Lack of strong completeness for stochastic flows

Xue-Mei Li[*]   Michael Scheutzow[†]

August 13, 2009

Abstract

It is well-known that a stochastic differential equation (SDE) on a Euclidean space driven by a Brownian motion with Lipschitz coefficients generates a stochastic flow of homeomorphisms. When the coefficients are only locally Lipschitz, then a maximal continuous flow still exists but explosion in finite time may occur. If – in addition – the coefficients grow at most linearly, then this flow has the property that for each fixed initial condition x, the solution exists for all times almost surely. If the exceptional set of measure zero can be chosen independently x, then the maximal flow is called *strongly complete*. The question, whether an SDE with locally Lipschitz continuous coefficients satisfying a linear growth condition is strongly complete was open for many years. In this paper, we construct a 2-dimensional SDE with coefficients which are even bounded (and smooth) and which is *not* strongly complete thus answering the question in the negative.

1 Introduction

We will assume throughout that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ is a given probability space. Let us consider the following stochastic differential equation (SDE) on $\mathbf{R}^d$

$$dX_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i(X_t)\, \mathrm{d}B_t^i + \sigma_0(X_t)\, \mathrm{d}t, \tag{1.1}$$

where $B^1, ..., B^n$ are independent standard Wiener processes defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and the σ_i are locally Lipschitz continuous vector fields and hence the SDE has a unique local solution for each initial condition $X(0) = x$.

[*]Department of Mathematics, The University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK; Xue-Mei.Hairer@warwick.ac.uk Research supported by the EPSRC (EP/E058124/1).

[†]Institut für Mathematik, MA 7-5, Fakultät II, Technische Universität Berlin, Straße des 17. Juni 136, 10623 Berlin, FRG; ms@math.tu-berlin.de

It is well-known that such SDEs with global Lipschitz coefficients do not only possess a unique global solution for each fixed initial condition but also a version of the global solution which is continuous in the initial data, [2]. This global solution generates in fact a *stochastic flow of homeomorphisms* [8], [9]. Furthermore it is well-known that for a unique global strong solution to exist, it suffices that the coefficients of the SDE satisfy a suitable local regularity condition and a growth condition at infinity – for example a local Lipschitz condition and a linear growth condition. Local Lipschitz continuity guarantees local existence and uniqueness of solutions as well as continuous dependence of the local flow on initial conditions while the linear growth condition (which can in fact be weakened a bit by allowing additional logarithmic terms) allows us to pass from local to global by a Gronwall's lemma procedure. Both conditions are almost necessary as the lack of a local Lipschitz condition can lead to lack of pathwise uniqueness and the lack of linear growth can lead to explosion. SDEs which have a global strong solution for each initial condition are said to be *complete* or *weakly complete*. It is well known that a complete SDE need not have a continuous modification of the solution as a function of time and the initial data. This marks a departure of the theory of stochastic flows from that of deterministic ordinary differential equations. However there is so far only a pitifully small number of examples of complete stochastic differential equations whose solutions do not admit a continuous modification as a function of time and initial data. Not a single such example has coefficients which are locally Lipschitz and of linear growth (in spite of a remark in [6] stating the contrary). The basic example is the following:

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathrm{d}x_t & = & (y_t^2 - x_t^2)\,\mathrm{d}B_t^1 - 2x_t y_t\,\mathrm{d}B_t^2 \\
\mathrm{d}y_t & = & -2x_t y_t\,\mathrm{d}B_t^1 + (x_t^2 - y_t^2)\,\mathrm{d}B_t^2,
\end{array}
$$

where B^1, B^2 are independent standard Brownian motions. It was first given by Elworthy [5] (see also [3], [10] for further discussion). This SDE is equivalent to $\mathrm{d}x_t = \mathrm{d}W_t$ on $\mathbf{R}^2\backslash\{0\}$ for some 2-dimensional Wiener process W through the transformation $z \mapsto \frac{1}{z}$ in the complex plane representation. It is clear that $x + W_t$ does not explode in $\mathbf{R}^2\backslash\{0\}$ for each individual x, as a Brownian motion does not see single points. The unique maximal flow is given by $\{x + W_t(\omega), x \in \mathbf{R}^2\backslash\{0\}\}$ (up to explosion) and it explodes for any given ω.

Our aim here is to construct stochastic differential equations which are complete but not *strongly complete*, i.e. which do not admit a continuous modification. In the examples, the lack of strong completeness is achieved by rapidly oscillating vector fields. The example which we will present in the next section shows that even under the additional constraint that the equation has no drift and the diffusion coefficient is bounded and C^∞, there may not exist a global solution flow. Even more, in our example the SDE is driven by a single one-dimensional Brownian motion. Note that such examples are clearly impossible for scalar equations, so the dimension of the state space of the SDE has to be at least 2. Our examples are in $\mathbf{R}^2$.

