

Stochastic and variational approach to finite difference approximation of Hamilton-Jacobi equations

Kohei Soga *

Abstract

The author presented a stochastic and variational approach to the Lax-Friedrichs finite difference scheme applied to hyperbolic scalar conservation laws and the corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equations in one-dimensional setting, showing new results on the stability and convergence of the scheme [8]. In this paper we extend these results to higher dimensional setting. Our framework enables us to approximate all of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with convex and superlinear Hamiltonians, the spatial derivatives of the viscosity solutions and the backward characteristic curves at the same time, within an arbitrary time interval. The proof is based on stochastic calculus of variations with random walks, a priori boundedness of minimizers of the variational problems that verifies a CFL type stability condition, and the law of large numbers realized in the hyperbolic scaling limit of random walks. Convergence of approximation and the order $O(\sqrt{\Delta x})$ of the error estimate are interpreted in terms of probability theory.

Keywords: finite difference scheme; Hamilton-Jacobi equation; calculus of variations; random walk; law of large numbers

AMS subject classifications: 65M06; 35L65; 49L25; 60G50

1 Introduction

We consider finite difference approximation to viscosity solutions of initial value problems for Hamilton-Jacobi equations

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} v_t + H(x, t, v_x) = h & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T], \\ v(x, 0) = v^0(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d, \quad v^0 \in Lip_r(\mathbb{R}^d), |v^0| \leq R, \end{cases}$$

where $v_x = (\frac{\partial v}{\partial x^1}, \dots, \frac{\partial v}{\partial x^d})$, $d \geq 1$, h is a given constant and $Lip_r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the family of Lipschitz functions: $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constants bounded by $r > 0$. Initial data

*Unité de mathématiques pures et appliquées, CNRS UMR 5669 & École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon, France. The work was supported by ANR-12-BS01-0020 WKBHJ as a researcher for academic year 2014-2015, hosted by Albert Fathi.

Currently, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University, 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, 223-8522, Japan (soga@math.keio.ac.jp).

is assumed to be bounded by $R > 0$. We arbitrarily fix the constants T, r, R . These problems arise in many fields such as theories of optimal control, dynamical systems and so on. We would like to approximate not only v but also v_x and characteristic curves at the same time. Our motivation mainly comes from a theory of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian dynamics called weak KAM theory. The central objects in weak KAM theory are viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, the spatial derivatives of the viscosity solutions and their characteristic curves. In numerical analysis of weak KAM theory, we need a method that enables us to approximate all of these objects at the same time. This paper presents foundation of a method that meets such requirement. Our results also clarifies stochastic aspects of finite difference approximation in (1.1), where the so-called *numerical viscosity* of the discretized equation is characterized by random walks on a grid in \mathbb{R}^d and convergence of approximation is proved through the law of large numbers realized in random walks. The key ingredient of our arguments is to introduce a stochastic Lax-Oleinik type operator for discretized Hamilton-Jacobi equations. The idea is reminiscent of the stochastic and variational approach with the Brownian motions to the vanishing viscosity method [5]. Our approach also enables us to prove a new results of the stability and convergence with an error estimate of a scheme within an arbitrary time interval. The meaning of the order $O(\sqrt{\Delta x})$ of the error estimate is made clear in terms of a limit theorem for random walks. In this paper, we focus our attention on a specific scheme introduced in Section 2 that is very simple and practical in applications on computers, which is direct generalization of the one-dimensional Lax-Friedrichs scheme on staggered grids.

The function H is assumed to satisfy the following (H1)–(H5):

(H1) $H(x, t, p) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, C^2,$

(H2) $H_{pp}(x, t, p)$ is positive definite on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d,$

(H3) H is uniformly superlinear with respect to p , namely, for each $a \geq 0$ there exists $b_1(a) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $H(x, t, p) \geq a \|p\| + b_1(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d,$

(H4) $H, H_{x^i}, H_{p^j}, H_{x^i x^j}, H_{x^i p^j}, H_{p^i p^j}$ are uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$ for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$

(H5) For the Legendre transform of $H(x, t, \cdot)$, denoted by L , there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $|L_{x^j}| \leq \alpha(1 + |L|)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for $j = 1, \dots, d.$

Here, $\|x\| := \sqrt{\sum_j (x^j)^2}$ and $x \cdot y := \sum_j x^j y^j$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that, due to (H1)–(H3), the function $L(x, t, \xi) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined and is given by

$$L(x, t, \xi) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{p \cdot \xi - H(x, t, p)\}.$$

We will show properties of L in Section 3. If H is periodic in (x, t) , it is called a Tonelli Hamiltonian ((H4) is automatically satisfied) and is common in weak KAM theory. Our main purpose is to deal with (1.1) with Tonelli Hamiltonians. However we do not restrict ourselves to this case, also because such a non-compact problem arises in different contexts.

There are many results on finite difference approximation of the viscosity solution of (1.1). The pioneering works are [2] and its generalization [11], where convergence of a class of finite difference schemes with error estimates of the order $O(\sqrt{\Delta x})$ is proved in an abstract setting, under the assumption that schemes are monotone. In these two works, the functions H with (H1)–(H5) are not covered and a convergence proof only for viscosity solutions is available. The main difficulty of finite difference approximation in (1.1) is to verify stability of schemes, i.e., a priori boundedness of the discrete derivatives of difference solutions (this yields monotonicity of schemes). A proof of the a priori boundedness is harder even in the one-dimensional case, if $H(x, t, p)$ is convex and superlinear with respect to p and is not of a separated form like $H(x, t, p) = f(p) + g(x, t)$. In the one-dimensional case, (1.1) is equivalent to the scalar conservation law

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} u_t + H(x, t, u)_x = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times (0, T], \\ u(x, 0) = u^0(x) & \text{on } \mathbb{R}, \quad u^0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}). \end{cases}$$

If $u^0 = v_x^0$, the viscosity solution v or entropy solution u is derived from the other and they satisfy the relation $u = v_x$. Therefore approximation of u implies approximation of v . Note that the converse is not necessarily true. The pioneering work on finite difference approximation of (1.2) with a wide class of functions H is [6], where stability and convergence of the Lax-Friedrichs finite difference scheme are proved within a restricted time interval based on functional analytic arguments. The restriction depends on the growth rate of H for $|p| \rightarrow \infty$. The author recently announced a stochastic and variational approach to the Lax-Friedrichs scheme [8], where stability and convergence of the scheme within an arbitrary time interval are available. Furthermore, approximation of entropy solutions, viscosity solutions and their characteristic curves is available at the same time. In this paper, we generalize the results in [8] to higher dimensional problems with the non-compact setting. In the case of dimension greater than one, there is no equivalence between Hamilton-Jacobi equations and scalar conservation laws. Therefore we discretize only Hamilton-Jacobi equations and obtain approximation of viscosity solutions, the spatial derivatives of the viscosity solutions and their characteristic curves, through a proper discretization that yields both of difference viscosity solutions and their discrete derivatives. The stochastic and variational approach to the Lax-Friedrichs scheme introduced in [8] is a basic tool for finite difference approximation methods of time dependent one-dimensional weak KAM theory [9] and selection problems of \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodic viscosity solutions [10]. The result of the present paper will be a basic tool for the similar problems in higher dimension.

