



Roger Tribe and Oleg Zaboronski
 Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

July 26, 2024

Abstract

This paper considers the decay in particle intensities for a translation invariant two species system of diffusing and reacting particles on \mathbb{Z}^d for $d \geq 3$. The intensities are shown to approximately solve modified rate equations, from which their polynomial decay can be deduced. The system illustrates that the underlying diffusion and reaction rates can influence the exact polynomial decay rates, despite the system evolving in a supercritical dimension.

1 Introduction

Our aim is to analyse the decay of densities in the two species reacting system $A + A \rightarrow A$ and $A + B \rightarrow A$, when particles perform simple random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d for $d \geq 3$. At time zero particles are, for example, Poisson with uniform (non-zero) intensities. The density of A particles should fall as $O(t^{-1})$, for typical random walks and reaction mechanisms. Our aim here is to show that the density of B particles falls like $O(t^{-\theta})$, for some θ to be found and which depends on the details of the random walks and reactions.

We specify one specific set of reactions. Type A particles perform rate D_A independent simple random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d , for $d \geq 3$. In addition, each pair of type A particles on the same site will (independently of other pairs) coalesce at rate $2\lambda_A$. Type B particles perform rate D_B simple random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d , independently of the A population. Moreover any pair of one A particle and one B particle at the same site, will (independently of all other randomness) coalesce into a type A particle at rate λ_B . Note that the A population is unaffected by the presence of the B population. All rates are strictly positive.

Suppose at $t = 0$ the numbers of A and B particles are independent and identically distributed at sites $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, with finite moments of all orders. The methods of Bramson and Griffiths [3] and of van den Berg and Kesten [9, 19] imply the asymptotics

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{there is an } A \text{ particle at the origin}] \sim \frac{1}{p_A \lambda_A t} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (1)$$

where

$$p_A = \frac{\gamma D_A}{\gamma D_A + \lambda_A}$$

is the probability that a system with just two A particles, both starting at the origin, never coalesces, and γ the probability that a simple random walk starting at 0 never makes a return visit to the origin. Note the constant $\frac{1}{p_A \lambda_A}$ holds universally over the possible initial conditions.

The aim of this paper is to show that

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{there is an } B \text{ particle at the origin}] \sim C t^{-\frac{p_B \lambda_B}{p_A \lambda_A}} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

where $C = C(D_A, D_B, \lambda_A, \lambda_B) > 0$ and

$$p_B = \frac{\gamma(D_A + D_B)}{\gamma(D_A + D_B) + \lambda_B}$$

is the probability that a system with just one type A and one type B particle, both starting at the origin, never coalesces. This leads to the decay rate $Ct^{-\theta}$ for the B population where

$$\theta = \frac{D_A + D_B}{D_A} \frac{1 + \gamma D_A \lambda_A^{-1}}{1 + \gamma(D_A + D_B) \lambda_B^{-1}}.$$

Note that this θ can take any value in $(0, \infty)$ and also the good sense that $\theta \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda_B \rightarrow 0$ and $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda_A \rightarrow 0$.

Taking $\lambda_A \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lambda_B \rightarrow \infty$ we expect to get the decay rates for the case of instantaneous coalescence. In particular

$$p_A \lambda_A \rightarrow \gamma D_A, \quad p_B \lambda_B \rightarrow \gamma(D_A + D_B) \quad \text{as } \lambda_A, \lambda_B \rightarrow \infty \quad (2)$$

so that $\theta \rightarrow 1 + (D_B/D_A)$. Notice that this limiting answer for θ has a higher degree universality than the exponent for finite reaction rates; the limit depends on the ratio D_B/D_A , but not the constant γ , which depends on the geometry of the underlying lattice. Therefore we conjecture that the infinite reaction rate formula $\theta = 1 + (D_B/D_A)$ is valid for a large class of translation invariant lattices (for example the triangular lattice).

These results should be compared with the solutions to naive rate equations:

$$\frac{da}{dt} = -\lambda_A a^2, \quad \frac{db}{dt} = -\lambda_B ab, \quad (3)$$

which yield $a(t) \sim 1/\lambda_A t$ and $b(t) \sim C t^{-\lambda_B/\lambda_A}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the naive rate equations correctly predict the polynomial rate of decay for A particles (with an incorrect constant) and fail to predict the correct decay rate for B particles. The point is that, in supercritical dimensions, such rate equations do give the right answers providing the constants are modified to

$$\frac{da}{dt} = -p_A \lambda_A a^2, \quad \frac{db}{dt} = -p_B \lambda_B ab. \quad (4)$$

Since the constants for this system of two equations get involved in the polynomial decay rate for B particles, one cannot read off the correct decay rates just from the naive rate equations and

the work establishing the modified constants is crucial. Our system was chosen as the simplest system to illustrate this point. This method, known as the 'modified rate equation method', should apply in all transient dimensions $d \geq 3$.

Our approach follows that in Van den Berg and Kesten [9, 19] on single species coalescent models, where enough asymptotic independence of sites is established to show that the modified rate equations give the correct decay rates. However, unlike [9, 19], we will exploit negative dependence inequalities for the A particle density. Van den Berg and Kesten show that these can be avoided, estimating covariances directly, and hence their results apply to a class of related coalescence models, with more complicated coalescence mechanisms, for which negative correlation is unknown. In our two species setting, the B particle decay rate can be arbitrarily slow which necessitates more work in the error estimates. We use high moments to establish the de-correlation of the A and B particle densities, which in turn exploit the negative dependence properties of the A particles. To estimate these high moments, we use a Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund type inequality (also called a square function inequality) for variables with negative dependence, see Proposition 5, which we believe is new and which may be of independent interest.

Related literature. The two-species reaction $A + A \rightarrow A$, $A + B \rightarrow A$ has been studied in theoretical physics in the context of persistence, where B 's play the role of test particles in the environment of reacting A particles. Then the density of B particles at time t reflects the probability that a test particle has not collided with an A particle through time t . In particular, in [10] the model has been treated in all spatial dimensions using a combination of rate and Smoluchowski equations; in [13] the one-dimensional case was analyzed by developing a perturbation theory in the small mobility of B particles; in [8], [16] the perturbative renormalisation group method was applied to calculate the answers for the space dimension $d = 2 - \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \geq 0$. (The final answers presented in [8] are incorrect even within the non-rigorous renormalisation group framework, as their derivations neglect the anomalous dimension of the field operator describing the B particles.)

We briefly discuss work in $d = 1, 2$. In the critical dimension $d = 2$, the modified rate equation method was shown to work for a single species coalescent system in [12], to derive the leading asymptotic of the decay rates of all multi-point densities, where logarithmic modifications appear to the $d \geq 3$ decay rates, and the leading asymptotic $a(t) \sim C \log(t)/t$ should be universal over a range of reaction mechanisms due to the recurrence. The two species system in $d = 2$ was studied using non-rigorous renormalisation group calculations in [16] and this suggests a surprising answer for the B particle density decay, where the logarithmic modifications to the answers are non-universal, in the sense that the powers of $\log t$ appearing in a full asymptotic expression for $b(t)$ depend on both the reaction and diffusion rates. For coalescing systems in dimension $d = 1$ the method fails, and the multi-point densities are more complicated. Luckily, for instantaneous coalescence, techniques from integrable probability allow all multi-point densities to be calculated, see [18], [6].

Layout. In section 2 we give a construction of the particle systems, explain the main intuition of the proof, following the arguments from [9, 19], and state the main result. In section 3 we establish a negative dependence property of the A particle density, and prove the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund type inequality. We complete the proof of the main result in section 4.

Notation. We will use small case constants $c_1(p), c_2(t) \dots$ for constants that will be referred

to later in the paper. We use large case constants $C_{p,t,\dots}$ for constants whose exact value is unimportant and may vary from line to line. In all cases the dependence on all variables will be indicated, except that we suppress dependence on the dimension d .

2 Construction

2.1 A strong equation

We now give a construction for the processes with finite reaction rates $\lambda_A, \lambda_B < \infty$. We construct the process as the solution of a system of equations on \mathbb{Z}^d , driven by Poisson processes (very close to standard graphical constructions of particle systems). We start with a probability space equipped with a collection of Poisson families as follows. Write $x \sim y$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, to mean that they are nearest neighbours, that is that $|x - y| = 1$ (in the Euclidean norm).

- The family $(P^A(i, x, y) : i \in \mathbb{N}, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x \sim y)$ of i.i.d. rate $D_A/2d$ Poisson processes will control the jumps of the i th type A particle at x to the site y .
- The family $(P^B(i, x, y) : i \in \mathbb{N}, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x \sim y)$ of i.i.d. rate $D_B/2d$ Poisson processes will control the jumps of the i th type B particle at x to the site y .
- The i.i.d. Poisson family $(P^{AA}(i, j, x) : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$, at rate λ_A , will control the coalescence of the i th type A particle onto the j th type A particle at site x (the total rate of coalescence for each pair will be $2\lambda_A$).
- The i.i.d. Poisson family $(P^{AB}(i, j, x) : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$, at rate λ_B , will control the coalescence of the i th type A particle with the j th type B particle at site x .

These families are independent of each other, are defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$, and are compatible with the filtration, that is that they are adapted and increments over any time interval $[s, t]$ are \mathcal{F}_s independent.

The processes $\xi = (\xi_t(x) : t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $\eta = (\eta_t(x) : t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ will record the particle numbers at sites $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and times $t \geq 0$ for the A and B type particles. They solve, for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the stochastic differential equations

$$d\xi_t(x) = \sum_{y:y \sim x} \sum_{i \geq 1} (I(i \leq \xi_{t-}(y)) dP_t^A(i, y, x) - I(i \leq \xi_{t-}(x)) dP_t^A(i, x, y)) - \sum_{i,j \geq 1} I(i \vee j \leq \xi_{t-}(x), i \neq j) dP_t^{AA}(i, j, x), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0, \text{ a.s.}, \quad (5)$$

$$d\eta_t(x) = \sum_{y:y \sim x} \sum_{i \geq 1} (I(i \leq \eta_{t-}(y)) dP_t^B(i, y, x) - I(i \leq \eta_{t-}(x)) dP_t^B(i, x, y)) - \sum_{i,j \geq 1} I(i \leq \xi_{t-}(x), j \leq \eta_{t-}(x)) dP_t^{AB}(i, j, x), \quad \text{for } t \geq 0, \text{ a.s.} \quad (6)$$

To formulate an existence and uniqueness result, we will look for solutions that live in certain weighted $l_2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ spaces. We will be interested in translation invariant solutions and the exact choice of weights is not so important; to be concrete we define the space of functions with slower than exponential growth by

$$S_\alpha = \{f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid \|f\|_\alpha := \sum_x |f(x)|^2 e^{-\alpha|x|} < \infty\} \quad \text{for } \alpha > 0.$$

With the norm $\|f\|_\alpha$, the space S_α is a complete metrisable space, S_α^2 is the product space and $D_{S_\alpha^2}[0, \infty)$ the space of cadlag S_α^2 valued paths in the Skorokhod topology.

Proposition 1. *Suppose ξ_0 and η_0 are \mathcal{F}_0 measurable variables satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\|\xi_0\|_\alpha] + \mathbb{E}[\|\eta_0\|_\alpha] < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Then there exist adapted solutions $(\xi_t, \eta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to (5) and (6) with paths in $D_{S_\alpha^2}[0, \infty)$. Solutions are pathwise unique and unique in law. If (ξ_0, η_0) are translation invariant then so too are (ξ_t, η_t) at all $t \geq 0$. Whenever $\mathbb{E}[\sum_x (|\xi_0(x)|^p + |\eta_0(x)|^p) e^{-\alpha|x|}] < \infty$, for some $p > 0$, then the same moments remain bounded over finite time intervals.*

The result can be established by, for example, a standard Picard scheme and Grönwall estimates for the moments. Similar infinite systems of Poisson driven equations are discussed in, for example, [7] in the context of spin systems.

