

Discrete approximation to local time for reflected diffusions

Wai-Tong (Louis) Fan *

January 4, 2020

Abstract

For an arbitrary bounded Lipschitz domain D , we propose a class of discrete analogues for the boundary local time of reflected diffusions in D . These discrete analogues are obtained from random walks on $D^{(k)} := D \cap 2^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^d$ and can be effectively simulated in practice. We prove weak convergence of the joint law of the random walks and the proposed analogues to the joint law of reflected diffusion and its boundary local time. A cornerstone in the proof is the local limit theorem for reflected diffusions.

1 Introduction

Let $d \geq 1$ and $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain. We first describe *Reflected diffusions* in D , which are natural mathematical objects to study. After all, the random motions of the pollen grains observed by Robert Brown in year 1827 were reflected at the boundary of the water tank. Suppose $\rho \in W^{1,2}(D) \cap C(\overline{D})$ is a strictly positive function, and $\mathbf{a} = (a^{ij})$ is a symmetric, bounded, uniformly elliptic $d \times d$ matrix-valued function with $a^{ij} \in W^{1,2}(D)$ for each i, j , where $W^{1,2}(D) := \{f \in L^2(D) : |\nabla f| \in L^2(D)\}$ and $C(\overline{D})$ is the space of continuous functions in \overline{D} . Then the bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, W^{1,2}(D))$ defined by $\mathcal{E}(f, g) := \frac{1}{2} \int_D \mathbf{a} \nabla f(x) \cdot \nabla g(x) \rho(x) dx$ is a regular Dirichlet form in $L^2(D, \rho(x)dx)$ and hence has an associated Hunt process X (unique in distribution). Furthermore, X is a continuous, irreducible, conservative strong Markov process with symmetrizing measure ρ and has infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{A} := \frac{1}{2\rho} \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{a} \nabla)$.

Definition 1.1. *We call X an \mathcal{A} -reflected diffusion. An important case is when \mathbf{a} is the identity matrix, in which X is called a reflected Brownian motion with drift $\frac{1}{2} \nabla(\log \rho)$. If in addition $\rho = 1$, then the $\frac{\Delta}{2}$ -reflected diffusion X is called a **reflected Brownian motion (RBM)**.*

Intuitively, X behaves like a diffusion process associated to the second order elliptic operator \mathcal{A} in the interior of D , and is instantaneously pushed back in the direction of the inward conormal direction $\vec{\nu} := \mathbf{a}\vec{n}$ when $X_t \in \partial D$, where \vec{n} is the inward unit normal. The surface measure σ is well-defined and there is a unique positive continuous additive functional (PCAF) $L = (L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ corresponding to $\sigma/2$. This PCAF L is called the *boundary local time* (or simply *local time*) of X and plays a vital role in the theory of reflected diffusions. In fact, L describes the amount of time spent by X near the boundary in the sense that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\delta} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s \in D^\delta\} ds = L_t \quad \text{in probability,} \quad (1.1)$$

*Research partially supported by Army Research Office W911NF-10-1-0158.

where $D^\delta := \{x \in D : \text{dist}(x, \partial D) < \delta\}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator function. Moreover, X admits the Skorohod decomposition

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \beta(X_s) dB_s + \int_0^t \vec{b}(X_s) ds + \int_0^t \rho \mathbf{a} \vec{n}(X_s) dL_s, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where B is the standard d -dimensional Brownian motion, $\beta^2 = \mathbf{a} = [\vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_2, \dots, \vec{a}_d]$ and $\vec{b} := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \cdot \vec{a}_i + \mathbf{a} \nabla \log \rho)$. We refer readers to [2, 5, 9] and the references therein for the above well-known properties about X and L .

In [3], Burdzy and Chen considered discrete approximating schemes for RBMs for a large class of domains D which contains bounded Lipschitz domains and von Koch snowflake domains. They showed that the laws of both discrete time and continuous time simple random walks (SRWs) on $D^{(k)} := D \cap 2^{-k} \mathbb{Z}^d$ moving at rate $d2^{2k}$ converge weakly, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, to the law of RBM in D . This naturally raises the following question which is the motivation of this paper: *What is a discrete analogue to the boundary local time of RBMs?* We consider this question interesting in its own right and as important as the study of local time of reflected diffusions. A suitable candidate for such an analogue, henceforth called "*discrete local time*", can be used to generate Monte Carlo approximations to Robin boundary value problems in partial differential equations; see (3.2). This discrete local time is hence useful in the study of partially reflected diffusions [10] and in stochastic particle systems in domains (such as [6]).

