

# Spinning Brownian motion

Mauricio Duarte E.

*Centro de Modelamiento Matemático  
Universidad de Chile  
Blanco Encalada 2120, piso 7  
Santiago, Chile  
e-mail: [maduarte@dim.uchile.cl](mailto:maduarte@dim.uchile.cl)*

**Abstract:** We present a reflection process  $X$  in a smooth, bounded domain  $D$  that behaves very much like obliquely reflected Brownian motion, except that the direction of reflection depends on an external parameter  $S$ , which we call spin. The spin is only allowed to change when the main process  $X$  is on the boundary of  $D$ . The model is inspired in a spinning Brownian ball that bounces of a moving wall.

We show strong existence and uniqueness of the joint process  $(X, S)$ , and prove that it has a unique stationary distribution. Our method uses techniques based on excursions of  $X$  from  $\partial D$ , and an associated exit system. We also show that this process admits a submartingale formulation and use known results to exhibit examples of the stationary distribution.

**AMS 2000 subject classifications:** Primary 60J60, 60H10; secondary 60J55, 60G10.

**Keywords and phrases:** stationary distribution, stochastic differential equations, excursion theory, degenerate diffusion, reflected diffusion.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded  $C^2$  domain, and let  $B_t$  be an  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion. A pair  $(X_t, S_t)$  with values in  $\overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p$  is called **spinning Brownian motion (sBm)** if it solves the following stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_t &= \sigma(X_t)dB_t + \vec{\gamma}(X_t, S_t)dL_t, \\ dS_t &= [\vec{g}(X_t) - \alpha(X_t)S_t]dL_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $L_t$  is the local time for  $X_t$ , and  $\vec{\gamma}$  points uniformly into  $D$ . Our assumptions on the coefficients are as follows:

- $\sigma(\cdot)$  is an  $(n \times n)$ -matrix valued, Lipschitz continuous function, and is uniformly elliptic, that is, there is a constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\xi^T \sigma(x) \xi \geq c_1 |\xi|^2$  for all  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and all  $x \in \overline{D}$ .
- $\vec{\gamma}(x, s) = \vec{n}(x) + \vec{\tau}(x, s)$  is defined for  $x \in \partial D$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , where  $\vec{n}$  is the interior normal to  $\partial D$ , and  $\vec{\tau}$  is a Lipschitz vector field on  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $\vec{n}(x) \cdot \vec{\tau}(x, s) = 0$  for all  $x \in \partial D$  and  $s \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,
- $\vec{g}(\cdot)$  is a Lipschitz vector field on  $\partial D$  with values in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ .

---

\*Research conducted at the University of Washington as part of the author's dissertation, and partially funded by the NSF grant number DMS 090-6743.

The process  $X_t$  behaves just like a Brownian diffusion inside  $D$ , and is reflected instantaneously in the direction  $\vec{\gamma} = \vec{n} + \vec{\tau}$  once it hits the boundary. The challenge is that the direction of reflection depends on an external parameter  $S_t$ , which is updated every time the main process  $X_t$  hits the boundary of  $D$ .

This type of process arises naturally from a physical model that might be useful for applications: consider a small ball that spins and moves around a planar box following a Brownian path. On the boundary of the box, we put tiny wheels which rotate at different speeds, modifying the spin of the ball as well as pushing it in a certain (non-normal) direction. In this context, it is natural to think of the boundary wheels as an external forcing system that is not affected by the hit of the ball: every wheel on the boundary rotates at a speed only dependent on its position. In this context, the position  $X_t$  of the particle at time  $t$  is described by the first equation in (1.1), in which the direction of the boundary push  $\vec{\gamma}(X_t, S_t)$  depends on the current position of the particle, that is, on which boundary wheel it hits, and the current spin  $S_t$  when the boundary is hit. The spin of the particle is recorded by the process  $S$ . As we described it, it only updates when the particle is on the boundary, and we have chosen its amount of change to be linear with respect to the current spin, since this is the physically relevant situation. Indeed, angular momentum is conserved when two particles collide in absence of external interference. The spinning Brownian particle of our interest will collide against the revolving wheel and this system will locally maintain its total angular momentum. It is natural then that the change of the spin is given by a linear combination of the current spin and the spin of the revolving boundary wheel ( $\vec{g}(x) - \alpha(x)s$ ), also taking into account that part of the angular momentum is used in reflecting the particle in a non-normal direction (thus the factor  $\alpha(x)$ .) This model has inspired us to call spinning Brownian motion to the solution of equation (1.1).

Even though our inspiration for the model comes from the spinning ball bouncing off of a moving boundary, from the mathematical point of view, it is natural to regard the process  $(X, S)$  as a multidimensional reflected diffusion in  $D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  with degeneracy, due to the absence of a diffusive motion in the  $p$  components of  $S$ . Setting  $Z = (X, S)$  we can write (1.1) as

$$dZ_t = \sigma_0(Z_t)dW_t + \vec{\kappa}(Z_t)dL_t, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $W_t$  is an  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion,  $\sigma_0(x, s)$  is the  $(n + p) \times n$  matrix obtained from  $\sigma(x)$  by augmenting it with zeroes, and  $\vec{\kappa}(x, s) = (\vec{\gamma}(x, s), \vec{g}(x) - s)$ . Since we have  $\partial(D \times \mathbb{R}^p) = \partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$ , the local times of (1.1) and (1.2) are the same because  $Z$  is in the boundary of its domain if and only if  $X \in \partial D$ , and the interior normal to  $D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  is just  $(\vec{n}, 0_p)$  where  $0_p$  is the zero vector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . Equation (1.2) does not fall within the domain of the submartingale problem of Stroock and Varadhan [17] since the diffusion matrix  $\sigma_0$  is not elliptic, and even though existence and uniqueness of a solution to equation (1.2) are direct to establish, their counterpart for the Submartingale problem is more subtle.

An alternative to the classical submartingale approach was introduced by Lions and Sznitman in Theorem 4.1 in [15], where existence of reflected diffusions

driven by a general semimartingale was shown, but that result only holds for smooth, bounded domains. Their approach is based on an analytical solution to the deterministic Skorokhod problem (see also [5] and [6, 7] for some non-smooth cases), but it does not yield many probabilistic results, such as the Feller property, that we need to study spinning Brownian motion and its stationary distribution.

In [1], a reflected process with inert drift is studied, and existence is obtained by constructing a reflected Brownian motion and then adding a drift through a Girsanov transformation. One could regard such process as a reflected diffusion with non-elliptic generator. Although their treatment of existence differs considerably from ours, the main ideas they use in the proof of uniqueness of the stationary distribution can be applied with some modification to our case.

Understanding the structure of the stationary distribution of spinning Brownian motion has been one of our main interests. First, we show that the spin  $S_t$  eventually hits and stays within a certain compact, convex set, which is independent of the starting position of the process. A classical result for Feller processes then yields the existence of a stationary distribution. The most challenging part is to prove that spinning Brownian motion admits a unique stationary distribution under the following crucial assumption on the vector field  $\vec{g}$ :

**A1** There are  $p + 1$  points  $x_1, \dots, x_{p+1}$  on the boundary of  $D$  such that for every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , there exist non negative coefficients  $\lambda_j$  such that  $y = \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \lambda_j \vec{g}(x_j)$ .

We start with an intermediate result that apparently has little to do with the stationary distribution, and it is interesting on its own. We identify the components of an exit system (see Section 2.2, or [16] for a definition) for excursions away from the boundary, in terms of the local time  $L_t$  of the process, and an excursion measure  $\mathbf{H}_x$  that has been constructed in the build up for Theorem 7.2 in [3]. It has been pointed out to us that it is possible to use the exit system  $(L_t, \mathbf{H}_x)$  to construct a stationary distribution for the process  $(X, S)$ , in a similar manner that is done in Theorem 8.1 in [9]. We do not need to use Doob's machinery to obtain a stationary distribution as spinning Brownian motion happens to be a Feller process that eventually stays within a fixed compact set, and thus existence of a stationary distribution follows from standard results.

Our proof of uniqueness of the stationary distribution is an adaptation, and somehow a generalization, of an analogous result for Brownian motion with inert drift, recently proved by Bass, Burdzy, Chen and Hairer in [1]. Although the literature in stationary distributions of elliptic reflecting diffusions is vast, we have not found other models or results for process that are similar to spinning Brownian motion. Nonetheless, some of the results available for elliptic reflected diffusions have been inspiring to understand the challenges of our research. The reader can consult the articles [10, 11, 12] to obtain an idea of the treatment of the problem in the case of an elliptic generator, and to see hence the differences with our approach to the problem.

One result that helps characterize the stationary distribution was developed by Weiss in his unpublished thesis [18], by a test that involves only the candidate

to stationary measure, the infinitesimal generator of the diffusion, and the vector field defining the directions of reflection. A recent extension of this result to some non-smooth domains was carried out by Kang and Ramanan in [13]. Both results ask for the submartingale problem associated to the diffusion to be well-posed, but they do not request ellipticity of the infinitesimal generator, and thus apply to our setting. We make use of this characterization of the stationary distribution to produce an explicit example of stationary distribution is a specific case of (1.1), and we also suggest simulations to obtain numerical approximations of the stationary distribution.

### 1.1. Outline

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we present the core results of our research: strong existence of SBM, the excursion decomposition of paths, and many lemmas on the stationary distribution. We leave out two key (and harder) proofs for Section 3.

The submartingale problem characterization allow us to provide both explicit and numerical examples of the stationary distribution for SBM processes. Section 4 contains an explicit example of a SBM and its stationary distribution, and we also provide some simulation-generated graphs of the spin marginal of the stationary distribution for two different 2-dimensional SBM.

## 2. Main results

### 2.1. Existence of Spinning Brownian motion

Our first results establish existence and uniqueness of Spinning Brownian motion both as a solution to the SDE (1.1), and also as a solution to a submartingale problem.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a complete probability space and let  $\{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  be a Brownian motion adapted to a filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , which satisfies the usual conditions. We refer the reader to the book of Karatzas and Shreve [14] for standard probabilistic notation.

We recall our basic assumptions on the coefficients of equation (1.1): the domain  $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is assumed to be of class  $C^2$  and bounded. We assume that  $\sigma$  is an  $n \times n$  uniformly elliptic, matrix valued function satisfying the Lipschitz condition:

$$\|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\| \leq c \|x - y\| \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where the norms are standard for matrices and  $n$ -dimensional vectors. We recall our assumptions on the field  $\vec{\gamma}: \partial D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ : it is Lipschitz continuous, and for every  $x \in \partial D$  we have  $\vec{\gamma}(x) \cdot \hat{n}(x) = 1$ . The vector field  $\vec{g}: \partial D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  is Lipschitz (and bounded), and  $\alpha: \partial D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a uniformly positive, Lipschitz continuous (and bounded) function.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Under the conditions stated above, the stochastic differential equation with reflection*

$$\begin{cases} dX_t &= \sigma(X_t)dB_t + \vec{\gamma}(X_t, S_t)dL_t, \\ dS_t &= (\vec{g}(X_t) - \alpha(X_t)S_t) dL_t, \end{cases}$$

has a unique strong solution.

*Proof.* The theorem follows almost immediately from Corollary 5.2 in [6] after a simple manipulation of the equation. Set  $Z_t = (X_t, S_t)$ , and for  $z = (x, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$  define  $\tilde{\sigma}(x, s)^T = [\sigma(x)^T 0_{n,p}^T]$ , where  $0_{n,p}$  is an  $n \times p$  matrix with all its entries equal to zero. Also set,  $\vec{\kappa}(x, s) = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{\gamma}(x, s) \\ \vec{g}(x) - \alpha(x)s \end{pmatrix}$ . Equation(1.1) can be rewritten as

$$dZ_t = \tilde{\sigma}(Z_t)dB_t + \vec{\kappa}(Z_t)dL_t, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $Z_t \in \overline{D \times \mathbb{R}^p}$ . Note that  $\partial(D \times \mathbb{R}^p) = \partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$ , and the interior normal to  $D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  is just the interior normal  $\hat{n}$  to  $D$  enlarged by  $p$  zeros. It is straight forward to check, then, that the local times in (1.1) and (2.1) are equivalent, and so, these two equations are indeed equivalent.

