varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2)$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. By duality

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(\delta(u)F\varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2)\big) &= E\big(\langle u, D(F\varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2))\rangle_H\big) \\ &= E\big(\varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2)\langle u, DF\rangle_H\big) + 2E\big(F\varphi_\epsilon^{'}(||u||_H^2)\langle u, Du\rangle_H\big). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the random variable

$$X_\epsilon = \varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2)\langle u, DF\rangle_H + 2F\varphi_\epsilon^{'}(||u||_H^2)\langle u, Du\rangle_H.$$

Assume that $u(\omega) = 0$, P a.s. on A. Then, as $\epsilon \to 0$, $X_\epsilon \to 0$ a.s. on A.
Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\varphi_\epsilon(||u||_H^2)\langle u, DF\rangle_H| \leq ||\varphi||_\infty ||u||_H ||DF||_H \\ &|\varphi_\epsilon^{'}(||u||_H^2)\langle u, Du\rangle_H| \leq \sup_x |x\varphi_\epsilon^{'}(x)| ||Du||_{H\otimes H} \leq ||\varphi^{'}||_\infty ||Du||_{H\otimes H}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by bounded convergence we conclude. □

The local property of the operator D allows to define localized versions of the domains of this operator in $L^p(\Omega)$. Indeed, let V be a Hilbert space; we define $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}_{\rm loc}(V)$ as the set of V-valued random vectors such that there exists an increasing sequence $\Omega_n \subset \Omega$, and a sequence $F_n \in \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(V)$, $n \geq 1$, such that

1. $\Omega_n \uparrow \Omega$, a.s.
2. $F_n = F$ on Ω_n.

For $F \in \mathbb{D}^{k,p}_{\rm loc}(V)$ we define $DF = DF_n$, on Ω_n. The local property of D ensures that this is well defined.
Analogously, if u is an element of $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}_{\rm loc}(H)$, we define $\delta(u) = \delta(u_n)$ on Ω_n. Remember that $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H) \subset \mathrm{Dom}\,\delta$.

Comments

This chapter requires knowledge of Itô's results on multiple stochastic integrals and their rôle in the Wiener chaos decomposition. They are proved in [19].
One could intitle this chapter "Essentials of Malliavin Calculus". Indeed it is a very brief account of a deep and large theory presented in a quite simplified way.
Since the seminal work by Malliavin [32] there have been many contributions to understand and develop his ideas using differents approaches. We would like to mention here some of them in the context of Gaussian spaces and in the form of courses and lecture notes. In chronological order: [61], [65], [10], [8], [46], [18], [41], [62], [33], [42].
In view of the applications to SPDE's with coloured noise we have presented the basic notions of Malliavin Calculus in the general setting of a Gaussian process indexed by a Hilbert-valued parameter. Our main reference is [65] and [42].

Exercises

4.1 Let $g \in L^2([0,T])$ and set $||g|| = ||g||_{L^2([0,T])}$. Consider the random variable

$$X = \exp\Big(\int_0^T g(s)dW(s) - \frac{1}{2}||g||^2\Big),$$

where W is a standard Wiener process.
Show that the projection of X on the n-th Wiener chaos is

$$J_n X = ||g||^n H_n\Big(\frac{\int_0^T g(s)dW_s}{||g||}\Big).$$

4.2 Prove the following identities, where the symbol δ denotes the Skorohod integral.

1. $\int_0^T W(T)\delta W(t) = W^2(T) - T$.
2. $\int_0^T W(t)[W(T) - W(t)]\delta W(t) = \frac{1}{6}(W^3(T) - 3TW(T))$.

Hint: Apply the results of Section 4.5 in the particular case where $A = [0, T]$, $\mathcal{A}$ is the Borel σ-algebra of sets of $[0, T]$ and m is the Lebesgue measure.

4.3 Consider the framework of Section 4.5. Let F be a random variable belonging to the domain of D^n, the n-th iterate of D. Prove Stroock's formula

$$f_n(t_1, \cdots, t_n) = \frac{E(D^n_{t_1,\cdots,t_n} F)}{n!}.$$

Hint: Apply recursively formula (4.30).

4.4 Let $(W_t, t \in [0, T])$ be a standard Wiener process. Find the Malliavin derivative of the following random variables:

1. $F = \exp(W_t)$,
2. $F = \int_0^T \left(\int_0^{t_2} \cos(t_1 + t_2) dW(t_1) \right) dW(t_2)$,
3. $F = 3W_s W_t^2 + \log(1 + W_s^2)$,
4. $F = \int_0^T W_t \delta W_s$,

$s, t \in [0, T]$.

4.5 Let $(W_t, t \in [0, 1])$ be a standard Wiener process. Prove that the random variable $X = \sup_{t\in[0,1]} W_t$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $D_t X = \mathbb{1}_{[0,\tau]}(t)$, where τ is the a.s. unique point where the maximum of W is attained.

Hint: Consider a countable dense subset of $[0, 1]$, $(t_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$. Set $X_n = \max_{0\le i\le n} W_{t_i}$ and $\varphi_n(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \max(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$. Prove that $\varphi_n(X_n) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and apply Proposition 4.5.

4.6 Consider the Gaussian space associated with a standard Wiener process on $[0, 1]$. Let $f(\omega, t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i \mathbb{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{1}_{]t_i,t_{i+1}]}(t)$, $u \in L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{D}^{1,2})$, $M_t = \delta(u\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]})$, $t \in [0, 1]$.

Prove that $fu \in \mathrm{Dom}\delta$ and

$$\delta(fu) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i \mathbb{1}_{A_i} (M_{t_{i+1}} - M_{t_i}).$$

Hint: Use the definition of the adjoint operator δ together with an approximation for $\mathbb{1}_{A_i}$ (see [21]).

5 Representation of Wiener Functionals

This chapter is devoted to an application of the Malliavin calculus to integral representation of square integrable random variables. The start point is the renowned result by Itô we now quote.
Let $W = (W_t, t \in [0,T])$ be a standard one-dimensional Wiener process. Consider a random variable F measurable with respect to the σ-field generated by W. Then there exist a stochastic process Φ, measurable and adapted, satisfying

$$E\big(\int_0^T \Phi^2(t)dt\big) < \infty,$$

such that

$$F = E(F) + \int_0^T \Phi(t)dW_t. \tag{5.1}$$

We shall prove that if F has some regularity in the Malliavin sense, the kernel process Φ admits a description in terms of the Malliavin derivative of F. Then we shall apply this kind of results to the analysis of portfolios in finance.
In the application of this technique we face the following question: Is the Itô integral consistent with the Skorohod one? That means if a process is integrable in the sense of Itô, does it belong to $\operatorname{Dom}\delta$ and do both integrals coincide? The first section of this chapter is devoted to this question.

5.1 The Itô integral and the divergence operator

For any $G \in \mathcal{A}$ we denote by $\mathcal{F}_G$ the σ-field generated by the random variables $W(B)$, $B \in \mathcal{A}$, $B \subset G$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let W be a white noise based on $(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$. Let F be a square integrable random variable with Wiener chaos representation $F = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n(f_n)$. For any $G \in \mathcal{A}$ it holds that*

$$E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n(f_n \mathbb{1}_G^{\otimes n}). \tag{5.2}$$

Proof: It suffices to prove the Lemma for $F = I_n(f_n)$, where $f_n \in L^2(A^n)$ and is symmetric. Moreover, since the set $\mathcal{E}_n$ of elementary functions is dense in $L^2(A^n)$ we may assume that

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}_{B_1 \times \cdots B_n}.$$

where $B_1, \cdots, B_n$ are mutually disjoint sets of $\mathcal{A}$ having finite m measure.
For this kind of F we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) &= E(W(B_1)\cdots W(B_n)/\mathcal{F}_G) \\ &= E\big(\Pi_{i=1}^n (W(B_i \cap G) + W(B_i \cap G^c))/\mathcal{F}_G\big) \\ &= I_n(\mathbb{1}_{(B_1\cap G)\times\cdots\times(B_n\cap G)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because of independence. Therefore the Lemma is proved. $\square$

Lemma 5.2 *Assume that* $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. *Let* $G \in \mathcal{A}$. *Then* $E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ *and*

$$D_t E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) = E(D_t F/\mathcal{F}_G)\mathbb{1}_G(t).$$

Hence, if in addition F *is* $\mathcal{F}_G$*-measurable,* $D_t F$ *vanishes almost everywhere in* $\Omega \times G^c$.

Proof: By virtue of Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 4.13 we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_t E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n I_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot, t)\mathbb{1}_G^{\otimes(n-1)})\mathbb{1}_G(t) \\ &= E(D_t F/\mathcal{F}_G)\mathbb{1}_G(t). \end{aligned}$$

If F is $\mathcal{F}_G$-measurable the preceding equality yields

$$D_t F = D_t F \mathbb{1}_G(t).$$

Hence $(D_t F)(\omega) = 0$ if $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times G^c$. The Lemma is completely proved. $\square$

Lemma 5.3 *Let* $G \in \mathcal{A}$, $m(G) < \infty$. *Let* F *be a random variable in* $L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{F}_{G^c}$*-measurable. Then the process* $F\mathbb{1}_G$ *belongs to* $\operatorname{Dom}\delta$ *and*

$$\delta(F\mathbb{1}_G) = FW(G).$$

Proof: Assume first that $F \in \mathcal{S}$. Then by (4.15) we have

$$\delta(F\mathbb{1}_G) = FW(G) - \int_A D_t F \mathbb{1}_G(t) m(dt).$$

By the preceding Lemma $\int_A D_t F \mathbb{1}_G(t) m(dt) = 0$. Hence the result is true in this particular situation.
Since $\mathcal{S}$ is dense in $L^2(\Omega)$ and δ is closed the result extends to $F \in L^2(\Omega)$. $\square$

Consider the particular case $H = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$ with $A = [0, T] \times \{1, \cdots, d\}$. That means, the noise W is a d-dimensional standard Wiener process. Let L_a^2 be the class of measurable adapted processes belonging to $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. For any $\Phi \in L_a^2$ the *Itô integral* $\int_0^T \Phi(t) dW_t$ is well defined (see for instance [55]). We now prove its relationship with the Skorohod integral.

Proposition 5.1 *We have* $L_a^2 \subset \operatorname{Dom}\delta$ *and on* L_a^2 *the operator* δ *coincides with the Itô integral.*

Proof: For the sake of simplicity we shall assume that W is one-dimensional. Let $u \in L_a^2$ be a simple process like

$$u(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} F_j \mathbb{1}_{(t_j, t_{j+1}]}(t),$$

with F_j square integrable, $\mathcal{F}_{[0,t_j]}$-measurable random variables, $0 \le t_1 < \cdots < t_{m+1} \le T$.
Lemma 5.3 yields $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$ and

$$\delta(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} F_j(W(t_{j+1}) - W(t_j)). \tag{5.3}$$

Therefore for elementary processes the Itô and the Skorohod integrals coincide. The fundamental result in the consstruction of Itô's integrals says that any $u \in L_a^2$ is approximated in the norm of $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T])$ by a sequence u_n of elementary processes for which (5.3) holds and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T u(t)dW_t &= L^2(\Omega) - \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T u_n(t)dW_t \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \delta(u_n). \end{aligned}$$

Since δ is closed we conclude that $u \in \operatorname{Dom}\delta$ and $\delta(u) = \int_0^T u(t)dW_t$. $\square$

5.2 The Clark-Ocone formula

The framework here is that of a white noise on $L^2([0,T], \mathcal{B}([0,T]), \ell)$, where ℓ denotes Lebesgue measure. That means, the Gaussian process is a standard one-dimensional Wiener process W. We denote by $\mathcal{F}_t$ the σ-field $\mathcal{F}_{[0,t]}$, $t \in [0,T]$.

Theorem 5.1 *For any random variable $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ we have*

$$F = E(F) + \int_0^T E(D_tF/\mathcal{F}_t)dW_t. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof : Owing to Proposition 4.13 and Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(D_tF/\mathcal{F}_t) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nE(I_{n-1}(f_n(\cdot,t))/\mathcal{F}_t) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nI_{n-1}\big(f_n(t_1,\cdots,t_{n-1},t)\mathbb{1}_{(t_1\vee\cdots\vee t_{n-1}\le t)}\big). \end{aligned}$$

Let $u_t = E(D_tF/\mathcal{F}_t)$. By Proposition 4.14 the integral $\delta(u)$ is computed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(u) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nI_n\big(f_n(t_1,\cdots,t_{n-1},t)\mathbb{1}_{(t_1\vee\cdots\vee t_{n-1}\le t)}\big)^s \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n(f_n) \\ &= F - E(F), \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript "s" means symmetrization in all the variables and we have used that each f_n is symmetric. Indeed, f_n is symmetric in its n variables and a simple computation shows that $\big(\mathbb{1}_{(t_1\vee\cdots\vee t_{n-1}\le t)}\big)^s = \frac{1}{n}$.
Clearly the process $(u_t = E(D_tF/\mathcal{F}_t), t \in [0,T])$ belongs to L^2_a. Hence the integral $\delta(u)$ is an Itô integral. This proves (5.4). $\square$

5.3 Generalized Clark-Ocone formula

In this section we consider transformations of an m-dimensional Wiener process by means of a drift. More precisely, let $(\theta(t), t \in [0,T])$ be an $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued process, $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted and satisfying *Novikov's condition*

$$E\big(\exp(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \theta^2(s)ds)\big) < \infty. \tag{5.5}$$

Set

$$Z(t) = \exp\big(-\int_0^t \theta(s)dW_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \theta^2(s)ds\big), \tag{5.6}$$

$$\tilde{W}(t) = \int_0^t \theta(s)ds + W(t), \tag{5.7}$$

$$\tag{5.8}$$

$0 \le t \le T$. Define the measure on $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_T$ by

$$dQ = Z(T)dP. \tag{5.9}$$

Girsanov's theorem states that $\tilde{W} = (\tilde{W}(t), t \in [0,T])$ is a Wiener process with respect to the probability Q. In addition $\tilde{W}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale with respect to Q (see for instance [22], [48]).
The purpose is to obtain a representation result in the spirit of the previous Theorem 5.1 but with respect to the new Wiener process $\tilde{W}$. A motivation for this extension is the pricing of options in finances, as we shall see later.
In the sequel we shall write E for the expectation operator with respect to the probability P and E_Q that with respect to Q defined by (5.9).

Remark 5.1 *If F is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable then $D_sF = 0$, except if $s \le t$. This is a trivial consequence of Lemma 5.2.*

Theorem 5.2 *Let $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ be a $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable. Assume that for any $t \in [0,T]$ a.e. the random variable D_tF belongs to $L^1(Q)$, the process θ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}\big(L^2([0,T])\big)$ and $Z(T)F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. Then*

$$F = E_Q(F) + \int_0^T E_Q\big((D_tF - F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s)/\mathcal{F}_t\big)d\tilde{W}_t. \tag{5.10}$$

Notice that Theorem 5.2 is not a trivial rephrasing of Theorem 5.1 because F is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and not necessarily measurable with respect to the σ-field $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_T$ generated by the new Wiener process $\tilde{W}$.
Before giving the proof of Theorem 5.2 we need to establish some auxiliary results, as follows.

Lemma 5.4 *Consider two probabilites μ and ν on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. Assume that $d\nu = f d\mu$, with $f \in L^1(\mu)$. Let X be a random variable defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ belonging to $L^1(\nu)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a σ-algebra. Then*

$$E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) E_\mu(f/\mathcal{F}_0) = E_\mu(fX/\mathcal{F}_0)). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof: Let $B \in \mathcal{F}_0$. By the definition of the conditional expectation we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_B E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) f d\mu &= \int_B E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) d\nu = \int_B X d\nu \\ &= \int_B X f d\mu = \int_B E_\mu(fX/\mathcal{F}_0) d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

Using properties of the conditional expectation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_B E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) f d\mu = E_\mu\big(E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) f \mathbb{1}_B\big) \\ &= E_\mu\big(E_\mu(E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) f \mathbb{1}_B/\mathcal{F}_0)\big) \\ &= E_\mu\big(\mathbb{1}_B E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) E_\mu(f/\mathcal{F}_0)\big) \\ &= \int_B E_\nu(X/\mathcal{F}_0) E_\mu(f/\mathcal{F}_0) d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude comparing the two results obtained in the preceding computations.
□

Applying this Lemma to $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}_t$, $\mu = P$, $\nu = Q$, defined in (5.9), $f = Z(T)$, defined in (5.6) and any $G \in L^1(Q)$, we obtain the fundamental identity

$$E_Q(G/\mathcal{F}_t) Z(t) = E(Z(T) G/\mathcal{F}_t), \tag{5.12}$$

since $Z(t)$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale in the space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$.
Let $u \in L^2_a$. Assume that $u \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(L^2[0,T])$. Then

$$E\big(\int_0^T dt \int_0^T ds |D_t u(s)|^2\big) = E\big(\int_0^T ds \int_{t \le s} dt |D_t u(s)|^2\big) < \infty.$$

In particular for almost every $t \in [0,T]$, the process $(D_t u(s), s \in [0,T])$ belongs to L^2_a and $\int_0^T D_t u(s) dW_s \in L^2(\Omega \times [0,T])$. Hence Proposition 4.15 yields

$$\begin{aligned}D_t\big(\int_0^T u(s) dW_s\big) &= \int_0^T D_t u(s) dW_s + u(t), \\ &= \int_t^T D_t u(s) dW_s + u(t).\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Lemma 5.5 *Let Q be the probability defined in (5.9), Z be the process defined in (5.6). Let $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and θ be a stochastic process satisfying (5.5) and $\theta \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}\big(L^2[0,T]\big)$. Then the following identity holds:*

$$D_t(Z(T)F) = Z(T)\big(D_tF - F(\theta(t) + \int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s)\big) \tag{5.14}$$

Proof: By the chain rule,

$$D_t(Z(T)F) = Z(T)D_tF + FD_t(Z(T)). \tag{5.15}$$

Using again the chain rule, Remark 5.1 and (5.13) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t(Z(T)) &= Z(T)\big(- D_t\big(\int_0^T \theta(s)dW_s\big) - \frac{1}{2}D_t\big(\int_0^T \theta^2(s)ds\big)\big) \\
&= Z(T)\big(- \int_t^T D_t\theta(s)dW_s - \theta(t) - \int_t^T \theta(s)D_t(\theta(s))ds\big) \\
&= Z(T)\big(- \int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s - \theta(t)\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Plugging this identity into (5.15) yields the result. □

We can now proceed to the proof of the generalized Clark-Ocone formula.
Proof of Theorem 5.2: Set $Y(t) = E_Q(F/\mathcal{F}_t)$. Since F is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable, $Y(T) = F$. Let $\Lambda(t) = Z^{-1}(t)$. Notice that

$$\Lambda(t) = \exp\big(\int_0^t \theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \theta^2(s)ds\big).$$

Hence $\Lambda(t)$ satisfies the linear equation

$$d\Lambda(t) = \Lambda(t)\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t \tag{5.17}$$

Applying (5.12) to $G := F$, the usual Clark-Ocone formula given in Theorem 5.1 to $F := E\big(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t\big)$ and Lemma 5.2 to $F := E\big(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t\big)$ and $F_{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{F}_s$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(t) &= \Lambda(t)E\big(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t\big) \\
&= \Lambda(t)\big(E(E(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t)) + \int_0^T E(D_sE(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t)/\mathcal{F}_s)dW_s\big) \\
&= \Lambda(t)\big(E(Z(T)F) + \int_0^t E(D_s(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_s)dW_s\big) \\
&= \Lambda(t)U(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$U(t) = E(Z(T)F) + \int_0^t E(D_s(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_s)dW_s.$$

By the Itô formula

$$\begin{aligned}
dY(t) &= U(t)d\Lambda(t) + \Lambda(t)dU(t) + d\langle U, \Lambda\rangle_t \\
&= Y(t)\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t + \Lambda(t)E\big(D_t(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_t\big)dW_t \\
&\quad + E\big(D_t(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_t\big)\Lambda(t)\theta(t)dt \\
&= Y(t)\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t + \Lambda(t)E\big(D_t(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_t\big)d\tilde{W}_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, by (5.17)

$$U(t)d\Lambda(t) = U(t)\Lambda(t)\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t = Y(t)\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t,$$

and

$$d\langle U, \Lambda\rangle_t = E\big(D_t(Z(T)F)/\mathcal{F}_t\big)\Lambda(t)\theta(t)dt.$$

Owing to (5.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
dY(t) = Y(t)&\theta(t)d\tilde{W}_t \\
&+ \Lambda(t)\big(E(Z(T)D_tF/\mathcal{F}_t) - E(Z(T)F\theta(t)/\mathcal{F}_t) \\
&- E(Z(T)F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s/\mathcal{F}_t))d\tilde{W}_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (5.12) first to $G := D_tF$, then to $G := F\theta(t)$ and $G := F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s$ we obtain

$$dY(t) = E_Q\Big(\big(D_tF - F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}(s)\big)/\mathcal{F}_t\Big)d\tilde{W}_t.$$

Since $Y(0) = E_Q(F/\mathcal{F}_0) = E(F)$, the theorem is formally proved.
The above arguments are correct if the following assumptions are satisfied:

(1) $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $F \in L^1(Q)$ and $D_tF \in L^1(Q)$, t-a.e.

(2) $\theta \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}\big(L^2([0,T])\big)$, $F\theta(t)$ and $F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s$ in $L^1(Q)$, t-a.e.

(3) $E\big(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t\big) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$.

This can be checked from the assumptions of the theorem. Indeed, the hypothesis $Z(T)F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ implies $F \in L^1(Q)$ and also $E\big(Z(T)F/\mathcal{F}_t\big) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, because of Lemma 5.2. Moreover, the same hypothesis, together with $\theta \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}\big(L^2([0,T])\big)$ yield that $F\theta(t)$ and $F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}_s$ belong to $L^1(Q)$, t-a.e.
Hence, the theorem is completely proved. □

5.4 Application to option pricing

Consider two kind of investments, safe and risky. For example, bonds belong to the first type and stock options to the second one. The price dynamics for safe investments is given by

$$dA(t) = \rho(t)A(t)dt,$$

where $\rho(t)$ is the interest rate at time t. We suppose $A(t) \neq 0$, t-a.s. For risky investments a very usual model for its price dynamics is

$$dS(t) = \mu(t)S(t)dt + \sigma(t)S(t)dW(t),$$

where W is a Wiener process and $\sigma(t) \neq 0$, t-a.s.
We assume that the coefficients in the above equations are adapted stochastic processes satisfying the appropriate conditions ensuring existence and uniqueness of solution.
A *portfolio* consists of a random number of assets of each type -safe and risky- this number varies with time. Let us call them $\xi(t)$, $\eta(t)$, respectively. Its value at time t is clearly given by

$$V(t) = \xi(t)A(t) + \eta(t)S(t). \tag{5.18}$$

A portfolio is *self-financing* if

$$dV(t) = \xi(t)dA(t) + \eta(t)dS(t). \tag{5.19}$$

Notice that by applying the Itô formula to (5.18) we shall not obtain (5.19). The condition means that no money is brought in or taken out in the system in the time interval we are considering.
One problem in option pricing consists of determining a portfolio $(\xi(t), \eta(t))$ and an initial value $V(0)$ which at a future time T leads to a given value G, called the *payoff function*. That is

$$V(T) = G, \text{ a.s.} \tag{5.20}$$

The form of G depends on the financial model. Later on we shall give the example of European calls.
From (5.18) we have

$$\xi(t) = \frac{V(t) - \eta(t)S(t)}{A(t)}.$$

Then, using the equation satisfied by $A(t)$ and $S(t)$ we obtain the following stochastic differential equation for the value process V:

$$dV(t) = (\rho(t)V(t) + (\mu(t) - \rho(t))\eta(t)S(t))dt + \sigma(t)\eta(t)S(t)dW(t). \tag{5.21}$$

Notice that the known process is actually $(V(t), \eta(t))$ and must be $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted and satisfy (5.20), (5.21).
This is a problem in *Stochastic Backward Differential Equations* (see for instance [50]). However this theory does not provide explicit solutions. We shall see now how the generalized Clark-Ocone formula does the job.
We shall not be specific in all the necessary assumptions to perform rigourously the next computations.