An answer to this question does not follow directly from [3] or other published results; extra work is required to extract a candidate for the discrete local time and to prove convergence. To see this last remark, first note that results in [3] imply that for *fixed* $\delta > 0$,

$$A_\delta^{(k)}(t) := \frac{1}{2\delta} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s^{(k)} \in D^\delta\} ds \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\delta} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s \in D^\delta\} ds \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.3)$$

in distribution, where X is the RBM and we used the same notation $X^{(k)}$ to denote both discrete time (time parameter is extended by interpolation) and continuous time SRWs on $D^{(k)}$ moving at rate $d2^{2k}$. Even though we have (1.1), the results in [3] *do not* tell us how small δ should be taken relative to k . A possible candidate is the left hand side of (1.3) with $\delta = C2^{-k}$ for some constant $C > 0$ large enough so that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $D^{C2^{-k}}$ contains the *graph-boundary* $\partial D^{(k)} := \{x \in D^{(k)} : v_k(x) < 2d\}$, where $v_k(x)$ is the graph degree of the vertex x in $D^{(k)}$. Such a constant C can be chosen to depend only on the Lipschitz constant of ∂D . However, this candidate $A_{C2^{-k}}^{(k)}(t)$ turns out to be problematic since it is too sensitive to the local configuration of the graph $D^{(k)}$ near the boundary. See Example 5.4 for an illustration; this example also indicates that the "naive" candidate $\frac{1}{2(2^{-k})} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s^{(k)} \in \partial D^{(k)}\} ds$ does *not* work either. Another approach is to extract a candidate by considering a discrete analogue of the Skorohod representation for $X^{(k)}$: one writes $X_t^{(k)}$ as the sum of a local martingale and a process of finite variation, then tries to show that the finite variational part converges in distribution to $\int_0^t \vec{n}(X_s) dL_s$. However, this has to be rigorously established and we plan to further elucidate this idea in future work; see Remark 2.3 (v).

As mentioned in the introduction of [3], the literature on discrete approximations to reflected diffusions is rather limited. To the best of our knowledge, the question of discrete approximation to boundary local time of reflected diffusions has not been rigorously addressed before. The main goal in this paper is to fill this gap. More precisely, we first obtain a candidate $L^{(k)}$ for the discrete local time of both continuous time and discrete time SRWs in $D^{(k)}$, then we rigorously prove weak convergence of joint laws $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)}) \rightarrow (X, L)$. See our main result in Theorem 3.1.

Our candidate is explicit (see (2.2) or (2.4)) and is amenable to computer simulations. The key of proof is the local limit theorem, Theorem 4.5, established in [6].

In section 2, we construct our candidate for the discrete local time. In section 3, we state our main result, Theorem 3.1. Section 4 collects the key properties of transition density of $X^{(k)}$, including the local limit theorem. These properties will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in section 5. Generalization to arbitrary reflected diffusions and other extensions of this work is discussed in section 6.

2 Discrete local time

An important feature in our approach is that we incorporate geometric information of ∂D in our approximation scheme. That is, besides approximating D by $D^{(k)}$, we also approximate ∂D by $\Lambda^{(k)}$, where $\Lambda^{(k)}$ is a partition of ∂D into pieces not just of comparable sizes in terms of surface measure, but also of comparable diameters. This extra information is in a sense necessary for our explicit scheme, in view of Example 5.4. The choice of $\Lambda^{(k)}$ is specified by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose D is a bounded Lipschitz domain of \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists a sequence of partitions $\{\Lambda^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of ∂D and a constant C which depends only on D , such that (a), (b) and (c) below hold simultaneously:*

- (a) $2^{-k(d-1)}/C \leq \sigma(\lambda) \leq C 2^{-k(d-1)}$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where σ is the surface measure.
- (b) $\sup_{x \in \bar{D}} \#\{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)} : \lambda \cap B(x, s) \neq \emptyset\} \leq C (2^k s \vee 1)^{d-1}$ for $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\#A$ is the number of elements in the finite set A and $B(x, s) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |y - x| < s\}$.
- (c) For any equi-continuous and uniformly bounded family \mathcal{F} in $\mathcal{C}(\partial D)$, the space of continuous functions on ∂D , we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \left| \sup_{x \in \lambda} f(x) - \inf_{x \in \lambda} f(x) \right| \sigma(\lambda) = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} f(x_\lambda) \sigma_\lambda = \int_{\partial D} f d\sigma$ uniformly for $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all choices of $\{x_\lambda\}$ satisfying $x_\lambda \in \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}$.

The proof of Lemma 2.1 follows from an easy geometric argument and can be found in [6], in which a more general result (about partitioning any rectifiable subsets of ∂D) is presented.

We can now state our class of candidates for discrete local time.

Definition 2.2. *(Discrete local time) Fix any $\alpha > \sqrt{1 + M^2}$ where M is the Lipschitz constant for ∂D . Associate each $\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}$ a non-empty subset $D_\lambda^{(k)} \subset D^{(k)}$ such that each $z \in D_\lambda^{(k)}$ is of distance at most $\alpha 2^{-k}$ to λ . Define, for each r.c.l.l. path $\omega : [0, \infty) \rightarrow D^{(k)}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$L_t^{(k)}(\omega) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \sum_{z \in D_\lambda^{(k)}} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\omega(s) = z\}}{m_k(z)} \frac{\sigma(\lambda)}{\#D_\lambda^{(k)}} ds, \quad (2.2)$$

where σ is the surface measure of ∂D , $m_k(x) := 2^{-kd} v_k(x)/2d$ with $v_k(x)$ being the graph degree of the vertex $x \in D^{(k)}$. In particular, when $D_\lambda^{(k)}$ is chosen to be just a single point $\{z_\lambda\}$, then (2.2) is reduced to

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\omega(s) = z_\lambda\}}{m_k(z_\lambda)} \sigma(\lambda) ds. \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.3. (i) Observe $D_\lambda^{(k)}$ can indeed be taken to be non-empty by the condition on α , so that (2.2) is well-defined. Furthermore, $\{D_\lambda^{(k)} : \lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}\}$ can be flexibly chosen in such a way that $\partial^{(k)} := \cup_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} D_\lambda^{(k)}$ is equal to the graph boundary $\partial D^{(k)}$; in this case, $\#D_\lambda^{(k)}$ maybe larger than 1 for some λ , so we have to use (2.2) rather than (2.3).

