

Hawkes process with a diffusion-driven baseline: long-run behavior, inference, statistical tests

Maya Sadeler Perrin^{a,*}, Anna Bonnet^b, Charlotte Dion Blanc^{b,c}, Adeline Samson^a

^a*Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP¹, LJK, 38000 Grenoble, France*

^b*Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Laboratoire de Probabilités, Statistique et Modélisation, LPSM, UMR 8001, Paris, F-75005, France*

^c*CMAF, Ecole Polytechnique, IP Paris, Palaiseau, France*

Abstract

Event-driven systems in fields such as neuroscience, social networks, and finance often exhibit dynamics influenced by continuously evolving external covariates. Motivated by these applications, we introduce a new class of multivariate Hawkes processes, in which the spontaneous rate of events is modulated by a diffusion process. This framework allows the point process to adapt dynamically to continuously evolving covariates, capturing both intrinsic self-excitation and external influences. In this article, we establish the probabilistic properties of the coupled process, proving stability and ergodicity under moderate assumptions. Classical functional results, including law of large numbers and mixing properties, are extended to this diffusion-driven setting. Building on these results, we study parametric inference for the Hawkes component: we derive consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator in the long-time regime, and derive stronger convergence results under additional assumptions on the covariate process. We further propose hypothesis testing procedures to assess the statistical relevance of the covariate. Simulation studies illustrate the validity of the asymptotic results and the effectiveness of the proposed inference methods. Overall, this work provides theoretical and practical foundations for diffusion-driven Hawkes models.

Keywords: Hawkes process with covariate, Stochastic baseline,

*Corresponding author maya.sadeler@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

¹Institute of Engineering Univ. Grenoble Alpes

1. Introduction

Many systems exhibit event-driven dynamics, where the intensity of occurrences evolves through self-excitation and external time-varying covariates. For instance, in biology, mutation events in a cell population may depend on past mutations and stochastic environmental factors, while in social networks, the propagation of information depends on prior activity and evolving contextual signals. In these frameworks, the probability of new events occurring is a functional of both the system's history and continuously evolving stochastic covariates.

To describe this type of dependence, we consider a Hawkes process with stochastic baseline intensity, in which the spontaneous rate of activity is driven by a diffusion process. The covariate process $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is modeled as the solution of the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX(t) = b(X(t)) dt + \sigma(X(t)) dW(t), \quad X(0) \sim \pi_0, \quad (1)$$

where $W(t)$ is a standard l -dimensional Brownian motion with $l \leq m$, $b : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is the drift function, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$ is the diffusion coefficient, and $X(0)$ is distributed according to π_0 . The point process $N = (N_1, \dots, N_d)$ describing event arrival has an intensity $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, which takes the form of

$$\lambda_i(t) := g_i(X(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0, t^-)} h_{ij}(t-s) dN_j(s), \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (2)$$

where $g_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a state-dependent baseline intensity. The kernel h_{ij} quantifies the influence of past events of component j on the current intensity of component i and characterizes how the occurrence of an event increases the probability of future events, and how this excitation decays over time.

The coupled system $(X(t), N(t))$ thus forms a diffusion-point process pair, in which the diffusion $X(t)$ modulates the spontaneous emission event rate of $N(t)$. The application that motivates this work is from neuroscience, where $N(t)$ represents the spike train of a neural network, and $X(t)$ encodes external or latent inputs such as sensory stimuli, the animal's spatial position, or environmental conditions like light intensity or temperature. By

explicitly incorporating $X(t)$ into the intensity function, the model captures how neuronal firing is dynamically modulated in real time by continuously evolving external signals. Such a representation allows to quantify, for instance, how a neuron’s behavior changes in response to variations in sensory input or behavioral state, and to untangle the contributions of intrinsic self-excitation from stimulus-driven effects. In this work, we focus on the case where the excitation kernel takes an exponential form, that is

$$h_{ij}(t) = \alpha_{ij}e^{-\beta_{ij}t}, \quad \alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij} > 0. \quad (3)$$

This specification is common as it allows for a Markovian representation of the process intensity [1, 2]. It is also justified by the application considered in neuroscience as many studies focusing on neuronal activity (studies not necessarily based on Hawkes processes) rely on an exponential decay of the impact of past spikes on the current neuronal activity [3, 4, 5].

The goal of this paper is to study this new diffusion-driven Hawkes process, both from a probabilistic and inferential points of view.

State of the Art

Introduced by [6] in 1971, linear Hawkes processes are reference models for self-exciting point phenomena. In their classical formulation, each component N_i of the process has a predictable intensity depending on a constant baseline $\mu_i > 0$ (i.e., $g_{\mu_i}(x) = \mu_i$ in Equation (2)) and a kernel h_{ij} describing the influence of past events. For a general kernel $h_{ij} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, existence, uniqueness, stability, and stationarity of the multivariate Hawkes process have been established [6, 7, 8], and functional limit theorems have been derived for the asymptotic distribution of event counts [9]. Many works deal with inference for these processes. In general, approaches can be divided into nonparametric methods, such as kernel smoothing, projection, or moment-based techniques [4, 10], and parametric methods, including Bayesian inference [11], Maximum Likelihood Estimation [12, 1] and penalized estimation such as Lasso for high-dimensional or sparse interaction structures [13, 14].

A simplification occurs for exponential kernels, where the intensity $\lambda(t)$ admits a Markovian representation [1]. This structure facilitates probabilistic analysis and recursive likelihood computation, leading to stronger results both on the process’s probabilistic behavior—such as exponential ergodicity with explicit control of regeneration times [15]—and on statistical inference, notably with central limit theorems for the maximum likelihood estimator, and moment convergence [12, 1].

However, the models studied in those paper remain autonomous: their dynamics depend solely on past events. To account for external influences, several generalizations have been proposed. Marked Hawkes processes include event-specific covariates or marks [16, 17, 18, 19], although the covariates are typically observed only at event times [20]. Spatio-temporal extensions have also been considered [21], but do not handle continuously evolving covariates.

Other models build on a framework similar to that defined by Equations (1)–(2), allowing for time-varying coefficients in the intensity. These approaches, however, have been explored from a rather different perspective, focusing primarily on the high-frequency regime, where the observation window T is fixed and the number of events N goes to infinity [1, 22, 14, 23]. This includes univariate exponential Hawkes processes with stochastic coefficients [1, 22], as well as non-exponential kernels with deterministic, time-dependent baselines [14]. Although these works provide consistent and asymptotically normal estimators, they do not investigate other probabilistic properties of the model—such as stability, ergodicity, or mixing behavior—which are central to the present study.

The low-frequency (long-duration) regime has received less attention, with some contributions addressing nonparametric inference for indicator-type kernels [23]. Recent works integrate covariates directly into the Hawkes process, but typically no explicit model is specified for the covariate, and the effect of its dynamics is not analyzed. Moreover, covariates are often not continuous in time or treated as deterministic. For instance, [24] models the baseline intensity as a constant and expressed as a log-linear function of covariate matrix X and a parameter to estimate. A similar model is used in [25], which focuses on parametric estimation with penalization to improve inference and stability of the estimated parameters. In [26], the authors consider marked Hawkes processes for cyber-attack frequency modeling, where part of the baseline intensity is driven by unobserved homogeneous Poisson components. However, these models rely on latent baselines, which differs from our framework where the external covariate $X(t)$ is continuous, fully observed, and modulates the intensity of the Hawkes process.

Given the variety of existing Hawkes models and the additional complexity introduced by the covariate in the baseline, we are interested in testing the relevance of the covariate. However, even for the standard Hawkes process, existing statistical testing procedures are scarce. Classical goodness-of-fit methods, such as those based on the time-change theorem [27], require repeated events [28] and have no straightforward extension to the long-duration

regime. The only theoretically grounded procedure in this setting is the test proposed by [29], which accounts for the asymptotic fluctuations of the estimated compensator. In practice, however, implementing this test is complex and computationally demanding, so practical tools for assessing covariate relevance in such models remain limited.

Contribution and paper organization

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We establish the probabilistic properties of the process $(X(t), N(t))$, showing that under moderate assumptions, it admits stable and ergodic dynamics. We also extend classical functional results, as the law of large numbers of the functional limit theorem, for the point process N .
- We extend to our framework the classical mixing theorem known for standard Hawkes processes. Beyond a direct extension, we propose several results depending on the strength of the assumptions made on the covariate process and on how it impacts the intensity.
- We study statistical inference for the model parameters in the long-time (low-frequency) regime, proving consistency and central limit theorems for the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) under general ergodicity conditions on $X(t)$. As for the mixing theorem, we develop a complementary version of this result: when stronger conditions on X hold, we obtain a stronger version with convergence of moments for the estimator.
- We develop hypothesis testing procedures to assess the relevance of the covariate, enabling formal evaluation of whether including $X(t)$ significantly enhances data description.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the Hawkes process with stochastic baseline intensity, define the coupled process $(X(t), N(t))$, and establish basic existence results. Section 3 presents the theoretical properties, including ergodicity, functional limit theorems, and mixing results under different assumptions on $X(t)$. Section 4 focuses on statistical inference, studying the MLE in the long-time regime with consistency and CLTs results. Section 5 introduces hypothesis testing for the relevance of the covariate. Finally, Section 6 illustrates our theoretical conclusions using simulations, presenting the behavior of the process, the performance of the MLE, and the testing procedures.

2. Hawkes process with stochastic time-dependent baseline

Before introducing the model, let us first define some notation.

2.1. Notation

Throughout the paper, we work on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with canonical filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\left(X(0), W(s), N(s), s \leq t\right),$$

where X is the covariate process, driven by a noise process W , and $N = (N_1, \dots, N_d)$ is the d -dimensional counting process. For any stochastic process Z , \mathcal{F}^Z denotes its canonical filtration, for instance \mathcal{F}^W or \mathcal{F}^N . Let $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ denote the jump times of N , with $T_0 := 0$. The true Hawkes intensity of component N_i at time t is denoted by $\lambda_i^*(t)$, and the full intensity vector is $\lambda^*(t) := (\lambda_1^*(t), \dots, \lambda_d^*(t))^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. The associated compensator

$$\Lambda^*(T) := \int_0^T \lambda^*(t) dt$$

is the unique predictable increasing process such that $N(T) - \Lambda^*(T)$ is a martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, see *e.g.* [7, 30].

For a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ depending on a state variable x and a parameter η , we denote by $\nabla_x f_\eta(x)$ the gradient with respect to x , and by $\nabla_\eta f_\eta(x)$ the gradient with respect to η . Higher-order derivatives with respect to η are denoted $\nabla_\eta^j f_\eta(x)$. Finally, we denote $\mathcal{D}(E, \mathbb{R})$ the set of functions $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^1(E, \mathbb{R})$ such that $(u, v, w) \mapsto \nabla \psi(u, v, w)$ has polynomial growth, and $\mathcal{C}_b(E, \mathbb{R})$ the set of continuous bounded functions on E .

Finally, we denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm.

2.2. Model description

We consider a model in which a multivariate Hawkes process is influenced by an external covariate that evolves continuously over time. The joint process $(X(t), N(t))$ combines a diffusion for the covariate with a self-exciting point process whose dynamics depend both on the current state of the covariate and on the history of past events. The covariate $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is modeled as the solution of a SDE driven by a standard l -dimensional Brownian motion given in Equation (1). To ensure that this diffusion component is well-defined, we impose the following regularity condition on its drift and diffusion coefficients.

Assumption 1 *The coefficient functions $b : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$ are continuous and globally Lipschitz.*

Under Assumption 1, the SDE defined in Equation (1) admits a unique global strong solution. Conditionally on $X(t)$, the multivariate Hawkes process N is then defined through its intensity for each component i :

$$\lambda_{\theta,i}(t) := g_{\mu_i}(X(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t^-)} \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} dN_j(s). \quad (4)$$

We denote the main parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, composed of three types of parameters μ , α , and β , where μ parametrises the baseline functions while α and β parametrise the interaction functions:

$$\theta := ((\mu_i)_{i=1}^d, (\alpha_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d, (\beta_{ij})_{i,j=1}^d).$$

Furthermore, the parameter space Θ is assumed to be a Cartesian product $\Theta := \Theta_1 \times \Theta_2$, with Θ_1 a compact representing all admissible values for $\mu = (\mu_i)_{i=1}^d$, and $(\alpha, \beta) = ((\alpha_{ij})_{i,j}, (\beta_{ij})_{i,j}) \in \Theta_2$ with

$$\Theta_2 := [\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}]^{d^2} \times [\underline{\beta}, \overline{\beta}]^{d^2}$$

for some positive constants $\underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}, \overline{\beta}$. Finally, we assume the existence of a true parameter $\theta^* \in \Theta$ such that

$$\lambda^*(t) := \lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$$

denotes the true intensity vector, with associated compensator denoted $\Lambda_{\theta^*}(\cdot)$.

For the Hawkes component, we further require a stability condition ensuring that self and cross-exciting effects remain bounded.

Assumption 2 *The kernel matrix $K := (\alpha_{ij}^*/\beta_{ij}^*)$ satisfies $\rho(K) < 1$, where $\rho(K)$ denotes its spectral radius.*

Assumptions 1 and 2 guarantee that the joint process $(X(t), N(t))$ is well-posed, ensuring existence and uniqueness of $X(t)$ and stability/non-explosion of $N(t)$. These conditions are always assumed throughout this work.

2.3. Existence result

In order to prove the existence of the process, let us exhibit a thinning representation that applies to the Hawkes component of the process defined by Equations (1)–(4).

Assumption 3 (Boundedness of the random baseline) *It is assumed that there exists $g_+ > 0$ such that one of the following two statements is true.*

- *Either, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $0 < \max_{i \in \llbracket 1 \dots d \rrbracket} g_{\mu_i^*}(x) < g_{\mu_+^*}$.*
- *Or, there exist x_1, x_2 such that for any initial condition $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, $X(t) \in [x_1, x_2] \quad \mathbb{P}_x - a.s$ and $g_{\mu_i^*}([x_1, x_2]) \subset (0, g_+]$.*

Each condition of Assumption 3 implies the existence of an upper bound for the process $g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t))$ which ensures the existence of a thinning procedure.

Theorem 1 (Existence). *Suppose that Assumption 3 holds. Then, the process $(\lambda_{\theta^*}(t))$ admits a Thinning procedure representation given by*

$$\begin{aligned} dX(t) &= b(X(t)) dt + \sigma(X(t)) dW(t), \\ \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) &= g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) dN_j^{(n)}(s), \\ dN_j^{(n+1)}(t) &= N_j^P([0, \lambda_j^{(n+1)}(t)] \times dt), \end{aligned}$$

with $\lambda^{(0)} = 0$, $N^{(0)} = \emptyset$, N_j^P a homogeneous unitary Poisson random measure on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with intensity measure equal to the Lebesgue measure and where $N_j^P([0, \lambda_j^{(n+1)}(t)] \times dt)$ denotes the number of points of N_j^P in $[0, \lambda_j^{(n+1)}(t)] \times [t, t + dt]$.

Proof. Assumption 1 ensures the existence of a unique strong solution on $[0, T]$ for the SDE, for any $T > 0$. We can therefore work conditionally to the Brownian filtration. We then fall back to the case of a Hawkes process with a deterministic baseline function which is bounded, thanks to Assumption 3, and thus apply Theorem 1 of [23] which studies a similar set-up. \square

3. Asymptotic behavior of the process

In this section, we study the asymptotic properties of the point process $N(t)$ and its intensity $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$. We focus on three aspects: ergodicity, limit theorems (law of large numbers and central limit theorem), and mixing properties. These results characterize the long-term behavior of the process and extend classical results obtained for Hawkes processes with constant baselines [12, 8, 1, 31].

3.1. Exponential ergodicity of the intensity process

To establish the ergodicity of the intensity, we study the joint dynamics of the covariate X and the excitation component of the Hawkes process. Specifically, we introduce a Markovian representation of the system to use classical results from the ergodic theory of Markov processes.

3.1.1. Markovian representation

We consider the joint process $Z(t) := (X(t), Y(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ with Y defined by

$$Y_{ij}(t) := \int_{(0,t)} \alpha_{ij}^* e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} dN_j(s), \quad Y(t) = (Y_{ij}(t))_{1 \leq i,j \leq d}, \quad (5)$$

so that

$$\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) = g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d Y_{ij}(t).$$

Our goal is to analyze the asymptotic behavior of Z by applying the ergodic theory for Markov processes developed in [32]. The dynamics of Z is given by the coupled system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = b(X(t)) dt + \sigma(X(t)) dW(t), \\ dY_{ij}(t) = -\beta_{ij}^* Y_{ij}(t) dt + \alpha_{ij}^* dN_j(t). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) shows that the joint process Z is Markovian w.r.t the filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) defined in Section 2.1.

3.1.2. Ergodicity property

To ensure the ergodicity of the diffusion-driven baseline process, we impose structural assumptions on the diffusion $X(t)$. We begin with classical conditions, which guarantee that the SDE admits smooth transition densities and suitable Lyapunov functions.

Assumption 4 *Consider the following conditions.*

- **Hörmander's condition.** Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ denote the columns of the diffusion matrix σ and set $\sigma_0 := b$ for the drift vector field. We say that the Hörmander condition holds if the Lie Algebra generated by $\{\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_m\}$ span \mathbb{R}^m

- **Dissipative drift and elliptic diffusion.** Suppose that the function b satisfies

$$\langle b(x), x \rangle \leq -\gamma \|x\|^q, \quad \text{for all } \|x\| \geq \mathcal{R},$$

for some constants $\mathcal{R} > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, and $q \geq 1$, and the diffusion matrix

$$a(x) := \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top$$

is either semi positive definite or bounded on \mathbb{R}^m .

Assumption 4 has two classical consequences for the diffusion X . First, Hörmander's condition ensures that the transition kernel $P_t^X(x, dy)$ admits a smooth density $p_t(x, y)$ which is \mathcal{C}^∞ in t , x and y , with respect to the Lebesgue measure (see [33]). Second, the dissipativity and ellipticity assumptions guarantee the existence of norm-like Lyapunov functions. In particular, it is possible to construct a function of the form

$$V_1(x) = \exp(\xi \|x\|^q), \quad (7)$$

with $\xi > 0$, which satisfies the drift condition

$$\mathcal{A}^X V_1 \leq -c V_1 + d_1 \mathbb{1}_{K_1} \quad (8)$$

for suitable constants $c_1, d_1 > 0$, a compact set $K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and where \mathcal{A}^X denotes the infinitesimal generator of X .