2 Results

Let $\Delta x > 0$ and $\Delta t > 0$ be discretization parameters for space and time respectively. Set $G_{\text{even}} := \{m\Delta x \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, m = \text{even}\}$, $G_{\text{odd}} := \{m\Delta x \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, m = \text{odd}\}$, $t_k := k\Delta t$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &:= \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \{((G_{\text{even}})^d \times \{t_{2k}\}) \cup ((G_{\text{odd}})^d \times \{t_{2k+1}\})\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{G}} &:= \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \{((G_{\text{odd}})^d \times \{t_{2k}\}) \cup ((G_{\text{even}})^d \times \{t_{2k+1}\})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{G} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subsetneq (\Delta x \mathbb{Z}^d) \times (\Delta t \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})$. Each point of $(\Delta x \mathbb{Z}^d) \times (\Delta t \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})$ is denoted by $(x_m, t_k) = (x_{m^1}^1, \dots, x_{m^d}^d, t_k)$. We sometimes use the notation $(x_m, t_k), (x_{m+1}, t_{k+1})$ for points of \mathcal{G} and $(x_{m+1}, t_k), (x_m, t_{k+1})$ for points of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ with $\mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $k(T)$ be the largest integer such that $k(T)\Delta t \leq T$. For $(x, t) \in \mathcal{G} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, the notation $m(x)$ denotes the index of x . Let e_1, \dots, e_d be the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the sets

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \{\sigma_1 e_1 + \dots + \sigma_d e_d \mid \sigma_j = \pm 1, j = 1, \dots, d\}, \\ B_+^i &:= \{\sigma_1 e_1 + \dots + \sigma_d e_d \mid \sigma_i = +1, \sigma_j = \pm 1, j = 1, \dots, d, j \neq i\}, \\ B_-^i &:= \{\sigma_1 e_1 + \dots + \sigma_d e_d \mid \sigma_i = -1, \sigma_j = \pm 1, j = 1, \dots, d, j \neq i\}, \\ b &:= \#B = 2^d, \quad \bar{b} := \#B_{\pm}^i = 2^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $v = v_{m+1}^k$ denote a function: $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \ni (x_{m+1}, t_k) \mapsto v_{m+1}^k \in \mathbb{R}$. Introduce the spatial difference derivatives of v_{m+1}^k that are defined at each point $(x_m, t_k) \in \mathcal{G}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} (D_{x^i} v^k)_m &:= \left\{ \left(\bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} v_{m+\omega}^k \right) - \left(\bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} v_{m+\omega}^k \right) \right\} \frac{1}{2\Delta x}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \\ (D_x v^k)_m &:= ((D_{x^1} v^k)_m, \dots, (D_{x^d} v^k)_m). \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the temporal difference derivative of v_{m+1}^k as

$$D_t v_m^{k+1} := \left\{ v_m^{k+1} - b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v_{m+\omega}^k \right\} \frac{1}{\Delta t}.$$

Discretize (1.1) as

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} D_t v_m^{k+1} + H(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_m) = h & \text{in } \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \\ v_{m+1}^0 = v^0(x_{m+1}) & \text{on } (G_{\text{odd}})^d. \end{cases}$$

Note that v_m^{k+1} is unknown determined by v_{m+1}^k as recursion in (2.1). If $d = 1$, (2.1) is exactly the same as the one in [8].

We introduce space-time inhomogeneous random walks on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, which correspond to characteristic curves of (1.1). For each point $(x_n, t_{l+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, we consider the backward random walks γ within $[t_{l'}, t_{l+1}]$ which start from x_n at t_{l+1} and move by $\omega \Delta x$, $\omega \in B$ in each backward time step Δt :

$$\gamma = \{\gamma^k\}_{k=l', \dots, l+1}, \quad \gamma^{l+1} = x_n, \quad \gamma^k = \gamma^{k+1} + \omega \Delta x.$$

More precisely, we set the following objects for each $(x_n, t_{l+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and $l' \leq l$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_n^{l+1, k} &:= \{x_{m+1} \mid (x_{m+1}, t_k) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \|x_{m+1} - x_n\| \leq \|\mathbf{1}\| (l+1-k)\Delta x\}, \quad k \leq l+1, \\ G_n^{l+1, l'} &:= \bigcup_{l' \leq k \leq l} (X_n^{l+1, k+1} \times \{t_{k+1}\}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \\ \xi &: G_n^{l+1, l'} \ni (x_m, t_{k+1}) \mapsto \xi_m^{k+1} \in [-(d\lambda)^{-1}, (d\lambda)^{-1}]^d, \quad \lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x, \\ \rho &: G_n^{l+1, l'} \times B \ni (x_m, t_{k+1}; \omega) \mapsto \rho_m^{k+1}(\omega) := b^{-1}(1 - \lambda(\omega \cdot \xi_m^{k+1})) \in [0, 1], \\ \gamma &: \{l', l'+1, \dots, l+1\} \ni k \mapsto \gamma^k \in X_n^{l+1, k}, \quad \gamma^{l+1} = x_n, \quad \gamma^k = \gamma^{k+1} + \omega \Delta x, \quad \omega \in B, \\ \Omega_n^{l+1, l'} &: \text{the family of the above } \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We may regard $\{\rho_m^{k+1}(\omega)\}_{\omega \in B}$ as a transition probability from (x_m, t_{k+1}) to each point belonging to $\{(x_m + \omega \Delta x, t_k)\}_{\omega \in B}$. In fact, since $B_+^i \cup B_-^i = B$ and $\{-\omega \mid \omega \in B_+^i\} = B_-^i$, we have $\sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_m^{k+1}(\omega) = 1$. We control the transition of our random walks by ξ , which plays a velocity field-like role in $G_n^{l+1, l'}$. We define the density of each path $\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, l'}$ as

$$\mu(\gamma) := \prod_{l' \leq k \leq l} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega^{k+1}),$$

where $\omega^{k+1} := (\gamma^k - \gamma^{k+1})/2\Delta x$. The density $\mu(\cdot) = \mu(\cdot; \xi)$ yields a probability measure of $\Omega_n^{l+1, l'}$, namely,

$$prob(A) = \sum_{\gamma \in A} \mu(\gamma; \xi) \quad \text{for } A \subset \Omega_n^{l+1, l'}.$$

The expectation with respect to this probability measure is denoted by $E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)}$, namely, for a random variable $f : \Omega_n^{l+1, l'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)}[f(\gamma)] := \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, l'}} \mu(\gamma; \xi) f(\gamma).$$

We remark that, since our transition probabilities are space-time inhomogeneous, the well-known law of large numbers and central limit theorem for random walks do not always hold in our case. The author investigated the asymptotics for $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ of the probability measure of $\Omega_n^{l+1, l'}$ under hyperbolic scaling for the one-dimensional case [7]. We need similar investigation in the current multi-dimensional case.

