

Strong solutions of jump-type stochastic equations¹

Zenghu Li and Fei Pu

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University,
Beijing 100875, People's Republic of China
E-mails: lizh@bnu.edu.cn and pufei@mail.bnu.edu.cn

Abstract. We establish the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to some jump-type stochastic equations under non-Lipschitz conditions. The results improve those of Fu and Li [11] and Li and Mytnik [15].

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 60H20; secondary 60H10.

Key words and phrases. Strong solution, jump-type stochastic equation, pathwise uniqueness, non-Lipschitz condition.

Abbreviated Title: Strong solutions of stochastic equations

1 Introduction

The problem of existence and uniqueness of solutions to jump-type stochastic equations under non-Lipschitz conditions have been studied by many authors; see, e.g., [1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 13, 15] and the references therein. In particular, some criteria for the existence and pathwise uniqueness of non-negative and general solutions were given in [10, 11, 15]. Stochastic equations have played important roles in the recent progresses in the study of continuous-state branching processes; see, e.g., [5, 6, 7, 14]. The main difficulty of pathwise uniqueness for jump-type stochastic equations usually comes from the compensated Poisson integral term. Let us consider the equation

$$dx(t) = \phi(x(t-))d\tilde{N}(t), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\{\tilde{N}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a compensated Poisson process. For each $0 < \alpha < 1$ there is a α -Hölder continuous function ϕ so that the pathwise uniqueness for (1.1) fails. In fact, before the first jump of the Poisson process, the above equation reduces to

$$dx(t) = -\phi(x(t))dt. \quad (1.2)$$

¹ Supported by NSFC (No. 11131003), 973 Program (No. 2011CB808001) and 985 Program.

Then to assure the pathwise uniqueness for (1.1) the uniqueness of solution for (1.2) is necessary. If we set $h_\alpha(x) = (1 - \alpha)^{-1}x^\alpha 1_{\{x \geq 0\}}$, then both $x_1(t) = 0$ and $x_2(t) = t^{1/(1-\alpha)}$ are solutions of (1.2) with $\phi = -h_\alpha$. From those it is easy to construct two distinct solutions of (1.1). The key of the pathwise uniqueness results in [11, 15] is to consider a non-decreasing kernel for the compensated Poisson integral term in the stochastic equation. The condition was weakened considerably by Fournier [10] for stable driving noises. In fact, as a consequence of Theorem 2.2 in [15], given any $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a pathwise unique strong solution to (1.1) with $\phi = h_\alpha$. On the other hand, the monotonicity assumption also excludes some interesting jump-type stochastic equations. Two of them are given below.

Example 1.1 Let $z^2\nu(dz)$ be a finite measure on $(0, 1]$. Suppose that $\tilde{M}(ds, dz, dr)$ is a compensated Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty) \times (0, 1]^2$ with intensity $ds\nu(dz)dr$. Given $0 \leq x(0) \leq 1$, we consider the stochastic integral equation

$$x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_0^1 zq(x(s-), r)\tilde{M}(ds, dz, dr), \quad (1.3)$$

where

$$q(x, r) = 1_{\{r \leq 1 \wedge x\}} - (1 \wedge x)1_{\{x \geq 0\}}.$$

This equation was introduced by Bertoin and Le Gall [4] in their study of generalized Fleming-Viot flows. The existence and uniqueness of a weak solution flow to (1.3) was proved in [4]. The pathwise uniqueness for the equation follows from a result in [7]. The result cannot be derived directly from the those in [11, 15] since $x \mapsto q(x, r)$ is not a non-decreasing function.

Example 1.2 Let $(1 \wedge u^2)\mu(du)$ be a finite measure on $(0, \infty)$. Suppose that $\tilde{N}(ds, du, dr)$ is a compensated Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty)^3$ with intensity $ds\mu(du)dr$. Given $y(0) \geq 0$, we consider the stochastic equation

$$y(t) = y(0) + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty g(y(s-), u, r)\tilde{N}(ds, du, dr), \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$g(x, u, r) = -1_{\{rx \leq 1\}}x(1 - e^{-u}).$$

Some generalizations of the above equation were introduced by Döring and Barczy [8] in the study of self-similar Markov processes. From their results it follows that (1.4) has a pathwise unique non-negative strong solution. Since $x \mapsto g(x, u, r)$ is not non-decreasing, one cannot derive the pathwise uniqueness for (1.4) from the results in [11, 15].

