

SHORT-TIME ASYMPTOTICS OF ONE-DIMENSIONAL HARRIS FLOWS

ALEXANDER SHAMOV

ABSTRACT. We study the short-time asymptotical behavior of stochastic flows on \mathbb{R} in the sup-norm. The results are stated in terms of a Gaussian process associated with the covariation of the flow. In case the Gaussian process has a continuous version the two processes can be coupled in such a way that the difference is uniformly $o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$. In case it has no continuous version, an $O(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$ estimate is obtained under mild regularity assumptions. The main tools are Gaussian measure concentration and a martingale version of the Slepian comparison principle.

1. Introduction

In this paper we investigate the asymptotical behavior of the point motion of one-dimensional stochastic flows. The term “stochastic flow” means a family of random maps $(X_{s,t}(\cdot))_{s \leq t}$ that satisfies the flow property $X_{t,r} \circ X_{s,t} = X_{s,r}$ and has independent values on disjoint intervals. What we call the point motion is the family of maps $X_{0,t}$, which we denote by $X(\cdot, t)$. We consider only flows of monotone maps from \mathbb{R} to itself.

The basic example of a stochastic flow is a solution of an SDE regarded as a function of the initial point. Flows of this kind are known to exist for SDEs with Lipschitz coefficients, and in this case the maps $X(\cdot, t)$ are homeomorphisms or even diffeomorphisms [7]. On the other hand, there are also examples of flows of discontinuous maps [2], the Arratia flow [1] being historically the first of them and perhaps one of the most important. The point motion of the Arratia flow is a two-parametric process $(X(u, t))_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0}$ such that for each u the process $X(u, \cdot)$ is a Brownian martingale with the following properties:

- (1) $X(u, 0) = u$
- (2) $\frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t), X(v, t) \rangle = \mathbf{1} \{X(u, t) = X(v, t)\}$
- (3) $X(u, t) \leq X(v, t)$ for all $u \leq v$.

Roughly speaking, the Arratia flow consists of Brownian “particles” that evolve independently until they meet, and coalesce thereafter (Fig. 1). It is known that the $X(\cdot, t)$ -image of any bounded subset of \mathbb{R} is finite for any positive t due to coalescence [3].

Received 2010-10-21; Communicated by A. Dorogovtsev.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60G17; Secondary 60G44.

Key words and phrases. Stochastic flows, law of iterated logarithm, Slepian comparison.

This research is supported by the State fund for fundamental researches of Ukraine and the Russian foundation for basic research, F40.1/023.




FIGURE 1. Point motion of the Arratia flow.

More generally, one can consider so-called Harris flows, defined the same way except that its “infinitesimal covariation function” may be an arbitrary real positive definite function:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t), X(v, t) \rangle = \varphi(X(u, t) - X(v, t))$$

(Definition 2.1). We assume that $\varphi(0) = 1$ for convenience. Furthermore, we assume that $|\varphi(x)| < 1$ for $x \neq 0$, which excludes a possibility for periodic flows, regarded more naturally as flows on the circle. However, taking them into account would lead to no serious complications.

We study the asymptotical behavior of

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |X(u, t) - u| \tag{1.1}$$

for small t . The main approach is to compare $X(u, t)$ to a family of Gaussian martingales ($Y(u, t)$) which we call a “tangent process”, defined by the following properties:

$$Y(u, 0) = u,$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t), Y(v, t) \rangle = \varphi(X(u, t) - v),$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle Y(u, t), Y(v, t) \rangle = \varphi(u - v).$$

Note that if φ is continuous, then for any fixed u the quadratic variation of $X(u, \cdot) - Y(u, \cdot)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t) - Y(u, t) \rangle|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Since $X(u, t) - Y(u, t)$ is a time-changed Brownian motion [6], one can easily deduce from the law of iterated logarithm that $|X(u, t) - Y(u, t)| = o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. It turns out that if Y has a modification that is continuous w.r.t. both variables then this holds uniformly in u . Namely,