2 Negative Results

Below, we will construct an example of an SDE in the plane of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}X(t) &= \sigma(X(t), Y(t))\,\mathrm{d}W(t) \\
\mathrm{d}Y(t) &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

which is *not* strongly complete and where $\sigma : \mathbf{R}^2 \to (0, \infty)$ is bounded, bounded away from 0 and C^∞.

Before going into details, let us explain the idea of the construction. From (2.2) it is clear that in our example trajectories move on straight lines parallel to the first coordinate axis. If the equation was driven by a family of Brownian motions (rather than a single one) which are indexed by $y \in \mathbf{R}$ and are independent for different values of y, then clearly the supremum over all solutions at time 1 (say) with initial conditions of the form $(0, y)$, $0 \leq y \leq 1$ would be infinite. Such a modification would of course contradict our assumptions but we can (and will) try to approximate this behavior using an equation of type (2.2) with carefully chosen σ (satisfying all properties stated above). Our σ will exhibit increasingly heavy oscillations when $x \to \infty$ with different frequencies for different values of y. Thus we can make sure that for different values of y, the solutions behave (for large x) almost as if they were driven by independent Brownian motions – in spite of the fact that they are all driven by the same Brownian motion. If we manage to construct σ such that approximate independence sets in sufficiently quickly, then we can hope to observe exploding solutions, i.e. lack of strong completeness. In fact it will turn out that in our example, solutions for different values of y will not be asymptotically independent but that solutions can be asymptotically written as a sum of two Brownian motions: one which is the same for all y and another one which is independent for different y. This property suffices to show that strong completeness does not hold.

2.1 Preliminaries

The following lemma which is proved in [9], Theorem 4.7.1 ensures the existence of a maximal (continuous) flow generated by the SDE (1.1).

Lemma and Definition 2.1 (Maximal Flow)**.** Suppose that the vector fields σ_i are locally Lipschitz continuous. Then there exist a function $\tau : \mathbf{R}^d \times \Omega \to (0, \infty]$ and a map $\phi : \{(t, x, \omega) : x \in \mathbf{R}^d,\ \omega \in \Omega,\ t \in [0, \tau(x, \omega))\} \to \mathbf{R}^d$ such that the following holds:

1. For each $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $\phi_t(x, .)$ solves (1.1) with initial condition x on $[0, \tau(x, \omega))$,

2. $\phi_t(x, \omega) : \{(t, x) : t < \tau(x, \omega)\} \to \mathbf{R}^d$ is a continuous function of (t, x);

3. for each x, $\limsup_{t \to \tau(x, \omega)} |\phi_t(x, \omega)| = \infty$ on $\{\omega : \tau(x, \omega) < \infty\}$.

The map ϕ is called a *maximal flow*. (ϕ, τ) are unique up to a null set. If, for each $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we have $\tau(x, \omega) = \infty$ almost surely, then we call the SDE (or the maximal flow) *complete* or *weakly complete*. If, moreover, there exists a set Ω_0 such that $\tau(x, \omega) = \infty$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and all $\omega \in \Omega_0$, then the SDE or the maximal flow are called *strongly complete*.

Usually, flows are assumed to have two time parameters (an additional one for the starting time) and to satisfy a corresponding composition property, but in this paper we will not dwell on this.

We review briefly some positive results for strong completeness of the SDE (1.1) in terms of growth conditions on the coefficients of the SDE. For simplicity assume that the vector fields are C^2 and consider the derivative equation:

$$\mathrm{d}v_t = \sum_i D\sigma_i(x_t)(v_t)\,\mathrm{d}B_t^i + D\sigma_0(x_t)(v_t)\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{2.3}$$

If $T_x\phi_t(v)$ is the solution to the derivative equation with initial value v, the SDE is strongly complete if it does not explode starting from one starting point and if for some $p > n - 2$, $\sup_{x \in K} \mathbf{E} \sup_{s \le t} |T_t\phi_s|^p 1_{s < \tau(x)}$ is finite for every compact set K [10]. For $n = 2$, it is sufficient to take $p = 1$. In terms of the vector fields σ_i there is the following theorem summarized from Theorem 5.1, which is valid for SDEs on manifolds, and Lemma 6.1 in [10].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the generator of the SDE* (1.1) *and $\sigma^{\mathcal{L}}$ its symbol so $\sigma^{\mathcal{L}}(dg, dg) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}(g^2) - g\mathcal{L}g$. If g is a Lyapunov function in the sense that $\mathcal{L}g + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{\mathcal{L}}(dg, dg) \le c$ and $\lim_{x \to \infty} g(x) = \infty$ then the SDE is strongly complete if the solution from some initial point exists globally and if $|D\sigma_i(x)|^2 \le g(x)$ and $2\langle D\sigma_0(x)(v), v \rangle \le g(x)|v|^2$ for all $v \in \mathbf{R}^d$.*

Examples of such Lyapunov functions include $g(x) = 1 + \ln(1 + |x|^2)$ and $g(x) = x^\varepsilon$. For a recent result on strong completeness, see [6]. For earlier works, see also [1] and [4]. For results on strong completeness for stochastic delay differential equations, the reader is referred to [12].