In this paper, we give some criteria for the existence and pathwise uniqueness of strong solutions of jump-type stochastic equations. The results improve those in [11, 15] and can be applied to equations like (1.3) and (1.4). In Section 2 we give some basic formulations of the stochastic equations. Two theorems on the pathwise uniqueness of general solutions are presented in Section 3. In Section 4 we prove the existence of weak solutions by a martingale problem approach. The main results on the existence and pathwise uniqueness

of general strong solutions are given in Section 5. In Section 6 we give some results on the existence and pathwise uniqueness of non-negative strong solutions. Throughout this paper, we make the conventions

$$\int_a^b = \int_{(a,b]} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_a^\infty = \int_{(a,\infty)}$$

for any $b \geq a \geq 0$. Given a function f defined on a subset of \mathbb{R} , we write

$$\Delta_z f(x) = f(x+z) - f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad D_z f(x) = \Delta_z f(x) - f'(x)z$$

if the right hand sides are meaningful.

2 Preliminaries

Suppose that $\mu_0(du)$ and $\mu_1(du)$ are σ -finite measures on the complete separable metric spaces U_0 and U_1 , respectively. Throughout this paper, we consider a set of parameters (σ, b, g_0, g_1) satisfying the following basic properties:

- $x \mapsto \sigma(x)$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{R} ;
- $x \mapsto b(x)$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{R} having the decomposition $b = b_1 - b_2$ with b_2 being continuous and non-decreasing;
- $(x, u) \mapsto g_0(x, u)$ and $(x, u) \mapsto g_1(x, u)$ are Borel functions on $\mathbb{R} \times U_0$ and $\mathbb{R} \times U_1$, respectively.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_t, \mathbf{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual hypotheses. Let $\{B(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be a standard (\mathcal{G}_t) -Brownian motion and let $\{p_0(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{p_1(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be (\mathcal{G}_t) -Poisson point processes on U_0 and U_1 with characteristic measures $\mu_0(du)$ and $\mu_1(du)$, respectively. Suppose that $\{B(t)\}$, $\{p_0(t)\}$ and $\{p_1(t)\}$ are independent of each other. Let $N_0(ds, du)$ and $N_1(ds, du)$ be the Poisson random measures associated with $\{p_0(t)\}$ and $\{p_1(t)\}$, respectively. Let $\tilde{N}_0(ds, du)$ be the compensated measure of $N_0(ds, du)$. By a *solution* to the stochastic equation

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s-))dB(s) + \int_0^t \int_{U_0} g_0(x(s-), u)\tilde{N}_0(ds, du) \\ & + \int_0^t b(x(s-))ds + \int_0^t \int_{U_1} g_1(x(s-), u)N_1(ds, du), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

we mean a càdlàg and (\mathcal{G}_t) -adapted real process $\{x(t)\}$ that satisfies the equation almost surely for every $t \geq 0$. Since $x(s-) \neq x(s)$ for at most countably many $s \geq 0$, we can also use $x(s)$ instead of $x(s-)$ for the integrals with respect to $dB(s)$ and ds on the right hand side of (2.1). We say *pathwise uniqueness* holds for (2.1) if for any two solutions $\{x_1(t)\}$ and $\{x_2(t)\}$ of the equation satisfying $x_1(0) = x_2(0)$ we have $x_1(t) = x_2(t)$ almost surely for every $t \geq 0$. Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the augmented natural filtration generated by $\{B(t)\}$, $\{p_0(t)\}$ and $\{p_1(t)\}$. A solution $\{x(t)\}$ of (2.1) is called a *strong solution* if it is

adapted with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) ; see [12, p.163] or [16, p.76]. Let $U_2 \subset U_1$ be a set satisfying $\mu_1(U_1 \setminus U_2) < \infty$. We also consider the equation

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) = & x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s-))dB(s) + \int_0^t \int_{U_0} g_0(x(s-), u)\tilde{N}_0(ds, du) \\ & + \int_0^t b(x(s-))ds + \int_0^t \int_{U_2} g_1(x(s-), u)N_1(ds, du). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Proposition 2.1 *If (2.2) has a strong solution for every given $x(0)$, so does (2.1). If the pathwise uniqueness holds for (2.2), it also holds for (2.1).*

The above proposition can be proved similarly as Proposition 2.2 in [11]. Then all conditions in the paper only involve U_2 instead of U_1 .

3 Pathwise uniqueness

In this section, we prove some results on the pathwise uniqueness for (2.2) under non-Lipschitz conditions. Suppose that (σ, b, g_0, g_1) are given as in the second section. Let us consider the following conditions on the modulus of continuity:

(3.a) for each integer $m \geq 1$ there is a non-decreasing and concave function $z \mapsto r_m(z)$ on \mathbb{R}_+ such that $\int_{0+} r_m(z)^{-1} dz = \infty$ and

$$|b_1(x) - b_1(y)| + \int_{U_2} |l_1(x, y, u)|\mu_1(du) \leq r_m(|x - y|), \quad |x|, |y| \leq m,$$

where $l_1(x, y, u) = g_1(x, u) - g_1(y, u)$;

(3.b) the function $x \mapsto x + g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing for all $u \in U_0$ and for each integer $m \geq 1$ there is a constant $K_m \geq 0$ such that

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^2 + \int_{U_0} l_0(x, y, u)^2 \mu_0(du) \leq K_m |x - y|, \quad |x|, |y| \leq m,$$

where $l_0(x, y, u) = g_0(x, u) - g_0(y, u)$.