2.2 The main result

Initial Conditions. For initial conditions we ask that $(\xi_0(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(\eta_0(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are independent i.i.d. families, and that $\mathbb{E}[\xi_0^p(0) + \eta_0^p(0)] < \infty$ for all $p \geq 0$. We will also place some restriction on the law of $\xi_0(0)$ so that we can use BKR inequalities to derive negative dependence properties. We ask that the law of $\xi_0(0)$ lies in

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}_{PB}} = \text{closure of the set of Poisson-Binomial variables} \quad (7)$$

where the closure is in the topology of convergence in distribution, and a Poisson-Binomial variable is a variable X that can be written as a sum $X = \sum_{i=1}^N B(p_i)$ of independent Bernoulli $B(p_i)$ variables. In particular deterministic ξ_0 or Poisson ξ_0 are special cases.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that (ξ, η) are solutions to (5) and (6) in $d \geq 3$ with non-zero initial conditions as above. Then there exists $\kappa_1 = \kappa_1(d) > 0$ so that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)] = \frac{1}{p_A \lambda_A} t^{-1} (1 + O(t^{-\kappa_1}))$$

and there exists $\kappa_2 = \kappa_2(d) > 0$ and c_0 (where c_0 may depend on the initial conditions and all rates $D_A, D_B, \lambda_A, \lambda_B$) so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)] = c_0 t^{-\frac{p_B \lambda_B}{p_A \lambda_A}} (1 + O(t^{-\kappa_2})).$$

Remark 2.2.1 In the instantly coalescing cases, where either λ_A or λ_B or both are infinite, we believe that the same results holds except that either or both of the substitutions in (2) are required. We discuss two methods to establish this belief at the end of Section 4.

Remark 2.2.2 The leading asymptotics can be stated in terms of occupation probabilities densities since

$$\mathbb{P}[\xi_t(0) > 0] \sim \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[\eta_t(0) > 0] \sim \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)] \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Remark 2.2.2 Concrete values for κ_1, κ_2 , which we do not claim are optimal, can be read off from the proofs; for example any $\kappa_1 < (d-2)/(3d-4)$ is achievable (see Remark 4.2.1); one can take $\kappa_2 = \frac{1}{17}$ in $d=3$ and $\kappa_2 = \kappa_1$ for large d (see Remark 4.4.1).

In the rest of this subsection we repeat the heuristic argument from [9] that guide the calculations, adapting it for our two species case. We can divide the proof into three steps.

Step I. An exact calculation shows that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)] = -\lambda_B \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta(0)].$$

At large times, the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta(0)]$ is well approximated by $\mathbb{P}[\xi_t(0) = \eta_t(0) = 1]$ since the occurrence of sites with three or more particles will be of smaller order in t^{-1} . Trace an A and a B particle that are at 0 at time t back to the time $t-s$, where we will take $1 \ll s \ll t$. These particles must have been located at some points x and y , suggesting that (using an informal notation \approx for 'approximately equal to')

$$\mathbb{P}[\xi_t(0) = \eta_t(0) = 1] \approx \sum_{x,y} \mathbb{P}[\xi_{t-s}(x) = 1, \eta_{t-s}(y) = 1] \psi_s(x, y)$$

where $\psi_s(x, y)$ is the probability an A and a B particle starting at x and y end up at 0 at time s without coalescing. Step I is to justify (and quantify) these approximations, which all follow from the density of particles being low, requiring $t-s \gg 0$.

Step II. A random walk calculation shows that, when $1 \ll |x-y| = O(t^{1/2})$ and $s \gg 1$,

$$\psi_s(x, y) \approx p_B p_s^A(x) p_s^B(y)$$

where $p_s^A(x)$ and $p_s^B(x)$ are the simple random walk transition densities for A and B particles. This is intuitive if one reverses the paths and look at them starting at 0 and reaching x and y without coalescing, since then coalescence in transient dimensions is mostly decided by times smaller than s . Combining this with step I leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)] \approx -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x,y} \xi_{t-s}(x) p_s^A(x) \eta_{t-s}(y) p_s^B(y) \right].$$

The estimates for this approximation step will be taken from [9] Lemma 12.

Step III. The hardest step is to get some quantitative control on the approximate independence

$$\mathbb{P}[\xi_{t-s}(x) = 1, \eta_{t-s}(y) = 1] \approx \mathbb{P}[\xi_{t-s}(x) = 1] \mathbb{P}[\eta_{t-s}(y) = 1]$$

which holds at least for $|x-y| \gg 1$ and $t-s \gg 1$. We bound the covariance of $\sum \xi_t(x)f(x)$ and $\sum \eta_t(x)g(x)$ using Hölder's inequality and high fluctuation moments for the A population

(which will exploit the negative dependence properties). This will be sufficiently to justify the final step

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)] &\approx -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_x \xi_{t-s}(x) p_s^A(x) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_x \eta_{t-s}(x) p_s^B(x) \right] \\ &= -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(0)] \mathbb{E}[\eta_{t-s}(0)] \\ &\approx -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)] \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)]. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the second of the modified rate equations (4) (and a similar and simpler argument will justify the first of the modified rate equations). The resulting asymptotics follow from analysing these equations and the error estimates in the approximations above.

3 Negative dependence

Negative dependence properties for the one species coalescing system were first used in Arratia [2] to estimate variances, and subsequently in [9, 19], [12]. The property of negative association, and the weaker property LNQD, are some of a number of related definitions - see Newman [14] or Pemantle [15] for discussions.

We will broadly follow the van den Berg and Kesten argument from [19], where they deduce a negative dependence property for some coalescing systems from the van den Berg-Kesten-Reimers (BKR) inequality. In particular, we modify the nice technique used in [19] of obtaining our desired system as the limit of projections of suitable multi-colour particle systems.

In section 3.1 we state the main negative correlation property for the A -particles, and derive consequences for moments of the process. In section 3.2 we derive a 'square function' inequality (analogous to half of a Burkholder inequality) for variables with a suitable negative dependency. The proof of negative association, following closely that for the systems in [19], is given in 3.3.

3.1 Negative association for A particles

Definition A random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is said to be *negatively associated* if

$$\mathbb{E} [f(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) g(X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_l})] \leq \mathbb{E} [f(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k})] \mathbb{E} [g(X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_l})]$$

whenever $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ are disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are bounded increasing functions. An infinite vector is called negatively associated, if every finite subvector has the corresponding property.

Proposition 3. *Let ξ be the solution of the A -particle equation (5) started from an initial condition $(\xi_0(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ of independent variables from $\overline{\mathcal{M}_{PB}}$. Then for any $t > 0$ the vector $(\xi_t(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is negatively associated. In addition it satisfies the inequality*

$$\mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq k + l] \leq \mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq k] \mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq l] \quad \text{for } k, l \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (8)$$

The proof is given in section 3.3.

Corollary 4. For ξ as in Proposition 3 we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x_1) \dots \xi_t(x_n)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x_1)] \dots \mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x_n)] \text{ for disjoint } x_1, \dots, x_n \text{ and } t \geq 0, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1) \dots (\xi_t(x) - (n - 1))] \leq n! (\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)])^n \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } t > 0. \quad (10)$$

Proof of Corollary 4. By the negative association and induction in n we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \leq n} (\xi_t(x_i) \wedge K) \right] \leq \prod_{i \leq n} \mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x_i) \wedge K]$$

and letting $K \uparrow \infty$ yields (9). Starting with (8), induction yields, for $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq k_1 + \dots + k_n] \leq \mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq k_1] \dots \mathbb{P} [\xi_t(x) \geq k_n]$$

Now (10) follows from the identity

$$X(X - 1) \dots (X - (n - 1)) = n! \sum_{i_1=1}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}(X \geq i_1 + \dots + i_n).$$

□

Remark 3.1.1 The properties (8) and (10) are instances of the factorial moment negative dependence discussed in Liggett [11] for systems of independent random walks. However the method of proof used in [11] does not seem to extend to establish such properties for coalescing systems.

Remark 3.1.2 We have not been able to establish useful negative dependence properties between A and B particles. As a guiding example, consider the two processes started with exactly one A particle and one B particle, both at the origin. Then $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)\eta_t(0)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)]\mathbb{E}[\eta_t(0)]$ for $|x|$ small, but the reverse inequality holds for $|x|$ large.

3.2 A Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality for negatively dependent variables

The following is an analogue of the classical Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality for independent variables, or Burkholder type inequality for martingales (see [4]). It only uses a slightly weaker form of negative correlation called LNQD (linearly negative quadrant dependant - see [14]) which we now recall.

Definition A random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is called *linearly negative quadrant dependent* (LNQD) if the pair $\sum_{i \in A} \lambda_i X_i$ and $\sum_{j \in B} \mu_j X_j$ are negatively associated for any disjoint A and B and positive λ_i, μ_j . An infinite vector is called LNQD if every finite subvector has the corresponding property.

Proposition 5. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists constants $C_p < \infty$ so that if $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ is LNQD for some $N \geq 1$, $E[X_i] = 0$ and $E[|X_i|^{2p}] < \infty$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right|^{2p} \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^N X_i^2 \right|^p \right].$$

Proof. Unindexed sums \sum_i will be over the indices $i = 1, \dots, N$. Set $S = \sum_i X_i$ and $S_i = \sum_{j>i}^N X_j$ and $[S] = \sum_i X_i^2$. The binomial expansion

$$S^{2p} = (X_1 + S_1)^{2p} = \sum_{k=0}^{2p} \binom{2p}{k} X_1^k S_1^{2p-k} = S_1^{2p} + \sum_{k=1}^{2p} \binom{2p}{k} X_1^k S_1^{2p-k}$$

may be iterated, by repeating the expansion on the terms $S_1^{2p}, S_2^{2p}, \dots, S_{N-1}^{2p}$, to find

$$S^{2p} = S_{N-1}^{2p} + \sum_{k=1}^{2p} \binom{2p}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} X_i^k S_i^{2p-k} = \sum_{k=1}^{2p} \binom{2p}{k} \sum_i X_i^k S_i^{2p-k} \quad (11)$$

where in the last equality we are using the convention that $S_N^k = 0$ for $k \geq 1$ but $S_N^0 = 1$. Taking expectations, the term in (11) when $k = 1$, that is $\sum_i X_i S_i^{2p-1}$, has negative expectation by the LNQD assumption; indeed we may apply the negative association to the increasing functions $f(x) = x$ and $g(x) = x^{2p-1}$ to the truncated variables $\psi_K(X_i)$ and $\psi_K(S_i)$ for $\phi_K(x) = (x \wedge K) \vee (-K)$ and then let $K \uparrow \infty$ using the moment assumption to remove the truncation. Also the term in (11) when $k = 2p$ satisfies $\sum_i X_i^{2p} \leq (\sum_i X_i^2)^p = [S]^p$. The aim is to control the remaining terms in (11) using $[S]$.

Consider the term $\sum_i X_i^k S_i^{2p-k}$ for some $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, 2p-1\}$. In the martingale proof (that is for a Burkholder inequality) one could first bound this by Hölder's inequality, for any $\delta > 0$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i X_i^k S_i^{2p-k} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \leq N} |S_j|^{2p-k} \sum_i |X_i|^k \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2p-k}{2p} \delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \leq N} |S_j|^{2p} \right] + \frac{k}{2p} \delta^{-(2p-k)/k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_i |X_i|^k \right)^{2p/k} \right] \\ &\leq C_{p,k} \delta \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{j \leq N} |S_j|^{2p} \right] + C_{p,k,\delta} \mathbb{E} [[S]^p]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Then Doob's maximal inequality allows one to bound $\mathbb{E}[\sup_j |S_j|^{2p}]$ by $C_p \mathbb{E}[S^{2p}]$. Choosing small δ one finds

$$\mathbb{E}[S^{2p}] \leq C_p \mathbb{E}[[S]^p] + (1/2) \mathbb{E}[S^{2p}]$$

and one can close the inequality. In our case we don't see how to get a suitable maximal inequality working just from a negative dependence assumption.