Let $v(x, t)$ be the viscosity solution of (1.1) (v uniquely exists as a Lipschitz function). Then v satisfies

$$v(x, t) = \inf_{\gamma \in AC, \gamma(t)=x} \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma(s), s, \gamma'(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma(0)) \right\} + ht,$$

where AC is the family of absolutely continuous curves $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (a Lax-Oleinik type operator for (1.1)). There exists a minimizing curve γ^* for $v(x, t)$, which is a backward characteristic curve of v . We say that a point $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ is regular, if $v_x(x, t)$ exists. The viscosity solution v of (1.1) is Lipschitz and hence it is differentiable a.e. If (x, t) is regular, the minimizing curve γ^* for $v(x, t)$ is unique. Let (x, t) be regular and let γ^* be the minimizing curve for $v(x, t)$. Then we have

$$v_x(x, t) = \int_0^t L_x(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v_x^0(\gamma^*(0)),$$

where v^0 is supposed to be semiconcave. Otherwise, $v_x^0(\gamma^*(0))$ must be replaced by $L_\xi(\gamma^*(0), 0, \gamma^{*'}(0))$. We refer to [1] and [4] for more on viscosity solutions and calculus of variations.

Now we state the main results. The first theorem shows a stochastic and variational representation of difference solutions to (2.1) (a Lax-Oleinik type operator for (2.1)).

Theorem 2.1. *There exists $\lambda_1 > 0$ (depending on T, r and R , but independent of Δ) for which we have the following statements:*

(1) For any small $\Delta = (\Delta x, \Delta t)$ with $\lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x < \lambda_1$, the expectation

$$E_n^{l+1}(\xi) := E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] + ht_{l+1}, \quad \gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}$$

has the infimum denoted by V_n^{l+1} with respect to $\xi : G_n^{l+1,0} \rightarrow ([-(d\lambda)^{-1}, (d\lambda^{-1})])^d$ for each n and l with $0 < l+1 \leq k(T)$ such that $(x_n, t_{l+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. There exists the unique minimizing velocity field ξ^* for the infimum. ξ^* satisfies $\|\xi^*\|_\infty \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}$.

(2) Define v_{m+1}^k on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ for $0 \leq k \leq k(T)$ as $v_m^{k+1} := V_m^{k+1}$ and $v_{m+1}^0 := v^0(x_{m+1})$. Then the minimizing velocity field ξ^* for V_n^{l+1} satisfies

$$\xi^{*k+1} = H_p(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_m) \quad (\Leftrightarrow \quad (D_x v^k)_m = L_\xi(x_m, t_k, \xi^{*k+1})).$$

In particular, $(D_x v^k)_m$ is uniformly bounded on $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}|_{0 \leq k \leq k(T)}$ independently from Δ .

(3) The above v_{m+1}^k is the solution of (2.1).

(4) Let $\xi^*(\omega)$ be the minimizing control for $v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1}$ for each $\omega \in B$ and let $\gamma, \mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\omega))$ be the minimizing random walk for $v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1}$. Then we have for $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} (D_{x^i} v^{l+1})_{n+1} &\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\omega))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L_x(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k(\omega)) \cdot e_i \Delta t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{v^0(\gamma^0 + e_i \cdot 2\Delta x) - v^0(\gamma^0)}{2\Delta x} \right] + \theta \Delta x, \\ (D_{x^i} v^{l+1})_{n+1} &\geq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\omega))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L_x(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k(\omega)) \cdot e_i \Delta t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{v^0(\gamma^0) - v^0(\gamma^0 - e_i \cdot 2\Delta x)}{2\Delta x} \right] - \theta \Delta x, \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta > 0$ is independent of Δ .

The next theorem is on convergence of approximation.

Theorem 2.2. We take the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ under hyperbolic scaling, namely, $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ with $0 < \lambda_0 \leq \lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x < \lambda_1$, where λ_1 is from Theorem 2.1. Then the following statements hold:

(1) Let v be the viscosity solution of (1.1) and let v_Δ be the linear interpolation of the solution v_{m+1}^k of (2.1). Then there exists $\beta > 0$ independent of Δ for which we have

$$\|v_\Delta - v\|_{C^0(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])} \leq \beta \sqrt{\Delta x} \quad \text{as } \Delta \rightarrow 0.$$

(2) Let $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T]$ be a regular point and $\gamma^* : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the minimizing curve for $v(x, t)$. Let $(x_n, t_{l+1}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ be a point such that $t \in [t_{l+1} - \Delta t, t_{l+1} + \Delta t]$ and x belongs to the d -cube formed by the points of $\{x_n + \omega \Delta x\}_{\omega \in B}$. Let γ_Δ be the linear interpolation with $\gamma_\Delta(t) := x$ of the random walk γ derived from the minimizing control ξ^* for v_n^{l+1} . Then we have

$$\gamma_\Delta \rightarrow \gamma^* \quad \text{uniformly on } [0, t] \text{ in probability} \quad \text{as } \Delta \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, the average of γ_Δ converges uniformly to γ^* on $[0, t]$.

(3) Suppose in addition that v^0 is semiconcave with a linear modulus. Let u_Δ be the step function derived from $(D_x v^k)_m$. Then, for each regular point $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, T]$, we have

$$u_\Delta(x, t) \rightarrow v_x(x, t) \quad \text{as } \Delta \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, u_Δ converges to v_x pointwise a.e., and hence, for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, u_Δ converges uniformly to v_x on $(K \times [0, T]) \setminus \Theta$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, where Θ is a neighborhood of the set of points of singularity of v_x with arbitrarily small measure positive.

Remark. The assumption of semiconcavity in (3) is removed, if $d = 1$ [8].