Let us explain the completeness and strong completeness concepts using stopping times. First note the following observation. Let $U_1 \subset U_2 \subset U_3 \subset ...$ be an exhausting sequence of bounded open subsets of $\mathbf{R}^d$. Let $\tau_n(x)$ be the first exit time of the solution, starting from a point x from U_n. If there exists a non-increasing sequence of δ_n such that $\sum \delta_n = \infty$ and $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_n(x) \le t\} \le ct^2$ for any $t \le \delta_n$ and $x \in U_{n-1}$, then an application of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma shows that weak completeness holds [11]. We state the corresponding elementary lemma for strong completeness with converse whose essence will be used in the proof for the claim in the example we will construct.

Lemma 2.3. *Take $\phi_t(x, \omega)$ to be the maximal flow and let K be a compact set and $\tau_n^K := \inf\{t > 0 : \phi_t(K) \nsubseteq U_n\}$. Define $\tau^K = \inf_{x \in K} \tau(x)$. If for two sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ with $\sum_n a_n = \infty$ and $\sum b_n < \infty$,*

$$P\{\tau_n^K - \tau_{n-1}^K \le a_n, \tau_{n-1}^K < \infty\} \le b_n,$$

then τ^K is infinite and if this property holds for every compact set K, then we have strong completeness.

Conversely, let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ be two summable sequences. Let T_j be finite random times such that $\tau^K \le \sum_j T_j$, then $\tau^K < \infty$ almost surely if

$$\mathbf{P}\{T_n \ge a_n\} \le b_n.$$

2.2 A Bunch of Lemmas

Lemma 2.5 below is the key to the construction of our example. While known results in homogenization theory state convergence in law of the solutions of a sequence of SDEs like (2.4) to a Brownian motion (with a certain *effective* diffusion constant) we are not aware that the asymptotics of the joint laws of the solutions has been investigated in the literature. The proof of Lemma 2.5 will use the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $X^\varepsilon = \left(X_1^\varepsilon, X_2^\varepsilon, ...\right)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ be a family of continuous local martingales starting at 0. Let $B_1, B_2, ...$ be independent standard Brownian motions, $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbf{R}$, $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sum_j \alpha_{ij}^2 < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, $V_i := \sum_{j=1}^\infty \alpha_{ij} B_j$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$, and $V = (V_1, V_2, ...)$. If the quadratic variation $[X_k^\varepsilon, X_l^\varepsilon]_t$ converges in law to $[V_k, V_l]_t = t \sum_{j=1}^\infty \alpha_{kj} \alpha_{kl}$ for all $k, l \in \mathbf{N}$, $t \geq 0$, then X^ε converges to V weakly as $\varepsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem VIII.2.17 in [7] (the theorem is formulated for a family of $\mathbf{R}^n$-valued X^ε rather than sequences but the statement for sequences is an immediate corollary). See also Revuz-Yor [13]. ☐

Lemma 2.5. *Let $H_i : \mathbf{R} \to [0, \infty)$, $i = 1, 2$ be Lipschitz continuous with period 1 and assume that H_1 is non-constant and $H_1(x) + H_2(x) > 0$ for all x. Let W_i, $i = 1, 2$ be independent standard one-dimensional Brownian motions and $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the SDE*

$$\mathrm{d}X^\varepsilon(t) = H_1\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}X^\varepsilon(t)\right)\mathrm{d}W_1(t) + H_2\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}X^\varepsilon(t)\right)\mathrm{d}W_2(t) \tag{2.4}$$
$$X^\varepsilon(0) = x.$$

There exist $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} > 0$ (not depending on the initial condition x) such that the following holds: if (ε_n) is a sequence of positive reals satisfying $\varepsilon_{n+1}/\varepsilon_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, then $(X^{\varepsilon_n} - x, X^{\varepsilon_{n+1}} - x, ...)$ converges weakly to $(\hat{\alpha}B_0 + \hat{\beta}B_1, \hat{\alpha}B_0 + \hat{\beta}B_2, ...)$ as $n \to \infty$, where $B_0, B_1, \ldots$ are independent standard Brownian motions.