Let us define a sequence of functions $\{\phi_k\}$ as follows. For each integer $k \geq 0$ define $a_k = \exp\{-k(k+1)/2\}$. Then $a_k \rightarrow 0$ decreasingly as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\int_{a_k}^{a_{k-1}} z^{-1} dz = k, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Let $x \mapsto \psi_k(x)$ be a non-negative continuous function supported by (a_k, a_{k-1}) so that

$$\int_{a_k}^{a_{k-1}} \psi_k(x) dx = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_k(x) \leq 2(kx)^{-1} \quad (3.1)$$

for every $a_k < x < a_{k-1}$. For $z \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\phi_k(z) = \int_0^{|z|} dy \int_0^y \psi_k(x) dx. \quad (3.2)$$

It is easy to see that the sequence $\{\phi_k\}$ has the following properties:

- (i) $\phi_k(z) \mapsto |z|$ non-decreasingly as $k \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $0 \leq \phi'_k(z) \leq 1$ for $z \geq 0$ and $-1 \leq \phi'_k(z) \leq 0$ for $z \leq 0$;
- (iii) $0 \leq |z|\phi''_k(z) = |z|\psi_k(|z|) \leq 2k^{-1}$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

By Taylor's expansion, for any $h, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$D_h \phi_k(\zeta) = h^2 \int_0^1 \psi_k(|\zeta + th|)(1-t) dt \leq \frac{2}{k} h^2 \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)}{|\zeta + th|} dt. \quad (3.3)$$

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that $x \mapsto x + g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing for $u \in U_0$. Then, for any $x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) \leq \frac{2}{k} \int_0^1 \frac{l_0(x, y, u)^2 (1-t)}{|x - y + tl_0(x, y, u)|} dt \leq \frac{2l_0(x, y, u)^2}{k|x - y|}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from (3.3). Since $x \mapsto x + g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing, for $x > y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $x - y + l_0(x, y, u) \geq 0$, and hence $x - y + tl_0(x, y, u) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. It is elementary to see

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \frac{l_0(x, y, u)^2 (1-t)}{x - y + tl_0(x, y, u)} dt \\ &= l_0(x, y, u) \int_0^1 \left[\frac{x - y + l_0(x, y, u)}{x - y + tl_0(x, y, u)} - 1 \right] dt \\ &= [x - y + l_0(x, y, u)] \log \left(1 + \frac{l_0(x, y, u)}{x - y} \right) - l_0(x, y, u) \\ &\leq [x - y + l_0(x, y, u)] \frac{l_0(x, y, u)}{x - y} - l_0(x, y, u) \\ &= \frac{l_0(x, y, u)^2}{x - y}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the second inequality in (3.4) follows by symmetry. \square

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose that conditions (3.a,b) are satisfied. Then the pathwise uniqueness for (2.2) holds.*

Proof. By condition (3.b) and Lemma 3.1, for $x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $|x|, |y| \leq m$ we have

$$\phi''_k(x - y) [\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)]^2 \leq K_m \phi''_k(x - y) |x - y| \leq \frac{2K_m}{k}$$

and

$$\int_{U_0} D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) \mu_0(du) \leq \int_{U_0} \frac{2l_0(x, y, u)^2}{k|x - y|} \mu_0(du) \leq \frac{2K_m}{k}.$$

The right-hand sides of both inequalities tend to zero uniformly on $|x|, |y| \leq m$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then the pathwise uniqueness for (2.2) follows by a simple modification of Proposition 3.1 in [15]; see also Theorem 3.1 in [11]. \square

We next introduce some condition that is particularly useful in applications to stochastic equations driven by Lévy processes. The condition is given as follows:

(3.c) there is a constant $0 \leq c \leq 1$ such that $x \mapsto cx + g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing for all $u \in U_0$ and for each integer $m \geq 1$ there are constants $K_m \geq 0$ and $p_m > 0$ such that

$$|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)|^2 \leq K_m |x - y| \quad \text{and} \quad |l_0(x, y, u)| \leq |x - y|^{p_m} f_m(u)$$

for $|x|, |y| \leq m$, where $l_0(x, y, u) = g_0(x, u) - g_0(y, u)$ and $u \mapsto f_m(u)$ is a strictly positive function on U_0 satisfying

$$\int_{U_0} [f_m(u) \wedge f_m(u)^2] \mu_0(du) < \infty.$$

For each $m \geq 1$ and the function f_m specified in (3.c) we define the constant

$$\alpha_m = \inf \left\{ \beta > 1 : \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} x^{\beta-1} \int_{U_0} f_m(u) 1_{\{f_m(u) \geq x\}} \mu_0(du) = 0 \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

By Lemma 2.1 in [15] we have $1 \leq \alpha_m \leq 2$.