However there is alternative argument. If we symmetrize (11) over all $N!$ possible orderings of the variables X_1, \dots, X_N we obtain

$$S^{2p} = \sum_{k=1}^{2p} \binom{2p}{k} \sum_i X_i^k Z(i, k) \quad (13)$$

where $Z(i, 2p) = 1$ and for $k = 1, \dots, 2p - 1$

$$Z(i, k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{j}^{-1} \sum_{\Lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i\}, |\Lambda|=j} S_{\Lambda}^{2p-k}$$

with $S_{\Lambda} = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} X_i$. Again, the term $k = 1$ has negative expectation by the LNQD assumption, so we need we need to bound the terms when $k = 2, \dots, 2p - 1$. Let A be a random subset of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ chosen as follows. First choose K uniformly from $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and then, conditional on K , choose A uniformly from all subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of size K (so that $A = \emptyset$ if $K = 0$). Then, for a fixed i and fixed $\Lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i\}$ with $|\Lambda| = j$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[A \setminus \{i\} = \Lambda] &= \mathbb{P}[A = \Lambda] + \mathbb{P}[A = \Lambda \cup \{i\}] \\ &= \frac{1}{N+1} \left(\binom{N}{j}^{-1} + \binom{N}{j+1}^{-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \binom{N-1}{j}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume (by extending the probability space if necessary) that (K, A) are defined on the same probability space as X but are independent of X . Then the term $\mathbb{E}[\sum_i X_i^k Z(i, k)]$ can be rewritten (with the convention that $S_{\emptyset} = 0$) as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i X_i^k Z(i, k) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i X_i^k S_{A \setminus \{i\}}^{2p-k} \right]. \quad (14)$$

The idea is to approximate each term $S_{A \setminus \{i\}}$ by S_A , a common factor independent of i . Since

$$|S_{A \setminus \{i\}}|^{2p-k} \leq C_{p,k} \left(|S_A|^{2p-k} + |X_i|^{2p-k} \right)$$

we have the bound, arguing as in (12), for any $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, p-1\}$ and $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i X_i^k S_{A \setminus \{i\}}^{2p-k} \right] &\leq C_{p,k} \mathbb{E} \left[|S_A|^{2p-k} \sum_i |X_i|^k \right] + C_{p,k} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i |X_i|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq C_{p,k} \delta \mathbb{E}[S_A^{2p}] + C_{p,k,\delta} \mathbb{E}[S^p]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

To close the inequality it remains to show that we can bound $\mathbb{E}[S_A^{2p}]$ in terms of $\mathbb{E}[S^{2p}]$. For large N , S_A^{2p} should be well approximated by $|\sum_i W_i X_i|^{2p}$ where the vector $W = (W_1, \dots, W_N)$ is chosen independently of X by first picking K uniformly as above and then, conditionally on K , letting W_i be i.i.d. Bernoulli (K/N) variables. We claim (and prove below) that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_i W_i = j \right] \geq \frac{1}{4(N+1)} \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, N. \quad (16)$$

Conditional on $\sum W_i = j$ the vector (W_1, \dots, W_N) is uniformly distributed over all vectors with j ones $N - j$ zeros. This and the claim (16) now imply that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_A^{2p}] \leq 4 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i W_i X_i \right|^{2p} \right]. \quad (17)$$

We can bound this easier sum by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i W_i X_i \right|^{2p} \right] &\leq 2^{2p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i (W_i - (K/N)) X_i \right|^{2p} \right] + 2^{2p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[(K/N)^{2p} \left| \sum_i X_i \right|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i (W_i - (K/N)) X_i \right|^{2p} \right] + C_p \mathbb{E}[S^{2p}]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

But we can now use the case of Zygmund's inequality for independent variables to see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i (W_i - (K/N)) X_i \right|^{2p} \middle| \sigma\{X, K\} \right] &\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i (W_i - (K/N))^2 X_i^2 \right|^p \middle| \sigma\{X, K\} \right] \\ &\leq C_p \left| \sum_i X_i^2 \right|^p = C_p [S]^p. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The last three steps (17,18,19) allow us to bound

$$\mathbb{E}[S_A^{2p}] \leq 4\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_i W_i X_i \right|^{2p} \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E}[S^{2p}] + C_p \mathbb{E}[[S]^p]$$

which along with (13,14,15) completes the proof by closing the inequality as in the martingale case.

To establish the claim (16) note that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_i W_i = n \right] = \frac{1}{N+1} \binom{N}{n} \sum_{l=0}^N \left(\frac{l}{N} \right)^n \left(1 - \frac{l}{N} \right)^{N-n}.$$

For $n = 0$, or for $n = N$, this immediately gives the desired lower bound, by examining just the term $l = 0$, or the term $l = N$. When $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ note that the function $x^n(1-x)^{N-n}$ is unimodal and achieves its maximum at $x = n/N$. Examining Riemann block diagrams one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{n/N} x^n (1-x)^{N-n} dx &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^n \left(\frac{l}{N} \right)^n \left(1 - \frac{l}{N} \right)^{N-n}, \\ \int_{n/N}^1 x^n (1-x)^{N-n} dx &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=n}^N \left(\frac{l}{N} \right)^n \left(1 - \frac{l}{N} \right)^{N-n} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\sum_{l=0}^N \left(\frac{l}{N} \right)^n \left(1 - \frac{l}{N} \right)^{N-n} \geq (N/2) \int_0^1 x^n (1-x)^{N-n} dx.$$

Using this we have for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_i W_i = n \right] &\geq \frac{N}{2} \frac{1}{N+1} \binom{N}{n} \int_0^1 x^n (1-x)^{N-n} dx \\ &= \frac{N}{2} \frac{1}{N+1} \binom{N}{n} \frac{n!(N-n)!}{(N+1)!} \geq \frac{1}{4(N+1)} \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of the claim. \square

Remark 3.2.1 The proof uses only the special case of LNQD, that $\mathbb{E}[X_i(\sum_{j \in A} X_j)^k] \leq 0$ for odd k and $i \notin J$.

Remarks 3.2.2 A converse inequality of the form $\mathbb{E}[[S]^p] \leq C_p \mathbb{E}[S^{2p}]$, which holds for i.i.d. variables, will certainly fail for negatively associated variables (as it does for the martingale case). Indeed the vector of i.i.d. variables, each taking values ± 1 with probability $1/2$, conditioned that their sum equals 0 will be negatively associated. This example is also useful to keep in mind if one wants to look for a maximal inequality for negatively associated variables.

3.3 Proof of Proposition 3

Following [19] we derive the negative association from the BKR inequality first used in percolation models. and slight variant on the types of negative dependency. The BKR inequality [17] is stated for a product probability measure μ on the product space $\Omega = \prod_{i \in V} S_i$, where V , and S_i for each $i \in V$, are finite sets. We recall the formulation: for $\omega \in \Omega$ and $K \subseteq V$ the cylinder $[\omega]_K$ is defined by $[\omega]_K := \{\omega' : \omega'_i = \omega_i, \forall i \in K\}$; for $A, B \subseteq \Omega$ the set $A \square B$ is defined by

$$A \square B = \{\omega : \exists \text{ disjoint } K, L \subseteq V \text{ with } [\omega]_K \subseteq A \text{ and } [\omega]_L \subseteq B\}.$$

The BKR inequality states that $\mu(A \square B) \leq \mu(A)\mu(B)$.

The papers [9, 19] define a product set-up as above within the graphical construction for their particle system. We argue slightly differently, by first defining a finite oriented percolation structure, equivalent to a system of discrete time coalescing processes, for which BKR implies negative correlations. We then sketch the standard arguments for a sequence of discrete time approximations that converge in distribution to the A particle process that we study. Since negative correlations statements survive such convergence we may deduce the inequalities we need.

The product set-up we will construct will encode a system of discrete time instantly coalescing particles performing random walks on $[-M, M]^d := \{-M, -M + 1, \dots, M - 1, M\}^d$ over the time steps $[0, T] := \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$. The particles will also have colours with values in $[1, K] = \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

In our construction, $V = V_1 \cup V_2$. The set $V_1 = [-M, M]^d \times [1, K]$ with $S_{(x,k)} = \{0, 1\}$ for $(x, k) \in V_1$ will encode the initial conditions; when $\omega_{(x,k)} = 1$ there will be a particle of colour k at position x at time 0. The set $V_2 = [0, T] \times [-M, M]^d \times [1, K]$ with $S_{(t,x,k)} = \{0, (\pm e_i)\} \times [1, K]$ for $(t, x, k) \in V_2$ will control the movement and colour change of particles. Here (e_1, \dots, e_d) are the standard unit vectors. For example, when $\omega_{(t,x,k)} = (e_1, k')$ a particle with colour k at position x at time t will move to position $x + e_1$ at time $t + 1$ and change colour to k' .

To define the positions of particles we adopt the terminology of oriented percolation. We first define paths running from time 0 to time T : a path π consists of a sequence of space-colour points $\pi = ((x_i, k_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, T)$ where $k_i \in [1, K]$ and $x_i \in [-M, M]^d$ satisfy $|x_i - x_{i-1}| \in \{0, (\pm e_i)\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, T$. The range of a path $R(\pi)$ is the set of time-space-colour points the path visits, that is $\{(i, x_i, k_i) : i \in [0, T]\}$. For $\omega \in \Omega$ we say a path $\pi = ((x_i, k_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, T)$ is

open if $\omega_{(x_0, k_0)} = 1$ and

$$(x_i - x_{i-1}, k_i) = \omega_{(i-1, x_{i-1}, k_{i-1})} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, T.$$

The key observation is that the open paths are instantly coalescing: if two open paths $\pi = ((x_i, k_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, T)$ and $\pi' = ((x'_i, k'_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, T)$ agree at time $t \in [0, T]$, that is $(x_t, k_t) = (x'_t, k'_t)$, then they agree at all times $t + 1, \dots, T$.

Finally we define the occurrence of a coloured particle for $t \in [0, T], x \in [-M, M]^d, k \in [1, K]$ by

$$\xi_t^{(k)}(x)(\omega) := \mathbb{I}(\text{there is an open path } \pi \text{ with } (x_t, k_t) = (x, k)).$$

The sum $\xi_t(x) := \sum_{k=1}^K \xi_t^{(k)}(x)$ records the number of particles of any colour at x at time t . Note the variables $(\xi_t^{(k)}(x) : x \in [-M, M], k \in [1, K])$ form a Markov chain over $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$. The initial conditions are product Bernoulli variables since μ is a product measure. For suitably chosen μ we will show that the process $(\xi_t(x) : t \geq 0)$ will approximate our A-particle process.

The following lemma is sufficient for all the negative dependency properties we use. For a subset $A \subseteq [-M, M]^d \times [1, K]$ we define the set $O_A \subseteq \Omega$ by

$$O_A = \{\omega : \text{for all } a \in A \text{ there are open paths } \pi_a \text{ whose final value } (x_T, k_T) \text{ equal } a\}.$$

Lemma 6. *Suppose \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 are two collections of subsets of $[-M, M] \times [1, K]$. Define*

$$\Omega_1 = \bigcup_{A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1} O_{A_1}, \quad \Omega_2 = \bigcup_{A_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2} O_{A_2}, \quad \Omega_{1,2} = \bigcup_{\substack{A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \\ A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset}} O_{A_1 \cup A_2}.$$

Then $\mu(\Omega_{1,2}) \leq \mu(\Omega_1)\mu(\Omega_2)$.