Equation (2.1) fits the framework of Corollary 5.2 in [6], except for the fact that the domain of the reflected diffusion is unbounded, which makes the vector field  $\vec{\kappa}$  unbounded. To fix this, we apply the Corollary 5.2 to equation (2.1) in the domain  $D \times B(0, 2n)$  to obtain a process  $Z_t^n$ , and define for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  the stopping times  $\tau_m^n = \inf \{t \geq 0 : |S_t^n| > m\}$ . By path-wise uniqueness in Corollary 5.2, [6], for large  $k \geq n \geq m$  we have that  $Z_{t \wedge \tau_m^k}^k = Z_{t \wedge \tau_m^n}^n$  which implies that  $\tau_m^k = \tau_m^n$  under  $\mathbb{P}_z$ , whenever  $|z| < m$ . In particular, this shows that  $\tau_m = \tau_m^k$  is well defined, and thus the process  $Z_t = Z_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k$  is also well defined for  $t < \tau_m$  under  $\mathbb{P}_z$  for  $|z| < m$ .

It follows that a process  $Z_t$  solving (2.1) can be defined up to time  $\tau = \sup_n \tau_n$ . We next show that  $\tau = \infty$  under  $\mathbb{P}_z$  for any  $z \in \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ . Indeed, since the local time  $L_t$  is continuous and of bounded variation, we have that the quadratic variation of  $S^k$  is zero. Let  $\alpha_0 = \inf \{\alpha(x) : x \in \partial D\}$ . By Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\alpha_0 L_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k} |S_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k|^2 &= |S_0|^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} 2e^{\alpha_0 L_u^k} S_u^k dS_u^k + \alpha_0 \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} e^{\alpha_0 L_u^k} |S_u^k|^2 dL_u^k \\ &\leq |S_0|^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} e^{\alpha_0 L_u^k} \left( 2 \|\vec{g}\|_\infty |S_u^k| - \alpha_0 |S_u^k|^2 \right) dL_u^k \\ &\leq |S_0|^2 + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} e^{\alpha_0 L_u^k} \frac{\|\vec{g}\|_\infty^2}{\alpha_0} dL_u^k \\ &= |S_0|^2 + \frac{\|\vec{g}\|_\infty^2}{\alpha_0^2} \left( e^{\alpha_0 L_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$|S_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k|^2 \leq |S_0|^2 e^{-\alpha_0 L_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k} + \frac{\|\vec{g}\|_\infty^2}{\alpha_0^2},$$

which shows that for large enough  $m$ , we have  $\tau_m = \infty$  under  $\mathbb{P}_z$ . Otherwise, taking  $t \rightarrow \infty$  above yields  $m^2 \leq |S_0|^2 + \alpha_0^{-2} \|\bar{g}\|_\infty^2$  for all large enough  $m$ , which is obviously a contradiction. This shows that the process  $Z_t$  solves (2.1) for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Uniqueness follows from the same idea. Any two processes solving (2.1) would coincide up to time  $\tau_m$  by Corollary 5.2, [6], thus they would coincide for all times.  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** *The computation that lead to the bound in  $|S_{t \wedge \tau_m}^k|^2$  carries over to  $S_t$ . In this case we obtain  $|S_t|^2 \leq |S_0|^2 e^{-\alpha_0 L_t} + \alpha_0^{-2} \|\bar{g}\|_\infty^2$ . As we will show later,  $L_t$  grows to infinity a.s., which implies that for large times, the spin process lives in a neighbourhood of the ball  $B(0, \alpha_0^{-1} \|\bar{g}\|_\infty)$ , and so any stationary distribution of  $(X_t, S_t)$  must be supported at most in the closure of  $D \times B(0, \alpha_0^{-1} \|\bar{g}\|_\infty)$ . For this reason, from this point on we will only consider  $(X_t, S_t)$  as a bounded diffusion.*

One very successful way of constructing diffusion processes with boundary conditions was developed by Stroock and Varadhan [17]. Their submartingale problem proved to be a successful extension of their ideas developed to treat the well-known martingale problem. The following survey on the submartingale problem is based on their original presentation.

Let  $G$  a non-empty, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , such that:

- (i) there exists  $\phi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathbb{R})$  such that  $G = \phi^{-1}(0, \infty)$ , and  $\partial G = \phi^{-1}(\{0\})$ .
- (ii)  $\|\nabla \phi(x)\| \geq 1$  for all  $x \in \partial G$ .

The following functions will also be given:

- (i)  $a : [0, \infty) \times G \rightarrow M_n^+(\mathbb{R})$  which is bounded and continuous,
- (ii)  $b : [0, \infty) \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  which is bounded and continuous,
- (iii)  $\bar{\eta} : [0, \infty) \times \partial G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  which is bounded, continuous, and satisfies that  $\langle \bar{\eta}(t, x), \nabla \phi(x) \rangle \geq \beta > 0$  for  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in \partial G$ .
- (iv)  $\rho : [0, \infty) \times \partial G \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which is bounded and continuous.

Define, for  $u \geq 0$  and  $x \in G$

$$\mathcal{L}_u = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^k a_{i,j}(u, x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i(u, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}; \quad (2.2)$$

and, for  $u \geq 0$  and  $x \in \partial G$

$$J_u = \sum_{i=1}^k \eta_i(u, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}.$$

We say that a probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  solves the submartingale problem on  $G$  for coefficients  $a, b, \bar{\eta}$  and  $\rho$  if  $\mathbb{P}(Z_t \in \bar{G}) = 1$ , for  $t \geq 0$ , and

$$f(t, Z_t) - \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_G(Z_u) \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} + \mathcal{L}_u f \right] (u, Z_u) du$$

is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -submartingale for any  $f \in C_0^{1,2}([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^k)$  satisfying

$$\rho \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + J_t f \geq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad [0, \infty) \times \partial G.$$

We say the the submartingale problem is well-posed if it has a unique solution.

We next show that the SDE (1.1) and its submartingale problem formulation are equivalent. This is done in order to access all the probabilistic results that the submartingale problem framework provides. In our case, the domain  $D$  satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) above, which are easy to extend to  $G = D \times \mathbb{R}^p$ . We set  $a = \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma}^T$ ,  $b \equiv 0$  and  $\bar{\eta} = \bar{\kappa}$ , as in equation (2.1). In our case, we take  $\rho \equiv 0$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** *The solution to (1.1) constructed in Theorem 2.1 is the unique solution to the associated submartingale problem.*

*Proof.* From Itô's formula, it is direct to check that the solution to (2.1) solves the submartingale problem. We only need to show uniqueness.

Let  $Z_t^*$  be a solution to the submartingale problem. We are going to show that  $Z_t^*$  is a weak solution to (2.1).

Indeed, by Theorem XX there exists an increasing, continuous process  $t \mapsto L_t^*$  such that  $dL_t^*$  is supported in the set  $\{Z_t^* \in \partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p\}$ , and by Theorem 2.1 in [17], we have that for all  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$  the following is a martingale:

$$M_t^\theta = \exp \left[ \theta \cdot \left( Z_t^* - Z_0^* - \int_0^t \bar{\kappa}(Z_u^*) dL_u^* \right) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \theta \cdot a(Z_u^*) \theta du \right] \quad (2.3)$$

For  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$  let  $M^j$  be the martingale above, obtained from  $\theta = \eta + \mathbf{e}^i + \lambda \mathbf{e}^j$ , where  $\eta, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}^j$  is the  $j$ -th vector in the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ . Note that we only care about the  $n$  first vectors in this basis. By doing a second-order Taylor expansion of  $M_t^{ij}$  in the variables  $\eta, \lambda$  we readily obtain that for  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$N_t^j = Z_t^{*j} - Z_0^{*j} - \int_0^t \bar{\gamma}(Z_u^*)^j dL_u^* \quad (2.4)$$

is a continuous martingale with quadratic cross-variation given by

$$\langle N^i, N^j \rangle_t = \int_0^t [\sigma \sigma^T](Z_u^*)^{ij} du. \quad (2.5)$$

Since  $\sigma$  is a bounded, elliptic matrix (here is crucial that  $i, j \leq n$ ), we have that these cross-variation processes are absolutely continuous functions of  $t$ , thus, in view of Theorem 4.2 and Remark 4.3 in [14] we conclude that there is an  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $\{W_t\}$  in  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$  and an  $n \times n$  matrix valued, adapted process  $\{X_t\}$ , with

$$Z_t^{*j} - Z_0^{*j} - \int_0^t \bar{\gamma}(Z_u^*)^j dL_u^* = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^t X_u^{j,k} dW_u^k, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

From (2.5), and Itô's isometry it follows by continuity that for all  $t > 0$

$$X_t X_t^T = \sigma(Z_t^*) \sigma(Z_t^*)^T.$$

Since  $\sigma$  is uniformly elliptic, it is non-singular, and from the equation above it follows that  $X_t$  has non-zero determinant for all  $t > 0$ . Set  $\Gamma_t = \sigma(Z_t^*)^{-1} X_t$ , and  $B_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_u dW_u$ . It is easy to check that  $\Gamma_t$  is unitary for all  $t > 0$ , and that  $\{B_t\}$  is a Brownian motion adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$  by using Levy's Theorem. It follows that

$$N_t = \int_0^t X_u dW_u = \int_0^t \sigma(Z_u^*) \Gamma_u dW_u = \int_0^t \sigma(Z_u^*) dB_u,$$

as desired.

By using  $\theta = \lambda e^j$ , with  $j = n+1, \dots, n+p$ , and doing a Taylor expansion in the variable  $\lambda$  in (2.3), we readily see that for  $Z_t^* = (X_t^*, S_t^*)$  we have that

$$\left( Z_t^{*j} - Z_t^{*j} - \int_0^t (\vec{g}(S_u^*) - \alpha(X_u^*) S_u^*) dL_u^* \right)^m$$

is a martingale starting from zero for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and thus is identically zero. This completes the proof that  $Z^* = (X^*, S^*)$  is a weak solution of (1.1), and thus the law of  $Z^*$  must be the one of the unique solution to (1.1), completing the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

The following representation formula simplifies the analysis of the spin process  $S_t$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $(X_t, S_t)$  solve equation (1.1). Define  $Y_t = \exp\left(\int_0^t \alpha(X_u) dL_u\right)$ . Then we have  $dY_t = \alpha(X_t) Y_t dL_t$ , and the spin process  $S_t$  has the pathwise representation*

$$S_t = Y_t^{-1} S_0 + Y_t^{-1} \int_0^t \frac{\vec{g}(X_u)}{\alpha(X_u)} dY_u. \quad (2.6)$$

Also, the support of any stationary distribution of  $(X_t, S_t)$  must be contained in the closure of  $D \times H$ , where  $H$  is the convex hull of the set  $\{\alpha(x)^{-1} \vec{g}(x) : x \in \partial D\}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $t \mapsto L_t$  is increasing and continuous,  $dL_t$  is a Riemann-Stieltjes measure and the first assertion is a consequence of the Chain rule. The spin process has zero quadratic variation as  $L_t$  does. We compute:

$$d(S_t Y_t) = (\vec{g}(X_t) - \alpha(X_t) S_t) Y_t dL_t + S_t Y_t \alpha(X_t) dL_t = \vec{g}(X_t) Y_t dL_t,$$

and so  $d(S_t Y_t) = \alpha^{-1}(X_t) \vec{g}(X_t) dY_t$ . Since  $Y_t \geq 1$  for all  $t > 0$ , (2.6) follows from integration of the equation above, and division by  $Y_t$ .

Next we prove the assertion on the support of stationary distributions. Since  $X_t \in \bar{D}$ , it is enough to show that for any stationary distribution  $\mu$  and open set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p \setminus \bar{H}$ , we have that  $\mu(\bar{D} \times A) = 0$ . Moreover, it is enough to consider sets of the form  $A_n = \{s \in \mathbb{R}^p : \text{dist}(s, H) > \frac{1}{n}\}$ .



Let  $C_t = (Y_t - 1)^{-1} \int_0^t \frac{\tilde{g}(X_u)}{\alpha(X_u)} dY_u$ . It is clear that  $C_t \in \overline{H}$  for all  $t > 0$ . It's not hard to arrive at the estimate

$$\text{dist}(S_t, H) \leq |S_t - C_t| \leq \left( |S_0| + \frac{\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty}{\alpha_0} \right) e^{-\alpha_0 L_t}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(S_t \in A_n) \leq \mathbb{P}_{x,s} \left( L_t < \alpha_0^{-1} \left| \log n \left( |s| + \frac{\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty}{\alpha_0} \right) \right| \right)$$

which converges to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $L_t \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. Since  $\mu$  is a stationary distribution, we have for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mu(\overline{D} \times A_n) = \int \mathbb{P}_{x,s}(S_t \in A_n) \mu(dx ds),$$

and by dominated convergence, we deduce that  $\mu(\overline{D} \times A_n) = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , as we wanted to show.  $\square$

## 2.2. Exit system for excursions away from the boundary

We introduce the notion of Exit System, first developed by Maisonneuve in [16]. Let  $Z$  be a standard Markov process taking values in a domain  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  with boundary  $\partial E$ . We attach to  $E$  a ‘‘cemetery’’ point  $\Delta$  outside of  $\overline{E}$ , and we denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  the set of functions  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\Delta\}$  that are continuous in some interval  $[0, \zeta)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and are equal to  $\Delta$  in  $[\zeta, \infty)$ .