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |X(u, t) - Y(u, t)| = o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}}).$$

Together with the law of iterated logarithm for the Gaussian process Y this yields

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |X(u, t) - u|}{\sqrt{2t \ln \ln t^{-1}}} = 1.$$

In Section 5 we consider the case when the “tangent process” has no continuous modification, which may happen if the covariation function is not smooth enough at zero. In this case we compare X and Y in distribution and obtain the following result:

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |X(u, t) - u| - \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq k < t^{-1/2}} |Y(kt^{1/2}, t) - kt^{1/2}| = O(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}}).$$

The main tool used there is a martingale version of the Slepian comparison inequality, well-known in the theory of Gaussian processes [10]. The comparison inequality is stated and proved in Appendix (Theorem 6.2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give basic definitions and state an existence theorem for Harris flows. In Section 3 we give a universal $O(\sqrt{t \ln t^{-1}})$ upper bound of (1.1) for monotone families of Brownian motions, which is used later. In Sections 4 and 5 we prove our main results for the flows with continuous and discontinuous tangent processes, respectively. In Appendix we prove the martingale comparison theorem and give a convenient formulation of a classical result concerning concentration of measure that is needed in Section 5.

2. An Existence Result

Definition 2.1. The point motion of a *Harris flow* is a family $(X(u, t))_{u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0}$ of continuous martingales adapted to a common filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) , satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) For each u $X(u, \cdot)$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -Brownian motion starting at u .
- (2) For each u, v the joint covariation of $(X(u, \cdot))$ and $(X(v, \cdot))$ is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t), X(v, t) \rangle = \varphi(X(u, t) - X(v, t)),$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is quadratic covariation, and φ is a positive definite function.

- (3) $(X(\cdot, t))$ is monotone in u for each t , and φ is aperiodic.

Remark 2.2. Note that condition 3 makes the Brownian motions coalesce once they hit each other. That is,

$$\forall t \geq \inf \{s \mid X(u, s) = X(v, s)\} : X(u, t) = X(v, t).$$

Remark 2.3. Once and for all, by X we denote a modification that is separable and continuous in t for each u .

The following existence result is given in [5].

Theorem 2.4. *The Harris flow exists provided that φ is Lipschitz outside each interval $(-c, c)$ and its spectral distribution is not of pure jump type.*

In the sequel we will need not only X itself, but also a Gaussian process $(Y(u, t))$ starting at u with joint covariation given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle Y(u, t), Y(v, t) \rangle &= \varphi(u - v), \\ \frac{d}{dt} \langle X(u, t), Y(v, t) \rangle &= \varphi(X(u, t) - v). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The joint covariation is positive definite, hence (X, Y) exists, possibly on an extended filtered probability space. However, it is not unique, since the construction involves additional randomization.

3. An Upper Bound

An important special case of a Harris flow is the Arratia flow (Fig. 1). Its covariation function φ is given by $\varphi(0) = 1$ and $\varphi = 0$ elsewhere. Thus the “particles” $X(u, \cdot)$ move independently until they coalesce. It follows from our results (Theorem 5.1) that the point motion of the Arratia flow has the following asymptotics in the sup-norm:

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |X(u, t) - u| \sim \sqrt{t \ln t^{-1}}, t \rightarrow 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Now we will see that the Arratia flow is in some sense the “extreme case”. Namely, for any Harris flow (and in fact for any monotone family of Brownian motions) an inequality in (3.1) holds.