These two properties — smooth transition densities and the existence of a Lyapunov function — are the usual conditions required to apply the ergodic theory of [32] to SDE as they assure the diffusion X is ergodic and therefore admits a unique invariant probability measure, denoted π_X .

In particular, these assumptions are relatively easy to verify and have already been established for a variety of SDE models [34, 35]. Nevertheless, one could work under more general Markovian stability conditions, relying for instance on the broader framework of [32]. For completeness, we state in the following remark a set of more general conditions under which our results remain valid.

Remark 2 (General Markovian conditions for X). *The general framework of [32] only requires $X(t)$ is a left-continuous Markov process satisfying the following properties.*

1. **Lyapunov drift condition.** *There exists a norm-like Lyapunov function V_1 such that*

$$\mathcal{A}^X V_1 \leq -c_1 V_1 + d_1 \mathbf{1}_{K_1},$$

where \mathcal{A}^X denotes the infinitesimal generator, $c_1, d_1 > 0$ are constant and K_1 is a compact set of \mathbb{R}^m .

2. **T -chain condition.** *There exists a transition kernel Q_1 such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, for all Borel set A ,*

$$P_T^X(x, A) \geq Q_{1,T}(x, A)$$

with $Q_{1,T}$ verifying

- for every Borel set A , the map $x \mapsto Q_{1,T}(x, A)$ is lower semi-continuous
- $Q_{1,T}(x, \mathbb{R}^m) > 0$ for all x .

3. **Accessible point.** *There exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that every neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x_0 satisfies*

$$P_T^X(x_0, \mathcal{U}) > 0 \quad \text{for some } T > 0.$$

It should be noted that these general conditions are automatically satisfied under Assumption 4. Indeed, existence of a density for $P_t^X(x, \cdot)$ leads to

$$Q_{1,t}(x, A) = \int_A p_t(x, y) dy$$

which is lower semi-continuous by Fatou's lemma. Furthermore it ensures that every point is accessible. Similarly, the dissipativity and ellipticity conditions guarantees the existence of a Lyapunov function of the form $V_1(x) = \exp(\xi \|x\|^q)$ satisfying the required drift inequality.

Throughout the paper, our main results are stated under Assumption 4 for clarity and simplicity. However, each of these results remains valid if one replaces Assumption 4 with the more general Markovian conditions listed in this remark.

In addition to the ergodicity condition on X discussed above, we also need to strengthen Assumption 3 to ensure the ergodicity of the process λ . We now require that the functions g_{μ_i} are not only upper bounded but also bounded away from zero.

Assumption 5 (Boundedness of the random baseline) *We assume that one of the following two conditions holds:*

- *Either, for every $\mu \in \Theta_1$, there exist constants $g_{\mu-}$ and $g_{\mu+}$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$0 < g_{\mu-} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} g_{\mu_i}(x) < g_{\mu+}.$$

- *Or, for every $\mu \in \Theta_1$, there exist constants $g_{\mu-}$ and $g_{\mu+}$ and vectors $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that, for any initial condition $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, the process remains almost surely within this interval: $X(t) \in [x_1, x_2]$ \mathbb{P}_x -a.s., and for all $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and all $\mu \in \Theta_1$, we have*

$$0 < g_{\mu-} \leq g_{\mu_i}(x) \leq g_{\mu+}, \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_1, x_2].$$

We now establish the exponential ergodicity of the process Z . Let us define the transition kernel $P_t^Z((x, y), \cdot)$:

$$P_t^Z((x, y), (A, B)) := \mathbb{P}(X(t) \in A, Y(t) \in B \mid X(0) = x, Y(0) = y).$$

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 2-4-5, the process Z is exponentially ergodic. In particular, there exist an invariant measure π and constants $B < +\infty$ and $\rho < 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and all $y > 0$,*

$$\|P_t^Z((x, y), \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|_f \leq Bf(x, y)\rho^t, \quad (9)$$

where $\|\mu\|_f := \sup_{|g| \leq f} |\int g(s) \mu(ds)|$ denotes the f -norm (a weighted extension of the total variation norm), and function $f : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \mapsto V_1(x) + e^{\langle m, y \rangle}$, with V_1 defined in Assumption 4.

This theorem guarantees that the process Z is exponentially ergodic. In particular, $Z(t)$ converges geometrically fast to its invariant measure π in the f -norm. Furthermore, it satisfies Birkhoff's ergodic theorem: for any function ψ dominated by f , we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \psi(Z(s)) ds \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} \pi(\psi) \quad \text{almost surely and in } \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P}).$$

This result ensures that the intensity vector $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$ is itself ergodic. Indeed, to establish ergodicity it is sufficient to apply Birkhoff's theorem to all functions in \mathcal{L}^1 , which guarantees convergence of time averages. For any polynomial function ψ , we can write $\psi(\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)) = \psi \circ \nu(Z(t))$, where ν maps $Z(t)$ to $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$. Since ν is built from bounded functions $g_{\mu_i^*}$ and sums function, we have $\psi \circ \nu(z) \leq f(z)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$, so $\psi(\lambda_{\theta^*}(t))$ is in \mathcal{L}^1 . It follows that $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$ inherits the ergodicity property from $Z(t)$.

3.2. Asymptotic functional central limit theorem

In this section, we present asymptotic results for the counting process and its associated intensity. These results, stated as a Proposition and a Theorem, establish the stability of $\lambda_{\theta,i}(t)$, a Law of Large Numbers (LLN), and a Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for $N(t)$.

Proposition 1. *Suppose Assumptions 4 and 5 hold, and define the stationary version of the intensity as*

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t) = g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(-\infty, t)} \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} d\bar{N}_j(s), \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{X} = (\bar{X}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is distributed according to the stationary law π_X of the SDE and where $\bar{N}_j = (\bar{N}_j(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ denote the stationary Hawkes process.

Then, we have convergence in distribution,

$$(\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t), \lambda_{\theta,i}(t), \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\theta,i}(t)) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} (\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}, \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}, \nabla_{\theta} \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}).$$

Moreover, there exist constants $c > 0$ (independent of θ) and $C_{\theta} > 0$ (depending on θ) such that,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\lambda_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t)| \right] \leq C_{\theta} e^{-ct}.$$

The proof is given in Appendix A.2. The first part follows from the stability results in [8], extending classical Hawkes process stability to the covariate-dependent setting. The second part quantifies the exponential rate of convergence to the stationary intensity, a consequence of the exponential kernel and the exponential ergodicity of X .

We now generalize classical functional limit theorems for Hawkes processes with a constant baseline, proven in [31]. The key difference is that the limiting behavior now involves the stationary mean of the covariate-dependent baseline:

$$\bar{\mu} := \int g_{\mu^*}(x) \pi_X(dx). \quad (11)$$

The structure of the LLN and CLT remains unchanged, with the baseline replaced by its stationary average.

To formalize this result, we introduce the Skorokhod space together with its canonical topology. For general definitions and standard properties, we

refer to [36, Chapter 3]. Let $\mathbb{D}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the space of \mathbb{R}^d -valued càdlàg functions on $[0, 1]$, that is, functions that are right-continuous with left limits. We equip $\mathbb{D}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ with the Skorokhod J_1 topology, under which convergence corresponds to the existence of time deformations making the trajectories close in the uniform metric.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that Assumptions 4–5 hold. Let $\bar{\mu}$ be defined by Equation (11) where π_X denotes the stationary distribution of the process $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$, and define the diagonal covariance matrix*

$$\Sigma_{ii} = ((I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu})_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

with $K = \left(\frac{\alpha_{ij}^}{\beta_{ij}^*} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$. Then, the following yields.*

(i) **(Law of large numbers)**

$$\sup_{v \in [0, 1]} \left\| \frac{1}{T} N(Tv) - v (I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu} \right\| \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \text{almost surely and in } L^2(\mathbb{P}).$$

(ii) **(Functional Central Limit Theorem)**

$$\left(\sqrt{T} \left(\frac{1}{T} N(Tv) - v (I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu} \right) \right)_{v \in [0, 1]} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} ((I - K)^{-1} \Sigma^{1/2} W_v)_{v \in [0, 1]},$$

where $W = (W_v)_{v \in [0, 1]}$ is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. The convergence in law holds in $\mathbb{D}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^d)$ endowed with the Skorokhod J_1 topology.

As announced, we find the same structure as in the classical Hawkes process with a constant baseline, as proven by [31] for Hawkes processes with a general kernel and a constant baseline. The proof of this theorem, which can be found in Appendix A.4, is largely inspired by this work.

As in [31], the arguments used do not rely on the exponential form of the kernel, and the result should therefore remain valid without this assumption. Furthermore, it should be noted that these asymptotic results only require the ergodicity of X and the boundedness of $g_{\mu_i}^*$, so that Birkhoff's ergodic theorem applies.

3.3. Mixing property of the intensity process

Consider the vector composed of the intensity and its gradient with respect to the parameter θ , denoted $U_{\theta,i}(t)$. For the i -th component, it is defined, for $t > 0$, as

$$U_{\theta,i}(t) := (\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t), \lambda_{\theta,i}(t), \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\theta,i}(t)). \quad (12)$$

In this section, we study the mixing properties of the process $U_{\theta,i}(t)$. These properties are useful for the theoretical analysis of the model and are required to establish the asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator (see Section 4). In particular, mixing implies ergodicity, which is necessary to ensure consistency of the MLE. Studying the mixing behavior of $U_{\theta,i}(t)$ therefore extends Theorem 4 which establishes ergodicity only for the true intensity $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$.

Formally, a process $(U(t))_{t \geq 0}$ taking values in a space E is said to be C -mixing, for a set of functions $C : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if for any $\phi, \psi \in C$,

$$\rho_u := \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov} [\psi(U(t)), \phi(U(t+u))] \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Depending on assumptions about the baseline functions and the covariant process $X(t)$, two distinct mixing regimes can be identified. Under moderate boundedness conditions, the process satisfies a weak mixing property with respect to continuous and bounded functions. When stricter boundedness assumptions are imposed on $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$, a strong mixing property applies. The corresponding assumptions are presented below.

Assumption 6 (Boundedness of the random baseline) *We assume that there exist two strictly positive constants g_- and g_+ such that one of the following conditions holds.*

- *Either, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$*

$$g_- \leq \sup_{\mu \in \Theta_1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} g_{\mu_i}(x) < g_+.$$

- *Or, there exist $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that for any initial condition $x \in [x_1, x_2]$, the process remains in this interval almost surely: $X(t) \in [x_1, x_2]$ \mathbb{P}_x -a.s., and:*

$$g_- \leq \sup_{\mu \in \Theta_1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} g_{\mu_i}(x) \leq g_+ \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_1, x_2].$$

We now introduce an assumption that ensures the existence of moments for the process $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$. This condition involves two parameters, (p, j) , where p specifies the moment order and j the derivative order. Later, different combinations of (p, j) are required, depending on the specific results we aim to prove.

Assumption 7 (p,j) (*Moment existence*) *We assume that for all $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ we have the following*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \sup_{\mu \in \Theta_1} \nabla_{\mu}^j g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) \right\|^p \right) < +\infty.$$

Remark 5. *Assumption 4 ensures that X admits moments of all orders, as the Lyapunov function 7 dominates any polynomial function $x \mapsto |x|^p$. As a result, Assumption 7 is satisfied whenever $g_{\mu_i}(x)$ is a polynomial function of x with coefficients uniformly bounded in μ . For example, $g_{\mu_1}(x) = \mu_{11}x^T + \mu_{12}$ satisfies Assumption 7.*

Under these strengthened assumptions, we can now state the theorem that guarantees the mixing property.

Theorem 6 (Mixing Properties of the Intensity). *Let the state space be $E = \mathbb{R}_+^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \times \mathbb{R}^s \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ where $s = \sum_{i=1}^d d_i$ is the dimension of the parameter (μ_i) . The augmented intensity process $U_{\theta,i}(t)$, given in Equation (12), satisfies the following mixing properties:*

- **Weak Mixing:** *If Assumptions 4–5 hold then for all functions $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(E, \mathbb{R})$ and for all $\theta \in \Theta$, we have for all i :*

$$\rho_{\theta,i}(u) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)), \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u))) \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

- **Strong Mixing:** *If Assumptions 4–6 and 7(p,1) are verified for all $p > 1$, then and for $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{D}(E, \mathbb{R})$, there exists $r < 1$ such that for all i :*

$$\rho_i(u) := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)), \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u))) = o(r^u)$$

The proof of this theorem, presented in Appendix A.5, follows the approach of [1] and [22], who establish mixing properties for Hawkes models with constant baseline. The method is based on truncating the memory

of the process to neglect the influence of the distant past, which becomes negligible due to the exponential decay of the memory kernel.

We obtain two types of asymptotic behavior, depending on the assumptions made on the covariate process X and the baseline functions μ_i . In all cases, the ergodicity of X is required to ensure the stability of the process and to derive asymptotic results. The strong exponential mixing property holds under Assumptions 6 and 7(p,1), which require uniform boundedness of $\mu_i(X(t))$ and its derivative $\nabla_{\mu}\mu_i(X(t))$ in L^p for all $p > 1$. In the strong case, the mixing property is uniform in θ , contrary to the weak case. Under the weaker Assumption 5, the process remains mixing, but the result is not uniform in θ ; however, this setting relies on weaker assumptions on the baseline functions and still ensures mixing for bounded test functions.

These two types of mixing properties are important because they lead to different levels of convergence for the MLE, as we will see in Theorem 7. Indeed, the weak mixing property is sufficient to establish the classical version of the asymptotic normality of the MLE. The strong mixing property allows for the control of the expectations of test functions in $\mathcal{D}(E, \mathbb{R})$, leading to moment convergence at all order.

4. Inference via likelihood maximization

In this section, we investigate the inferential properties of the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE). We work in a parametric setting for the SDE driving the covariate process X , introducing a parameter ξ^* such that the drift takes the form $b(\cdot) := b(\cdot, \xi^*)$. Our objective is to estimate the joint parameter (θ^*, ξ^*) , where θ^* specifies the Hawkes component (see Section 2) and $\xi^* \in \Xi$ governs the dynamics of X . The set Ξ denotes the parameter space associated with the diffusion, typically a compact subset.

The asymptotic theory for estimating diffusion coefficients is well-developed in the literature (see, e.g., [37]); hence, our main focus is on the estimation of θ^* , while the treatment of ξ^* is included primarily for completeness.

4.1. Likelihood

Let us briefly recall that for a multivariate point process with intensity λ_{θ} , the log-likelihood associated with a trajectory observed over $[0, T]$ in continuous time, is given by (see [7]):

$$\ell_T^N(\theta) := \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\int_0^T \log(\lambda_{\theta,i}(t)) dN_i(t) - \int_0^T \lambda_{\theta,i}(t) dt \right).$$

In parallel, for a diffusion process X with a drift depending on a parameter ξ , the log-likelihood of an observed trajectory in continuous time over $[0, T]$ is given by Girsanov's theorem (see [37] for example):

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_T^X(\xi) &= \int_0^T b(X(s), \xi)^\top a(X(s))^{-1} dX(s) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T b(X(s), \xi)^\top a(X(s))^{-1} b(X(s), \xi) ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $a(x) = (\sigma\sigma^\top)(x)$. Hence, for a joint observation of the process $(X(t), N(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ defined by Equations (1)-(4), the full log-likelihood function is:

$$\ell_T^{(X, N)}(\theta, \xi) = \ell_T^N(\theta) + \ell_T^X(\xi).$$

Note that the parameter θ is only involved in $\ell_T^N(\theta)$ which is the part of the log-likelihood linked to the Hawkes process. Similarly, ξ only appears in $\ell_T^X(\xi)$, the diffusion part of the log-likelihood. The MLE computation then relies on the separate maximization of those two terms:

$$\hat{\theta}_T \in \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell_T^N(\theta) \quad \hat{\xi}_T \in \arg \max_{\xi \in \Xi} \ell_T^X(\xi).$$

In this article, we focus only on $\hat{\theta}_T$. As the interaction between the two components is unidirectional —namely, the intensity λ depends on X , while λ does not impact X - the computations of $\hat{\theta}_T$ and $\hat{\xi}_T$ are independent. Furthermore, the estimation of ξ^* for ergodic diffusions is well known, and our framework does not introduce new contributions in this direction [37].

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that a joint estimation of (θ, ξ) could in principle be performed. In that case, the resulting estimators $(\hat{\theta}_T, \hat{\xi}_T)$ would jointly inherit the asymptotic properties associated with both $\hat{\xi}_T$ and $\hat{\theta}_T$, as detailed in later sections.

4.2. MLE behavior

We now investigate the properties of $\hat{\theta}_T$, focusing in particular on its consistency and asymptotic normality. Although these properties rely heavily on the mixing condition established in the previous section, they also require two additional assumptions.

The first requirement is a regularity condition with respect to the parameter μ , which ensures the differentiability and continuity of the likelihood function with respect to the estimated parameters.

The second is an identifiability condition, necessary to guarantee that the parameter θ can be uniquely recovered from the intensity trajectories. It also ensures that the Fisher information matrix is non-degenerate.

Assumption 8 (k) (Regularity of g) Assume that for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, d \rrbracket$ and all μ , $x \mapsto g_{\mu_i}(x)$ is continuous, and that $\mu \mapsto g_{\mu_i}(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^k for all x .

Assumption 9 (Identifiability) Assume that for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, d \rrbracket$

1. The application $\mu \mapsto g_{\mu_i}$ is one-to-one.
2. For all $\mu \neq \mu^*$, $\pi_X\left((g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{d_i} \setminus \{0\})\right) > 0$ and $\pi_X((\nabla_{\mu} g_{\mu_i})^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^*)) > 0$.
3. $\sigma^T \sigma(\cdot)$ is semi definite positive and for any μ, μ^* ,

$$\nabla_x(g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(\overline{X}) = 0 \Rightarrow \nabla_x(g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*}) = 0$$

with $\overline{X} \sim \pi_X$, the invariant measure associated with X .