Proof. We claim $\Omega_{1,2} \subseteq \Omega_1 \square \Omega_2$, so that the result then follows from the BKR inequality. Indeed, for $\omega \in \Omega_{1,2}$ there exist disjoint A_1, A_2 so that $\omega \in O_{A_1 \cup A_2}$. Let

$$R_i = \bigcup_{a \in A_i} R(\pi_a)$$

be the union of the ranges of the paths π_a that lead to $a \in A_i$, for $i = 1, 2$. The coalescence of open paths implies that $R_1 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$. Moreover the cylinders $[\omega]_{R_i} \subseteq O_{A_i} \subseteq \Omega_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. \square

As an example, one can apply this lemma to conclude, for $x \neq y$ and $m, n \geq 1$, that

$$\mathbb{P}[\xi_T(x) \geq m, \xi_T(y) \geq n] \leq \mathbb{P}[\xi_T(x) \geq m] \mathbb{P}[\xi_T(y) \geq n]$$

by taking

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 &= \{A = \{(k_1, x), \dots, (k_m, x)\} : k_1, \dots, k_m \in [1, K] \text{ disjoint}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{A = \{(k_1, y), \dots, (k_n, y)\} : k_1, \dots, k_n \in [1, K] \text{ disjoint}\}, \end{aligned}$$

since then $\Omega_1 = \{\xi_T(x) \geq m\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{\xi_T(y) \geq n\}$. To apply the lemma to conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}[\xi_T(x) \geq m_1 + m_2] \leq \mathbb{P}[\xi_T(x) \geq m_1] \mathbb{P}[\xi_T(x) \geq m_2]$$

we take $\mathcal{F}_i = \{A = \{(k_1, x), \dots, (k_{m_i}, x)\} : k_1, \dots, k_{m_i} \in [1, K] \text{ disjoint}\}$, noting then that $\Omega_{1,2} = \{\xi_T(x) \geq m_1 + m_2\}$.

To apply the lemma to establish negative association for $\{\xi_T(x) : x \in [-M, M]\}$ we fix disjoint subsets $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ and $\{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ and non-negative increasing functions $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We will show, for $m, n \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[f(\xi_T(x_{i_1}), \dots, \xi_T(x_{i_k})) \geq m, g(\xi_T(x_{j_1}), \dots, \xi_T(x_{j_l})) \geq n] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}[f(\xi_T(x_{i_1}), \dots, \xi_T(x_{i_k})) \geq m] \mathbb{P}[g(\xi_T(x_{j_1}), \dots, \xi_T(x_{j_l})) \geq n] \end{aligned}$$

which then implies the desired negative association. For a set $A = \{(k_1, a_1), \dots, (k_l, a_l)\} \subseteq [1, K] \times [-M, M]^d$ we associate a count

$$C^A(x) := \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbb{I}(x = a_i) \quad \text{for } x \in [-M, M]^d.$$

Then we choose

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 = \{A = \{(k_1, a_1), \dots, (k_l, a_l)\} : a_i \in \{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}\} \text{ for } i \leq l, \\ (k_i, a_i) \text{ disjoint and } f(C^A(x_{i_1}), \dots, C^A(x_{i_k})) \geq m\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since f is increasing we find $\Omega_1 = \bigcup_{A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1} O_{A_1}$ is the event $\{f(\xi_T(x_{i_1}), \dots, \xi_T(x_{i_k})) \geq m\}$. Use the equivalent definition for \mathcal{F}_2 , replacing f, m and $\{x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}\}$ by g, n and $\{x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_l}\}$. Note that $A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ are automatically disjoint.

We now sketch the steps needed to approximate our A-particle process by the discrete time processes above. As a summary, we go in the following order (i) pass to continuous time; (ii) check, by Dynkin's criterion, that $\sum_k \xi_t^{(k)}$ remains a Markov process; (iii) let $K \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain the desired reaction and diffusion rates, and desired initial conditions; (iv) let $M \rightarrow \infty$ to obtain a system on \mathbb{Z}^d .

The first aim (i) is to use a sequence of discrete time Markov chains, as in the oriented percolation construction above, to approximate a continuous time chain, which is easier to control when taking $K, M \rightarrow \infty$. We aim for the limit of the approximating sequence to be the continuous time Markov chain $(\bar{\xi}_t^{(k)}(x) : x \in [-M, M]^d, k \in [1, K])_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, with state space $\{0, 1\}^{[-M, M]^d \times [1, K]}$; it will be a system of instantly coalescing coloured particles (where two particles at the same place and of the same colour instantly coalesce) performing random uniform colour updates at rate λ , and performing a simple random walk step with simultaneous random colour update at rate $2dD$. This can be defined by listing the rates of all types of possible jumps: independently for all $k, l \in [1, K]$ and for $x, x + e_i \in [-M, M]^d$

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{cases} \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x) - 1, \\ \bar{\xi}^{(l)}(x) \rightarrow (\bar{\xi}^{(l)}(x) + 1) \wedge 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{at rate } \lambda K^{-1} \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x), \\ & \begin{cases} \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x) - 1, \\ \bar{\xi}^{(l)}(x + e_i) \rightarrow (\bar{\xi}^{(l)}(x + e_i) + 1) \wedge 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{at rate } DK^{-1} \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We use a standard method to approximate by discrete chains: choosing the time grid $\{0, T/N, 2T/N, \dots, T\}$ for the N 'th approximation and linearly interpolation to produce a process indexed over $0 \leq t \leq T$. The N 'th approximation has a transition matrix $P^{(N)}$ controlled

by the choice of product measure $\mu^{(N)}$ in the percolation construction. We keep the initial conditions constant, that is product Bernoulli variables. Note the limit Markov chain has a finite state space and so it is enough to check that the elements $NP^{(N)}(\xi, \xi') \rightarrow Q(\xi, \xi')$ for the rates $Q(\xi, \xi')$ in (20) to ensure convergence of the processes (although we only use convergence of the marginal at time T). The components of $\mu^{(N)}$ on the factor $S_{t,k,x}$ will have the form $\mu_{(t,x,k)}((0, k)) = 1 - O(N^{-1})$, so that with high probability at most one of the open paths will either change location or change colour at any time. We may now choose the values of $\mu_{(t,x,k)}((e_i, l))$ and $\mu_{(t,x,k)}((k, l))$, both $O(N^{-1})$, to yield the desired limiting Q matrix.

In step (ii) we apply Dynkin's criterion [5] to see that the process $\bar{\xi}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^K \bar{\xi}^{(k)}(x)$ is a Markov process with state space $\{0, 1, \dots, K\}^{[-M, M]^d}$ and with jump rates

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\xi}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x) - 1, \\ \bar{\xi}(x + e_i) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x + e_i) + 1, \\ \bar{\xi}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x) - 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{at rate } DK^{-1}\bar{\xi}(x)(K - \bar{\xi}(x + e_i)), \\ \text{at rate } \lambda K^{-1}\bar{\xi}(x)(\bar{\xi}(x) - 1) + DK^{-1}\bar{\xi}(x) \sum_{y \sim x: y \in [-M, M]^d} \bar{\xi}(y). \end{array}$$

The initial conditions for $\{\bar{\xi}_0(x) : x \in [-M, M]^d\}$ are now independent Poisson-Bernoulli variables.

Step (iii) is to choose $D = \frac{D_A}{2d}$ and $\lambda = K\lambda_A$ and let $K \rightarrow \infty$. This yields a Markov process with (infinite) state space $\{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}^{[-M, M]^d}$ and jump rates

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\xi}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x) - 1, \\ \bar{\xi}(x + e_i) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x + e_i) + 1, \\ \bar{\xi}(x) \rightarrow \bar{\xi}(x) - 1 \end{cases} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{at rate } \frac{D_A}{2d} \bar{\xi}(x), \\ \text{at rate } \lambda_A \bar{\xi}(x)(\bar{\xi}(x) - 1). \end{array}$$

The limiting initial conditions $\xi_0(x)$ will be independent for $x \in [-M, M]^d$. We choose them to be identically distributed as a law lying in the closure $\overline{\mathcal{M}_{PB}}$ of the set of Poisson-Bernoulli laws. Note that the total number of particles at $t = 0$ is almost surely finite and the total number then only decreases in time due to coalescence. This is the desired A-particle process restricted to the region $[-M, M]^d$ (that is jumps leaving this region are suppressed).

The final step (iv), letting $M \rightarrow \infty$ to yield the process on \mathbb{Z}^d can be done, for example, by coupling strong equations, as in (5), for a finite $(\bar{\xi}_M(t, x) : x \in [-M, M]^d, t \geq 0)$ to an infinite system $(\xi(t, x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t \geq 0)$, using the same Poisson clocks where possible, and estimating the difference $\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\xi}_M(t) - \xi(t)\|_\alpha]$ at later times in this weighted norm. Such a technique is well known when approximating infinite volume spatial systems and we omit details (which are in the thesis [1] for the case $d = 2$.)

For each of the steps above that establish a convergence of processes, the negative correlation statements can be carried over, leading to the conclusions of Proposition 3.

4 Proof of Theorem 2

We suppose throughout this section that (ξ, η) are solutions to (5) and (6) in $d \geq 3$ satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 2. We need to develop over time various expectations of moments.

These are infinitesimal generator calculations which we do by calculus from the strong equations. Compensating each Poisson process in (5) and (6), that is writing P_t as $(P_t - \lambda t) + \lambda t$ where λ is the corresponding intensity, we can define (local) martingales $dM_t^A(x), dM_t^B(x)$ so that

$$d\xi_t(x) = D_A \Delta \xi_t(x) dt - \lambda_A \xi_t(x) (\xi_t(x) - 1) dt + dM_t^A(x) \quad (21)$$

$$d\eta_t(x) = D_B \Delta \eta_t(x) dt - \lambda_B \xi_t(x) \eta_t(x) dt + dM_t^B(x) \quad (22)$$

where $\Delta := \Delta_x$ is the discrete Laplacian defined by $\Delta f(x) = (1/2d) \sum_{y: y \sim x} (f(y) - f(x))$. We will need the brackets processes defined by

$$[\xi_t(x), \xi_t(y)] = \sum_{s \leq t} (\xi_s(x) - \xi_{s-}(x)) (\xi_s(y) - \xi_{s-}(y)).$$

The (unique continuous adapted) compensators $\langle\langle \xi(x), \xi(y) \rangle\rangle_t$ can be calculated to be

$$d\langle\langle \xi(x), \xi(y) \rangle\rangle_t = \begin{cases} \frac{D_A}{2d} \sum_{y: y \sim x} (\xi_t(y) + \xi_t(x)) dt + \lambda_A \xi_t(x) (\xi_t(x) - 1) dt & \text{if } x = y, \\ -\frac{D_A}{2d} (\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y)) dt & \text{if } x \sim y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

We will not need $[\eta_t(x), \eta_t(y)]$ and since there are no simultaneous jumps between $\xi_t(x)$ and $\eta_t(y)$ we have $[\xi_t(x), \eta_t(y)] = 0$.

Notation. To ease the presentation we use the following notation:

We write $\hat{\xi}_t$ and $\hat{\eta}_t$ for the expected values $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\eta_t(x)]$.

For bounded $f, g : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we write $\langle f, g \rangle$ for the sum $\sum_x f(x)g(x)$ when this is defined.

When $\phi : \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we similarly write $\langle f * g, \phi \rangle$ for the sum $\sum_{x,y} f(x)g(y)\phi(x,y)$.

4.1 A particle estimates

As in Bramson and Griffeath [3], we start with a 'crude' upper and lower bound on $\hat{\xi}_t$: there exist $0 < c_1 = c_1(\lambda_A, D_A, \hat{\xi}_0)$ and $0 < c_2 = c_2(\lambda_A, D_A, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0))$ so that

$$\frac{c_1}{t} \leq \hat{\xi}_t \leq \frac{c_2}{t} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1. \quad (24)$$

These bounds already shows that the correct polynomial rate is $O(t^{-1})$ and constituted a key part of the argument in [3]. The efforts in the modified rate equation method are to resolve the exact constant in the asymptotics.

Although the bounds in [3] are derived for the instantaneously coalescing case, they were extended in [9] to hold for the models considered there and can also be adapted for our A particle model. Indeed the lower bound follows immediately from negative correlation, as we will see just below. The upper bound argument in [3] is however rather closely related to the methods here; they show that the expected density satisfies a discrete time version of the equation $d\hat{\xi}_t \leq -C\hat{\xi}_t^2$. Regardless of the value of the constant $C > 0$, this already implies an upper bound as in (24).