Proof. By the previous lemma, it suffices to show that there exist $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} > 0$ such that $[X^\varepsilon - x]_t$ and $[X^\varepsilon - x, X^{\tilde{\varepsilon}} - x]_t$ converge to $(\hat{\alpha}^2 + \hat{\beta}^2)t$ respectively $\hat{\alpha}^2 t$ in law for each $t \geq 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \to 0$ such that $\tilde{\varepsilon}/\varepsilon \to 0$. Set $z^\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}X^\varepsilon(t\varepsilon^2)$ and let $W_i^\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}W_i(t\varepsilon^2)$, $i = 1, 2$, be the rescaled Brownian motions. Then $z^\varepsilon(t)$ satisfies:

$$\mathrm{d}z^\varepsilon(t) = H_1\left(z^\varepsilon(t)\right)\mathrm{d}W_1^\varepsilon(t) + H_2\left(z^\varepsilon(t)\right)\mathrm{d}W_2^\varepsilon(t).$$

The projection to $[0, 1]$ is an ergodic Markov process with invariant measure μ:

$$\mu(\mathrm{d}y) = \frac{1}{v}\frac{\mathrm{d}y}{H_1^2(y) + H_2^2(y)}$$

for $v = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{H_1^2(y) + H_2^2(y)}\mathrm{d}y$ the normalising constant. If f is a continuous periodic function with period 1, denote by $\bar{f}$ its average:

$$\bar{f} = \int_0^1 f(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x).$$

5

Then by the law of large numbers for z^ε, for each fixed $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_0^t f\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_0^t f\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{s}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \mathrm{d}s$$

$$= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \varepsilon^2 \int_0^{\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2}} f\left(z^\varepsilon(r)\right) \mathrm{d}r = t\bar{f}. \tag{2.5}$$

The convergence is in L^p for every $p > 0$. This applies in particular to H_1 and H_2. The zero mean martingale diffusion process $X^\varepsilon(\cdot) - x$ has quadratic variation

$$[X^\varepsilon - x]_t = \int_0^t \left[H_1(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s))\right]^2 \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t \left[H_2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s))\right]^2 \mathrm{d}s$$

which – due to (2.5) – converges in L^1 to $\beta_1^2 t$, where

$$\beta_1 := \sqrt{\left(\int_0^1 (H_1^2(x) + H_2^2(x))\, \mathrm{d}\mu(x)\right)} = v^{-1/2}.$$

Next, we show that

$$[X^\varepsilon - x, X^{\tilde\varepsilon} - x]_t \to \hat{\alpha}^2 t \qquad \text{for } \hat{\alpha} := (\bar{H}_1^2 + \bar{H}_2^2)^{1/2} \text{ as } \varepsilon, \tilde\varepsilon/\varepsilon \to 0. \tag{2.6}$$

We have

$$[X^\varepsilon - x, X^{\tilde\varepsilon} - x]_t = \int_0^t H_1(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)) H_1(\frac{1}{\tilde\varepsilon} X^{\tilde\varepsilon}(s))\, \mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t H_2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)) H_2(\frac{1}{\tilde\varepsilon} X^{\tilde\varepsilon}(s))\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Let $f : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ be continuous and periodic with period 1 and $g(s) := f(s) - \bar{f}$. Then

$$\int_0^t f\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)\right) f\left(\frac{1}{\tilde\varepsilon} X^{\tilde\varepsilon}(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s = \int_0^t g\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)\right) g\left(\frac{1}{\tilde\varepsilon} X^{\tilde\varepsilon}(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s$$

$$+ \bar{f}^2 t + \bar{f} \int_0^t g\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s + \bar{f} \int_0^t g\left(\frac{1}{\tilde\varepsilon} X^{\tilde\varepsilon}(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s.$$

The sum of the last three terms converges to $\bar{f}^2 t$ by (2.5), so in order to prove (2.6), it suffices to show that the first term converges to zero in probability. Let $N := \lceil 1/(\varepsilon\tilde\varepsilon) \rceil$, $b_i := it/N, i = 0, 1, ..., N$, and $C := \sup_{x \in [0,1]} |g(x)|$. Then

6

$$\left| \int_0^t g\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} X^\varepsilon(s)\right) g\left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{\varepsilon}} X^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s)\right) \mathrm{d}s \right| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{b_i}^{b_{i+1}} g(z^\varepsilon(s/\varepsilon^2)) g(z^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2)) \mathrm{d}s \right|$$

$$= \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 \left| \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{b_i/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}^{b_{i+1}/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2} g(z^\varepsilon(s\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2/\varepsilon^2)) g(z^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s)) \mathrm{d}s \right|$$

$$\leq \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left| g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{b_i}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \right| \left| \int_{b_i/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}^{b_{i+1}/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2} g(z^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s)) \mathrm{d}s \right|$$

$$+ \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{b_i/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}^{b_{i+1}/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2} \left| g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 s}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) - g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{b_i}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \right| \left| g(z^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s)) \right| \mathrm{d}s$$

$$\leq \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 C \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left| \int_{b_i/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}^{b_{i+1}/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2} g(z^{\widetilde{\varepsilon}}(s)) \mathrm{d}s \right| + \widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 C \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{b_i/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2}^{b_{i+1}/\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2} \left| g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 s}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) - g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{b_i}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \right| \mathrm{d}s.$$

The expected value of the first term converges to 0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$ by the ergodic theorem since $\widetilde{\varepsilon}/\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\mathbf{E}\left| g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{\widetilde{\varepsilon}^2 s}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) - g\left(z^\varepsilon\left(\frac{b_i}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \right|$ converges to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$ uniformly for all i, $s \in [b_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}^{-2}, b_{i+1} \widetilde{\varepsilon}^{-2}]$ since z^ε has uniformly bounded volatility. This proves (2.6).

