

AD-A159 180

HITTING A BOUNDARY POINT BY DIFFUSIONS IN THE CLOSED
HALF SPACE. (U) NORTH CAROLINA UNIV AT CHAPEL HILL
CENTER FOR STOCHASTIC PROC. S RAMASUBRAMANIAN JUN 85

1/1


UNCLASSIFIED

TR-100 AFOSR-TR-85-0703 F49620-82-C-0009

F/G 12/1

ML






MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

CENTER FOR STOCHASTIC PROCESSES

Department of Statistics
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

AD-A159 180



HITTING A BOUNDARY POINT BY DIFFUSIONS IN THE CLOSED HALF SPACE

by

S. Ramasubramanian

Technical Report 108

June 1985

DTIC FILE COPY

DTIC
Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b. REACTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT UNLIMITED Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report No. 108		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFOSR-TR-85-0703	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Center for Stochastic Processes	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Statistics Dept., 321 PH 039A, UNC Chapel Hill, NC 27514		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) AFOSR/NM Bldg 410 Bolling AFB DC 20332-6448	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION AFOSR	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER FH9620-82-C-0009	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Bolling AFB Washington, DC 20332		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. G1102F	PROJECT NO. 2304
		TASK NO. A5	WORK UNIT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) <i>Hitting a boundary point by diffusions in the closed half space</i>			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) S. Ramasubramanian			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 9/1/84 TO 8/31/85	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) June 1985	15. PAGE COUNT 14
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	
		Stochastic differential equations, Wentzell's boundary conditions, submartingale problems, stopping times	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
It is proved that a nondegenerate diffusion process in the closed half space $G = \{x \in R^d : x_1 \geq 0\}$, where $d \geq 2$, with Wentzell's boundary conditions does not hit any specified point on the boundary.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input type="checkbox"/>		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL <i>May Woodruff</i>		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (202) 767-5027	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL <i>Y171</i>

HITTING A BOUNDARY POINT BY DIFFUSIONS IN THE CLOSED HALF SPACE

by

S. Ramasubramanian
Indian Statistical Institute
Bangalore, India

and

Center for Stochastic Processes
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

Abstract

It is proved that a nondegenerate diffusion process in the closed half space $\bar{G} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 \geq 0\}$, where $d \geq 2$, with Wentzell's boundary conditions does not hit any specified point on the boundary.

Information For

CLASSI

10

Abbreviated Title: Diffusions in Closed Half Space

AMS 1970 Subject Classification: 60J60



AH

This research partially supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research Contract F49620 82 C 0009.

(1)

It is known that a Brownian motion in the unit sphere, with normal reflection at the boundary, does not hit a specified point on the boundary, (see McKean (1969)). The aim of this article is to prove that a non-degenerate diffusion in the closed half space, with certain Wentzell-type boundary conditions, does not hit a point on the boundary specified in advance. We also give an application to a boundary value problem.

Let $G = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) : x_1 > 0\}$, $\partial G = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$ and $\bar{G} = G \cup \partial G$, where $d \geq 2$. We have the coefficients a, b defined on \bar{G} , and α, γ, ρ defined on ∂G , satisfying one of the following two sets of conditions.

Conditions I. (I 1) For each $x \in \bar{G}$, $a(x) = ((a_{ij}(x)))_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ is a $d \times d$ real symmetric positive definite matrix; $a(\cdot)$ is bounded and continuous; $a^{-1}(\cdot)$ is also bounded and continuous.

(I 2) $b(\cdot) = (b_1(\cdot), \dots, b_d(\cdot))$ is a bounded and continuous \mathbb{R}^d -valued function on \bar{G} .

(I 3) $\gamma(\cdot) = (\gamma_2(\cdot), \dots, \gamma_d(\cdot))$ is an \mathbb{R}^{d-1} -valued function on ∂G ; $\gamma_j \in C_b^2(\partial G)$ for $j = 2, \dots, d$.

(I 4) $\alpha \equiv 0$ as a $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ matrix.

(I 5) $\rho \equiv 0$; or ρ is a bounded locally Lipschitz function which is strictly positive at each point of ∂G .