Define

$$\theta(t) = \frac{\mu(t) - \rho(t)}{\sigma(t)},$$
$$\tilde{W}(t) = \int_0^t \theta(s)ds + W(t).$$

By Girsanov's Theorem, $\tilde{W}$ is a Wiener process with respect to the probability Q given in (5.9). We can write Equation (5.21) in terms of this new Wiener process as follows,

$$dV(t) = \rho(t)V(t)dt + \sigma(t)\eta(t)S(t)d\tilde{W}(t). \tag{5.22}$$

Set

$$U(t) = \exp\big(-\int_0^t \rho(s)ds\big)V(t). \tag{5.23}$$

Owing to (5.22) we obtain

$$dU(t) = \exp\big(-\int_0^t \rho(s)ds\big)\sigma(t)\eta(t)S(t)d\tilde{W}(t),$$

or equivalently

$$\exp\big(-\int_0^T \rho(s)ds\big)V(T) = V(0) + \int_0^T \exp\big(-\int_0^t \rho(s)ds\big)\sigma(t)\eta(t)S(t)d\tilde{W}(t). \tag{5.24}$$

Consider the random variable

$$F = \exp\big(-\int_0^T \rho(s)ds\big)G \tag{5.25}$$

and apply the formula (5.10). We conclude

$$V(0) = E_Q(F), \tag{5.26}$$
$$\exp\big(-\int_0^t \rho(s)ds\big)\sigma(t)\eta(t)S(t) = E_Q\big((D_tF - F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}(s)/\mathcal{F}_t)\big).$$

Hence

$$\eta(t) = \exp\big(\int_0^t \rho(s)ds\big)\sigma^{-1}(t)S^{-1}(t)E_Q\big((D_tF - F\int_t^T D_t\theta(s)d\tilde{W}(s)/\mathcal{F}_t)\big). \tag{5.27}$$

Therefore, the evolution of the number of risky assets can be computed using the generalized Clark-Ocone formula by means of the characteristics of the market.

Example 5.1 *Consider the particular case where the coefficients ρ, μ, σ do not depend on t and in addition $\sigma \neq 0$. Then, since θ is also constant, $D\theta = 0$ and (5.27) becomes*

$$\eta(t) = \exp\big(\rho(t-T)\big)\big)\sigma^{-1}S^{-1}(t)E_Q\big(D_tG/\mathcal{F}_t\big). \tag{5.28}$$

Consider the particular case $G = \exp(\alpha W(T))$, $\alpha \neq 0$. The chain rule of Malliavin calculus yields

$$D_t G = \alpha \exp(\alpha W(T)) \mathbb{1}_{t \leq T} = \alpha \exp(\alpha W(T)).$$

Then (5.28) and (5.12) imply

$$\eta(t) = \alpha \exp\big(\rho(t-T)\big)\sigma^{-1} S^{-1}(t) Z^{-1}(t) E\big(Z(T)\exp(\alpha W(T))/\mathcal{F}_t\big).$$

Consider the martingale $M(t) = \exp\big((\alpha-\theta)W(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha-\theta)^2 t\big)$. Then,

$$Z(T)\exp(\alpha W(T)) = M(T)\exp\big(\frac{T}{2}((\alpha-\theta)^2 - \theta^2)\big),$$

and consequently

$$\eta(t) = \alpha \exp\big(\rho(t-T)\big)\sigma^{-1} S^{-1}(t) Z^{-1}(t) M(t) \exp\big(\frac{T}{2}((\alpha-\theta)^2 - \theta^2)\big). \quad (5.29)$$

The equation satisfied by the process $S(t)$ is linear with constant coefficients; therefore it can be solved explicitely. Indeed we have

$$S(t) = S(0)\exp\big((\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})t + \sigma W(t)\big). \quad (5.30)$$

Substituting this expresion for $S(t)$ in (5.29) we obtain an explicit value for $\eta(t)$ in terms of α, ρ, μ, σ, θ and $W(t)$, as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(t) = \alpha\sigma^{-1} S(0)^{-1} \exp\big(&\rho(t-T) + (\alpha-\sigma)W(t) \\ &+ \frac{T-t}{2}(\alpha-\theta)^2 - \frac{\theta^2 T}{2} + (\frac{\theta^2+\sigma^2}{2} - \mu)t\big).\end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the same situation as in the preceding example for the particular case of stock options called *European call options*. This type of financial product gives the owner the right (but not the obligation) to buy the risky stock with value $S(T)$ at the maturity time T at a fixed price K.

The strategy of the owner is as follows. If $S(T) > K$ the profit is $S(T) - K$ and he will buy the stock. If $S(T) \leq K$ he does not exercise his right and the profit is zero. Hence

$$G = f(S(T)),$$

with

$$f(x) = (x-K)^+.$$

Our goal is to apply formula (5.28) for this particular random variable G. Notice that the function f is Lipschitz. Moreover, from (5.30) it clearly follows that $S(T) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $D_t S(T) = \sigma S(T)$. Thus, $G \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ (see Proposition 4.6). Actually DG can be computed by approximating f throught a sequence of smooth functions (see Proposition 4.5), obtaining

$$D_t G = \mathbb{1}_{[K,\infty)}(S(T))S(T)\sigma. \quad (5.31)$$

An alternative argument to check (5.31) relies on the local property of the operator D. Indeed, on the set $A = \{\omega; S(T)(\omega) < K\}$, $G = 0$ and on A^c, $G = S(T) - K$.
Thus, by (5.28)

$$\eta(t) = \exp(\rho(t-T))S^{-1}(t)E_Q(S(T)\mathbb{1}_{[K,\infty)}(S(T))/\mathcal{F}_t).$$

Computations can be made more explicit. Indeed, the process $S(t)$ satisfies $S(0) = y$ and

$$\begin{aligned} dS(t) &= \mu S(t)dt + \sigma S(t)dW(t) \\ &= \rho S(t)dt + \sigma S(t)d\tilde{W}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $S(t)$ is a diffusion process in the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, Q)$ and hence it possess the Markov property in this space. Moreover,

$$S(t) = S(0)\exp\big((\rho - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})t + \sigma\tilde{W}(t)\big).$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(t) &= \exp(\rho(t-T))S^{-1}(t)E_Q^y\big(S(T-t)\mathbb{1}_{[K,\infty)}(S(T-t))\big)\big|_{y=S(t)} \\ &= \exp(\rho(t-T))S^{-1}(t)E^y\big(Y(T-t)\mathbb{1}_{[K,\infty)}(Y(T-t))\big)\big|_{y=S(t)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

where E_Q^y denotes the conditional expectation E_Q knowing that $S(0) = y$ and

$$Y(t) = S(0)\exp((\rho - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})t + \sigma W(t)).$$

Since the law of $W(t)$ is known, the value $\eta(t)$ can be written explicitely in terms of quantities involving $S(t)$ and the normal distribution.
Remember that $\eta(t)$ is the number of units of the risky asset we must have in the portfolio at any time $t \le T$ in order to get the payoff $G = (S(T) - K)^+$, a.s. at time T and $V(0)$ is the initial capital needed to achieve this goal. Owing to (5.26), (5.25) and the previous computations,

$$\begin{aligned} V(0) &= E_Q(e^{-\rho T}G) = e^{-\rho T}E_Q((S(T) - K)^+) \\ &= e^{-\rho T}E((Y(T) - K)^+), \end{aligned}$$

which, by the same arguments as before, can be computed explicitely . The expresion of $\eta(t)S(t)$ given in the formula (5.32) is known as the Black-Sholes pricing formula for European call options.

Comments

Malliavin Calculus is currently having applications in a field of quite recent development: stochastic financial mathematics. We have chosen here one of these applications -the most known- to a problem in option pricing. The choice was made of the basis of its theoretical interest.

In fact it gives further insight to Itô's result on representation of square integrable random variables. We have followed the lecture notes [49]. The results of Section 5.1 are from Nualart and Zakai (see [45]).
Theorem 5.1 has been proved in [47] (see also [11]); Theorem 5.2 appears in [23].

Exercises

5.1 Let W be a white noise based on $(A, \mathcal{A}, m)$. Consider a random variable $F \in \mathrm{Dom} D^k$ and $G \in \mathcal{A}$. Prove that

$$D^k_{\underline{t}} E(F/\mathcal{F}_G) = E(D^k_{\underline{t}} F/\mathcal{F}_G) \mathbb{1}_{G^k}(\underline{t}).$$

Hint: This is a generalization of Lemma 5.2. Give an expression of the iterated derivative in terms of the Wiener chaos decomposition which generalizes Proposition 4.13.

5.2 Using the Clark-Ocone formula (5.4) find the integral representation of the following random variables (you can check the result using Itô's formula):

1. $F = W^2(T)$,
2. $F = W^3(T)$,
3. $F = (W(T) + T) \exp(-W(T) - \frac{1}{2}T)$.

5.3 In the framework of the generalized Clark-Ocone formula (5.10), find the integral representation with respect to the integrator $\tilde{W}$ for the following random variables:

1. $F = W^2(T)$, θ deterministic,
2. $F = \exp(\int_0^T \lambda(s) dW(s))$, λ, θ deterministic,
3. $F = \exp(\int_0^T \lambda(s) dW(s))$, λ deterministic and $\theta(s) = W(s)$.

6 Criteria for absolute continuity and smoothness of probability laws

In Chapter 1 we have given general results ensuring existence and smoothness of density of probability laws. The assumptions were formulated in terms of validity of integration by parts formulae or related properties. The purpose now is to analyze under which conditions on the random vectors these assumptions are fullfiled.
The underlying probability space is the one associated with a generic Gaussian process $(W(h), h \in H)$, as has been described at the begining of Chapter 4.

6.1 Existence of density

Let us start with a very simple result whose proof owns to the arguments of Section 2.3.

Proposition 6.1 *Let F be a random variable belonging to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. Assume that the random variable $\frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}$ belongs to the domain of δ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Then the law of F is absolutely continuous. Moreover, the density is given by*

$$p(x) = E\Big(\mathbb{1}_{(F \ge x)} \delta\big(\frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\big)\Big) \tag{6.1}$$

and therefore it is continuous and bounded.

Proof: We are going to check that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,

$$E(\varphi'(F)) = E\Big(\varphi(F)\delta\big(\frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\big)\Big). \tag{6.2}$$

Thus (2.1) holds for $G = 1$ with $H_1(F, 1) = \delta\big(\frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\big)$. Then the results follow from part 1 of Proposition 2.1.
The chain rule of Malliavin calculus yields $D(\varphi(F)) = \varphi'(F)DF$. Thus,

$$\varphi'(F) = \langle D(\varphi(F)), \frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\rangle_H.$$

Then, the integration by parts formula implies

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(\varphi'(F)\big) &= E\big(\langle D(\varphi(F)), \frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\rangle_H\big) \\ &= E\Big(\varphi(F)\delta\big(\frac{DF}{\|DF\|_H^2}\big)\Big), \end{aligned}$$

proving (6.2). □

Remark 6.1 *Notice the analogy between (6.2) and the finite dimensional formula (3.16).*

If $n > 1$ the analysis is more involved. We illustrate this fact in the next statement. First we introduce a notion that plays a crucial rôle.

Definition 6.1 *Let $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector with components $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. The Malliavin matrix of F is the $n \times n$ matrix, denoted by γ, whose entries are the random variables $\gamma_{i,j} = \langle DF^i, DF^j \rangle_H$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$.*

Proposition 6.2 *Let $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector with components $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Assume that*

(1) the Malliavin matrix γ is inversible, a.s.

(2) For every $i, j = 1, \cdots, n$, the random variables $(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j} DF^j$ belong to $\operatorname{Dom} \delta$,

Then for any function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty$,

$$E(\partial_i \varphi(F)) = E(\varphi(F) H_i(F, 1)), \tag{6.3}$$

with

$$H_i(F, 1) = \sum_{l=1}^n \delta((\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} DF^l). \tag{6.4}$$

Consequently the law of F is absolutely continuous.

Proof: Fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty$. By virtue of the chain rule we have $\varphi(F) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D(\varphi(F)), DF^l \rangle_H &= \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k \varphi(F) \langle DF^k, DF^l \rangle_H \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k \varphi(F) \gamma_{k,l},\end{aligned}$$

$l = 1, \cdots, n$. Since γ is inversible a.s., this system of equations can be solved. That is,

$$\partial_i \varphi(F) = \sum_{l=1}^n \langle D(\varphi(F)), (\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} DF^l \rangle_H, \tag{6.5}$$

$i = 1, \cdots, n$, a.s. The assumption (2) and the duality formula yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{l=1}^n E\big(\varphi(F) \delta\big((\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} DF^l\big)\big) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^n E\big(\langle D(\varphi(F)), (\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} DF^l \rangle_H\big) \\ &= E\big(\partial_i \varphi(F)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Hence (6.3), (6.4) is proved. Notice that by assumption $H_i(F, 1) \in L^2(\Omega)$. Thus Proposition 2.2 part 1) yields the existence of density. $\square$

Using Propositions 4.9 and 4.10 one can give sufficient conditions ensuring the validity of the above assumption 2 and an alternative form of the random variables $H_i(F,1)$, as follows.

Corollary 6.1 *Assume that the Malliavin matrix γ is inversible a.s. and for any $i,j = 1,\cdots,n$, $F^j \in \operatorname{Dom} L$, $(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j} \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, $(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j}DF^j \in L^2(\Omega, H)$, $(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j}\delta(DF^j) \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\langle D(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j}, DF^j\rangle_H \in L^2(\Omega)$. Then the conclusion of Proposition 6.2 holds true and moreover*

$$H_i(F,1) = -\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(\langle DF^j, D(\gamma^{-1})_{i,j}\rangle\rangle_H + (\gamma^{-1})_{i,j}LF^j\big).$$

The assumption of part 2 of Proposition 6.2 as well as the sufficient conditions given in the preceding Corollary are not easy to verify. In the next Proposition we give a much more suitable statement for applications.

Theorem 6.1 *Let $F : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^{2,4}$, for any $j = 1,\cdots,n$,

(b) the Malliavin matrix is inversible, a.s.

Then the law of F has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof: As in the proof of Proposition 6.2 we obtain the system of equations (6.5) for any function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty$. That is,

$$\partial_i\varphi(F) = \sum_{l=1}^{n}\langle D(\varphi(F)), (\gamma^{-1})_{i,l}DF^l\rangle_H,$$

$i = 1,\cdots,n$, a.s. We would like to take moments in both sides of this expresion. However assumption (a) does not ensure the integrability of γ^{-1}. We overcome this problem by localising (6.5), as follows. For any natural number $N \geq 1$ we define the set

$$C_N = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^n) : ||\sigma|| \leq N, |\det\sigma| \geq \frac{1}{N}\}.$$

Then we consider a nonnegative function $\psi_N \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty/\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}^n))$ satisfying

(i) $\psi_N(\sigma) = 1$, if $\sigma \in C_N$,

(ii) $\psi_N(\sigma) = 0$, if $\sigma \notin C_{N+1}$.

From (6.5) it follows that

$$E\big(\psi_N(\gamma)\partial_i\varphi(F)\big) = \sum_{l=1}^{n}E\big(\langle D(\varphi(F)), \psi_N(\gamma)DF^l(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l}\rangle_H\big) \qquad (6.6)$$

The random variable $\psi_N(\gamma)DF^l(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l}$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}(H)$, by assumption (a). Consequenly $\psi_N(\gamma)DF^l(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} \in \mathrm{Dom}\delta$ (see Proposition 4.8). Hence, by the duality identity

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|E\big(\psi_N(\gamma)\partial_i\varphi(F)\big)\big| &= \big|\sum_{l=1}^n E\big(\langle D(\varphi(F)), \psi_N(\gamma)DF^l(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l}\rangle_H\big)\big| \\
&\le E\Big(\Big|\sum_{l=1}^n \delta\big(\psi_N(\gamma)DF^l(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l}\big)\Big|\Big)||\varphi||_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.2 part 1 (see Remark 2.3) yields the existence of density for the probability law $P_N \circ F^{-1}$, where P_N denotes the finite measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{G})$ absolutely continuous with respect to P with density given by $\psi_N(\gamma)$. Therefore, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with Lebesgue measure equal to zero, we have

$$\int_{F^{-1}(B)} \psi_N(\gamma)dP = 0$$

Let $N \to \infty$. Assumption (b) implies $\lim_{N\to\infty} \psi_N(\gamma) = 1$. Hence, by bounded convergence we obtain $P(F^{-1}(B)) = 0$. This finishes the proof of the Proposition. □

Remark 6.2 *The assumptions of the above Theorem 6.1 are not optimal. Indeed, Bouleau and Hirsch proved a better result using other techniques in the more general setting of Dirichlet forms. For the sake of completeness we give one of their statements, the more similar to Theorem 6.1, and refer the reader to [7] for the complete information.*

Proposition 6.3 *Let $F : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, for any $j = 1, \cdots, n$,

(b) the Malliavin matrix is inversible, a.s.

Then the law of F has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

6.2 Smoothness of the density

This section is devoted to the proof of the following result:

Theorem 6.2 *Let $F : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector satisfying the assumptions*

(a) $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$, for any $j = 1, \cdots, n$,

(b) the Malliavin matrix γ is inversible, a.s. and

$$\det \gamma^{-1} \in \cap_{p\in[1,\infty)} L^p(\Omega).$$

Then the law of F has an infinitely differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

So far we have been dealing with applications of part 1 of Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. That is, we have only considered first order derivatives and the corresponding integration by parts formula (2.1) with $G = 1$. Studying the question of smoothness of density needs iterations of this first-order formula and then we really need to consider (2.1) for $G \neq 1$.
Theorem 6.2 is a consequence of the next proposition and Proposition 2.1 part 2.

Proposition 6.4 *Let $F : \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random vector such that $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ for any $j = 1, \cdots, n$. Assume that*

$$\det \gamma^{-1} \in \cap_{p\in[1,\infty)} L^p(\Omega). \tag{6.7}$$

Then,

(1) $\det \gamma^{-1} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ *and* $\gamma^{-1} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m)$.

(2) Let $G \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$. For any multiindex $\alpha \in \{1, \cdots, n\}^r$, $r \geq 1$, there exists a random variable $H_\alpha(F, G) \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ such that for any function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$E\big((\delta_\alpha \varphi)(F)G\big) = E\big(\varphi(F)H_\alpha(F, G)\big). \tag{6.8}$$

The random variables $H_\alpha(F, G)$ are defined recursively as follows:
If $|\alpha| = 1$, $\alpha = i$, then

$$H_i(F, G) = \sum_{l=1}^{n} \delta(G(\gamma^{-1})_{i,l} DF^l), \tag{6.9}$$

and in general, for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{r-1}, \alpha_r)$,

$$H_\alpha(F, G) = H_{\alpha_r}(F, H_{(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{r-1})}(F, G)). \tag{6.10}$$

Proof: Consider the sequence of random variables $\big(Y_N = (\det \gamma + \frac{1}{N})^{-1}, N \geq 1\big)$. The assumption (6.7) clearly yields

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} Y_N = \det \gamma^{-1},$$

in $L^p(\Omega)$.
We next prove the following facts:

(a) $Y_N \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$, for any $N \geq 1$,

(b) $(D^k Y_N, n \geq 1)$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(\Omega; H^{\otimes k})$, for any natural number k.

Then, since the operator D^k is closed, the claim (1) follows.
Consider the function $\varphi_N(x) = (x + \frac{1}{N})^{-1}$ $x > 0$. Notice that $\varphi_N \in \mathcal{C}_p^\infty$. Then Remark 4.4 yields recursively (a). Indeed, $\det \gamma \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$.
Let us now prove (b). The sequence of derivatives $\big(\varphi_N^{(n)}(\det \gamma), N \geq 1\big)$, is Cauchy in $L^p(\Omega)$, for any $p \in [1, \infty)$. This can be proved using (6.7) and bounded convergence. Then the result follows by expressing the difference $D^k Y_N - D^k Y_M$, $N, M \geq 1$, by means of Leibniz's rule (see (4.20))and using that $\det \gamma \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$.
Once we have proved that $\det \gamma^{-1} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ we trivially obtain $\gamma^{-1} \in \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m)$, by a direct computation of the inverse of a matrix and using that $F^j \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$. The proof of (2) is done by induction on the order r of the multiindex α. Let $r = 1$. Consider the identity (6.5), multiply both sides by G and take expectations. We obtain (6.8) and (6.9).
Assume that (6.8) holds for multiindices of order $k - 1$. Fix $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_k)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} E\big((\partial_\alpha \varphi)(F) G\big) &= E\big(\partial_{(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1})}((\partial_{\alpha_k} \varphi)(F)) G\big) \\ &= E\big((\partial_{\alpha_k} \varphi)(F) H_{(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1})}(F, G)\big) \\ &= E\big(\varphi(F) H_{\alpha_k}(F, H_{(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{k-1})}(F, G)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Comments
The results of this chapter are either rephrasings or quotations of statements from [7] [18], [41], [46], [61], [65], just to mention a few of them. The common source is [32].

7 Stochastic partial differential equations driven by a Gaussian spatially homogeneous correlated noise

The purpose of the rest of this course is to apply the criteria established in Chapter 5 to random vectors which are solutions of SPDEs at fixed points.
As preliminaries, we give in this chapter a result on existence and uniqueness of solution for a general type of equations that cover all the cases we shall encounter. We start by introducing the stochastic integral to be used in the rigourous formulation of the SPDEs and in the application of the Malliavin differential calculus. This is an extension of the integral studied in [14] developed in [52]

7.1 Stochastic integration with respect to coloured noise

Along this section we will use the notations and notions concerning distributions given in [59].
Let $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be the space of Schwartz test functions and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be the set of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with rapid decrease. We recall that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Generic elements of this space shall be denoted by $\varphi(s,x)$.
For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we define the Fourier transform as

$$\mathcal{F}\varphi(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i \langle x,\xi\rangle} \varphi(x)dx,\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\langle \cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the Euclidean scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$.
Let Γ be a non-negative, non-negative definite tempered measure. Define

$$J(\varphi,\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(\varphi(s) * \tilde{\psi}(s))(x), \tag{7.1}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(s,x) = \psi(s,-x)$ and the symbol "*" means the convolution operation. According to [59], Chap. VII, Théorème XVII, the measure Γ is symmetric. Hence the functional J defines an inner product on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \times \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Moreover, there exists a non-negative tempered measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose Fourier transform is Γ (see [59], Chap. VII, Théorème XVIII). Therefore,

$$J(\varphi,\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\mathcal{F}\varphi(s)(\xi)\overline{\mathcal{F}\psi(s)(\xi)}. \tag{7.2}$$

There is a natural Hilbert space associated with the covariance functional J. Indeed, let $\mathcal{E}$ be the inner-product space consisting of functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, endowed with the inner-product $\langle \varphi,\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{E}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(\varphi * \tilde{\psi})(x)$, where $\tilde{\psi}(x) = \psi(-x)$. Notice that

$$\langle \varphi,\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{E}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\mathcal{F}\varphi(\xi)\overline{\mathcal{F}\psi(\xi)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the completion of $(\mathcal{E}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{E}})$. Set $\mathcal{H}_T = L^2([0,T];\mathcal{H})$. The scalar product in $\mathcal{H}_T$ extends that defined in (7.1).
On a fixed probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, P)$ we consider a Gaussian stochastic process $F = \big(F(\varphi), \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})\big)$, zero mean and with covariance functional given by (7.1). We shall derive from F a stochastic process

$$M = \big(M_t(A), t \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)\big)$$

which shall act as integrator. Fix a rectangle R in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Let $(\varphi_n, n \geq 0) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ be such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_n = 1\!\!1_R$ pointwise. Then, by bounded convergence it follows that

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} E\big(F(\varphi_n) - F(\varphi_m)\big)^2 = E\big(F(\varphi_n - \varphi_m)^2\big) = 0.$$

Set $F(R) = \lim_{n\to\infty} F(\varphi_n)$, in $L^2(\Omega)$. It is easy to check that the limit does not depend on the particular approximating sequence. This extension of F trivially holds for finite unions of rectangles. If R^1, R^2 are two such elements one proves, using again bounded convergence, that

$$E\big(F(R^1)F(R^2)\big) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(1\!\!1_{R^1}(s) * \tilde{1\!\!1}_{R^2}(s))(x).$$

In addition, if $R_n, n \geq 0$, is a sequence of finite unions of rectangles decreasing to $\emptyset$, then by the same kind of arguments yield $\lim_{n\to\infty} E\big(F(R_n)^2\big) = 0$. Hence the mapping $R \to F(R)$ can be extended to an $L^2(P)$-valued measure defined on $\mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$.
For any $t \geq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, set $M_t(A) = F([0,t] \times A)$. Let $\mathcal{G}_t$ be the completion of the σ-field generated by the random variables $M_s(A)$, $0 \leq s \leq t$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The properties of F ensure that the process

$$M = \big(M_t(A), t \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)\big),$$

is a martingale with respect to the filtration $\big(\mathcal{G}_t, t \geq 0\big)$. Thus the process M is a *martingale measure* (see [64], p. 287). The covariance functional coincides with the mutual variation; it is given by

$$\langle M(A), M(B)\rangle_t = t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(1\!\!1_A * \tilde{1\!\!1}_B)(x).$$

The dominating measure (see [64], p. 291) coincides with the covariance functional.
The theory of stochastic integration with respect to martingale measures developed by Walsh allows to integrate predictable stochastic process $(X(t,x)$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying the integrability condition

$$E\big(\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(|X|(s) * |\tilde{X}|(s))(x)\big) < \infty.$$

In the context of SPDEs this integral is not always appropriate. Consider for instance the stochastic wave equation in dimension $d \geq 3$. The fundamental solution is a distribution. Therefore in evolution formulations of the equation we shall meet integrands which include a deterministic distribution-valued function. With this problem as motivation, Dalang has extended in [14] Walsh's stochastic integral. In the remainig of this section we shall review his ideas in the more general context of Hilbert-valued integrands. This extension is needed when dealing with the Malliavin derivatives of the solutions of SPDEs.
Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a separable real Hilbert space with inner-product and norm denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{K}}$, respectively. Let $K = \{K(s,z), (s,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$ be a $\mathcal{K}$-valued predictable process; we assume the following condition:

Hypothesis B *The process K satisfies* $\sup_{(s,z)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||K(s,z)||^2_{\mathcal{K}}\right) < \infty$.