3 Proof of Results

We state the properties of $L(x, t, \xi)$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $H(x, t, p)$ satisfy (H1)–(H4) and let $L(x, t, \xi)$ be the Legendre transform of $H(x, t, \cdot)$. Then L satisfies the following (L1)–(L4):

(L1) $L(x, t, \xi) : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, C^2 ,

(L2) $L_{\xi\xi}(x, t, \xi)$ is positive definite on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

(L3) L is uniformly superlinear with respect to ξ , namely, for each $a \geq 0$ there exists $b_2(a) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L(x, t, \xi) \geq a \|\xi\| + b_2(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

(L4) $L, L_{x^i}, L_{\xi^i}, L_{x^i x^j}, L_{x^i \xi^j}, L_{\xi^i \xi^j}$ are uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$ for each compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$.

Proof. Fix arbitrary $(x, t, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Take $a > \|\xi\|$. It follows from (H3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \cdot p - H(x, t, p) &\leq \xi \cdot p - (a \|p\| + b_1(a)) \leq (\|\xi\| - a) \|p\| - b_1(a) \\ &\rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } \|p\| \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{\xi \cdot p - H(x, t, p)\}$ is achieved in a bounded ball of \mathbb{R}^d , namely, there exists $p^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $L(x, t, \xi) = \xi \cdot p^* - H(x, t, p^*)$ and $H_p(x, t, p^*) = \xi$. Since $H_p(x, t, p^*) = \xi$ is invertible with respect to p^* , we have the C^1 -map $p^* = p(x, t, \xi)$ such that $H_p(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)) \equiv \xi$. Therefore L is of C^1 . Direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} L_\xi(x, t, \xi) &= p(x, t, \xi), \\ L_{\xi\xi}(x, t, \xi) &= p_\xi(x, t, \xi) = H_{pp}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi))^{-1}, \\ L_x(x, t, \xi) &= -H_x(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)), \\ L_{xx}(x, t, \xi) &= -H_{xx}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)) \\ &\quad + H_{xp}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)) H_{pp}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi))^{-1} H_{px}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)), \\ L_{x\xi}(x, t, \xi) &= -H_{xp}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)) H_{pp}(x, t, p(x, t, \xi))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

(L1) and (L2) are now clear.

For each $a \geq 0$, consider $b_2(a) := -\max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}, \|p\|=a} H(x, t, p)$. We have $L(x, t, \xi) \geq \xi \cdot p - H(x, t, p)$ for all x, t, ξ, p . Take p such that $p/\|p\| = \xi/\|\xi\|$ and $\|p\| = a$. Then we see that $L(x, t, \xi) \geq a\|\xi\| + b_2(a)$, which holds for all x, t, ξ . Now (L3) is clear.

Let K be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d and let $a > \max_{\xi \in K} \|\xi\|$. Then we have $H(x, t, p) \geq a\|p\| + b_1(a)$ for all x, t, p . Hence $\xi \cdot p - H(x, t, p) \leq \|\xi\|\|p\| - (a\|p\| + b_1(a)) < -b_1(a)$ for all $\xi \in K$ and $(x, t, p) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, with (L3), we obtain $b_2(a) \leq L(x, t, \xi) = \xi \cdot p(x, t, \xi) - H(x, t, p(x, t, \xi)) < -b_1(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$. Finally we show the boundedness of $p(x, t, \xi)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$, which ends the proof of (L4). Suppose that there exist $(x_j, t_j, \xi_j) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$ for which the norm of $p_j := p(x_j, t_j, \xi_j)$ diverges as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} L(x_j, t_j, \xi_j) &= \xi_j \cdot p_j - H(x_j, t_j, p_j) \leq \|\xi_j\|\|p_j\| - (a\|p_j\| + b_1(a)) \\ &= (\|\xi_j\| - a)\|p_j\| - b_1(a) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

However L is bounded below by $b_2(a)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times K$, and we reach a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We recall and define the following constants:

$$\begin{aligned} |v^0| &\leq R, \quad \|v_x^0\|_\infty \leq r, \quad \|L_x\|_\infty \leq \alpha(1 + |L|), \quad L_* := \min\left\{\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d} L, 0\right\}, \\ \alpha_1 &:= T \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}} |L(x, t, 0)| + R, \quad \alpha_2 := \alpha\{\alpha_1 + R + (1 + 2L_*)T\}, \\ \lambda_1 &:= \left(d \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}, \|p\| \leq 1+r+\alpha_2} \|H_p(x, t, p)\|_\infty\right)^{-1}, \\ \theta &:= T \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}, \|\xi\| \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}, j} |L_{x^j x^j}(x, t, \xi)|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Delta = (\Delta x, \Delta t)$ be such that $\Delta x \theta \leq 1$ and $\lambda = \Delta t / \Delta x < \lambda_1$. Since L and v^0 are bounded below, there exists the infimum V_n^{l+1} of $E_n^{l+1}(\xi)$ with respect to $\xi : G_n^{l+1,0} \rightarrow ([-(d\lambda)^{-1}, (d\lambda)^{-1}])^d$. Since $G_n^{l+1,0}$ consists of a finite number of points, there exists a minimizing control ξ^* for V_n^{l+1} . We set $v_m^{k+1} := V_m^{k+1}$, $v_{m+1}^0 := v^0(x_{m+1})$. It follows from the definition of the random walk that for each n and $0 < k \leq l$ we have

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} E_n^{l+1}(\xi) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,k}} \mu(\gamma; \xi|_{G_n^{l+1,k}}) \left\{ \sum_{k < k' \leq l+1} L(\gamma^{k'}, t_{k'-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^{k'})}^{k'}) \Delta t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + E_{m(\gamma^k)}^k(\xi|_{G_{m(\gamma^k)}^{k,0}}) \right\} + h(t_{l+1} - t_k). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} E_n^1(\xi) &= L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1) \Delta t + \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_n^1(\omega) v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + h t_1 \\ &= L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) - \frac{\Delta t}{b \Delta x} \sum_{\omega \in B} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d (\xi_n^1)^i \omega^i \right\} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + h \Delta t \\ &= L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Delta t}{b \Delta x} \sum_{i=1}^d (\xi_n^1)^i \left\{ \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} \omega^i v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} \omega^i v^0(x_{n+\omega}) \right\} + h \Delta t \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) - \frac{\Delta t}{b \Delta x} \sum_{i=1}^d (\xi_n^1)^i (D_{x^i} v^0)_n \cdot 2 \Delta x \cdot \bar{b} + h \Delta t \\
&= L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) - \xi_n^1 \cdot (D_x v^0)_n \Delta t + h \Delta t \\
&= -\{\xi_n^1 \cdot (D_x v^0)_n - L(x_n, t_0, \xi_n^1)\} \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + h \Delta t \\
&\geq -H(x_n, t_0, (D_x v^0)_n) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + h \Delta t
\end{aligned}$$

for any ξ , where the last inequality becomes an equality if and only if ξ is given as

$$\xi_n^1 = H_p(x_n, t_0, (D_x v^0)_n).$$

Hence the minimizing control ξ^* for $v_n^1 = V_n^1 = \inf_{\xi} E_n^1(\xi)$ satisfies

$$(3.2) \quad \xi_n^{*1} = H_p(x_n, t_0, (D_x v^0)_n), \quad \|\xi^*\|_{\infty} \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}$$

with

$$(3.3) \quad v_n^1 = -H(x_n, t_0, (D_x v^0)_n) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v^0(x_{n+\omega}) + h \Delta t.$$