It is not surprising therefore that the related arguments in this paper can also be used to derive such an upper bound. We show the steps needed in the Appendix, mainly so that the paper can be considered self-contained (rather than suggesting that the steps here are any easier than adjusting the arguments from [3]).

We suppose now that the bounds (24) have been established. As a consequence, using the negative dependency estimate (10) we find constants $c_3 = c_3(n, \lambda_A, D_A, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0))$ so that, for $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $n \in N$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1) \dots (\xi_t(x) - (n - 1))] \leq \frac{c_3}{t^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} [\xi_t^n(x)] \leq \frac{c_3}{t}. \quad (25)$$

Here the second bound follows by expressing the moments in terms of factorial moments.

One point estimates. Using the moments assumptions on our initial conditions, the local martingales in (21) and (22) are true martingales. In particular, taking expectations in (21) and exploiting translation invariance, we have

$$d\hat{\xi}_t = -\lambda_A \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] dt. \quad (26)$$

In particular $t \rightarrow \hat{\xi}_t$ is decreasing, and using negative dependence (10) we obtain

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} \geq -\lambda_A \hat{\xi}_t^2 \quad \text{for } t \geq 0$$

and solving this differential inequality yields

$$\hat{\xi}_t \geq \left(\hat{\xi}_0^{-1} + \lambda_A t \right)^{-1} \quad (27)$$

(which is one way to establish the lower bound in (24)).

For a (suitably smooth and integrable) test function $\phi_t(x)$ we have

$$d\langle \xi_t, \phi_t \rangle = \langle \xi_t, \dot{\phi}_t + D_A \Delta \phi_t \rangle dt - \lambda_A \langle \xi_t(\xi_t - 1), \phi_t \rangle dt + d\langle M_t^A, \phi_t \rangle. \quad (28)$$

A useful example is to take integrable $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and choose

$$\phi_s(x) = P_{t-s}^A f(x) := \sum_y p_{t-s}^A(y) f(x - y) \quad \text{for } s \in [0, t]$$

where $p_t^A(y)$ is the transition density for an A particle performing rate D_A simple random walk. Then $\dot{\phi}_s + D_A \Delta \phi_s = 0$ over $s \in [0, t]$ so that

$$d\langle \xi_s, P_{t-s}^A f \rangle = -\lambda_A \langle \xi_s(\xi_s - 1), P_{t-s}^A f \rangle ds + d\langle M_s^A, P_{t-s}^A f \rangle. \quad (29)$$

Note the drift term on the right hand side is non-positive when $f \geq 0$. This leads to the following one point estimate, which allows us, over short periods of time, to approximate the solution by (random walk) heat flow, bounding the error caused by coalescence.

Lemma 7. *For $f \geq 0$ we have $\mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_t, f \rangle] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, P_s^A f \rangle]$. Moreover*

$$|\mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_t, f \rangle] - \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, P_s^A f \rangle]| \leq 4c_2^2 \lambda_A \langle f, 1 \rangle s t^{-2} \quad \text{when for } 0 < s < t/2, t \geq 1. \quad (30)$$

Proof Integrating (29) over the interval $[t-s, t]$ and taking expectations we reach

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, f \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, P_s^A f \rangle] = -\lambda_A \int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_r(\xi_r - 1), P_{t-r}^A f \rangle] dr \leq 0.$$

Using translation invariance and the negative dependence result (10) we find

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_r(\xi_r - 1), P_{t-r}^A f \rangle] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_r(0)(\xi_r(0) - 1)] \langle 1, P_{t-r}^A f \rangle \leq \xi_r^2 \langle 1, f \rangle.$$

The inequality in (30) follows from the upper bound (24). \square

Two point estimates. We aim to use a two-point calculation to estimate $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1)]$. Use the integration by parts $d(\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)) = \xi_{t-}(x)d\xi_t(y) + \xi_{t-}(y)d\xi_t(x) + d[\xi(x), \xi(y)]_t$ to find

$$\begin{aligned} d(\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)) &= D_A \Delta(\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y))dt - \lambda_A \xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)(\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y) - 2)dt \\ &\quad + \xi_{t-}(x)dM_t^A(y) + \xi_{t-}(y)dM_t^A(x) + d[\xi(x), \xi(y)]_t \end{aligned}$$

where the Laplacian $\Delta = \Delta_x + \Delta_y$ now acts in both variables. We replace the jump term $d[\xi(x), \xi(y)]_t$ by its compensator $d\langle \xi(x), \xi(y) \rangle_t$ as in (23) plus martingale increments, which we henceforth denote by MI , reaching

$$d(\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)) = D_A \Delta(\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y))dt - \lambda_A \xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)(\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y) - 2)dt + d\langle \xi(x), \xi(y) \rangle_t + MI. \quad (31)$$

Using also discrete integration by parts to transfer the discrete Laplacian onto the test function, that for (suitably smooth and integrable) $\phi_t(x, y)$

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle \xi_t * \xi_t, \phi_t \rangle &= \langle \xi_t * \xi_t, \dot{\phi}_t + D_A \Delta \phi_t \rangle dt - \lambda_A \sum_x \sum_y \xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)(\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y) - 2)\phi_t(x, y)dt \\ &\quad + \sum_x \left(\frac{D_A}{2d} \sum_{y: y \sim x} (\xi_t(y) + \xi_t(x)) + \lambda_A \xi_t(\xi_t(x) - 1) \right) \phi_t(x, x)dt \\ &\quad - \frac{D_A}{2d} \sum_x \sum_{y: y \sim x} (\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y))\phi_t(x, y)dt + MI \\ &= \langle \xi_t * \xi_t, \dot{\phi}_t + D_A \Delta \phi_t \rangle dt - \lambda_A \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)(\xi_t(x) + \xi_t(y) - 2)\phi_t(x, y)dt \\ &\quad - \lambda_A \sum_x (2\xi_t^3(x) - 3\xi_t^2(x) + \xi_t(x))\phi_t(x, x) + D_A \langle \xi_t, \Pi \phi_t \rangle dt + MI \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

where we define

$$\Pi \phi_t(x) := \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{y: y \sim x} (\phi_t(x, x) + \phi_t(y, y) - \phi_t(x, y) - \phi_t(y, x)).$$

A useful specific choice of test function is as follows: set

$$\psi_t^{a,b}(x, y) = \mathbb{P}[S_t^{x,A} = a, S_t^{y,A} = b, \tau > t] \quad (33)$$

where $S^{x,A}$ and $S^{y,A}$ are independent type A random walks started at x and y , and where

$$\tau = \inf\{t : \int_0^t I(S_s^x = S_s^y)ds > \mathcal{E}\}$$

for \mathcal{E} is an independent exponential variable with rate $2\lambda_A$. Then choosing $\phi_s = \psi_{t-s}^{a,b}$ over $s \in [0, t]$ we have that

$$\dot{\phi}_s(x, y) + D_A \Delta \phi_s(x, y) = 2\lambda_A \phi_s(x, y) I(x = y), \quad \text{and } \phi_t(x, y) = I(x = a, y = b). \quad (34)$$

Using this test function in (32) we find, for $s \in [0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle \xi_s * \xi_s, \phi_s \rangle &= -\lambda_A \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \xi_s(x) \xi_s(y) (\xi_s(x) + \xi_s(y) - 2) \phi_s(x, y) ds \\ &\quad - \lambda_A \sum_x (2\xi_s^3(x) - 5\xi_s^2(x) + \xi_s(x)) \phi_s(x, x) ds + D_A \langle \xi_s, \Pi \phi_s \rangle ds + \text{MI}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

We now define $\tilde{\phi} : [0, t] \times \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\tilde{\phi}_s(x) = \phi_s(x, x)$. The idea is to choose $a = b = 0$ so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t * \xi_t, \phi_t \rangle - \langle \xi_t, \tilde{\phi}_t \rangle] = E[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)]. \quad (36)$$

A short calculation shows that

$$\Delta \tilde{\phi}_s(x) = \Delta \phi_s(x, x) + \Pi \phi_s(x).$$

Then $\dot{\tilde{\phi}} + D_A \Delta \tilde{\phi} = 2\lambda_A \tilde{\phi} + D_A \Pi \phi$ and using (28) we have

$$d\langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle = 2\lambda_A \langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle ds - \lambda_A \langle \xi_s(\xi_s - 1), \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle ds + D_A \langle \xi_s, \Pi \phi_s \rangle ds + \text{MI}. \quad (37)$$

Combining (35) and (37) we find

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle \xi_s * \xi_s, \phi_s \rangle - d\langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle &= -\lambda_A \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \xi_s(x) \xi_s(y) (\xi_s(x) + \xi_s(y) - 2) \phi_s(x, y) ds \\ &\quad - 2\lambda_A \langle \xi_s(\xi_s - 1)(\xi_s - 2), \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle ds + \text{MI} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Note that both drift terms on the right hand side are non-positive. This will lead to the following two point moment estimate.

Lemma 8. *Let $\psi^{0,0}$ be defined as in (33). Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle] \quad (39)$$

and moreover, for some $c_4 = c_4(\lambda_A, D_A, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0))$, for $0 < s < t/2$ and $t \geq 1$

$$|\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle]| \leq c_4 \left(t^{-1} s^{-d/2} + s t^{-3} \right). \quad (40)$$

Proof. Choosing $\phi_s = \psi_{t-s}^{0,0}$ as above, integrating (38) over the interval $[t-s, t]$ and then take expectations we reach, using (36),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, \tilde{\phi}_{t-s} \rangle] - \lambda_A \int_{t-s}^t \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \mathbb{E}[\xi_r(x) \xi_r(y) (\xi_r(x) + \xi_r(y) - 2)] \phi_r(x, y) dr \\ &\quad - 2\lambda_A \int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_r(\xi_r - 1)(\xi_r - 2), \tilde{\phi}_r \rangle] \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Now we use $\psi_t^{0,0}(x, y) \leq p_t^A(x)p_t^A(y)$ and the bound

$$p_t^A(x) \leq C(D_A)(t^{-d/2} \wedge 1) \quad \text{for all } t, x, y. \quad (42)$$

In particular $\langle 1, \tilde{\phi}_{t-s} \rangle = \sum_x \psi_s^{0,0}(x, x) \leq C(D_A)s^{-d/2}$. The negative association and (10) imply, when $x \neq y$, that

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_r(x)\xi_r(y)(\xi_r(x) + \xi_r(y) - 2)] = \mathbb{E} [\xi_r(x)(\xi_r(x) - 1)\xi_r(y)] + \mathbb{E} [\xi_r(x)\xi_r(y)(\xi_r(y) - 1)] \leq 4\tilde{\xi}_r^3. \quad (43)$$

Now using (25) all three terms on the right hand side of (41) can thus be bounded as stated. \square

The final estimate is on the non-coalescence probability test function used above, namely $\psi_t^{0,0}(x, y) = \mathbb{P}[S_t^{x,A} = 0, S_t^{y,A} = 0, \tau > t]$. The random walk arguments from [9] give good approximations for this ψ ; it is shown, when $d \geq 3$, that for some $\delta > 0$ and $c_5 = c_5(D_A)$

$$\sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \left| \psi_t^{0,0}(x, y) - p_{AP}^A(x)p_t^A(y) \right| \leq c_5 t^{-\delta} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (44)$$

Remark. 4.1.1 Indeed, taking $m = 0$ in Lemma 12 in [9] shows that $\delta = (d-2)/(3d^2 - 3d - 4)$ will work. However [9] treats a more general random walk jump requiring only second moments. In our nearest neighbour case the argument yields $c_5 = c_5(D_A, \delta)$ for any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2} \frac{(d-2)}{(d-1)}$.