Our first purpose is to define a martingale measure with values in $\mathcal{K}$ obtained by integration of K.
Let $\{e_j, j \geq 0\}$ be a complete orthonormal system of $\mathcal{K}$. Set $K^j(s,z) = \langle K(s,z), e_j \rangle_{\mathcal{K}}$, $(s,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. According to [64], for any $j \geq 0$ the process

$$M_t^{K^j}(A) = \int_0^t \int_A K^j(s,z) M(ds,dz),\ t \in [0,T], A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

defines a martingale measure. Indeed, the process K^j is predictable and

$$\sup_{(s,z)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(|K^j(s,z)|^2\right) \leq \sup_{(s,z)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||K(s,z)||^2_{\mathcal{K}}\right) < \infty,$$

which yields

$$E\Big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(1\!\!1_A K^j(s) * \tilde{1\!\!1_A} \tilde{K^j}(s))(x)\Big) < \infty.$$

Set, for any $t \in [0,T], A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$M_t^K(A) = \sum_{j\geq 0} M_t^{K^j}(A) e_j. \tag{7.4}$$

The right hand-side of (7.4) defines an element of $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{K})$. Indeed, using the isometry property of the stochastic integral, Parseval's identity and Cauchy-

Schwarz inequality we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(|M_t^{K^j}(A)|^2\right) = \sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(\left|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A(z) K^j(s,z) M(ds,dz)\right|^2\right)\\
&= \sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \mathbb{1}_A(y) K^j(s,y) \mathbb{1}_A(y-x) K^j(s,y-x)\right)\\
&= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \mathbb{1}_A(y)\ 1_A(y-x) E\left(\langle K(s,y), K(s,y-x)\rangle_{\mathcal{K}}\right)\\
&\leq \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||K(t,x)||_{\mathcal{K}}^2\right) \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \mathbb{1}_A(y) \mathbb{1}_A(y-x)\\
&\leq C \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||K(t,x)||_{\mathcal{K}}^2\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that $E\big(\big\|M_t^K(A)\big\|_{\mathcal{K}}^2\big) = \sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(|M_t^{K^j}(A)|^2\right) < \infty$, due to Hypothesis B.

Clearly, the process $\{M_t^K(A), t \in [0,T], A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$ defines a worthy $\mathcal{K}$-valued martingale measure and by construction we have that $\langle M_t^K(A), e_j\rangle_{\mathcal{K}} = M_t^{K^j}(A)$. By the previous computations

$$
E\big(\big\|M_t^K(A)\big\|_{\mathcal{K}}^2\big) = \sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(\int_0^t ds ||\mathbb{1}_A(\cdot) K^j(s,\cdot)||_{\mathcal{H}}^2\right),
$$

where we have denoted by "$\cdot$" the $\mathcal{H}-$variable.

Our next goal is to introduce stochastic integration with respect to M^K, allowing the integrands to take values on some subset of the space of Schwartz distributions. First we briefly recall Walsh's construction in a Hilbert-valued context.

A stochastic process $\{g(s,z;\omega), (s,z) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\}$ is called *elementary* if

$$
g(s,z;\omega) = \mathbb{1}_{(a,b]}(s) \mathbb{1}_A(z) X(\omega),
$$

for some $0 \leq a < b \leq T$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and X a bounded $\mathcal{F}_a-$measurable random variable. For such g the stochastic integral $g \cdot M^K$ is the $\mathcal{K}$-valued martingale measure defined by

$$
(g\cdot M^K)_t(B)(\omega) = \left(M_{t\wedge b}^K(A\cap B) - M_{t\wedge a}^K(A\cap B)\right) X(\omega),
$$

$t \in [0,T]$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This definition is extended by linearity to the set $\mathcal{E}_s$ of all linear combinations of elementary processes. For $g \in \mathcal{E}_s$ and $t \geq 0$ one easily checks that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left(||(g\cdot M^K)_t(B)||^2_{\mathcal{K}}\right)\\
&=\sum_{j\geq 0} E\Big(\int_0^t ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(dx)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy 1_B(y) g(s,y)K^j(s,y)1_B(y-x)\\
&\quad g(s,y-x)K^j(s,y-x)\Big)\\
&\leq ||g||^2_{+,K},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

where

$$||g||^2_{+,K}:=\sum_{j\geq 0} E\left(\int_0^T ds\big|\big|g(s,\cdot)K^j(s,\cdot)\big|\big|^2_{\mathcal{H}}\right).$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_{+,K}$ be the set of all predictable processes g such that $||g||_{+,K}<\infty$. Then, owing to [64, Exercise 2.5, Proposition 2.3], $\mathcal{P}_{+,K}$ is complete and $\mathcal{E}_s$ is dense in this Banach space. Thus, we use the bound (7.5) to define the stochastic integral $g\cdot M^K$ for $g\in\mathcal{P}_{+,K}$.
Next, following [14] we aim to extend the above stochastic integral to include a larger class of integrands. Consider the inner product defined on $\mathcal{E}_s$ by the formula

$$\langle g_1,g_2\rangle_{0,K}=\sum_{j\geq 0} E\Big(\int_0^T ds\langle g_1(s,\cdot)K^j(s,\cdot), g_2(s,\cdot)K^j(s,\cdot)\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\Big)$$

and the norm $||\cdot||_{0,K}$ derived from it.
By the first equality in (7.5) we have that

$$E\left(||(g\cdot M^K)_T(\mathbb{R}^d)||^2_{\mathcal{A}}\right)=||g||^2_{0,K}$$

for any $g\in\mathcal{E}_s$.
Let $\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$ be the completion of the inner-product space $(\mathcal{E}_s,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{0,K})$. Since $||\cdot||_{0,K}\leq||\cdot||_{+,K}$, the space $\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$ will be in general larger than $\mathcal{P}_{+,K}$. So, we can extend the stochastic integral with respect to M^K to elements of $\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$. Let $(\mathcal{M},||\cdot||_{\mathcal{M}})$ be the space of $\mathcal{K}-$valued continuous square integrable martingales endowed with the norm $||X||^2_{\mathcal{M}}=E(||X_T||^2_{\mathcal{K}})$. Then the map $g\mapsto g\cdot M^K$, where $g\cdot M^K$ denotes the martingale $t\mapsto(g\cdot M^K)_t(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is an isometry between the spaces $(\mathcal{P}_{0,K},||\cdot||_{0,K})$ and $(\mathcal{M},||\cdot||_{\mathcal{M}})$. Here we still have denoted by $||\cdot||_{0,K}$ the norm derived from the inner product of the completion of $(\mathcal{E}_s,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{0,K})$. Classical results on Hilbert spaces tell us precisely how this norm is constructed (see for instance [6, Chapter V, §2]).
In the sequel we denote either by $(g\cdot M^K)_t$ or by $\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(s,z)K(s,z)M(ds,dz)$ the martingale obtained by stochastic integration of $g\in\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$ with respect to M^K.
Let us consider the particular case where the following stationary assumption is fulfilled.

Hypothesis C *For all* $j \geq 0,\ s \in [0,T],\ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$E(K^j(s,x)K^j(s,y)) = E(K^j(s,0)K^j(s,y-x)).$$

Consider the non-negative definite function $G_j^K(s,z) := E\left(K^j(s,0)K^j(s,z)\right)$. Owing to [59, Theorem XIX, Chapter VII], the measure $\Gamma_{j,s}^K(dz) = G_j^K(s,z) \times\Gamma(dz)$, is a non-negative definite distribution. Thus, by Bochner's theorem (see for instance [59, Theorem XVIII, Chapter VII]) there exists a non-negative tempered measure $\mu_{j,s}^K$ such that $\Gamma_{j,s}^K(dz) = \mathcal{F}\mu_{j,s}^K$.
Clearly, the measure $\Gamma_s^K(dz) := \sum_{j\geq 0} \Gamma_{j,s}^K(dz)$ is a well defined non-negative definite measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, because

$$\sum_{j\geq 0} G_j^K(s,z) \leq \sup_{(s,z)\in[0,T]\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||K(s,z)||_{\mathcal{K}}^2\right) < \infty.$$

Consequently, there exists a non-negative tempered measure μ_s^K such that $\mathcal{F}\mu_s^K = \Gamma_s^K$. Furthermore, by the uniqueness and linearity of the Fourier transform, $\mu_s^K = \sum_{j\geq 0} \mu_{j,s}^K$.
Thus, if Hypotheses B and C are satisfied then for any *deterministic* function $g(s,z)$ such that $||g||_{0,K}^2 < \infty$ and $g(s) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
||g||_{0,K}^2 &= \sum_{j\geq 0} \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy\, g(s,y)g(s,y-x)G_j^K(s,x) \\
&= \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_s^K(dx)(g(s,\cdot) * \tilde{g}(s,\cdot))(x) \\
&= \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}g(s)(\xi)|^2. \qquad (7.6)
\end{aligned}$$

We want now to give examples of deterministic distribution-valued functions $t \to S(t)$ belonging to $\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$. A result in this direction is given in the next theorem, which is the Hilbert-valued counterpart of [14, Theorems 2, 5].

Theorem 7.1 *Let* $\{K(s,z), (s,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$ *be a* $\mathcal{K}-$*valued process satisfying Hypothesis B and C. Let* $t \mapsto S(t)$ *be a deterministic function with values in the space of non-negative distributions with rapid decrease, such that*

$$\int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(t)(\xi)|^2 < \infty.$$

Then S *belongs to* $\mathcal{P}_{0,K}$ *and*

$$E\big(||(S\cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^2\big) = \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2. \qquad (7.7)$$

Moreover, for any $p \in [2, \infty)$,

$$E\big(||(S \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^p\big) \le C_t \int_0^t ds \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} E(||K(s,x)||_{\mathcal{K}}^p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2, \quad (7.8)$$

with $C_t = (\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}$, $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof: Let ψ be a non-negative function in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support contained in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x)dx = 1$. Set $\psi_n(x) = n^d \psi(nx)$, $n \ge 1$. Define $S_n(t) = \psi_n * S(t)$. Clearly, $S_n(t) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any $n \ge 1$, $t \in [0,T]$ and $S_n(t) \ge 0$.

We first prove that $S_n \in \mathcal{P}_{+,K} \subset \mathcal{P}_{0,K}$. The definition of the norm $|| \cdot ||_{+,K}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} ||S_n||_{+,K}^2 &= \sum_{j \ge 0} E\Big(\int_0^T ds |||S_n(s,\cdot)K^j(s,\cdot)|||_{\mathcal{H}}^2\Big) \\ &\le \int_0^T ds \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} E(||K(s,z)||_{\mathcal{K}}^2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S_n(t)(\xi)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sup_n |\mathcal{F}S_n(t)(\xi)| \le |\mathcal{F}S(t)(\xi)|$, this implies

$$\sup_n ||S_n||_{+,K} < \infty. \quad (7.9)$$

Let us now show that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} ||S_n - S||_{0,K} = 0. \quad (7.10)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} ||S_n - S||_{0,K}^2 &= \int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_t^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(S_n(t) - S(t))|^2 \\ &= \int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_t^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\psi_n(\xi) - 1|^2 |\mathcal{F}S(t)(\xi)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the integrand in the last expresion converges pointwise to 0 as n tends to infinity. Then, since $|\mathcal{F}\psi_n(\xi) - 1| \le 2$, it suffices to check that

$$||S||_{0,K}^2 = \int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_t^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(t)(\xi)|^2 < \infty.$$

We know that $|\mathcal{F}S_n(t)(\xi)|$ converges pointwise to $|\mathcal{F}S(t)(\xi)|$ and

$$||S_n||_{0,K}^2 = \int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_t^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S_n(t)|^2.$$

Then, Fatou's lemma implies

$$||S||_{0,K}^2 \le \liminf_{n \to \infty} ||S_n||_{0,K}^2 \le \liminf_{n \to \infty} ||S_n||_{+,K}^2 < \infty,$$

by (7.9). This finish the proof of (7.10) and therefore $S \in \mathcal{P}_{0,K}$.
By the isometry property of the stochastic integral and (7.6) we see that the equality (7.7) holds for any S_n; then the construction of the stochastic integral yields

$$\begin{aligned}
E(||(S \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^2) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E(||(S_n \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^2) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(S_n(s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(S(s)(\xi)|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from bounded convergence. This proves (7.7).
We now prove (7.8). The previous computations yield

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} ||(S_{n_k} \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}) = ||(S \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}, \tag{7.11}$$

a.s. for some subsequence n_k, $k \geq 1$. By Fatou's Lemma,

$$E(||(S \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^p) \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} E(||(S_{n_k} \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^p).$$

In the sequel se shall write S_n instead of S_{n_k}, for the sake of simplicity. Since each S_n is a smooth, the stochastic integral $S_n \cdot M^K$ is a classical one (in Walsh's sense). The stochastic process $\big((S_{n_k} \cdot M^K)_t, t \geq 0\big)$ is a $\mathcal{K}$-valued martingale. Then, Burkholder's inequality for Hilbert-valued martingales (see [35]) and Schwarz inequality ensure

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\big(||(S_n \cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^p\big) \\
&\leq CE\Big(\sum_{j\geq 0} \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy S_n(s,y) S_n(s,x-y) K^j(s,y) K^j(s,x-y)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
&\leq CE\Big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy S_n(s,y) S_n(s,x-y) ||K(s,y)||_{\mathcal{K}} ||K(s,x-y)||_{\mathcal{K}}\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

For each $n \geq 1$, $t \in [0,T]$, the measure on $[0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ given by $S_n(s,y) \cdot S_n(s,x-y) ds\Gamma(dx)dy$ is finite. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{n,t} \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy S_n(s,y) S_n(s,x-y) \\
&\leq \sup_{n,t} \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S_n(s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&\leq \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Hölder's inequality applied to this measure yields that the last term in (7.12) is bounded by

$$C\Big(\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}$$
$$\times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy S_n(s,y)S_n(s,x-y)E(||K(s,y)||_{\mathcal{K}}^{\frac{p}{2}}||K(s,x-y)||_{\mathcal{K}}^{\frac{p}{2}}).$$

Finally, using Hypothesis B one gets,

$$E(||(S\cdot M^K)_t||_{\mathcal{K}}^p) \leq C\Big(\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}$$
$$\int_0^t ds \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E(||K(s,x)||_{\mathcal{K}}^p) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S_n(s)(\xi)|^2.$$

Therefore (7.8) holds true. □

Remark 7.1 *From the identity (7.7) it follows that for any S satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 we have*

$$||S||_{0,K}^2 = \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^K(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2.$$

Remember that we shall also use the notation

$$\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} S(s,y)K(s,y)M(ds,dy),$$

for the stochastic integral of Theorem 7.1.

Remark 7.2 *For the sake of completeness we stress that if $\mathcal{K}=\mathbb{R}$ the assumptions B and C on the real-valued process K read,*

$$\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|K(s,x)|^2) < \infty,$$
$$E\big(K(s,x)K(s,y)\big) = E\big(K(s,0)K(s,y-x)\big),$$

respectively.

7.2 Stochastic Partial Differential Equations driven by a coloured noise

We are interested in the study of initial-value stochastic problems driven by Gaussian noises which are white in time and correlated in space. The abstract setting is

$$Lu(t,x) = \sigma(u(t,x))\dot{F}(t,x) + b(u(t,x)), \tag{7.13}$$

$t \in [0,T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. L is a differential operator, the coefficients σ and b are real-valued globally Lipschitz functions and $\dot{F}$ is the *formal* differential of the Gaussian process introduced in the previous section. We must precise the initial conditions. For example, if L is of parabolic type we impose

$$u(0,x) = u_0(x).$$

If L is a hyperbolic operator we fix

$$u(0,x) = u_0(x), \qquad \partial_t u(t,x)\big|_{t=0} = v_0(x).$$

For the sake of simplicity we shall assume that the initial conditions are null. This allows an unified approach for parabolic and hyperbolic operators. However, it is not difficult to extend the results to non zero initial conditions.
Let us formulate the assumptions concerning the differential operator L and the correlation of the noise.
Hypothesis D The fundamental solution Λ of $Lu = 0$ is a deterministic function in t taking values in the space of non-negative measures with rapid decrease (as a distribution). Moreover, $\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \Lambda(t)(\mathbb{R}^d) < \infty$ and

$$\int_0^T dt \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2 < \infty. \tag{7.14}$$

We already met hypothesis (7.14) in Theorem 7.1. It is worthy to study its meaning in some important examples, like the stochastic heat and wave equations.

Lemma 7.1

(1) *Let $L_1 = \partial_t - \Delta_d$, where Δ_d denotes the Laplacian operator in dimension $d \geq 1$. Then, for any $t \leq 1$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$C_1 \frac{t}{1+|\xi|^2} \leq \int_0^t ds |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2 \frac{t+1}{1+|\xi|^2}, \tag{7.15}$$

for some positive constants C_i, $i = 1,2$. Consequently (7.14) holds if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{1+|\xi|^2} < \infty. \tag{7.16}$$

(2) *Let $L_2 = \partial_{tt}^2 - \Delta_d$, $d \geq 1$. Then, for any $t \geq 0$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that*

$$c_1(t \wedge t^3) \frac{1}{1+|\xi|^2} \leq \int_0^t ds |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq c_2(t+t^3)\frac{1}{1+|\xi|^2}, \tag{7.17}$$

for some positive constants c_i, $i = 1,2$. Thus (7.14) is equivalent to (7.16).

Proof: In case (1) $\Lambda(t)$ is a function given by

$$\Lambda(t,x) = (2\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\big(- \frac{|x|^2}{2t}\big).$$

Its Fourier transform is

$$\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi) = \exp(-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2).$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^t dt|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2 = \frac{1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2}.$$

On the set $(|\xi| > 1)$, we have

$$\frac{1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2)}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \le \frac{1}{2\pi^2|\xi|^2} \le \frac{C}{1+|\xi|^2}.$$

On the other hand, on $(|\xi| \le 1)$, we use the property $1-e^{-x} \le x$, $x \ge 0$, and we obtain

$$\frac{1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2)}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \le \frac{Ct}{1+|\xi|^2}.$$

This yields the upper bound in (7.15). Moreover, the inequality $1-e^{-x} \ge \frac{x}{1+x}$, valid for any $x \ge 0$, implies

$$\int_0^t ds|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2 \ge C\frac{t}{1+4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}.$$

Assume that $4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2 \ge 1$. Then $1+4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2 \le 8\pi^2 t|\xi|^2$ and if $4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2 \le 1$ then $1+4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2 < 2$ and therefore $\frac{1}{1+4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2} \ge \frac{1}{2(1+|\xi|^2)}$. Hence, if $t < 1$, we obtain the lower bound in (7.15) and now the equivalence between (7.14) and (7.16) is obvious.

Let us now consider the wave operator. It is well known that

$$\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi) = \frac{\sin(2\pi t|\xi|)}{2\pi|\xi|}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2 &\le \frac{1}{2\pi^2(1+|\xi|^2)}\mathbb{1}_{(|\xi|\ge 1)} + t^2\mathbb{1}_{(|\xi|\le 1)}\\ &\le C\frac{1+t^2}{1+|\xi|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This yields the upper bound in (7.17).

Assume that $2\pi t|\xi| \ge 1$. Then $\frac{\sin(4\pi t|\xi|)}{2t|\xi|} \le \pi$ and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t ds\frac{\sin^2(2\pi s|\xi|)}{(2\pi|\xi|)^2} &\ge C\frac{t}{1+|\xi|^2}\int_0^{2\pi t} \sin^2(u|\xi|)du\\ &= C\frac{t}{1+|\xi|^2}(2\pi - \frac{\sin(4\pi t|\xi|)}{2t|\xi|})\\ &\ge C\frac{t}{1+|\xi|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Next we assume that $2\pi t|\xi| \le 1$ and we notice that for $r \in [0,1]$, $\frac{\sin^2 r}{r^2} \ge \sin^2 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t ds \frac{\sin^2(2\pi s|\xi|)}{(2\pi|\xi|)^2} &\ge C \sin^2 1 \int_0^{2\pi t} u^2 du \\ &\ge C \frac{t^3}{1+|\xi|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the lower bound in (7.17) and that of the Lemma. □

Let us now give a notion of solution to the formal expresion (7.13).

Definition 7.1 *A solution to the stochastic initial-value problem (7.13) with null initial conditions is a predictable stochastic process* $u = \big(u(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\big)$ *such that*

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(|u(t,x)|^2\big) < \infty, \tag{7.18}$$

$$E\big(u(t,x)u(t,y)\big) = E\big(u(t,0)u(t,x-y)\big)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}u(t,x) = &\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma(u(s,y))M(ds,dy) \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(u(t-s,x-y))\Lambda(s,dy).\end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

Remark 7.3 *The stochastic integral in (7.19) is of the type defined in Theorem 7.1. More precisely, here the Hilbert space* $\mathcal{K}$ *is* $\mathbb{R}$ *and* $K(s,z) := \sigma(u(s,z))$. *Notice that, since* σ *is Lipschitz, the requirements on the process* u *ensure the validity of assumptions B and C.*

This setting for stochastic partial differential equations is not general enough to deal with the problem we have in mind: the study of the probability law of the solution of (7.13) via Malliavin calculus. Indeed, we need to formulate Malliavin derivatives of any order of the solution and show that they satisfy stochastic differential equations obtained by differentiation of (7.19). Hence a Hilbert-valued framework is needed.
Indeed, assume that the coefficients are differentiable; owing to (4.21), a formal differentiation of Equation (7.19) gives

$$\begin{aligned}Du(t,x) = Z(t,x) &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma'(u(s,y))Du(s,y)M(ds,dy) \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b'(u(t-s,x-y))Du(t-s,x-y)\Lambda(s,dy),\end{aligned}$$

where $Z(t,x)$ is a $\mathcal{H}_T$-valued stochastic process that will be made explicit later.

Let $\mathcal{K}_1$, $\mathcal{K}$ be two separable Hilbert spaces. If there is no reason for misunderstanding we will use the same notation, $||\cdot||$, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, for the norms and inner products in these two spaces, respectively.
Consider two operators

$$\sigma, b : \mathcal{K}_1 \times \mathcal{K} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}$$

satisfying the next two conditions for some positive constant C:

(c1)

$$\sup_{x\in\mathcal{K}_1} \big(||\sigma(x,y) - \sigma(x,y')|| + ||b(x,y) - b(x,y')||\big) \le C||y-y'||,$$

(c2) there exists $q \in [1,\infty)$ such that

$$||\sigma(x,0)|| + ||b(x,0)|| \le C(1+||x||^q),$$

$x \in \mathcal{K}_1$, $y, y' \in \mathcal{K}$.

Notice that (c1) and (c2) clearly imply

(c3) $||\sigma(x,y)|| + ||b(x,y)|| \le C(1+||x||^q + ||y||)$.

Let $V = \big(V(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\big)$ be a predictable $\mathcal{K}_1$-valued process such that

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||V(t,x)||^p\big) < \infty, \tag{7.20}$$

for any $p \in [1,\infty)$, and

$$E\big(\langle V(t,x), V(t,y)\rangle\big) = E\big(\langle V(t,0), V(t,x-y)\rangle\big). \tag{7.21}$$

Consider also a predictable $\mathcal{K}$-valued process $U_0 = \big(U_0(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\big)$ satisfying the analogue of the properties (7.20), (7.21). Set

$$\begin{aligned} U(t,x) = U_0(t,x) &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma\big(V(s,y),U(s,y)\big) M(ds,dy) \\ &+ \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b\big(V(t-s,x-y),U(t-s,x-y)\big)\Lambda(s,dy). \end{aligned} \tag{7.22}$$

The next definition is the analogue of Definition 7.1 in the context of Equation (7.22).

Definition 7.2 *A solution to Equation (7.22) is a $\mathcal{K}$-valued predictable stochastic process $\big(U(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\big)$ such that*

(a) $\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U(t,x)||^2\big) < \infty$.

(b) $E\big(\langle U(t,x), U(t,y)\rangle\big) = E\big(\langle U(t,0), U(t,x-y)\rangle\big)$

and it satisfies the relation (7.22).