The set of alternative conditions is

Conditions II. (II 1) In addition to (I 1) we assume that for each $x \in \bar{G}$, there exists a $d \times d$ real symmetric positive definite matrix $\sigma(x) = ((\sigma_{ij}(x)))_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$ such that $a(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma^*(x)$; $\sigma(\cdot)$ is bounded and continuous, and $\sigma^{-1}(\cdot)$ is also bounded and continuous.

(II 2) Same as (I 2).

Stochastic differential equations and boundary value problems

(II 3) $\gamma(\cdot) = (\gamma_2(\cdot), \dots, \gamma_d(\cdot))$ is an \mathbb{R}^{d-1} -valued bounded and continuous function on ∂G .

(II 4) For each $x \in \partial G$, $\alpha(x) = ((\alpha_{ij}(x)))_{2 \leq i, j \leq d}$ is a $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ real symmetric positive definite matrix, and there exists a $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ real symmetric positive definite matrix $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = ((\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(x)))_{2 \leq i, j \leq d}$ such that $\alpha(x) = \tilde{\sigma}(x) \cdot \tilde{\sigma}^*(x)$. $\tilde{\sigma}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}^{-1}(\cdot)$ are bounded and continuous.

(II 5) Same as (I 5).

Define

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \quad (1)$$

and

$$J = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^d \alpha_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=2}^d \gamma_i(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \quad (2)$$

Let $\Omega = C([0, \infty) : \bar{G})$ be endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compacta and the natural Borel structure.

Under conditions less restrictive than the set of Conditions I, Stroock and Varadhan (1971) have established the existence of a unique solution to the submartingale problem corresponding to the coefficients a, b, γ, ρ . Following Watanabe (1971), Nakao and Shiga (1972) have established the existence of a unique solution to the stochastic differential equation corresponding to the coefficients $a, b, \alpha, \gamma, \rho$ under conditions less restrictive than the set of Conditions II. The equivalence of these two formulations can be found in N.B. Karoui (1975). (Here uniqueness is in the sense of law).

So, when Conditions I or II hold, for each $x \in \bar{G}$ there exists a unique probability measure P_x on Ω such that

$$1) P_x \{X(t) \in \bar{G} \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } X(0) = x\} = 1$$

$$2) f(X(t)) - \int_0^t [I_G \circ (Lf)](X(u)) du$$

is a P_x -submartingale for any $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $Jf \geq 0$ on ∂G , and where $X(t)$ denotes the t -th coordinate map on Ω ; also the process $X(t)$ is strong Markov and Feller continuous. Further, there exists a continuous, non-decreasing, non-anticipating process $\xi(t)$ on Ω such that

$$(i) \quad \xi(t) = \int_0^t I_{\partial G}(X(u)) d\xi(u) \quad (3a)$$

and

$$(ii) \quad f(X(t)) - \int_0^t [I_G \circ (Lf)](X(u)) du - \int_0^t Jf(X(u)) d\xi(u) \quad (3b)$$

is a P_x -martingale for every $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We shall call the family $\{P_x : x \in \bar{G}\}$ the diffusion corresponding to (L, J) .

We first prove a theorem which effectively reduces the problem to the case of normal reflection; this theorem may be of independent interest. But, we first need a few lemmas.

Lemma 1. Let $g: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a bounded and continuous function (i.e. image of g is contained in a compact set). Define $g_1: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by $g_1(x) = x + g(x)$.

Then g_1 is onto.

Proof. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be fixed. Define $h_z: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by $h_z(x) = -g(x) + z$. Since range of h_z is contained in a compact set, by Brouwer's fixed point theorem, there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $h_z(x) = x$, i.e. $z = x + g(x)$. This shows that g_1 is onto. \square

Lemma 2. Let Conditions 1 hold. There exists a C^2 -diffeomorphism $T: \bar{G} \rightarrow \bar{G}$, given by $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) = T(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d)$, such that the following hold:

(i) T is identity on ∂G .

(ii) under T^{-1} , $J = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} + \sum_{i=2}^d \gamma_i(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$ is transformed to $\tilde{J} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}$ on ∂G .

(iii) L , given by (1) (in the variables y_1, \dots, y_d), is transformed to a strictly elliptic operator \tilde{L} with bounded coefficients (in the variables z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) under T^{-1} ; and \tilde{L} has a representation like (1).