Theorem 3.1. *For any Harris flow X with $\varphi(0) = 1$ one has*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{|X(u, t) - u|}{\sqrt{t \ln t^{-1}}} \leq 1.$$

Proof. First let’s prove the inequality for an increasing number of points $u_{nk} = kt_n^{1/2}$, where $t_n = q^n, 0 < q < 1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_n \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq k \leq t_n^{-1/2}} \sup_{s \leq t_n} |X(u_{nk}, s) - u_{nk}| \geq \sqrt{(1 + \varepsilon) t_n \ln t_n^{-1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_n \left[t_n^{-1/2} \right] \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{s \leq t_n} |X(u_{n0}, s) - u_{n0}| \geq \sqrt{(1 + \varepsilon) t_n \ln t_n^{-1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \text{const} \times \sum_n t_n^{-1/2} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} (1 + \varepsilon) \ln t_n^{-1} \right] \\ &= \text{const} \times \sum_n q^{n\varepsilon/2} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \sup_{s \leq t_n} \frac{|X(u_{nk}, s) - u_{nk}|}{\sqrt{t_n \ln t_n^{-1}}} \leq 1.$$

Now let u be an arbitrary point from $[0, 1]$, and let k be such that $u_{nk} \leq u \leq u_{n,k+1}$ for a fixed t_n . Using the monotonicity property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |X(u, s) - u| &\leq |X(u_{nk}, s) - u| \vee |X(u_{n,k+1}, s) - u| \\ &\leq |X(u_{nk}, s) - u_{nk}| \vee |X(u_{n,k+1}, s) - u_{n,k+1}| + \sqrt{t_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \sup_{s \leq t_n} \frac{|X(u, s) - u|}{\sqrt{t_n \ln t_n^{-1}}} \leq 1.$$

Now by taking q close enough to 1 we prove the statement. Namely, let q be such that $\sqrt{q^n \ln q^{-n}} \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \sqrt{q^{n+1} \ln q^{-n-1}}$ for sufficiently large n . Then since $\sqrt{t \ln t^{-1}}$ is monotone for small t , we obtain

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{|X(u, t) - u|}{\sqrt{t \ln t^{-1}}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \frac{|X(u, t) - u|}{\sqrt{t_n \ln t_n^{-1}}} \leq 1 + \varepsilon,$$

where $t_n = q^n$ is such that $q^{n+1} \leq t \leq q^n$. □

4. The Continuous Case

In this paper we estimate the asymptotics of X by comparing it to the process which we denote Y , defined by (2.1). It is a Gaussian process, stationary in $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and also a Brownian motion in t . In this section we consider the case when it has a continuous modification. Note that continuity w.r.t. both variables follows easily from continuity of $Y(\cdot, 1)$. Indeed, when restricted to $u \in [0, 1]$ the process becomes a $C[0, 1]$ -valued Brownian motion for which Kolmogorov's continuity criterion is applicable.

A well-known result of the theory of Gaussian processes states that a stationary Gaussian process has a continuous (or, equivalently, bounded) modification iff its Dudley integral converges [10]. In our case this is equivalent to

$$\int_{0+} |\ln \lambda \{x \mid \varphi(x) \geq 1 - u^2\}|^{1/2} du < \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. Note that continuity of Y does not imply continuity of X ¹. Nevertheless, the following result shows that X is close to Y in the sup-norm.

Theorem 4.1. *Assuming that Y has a continuous modification,*

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |X(u, t) - Y(u, t)| = o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}}).$$

¹ Actually, X is either coalescing or continuous [12], depending on whether

$$\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{x dx}{1 - \varphi(x)}$$

is finite. Thus $\varphi(x) = e^{-|x|^\alpha}$, $0 < \alpha < 2$ provides an example when Y is continuous but X is not.

Proof. Take a function $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that is monotone, continuous, satisfying $\alpha(0) = 0$ and

$$\|Y(\cdot, 1)\|_\alpha := \sup_{0 \leq u < v \leq 1} \frac{|Y(u, 1) - Y(v, 1)|}{\alpha(|u - v|)} < \infty, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.2)$$

Its existence may be easily deduced from the fact that the distribution of $Y(\cdot, 1)$ is supported by a σ -compact subspace of $C[0, 1]$. Let t_n be q^n for some $0 < q < 1$, and let's consider $[\ln n]$ points² $u_{nk} := k/\ln n$. For Y to have a continuous modification, φ must be continuous at zero. Theorem 3.1 implies that the quadratic variation of $X(u, \cdot) - Y(u, \cdot)$ is $o(t)$ uniformly in u :