Remark 7.4 *Since we are assuming Hypothesis D, the stochastic integral in (7.22) is of the type given in Theorem 7.1. Indeed, condition (c3) on the coefficients yields*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||\sigma\big(V(t,x),U(t,x)\big)||^2\big)\\
&\le \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} CE\big(1+||U(t,x)||^2+||V(t,x)||^{2q}\big)\\
&\le C.
\end{aligned}$$

The constant C is finite (see condition (a) in the previous definition and (7.20)). Hence Hypothesis B is satisfied. It is obvious that Hypothesis C also holds (see condition (b) before and (7.21)).

Our next purpose is to prove a result on existence and uniqueness of solution for the Equation (7.22). In particular we shall obtain the version proved in [14] for the particular case of Equation (7.19)

Theorem 7.2 *We assume that the coefficients σ and b satisfy the conditions (c1) and (c2) above and moreover, that Hypothesis D is satisfied. Then Equation (7.22) has a unique solution in the sense given in Definition 7.2. In addition the solution satisfies*

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U(t,x)||^p\big) < \infty, \tag{7.23}$$

for any $p\in[1,\infty)$.

Proof: Define a Picard iteration scheme, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
U^0(t,x) &= U_0(t,x),\\
U^n(t,x) &= U_0(t,x) + \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma\big(V(s,y),U^{n-1}(s,y)\big)M(ds,dy)\\
&\quad + \int_0^t ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b\big(V(t-s,x-y),U^{n-1}(t-s,x-y)\big)\Lambda(s,dy),
\end{aligned}\tag{7.24}$$

$n\ge 1$. Fix $p\in[1,\infty)$. We prove the following facts:

(i) $U^n=(U^n(t,x),(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$, $n\ge1$ are well defined predictable process and have spatially stationary covariance.

(ii) $\sup_{n\ge0}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^n(t,x)||^p\big)<\infty$,

(iii) Set $M_n(t)=\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n+1}(t,x)-U^n(t,x)||^p\big)$, $n\ge0$. Then

$$M_n(t)\le C\int_0^t dsM_{n-1}(s)(J(t-s)+1), \tag{7.25}$$

where

$$J(t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2. \tag{7.26}$$

Proof of (i): We prove by induction on n that U^n is predictable and

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^n(t,x)||^2\big) < \infty. \tag{7.27}$$

This suffices to give a rigourous meaning to the integrals appearing in (7.24). Indeed, by assumption this is true for $n = 0$. Assume that the property is true for any $k = 0, 1, \cdots n-1$, $n \geq 2$. Consider the stochastic process given by

$$K(t,x) = \sigma\big(V(x,t), U^{n-1}(t,x)\big). \tag{7.28}$$

The induction assumption and the arguments of Remark 7.4 ensure that the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 are satisfied. In particular (7.8) for $p = 2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma\big(V(s,y),U^{n-1}(s,y)\big)M(ds,dy)||^2\big)\\
&\leq \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} CE\big(1+||U^{n-1}(t,x)||^2+||V(t,x)||^{2q}\big) \qquad (7.29)\\
&\quad\times\int_0^T dt\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2. \qquad (7.30)
\end{aligned}$$

This last expresion is finite, by assumption.
Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||\int_0^t ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b\big(V(t-s,x-y),U^{n-1}(t-s,x-y)\big)\Lambda(s,dy)||^2\big)\\
&\leq \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} CE\big(1+||U^{n-1}(t,x)||^2+||V(t,x)||^{2q}\big)\int_0^T ds\Lambda(s,\mathbb{R}^d), \qquad (7.31)
\end{aligned}$$

which is also finite.
Hence we deduce (7.27).
The property on the covariance is also proved inductively with the arguments of Lemma 18 in [14].
Proof of (ii): Fix $p \in [1,\infty)$. We first prove that for any $n \geq 1$

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^n(t,x)||^p\big) \leq C_1 + C_2\int_0^t ds\big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n-1}(s,x)||^p\big)(J(t-s)+1) \tag{7.32}$$

$t \in [0,T]$, $n \geq 1$.
The arguments are not very far from those used in the proof of (i). Indeed, we have

$$E\big(||U^n(t,x)||^p\big) \leq C\big(C_0(t,x) + A_n(t,x) + B_n(t,x)\big), \tag{7.33}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0(t,x) &= E\big(||U_0(t,x)||^p\big),\\
A_n(t,x) &= E\big(||\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma(V(s,y),U^{n-1}(s,y))M(ds,dy)||^p\big),\\
B_n(t,x) &= E\big(||\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(V(t-s,x-y),U^{n-1}(t-s,x-y))\Lambda(s,dy)||^p\big).
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} C_0(t,x) < \infty. \tag{7.34}$$

Consider the stochastic process $K(t,x)$ defined in (7.28), which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.1. In particular (7.8) yields

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} A_n(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds (1 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n-1}(s,y)||^p\big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2. \tag{7.35}$$

Moreover, Jensen's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} B_n(t,x) &\le C \int_0^t ds (1 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n-1}(s,y)||^p\big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dy)\\ &= C \int_0^t ds (1 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n-1}(s,y)||^p\big) \Lambda(t-s,\mathbb{R}^d)\\ &\le C \int_0^t ds (1 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^{n-1}(s,y)||^p\big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.36}$$

Plugging the estimates (7.34) to (7.36) into (7.33) yields (7.32). Finally, the conclusion of part (ii) follows applying the version of Gronwall's Lemma given in Lemma 7.2 below to the following situation: $f_n(t) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||U^n(t,x)||^p\big)$, $k_1 = C_1$, $k_2 = 0$, $g(s) = C_2(J(s)+1)$, with C_1, C_2 given in (7.32).
Proof of (iii): Consider the decomposition

$$E\big(||U^{n+1}(t,x) - U^n(t,x)||^p\big) \le C(a_n(t,x) + b_n(t,x)),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_n(t,x) &= E\big(|| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\\ &\quad \big(\sigma(V(s,y),U^n(s,y)) - \sigma(V(s,y),U^{n-1}(s,y))\big) M(ds,dy)||^p\big),\\ b_n(t,x) &= E\big(|| \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dy)\big(b(V(t-s,x-y),U^n(t-s,x-y))\\ &\quad - b(V(t-s,x-y),U^{n-1}(t-s,x-y))\big)||^p\big). \end{aligned}$$

Then, (7.25) follows by similar arguments as those which lead to (7.32), using the Lipschitz condition (c1).
We finish the proof applying Lemma 7.2 in the particular case. $f_n(t) = M_n(t)$, $k_1 = k_2 = 0$, $g(s) = C(J(s)+1)$, with C given in (7.25). Notice that the results proved in part (ii) show that $M := \sup_{0\le s\le T} f_0(s)$ is finite. Then we conclude that $(U^n(t,x),(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ converges uniformly in $L^p(\Omega)$ to a limit $U = (U(t,x),(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$. It is not difficult to check that U satisfies the conditions of Definition 7.2 and therefore the theorem is completely proved. □

Example 7.1 *Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}$, σ and b depending only on the second variable $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then condition (c1) states the Lipschitz continuity, (c2) is trivial and (c3) follows from (c1). Equation (7.22) is of the same kind of (7.19), except for the non trivial initial condition. Therefore Theorem 7.2 yields the existence of a unique solution in the sense of Definition 7.1. Moreover, the process u satisfies*

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(|u(t,x)|^p\big) < \infty. \tag{7.37}$$

This is a variant of Theorem 13 in [14].

We finish this section quoting a technical result -a version of Gronwall's Lemma proved in [14]- that have been applied throughout the proof of the previous theorem.

Lemma 7.2 *([14], Lemma 15) Let $g : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a non-negative function such that $\int_0^T g(s)ds < \infty$. Then there is a sequence $(a_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$ of non-negative real numbers such that for all $p \geq 1$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty$, and with the following property:*
Let $(f_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of non-negative functions on $[0.T]$ and k_1, k_2 be non-negative numbers such that for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$f_n(t) \leq k_1 + \int_0^t (k_2 + f_{n-1}(s))g(t-s)ds.$$

If $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} f_0(s) = M$, then for $n \geq 1$,

$$f_n(t) \leq k_1 + (k_1 + k_2)\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i + (k_2 + M)a_n.$$

In particular, $\sup_{n\geq 0}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} f_n(t) < \infty$, and if $k_1 = k_2 = 0$, then $\sum_{n\geq 0} f_n(t)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ converges iniformly on $[0,T]$.

Comments
This chapter requires as prerequisite knowledge of the theory of stochastic integration with respect to martingale measures, as have been developed in [64]. The results of section 7.1 are from [52] and are deeply inspired on [14]. Theorem 7.2 is a generalized version of a slight variant of Theorem 13 in [14]. The analysis of Hypothesis D owns to work published in [24], [31] and [34].
A different approach to SPDE's driven by coloured noise and the study of the required stochastic integrals is given in [51] (see also the references herein), following mainly the theoretical basis from [15].

Exercises

7.1 Let S be a distribution valued function defined on $[0,T]$ satisfying the conditons of Theorem 7.1. Prove the following statements.

1. Assume that there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma_1 \in (0.\infty)$ such that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^{2\gamma_1}, \tag{7.38}$$

   $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$. Then for any $p \in [2,\infty)$, $T > 0$, $h \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} E\big(|(S \cdot M)_{t+h} - (S \cdot M)_t|^p\big) \leq Ch^{\gamma_1 p}. \tag{7.39}$$

   Hence the stochastic process $\big((S \cdot M)_t, t \in [0,T]\big)$ has a.s. α-Hölder continuous paths for any $\alpha \in (0, \gamma_1)$.

2. Assume (7.38) and in addition that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and $\gamma_2 \in (0,\infty)$ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s+h)(\xi) - \mathcal{F}S(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq Ch^{2\gamma_2}. \tag{7.40}$$

   Then, for any $p \in [2,\infty)$, $h \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} E\Big(\big|\big(S(t+h-\cdot)\cdot M\big)_{t+h} - \big(S(t-\cdot)\cdot M\big)_t\big|^p\Big) \leq Ch^{\gamma p}, \tag{7.41}$$

   with $\gamma = \min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$. Hence the stochastic process $\big((S(t-\cdot)\cdot M)_t, t \geq 0\big)$ has a.s. β-Hölder continuous paths for any $\beta \in (0,\gamma)$.

Hint: Here the stochastic integrals define Gaussian processes. Therefore L^p estimates follow from L^2 estimates. The former are obtained using the isometry property of the stochastic integral (see (7.7) with $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}$ and $K = 1$).

7.2 Suppose there exists $\eta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} < \infty. \tag{7.42}$$

Prove that the above conditions (7.38), (7.40) are satisfied by

1. the fundamental solution of the wave equation, with $\gamma_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\gamma_2 \in (0, 1-\eta]$,

2. the fundamental solution of the wave equation, with $\gamma_j \in (0, \frac{1-\eta}{2}]$, $j = 1,2$.

Hint: Split the integral with respect to the variable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ into two parts: in a neighbourhood of the origin and the complementary set.

7.3 Let S be as in Exercise 6.1. Assume that for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}S(s, x+z-\cdot)(\xi) - \mathcal{F}S(s,x-\cdot)(\xi)|^2 \leq C|z|^{2\gamma},$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $z \in K$.
Prove that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $z \in K$, $p \in [2, \infty)$, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} E\Big(\Big|\big(S(t-\cdot, x+z-\cdot)\cdot M\big)_t - \big(S(t-\cdot, x-\cdot)\cdot M\big)_t\Big|^p\Big) \le C|z|^{p\gamma}. \quad (7.43)$$

Thus, the process $\big((S(t-\cdot, x-\cdot)\cdot M)_t\big)$ has a.s. β-Hölder continuous paths, with $\beta \in (0, \gamma)$.

7.4 Assume that condition (7.42) holds. Prove that the estimate (7.43) holds true for the fundamental solutions of the heat and the wave equation with $\gamma \in (0, 1-\eta)$.

7.5 Consider the stochastic wave equation in dimension $d \ge 1$ with null initial condition. That means, Equation (7.19) with $\Lambda(t,x) = (2\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\big(-\frac{|x|^2}{2t}\big)$. The aim of this exercise is to prove that if condition (7.42) is satisfied, then the paths of the solution are β_1-Hölder continuous in t and β_2-Hölder continuous in x with $\beta_1 \in (0, \frac{1-\eta}{2})$, $\beta_2 \in (0, 1-\eta)$. The proof uses the factorization method (see[15]) and can be carried out following the next steps.

1. Fix $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and set

$$Y_\alpha(r,z) = \int_0^r \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(r-s, z-y)\sigma(u(s,y))(r-s)^{-\alpha} M(ds,dy).$$

   Using the semigroup property of Λ and the stochastic Fubini's theorem from [64], prove that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(r-s, z-y)\sigma(u(s,y)) M(ds,dy)\\ &\quad = \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi} \int_0^t dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dz \Lambda(t-r, x-z)(t-r)^{\alpha-1} Y_\alpha(r,z). \quad (7.44)\end{aligned}$$

2. Check that for any $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1-\eta}{2})$,

$$\sup_{0 \le r \le T} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} E(|Y_\alpha(r,z)|^p) < \infty.$$

3. Using Kolmogorov's continuity criterium and the previous result prove the estimates

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} E(|u(t+h,x) - u(t,x)|^p) \le C h^{\gamma_1 p},$$
$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} E(|u(t,x+z) - u(t,x)|^p) \le C h^{\gamma_2 p},$$

   $t, h \in [0,T]$, $t+h \in [0,T]$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma_1 \in (0, \frac{1-\eta}{2})$, $\gamma_2 \in (0, 1-\eta)$.

Hints: To prove part 2 apply the L^p estimates of the stochastic integral given in Theorem 7.1. Then the problem reduces to check that

$$\nu_{r,z} = \int_0^r ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}[\Lambda(r-s, z-\cdot)(r-s)^{-\alpha}](\xi)|^2$$

is finite. This can be proved splitting the integral on $\mathbb{R}^d$ into two parts -in a neighbourhood and outside zero.
The proof of the estimates in part 3 is carried out using the alternative expression of the stochastic integral given in (7.44), Hölder's inequality and the result of part 2.

Remark The exercises of this section are excerpts of [57] and [58].

8 Malliavin regularity of solutions of SPDEs

In this chapter we show that the solution of equation (7.13) at any fixed point $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ belongs to the space $\mathbb{D}^\infty$ and we deduce the equation satisfied by the Malliavin derivative of any order.
Following the discusion at the begining of Chapter 3, the underlying Gaussian family needed in the Malliavin calculus machinery shall be $\big(W(h), h \in \mathcal{H}_T\big)$, where for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$, $W(h) = \sum_{n\geq 1}\langle h, e_n\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_T} g_n$, $(e_n, n \geq 1)$ ia a complete orthonormal system of $\mathcal{H}_T$ and $(g_n, n \geq 1)$ a sequence of standard independent Gaussian random variables.
Actually $W(h)$ can be considered as an stochastic integral in Dalang's sense, as in [14], of a deterministic integrand $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$ with respect to the martingale measure M introduced in Chapter 6. Indeed for any $h \in \mathcal{H}_T$ there exists a sequence $(h_n, n \geq 1) \subset L^2([0,T];\mathcal{E})$ converging to h in the topology of $\mathcal{H}_T$. Set $W(h_n) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_n(s,x)M(ds,dx)$. The stochastic integral is well defined as a Walsh integral of a deterministic function with respect to the martingale measure M. Notice that $E(W(h_n)) = 0$ and

$$E\big(W(h_n)W(h_m)\big) = \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\mathcal{F}h_n(s)(\xi)\overline{\mathcal{F}h_m(s)(\xi)}.$$

Set

$$\tilde{W}(h) = \lim_{n\to\infty} W(h_n),$$

in $L^2(\Omega, P)$. Then $\big(\tilde{W}(h), h \in \mathcal{H}_T\big)$ is a Gaussian family of random variables with the same characteristics (mean and covariance) than $\big(W(h), h \in \mathcal{H}_T\big)$.

The proof of differentiability uses the following tool which follows from the fact that D^N is a closed operator defined on $L^p(\Omega)$ with values in $L^p(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$.

Lemma 8.1 *Let $(F_n, n \geq 1)$ be a sequence of random variables belonging to $\mathbb{D}^{N,p}$. Assume that*

(a) there exists a random variable F such that F_n converges to F in $L^p(\Omega)$, as n tends to ∞,

(b) the sequence $(D^N F_n, n \geq 1)$ converges in $L^p(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$.

Then F belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{N,p}$ and $D^N F = L^p(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}) - \lim_{n\to\infty} D^N F_n$.

Before stating the main result we introduce some notation.
For $r_i \in [0,T]$, $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i = 1,\ldots,N$ and a random variable X we set

$$D^N_{((r_1,\varphi_1),\ldots,(r_N,\varphi_N))}X = \langle D^N_{(r_1,\ldots,r_N)}X, \varphi_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \varphi_N\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}},$$

Thus, we have that

$$\|D^N X\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}} = \int_{[0,T]^N} dr_1 \ldots dr_N \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_N\geq 0} |D^N_{((r_1,e_{j_1}),\ldots,(r_N,e_{j_N}))}X|^2, \quad (8.1)$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j\geq 0}$ is a complete orthonormal system of $\mathcal{H}$.
Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, fix a set $A_N = \{\alpha_i = (r_i, \varphi_i) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{H}, i = 1, \ldots, N\}$ and set $\bigvee_i r_i = \max(r_1, \ldots, r_N)$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N)$, $\hat{\alpha}_i = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_N)$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_m$ the set of partitions of A_N consisting of m disjoint subsets $p_1, \ldots, p_m$, $m = 1, \ldots, N$, and by $|p_i|$ the cardinal of p_i. Let X be a random variable belonging to $\mathbb{D}^{N,2}$, $N \geq 1$, and g be a real $\mathcal{C}^N$-function with bounded derivatives up to order N. Leibniz's rule for Malliavin's derivatives (see (4.20)) yields

$$D^N_\alpha(g(X)) = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \sum_{\mathcal{P}_m} c_m g^{(m)}(X) \prod_{i=1}^{m} D^{|p_i|}_{p_i} X, \tag{8.2}$$

with positive coefficients c_m, $m = 1, \ldots, N$, $c_1 = 1$. Let

$$\Delta^N_\alpha(g, X) := D^N_\alpha(g(X)) - g'(X) D^N_\alpha X.$$

Notice that $\Delta^N_\alpha(g, X) = 0$ if $N = 1$ and for any $N > 1$ it only depends on the Malliavin derivatives up to the order $N - 1$.
Here is the result on differentiability of the process $(u(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ solution to (7.19).

Theorem 8.1 *Assume Hypothesis D and that the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with bounded derivatives of any order greater or equal than one. Then, for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the random variable $u(t,x)$ belongs to the space $\mathbb{D}^\infty$. Moreover, for any $p \geq 1$ and $N \geq 1$, there exists a $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})-$valued random process $\{Z^N(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} D^N u(t,x) &= Z^N(t,x) \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)[\Delta^N(\sigma, u(s,z)) + D^N u(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z))] M(ds,dz) \\ &+ \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[\Delta^N(b, u(t-s, x-z)) \\ &\quad + D^N u(t-s, x-z) b'(u(t-s, x-z))], \end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

and

$$\sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|D^N u(s,y)\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}) < +\infty.$$

The proof of this Theorem consists of two parts. In the first one we shall assume that the measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\Lambda(t)$, is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, that is,

$$\Lambda(t, dx) = \Lambda(t,x)dx. \tag{8.4}$$

In the second one we shall consider a mollifying procedure, use the results obtained in the first part and prove the result in the more general case of a non-negative measure.
The next Proposition is devoted to the first part.

Proposition 8.1 *Assume Hypothesis D and moreover that the measure $\Lambda(t)$, is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Suppose that the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with bounded derivatives of any order greater or equal than one. Then, for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the random variable $u(t,x)$ belongs to the space $\mathbb{D}^\infty$. Moreover, for any $N \geq 1$ the Malliavin derivative $D^N u(t,x)$ satisfies the equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&D^N u(t,x) = Z^N(t,x) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)[\Delta^N(\sigma, u(s,z)) + D^N u(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z))]M(ds,dz) \\
&+ \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[\Delta^N(b, u(t-s,x-z)) \\
&\times D^N u(t-s,x-z) b'(u(t-s,x-z))],
\end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

where for $\alpha = ((r_1,\varphi_1), \cdots, (r_N,\varphi_N))$ with $r_1, \cdots, r_n \geq 0$ and $\varphi_1, \cdots, \varphi_N \in \mathcal{H}$.

$$Z^N_\alpha(t,x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda(t-r_i, x-*) D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u(r_i,*)), \varphi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{8.6}$$

In addition, for any $p \in [1,\infty)$,

$$\sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|D^N u(s,y)\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}) < +\infty.$$

The proof of this Proposition relies on the results given in the next three lemmas based on the Picard iterations

$$\begin{aligned}
u^0(t,x) &= 0, \\
u^n(t,x) &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y)\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y))M(ds,dy) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-y))\Lambda(s,dy).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

Lemma 8.2 *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 8.1, the sequence of random variables $\big(u^n(t,x), n \geq 0\big)$ defined recursively in (8.7) belong to $\mathbb{D}^{N,2}$.*

Proof: It is done by a recursive argument on N. Let $N = 1$. We check that $u^n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, for any $n \geq 0$. Clearly the property is true for $n = 0$. Assume it holds up to the $(n-1)$-th iteration. By the rules of Malliavin calculus, the right hand-side of (8.7) belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. Hence $u^n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
Du^n(t,x) &= \Lambda(t-\cdot, x-*)\sigma(u^{n-1}(\cdot,*)) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-y))\sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,y))Du^{n-1}(s,y)M(ds,dy) \\
&+ \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dy)b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-y))Du^{n-1}(t-s,x-y).
\end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

Assume that $u^n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{N-1,2}$, for any $n \geq 0$. Leibniz's rule and (4.21) yield the following equality satisfied by $D^{N-1}u^n(t,x)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha^{N-1}u^n(t,x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \langle \Lambda(t-r_i, x-*) D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-2} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,*)), \varphi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z) [\Delta_\alpha^{N-1}(\sigma, u^{n-1}(s,z)) \\
&+ D_\alpha^{N-1} u^{n-1}(s,z) \sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z))] M(ds,dz) \\
&+ \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) [\Delta_\alpha^{N-1}(b, u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)) \\
&+ D_\alpha^{N-1} u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z) b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z))],
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.9}
$$

where $\alpha = ((r_1,\varphi_1),\dots,(r_{N-1},\varphi_{N-1}))$, with $r_1,\dots,r_{N-1} \geq 0$ and $\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_{N-1} \in \mathcal{H}$.
We want to prove that $u^n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{N,2}$, for any $n \geq 0$ as well. Clearly the property is true for $n = 0$. Assume it holds for all the iterations up to the order $n-1$. Then, as before, using the rules of Malliavin calculus we obtain that the right hand side of the preceding equality belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{N,2}$. Thus, $u^n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{N,2}$ and satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha^{N}u^n(t,x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \Lambda(t-r_i, x-*) D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,*)), \varphi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z) [\Delta_\alpha^{N}(\sigma, u^{n-1}(s,z)) \\
&+ D_\alpha^{N} u^{n-1}(s,z) \sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z))] M(ds,dz) \\
&+ \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) [\Delta_\alpha^{N}(b, u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)) \\
&+ D_\alpha^{N} u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z) b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z))],
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.10}
$$

where $\alpha = ((r_1,\varphi_1),\dots,(r_N,\varphi_N))$, with $r_1,\dots,r_N \geq 0$ and $\varphi_1,\dots,\varphi_N \in \mathcal{H}$.
This ends the proof of the Lemma. □

Lemma 8.3 *Assume the same hypothesis than in Proposition 8.1. Then, for any positive integer $N \geq 1$ and for all $p \in [1,\infty)$,*

$$
\sup_{n\geq 0} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||D^N u^n(t,x)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\big) < \infty. \tag{8.11}
$$

Proof: We shall use an induction argument with respect to N with $p \geq 2$ fixed. Consider $N = 1$. Denote by $B_{i,n}$, $i = 1,2,3$ each of the terms of the right hand-side of (8.8), respectively.