(ii) $\#D_\lambda^{(k)} \leq N$ for some constant N which depends only on the Lipschitz constant M .

(iii) Clearly, $L_t^{(k)}(\omega)$ is non-decreasing in t and increases only when $\omega(t) \in \partial^{(k)}$. Hence

$$L_t^{(k)}(\omega) = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{w(s) \in \partial^{(k)}\} dL_s^{(k)}(\omega).$$

(iv) Intuitively, if the mass $\sigma(\lambda)$ of λ is evenly distributed among elements in $D_\lambda^{(k)}$, then the total mass received by z is given by $\sigma_k(z) := \sum_{\{\lambda: z \in D_\lambda^{(k)}\}} \sigma(\lambda)/\#D_\lambda^{(k)}$. The measure σ_k on $\partial^{(k)}$ approximates σ in the sense that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{z \in \partial^{(k)}} F(z) \sigma_k(z) = \int_{\partial D} F(z) \sigma(dz)$$

for any $F : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is bounded and continuous on a neighborhood of ∂D . This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.1. Moreover, (2.2) can be written as

$$L_t^{(k)}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sum_{z \in \partial^{(k)}} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\omega(s) = z\}}{m_k(z)} \sigma_k(z) ds. \quad (2.4)$$

(v) In case $\partial^{(k)} = \partial D^{(k)}$, which is always possible according to (i), then the SRW $X^{(k)}$ admits a pathwise decomposition analogous to (1.2):

$$X_t^{(k)} = B_t^{(k)} + \int_0^t \eta_s^{(k)} dL_s^{(k)},$$

where $B^{(k)}$ is the SRW (continuous time or discrete time, according to $X^{(k)}$) on the whole lattice $2^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^d$, under the law of $X^{(k)}$; and $\eta^{(k)}$ is a $\mathcal{F}_t^{X^{(k)}}$ -adapted process with values in \mathbb{R}^d . This "Skorohod decomposition" will not play a role in our proof. We reserve discussions on its implications and the properties of $\eta^{(k)}$ in a future work. A related result can be found in [5], in which RBM is approximated by a sequence of RBMs on an increasing sequence of smooth domains.

3 Main result

Recall that $X^{(k)}$ is the SRW on the graph $D^{(k)}$ moving at rate $d2^{2k}$, either continuous time or discrete time. In the latter case, time parameter is extended by interpolation as in [3]. In each case, $X^{(k)}$ has stationary distribution m_k stated in Definition 2.2. We denote by \mathbf{P}_{x_k} and \mathbf{P}_{m_k} the law of SRW $X^{(k)}$ starting from $x_k \in D^{(k)}$ and m_k respectively. We also denote by \mathbb{P}^x and \mathbb{P}^m the law of RBM X starting from $x \in \overline{D}$ and m respectively. \mathbf{E}_{x_k} , \mathbf{E}_{m_k} , \mathbb{E}^x and \mathbb{E}^m denote the expectation with respect to \mathbf{P}_{x_k} , \mathbf{P}_{m_k} , \mathbb{P}^x and \mathbb{P}^m respectively. For a metric space S , we denote by $\mathcal{D}([0, T], S)$ the space of r.c.l.l. paths from $[0, T]$ to S equipped with the Skorohod topology, and by $\mathcal{C}([0, T], S)$ the space of continuous paths equipped with uniform topology. Here is our main result.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose D be a bounded Lipschitz domain in \mathbb{R}^d . Then for every $T > 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, the followings hold:*

- (i) $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})$ under \mathbf{P}_{m_k} converges to (X, L) in distribution both in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$ and in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$, where X is the reflected Brownian motion in D with stationary initial distribution and L is the boundary local time of X .
- (ii) If $x_k \in D^{(k)}$ converges to $x \in D$, then $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})$ under \mathbf{P}_{x_k} converges to (X, L) in distribution both in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$ and in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$, where X is the reflected Brownian motion in D starting at x and L is the boundary local time of X .