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) &:= \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} \langle X(u, t) - Y(u, t) \rangle \\ &= 2 \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} \int_0^t (1 - \varphi(X(u, s) - u)) ds = o(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

This implies that $|X(u, t) - Y(u, t)|$ must be $o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$ for each u , and moreover, uniformly in $u = u_{nk}$, since there are “not too many” of them. More precisely, let τ be $\inf\{t \mid V(t) > \varepsilon t\}$. One-dimensional continuous martingales are time-changed Brownian motions [6], hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_n \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq k < 1/\ln n} \sup_{s \leq t_n} |X(u_{nk}, s \wedge \tau) - Y(u_{nk}, s \wedge \tau)| \geq \sqrt{3\varepsilon t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \text{const} \times \sum_n \ln n \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \cdot 3 \ln \ln t_n^{-1} \right] \\ &\leq \text{const} \times \sum_n \ln n \cdot (\ln t_n^{-1})^{-3/2} \\ &= \text{const} \times \sum_n \frac{\ln n}{n^{3/2}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By letting ε small enough we obtain

$$\sup_k \sup_{s \leq t_n} |X(u_{nk}, s) - Y(u_{nk}, s)| = o(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}).$$

Note that points $u \in [0, 1]$ other than u_{nk} may be treated as follows. Let k be such that $u_{nk} \leq u \leq u_{n, k+1}$. Then for $s \leq t_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|X(u, s) - Y(u, s)| \\ &\leq 2|Y(u_{nk}, s) - X(u_{nk}, s)| + |Y(u_{n, k+1}, s) - X(u_{n, k+1}, s)| \\ &\quad + |Y(u_{n, k+1}, s) - Y(u_{nk}, s)| + |Y(u, s) - Y(u_{nk}, s)|. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

The first two terms in (4.4) are already shown to be uniformly $o(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}})$. The last two terms are actually $O(\alpha(u_{n, k+1} - u_{nk}) \sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}})$ uniformly in k and $s \leq t_n$. This follows from the concentration principle for the α -seminorm in

² We use $[\cdot]$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ to denote the lower and upper integral part, respectively.

(4.2), which is in fact valid for any Lipschitz function of a Gaussian random vector (see Theorem 6.5 in Appendix). More precisely, the following inequality holds:

$$P \{ \|Y(\cdot, t)\|_\alpha \geq E \|Y(\cdot, t)\|_\alpha + C \} \leq e^{-C^2/2\sigma^2 t}.$$

for some σ and any positive C . Together with the fact that $E \|Y(\cdot, t)\|_\alpha$ is finite and evidently $O(\sqrt{t})$ this yields

$$\|Y(\cdot, t_n)\|_\alpha = O(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \leq t_n} |X(u, s) - Y(u, s)| &\leq o(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}) + \alpha (1/\ln t_n) \|Y(\cdot, t_n)\|_\alpha \\ &= o(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

The case $t \neq t_n$ is handled the same way as in Theorem 3.1 by letting $q \rightarrow 1$. \square

Though there are cases when the “tangent process” is discontinuous and nevertheless the difference $X - Y$ is small enough³, it seems that this is not the case in general. That’s why in the sequel we do not estimate the difference but rather compare the tail probabilities of X with those of Y . In this way we estimate $\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |X(u, t) - u|$ up to an $O(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$ term, which is slightly weaker than the $o(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$ in Theorem 4.1.

5. Tail Comparison

In this section we impose no regularity assumptions on the “tangent process” except local monotonicity of the covariation function. Basically, we use the same approach as in Theorems 3.1 and 4.1. Namely, we start by estimating the deviation of an increasing number of points u_{nk} , and then use the monotonicity property of the flow to handle the points other than u_{nk} . It turns out that $t_n^{-1/2}$ points $u_{nk} = kt_n^{1/2}$ give the right asymptotics up to an $O(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}})$ term.