Assumption 4 already imposes Hörmander's condition together with a dissipative drift, while allowing the diffusion matrix $a(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top$ to be either uniformly elliptic or merely bounded. However, for the identifiability analysis developed below, the boundedness of $a(x)$ is no longer sufficient. In particular, to ensure identifiability of the parameter μ , we require that $\sigma^T \sigma$ is semi-definite positive, as stated in Assumption 9.3. To further clarify the need for this specific item, we invite the reader to consult Section 4.3, where it is discussed in more detail.

Theorem 7 (Asymptotic normality of the MLE). Suppose Assumptions 4, and 9 hold. Let Γ denote the Fisher information matrix and $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, Id)$. Let $\widehat{\theta}_T$ be the MLE of θ^* . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\psi(\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta^*))\right] \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\psi(\Gamma^{-1/2} \xi)],$$

where the class of functions ψ depends on the Assumptions:

- **Convergence in distribution:** $\psi \in C_b(E, \mathbb{R})$, provided Assumption 5, Assumption 8(2) and Assumption 7(2,j) for all $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

- **Convergence in moment:** $\psi \in D(E, \mathbb{R})$, provided Assumption 6, Assumption 8(4), and Assumption 7(p,j) holds for all $p > 1$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, together with $\int V_1(x) \pi_0(dx) < \infty$, where π_0 is the law of $X(0)$ and V_1 is defined in Assumption 4.

The proof of this theorem, given in Appendix A.6, relies on the general result of [1] and [38], which provides general conditions under which the maximum likelihood estimator for a point process is consistent and asymptotically normal.

The two cases follow the distinction between weak and strong mixing regimes. In the weak mixing set-up (with additional assumptions), the classical CLT holds, providing convergence in distribution for bounded functions. In the set-up of the strong mixing, the result is stronger: it applies to polynomial functions and ensures convergence of moments of all orders. It is worth noting that the convergence of all moments implies convergence in distribution via Prokhorov's theorem. Indeed, moment convergence guarantees tightness of the sequence of measures. Moreover, any subsequence that converges in distribution must converge to the normal law, because the Gaussian distribution is uniquely determined by its moments. Thus, the convergence in moment is a stronger version of the classical CLT which provides additional information.

Remark 8. *In the specific setting of one-dimensional SDEs, i.e., when $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, the existence of a density further guarantees that Assumption 9.2 and the second point of Assumption 9.3 hold. Indeed, the stationary distribution of this SDE is explicitly known in this case and admits a strictly positive density on \mathbb{R} (see [37]). The stationary measure then assigns a positive mass to every region of the state space, including those required to distinguish between the different basis functions g_{μ_i} .*

4.3. Discussion and relaxation of assumptions

So far, we have made numerous assumptions, particularly in the context of Theorem 7. We therefore devote this subsection to discuss some of these assumptions.

Boundedness condition

All the stated theorems assume that the process $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$ is, in one way or another, bounded (see Assumptions 3, 5, 6). This condition generalizes a classical assumption of standard Hawkes processes, in which the constant

representing the baseline belongs to a compact set of \mathbb{R}_+^* , bounded both from above and from below.

The main advantage of this assumption is that it facilitates the dissociation of the behavior of the Hawkes component from the SDE component of the model. This allows us to frame the behavior of the Hawkes component between two Hawkes processes with a constant baseline, the behavior of which has already been studied [39] [1] [22].

From an application point of view, the relevance of this assumption depends on the context, but in practice many stochastic processes are naturally bounded by constraints. For example, in classical applications of Hawkes models: in finance, buying and selling prices are bounded both from below and from above due to money stocks; in ecology, SDE models describing animal movements are subject to physical constraints.

Identifiability conditions

We aim to clarify here some points raised in Hypothesis 9. Accurate parameter identification from observed intensity trajectories requires distinguishing between two sources of variation: the contribution of the variable $X(t)$ through the term $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$, and that of the memory of past events $(Y_{ij}(t))_{ij}$.

The objective of the third point of Assumption 9.3 is therefore to ensure that these two intensity components do not somehow merge. For that, we exploit their structural difference: $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$ evolves according to a SDE (thanks to the regularity of g), while Y_{ij} are jump processes, piecewise deterministic and very regular between jumps (even C^∞). If the two contributions became indistinguishable, this would mean that the diffusive part $g_{\mu_i}(X(t))$ no longer varies randomly, i.e., its quadratic variation would be zero. Now, this quadratic variation is expressed by:

$$\nabla_x g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) \sigma^T \sigma(X(t)) \nabla_x g_{\mu_i}(X(t))^T.$$

Hypothesis 9.3 then ensures that this expression can only be canceled if the function g_{μ_i} no longer depends on $X(t)$, which places us back in the usual framework of a Hawkes process with a constant baseline, a known and studied framework.

This remark underlines that what truly matters is not the non-degeneracy of $\sigma^T \sigma$, but rather the impossibility of confusing a stochastic diffusion with a deterministic jump process, suggesting that Hypothesis 9.3 can in fact be

relaxed. A more general but less intuitive way to formulate this idea is: if \mathbb{P} -a.s the diffusion process $g_{\mu_i}(X(t^-))$ is equal to the jump process $\sum_j Y_{ij}(t)$ then both the diffusion and jump process are identically null.

This shows that the class of admissible SDEs is actually wider than initially considered, and can include some types of hypoelliptic diffusions i.e with a degenerate diffusion matrix $\sigma^T \sigma$.

5. Model validation and statistical testing

In this section, we present the statistical tests that follow from the asymptotic convergence of the likelihood estimator, established by Theorem 7, as well as certain properties of the intensity of the model (such as the ergodic property).

5.1. Testing the baseline parameters

We first introduce tests designed to assess the value of the model coefficients. These tests rely both on the asymptotic normality of the estimators and on the existence of a consistent estimator of the Fisher information matrix. Both aspects are detailed in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let \hat{I}_T be an consistent estimator of Γ that is defined by either:*

$$-\frac{\nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell_T^N(\hat{\theta}_T)}{T} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^T \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T, i}(t)^{-2} \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T, i}(t) \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T, i}(t)^T dN_i(t). \quad (13)$$

Then, under Hypothesis of Theorem 7, \hat{I}_T is asymptotically non-degenerate, and its inverse \hat{I}_T provides a consistent estimator of the Fisher information matrix Γ^{-1} . As a consequence, we have the asymptotic distribution:

$$\sqrt{T} \hat{I}_T^{1/2}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, I_d).$$

Both expressions in Equation (13) are in fact very similar as for all θ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(-\frac{\nabla_{\theta}^2 \ell_T^N(\theta^*)}{T}\right) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T \lambda_{\theta^*, i}^i(t)^{-2} \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\theta^*, i}^i(t) \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\theta^*, i}^i(t)^T dN_i(t)\right).$$

However, the second expression is often preferred in practice, as it only requires access to the first-order derivatives of the intensity.

The convergence established in Corollary 1 allows us to develop statistical tests on various parameters of the model. Although this type of procedure is not new (see, for example, [16]), the interest here lies in their application in a novel framework, in order to test the effect of a baseline dependence on the covariates.

For example, suppose there exists one value μ_0^* of the parameters for which the baseline function is constant and equal to μ_0^* . Testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu^* = \mu_0^*$ then allows verifying whether the covariate $X(t)$ has a significant effect on the intensity. If the null is not rejected, the intensity is effectively constant in space, meaning that we retrieve a Hawkes process with constant baseline. Otherwise, the covariate introduces a spatial modulation of the event rate.

As an example, we present a test that follows from the asymptotic normality result of Corollary 1. This corresponds to testing the value of a parameter in a normal distribution with unknown variance. For the sake of conciseness, we only describe this single test here; however, other tests, such as those assessing the equality of two coefficients, are provided in Appendix E.

Algorithm 1 Test for one coefficient: $H_0 : \theta_i^* = \theta_0^*$ vs $H_1 : \theta_i^* \neq \theta_0^*$

Require: Sample $\mathcal{S} := \{(t, X(t)) : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$, with \mathcal{T} such that $(T_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1, N(T) \rrbracket} \subset \mathcal{T}$

1. Compute the MLE $\hat{\theta}_T$;
2. Compute \hat{I} as in Equation (13);
3. Compute

$$\mathcal{Z}_i := \frac{\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_{T,i} - \theta_0^*)}{\hat{\sigma}_i}, \quad \text{with } \hat{\sigma}_i = \sqrt{(\hat{I}^{-1})_{ii}};$$

4. Reject H_0 if $|\mathcal{Z}_i| > q_{1-\alpha/2}$, where $q_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of the standard Gaussian distribution.
-

5.2. Test on the model

We now introduce a test aimed at assessing the adequacy of the proposed model. A classical approach for evaluating the fit of a point process model relies on the time-change theorem [27], which states that the increments of the true compensator follow an i.i.d. exponential distribution with unit mean.

Let (T_i) denote the jump times of the process N . The theorem ensures that the random variables E_i defined as

$$E_i := \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_{i-1}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N},$$

are i.i.d. from exponential distribution with rate 1, that we denote $\mathcal{E}(1)$.

This motivates a goodness-of-fit procedure based on a plug-in version of this property. If the estimated intensity $\lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t)$ is close to the true one, then the transformed increments

$$\hat{E}_i := \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1})$$

should be approximately exponentially distributed with parameter 1. Yet there was no theoretical guarantee for this test, and empirical evidence suggests that it does not perform well: the resulting p-values tend to be too large, leading to overestimation of model adequacy (see, e.g., [16]).

A first theoretical justification of this phenomenon was proposed in [29] which proved that the process $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\left(\Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(uT) - \Lambda_{\theta^*}(uT)\right)\right)_{u \in [0,1]}$ converges to the process $(u\mathbb{E}(\nabla_{\theta}\bar{\lambda}_{\theta})\Gamma^{-1/2}\mathcal{N}(0, I_d))_{u \in [0,1]}$. Building on this result, [29] also proposed a test for model adequacy. Although this test is theoretically valid in our context, its practical use remains limited. Indeed, the mentioned test statistics involve computing the compensator between two points, τ_{i-1} and τ_i , which are not jump points. In our case, the compensator itself must already be approximated, due to the term $\int g_{i_{\mu}}(X(t))dt$, which introduces numerical errors and can be computationally demanding. Therefore, computing the integral of the compensator adds yet another source of error and can be quite long. As a result, making the test operational would require both a large amount of data and a long observation window, which is not feasible in practice.

We now turn to the following theorem, which extends the previous framework by introducing a correction to the compensator increments. Unlike earlier results, it establishes that these corrected increments converge to i.i.d. exponential random variables. In particular, the theorem provides a theoretical guarantee ensuring the convergence of an associated estimator under the null hypothesis H_0 .

Theorem 9. *Suppose Assumptions 4, 6, 8(4), and 9 hold, together with Assumption 7(p, j) for all $p > 1$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and assume $\int V_1(x) \pi_0(dx) < \infty$, where π_0 is the law of $X(0)$ and V_1 is defined in Assumption 4.*

Let \tilde{N} and N be two independent stationary multivariate Hawkes processes with stationary law N , and denote by (\tilde{T}_j) and (T_j) their associated jump times. Define for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, d \rrbracket$ the stationary intensities

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t) &= g_{\mu_i}(\tilde{X}(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{-\infty}^{t^-} \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} d\tilde{N}_j(s), \\ \lambda_{\theta,i}(t) &= g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{-\infty}^{t^-} \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} dN_j(s),\end{aligned}$$

where $X, \tilde{X} \sim \pi_X$ are distributed according to the stationary law of the SDE. Define the MLE $\hat{\theta}_T$ computed using only the process \tilde{N} . The corrected increments are defined as follows

$$\hat{E}_i(T) := \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}(T_i - T_{i-1}) \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X}, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\tilde{\rho}_T := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\lambda}_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t) dt, \quad \tilde{I}_T := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^T \tilde{\lambda}_{\hat{\theta}_T,i}^{-2}(t) \nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\lambda}_{\hat{\theta}_T,i}(t) \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T,i}(t)^\top d\tilde{N}_i(t).$$

Then,

$$(\hat{E}_i(T))_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}(1),$$

that is, the sequence of compensated increments converges in law to i.i.d. standard exponential random variables.

The proof of this Theorem can be found in Appendix A.7. The assumptions required in Theorem 9 coincide with those used to establish moment convergence. They are needed here to control the expectations of the estimators of the Fisher information matrix and of $\hat{\rho}_T$. In addition, ergodicity of the process guarantees the convergence of time averages toward their expectations, which is essential for the asymptotic validity of the test.

It is worth noting that Theorem 9 assumes two independent samples (N, \tilde{N}) for technical reasons. This assumption simplifies the theoretical proof, since it avoids dealing with the joint law of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_T$ (which depends on N) and the jump times (T_i) themselves.

In practice, we are mainly interested in situations with few observations—sometimes as few as one, as is common in neuroscience or biology. When many independent repetitions are available, as in some financial applications, the existing test of [28] can be applied. Here, we use the same observed realization of N for both estimation and testing, and we show that the correction remains numerically valid even in this single-observation setting.

The corresponding testing procedure presented in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Corrected GOF procedure for testing $H_0 : N \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{=} N_{\theta^*}$ for some $\theta^* \in \Theta$

Require: Sample $\mathcal{S} := \{(t, X(t)) : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$, with \mathcal{T} such that $(T_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1, N(T) \rrbracket} \subset \mathcal{T}$

1. Compute $\hat{\theta}_T$ MLE estimator of θ^* .
2. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_T &:= \frac{1}{T} \int_{(0,T)} \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t) dt, \\ \hat{I}_T &:= \frac{1}{T} \int_{(0,T)} \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t) \nabla_{\theta} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t)^{\top} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t)^{-2} dN(t).\end{aligned}$$

3. Compute the compensated increments $\Delta_i \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T} := \int_{(T_{i-1}, T_i)} \lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(t) dt$.
 4. Draw $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ and form the corrected variables $\hat{E}_i(T) := \Delta_i \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}(T_i - T_{i-1}) \hat{\rho}_T \hat{I}_T^{-1/2} x$.
 5. Compare $\left(\hat{E}_i(T)\right)_{i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, N(T)-1 \rrbracket}$ to an exponential distribution of parameter 1.
-

This goodness-of-fit test is illustrated in the following section.

6. Numerical illustration

The aim of this section is to illustrate the behavior of the considered point process, as well as its asymptotic convergence, while highlighting some observations related to the relaxation of assumptions on the SDE. With this in mind, we present three simulation frameworks.

6.1. Benchmark Simulation: Well-Specified OU-Driven Hawkes Process

We first focus on a two-dimensional Hawkes process driven by a bivariate Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process $X(t)$. This example satisfies all the conditions required by the theorems presented above, and its main purpose is to illustrate the properties previously demonstrated.

Simulation set-up. We consider a two-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process for the covariate $X(t)$. Namely, we take $dX(t) = -\xi X(t) dt + \sqrt{2|\xi|} dW(t)$, with $\xi^* = 0.05$ and initial condition $X_0 = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The kernel parameters are $\alpha^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0.3 & 0.4 \\ 0.5 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\beta^* = (0.8, 1.5)$. Baseline functions for the Hawkes process are $g_{\mu_1^*}(x) = \mu_{12}^* + (\mu_{11}^* - \mu_{12}^*) \exp(-5\|x - x_1\|^2)$ and $g_{\mu_2^*}(x) = \mu_{22}^*$ with $x_1 = (0.1, 0.1)$, $\mu_{11}^* = 0.5$, $\mu_{12}^* = 0.8$ and $\mu_{22}^* = 0.7$.

Estimation set-up. For the estimation, we consider the following class of baseline functions: $g_{\mu_i}(x) = \mu_{i,2} + (\mu_{i,1} - \mu_{i,2}) \exp(-5\|x - x_1\|^2)$ where $x_1 = (0.1, 0.1)$. Hence, the estimation procedure allows for the possibility that the second component of the Hawkes process also depends on the covariate X (as the estimation phase can lead to a non-constant $g_{\hat{\mu}_2}$). Let us recall that we do not seek to compute the parameter defining the diffusion, but only $\hat{\theta}_T$.

After estimation, we test the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_{i,1}^* = \mu_{i,2}^*$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ using Test 3, in order to evaluate the dependence of each process on the covariate.




Figure 1: Trajectory of the covariate process X , with colored dots indicating event times—yellow for N_1 , green for N_2 —along the path (Figure 1a), together with the associated intensity functions (Figure 1b). Figure 1c shows the distribution of the test statistic for $H_0 : \mu_{i,1}^* = \mu_{i,2}^*$ with $i \in \{1, 2\}$. For Figure 1a–1b $T = 10$ whereas for Figure 1c $T = 3000$ and $n = 300$ repetitions were used.

Figure 1a–1b shows both the trajectory of the covariate process X and the intensity functions of the bivariate Hawkes process. This figure illustrates

the influence of X : the intensity of process N_1 exhibits larger irregularity due to its dependency on the covariate, while the intensity of N_2 , whose baseline function is constant, corresponds to the classical behavior of a Hawkes process without covariates.

Figure 1 also displays the distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_{i,1}^* = \mu_{i,2}^*$, with $i \in \{1, 2\}$, illustrating the asymptotic normality established in Theorem 7. As shown in Figure 1c, both estimators are asymptotically normal but not centered at the same value. The statistic Z_2 , which corresponds to the test for N_2 , is centered at zero, which is consistent with the fact that the simulations were performed without any dependence between the process and the covariate. In contrast, Z_1 is not centered at zero, reflecting the dependence of the baseline of process N_1 on X .

6.2. Stress-Test Simulation: Hypoelliptic Diffusion via the Kramers Oscillator

In this example, we are interested in hypoelliptic diffusion, i.e., diffusion with a degenerate diffusion matrix. This case aims at illustrating remark 4.3 and shows that estimation and testing can be performed in this setting.

Simulation set-up. The covariate is a two-dimensional process $(X(t), V(t))$ evolving according to the Kramers oscillator dynamics (see [40]):

$$\begin{aligned} dX(t) &= V(t) dt \\ dV(t) &= (-\eta_* V(t) + a_* X(t) - b_* X(t)^3) dt + \sqrt{\sigma_*^2} dW(t), \end{aligned}$$

with parameters $\eta_* = 0.65$, $a_* = 1$, $b_* = 0.6$, $\sigma_*^2 = 0.1$, and initial condition $X_0 = (1.0, 0.0)$. The Hawkes process is a one-dimensional Hawkes process with baseline function being form $g_{\mu^*}(x, v) = \mu_1^* + \mu_2^* \frac{(1-x)^2}{2}$, with $\mu_1^* = 0.2$ and $\mu_2^* = 0.5$. The kernel parameters are $\alpha^* = 0.6$ and $\beta^* = 2.0$.