As an immediate application, we consider the heat equation with Robin boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u(t, x)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(t, x) & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times D \\ \frac{\partial u(t, x)}{\partial \vec{n}} = g(t, x) u(t, x) & \text{on } (0, \infty) \times \partial D \\ u(0, x) = \varphi(x) & \text{on } D, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

with $\varphi \in C_b(D)$ and $g \in C_b([0, \infty) \times \partial D)$, where $C_b(E)$ denotes the space of bounded continuous functions on E . The solution (see, for example, [6, Proposition 2.17]) is given by

$$u(t, x) := \mathbb{E}^x \left[\varphi(X_t) \exp \left(- \int_0^t g(t-s, X_s) dL_s \right) \right].$$

Theorem 3.1 guarantees that the function

$$u_k(t, x_k) := \mathbf{E}_{x_k} \left[\varphi(\omega(t)) \exp \left(- \int_0^t G(t-s, \omega(s)) dL_s^{(k)}(\omega) \right) \right] \quad (3.2)$$

converges ¹ to $u(t, x)$ whenever $x_k \rightarrow x \in \overline{D}$ and $G \in C_b([0, \infty) \times \overline{D})$ is an extension of g . Since $L_s^{(k)}(\omega)$ increases only when $\omega(s) \in \partial^{(k)} := \cup_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} D_\lambda^{(k)}$, so in practice, we can simply take $G(\cdot, z) := g(\cdot, z_\lambda)$ in the following way: for $z \in \partial^{(k)}$, pick an arbitrary λ such that $z \in D_\lambda^{(k)}$, then pick an arbitrary z_λ in λ . Hence Theorem 3.1 provides us with a convenient discrete approximation to the solution of (3.1), using simple random walks and a decomposition of the boundary.

The next two sections are devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

¹when $\varphi \in C(\overline{D})$, the convergence is uniform on $[a, b] \times \overline{D}$ for any compact interval $[a, b] \subset (0, \infty)$

4 Discrete heat kernel and local limit theorem

In this section, we collect the key properties of the transition density of the random walk that is needed in the proof of Theorem 3.1. These properties are proved in [6] for RBM with drifts. We consider more generally $D^\varepsilon := D \cap \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ for $\varepsilon > 0$, and denote the graph-boundary $\partial D^\varepsilon := \{x \in D^\varepsilon : v_\varepsilon(x) < 2d\}$, where $v_\varepsilon(x)$ is the degree of x in D^ε . We define X^ε to be the simple random walk (SRW) on D^ε moving at rate d/ε^2 , either continuous time or discrete time (as before, in the latter case, we extend time parameter by interpolation). Hence $X^{2^{-k}}$ in this section is the $X^{(k)}$ we have been considering.

The transition density of X^ε with respect to the measure $m_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^d v_\varepsilon(x)/2d$ is defined as

$$p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) := \frac{\mathbb{P}^x(X_t^\varepsilon = y)}{m_\varepsilon(y)}, \quad t > 0, x, y \in D^\varepsilon. \quad (4.1)$$

Clearly, p^ε is strictly positive and is symmetric in x and y . It is proved in [6] that the transition density p^ε enjoys two-sided Gaussian bound and is jointly Hölder continuous uniform in $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, and that p^ε converges to p uniformly on compact subsets of $(0, \infty) \times \overline{D} \times \overline{D}$. In rigorous terms, we have the following four results. The important point is that the constants involved are uniform for ε small enough.

Theorem 4.1. (*Gaussian upper bound*) *There exist $C_k = C_k(d, D, T) > 0$, $k = 1, 2$, and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d, D) \in (0, 1]$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $x, y \in D^\varepsilon$,*

$$p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee t^{1/2})^d} \exp\left(-C_2 \frac{|x - y|^2}{t}\right) \quad \text{for } t \in [\varepsilon, T] \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee t^{1/2})^d} \exp\left(-C_2 \frac{|x - y|}{t^{1/2}}\right) \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \varepsilon). \quad (4.3)$$

Observe that (4.2) implies that (4.3) also holds for $t \in [\varepsilon, T]$. As an application of the upper bound, we have an estimate for the exit time for a ball by a standard argument (see [2]) using the strong Markov property.

Corollary 4.2. (*Exit time estimate*) *There exists $C = C(d, D, T) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d, D) > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, T]$, $x \in D^\varepsilon$, $\eta > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}^x\left(\sup_{s \leq t} |X_s^\varepsilon - x| \geq \eta\right) \leq C \exp\left(t - \frac{\eta}{4(t^{1/2} \vee \varepsilon)}\right). \quad (4.4)$$

Theorem 4.3. (*Gaussian lower bound*) *There exist $C_k = C_k(d, D, T) > 0$, $k = 1, 2$, and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d, D) \in (0, 1]$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $t \in (0, T]$ and $x, y \in D^\varepsilon$,*

$$p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) \geq \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee t^{1/2})^d} \exp\left(-C_2 \frac{|x - y|^2}{t}\right). \quad (4.5)$$

Theorem 4.4. (*Hölder continuity*) *There exist positive constants $\alpha(d, D, T)$, $\beta(d, D, T)$, $\varepsilon_0(d, D)$ and $C(d, D, T)$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, $(t, x, y), (t', x', y') \in (0, T] \times D^\varepsilon \times D^\varepsilon$,*

$$|p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) - p^\varepsilon(t', x', y')| \leq C \frac{(|t - t'|^{1/2} + |x - x'| + |y - y'|)^\alpha}{(t \wedge t')^{(d+\beta)/2}}. \quad (4.6)$$

Theorem 4.5. (*Local limit theorem*) Let $p^{(k)} = p^{2^{-k}}$ be the transition density of $X^{(k)}$ with respect to m_k , and $p(t, x, y)$ be the transition density of the RBM with respect to Lebesgue measure. Then we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [a, b]} \sup_{x, y \in D^{(k)}} \left| p^{(k)}(t, x, y) - p(t, x, y) \right| = 0$$

for any compact interval $[a, b] \subset (0, \infty)$.