An exit system for the process  $Z$  from  $\partial E$  is a pair  $(L_t^*, \mathbf{H}_x)$ , where  $L_t^*$  is a positive additive functional of  $Z$ , and  $\{\mathbf{H}_x\}_{x \in \partial E}$  is a family of sigma-finite measures on  $\mathcal{C}$  such that the canonical process is strong Markov on  $(t_0, \infty)$  under  $\mathbf{H}_x$ . These measures are called **excursion laws**.

Excursions of  $Z$  from  $\partial E$  will be denoted  $e$  or  $e_s$ , i.e, if  $s < u$  and  $Z_s, Z_u \in \partial E$ , and  $Z_t \notin \partial E$  for  $t \in (s, u)$ , then  $e_s = \{e_s(t) = X_{t+s}, t \in [0, u-s)\}$  and the lifetime of such excursion is given by  $\zeta(e_s) = u - s$ . By convention,  $e_s(t) = \Delta$  for  $t \geq \zeta$ .

Let  $\sigma_t = \inf \{s \geq 0 : L_s^* \geq t\}$  and let  $I$  be the set of left endpoints of all connected components of  $(0, \infty) \setminus \{t \geq 0 : X_t \in \partial E\}$ . The following result is a specialized version of the exit system formula.

**Theorem 2.4** (Theorem 1 in [16]). *There exists a positive, continuous additive functional  $L^*$  of  $(X, S)$  such that, for every  $x \in \overline{E}$ , any positive, bounded, predictable process  $V$ , and any universally measurable function  $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  that vanishes on excursions  $e_t$  identically equal to  $\Delta$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,s} \left[ \sum_{t \in I} V_t f(e_t) \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty V_{\sigma_s} \mathbf{H}_{Z(\sigma_s)}(f) ds \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty V_t \mathbf{H}_{Z_t}(f) dL_t^* \right]. \quad (2.7)$$

Standard notation is used for  $\mathbf{H}_x(f) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} f d\mathbf{H}_x$ .

The exit system formula provides a technical tool to reconstruct the process  $Z_t$  excursion by excursion. A very nice use of the excursion formula allows us to “count” excursion with a given property. For instance, let  $\Gamma$  be the set of excursions from  $\partial E$  starting at a time  $t \in [a, b)$  and going through an open set  $U \subseteq E$ . We set  $V_t \equiv 1$  and  $f = \mathbb{1}_\Gamma$  in the exit formula to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{a \leq u < b} \mathbb{1}_\Gamma(e_u) \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_a^b \mathbf{H}_{Z_u} dL_u^* \right]$$

The left hand side is the expectation of the number of excursions in  $\Gamma$ , which can be computed using the exit system  $(dL_t^*, \mathbf{H}_x)$  according to the right hand side.

For spinning Brownian motion in a domain  $D$ , note that excursions of  $(X, S)$  from  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  correspond to excursions of  $X$  from  $\partial D$  as  $S$  doesn't change within any excursion that goes inside  $D$ . In view of (2.7), it is enough to consider excursion laws  $\{\mathbf{H}_x\}_{x \in \partial D}$  for an exit system for  $X$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $\mathbb{P}^D$  be the law of Brownian motion killed upon exiting  $D$ . Define*

$$\mathbf{H}_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{P}_{x+\lambda\bar{n}(x)}^D \tag{2.8}$$

and let  $L_t$  be the local time of  $(X, S)$ , satisfying equation (1.1). Then  $\mathbf{H}_x$  is a sigma-finite measure, strongly Markovian with respect to the filtration of the driving Brownian motion  $B_t$ , and  $(L_t, c_1 \mathbf{H}_x)$  is an exit system from  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  for the process  $(X, S)$ , for some constant  $c_1 > 0$ .

*Proof.* See section 3. □

Notice that the exit system formula does not offer a natural way to normalize the measures  $\mathbf{H}_x$ . Moreover, if  $(A_t, \mathbf{H}_x)$  is an exit system and  $\eta(x)$  defines a positive, measurable function in  $E$ , then  $(\eta \cdot A_t, \eta(x)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_x)$  also defines an exit systems that satisfies (2.7). The excursion measures introduced in the previous theorem have been used by Burdzy [3] to establish a canonical choice of an exit system for reflected Brownian motion in Lipschitz domains.

For spinning Brownian motion, excursions from  $\partial D$  start exactly at times when the local time increases, and thus it is natural that for some positive function  $\eta : \partial D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have that  $(\eta \cdot dL_t, \mathbf{H}_x)$  is an exit system, because excursions of sBm don't look any different from those of reflected Brownian motion. By reasoning as above, an exit system for sBm should be  $(dL_t, \eta^{-1}(x) \mathbf{H}_x)$ . The theorem then proves that  $\eta \equiv 1$ .

### 2.3. The stationary distribution

The main goal of the section is to prove existence and uniqueness of the stationary distribution of spinning Brownian motion.

One of the issues with the diffusion  $(X_t, S_t)$  is the lack of a driving Brownian motion for the coordinates related to the spin. At an intuitive level, this means that the spin  $S_t$  could be confined to very small regions of the space, regions having Hausdorff dimension less than  $p$ , and consequently the support of the stationary distribution of the process could be singular with respect to Lebesgue measure. To make sure this is not the case, we need to impose some condition on the infinitesimal change of  $S_t$ , more precisely, on the function  $\vec{g}$ :

**A1** There are  $p+1$  points  $x_1, \dots, x_{p+1}$  on the boundary of  $D$  such that for every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , there exist non negative coefficients  $\lambda_j$  such that  $y = \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \lambda_j \vec{g}(x_j)$ .

From now on, we assume that **A1** holds, and we fix the points  $x_1, \dots, x_{p+1}$  that realize it. Notice that if  $y = \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \vec{g}(x_j)$ , then A1 implies that  $-y$  has an expansion with non-negative coefficients, and so we have that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are coefficients  $\eta_j > 0$  such that  $0 = \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \eta_j \vec{g}(x_j)$ , and  $\sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \eta_j < \varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *The set  $U_\varepsilon = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \eta_j \vec{g}(x_j) : \eta_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{p+1} \eta_j < \varepsilon \right\}$  is an open neighborhood of zero for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $U_\varepsilon = \varepsilon U_1$  it suffices to show that  $U_1$  is open. The previous discussion shows that  $0 \in U_1$ . By **A1**,  $\mathbb{R}^p = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$ , and so one of the sets  $U_n$  contains an open set by Baire's category theorem. As  $U_n = nU_1$ , we deduce that  $U_1$  contains an open set, which we call  $V$ .

Let  $w \in V$ . Since we can write  $w = \sum \eta_j \vec{g}(x_j)$  with  $\sum \eta_j < 1$ , it follows that  $0 \in U_1 - w \subseteq U_2 = 2U_1$ , and we deduce that  $U_1$  contains an open set around zero, and so does every  $U_\varepsilon$ . We need to show that a similar property holds at every point  $z \in U_1$ . Let  $z = \sum \lambda_j \vec{g}(x_j) \in U_1$  with  $\sum \lambda_j = 1 - \delta$ . Then  $z + U_\delta$  is a neighborhood of  $z$  contained in  $U_1$ , which shows that  $U_1$  is open, as we wanted to show.  $\square$

As we have already seen in Lemma 2.3, the set of convex combinations of  $\vec{g}/\alpha$  plays a significant role in the characterization of the support of the stationary distribution of spinning Brownian motion. We name this set  $H$ , and refer to it as the *convex hull of  $\{\vec{g}/\alpha\} = \{\vec{g}(x)\alpha(x)^{-1} : x \in \partial D\}$* :

$$H_{\vec{g}, \alpha} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \frac{\vec{g}(y_j)}{\alpha(y_j)} : y_j \in \partial D, \lambda_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j = 1 \right\}.$$

In Lemma 2.3, we have seen that when started on  $\overline{H}$ , the spin process  $S_t$  lives forever in the closure of this set. Moreover, starting the sling at  $s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the spin process tends to live very close to  $H_{\vec{g}, \alpha}$ , and thus any stationary distribution must be supported within the closure of  $D \times H_{\vec{g}, \alpha}$ .

We prepare to prove that the stationary distribution, exists, is unique, and its support corresponds to the closure of  $D \times H_{\vec{g}, \alpha}$ . The proof consists of four steps. In the first one (Proposition 2.8), we use a support theorem and continuity results for the Skorohod map to show that for any given point  $z \in D$ ,  $T > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the probability of  $(X_T, S_T)$  to be in a ball of radius  $\varepsilon$  around the final point  $(z, 0)$  is positive, no matter what the initial position is. In the second step,

we use the results of Section 2.2 and excursion theory to show how the path of  $X_t$  can be decomposed into several excursions, and how spinning Brownian motion up to the first hitting time of a ball  $U \subseteq D$  can be obtained from sBm conditioned on never hitting  $U$ , and adding a suitable “last excursion” that hits  $U$ . This construction is then used in the third step to patch together a spinning Brownian motion from several independent spinning Brownian motions  $Y_t^j$ . In the final step, we show how to condition each of the  $Y^j$ 's on hitting the boundary of  $D$  only at certain places and deduce from this that a component of the spin  $S_t$  has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure. This procedure is detailed in Theorem 2.10.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $D$ ,  $\vec{\gamma}$  and  $\vec{g}$  be as above. Let  $r, T > 0$ , and  $z \in D$ . Assume that A1 holds. Then, for any  $(x_0, s_0) \in \bar{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p$  there is  $\omega \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$  with bounded variation such that there is a unique  $(x, s) \in C([0, T]; \bar{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p)$  satisfying  $(x(0), s(0)) = (x_0, s_0)$ ,  $(x(T), s(T)) = (z, 0)$ , and for  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x_0 + \omega(t) + \int_0^t \vec{\gamma}(x(u), s(u)) dl(u), \\ s(t) &= s_0 + \int_0^t \vec{g}(x(u)) - \alpha(x(u))s(u) dl(u), \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $l(\cdot)$  is a continuous and increasing function, that only increases when  $x(t) \in \partial D$ , that is  $l(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\partial D}(x(u)) dl(u)$ .

*Proof.* In virtue of Theorem 4.1 in [15], we would expect uniqueness to hold in the bounded variation case. The issue to apply such theorem directly is that the reflection vector  $\vec{\gamma}$  depends on the value of  $s(\cdot)$ , but the same proof carries over to our case.

Next we construct a function  $\bar{\omega} \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$  with bounded variation, and a solution  $(x, s)$  of the system above. Consider the uniform partition  $0 < a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < \dots < b_{p+1} < T$  of  $[0, T]$ .

To construct  $\bar{\omega}$  and the associated solution, set  $\bar{\omega}(0) = 0$  and for  $t \in (0, a_1]$ , let  $\bar{\omega}(t)$  be defined as any fixed continuous function with bounded variation, such that  $x_0 + \bar{\omega}(t) \in D$ , and  $x_0 + \bar{\omega}(a_1) = x_1$ . It is clear that any solution  $(x, s)$  has to satisfy  $x(t) = x_0 + \bar{\omega}(t)$ ,  $s(t) = s_0$ , and  $l(t) = 0$  up to time  $a_1$ . Next we want to keep  $x(t)$  at  $x_1$  from  $a_1$  to  $b_1$ . In view of (2.6), for  $t \in [a_1, b_1]$  we set  $y_1(t) = \exp[\alpha(x_1)(l(t) - l(a_1))] = e^{\alpha(x_1)l(t)}$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} s(t) &= y_1(t)^{-1} s_0 + \vec{g}(x_1) y_1(t)^{-1} \int_{a_1}^t e^{\alpha(x_1)l(u)} dl(u) \\ &= y_1(t)^{-1} s_0 + \frac{\vec{g}(x_1)}{\alpha(x_1)} y_1(t)^{-1} [y_1(t) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

By setting  $l(t) = 0 + \eta_1(t - a_1)$  for  $t \in [a_1, b_1]$ , where  $\eta_1$  is to be determined, we obtain that both  $l$  and  $s$  are continuous. All this implies that we need to define

$$\bar{\omega}(t) = x_1 - x_0 - \eta_1 \int_{a_1}^t \vec{\gamma}(x_1, s(u)) du.$$

Uniqueness in  $[a_1, b_1]$  follows directly from the fact that the equation above defines a continuous function with bounded variation. Thus, the functions  $(x, s)$  defined above correspond to the unique solutions to the Skorokhod problem for  $\bar{w}$  in  $[a_1, b_1]$ .