All that remains to show is that $\hat{\beta} := \sqrt{\beta_1^2 - \hat{\alpha}^2} > 0$ but this is true (by Jensen's inequality) since $\int H_2^2(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x) \geq \bar{H}_2^2$ and $\int H_1^2(x)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(x) > \bar{H}_1^2$ since H_1 is non-constant. Therefore the proof of the lemma is complete. $\qquad\square$

We will need the following elementary lemmas.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $W, B^1, B^2, \dots$ be independent standard Brownian motions and let $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}, a, \delta, S, T > 0$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\cup_{i=1}^n \left(\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq S} (\hat{\beta} B_t^i + \hat{\alpha} W_t) \geq a \right\} \cap \left\{ \inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\hat{\beta} B_t^i + \hat{\alpha} W_t) \geq -\delta \right\} \right) \right) = 1.$$

Proof. For $i \in \mathbf{N}$, let

$$A_i := \{ \omega : \sup_{0 \leq t \leq S} (\hat{\beta} B_t^i + \hat{\alpha} W_t) \geq a, \ \inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} (\hat{\beta} B_t^i + \hat{\alpha} W_t) \geq -\delta \}.$$

Birkhoff's ergodic theorem implies that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{A_i} = \mathbf{P}\left(A_1 | \sigma(W)\right) \text{ a.s.,}$$

which is strictly positive almost surely, so the assertion of the lemma follows. $\qquad\square$

The following is a quantitative version of the Borel Cantelli lemma, which provides an upper bound, and as a corollary a lower bound, for M events out of N events to happen simultaneously. The lemma was proposed by Martin Hairer who also supplied an intuitive proof which our proof is based on.

Lemma 2.7 (Hairer's Borel-Cantelli lemma). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space and $\{A_i\}, 1 \leq i \leq N$ events with $\mathbf{P}(A_i) = p_i$. Then*

- *the probability that at least M of the events happen simultaneously is smaller or equal to $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i / M$;*

- *the probability that at least M of the events $\{A_i\}$ happen simultaneously is at least $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i - M + 1}{N - M + 1}$.*

Proof. Let $Q_{M,N}$ be the set of ω which belong to at least M of the N events from $\{A_i\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(Q_{M,N}) &= \mathbf{P}\{\omega : \#\{1 \leq i \leq N : \omega \in A_i\} \geq M\} \\
&= \mathbf{P}\{\omega : \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}(\omega) \geq M\} \leq \frac{1}{M} \mathbf{E} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}_{A_i} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i.
\end{aligned}
$$

For the corresponding lower bound denote by B_i the complement of A_i and $q_i := \mathbf{P}(B_i) = 1 - p_i$. Let $Q_{M,N}^c$ be the complement of $B_{M,N}$, which is the event that at most $M - 1$ of the events A_i happen or – equivalently – the set on which at least $N - M + 1$ events from the $\{B_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ happen. It follows from the previous lemma that

$$
\mathbf{P}(Q_{M,N}^c) \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} q_i}{N - M + 1} = \frac{N - \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i}{N - M + 1},
$$

so that

$$
\mathbf{P}(Q_{M,N}) \geq 1 - \frac{N - \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i}{N - M + 1} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i - M + 1}{N - M + 1},
$$

as required. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 2.8. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$. Then, for every $T > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that for each $m \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists some $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that the following holds: for every sequence $M_1, M_2, \ldots$ of martingales with continuous paths on the same space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, starting at zero such that $\alpha \leq \frac{d}{dt}\langle M_i \rangle_t \leq \beta$ for all i and t, the stopping time*

$$
\tau := \inf\left\{t > 0 : M_i(t) \geq \delta \text{ for at least } m \text{ different } i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}\right\}
$$

satisfies

$$
\mathbf{P}\{\tau \leq T\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.
$$

Proof. For $\delta > 0$, let $\lambda_i^\delta := \mu\{0 \leq t \leq T : M_i(t) \geq \delta\}$, where μ denotes normalized Lebesgue measure on $[0, T]$. We claim that there exist $\delta > 0$ and $u > 0$ such that for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, we have

$$
\mathbf{P}\{\lambda_i^\delta \geq u\} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{2.7}
$$