Proof. By condition (I 1) there exist constants $a_0 > 0$, $M > 0$ such that

$$|a_{ij}(x)| \leq M \quad \text{for all } x \in \bar{G}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d,$$

and

$$a_0 = \inf\{\text{eigenvalues of } a(x) : x \in \bar{G}\}.$$

We first consider the case when there is a constant μ such that

$$|\gamma_j|, \left| \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial x_k} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial^2 \gamma_j}{\partial x_k \partial x_\ell} \right| \leq \mu < \frac{a_0}{8Md^3} \quad (4)$$

For $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$, let $\tilde{x} = (0, x_2, \dots, x_d)$. Note that by (4), for $\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}' \in \partial G$, we have

$$|\gamma(\tilde{x}) - \gamma(\tilde{x}')|^2 \leq (d-1)\mu^2 |\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}'|^2 \quad (5)$$

Let λ be such that $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{2d\mu}$; let ϕ be a smooth function on $(-1, \infty)$ such that ϕ is non-decreasing, $|\phi'| \leq 1$, and $\phi(v) = v$ if $v \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda$, and $\phi(v) = \lambda$ if $v \geq \lambda$.

Define $T: \bar{G} \rightarrow \bar{G}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) &= T(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) \\ &= (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) + \phi(z_1)(0, \gamma_2(\tilde{z}), \dots, \gamma_d(\tilde{z})) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We claim that T is one-to-one; indeed, let $T(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) = T(z'_1, z'_2, \dots, z'_d)$. By (6), it is clear that $z_1 = z'_1$; and hence, $\phi(z_1) = \phi(z'_1)$. Therefore $\tilde{z} + \phi(z_1)\gamma(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{z}' + \phi(z_1)\gamma(\tilde{z}')$. Consequently by (5),

$$|\tilde{z} - \tilde{z}'| = \phi(z_1) |\gamma(\tilde{z}) - \gamma(\tilde{z}')| \leq \lambda \sqrt{d-1} \mu |\tilde{z} - \tilde{z}'| < |\tilde{z} - \tilde{z}'|$$

which is a contradiction unless $\tilde{z} = \tilde{z}'$. Thus T is 1-1. By Lemma 1, T is onto. (Actually T is one-one and onto on every $\{z_1 = \text{constant}\}$). Since $\phi(0) = 0$, it follows that T is identity on ∂G .

Since T is a bijection, from (6), we may write

$$\begin{aligned} (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) &= (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) - \phi(z_1)(0, \gamma_2(\tilde{z}), \dots, \gamma_d(\tilde{z})) \\ &= (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d) - \phi(y_1)(0, \theta_2(y), \dots, \theta_d(y)) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\theta_j(y) = \gamma_j(\tilde{z}(y))$, with \tilde{z} expressed as a function of y .

Since γ_j 's are twice continuously differentiable, by inverse function theorem, it follows that the transformation T is a C^2 -diffeomorphism and its inverse is also a C^2 -diffeomorphism. Thus θ_j 's are twice differentiable as functions of y .

Next, we claim that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial y_p} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d} \mu}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)} \quad (8)$$

To that end, set $\gamma_1 \equiv 0$, $\theta_1 \equiv 0$; $\partial_p \theta = (\frac{\partial \theta_1}{\partial y_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial \theta_d}{\partial y_p})$, $\tilde{\partial}_p \gamma = (\frac{\partial \gamma_1}{\partial z_p}, \dots, \frac{\partial \gamma_d}{\partial z_p})$, for $p = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Here it may be noted that $\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_d$ can be considered functions on \bar{G} by making $\gamma_j(x) = \gamma_j(\tilde{x})$. Let $D_z \gamma$ denote the $(d \times d)$ matrix given by $(D_z \gamma)_{jk} = \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial z_k}$. Then a simple computation shows that

$$[I + \phi(y_1)(D_z \gamma)] \partial_p \theta = \tilde{\partial}_p \gamma \quad (9)$$

where I is the $(d \times d)$ identity matrix. Since $|\phi(y_1) \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial z_k}| \leq \lambda \mu$ and $d\lambda\mu < \frac{1}{2}$, it follows that $[I + \phi(y_1)D_z \gamma]^{-1}$ exists and

$$\| [I + \phi(y_1)D_z \gamma]^{-1} \| \leq \frac{1}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)}.$$

Hence by (4) and (9) we get

$$|\partial_p \theta| \leq \frac{\sqrt{d} \mu}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)}$$

whence (8) follows.