Next, we want to keep  $s(t)$  constant in  $[b_1, a_2]$ , while we move  $x(t)$  from  $x_1$  to  $x_2$ . To this end, pick a curve  $\zeta_1 : [b_1, a_2] \rightarrow \bar{D}$  such that  $\zeta_1(b_1) = x_1$ ,  $\zeta_1(a_2) = x_2$  and  $\zeta_1(t) \in D$  for other values of  $t$ . Set  $l(t) = l(b_1)$  for  $t \in [b_1, a_2]$ , and  $\bar{w}(t) = \zeta(t) - x_1 + \bar{w}(b_1)$ . It is clear that the only solution with bounded variation in this interval is  $x(t) = \zeta_1(t)$  and  $s(t) = s(b_1)$ .

We iterate this process by keeping  $x(t)$  at  $x_j$  in  $[a_j, b_j]$ , and by defining  $l(t) = l(b_{j-1}) + \eta_j(t - a_j)$ ,  $y_j(t) = \exp[\eta_j \alpha(x_j)(t - a_j)]$  in that interval. This way, the function  $s(t)$  must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} s(t) &= [y_1(b_1) \cdots y_{j-1}(b_{j-1}) y_j(t)]^{-1} s_0 + \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^j \frac{\bar{g}(x_m)}{\alpha(x_m)} [y_m(b_m) \cdots y_{j-1}(b_{j-1}) y_j(t)]^{-1} [y_m(b_m) - 1] \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

for  $t \in [a_j, b_j]$ . The calculation leading to such equation, though tedious, is straight-forward to carry out by splitting the integral in  $[0, t]$  into integrals in the sets  $[a_j, b_j]$  and  $[b_j, b_{j+1}]$ , and using our definition of  $l(u)$  in each of those intervals. In the interval  $[a_j, b_j]$ , define  $\bar{w}(t)$  by

$$\bar{w}(t) = \bar{w}(a_j) - \eta_j \int_{a_j}^t \bar{\gamma}(x_j, s(u)) du.$$

Once again the unique solution in this interval for this  $\bar{w}$  is  $(x_j, s(t))$ .

From  $b_j$  to  $a_{j+1}$  we find a curve  $\zeta_j$  going from  $x_j$  to  $x_{j+1}$  through  $D$ , and set  $\bar{w}(t) = \zeta_j(t) - x_j + \bar{w}(b_j)$  and  $l(t) = l(b_j)$ . The unique solution is then  $(\zeta_j(t), s(b_j))$ . This procedure can be also done so that  $x(T) = z$ .

It remains to show that we can choose the values of  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{p+1} \geq 0$  such that  $s(T) = 0$ . At time  $T$  we find that

$$s(T) = s_0 \prod_{m=1}^{p+1} y_m(b_m)^{-1} + \sum_{m=1}^{p+1} \frac{\bar{g}(x_m)}{\alpha(x_m)} [y_m(b_m) - 1] \prod_{i=m}^{p+1} y_i(b_i)^{-1},$$

and to obtain  $s(T) = 0$  we need

$$-s_0 = \sum_{m=1}^{p+1} \frac{\bar{g}(x_m)}{\alpha(x_m)} [y_m(b_m) - 1] \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} y_i(b_i).$$

By **A1** there are non-negative  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{p+1}$  such that  $-s_0 = \sum_{m=1}^{p+1} \bar{g}(x_m) \lambda_m$ , so we need to choose the numbers  $\eta_m$  so that  $y_m(b_m)$  satisfies  $\alpha(x_m) \lambda_m = [y_m(b_m) - 1] \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} y_i(b_i)$ . This is easily achieved by an inductive procedure, and the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $D$ ,  $\vec{\tau}$ ,  $\vec{g}$ ;  $r, T > 0$ , and  $z \in D$  as in Lemma 2.7. Then, for every  $(x_0, s_0) \in D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  there exists  $p > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_0, s_0}((X_T, S_T) \in B(z, r) \times B(0, r)) \geq q,$$

where  $q$  depends on  $T$  and  $r$ , but is independent of  $(x_0, s_0)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be the law of standard Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . By pathwise uniqueness, we know that for a.e.  $\omega \in \text{supp}(\mathbb{P})$  there is a unique pair  $(x, s) \in C([0, T]; \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p)$ , such that for  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= x_0 + \omega(t) + \int_0^t \vec{\tau}(x(u), s(u)) dl(u), \\ s(t) &= s_0 + \int_0^t \vec{g}(x(u)) - s(u) dl(u), \end{aligned}$$

where,  $l(\cdot)$  is a continuous and increasing, satisfying  $l(t) = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\partial D}(x(u)) dl(u)$ , that is, it only increases when  $x(t) \in \partial D$ . It is standard to call this function  $l(\cdot)$  the local time.

Let  $\Omega$  be the set of continuous  $\omega \in D([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$  such that this uniqueness hold. We emphasize that  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$  and that the  $\overline{\omega}$  constructed in Lemma 2.7 belongs to  $\Omega$ . Define  $\Gamma$  in  $\Omega$  by the assignment  $\omega \mapsto (x, s)$  as above. We claim that  $\Gamma$  is continuous at  $\overline{\omega}$ , where continuity is taken in the sense of uniform convergence in compact sets. Indeed, let  $\omega_j \in \Omega$  be a sequence converging uniformly in  $[0, T]$  to  $\overline{\omega}$ . Then, by setting  $z(t) = (x, s)(t)$  and  $\vec{\zeta}(z) = (\vec{\tau}(x, s), \vec{g}(x))$ , we have that the  $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ -valued functions  $\eta_j = (\omega_j, 0)$  converge uniformly to  $\overline{\eta} = (\overline{\omega}, 0)$ . By Theorem 3.1 in [5], we have that the unique solutions  $(x_j, s_j)$  to the Skorokhod problem with reflecting vector  $\vec{\zeta}$  in  $\overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}^p$ , and corresponding driving function  $\eta_j$  is relatively compact, and any limit is a solution of the corresponding problem with driving function  $\overline{\omega}$ . By uniqueness ( $\overline{\omega} \in \Omega$ ), we deduce that  $(x_j, s_j) \rightarrow (\overline{x}, \overline{s})$  in  $D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{n+p})$ . But as all the involved functions are continuous, we actually deduce that the latter convergence is uniform in  $[0, T]$ .

In particular, there is  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\omega \in \Omega \cap B_C(\overline{\omega}, \delta)$ , then the associated solution to the Skorokhod problem  $(x, s) \in B_{C[0, T]}((\overline{x}, \overline{s}), r)$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{x_0, k_0}((X_T, S_T) \in B(z, r) \times B(y, r)) &\geq \mathbb{P}_{x_0, k_0}((x, s) \in B_C((\overline{x}, \overline{s}), r)) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(\omega \in B_C(\overline{\omega}, \delta)), \end{aligned}$$

which is greater than some positive constant  $q$ , independent of  $x_0$ , by the support theorem of Brownian motion. □

**Corollary 2.9.** *Let  $r > 0$  and  $\tau = \inf \{t > 0 : S_t \in B(0, r)\}$ . Then  $\tau$  is finite almost surely.*

*Proof.* Let  $N[a, b]$  be the event “ $S_t$  is not in  $B(0, r)$  for any  $t \in [a, b]$ ”. Then  $\mathbb{P}_{x, s}(\tau < \infty) = 1 - \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x, s}(N[0, b])$ , where the limit is clearly decreasing.

By Proposition 2.8 we have that  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(N[0, T]) \leq 1 - q$ , and a standard application of the Markov property shows that  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(N[0, nT]) \leq (1 - q)^n$ , which yields  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(\tau < \infty) = 1$ .  $\square$

We next proceed to introduce some results about the stationary distribution of spinning Brownian motion. Our method is very much an adaptation of the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [1]. Such argument involves a decomposition of (the law of)  $X_t$  in several reflecting processes that are somewhat independent of each other. To the reader familiar with excursion theory, “independence” is achieved by using suitable exit systems. This decomposition allows us to control both the local time and the trajectory of the process before hitting a fixed open set  $U$ , and deduce that no stationary measure can be null in  $U$ .

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $(X, S)$  be spinning Brownian motion solving (1.1) with  $S_0 = 0$ . Then, for every  $T > 0$ , there is an open set  $U \subseteq H_{\tilde{g}, \alpha}$ , and  $c > 0$  such that for every open  $B \subseteq U$  it holds that  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(S_T \in B) > c m^p(B)$ .*

*Proof.* See section 3.2.

**Corollary 2.11.** *Spinning Brownian motion has a unique stationary distribution, supported in the closure of  $D \times H_{\tilde{g}, \alpha}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $T > 0$ , and  $U$  given by the previous theorem. Since  $S$  does not change when  $X$  is inside the domain  $D$  and  $X$  behaves like Brownian motion within excursions, we conclude from the Markov property that  $(X_{T+1}, S_{T+1})$  has a component with a density with respect to  $(n + d)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure on a non-empty open subset of  $E \times U$ . By Proposition ??, we can assume that  $U \subseteq H_{\tilde{g}, \alpha}$ .

We can now combine this with the result of Proposition 2.8 using the Markov property to see that for some non-empty set  $\tilde{U}$  and any starting point  $(X_0, S_0) = (z_0, k_0)$ , the process  $(X_{t_0}, S_{t_0})$  has a positive density with respect to  $(n + d)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure on  $\tilde{U}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_{z_0, k_0}$ . This property is generally referred to as Harris irreducibility of the process  $(X, S)$ .

From Lemma 2.3, we know that any stationary distribution of  $(X, S)$  has to be supported in the closure of  $D \times H_{\tilde{g}, \alpha}$ , a bounded set, therefore we deduce that  $(X, S)$  has at least one stationary distribution from the standard theory of Feller processes (see Theorem IV.9.3 in [8]). Let  $\mu$  be one of them. For the open set  $\tilde{U}$  in the preceding paragraph

$$\mu(\tilde{U}) = \int_E \mathbb{P}_{x,k} \left[ (X_{t_0}, S_{t_0}) \in \tilde{U} \right] \mu(dxdy) \geq c m^d(\tilde{U}) > 0,$$

which means that any stationary distribution contains  $\tilde{U}$  in its support. This contradicts Birkhoff’s ergodic theorem in case that more than one stationary distribution exist, so there is only one stationary distribution.  $\square$

### 3. Two proofs

#### 3.1. Exit system for excursions away from the boundary

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $\mathbb{P}^D$  be the law of Brownian motion killed upon exiting  $D$ . Define*

$$\mathbf{H}_x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{P}_{x+\lambda\vec{n}(x)}^D \quad (2.8)$$

and let  $L_t$  be the local time of  $(X, S)$ , satisfying equation (1.1). Then  $\mathbf{H}_x$  is a sigma-finite measure, strongly Markovian with respect to the filtration of the driving Brownian motion  $B_t$ , and  $(L_t, c_1 \mathbf{H}_x)$  is an exit system from  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$  for the process  $(X, S)$ , for some  $c_1 > 0$  independent of  $x$ .

*Proof.* The fact that  $\mathbf{H}_x$  is sigma-finite for all  $x \in \partial D$ , and strongly Markovian is proved in Theorem 7.2 in [3]. The proof actually applies as these are properties of the measures and do not have anything to do with the local time.

Let  $(dL_t^*, \mathbf{H}_x)$  be an exit system for  $(X, S)$ , where  $L^*$  is the additive functional from Theorem 2.4. We will prove that it is possible to replace  $L_t^*$  by the local time  $L_t$  from equation (1.1). Let  $K \subseteq \partial D$  be open in the relative topology, and set  $C = \|\vec{\gamma} - \vec{n}\|_\infty$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be a very small number. For  $T > 0$ , denote by  $A^\varepsilon$  the set of excursions from  $\partial D$  that start before time  $T$  and reach a level  $\varepsilon$  from  $\partial D$ :

$$A^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ e_t : t < T, \sup_{s < \zeta} \text{dist}(e_t(s), \partial D) > \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Let  $x \in \partial D$  be fixed. Pick  $\delta > 0$  so small such that the following is possible: Choose a small  $r$  and coordinates  $(x^i)_{i=1}^n$  that differ from the canonical coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by a translation and a rotation, such that  $x = 0$  in these coordinates, and

- $D \cap B_r(x) = \{(y, s) : s > \phi(y)\} \cap B_r(x)$ , that is,  $D$  is locally is the graph above a function  $\phi$ ,
- $\partial D \cap B_r(x) = \{(y, \phi^i(y))\} \cap B_r(x)$ ,
- $\nabla \phi(x) = 0$ .

We call the above a normal set of coordinates centered at  $x$ .