Hölder's inequality with respect to the finite measure $\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\Lambda(t-s,x-y+z)ds\Gamma(dz)dy$, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the properties of σ imply

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E\big(||B_{1,n}||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)\\
&= E\Big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(dz)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\Lambda(t-s,x-y+z)\\
&\times \sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y))\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y-z))\Big)^{p/2}\\
&\le \Big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(dz)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\Lambda(t-s,x-y+z)\Big)^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\\
&\times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Gamma(dz)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy\Lambda(t-s,x-y)\Lambda(t-s,x-y+z)\\
&\times E\big(|\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y))\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y-z))|^{p/2}\big)\\
&\le C\big(1+\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u^{n-1}(t,x)|^p)\big)\int_0^T ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

which is uniformly bounded with respect to n (see (ii) in the proof of Theorem 7.2).
Consider now the second term $B_{2,n}(t,x)$. By Theorem 7.1 and the properties of σ it holds that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E(\|B_{2,n}(t,x)\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \le C\int_0^t ds \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||\sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z))Du^{n-1}(s,z)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)J(t-s)\\
&\le C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,z)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||Du^{n-1}(\tau,z)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)J(t-s),
\end{aligned}
$$

with J defined as in (7.26).
Finally, for the third term $B_{3,n}(t,x)$ we use Hölder's inequality with respect to the finite measure $\Lambda(s,dz)ds$. Then, the assumptions on b and Λ yield

$$
E(\|B_{3,n}(t,x)\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T} \le C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,z)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||Du^{n-1}(\tau,z)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big).
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(s,z)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||Du^n(s,z)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)\\
&\le C\big(1+\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,z)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||Du^{n-1}(\tau,z)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)(J(t-s)+1)\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, by Gronwall's Lemma 7.2 we finish the proof for $N=1$.
Assume that

$$
\sup_{n\ge 0}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||D^k u^n(t,x)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes k}}\right) < +\infty,
$$

for any $k = 1, \dots, N-1$.
Let $\alpha = \big((r_1, e_{j_1}), \dots, (r_N, e_{j_N})\big)$, $r = (r_1, \dots, r_N)$, $dr = dr_1 \dots dr_N$. Then, by (8.1) we have that

$$E\left(||D^N u^n(t,x)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) = E\left(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} |D^N_\alpha u^n(t,x)|^2\right)^{p/2}$$
$$\leq C \sum_{i=1}^5 N_i,$$

where

$$N_1 = E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda(t - r_i, x - *)$$
$$\times D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i, *)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \Big|^2\Bigg)^{p/2},$$

$$N_2 = E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)$$
$$\times \Delta^N_\alpha(\sigma, u^{n-1}(s,z)) M(ds,dz) \Big|^2\Bigg)^{p/2},$$
$$N_3 = E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dz)$$
$$\times \Delta^N_\alpha(b, u^{n-1}(t-s, x-z)) \Big|^2\Bigg)^{p/2},$$
$$N_4 = E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z) D^N_\alpha u^{n-1}(s,z)$$
$$\times \sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z)) M(ds,dz) \Big|^2\Bigg)^{p/2},$$
$$N_5 = E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dz) D^N_\alpha u^{n-1}(t-s, x-z)$$
$$\times b'(u^{n-1}(t-s, x-z)) \Big|^2\Bigg)^{p/2}.$$

By Parseval's identity and the definition of the $\mathcal{H}$-norm it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_1 \leq\, & C \sum_{i=1}^{N} E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_N} |\langle \Lambda(t-r_i, x-*) \\
& \times D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,*)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2 \Bigg)^{p/2} \\
=\, & C \sum_{i=1}^{n} E\left(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \|\Lambda(t-r_i, x-*) D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,*))\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right)^{p/2} \\
=\, & C \sum_{i=1}^{n} E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(t-r_i, x-y) \Lambda(t-r_i, x-y+z) \\
& \times \left[\sum_{\hat{j}_i} D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,y)) D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i, y-z)) \right] \Bigg)^{p/2},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\hat{j}_i = j_1, \ldots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \ldots, j_N$.
Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Hölder's inequality the preceding ex-

pression is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{n} E\Bigg(\int_0^T dr_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(t-r_i, x-y)\Lambda(t-r_i, x-y+z) \\
&\quad \times \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i ||D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,y))||_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\quad \times ||D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,y-z))||_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}}\Bigg)^{p/2} \\
&\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_0^T dr_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(t-r_i, x-y)\Lambda(t-r_i, x-y+z) \\
&\quad \times E\Bigg(\int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \|D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,y))\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\quad \times \|D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,y-z))\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}}\Bigg)^{p/2} \\
&\leq C\sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_0^T dr_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(t-r_i, x-y)\Lambda(t-r_i, x-y+z) \\
&\quad \times \sup_{v\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(\int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \|D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,v))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}}\right)^{p/2} \\
&\leq C \sup_{(s,z)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(\|D^{N-1}\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,z))\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes(N-1)}}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

with $d\hat{r}_i = dr_1 \dots dr_{i-1}dr_{i+1}\dots dr_N$. Then, by Leibniz's rule , the assumptions on σ and the induction hypothesis, it follows that N_1 is uniformly bounded with respect of n, t and x. In the remaining terms we can replace $\bigvee_i r_i$ by 0, because the Malliavin derivatives involved vanish for $t < \bigvee_i r_i$.
By Theorem 7.1

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_2 &= E\left(\left\|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)\Delta^N(\sigma, u^{n-1}(s,z))M(ds,dz)\right\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) \\
&\leq C\int_0^t ds \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||\Delta^N(\sigma, u^{n-1}(s,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&\leq C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||\Delta^N(\sigma, u^{n-1}(\tau,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) J(t-s),
\end{aligned}
$$

with $J(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2$.
According to the induction hypothesis, this last term is uniformly bounded with respect to n, t and x.

Using similar arguments -that time for deterministic integration of Hilbert-valued processes- Hölder's inequality and the assumptions on Λ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
N_3 &\le C \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) E\|\Delta^N(b, u^{n-1}(t-s, x-z))\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}} \\
&\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||\Delta^N(b, u^{n-1}(s,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which again, by the induction hypothesis, is uniformly bounded in n, t and x. For N_4 we proceed as for N_2; this yields,

$$N_4 \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||D^N u^{n-1}(\tau,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) J(t-s).$$

Finally, as for N_3,

$$N_5 \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||D^N u^{n-1}(\tau,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right).$$

Summarising the estimates obtained so far we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(s,y)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||D^N u^n(s,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right) \\
&\le C\left[1 + \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(||D^N u^{n-1}(\tau,y))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\right)(J(t-s)+1)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the proof ends applying the version of Gronwall's lemma given in Lemma 7.2. □

Lemma 8.4 *We suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 8.1 are satisfied. Then for any positive integer $N \ge 1$ the sequence $D^N u^n(t.x)$, $n \ge 0$, converges in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$ to the $\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}$-valued stochastic processes $\big(U(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\big)$ solution of the equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
&U(t,x) = Z^N(t,x) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)[\Delta^N(\sigma, u(s,z)) + U(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z))] M(ds,dz) \\
&+ \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[\Delta^N(b, u(t-s,x-z)) + U(t-s,x-z) b'(u(t-s,x-z))],
\end{aligned} \tag{8.12}$$

with Z^N given by (8.6).

Proof : Here again we use induction on N.

For $N = 1$ we proceed as follows. Let $\big(U(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\big)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} U(t,x) = \Lambda(t - \cdot, x - *)\sigma(u(\cdot,*)) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z) \\ \sigma'(u(s,z))U(s,z)M(ds,dz) \\ + \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) b'(u(t-s,x-z))U(t-s,x-z). \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

We prove that

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\Big(\big\|Du^n(t,x) - U(t,x)\big\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\Big) \to 0, \tag{8.14}$$

as n tends to infinity. This implies that $u(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and the process $\{Du(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\}$ satisfies equation (8.13).
Set

$$\begin{aligned} I_Z^{n,N}(t,x) &= \Lambda(t - \cdot, x - *)\big(\sigma(u^{n-1}(\cdot,*)) - \sigma(u(\cdot,*))\big), \\ I_\sigma^n(t,x) &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z)\sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z))Du^{n-1}(s,z)M(ds,dz) \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z)\sigma'(u(s,z))U(s,z)M(ds,dz), \\ I_b^n(t,x) &= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)\big(b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z))Du^{n-1}(t-s,x-z) \\ &\quad - b'(u(t-s,x-z))U(t-s,x-z)\big). \end{aligned}$$

The Lipschitz property of σ yields

$$\begin{aligned} E(||I_Z^{n,N}(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) &\le C \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u^{n-1}(t,x) - u(t,x)|^2) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \\ &\le C \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u^{n-1}(t,x) - u(t,x)|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(||I_Z^{n,N}(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) = 0. \tag{8.15}$$

Consider the decomposition

$$E(\|I_\sigma^n(t,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \le C(D_{1,n}(t,x) + D_{2,n}(t,x),$$

where

$$D_{1,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)[\sigma'(u^{n-1}(s,z))$$
$$- \sigma'(u(s,z))] Du^{n-1}(s,z) M(ds,dz)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big),$$
$$D_{2,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-z)\sigma'(u(s,z))[Du^{n-1}(s,z)$$
$$- U(s,z)] M(ds,dz)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big).$$

The isometry property of the stochastic integral, Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and the properties of σ yield

$$D_{1,n}(t,x) \le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \big(E(|u^{n-1}(s,y) - u(s,y)|^4) E(\|Du^{n-1}(s,y)\|^4_{\mathcal{H}_T})\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2.$$

Owing to Theorem 7.2 and Lemma 8.3 we conclude that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} D_{1,n}(t,x) = 0.$$

Similarly,

$$D_{2,n}(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du^{n-1}(\tau,y) - U(\tau,y)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) J(t-s). \quad (8.16)$$

For the deterministic integral term, we have

$$E(\|I_b^n(t,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \le C(b_{1,n}(t,x) + b_{2,n}(t,x)),$$

with

$$b_{1,n}(t,x) = E\big(|| \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)) - b'(u(t-s,x-z))]$$
$$\times Du^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big),$$
$$b_{2,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) b'(u(t-s,x-z))$$
$$\times [Du^{n-1}(t-s,x-z) - U(t-s,x-z)]\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big).$$

By the properties of the deterministic integral of Hilbert-valued processes, the assumptions on b and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality we obtain

$$b_{1,n}(t,x) \le \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) E\big(|b'(u^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)) - b'(u(t-s,x-z))|^2$$
$$\times \|Du^{n-1}(t-s,x-z)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)$$
$$\le \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \big(E|u^{n-1}(s,y) - u(s,y)|^4 \, E\|Du^{n-1}(s,y)\|^4_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)^{1/2} \int_0^t ds \Lambda(s,dz).$$

Thus, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} b_{1,n}(t,x) = 0$.
Similar arguments yield

$$b_{2,n}(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du^{n-1}(\tau,y) - U(\tau,y)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}).$$

Therefore we have obtained that

$$\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(||Du^n(s,x) - U(s,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T})$$
$$\le C_n + C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,x)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(||Du^{n-1}(\tau,x) - U(\tau,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T})(J(t-s)+1),$$

with $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_n = 0$. Thus applying Gronwall's Lemma 7.2 we complete the proof of (8.14).
We now assume that the convergence in quadratic mean holds for all derivatives up to the order $N-1$ and prove the same result for the order N. That means we must check that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\big(||D^N u^n(t,x) - U(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\big) = 0, \tag{8.17}$$

where $D^N u^n(t,x)$, $U(t,x)$ satisfy the equations (8.10), (8.12), respectively. We start with the convergence of the terms playing the rôle of initial conditions.
Set

$$Z^n := E\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big|\sum_{i=1}^N \langle\Lambda(t-r_i, x-*)$$
$$(D^{N-1}_{\hat\alpha_i}\sigma(u^{n-1}(r_i,*)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} - D^{N-1}_{\hat\alpha_i}\sigma(u(r_i,*)),(r_i,*)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\Big|^2.$$

Then, Parseval's identity and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality ensure

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z^n &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \\
&\quad \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \left\| \Lambda(t-\cdot, x-*)[D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u^{n-1}(\cdot,*)) - D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u(\cdot,*))] \right\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T} \\
&\le \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(t-s, x-y) \\
&\quad \times \Lambda(t-s, x-y+z) \left\| D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i} \left(\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\quad \times \left\| D^{N-1}_{\hat{r}_i} \left(\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y-z)) - \sigma(u(s,y-z))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\le \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E \left(\left\| D^{N-1} \left(\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes(N-1)}} \right) \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E \left(\left\| D^{N-1} \left(\sigma(u^{n-1}(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes(N-1)}} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Leibniz's formula, the result proved in Lemma 8.3 and the induction assumption yield that the last term tends to zero as n goes to infinity.
We finish the proof by similar arguments as those used for $N = 1$. We omit the details. □

We are now prepared to give the proof of Proposition 8.1.
Proof of Proposition 8.1: We apply Lemma 8.1 to the sequence of random variables consisting of the Picard iterations for the process u defined in (8.7). More precisely, fix $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and set $F_n = u^n(t,x)$, $F = u(t,x)$. By Theorem 13 of [14] (see also Theorem 7.2),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u^n(t,x) - u(t,x)|^p) = 0.$$

Thus, assumption (a) in Lemma 8.1 -which does not need any kind of differentiability- is satisfied.
The validity of assumption (b) follows from Lemmas 8.2-8.4 above. □

Remark 8.1 *The absolute continuity of* $\Lambda(t)$ *is only used in the analysis of the terms involving* σ *but not in those involving* b.

We now shall deal with more general Λ.
Let ψ be a $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function with compact support contained in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Define $\psi_n(x) = n^d \psi(nx)$ and

$$\Lambda_n(t) = \psi_n * \Lambda(t), \tag{8.18}$$

$n \geq 1$. It is well known that $\Lambda_n(t)$ is a $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function. Moreover,

$$|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_n(t)| \leq |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)|. \tag{8.19}$$

Consider the sequence of processes $\big(u_n(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\big)$ solution to the equations

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(t,x) = & \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s, x-z)\sigma(u_n(s,z))M(ds,dz) \\ & + \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b(u_n(t-s,x-z))\Lambda(s,dz). \end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

Under the assumptions of Theorem 8.1 we conclude from Proposition 8.1 and Remark 8.1that $u_n(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$, for all $n \geq 1$. Moreover, the derivative $D^N u_n(t,x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^N u_n(t,x) = & \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda_n(t-r_i, x-*) D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1} \sigma(u_n(r_i,*)), \varphi_i \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ & + \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)[\Delta_\alpha^N(\sigma, u_n(s,z)) \\ & \quad + D_\alpha^N u_n(s,z)\sigma'(u_n(s,z))]M(ds,dz) \\ & + \int_{\bigvee_i r_i}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[\Delta_\alpha^N(b, u_n(t-s,x-z)) \\ & \quad + D_\alpha^N u_n(t-s,x-z) b'(u_n(t-s,x-z))], \end{aligned} \tag{8.21}$$

where $\alpha = ((r_1,\varphi_1), \ldots, (r_N,\varphi_N))$, with $r_1, \ldots, r_N \geq 0$ and $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_N \in \mathcal{H}$. With these tools we can now give the ingredients for the proof of Theorem 8.1.

Lemma 8.5 *Assume that the coefficients σ and b are Lipschitz continuous and that Hypothesis D is satisfied. Then for any $p \in [1,\infty)$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \big(\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(t,x) - u(t,x)|^p\big) = 0. \tag{8.22}$$

Proof: We first prove that for any $p \in [1,\infty)$,

$$\sup_{n\geq 1} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(|u_n(t,x)|^p\big) < \infty. \tag{8.23}$$

Taking into account (8.20), we have $E(|u_n(t,x)|^p) \leq C(A_{1,n}(t,x) + A_{2,n}(t,x))$, where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1,n}(t,x) &= E\big(\big|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\sigma(u_n(s,z))M(ds,dz)\big|^p\big), \\ A_{2,n}(t,x) &= E\big(\big|\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) b(u_n(t-s,x-z))\big|^p\big). \end{aligned}$$

Owing to Theorem 7.1, the properties of σ and the definition of Λ_n, we obtain

$$A_{1,n}(t,x) \le C\nu(t)^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \int_0^t ds \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(|\sigma(u_n(s,z))|^p\big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_n(t-s)(\xi)|^2$$
$$\le C \int_0^t ds\big(1+\sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(s,z)|^p)\big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_n(t-s)(\xi)|^2,$$

with $\nu(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2$. Consequently, (8.19) yields that

$$A_{1,n}(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds\big[1+\sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(|u_n(\tau,y)|^p\big)\big] J(t-s). \qquad (8.24)$$

Hölder's inequality with respect to the finite measure $\Lambda(s,dz)ds$, the properties of b and Hypothesis D yield

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,n}(t,x) &\le C \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) E\big(|b(u_n(t-s,x-z))|^p\big) \\ &\le C \int_0^t ds\big[1+\sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,y)|^p)\big] \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) \\ &\le C \int_0^t ds\big[1+\sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,y)|^p)\big]. \end{aligned} \qquad (8.25)$$

Putting together (8.24) and (8.25) we obtain

$$\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(s,x)|^p) \le C \int_0^t ds\big[1+\sup_{(\tau,x)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,x)|^p)\big](J(t-s)+1).$$

Then we apply the version of Gronwall's Lemma given in Lemma 7.2 and finish the proof of (8.23).
Next we prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big(\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2\big) = 0. \qquad (8.26)$$

Indeed, according to the integral equations (8.20) and (7.19), we have

$$E(|u_n(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2) \le C(I_{1,n}(t,x)+I_{2,n}(t,x)),$$

where

$$I_{1,n}(t,x) = E\big(\big|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [\Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\sigma(u_n(s,z))$$
$$-\Lambda(t-s,x-z)\sigma(u(s,z))]M(ds,dz)\big|^2\big),$$
$$I_{2,n}(t,x) = E\big(\big|\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[b(u_n(t-s,x-z))-b(u(t-s,x-z))]\big|^2\big).$$

We have $I_{1,n}(t,x) \le C(I^1_{1,n}(t,x) + I^2_{1,n}(t,x))$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
I^1_{1,n}(t,x) &= E\big(\big|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)[\sigma(u_n(s,z)) - \sigma(u(s,z))]M(ds,dz)\big|^2\big),\\
I^2_{1,n}(t,x) &= E\big(\big|\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [\Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\\
&\quad - \Lambda(t-s,x-z)]\sigma(u(s,z))M(ds,dz)\big|^2\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

By the isometry property of the stochastic integral, the assumptions on σ and the definition of Λ_n, we obtain

$$
I^1_{1,n}(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,y) - u(\tau,y)|^2) J(t-s).
$$

Although $\Lambda_n(t-s) - \Lambda(t-s)$ may not be a non-negative distribution, it does belong to the space $\mathcal{P}_{0,\sigma(u)}$ of deterministic processes integrable with respect to the martingale measure $M^{\sigma(u)}$. Hence, by the isometry property of the stochastic integral,

$$
I^2_{1,n}(t,x) = ||\Lambda_n(t-\cdot, x-*) - \Lambda(t-\cdot,x-*)||^2_{0,\sigma(u)}.
$$

Then, the definition of the norm in the right-hand side of the above equality yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
I^2_{1,n}(t,x) &= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\sigma(u)}(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_n(t-s) - \Lambda(t-s))(\xi)|^2\\
&= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\sigma(u)}(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\psi_n(\xi) - 1|^2 |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, by bounded convergence we conclude that $C_n := \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} I^2_{1,n}(t,x)$ tends to zero as n goes to infinity.

Now we study the term $I_{2,n}(t,x)$. Applying the same techniques as for the term $A_{2,n}(t,x)$ before we obtain

$$
I_{2,n}(t,x) \le C \int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,y) - u(\tau,y)|^2).
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(s,x) - u(s,x)|^2)\\
&\le C_n + C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,x)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(\tau,x) - u(\tau,x)|^2)(J(t-s)+1),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_n = 0$. The proof of (8.26) concludes with an application of the above mentioned version of Gronwall's Lemma. The convergence (8.22) is now a consequence of (8.23) and (8.26). $\square$

Lemma 8.6 *Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 8.1 are satisfied. Then, for any positive integer $N \geq 1$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$,*

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||D^N u_n(t,x)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}\big) < \infty. \tag{8.27}$$

Proof: We follow exactly the same scheme as in the proof of Lemma 8.3, with the obvious changes. In the estimates we must use the above mentioned property (8.19). We omit the details. □

The next result is a step further to the identification of the stochastic process $Z^N(t,x)$ appearing in the right hand-side of (8.3). For $N \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$, $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_N)$, $\alpha = ((r_1, e_{j_1}), \cdots, (r_N, e_{j_N}))$ and $(t,x) \in [0,t] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}-$valued random variable $Z_r^{N,n}(t,x)$ as follows,

$$\langle Z_r^{N,n}(t,x), e_{j_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{j_N} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda_n(t - r_i, x - *) D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u_n(r_i, *)), e_{j_i} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Applying Lemma 8.6 it can be easily seen that $Z^{N,n}(t,x) \in L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$, and

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Z^{N,n}(t,x)\|^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}}) < +\infty, \tag{8.28}$$

for every $p \in [1, \infty)$. Notice that $Z^{N,n}(t,x)$ coincides with the first term of the right hand-side of Equation (8.21) for $\alpha = ((r_1, e_{j_1}), \cdots, (r_N, e_{j_N}))$.
For $N \geq 1$ we introduce the assumption
(H_{N-1}) *The sequence $\{D^j u_n(t,x), n \geq 1\}$ converges in $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes j})$, $j = 1, \cdots, N-1$,*
with the convention that $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes 0}) = L^p(\Omega)$.
Lemma 8.5 yields the validity of (H_0). Moreover, for $N > 1$, (H_{N-1}) implies that $u(t,x) \in \mathbb{D}^{j,p}$ and the sequences $\{D^j u_n(t,x), n \geq 1\}$ converge in $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes j})$ to $D^j u(t,x)$. In addition, by Lemma 8.6

$$\sup_{(s,y) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} E(||D^j u(s,y)||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes j}}) < \infty, \tag{8.29}$$

$j = 1, \cdots, N-1$.

Lemma 8.7 *Fix $N \geq 1$. Assume the same hypothesis as in Theorem 8.1 and that (H_{N-1}) holds. Then the sequence $\{Z^{N,n}(t,x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges in $L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$ to a random variable $Z^N(t,x)$.*

Proof. Consider first the case $N = 1$. Then

$$Z^{1,n}(t,x) = \Lambda_n(t - \cdot, x - *) \sigma(u_n(\cdot, *)).$$

We prove that $\{Z^{1,n}(t,x), n \geq 1\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T)$. Indeed, for any $n, m \geq 1$ we consider the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E(\|\Lambda_n(t - \cdot, x - *) \sigma(u_n(\cdot, *)) - \Lambda_m(t - \cdot, x - *) \sigma(u_m(\cdot, *))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \\
&\leq C(T_{1,n}(t,x) + T_{2,n,m}(t,x) + T_{3,m}(t,x)),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_{1,n}(t,x) = E(\|\Lambda_n(t-\cdot,x-*)[\sigma(u_n(\cdot,*)) - \sigma(u(\cdot,*))]\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}),$$
$$T_{2,n.m}(t,x) = E(\|[\Lambda_n(t-\cdot,x-*) - \Lambda_m(t-\cdot,x-*)]\sigma(u(\cdot,*))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}),$$
$$T_{3,m}(t,x) = E(\|\Lambda_m(t-\cdot,x-*)[\sigma(u(\cdot,*)) - \sigma(u_m(\cdot,*))]\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}).$$

Since Λ_n is a positive test function, the Lipschitz property of σ and the definition of Λ_n yield

$$\begin{aligned} T_{1,n}(t,x) &\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(s,y) - u(s,y)|^2) \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_n(s)(\xi)|^2 \\ &\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|u_n(s,y) - u(s,y)|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 8.5 we conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} T_{1,n}(t,x) = 0$. Similarly, $\lim_{m\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} T_{3,m}(t,x) = 0$. Owing to the isometry property of the stochastic integral we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{2,n,m}(t,x) &= E(\|\Lambda_n(t-\cdot,x-*) - \Lambda_m(t-\cdot,x-*)\|^2_{0,\sigma(u)}) \\ &= \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\sigma(u)}(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(\psi_n - \psi_m)(\xi)|^2 |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by bounded convergence we conclude that

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} T_{2,n,m}(t,x) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|\Lambda_n(t-\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u_n(\cdot,*)) - \Lambda_m(t-\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u_m(\cdot,*))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T})$$

tends to zero as n,m tends to infinity and consequently the sequence $\{Z^{1,n}(t,x), n\ge 1\}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T)$ to a random variable denoted by $Z(t,x)$. Actually, the convergence holds in $L^p(\Omega,\mathcal{H}_T)$ for any $p\in[1,\infty)$. Indeed

$$\sup_{n\ge 1} \sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||\Lambda_n(t-\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u_n(\cdot,*))||^p_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big) < \infty.$$

This finishes the proof for $N=1$.
Assume $N>1$. In view of (8.28) it suffices to show that $\{Z^{N,n}(t,x)\}_{n\ge1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$.
For $n,m\ge 1$, set

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{n,m} := E\int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} \Big| &\sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda_n(t-r_i,x-*)D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u_n(r_i,*)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \Lambda_m(t-r_i,x-*)D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u_m(r_i,*)), e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \Big|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$Z^{n,m} \le C(Z_1^n + Z_2^{n,m} + Z_3^m),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1^n &= \sum_{i=1}^N E \int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} |\langle \Lambda_n(t-r_i, x-*) \\
&\quad \times [D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u_n(r_i,*)) - D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u(r_i,*))], e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2, \\
Z_2^{n,m} &= \sum_{i=1}^N E \int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} |\langle D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u(r_i,*)) \\
&\quad \times [\Lambda_n(t-r_i, x-*) - \Lambda_m(t-r_i, x-*)], e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2, \\
Z_3^m &= \sum_{i=1}^N E \int_{[0,T]^N} dr \sum_{j_1,\dots,j_N} |\langle \Lambda_m(t-r_i, x-*) \\
&\quad \times [D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u(r_i,*)) - D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u_m(r_i,*))], e_{j_i}\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Parseval's identity and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality ensure

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1^n &= \sum_{i=1}^N E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \\
&\quad \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \left\| \Lambda_n(t-\cdot, x-*)[D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u_n(\cdot,*)) - D_{\hat{\alpha}_i}^{N-1}\sigma(u(\cdot,*))] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_T}^2 \\
&\le \sum_{i=1}^N E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda_n(t-s, x-y) \\
&\quad \times \Lambda_n(t-s, x-y+z) \left\| D_{\hat{r}_i}^{N-1}\left(\sigma(u_n(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\quad \times \left\| D_{\hat{r}_i}^{N-1}\left(\sigma(u_n(s,y-z)) - \sigma(u(s,y-z))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes(N-1)}} \\
&\le \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(\left\| D^{N-1}\left(\sigma(u_n(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes(N-1)}}^2 \right) \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\left(\left\| D^{N-1}\left(\sigma(u_n(s,y)) - \sigma(u(s,y))\right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes(N-1)}}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Leibniz's rule, Lemma 8.6 and the assumption (H_{N-1}) yield that the last term tends to zero as n goes to infinity. Analogously, Z_3^m tends to zero as m tends to infinity.