Now for any smooth function g , by (7), we obtain the following:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_1} &= \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_1} + \sum_{j=2}^d [-\phi'(y_1)\theta_j(y) - \phi(y_1) \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial y_1}] \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}, \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_i} &= [1 - \phi(y_1) \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial y_i}] \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_i} + \sum_{j \neq 1, i} [-\phi(y_1) \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial y_i}] \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (10)$$

for $i = 2, \dots, d$. Since $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi'(0) = 1$ and $\theta_j(y) = \gamma_j(\tilde{y})$ on $\{y_1 = 0\}$, it follows from (10) that

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} + \sum_{i=2}^d \gamma_i(\tilde{y}) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \right] \Big|_{y_1=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \Big|_{z_1=0} \quad (11)$$

This establishes conclusion (ii) of the lemma.

Differentiating again, it can be shown that, for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 g(\cdot)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} = \frac{\partial^2 g(\cdot)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} + \sum_{k, \ell=1}^d \delta_{k\ell}^{ij}(\cdot) \frac{\partial^2 g(\cdot)}{\partial z_k \partial z_\ell} + \text{first order terms}, \quad (12)$$

where $\delta_{k\ell}^{ij} = \delta_{\ell k}^{ji}$; since $|\phi| \leq \lambda$, $|\phi'| \leq 1$, $|\theta_j| \leq \mu < 1$, by (4), (8) and the calculations leading to (12), it can be proved that

$$|\delta_{k\ell}^{ij}| \leq \frac{4}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)} \mu \quad (13)$$

Now from (12) we get

$$\sum_{i, j=1}^d a_{ij}(\cdot) \frac{\partial^2 g(\cdot)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(\cdot) \frac{\partial g(\cdot)}{\partial y_i} = \sum_{i, j=1}^d [a_{ij}(\cdot) + \eta_{ij}(\cdot)] \frac{\partial^2 g(\cdot)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} + \text{first order terms} \quad (14)$$

where $\eta_{ij}(\cdot) = \sum_{k, \ell=1}^d a_{ij}(\cdot) \delta_{k\ell}^{ij}(\cdot)$. In view of (13) it is easily seen that

for any $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d)$ in \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\left| \sum_{i,j=1}^d \eta_{ij} \zeta_i \zeta_j \right| \leq \frac{4Md^3}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)} \mu |\zeta|^2 \quad (15)$$

Since $d\lambda\mu < \frac{1}{2}$, we have from (4) and (15),

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^d (a_{ij} + \eta_{ij}) \zeta_i \zeta_j \geq \left[a_0 - \frac{4Md^3}{1 - (d\lambda\mu)} \mu \right] |\zeta|^2 > 0$$

for any $\zeta \neq 0$. It may be noted that there are no terms of the form $q(\cdot)g(\cdot)$ in (12), and hence in (14). Thus \tilde{L} , given by the right-side of (14), is uniformly elliptic (in the variables z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d). This completes the proof in the special case.

In the general case, since $\gamma_j \in C_b^2(\partial G)$, there exists a constant K_1 such that

$$|\gamma_j|, \left| \frac{\partial \gamma_j}{\partial z_k} \right|, \left| \frac{\partial^2 \gamma_j}{\partial z_k \partial z_\ell} \right| \leq K_1.$$

Choose K large enough that $\frac{K_1}{K} < \frac{a_0}{8Md^3}$. Note that the diffusion corresponding to (L, J) is also the diffusion corresponding to $(L, \frac{1}{K}J)$.