Next we decompose  $K$  into sets closed set  $K_1, \dots, K_{m_\delta}$  such that the surface measure of the symmetric difference between  $K_j$  and  $K_i$  is zero ( $i \neq j$ ), and such that in each  $K_j$  we have sets of normal coordinates centered at  $x_1, \dots, x_{m_\delta}$ , and respective boundary defining functions  $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^{m_\delta}$  as above, and

$$\vec{n}(z) \cdot \vec{n}(x_j) > 1 - \delta^2 \quad \forall z \in K_j. \quad (3.1)$$

To simplify notation, for  $z = (y, \phi^j(y)) \in \partial D$ , we will write  $\phi^j(z)$  instead of  $\phi^j(y)$ . This is obviously an abuse of notation that can be justified by identifying  $\phi^j$  with  $\phi^j \circ \iota_{n-1}$  on the boundary of  $D$ , where  $\iota_{n-1}$  is the projection into the



first  $n - 1$  coordinates. By our choice of  $\nabla\phi^j(x_j) = 0$ , we have that  $\vec{n}(x_j) = \mathbf{e}_n$ . With this convention, condition (3.1) reads

$$1 - \delta^2 < \vec{n}(z) \cdot \mathbf{e}_n = \frac{(-\nabla\phi^j(z), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + \|\nabla\phi^j(z)\|^2}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_n = \sqrt{1 + \|\nabla\phi^j(z)\|^2}^{-1}.$$

We deduce that for small  $\delta$ , the estimate  $\|\nabla\phi^j(z)\| \leq 2\delta$  holds, and by the mean value theorem

$$|\phi^j(z)| = |\phi^j(z) - \phi^j(x_j)| \leq 2\delta \|x_j - z\| \leq 2\delta r_\delta.$$

Let  $T_{x_j}$  be the tangent plane to  $\partial D$  at  $x_j$ . The computation above says that the piece of the boundary  $\partial D \cap B_{r_\delta}(x_j)$  is contained in the cylinder  $[T_{x_j} \cap B_{r_\delta}(x_j)] \times [-2\delta r_\delta, 2\delta r_\delta]$ . Thus,  $K_j \subseteq C_j \cap \partial D$ . In our proof, it will be useful to set  $\lambda = \lambda(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}$  and define the cylinder  $C_j = [T_{x_j} \cap B_{r_\delta}(x_j)] \times [-\lambda, \lambda]$ . The ‘‘top’’ of the cylinder  $C_j$  will be denoted by  $C_j^T$ .




FIGURE 1. Cylinder  $C_j$ , and other related objects.

By the exit system formula with  $V_u = 1$ , and the construction above, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* &= \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \sum_{u < T} \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m_\delta} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \sum_{u < T} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

for any Borel set  $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ , and any  $T > 0$ .

Let  $\sigma^j = \inf \{t \geq 0 : X_t \in K_j\}$  and  $\tau^j = \inf \{t \geq 0 : X_t \notin C_j\}$ . Set  $\sigma_0^j = \sigma_0^j$ , and for each integer  $k \geq 1$ , let  $\tau_k^j = \tau^j \circ \theta(\sigma_k^j) + \sigma_k^j$  and  $\sigma_{k+1}^j = \sigma_0^j \circ \theta(\tau_k^j) + \tau_k^j$ , where  $\theta$  is the usual shift operator. It is a well known fact that all these objects are stopping times. Since  $K_j$  is closed, the process  $\mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u)$  is predictable as  $X$

is continuous. Then,  $\tilde{V}_u = V_u \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u)$  is non-negative, predictable and bounded, and so, by the exit formula for  $(dL_t^*, \mathbf{H}_x)$ , and a simple change of variable,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \sum_{u < T} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u) &= \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_k^j < T\}} \int_{\sigma_k^j}^{\tau_{k+1}^j} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_k^j < T\}} \left( \int_0^{\tau^j} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* \circ \theta(\sigma_k^j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_k^j < T\}} \mathbb{E}^{X_{\sigma_k^j}, S_{\sigma_k^j}} \left( \int_0^{\tau^j} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by the strong Markov property applied at time  $\sigma_k^j$ .

Assume that for all  $z = (x, s)$  with  $x \in C_j \cap \partial D$ , the following equation holds for some  $c_1 > 0$  independent of  $x$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_z \int_0^{\tau^j} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* &= (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbb{E}_z \int_0^{\tau^j} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) c_1 dL_u \\ &\quad + O(\delta) \mathbb{E}_z(L_{\tau^j}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $O(\delta)$  is standard notation for a bounded function that converges to zero as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Then, we can trace back all of our computations up to (3.2) to obtain the following property: for all measurable sets  $K \subseteq \partial D$  and  $v < t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* &= O(\delta) \mathbb{E}_{x,s} L_t + \\ &\quad + (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) c_1 \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $K$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $v < t$  are independent of  $\delta$ , we can take the limit as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in last equation to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* = \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t \mathbb{1}_K(X_u) c_1 \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u.$$

A standard argument involving the monotone class theorem, shows that this last equation is not only valid for  $\mathbb{1}_K$ , but also for all bounded, measurable functions  $f : \partial D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Since for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the function  $x \mapsto \mathbf{H}_x(A^\varepsilon)$  is bounded away from zero (see [3]), we can take  $f(x) = e^{-\alpha t} \mathbf{H}_x(A^\varepsilon)^{-1}$  to get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t e^{-\alpha t} dL_u^* = \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_v^t e^{-\alpha t} c_1 dL_u, \quad (3.4)$$

for any positive  $\alpha$ , and arbitrary  $v < t$ . We can extend (3.4) in the following way: for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $T > 0$ , define simple functions by

$$f_{N,T}(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(t) + \sum_{k=0}^N \mathbb{1}_{\left(\frac{kT}{N}, \frac{(k+1)T}{N}\right]}(t) e^{-\alpha \frac{(k+1)T}{N}}.$$

It follows from (3.4) that  $\mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^\infty f_{N,T}(u) dL_u^* = \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^\infty f_{N,T}(u) c_1 dL_u$ . It is clear that  $f_{N,T}(u)$  increases to  $e^{-\alpha u} \mathbb{1}_{[0,T]}(u)$  for all  $T > 0$ , and so, by the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha u} dL_u^* = \mathbb{E}_{x,s} \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha u} c_1 dL_u,$$

that is,  $L^*$  and  $L$  have the same  $\alpha$ -potential functions. Since both  $L^*$  and  $L$  are continuous, it follows by [2], Chapter 4, Theorem 2.13, that  $c_1 L = L^*$  a.s. This shows that  $(dL_t, c_1 \mathbf{H}_x)$  is an exit system, and the theorem is proved.

It remains to show that equation (3.3) holds. It might seem that the exit formula (2.7), and equation (3.3) just differ on the upper limit of the integral. In the former, the upper limit is a fixed time  $T$  whereas in the latter, the upper limit is the random time  $\tau^j$ . The advantage of having  $\tau^j$  as an upper limit is that *at most one excursion* that reaches level  $\varepsilon$  away from  $\partial D$  starts before time  $\tau^j$ . We will drop the super index  $j$  from  $\tau^j$  for notational simplicity.

Call  $I_z$  to the left hand side of (3.3). The process  $\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau < u\}}$ , and thus  $\mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq \tau\}}$ , are predictable. Since at time  $\tau$  the process  $X$  cannot be on the boundary, we see by the exit formula (2.7) applied with  $V_u = \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq \tau\}} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u)$

$$\begin{aligned} I_z &= \mathbb{E}_z \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{u < \tau\}} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* \\ &= \mathbb{E}_z \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq \tau\}} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^* = \mathbb{E}_z \sum_{u < \infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq \tau\}} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_z \sum_{u < \infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{u < \tau\}} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u) = \mathbb{E}_z \sum_{u < \tau} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u), \end{aligned}$$

which roughly says that the exit formula is also valid if we change  $T > 0$  for the stopping time  $\tau$ .

Since only one excursion in  $A^\varepsilon$  can happen before time  $\tau$ , we see that  $I_z$  is equal to the probability that, after escaping  $C_j$ , an excursion reaches distance  $\varepsilon$  away from  $\partial D$ . Intuitively, a reflected Brownian motion  $Y$  starting at  $z$  accumulate roughly the same local time as  $X$  before exiting  $C_j$ . Since the cylinder  $C_j$  is very thin, both  $Y$  and  $X$  are likely to exit the cylinder through  $C_j^T$  and be away from each other no more than the amount of local time accumulated up to time  $\tau$ . Since both  $X$  and  $Y$  are the same Brownian motion inside of  $D$ , the probability that, after exiting  $C_j$ , an excursion of  $X$  reaches distance  $\varepsilon$  from  $\partial D$  is roughly the same as if such probability is computed with respect to  $Y$ . This idea yields that  $I_z$  can be estimated by using  $Y$  instead of  $X$ . For reflected Brownian motion, it is known that  $L^*$  can be chosen to be the local time from

its Skorohod decomposition, that is,  $Y$  satisfies (3.3). So,  $X$  should satisfy (3.3) as well. We will formalize this idea next.

Define  $\Lambda = \{\exists u < \tau, X_u \in K_j, e_u \in A^\varepsilon\}$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_z \sum_{u < \tau} \mathbb{1}_{K_j}(X_u) \mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u) = \mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda) = \mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \in C_j^T) \left( 1 + \frac{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \notin C_j^T)}{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \in C_j^T)} \right).$$

Call  $D^\varepsilon$  to the set of points in  $D$  at distance at least  $\varepsilon$  from  $\partial D$ . Let  $T_{D^\varepsilon}$  be the hitting time of  $D^\varepsilon$  and  $T_{C_j}$  the hitting time of  $C_j$ . By the strong Markov property,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \notin C_j^T)}{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \in C_j^T)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}_z \left( \mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D}) \mathbb{1}_{\partial C_j \setminus C_j^T}(X_\tau) \right)}{\mathbb{P}_z \left( \mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D}) \mathbb{1}_{C_j^T}(X_\tau) \right)}.$$

The process  $\tilde{B}_t = B(T_{D^\varepsilon} - t)$  is also a Brownian motion by the strong Markov property and independence of increments. Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \notin C_j^T)}{\mathbb{P}_z(\Lambda, X_\tau \in C_j^T)} \leq \frac{\sup_{x \in D^\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}_x(\tilde{B}_{T_{C_j}} \in \partial C_j \setminus C_j^T)}{\inf_{x \in D^\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}_x(\tilde{B}_{T_{C_j}} \in C_j^T)} \leq C_\varepsilon \frac{\omega^y(\partial C_j \setminus C_j^T)}{\omega^y(C_j^T)},$$

where  $\omega^y$  represents the harmonic measure of  $D \setminus C_j$ , for an arbitrary point  $y \in D^\varepsilon$ , and  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  only depends on  $\varepsilon$ . The surface area of the side of the cylinder  $C_j$  is about  $\sqrt{\delta}$  times less the surface area of the top of  $C_j$ , so we conclude that

$$I_z = (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbb{P}_z \left( \mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D}) \mathbb{1}_{C_j^T}(X_\tau) \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Next we introduce a reflected Brownian motion  $Y$  starting from  $z$ , driven by the same Brownian motion  $B$  that drives  $X$ . We proceed to do some estimate to compare  $X$  and  $Y$ .

We claim that  $\mathbb{P}_z(L_\tau > 2r_\delta \sqrt{\delta}) = O(\delta)$ . Otherwise, there is a sequence  $\delta_n \downarrow 0$  and  $p > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_z(L_\tau > 2r_{\delta_n} \sqrt{\delta_n}) > p$ . But any function  $\omega \in C[0, 1]$  with  $L_\tau(\omega) > 2r_\delta \sqrt{\delta}$  satisfies that  $B_t^n(\omega) < 0$  for  $t < T_\delta(\omega)$ . This only occurs with probability  $O(\delta)$ , which contradicts the existence of the sequence  $\delta_n$ . Since

$$\|X_t - Y_t\|^2 - |X_t^n - Y_t^n|^2 \leq \delta^2 (L_\tau + L_\tau^Y)^2 + \|\bar{\gamma}\|_\infty^2 L_\tau^2,$$

the process  $Y$  leaves the cylinder  $C_j$  through the side only when  $X_t$  gets at distance  $(\delta^2 + r_\delta \sqrt{\delta})O(1)$  from the side of  $C_j$ . This event has probability of order  $\sqrt{\delta}$  by a harmonic measure argument similar to that that lead to (3.5). Therefore, the event  $Y_u \in C_j$  for  $u \leq \tau$  has probability  $1 - O(\delta)$ . Actually, the event holds true if we request that  $|z - x_j| < r_\delta - 2r_\delta \sqrt{\delta}$ , as long as  $L_\tau \leq 2r_\delta \sqrt{\delta}$ . Thus, since for  $y \in C_j \cap \partial D$  we have  $1 \geq \bar{n}(y) \mathbf{e}_n \geq 1 - \delta^2$ ,

$$X_t^n - Y_t^n = \int_0^t \bar{n}(X_u) \mathbf{e}_n dL_u - \int_0^t \bar{n}(Y_u) \mathbf{e}_n dL_u^Y = (1 + O(\delta)) [L_t - L_t^Y],$$

for all  $t \leq \tau$ , on the set  $\{L_\tau \leq 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}\}$ .