Using similar arguments we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_2^{n,m} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \\
&\quad \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \| D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u(\cdot,*))[\Lambda_n(t-\cdot, x-*) - \Lambda_m(t-\cdot, x-*)]\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u(s,y)) \\
&\quad \times D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i} \sigma(u(s,y-z))[\Lambda_n(t-s,x-y) - \Lambda_m(t-s,x-y)] \\
&\quad \times [\Lambda_n(t-s,x-y+z) - \Lambda_m(t-s,x-y+z)] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)}(d\xi) \\
&\quad |\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_n(t-s) - \Lambda_m(t-s))(\xi)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This term tends to zero as m and n go to infinity. Indeed, arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2 from [14] (see also Theorem 7.1) we have that

$$\|\Lambda(t-\cdot)\|^2_{0,D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \|\Lambda_k(t-\cdot)\|^2_{0,D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)}.$$

Then by Fatou's Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \sum_{j_{\hat{i}}} \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)}(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2 \\
&= \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \sum_{j_{\hat{i}}} \|\Lambda(t-\cdot)\|^2_{0,D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)} \\
&\leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \int_{[0,T]^{N-1}} d\hat{r}_i \sum_{\hat{j}_i} \|\Lambda_k(t-\cdot)\|^2_{0,D^{N-1}_{\hat{\alpha}_i}\sigma(u)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This last term is bounded by a finite constant not depending on k as can be easily seen using (8.29). Then we conclude by bounded convergence. □

Lemma 8.8 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 8.1, for any positive integer $N \geq 1$ and $p \in [1,\infty)$, the sequence $\left(D^N u_n(t,x), n \geq n\right)$ converges in the topology of $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N})$ to the $\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes N}$-valued random vector $U(t,x)$ defined by the equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
& U(t,x) = Z^N(t,x) \\
& + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z)[\Delta(\sigma,u(s,z)) + U(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z))]M(ds,dz) \\
& + \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[\Delta(b,u(t-s,x-z)) + U(t-s,x-z)b'(u(t-s,x-z))],
\end{aligned} \tag{8.30}$$

with $Z^N(t,x)$ given in Lemma 8.7.

Proof: We will use an induction argument on N. Let us check that the conclusion is true for $N=1$. Set

$$\begin{aligned}
&I_Z^n(t,x) = Z_n(t,x) - Z(t,x),\\
&I_\sigma^n(t,x) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\sigma'(u_n(s,z))Du_n(s,z)M(ds,dz)\\
&\quad - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z)\sigma'(u(s,z))U(s,z)M(ds,dz),\\
&I_b^n(t,x) = \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)\big(b'(u_n(t-s,x-z))Du_n(t-s,x-z)\\
&\quad - b'(u(t-s,x-z))U(t-s,x-z)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

By the preceding Lemma 8.7, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E\big(||I_Z^n(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big) = 0$. Consider the decomposition

$$E(\|I_\sigma^n(t,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \le C(D_{1,n}(t,x) + D_{2,n}(t,x) + D_{3,n}(t,x)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&D_{1,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)[\sigma'(u_n(s,z))\\
&\quad - \sigma'(u(s,z))]Du_n(s,z)M(ds,dz)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big),\\
&D_{2,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\sigma'(u(s,z))[Du_n(s,z)\\
&\quad - U(s,z)]M(ds,dz)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big),\\
&D_{3,n}(t,x) = E\big(\| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [\Lambda_n(t-s,x-z)\\
&\quad - \Lambda(t-s,x-z)]\sigma'(u(s,z))U(s,z)M(ds,dz)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

The isometry property of the stochastic integral, Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and the properties of σ and Λ_n yield

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{1,n}(t,x) &\le C \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \big(E(|u_n(s,y)-u(s,y)|^4)E(\|Du_n(s,y)\|^4_{\mathcal{H}_T})\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Owing to Lemmas 8.5, 8.6 we conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} D_{1,n}(t,x) = 0$. Similarly,

$$D_{2,n}(t,x) \le C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du_n(\tau,y) - U(\tau,y)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T})J(t-s).$$

Denote by $\bar{U}$ the $\mathcal{H}_T$-valued process $\{\sigma'(u(s,z))U(s,z), (s,z) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\}$. Then, the isometry property yields

$$\begin{aligned} D_{3,n}(t,x) &= \|\Lambda_n(t-\cdot, x-*) - \Lambda(t-\cdot, x-*)\|^2_{0,\bar{U}} \\ &= \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\bar{U}}(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\psi_n(\xi)-1|^2|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t-s)(\xi)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by bounded convergence $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} D_{3,n}(t,x) = 0$. For the deterministic integral term, we have

$$E(\|I_b^n(t,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \le C(b_{1,n}(t,x) + b_{2,n}(t,x)),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} &b_{1,n}(t,x) = E\big(\|\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz)[b'(u_n(t-s,x-z)) - b'(u(t-s,x-z))] \\ &\times Du_n(t-s,x-z)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big), \\ &b_{2,n}(t,x) = E\big(\|\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) b'(u(t-s,x-z)) \\ &\times [Du_n(t-s,x-z) - U(t-s,x-z)]\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big). \end{aligned}$$

By the properties of the deterministic integral of Hilbert-valued processes, the assumptions on b and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &b_{1,n}(t,x) \le \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dz) E\big(|b'(u_n(t-s,x-z)) - b'(u(t-s,x-z))|^2 \\ &\times \|Du_n(t-s,x-z)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}\Big) \\ &\le \sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} \big(E|u_n(s,y)-u(s,y)|^4\, E\|Du_n(s,y)\|^4_{\mathcal{H}_T}\big)^{1/2} \int_0^t ds\Lambda(s,dz). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} b_{1,n}(t,x) = 0$.
Similar arguments yield

$$b_{2,n}(t,x) \le C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,y)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du_n(\tau,y) - U(\tau,y)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}).$$

Therefore we have obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(s,x)\in[0,t]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du_n(s,x) - U(s,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}) \\ &\le C_n + C\int_0^t ds \sup_{(\tau,x)\in[0,s]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(\|Du_n(\tau,x) - U(\tau,x)\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_T})(J(t-s)+1), \end{aligned}$$

with $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_n = 0$. Thus applying Gronwall's Lemma 7.2 we complete the proof.

Assume the induction hypothesis (H_{N-1}) with $p = 2$. Then we can proceed in a similar maner than for $N = 1$ and complete the proof. We omit the details.

$\square$

We are now prepared to end out with the proof of the main result.

Proof of Theorem 8.1: We follow the same scheme as in the proof of Proposition 8.1. More explicitely, we fix $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and apply Lemma 8.1 to the sequence $\big(u_n(t, x), n \geq 1\big)$ defined in (8.20).

The validity of assumption (a) is ensured by Lemma 8.5. Lemmas 8.6-8.8 show that the assumption (b) is also satisfied.

Moreover, the process Z^N in Equation (8.3) is given in Lemma 8.7. Hence the proof is complete. $\square$

Comments

The actual presentation of the results of this chapter are not present in previous literature. However there are several references where particular examples or some pieces of these results are published.

The analysis of the Malliavin differentiability of solutions of SPDE's with coloured noise has been first done in [39] for the wave equation in spatial dimension $d = 2$. In [34] a general setting is presented which covers the stochastic heat equation in any spatial dimension d and the wave equation in dimension $d = 1, 2$. The extension to equations whose fundamental solution is a distribution can be found in [52] and [53].

Exercises

8.1 Consider the stochastic heat equation in dimension $d \geq 1$ (see Exercise 6.5). Prove that if σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives then for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ the solution $u(t, x)$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$.

8.2 Under the same assumptions of the preceding exercise, prove the same conclusion for the stochastic wave equation in dimension $d = 2$.

8.3 Consider the stochastic heat equation in dimension $d = 3$. Prove that if σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives then, for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the solution $u(t, x)$ belongs to $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$.

Remark: The purpose of these exercises is to give a first insight into Proposition 8.1 in a concrete and simplified setting and a particular example of the general statement in Theorem 8.1. Actually, a first reading of this chapter could consist in proving results at the level of the first derivative (first step in the induction assumptions) and then apply them to the examples given here.

9 Analysis of the Malliavin matrix of solutions of SPDEs

In this Chapter we study the $L^p(\Omega)$-integrability of the inverse of the Malliavin matrix corresponding to the solution of Equation (7.19) at given fixed points $(t, x_1), \cdots, (t, x_m)$, $t \in (0, T]$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, \cdots, m$. The final aim is to combine the results of the previous chapter and this one in order to apply Theorem 6.2. That means we shall analyze under which conditions on the coefficients of the equation, the differential operator and the covariance of the noise the law of the random vector

$$u(t, \underline{x}) = \big(u(t, x_1), \cdots, u(t, x_m)\big) \tag{9.1}$$

has an infinite differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$. First we shall assume $m = 1$. In this case the Malliavin matrix is a random variable and the analysis is easier. In a second step we shall give examples where the results can be applied. Finally we shall extend the results to $m > 1$ in some particular cases.

9.1 One dimensional case

For a fixed $(t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ we consider $u(t, x)$ defined in (7.19). We want to study the validity of the following property:
(I) For any $p > 0$,

$$E(||Du(t, x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-p}) < \infty. \tag{9.2}$$

We recall that the Malliavin derivative $Du(t, x)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} Du(t, x) &= Z(t, x) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t - s, x - y)\sigma'(u(s, y))Du(s, y)M(ds, dy) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dy)b'(u(t - s, x - y))Du(t - s, x - y). \end{aligned} \tag{9.3}$$

If $\Lambda(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and we denote by $\Lambda(t, x)$ the density, then $Z(t, x)$ is the $\mathcal{H}_T$-valued random vector $\Lambda(t - \cdot, x - *)\sigma(u(\cdot, *))$. For a general Λ satisfying the Hypothesis D, $Z(t, x)$ is obtained as the $L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_T)$-limit of the sequence $\Lambda_n(t - \cdot, x - *)\sigma(u(\cdot, *))$, with Λ_n given in (8.18) (see Lemma 8.8, Equation (8.30) with $N = 1$).
As in the study of the Malliavin differentiability we shall consider two steps, depending on the regularity properties of the fundamental solution of the equation. The results are given in the next Propositions 9.1 and 9.2.

Proposition 9.1 *Suppose that Hypothesis D is satisfied and in addition that the measure $\Lambda(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, assume that*

(1) the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives,

(2) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z \in \mathbb{R}\} \geq \sigma_0$,

(3) there exist $\theta_i, C_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying $\theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)$ and such that for any $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$C_1 t^{\theta_1} \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2 t^{\theta_2}, \tag{9.4}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, y) dy \leq C_3 t^{\theta_3}. \tag{9.5}$$

Then (I) holds.

Before giving the proof of this Proposition we prove some auxiliary results.

Lemma 9.1 *Assume Hypothesis D and that the measure $\Lambda(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Suppose also that σ satisfies the restriction on the growth*

$$|\sigma(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|).$$

For any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, define the $\mathcal{H}_t$-valued random variable

$$\tilde{Z}(t, x) = \Lambda(\cdot, x - *)\sigma(u(t - \cdot, *)).$$

Then, for any $p \in [1, \infty)$

$$E(||\tilde{Z}(t, x)||_{\mathcal{H}_t}^{2p}) \leq C\big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2\big)^p. \tag{9.6}$$

Proof: Hölder's inequality with respect to the non-negative finite measure $\Lambda(s, x - y)\Lambda(s, x - y + z) ds \Gamma(dz) dy$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
E(||Z(t, x)||_{\mathcal{H}_t}^{2p}) &= E\big(\big|\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(s, x - y)\sigma(u(t - s, y)) \\
&\quad \times \Lambda(s, x - y + z)\sigma(u(t - s, y - z))\big|^p\big) \\
&\leq \big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(s, x - y)\Lambda(s, x - y + z)\big)^{p-1} \\
&\quad \times \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(s, x - y)\Lambda(s, x - y + z) \\
&\quad \times E(|\sigma(u(t - s, y))\sigma(u(t - s, y - z))|^p) \\
&\leq C\big(1 + \sup_{(s,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} E(|u(s, z|^{2p})\big) \\
&\quad \times \big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dz)(\Lambda(s) * \tilde{\Lambda}(s))(z)\big)^p \\
&\leq C\big(\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2\big)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (9.6) is complete. □

Lemma 9.2 *We assume the same hypothesis on Λ and μ than in the previous lemma. Suppose also that the coefficients σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives. Then*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} E(||D_{t-\cdot,*}u(t-s,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_t}^{2p}) \le C\big(\int_0^t ds\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2\big)^p, \quad (9.7)$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$ and $p\in[1,\infty)$.

Proof: Owing to the equation (9.3) satisfied by the Malliavin derivative $Du(t,x)$, the proof of (9.7) needs estimates for the $L^{2p}(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_t)$ norm of three terms: the initial condition, the stochastic integral and the path integral.
The first one is proved in Lemma 9.1. To obtain the second one we apply (7.8). Finally for the third one we use Jensen's inequality. Then the conclusion follows from Lemma 7.2, taking into account that

$$\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^p) < \infty,$$

for any $p\in[1,\infty)$. □

Lemma 9.3 *Property (I) holds if and only if for any $p\in(0,\infty)$ there exists $\epsilon_0>0$, depending on p, such that*

$$\int_0^{\epsilon_0}\epsilon^{-(1+p)}P(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^2<\epsilon)d\epsilon<\infty. \quad (9.8)$$

Proof: It is well known that for any positive random variable,

$$E(F)=\int_0^\infty P(F>\eta)d\eta.$$

Apply this formula to $F:=||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-2p}$. We obtain

$$E(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-2p}) = m_1+m_2,$$

with

$$m_1=\int_0^{\eta_0}P(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-2p}>\eta)d\eta,$$
$$m_2=\int_{\eta_0}^{\infty}P(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-2p}>\eta)d\eta.$$

Clearly, $m_1\le\eta_0$. The change of variable $\eta=\epsilon^{-p}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}m_2&=\int_{\eta_0}^{\infty}P(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-2p}>\eta)d\eta\\&=\int_{\eta_0}^{\infty}P(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{2}<\eta^{-\frac{1}{p}})d\eta\\&=p\int_0^{\eta_0^{-\frac{1}{p}}}\epsilon^{-(1+p)}P(||Du(t,x)||^2<\epsilon)d\epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. $\square$

Remark 9.1 *The proces* $\big(Du(t,x),(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\big)$ *is* $\mathcal{F}_t$*-adapted. Hence, by virtue of Lemma 5.2,*

$$||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}=||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_t}.$$

Proof of Proposition 9.1: Owing to Lemma 9.3 we have to study the integrability in a neighborhood of zero of the function

$$\Phi(\epsilon)=\epsilon^{-(1+p)}P\big(||Du(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}<\epsilon\big).$$

Let $\epsilon_1,\delta>0$ be such that for any $\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_1]$, $t-\epsilon^\delta>0$. In view of (9.3) we consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}&P\big(||Du(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}<\epsilon\big)=P\big(||Du(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_t}<\epsilon\big)\\&\le P^1(\epsilon,\delta)+P^2(\epsilon,\delta),\end{aligned}\tag{9.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&P^1(\epsilon,\delta)=P\Big(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t drM(t,r,x)\Big|\Big)\ge\epsilon\Big),\\&P^2(\epsilon,\delta)=P\big(||\Lambda(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))||^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}<2\epsilon\big),\end{aligned}$$

with $M(t,r,x)=||D_{r,*}u(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}}-||Z_{r,*}(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let us first consider the term $P^1(\epsilon,\delta)$. By Chebychev's inequality, for every $q\ge1$ we have that

$$P^1(\epsilon,\delta)\le\epsilon^{-q}E\left(\left|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t drM(t,r,x)\right|^q\right)\le C\epsilon^{-q}\sum_{k=1}^5T_k,\tag{9.10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}T_1=E\Big(\Big|&\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr\langle Z_{r,*}(t,x),\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Lambda(t-s,x-z)D_{r,*}u(s,z)\\&\times\sigma'(u(s,z))M(ds,dz)\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\Big|^q\Big),\end{aligned}$$

$$T_2 = E\Bigg(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \langle Z_{r,*}(t,x), \int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) D_{r,*}u(s,x-z)$$

$$\times\, b'(u(s,x-z))\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\Big|^q\Bigg),$$

$$T_3 = E\Bigg(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \Big\|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z) D_{r,*}u(s,z)$$

$$\times\, \sigma'(u(s,z)) M(ds,dz)\Big\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\Big|^q\Bigg),$$

$$T_4 = E\Bigg(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \langle \int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z) D_{r,*}u(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z)) M(ds,dz),$$

$$\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Lambda(t-s,dz) D_{r,*}u(s,x-z) b'(u(s,x-z))\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}\Big|^q\Bigg),$$

$$T_5 = E\Bigg(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \Big\|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) D_{r,*}u(s,x-z)$$

$$\times\, b'(u(s,x-z))\Big\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\Big|^q\Bigg).$$

Schwarz inequality yields

$$T_1 \le T_{11}^{1/2} T_{12}^{1/2},$$

with

$$T_{11} = E\left(\left|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \|Z_{r,*}(t,x)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\right|^q\right),$$

$$T_{12} = E\Bigg(\Big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \Big\|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z) D_{r,*}u(s,z)$$

$$\times\, \sigma'(u(s,z)) M(ds,dz)\Big\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2\Big|^q\Bigg).$$

By Lemma 9.1 and (9.4),

$$T_{11} \le C\big(\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2\big)^q \le C\epsilon^{q\delta\theta_2}. \tag{9.11}$$

Clearly,

$$T_{12} = E\left(\left\|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,x-z) D_{t-\cdot,*}u(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z)) M(ds,dz)\right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^{2q}\right).$$

Here we apply Theorem 7.1 to $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}$, $K(s,z) := D_{t-\cdot,*}u(s,z)\sigma'(u(s,z))$ and $S := \Lambda$. Thus, Lemma 9.2 and (9.4) ensure

$$T_{12} \leq C \left(\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \right)^{2q} \leq \epsilon^{2q\delta\theta_2}. \tag{9.12}$$

Hence,

$$T_1 \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}q\delta\theta_2}. \tag{9.13}$$

We now consider the term

$$T_{22} := E\left(\left\| \int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) D_{t-\cdot,*}u(s,x-z) b'(u(s,x-z)) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^{2q} \right).$$

Jensen's inequality and then Hölder's inequality with respect to the finite measure $\Lambda(t-s,dz)ds$ on $[t-\epsilon^\delta, t] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} T_{22} \leq & \left(\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) \right)^{2q-1} \\ & \times E\left(\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) \| D_{t-\cdot,*}u(s,x-z) b'(u(s,x-z)) \|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^{2q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (9.5) we obtain

$$\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s,dz) = \int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dz \Lambda(s,z) \leq C\epsilon^{\theta_3\delta},$$

Then, since b' is bounded, Lemma 9.2 and (9.4) imply

$$T_{22} \leq C\epsilon^{q\delta(2\theta_3+\theta_2)}. \tag{9.14}$$

Schwarz inequality and the estimates (9.11), (9.12), (9.14) yield

$$\begin{aligned} & T_2 \leq T_{11}^{1/2} T_{22}^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon^{q\delta(\theta_2+\theta_3)}, \\ & T_3 = T_{12} \leq C\epsilon^{2q\delta\theta_2}, \\ & T_4 \leq T_{12}^{1/2} T_{22}^{1/2} \leq C\epsilon^{q\delta(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2+\theta_3)}, \\ & T_5 = T_{22} \leq C\epsilon^{q\delta(2\theta_3+\theta_2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.15}$$

Therefore, (9.10), (9.13) and (9.15) imply

$$P^1(\epsilon,\delta) \leq C\epsilon^{q(-1+(\frac{3}{2}\delta\theta_2)\wedge(\delta(\theta_2+\theta_3)))}.$$

Consequently, for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$ condition $\int_0^{\epsilon_0} P^1(\epsilon,\delta)\epsilon^{-(1+p)} d\epsilon < \infty$ holds if

$$\frac{1}{\delta} < \frac{q\left(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2+\theta_3)\right)}{p+q}. \tag{9.16}$$

We now study the term $P^2(\epsilon,\delta)$. Our purpose is to chose some positive δ such that for ϵ sufficiently small the set $\big(||\Lambda(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))||^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}<2\epsilon\big)$ is empty and therefore $P^2(\epsilon,\delta)=0$.
The assumption (2) yields

$$||\Lambda(r,x-*)\sigma(u(t-r,*))||^2_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \sigma_0^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(r)(\xi)|^2.$$

Hence, the lower bound in (9.4) implies

$$\begin{aligned}&||\Lambda(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))||^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}\\ &\geq C_1\sigma_0^2\epsilon^{\delta\theta_1}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta>0$ be such that

$$\delta\theta_1<1. \tag{9.17}$$

Set $\epsilon_2 := \big(\frac{C_1}{2}\sigma_0^2\big)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta\theta_1}}$. Then for any $\epsilon\leq\epsilon_2$ we have that $P^2(\epsilon,\delta)=0$.
Summarizing the restrictions imposed so far we obtain (see (9.16) and (9.17))

$$\theta_1<\frac{1}{\delta}<\frac{\big(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2\wedge(\theta_2+\theta_3)\big)q}{p+q}. \tag{9.18}$$

Fix $q_0\in(1,\infty)$ such that

$$\theta_1<\frac{\big(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2\wedge(\theta_2+\theta_3)\big)q_0}{p+q_0}.$$

Since by assumption $\theta_1<\frac{3}{2}\theta_2\wedge(\theta_2+\theta_3)$ this is always possible. Then let δ_0 be such that (9.18) holds with $q:=q_0$. Let $\epsilon_1>0$ be such that for any $\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon_1]$, $t-\epsilon^{\delta_0}>0$. The preceding arguments with $\delta:=\delta_0$ and $q:=q_0$ prove that the function $\Psi(\epsilon)=\epsilon^{-(1+p)}P\big(||Du(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}<\epsilon\big)$ is integrable on $(0,\epsilon_0)$, with $\epsilon_0=\epsilon_1\wedge\epsilon_2$. This finishes the proof of the Proposition. □

Let us now consider the case where Λ satisfies Hypothesis D, without further smooth properties.

Proposition 9.2 *Suppose that Hypothesis D is satisfied and also that:*

(1) the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives,

(2) there exists $\sigma_0>0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z\in\mathbb{R}\}\geq\sigma_0$,

(3) there exist $\theta_i, C_i>0$, $i=1,2,3,4,5$, satisfying $\theta_4<\theta_1<\frac{3}{2}\theta_2\wedge(\theta_2+\theta_3)$,

$\theta_4 \le \theta_5$, *such that for any* $t \in (0,1)$,

$$C_1 t^{\theta_1} \le \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \le C_2 t^{\theta_2}, \tag{9.19}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dy) \le C_3 t^{\theta_3}, \tag{9.20}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\xi| |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \le C_4 t^{\theta_4}, \tag{9.21}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\bar\sigma}(d\xi) |\xi| |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \le C_4 t^{\theta_5}. \tag{9.22}$$

where $\bar\sigma(s,x) = \sigma(u(t-s,x))$, $0 \le s \le t$.

Then (I) holds.