Assume that this has been shown. For $k \geq 2$, let

$$
\Omega_k := \{\lambda_i^\delta \geq u \text{ for at least } k \text{ different } i \in \{1, \ldots, 2(k-1)\}\}.
$$

Then, by Lemma 2.7,

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\Omega_k\big) \geq \frac{2(k-1)(1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2})-k+1}{2(k-1)-k+1} = 1-\varepsilon.$$

Invoking Lemma 2.7 once more, we see that on Ω_k, there exists some $t \in [0,T]$ such that $M_i(t) \geq \delta$ for at least m different $i \in \{1,...,2k-2\}$ provided that the numerator $uk - m + 1$ in the formula in Corollary 2.7 is strictly positive. Letting $k := \lceil \frac{m}{u} \rceil$ and $N := 2k-2$, the assertion of the corollary follows at once.

It remains to prove (2.7). Let $\delta > 0$ (we will fix the precise values later). For ease of notation, we drop the index i (observe that all estimates below are uniform in i). The martingale M can be represented as a time-changed Brownian motion: $M(t) = W([M]_t)$. Since $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}[M]_t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, we obtain for $a, t > 0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(\sup_{s \in [0,t]} M(s) \geq a) &= \mathbf{P}(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} W([M]_s) \geq a) \\
&\geq \mathbf{P}(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq \alpha t} W(s) \geq a) \\
&= 2\,\mathbf{P}(W(\alpha t) \geq a) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{a/\sqrt{\alpha t}}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x =: p_0(a,t),
\end{aligned}
$$

and, analogously,

$$\mathbf{P}(\inf_{s \in [0,t]} M(s) \geq -a) \geq \mathbf{P}(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} W(\beta s) \leq a) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^{a/\sqrt{\beta t}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}x =: q_0(a,t).$$

Let $\tilde{\tau}$ be the first time that $M(t) \geq 2\delta$. Using the fact that $M(\tilde{\tau} \wedge c + t) - M(\tilde{\tau} \wedge c)$ also satisfies the assumptions of the corollary for each $c \geq 0$, we get for $u \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\{\lambda^\delta(\omega) \geq u\} \\
&\geq \mathbf{P}\left(\inf_{\tilde{\tau} \leq t \leq \tilde{\tau}+uT} M(t) \geq \delta \;\Big|\; \tilde{\tau} \leq \frac{T}{2}\right) \mathbf{P}\left(\tilde{\tau} \leq \frac{T}{2}\right) \\
&\geq q_0(\delta, uT)\, p_0(2\delta, \frac{T}{2}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Choosing first $\delta > 0$ so small that the second factor is close to 1 and then choosing $u > 0$ small enough, we can ensure that the product is at least $1 - \varepsilon/2$ proving (2.7), so the proof of the corollary is complete. $\qquad\square$

2.3 The Examples

Example 2.9. Consider the SDE (2.2). We will start by defining the coefficient σ restricted to $\mathbf{R} \times [0,1]$. Fix a smooth non-constant, strictly positive function H of period one. To construct the example, we subdivide the square $[n, n+1] \times [0,1]$ into M_n horizontal strips of width $1/M_n$ each, with M_n increasing sufficiently quickly and let σ be equal to H sped up by a factor depending on the particular strip. Thus, the

probability that one of the solutions starting from (n, y), $y \in [0, 1]$ will reach the next level $(n + 1, y)$ within a very short time will increase with n allowing us to conclude that strong completeness fails. We now state the precise assumptions.

Let $H : \mathbf{R} \to [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ be an infinitely differentiable non-constant function with period 1. Assume that all its derivatives vanish at 0. Fix a sequence of positive integers a_i, $i = 0, 1, ...$ such that $a_0 = 1$ and $\lim_{i \to \infty} a_{i+1}/a_i = \infty$. Assume that $N_0, N_1, N_2, ...$ are positive even integers whose values we will fix later. Let $M_n := \prod_{i=0}^{n} N_i$, $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ and define

$$\sigma(x, y) = H(a_i x) \text{ if } i \in \{0, 1, ..., \frac{N_n}{2} - 1\}, \ x \in [n, n + 1], \tag{2.8}$$

$$y \in \left[\frac{kN_n + 2i}{M_n}, \frac{kN_n + 2i + 1}{M_n} \right], \ k = 0, ..., M_{n-1} - 1.$$

Further, let $\sigma(x, y) = H(x)$ for $x \leq 0, y \in [0, 1]$. On the set where σ has been defined, it is clearly bounded, strictly positive, and C^{∞} (since we assumed that all derivatives of H to vanish at zero). It is also clear that σ can be extended to a C^{∞} function taking values in $[1/2, 1]$ on all of $\mathbf{R}^2$. We claim that the associated flow is not strongly complete in case the integers $N_0, N_1, ...$ are chosen to increase sufficiently quickly.