Lemma 3.3 *Suppose that condition (3.c) holds. Then for any $h \geq 0$ and $|x|, |y| \leq m$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{U_0} D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) \mu_0(du) \\ & \leq \frac{2}{k} |x - y|^{2p_m - 1} 1_{\{(1-c)|x-y| < a_{k-1}\}} \int_{U_0} f_m(u)^2 1_{\{f_m(u) \leq h\}} \mu_0(du) \\ & \quad + 2|x - y|^{p_m} 1_{\{(1-c)|x-y| < a_{k-1}\}} \int_{U_0} f_m(u) 1_{\{f_m(u) > h\}} \mu_0(du). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We first consider $x > y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $x \mapsto cx + g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing, we have $c(x - y) + l_0(x, y, u) \geq 0$, and hence $c(x - y) + tl_0(x, y, u) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. It follows that $x - y + tl_0(x, y, u) \geq (1 - c)(x - y)$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Then $(1 - c)(x - y) \geq a_{k-1}$ implies $x - y + tl_0(x, y, u) \geq a_{k-1}$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. In view of the equality in (3.3) we have

$$D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad (1 - c)(x - y) \geq a_{k-1}.$$

By the symmetry of ϕ_k it follows that, for arbitrary $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad (1 - c)|x - y| \geq a_{k-1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Then we can use condition (3.c) to get

$$\begin{aligned} D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) & \leq 2|l_0(x, y, u)| 1_{\{(1-c)(x-y) < a_{k-1}\}} \\ & \leq 2|x - y|^{p_m} f_m(u) 1_{\{(1-c)|x-y| < a_{k-1}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (3.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{l_0(x, y, u)} \phi_k(x - y) & \leq \frac{2l_0(x, y, u)^2}{k|x - y|} 1_{\{(1-c)|x-y| < a_{k-1}\}} \\ & \leq \frac{2}{k} |x - y|^{2p_m - 1} f_m(u)^2 1_{\{(1-c)|x-y| < a_{k-1}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Those give the desired result. \square

Theorem 3.4 Suppose that conditions (3.a,c) hold with: (i) $c = 1, \alpha_m = 2, p_m = 1/2$; or (ii) $c < 1, \alpha_m < 2, 1 - 1/\alpha_m < p_m \leq 1/2$. Then the pathwise uniqueness holds for (2.2).

Proof. Let us consider the case (i). By Lemma 3.3, for any $h \geq 1$ and $|x|, |y| \leq m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{U_0} D_{l_0(x,y,u)} \phi_k(x-y) \mu_0(du) \\ & \leq \frac{2}{k} \int_{U_0} f_m(u)^2 1_{\{f_m(u) \leq h\}} \mu_0(du) + 2\sqrt{2m} \int_{U_0} f_m(u) 1_{\{f_m(u) > h\}} \mu_0(du) \\ & \leq \frac{2h}{k} \int_{U_0} [f_m(u) \wedge f_m(u)^2] \mu_0(du) + 2\sqrt{2m} \int_{U_0} f_m(u) 1_{\{f_m(u) > h\}} \mu_0(du). \end{aligned}$$

By letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$ one can see

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U_0} D_{l_0(x,y,u)} \phi_k(x-y) \mu_0(du) = 0.$$

Then the pathwise uniqueness for (2.2) follows by a modification of Proposition 3.1 in [15]; see also Theorem 3.1 in [11]. The case (ii) follows as in the proof of Proposition 3.3 in [15]. \square

We remark that our conditions (3.b) and (3.c) improve similar conditions in [11, 15], where it was assumed that $x \mapsto g_0(x, u)$ is non-decreasing for all $u \in U_0$. The following example shows that the global monotonicity of the functions $x \mapsto x + g_0(x, u)$ and $x \mapsto cx + g_0(x, u)$ in conditions (3.b) and (3.c) are necessary to assure the pathwise uniqueness.

Example 3.5 Let us consider the equation (1.1). Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be a constant and define the bounded positive α -Hölder continuous function

$$\phi(x) = (1 - \alpha)^{-1} (|x|^\alpha \wedge |x - 1|^\alpha) 1_{\{0 \leq x \leq 1\}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.7)$$

Clearly, this function is nondecreasing in the interval $(-\infty, 1/2)$ and nonincreasing in the interval $(1/2, \infty)$. Let $y_1(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 0$ and let

$$y_2(t) = \begin{cases} 1 - t^{1/(1-\alpha)} & \text{for } 0 \leq t < 2^{\alpha-1}, \\ (2^\alpha - t)^{1/(1-\alpha)} & \text{for } 2^{\alpha-1} \leq t < 2^\alpha, \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq 2^\alpha. \end{cases}$$

It is elementary to show that both $\{y_1(t)\}$ and $\{y_2(t)\}$ are solutions of (1.2) satisfying $y_1(0) = y_2(0) = 1$. Based on $\{y_1(t)\}$ and $\{y_2(t)\}$, it is easy to construct infinitely many solutions of (1.2) satisfying $y(0) = 1$. Therefore (1.1) has infinitely many solutions $\{x(t)\}$ satisfying $x(0) = 1$.