We proceed by induction: Suppose that, for some $l \geq 0$, the minimizing control ξ^* for V_n^{l+1} is uniquely found for each n as

$$\xi_m^{*k+1} = H_p(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_m) \quad \text{on } G_n^{l+1,0}, \quad \|\xi^*\|_{\infty} \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}.$$

This is true for $l = 0$. In order to see that this is true also for $l + 1$, we first examine the bound of $(D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1}$. Set $\nu_j(\omega) := (\omega - 2e_j)$. Then we have $B_-^j = \{\nu_j(\omega) \mid \omega \in B_+^j\}$. Let $\xi^*(\omega)$ denote a minimizer for $V_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1}$. The variational property yields for $\omega \in B_+^j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} - v_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1} &\leq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k + e_j \cdot 2\Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + v^0(\gamma^0 + e_j \cdot 2\Delta x) \right] - E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(D_{x^j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} &\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L_{x^j}(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{v^0(\gamma^0 + e_j \cdot 2\Delta x) - v^0(\gamma^0)}{2\Delta x} \right] + \theta \Delta x \\
&\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L_{x^j}(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) \Delta t \right] \\
&\quad + r + \theta \Delta x \\
&\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} \alpha \{1 + |L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega)))|\} \Delta t \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +r + \theta\Delta x \\
\leq & \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} \alpha \{1 + L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) + 2|L_*|\} \Delta t \right] \\
& +r + \theta\Delta x \\
= & \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} \alpha \{1 + L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) + 2|L_*|\} \Delta t \right. \\
& \left. + v^0(\gamma^0) - v^0(\gamma^0) \right] + r + \theta\Delta x \\
\leq & \alpha \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*(\nu_j(\omega)))} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}(\nu_j(\omega))) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] \\
& + \alpha T + 2\alpha |L_*| T + \alpha R + r + \theta\Delta x \\
\leq & \alpha \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} E_{\mu(\cdot; 0)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, 0) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] \\
& + \alpha T + 2\alpha |L_*| T + \alpha R + r + \theta\Delta x \\
\leq & \alpha \alpha_1 + \alpha T + 2\alpha |L_*| T + \alpha R + r + 1 \\
= & \alpha_2 + r + 1
\end{aligned}$$

We can show $(D_{x_j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} \geq -\alpha_2 - r - 1$ in a similar way. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.4) \quad & \| (D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1} \|_{\infty} \leq 1 + r + \alpha_2, \\
& \| H_p(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, (D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1}) \|_{\infty} \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

We observe that for each n and for any ξ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.5) \quad E_{n+1}^{l+2}(\xi) &= L(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, \xi_{n+1}^{l+2}) \Delta t + \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{n+1}^{l+2}(\omega) E_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1}(\xi|_{G_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1,0}}) + h\Delta t \\
&\geq L(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, \xi_{n+1}^{l+2}) \Delta t + \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{n+1}^{l+2}(\omega) v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} + h\Delta t \\
&= L(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, \xi_{n+1}^{l+2}) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} - \xi_{n+1}^{l+2} \cdot (D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1} \Delta t + h\Delta t \\
(3.6) \quad &\geq -H(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, (D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1}) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} + h\Delta t.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the assumption of induction and the properties of the Legendre transform that the above inequalities become equalities, if $\xi = \xi^*$ is given as

$$\xi_m^{*k+1} = H_p(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_{m+1}) \quad \text{on } G_{n+1}^{l+2,0},$$

which makes sense due to (3.4). Hence we found a minimizing control ξ^* for

$$(3.7) \quad v_{n+1}^{l+2} = V_{n+1}^{l+2} = -H(x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}, (D_x v^{l+1})_{n+1}) \Delta t + b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} + h\Delta t,$$

which satisfies $\| \xi^* \|_{\infty} \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}$. Let ξ be another minimizing control for v_{n+1}^{l+2} different from ξ^* . If $\xi_{n+1}^{l+2} \neq \xi_{n+1}^{*l+2}$, then (3.6) becomes strict inequality yielding the contradiction that $v_{n+1}^{l+2} > v_{n+1}^{*l+2}$. If $\xi_{n+1}^{l+2} = \xi_{n+1}^{*l+2}$, then there exists $\omega \in B$ such that $\xi|_{G_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1,0}}$ is

not minimizing control for v_{n+1}^{l+1} due to the assumption of induction. Therefore (3.5) becomes strict inequality yielding the contradiction that $v_{n+1}^{l+2} > v_{n+1}^{l+2}$.

Thus we conclude that the minimizing control ξ^* for $\inf_{\xi} E_{n+1}^{l+2}(\xi)$ is uniquely found for each n as

$$(3.8) \quad \xi_m^{*k+1} = H_p(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_m) \quad \text{on } G_{n+1}^{l+2,0}, \quad \|\xi^*\|_{\infty} \leq (d\lambda)^{-1}.$$

By induction, (1) is clear. (2) follows from (3.2) and (3.8). (3) follows from (3.3) and (3.7). (4) follows from the above calculation for (3.4). \square

We study scaling limit of our random walks. Let $\bar{\gamma}^k$ be the averaged path of γ , i.e.,

$$\bar{\gamma}^k := \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}} \mu(\gamma) \gamma^k.$$

$\bar{\gamma}$ satisfies

$$\bar{\gamma}^k = \bar{\gamma}^{k+1} - \bar{\xi}^{k+1} \Delta t, \quad \bar{\xi}^k := \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}} \mu(\gamma) \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k.$$