Estimation set-up. For the estimation phase, we consider the following class of baseline functions: $g_{\mu}(x, v) = \mu_1 + \mu_2 \frac{(1-x)^2}{2}$.

On the left graph of Figure 2, we observe the first component of the process (X, V) , as well as the event times of the point process N , represented by green dots. It is clear that events tend to occur when $X(t)$ moves away from the level $x = 1$, which is consistent with the shape of the baseline function. On the right graph, the histograms of the estimators associated with the coefficients μ_1 and μ_2 exhibit a Gaussian shape, despite the fact




Figure 2: Left: trajectory of the process X over time, with green dots indicating the event times for N_1 along the path. Right: histograms of the estimators under the null hypotheses $H_0 : \mu_1^* = 0.2$ (top) and $H_0 : \mu_2^* = 0.5$ (bottom). For this simulation $T = 2000$ and $n = 300$ repetitions were used.

that the underlying SDE process does not satisfy all the conditions stated in the assumptions of Theorem 7.

To better understand this behavior, note that although the diffusion system has a degenerate diffusion matrix, it is still ergodic (see, e.g., [34, 40]). This degeneracy, however, prevents the identifiability conditions (e.g Assumption 9.3) from being met. As explained in Section 4.3, this does not affect the asymptotic behavior of the estimators, and the normal-approximation distribution remains reasonable in this setting, as illustrated in Figure 2.

6.3. Benchmark simulation: Goodness-of-Fit Test for Model Adequacy

In this section, we illustrate the behavior of the goodness-of-fit procedure in the context of Algorithm 2. We focus here on the impact of the estimation step on the empirical distribution of the corrected inter-event times ($\hat{E}_i(T)$).

Simulation set-up. We consider a one-dimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process for the covariate $X(t)$. Namely we take $dX(t) = -\xi X(t) dt + \sqrt{2|\xi|} dW(t)$, with $\xi^* = 0.05$ and initial condition $X_0 = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The jump component is one-dimensional with kernel parameters $\alpha^* = 0.8$ and $\beta^* = 0.9$. The baseline function for the Hawkes process is $g_{\mu_1^*}(x) = \mu_{12}^* + (\mu_{11}^* - \mu_{12}^*) \exp(-\|x - x_1\|^2)$ with $x_1 = (0.1, 0.1)$, $\mu_{11}^* = 0.5$, $\mu_{12}^* = 1.0$, and $\mu_{22}^* = 0.2$.

Estimation set-up. For the estimation, we consider the following class of baseline functions: $g_{\mu_i}(x) = \mu_{i,2} + (\mu_{i,1} - \mu_{i,2}) \exp(-\|x - x_1\|^2)$ where $x_1 = (0.1, 0.1)$.




Figure 3: Illustration of Algorithm 2. Green points show the distribution of p-values when the corrected increments $(\hat{E}_i(T))$, defined in Equation (14), are tested directly against a unit exponential distribution using a KS test. Red points correspond to p-values obtained after randomly subsampling a subset of size $N(T)^{2/3}$ from $(\hat{E}_i(T))$ and applying the KS test to this subset. The p-values are compared to a standard uniform distribution using a QQ plot: the theoretical quantiles of the uniform distribution are shown as a black line, with 95% confidence intervals represented as the blue region.

In Figure 3, we present the distribution of the p-values obtained from the test described in Algorithm 2 and examine whether they follow a uniform distribution, as expected under correct model specification. The test results, represented by the green dots, show that we reject the hypothesis of a uniform law for the p-values. This suggests that the test statistic converges at a slower rate than the expected $\sqrt{N(T)}$. The issue therefore lies in a mismatch between the convergence rate of the test statistic and that of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Addressing this properly would require the development or the study of nonparametric tests, which is beyond the scope of the present work. For this reason, we instead focus on a simple and practical adjustment that restores a test with an appropriate rejection rate.

One way to correct this problem is to subsample the $(\hat{E}_i(T))$ before applying the nonparametric test. This approach relaxes the critical limits of the test and restores the uniformity of the p-values under H_0 . This idea is not new and has already been used in the literature on goodness-of-fit testing.

For instance, [29] introduced a clustering procedure in which a hyperparameter c controls the aggregation of points before applying the KS test to the resulting clustered increments. Our approach can be viewed as a simplified variant of this method, where random subsampling replaces explicit clustering. Another related example is Test 4 in [28], which evaluates model adequacy for point processes observed over multiple independent repetitions. In their setting, subsampling is performed across repetitions, and the authors show that when the ratio between the subsample size and the total number of repetitions tends to zero, the p-values recover uniformity under H_0 .

Figure 3 illustrates the impact of our subsampling procedure on the distribution of p-values. In particular, the red dots represent the distribution of p-values obtained when a random subsample of size $N(T)^{2/3}$ is drawn from $(\widehat{E}_i(T))$, and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is applied to this reduced sample. It should be noted that the size of the subsample is chosen arbitrarily, as there is no clear theoretical argument for this particular exponent. Nevertheless, this choice was made in light of the recommendations in [28], since our subsampling procedure is based on the same principle.

7. Conclusion and discussion

In this work, we have introduced a generalization of the Hawkes process where the baseline is driven by a covariate process, modeled as the solution of a SDE. We extended several results known for standard Hawkes processes to this setting, including ergodicity, mixing properties, and functional limit theorems. We also developed the asymptotic theory for statistical inference in the long-time regime, establishing consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator, as well as moment convergence under stronger conditions on the covariate process. Finally, we proposed hypothesis testing procedures to evaluate the relevance of the covariate and supported our theoretical findings through simulation studies.

The assumptions made open several perspectives of generalization for this work. A central element of our framework is the use of an exponential kernel, which ensures that the joint process Z is Markovian and allows us to rely on the ergodicity theory of strong Markov processes developed in [32]. However, several results do not rely directly on the Markov property, but only on the ergodicity of X . For instance, both the Central Limit Theorem and weak mixing results depend on the existence of a stationary invariant measure to which X converges in distribution, as well as on the validity of

Birkhoff’s ergodic theorem. This indicates that our results could potentially be extended to Hawkes processes with non-exponential kernels, provided the covariate process X remains ergodic. Similarly, the theorem establishing the asymptotic distribution of the MLE does not rely on the Markovian structure. Instead, it is based on the convergence in distribution and on the fact that the process forgets its past sufficiently fast (in our case, at an exponential rate). These ideas are also used in [22] (Lemma 13), where it is shown that a Hawkes process with a general kernel h is mixing. Similar reasoning appears in Lemma 6.6 of [1], which focuses specifically on the exponential kernel. This indicates that the mixing and asymptotic normality results could potentially be extended to a broader class of kernels beyond the exponential case.

A similar line of reasoning applies to the modeling of the covariate process. In our framework, $X(t)$ is defined here as the solution of a SDE, see Equation (1), with state-dependent but time-independent drift and diffusion coefficients. Let us highlight that this choice is mainly motivated by the application in neuroscience described in the introduction. Indeed, in this case, the intensity process describes the spiking activity of the mouse during the learning phase of the experiment, and the continuous covariate X describes its move in the arena. But this choice also facilitates the theoretical analysis. In particular, it fits within the framework of Markov processes, which is central when establishing ergodicity. However, as in the proof of the ergodicity of Z (see Section 3), most arguments employed in this paper do not rely directly on the specific SDE model assumed for X , but rather on the properties it induces. For example, in the proofs of the functional CLT, Appendix A.4, we only use that X admits a stationary distribution toward which it converges—and that X satisfies Birkhoff’s ergodic theorem. Although such properties hold for certain SDEs, it is not necessary for X itself to be defined as an SDE for these assumptions to be valid. Therefore, results such as the functional CLT, weak mixing, and the convergence in distribution of MLEs could be extended to the case where X is a general process that is left-continuous, exponentially ergodic and satisfies Birkhoff’s ergodic theorem.

Another important perspective raised by our study concerns the use of goodness-of-fit tests for corrected increments. One perspective would therefore be to characterize the convergence rate of the test statistic, which would allow the KS test to be adjusted or develop new nonparametric procedures that are adapted to the test of an asymptotic distribution (in contrast to the KS-test which is non-asymptotic).

Acknowledgements

This work is part of the 2022 DAE 103 EMERGENCE(S) - PROCECO project supported by Ville de Paris.

This paper was completed while C. Dion-Blanc was affiliated with the Centre de Mathématiques Appliquées (CMAP) at Ecole Polytechnique. She is grateful to Sylvie Méléard for the opportunity to join her team, supported by the European Union (ERC, SINGER, 101054787).

References

- [1] S. Clinet, N. Yoshida, Statistical inference for ergodic point processes and application to limit order book, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 127 (6) (2017) 1800–1839.
- [2] P. J. Laub, Y. Lee, T. Taimre, *The elements of Hawkes processes*, Springer, 2021.
- [3] A. Bonnet, C. Dion-Blanc, F. Gindraud, S. Lemler, Neuronal network inference and membrane potential model using multivariate Hawkes processes, *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 372 (2022) 109550.
- [4] P. Reynaud-Bouret, C. Tuleau-Malot, V. Rivoirard, F. Grammont, et al., Spike trains as (in) homogeneous Poisson processes or Hawkes processes: non-parametric adaptive estimation and goodness-of-fit tests, *Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience* 39 (8) (2013) 32–33.
- [5] J. Chevallier, A. Duarte, E. Löcherbach, G. Ost, Mean field limits for nonlinear spatially extended Hawkes processes with exponential memory kernels, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 129 (1) (2019) 1–27.
- [6] A. G. Hawkes, Point spectra of some mutually exciting point processes, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 33 (3) (1971) 438–443.
- [7] D. J. Daley, D. Vere-Jones, et al., *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume I: elementary theory and methods*, Springer, 2003.
- [8] P. Brémaud, L. Massoulié, Stability of nonlinear Hawkes processes, *The Annals of Probability* (1996) 1563–1588.

- [9] L. Zhu, Central limit theorem for nonlinear Hawkes processes, *Journal of Applied Probability* 50 (3) (2013) 760–771.
- [10] E. Bacry, I. Mastromatteo, J.-F. Muzy, Hawkes processes in finance, *Market Microstructure and Liquidity* 1 (01) (2015) 1550005.
- [11] D. Sulem, V. Rivoirard, J. Rousseau, Bayesian estimation of nonlinear Hawkes processes, *Bernoulli* 30 (2) (2024) 1257–1286.
- [12] Y. Ogata, Estimators for stationary point processes, *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math* 30 (Part A) (1978) 243–261.
- [13] C. Dion-Blanc, C. Denis, L. Sansonnet, R. E. Lacoste, Erm-lasso classification algorithm for Multivariate Hawkes Processes paths, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11455* (2024).
- [14] T.-K. J. Kwan, F. Chen, W. Dunsmuir, Likelihood inference of the non-stationary Hawkes process with non-exponential kernel, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09710* (2024).
- [15] P. Cattiaux, L. Colombani, M. Costa, Limit theorems for Hawkes processes including inhibition, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 149 (2022) 404–426.
- [16] A. Bonnet, C. Dion-Blanc, M. Sadeler Perrin, Testing procedures based on maximum likelihood estimation for marked Hawkes processes, *Computational Statistics* (2025) 1–43.
- [17] J. Zhuang, Y. Ogata, D. Vere-Jones, Stochastic declustering of space-time earthquake occurrences, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 97 (458) (2002) 369–380.
- [18] S. Clinet, W. T. Dunsmuir, G. W. Peters, K.-A. Richards, Asymptotic distribution of the score test for detecting marks in Hawkes processes, *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 24 (3) (2021) 635–668.
- [19] W.-H. Chiang, X. Liu, G. Mohler, Hawkes process modeling of covid-19 with mobility leading indicators and spatial covariates, *International journal of forecasting* 38 (2) (2022) 505–520.

- [20] L. Davis, B. Baeumer, T. Wang, A fractional Hawkes process model for earthquake aftershock sequences, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* 73 (5) (2024) 1185–1202.
- [21] A. Bernabeu, J. Zhuang, J. Mateu, Spatio-temporal Hawkes point processes: a review, *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics* 30 (1) (2025) 89–119.
- [22] Y. Potiron, O. Scaillet, V. Volkov, S. Yu, High-frequency estimation of itô semimartingale baseline for Hawkes processes, *Swiss Finance Institute Research Paper* (25-13) (2025).
- [23] B. Cai, J. Zhang, Y. Guan, Latent network structure learning from high-dimensional multivariate point processes, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 119 (545) (2024) 95–108.
- [24] C. Li, K. Cui, Multivariate Hawkes processes with spatial covariates for spatiotemporal event data analysis, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 76 (4) (2024) 535–578.
- [25] G. Mohler, J. Carter, R. Raje, Improving social harm indices with a modulated Hawkes process, *International Journal of Forecasting* 34 (3) (2018) 431–439.
- [26] A. Boumezoued, Y. Cherkaoui, C. Hillairet, Calibration techniques for Marked Hawkes Processes with External Excitation for cyber-attack Frequency Modeling (2025).
- [27] F. Papangelou, Integrability of expected increments of point processes and a related random change of scale, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 165 (1972) 483–506.
- [28] P. Reynaud-Bouret, V. Rivoirard, F. Grammont, C. Tuleau-Malot, Goodness-of-fit tests and nonparametric adaptive estimation for spike train analysis, *The Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience* 4 (2014) 1–41.
- [29] J. Baars, S. U. Can, R. J. Laeven, Asymptotically distribution-free goodness-of-fit testing for point processes, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.24197* (2025).

- [30] D. J. Daley, D. Vere-Jones, An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume II: general theory and structure, Springer, 2008.
- [31] E. Bacry, S. Delattre, M. Hoffmann, J.-F. Muzy, Some limit theorems for Hawkes processes and application to financial statistics, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 123 (7) (2013) 2475–2499.
- [32] S. P. Meyn, R. L. Tweedie, Stability of Markovian processes iii: Foster–Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes, *Advances in Applied Probability* 25 (3) (1993) 518–548.
- [33] L. C. G. Rogers, D. Williams, Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales, Vol. 2, Cambridge university press, 2000.
- [34] J. C. Mattingly, A. M. Stuart, D. J. Higham, Ergodicity for sdes and approximations: locally lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise, *Stochastic processes and their applications* 101 (2) (2002) 185–232.
- [35] E. Gobet, Lan property for ergodic diffusions with discrete observations, in: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, Vol. 38, Elsevier, 2002, pp. 711–737.
- [36] P. Billingsley, Convergence of probability measures, John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [37] Y. A. Kutoyants, Statistical inference for ergodic diffusion processes, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [38] Y. Potiron, Parametric inference for Hawkes processes with a general kernel, Preprint last accessed November (2025).
- [39] Y. Ogata, Statistical models for earthquake occurrences and residual analysis for point processes, *Journal of the American Statistical association* 83 (401) (1988) 9–27.
- [40] P. Pilipovic, A. Samson, S. Ditlevsen, Strang splitting for parametric inference in second-order stochastic differential equations, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 187 (2025) 104650.
- [41] D. Applebaum, Lévy processes and stochastic calculus, Cambridge university press, 2009.

- [42] P. E. Protter, P. E. Protter, Stochastic differential equations, Springer, 2005.
- [43] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe, Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes, Vol. 24, Elsevier, 2014.
- [44] C. Dion, S. Lemler, E. Löcherbach, Exponential ergodicity for diffusions with jumps driven by a Hawkes process, Theory of Probability and Mathematical Statistics 102 (2020) 97–115.
- [45] S. Asmussen, Applied probability and queues, Springer, 2003.
- [46] J. Jacod, A. Shiryaev, Limit theorems for stochastic processes, Vol. 288, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [47] S. Clinet, Y. Potiron, Statistical inference for the doubly stochastic self-exciting process, Bernoulli 24 (2018) 3469–3493.

Appendix A. Proofs

This section is dedicated to the proofs of the theoretical results set out in this article.

Appendix A.1. Technical results

We begin the proofs by introducing some additional notation and a few preliminary results that will be used throughout the proofs.

Additional notation. Recall that $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ denotes the sequence of event times corresponding to the jumps of the multivariate counting process $N = (N_1, \dots, N_d)$ and that the inter-arrival times are defined by $\Delta T_n := T_n - T_{n-1}$, and $K_n \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ indicates the component in which the n -th jump occurs, that is, N_{K_n} jumps at time T_n .

We first collect two propositions that will be used throughout the subsequent proofs.

Proposition 2. *Consider the process $\tilde{\lambda}_i(t) = \tilde{m}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_{ij}(t-s) dN_j(s)$ with \tilde{h} a positive function and \tilde{m} an adapted stochastic process verifying:*

1. $\mathbb{P} - a.s$, $\tilde{m}(t) > 0$ for all t ,
 2. If for some $q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $\tilde{h}_{ij} \in L^q$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{m}(t)^q) < +\infty$,
- then for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, d \rrbracket$ and all $l \in \llbracket 1, q \rrbracket$, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \tilde{\lambda}_i(t) \right|^l \right) < +\infty$

The proof of this Proposition can be found in Appendix B. There are two main ingredients in this proof. Firstly, the following inequality: for any

$$x, y, z > 0, p \geq 1, (x + y)^p \leq (1 + z)^{p-1} x^p + (1 + z^{-1})^{p-1} y^p,$$

which allows us to dissociate the dependence, at the moment of order p , of the different elements that make up the intensity. Another key point is Lemma A.2 of [1], which is in fact an application of Kunita's inequality, see [41], to relate p -order moments to the product of lower-order moments.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that Assumption 4–5 are verified. Then:*

1. *there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 0$:*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\lambda_{\theta^*, i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*, i}(t)|) \leq C e^{-ct}.$$

2. *if $\int V_1(x) \pi_0(dx) < +\infty$, with V_1 defined in Equation (7) and π_0 the law of $X(0)$ then, for all $\mu \in \Theta_1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(|g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t))|) \leq \|g_{\mu_i}\|_{\infty} C_1 r_1^t,$$

where $C_1 > 0$ and $r_1 \in (0, 1)$ are two constant that do not depend on μ .

Proof. Let us start by the first point stated.