First of all, let’s consider the tail probabilities of a Gaussian process. It is known that the probability distribution of the supremum of a Gaussian process is concentrated around its mean at least as strongly as a single Gaussian r.v. is (see Theorem 6.5 in Appendix). That is, if M is a centered Gaussian vector in \mathbb{R}^d , then

$$P \left\{ \left| \sup_i M^i - E \sup_i M^i \right| \geq x \right\} \leq C e^{-x^2/2\sigma^2}. \tag{5.1}$$

for some absolute constant C and any $x \geq 0$, σ^2 being $\sup_i E (M^i)^2$. From this concentration inequality it is easy to deduce a law of iterated logarithm of the following kind:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}| - E \sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}|}{\sqrt{2t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}} \leq 1.$$

³ We mean not the supremum over $u \in [0, 1]$, which is of course infinite, but rather the supremum over an increasing number of points, as considered in Section 5.

If Y is continuous, then $\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}| \sim \text{const} \times t_n^{1/2}$. In our case, though, the process may be discontinuous, and $\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}|$ may be asymptotically greater than $\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}$. Actually, for the Arratia flow Y consists of independent Brownian motions⁴, and in this case

$$\sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}| \sim \mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}| \sim \sqrt{t_n \ln t_n^{-1}}.$$

We do not know whether a concentration inequality similar to (5.1) holds for $\sup_u |X(u, t) - u|$. Nevertheless, we show that $\sup_u |X(u, t) - u|$ is deterministic up to $O(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}})$:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that φ is monotone on $[0, \delta]$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |X(u, t) - u| = E(t) + O(\sqrt{t \ln \ln t^{-1}}), \quad t \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.}, \quad (5.2)$$

with $E(t)$ being defined by

$$E(t) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq k < t^{-1/2}} |Y(kt^{1/2}, t) - kt^{1/2}|.$$

Proof. In the proof we assume that φ is monotone on $(0, \infty)$. If φ is only locally monotone, the result is obtained for sufficiently small intervals instead of $[0, 1]$.

First let's prove the upper bound. As usual, take $t_n = q^n$ and $u_{nk} = kt_n^{1/2}$. We are going to apply the comparison inequality (Theorem 6.2, see also Remark 6.4) to $X(u_{nk}, t) - u_{nk}$ and $Y(u_{nk}, t) - u_{nk}$. Therefore we need a deterministic lower bound on the infinitesimal covariation of the martingale $(X(u_{nk}, t) - u_{nk})$. If φ is monotone on $[0, \infty)$, it is sufficient to obtain a deterministic upper bound on $\sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t) - u_{nk}|$. So we stop the martingale once the deviation gets too large. To be precise, let's consider the following optional times:

$$\tau_n := \inf \left\{ t \mid \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |X(u, t) - u| \geq 2\sqrt{t_n \ln t_n^{-1}} \right\}.$$

Theorem 3.1 implies that a.s. $\tau_n \geq t_n$ for sufficiently large n . Take $\tilde{u}_{nk} := 2\lceil \sqrt{\ln t_n^{-1}} \rceil u_{nk}$. If φ is monotone on $[0, \infty)$, then the $2\lceil t_n^{-1/2} \rceil$ -dimensional martingales $\pm(X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk})$ and $\pm(Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t) - \tilde{u}_{nk})$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 6.2. We use the submodular function

$$f(M) := \exp \lambda \sup_i M^i, \quad \lambda \geq 0.$$

(see Remark 6.3). The comparison theorem yields

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t_n \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}| \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}|$$

⁴ We do not care about separability since in this section we use the distribution of Y of finite or countable dimension only.

for any $\lambda \geq 0$. Since $\sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}|$ is a submartingale, the well-known (sub)martingale inequalities [6] imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}| \\ & \leq \text{const} \times \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

(const does not depend on λ). The right-hand term may be estimated by means of the concentration inequality (Theorem 6.5):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}| \\ & \leq \exp \left[\lambda \mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}| + t_n \lambda^2 / 2 \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