Let ψ_{st} denote the x-component of the maximal flow ϕ of the SDE started at time s ($s \leq t$). We define a sequence of stopping times τ_n, $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ and intervals $I_n \subseteq [0, 1]$ as follows: $\tau_0 := 0$, $I_0 := [0, 1]$, $\tau_{n+1} := \inf\{t > \tau_n : \sup_{y \in I_n} \psi_{\tau_n t}(n, y) = n + 1\}$ and let $I_{n+1} \subseteq I_n$ be some interval of the form $\left[\frac{2k}{M_n}, \frac{2k+1}{M_n} \right]$ on which the supremum in the definition of τ_{n+1} is attained (note that the supremum is attained for *every* point in such an interval if it is attained for *some* point in the interval). Define $\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \sup_{y \in [0,1]} \psi_{0t}(0, y) = \infty\}$. Then $\tau \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \tau_n$ and it suffices show that $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n \geq 2^{-n}\}$ is summable over n to deduce that $\mathbf{P}\{\tau < \infty\} > 0$ (a straightforward argument then shows that even $\tau < \infty$ almost surely).

Fix $n \in \mathbf{N}$. We will show that we can choose $N_n \in \mathbf{N}$ in such a way that

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n \geq 2^{-n} | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}\} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Let $\hat{y} \in I_n$ and let M_j^n solve the following SDE:

$$\mathrm{d}M_j^n(t) = \xi_j^n(M_j^n(t)) \, \mathrm{d}W(t),$$
$$M_j^n(0) = n,$$

where

$$\xi_j^n(z) := \begin{cases} \sigma(z, \hat{y}) & \text{if } z \leq n \\ H(a_j z) & \text{if } z \geq n. \end{cases}$$

Observe that ξ_j^n does not depend on the particular choice of $\hat{y} \in I_n$ and that (up to a shift of the Wiener process W) $M_j^n(t)$, $j = 0, .., \frac{N_n}{2} - 1$ are the solutions of our SDE after τ_n and until τ_{n+1} on the intervals $\left[\frac{lN_n + 2j}{M_n}, \frac{lN_n + 2j + 1}{M_n} \right]$, where l is chosen such that $(lN_n + 1)/M_n \in I_n$. We need to ensure that for N_n large enough, one of the M_j^n will reach the next level $n + 1$ within time 2^{-n} with probability at least $1 - 2^{-n}$. Unfortunately, we cannot apply the homogenization lemma 2.5 directly to the M_j^n, since

they all have the same diffusion coefficient for $z \leq n$. Therefore, we will wait at most time $T_n = \frac{1}{2}2^{-n}$ and show that for N_n large, it is very likely, that many of the M_j^n have reached at least level $n + \delta_n$ for some (possibly very small) $\delta_n > 0$. We will then apply the homogenization lemma only to these M_j^n. Of course, this is possible only if the solution does not go back to level n before time τ_{n+1}. Lemma 2.6 ensures, that with high probability, we can find at least one of the remaining M_j^n for which this is true. We now provide the details of the argument.

Step 1: We apply Corollary 2.8 to the martingales $M_j^n - n$, $j = 0, 1, 2, ...$ with $T_n = \frac{1}{2}2^{-n}$, $\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{4}2^{-n}$, $\alpha = 1/4$, $\beta = 1$ and obtain a number $\delta_n > 0$ which satisfies (2.7) in the proof of Corollary 2.8. We can assume that $\delta_n < 1$.

Step 2: Now, we define $\tilde{M}_j^n$, $j \in \mathbf{N}_0$ as the solution of the SDE

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}\tilde{M}_j^n(t) &= H(a_j\,\tilde{M}_j^n(t))\,\mathrm{d}W(t), \\
\tilde{M}_j^n(0) &= n + \delta_n.
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Lemma 2.5 to $\tilde{M}_0^n, \tilde{M}_1^n, ...$ with $x = n + \delta_n$, $H_1 = H$, $H_2 = 0$, we see that $(\tilde{M}_k^n - x, \tilde{M}_{k+1}^n - x, ...)$ converges in law to $(\hat{\alpha}B_0 + \hat{\beta}B_1, \hat{\alpha}B_0 + \hat{\beta}B_2, ...)$ as $k \to \infty$, where $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta} > 0$ and $B_0, B_1, ...$ are independent standard Wiener processes.