The proofs for the above properties are standard once we establish a discrete analogue of a relative isoperimetric inequality in [6, Theorem 5.5] for bounded Lipschitz domains. Details and stronger versions can be found in [6] and are omitted here. The following uniform estimate has a continuous analog and will be crucial to our proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 4.6. *There exist $C = C(d, D, T) > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(d, D) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in D^\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{d-1} \sum_{y \in \partial D^\varepsilon} p^\varepsilon(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon \vee t^{1/2}} \quad (4.7)$$

for all $t \in (0, T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

Proof Fix $\theta \in (0, T]$. By the Gaussian upper bound in Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{y \in \partial D^\varepsilon} p^\varepsilon(\theta, x, y) \\ & \leq \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^d} \sum_{y \in \partial D^\varepsilon} \exp\left(\frac{-|y-x|}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}}\right) \\ & = \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^d} \int_0^\infty \#\{y \in D^\varepsilon : |f(y)| > r\} dr \quad \text{by setting } f(y) = \mathbf{1}_{\partial D^\varepsilon}(y) \exp\left(\frac{-|y-x|}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}}\right) \\ & = \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^d} \int_0^1 \#\{\partial D^\varepsilon \cap B(x, (\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})(-\ln r))\} dr \quad (\text{since } f \leq 1) \\ & = \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^{d+1}} \int_0^\infty \#\{\partial D^\varepsilon \cap B(x, s)\} \exp\left(\frac{-s}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}}\right) ds \quad (\text{where } s = (\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})(-\ln r)) \\ & \leq \frac{C_1}{(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^d} \vee \frac{C_2}{\varepsilon^{d-1}(\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2})^{d+1}} \int_0^\infty s^{d-1} \exp\left(\frac{-s}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}}\right) ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{d-1}} \left(\frac{C_1}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}} \vee \frac{C_2}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}} \int_0^\infty w^{d-1} e^{-w} dw \right) \quad (\text{where } w = \frac{s}{\varepsilon \vee \theta^{1/2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here C_i are all constants which depend only on d, D and T . Note that in the second last line, we used the fact, which follows from Lipschitz property of ∂D , that $\#\{\partial D^\varepsilon \cap B(x, s)\} \leq C((s/\varepsilon)^{d-1} \vee 1)$ for all $s > 0$, for some $C = C(d, D)$. The proof is now complete. \square

Recall $\partial^{(k)}$ in Remark 2.3, which can be chosen to be $\partial D^{(k)}$. Lemma 2.1 implies that $\#\{\partial^{(k)} \cap B(x, s)\} \leq C(2^k s \vee 1)^{d-1}$ for some $C = C(d, D)$. Hence the proof of Lemma 4.6 gives us

Lemma 4.7. *There exist $C = C(d, D, T) > 0$ and $k_0 = k_0(d, D) > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in D^{(k)}} 2^{k(d-1)} \sum_{y \in \partial^{(k)}} p^{(k)}(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C}{2^{-k} \vee t^{1/2}} \quad (4.8)$$

for all $t \in (0, T]$ and $k \geq k_0$, where $p^{(k)}$ is the transition density of $X^{(k)}$ with respect to m_k .

5 Proof of main theorem

In the following lemmas, we let $0 \leq a \leq b$ and $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary, and

$$\Delta_\ell[a, b] := \{(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_\ell) : a \leq s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_\ell \leq b\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *For $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\partial D)$ and $x \in \overline{D}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^x \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right] &= \frac{\ell!}{2^\ell} \int_{\Delta_\ell[0, b-a]} \int_{\partial D} \cdots \int_{\partial D} \sigma(dy_1) \cdots \sigma(dy_\ell) ds_1 \cdots ds_\ell \\ &\quad p(a + s_1, x, y_1) p(s_2, y_1, y_2) \cdots p(s_\ell, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell) f(y_1) \cdots f(y_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Proof For $x \in \overline{D}$ and $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^x \left[\int_0^t f(X_s) dL_s \right] = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\partial D} p(s, x, y) f(y) \sigma(dy) ds. \quad (5.1)$$

See [9, Proposition 1.1] for the case when D has C^3 boundary. For Lipschitz boundary, the same proof goes through in view of results in [2]. By Fubini's Theorem and Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^x \left[\left(\int_0^t f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right] \\ &= \ell! \mathbb{E}^x \int_{\Delta_\ell[0, t]} f(X_{s_\ell}) \cdots f(X_{s_1}) dL_{s_\ell} \cdots dL_{s_1} \\ &= \ell! \mathbb{E}^x \int_0^t \left(\int_{\Delta_{\ell-1}[s_1, t]} f(X_{s_\ell}) \cdots f(X_{s_2}) dL_{s_\ell} \cdots dL_{s_2} \right) f(X_{s_1}) dL_{s_1} \\ &= \ell! \mathbb{E}^x \int_0^t \left(\int_{\Delta_{\ell-1}[0, t-s_1]} f(X_{s_\ell}) \cdots f(X_{s_2}) dL_{s_\ell} \cdots dL_{s_2} \right) \circ \theta_{s_1} f(X_{s_1}) dL_{s_1} \\ &= \ell! \mathbb{E}^x \int_0^t \mathbb{E}^{x_{s_1}} \left[\int_{\Delta_{\ell-1}[0, t-s_1]} f(X_{s_\ell}) \cdots f(X_{s_2}) dL_{s_\ell} \cdots dL_{s_2} \right] f(X_{s_1}) dL_{s_1} \\ &= \frac{\ell!}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\partial D} p(s_1, x, y) g(y) \sigma(dy) ds_1 \quad \text{by (5.1),} \end{aligned}$$