4 Weak solutions

In this section, we prove the existence of the weak solution to (2.2) by considering the corresponding martingale problem. Let (σ, b, g_0, g_1) be given as in the second section. Let $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ be the set of twice continuously differentiable functions on \mathbb{R} which together with their derivatives up to the second order are bounded. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ we define

$$Af(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma(x)^2 f''(x) + \int_{U_0} D_{g_0(x,u)} f(x) \mu_0(du)$$

$$+ b(x)f'(x) + \int_{U_2} \Delta_{g_1(x,u)} f(x) \mu_1(du). \quad (4.1)$$

To simplify the statements we introduce the following condition:

(4.a) there is a constant $K \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |b(x)| + \sigma(x)^2 + \int_{U_0} g_0(x,u)^2 \mu_0(du) \\ & + \int_{U_2} [|g_1(x,u)| \vee g_1(x,u)^2] \mu_1(du) \leq K, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1 *Suppose that condition (4.a) holds. Then a càdlàg process $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a weak solution to (2.2) if and only if for every $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$f(x(t)) - f(x(0)) - \int_0^t Af(x(s))ds, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (4.2)$$

is a locally bounded martingale.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ is deterministic. If $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a solution to (2.2), by Itô's formula it is easy to see that (4.2) is a locally bounded martingale. Conversely, suppose that (4.2) is a martingale for every $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$. By a standard stopping time argument, we have

$$x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t b(x(s-))ds + \int_0^t ds \int_{U_2} g_1(x(s-), u) \mu_1(du) + M(t)$$

for a square-integrable martingale $\{M(t) : t \geq 0\}$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.2 in [11], we obtain the equation (2.2) on an extension of the probability space by applying martingale representation theorems; see, e.g., [12, p.90 and p.93]. \square

Now suppose that conditions (3.a,b) and (4.a) are satisfied. For simplicity, in the sequel we assume the initial value $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ is deterministic. Let $\{V_n\}$ be a non-decreasing sequence of Borel subsets of U_0 so that $\cup_{n=1}^\infty V_n = U_0$ and $\mu_0(V_n) < \infty$ for every $n \geq 1$. It is easy to see that

$$x \mapsto \int_{V_n} g_0(x,u) \mu_0(du)$$

is a bounded continuous function on \mathbb{R} . For $n \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\chi_n(x) = \begin{cases} n, & \text{if } x > n, \\ x, & \text{if } |x| \leq n, \\ -n, & \text{if } x < -n. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

By the result on continuous-type stochastic equations, there is a weak solution to

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s))dB(s) + \int_0^t b(x(s))ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t ds \int_{V_n} g_0(\chi_n(x(s)), u) \mu_0(du); \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

see, e.g., [12, p.169]. We can rewrite (4.4) into

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s))dB(s) + \int_0^t [b_1(x(s)) + \mu_0(V_n)\chi_n(x(s))]ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left\{ b_2(x(s)) + \int_{V_n} [\chi_n(x(s)) + g_0(\chi_n(x(s)), u)]\mu_0(du) \right\} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$x \mapsto b_2(x) + \int_{V_n} [\chi_n(x) + g_0(\chi_n(x), u)]\mu_0(du)$$

is a bounded continuous non-decreasing function on \mathbb{R} . By Theorem 3.2 the pathwise uniqueness holds for (4.5), so it also holds for (4.4). Then there is a pathwise unique strong solution to (4.4). Let $\{W_n\}$ be a non-decreasing sequence of Borel subsets of U_2 so that $\cup_{n=1}^\infty W_n = U_2$ and $\mu_1(W_n) < \infty$ for every $n \geq 1$. Following the proof of Proposition 2.2 in [11] one can see for every integer $n \geq 1$ there is a strong solution to

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(x(s))dB(s) + \int_0^t b(x(s))ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{V_n} g_0(\chi_n(x(s-)), u)\tilde{N}_0(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{W_n} g_1(x(s-), u)N_1(ds, du). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By Theorem 3.2 the pathwise uniqueness holds for (4.6), so the equation has a unique strong solution; see, e.g., [16, p.104]. Let us denote the strong solution to (4.6) by $\{x_n(t) : t \geq 0\}$. By Proposition 4.1, for every $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$f(x_n(t)) = f(x_n(0)) + \int_0^t A_n f(x_n(s))ds + \text{mart.}, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_n f(x) &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma(x)^2 f''(x) + \int_{V_n} D_{g_0(\chi_n(x), u)} f(x)\mu_0(du) \\ &\quad + b(x)f'(x) + \int_{W_n} \Delta_{g_1(x, u)} f(x)\mu_1(du). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2 *Suppose that conditions (4.a) and (3.a,b) are satisfied. If $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $A_n f(x_n) \rightarrow Af(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let $M \geq 0$ be a constant so that $|x|, |x_n| \leq M$ for all $n \geq 1$. Under the conditions, it is easy to see that