It is clear that  $\text{dist}(X_\tau, \partial D)$  is comparable to  $r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}$ , and that  $\text{dist}(Y_\tau, \partial D)$  is comparable to  $Y_\tau^n$ , since  $Y_\tau^n$  does not leave the cylinder  $C_j$  on the event  $\{L_\tau \leq 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}\}$ . We will argue that  $|X_\tau^n - Y_\tau^n| \leq 4r_\delta\delta$ . Indeed, assume that  $X_t^n \geq 2r_\delta\delta$ . Since no piece of the boundary is above level  $2r_\delta\delta$ , no local time  $L$  is accumulated and so  $X^n - Y^n$  does not increase. Similarly  $Y^n - X^n$  does not increase when  $Y^n \geq 2r_\delta\delta$ . But if both  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  are less than  $2r_\delta\delta$ , then it is clear that  $|X^n - Y^n| \leq 4r_\delta\delta$ , since the piece of boundary  $C_j \cap \partial D$  is between levels  $-2r_\delta\delta$  and  $2r_\delta\delta$ . Thus,

$$\left| \frac{Y_\tau^n}{X_\tau^n} - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{Y_\tau^n - X_\tau^n}{X_\tau^n} \right| \leq 2\sqrt{\delta},$$

and so, for some positive constants  $a_\delta, b_\delta$ , depending on  $\delta$ ,

$$a_\delta < \frac{\text{dist}(Y_\tau, \partial D)}{\text{dist}(X_\tau, \partial D)} < b_\delta.$$

Thus, by the boundary Harnack principle, there are positive constants  $c_\delta, C_\delta$  such that

$$c_\delta < \frac{\mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})}{\mathbb{P}_{Y_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})} < C_\delta.$$

Moreover, since  $\|X_\tau - Y_\tau\| \rightarrow 0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , Lemma 1 in [4] shows that both  $c_\delta$  and  $C_\delta$  can be chosen arbitrarily close to 1 as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Using this fact in (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_z &= (1 + O(\delta))\mathbb{P}_z(\mathbb{P}_{Y_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})\mathbb{1}_{C_j}(Y_\tau)) \\ &\quad + (1 + O(\delta))\mathbb{P}_z\left(\mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})\mathbb{1}_{\{L_\tau > 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}\}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Since  $\text{dist}(X_\tau, \partial D)$  is about  $2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}$ , standard estimates for Brownian motion show that  $\mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})$  is comparable to  $\varepsilon^{-1}r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}$ , so

$$\mathbb{P}_z\left(\mathbb{P}_{X_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})\mathbb{1}_{\{L_\tau > 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}\}}\right) \leq C\mathbb{E}_z\left(L_\tau\mathbb{1}_{\{L_\tau > 2r_\delta\sqrt{\delta}\}}\right) = O(\delta)\mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau).$$

By using this last equation in (3.6), we are allowed to write the following equation, by the same arguments that led to (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} I_z &= (1 + O(\delta))\mathbb{P}_z(\mathbb{P}_{Y_\tau}(T_{D^\varepsilon} < T_{\partial D})\mathbb{1}_{C_j}(Y_\tau)) + O(\delta)\mathbb{E}_x(L_\tau) \\ &= (1 + O(\delta))\mathbb{E}_z\left(\sum_{u < \tau} \mathbb{1}_{C_j}(Y_u)\mathbb{1}_{A^\varepsilon}(e_u^Y)\right) + O(\delta)\mathbb{E}_x(L_\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where  $e^Y$  denotes excursions of the reflected Brownian motion  $Y$ . Theorem 7.2 in [3] says that  $(dL_t^Y, c_1\mathbf{H}_y)$  is an exit system for  $Y$  for some constant  $c_1 > 0$  independent of  $y$ , therefore

$$I_z = (1 + O(\delta))\mathbb{E}_z\left(\int_0^\tau \mathbb{1}_{C_j}(Y_u)c_1\mathbf{H}_{Y_u}(A^\varepsilon)dL_u^Y\right) + O(\delta)\mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau). \quad (3.7)$$

We will use the Harnack boundary principle for the harmonic function  $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_x^D(A^\varepsilon)$ , which vanishes on  $C_j \cap \partial D$ . Since

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_y(A^\varepsilon)}{\mathbf{H}_{x_k}(A^\varepsilon)} = \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{y+\lambda \mathbf{e}_n}^D(A^\varepsilon)}{\mathbb{P}_{x_k+\lambda \mathbf{e}_n}^D(A^\varepsilon)}.$$

By the Harnack boundary principle, and Lemma 1 in [4], we obtain that the right hand side above is of order  $1 + O(\delta)$ . It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_z \int_0^\tau \mathbb{1}_{C_j}(Y_u) \mathbf{H}_{Y_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u^Y = (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbf{H}_{x_j}(A^\varepsilon) \mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau^Y). \quad (3.8)$$

The same argument allows us to write

$$\mathbb{E}_z \int_0^\tau \mathbb{1}_{C_j}(X_u) \mathbf{H}_{X_u}(A^\varepsilon) dL_u = (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbf{H}_{x_j}(A^\varepsilon) \mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau). \quad (3.9)$$

By the previous estimates and the optional sampling theorem applied to  $B_\tau^n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau)}{\mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau^Y)} &= (1 + O(\delta)) \frac{\mathbb{E}_z(X_\tau^n - B_\tau^n + \delta^2 L_\tau)}{\mathbb{E}_z(Y_\tau^n - B_\tau^n)} \\ &= (1 + O(\delta)) \left( 1 + \frac{\mathbb{E}_z(X_\tau^n - Y_\tau^n + \delta^2 L_\tau)}{\mathbb{E}_z(Y_\tau^n - X_\tau^n + X_\tau^n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_z(X_\tau^n - Y_\tau^n + \delta^2 L_\tau)}{\mathbb{E}_z(Y_\tau^n - X_\tau^n + X_\tau^n)} \right| \leq \frac{4r_\delta \delta + \delta^2 \mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau)}{-4r_\delta \delta + 2r_\delta \sqrt{\delta}} = O(\delta),$$

which shows that  $\mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau) = (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbb{E}_z(L_\tau^Y)$ . Using this fact, equations (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9), we obtain (3.3), as desired, and the theorem is proved.  $\square$

### 3.2. The stationary distribution

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $(X, S)$  be spinning Brownian motion solving (1.1) with  $S_0 = 0$ . Then, for every  $T > 0$ , there is an open set  $U \subseteq H_{\vec{g}, \alpha}$ , and  $c > 0$  such that for every open  $B \subseteq U$  it holds that  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}(S_T \in B) > c m^p(B)$ .*

*Proof.* In Theorem 2.5 we have obtained an exit system for  $Z_t = (X_t, S_t)$  representing excursions from  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$ . As  $S_t$  does not change within an excursion of  $Z_t$  away from  $\partial D \times \mathbb{R}^p$ , we can think of the excursion law  $\mathbf{H}_{x,s}$  as a measure representing paths of  $X$  only, and thus we will drop the subindex  $s$ .

From now on we closely follow part of the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [1]. To simplify the notation, call  $Z = (X, S)$ , and we use the standard nomenclature  $T_U^X$  for first hitting time of a set  $U$  by the process  $X$ , and  $\sigma_t = \inf \{s \geq 0 : L_s \geq t\}$  for the right inverse of local time.

We proceed to describe an exit system for a different, though related, process  $X'$ . Let  $z_0 \in D$  and  $r > 0$  be arbitrary but fixed, so that  $\bar{B}_r(x_0) \subseteq D$  and

set  $U = \overline{B}_r(z_0)$ . Let  $X' = X'^U$  be the process  $X$  conditioned by the event  $\{T_U^X > \sigma_1\}$ . It follows from Proposition 2.8 and the strong Markov property that for any starting point in  $D$ , the probability of  $\{T_U^X > \sigma_1\}$  is greater than zero. It is easy to see that  $(X'_t, L_t)$  is a time homogeneous Markov process under  $\mathbb{P}_{z_0, s_0}$  in  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . To be consistent with the notation, we will write  $(X'_t, L'_t)$  instead of  $(X'_t, L_t)$ .

The arguments in step 2 in the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [1] can be followed without any essential modification to use the exit system  $(dL_t, \mathbf{H}_x)$  to construct a new exit system, for the process  $(X'^U, L'_t)$ , and use it to show how  $X_t$  up to time  $T_U^X$  can be recovered from  $X'^U$  by adding a las excursion that hits  $U$ . In particular, there is a measurable map  $\Gamma : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}(\overline{D}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\Gamma(X'^U, U)$  and  $X$  have the same distribution up to time  $T_U^X$ .

Let  $U_j = \overline{B}_r(z_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p+1$ , where  $z_j \in D$  are chosen so that the sets  $U_j$  are pairwise disjoint and their union is a subset of  $D$ .

Let  $X^1$  be the process  $X'^{U_2}$  satisfying that  $X_0^1$  is uniform in  $U_1$ . Define  $Y^1 = \Gamma(X^1, U_2)$ . The process  $Y^1$  is an sBm starting with uniform distribution in  $U_1$ , observed until the first hit of  $U_2$ , at time  $T_1 = \inf\{t > 0 : Y_t^1 \in U_2\}$ . Similarly, for  $j = 2, \dots, p$  we define  $X^j$  to be the process  $X'^{U_{j+1}}$  starting with uniform distribution in  $U_j$ , and set  $Y^j = \Gamma(X^j, U_{j+1})$  and  $T_j = \inf\{t > 0 : Y_t^j \in U_{j+1}\}$ . It should be clear that the processes  $Y^j$  can be chosen to be pairwise independent and they have the distribution of a sBm starting with uniform distribution in  $U_j$  observed up to the first hitting time of  $U_{j+1}$ .

In the exact same way as in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 6.1 [1], we can use the processes  $\{Y^j\}$  to construct a spinning Brownian motion  $X^*$  in  $D$ , starting with uniform distribution in  $U_1$ , and such that, conditional on  $\{X_t^j, t \geq 0\}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p+1$ , there is  $c_6 > 0$  such that with probability at least  $c_6$  we have that  $X^*$  is a time-shifted path of  $X_t^j$  on some appropriate interval, for all  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .

To conclude this proof, we show that with a positive probability, the process  $S$  can have “almost” independent and “almost” linearly independent increments over disjoint intervals of time. This is used to show that a conditioned version of  $S$  has a density, or equivalently, that  $S$  has a component with a density, in an appropriate open set.

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_{p+1}$  be points in  $\partial D$  satisfying assumption **A1**. Since the matrix  $[\vec{g}(x_1) | \dots | \vec{g}(x_{p+1})]$  has rank  $p$ , it is possible to eliminate a column from it and still have a matrix with rank  $p$ . It follows, without loss of generality, that the vectors  $\vec{g}(x_1), \dots, \vec{g}(x_p)$  are linearly independent. For  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , let  $C_j = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \angle(\vec{g}(x_j), z) \leq \delta_0\}$ , for some  $\delta_0 > 0$  so small that for any  $z_j \in C_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , the vectors  $\{z_j\}$  are still linearly independent. Let  $\delta_1 > 0$  be so small that for every  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , and any  $x \in \partial D \cap B_{\delta_1}(x_j)$ , we have  $\vec{g}(x) \in C_j$ .

Let  $L^j$  the local time of  $X^j$  on  $\partial D$  and  $\sigma_t^j = \inf\{s \geq 0 : L_s^j \geq t\}$ . It is not hard to see that for some  $p_2 > 0$ , the probability that for every  $j = 1, \dots, p$  we have  $X_t^j \notin \partial D \setminus B_{\delta_1}(x_j)$ , for  $t \in [0, \sigma_t^j]$ , is greater than  $p_2$ . Let

$$R_j = \sup\{t < T_j : Y_t^j \in \partial D\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_j = L_{R_j}^j.$$

Consider the event  $F_\star$  containing all trajectories such that for  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , we have  $X_t^j \notin \partial D \setminus B_{\delta_1}(y_j)$  for  $t \in [0, \sigma_1^j]$  and  $R_j < \sigma_1^j$ . The construction of the process  $X'$  in [1] then shows easily that for some constant  $c_3 > 0$  the inequality  $\mathbb{P}_{z_0}(F_\star) \geq p_2(1 - e^{-c_3})^p$  holds.