where θ_s is the shift operator $(\theta_s(\omega))(t) = \omega(s + t)$, $\omega \in \mathcal{D}([0, \infty), \overline{D})$, and

$$g(y) = \mathbb{E}^y \left[\int_{\Delta_{\ell-1}[0, t-s_1]} f(X_{s_\ell}) \cdots f(X_{s_2}) dL_{s_\ell} \cdots dL_{s_2} \right] f(y).$$

By induction, the result for the case $a = 0$ holds. The result also holds when $a > 0$ since $\mathbb{E}^x \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right] = E^x E^{X_a} \left[\left(\int_0^{b-a} f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right]$ by Markov property of the RBM X . \square

By the same calculations and using the Markov property of $X_t^{(k)}$, we obtain

Lemma 5.2. *For $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(D)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in D^{(k)}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}_x \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s^{(k)}) dL_s^{(k)} \right)^\ell \right] \\ &= \frac{\ell!}{2^\ell} \int_{\Delta_\ell[0, b-a]} \sum_{\lambda_1 \in \Lambda^{(k)}} \cdots \sum_{\lambda_\ell \in \Lambda^{(k)}} p^{(k)}(a + s_1, x, z_{\lambda_1}) p^{(k)}(s_2, z_{\lambda_1}, z_{\lambda_2}) \cdots p^{(k)}(s_\ell, z_{\lambda_{\ell-1}}, z_{\lambda_\ell}) \\ &\quad f(z_{\lambda_1}) \cdots f(z_{\lambda_\ell}) \sigma(\lambda_1) \cdots \sigma(\lambda_\ell) ds_1 \cdots ds_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

The following convergence result is the key in identifying subsequential limits of $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})$.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(D)$ which is uniformly continuous in a neighborhood of ∂D , we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{x_k} \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s^{(k)}) dL_s^{(k)} \right)^\ell \right] = \mathbb{E}^x \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right] \quad (5.2)$$

uniformly for $x \in \overline{D}$ and for any sequence $x_k \in D^{(k)}$ which converges to x . In particular,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{m_k} \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s^{(k)}) dL_s^{(k)} \right)^\ell \right] = \mathbb{E}^m \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s) dL_s \right)^\ell \right]. \quad (5.3)$$

Proof It suffices to show the right hand side of the identities in Lemma 5.1 converges to that of Lemma 5.2 in the sense stated for (5.2). We demonstrate the case $\ell = 1$, as other cases can be proved in the same way. We want to show that

$$\int_a^b \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} p^{(k)}(s, x_k, z_\lambda) f(z_\lambda) \sigma(\lambda) ds \rightarrow \int_a^b \int_{\partial D} p(s, x, z) f(z) \sigma(dz) ds \quad (5.4)$$

uniformly for $x \in \overline{D}$ and for any sequence $x_k \in D^{(k)}$ which converges to x . We first argue pointwise convergence. For fixed $s \in (a, b)$, the integrand (with respect to ds) converges by the local limit theorem (Theorem 4.5) and Lemma 2.1. Hence by Lemma 4.7 and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have (5.4) whenever $x_k \rightarrow x$.

By assumption on f , there exists k_0 large enough such that f is uniformly continuous in a neighborhood of ∂D which contains $\Lambda^{(k)}$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Besides, by interpolations (see, for example, [6]), $p^{(k)}$ can be viewed as an element in $\mathcal{C}([0, \infty) \times \overline{D} \times \overline{D})$. Now the desired uniform convergence follow from the pre-compactness of the sequence $\{g_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}(\overline{D})$, where $g_k(x) = \int_a^b \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^{(k)}} p^{(k)}(s, x, z_\lambda) f(z_\lambda) \sigma(\lambda) ds$ is the left hand side of (5.4). More precisely, uniform boundedness follows from Lemma 4.7, while equicontinuity follows from the Hölder continuity of $p^{(k)}$ in Theorem 4.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1: By Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\left(\int_a^b f(X_s^{(k)}) dL_s^{(k)} \right)^\ell \right] &\leq \frac{\ell!}{2^\ell} \|f\|^\ell C^\ell \int_{\Delta_\ell[0, b-a]} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(a+s_1)s_2 \cdots s_\ell}} ds_1 \cdots ds_\ell \\ &\leq \|f\|^\ell \frac{C^\ell \ell!}{\Gamma((\ell+2)/2)} (b-a)^{\ell/2} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

for all $x \in D^{(k)}$ and $k \geq k_0 = k_0(D)$, where $C = C(d, D, T) > 0$ and Γ is the Gamma function. Taking $f \equiv 1$, we obtain