$$x \mapsto \int_{V_k^c} g_0(x, u)^2 \mu_0(du) + \int_{W_k^c} |g_1(x, u)| \mu_1(du)$$

is a continuous function for each $k \geq 1$. By Dini's theorem we have, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\varepsilon_k := \sup_{|x| \leq M} \left[\int_{V_k^c} g_0(x, u)^2 \mu_0(du) + \int_{W_k^c} |g_1(x, u)| \mu_1(du) \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Let $y_n = \chi_n(x_n)$. For $n \geq k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{V_n} D_{g_0(y_n, u)} f(x_n) \mu_0(du) - \int_{U_0} D_{g_0(x, u)} f(x) \mu_0(du) \right| \\
& \leq \int_{V_k} \left| D_{g_0(y_n, u)} f(x_n) - D_{g_0(x, u)} f(x) \right| \mu_0(du) + \|f''\| \varepsilon_k \\
& \leq \int_{V_k} \left| f(x_n + g_0(y_n, u)) - f(x + g_0(x, u)) \right| \mu_0(du) \\
& \quad + \int_{V_k} |f(x_n) - f(x)| \mu_0(du) + \|f''\| \varepsilon_k \\
& \quad + \int_{V_k} \left| f'(x_n) g_0(y_n, u) - f'(x) g_0(x, u) \right| \mu_0(du) \\
& \leq \|f'\| \int_{V_k} \left| (x_n + g_0(y_n, u)) - (x + g_0(x, u)) \right| \mu_0(du) \\
& \quad + \int_{V_k} |f(x_n) - f(x)| \mu_0(du) + \|f''\| \varepsilon_k \\
& \quad + \|f'\| \int_{V_k} |g_0(y_n, u) - g_0(x, u)| \mu_0(du) \\
& \quad + \int_{V_k} |f'(x_n) - f'(x)| |g_0(x, u)| \mu_0(du) \\
& \leq 2\|f'\| \int_{V_k} |g_0(y_n, u) - g_0(x, u)| \mu_0(du) \\
& \quad + \left[\|f'\| |x_n - x| + |f(x_n) - f(x)| \right] \mu_0(V_k) + \|f''\| \varepsilon_k \\
& \quad + |f'(x_n) - f'(x)| \mu_0(V_k)^{1/2} \left[\int_{U_0} g_0(x, u)^2 \mu_0(du) \right]^{1/2}, \tag{4.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\int_{V_k} |g_0(y_n, u) - g_0(x, u)| \mu_0(du) \leq \left[\mu_0(V_k) \int_{U_0} |g_0(y_n, u) - g_0(x, u)|^2 \mu_0(du) \right]^{1/2}. \tag{4.9}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.8) and using condition (3.b) one can see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{V_n} D_{g_0(y_n, u)} f(x_n) \mu_0(du) = \int_{U_0} D_{g_0(x, u)} f(x) \mu_0(du). \tag{4.10}$$

Similarly, for $n \geq k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{W_n} \Delta_{g_1(x_n, u)} f(x_n) \mu_0(du) - \int_{U_2} \Delta_{g_1(x, u)} f(x) \mu_1(du) \right| \\
& \leq \|f'\| \int_{U_2} |g_1(x_n, u) - g_1(x, u)| \mu_1(du) + 2\|f'\| \varepsilon_k \\
& \quad + \left[\|f'\| |x_n - x| + |f(x_n) - f(x)| \right] \mu_1(W_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Then letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using condition (3.a) one sees

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{W_n} \Delta_{g_1(x_n, u)} f(x_n) \mu_0(du) = \int_{U_2} \Delta_{g_1(x, u)} f(x) \mu_1(du). \tag{4.11}$$

In view of (4.10) and (4.11), it is obvious that $A_n f(x_n) \rightarrow A f(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proposition 4.3 *Suppose that conditions (4.a) and (3.a,b) are satisfied. Then there exists a weak solution to (2.2).*

Proof. Following the proof of Lemma 4.3 in [11] it is easy to show that $\{x_n(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a tight sequence in the Skorokhod space $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. Then there is a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ that converges to some process $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$ in distribution on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. By the Skorokhod representation theorem, we may assume those processes are defined on the same probability space and $\{x_{n_k}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ converges to $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$ almost surely in $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$. Let $D(x) := \{t > 0 : \mathbf{P}\{x(t-) = x(t)\} = 1\}$. Then the set $[0, \infty) \setminus D(x)$ is at most countable; see, e.g., [9, p.131]. It follows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k}(t) = x(t)$ almost surely for every $t \in D(x)$; see, e.g., [9, p.118]. From (4.7) and Lemma 4.2 it follows that (4.2) is a locally bounded martingale. Then we get the result by Proposition 4.1. \square