4.2 A -particle modified rate equation

We repeat the lines of the argument of van den Berg and Kesten [9], which will help prepare us for related steps when deriving the B -particle modified rate equation. There are four approximations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} &= -\lambda_A \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] \\ &\approx -\lambda_A \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle] \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

$$\approx -\lambda_{AP} \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle^2] \quad (46)$$

$$\approx -\lambda_{AP} (\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle])^2 \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\lambda_{AP} \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \\ &\approx -\lambda_{AP} \hat{\xi}_t^2 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Using the lemmata from the previous section we will below bound the errors in these approximations to show, for a $\kappa_1 \in (0, 1)$ to be chosen soon, that

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} = -\lambda_{AP} \hat{\xi}_t^2 + \mathcal{E}_t, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{E}_t = O(t^{-2-\kappa_1}). \quad (49)$$

Now a short calculus exercise (as van den Berg and Kesten put it), using the lower bound $\hat{\xi}_t \geq c_1/t$, shows that

$$\left| \hat{\xi}_t - \frac{1}{\lambda_{AP} t} \right| \leq C t^{-1-\kappa_1}$$

completing the proof of the asymptotics for the A -particle density. One way to do this calculus exercise is to integrate $\hat{\xi}_t^{-2} d\hat{\xi}_t/dt$ to get

$$\hat{\xi}_t^{-1} - \hat{\xi}_{t_0}^{-1} = \lambda_{AP} (t - t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t \hat{\xi}_s^{-2} \mathcal{E}_s ds \quad (50)$$

and use the lower bound to see that the final integral is bounded by $Ct^{1-\kappa_1}$.

While checking (49) we shall take $t \geq 1$ and make use of a chosen $0 < s \leq t/2$. We will use a running constant C which will depend on $d, \lambda_A, D_A, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0)$. Lemma 8 gives the error bound for the first approximation (45), namely $C(t^{-1}s^{-d/2} + st^{-3})$. Using (44), the negative association, and the bound $\psi_t^{0,0}(x, y) \leq (p_s^A(x))^2$ we bound the approximation in (46) by

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle] - p_A \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle^2]| &\leq c_4 s^{-\delta} \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 + \sum_x \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}^2(x)] (p_s^A(x))^2 \\ &\leq C(t^{-2}s^{-\delta} + t^{-1}s^{-d/2}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (25) and (42) for the final inequality.

The negative association leads to a simple estimate of the variance of $\langle \xi_t, f \rangle$. Indeed we have for $t \geq 1$ and $f \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Variance}(\langle \xi_t, f \rangle) &= \sum_x \sum_y \mathbb{E}[(\xi_t(x) - \hat{\xi}_t)(\xi_t(y) - \hat{\xi}_t)] f(x) f(y) \\ &\leq \sum_x \mathbb{E}[(\xi_t(x) - \hat{\xi}_t)^2] f^2(x) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\xi_t(0))^2] \langle f^2, 1 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Now we use (51) to bound the third approximation in (47) by

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle^2] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle]^2 \right| \leq \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^2 \rangle \leq Ct^{-1}s^{-d/2}. \quad (52)$$

Using translation invariance, Lemma 7 implies that $|\hat{\xi}_t - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}| \leq 4c_2^2 \lambda_A s t^{-2}$. Hence we may bound the final approximation in (48) using

$$\left| \hat{\xi}_t^2 - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \right| = \left| \hat{\xi}_t - \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \right| \left| \hat{\xi}_t + \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \right| \leq C s t^{-3}.$$

Combining all four estimates we reach (49) with $|\mathcal{E}_t| \leq C(t^{-1}s^{-d/2} + st^{-3} + t^{-2}s^{-\delta})$. Choosing $s = t^\alpha$ where $\alpha \in (2/d, 1)$ we have

$$|\mathcal{E}_t| \leq Ct^{-2-\kappa_1} \quad \text{where } \kappa_1 = \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha d}{2} - 1, 1 - \alpha, \delta \alpha \right\} > 0. \quad (53)$$

Remark 4.2.1 Choosing δ just below $\frac{1}{2} \frac{d-2}{d-1}$, as in the remark after (44), we can then choose an optimal value of α above (just above $\frac{2d-2}{3d-4}$) to find κ_1 as close to $\frac{d-2}{3d-4}$ as we want.

4.3 B -particle estimates

A key estimate in this paper is to bound the covariance between $\langle \xi_t, f \rangle$ and $\langle \eta_t, g \rangle$. Without negative dependence results for B particles we rely simply on Hölder's inequality.

Recall we have translation invariant solutions and we are writing $\hat{\eta}_t$ and $\hat{\xi}_t$ for $E[\eta_t(0)]$ and $E[\xi_t(0)]$. Suppose $f, g : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfy $\langle f, 1 \rangle = \langle g, 1 \rangle = 1$. Choose p, q satisfying $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, f \rangle \langle \eta_t, g \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, f \rangle] \mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_t, g \rangle]| &= \left| \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t, f \rangle \langle \eta_t, g \rangle] \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t, f \rangle^q] \right|^{1/q} |\mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_t, g \rangle^p]|^{1/p}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Let $\tilde{\eta} = \mathbb{E}[\eta | \sigma(\xi)]$ be the B particle process conditional on the A population. In the above, if we take conditional expectations with respect to $\sigma(\xi)$ before applying Hölder's inequality then we may replace $\langle \eta, g \rangle$ by $\langle \tilde{\eta}, g \rangle$ on the right hand side of (54). Taking conditional expectations in (22) we see that $\tilde{\eta}$ solves

$$d\tilde{\eta}_t(x) = D_B \Delta \tilde{\eta}_t(x) dt - \lambda_B \xi_t(x) \tilde{\eta}_t(x) dt$$

namely the heat flow with random killing at rate $\lambda_B \xi_t(x)$ and constant initial condition $\mathbb{E}[\eta_0(0)]$. In particular $\tilde{\eta}_t(x) \leq \mathbb{E}[\eta_0(0)]$ for all t, x . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{\eta}_t, g \rangle^p] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{\eta}_t^p, g \rangle] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{\eta}_t, g \rangle] \mathbb{E}[\eta_0(0)]^{p-1} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_t, g \rangle] \mathbb{E}[\eta_0(0)]^{p-1} = \mathbb{E}[\eta_0(0)]^{p-1} \hat{\eta}_t. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The idea is that the L^p norm $\|\langle \tilde{\eta}, g \rangle\|_p$ will be bounded by $C \hat{\eta}_t^{1/p}$. By taking p close to 1 we will get as close as desired to polynomial rate of $t^{-\theta}$, which will be needed if the error estimates that use Hölder's inequality are small for the modified B particle rate equation. For this reason we will need high q 'th moments of the A population, which is why we asked for all moments of the initial conditions to be finite.

To bound the L^q norm of $\langle \xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t, f \rangle$ we can use the square function inequality Proposition 5 from Section 3.2 to bound, when $q/2 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t, f \rangle^q] &\leq C_q \mathbb{E}[\langle (\xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t)^2, f^2 \rangle^{q/2}] \\ &\leq C_q \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t^2, f^2 \rangle^{q/2}] + C_q t^{-q} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \\ &\leq C_q \mathbb{E}[\xi_t^q(0)] \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} + C_q t^{-q} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \\ &\leq C_q t^{-1} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} + C_q t^{-q} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

by the moment bounds (25). Or we can do better by repeating the trick: write $\xi_t^2(x) = \xi_t^2(x) - m_2(t) + m_2(t)$ where $m_2(t) := \mathbb{E}[\xi_t^2(0)] = O(t^{-1})$ and use the square function inequality on the

negatively associated variables $(\xi_t^2(x) - m_2(t) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^d)$. This gives, when $q/4 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi_t - \hat{\xi}_t, f \rangle^q \right] &\leq C_q \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi_t^2 - m_2(t), f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \right] + C_q t^{-q/2} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \\
&\leq C_q \mathbb{E} \left[\langle (\xi_t^2 - m_2(t))^2, f^4 \rangle^{q/4} \right] + C_q t^{-q/2} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \\
&\leq C_q \mathbb{E} \left[\langle (\xi_t^4, f^4) \rangle^{q/4} \right] + C_q t^{-q/2} \langle 1, f^4 \rangle^{q/4} + C_q t^{-q/2} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2} \\
&\leq C_q t^{-1} \langle 1, f^4 \rangle^{q/4} + C_q t^{-q/2} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{q/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

One could repeat the trick more times here, but this estimate will already be sufficient for us. By normalising integrable f, g we reach the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *For $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$, and conjugate p , there exists $c_6 = c_6(q, \lambda_A, D_A, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0))$ so that for integrable $f, g \geq 0$*

$$|\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, f \rangle \langle \eta_t, g \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_t, f \rangle] \mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_t, g \rangle]| \leq c_6 \left(t^{-1/q} \langle 1, f^4 \rangle^{1/4} + t^{-1/2} \langle 1, f^2 \rangle^{1/2} \right) \langle g, 1 \rangle \hat{\eta}_t^{1/p}.$$

One point estimates. Taking expectations in (22) and using translation invariance, we find

$$d\hat{\eta}_t = -\lambda_B \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta_t(0)]dt \tag{58}$$

so that $t \rightarrow \hat{\eta}_t$ is decreasing. The test function formulation becomes

$$d\langle \eta_t, \phi_t \rangle = \langle \eta_t, \dot{\phi}_t + D_B \Delta \phi_t \rangle dt - \lambda_B \langle \xi_t \eta_t, \phi_t \rangle dt + d\langle M_t^B, \phi_t \rangle. \tag{59}$$

Taking $\phi_s(x) = P_{t-s}^B f(x) := \sum_y p_{t-s}^B(y) f(x-y)$ for $s \in [0, t]$, we find

$$d\langle \eta_s, P_{t-s}^B f \rangle = -\lambda_B \langle \xi_s \eta_s, P_{t-s}^B f \rangle ds + d\langle M_s^B, P_{t-s}^B f \rangle. \tag{60}$$

Taking expectations we find

$$|\mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_t, f \rangle] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \eta_{t-s}, P_s^B f \rangle]| = \lambda_B \left| \int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_r \eta_r, P_{t-r}^B f \rangle] dr \right|. \tag{61}$$

Without any correlation properties, to estimate the right hand side we will bound $\mathbb{E}[\xi_r(0)\eta_r(0)]$ by developing a two point calculation.

Two point estimates. Note that $d[\eta(x), \xi(y)]_t = 0$ since the processes never jump simultaneously. So calculus leads, for suitable test function $\phi_t(x, y)$, to

$$\begin{aligned}
d\langle \xi_t * \eta_t, \phi_t \rangle &= d\langle \xi_t * \eta_t, \dot{\phi}_t + (D_A \Delta_x + D_B \Delta_y) \phi_t \rangle dt \\
&\quad - \sum_x \sum_y \xi_t(x) \eta_t(y) (\lambda_B \xi_t(y) + \lambda_A (\xi_t(x) - 1)) \phi_t(x, y) dt + \text{MI}.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Define the test function

$$\psi_t^B(x, y) = \mathbb{P}[S_t^{A,x} = 0, S_t^{B,y} = 0, \tau > t] \tag{63}$$

where $S^{A,x}$ is a rate D_A simple random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d starting at x , $S^{B,y}$ is a rate D_B simple random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d starting at y , and

$$\tau = \inf \left\{ t : \int_0^t I(S_s^{A,x} = S_s^{B,y}) ds > \mathcal{E} \right\}$$

where \mathcal{E} is an independent rate λ_B exponential variable. Choosing $\phi_s = \psi_{t-s}^B$ for $s \in [0, t]$, we have $\phi_t(x, y) = I(x = y = 0)$ and

$$\dot{\phi}_s(x, y) + (D_A \Delta_x + D_B \Delta_y) \phi_s(x, y) = \lambda_B I(x = y) \phi_s(x, y), \quad \text{for } s \in [0, t].$$

Using this in (62) we reach

$$\begin{aligned} d\langle \xi_s * \eta_s, \phi_s \rangle &= -\lambda_B \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \xi_s(x) \xi_s(y) \eta_s(y) \phi_s(x, y) ds \\ &\quad - \lambda_A \sum_x \sum_y \xi_s(x) (\xi_s(x) - 1) \eta_s(y) \phi_s(x, y) ds + \text{MI}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Note in particular, using $\psi_t(x, y) \leq p_t^A(x) p_t^B(y)$, that