$$\sup_{k \geq k_0} \sup_{x_k \in D^{(k)}} \mathbf{E}_{x_k} \left[|L_b^{(k)} - L_a^{(k)}|^\ell \right] \leq C(b-a)^{\ell/2} \quad (5.6)$$

for all $0 \leq a \leq b \leq T$, where $k_0 = k_0(D)$ and $C = C(d, D, \ell, T)$ are constants. By (5.6) and the Kolmogorov-Centov tightness criteria (see [8, Theorem 3.8.8]), we obtain tightness of $\{L^{(k)}\}$ under $\{\mathbf{P}_{x_k}\}$ in $\mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$, where $\{x_k\}$ is any sequence such that $x_k \in D^{(k)}$. Besides, (5.6) clearly implies

$$\sup_{k \geq k_0} \mathbf{E}_{m_k} \left[|L_b^{(k)} - L_a^{(k)}|^\ell \right] \leq C(b-a)^{\ell/2}. \quad (5.7)$$

Hence we also have the tightness of $\{L^{(k)}\}$ under $\{\mathbf{P}_{m_k}\}$. By [3, Lemma 2.1, Lemma 3.2] and [4, Remark 3.7], $\{X^{(k)}\}$ is tight in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D})$ under both $\{\mathbf{P}_{x_k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}_{m_k}\}$. Hence we trivially obtain tightness of $\{(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})\}$ in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$, under both $\{\mathbf{P}_{x_k}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{P}_{m_k}\}$. Tightness of $\{(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})\}$ in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ also holds since the second component is continuous. It remains to identify subsequential limits.

We first consider subsequential limits in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$. Suppose, WLOG, the full sequence $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})$, under $\{\mathbf{P}_{m_k}\}$, converges in distribution to (\tilde{X}, \tilde{L}) defined on some probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. Then results in [3] implies that \tilde{X} is the RBM under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, because the map from $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ to $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D})$ which sends (ω_1, ω_2) to ω_1 is continuous (see problem 13 in [8, Chapter 3]). It remains to check that \tilde{L} is the boundary local time of \tilde{X} under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$.

We first show that \tilde{L} is a PCAF of \tilde{X} . First, \tilde{L}_t is continuous by (5.7). This continuity then implies the convergence of finite dimensional distributions (see Theorem 7.8 in [8, Chapter 3])

$$(L_{t_1}^{(k)}, \dots, L_{t_m}^{(k)}) \rightarrow (\tilde{L}_{t_1}, \dots, \tilde{L}_{t_m})$$

for all $0 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_m < \infty$. In particular, $\tilde{L}_0 = 0$ a.s. By first considering rational numbers and then using continuity of \tilde{L} , we can check that \tilde{L}_t is non-decreasing in t , since each of its prelimits satisfies these properties. Second, observe that $L^{(k)}$ is an additive functional by construction. Hence by convergence of joint distribution $(L_s^{(k)}, L_t^{(k)}, L_s^{(k)} \circ \theta_t)$ for $t, s \geq 0$, we have $\tilde{L}_{t+s}(\omega) = \tilde{L}_t(\omega) + \tilde{L}_s(\theta_t \omega)$ a.s. for all $t, s \geq 0$. By continuity of \tilde{L} , we can strengthen the previous statement to obtain the additive property

$$\tilde{L}_{t+s}(\omega) = \tilde{L}_t(\omega) + \tilde{L}_s(\theta_t \omega), \quad t, s \geq 0, \tilde{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Third, \tilde{L}_t is $\sigma(\tilde{X}_s : s \leq t)$ measurable by Skorohod representation theorem and the fact that $L_t^{(k)}$ is $\sigma(X_s^{(k)} : s \leq t)$ measurable for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \geq 0$. These asserts that \tilde{L} is a PCAF of \tilde{X} .

Fix any $f \in C_b(\partial D)$. Let $F \in C_b(\overline{D})$ be any extension of f . Then the map $(\mu, \nu) \mapsto \int_0^\cdot F(\mu_s) d\nu_s$ is continuous from $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D} \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ to $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$. Hence $\int_0^\cdot X_s^{(k)} dL_s^{(k)} \rightarrow \int_0^\cdot \tilde{X}_s d\tilde{L}_s$ in distribution in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$. Since the limit $\int_0^t \tilde{X}_s d\tilde{L}_s$ is continuous in t (due to continuity of \tilde{L}), we have, all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E} \int_0^t f(\tilde{X}_s) d\tilde{L}_s &= \tilde{E} \int_0^t F(\tilde{X}_s) d\tilde{L}_s \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{m_k} \int_0^t F(X_s^{(k)}) dL_s^{(k)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_m \int_0^t f(X_s) dL_s \quad \text{by (5.3)} \\ &= \frac{t}{2} \int_{\partial D} f(y) \sigma(dy) \quad \text{by (5.1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By a standard monotone convergence argument, we have $\tilde{E} \int_0^t f(\tilde{X}_s) d\tilde{L}_s = \frac{t}{2} \int_{\partial D} f(y) \sigma(dy)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(\partial D)$. Therefore, \tilde{L} is the PCAF of \tilde{X} associated with the measure $\sigma/2$ (see [7, Appendix]). By definition, \tilde{L} is the boundary local time of \tilde{X} under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$. The same arguments in the last three paragraphs work for subsequential limits of $(X^{(k)}, L^{(k)})$ under $\{\mathbf{P}_{x_k}\}$, using (5.2) rather than (5.3).