Set $\hat{z}_1 = Kz_1$, $\hat{z}_j = z_j$, $j = 2, \dots, d$; $\hat{\gamma}_j(\hat{z}) = \frac{1}{K} \gamma_j(z)$ for $z \in \partial G$. It is then easily seen that the general case is reduced to the previous case with the new ellipticity constant $a_0(K\wedge 1)$; also $\frac{1}{K}J$ in the z -coordinates is transformed to $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}_1} + \sum_{i=2}^d \hat{\gamma}_j(\hat{z}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}_j}$ in the \hat{z} -coordinates. The lemma now follows

in the general case from the special case considered previously. \square

We can now state our first theorem.

Theorem 1. Let Conditions 1 hold; let $L, \tilde{L}, J, \tilde{J}, T$ be as in Lemma 2. Let $\{P_y : y \in \bar{G}\}$ be the diffusion corresponding to (L, J) . Let $\hat{T}: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be defined by $(\hat{T}w)(t) = T(w(t))$. \hat{T} is a homeomorphism on Ω . Set $\hat{P}_z = P_y \hat{T}$, where $y = T(z)$.

Then $\{\tilde{P}_z : z \in \bar{G}\}$ is the diffusion corresponding to (\tilde{L}, \tilde{J}) .

Proof. Let $B_t = \sigma\{X(s) : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ be the natural filtration in Ω . If $E \in B_t$, note that $\hat{T}E, \hat{T}^{-1}E \in B_t$. Let $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\tilde{J}f \geq 0$ on ∂G . Define \bar{f} by setting $\bar{f}(y) = f(T^{-1}y)$. Note that $J\bar{f}(y) = \tilde{J}f(z)$, where $y = T(z)$; consequently $J\bar{f} \geq 0$ on ∂G . Hence

$$\bar{f}(X(t)) - \int_0^t [I_G \cdot (L\bar{f})](X(u)) du$$

is a P_y -submartingale (with respect to B_t).

Note that by Lemma 2

$$[I_G \cdot (\tilde{L}f)](\hat{T}^{-1}X(t, \omega)) = [I_G \cdot (L\bar{f})](X(t, \omega))$$

for all t and all $\omega \in \Omega$. Consequently, an elementary argument involving change of variables yields that

$$f(X(t)) - \int_0^t [I_G \cdot (\tilde{L}f)](X(s)) ds$$

is a \tilde{P}_z -submartingale. This completes the proof. \square

Remark. Let Conditions II hold; in addition, let $\gamma_j \in C_b^2(\partial G)$. Let T be defined as in (6). Since $\phi(0) = 0$, the calculations leading to (12) show that for $2 \leq i, j \leq d$, $\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_1 \partial z_j}$ on ∂G . Consequently, analogues of Lemma 2 and Theorem 1 hold in this case with J given by (2) (in the y -variables) and $\tilde{J} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^d \alpha_{ij}(\cdot) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1 \partial z_j}$. \square

Hereafter, L and J will be as in (1) and (2), that is, in the x -variables.

We need a few lemmas.

Lemma 3. Let Conditions I or II hold; let $\{P_x : x \in \bar{G}\}$ be the diffusion corresponding to (L, J) . Let U be a bounded open set in \bar{G} . Then $\sup_{x \in U} E_x(\eta_U) < \infty$

and $\sup_{x \in U} E_x(\xi(\eta_U)) < \infty$, where ξ is as in (3) and $\eta_U = \inf\{t \geq 0: X(t) \notin U\}$.

Proof. Let $h \in C_b^2(\bar{G})$ be such that $h(x) = e^{qx_1}$ for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ in \bar{U} and q is a suitable positive constant so that $Lh \geq 1$ in \bar{U} . Note that $Jh \geq q > 0$ on $\partial G \cap U$. By (3b) and optional sampling theorem, for every $T > 0$

$$E_x[h(X(\eta_U \wedge T)) - h(X(0))] - \int_0^{\eta_U \wedge T} [L_G \cdot (Lh)](X(u)) du - \int_0^{\eta_U \wedge T} Jh(X(u)) d\xi(u) = 0 \quad (16)$$

for $x \in U$ and $X(0) = x$. Since h is bounded, $Lh \geq 1$ in \bar{U} and $Jh > 0$ on ∂G , by (16) and monotone convergence theorem it follows that $\sup_{x \in U} E_x(\eta_U) < \infty$. Again, since h is bounded, $Jh \geq q > 0$ on $\partial G \cap U$ and $Lh > 0$ in \bar{U} , by (16) and monotone convergence theorem it follows that $\sup_{x \in U} E_x(\xi(\eta_U)) < \infty$. \square