We recall that $\mu_s^{\bar\sigma}$ is the spectral measure of the finite measure

$$\Gamma_s^{\bar\sigma}(dz) = E\big(\bar\sigma(u(t-s,0))\bar\sigma(u(t-s,z))\big)\Gamma(dz),$$

(see Section 6.1).
The difference between the proof of this proposition and the preceding one lies on the analysis of the term $P^2(\epsilon,\delta)$, where we use a mollifying procedure. More precisely, as in Chapter 7, let ψ be a non-negative function in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support contained in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x)dx = 1$. For any $\eta > 0$, set $\psi_\eta(x) = \eta^d \psi(\eta x)$ and $\Lambda_\eta = \psi_\eta * \Lambda$. We shall need a technical result.

Lemma 9.4 *We have the following upper bound:*

$$|\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_\eta - \Lambda)(t)(\xi)|^2 \le 4\pi |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi)|^2 |\xi| \eta^{-1}, \tag{9.23}$$

for any $t \in [0,T]$ *and* $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof: The definition of the Fourier transform and a change of variables yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}\psi_\eta(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi_\eta(x) e^{-2i\pi x\cdot\xi} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(y) e^{-2i\pi \frac{y}{\eta}\cdot\xi} dy,\end{aligned}$$

where the notation "$\cdot$" means the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{F}(\psi_\eta(\xi) - 1)|^2 &= \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(y)(e^{-2i\pi\frac{y}{\eta}\cdot\xi} - 1)dy\Big|^2 \\ &= \Big|\int_{|y|\le 1} \psi(y)(e^{-2i\pi\frac{y}{\eta}\cdot\xi} - 1)dy\Big|^2 \\ &\le \sup_{|y|\le 1} |e^{-2i\pi\frac{y}{\eta}\cdot\xi} - 1|^2 \\ &= 2\sup_{|y|\le 1}\big(1 - cos(2\pi(y\cdot\xi)\eta^{-1})\big).\end{aligned}$$

A Taylor expansion of the function $\cos(x)$ in a neighborhood of zero yields for the last term the upper bound

$$2\sup_{|y|\leq 1}\big(2\pi(y\cdot\xi)\eta^{-1}\sin(2\pi(y\cdot\xi)\eta_0\big),$$

with $\eta_0\in(0,\eta^{-1})$.
Therefore

$$|\mathcal{F}(\psi_\eta(\xi)-1)|^2\leq 4\pi|\xi|\eta^{-1}.$$

This proves (9.23). □

Proof of Proposition 9.2: As in the proof of Proposition 9.1 we shall use Lemma 9.3 and consider the decomposition

$$P\big(||Du(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_T}<\epsilon\big)\leq P^1(\epsilon,\delta)+P^2(\epsilon,\delta),$$

where

$$P^1(\epsilon,\delta)=P\big(\big|\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t drM(t,r,x)\big|\big)\geq\epsilon\big),$$
$$P^2(\epsilon,\delta)=P\big(||\bar{Z}(t,x)||^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}\leq 2\epsilon\big),$$

where $\bar{Z}(t,x)$ is the $L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{H}_T)$-limit of the sequence $\Lambda_n(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))$.
Notice that $\bar{Z}_{\cdot,*}(t,x)=Z_{t-\cdot,*}(t,x)$.
We obtain that $\int_0^{\epsilon_0}P^1(\epsilon,\delta)\epsilon^{-(p+1)}d\epsilon<\infty$ if and only if the restriction (9.16) is satisfied.
The analysis of $P^2(\epsilon,\delta)$ cannot be carried out as in Proposition 9.1. In fact the process $Z(t,x)$ is no more a product of a deterministic function and a process. We overcome this problem by smoothing the fundamental solution Λ and controlling the error made in this approximation. To this end we introduce a further decomposition, as follows,

$$P^2(\epsilon,\delta)\leq P^{2,1}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)+P^{2,2}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu),$$

where $\eta>0$ and

$$P^{2,1}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)=P\{\|\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}<6\epsilon\},$$
$$P^{2,2}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)=P\{\|Z_{t-\cdot,*}(t,x)-\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}\geq\epsilon\}$$

Let us start with the study of the term $P^{2,1}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)$. Our purpose is to choose some positive δ and ν such that for ϵ sufficiently small the set

$$\{\|\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|^2_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}<6\epsilon\}$$

is empty and therefore $P^{2,1}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)=0$.

The assumption (2) yields

$$\|\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(r,x-*)\sigma(u(t-r,*))\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \geq \sigma_0^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(r)(\xi)|^2$$
$$\geq \sigma_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(r)(\xi)|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}} - \Lambda)(r)(\xi)|^2 \right).$$

Lemma 9.4 and the bounds (9.19), (9.21) yield

$$\|\Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^2$$
$$\geq \sigma_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda_3(r)(\xi)|^2 - 4\pi\epsilon^\nu \int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(r)(\xi)|^2 \right)$$
$$\geq \sigma_0^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} C_1 \epsilon^{\theta_1\delta} - C_2\epsilon^{\nu+\delta\theta_4} \right),$$

for some positive constants C_1, C_2. Let $\nu,\delta > 0$ be such that

$$\frac{\theta_1 - \theta_4}{\nu} < \frac{1}{\delta}, \tag{9.24}$$

then $\frac{1}{2}C_1\epsilon^{\theta_1\delta} - C_2\epsilon^{\nu+\delta\theta_4} \geq \frac{C_1}{4}\epsilon^{\theta_1\delta}$, for all $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2 := \left(\frac{C_1}{4C_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu-\delta(\theta_1-\theta_4)}}$. Thus, for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, $\|S_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^2 \geq \sigma_0^2 \frac{1}{4} C_1 \epsilon^{\theta_1\delta}$. Moreover, the condition

$$\theta_1\delta < 1, \tag{9.25}$$

implies $6\epsilon < \sigma_0^2 \frac{C_1}{4}\epsilon^{\theta_1\delta}$, for $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3 := \left(\frac{C_1\sigma_0^2}{24}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta_1\delta}}$. Hence, if $\nu,\delta > 0$ satisfy (9.24) and (9.25) then $P^{2,1}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu) = 0$, for any $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_2 \wedge \epsilon_3$.
Consider now the term $P^{2,2}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)$. By Chebychev's inequality, Lemma 9.4 and (9.22) we have that

$$P^{2,2}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu) \leq \epsilon^{-1}E(\|Z_{t-\cdot,*}(t,x) - \Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(\cdot,x-*)\sigma(u(t-\cdot,*))\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}^2)$$
$$= \epsilon^{-1}\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\bar\sigma}(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}(\Lambda(s) - \Lambda_{\epsilon^{-\nu}}(s))(\xi)|^2$$
$$\leq 4\pi\epsilon^{-1+\nu}\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\bar\sigma}(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2,$$
$$\leq C\epsilon^{-1+\nu+\delta\theta_5},$$

for some positive constant C.
Thus, $\int_0^{\epsilon_0} \epsilon^{-(1+p)}P^{2,2}(\epsilon,\delta,\nu)d\epsilon < \infty$ if

$$-1 - p + \nu + \delta\theta_5 > 0. \tag{9.26}$$

We finish the proof by analyzing the intersection of conditions (9.16), (9.24)-(9.26). We recall that $p \in [0,\infty)$ is fixed.

Choose $\nu > 0$ such that

$$\nu > \frac{\theta_1 - \theta_4}{\theta_1}. \tag{9.27}$$

We are assuming that $\theta_1 > \theta_4 > 0$, therefore such a choice is possible. Then conditions (9.16), (9.25), (9.26) are equivalent to

$$\theta_1 < \frac{1}{\delta} < \frac{q\left(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)\right)}{p+q}. \tag{9.28}$$

$$-1 - p + \nu + \delta\theta_5 > 0. \tag{9.29}$$

Let us now choose $q_0 \in (1, \infty)$ such that

$$\theta_1 < \frac{q_0\left(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)\right)}{p+q_0}.$$

The condition $\theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)$ allows this choice. Then let $\delta > 0$ satisfying (9.28) with $q = q_0$.
For this δ choose $\nu > 0$ sufficiently large such that (9.27) and (9.29) hold true. The proof of the proposition is complete. $\square$

If our purpose were limited to study the existence of density for the probability law of $u(t,x)$ it would suffice to study the validity of the property $||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T} > 0$, a.s. A sufficient condition for this is
(I') There exists $p > 0$ such that $E(||Du(t,x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^{-p}) < \infty$.
We leave as exercise for the reader the next proposition that can be proved following the same ideas as those of Propositions 9.1 and 9.2.

Proposition 9.3 *Suppose that Hypothesis D is satisfied and also that:*

(1) the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives,

(2) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z \in \mathbb{R}\} \geq \sigma_0$,

(3) there exist $\theta_i, C_i > 0$, $i = 1,2,3,4$, satisfying $\theta_4 < \theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)$ such that for any $t \in (0,1)$,

$$C_1 t^{\theta_1} \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2 t^{\theta_2},$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dy) \leq C_3 t^{\theta_3},$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_4 t^{\theta_4},$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^{\bar{\sigma}}(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_4 t^{\theta_5}.$$

where $\bar{\sigma}(s,x) = \sigma(u(t-s,x))$, $0 \leq s \leq t$.

Then (I') holds.

9.2 Examples

We study in this section two important examples of stochastic partial differential equations: the wave and heat equations. We shall check that the assumptions of Proposition 9.1 are satisfied by the heat equation in any spatial dimension $d \geq 1$ and by the wave equation in dimension $d = 1, 2$, while Proposition 9.2 applies to the wave equation for $d = 3$.
The next assumption shall play a relevant rôle.
Condition (H_η) There exists $\eta \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1 + |\xi|^2)^\eta} < \infty. \tag{9.30}$$

Notice that for $\eta = 1$, the condition (H_η) is (7.16).
We begin with the analysis of the heat operator.

Lemma 9.5 *Let Λ be the fundamental solution of $L_1 = 0$, with $L_1 = \partial_t - \Delta_d$.*

(1) Assume that condition (7.16) holds; then for any $t \geq 0$ there exists a positive constant $C > 0$, not depending on t, such that

$$Ct \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2. \tag{9.31}$$

(2) Suppose that (9.30) holds for some $\eta \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $t \geq 0$ there exists a constant $C > 0$, not depending on t and $\beta \in (0, 1 - \eta]$ such that

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq Ct^\beta. \tag{9.32}$$

(3) For any $t \geq 0$, there exists a positive constant C, not depending on t such that

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \Lambda(s, y) \leq Ct. \tag{9.33}$$

Proof: We recall that $\mathcal{F}\Lambda(t)(\xi) = \exp(-2\pi^2 t |\xi|^2)$.
The proof of (1) follows immediately from the lower bound of (7.15).
For the proof of (2) we consider the decomposition

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq T_1(t) + T_2(t),$$

with

$$T_1(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi| \leq 1} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2,$$

$$T_2(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi| > 1} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2.$$

Since μ is a tempered measure, it is finite on any compact set. Thus

$$T_1(t) \le \mu(|\xi| \le 1)t.$$

To study $T_2(t)$ we apply the inequality $1 - \exp(-x) \le x$, valid for any $x \ge 0$. We obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2(t) &= \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{(1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2))^{\eta}(1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2))^{1-\eta}}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \\
&\le 2^{\eta} \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{(1-\exp(-4\pi^2 t|\xi|^2)^{1-\eta}}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \\
&\le 2^{-\eta}\pi^{-2\eta} \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{t^{1-\eta}}{|\xi|^{2\eta}} \\
&\le \pi^{-2\eta} t^{1-\eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{\eta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (3) is trivial. Indeed by its very definition $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,y)dy \le C$. □

As a consequence of the previous Lemma we can now state the result concerning the heat equation.

Theorem 9.1 *Let $u(t,x)$ be the solution of Equation (7.13) with $L := \partial_t - \Delta_d$ at a fixed point $(t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose that*

(a) the coefficients σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with bounded derivatives of any order greater or equal than one,

(b) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z \in \mathbb{R}\} \ge \sigma_0$,

(c) there exists $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$ such that condition (H_η) holds.

Then the law of $u(t,x)$ has an infinite differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof: It is based on the criterium given in Theorem 6.2. The validity of assumption (a) of this Theorem is ensured by Proposition 8.1.
Let us now check assumption (b). By virtue of Lemma 9.5 the hypotheses (3) of Proposition 9.1 hold with $\theta_1 = 1$, $\theta_2 = 1 - \eta$ and $\theta_3 = 1$. These parameters satisfy the restriction $\theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)$ if $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$. □

The next step is to study the stochastic wave equation with spatial parameter $d = 1, 2$. We begin with some auxiliary results whose validity extends to any dimension $d \ge 1$.

Lemma 9.6 *Let Λ be the fundamental solution of $L_2 = 0$ with $L_2 = \partial_{tt}^2 - \Delta_d$, $d \ge 1$.*

(1) Assume that (7.16) holds; then for any $t \geq 0$ we have

$$C_1(t \wedge t^3) \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2(t + t^3), \tag{9.34}$$

where C_i, $i = 1, 2$ are positive constants independent of t. In particular, for $t \in [0, 1)$,

$$C_1 t^3 \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2 t. \tag{9.35}$$

(2) Suppose that (H_η) holds for some $\eta \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C t^{3-2\eta}, \tag{9.36}$$

where C is a positive constant depending on η and T.

(3) Let $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then there exists a positive constant independent of t such that

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s, dy) \leq C t^2 \tag{9.37}$$

Proof: The estimates (9.34) follow from (7.17) and (9.35) is a trivial consequence of (9.34).
Let us check (9.36). Set

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 = R_1(t) + R_2(t),$$

with

$$R_1(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|\leq 1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{\sin^2(2\pi s|\xi|)}{(2\pi|\xi|)^2},$$
$$R_2(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{\sin^2(2\pi s|\xi|)}{(2\pi|\xi|)^2}.$$

Since $\sin x \leq x$, we clearly have

$$R_1(t) \leq \mu\{|\xi| \leq 1\} \frac{t^3}{3}.$$

For $R_2(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_2(t) &\leq \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi) \frac{(\sin(2\pi s|\xi|)^{2(1-\eta)}}{(2\pi|\xi|)^2} \\ &\leq \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} (2\pi s|\xi|)^{2(1-\eta)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\pi^{2\eta}(3-2\eta)} \Big(\int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} \Big) t^{3-2\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the upper bound (9.36) with

$$C = \frac{\mu\{|\xi| \le 1\}}{3} T^{2\eta} + \frac{1}{(2\pi^{2^\eta}(3-2\eta)} \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}.$$

The proof of (3) depends on the value of d. For $d=1$, $\Lambda(s)$ is the function defined by $\Lambda(s,dy) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{|y|<s}\right)dy$. Thus,

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda(s,dy) = \frac{t^2}{2}.$$

For $d=2$,

$$\Lambda(s,dy) = \big(\frac{1}{2\pi}(s^2 - |y|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbb{1}_{|y|\le s}\big)dy.$$

Thus, a direct computation yields

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Lambda(s,dy) = \frac{t^2}{2}.$$

Finally, for $d=3$, $\Lambda(s) = \frac{1}{4\pi s}\sigma_s$, where σ_s denotes the uniform measure on the 3-dimensional sphere of radius s. therefore,

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Lambda(s,dy) = \int_0^t s ds = \frac{t^2}{2}.$$

□

This lemma allows to study the existence and smoothness of density for the stochastic wave equation with $d=1,2$, as follows.

Theorem 9.2 *Let $u(t,x)$ be the solution of Equation (7.13) with $L := \partial_{tt}^2 - \Delta_d$, $d=1,2$, at a fixed point $(t,x)\in(0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose that*

(a) the coefficients σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with bounded derivatives of any order greater or equal than one,

(b) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z\in\mathbb{R}\} \ge \sigma_0$,

(c) there exists $\eta \in (0,\frac{1}{2})$ such that condition (H_η) holds.

Then the law of $u(t,x)$ has an infinite differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof: We proceed as in the proof of the preceding Theorem 9.1. Notice that the hypotheses (3) of Proposition 9.1 hold with $\theta_1 = 3$, $\theta_2 = 3-2\eta$ and $\theta_3 = 2$. These parameters satisfy the restriction $\theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2+\theta_3)$ if $\eta\in(0,\frac{1}{2})$. □

Our next purpose is to study the stochastic wave equation for $d=3$. The fundamental solution of the underlying differential operator is no more a function, but a non-negative measure. Thus we shall try to apply Proposition 9.2. In addition with the work done in lower dimensions we must analize the validity of (9.21). The next three lemmas give the technical background.

Lemma 9.7 *Suppose that there exists $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that (H_η) is satisfied. Then for any $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \le Ct^{2-2\eta}, \tag{9.38}$$

with $C = \frac{\mu\{|\xi|\le 1\}}{3} T^{1+2\eta} + \frac{1}{(2-2\eta)2^{1+\eta}\pi^{1+2\eta}} \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$.

Proof: We decompose the left hand-side of (9.38) into the sum $J_1(t) + J_2(t)$, with

$$J_1(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|\le 1} \mu(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2,$$
$$J_2(t) = \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2.$$

Clearly,

$$J_1(t) \le \mu\{|\xi| \le 1\}\frac{t^3}{3}. \tag{9.39}$$

Let $0 < \gamma < 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(t) &= \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi)|\xi| \frac{(\sin 2\pi s|\xi|)^\gamma}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \le (2\pi)^{\gamma-2} \int_0^t ds \int_{|\xi|>1} \mu(d\xi)|\xi|^{\gamma-1}s^\gamma \\ &= (2\pi)^{\gamma-2}\frac{t^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma+1} \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(|\xi|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}} \le \frac{2^{\frac{\gamma-3}{2}}\pi^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma+1} t^{\gamma+1} \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta := \frac{1-\gamma}{2}$. We obtain

$$J_2(t) \le \bar{C}t^{2-2\eta}, \tag{9.40}$$

with $\bar{C} = \frac{1}{(2-2\eta)2^{1+\eta}\pi^{1+2\eta}} \int_{|\xi|>1} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$.
Consequently, (9.39) and (9.40) yield (9.38) with the value of the constant C given in the statement. □

Let $\big(Z(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d\big)$ be a predictable L^2-process with stationary covariance function such that $\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|Z(t,x)|^2) < \infty$. We recall the notation $\Gamma_s^Z(dx) = g(s,x)\Gamma(dx)$, with $g(s,x) = E(Z(s,y)Z(s,x+y))$ and $\mu_s^Z = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\Gamma_s^Z)$.
Set $G_{d,\eta}(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(\frac{1}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}\big)(x)$, $d \ge 1$, $\eta \in (0,\infty)$. It is well-known (see for instance [16]) that

$$G_{d,\eta}(x) = C_{d,\eta}|x|^{\eta-\frac{d}{2}} K_{\frac{d}{2}-\eta}(|x|),$$

where $C_{d,\eta}$ is some strictly positive constant and K_ρ is the modified Bessel function of second kind of order ρ. Set

$$F_{d,\eta}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) G_{d,\eta}(x-y),$$

$y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
We remark that if the function $\varphi = \frac{1}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$ were in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -which is not the case- then

$$F_{d,\eta}(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}.$$

The next lemma clarifies the relation between the property (H_η) and the finiteness of $F_{d,\eta}(y)$.

Lemma 9.8 *For any $\eta \in (0,\infty)$ the following statements are equivalent*

(i) $\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} F_{d,\eta}(y) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) G_{d,\eta}(x-y) < \infty$,

(ii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} < \infty$.

Actually $\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} F_{d,\eta}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$.

Proof: Assume (i). For any $t>0$ set $p_t = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(e^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2})$. Since p_t is the density of a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ we clearly have that

$$\sup_{t>0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy p_t(y) F_{d,\eta}(y) \le \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} F_{d,\eta}(y) < \infty.$$

The definition of $F_{d,\eta}$ and Fubini's Theorem yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_t(y) F_{d,\eta}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x).$$

Since $G_{d,\eta} * p_t \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} e^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}.$$

By monotone convergence,

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} e^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta},$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} \le \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} F_{d,\eta}(y) < \infty,$$

proving (ii).
Assume now that (ii) holds. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we set $(\tau_y \circ G_{d,\eta})(x) = G_{d,\eta}(x-y)$.

Since $\frac{e^{-2\pi^2 t|\cdot|^2}}{(1+|\cdot-y|^2)^\eta} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\mathcal{F}(\tau_y \circ G_{d,\eta})(\xi)\mathcal{F}p_t(\xi) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)((\tau_y \circ G_{d,\eta}) * p_t)(x) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x-y).
\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of the symmetry of μ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\mathcal{F}(\tau_y \circ G_{d,\eta})(\xi)\mathcal{F}p_t(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\cos(2\pi\xi\cdot y)(\mathcal{F}G_{d,\eta})(\xi)e^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}.$$

Then, Fatou's Lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)G_{d,\eta}(x-y) &\le \liminf_{t\searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x-y) \\
&= \liminf_{t\searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\cos(2\pi\xi\cdot y)\mathcal{F}G_{d,\eta}(\xi)e^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By bounded convergence we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)G_{d,\eta}(x-y) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)\frac{\cos(2\pi\xi\cdot y)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}.$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)G_{d,\eta}(x-y) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} < \infty.$$

□

The next lemma is a technical result needed in the proof of the analogue of Lemma 9.7 for the measure μ_s^Z.

Lemma 9.9 *Assume that* (H_η) *holds for some* $\eta \in (0,1)$. *Then*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu_s^Z(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} \le C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta},$$

for some positive constant C.

Proof. Set

$$F_{d,\eta}^Z(s,y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_s^Z(dx)G_{d,\eta}(x-y),$$

$s \in [0,T]$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Lemma 9.8 implies that

$$\sup_{(s,y)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} F_{d,\eta}^Z(s,y) < \infty.$$

Indeed, this follows from the definition of the measure Γ_s^Z and the properties of the process Z. Then, by the Lemma 9.8 again it follows that for any $s \in [0,T]$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu_s^Z(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} < \infty.$$

Let p_t be as in the preceding lemma; by bounded convergence we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^Z(d\xi) \frac{1}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} = \lim_{t \searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^Z(d\xi) \frac{\exp^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$$
$$= \lim_{t \searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_s^Z(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x).$$

Fubini's Theorem yields that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_s^Z(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \; p_t(y) F_{d,\eta}^Z(s,y).$$

But, the definition of Γ_s^Z implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \; p_t(y) F_{d,\eta}^Z(s,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \; p_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma_s^Z(dx) G_{d,\eta}(x-y)$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \; p_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) g(s,x) G_{d,\eta}(x-y)$$
$$\leq \sup_{(s,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(|Z(s,x)|^2) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy \; p_t(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) G_{d,\eta}(x-y)$$
$$= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx)(G_{d,\eta} * p_t)(x) = C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) \frac{\exp^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}.$$

Owing to (H_η) and using again bounded convergence, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^Z(d\xi) \frac{1}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta} \leq C \lim_{t \searrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) \frac{\exp^{-2\pi^2 t|\xi|^2}}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}$$
$$= C \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mu(d\xi)}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}.$$

□

We can now give the last ingredient we need.

Lemma 9.10 *Assume that (H_η) holds with η restricted to the interval $(0, \frac{1}{2})$. Then for any $t \in [0,T]$ there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^Z(d\xi) |\xi| |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C t^{2-2\eta}. \tag{9.41}$$

Proof: Clearly, by the inequality (7.8) with $p = 2$ and Lemma 9.6 (see (9.36))

$$T_1(t) := \int_0^t ds \int_{\{|\xi|\leq 1\}} \mu_s^Z(d\xi)|\xi||\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq Ct^{3-2\eta}. \tag{9.42}$$

Using the same arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 9.7 to study the term $J_2(t)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} T_2(t) : &= \int_0^t ds \int_{\{|\xi|>1\}} \mu_s^Z(d\xi)|\xi| \frac{\sin^2(2\pi s|\xi|)}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \\ &\leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\{|\xi|>1\}} \mu_s^Z(d\xi)|\xi| \frac{\big(\sin(2\pi s|\xi|)\big)^{1-2\eta}}{4\pi^2|\xi|^2} \\ &\leq C \int_0^t ds\ s^{1-2\eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu_s^Z(d\xi) \frac{1}{(1+|\xi|^2)^\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the preceding lemma, this last term is bounded by $Ct^{2-2\eta}$, which together with (9.42) imply (9.41). □

We can now give the result on existence and smoothness of density for the stochastic wave equation in dimension $d = 3$. The restriction on the dimension is imposed by the non-negative requirement on the fundamental solution in order to have existence and uniqueness of a real-valued solution to Equation (7.13), (see Theorem 7.2 and Example 7.1).

Theorem 9.3 *Let $u(t,x)$ be the solution of Equation (7.13) with $L := \partial_{tt}^2 - \Delta_3$ at a fixed point $(t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$. Suppose that*

(a) the coefficients σ, b are $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with bounded derivatives of any order greater or equal than one,

(b) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z \in \mathbb{R}\} \geq \sigma_0$,

(c) there exists $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that condition (H_η) holds.