Recall that $\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}$ is given in Equation (10). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t)|) &\leq \mathbb{E}(|g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i^*}(\bar{X}(t))|) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} \alpha_{ij}^* e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} |d\bar{N}_j(s) - dN_j(s)|\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(-\infty,0)} \alpha_{ij}^* e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} d\bar{N}_j(s)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$f(t) := \mathbb{E} [\|\lambda_{\theta^*}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*}(t)\|] \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

and

$$r(t) := \left(\mathbb{E}\left(|g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i^*}(\bar{X}(t))|\right) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(-\infty,0)} \alpha_{ij}^* e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} \mathbb{E}(\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,j}(s)) ds \right)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

then the previous inequality becomes (where the inequality is vectorial):

$$f(t) \leq (f \star \alpha^* e^{-\beta^* \cdot})(t) + r(t),$$

where \star denotes the matrix convolution, defined for $U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$(U \star V)_i(t) := \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} U_{ij}(t-s) V_j(s) ds.$$

This yields the same type of inequality as in the classical multivariate Hawkes process setting. By following the reasoning from the proof of Proposition 4.4 in [1], we thus obtain that there exist $c, C > 0$ such that:

$$f(t) = \mathbb{E} [\|\lambda_{\theta^*}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*}(t)\|] \leq C e^{-ct}.$$

This concludes the first part of the proof.

Let us turn to the second point.

We know that

$$\mathbb{E}(|g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t))|) \leq \|g_{\mu_i}\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{L}(X(t)) - \pi_X\|_{TV} = \|g_{\mu_i}\|_{\infty} \|\pi_0 P_t^X - \pi_X\|$$

where π_0 is the law of $X(0)$. And thanks to Assumption 4, there exist $\tilde{C} > 0$ and $0 < r_1 < 1$ such that for all x , $\|P_t^X(x, \cdot) - \pi_X(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq \tilde{C} V_1(x) r_1^t$. As a result,

$$\mathbb{E}(|g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t))|) \leq \|g_{\mu_i}\|_{\infty} \int \|P_t^X(x, \cdot) - \pi_X(\cdot)\|_{TV} \pi_0(dx) \leq \|g_{\mu_i}\|_{\infty} \left(\int V_1(x) \pi_0(dx) \right) \tilde{C} r_1^t.$$

Denoting $C_1 := \tilde{C} \int V_1(x) \pi_0(dx) < \infty$, the previous inequality concludes the proof. \square

Appendix A.2. Proof of Proposition 1

The proof relies on Proposition 3, which shows the first point stated in Proposition 1. The second point is a direct consequence of the fact that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\lambda_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t)\|] &\leq \mathbb{E}(|g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t))|) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{t^-} \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} \mathbb{E}(|\lambda_{\theta^*}(s) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*}(s)|) ds + \int_{-\infty}^0 \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} \mathbb{E}(\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,j}) ds, \end{aligned}$$

Appendix A.3. Proof of Theorem 3

As mentioned in the main text, establishing the ergodicity of Z requires only general Markovian properties for X . For this reason, we consider a general diffusion process satisfying the conditions stated in Remark 2. However, as already noted earlier, these conditions indeed imply those of Assumption 4.

We rely on Theorem 6.1 of [32], which establishes that, under the T -chain property and a suitable Lyapunov function V , a Markov process is geometrically ergodic. In particular, it ensures that under those conditions, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $r \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\|P_T^Z(z, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq CV(z) r^T,$$

where $P_t^Z(x, \cdot)$ denotes the transition kernel of the process and π its unique invariant distribution. In the following, we verify that both the Lyapunov condition and the T -chain property hold for our process.

Appendix A.3.1. The Lyapunov condition

The first condition is the existence of a Lyapunov function that verifies the following bound:

$$\mathcal{A}_Z V(x, y) \leq -cV(x, y) + d\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{K}} \text{ with } c, d \text{ strictly positive constants and } \mathcal{K} \text{ a compact set} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the infinitesimal generator is defined, when the limit exists, by

$$\mathcal{A}_Z f(z) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{E}_z[f(Z(t))] - f(z)}{t}.$$

Infinitesimal generator computation. We begin by computing the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{A}_Z before explaining the form of the function V .

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function of class C^2 . Applying Itô's formula (see for example [42, 41] or [43, Chapter II, Theorem 5.1]), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(X(t), Y(t)) - f(x, y) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^t \nabla_{x_i} f(X(s^-), Y(s^-)) dX_i(s) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m \int_0^t \nabla_{x_i x_j}^2 f(X(s^-), Y(s^-)) d[X_i, X_j](s) \\
&+ \sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t \nabla_{y_{ij}} f(X(s^-), Y(s^-)) dY_{ij}(s) \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t \left(f(X(s), Y(s)) - f(X(s^-), Y(s^-)) - \sum_{i=1}^d \Delta Y_{ij}(s) \nabla_{y_{ij}} f(X(s^-), Y(s^-)) \right) dN_j(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations and using the dynamics of $(X(t), Y(t))$ given in Equation (6), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[f(X(t), Y(t)) - f(X(0), Y(0))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\int_0^t \nabla_x f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))^T b(X(s^-)) ds + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[(\sigma \sigma^T)(X(s^-)) \nabla_x^2 f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))] ds \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t (-\beta_{ij}^* Y_{ij}(s^-) \nabla_{y_{ij}} f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))) ds \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t (f(X(s^-), Y(s^-) + A_j) - f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))) dN_j(s) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the matrix whose only nonzero entries are in the j -th column, given by the vector $(\alpha_{ij}^*)_i$. Then, using the fact that $\mathbb{E}[h(s) dN_j(s)] = \mathbb{E}[h(s) \lambda_j^*(s) ds]$, with

$$\lambda_k^*(s) = g_{\mu_k}^*(X(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^d Y_{kj}(s),$$

we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[f(X(t), Y(t)) - f(X(0), Y(0))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\int_0^t \nabla_x f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))^T b(X(s^-)) ds + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[(\sigma \sigma^T)(X(s^-)) \nabla_x^2 f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))] ds \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\sum_{i,j=1}^d \int_0^t (-\beta_{ij}^* Y_{ij}(s^-) \nabla_{y_{ij}} f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))) ds \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t (f(X(s^-), Y(s^-) + A_j) - f(X(s^-), Y(s^-))) \left(g_{\mu_j}^*(X(s^-)) + \sum_{i=1}^d Y_{ji}(s^-) \right) ds \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{A}_Z of the process $Z(t) = (X(t), Y(t))$, by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_Z f(x, y) &= \nabla_x f(x, y)^T b(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[(\sigma \sigma^T)(x) \nabla_x^2 f(x, y)] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d (f(x, y + A_j) - f(x, y)) \left(g_{\mu_j^*}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d y_{ji} \right) - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \beta_{ij}^* \nabla_{y_{ij}} f(x, y) y_{ij}.\end{aligned}$$

Lyapunov condition. Denoting

$$\langle A, B \rangle := \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} b_{ij} \text{ for all } A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2},$$

we define the function $V_2 : \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$V_2(y) := e^{\langle M, y \rangle},$$

where $M = (m_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a matrix of real parameters to be chosen later. We then consider the candidate Lyapunov function $V : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$V(x, y) := V_1(x) + V_2(y),$$

where $V_1 : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the function given by in Equation (7) in the context of Assumption 4 or by Remark 2 in the general Markovian context. Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_Z V(x, y) &= \mathcal{A}_X V_1(x) + \sum_{j=1}^d e^{\langle M, y \rangle} (e^{\langle M, A_j \rangle} - 1) \left(g_{\mu_j^*}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d y_{ji} \right) - e^{\langle M, y \rangle} \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij}^* y_{ij} m_{ij} \\ &\leq \mathcal{A}_X V_1(x) + \sum_{j=1}^d e^{\langle M, y \rangle} (e^{\langle M, A_j \rangle} - 1) \left(g_{\mu_+^*} + \sum_{i=1}^d y_{ji} \right) - e^{\langle M, y \rangle} \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij}^* y_{ij} m_{ij}\end{aligned}$$

where we used the upper bound of Assumption 5

The first term corresponds to the generator of the diffusion X , applied to V_1 . Furthermore, there exist constants $c_1 > 0$ and $d_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_X V_1(x) \leq -c_1 V_1(x) + d_1 \mathbb{1}_{K_1}(x).$$

where K_1 is given by in Equation (8) in the context of Assumption 4 or by Remark 2 in the general Markovian context. The second term, namely

$$A_2 V(x, y) := \mathcal{A}_Z V(x, y) - \mathcal{A}_X V_1(x) := \sum_{j=1}^d e^{\langle M, y \rangle} (e^{\langle M, A_j \rangle} - 1) \left(g_{\mu_+^*} + \sum_{i=1}^d y_{ji} \right) - e^{\langle M, y \rangle} \sum_{i,j} \beta_{ij}^* y_{ij} m_{ij},$$

and corresponds to the generator acting on V_1 for a multidimensional Hawkes process with constant baseline intensity $g_{\mu_+^*}$. Following arguments from Proposition 4.5 of [1], which establishes a Lyapunov property for a multidimensional Hawkes process with exponential kernel and constant baseline, there exist constant $c_2 > 0$, $d_2 > 0$, and a compact set $K_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_2 V(x, y) \leq -c_2 V_2(y) + d_2 \mathbf{1}_{K_2}(y).$$

Combining both inequalities concludes the proof:

$$\mathcal{A}_Z V(x, y) \leq -cV(x, y) + d\mathbf{1}_{K_1 \times K_2}(x, y).$$

Appendix A.3.2. T -chain property of the transition kernel

It is generally acknowledged that this type of proof is tedious and difficult to follow, particularly due to the large number of indices to manipulate. For clarity and readability, we therefore present the proof in the case of a Hawkes process of two components, that is, $d = 2$. The proof for an arbitrary dimension $d \geq 1$ proceeds in the exact same way, and can be found in Appendix D.

In the following we thus consider a bidimensional Hawkes process having baseline functions $g_{\mu_1^*}$ and $g_{\mu_2^*}$ with an interaction matrix $\alpha^* = (\alpha_{ij}^*)_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}$ and a decay matrix $\beta^* = (\beta_{ij}^*)_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}$

We want to show that the transition kernel of Z verifies

$$P_T^Z((x, y), A \times B) \geq Q_T((x, y), A \times B),$$

with Q_T a nontrivial kernel such that $Q_T(\cdot, A \times B)$ is lower semi-continuous and for any subset $A \times B$ of $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^{d^2}$. The main idea is to treat separately the component of the intensity that depends on the process Y , by first conditioning on the trajectory of $W(t)$ allowing us to consider $X(t)$ as non-random.

$$\begin{aligned} P_T^Z((x, y), A \times B) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x, y)}(\mathbf{1}_A(X(T))\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T))) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x, y)}(\mathbf{1}_A(X(T))\mathbb{E}_{(x, y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T))|\mathcal{F}_W^T)) \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where \mathcal{F}_W^T denoted the canonical filtration of the Brownian motion.

We thus start working on $\mathbb{E}_{(x, y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T))|\mathcal{F}_W^T)$. In this setting, the deterministic part of the intensity, given by $g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t))$, can be viewed as a bounded function of time. Using this boundedness, we recover a setting similar to a standard Hawkes process with constant baseline intensity, which allows us to apply existing results from the classical Hawkes process framework.

We employ techniques already used in [1] (proof of Lemma A.3) and [44], relying on the fact that the intensity is piecewise deterministic. Fixing the number of jumps that occurred before T , the value of $Y(T)$ becomes a deterministic function depending only on the initial condition and the jump times (see Equation (6)), which simplifies the computation of the expectation.

We thus work on the event

$$A_T := \{T_1 < T_2 < T_3 < T_4 < T < T_5\} \cap \{K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1, K_3 = 2, K_4 = 2\}.$$

In other words, we require that each component jumps $d = 2$ times before time T , and that the jumps of component 1 occur before those of component 2. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_W^T) \geq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T))\mathbf{1}_{A_T} \mid \mathcal{F}_W^T),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T))\mathbf{1}_{A_T} \mid \mathcal{F}_W^T) \\ &= \int f^{(\Delta T_5, tK_5, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)}(t_5, k_5, \dots, t_1, k_1) \mathbf{1}_B(\gamma_y(T)) \mathbf{1}_{t_1+\dots+t_4 < T} \mathbf{1}_{t_1+\dots+t_5 > T} dt_1 \dots dt_5, \end{aligned}$$

where:

- $f^{(\Delta T_1, K_1, \dots, \Delta T_5, K_5)}(t_5, k_5, \dots, t_1, k_1)$ is the joint density of the inter-arrival times $\Delta T_i := T_i - T_{i-1}$ and the marks (K_i) , conditional on the trajectory of W ;
- $\gamma_y(T) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ denotes the value of $Y(T)$, conditional on the event $\{Y(0) = y\} \cap \{\Delta T_1 = t_1, K_1 = 1, \dots, \Delta T_4 = t_4, K_4 = 2\}$ and conditional to W .

Computation of $\gamma_y(T)$. Using the recursive expression of Y , we can write $\gamma_y(t)$ on each interval $[t_1 + \dots + t_{i-1}, t_1 + \dots + t_i]$ as a piecewise-deterministic function that depends on the initial condition y and the jump times:

$$\begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} y_{11}e^{-\beta_{11}^*t} & y_{12}e^{-\beta_{12}^*t} \\ y_{21}e^{-\beta_{21}^*t} & y_{22}e^{-\beta_{22}^*t} \end{pmatrix}, & t \leq t_1 \\ \begin{pmatrix} y_{11}e^{-\beta_{11}^*t} + \alpha_{11}^*e^{-\beta_{11}^*(t-t_1)} & y_{12}e^{-\beta_{12}^*t} \\ y_{21}e^{-\beta_{21}^*t} + \alpha_{21}^*e^{-\beta_{21}^*(t-t_1)} & y_{22}e^{-\beta_{22}^*t} \end{pmatrix}, & t_1 < t \leq t_1 + t_2 \end{cases}$$

and so on, and for $\sum_{i=1}^4 t_i < t \leq T$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_{11}e^{-\beta_{11}^*t} + \alpha_{11}^*(e^{-\beta_{11}^*(t-t_1)} + e^{-\beta_{11}^*(t-t_1-t_2)}) & y_{12}e^{-\beta_{12}^*t} + \alpha_{12}^*(e^{-\beta_{12}^*(t-\sum_{i=1}^3 t_i)} + e^{-\beta_{12}^*(t-\sum_{i=1}^4 t_i)}) \\ y_{21}e^{-\beta_{21}^*t} + \alpha_{21}^*(e^{-\beta_{21}^*(t-t_1)} + e^{-\beta_{21}^*(t-t_1-t_2)}) & y_{22}e^{-\beta_{22}^*t} + \alpha_{22}^*(e^{-\beta_{22}^*(t-\sum_{i=1}^3 t_i)} + e^{-\beta_{22}^*(t-\sum_{i=1}^4 t_i)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

In a more compact form, these equations can be written

$$\gamma_y(T) = \left(y_{ij}e^{-\beta_{ij}^*T} + \alpha_{ij}^* \sum_{i=2(j-1)+1}^{2j} e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(T-t_1-\dots-t_i)} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We denote by $(\gamma_y^{kj}(t))_{1 \leq k, j \leq 2}$ the entries of the matrix $\gamma_y(t)$, and define, for each k ,

$$\gamma_y^k(s) := \gamma_y^{k1}(s) + \gamma_y^{k2}(s),$$

which represents the total contribution to component k obtained by summing over the two columns of $\gamma_y(s)$.

Computation of the joint density f . We aim to make explicit the joint density f of the random vector $(\Delta T_5, K_5, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)$. Using Bayes' formula, we have:

$$f^{(\Delta T_5, K_5, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)} = \prod_{k=0}^4 \prod_{i=2k+1}^{2(k+1)} f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the notation $f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}$ corresponds to the conditional density of the pair $(\Delta T_i, K_i)$ given the previous history.

To compute the conditional terms $f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}$, we first consider the survival function of the i -th inter-arrival time given the past, and then derive the corresponding density from it. Working on the event A_T , for $i \in \llbracket 1, 2 \rrbracket$, the condition $\Delta T_i > t_i$ is equivalent to $N_1([T_{i-1}, T_{i-1} + t_i]) = 0$, meaning that between two jump times, the process behaves as an inhomogeneous Poisson process with intensity $s \mapsto g_{\mu_1^*}(X(s)) + \sum_{j=1}^2 \gamma_y^{1j}(s) = g_{\mu_1^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^1(s)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta T_i > t_i \mid \Delta T_{i-1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) &= \mathbb{P}(N_1([T_{i-1}, T_{i-1} + t_i]) = 0 \mid \Delta T_{i-1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) \\ &= \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} [g_{\mu_1^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^1(s)] ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $i \in \{3, 4\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta T_i > t_i \mid \Delta T_{i-1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) = \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} [g_{\mu_2^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^2(s)] ds \right).$$

Once again for $i = 5$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta T_5 > t_5 \mid \Delta T_4, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) = \exp \left(- \int_{T_4}^{T_4 + t_5} [g_{\mu_2^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^{k_5}(s)] ds \right).$$

where k_5 is the component that jumps at time T_5 . Hence, for all i , the conditional density of ΔT_i is given by

$$t \mapsto \left(g_{\mu_k^*}(X(T_{i-1} + t)) + \gamma_y^k(T_{i-1} + t) \right) \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t} [g_{\mu_k^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^k(s)] ds \right),$$

where k is the component that jump at time T_k : $k = 1$ if $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k = 2$ if $i \in \{3, 4\}$. For $i = 5$, note that k_5 plays no role as we have no condition imposed on it.

For the conditional mark density, given $\Delta T_i, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T$, the probability that the event occurs in component k is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(K_i = k \mid \Delta T_i, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) &= \frac{\lambda_k(T_i^-)}{\lambda_1(T_i^-) + \lambda_2(T_i^-)} \\ &= \frac{g_{\mu_k^*}(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^k(T_i^-)}{g_{\mu_1^*}(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^1(T_i^-) + g_{\mu_2^*}(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^2(T_i^-)}. \end{aligned}$$

We can then write the full conditional density as:

$$f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}(t_i, k_i, \dots, t_1, k_1) = \frac{g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_i^-)}{g_{\mu_1^*}^* + \gamma_y^1(T_i^-) + g_{\mu_2^*}^*(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^2(T_i^-)} \\ \times \left(g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(T_{i-1} + t_i)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_{i-1} + t_i) \right) \\ \times \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(s)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(s) ds \right),$$

where we recall that k_i is equal to 1 if $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and to 2 if $i \in \{3, 4\}$, and is arbitrary for $i = 5$.