In fact we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\gamma}^k &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}} \mu(\gamma) \gamma^k = \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,k}} \mu(\gamma) \gamma^k \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,k+1}} \sum_{\omega \in B} \mu(\gamma) \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) (\gamma^{k+1} + \omega \Delta x) \\ &= \bar{\gamma}^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,k+1}} \sum_{\omega \in B} \mu(\gamma) b^{-1} \{1 - \lambda(\omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})\} \omega \Delta x \\ &= \bar{\gamma}^{k+1} - \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,k+1}} \sum_{\omega \in B} \mu(\gamma) b^{-1} (\omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}) \omega \Delta t \\ &= \bar{\gamma}^{k+1} - b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} (\omega \cdot \bar{\xi}^{k+1}) \omega \Delta t, \end{aligned}$$

where the i -th component of the second term on the last line becomes

$$\begin{aligned} b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j \right) \omega_i \Delta t &= b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B} \left((\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^i + \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^i \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j \right) \Delta t \\ &= (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^i \Delta t + b^{-1} \left(\sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^i \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j + \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^i \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j \right) \Delta t \\ &= (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^i \Delta t + b^{-1} \left(\sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j - \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^j (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^j \right) \Delta t \\ &= (\bar{\xi}^{k+1})^i \Delta t. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta(\gamma)$ be a random variable defined for each $\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}$ as

$$\eta^k(\gamma) = \eta^{k+1}(\gamma) - \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1} \Delta t, \quad \eta^{l+1}(\gamma) = x_n.$$

The lemma below is a key to the convergence proof of our difference scheme.

Lemma 3.2. Set $\tilde{\sigma}_i^k := E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)}[(\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i (\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i]$ and $\tilde{\delta}_i^k := E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)}[(\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i]$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, where $(\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i$ is the i -th component of $\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k$. Then we have

$$(\tilde{\delta}_i^k)^2 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_i^k \leq (t_{l+1} - t_k) \frac{\Delta x}{\lambda}.$$

Remark. The standard variance is of $O(1)$ in general for inhomogeneous random walks. However $\tilde{\sigma}_i^k$ and $\tilde{\delta}_i^k$ always tends to 0 for any ξ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ under hyperbolic scaling. In the homogeneous case, namely ξ is constant, $\tilde{\sigma}_i^k$ is equal to the standard variance.

Proof. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_i^k &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k}} \mu(\gamma) (\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i (\eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^k)^i \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \{(\eta^{k+1}(\gamma) - \gamma^{k+1})^i - (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i \Delta t - \omega^i \Delta x\}^2 \\ &= \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left[\sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \{\omega^i + \lambda(\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i\}^2 \right] \Delta x^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left\{ 2\lambda(\eta^{k+1}(\gamma) - \gamma^{k+1})^i (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2(\eta^{k+1}(\gamma) - \gamma^{k+1})^i \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \omega^i \right\} \Delta x \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \omega^i &= \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} b^{-1} (1 - \lambda \omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}) \omega^i + \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} b^{-1} (1 - \lambda \omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}) \omega^i \\ &= b^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} (1 - \lambda \omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}) - \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} (1 - \lambda \omega \cdot \xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}) \right\} \\ &= b^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} \left(1 - \lambda (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i - \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^j (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^j \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\omega \in B_-^i} \left(1 - \lambda (-1) (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i - \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} \omega^j (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^j \right) \right\} \\ &= b^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^i} -2\lambda (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i \\ &= -\lambda (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}_i^k &= \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left[\sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \{\omega^i + \lambda(\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i\}^2 \right] \Delta x^2 \\ &= \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left[\sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1}(\omega) \{1 + 2\lambda \omega^i (\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i + \{\lambda(\xi_{m(\gamma^{k+1})}^{k+1})^i\}^2\} \right] \Delta x^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left[1 + \{\lambda(\xi_m^{k+1}(\gamma))\}^i \right]^2 + 2\lambda(\xi_m^{k+1}(\gamma))^i \sum_{\omega \in B} \rho_m^{k+1}(\omega) \omega^i \} \Delta x^2 \\
&= \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, k+1}} \mu(\gamma) \left[1 - \{\lambda(\xi_m^{k+1}(\gamma))\}^i \right]^2 \Delta x^2 \\
&\leq \tilde{\sigma}_i^{k+1} + \frac{\Delta x}{\lambda} \Delta t.
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to the assertion. \square

We observe the following facts on the viscosity solution v of (1.1):

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\gamma^* : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a minimizing curve for $v(x, t)$.*

1. *The following regularity properties hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
L_\xi^c(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau, \gamma^{*\prime}(\tau)) &\in \partial_x^- v(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau) \text{ for } 0 \leq \tau < t, \\
L_\xi^c(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau, \gamma^{*\prime}(\tau)) &\in \partial_x^+ v(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau) \text{ for } 0 < \tau \leq t,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\partial_x^- v$ ($\partial_x^+ v$) is the subdifferential (superdifferential). In particular $v_x(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau)$ exists for $0 < \tau < t$ and is equal to $L_\xi^c(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau, \gamma^{*\prime}(\tau))$.

2. $|\gamma^{*\prime}(\tau)| \leq (d\lambda_1)^{-1}$ for $0 \leq \tau \leq t$, where λ_1 is given in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

3. If (x, t) is regular, we have for any $0 \leq \tau < t$

$$v_x(x, t) = \int_\tau^t L_x^c(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*\prime}(s)) ds + L_\xi^c(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau, \gamma^{*\prime}(\tau)).$$

If v^0 is semiconcave, $L_\xi^c(\gamma^*(0), 0, \gamma^{*\prime}(0)) = v_x^0(\gamma^*(0))$.

This lemma is known and is proved in the same manner as the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [8].

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Hereafter, β_1, β_2, \dots are constants independent of $\Delta x, \Delta t, x_m, t_k$.