Then the law of $u(t,x)$ has an infinite differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof: We apply Theorem 6.2. Assumption (a) of this theorem is assured by Proposition 8.1. We next prove that the hypothesis of Proposition 9.2 are satisfied. Thus, condition (b) of the above mentioned theorem also holds true. Indeed, by Lemma 9.7 the upper bound (9.21) holds with $\theta_4 = 2-2\eta$. Applying Lemma 9.10 to the process $Z(s,x) = \sigma(u(t-s,x))$ yields that the upper bound (9.22) is satisfied with $\theta_5 = 2 - 2\eta$. On the other hand we already know that (9.19) and (9.20) hold with $\theta_1 = 3$, $\theta_2 = 3 - 2\eta$, $\theta_3 = 2$. Then, $\theta_4 = \theta_5 < \theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3)$. □

9.3 Multidimensional case

Let $x_1, \cdots, x_m$ be distinct points of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the solution of Equation (7.13) at $(t, x_1), \cdots, (t, x_m)$. Set $u(t, \underline{x}) = \big(u(t, x_1), \cdots, u(t, x_m)\big)$. We denote by $\Gamma(t, \underline{x})$ the Malliavin matrix of $u(t, \underline{x})$, that is,

$$\big(\langle Du(t, x_i), Du(t, x_j)\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_T}, \, 1 \le i, j \le m\big).$$

In this section we study sufficient conditions ensuring the property:

(J) For every $p > 0$,

$$E\big(\det \Gamma(t, \underline{x})^{-p}\big) < \infty \tag{9.43}$$

We start with a result which has an analogous function as Lemma 9.3 in our new context.

Lemma 9.11 *Fix $p > 0$. Assume that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$, depending on p and v such that*

$$\int_0^{\epsilon_0} \epsilon^{-(1+pm+2m)} P\big(v^T \Gamma(t, \underline{x}) v < 2\epsilon\big) < \infty. \tag{9.44}$$

Then, (9.43) holds true.

Proof: Let $\lambda(t, \underline{x}) = \inf_{|v|=1} v^T \Gamma(t, \underline{x}) v$. Then $\det \Gamma(t, \underline{x}) \ge \big(\lambda(t, \underline{x})\big)^m$. Set $q = pm$; it suffices to check that

$$E\big(\lambda(t, \underline{x})\big)^{-q} < \infty.$$

A simple argument yields the following (see, for instance Lemma 2.3.1 in [41]): For any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$P\big(\lambda(t, \underline{x}) < \epsilon\big) \le \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} P\big(v_k^T \Gamma(t, \underline{x}) v_k < 2\epsilon\big) + P\big(||\Gamma(t, \underline{x})|| > \epsilon^{-1}\big), \tag{9.45}$$

where n_0 denotes the number of balls centered at the unit vectors of $\mathbb{R}^m$, $v_1, \cdots, v_{n_0}$ with radius $\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}$ covering the unit sphere S^{m-1} and $|| \cdot ||$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. Notice that $n_0 \le C\epsilon^{-2m}$.

Set $F = \big(\lambda(t, \underline{x})\big)^{-q}$. The classical argument used in the proof of Lemma 9.3 yields

$$E(F) \le \eta_0 + q \int_0^{\eta_0^{-\frac{1}{q}}} \epsilon^{-(q+1)} P\big(\lambda(t, \underline{x}) < \epsilon\big) d\epsilon. \tag{9.46}$$

We have proved in Proposition 8.1 that $\sup_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d} E(||Du(t, x)||_{\mathcal{H}_T}^p) < \infty$, for any $p \in [1, \infty)$. Then Chebychev's inequality yields

$$P\big(||\Gamma(t, \underline{x})|| > \epsilon^{-1}\big) \le \epsilon^r E(||\Gamma(t, \underline{x})||^r) \le C\epsilon^r,$$

for any $r \in [1, \infty)$.

Therefore, in view of (9.45) and (9.46) we conclude. $\square$

We would like now to carry out a similar programme as in Section 9.1. However we do not succeed yet. We know how to deal with the wave equation in spatial dimension $d = 2$ when the correlation of the noise is of an special type; this is the main topic in [39]. In spite of these restrictions we present a general result -which for the moment only applies to this example- with the hope that the stochastic heat equation could be analyzed with the same tool. It is the multidimensional version of Proposition 9.1. Similarly, we could prove the multidimensional analogue of Proposition 9.2. However we do not have yet any example where it could be applied.

Proposition 9.4 *Suppose that Hypothesis D is satisfied and in addition that the measure $\Lambda(t)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, assume that*

(1) the coefficients σ and b are $\mathcal{C}^1$ functions with bounded Lipschitz continuous derivatives,

(2) there exists $\sigma_0 > 0$ such that $\inf\{|\sigma(z)|, z \in \mathbb{R}\} \geq \sigma_0$,

(3) there exist $\theta_i, C_i > 0$, $i = 1,2,3,4$, satisfying $\theta_1 < \frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2 + \theta_3) \wedge \theta_4$ and such that for any $t \in (0,1)$,

$$C_1 t^{\theta_1} \leq \int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \leq C_2 t^{\theta_2}, \tag{9.47}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,y)dy \leq C_3 t^{\theta_3}, \tag{9.48}$$

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_1 - \cdot))||\overline{\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_2 - \cdot))}| \leq C_4 t^{\theta_4}, \tag{9.49}$$

where x_1, x_2 are different points in $\mathbb{R}^d$

Then (J) holds.

Proof: Let $\big(\xi_{r,z}(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, r \leq t, z \in \mathbb{R}^d\big)$, be the solution of the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{r,z}(t,x) = \Lambda(t-r, x-z) + \int_r^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(t-s, x-y)\sigma'(u(s,y))\xi_{r,z}(s,y)M(ds,dy) \\ + \int_r^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Lambda(s,dy) b'(u(t-s,x-y))\xi_{r,z}(t-s,x-y),\end{aligned} \tag{9.50}$$

for fixed r, z.
By uniqueness of solution $D_{r,z}u(t,x) = \sigma(u(r,z))\xi_{r,z}(t,x)$. Let $\epsilon_1, \delta > 0$ be such that $t - \epsilon^\delta > 0$ for any $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$. Then, if $v = (v_1, \cdots, v_m)$, by hypothesis (2),

$$v^T \Gamma(t, \underline{x}) v \geq \sigma_0^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy v_i v_j \xi_{r,y}(t,x_i) \xi_{r,x-y}(t,x_j).$$

Therefore,

$$P(v^T\Gamma(t,\underline{x})v < \epsilon) \le p^1(\epsilon,\delta) + p^2(\epsilon,\delta), \tag{9.51}$$

where

$$p^1(\epsilon,\delta) = P\Big(\int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy v_j^2 \xi_{r,y}(t,x_j)\xi_{r,x-y}(t,x_j) < \frac{2}{\sigma_0^2}\epsilon\Big),$$

$$p^2(\epsilon,\delta) = P\Big(\sum_{i\neq j} \int_{t-\epsilon^\delta}^t dr \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Gamma(dx) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy v_i v_j \xi_{r,y}(t,x_i)\xi_{r,x-y}(t,x_j) \ge \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma_0^2}\Big),$$

for any $j = 1, 2, \cdots, m$.
We study the ϵ-size of the term $p^1(\epsilon,\delta)$ following the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 9.1. We come out with the following conclusion: Fix $p \in [1,\infty)$. Assume there exist $q \in [1,\infty)$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\theta_1 < \frac{1}{\delta} < \frac{\big(\frac{3}{2}\theta_2 \wedge (\theta_2+\theta_3)\big)q}{pm+2m+q}. \tag{9.52}$$

Then the function $\varphi(\epsilon) = \epsilon^{-(1+pm+2m)} p^1(\epsilon,\delta)$ is integrable in a neighbourhood of zero.
Chebychev's inequality yields

$$p^2(\epsilon,\delta) \le C\epsilon^{-q} E\big(|\langle \xi_{t-\cdot,*}(t,x_i), \xi_{t-\cdot,*}(t,x_j)\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon^\delta}}|^q. \tag{9.53}$$

By virtue of the equation (9.50) and following similar arguments as those of the proof of Lemma 9.2 one can check that the right hand-side of (9.53) is bounded by

$$C\Big(\int_0^{\epsilon^\delta} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi) |\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_1-\cdot))||\overline{\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_2-\cdot))}|\Big)^q.$$

Hence, owing to (9.49)

$$p^2(\epsilon,\delta) \le C\epsilon^{q(-1+\delta\theta_4)}.$$

Consequently the integrability of the function $\psi(\epsilon) = \epsilon^{-(1+pm+2m)} p^2(\epsilon,\delta)$ in a neighbourhood of zero is assured as far as

$$\frac{1}{\delta} < \frac{q\theta_4}{pm+2m+q}, \tag{9.54}$$

for some $q \in [1,\infty)$.
We conclude by checking that both restrictions (9.52) and (9.54) are compatible under the assumptions on θ_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 4$ given in the statement. □

Example 9.1 *Consider the stochastic wave equation in dimension $d = 2$. We assume that $\Gamma(dx) = f(x)dx$, with $f(x) = |x|^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and the same assumptions (a) and (b) of Theorem 9.2. Then the law of the random vector $u(t,\underline{x})$ has an infinite differentiable density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$.*

Indeed, let us check that the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 are satisfied. Hypothesis (a) follows from Proposition 8.1, while condition (b) shall follow from the previous proposition.
In fact, Lemma A1 in [39] states that

$$\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(\xi)|^2 \sim t \int_0^t rf(r)\ln\big(1+\frac{t}{r}\big)dr,$$

by virtue of the particular expression of the fundamental solution. On the other hand, by the particular choice of the correlation density, it is easy to check that

$$\int_0^t rf(r)\ln\big(1+\frac{t}{r}\big)dr \sim t^{2-\alpha}. \tag{9.55}$$

Consequently, $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 3-\alpha$. We already know that $\theta_3 = 2$.
Let us now prove that $\theta_4 = 3$. Set $m = |x_1 - x_2|$. Then, if $4t < m$, $|z-x_1| < t$, $|z'-x_2| < t$ imply $\frac{m}{2} \le |z-z'| \le \frac{3m}{2}$. Hence, since f is continuous, for these range of $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $f(|z-z'|)$ is bounded. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_1-\cdot)||\overline{\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_2-\cdot)}| \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} dxdzf(x)\Lambda(s,z-x)\Lambda(s,z) \\
&= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(z-z')\Lambda(s,z')\Lambda(s,z) \\
&\le C\int_0^t \Big(\int_{(|z|\le s)} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{s^2-|z|^2}}\Big)^2 ds \\
&\le Ct^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where we made the change of variables $z - x = z'$.
Is is trivial to check that for any $\alpha \in (0,2)$ these values of θ_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 4$, satisfy the conditions of Proposition 9.4.

Remark 9.2 *It is natural to compare the assumptions on Γ in the preceding example with the validity of condition (H_η).*
It is well known that $\mathcal{F}f(\xi) = |\xi|^{-(2-\alpha)}$. Then condition (H_η) is equivalent to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\rho d\rho}{\rho^{2-\alpha}(1+\rho^2)^\eta} < \infty.$$

Assume that $\alpha \in (\eta, 2\eta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 \frac{\rho d\rho}{\rho^{2-\alpha}(1+\rho^2)^\eta} &\le \int_0^1 \frac{\rho d\rho}{\rho^{2-\alpha}(1+\rho^2)^{\frac{\eta}{2}}} \\
&\le \int_0^1 \rho^{-1+\alpha-\eta} d\rho < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\alpha > \eta$.
Moreover

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{\rho d\rho}{\rho^{2-\alpha}(1+\rho^2)^\eta} \leq \int_1^\infty \rho^{-1*\alpha-2\eta} d\rho < \infty,$$

since $\alpha < 2\eta$.

Remark 9.3 *There are two facts in Example 9.1 worthy to be mentioned. The first one is that the value* $\theta_1 = 3 - \alpha$ *is better that the one obtained in (9.35)* ($\theta_1 = 3$)*, which means that the results of Lemma A1 in [39] are sharper than those of Lemma 9.6 for* $\mathrm{d} = 2$.
The second one is the value of θ_4 *which has been obtained using the particular form of the fundamental solution in this dimension. One could be tempted to apply Schwarz's inequality to* $\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_1-\cdot))||\overline{\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x_2-\cdot))}|$ *and then use the bound of* $\int_0^t ds \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(d\xi)|\mathcal{F}\Lambda(s)(x-\cdot))|^2$. *This procedure would leed to a rougher inequality* ($\theta_2 = \theta_4$) *which is not suitable for the analysis of Example 9.1.*

Remark 9.4 *In view of the preceding remarks it seems that an extension of Theorem 9.3 to the multidimensional case requires, as in dimension 2, a strengthening of Lemma 9.6. In view of the complexity of the above mentioned Lemma A1 in [39] this seems to be a difficult but challenging problem.*

Comments

In this chapter we have followed the strategy of [34] of giving sufficient conditions on the behaviour of the fundamental solution ensuring non degeneracy of the Malliavin matrix. In comparison with [34] our results apply to a broader class of equations including the stochastic wave equation with spatial dimension three. Proposition 9.2 is an abstract formulation of results published in [53]. Section 9.2 contains results from [31], [34] and [53]. Lemma 9.8 is a new contribution towards the analysis of condition (H_η). We believe that the results concerning the stochastic wave equation can be extended to the damped wave equation using the analysis of the fundamental solution carried out in [31].

10 Definition of spaces used along the course

$\mathcal{C}_0^r(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $r \in (0, \infty]$, is the space of r-differentiable functions with compact support.
$\mathcal{C}_b^r(\mathbb{R}^m)$, $r \in (0, \infty]$, is the space of bounded r-differentiable functions with bounded derivatives of any order.
$\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of infinite dimensional functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$. For $m = 1$ we write $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ instead of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$.
$\mathcal{C}_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of infinite dimensional functions f defined on $\mathbb{R}^m$ such that f and its partial derivatives have polynomial growth.
$\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of Schwartz test functions, that means, the topological vector space of functions in $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with the topology induced by the following notion of convergence: $\varphi_n \to \varphi$ if and only if:

1. there is a compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_n - \varphi) \subset K$, for all n;
2. $\lim_{n\to\infty} \nabla^\alpha \varphi_n = \nabla^\alpha \varphi$, uniformly on K, for any multiindex α.

$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ functions with rapid decrease.
$\mathcal{B}_b(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the set of Borel bounded subsets of $\mathbb{R}^m$.
$\mathcal{P}$ is the set of Gaussian functionals of the form $F\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big)$, where f is a polynomial.
$\mathcal{S}$ is the set of Gaussian functionals of the form $F\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big)$, where $f \in \mathcal{C}_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$.
$\mathcal{S}_b$ is the set of Gaussian functionals of the form $F\big(W(h_1), \cdots, W(h_n)\big)$, where $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$.
$\mathcal{S}_\mathcal{H}$ is the set of random vectors of the type $u = \sum_{j=1}^n F_j h_j$, $F_j \in \mathcal{S}$, $h_j \in H$, $j = 1, \cdots, n$.
$\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of linear applications from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$.

References

[1] V. Bally: *An elementary introduction to Malliavin calculus.* Rapport de recherche 4718. INRIA, Février 2003.

[2] V. Bally, I. Gyöngy and E. Pardoux: *White noise driven parabolic SPDEs with measurable drift.* J. Functional Analysis 96, 219-255 (1991).

[3] V. Bally and D. Talay: *The law of the Euler scheme for stochastic differential equations: I. Convergence rate of the distribution function.* Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 104, 43-60 (1996).

[4] X. Bardina and M. Jolis: *Estimation of the density of hypoelliptic diffusion processes with application to an extended Itô's formula.* J. Theoretical Probab. 15,1, 223-247 (2002).

[5] D. Bell and S-E. Mohammed: *An extension of Hörmander's theorem for infinitely degenerate second-order operators.* Duke Math. J. 78, 3, 453-475 (1995).

[6] S. K. Berberian: *Introduction to Hilbert Space*, 2nd ed. Chelsea Publ. Co., New York, 1976.

[7] N. Bouleau and F. Hirsch: *Dirichlet Froms and Analysis on the Wiener Space.* de Gruyter Studies in Math. 14, Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

[8] D.R. Bell: *The Malliavin Calculus.* Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Math. 34, Longman and Wiley, 1987.

[9] G. Ben Arous and R. Léandre: *Décroissance exponentielle du noyau de la chaleur sur la diagonal II.* Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 90, 377-402 (1991).

[10] J.M. Bismut: *Large deviations and Malliavin calculus.* Progress in Math. 45. Birkhäuser, 1984.

[11] J.M.C. Clark: *The representation of functionals of Brownian motion by stochastic integrals. Ann. Math. Statis.* 41, 1282-1295 (1970).

[12] D. Dalang and E. Nualart: *Potential theory for hyperbolic spde's.* Prepublication 2003.

[13] Dalang, R.C. and Frangos, N., *The stochastic wave equation in two spatial dimensions*, Ann. Probab. 26, 187-212 (1998) .

[14] R. C. Dalang: *Extending the martingale measure stochastic integral with applications to spatially homogeneous SPDEs.* Electronic J. of Probability, 4, 1-29 (1999).

[15] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk: *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions.* Cambridge University Press, second edition, 1998.

[16] W. F. Donoghe: *Distributions and Fourier transforms.* Academic Press, New York, 1969.

[17] L. Hörmander: *Hypoelliptic second order differential equations.* Acta Math. 119, 147-171 (1967).

[18] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe: *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes.* North-Holland, second edition, 1989.

[19] K. Itô: *Multiple Wiener integral.* J. Math. Soc. Japan 3, 157-169 (1951).

[20] S. Janson: *Gaussian Hilbert spaces.* Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[21] M. Jolis and M. Sanz-Solé: *Integrator Properties of the Skorohod Integral.* Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, 41, 163-176 (1992).

[22] I. Karatzas and S.E. Shreve: *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus.* Springer Verlag, 1988.

[23] I. Karatzas and D. Ocone: *A generalized Clark representation formula, with application to optimal portfolios.* Stochastics and Stochastics Reports 34, 187-220 (1991).

[24] A. Karczeswska and J. Zabczyk: *Stochastic pde's with function-valued solutions.* In: Clément, Ph., den Hollander, F., van Neerven, J., de Pagter, B. (Eds.), Infinite-Dimensional Stochastic Analysis, Proceedings of the Colloquium of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Ansterdam. North-Holland, Amsterdam 1999.

[25] A. Kohatsu-Higa, D. Márquez-Carreras and M. Sanz-Solé: *Logarithmic estimates for the density of hypoelliptic two-parameter diffusions.* J. of Functional Analysis 150, 481-506 (2002).

[26] A. Kohatsu-Higa, D. Márquez-Carreras and M. Sanz-Solé: *Asymptotic behavior of the density in a parabolic SPDE.* J. of Theoretical Probab. 14,2, 427-462 (2001.)

[27] S. Kusuoka and D.W. Stroock: *Application of the Malliavin calculus I.* In: Stochastic Analysis, Proc. Taniguchi Inter. Symp. on Stochastic Analysis, Katata and Kyoto 1982, ed.: K. Itô, 271-306. Kinokuniya/North-Holland, Tokyo, 1984.

[28] S. Kusuoka and D.W. Stroock: *Application of the Malliavin calculus II.* J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect IA Math. 32, 1-76 (1985).

[29] S. Kusuoka and D.W. Stroock: *Application of the Malliavin calculus III.* J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect IA Math. 34, 391-442 (1987).

[30] R. Léandre and F. Russo: *Estimation de Varadhan pour les diffusions à deux paramètres.* Probab. Theory Rel Fields 84, 421-451 (1990).

[31] O. Lévêque: *Hyperbolic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations Driven by Boundary Noises*, Thèse 2452 EPFL Lausanne (2001).

[32] P. Malliavin: *Stochastic calculus of variations and hypoelliptic operators.* In: Proc. Inter. Symp. on Stoch. Diff. Equations, Kyoto 1976, Wiley 1978, 195-263.

[33] P. Malliavin: *Stochastic Analysis.* Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 313. Springer Verlag, 1997.

[34] D. Márquez-Carreras, M. Mellouk and M. Sarrà: *On stochastic partial differential equations with spatially correlated noise: smoothness of the law*, Stoch. Proc. Aplic. 93, 269-284 (2001).

[35] M. Métivier: *Semimartingales.* de Gruyter, Berlin 1982.

[36] P.A. Meyer: *Transformations de Riesz pour les lois gaussiennes* . In: Séminaire de Probabilités XVIII. Lecture Notes in Math. 1059, 179-193. Springer Verlag, 1984.

[37] A. Millet, D. Nualart and M. Sanz-Solé: *Integration by parts and time reversal for diffusion processes.* Annals of Probab. 17, 208-238 (1989).

[38] A. Millet, D. Nualart and M. Sanz-Solé: *Time reversal for infinite dimensional diffusions.* Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 82, 315-347 (1989).

[39] A. Millet and M. Sanz-Solé: *A stochastic wave equation in two space dimension: Smoothness of the law*, Ann. Probab. 27 (2) 803-844 (1999).

[40] S. Moret and D. Nualart: *Generalization of Itô's formula for smooth nondegenerate martingales.* Stochastic Process. Appl. 91,3, 115-149 (2001).

[41] D. Nualart: *Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*, Springer Verlag, 1995.

[42] D. Nualart: *Analysis on the Wiener space and anticipating calculus*, In: École d'été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XXV, Lecture Notes in Math. 1690, Springer Verlag, 1998.

[43] D. Nualart and E. Pardoux: *Stochastic calculus with anticipating integrands.* Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 78, 535-581 (1988).

[44] D. Nualart and M. Zakai: *Generalized stochastic integrals and the Malliavin Calculus.* Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 73, 255-280 (1986).

[45] D. Nualart and M. Zakai: *Generalized multiple integrals and the representation of Wiener functionals.* Stochastics and Stochastics Reports 23, 311-330 (1988).

[46] D. Ocone: *A guide to the Stochastic Calculus of Variations.* In: Stochastic Analysis and Related Topics, H. Korezlioglu and A.S. Ustunel (Eds). Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1316, pp. 1-79. Springer Verlag, 1988.

[47] D. Ocone: *Malliavin calculus and stochastic integral representation of diffusion processes*. Stochastics and Stochastics Reports 12, 161-185 (1984).

[48] B. Øksendal: *Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer Verlag, 1995.

[49] B. Øksendal: *An Introduction to Malliavin Calculus with Applications to Economics*. Norges Handelshøyskole. Institutt for foretaksøkonomi. Working paper 3/96.

[50] E. Pardoux and S. Peng: *Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation*. Systems & Control Letters 14, 55-61 (1990).

[51] S. Peszat and J. Zabczyk: *Nonlinear stochastic wave and heat equations*. Probab. Theory Rel. Fields 116, 421-443 (2000).

[52] L. Quer-Sardanyons and M. Sanz-Solé, M: *Absolute Continuity of The Law of The Solution to the Three-Dimensional Stochastic Wave Equation*. J. of Functional Analysis, to appear.

[53] : L. Quer-Sardanyons and M. Sanz-Solé, M: *A stochastic wave equation in dimension three: Smoothness of the law*. Bernoulli, to appear.

[54] M. Reed and B. Simon: *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*. Functional Analysis I. Academic Press, 1980.

[55] D. Revuz and M. Yor: *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 293. Springer Verlag, 1991.

[56] T. Sekiguchi and Y. Shiota: *L^2-theory of noncausal stochastic integrals*. Math. Rep. Toyama Univ. 8, 119-195 (1985).

[57] M. Sanz-Solé and M. Sarrà: *Path properties of a class of Gaussian processes with applications to spde's*. Canadian mathematical Society Conference Proceedings, 28, 303-316 (2000).

[58] M. Sanz-Solé and M. Sarrà: *Hölder continuity for the stochastic heat equation with spatially correlated noise*. Progess in Probability, 52, 259-268. Birkhäuser 2002.

[59] L. Schwartz: *Théorie des distributions*, Hermann, Paris (1966).

[60] A. V. Skorohod: *On a generalization of a stochastic integral*. Theory Probab. Appl. 20, 219-233 (1975).

[61] D. W. Stroock: *Some Application of Stochastic Calculus to Partial Differential Equations*. In: Ecole d'Eté d Probabilités de Saint-Flour XI-1981. P.L. Hennequin (Ed.). Lecture Notes in Math. 976, pp. 268-380. Springer Verlag,1983.

[62] A. S. Üstünel: *An Introduction to Analysis on Wiener Space.* Lecture Notes in Math. 1610. Springer Verlag, 1995.

[63] A. S. Üstünel and M. Zakai: *Transformation of Measure on Wiener Space.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer Verlag 2000

[64] J.B. Walsh: *An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations.* In: École d'été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV, Lecture Notes in Math. 1180. Springer Verlag, 1986.

[65] S. Watanabe: *Lectures on Stochastic differential equations and Malliavin Calculus.* Tata Institute of Fundamental Research. Bombay. Springer Verlag, 1984.

[66] K. Yosida: *Functional Analysis.* Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 123. Springer Verlag, fourth edition, 1974.