Fix $\zeta \in \bar{G}$. For $x \in \bar{G}$ such that $x \neq \zeta$, define

$$A_\zeta(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}(x) \frac{(x_i - \zeta_i)(x_j - \zeta_j)}{|x - \zeta|^2},$$

$$B(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d a_{ii}(x), \quad C_\zeta(x) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(x)(x_i - \zeta_i).$$

For $r > 0$, define

$$\bar{\beta}_\zeta(r) = \sup_{|x-\zeta|=r} \frac{B(x) - A_\zeta(x) + C_\zeta(x)}{A_\zeta(x)},$$

$$\underline{\beta}_\zeta(r) = \inf_{|x-\zeta|=r} \frac{B(x) - A_\zeta(x) + C_\zeta(x)}{A_\zeta(x)}.$$

Let $c > 0$. Define for $r \geq c$,

$$\bar{T}_{c,\zeta}(r) = \int_c^r \frac{1}{u} \bar{\beta}_\zeta(u) du, \quad \underline{T}_{c,\zeta}(r) = \int_c^r \frac{1}{u} \underline{\beta}_\zeta(u) du,$$

$$\bar{F}_{c,\zeta}(r) = \int_c^r \exp(-\bar{T}_{c,\zeta}(u)) du, \quad \underline{F}_{c,\zeta}(r) = \int_c^r \exp(-\underline{T}_{c,\zeta}(u)) du$$

and let $\bar{f}_{c,\zeta}(x) = \bar{F}_{c,\zeta}(|x - \zeta|)$ and $\underline{f}_{c,\zeta}(x) = \underline{F}_{c,\zeta}(|x - \zeta|)$.

Let H be a real valued twice continuously differentiable function on $(0, \infty)$, and let $h(x) = H(|x - \zeta|)$. Then it is easily seen that for $|x - \zeta| > 0$,

$$2Lh(x) = A_{\zeta}(x)H''(|x - \zeta|) + \frac{H'(|x - \zeta|)}{|x - \zeta|}(B(x) - A_{\zeta}(x) + C_{\zeta}(x)) \quad (17)$$

Lemma 4. Let Conditions I or II hold; let $\zeta \in \bar{G}$ be fixed. Let c and n be fixed real numbers such that $c < n$; let $x \in \bar{G}$ be such that $c < |x - \zeta| < n$; and let $\tau_n = \inf\{t \geq 0: |X(t) - \zeta| = c \text{ or } n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{F_{c, \zeta}(|x - \zeta|)}{F_{c, \zeta}(n)} + \frac{1}{F_{c, \zeta}(n)} E_x \left[\int_0^{\tau_n} J \underline{f}_{c, \zeta}(X(u)) d\xi(u) \right] \\ & \leq P_x(\tau_{\partial B(\zeta; n)} < \tau_{\partial B(\zeta; c)}) \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{F}_{c, \zeta}(|x - \zeta|)}{\bar{F}_{c, \zeta}(n)} + \frac{1}{\bar{F}_{c, \zeta}(n)} E_x \left[\int_0^{\tau_n} J \bar{f}_{c, \zeta}(X(u)) d\xi(u) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where for a closed set K in \bar{G} , $\tau_K = \inf\{t \geq 0: X(t) \in K\}$.

Proof. Note that, by Lemma 3, $\tau_n < \infty$ a.s. P_x . We apply (3b) to the functions $\underline{f}_{c, \zeta}$ and $\bar{f}_{c, \zeta}$ and proceed as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 in Bhattacharya and Ramasubramanian (1982); finally an application of the optional sampling theorem yields the lemma. We omit the details. \square

Remark. Suppose L transforms smooth radial functions into smooth radial functions. Further, let $J = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$. Also, let $\zeta = 0$ for simplicity. Then $A_0(x)$ and $B(x) + C_0(x)$ are easily seen to be radial functions; consequently $\bar{\beta} \equiv \underline{\beta}$. Also $J\bar{f} \equiv J\underline{f} \equiv 0$ on ∂G . Hence (18) becomes

$$\frac{F_{c, 0}(|x|)}{F_{c, 0}(n)} = P_x(\tau_{\partial B(0; n)} < \tau_{\partial B(0; c)}) = \frac{\bar{F}_{c, 0}(|x|)}{\bar{F}_{c, 0}(n)} \quad (19)$$

Since L transforms radial functions into radial functions, by (17), it can be seen that solving $Lh(x) = 0$ in $c < |x| < n$ is reduced to solving a (one-dimensional) second order ordinary differential equation in the interval (c, n) .