What remains is to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}| = E(t_n) + O(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}),$$

that is, to compare $\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(Nu_{nk}, t_n) - Nu_{nk}|$ and $\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(u_{nk}, t_n) - u_{nk}|$, N being equal to $2 \lceil \sqrt{\ln t_n^{-1}} \rceil$. The following inequality is trivial:

$$\sup_{0 \leq k < t_n^{-1/2}} |Y(Nu_{nk}, t_n) - Nu_{nk}| \leq \sup_{0 \leq m < N} S_m,$$

where

$$S_m := \sup_{0 \leq k < t_n^{-1/2}} \left| Y\left(u_{nk} + mt_n^{1/2}, t_n\right) - u_{nk} - mt_n^{1/2} \right|.$$

Note that S_m are identically distributed, and also sub-Gaussian due to the concentration inequality. That is,

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \lambda S_m \leq \exp(\lambda \mathbb{E} S_m + t_n \lambda^2 / 2).$$

What follows is a classical argument that gives an upper bound for the expectation of supremum of sub-Gaussian variables [10].

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_m S_m & \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda \sup_m S_m \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln \sum_m \mathbb{E} \exp \lambda S_m \\ & \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \ln (N \exp(\lambda \mathbb{E} S_m + t_n \lambda^2 / 2)) \\ & = \inf_{\lambda > 0} \left(\mathbb{E} S_m + t_n \lambda / 2 + \frac{\ln N}{\lambda} \right) \\ & = \mathbb{E} S_m + \sqrt{2 t_n \ln N}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $N \asymp \sqrt{\ln t_n^{-1/2}}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_k |Y(\tilde{u}_{nk}, t_n) - \tilde{u}_{nk}| \leq E(t_n) + O(\sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}}). \tag{5.5}$$

By combining (5.3), (5.4) and (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \exp \lambda \sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}| \\ & \leq \text{const} \times \exp \left[\lambda \left(E(t_n) + \text{const} \times \sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}} \right) + t_n \lambda^2 / 2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now to estimate the tail probability we may use the Chernoff bound [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}| \geq C + E(t_n) + \text{const} \times \sqrt{t_n \ln \ln t_n^{-1}} \right\} \\ & \leq \text{const} \times \inf_{\lambda} e^{-\lambda C + t_n \lambda^2 / 2} = \text{const} \times e^{-C^2 / 2t_n}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the upper bound in the law of iterated logarithm for

$$\sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t \wedge \tau_n) - u_{nk}| - E(t_n),$$

and since $\tau_n \geq t_n$ for n sufficiently large, the same for

$$\sup_{t \leq t_n} \sup_k |X(u_{nk}, t) - u_{nk}| - E(t_n).$$

The remaining steps are routine.

The lower bound in (5.2) is obtained along the same way. The difference is that now we exchange u_{nk} and \tilde{u}_{nk} to get a bound on the infinitesimal covariation from above. □

6. Appendix: Comparison and Concentration

The classical comparison inequality due to Slepian says that if (M^i) and (N^i) are centered Gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d with $\mathbf{E} |M^i|^2 = \mathbf{E} |N^i|^2$ and $\mathbf{E} M^i M^j \geq \mathbf{E} N^i N^j$, then $\max_i N^i$ stochastically dominates $\max_i M^i$ [10]. For our purpose we need a generalization involving martingales⁵ compared by quadratic covariation instead of Gaussian vectors compared by covariance.

We start with a martingale version of the lemma that is used to derive comparison inequalities for Gaussian vectors [10].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(M(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a continuous \mathbb{R}^d -valued martingale and $(N(t))$ be a continuous \mathbb{R}^d -valued Gaussian martingale, both with absolutely continuous quadratic variation and satisfying $M(0) = N(0) = 0$. Assume that N is independent of M . Then for any C^2 -smooth function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with second derivatives of at most exponential growth⁶ the following equality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} f(M(1)) - \mathbf{E} f(N(1)) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{E} \partial_{ij} f(M(t) + N(1) - N(t)) \left(K_M^{ij}(t) - K_N^{ij}(t) \right) dt, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $K_M^{ij}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \langle M^i(t), M^j(t) \rangle$ and $K_N^{ij}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \langle N^i(t), N^j(t) \rangle$.