Now, using the fact that the baseline intensities $(g_{\mu_k^*}^*(X(t)))_k$ are bounded above and below (Assumption 5), we can deduce a lower bound:

$$f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}(t_i, k_i, \dots, t_1, k_1) \geq \frac{g_{\mu_-^*}^* + \gamma_y^k(T_i^-)}{g_{\mu_+^*}^* + \gamma_y^1(T_i^-) + g_{\mu_+^*}^* + \gamma_y^2(T_i^-)} \\ \times \left(g_{\mu_-^*}^* + \gamma_y^k(T_{i-1} + t_i) \right) \times \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} g_{\mu_+^*}^* + \gamma_y^k(s) ds \right).$$

Using Equation (A.4), we obtain an expression that is very similar to the one derived for a Hawkes process with constant baseline (see the third equation in the proof of Lemma A.4 in [1]). The only difference lies in the fact that, instead of having two constants $g_{\mu_+^*}^*$ and $g_{\mu_-^*}^*$, the reference only involves a single constant, namely the baseline rate of the Hawkes process (which in our setting would correspond to the case $g_{\mu_+^*}^* = g_{\mu_-^*}^*$). Nevertheless, the rest of the argument is unchanged, since it relies on a change of variables in \mathbb{R}^d associated with the mapping $(t_1, \dots, t_d) \mapsto \gamma_y(t)$, which remains valid in our framework.

Thus, the same arguments as in Lemma A.3 of [1] apply, showing that:

$$Q_{2,T}(y, B) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d^2}} f^{(\Delta T_5, K_5, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)}(t_5, k_5, \dots, t_1, k_1) \mathbb{1}_B(\gamma_y(T)) dt_1 \dots dt_5$$

is a kernel that is non-trivial and lower semi-continuous. Combining this with Equation (A.2) and Assumption 5, we obtain:

$$P_T^Z((x, y), A \times B) \geq Q_T((x, y), A \times B) := Q_{1,T}(x, A) Q_{2,T}(y, B)$$

which proves that P is a T -chain.

It remains to show that the core $Z = (X, Y)$ admits a reachable point. We already know that the process X admits such a point (see Assumption 4). Now, the Hawkes dynamics can be framed by the one of two Hawkes processes with a constant baseline (due to the bounds on $(g_{\mu_k^*}^*)_k$) and we know that in these cases 0 is reachable for the kernel. For this reason, 0 is a reachable point for Y too.

Therefore, Z is ψ -irreducible. Using Proposition 6.2.1 of [32], we conclude that every compact set is a petite set. We note that the notion of a petite set is quite specific to the theory of Markov processes, similar to that of ψ -irreducibility. For a precise definition, we refer the reader to [32].

Appendix A.4. Proof of Theorem 4

The proof of this theorems is largely inspired by the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 in [31], which establish analogous results in the case of a constant baseline. The main difference here is that we also need to handle the convergence of the baseline process. Following their approach, we define

$$M(t) := N(t) - \int_0^t \lambda^*(s) ds \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad V(t) := N(t) - m(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{with} \quad m(t) := \mathbb{E}[N(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We also define for two function F, H from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R}^{d^2} , the convolution

$$F \star H(t) = \int_0^t F(t-s)H(s)ds$$

Then the following relations hold (where each equality are to be understood componentwise):

- The function m satisfies the following Volterra equation (see Chapter 4 of [45] for a deeper study of this equation):

$$m(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[g(X(s))] ds + \int_0^t h_{\theta^*}(t-s) m(s) ds.$$

- The centered process V satisfies the renewal-type equation:

$$V(t) = M(t) + \int_0^t h_{\theta^*}(t-s) V(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

- Since $\rho(K) < 1$, the series

$$\psi := \sum_{n \geq 1} (h_{\theta^*})^{*n}$$

converges componentwise and belongs to $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. By iterating Equation (A.5), we obtain the following (vectorial) representation:

$$V(t) = M(t) + \int_0^t \psi(t-s) M(s) ds. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

It is worth noting that in this proof we retain the matrix notation h_{θ^*} , which is general. This is intentional and emphasizes that the demonstration does not rely on the exponential form of the kernel.

Appendix A.4.1. Proof of the LLN property.

The proof is divided into two parts.

1. We start by showing that $\frac{1}{T}(N(Tv) - m(Tv)) = \frac{1}{T}V(Tv) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ uniformly in $v \in [0, 1]$, in L^2 and almost surely.
2. We then prove that $\frac{1}{T}m(Tv) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} v(I - K)^{-1}\bar{\mu}$ uniformly in $v \in [0, 1]$.

Let us start by the first point. Namely, we show that

$$\frac{1}{T}(N(Tv) - m(Tv)) = \frac{1}{T}V(Tv) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } v \in [0, 1] \text{ in } L^2 \text{ and a.s.}$$

Convergence in L^2 . Using Equation (A.6), we get the following upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{T} V(Tv) \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{T^2} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT)\| \left(1 + \int_0^{vT} \|\psi(s)\| ds \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T^2} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT)\| (1 + \|\psi(T)\|_{L^1}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Using Doob's inequality (with $p = 2$) for the vector martingale M , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(Tv)\|^2 \right) \leq 4 \mathbb{E}(\|M(T)\|^2) = 4 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d M_i(T)^2 \right) = 4 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d [M]_i(T) \right) = 4 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d N_i(T) \right)$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(Tv)\|^2 \right) \leq 4 \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^T \lambda_i^*(t) dt \right) \leq 4 \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(\|\lambda^*(t)\|) \times T$$

where $\mathbb{E}(\|\lambda^*(t)\|) < \infty$ thanks to Assumption 5 and Proposition 2. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(Tv)\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{4 \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(\|\lambda^*(t)\|)}{T} \leq \frac{4}{T} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_X}(g_{\mu_i^*}(\bar{X}))}{1 - \rho(K)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This result, combined with Equation (A.7) implies that $(\frac{1}{T} V(vT))_v$ converges to 0 in L^2 , uniformly in v .

Almost sure convergence. Given Equation (A.7), it is sufficient to prove

$$\frac{1}{T} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT)\| \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0.$$

According to the previous calculation, for all $T \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT)\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{T} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_X}(\|g_{\mu^*}(\bar{X}(t))\|_\infty)}{1 - \rho(K)}.$$

Therefore, by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT)\| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(\sup_v \|M(vT)\|^2)}{\varepsilon^2 T^2} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 T} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_X}(\|g_{\mu^*}(\bar{X}(t))\|_\infty)}{1 - \rho(K)}.$$

If we choose the subsequence $T_n = 2^n$, then $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(T_n \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(vT_n)\| > \varepsilon) < \infty$, hence by Borel–Cantelli $\sup_v \|M(T_n v)\| \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. For any T with $2^n \leq T \leq 2^{n+1}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(Tv)\| = \frac{1}{T} \sup_{s \leq T} \|M(s)\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \sup_{s \leq 2^{n+1}} \|M(s)\| \leq 2 \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|M(v2^{n+1})\|.$$

We thus obtain the desired convergence:

$$\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{T} V(Tv) \right\| \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We now turn to the proof of the following statement:

$$\frac{1}{T} m(Tv) \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} v (I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu} \quad \text{uniformly in } v \in [0, 1].$$

Recall that $\bar{G}(t) := \int_0^t \mathbb{E}(g_{\mu^*}(X(s))) ds$ and that the function m satisfies the following equation:

$$m(t) = \bar{G}(t) + (\psi * \bar{G})(t).$$

Therefore, for all $v \in [0, 1]$,

$$\frac{1}{T} m(Tv) = \frac{1}{T} \bar{G}(Tv) + \frac{1}{T} (\psi * \bar{G})(Tv).$$

1. *First term:* by the ergodicity assumption (e.g Assumption 4) and the fact that g_{μ^*} is bounded (see Assumption 5), we have:

$$\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{T} \bar{G}(Tv) - v \bar{\mu} \right\| \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

where the convergence is both a.s and in L^2 .

2. *Second term (convolution)* We write, by changing the variable $s = Tu$,

$$\frac{1}{T} (\psi * \bar{G})(Tv) = \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) \bar{G}(Tu) du.$$

Let us use the uniform decomposition

$$\frac{\bar{G}(Tu)}{T} = u \bar{\mu} + r_T(u), \quad \text{with} \quad \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \|r_T(u)\| \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} (\psi * \bar{G})(Tv) &= T \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) (u \bar{\mu} + r_T(u)) du \\ &= T \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) u du \bar{\mu} + T \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) r_T(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we perform the integration change $w = T(v-u)$ and obtain

$$T \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) u du = \int_0^{Tv} \psi(w) \left(v - \frac{w}{T}\right) dw = v \int_0^{Tv} \psi(w) dw - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{Tv} w \psi(w) dw.$$

Since $\psi \in L^1$ and $w\psi(w) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$ the first quantity converges for $T \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$v \int_0^\infty \psi(w) dw.$$

The second term (with r_T) is controlled by

$$\left\| T \int_0^v \psi(T(v-u)) r_T(u) du \right\| \leq \sup_u \|r_T(u)\| \cdot \int_0^{Tv} \|\psi(w)\| dw \leq \sup_u \|r_T(u)\| \cdot \int_0^\infty \|\psi(w)\| dw,$$

which tends uniformly in v towards 0 when $T \rightarrow \infty$ because $\sup_u \|r_T(u)\| \rightarrow 0$.

Thus

$$\frac{1}{T}(\psi * A)(Tv) \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} v \left(\int_0^\infty \psi(w) dw \right) \bar{\mu} \quad \text{uniformly in } v.$$

Noting the sum of convolutions,

$$\int_0^\infty \psi(w) dw = \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_0^\infty (h_{\theta^*})^{*n}(w) dw = \sum_{n \geq 1} K^n = (I - K)^{-1} - I,$$

we finally obtain

$$\frac{1}{T}m(Tv) \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} v \left(I + \int_0^\infty \psi \right) \bar{\mu} = v(I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu}.$$

Conclusion. Combining the two points above, we have for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \left\| \frac{1}{T}N(Tv) - v(I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu} \right\| \leq \sup_v \left\| \frac{1}{T}(N(Tv) - m(Tv)) \right\| + \sup_v \left\| \frac{1}{T}m(Tv) - v(I - K)^{-1} \bar{\mu} \right\|.$$

Each term on the right-hand side tends uniformly to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$ (the first bound read in I tends to 0 in L^2 and almost surely, the second in II tends to 0 uniformly and even in L^2 and almost surely). This establishes the uniform convergence announced, both almost surely and in the L^2 norm.

Appendix A.4.2. Proof of the CLT property.

For the rescaled family

$$M^{(T)}(v) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}M(Tv), \quad V^{(T)}(v) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}V(Tv),$$

the renewal equation yields

$$V^{(T)}(v) = M^{(T)}(v) + \int_0^v T \psi(Tu) M_{v-u}^{(T)} du,$$

with $\psi = \sum_{n \geq 1} (h_{\theta^*})^{*n}$.

By the martingale FCLT, [46], it suffices to check the convergence of quadratic variations. For each component $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$[M_i^{(T)}, M_i^{(T)}]_v = \frac{1}{T}N_i(Tv).$$

By the law of large numbers proved previously,

$$\frac{1}{T}N_i(Tv) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} v(\Gamma\bar{\mu})_i.$$

Since no simultaneous jumps occur across coordinates, cross-variations vanish. Therefore $(M^{(T)})_{T>0}$ converges in law to a Gaussian martingale with independent components,

$$(M^{(T)}(v)) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} (\Sigma^{1/2}W(v)),$$

where $\Sigma_{ii} = (\Gamma\bar{\mu})_i$. It remains to show that

$$\sup_{v \in [0,1]} \|V^{(T)}(v) - (\text{Id} - K)^{-1}M^{(T)}(v)\| \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

The exact following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(T)}(v) - (\text{Id} - K)^{-1}M^{(T)}(v) &= \int_0^v T\psi(Tu)(M^{(T)}(v-u) - M^{(T)}(v)) du \\ &\quad + \left(\int_0^\infty \psi - \int_0^v T\psi(Tu) du \right) M^{(T)}(v) \end{aligned}$$

shows that

1. the first term vanishes by tightness and uniform continuity in probability of $(M^{(T)})$,
2. the second vanishes since $\int_0^v T\psi(Tu) du \rightarrow \int_0^\infty \psi$ and $\sup_v \|M^{(T)}(v)\|$ is bounded in probability.

Combining previous argument, we thus have

$$(V^{(T)}(v))_{v \in [0,1]} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} ((\text{Id} - K)^{-1} \Sigma^{1/2}W(v))_{v \in [0,1]}.$$

which concludes the proof of the first point stated. Under Assumptions 4-5, the expectation satisfies $\mathbb{E}(N(Tv)) = Tv(\text{Id} - K)^{-1}\bar{\mu} + o(T)$ uniformly in v . Hence

$$\sqrt{T}\left(\frac{1}{T}N(Tv) - v(\text{Id} - K)^{-1}\bar{\mu}\right) = V^{(T)}(v) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

This concludes the proof.

Appendix A.5. Proof of Theorem 6

The goal is to show that distant parts of the process become asymptotically independent. To that end, we introduce a truncated version of the process U , that is:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(s,t) &:= \left(\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t), g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(s,t)} h_{\theta,i,j}(t-s) dN_j(s), \nabla g_{\mu_i}(X(t)), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(s,t)} \nabla_{\theta} h_{\theta,i,j}(t-s) dN_j(s) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The key step is to prove that the truncated and non-truncated processes share the same asymptotic behavior. By stability, this implies that the effect of the initial condition vanishes as time increases.

Appendix A.5.1. Weak mixing property

We start by proving the weak mixing property. Let us take $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(E, \mathbb{R})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\theta,i}(u) &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)), \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) &:= A_1^\theta(u) \\ &+ \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)), \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) &:= A_2^\theta(u) \end{aligned}$$

Let us study the term $A_1^\theta(u)$.

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^\theta(u) &\leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{V}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t))) \mathbb{V}(\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{V}(\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)) \right\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the second from the boundedness of ψ , and the third is a consequence of $\mathbb{V}(X) \leq \mathbb{E}(X^2)$. We now prove that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)) \right\|^2 \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof is composed of two main steps.

1. Recall that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) - U_{\theta,i}(t+u) \right\| \right] \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0$.
2. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)) \right\| > \varepsilon \right) \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0$.

We start by the first point.

Since $\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)$ only depends on the process history up to $t+\sqrt{u}$. The exponential kernel implies

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) - U_{\theta,i}(t+u) \right\| \right] = \mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta\sqrt{u}/2}).$$

This ensures the convergence of $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) - U_{\theta,i}(t+u) \right\| \right]$.

Let's now turn to the second point

Let $\eta, \varepsilon > 0$. Since $U_{\theta,i}$ converges to a stationary process (see Proposition 1), there exist a compact K_η and $t_0 \geq 0$ s.t. for all $t \geq t_0$, $u \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(U_{\theta,i}(t+u) \notin K_\eta \text{ or } \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) \notin K_\eta) \leq \eta.$$

So for all u , for all $t \geq t_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(U_{\theta,i}(t+u) \notin K_\eta \cup \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) \notin K_\eta\right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(U_{\theta,i}(t+u), \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u) \in K_\eta, \left\|\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))\right\| > \varepsilon\right). \end{aligned}$$

And, on K_η , ψ is continuous and therefore absolutely continuous. Therefore, there exists δ such that for all x, y in K_η ,

$$\|x - y\| \leq \delta \text{ implies } \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

So for all $u \geq 0$, for all $t \geq t_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \eta + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|U_{\theta,i}(t+u) - \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)\right\| \geq \delta\right)$$

Since η is chosen arbitrarily and $\sup_{s \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|U_{\theta,i}(t+u) - \tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)\right\| \geq \delta\right) \rightarrow 0$. We can deduce that $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\phi(U_{\theta,i}(t+u)) - \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))\right\| > \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 0$.

Let us now conclude the proof. Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For all $u, t \geq 0$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\psi(U_{\theta,i}(u+t)) - \psi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(\sqrt{u}+T, u+t))\right\|^2\right) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^2 + \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\psi(U_{\theta,i}(u+t)) - \psi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(\sqrt{u}+T, u+t))\right\|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\left\|\psi(U_{\theta,i}(u+t)) - \psi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(\sqrt{u}+T, u+t))\right\| \geq \varepsilon}\right) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^2 + \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\psi(U_{\theta,i}(u+t)) - \psi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(\sqrt{u}+T, u+t))\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\psi(U_{\theta,i}(u+t)) - \psi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(\sqrt{u}+T, u+t))\right\|^2\right)$ converge to 0. We thus have shown that $A_1^\theta(u) \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0$.

We can now turn to the study of $A_2^\theta(u)$.

$$\begin{aligned} A_2^\theta(u) &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \text{Cov}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)), \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) \\ &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left([\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)) - \mathbb{E}(\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)))] \times [\phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)) - \mathbb{E}(\phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)))]\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Proposition 1, we know that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u)) - \mathbb{E}(\phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t+\sqrt{u}, t+u))) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right] \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

As a result, $A_2^\theta(u) \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow \infty} 0$, which concludes the proof.

Appendix A.5.2. Strong mixing property

The ideas and structure of the proof of the strong mixing result are essentially identical to those in Lemma A.6 of [1]. The only difference lies in the way the baseline terms are incorporated: in our setting, the baseline process explicitly appears in $U_{\theta,i}$ and its truncated version $\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(s,t)$, whereas it is not the case in [1]. Nevertheless, the proof in [1] can be followed line by line, replacing what we denote $U_{\theta,i}$ and $\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(s,t)$ by their analogs $X^i(t,\theta)$ and $\tilde{X}^i(s,t,\theta)$. The reasons are as follows:

- The covariance can be decomposed, by applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, into a “difference” term (analogous to A_1 in the preceding proof) and a covariance term involving the truncated block (analogous to A_2 in the same proof),
- the truncated future block has the same asymptotic law as original process,
- uniform moment and control bounds hold for all relevant processes.

Under our assumptions, all these properties remain valid. We therefore refer the reader to [1] for the detailed argument.