Finally, subsequential limits in $\mathcal{D}([0, T], \overline{D}) \times \mathcal{C}([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+)$ can be identified in the same way. \square

Example 5.4. Let D be the square with vertices $\{(1, 0), (-1, 0), (0, 1), (0, -1)\}$. We take $C \in (\sqrt{2}, 3/\sqrt{2})$. Then $D^{C2^{-k}} \supset \partial D^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for each k , the set $D^{C2^{-k}} \cap D^{(k)}$ remains the same for all such C . Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we can check that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{x_k} [A_{C2^{-k}}^{(k)}(t)] &= \frac{3}{C\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{E}^x[L_t] \quad \text{and} \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_{x_k} \left[\frac{1}{2(2^{-k})} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s^{(k)} \in \partial D^{(k)}\} ds \right] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbb{E}^x[L_t] \end{aligned}$$

whenever $x_k \rightarrow x$. Hence neither $A_{C2^{-k}}^{(k)}(t)$ nor $\frac{1}{2(2^{-k})} \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{X_s^{(k)} \in \partial D^{(k)}\} ds$ is a suitable approximation to L_t . It is clear that in the second case above, the factor $1/\sqrt{2}$ comes from the fact that only about 2^k points on each side of the square is used in the calculation of the left hand side, while Definition 2.2 asserts that about $2^k \sqrt{2}$ points on $\partial D^{(k)}$ should be used.

6 Extensions

- (1) The method in this paper as well as that of [3] work for general symmetric reflected diffusions, as long as (\mathbf{a}, ρ) satisfies the conditions in the first paragraph in the introduction. That is, Theorem 3.1 holds with the *same* $L^{(k)}$ in Definition 2.2, even if X is now a general symmetric reflected diffusions, provided that $X^{(k)}$ is constructed suitably, such as using the procedure in [6, section 2.1.2]. Precisely, $X^{(k)}$ is the unique symmetric (non-simple) random walk on $D^{(k)}$ whose transition probabilities in the interior $D^{(k)} \setminus \partial D^{(k)}$ coincide with that in [11, section 3]. See [6] for details of construction of $X^{(k)}$ and proofs of the local limit theorem for RBMs with drifts. The reason for this generalization to hold is that both the extension theorem [7, Theorem 6.6.9] (in place of [3, Theorem 1.1]) and the discrete isoperimetric inequality [6, Theorem 5.5] can be applied to handle general symmetric reflected diffusions.
- (2) The sequence 2^{-k} for the lattice size in this paper is chosen to follow that in [3]. Generalization of results in [3] and in this paper to any sequence which tends to zero should not take much effort and is left to the readers (we have already shown that some estimates in section 4 hold for any $\epsilon > 0$).
- (3) The idea in this paper can be easily extended to construct discrete approximations to other PCAF, such as the local time on any $(d-1)$ -dimensional rectifiable subset in \overline{D} (e.g. an open subset of ∂D , the slit $[0, 1) \times \{0\}$ in the unit disc, etc).

Acknowledgements: The author thanks Profs. Amarjit Budhiraja, Krzysztof Burdzy and Zhen-Qing Chen for thoughtful remarks.

References

- [1] R. F. Bass, K. Burdzy and Z.-Q. Chen. Uniqueness for reflecting Brownian motion in lip domains. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*. **41** (2005), 197-235.
- [2] R. F. Bass and P. Hsu. Some potential theory for reflecting Brownian motion in Hölder and lipschitz domains. *Ann. Probab.* **19** (1991), 486-508.

- [3] K. Burdzy and Z.-Q. Chen. Discrete approximations to reflected Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **36** (2008), 698-727.
- [4] K. Burdzy and Z.-Q. Chen. Reflected random walk in fractal domains. *Ann. Probab.* **41** (2011), 2791-2819.
- [5] Z.-Q. Chen. On reflecting diffusion processes and Skorokhod decompositions. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.* **94** (1993), 281-316.
- [6] Z.-Q. Chen and W.-T. Fan. Hydrodynamic limits and propagation of chaos for interacting random walks in domains. Preprint, arXiv:1311.2325.
- [7] Z.-Q. Chen and M. Fukushima. *Symmetric Markov Processes, Time Change and Boundary Theory*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [8] S.N. Ethier and T.G. Kurtz. *Markov processes. Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York, 1986. MR0838085.
- [9] V. G. Papanicolaou. The probabilistic solution of the third boundary value problem for second order elliptic equations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.* **87** (1990), 27-77.
- [10] A. Singer, Z. Schuss, A. Osipov, and D. Holcman. Partially reflected diffusion. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics.* **68** (2008), 844-868.
- [11] D.W. Stroock and W. Zheng. Markov chain approximations to symmetric diffusions. *Ann. Inst. Henri. Poincar-Probab. Statist.* **33** (1997), 619-649. MR 1473568.