⁵ Indeed a martingale and a Gaussian martingale.

⁶ That is, $\partial_{ij} f(x) = O(\exp \lambda \|x\|)$ for some λ . Of course, there must be more natural growth conditions.

Proof. Let's denote $N(1) - N(1-t)$ by $\tilde{N}(t)$. Since N is a Gaussian martingale, \tilde{N} is a Gaussian martingale as well. We may assume that M and \tilde{N} are adapted to independent filtrations (\mathcal{F}_t) and (\mathcal{G}_t) , respectively. Consider a two-parametric process

$$F(t, s) := f\left(M(t) + \tilde{N}(s)\right).$$

Using It's formula w.r.t. t and s separately and taking expectations, we obtain⁷:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbb{E}F(t, s) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \partial_{ij} f\left(M(t) + \tilde{N}(s)\right) K_M^{ij}(t), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{E}F(t, s) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \partial_{ij} f\left(M(t) + \tilde{N}(s)\right) K_N^{ij}(1-s). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbb{E}F(t, 1-t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \partial_{ij} f\left(M(t) + \tilde{N}(1-t)\right) \left(K_M^{ij}(t) - K_N^{ij}(t)\right).$$

Finally, by integrating over $t \in [0, 1]$ we finish the proof. \square

Now suppose that we are given an inequality between K_M^{ij} and K_N^{ij} . It is then clear that by means of Lemma 6.1 we may obtain an inequality between $\mathbb{E}f(M(1))$ and $\mathbb{E}f(N(1))$ for an appropriate class of functions.

Theorem 6.2 (Martingale comparison). *Let M and N be a martingale and a Gaussian martingale with absolutely continuous quadratic variation, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function of at most exponential growth. Assume that the following inequalities hold⁸:*

$$\begin{aligned} K_M^{ii} + K_M^{jj} - 2K_M^{ij} &\leq K_N^{ii} + K_N^{jj} - 2K_N^{ij}, \quad i \neq j, \\ K_M^{ii} &\leq K_N^{ii}, \\ \partial_{ij} f &\leq 0, \quad i \neq j. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Furthermore, assume that either one of the following additional conditions is fulfilled:

(1)

$$K_M^{ii} = K_N^{ii}$$

(2)

$$\sum_j \partial_{ij} f \geq 0 \text{ for each } i \tag{6.3}$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}f(M(1)) \leq \mathbb{E}f(N(1)).$$

⁷ Note that since (\mathcal{F}_t) and (\mathcal{G}_s) are independent, by fixing one parameter we obtain (conditionally) a semimartingale w.r.t. the other one. Thus one-parametric stochastic calculus is applicable.

⁸ Derivatives of f are understood in the sense of Schwartz distributions.

Proof. Assume that the second derivatives of f are continuous and of at most exponential growth. Then by Lemma 6.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}f(M(1)) - \mathbb{E}f(N(1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \partial_{ij} f(M(t) + N(1) - N(t)) (K_M^{ij} - K_N^{ij}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in order to use Lemma 6.1 we assume that M and N are independent. If they are not, we may replace N by an independent process with the same distribution.

Next we rewrite the right-hand side in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j} \partial_{ij} f \cdot (K_M^{ij} - K_N^{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{i < j} \partial_{ij} f \cdot \left[(2K_M^{ij} - K_M^{ii} - K_M^{jj}) - (2K_N^{ij} - K_N^{ii} - K_N^{jj}) \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_i \left(\sum_j \partial_{ij} f \right) (K_M^{ii} - K_N^{ii}). \end{aligned}$$

The conditions imposed upon f and $K_M - K_N$ ensure that each term is negative.