Let  $E_t^j = \int_0^t \alpha(X_s^j) dL_s^j$ , and define the following collection of random variables

$$S^j(t_j, \dots, t_p) = \left( E_{\sigma_{t_j}^j}^j \cdots E_{\sigma_{t_p}^p}^p \right)^{-1} \int_0^{t_j} \bar{g}(X_{\sigma_u^j}^j) E_{\sigma_u^j}^j du.$$

Notice that if  $F_\star$  holds, then  $S^j(t_j, \dots, t_p) \in C_j$  for all  $t_j, \dots, t_p \in (0, 1]$  and  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . For any  $0 \leq a_k < b_k \leq Q_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, p$ , define the random set

$$\Lambda([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p]) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^p S^j(t_j, \dots, t_d) : t_k \in [a_k, b_k] \right\}.$$

It is not difficult to estimate the  $p$ -dimensional volume of  $\Lambda([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$  by using the definition of  $C_j$ 's. First, by continuity, it follows that under  $F_\star$  there is a positive constants  $q$  such that  $(1 - q\delta_0)e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j} \leq E_{\sigma_{t_j}^j}^j \leq (1 + q\delta_0)e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq p$ . By definition of the set  $C_j$ , it follows that for some positive constant  $\beta$ ,

$$(1 - \beta\delta_0) \frac{\bar{g}(x_j)}{\alpha(x_j)} \left[ e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j} - 1 \right] \leq \int_0^{t_j} \bar{g}(X_{\sigma_u^j}^j) E_{\sigma_u^j}^j du \leq (1 + \beta\delta_0) \frac{\bar{g}(x_j)}{\alpha(x_j)} \left[ e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j} - 1 \right],$$

where the inequality holds component by component. Define a function  $\vec{v}(t_1, \dots, t_d)$  by

$$\vec{v} = \sum_{j=1}^p e^{-\sum_{k=j}^p \alpha(x_k)t_k} \frac{\bar{g}(x_j)}{\alpha(x_j)} \left[ e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j} - 1 \right].$$

It follows from the inequalities in this paragraph that for some constant  $\eta > 0$ , independent of  $\delta_0$ , we have

$$(1 - \eta\delta_0)\vec{v}(t_1, \dots, t_p) \leq \sum_{j=1}^p S^j(t_j, \dots, t_p) \leq (1 + \eta\delta_0)\vec{v}(t_1, \dots, t_p),$$

where the inequalities hold by components. If  $\delta_0$  is small enough so that the vectors in different  $C_j$  are always linearly independent, the inequality above implies that there exist a constant  $c_3$  independent of  $a_k, b_k$  such that

$$c_3^{-1} \leq \frac{m^d (\Lambda([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p]))}{m^d \{\vec{v}(t_1, \dots, t_p) : t_k \in [a_k, b_k]\}} \leq c_3.$$

To compute the volume of the set in the denominator, we calculate the Jacobian of  $\vec{v}(\cdot)$  in Lemma 3.1, obtaining  $\det D\vec{v} = C \exp(-\sum_{k=1}^p k\alpha(x_k)t_k)$ , which, as  $t_k \in [0, 1]$ , readily yields that the  $p$ -dimensional volume of the random set



$\Lambda([a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_p, b_p])$  is bounded above by  $c_4(b_1 - a_1) \cdots (b_p - a_p)$  and below by  $c_5(b_1 - a_1) \cdots (b_p - a_p)$ .

Let us consider the processes  $X^*$  defined above, conditioned on the sigma field

$$\mathcal{G} = \sigma \left( \{S^j(t_j, \dots, t_p), t_k \in [0, 1]\}_{j=1}^p \right).$$

The construction of  $X'$  in [1] makes the random variable  $Q_j$  the time component of a time-exursion Poisson random variable with variable intensity given by

$$\mu([a, b] \times F) = \int_{1 \wedge a}^{1 \wedge b} \mathbf{H}_{X'_{\sigma'_t}}(F \cap A) dt,$$

where  $\sigma'$  is the right inverse of the local time of  $X'$  and  $A$  is a fixed set such that  $c_5 < \mathbf{H}_x(A) < c_6$  for positive constants  $c_5, c_6$  that are independent of  $x \in \partial D$ . It follows that  $Q_j$  has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure in  $[0, 1]$  that is bounded below. In view of our remarks on the volume of  $\Lambda$ , it follows that conditional on  $\mathcal{G}$ , the vector

$$S(Q_1, \dots, Q_p) = S^1(Q_1, \dots, Q_p) + S^2(Q_2, \dots, Q_p) + \cdots + S^p(Q_p)$$

has a density with respect to the  $p$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure that is bounded below by  $c_7 > 0$  on the open set  $U = \Lambda((0, 1), \dots, (0, 1))$ . We can now remove the conditioning on  $F_*$  and conclude that  $S(Q_1, \dots, Q_p)$  has a component with a density with respect to  $p$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure that is bounded below on  $U$ .

Define  $E_t^* = \exp(\int_0^t \alpha(X_u^*) L_u^*)$  and  $S_t^* = E_t^{*-1} \int_0^t \vec{g}(X_s^*) E_s^* dL_s^*$  and  $T_* = \sum_{j=1}^p T_j$ , where  $L^*$  is the boundary local time for spinning Brownian motion  $X^*$ . Using conditioning on  $F_*$ , we see that the distribution of  $S_{T_*}^*$  has a component with density greater than  $c_9$  on  $U$ .

The previous argument can be modified to show that for any fixed  $t_0 > 0$ , the random variable  $S_{t_0/2}^*$  has a component with a strictly positive density with respect to  $p$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure on a non-empty, open set  $U$ , which proves the theorem. All we need to do is, for small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find times  $t_j > 0$  such that  $T_j \in (t_j - \varepsilon, t_j + \varepsilon)$ , with uniformly (in  $j$ ) positive probability  $q_\varepsilon$ , and then further condition the stitched process  $X^*$  to satisfy  $T_j \in (t_j - \varepsilon, t_j + \varepsilon)$ . Set  $t_* = \sum_{j=1}^p t_j$ . This way,  $T_* = \sum_{j=1}^p T_j \in (t_* - \varepsilon p, t_* + \varepsilon p)$  and since  $X_{T_*}^* \in U_p$ , and  $U_p$  is away from the boundary, we can condition on  $X^*$  to not to hit  $\partial D$  in  $[t_* - \varepsilon p, t_* + \varepsilon p]$  and thus have  $S_{t_*}^* = S_{T_*}^*$ . We then choose  $t_0 = 2t_*$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\vec{v}(\cdot)$  be the function defined in the last step of the proof of Theorem 2.10. There exists a constant  $C \neq 0$ , depending only on the vectors  $\vec{g}(x_k)$  such that*

$$\det D\vec{v}(t_1, \dots, t_p) = C \exp \sum_{k=1}^p -k\alpha(x_k)t_k$$

for all  $t_1, \dots, t_p \in (0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* A stright forward calculation shows that for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ :

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial t_i} = e^{-\sum_{k=i}^p \alpha(x_k)t_k} \bar{g}(x_i) - \alpha(x_i) \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} e^{-\sum_{k=j}^p \alpha(x_k)t_k} \frac{\bar{g}(x_j)}{\alpha(x_j)} \left[ e^{\alpha(x_j)t_j} - 1 \right].$$

Let  $\lambda_{j,i}$  the coefficient of  $\bar{g}(x_j)$  in the expansion of  $\frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial t_i}$  above. Because the vectors  $\bar{g}(x_k)$  are linearly independent, these numbers are well defined. We specially remark that  $\lambda_{j,i} = 0$  for  $j > i$ . Let  $T_{\bar{g}}$  the  $p \times p$  matrix whose  $j$ -th column is  $\bar{g}(x_j)$  and let  $\Lambda$  be the matrix whose  $(j, i)$  component is  $\lambda_{j,i}$ . The calculation above then simply says that  $D\bar{v} = T_{\bar{g}}\Lambda$ . Therefore, as  $\Lambda$  is triangular

$$\det D\bar{v}(t_1, \dots, t_p) = \det T_{\bar{g}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_{i,i} = \det T_{\bar{g}} \cdot \exp \left( - \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{k=i}^p \alpha(x_k)t_k \right).$$

The double sum on the right hand side equals  $\sum_{k=1}^p k\alpha(x_k)t_k$ , by Fubini's theorem, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. Examples

In his unpublished thesis [18], Weiss presents a test to characterize any invariant measure of the solution to a well-posed submartingale problem. His test only works in a smooth setting, and has been recently extended for a large class of non-smooth domains by Kang and Ramanan in [13]. Even though we just need Weiss' result given our assumptions on the domain  $D$ , the fact the result is available for more general ones opens a research line that we had not considered before. We lay out these results next.

Set  $\bar{\kappa}(x, s) = (\bar{\gamma}(x, s), \bar{g} - s)$ . Since  $S_t$  is bounded in the stationary regime we can regard the vector  $\bar{\kappa}$  as bounded. It follows that the following theorem from the unpublished dissertation of Weiss [18] can be applied to our setting: Let  $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j}(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$  be a second order differential operator, where  $a_{i,j}$  and  $b_i$  are bounded, Lipschitz functions. Assume that a bounded, Lipschitz vector field  $\bar{\kappa}$  is given on the boundary of a  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  domain  $G$ , such that  $\bar{\kappa} \cdot \hat{n}(x) \geq \beta > 0$  for  $x \in \partial G$ . Let  $\phi$  be a  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  function defining the boundary of  $G$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (from [18]). *Let  $\bar{G}$  be compact in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $b_j$  and  $\bar{\kappa}$  as before, suppose  $(a_{i,j}(x))$  is bounded, continuous, and positive semidefinite satisfying  $\nabla \phi(x)^T a(x) \nabla \phi(x) > 0$  for  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $\partial G$  (i.e. the diffusion has nonzero random component normal to the boundary). Suppose that  $\mu$  is a probability measure on  $\bar{G}$  with  $\mu(\partial G) = 0$  and*

$$\int_G \mathcal{L}f(x) \mu(dx) \leq 0 \tag{4.1}$$

*for all  $f \in C_b^2(\bar{G})$  with  $\nabla f \cdot \bar{\kappa}(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in \partial G$ . Suppose that the submartingale problem for  $a, b$  and  $\bar{\kappa}$  is uniquely solvable starting from any  $x \in \bar{G}$ . Then  $\mu$  is an invariant measure of the diffusion.*

This theorem has been successfully used by Harrison, Landau and Shepp [10] to give an explicit formula for the stationary distribution  $\mu$  of obliquely reflected Brownian motion in planar domains, in two cases: (a) the domain is of class  $C^2(\mathbb{C})$  and bounded, and the reflection coefficient  $\kappa$  has a global extension to a  $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$  vector field; and (b) the domain is a convex polygon, and the reflection coefficient is constant in each face. Their technique to obtain an explicit representation is to assume that  $\mu(dx) = \rho(x)dx$  and integrate (4.1) by parts to obtain a PDE with boundary conditions for  $\rho$ , and solve such equation. Our approach to obtain the stationary distribution for some specific cases of spinning Brownian motion is based on the same idea.

#### 4.1. Spinning Brownian motion in a wristband

Consider the spinning Brownian motion in the strip  $[-1, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$  with periodic boundary conditions of period  $2\pi$ . This turns the strip into a compact domain and our construction from the previous section can be used to define SBM, and to prove that there exists only one stationary distribution. In this example we compute explicitly such stationary distribution.

Consider the function  $g(x, y) = \alpha \mathbb{1}_{\{1\}}(y) - \beta \mathbb{1}_{\{-1\}}(y)$  for positive constants  $\alpha, \beta$ , and  $\tau(x, y; s) = \lambda \hat{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{1\}}(y)$ , and the associated spinning BM solving the equation

$$\begin{cases} dX_t^y &= dB_t^y + \hat{n}(X_t) dL_t, \\ dX_t^x &= dB_t^x + \tau(X_t, S_t) dL_t, \\ dS_t &= [g(X_t) - S_t] dL_t. \end{cases}$$

Note that the normal depends only on the  $y$ -coordinate, and so  $X_t^y$  has the distribution of reflected Brownian motion in  $[-1, 1]$ . In particular,  $L_t$  depends exclusively on  $B_t^y$ . Also, if we identify the points  $x$  and  $x + 2\pi$ , the domain becomes a compact space and the existence of a unique stationary distribution follows with minor and obvious modifications from our theorem.