Appendix A.6. Proof of Theorem 7

The proof is divided into two subsections, each addressing one of convergence stated in the theorem.

Appendix A.6.1. Convergence in distribution

We begin by showing the convergence in distribution of the MLE, based on Theorem 1 of [38]. This theorem ensures that under the following conditions, the MLE is indeed asymptotically normal. We list below the required conditions, and then prove that they are indeed verified in our set-up.

Condition A. *Suppose that the following assumptions hold.*

- (A1) *For each $\theta \in \Theta$, the intensity process $\lambda_\theta(t)$ is nonnegative, measurable in (ω, t, θ) , and $\lambda_\theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Furthermore, for each time $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the mapping $\theta \mapsto \lambda_\theta(s)$ is twice continuously differentiable from Θ to \mathbb{R}_+^d , with a continuous extension to Θ .*
- (A2) *The process $U_{\theta,i}$ defined by 12 is ergodic in the following sense: for any bounded measurable ψ and any component $i = 1, \dots, d$,*

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \psi(U_{\theta,i}(t)) dt \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathbb{P}} \pi^{(i)}(\psi),$$

where $\pi^{(i)}$ denotes the invariant probability measure.

- (A3) *We have*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\lambda_\theta(t)\|^2 \right) < +\infty$$

- (A4) *The quantity $\mathbb{Y}(\theta)$, defined by*

$$\mathbb{Y}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i} - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i} + \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}} \right) \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i} \right] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

verifies $\mathbb{Y}(\theta) \neq 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \{\theta^\}$*

(A5) For all $\theta \in \Theta$ and any $T > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^T |\nabla_\theta \lambda_{\theta,i}(t)| dt < \infty\right) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^T |\nabla_\theta^2 \lambda_{\theta,i}(t)| dt < \infty\right) = 1.$$

(A6) For each $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| 1_{\{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) > 0\}} \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\frac{\nabla_\theta \lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)}{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)} \right) \right\| \lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) \right|^2 \right) &< +\infty, \\ \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| 1_{\{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) > 0\}} \left\| \nabla_\theta \left(\frac{\nabla_\theta \lambda_{\theta^*,i}^{\otimes 2}}{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)} \right) \lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) \right\|_1 \right\| \right) &< +\infty, \\ \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\|\nabla_\theta^2 \lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)\| \|\nabla_\theta \lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)\|}{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)} 1_{\{\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) > 0\}} \right) &< +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

For sake of clarity, let us remind Theorem 1 of [38].

Theorem A (Theorem 1 of [38]). *Under Condition A, the MLE estimator $\widehat{\theta}_T$ verifies*

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta^*) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma^{-1}).$$

We now aim to apply Theorem A. Condition (A1) is trivially satisfied. Assumptions (A3)–(A5)–(A6) follow directly from Proposition 2, together with Assumption 6 and Assumption 7(2,j) for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Similarly, the ergodicity of the vector $U_{\theta,i}$ is ensured by the mixing property established in Theorem 6.

We now turn to the proof of the remaining condition.

Lemma 1. *Under Assumptions 4–9, the process defined by Equation (4) verifies condition (A4)*

Proof. Recall that $\mathbb{Y}(\theta)$, defined in (A.8) as the asymptotic difference of the log-likelihood, is given by:

$$\mathbb{Y}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i} - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i} + \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}} \right) \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i} \right],$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t)$ denotes the intensity of the stationary version of the process given in Equation (10). Let us denote

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t) - \log \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t)}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t)} \right) \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t) f \left(\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t)}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t)} \right) \right]$$

with $f : x \mapsto 1 - x + \log(x)$ a negative function, null only in $x = 1$. Therefore, $\mathbb{Y}(\theta) = 0$ implies that, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ for all t , $\bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}(t) = \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}(t)$, \mathbb{P} -almost certainly. Let us show that $\theta = \theta^*$. Both processes are càdlàg, implying that, for all i , we have $\mathbb{P} - \text{a.s}$

$$g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t)) - g_{\mu_i^*}(\bar{X}(t)) = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(-\infty, t)} \left(\alpha_{ij}^* e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} - \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} \right) d\bar{N}_j(s). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The left member of this equality is a continuous process, whereas the right member is a jump process, which jumps have size $(\alpha_{ij} - \alpha_{ij}^*)_j$, implying that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ij}^*$.

Then, the right-hand side of Equation (A.9) is \mathcal{C}^1 with respect to time. Hence, it has a finite variation and therefore a zero quadratic variation. Thus, the left-hand side of the equation has zero quadratic variation. Since for all μ , the function g_{μ_i} is of class \mathcal{C}^2 , Itô's formula implies that the quadratic variation of the process $(g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(X(t))$ is given by:

$$\int_0^t \nabla_x (g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(X(s))^\top \sigma(X(s)) \sigma(X(s))^\top \nabla_x (g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(X(s)) ds.$$

Since $\sigma(x)\sigma(x)^\top$ is positive semi-definite for all x , the integrand must vanish almost everywhere. Therefore, for all t ,

$$\nabla_x (g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(X(t)) = 0.$$

Then, by Assumption 9, we deduce that

$$\nabla_x (g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x,$$

so that $g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*}$ is a constant function. Using Equation (A.9) with this information, we have shown that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(-\infty, t)} \left(\alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(t-s)} - \alpha_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-s)} \right) d\bar{N}_j(s)$$

is constant w.r.t time and therefore for all i, j , $\beta_{ij} = \beta_{ij}^*$. Hence, we now have that $g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t)) - g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t)) = 0$. And, if $\mu_i \neq \mu_i^*$, $\pi_X \left((g_{\mu_i} - g_{\mu_i^*})^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^{d_i} \setminus \{0\}) \right) > 0$, which, thanks to the Harris recurrence property of X , ensures that X returns an infinite number of times in $\mathbb{R}^{d_i} \setminus \{0\}$. As a result, $\mu_i = \mu_i^*$, which concludes the proof. \square

Appendix A.6.2. Convergence for all the moments

Now prove the second point of Theorem 7. The proof relies on Theorem 3.14 of [47] which gives four necessary conditions, ensuring the asymptotic normality of the MLE in the general framework of a point process. First, the conditions of application are specified, then their verification in our setting is demonstrated.

Condition B.(M1) *The mapping $\theta \mapsto \lambda_\theta(t)$ is \mathcal{C}^3 on Θ and admits a continuous extension to $\overline{\Theta}$, the closure of Θ .*

(M2) *for all $p > 1$ and $i \in \llbracket 0, 4 \rrbracket$ we have*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \sup_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta}^i \lambda_{\theta}(t) \right\|_p^p \right) < +\infty.$$

(M3) *There exists $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ such that, for all i , $U_{\theta,i}$ is $\mathcal{D}(E, \mathbb{R})$ -mixing uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$, with a rate ρ_u satisfying*

$$\rho_u = o(u^{-\varepsilon}) \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon > \frac{2\gamma}{1-2\gamma}.$$

Furthermore, there exists a limiting process $\overline{\lambda}_{\theta,i}$ such that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(E, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} t^\gamma \left| \mathbb{E}[\psi(U_{\theta,i}(t))] - \mathbb{E}[\psi(\overline{\lambda}_{\theta^*,i}, \overline{\lambda}_{\theta,i}, \partial_{\theta} \overline{\lambda}_{\theta,i})] \right| \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$$

with U given in Equation (12).

(M4) $\mathbb{Y}(\theta)$, defined by Equation (A.8), verifies :

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} -\frac{\mathbb{Y}(\theta)}{\|\theta - \theta^*\|^2} \geq 0.$$

Theorem B (Theorem 3.14 of [47]). *Under the Condition B, the MLE estimator $\widehat{\theta}_T$ verifies*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\psi \left(\sqrt{T} \left(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta^* \right) \right) \right) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E}(\psi(\mathcal{N}(0, \Gamma^{-1})))$$

for every ψ with polynomial growth.

In order to apply Theorem B, we verify that Conditions B hold in our setting.

Condition (M1) is straightforward given the intensity formula. Condition (M2) follows from Assumption 7(p, j), which holds for all $p > 1$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, together with Assumption 6 and Proposition 2. The first part of Condition (M3) has already been established in Theorem 6.

We now proceed to prove the two final point.

Lemma 2. *Under Assumption 6 and 7($p, 1$), for all $p > 1$, the process verifies (M3).*

The proof of this result is given in Appendix C.

Lemma 3. *Under Assumptions 4–9, the process defined by Equation (4) verifies condition (M4).*

Proof. In Lemma 1, we have already proven that the function \mathbb{Y} is always negative except at θ^\star , where the it value is null. To prove (M4), it remains to show that the Fisher matrix is semi-definite and positive, using Assumption 9. The Fisher matrix is given by $\Gamma = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t) \partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t)^T}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t)} \right)$.

Let us consider a vector $v := (v_i)_i$, where for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, the vector $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$ has the same dimension and structure as the parameter block $\theta_i = (\mu_i, (\alpha_{ij})_j, (\beta_{ij})_j)$. More precisely, each v_i can be written as:

$$v_i = (v_{\mu_i}, (v_{\alpha_{ij}})_j, (v_{\beta_{ij}})_j),$$

where $v_{\mu_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$, $v_{\alpha_{ij}} \in \mathbb{R}$, and $v_{\beta_{ij}} \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$.

Suppose now that the quadratic form satisfies:

$$v^\top \Gamma v = 0.$$

As $v^\top \Gamma v = \mathbb{E} \left(v_i^\top \frac{\partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t) \partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t)^T}{\bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t)} v_i \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\|\partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star}(t)^T v\|_2^2}{\partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta^\star, i}(t)} \right)$, it implies that for all i , $\partial_\theta \bar{\lambda}_{\theta, i}(t) v^\top = 0$ $\mathbb{P} - a.s$, hence $\mathbb{P} - a.s$, we have that for all t ,

$$\nabla_\mu g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t)) v_{\mu_i}^T + \sum_{j=1}^d v_{\alpha_{ij}} \int_{(-\infty, t)} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-u)} d\bar{N}_j(u) - v_{\beta_{ij}} \alpha_{ij} \int_{(-\infty, t)} (t-u) e^{-\beta_{ij}(u-s)} d\bar{N}_j(u) = 0. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The function $t \mapsto \nabla_\mu g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t)) v_{\mu_i}^T - \sum_{j=1}^d v_{\beta_{ij}} \alpha_{ij} \int_{(-\infty, t)} (t-u) e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-u)} d\bar{N}_j(u)$ is continuous, whereas the term $\sum_{j=1}^d v_{\alpha_{ij}} \int_{(-\infty, t)} e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-u)} d\bar{N}_j(u)$ is a jumping process, with discontinuities of size v_α . Thus, for the left-hand side of the equation to be continuous almost surely, it is necessary that $v_\alpha = 0$. As a result, using Equation (A.10),

$$\nabla_\mu g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t)) v_{\mu_i}^T - \sum_{j=1}^d v_{\beta_{ij}} \alpha_{ij} \int_{(-\infty, t)} (t-u) e^{-\beta_{ij}(t-u)} d\bar{N}_j(u) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s$$

which, using the derivation w.r.t the parameter α , ensures $v_\beta = 0$. Finally, as $\pi_X((\nabla_\mu g_{\mu_i})^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^\star)) > 0$, we can conclude that $v_{\mu_i} = 0$. □

Appendix A.7. Proof of Theorem 9

Let us recall the notations

$$E_i := \Lambda_{\theta^\star}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\theta^\star}(T_{i-1}) \sim \mathcal{E}(1), \quad \hat{E}_i(T) := \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\hat{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}(T_i - T_{i-1}) \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X}.$$

We proceed in three steps:

1. First, we show that for any i , $\hat{E}_i(T) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{E}(1)$.

2. Next, we show that for any k , $\left(\widehat{E}_1(T), \dots, \widehat{E}_k(T)\right) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \mathcal{E}(1)$.

3. Finally, we show that $(\widehat{E}_i(T))$ is tight. Specifically, we show that there exist M_i such that

$$\sum_i \sup_T \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{E}_i(T)| > M_i\right) < \infty.$$

Step 1. We know that

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1}) = \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Delta T_i \rho \Gamma^{-1/2} X + o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

and hence

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1}) - E_i - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Delta T_i \rho \Gamma^{-1/2} X = +o_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

For any $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\widehat{E}_i(T) - E_i\right\| > \eta\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1}) - \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\theta^*}(T_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Delta T_i \rho \Gamma^{-1/2} X\right\| > \eta/2\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Delta T_i (\rho \Gamma^{-1/2} X - \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X})\right\| > \eta/2\right). \end{aligned}$$

The first term tends to 0 according to Equation (A.11). For the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \Delta T_i (\rho \Gamma^{-1/2} X - \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X})\right\|\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbb{E} \Delta T_i \times \left[\mathbb{E}(\|\rho \Gamma^{-1/2}\|) \mathbb{E}(\|X\|) + \mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T\|) \mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{X}\|)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the equality holds since (T_i) are independent of X, \tilde{X} , of $\tilde{\rho}_T, \tilde{I}_T$ (which depend only on \tilde{N}), and of ρ, Γ (also independent of N).

Under the assumptions of moment convergence for the MLE, $\mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{\rho}_T\|^2)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{I}_T\|^2)$ are bounded (see Proposition 1). We thus conclude that for all i , $\widehat{E}_i(T)$ converges to E_i , hence to an exponential distribution with rate 1.

Step 2.. Now we show that $\left(\widehat{E}_1(T), \dots, \widehat{E}_k(T)\right) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \mathcal{E}(1)$.

We proceed by induction. First, we show that for any $k < l$, $(\widehat{E}_k(T), \widehat{E}_l(T)) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{E}(1) \otimes \mathcal{E}(1)$.

Let $t_k, t_l \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \widehat{E}_l(T) + it_k \widehat{E}_k(T)}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \widehat{E}_l(T)} e^{it_k \widehat{E}_k(T)} \middle| (\tilde{T}_j), (T_j)_{j \leq l-1}\right)\right).$$

For all $j < l$, $\Delta T_l \perp\!\!\!\perp T_j | (T_j)_{j \leq l-1}$, and since we also condition on (\tilde{T}_j) and \tilde{X} , $\hat{E}_l(T)$ and $\hat{E}_k(T)$ depend only on the inter-arrival times. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T) + it_k \hat{E}_k(T)}\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T)} | (\tilde{T}_j), (T_j)_{j \leq l-1}, \tilde{X}\right) \mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_k \hat{E}_k(T)} | (\tilde{T}_j), (T_j)_{j \leq l-1}, \tilde{X}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_k \hat{E}_k(T)} \mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T)} | (\tilde{T}_j), (T_j)_{j \leq l-1}, \tilde{X}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{E}_l(T)$ converges in probability to E_l , by the mapping theorem $e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T)}$ converges in probability to $e^{it_l E_l}$, and as $\|e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T)}\| < 1$, we have convergence in \mathcal{L}^1 . Similar reasoning apply for $e^{it_k \hat{E}_k(T)}$ which lead to

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^{it_l \hat{E}_l(T) + it_k \hat{E}_k(T)}\right) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1} \mathbb{E}(e^{it_k E_k}) \mathbb{E}(e^{it_l E_l}).$$

Thus, $(\hat{E}_k(T), \hat{E}_l(T)) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{E}(1) \otimes \mathcal{E}(1)$. By induction, for any $k > 0$, $(\hat{E}_1(T), \dots, \hat{E}_k(T)) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^k \mathcal{E}(1)$.

Step 3.. We show that there exist (M_i) such that

$$\sum_i \sup_T \mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{E}_i(T)| > M_i\right) < \infty.$$

We show that $\sup_T \mathbb{E}\left(|\hat{E}_i(T)|\right) \leq c_i$ for some $c_i > 0$. Indeed,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|\hat{E}_i(T)|\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta T_i \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta T_i \left\| \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X} \right\|\right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The second term tends to 0 since $\mathbb{E}\left(\left\| \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \right\|\right)$ is bounded and $\mathbb{E}(\Delta T_i) < \infty$, so there exists c_i^1 such that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta T_i \left\| \tilde{\rho}_T \tilde{I}_T \tilde{X} \right\|\right) \leq c_i^1.$$

For the first term in (A.12), conditioning on (\tilde{T}_j) , $\lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}$ is a process with mean $\tilde{\mu}_T + \tilde{K}(Id - K^*)^{-1} \mu^*$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1})\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\Delta T_i \left(\tilde{\mu}_T + \tilde{K}_T(Id - K^*)^{-1} \mu^*\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta T_i) \mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{\mu}_T + \tilde{K}_T(Id - K^*)^{-1} \mu^*\right), \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded. Hence $\sup_T \mathbb{E}\left(\Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_i) - \Lambda_{\tilde{\theta}_T}(T_{i-1})\right) < +\infty$.

This concludes the third step, and thus the proof.

Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 2

To prove this Proposition, we start by proving the result for $\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)$, the true intensity of the process and then extend it all $\theta \in \Theta$.

Appendix B.1. First result for the true parameter

Lemma 4. *For all $l \geq 1$ and all $i \in \{1 \dots d\}$, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)|^l \right) < +\infty$.*

Proof. Even though we consider the particular set up of a process with an exponential kernel, this property can be proven in much more general set-up where the kernel function is an integrable functions. We thus keep for this specific proof the general notation, i.e we consider $\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t) = g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,i,j}(t-s) dN_j(s)$ and suppose that this function verifies:

1. $\rho(K) < 1$ where $K = (\|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_{\mathcal{L}^1})_{ij}$
2. For all $i, j \in \llbracket 1, \dots, d \rrbracket$, $h_{\theta^*,ij} \in \mathcal{L}^q$ for a $q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

Under this hypothesis, we will show that for all $l \in [1, q]$, $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_{\theta^*}(t)|^l \right) < +\infty$. As the exponential kernel is in \mathcal{L}^p for all $p > 1$, proving this more general lemma will demonstrate the expected result.

The proof is done using recurrence on $l \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$. Let us recall that the thinning procedure to obtain $\lambda_{\theta^*,i}(t)$ is given by the following set of equations.