The case when f is not smooth enough may be treated by means of an approximation argument. Namely, let $\varphi_\varepsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ be a nonnegative function supported on $\{\|x\| \leq \varepsilon\}$, such that $\int \varphi_\varepsilon dx = 1$. Then $f * \varphi_\varepsilon$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 6.1, and $f * \varphi_\varepsilon$ converges to f in L^1 over any sub-Gaussian measure due to the growth condition. \square

Remark 6.3. The basic condition (6.2) is referred to as submodularity or L -subadditivity. It is known to be equivalent to the following inequality that involves only the lattice structure:

$$f(x \wedge y) + f(x \vee y) \leq f(x) + f(y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Here $x \wedge y$ and $x \vee y$ are coordinatewise minimum and maximum, respectively. Examples of submodular functions include $f(x^1, \dots, x^d) = \varphi(\max_i x^i)$ for any increasing function φ . If φ is also convex, then f satisfies (6.3).

Remark 6.4. It is clear that M and N may be exchanged, as long as integrability issues are taken care of⁹. Thus we also have comparison inequalities in the case when the infinitesimal covariation of a martingale is bounded deterministically from below.

Next we state the basic result concerning concentration of measure for Lipschitz functionals of Gaussian random vectors [9, 10].

Theorem 6.5 (The concentration principle). *Let N be a standard Gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^d , and let f be a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant L . Then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \lambda (f(N) - \mathbb{E}f(N)) \leq \exp(\lambda^2 L^2 / 2), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (6.4)$$

⁹ In the case of our interest nothing bad happens, since the martingale is bounded.

$$P\{f(N) - Ef(N) \geq C\} \leq \exp(-C^2/2L^2), \quad \forall C \geq 0. \quad (6.5)$$

Remark 6.6. Of course, Theorem 6.5 may be formulated for any Gaussian random vector in finite or infinite dimension. In this case the Lipschitz condition is assumed w.r.t. the Euclidean metric induced by the Gaussian measure.

References

1. Arratia, R. A.: *Coalescing Brownian motions on \mathbb{R} and the voter model on \mathbb{Z}* , Unpublished manuscript based on Ph.D. thesis (1981).
2. Darling, R. W. R.: Constructing Nonhomeomorphic Stochastic Flows, *Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc.* **70:376** (1987).
3. Dorogovtsev, A. A.: *Measure-Valued Processes and Stochastic Flows*, Inst. of Math., Kiev, 2007 (in Russian).
4. Fontes, L.R.G., Isopi, M., Newman, C.M., and Ravishankar, K.: The Brownian web – characterization and convergence, *Ann. Probab.* **32:4** (2004) 2857–2883, arXiv:math.PR/0304119.
5. Harris, T. E.: Coalescing and noncoalescing stochastic flows in \mathbb{R}_1 , *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **17** (1984) 187–210.
6. Kallenberg, O.: *Foundations of Modern Probability*, Springer, 1997.
7. Kunita, H.: *Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differential Equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
8. Le Jan, Y. and Raimond, O.: Flows, coalescence and noise, arXiv:math.PR/0203221, *Ann. of Prob.* **32:2** (2004) 1247–1315.
9. Ledoux, M.: Isoperimetry and Gaussian Analysis, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1648** 165–294, Springer, 1996.
10. Lifshits, M.: *Gaussian Random Functions*, Kluwer, Netherlands, 1995.
11. Lugosi, G.: *Concentration-of-measure inequalities*, www.econ.upf.edu/~lugosi/anu.pdf, 2009.
12. Matsumoto, H.: Coalescing stochastic flows on the real line, *Osaka J. Math.* **26** (1989) 139–158.
13. Maurer, A.: A proof of Slepian’s inequality, www.andreas-maurer.eu/Slepian3.pdf, 2011.

ALEXANDER SHAMOV: THEORY OF STOCHASTIC PROCESSES DEP., INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, N.A.S., KIEV, UKRAINE

E-mail address: trefoils@gmail.com