The latter can be done easily, and (19) thus gives the solution to the problem:

$$Lh(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } c < |x| < n, \quad Jh(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \partial G,$$

$$h(x) = 1 \quad \text{for } |x| = n, \quad h(x) = 0 \quad \text{for } |x| = c.$$

In the general case, for $\zeta \in \partial G$, $P_x(\tau_{\partial B(\zeta:n)} < \tau_{\partial B(\zeta:c)})$ is bounded above and below by similar radial functions (which are harmonic for an elliptic operator which transforms radial functions into radial functions), plus correction terms depending essentially on the boundary conditions. (cf. see [1] and [2]).

We are now in a position to prove our main theorem.

Theorem 2. Let Conditions I or II hold, and let $\zeta \in \partial G$. Then for any $n > 0$ and any x such that $0 < |x - \zeta| \leq n$,

$$\lim_{c \downarrow 0} P_x(\tau_{\partial B(\zeta:n)} < \tau_{\partial B(\zeta:c)}) = 1 \quad (20)$$

Consequently, the diffusion does not hit a point on the boundary specified in advance.

Proof. (i) Let Conditions I hold. In view of Theorem 1 it is sufficient to consider the case $J = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$. In such a case note that $Jf_{-c, \zeta} \equiv 0$ on ∂G . Then, as

$$\frac{F_{-c, \zeta}(|x - \zeta|)}{F_{-c, \zeta}(n)} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } c \downarrow 0 \quad \text{for any } n > 0 \text{ and any } 0 < |x - \zeta| \leq n, \quad (20) \text{ follows}$$

from (18).

(ii) Let Conditions II hold. Let $x \in \bar{G}$ be fixed and $x \neq \zeta$. Let $n > 0$ be fixed. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Choose $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{F_{\underline{c}, \zeta}(|x - \zeta|)}{F_{\underline{c}, \zeta}(n)} > (1 - \epsilon) \quad (21)$$

Note that constants Γ_j , $j = 2, \dots, d$ can be chosen so that

$$\hat{J}_{\underline{c}, \zeta} f(y) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } c \leq |y - \zeta| \leq n, \quad y \in \partial G, \quad (22)$$

where

$$\hat{J} = J + \sum_{i,j=2}^d \tilde{\sigma}_{ij}(\cdot) \Gamma_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$$

Let Q_x^c be the diffusion corresponding to (L, \hat{J}) , starting at x . Note that, by a Girsanov-type theorem (p. 468 and p. 453 of Nakao and Shiga (1972)),

$$\psi_{c,t} \equiv \frac{dQ_x^c}{dP_x} \Big|_{\mathcal{B}_t} = \exp\left\{ \sum_{j=2}^d \Gamma_j B_j(\xi(t)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^d \Gamma_j^2 \xi(t) \right\},$$

where $(B_2(s), \dots, B_d(s))$ is a $(d-1)$ dimensional P_x -Brownian motion independent of $\xi(t)$.

Write $\Lambda = \{\tau_{\partial B(\zeta;n)} < \tau_{\partial B(\zeta;c)}\}$ and $\Lambda_t = \{(\tau_{\partial B(\zeta;n)} \wedge t) < (\tau_{\partial B(\zeta;c)} \wedge t)\}$. By (18), (21), (22) applied to the (L, \hat{J}) -diffusion, we get

$$Q_x^c(\Lambda) > (1 - \epsilon)$$

Consequently, $Q_x^c(\Lambda_t) > (1 - \epsilon)$; and hence

$$\int_{\Lambda_t} \psi_{c,t} dP_x > (1 - \epsilon) \quad (23)$$

Note that $P_x(\psi_{c,t} > 1) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Hence (23) implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P_x(\Lambda_t) > (1 - \epsilon)$. Thus $P_x(\Lambda) > (1 - \epsilon)$, whence (20) follows. This completes the proof. \square

We now give two applications.

