

“Markov Processes”, Problem Sheet 5.

Diffusion processes and Euler approximations

Hand in solutions before Monday 21.11, 2 pm

The goal of this problem sheet is to apply Lyapunov functions to study diffusion processes on \mathbb{R}^d and Markov chains corresponding to Euler approximations of the corresponding stochastic differential equations.

Let $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be locally Lipschitz continuous functions. We consider a diffusion process (X_t, P_x) with possibly finite life-time ζ solving a stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t) dB_t + b(X_t) dt \quad \text{for } t < \zeta, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (1)$$

where (B_t) is a d -dimensional Brownian motion. Let $a(x) = \sigma(x)\sigma(x)^T$. For the exercises below, it will only be important to know that (X_t, P_x) solves the local martingale problem for the generator

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

in the sense that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $f \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$M_t^f = f(t, X_t) - \int_0^t \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial s} + \mathcal{L}f \right) (s, X_s) ds \quad (3)$$

is a local martingale w.r.t. P_x . More precisely, let $T_k = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X_t| \geq k\}$. Then $\zeta = \sup T_k$, and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the stopped process $(M_{t \wedge T_k})_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under P_x .

For a fixed time step $h > 0$, the *Euler-Maruyama approximation* of the diffusion process above is the time-homogeneous Markov chain (X_n^h, P_x) with transition step

$$x \mapsto x + \sqrt{h} \sigma(x) Z + h b(x), \quad Z \sim N(0, I_d).$$

We denote the corresponding transition kernel and generator by π_h and \mathcal{L}_h , respectively.

1. (Explosions).

- a) Prove that the diffusion process is non-explosive if

$$\operatorname{tr} a(x)/2 + x \cdot b(x) = O(|x|^2) \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Show that for $\epsilon > 0$, the condition $O(|x|^2)$ can not be replaced by $O(|x|^{2+\epsilon})$.

- b) Implement the Euler scheme on a computer, e.g. for $d = 1$. Do some experiments. Can you observe a different behavior in cases where the condition above is satisfied or violated, respectively ?
- c) As discrete time Markov chains, the Euler approximations always have infinite lifetime. Which properties can you prove for the Euler approximations under similar conditions as in a) ?

2. (Stationary distributions I). Suppose that $\zeta = \infty$ almost surely, and that there exist $V \in C^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\epsilon, c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $V \geq 0$ and

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \mathcal{L}V \leq -\epsilon + c1_B \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4)$$

- a) Prove that

$$E \left[\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t 1_B(X_s) ds \right] \geq \frac{\epsilon}{c} - \frac{V(0, x_0)}{ct}.$$

- b) It can be shown that (4) implies that (X_t, P_x) is a time-homogeneous Markov process with Feller transition semigroup $(p_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Conclude that there exists an invariant probability measure μ .

Hint: Try to carry over the proof in discrete time to the continuous time case.

3. (Stationary distributions II). Suppose that the conditions in Exercise 2 hold, and let μ be an invariant probability measure.

- a) Show that $\int \mathcal{L}f d\mu = 0$ for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
- b) Use this to compute μ explicitly in the case $d = 1$. Here, assume that b and σ are twice continuously differentiable, and $\sigma(x) > 0$ for all x . You may also assume without proof that μ has a twice continuously differentiable density $\rho(x)$ which is strictly positive.

4. (Stationary distributions III).

- a) Show that an invariant probability measure for the diffusion process on \mathbb{R}^d exists if

$$\limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (\operatorname{tr} a(x)/2 + x \cdot b(x)) < 0. \quad (5)$$

- b) Give conditions ensuring the existence of an invariant probability measure for the Euler approximations. Why is not enough to assume (5) ?
- c) Study different cases experimentally using an implementation of the Euler scheme. Can you see the difference between cases where an invariant probability measure exists or does not exist ?