(1): Since v and v_Δ are Lipschitz, it is enough to show $|v_n^{l+1} - v(x_n, t_{l+1})| = O(\sqrt{\Delta x})$. Let γ^* be a minimizing curve for $v(x_n, t_{l+1})$. Consider a control ξ defined as

$$\xi(x_m, t_{k+1}) := \gamma^{*\prime}(t_{k+1})$$

and the random walk γ generated by ξ . Then $\eta(\gamma)$ is independent of $\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1, 0}$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| \eta^k(\gamma) - \gamma^*(t_k) \|_\infty \leq \beta_1 \Delta x \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq l+1, \\
&\left| \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*\prime}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left\{ \sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\eta^k(\gamma), t_{k-1}, \xi_m^k(\gamma^k)) \Delta t + v^0(\eta^0(\gamma)) \right\} \right| \leq \beta_2 \Delta x.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
v_n^{l+1} &\leq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] + ht_{l+1} \\
&\leq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\eta^k(\gamma), t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^k) \Delta t + v^0(\eta^0(\gamma)) \right] + ht_{l+1} + \beta_3 \sqrt{\Delta x} \\
&\leq \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) + ht_{l+1} + \beta_4 \sqrt{\Delta x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$v_n^{l+1} - v(x_n, t_{l+1}) \leq \beta_4 \sqrt{\Delta x}.$$

Let ξ^* be the minimizing control for v_n^{l+1} . Consider the linear interpolation of $\eta(\gamma)$ within $[0, t_{l+1}]$, denoted by $\eta_\Delta(\gamma)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s) &= \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k} \quad \text{for } s \in (t_{k-1}, t_k), \\
v(x_n, t_{l+1}) &\leq \int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) dt + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) + ht_{l+1} \quad \text{for } \gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0}, \\
v(x_n, t_{l+1}) &\leq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*)} \left[\int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) dt + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right] + ht_{l+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
v_n^{l+1} &= E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] + ht_{l+1} \\
&\geq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*)} \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\eta^k(\gamma), t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v^0(\eta^0(\gamma)) \right] + ht_{l+1} - \beta_5 \sqrt{\Delta x} \\
&\geq E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*)} \left[\int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right] + ht_{l+1} - \beta_6 \sqrt{\Delta x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$v_n^{l+1} - v(x_n, t_{l+1}) \geq -\beta_6 \sqrt{\Delta x}.$$

In order to prove (2), we prepare the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *Let γ^* be the unique minimizer for $v(x, t)$. Define the set Γ^ε with $\varepsilon > 0$ and $b > 0$ as*

$$\Gamma^\varepsilon := \left\{ r : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \mid r \in Lip, \quad \|r(t) - \gamma^*(t)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|r'(s)\|_\infty \leq b, \right. \\
\left. \int_0^t L(r(s), s, r'(s)) ds + v^0(r(0)) \leq \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) + \varepsilon. \right\}$$

Then it holds that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{r \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} \|r - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0, t])} \rightarrow 0, \quad \sup_{r \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} \|r' - \gamma^{*'}\|_{L^2([0, t])} \rightarrow 0.$$

This is proved in a similar way to the proof of Lemma 3.4 of [8].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $f : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function with a Lipschitz constant θ satisfying $f(0) = 0$. Then it holds that $\|f\|_{C^0([0,t])} \leq \theta \|f\|_{L^2([0,t])} + \sqrt{\|f\|_{L^2([0,t])}}$.*

See Lemma 3.5 of [8] for a proof.

(2): Set $\Omega_\Delta^\varepsilon := \{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0} \mid \|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0,t])} \leq \varepsilon\}$ for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$. We will prove that $\text{prob}(\Omega_\Delta^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 1$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)}[\|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{L^2([0,t])}])^2 &\leq E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)}[\|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{L^2([0,t])}^2] \\ &\leq 2E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)}[\|\gamma_\Delta - \eta_\Delta(\gamma)\|_{L^2([0,t])}^2] + 2E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)}[\|\eta_\Delta(\gamma) - \gamma^*\|_{L^2([0,t])}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

where the first term on the second line tends to 0 as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ due to Lemma 3.2. We want to show that the second term also tends to 0 as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. For this purpose, we set

$$\tilde{\Omega}_\Delta^\varepsilon := \{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0} \mid \|\eta_\Delta(\gamma) - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0,t])} \leq \varepsilon, \|\eta_\Delta(\gamma)' - \gamma^{*'}\|_{L^2([0,t])} \leq \varepsilon\}$$

for each $\varepsilon > 0$, and show $\text{prob}(\tilde{\Omega}_\Delta^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 1$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that

$$v_n^{l+1} = E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)} \left[\int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right] + ht_{l+1} + O(\sqrt{\Delta x}).$$

By (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^{l+1} - v(x, t) &= O(\sqrt{\Delta x}) \\ &= E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)} \left[\int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right\} \right] + h(t_{l+1} - t) + O(\sqrt{\Delta x}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mu(\cdot;\xi^*)} \left[\int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right. \\ \left. - \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right\} \right] = O(\sqrt{\Delta x}). \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^+ := \left\{ \gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0} \mid \int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \right. \\ \left. - \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right\} \geq \Delta x^{1/4} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since γ^* is a minimizing curve, we have for each γ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s) + x - x_n, s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \\ &\quad - \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right\} \\ &\leq \int_0^t L(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma)'(s)) ds + v^0(\eta_\Delta(\gamma)(0)) \\ &\quad - \left\{ \int_0^t L(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s)) ds + v^0(\gamma^*(0)) \right\} + \beta_7 \Delta x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $O(\sqrt{\Delta x}) \geq \text{prob}(\Omega^+) \Delta x^{1/4} - \beta_\tau \Delta x$, and therefore $\text{prob}(\Omega^+) = O(\Delta x^{1/4})$. Since γ^* is the unique minimizing curve, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $\Omega_n^{l+1,0} \setminus \Omega^+ \subset \tilde{\Omega}_\Delta^\varepsilon$ for $\Delta x \ll \varepsilon$, which means that $\text{prob}(\tilde{\Omega}_\Delta^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 1$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. Thus we see that, for any $\varepsilon' > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $|\Delta| < \delta$ we have

$$E_{\mu(\cdot; \xi^*)}[\|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{L^2([0,t])}] \leq \varepsilon'.$$

Define $\Omega^{++} := \{\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0} \mid \|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{L^2([0,t])} \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon'}\}$. Then we have $\text{prob}(\Omega^{++}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon'}$. By Lemma 3.5, we obtain $\|\gamma_\Delta - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0,t])} \leq \varepsilon$ with $\varepsilon' \leq O(\varepsilon^4)$ for all $\gamma \in \Omega_n^{l+1,0} \setminus \Omega^{++}$. We conclude that $\Omega_n^{l+1,0} \setminus \Omega^{++} \subset \Omega_\Delta^\varepsilon$ and $\text{prob}(\Omega_\Delta^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 1$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$.