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) &= g_{\mu_i^*}(X(t^-)) + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) dN_j(s) \\ dN_i^{(n+1)}(t) &= \overline{N} \left(\left[0, \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) \right] \times dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

with $\lambda^{(0)} = 0$ and $N^{(0)} = \emptyset$. Using an induction, we show the following property:

$$H(k) : \exists C_k \text{ such that for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } t, \text{ for all } i \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n)}(t) \right|^k \right) \leq C_k.$$

We start by proving $H(1)$: The first step consists in proving that $\mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_i^{(n)}(t) - \lambda_i^{(n-1)}(t)| \right) \leq g_+ K^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_p$, to finally deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_i^{(n)}(t) \right) \leq g_+ \sum_{k=1}^d K^{k-1} \mathbf{1}_p.$$

where $\mathbf{1}_p$ denotes the vector in \mathbb{R}^p with all entries equal to 1. Let us start by studying $\mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_i^{(n)}(t) - \lambda_i^{(n-1)}(t)| \right)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n)}(t) - \lambda_i^{(n-1)}(t) \right| \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k_n=1}^d \int_0^{t^-} h_{\theta^*, ik_n}(t - s_n) \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_{k_n}^{(n-1)}(s_n) - \lambda_{k_n}^{(n-2)}(s_n) \right| \right) ds_n \\
& \leq \sum_{k_n=1}^d \int_0^t h_{\theta^*, ik_n}(t - s_n) \left[\sum_{k_{n-1}=1}^d h_{\theta^*, k_n k_{n-1}}(s_n - s_{n-1}) \mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_{k_{n-1}}^{(n-2)}(s_{n-1}) \right) ds_{n-1} \right] ds_n \\
& = \sum_{k_n=1}^d \int_0^t h_{\theta^*, ik_n}(t - s_n) \sum_{k_{n-1}=1}^d \int_0^{s_n} h_{\theta^*, k_n k_{n-1}}(s_n - s_{n-1}) \mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_{k_{n-1}}^{(n-2)}(s_{n-1}) \right) ds_{n-1} ds_n \\
& \leq \sum_{k_n=1}^d \int_0^t h_{\theta^*, ik_n}(t - s_n) \sum_{k_{n-1}=1}^d \int_0^{s_n} h_{\theta^*, k_n k_{n-1}}(s_n - s_{n-1}) \dots \sum_{k_1=1}^d \int_0^{s_3} h_{\theta^*, k_3 k_2}(s_3 - s_2) \mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_{k_2}^{(0)}(s_2) \right) ds_2 \dots ds_n \\
& \leq g_+ \sum_{k_n=1}^d \sum_{k_{n-1}=1}^d \dots \sum_{k_1=1}^d K_{ik_n} K_{k_n k_{n-1}} \dots K_{k_3 k_2} \\
& = (K^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_p)
\end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_i^{(n)} \right) (t) \leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(k)}(t) - \lambda_i^{(k-1)}(t) \right| \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\lambda_i^{(1)}(t) \right) \leq g_+ + \sum_{k=1}^n (K^{k-1} \mathbb{1}_p)_i \leq g_+ (1 - K)^{-1} \mathbb{1}_p$$

This shows the initialisation step.

We now suppose that $H(l-1)$ is verified for some $l-1 \geq 1$.

We use the following inequality: for all $x, y, z > 0, p \geq 1$: $(x+y)^p \leq (1+z)^{p-1}x^p + (1+z^{-1})^{p-1}y^p$, which implies (as $l-1 > 1$),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) \right|^k \right) & \leq (1+z)^{l-1} (g_{\mu_i^*}(X_{t-}))^l + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*, ij}(t-s) dN^{(n)}(s) \right)^l \\
& \leq (1+z)^{l-1} (g_{\mu_i^*}(X_{t-}))^l + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*, ij}(t-s) dN^{(n)}(s) \right)^l
\end{aligned}$$

Denoting $\overline{N}_j^{(n)}(t) = N_j^{(n)}(t) - \int_{(0,t)} \lambda_j^{(n)}(s)ds$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) dN_j^{(n)}(s) \right)^l \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) d\overline{N}_j^{(n)}(s) + \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^l \right) \\ &\leq (1+z)^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) d\overline{N}_j^{(n)}(s) \right)^l \right) + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^l \right). \end{aligned}$$

And using the Kunita inequality ensures that there exists K_l such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) d\overline{N}_j^{(n)}(s) \right)^l \right] &\leq K_l \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s)^l \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right) \\ &\quad + K_l \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s)^2 \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^{l/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have shown the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) \right|^l \right) &\leq (1+z)^l g_+^l \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{2(l-1)} K_l \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}^l(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right] \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{2(l-1)} K_l \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^{l/2} \right] \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^l \right] \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s)^l \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right] \leq \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_l^l \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_j^{(n)}(t) \right] \leq g_+ \|(1-K)^{-1}\| \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_l^l$

And, taking $f = h_{\theta^*,ij}^{1-2/l}$, $g = h_{\theta^*,ij}^{2/l} \times \lambda_j^{(n)}$, $p = l/2$ and $q = (1-2/l)^{-1}$ Hölder's inequality ensures:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^{l/2} \right] &\leq \left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}^2(t-s) ds \right)^{l/2} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}^2(t-s) \left(\lambda_j^{(n)}(s) \right)^{l/2} ds \right) \\ &\leq \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_2^{l+2} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\lambda_j^{(n)}(s) \right)^{l/2} \right) \\ &< \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_2^{l+2} \max(1, C_{l-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second and third inequalities are due to the recursive hypothesis and the fact that $h \in \mathcal{L}^p$ for $p \geq 2$. Using once again Hölder inequality with $p = l$ and $q = (1 - 1/l)^{-1}$ we have,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) ds \right)^l \right] \leq \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|_1 \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) \right|^l \right) ds.$$

Combined with the previous inequality, this gives:

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n+1)}(t) \right|^l \right) \leq K + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\| \int_{(0,t)} h_{\theta^*,ij}(t-s) \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n)}(s) \right|^l \right) ds,$$

where K is a constant independent of t .

As a result $\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) \right|^l \right) \leq K + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|^2 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n)}(t) \right|^l \right)$ implying that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n+1)}(t) \right|^l \right) \leq K + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|h_{\theta^*,ij}\|^2 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n)}(t) \right|^l \right).$$

As $\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(1)}(t) \right|^l \right) \leq g_+ < +\infty$ we thus deduce that for all $n \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_i^{(n)}(t) \right|^l \right) < +\infty$ and that $\left(\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \lambda_j^{(n)}(t) \right|^l \right) \right)_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded above by an arithmetico-geometric sequence (v_n) with having ratio $(1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \|h_{\theta_0}\|^2 < 1$. As a result (v_n) is bounded. In addition, the bounding constant depends only on the parameter defining the arithmetico-geometric sequence, implying that the bound does not depend on either n or t .

The dominated convergence theorem ensures the desired result: $\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left((\lambda_i(t))^l \right) < +\infty$. \square

Appendix B.2. Proof of the state Lemma

Let us take $l \geq 1$ with $l \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$. Using that for all $x, y, z > 0$ and all $p \geq 1$, $(x + y)^l < (1 + z)^{l-1} x^l + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} y^l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \tilde{\lambda}(t) \right|^l \right) &\leq (1 + z)^{l-1} |\tilde{m}(t)|^l + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) dN_j(s) \right)^l \\ &\leq (1 + z)^{l-1} |\tilde{m}(t)|^l + (1 + z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) dN_j(s) \right)^l \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, denoting $\bar{N}_j(t) = N_j(t) - \int_{(0,t)} \lambda_j(s) ds$ we obtain the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) N_j(ds) \right)^l \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) d\bar{N}_j(s) + \int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) \lambda_j(s) ds \right)^l \right) \\ &\leq (1+z)^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) d\bar{N}_j(s) \right)^l \right) + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) \lambda_j(s) ds \right)^l \right) \end{aligned}$$

And the Kunita inequality ensures that there exists K_l such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) d\bar{N}_j(s) \right)^l \right] \leq K_l \mathbb{E} \left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s)^l \lambda_j(s) ds \right) + K_l \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s)^2 \lambda_j(s) ds \right)^{l/2} \right).$$

As a result we have shown the following inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \tilde{\lambda}(t) \right|^l \right) &\leq (1+z)^l |\tilde{m}(t)|^l \\ &\quad (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} (1+z)^{l-1} K_l \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j^l(t-s) \lambda_j(s) ds \right] \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} (1+z)^{l-1} K_l \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) \lambda_j(s) ds \right)^{l/2} \right] \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{(0,t)} \tilde{h}_j(t-s) \lambda_j(s) ds \right)^l \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using Holder inequality we thus have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_t \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \tilde{\lambda}(t) \right|^l \right) &\leq (1+z)^l \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\tilde{m}(t)|^l + K_l (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} (1+z)^{l-1} \|h\|_l^l \sum_{j=1}^d \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} (|\lambda_j(s)|) \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} (1+z)^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\| \tilde{h}_j \right\|_1 \mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_j(t)|^{l/2} \right) \\ &\quad + (1+z^{-1})^{l-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \tilde{h}_j \right\|_1 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left(|\lambda_j(t)|^l \right) \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma 4 and the fact that $\tilde{h}_j \in \mathcal{L}^q \supseteq \mathcal{L}^l$ for all $1 \leq l \leq q$. This concludes the proof.

Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 2

We first note that under Assumption 6, the constant C_θ defined in Propostion 1, is independant of θ . As a result,

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\lambda_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{\lambda}_{\theta,i}\|) \leq Ce^{-ct}.$$

Then, for all $\phi \in D(E, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} t^\gamma \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \phi(\tilde{U}_{\theta,i}(t)) - \phi(\bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)) \right\| \right] &\leq t^\gamma \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \nabla \phi(\xi^\theta(t)) \cdot (U_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)) \right\| \right] \\ &\leq Ct^\gamma \mathbb{E} \left[\|U_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)\|^2 \right] < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some $\xi^\theta(t) \in [U_{\theta,i}(t), \bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)]$, and $C > 0$ a constant which does not depend on θ and t and where the inequality is due to $\sup_t \mathbb{E}[\sup_\theta \nabla \phi(\xi^\theta(t))] < +\infty$.

Thanks to Proposition 3 and the fact that each term in $U_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)$ can be written as a sum of integrals with respect to the measure $dN - d\bar{N}$, and a term $\mathbb{E}(\|g_{\mu_i}(X(t)) - g_{\mu_i}(\bar{X}(t))\|)$ we deduce that $\mathbb{E}[\|U_{\theta,i}(t) - \bar{U}_{\theta,i}(t)\|^2]$ decreases exponentially uniformly in θ .

Appendix D. T-chain property for a general d

We resume the proof of Appendix A.3.2 from Equation (A.2). As in the case $d = 2$, we begin by bounding $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T)) | \mathcal{F}_W^T)$ from below. We thus work on the event

$$A_T := \{T_1 < T_2 < \dots < T_{d^2} < T < T_{d^2+1}\} \cap \{K_1 = 1, \dots, K_d = 1, K_{d+1} = 2, \dots, K_{2d} = 2, \dots, K_{d^2} = d\}.$$

In other words, we require that each component jumps d times before time T , and that the jumps of N_1 occur before those of component N_2 which occur before those of N_3 and so on. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T)) | \mathcal{F}_W^T) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbf{1}_B(Y(T)) \mathbf{1}_{A_T} | \mathcal{F}_W^T) \\ &= \int f^{(\Delta T_{d^2+1}, K_{d^2+1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)}(t_{d^2+1}, k_{d^2+1}, \dots, t_1, k_1) \mathbf{1}_B(\gamma_y(T)) \mathbf{1}_{t_1 + \dots + t_{d^2} < T} \mathbf{1}_{t_1 + \dots + t_{d^2+1} > T} dt_1 \dots dt_{d^2+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where:

- $f^{(\Delta T_1, K_1, \dots, \Delta T_5, K_5)}(t_5, k_5, \dots, t_1, k_1)$ is the joint density of the inter-arrival times (ΔT_i) and the marks (K_i) , conditional on the trajectory of W ;
- $\gamma_y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ denotes the value of $Y(t)$, for $t \in [0, T]$, conditional on the event $\{Y(0) = y\} \cap \{\Delta T_1 = t_1, K_1 = 1, \dots, \Delta T_4 = t_4, K_4 = 2\}$ and conditional to W .

Computation of $\gamma_y(T)$. Using the recurrence property of Y we have:

$$\gamma_y(T) = \left(y_{ij} e^{-\beta_{ij}^* T} + \alpha_{ij}^* \sum_{i=jd+1}^{(j+1)d} e^{-\beta_{ij}^*(T-t_1-\dots-t_i)} \right)_{ij}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

We denote by $(\gamma_y^{kj}(t))_{1 \leq k, j \leq 2}$ the entries of the matrix $\gamma_y(t)$, and define, for each k ,

$$\gamma_y^k(s) := \sum_{j=1}^d \gamma_y^{ij}(s),$$

Computation of the joint density f . We aim to make explicit the joint density f of the random vector $(\Delta T_{d^2+1}, K_{d^2+1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)$. Using Bayes' formula, we have:

$$f^{(\Delta T_{d^2+1}, K_{d^2+1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)} = \prod_{k=0}^{d-1} \prod_{i=dk+1}^{(k+1)d} f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}.$$

where the notation $f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}$ corresponds to the conditional density of the pair $(\Delta T_i, K_i)$ given the previous history.

To compute the conditional terms $f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}$, we first consider the survival function of the i -the inter-arrival time, given the past. For all $i \in \llbracket dk+1, d(k+1) \rrbracket$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta T_i > t_i | \Delta T_{i-1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) &= \mathbb{P}(N_k([T_{i-1}, T_{i-1} + t_i]) = 0 | \Delta T_{i-1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) \\ &= \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} g_{\mu_k^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^k(s) ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\gamma_y^{ij}(s))_{ij}$, the coordinates of $\gamma_y^T(s)$ defined in Equation (A.3), represents the value of the Hawkes process $Y(s)$ conditionally on the Brownian motion, the initial condition y , and the jump times before time s .

Hence, for all i , the conditional density of ΔT_i is given by

$$t \mapsto \left(g_{\mu_k^*}(X(T_{i-1} + t)) + \gamma_y^k(T_{i-1} + t) \right) \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t} \left[g_{\mu_k^*}(X(s)) + \gamma_y^k(s) \right] ds \right),$$

Note that for $i = d^2 + 1$, k_{d^2+1} plays no role as we have no condition imposed on it.

For the conditional mark density, given $\Delta T_i, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T$, the probability that the event occurs in component k is:

$$\mathbb{P}(K_i = k | \Delta T_i, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1, \mathcal{F}_W^T) = \frac{\lambda_k(T_i^-)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d \lambda_\ell(T_i^-)} = \frac{g_{\mu_k^*}(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^\ell(T_i^-)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d (g_{\mu_\ell^*}(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^\ell(T_i^-))}.$$

We can then write the full conditional density $f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} & f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}(t_i, k_i, t_{i-1}, k_{i-1} \dots, t_1, k_1) \\ &= \frac{g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_i^-)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d (g_{\mu_\ell^*}^*(X(T_i^-)) + \gamma_y^\ell(T_i^-))} \\ & \times \left(g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(T_{i-1} + t_i)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_{i-1} + t_i) \right) \times \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} g_{\mu_{k_i}^*}^*(X(s)) + \gamma_y^{k_i}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the fact that the baseline intensities $(g_{\mu_k^*}^*(X(t)))_k$ are bounded above and below (see Assumption 5), we can deduce a lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(\Delta T_i, K_i | \Delta T_{<i}, K_{<i})}(t_i, k_i, t_{i-1}, k_{i-1} \dots, t_1, k_1) &\geq \frac{g_{\mu_-^*}^* + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_i^-)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^d (g_{\mu_+^*}^* + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_i^-))} \\ &\times \left(g_{\mu_-^*}^* + \gamma_y^{k_i}(T_{i-1} + t_i) \right) \times \exp \left(- \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_{i-1} + t_i} g_{\mu_+^*}^* + \gamma_y^{k_i}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

We are thus once again in the setting of a multidimensional Hawkes process with constant baseline. The same arguments as in Lemma A.3 of [1] apply, showing that:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{2,T}(y, B) &:= \int f^{(\Delta T_{d^2+1}, K_{d^2+1}, \dots, \Delta T_1, K_1)}(t_{d^2+1}, k_{d^2+1}, \dots, t_1, k_1) \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}_B(\gamma_y(T)) \mathbb{1}_{t_1 + \dots + t_{d^2} < T} \mathbb{1}_{t_1 + \dots + t_{d^2+1} > T} dt_1 \dots dt_{d^2+1} \end{aligned}$$

is a kernel that is non-trivial and lower semi-continuous.

Combining this with Equation (A.2) and using Assumption 5, we obtain:

$$P_T^Z((x, y), A \times B) \geq Q_T((x, y), A \times B) := Q_{1,T}(x, A) Q_{2,T}(y, B)$$

which proves that P is a T -chain.

It remains to show that the core Z admits a reachable point. We already know that the process X admits such a point. Now, the Hawkes dynamics can be framed by the one of two Hawkes processes with a constant baseline (due to the bounds on $(g_{\mu_k^*}^*)_k$), and we know from the theory of classical Hawkes processes that 0 is reachable for those process.

Therefore, Z is ψ -irreducible. By Proposition 6.2.1 of [32], we conclude that every compact set is a petite set.

Algorithm 3 Test for equality between coefficients $H_0: \theta_i^* = \theta_j^*$ vs $H_1: \theta_i^* \neq \theta_j^*$

Require: Sample $\mathcal{S} := \{(t, X(t)) : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$, with \mathcal{T} containing at least all $(T_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1, \dots, N(T) \rrbracket}$

1. Compute the MLE $\hat{\theta}_T$;
2. Compute \hat{I} as in Equation (13);
3. Compute

$$\mathcal{Z}_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_j)}{\sqrt{(\hat{I}^{-1})_{ii} - 2(\hat{I}^{-1})_{ij} + (\hat{I}^{-1})_{jj}}}$$

4. Reject H_0 if $|\mathcal{Z}_{ij}| > q_{1-\alpha/2}$ where $q_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of the standard Gaussian distribution.
-

Appendix E. Other test

We present here another available test which allow to compare the coefficient values of the model.

Moreover, both Algorithm 1 and 3 can be easily adapted to test one-sided alternatives, such as inequality constraints. For example, testing $\mathcal{H}_0 : \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ versus $\mathcal{H}_1 : \mu_1 > \mu_2$ simply amounts to computing the same test statistic but comparing it against the one-sided Gaussian quantile.