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(0) \eta_t(0)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s} * \eta_{t-s}, \psi_s \rangle] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B \rangle]. \quad (65)$$

Similarly, adjusting the test function, we can check

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x) \eta_t(y)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle]. \quad (66)$$

Lemma 10. *For any $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$, with conjugate p , there exists $c_7 = c_7(\mathbb{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0), \lambda_A, \lambda_B, D_A, q)$ so that whenever $0 \leq s \leq t/4$ and $t \geq 2$,*

$$|\hat{\eta}_t - \hat{\eta}_{t-s}| \leq c_7 s \left(t^{-1} + s^{-(3d/8)} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}.$$

Proof. From (61) and (65) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\eta}_t - \hat{\eta}_{t-s}| &= \lambda_B \int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E} [\xi_r(0) \eta_r(0)] dr \\ &\leq \lambda_B \int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-2s}, p_{r-t+2s}^A \rangle \langle \eta_{t-2s}, p_{r-t+2s}^B \rangle] dr. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Lemma 9 with the choice $f = p_s^A$ and $g = p_s^B$ we find, for any $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$ (and conjugate p), $s > 0$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_t, p_s^A \rangle \langle \eta_t, p_s^B \rangle] - \hat{\xi}_t \hat{\eta}_t \right| &\leq c_6 \left(t^{-1/q} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^4 \rangle^{1/4} + t^{-1/2} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^2 \rangle^{1/2} \right) \hat{\eta}_t^{1/p} \\ &\leq C \left(t^{-1/q} s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_t^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

using (42) in the final inequality. Using this in (67) we get, using $r - t + 2s \geq s$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\eta}_t - \hat{\eta}_{t-s}| &\leq \lambda_B s \left(\hat{\eta}_{t-2s} \hat{\xi}_{t-2s} + C \left((t-2s)^{-1/q} s^{-3d/8} + (t-2s)^{-1/2} s^{-d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \right) \\ &\leq C s \left(t^{-1} \hat{\eta}_{t-2s} + \left(t^{-1/q} s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \right) \quad (\text{using (24)}) \\ &\leq C \left(s t^{-1} + s^{1-(3d/8)} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

where we have thrown away $t^{-1/q}$, bounded $\hat{\eta}_t \leq C(p, \hat{\eta}_0) \hat{\eta}_t^{1/p}$ and $t^{-1/2} s^{1-(d/4)} \leq t^{-1} s + s^{1-(d/2)}$ for the final inequality. \square

To improve the upper bound (65) to an estimate we need to bound the terms on the right hand side of (64), that is we need upper bounds on the three point terms namely $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)\eta_t(y)]$ for $x \neq y$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1)\eta_t(y)]$ for all x, y .

Three point estimates. We are only looking for upper bounds. We will now show, analogously to (66), that when $0 \leq s \leq t$

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)\eta_t(y)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(y - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle] \quad (68)$$

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1)\eta_t(y)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle^2 \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle]. \quad (69)$$

Indeed using the test function $\phi_s(x, y) = \psi_{t-s}^{a,b}(x, y)$ from (33), we reach the decomposition for $d(\langle \xi_s * \xi_s, \phi_s \rangle - \langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle)$ given in (38). We combine this with the decomposition

$$d\langle \eta_s, p_{t-s}^B(\cdot - c) \rangle = -\lambda_B \langle \xi_s \eta_s, p_{t-s}^B(\cdot - c) \rangle ds + MI$$

from (60). Note that $\langle \xi_s * \xi_s, \phi_s \rangle - \langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle \geq 0$, $\langle \eta_s, p_{t-s}^B(\cdot - c) \rangle \geq 0$ and these two processes have no simultaneous jumps. We see that the product

$$\langle \eta_s, p_{t-s}^B(\cdot - c) \rangle \left(\langle \xi_s * \xi_s, \phi_s \rangle - \langle \xi_s, \tilde{\phi}_s \rangle \right)$$

is a positive supermartingale over $[0, t]$ since all the drift terms are negative. Comparing the expectations at times t and $t - s$ we reach

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\eta_t(c) (\xi_t(a)\xi_t(b) - \xi_t(a)I(a = b))] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(\cdot - c) \rangle \left(\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{a,b} \rangle - \langle \xi_{t-s}, \tilde{\psi}_s^{a,b} \rangle \right) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(\cdot - c) \rangle \left(\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(\cdot - a) * p_s^A(\cdot - b) \rangle - \langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(\cdot - a) p_s^A(\cdot - b) \rangle \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where in the final inequality we used the bound $\psi_s^{a,b}(x, y) \leq p_s^A(x - a)p_s^A(y - b)$. Now taking $c = b = y$, $a = x$ we reach (68), and taking $c = y$, $a = b = x$ we reach (69).

Lemma 11. For $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$, and conjugate p , there exist $c_8 = c_8(q, \mathbb{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0), \lambda_A, D_A)$ so that for all $0 < s \leq t/2$, $t \geq 1$ and x, y

$$\mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)\xi_t(y)\eta_t(y)] \vee \mathbb{E} [\xi_t(x)(\xi_t(x) - 1)\eta_t(y)] \leq c_8 \left(t^{-2} + s^{-3d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-s}^{1/p}$$

Proof. We again apply Hölder's inequality to (68,69) in order to bound them in terms of $\hat{\eta}$. We can write the right hand sides of (68,69) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A(z - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi_{t-s} - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \xi_{t-s} - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}, p_s^A(z - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi_{t-s} - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi_{t-s} - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}, p_s^A(z - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle \right] \\ & \quad + \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \mathbb{E} [\langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle]. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Arguing as in (54,55,57) the first term of (70) is bounded, when $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$, by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} - \hat{\xi}_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle^{2q}]^{1/q} \mathbb{E}[\langle \tilde{\eta}_{t-s}, p_s^B \rangle]^{1/p} \\ & \leq C \left((t-s)^{-1} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^4 \rangle^{q/2} + (t-s)^{-q} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^2 \rangle^q \right)^{1/q} \hat{\eta}_{t-s}^{1/p} \\ & \leq C \left(t^{-1/q} s^{-3d/4} + t^{-1} s^{-d/2} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-s}^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

when $0 < s \leq t/2$ and $t \geq 1$; here $C = C(q, (\xi_0, \eta_0), D_A, \lambda_A)$. Similarly, the second and third term of (70) are bounded by $Ct^{-1} (t^{-1/q} s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4}) \hat{\eta}_{t-s}^{1/p}$. The final term of (70) equals $\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \hat{\eta}_{t-s} \leq Ct^{-2} \hat{\eta}_{t-s}$. Collecting these bounds we reach, after grouping as in Lemma 10, the stated estimate. \square

These bounds can be used in our final estimate, which continues from the expansion in (64) using the test function ψ^B defined in (63).

Lemma 12. *For $q \in 4\mathbb{N}$, and conjugate p , there there exists $c_9 = c_9(\mathbb{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0), \lambda_A, \lambda_B, D_A, D_B, q)$ so that for $0 < s < t/4$ and $t \geq 2$*

$$|\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta_t(0)] - \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \eta_{t-s}, \psi_s^B \rangle]| \leq c_9 s \left(t^{-2} + s^{-3d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}.$$

Proof. Integrate (64) over the interval $[t-s, t]$. The estimate will follow if we bound the expectation of the two drift terms

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_B \int_{t-s}^t \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \xi_r(x) \xi_r(y) \eta_r(y) \psi_{t-r}^B(x, y) dr \\ & + \lambda_A \int_{t-s}^t \sum_x \sum_y \xi_r(x) (\xi_r(x) - 1) \eta_r(y) \psi_{t-r}^B(x, y) dr. \end{aligned}$$

We use $\psi_s^B(x, y) \leq p_s^A(x) p_s^B(y)$ and then the bounds from Lemma 11 to estimate this in terms of $\hat{\eta}_{t-2s}$; the requirement that $s \leq t/4$ and $t \geq 2$ ensure this lemma is applicable. \square

Finally we need an estimate analogous to (44) for the non-coalescence probability $\psi_t^B(x, y)$. Namely, when $d \geq 3$, for some $c_{10} = c_{10}(D_A, D_A, d)$

$$\sum_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\psi_t^B(x, y) - p_B p_t^A(x) p_t^B(y)| \leq c_{10} t^{-\delta} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (71)$$

The argument from Lemma 12 in [9] applies for two particles with different jumps rates D_A and D_B , and again the estimate holds for any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2} \frac{(d-2)}{(d-1)}$.

4.4 B -particle modified rate equation

We repeat the main approximations from the sketch in the introduction:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\eta}_t}{dt} &= -\lambda_B \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta_t(0)] \\ &\approx -\lambda_B \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \eta_{t-s}, \psi_s^B \rangle] \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

$$\approx -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle \langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B \rangle] \tag{73}$$

$$\approx -\lambda_B p_B \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle] E[\langle \eta_{t-s}, p_s^B \rangle] \tag{74}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\lambda_B p_B \hat{\xi}_{t-s} \hat{\eta}_{t-s} \\ &\approx -\lambda_B p_B \hat{\xi}_t \hat{\eta}_t \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

$$\approx -\frac{\lambda_B p_B}{\lambda_A p_A} \frac{1}{t} \hat{\eta}_t. \tag{76}$$

We will check below that the lemmata from Section 4.3 quantify these approximations and yield

$$\frac{d\hat{\eta}_t}{dt} = -\theta t^{-1} \hat{\eta}_t + \mathcal{E}_t \tag{77}$$

where $\theta = \lambda_B p_B / \lambda_A p_A$ and, for some $\kappa > 0$, $t_1 \geq 2$ and any $p > 1$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_t| \leq C t^{-(1+\kappa)} \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \quad \text{when } 0 < s \leq t/4 \text{ and } t \geq t_1 \tag{78}$$

with $C = C(\mathbb{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0), \lambda_A, \lambda_B, D_A, D_B, p)$. To analyse (77) let

$$t_* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \hat{\eta}_t \geq K t^{-\theta}\}.$$

By choosing K large we can ensure $t_* \geq t_1$. We will argue that $t_* = \infty$ if we choose K suitably. Note that for $t_1 \leq t \leq t_*$

$$\begin{aligned} t^\theta \mathcal{E}_t &\leq C t^\theta t^{-(1+\kappa)} \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \\ &\leq C K^{1/p} t^\theta t^{-(1+\kappa)} (t-2s)^{-\theta/p} \\ &\leq C K^{1/p} t^{\theta-(1+\kappa)-(\theta/p)} \end{aligned}$$

using $s \leq t/4$ in the final inequality (and letting C vary line to line). Choose $p > 1$ so that $\theta - (1+\kappa) - (\theta/p) < -1$. Suppose $t_1 \leq t_* < \infty$. Then, integrating $d(t^\theta \hat{\eta}_t)/dt = t^\theta \mathcal{E}_t$ over $[t_1, t_*]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K &= t_*^\theta \hat{\eta}_{t_*} \\ &= t_1^\theta \hat{\eta}_{t_1} + \int_{t_1}^{t_*} s^\theta \mathcal{E}_s ds \\ &\leq t_1^\theta \hat{\eta}_{t_1} + C K^{1/p} \int_{t_1}^{t_*} s^{\theta-(1+\kappa)-(\theta/p)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction if we choose $K = K(\theta, p, t_1, \hat{\eta}_{t_1})$ large enough. We conclude $t_* = \infty$ for suitable K and then we integrate up to find

$$t^\theta \hat{\eta}_t = t_1^\theta \hat{\eta}_{t_1} + \int_{t_1}^t s^\theta \mathcal{E}_s ds = t_1^\theta \hat{\eta}_{t_1} + \int_{t_1}^\infty s^\theta \mathcal{E}_s ds + O(t^{\theta-\kappa-(\theta/p)})$$

establishing the desired asymptotics in Theorem 2 with $\kappa_2 = \kappa - \theta + (\theta/p)$. Note that by taking p large we can take κ_2 as close to κ as desired.