(3): Let (x_{n+1}, t_{l+1}) be a point such that $t \in [t_{l+1} - \Delta t, t_{l+1} + \Delta t)$ and x belongs to the n -cube formed by the points of $\{x_{n+1} + \Delta x \omega\}_{\omega \in B}$. For any $\tau \in [0, \min\{t_{l+1}, t\}]$, we have

$$v_x(x, t) = \int_\tau^t L_x(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*\prime}(s)) ds + L_\xi(\gamma^*(\tau), \tau, \gamma^{*\prime}(\tau)) + h(t - \tau),$$

where γ^* is the unique minimizing curve for $v(x, t)$. Now v^0 is assumed to be semiconcave, and we have

$$v_x(x, t) = \int_0^t L_x(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*\prime}(s)) ds + v_x^0(\gamma^*(0)) + ht.$$

Set $\xi^*(x_m, t_{k+1}) := H_p(x_m, t_k, (D_x v^k)_m)$. Then we have for each $\omega \in B_+^j$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1} &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1,0}} \mu(\gamma; \xi^*) \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^0) \right] + ht_{l+1} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1, k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma; \xi^*) \left[\sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v_{m(\gamma^{k(\tau)})}^{k(\tau)} \right] \\ &\quad + h(t_{l+1} - t_{k(\tau)}) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1, k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*) \\ &\quad \times \left[\sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v_{m(\gamma^{k(\tau)} + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} \right] \\ &\quad + h(t_{l+1} - t_{k(\tau)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the notation $\mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*)$, $\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1, k(\tau)}$ stands for $\mu(\tilde{\gamma}; \xi)$, $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Omega_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1, k(\tau)}$ with $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x$. For each $\omega \in B_+^j$, define a control ζ on $G_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1,0}$ as

$$\zeta(x_m, t_{k+1}) := \begin{cases} \xi^*(x_m - e_j \cdot 2\Delta x, t_{k+1}) & \text{for } k(\tau) < k+1 \leq l+1, \\ \xi^*(x_m, t_{k+1}) & \text{for } 0 < k+1 \leq k(\tau). \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1,0}} \mu(\gamma; \zeta) \left[\sum_{0 < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \zeta_{m(\gamma^k)}^k) \Delta t + v^0(\gamma^k) \right] + h t_{l+1} \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma; \zeta) \left[\sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k - e_j \cdot 2\Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t + v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau))}^{k(\tau)} \right] \\
&\quad + h(t_{l+1} - t_{k(\tau)}) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \omega \Delta x; \zeta) \left[\sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k + \omega \Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k + \omega \Delta x - e_j \cdot 2\Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \omega \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} \right] + h(t_{l+1} - t_{k(\tau)}) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*) \left[\sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L(\gamma^k + \omega \Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \omega \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} \right] + h(t_{l+1} - t_{k(\tau)})
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{v_{n+1+\omega}^{l+1} - v_{n+1+\nu_j(\omega)}^{l+1}}{2\Delta x} &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*) \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L_{x^j}(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \omega \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} - v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)}}{2\Delta x} \right\} + \beta_8 \Delta x,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore with Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
(D_{x^j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} &\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*) \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \sum_{k(\tau) < k \leq l+1} L_{x^j}(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x, t_{k-1}, \xi_{m(\gamma^k + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{*k}) \Delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \omega \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} - v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)}}{2\Delta x} \right\} + \beta_8 \Delta x \\
&\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1,k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x; \xi^*) \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \int_{\tau}^t L_{x^j}(\eta_{\Delta}(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)(s), s, \eta_{\Delta}(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)'(s)) ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \omega \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)} - v_{m(\gamma^k(\tau) + \nu_j(\omega) \Delta x)}^{k(\tau)}}{2\Delta x} \right\} + \beta_9 \sqrt{\Delta x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Take $\tau = 0$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (D_{x^j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} - v_{x^j}(x, t) &\leq \bar{b}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in B_+^j} \sum_{\gamma \in \Omega_{n+1}^{l+1, k(\tau)}} \mu(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x; \xi^*) \\ &\times \left[\int_0^t \{L_{x^j}(\eta_\Delta(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x)(s), s, \eta_\Delta(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x)'(s)) - L_{x^j}(\gamma^*(s), s, \gamma^{*'}(s))\} ds \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{v_{m(\gamma^0 + \omega\Delta x)}^0 - v_{m(\gamma^0 + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x)}^0}{2\Delta x} - v_{x^j}^0(\gamma^*(s)) \right] + \beta_9 \sqrt{\Delta x}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{v_{m(\gamma^0 + \omega\Delta x)}^0 - v_{m(\gamma^0 + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x)}^0}{2\Delta x} - v_{x^j}^0(\gamma^*(s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\Delta x} \int_0^{2\Delta x} \{v_{x^j}^0(\gamma^0 + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x + ye_j) - v_{x^j}^0(\gamma^*(0))\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since v^0 is semiconcave (twice differentiable a.e.), the above equation makes sense and it holds that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \gamma^*(0)} v_{x^j}^0(x) = v_{x^j}^0(\gamma^*(0)).$$

We already know from the proof of (2) that $\|\eta_\Delta(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x) - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0, t])} \rightarrow 0$, $\|\eta_\Delta(\gamma + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x)' - \gamma^{*'}\|_{L^2([0, t])} \rightarrow 0$, $\|\gamma_\Delta + \nu_j(\omega)\Delta x - \gamma^*\|_{C^0([0, t])} \rightarrow 0$ as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ in probability. Thus we conclude that

$$\limsup_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \{(D_{x^j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} - v_{x^j}(x, t)\} \leq 0.$$

Similar reasoning yields

$$\liminf_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \{(D_{x^j} v^{l+1})_{n+1} - v_{x^j}(x, t)\} \geq 0.$$

□

References

- [1] P. Cannarsa and C. Sinestrari, Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations and optimal control, Birkhäuser (2004).
- [2] M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions, Two approximations of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, Math. Comp. **43** (1984), No. 167, 1-19.
- [3] W. E, Aubry-Mather theory and periodic solutions of the forced Burgers equation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **52** (1999), No. 7, 811-828.
- [4] A. Fathi, Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics, Cambridge Univ. Pr. (2011).
- [5] W. H. Fleming, The Cauchy problem for a nonlinear first order partial differential equation, J. Differ. Eqs **5** (1969), 515-530.

- [6] O. A. Oleinik, Discontinuous solutions of nonlinear differential equations, A. M. S. Transl. (ser. 2) **26** (1957), 95-172.
- [7] K. Soga, Space-time continuous limit of random walks with hyperbolic scaling, Non-linear Analysis **102** (2014), 264-271.
- [8] K. Soga, Stochastic and variational approach to the Lax-Friedrichs scheme, Math. Comp. **84** (2015), No. 292, 629-651.
- [9] K. Soga, More on stochastic and variational approach to the Lax-Friedrichs scheme, submitted (arXiv:1210.2178).
- [10] K. Soga, Selection problems of \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodic entropy solutions and viscosity solutions, submitted (arXiv: 1501.03594).
- [11] P. E. Souganidis, Approximation schemes for viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations, J. Differ. Eqs. **59** (1985), 1-43.