Step 3: Next, Lemma 2.6 says that there exists some $m_n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$
\mathbf{P}\Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m_n} \big(\big\{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}2^{-n}} (\hat{\alpha}B_0(t) + \hat{\beta}B_i(t)) \geq 1\big\} \cap \big\{\inf_{0 \leq t \leq 2^{-n}} (\hat{\alpha}B_0(t) + \hat{\beta}B_i(t)) \geq -\frac{\delta_n}{2}\big\}\big)\Big) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_n.
$$

Step 4: Let $\tilde{N}_n$ be the number in the conclusion of Corollary 2.8 associated to $\delta_n, \varepsilon_n, T_n$, and m_n. Thanks to the convergence stated in Step 2, we can find some $k_n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for any subset $J \subseteq \{k_n, k_n + 1, ..., k_n + \tilde{N}_n - 1\}$ of cardinality m_n, we have

$$
\mathbf{P}\Big(\bigcup_{i \in J} \big(\big\{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}2^{-n}} \tilde{M}_i^n \geq n+1\big\} \cap \big\{\inf_{0 \leq t \leq 2^{-n}} \tilde{M}_i^n \geq -\delta_n\big\}\big)\Big) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_n.
$$

Step 5: Define $N_n := k_n + \tilde{N}_n$. Using the strong Markov property and the fact that ψ is order preserving (and hence a solution starting at $n + \delta_n$ can never pass a solution starting at a larger value at the same time), we obtain for our choice of N_n that

$$
\mathbf{P}\big\{\tau_{n+1} - \tau_n \geq 2^{-n}\big|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}\big\} \leq 3\varepsilon_n < 2^{-n}
$$

as desired, so the proof is complete. $\qquad\square$

Note that if the SDE in the above example is changed into Stratonovich the SDE is strongly complete. To produces an example in Stratonovitch form, we use two independent Brownian motions.

Example 2.10. Consider the SDE

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}X(t) &= \sigma_1(X(t), Y(t))\,\mathrm{d}W_1(t) + \sigma_2(X(t), Y(t))\,\mathrm{d}W_2(t) \\
\mathrm{d}Y(t) &= 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.9}
$$

where W_1, W_2 are two independent standard one-dimensional Brownian motions. We will construct bounded and C^∞ functions σ_1 and σ_2 such that $\sigma_1^2(x, y) + \sigma_2^2(x, y) = 1$ for all x, y such that the associated flow is not strongly complete. Note that due to the condition $\sigma_1^2(x, y) + \sigma_2^2(x, y) = 1$, it does not matter if we interpret the stochastic differentials in the Itô or Stratonovich sense.

The construction of the example resembles that of the previous one closely, the only difference being that this time, we consider two non-constant C^∞ functions H_1, H_2 taking values in $[1/2, 1]$ such that $H_1^2(z) + H_2^2(z) = 1$ and apply Lemma 2.5 with these functions H_1, H_2 rather than with a single function H as before. $\qquad\square$

We essentially showed that we could trace back to and construct a random initial point $x_0(\omega)$ which goes out fast enough to explode. This is true in general: Suppose that there is a maximal flow $\{\phi_t(x, \omega), t < \tau(x, \omega)\}$ to the SDE. It is strongly complete if and only if for all measurable random points $x(\omega)$ on the state space, $\phi_t(x(\omega), \omega)$ exists almost surely for all t.

Remark 2.11. It remains an open question whether an SDE with globally Lipschitz diffusion coefficients and a drift which is locally Lipschitz and of linear growth admits a global solution flow.

References

[1] Baxendale, P. (1980) Wiener processes on manifolds of maps. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* **87A**, 127–152.

[2] Blagovescenskii, Ju.N., Freidlin, M.I. (1961). Some properties of diffusion processes depending on a parameter. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* **138**, 508–511.

[3] Carverhill, A.P. (1981). A pair of stochastic dynamical systems which have the same infinitesimal generator, but of which one is strongly complete and the other is not. University of Warwick Preprint.

[4] Carverhill, A.P. and Elworthy, K.D. (1983). Flows of stochastic dynamical systems: the functional analytic approach. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **65**, 245–267.

[5] Elworthy, K.D. (1982). Stochastic flows and the C_0 diffusion property. *Stochastics* **6**, 233–238.

[6] Fang, S. and Imkeller, P. and Zhang, T. (2007). Global flows for stochastic differential equations without global Lipschitz conditions. *Ann. Probab.* **35**, 180–205.

[7] Jacod, J. and Shiryayev, A. (2003). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes.* Second edition. Springer, New York.

[8] Kunita, H. (1981). On the decomposition of solutions of stochastic differential equations. In: Stochastic Integrals, ed. D. Williams, pp. 213-255. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 851.

[9] Kunita, H. (1990). *Stochastic Flows and Stochastic Differential Equations.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[10] Li, Xue-Mei (1994). Strong p-completeness of stochastic differential equations and the existence of smooth flows on noncompact manifolds, *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **100**, 485–511.

[11] Li, Xue-Mei (1994). Properties at infinity of diffusion semigroups and stochastic flows via weak uniform covers. *J. Potential Anal.* **3**, 339–357.

[12] Mohammed, S. and Scheutzow, M. (2003). The stable manifold theorem for nonlinear stochastic systems with memory I: Existence of the semiflow. *J. Funct. Anal.* **205**, 271–305.

[13] Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (1999). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion.* Third edition, Springer, New York.