Proposition 4.4 *Suppose that conditions (4.a) and (3.a,c) hold with: (i) $c = 1, \alpha_m = 2, p_m = 1/2$; or (ii) $c < 1, \alpha_m < 2, 1 - 1/\alpha_m < p_m \leq 1/2$. Then there exists a weak solution to (2.2).*

Proof. In condition (3.c), we can obviously assume $f_m \leq f_{m+1}$ for all $m \geq 1$. Let $V_n = \{u \in U_0 : f_n(u) \geq 1/n\}$. Then the conclusion of Lemma 4.2 remains true. The only necessary modification of the proof is that now we consider $n \geq k \geq M$. Then $|x|, |x_n| \leq M$ implies $|x|, |y_n| \leq k$, so we can replace (4.9) by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{V_k} |g_0(y_n, u) - g_0(x, u)| \mu_0(du) &\leq |y_n - x|^{p_k} \int_{V_k} f_k(u) \mu_0(du) \\ &\leq k |y_n - x|^{p_k} \int_{U_0} [f_k(u) \wedge f_k(u)^2] \mu_0(du). \end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows as in the proof of Proposition 4.3. \square

5 Strong solutions

In this section, we prove the existence of the strong solution to (2.1). Let (σ, b, g_0, g_1) be given as in the second section. We assume the following linear growth condition on the coefficients:

(5.a) there is a constant $K \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x)^2 + \int_{U_0} g_0(x, u)^2 \mu_0(du) + \int_{U_2} g_1(x, u)^2 \mu_1(du) \\ + b(x)^2 + \left(\int_{U_2} |g_1(x, u)| \mu_1(du) \right)^2 \leq K(1 + x^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.1 *Suppose that conditions (5.a) and (3.a,b) are satisfied. Then there is a pathwise unique strong solution to (2.1).*

Proof. By Proposition 4.3 for each integer $m \geq 1$ there is a weak solution to

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x(0) + \int_0^t \sigma(\chi_m(x(s)))dB(s) + \int_0^t b(\chi_m(x(s)))ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{U_0} g_0(\chi_m(x(s-)), u) \tilde{N}_0(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{U_2} \chi_m \circ g_1(\chi_m(x(s-)), u) N_1(ds, du). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

The pathwise uniqueness for the equation follows from Theorem 3.2. Then there is a unique strong solution $\{x_m(t) : t \geq 0\}$ to (5.1); see, e.g., [16, p.104]. Let $\tau_m = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |x_m(t)| \geq m\}$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.4 in [15] it is easy to get

$$\mathbf{E} \left[1 + \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} x_m(s \wedge \tau_m)^2 \right] \leq (1 + 6\mathbf{E}[x(0)^2]) \exp\{6K(4+t)t\}.$$

Then $\tau_m \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Following the proof of Proposition 2.2 in [11] one can show there is a pathwise unique strong solution to (2.2). Then the result follows from Proposition 2.1. \square

Theorem 5.2 *Let α_m be the number defined in (3.5). Suppose that conditions (5.a) and (3.a,c) hold with: (i) $c = 1, \alpha_m = 2, p_m = 1/2$; or (ii) $c < 1, \alpha_m < 2, 1 - 1/\alpha_m < p_m \leq 1/2$. Then there exists a pathwise unique strong solution to (2.1).*

Proof. Based on Proposition 4.4, this follows similarly as Theorem 5.1. \square

6 Non-negative solutions

In this section, we derive some results on non-negative solutions of the stochastic equation (2.1). Let (σ, b, g_0, g_1) be given as in the second section. In addition, we assume:

- $b(x) \geq 0$ and $\sigma(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$;
- for every $u \in U_0$ we have $x + g_0(x, u) \geq 0$ if $x > 0$ and $g_0(x, u) = 0$ if $x \leq 0$;
- $x + g_1(x, u) \geq 0$ for $u \in U_1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then, by Proposition 2.1 in [11], any solution of (5.1) is non-negative. By considering non-negative solutions, we can weaken the linear growth condition of the parameters into the following:

(6.a) there is a constant $K \geq 0$ such that

$$b(x) + \int_{U_2} |g_1(x, u)| \mu_1(du) \leq K(1+x), \quad x \geq 0;$$

(6.b) there is a non-decreasing function $x \mapsto L(x)$ on \mathbb{R}_+ so that

$$\sigma(x)^2 + \int_{U_0} g_0(x, u)^2 \mu_0(du) \leq L(x), \quad x \geq 0.$$

Theorem 6.1 *Suppose that conditions (6.a) and (3.a,b) are satisfied. Then for any $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ there is a pathwise unique non-negative strong solution to (2.1).*