Corollary 5. Let Conditions I or II hold. Let D be a bounded open set in \bar{G} satisfying an exterior cone condition (in \bar{G}) and such that $\partial D \cap \partial G$ is a finite set. Let $\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0: X(t) \notin D\}$. Then τ is continuous P_x -a.s. for any $x \in D$.

Proof. Set $\tau' = \inf\{t \geq 0: X(t) \notin \bar{D}\}$. It can be seen that τ is upper semi-continuous and that τ' is lower semicontinuous. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that $P_x(\tau = \tau') = 1$. Since, by Theorem 2, $P_x(X(\tau) \in \partial G) = 0$, it is sufficient to prove that $P_y(\tau' > 0) = 0$ for any $y \in \partial D$, $y \notin \partial G$. Because of the 0-1 law, it is sufficient to prove that $P_y(\tau' > 0) \neq 1$ for any $y \in \partial D$, $y \notin \partial G$. This now follows from the exterior cone condition and the support theorem of Stroock and Varadhan (1979, Exercise 6.7.5). \square

Corollary 6. Let Conditions I or II hold; let $\rho \equiv 0$. Let D and τ be as in the preceding lemma. Let f, g, h be bounded and continuous functions respectively on $D, \partial D, \partial G$. Then

$$u(x) = E_x[g(X(\tau)) - \int_0^\tau f(X(s))ds - \int_0^\tau h(X(s))d\xi(s)]$$

is continuous on D .

Proof. In view of Lemma 3, note that u is well defined and bounded. By the preceding corollary and Feller continuity, the corollary follows. \square

Remark. Note that u defined as in the preceding corollary is the unique solution to the boundary value problem:

$$Lu = f \text{ on } D, \quad u = g \text{ on } \partial D, \quad Ju = h \text{ on } \partial G;$$

that is,

$$u(X(t \wedge \tau)) - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} f(X(s))ds - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} h(X(s))d\xi(s)$$

is a P_x -martingale, and $u = g$ on ∂D . If D is as before and is connected, $f \geq 0$ in D and if $u(x) = 0$ for some $x \in D$, $x \notin \partial G$, then by the preceding corollary and Lemma 2.3 of Bhattacharya (1978) it follows that $u \equiv 0$ in \bar{D} .

Acknowledgment. The author wishes to thank Dr. P. Jothilingam for a useful discussion. Thanks are also due to a referee for valuable suggestions for improvement.

References.

1. Bhattacharya, R.N. (1978): Criteria for recurrence and existence of invariant measures for multidimensional diffusions. Ann. Prob., Vol. 6. (1978) 541-553.
2. Bhattacharya, R.N. and Ramasubramanian, S. (1982): Recurrence and ergodicity of diffusions. J. Multivariate Anal. 12 (1982) 95-122.
3. El Karoui, N. (1975): Processus de reflexion dans R^n . Seminaire de Probabilites. IX. Universite de Strasbourg. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. No. 465. pp. 534-554. Springer-Verlag.
4. McKean, H.P., Jr. (1969): Stochastic Integrals. Academic Press, N.Y.
5. Nakao, S. (1972): On the existence of solutions of stochastic differential equations with boundary conditions. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 12 (1972) 151-178.
6. Nakao, S. and Shiga, T. (1972): On the uniqueness of solutions of stochastic differential equations with boundary conditions. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 12 (1972) 451-478.
7. Stroock, D.W. and Varadhan, S.R.S. (1971): Diffusion processes with boundary conditions. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 24 (1971) 147-225.
8. Stroock, D.W. and Varadhan, S.R.S. (1979): Multidimensional Diffusion Processes. Springer-Verlag, N.Y.
9. Watanabe, S. (1971): On stochastic differential equations for multi-dimensional diffusion processes with boundary conditions. I, II. J. Math Kyoto Univ. 11 (1971) 169-180, 545-551.

END

FILMED

10-85

DTIC