It is clear from the equations that the law of  $(X, S)$  starting from  $(x, y; s)$  is the same as the law of  $(x + X^0, S)$ , where  $(X^0, S)$  starts from  $(0, y; s)$ . A standard argument then shows that the stationary distribution is invariant under translations in the  $x$ -coordinate. Thus, the stationary distribution of  $(X^x, X^y, S)$  can be obtained directly from that of  $(X^y, S)$ , that is, in terms of computing the stationary distribution, we can completely disregard the component  $X^x$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *The stationary distribution for the process  $(X^x, X^y, S)$  is given by the positive, integrable function  $\rho(x, y; s) = a(s)y + b(s)$ , where*

$$a(s) = \frac{2}{\alpha + \beta} \frac{s - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - \beta)}{\sqrt{(\alpha - s)(\beta + s)}} \quad b(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\alpha - s)(\beta + s)}}. \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* It is enough to show that  $\tilde{\rho}(y, s) = a(s)y + b(s)$  is stationary for the process  $(X^y, S)$  which is a diffusion that solves a well posed submartingale problem in the domain  $G = (-1, 1) \times (-\beta, \alpha)$ . Set up this way, theorem 4.1 does

not apply as  $G$  is not of class  $C^2$ . Nonetheless, since reflection only happens at the boundary of  $(-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R}$ , we can find a bounded domain  $G'$  of class  $C^2$  such that

$$G = (-1, 1) \times (-\beta, \alpha) \subseteq \overline{G} \subseteq G' \subseteq (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R},$$

and apply the theorem there for the density  $\tilde{\rho}' = \tilde{\rho} \mathbb{1}_G$ . Another option is to use the recent version of Theorem 4.1 for non-smooth domains due to Kang and Ramanan [13].

Set  $\tilde{\kappa}(y, s) = (\hat{n}(y), g(y) - s)$ , where  $\hat{n}(\cdot)$  is the negative of the sign function. The process  $(X^y, S)$  that uniquely solves the submartingale process associated to  $\partial_{y,y}$  with boundary condition  $\nabla f \cdot \tilde{\kappa}(y, s) \geq 0$  for  $y \in \partial G'$  and  $f \in C_b^2(\overline{G}')$ . Since  $\tilde{\rho}' = 0$  outside of  $G$ , the following computation is straight forward by integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G'} \partial_{yy} f(y, s) \tilde{\rho}'(y, s) dy ds &= \int_{-\beta}^{\alpha} \int_{-1}^1 \partial_{yy} f(y, s) \tilde{\rho}(y, s) dy ds \\ &= \int_{-\beta}^{\alpha} \partial_y f(y, s) \tilde{\rho}(y, s) - f(y, s) a(s) \Big|_{-1}^1 ds \end{aligned}$$

The boundary condition  $\nabla f \cdot \tilde{\kappa}(y, s) \geq 0$  for  $y = \pm 1$  translates into

$$[g(y) - s] \partial_s f(y, s) \geq \text{sgn}(y) \partial_y f(y, s) \quad y = \pm 1.$$

As  $\tilde{\rho} \geq 0$ , we see that  $\partial_y f(y, s) \tilde{\rho}(y, s) \Big|_{-1}^1 \leq \text{sgn}(y) [g(y) - s] \tilde{\rho}(y, s) \partial_s f(y, s) \Big|_{-1}^1$ . Also, direct computation shows that  $[g(y) - s] \tilde{\rho}(y, s) = \frac{2 \text{sgn}(y)}{\alpha + \beta} \sqrt{(\alpha - s)(\beta + s)}$  at  $y = \pm 1$ . Notice that this term vanishes both at  $s = -\beta$  and  $s = \alpha$ , and its partial derivative with respect to  $s$  equals to  $-\text{sgn}(y) a(s)$  at  $y = \pm 1$ . Doing integration by parts in  $s$ , and using the facts above we obtain:


$$\int_{G'} \partial_{yy} f(y, s) \tilde{\rho}'(y, s) dy ds \leq 0,$$

as desired.  $\square$

The following graph shows the density  $\rho(y, s)$  from different perspectives. We have set  $\alpha = \beta = 1$  to simplify the plotting, but the general shape of the graphs is maintained. The reader should notice that the stationary density goes to infinity both at  $(1, \alpha)$  and  $(-1, -\beta)$ . Heuristically, when the process  $(X^y, S)$  is near  $(1, \alpha)$ , the change in spin is little since  $\vec{g}(X_t) - S_t \approx \vec{g}(x, 1) - \alpha = 0$ . Thus, the spin stays around  $\alpha$  for a “long” period of time, and thus the occupation measure has a lot of weight around  $(1, \alpha)$ . A similar situation occurs at  $(-1, -\beta)$ . This observation does not seem to generalize trivially to higher dimensional cases, but it inspires the examples we show in the next section.

#### 4.2. Higher dimensional spin

The previous example involves one dimensional spin. We proceed to explore several examples of two dimensional spin, and their marginal stationary distributions to illustrate the impact of different vector fields  $\vec{g}(x)$ . Our setting is the

FIGURE 2. Graph of the density  $\rho(x, s)$  in (4.2).

following: consider the strip domain  $\tilde{D} = \mathbb{R} \times [-1, 1]$ . We will identify any point  $(x, y)$  in this domain with all  $x$ -translations by  $2\pi$ , that is,  $(x, y) = (x + 2\pi, y)$ . Let  $D$  be the domain obtained from the strip  $\tilde{D}$  after this identification of points.

Let  $\vec{\gamma}(x, y; s) = \vec{n}(y) + \tau(s)\vec{x}$ , where  $\vec{x}$  is the unit vector in the direction  $x$ , and  $\vec{n}(y)$  is the normal at  $y = \pm 1$ . Despite this is not strictly speaking a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ , our proof of existence and uniqueness of the stationary distribution apply with very little modifications. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^x &= dB_t^x + \tau(S_t)dL_t, \\ dX_t^y &= dB_t^y + \vec{n}(X_t^y)dL_t, \\ dS_t &= [\mathbb{1}_{\{1\}}(X_t^y)\vec{g}(X_t^x) + \mathbb{1}_{\{-1\}}(X_t^y)\vec{g}(X_t^x) - S_t] dL_t, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where  $B_t^x$  is a one dimensional Brownian motion modulo  $2\pi$ .

Since  $X_t$  is on the boundary of  $D$  exactly when the component  $X_t^y$  takes the values 1 or  $-1$ , we have that  $X_t^y$  is a one dimensional reflected Brownian motion in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . This process can be obtained independently of  $S_t$ , and thus, the local time  $L_t$  can be constructed independently of the spin  $S_t$ :

$$dX_t^y = dB_t^y + dL_t^{-1} - dL_t^1, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $L_t^1$  is the local time of the process at  $y = 1$ , and  $L_t^{-1}$  is the local time at  $y = -1$ .

We do not have explicit examples of the stationary distribution  $\mu$  in this case. Instead, we have simulated spinning Brownian motion for different functions  $\vec{g}$ , and computed the average occupation time for the spin component  $S_t$  in order to estimate its marginal distribution. Precisely, Corollary (2.11) and Theorem IV.9.3 in [8] imply that the marginal  $\mu_S$  of the stationary distribution of  $(X, S)$  is

$$\mu_S(U) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{P}(S_u \in U) du.$$

Even though we have not proved an invariance principle for spinning Brownian motion, our approach to estimate  $\mu_S$  is to discretize time to sample  $(B_t^x, B_t^y)$  at times discrete times  $t_0 = 0, t_k = k\delta$ , where  $\delta > 0$  is fixed and small, and determine the increment  $B_{t_{k+1}} - B_{t_k}$  as a two dimensional Normal distributed random variable with mean zero and variance  $\delta I_2$ . From equation (4.4) we can obtain the local times at  $-1$  and at  $1$ , and proceed to compute  $X_t^x$  and  $S_t$ .

**Measure concentrated near a point.** A key aspect of the behavior of the stationary distribution can be deduce from the differential equation  $dS_t = [\vec{g}(X_t) - S_t] dL_t$ , just as in the one dimensional case. Say that  $\vec{g}(x) = \vec{g}_0$  is an extremal point of  $H_{\vec{g}}$  and that the surface measure of the set  $\Lambda_0 = \{x : \vec{g}(x) = \vec{g}_0\}$  is positive. Intuitively, this implies that  $X_t$  spends a lot of local time on  $\Lambda_0$  and so  $S_t$  is frequently pushed towards the value  $\vec{g}_0$ . Further, if  $S_t$  takes a value close to  $\vec{g}_0$ , then the change  $dS_t$  is very small, since then  $\vec{g}(X_t) - S_t$  is small. The process then is more likely to stay close to such points than to drift away, and it is natural to assume that neighborhoods of such points will have a large occupation measure.

Based on this heuristic, we simulated the spinning Brownian motion (4.3) for  $\tau(s) = 1 - |s|^2$ , and vector  $\vec{g}$  given by  $\vec{g}(x, 1) = \frac{1}{2}(1, 0)$  and  $\vec{g}(x, -1) = \frac{1}{2}(\cos x, \sin x)$  and obtained the following graphs for the marginal stationary distribution of the spin  $S$ , where it can be seen that the point  $(1/2, 0)$  gets most of the weight of the measure.




FIGURE 3. Density concentrated near the point  $(1/2, 0)$ .

**Measure concentrated near the axes.** The next example represents a situation in which most of the density accumulates near the  $x$  and  $y$  axes. To force the spin to spend most of the time near the axes we will define the function  $\vec{g}$  to induce only a vertical change at the top of the wristband, and only a horizontal change at the bottom of the wristband:

$$\vec{g}(x, 1) = (0, \sin x) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{g}(x, -1) = (\cos x, 0).$$

Since most of the excursions of  $X_t$  from the boundary of the wristband both start and end on the same end of the wristband, the spin is rapidly pushed towards the axes. The expected graph of the spin marginal of the occupation measures, should show high concentration of density around the axes. This is exactly what was found through simulations.




FIGURE 4. Contour graph of density concentrated near the axes.

### Acknowledgements

The author conducted the research leading to this publication during his graduate studies at the University of Washington. He would like to thank his advisor Krzysztof Burdzy for introducing him to the problem he discusses in this article, and for many conversations that helped the author successfully conduct his research.

### References

- [1] Richard F. Bass, Krzysztof Burdzy, Zhen-Qing Chen, and Martin Hairer. Stationary distributions for diffusions with inert drift. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 146(1-2):1–47, 2010.
- [2] R. M. Blumenthal and R. K. Gettoor. *Markov processes and potential theory*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 29. Academic Press, New York, 1968.
- [3] K. Burdzy. *Multidimensional Brownian excursions and potential theory*, volume 164 of *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series*. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1987.
- [4] Krzysztof Burdzy and Davar Khoshnevisan. Brownian motion in a Brownian crack. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 8(3):708–748, 1998.
- [5] C. Costantini. The Skorohod oblique reflection problem in domains with corners and application to stochastic differential equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 91(1):43–70, 1992.

- [6] Paul Dupuis and Hitoshi Ishii. SDEs with oblique reflection on nonsmooth domains. *Ann. Probab.*, 21(1):554–580, 1993.
- [7] Paul Dupuis and Hitoshi Ishii. Correction: “SDEs with oblique reflection on nonsmooth domains” [Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 1, 554–580]. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1992–1997, 2008.
- [8] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov processes*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986. Characterization and convergence.
- [9] R. K. Gettoor. Excursions of a Markov process. *Ann. Probab.*, 7(2):244–266, 1979.
- [10] J. M. Harrison, H. J. Landau, and L. A. Shepp. The stationary distribution of reflected Brownian motion in a planar region. *Ann. Probab.*, 13(3):744–757, 1985.
- [11] J. M. Harrison and R. J. Williams. Brownian models of open queueing networks with homogeneous customer populations. *Stochastics*, 22(2):77–115, 1987.
- [12] J. M. Harrison and R. J. Williams. Multidimensional reflected Brownian motions having exponential stationary distributions. *Ann. Probab.*, 15(1):115–137, 1987.
- [13] W. Kang and K. Ramanan. Characterization of stationary distributions of reflected diffusions. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2012.
- [14] Ioannis Karatzas and Steven E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [15] P.-L. Lions and A.-S. Sznitman. Stochastic differential equations with reflecting boundary conditions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 37(4):511–537, 1984.
- [16] Bernard Maisonneuve. Exit systems. *Ann. Probability*, 3(3):399–411, 1975.
- [17] Daniel W. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan. Diffusion processes with boundary conditions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 24:147–225, 1971.
- [18] Alan Arthur Weiss. *Invariant measures of diffusion processes on domains with boundaries*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1981. Thesis (Ph.D.)–New York University.