Proof. By conditions (6.a) and (3.b) one can show that the parameters of (5.1) satisfy condition (4.a). Then for each integer $m \geq 1$ there is a non-negative weak solution to (5.1) by Proposition 4.3. The pathwise uniqueness for (5.1) holds by Theorem 3.2, so there is a unique non-negative strong solution to (5.1). Then the result follows as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 in [11]. \square

Corollary 6.2 (Dawson and Li [7]) *Given $0 \leq x(0) \leq 1$ there is a pathwise unique strong solution $\{x(t) : t \geq 0\}$ to (1.3) such that $0 \leq x(t) \leq 1$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. Observe that $q(x, r) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$ and $x \geq 1$. For any $0 \leq x, z, r \leq 1$ we have

$$0 \leq x + zq(x, r) = z1_{\{r \leq x\}} + (1 - z)x \leq 1.$$

Then $0 \leq x(0) \leq 1$ implies $0 \leq x(t) \leq 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. The function $x \mapsto x + q(x, r)$ is clearly non-decreasing and for any $0 \leq x, y \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \nu(dz) \int_0^1 z^2 |q(x, r) - q(y, r)|^2 dr &= [|x - y| - (x - y)^2] \int_0^1 z^2 \nu(dz) \\ &\leq |x - y| \int_0^1 z^2 \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by Theorem 6.1. \square

Corollary 6.3 (Döring and Barczy [8]) *Given $x(0) \geq 0$ there is a unique non-negative strong solution to (1.4).*

Proof. It is easy to see that $x \mapsto x + g(x, u, r)$ is a non-decreasing function. For any $x, y \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty dr \int_0^\infty (g(x, u, r) - g(y, u, r))^2 \mu_0(du) \\ &= \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-u})^2 \mu_0(du) [x + y - 2(x^{-1} \wedge y^{-1})xy] \\ &= \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-u})^2 \mu_0(du) |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6.1 there is a unique non-negative strong solution to the equation. \square

Theorem 6.4 *Suppose that conditions (6.a,b) and (3.a,c) hold with: (i) $c = 1, \alpha_m = 2, p_m = 1/2$; or (ii) $c < 1, \alpha_m < 2, 1 - 1/\alpha_m < p_m \leq 1/2$. Then there exists a pathwise unique non-negative strong solution to (2.1).*

Proof. This follows similarly as Theorem 6.1. Here condition (6.b) is used to guarantee condition (4.a) is satisfied by the parameters of (5.1). \square

Acknowledgements. The authors want to thank Professor M. Barczy for his careful reading of the paper and pointing out a number of typos. We would also like to acknowledge the Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems (Ministry of Education, China) for providing us the research facilities.

References

- [1] Bass, R.F. (2003): Stochastic differential equations driven by symmetric stable processes. *Lecture Notes Math.* **1801**, 302–313. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [2] Bass, R.F. (2004): Stochastic differential equations with jumps. *Probab. Surv.* **1**, 1–19.
- [3] Bass, R.F.; Burdzy, K. and Chen, Z.-Q. (2004): Stochastic differential equations driven by stable processes for which pathwise uniqueness fails. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **111**, 1–15.
- [4] Bertoin, J. and Le Gall, J.-F. (2005): Stochastic flows associated to coalescent processes II: Stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **41**, 307–333.
- [5] Bertoin, J. and Le Gall, J.-F. (2006): Stochastic flows associated to coalescent processes III: Limit theorems. *Illinois J. Math.* **50**, 147–181.
- [6] Dawson, D.A. and Li, Z. (2006): Skew convolution semigroups and affine Markov processes. *Ann. Probab.* **34**, 1103–1142.
- [7] Dawson, D.A. and Li, Z. (2012): Stochastic equations, flows and measure-valued processes. *Ann. Probab.* **40**, 813–857.
- [8] Döring, L and Barczy, M. (2011): A Jump-type SDE approach to positive self-similar Markov processes. *arXiv:1111.3235*.
- [9] Ethier, S.N. and Kurtz, T.G. (1986): *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York.
- [10] Fournier, N. (2011): On pathwise uniqueness for stochastic differential equations driven by stable Lévy processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* To appear.
- [11] Fu, Z.F. and Li, Z. (2010): Stochastic equations of non-negative processes with jumps. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **120**, 306–330.
- [12] Ikeda, N. and Watanabe, S. (1989): *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*. Second Edition. North-Holland/Kodasha, Amsterdam/Tokyo.
- [13] Komatsu, T. (1982): On the pathwise uniqueness of solutions of one-dimensional stochastic differential equations of jump type. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, **58**, 353–356.
- [14] Li, Z.H. (2012): Path-valued branching processes and nonlocal branching superprocesses. *Ann. Probab.* To appear.
- [15] Li, Z.; Mytnik, L. (2011): Strong solutions for stochastic differential equations with jumps. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **47**, 1055–1067.
- [16] Situ, R. (2005): *Theory of Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps and Applications*. Springer, Berlin.