It remains to verify the error bound stated in (78). We will choose $s = t^\alpha$, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ shortly and then we choose t_1 so that $t \geq t_1$ implies that $t \geq 2$ and $s \leq t/4$. Throughout C may depend on $p, d, \lambda_A, \lambda_B, D_A, D_B, \mathcal{L}(\xi_0, \eta_0)$.

The error in (72) is controlled by Lemma 12 and is bounded by $Cs (t^{-2} + s^{-3d/4}) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}$. The error in (73) is bounded, using (71) by

$$\lambda_B \sum_{x,y} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(x)\eta_{t-s}(y)] |\psi_s^B(x, y) - p_B p_s^A(x) p_s^B(y)| \leq Cs^{-\delta} \sup_{x,y} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(x)\eta_{t-s}(y)].$$

Using (66) and Lemma 9 once more we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(x)\eta_{t-s}(y)] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-2s}, p_s^A(x - \cdot) \rangle \langle \eta_{t-2s}, p_s^B(y - \cdot) \rangle] \\ &\leq \hat{\xi}_{t-2s} \hat{\eta}_{t-2s} + C \left(t^{-1/q} \langle 1, (p_s^A)^4 \rangle^{1/4} + t^{-1/2} \langle 1, (p_s^B)^2 \rangle \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \\ &\leq Ct^{-1} \hat{\eta}_{t-2s} + C \left(s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \\ &\leq C \left(t^{-1} + s^{-3d/8} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the error in (73) is bounded by $Cs^{-\delta} (t^{-1} + s^{-3d/8}) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}$. The error in (74) is the key covariance estimate in Lemma 9 and, as above, is bounded by $C (s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4}) \hat{\eta}_{t-s}^{1/p}$. For the error in (75) we combine Lemma 7 and Lemma 10 to obtain the bound $Cst^{-1} (t^{-1} + s^{-(3d/8)}) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p}$. The final error in (76) arises from the A-particle asymptotics in Theorem 2 and yields a term $C\hat{\eta}_t t^{-1-\kappa_1}$. Combining all the errors, using that $t \rightarrow \hat{\eta}_t$ is decreasing as always, and omitting terms that are dominated by other terms, we reach, for $0 < s \leq t/4$ and $t \geq 2$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_t| \leq C \left(st^{-2} + s^{-3d/8} + t^{-1/2} s^{-d/4} + s^{-\delta} t^{-1} + t^{-1-\kappa_1} \right) \hat{\eta}_{t-2s}^{1/p} \quad \text{when } 0 < s \leq t/4 \text{ and } t \geq t_1$$

Now choosing $s = t^\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in (8/3d, 1)$ produces the required estimate in (78).

Remark 4.4.1 The optimal choice of α is a bit fiddly and d dependent. In $d = 3$ by choosing $\alpha = \frac{16}{17}$ one achieves $\kappa_2 = \frac{1}{17}$; as $d \rightarrow \infty$ the error term $t^{-1-\kappa_1}$ dominates, so that $\kappa_2 = \kappa_1$ for large d .

Remark 4.4.2 We make brief comments about the models where either λ_A or λ_B , or both, are infinite. One method to establish the correct decay rates would be to pass to the limits $\lambda_A \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lambda_B \rightarrow \infty$ in the modified rate equations. The finite rate models, which we might denote by ξ^{λ_A} and $\eta^{\lambda_A, \lambda_B}$, converge (at least at fixed t) to their infinite rate counterparts ξ^∞ and $\eta^{\lambda_A, \infty}$ or $\eta^{\infty, \infty}$. Passing to the limit $\lambda_A \rightarrow \infty$ in (49), or the limit $\lambda_B \rightarrow \infty$ in (77) we expect to reach

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t^\infty}{dt} = -\gamma D_A (\hat{\xi}_t^\infty)^2 + \mathcal{E}_t, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{d\hat{\eta}_t^{\infty, \infty}}{dt} = -\theta t^{-1} \hat{\eta}_t^{\infty, \infty} + \mathcal{E}_t$$

with the appropriate limiting value of θ . The catch is that we need to bound the errors \mathcal{E}_t from (49,77) uniformly over large λ_A or λ_B . This is immediate for terms such as (46,47,48) which are bounded using the product $\lambda_A p_A$, which is bounded in λ_A , but looks less easy for the

approximation (45). We believe it is easier to restart the entire argument using the equations for the infinite rate models; the starting point in the case where both rates are infinite are the exact formulae

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} = -\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\xi_t(e)], \quad \frac{d\hat{\eta}_t}{dt} = -\mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)\eta_t(e)]$$

where e is a neighbouring site to the origin. Indeed an A particle modified rate equation for the case of instantaneous coalescence was established in $d = 2$ (where extra logarithms emerge) in [12] starting this way.

5 Appendix

We show here how the estimates on A particles in Section 4.2 can be used to derive the upper bound in (24). We repeat the steps (45,46), estimating errors only from above, as follows: for $0 < s < t$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} &= -\lambda_A \mathbb{E}[\xi_t(0)(\xi_t(0) - 1)] \\ &\leq -\lambda_A \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s} * \xi_{t-s}, \psi_s^{0,0} \rangle] + \mathcal{E}_1 \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq -\lambda_{AP} \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle^2] + \mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 \tag{80} \\ &\leq -\lambda_{AP} (\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, p_s^A \rangle])^2 + \mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 \\ &= -\lambda_{AP} \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 + \mathcal{E}_1 + \mathcal{E}_2. \end{aligned}$$

The error \mathcal{E}_2 can be estimated using (44), and $\psi_t^{0,0}(x, y) \leq p_t^A(x)p_t^A(y)$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_2 &\leq \lambda_A \sum_{x,y} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(x)\xi_{t-s}(y)] |p_{AP}^A(x)p_s^A(y) - \psi_s^{0,0}(x, y)| \\ &\leq \lambda_A \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \sum_{x \neq y} |p_{AP}^A(x)p_s^A(y) - \psi_s^{0,0}(x, y)| + \lambda_A \sum_x \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}^2(x)] (p_s^A(x))^2 \\ &\leq C(D_A, \lambda_A) \left(\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 s^{-\delta} + (\hat{\xi}_{t-s} + 2\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2) s^{-d/2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Here we have used the simple bound (42), we have bounded the second moment using $\mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}^2(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}(x)(\xi_{t-s}(x) - 1)] + \mathbb{E}[\xi_{t-s}^2(x)]$, and used negative correlation (10). To bound \mathcal{E}_1 we revisit the three terms in (41). Arguing as in Lemma 8 (see (42) and (43)),

$$\int_{t-s}^t \sum_x \sum_{y: y \neq x} \mathbb{E}[\xi_r(x)\xi_r(y)(\xi_r(x) + \xi_r(y) - 2)] \phi_r(x, y) dr \leq 4s \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^3;$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_{t-s}, \tilde{\phi}_{t-s} \rangle] \leq C(D_A) \hat{\xi}_{t-s} s^{-d/2}$$

and

$$\int_{t-s}^t \mathbb{E}[\langle \xi_r(\xi_r - 1)(\xi_r - 2), \tilde{\phi}_r \rangle] \leq C(D_A) \hat{\xi}_{t-s}^3 \int_0^s (r^{-d/2} \wedge 1).$$

Together these imply using (41) that for all $0 < s < t$

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \leq C(\lambda_A, D_A) \left((1+s)\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^3 + s^{-d/2}\hat{\xi}_{t-s} \right). \quad (82)$$

Using (82) and (81) we reach, for any $0 < s < t$ and $c_0 = c_0(\lambda_A, D_A)$,

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} \leq -\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2(\lambda_{APA} - c_0s^{-\delta} - c_0s^{-d/2}) + c_0(1+s)\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^3 + c_0s^{-d/2}\hat{\xi}_{t-s}. \quad (83)$$

The aim is to choose s carefully to show that the linear and cubic terms are dominated by the quadratic term. We will choose $s = s(t) \in [0, t]$ to be the solution to the implicit equation

$$s = \alpha\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{-1}, \quad (84)$$

where we will choose $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda_A, D_A) > 0$ shortly. Note that, for a fixed $t > 0$, the function $s \rightarrow \alpha\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{-1}$ is decreasing, so that there is a unique solution $s(t)$ as soon as $t \geq t_0 := \alpha\hat{\xi}_0^{-1}$. We note that $t \rightarrow s(t)$ is increasing and we claim that

$$(i) \ s(t) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \ t - s(t) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (85)$$

To see (i) we use $\hat{\xi}_t \downarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$; hence for any M we may find t_M so that $\alpha/\hat{\xi}_{t_M} = M$ and then $s(t_M + M) = M$. To see (ii) we use the lower bound $\hat{\xi}_t \geq \left(\hat{\xi}_0^{-1} + \lambda_A t\right)^{-1}$ from (27) so that $s(t) = \alpha\hat{\xi}_{t-s(t)}^{-1} \leq \alpha(\hat{\xi}_0^{-1} + \lambda_A(t - s(t)))$.

Now we take $t_1 \geq t_0$ so that for $t \geq t_1$ we have $s(t) \geq 1$ and

$$\lambda_{APA} - c_0s^{-\delta}(t) - c_0s^{-d/2}(t) \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{APA}.$$

Using $s = s(t)$ in (83) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} &\leq -\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \frac{\lambda_{APA}}{2} + 2c_0s\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^3 + c_0\hat{\xi}_{t-s}s^{-d/2} \\ &= -\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \left(\frac{\lambda_{APA}}{2} - 2c_0\alpha \right) + c_0\alpha^{-d/2}\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^{1+(d/2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose α so that $\frac{\lambda_{APA}}{2} - 2c_0\alpha = \frac{\lambda_{APA}}{3}$. Since $\hat{\xi}_t \rightarrow 0$ and $t - s(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ we may choose $t_2 \geq t_1$ so that

$$c_0\alpha^{-d/2}\hat{\xi}_{t-s(t)}^{1+(d/2)} \leq \frac{\lambda_{APA}}{4}\hat{\xi}_{t-s(t)}^2 \quad \text{for } t \geq t_2.$$

We have reached

$$\frac{d\hat{\xi}_t}{dt} \leq -\frac{\lambda_{APA}}{12}\hat{\xi}_{t-s}^2 \leq -\frac{\lambda_{APA}}{12}\hat{\xi}_t^2 \quad \text{for } t \geq t_2.$$

which implies the desired upper bound.

References

- [1]
- [2] R. Arratia. Limiting point processes for rescalings of coalescing and annihilating random walks on \mathbb{Z}^d . *The Annals of Probability*, pages 909–936, 1981.
- [3] M. Bramson and D. Griffeath. Asymptotics for interacting particle systems on \mathbb{Z}^d . *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 53(2):183–196, 1980.
- [4] Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher. *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [5] E. Dynkin. *Markov processes*. Springer, 1965.
- [6] B. Garrod, M. Poplavskyi, R. P. Tribe, and O. V. Zaboronski. Examples of interacting particle systems on \mathbb{Z} as pfaffian point processes: annihilating and coalescing random walks. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 19, pages 3635–3662. Springer, 2018.
- [7] C. Graham, T. G. Kurtz, S. Méléard, P. E. Protter, M. Pulvirenti, D. Talay, T. G. Kurtz, and P. E. Protter. Weak convergence of stochastic integrals and differential equations ii: Infinite dimensional case. *Probabilistic Models for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations: Lectures given at the 1st Session of the Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo (CIME) held in Montecatini Terme, Italy, May 22–30, 1995*, pages 197–285, 1996.
- [8] M. Howard. Fluctuation kinetics in a multispecies reaction-diffusion system. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 29(13):3437, 1996.
- [9] H. Kesten and J. van den Berg. Asymptotic density in a coalescing random walk model. *CWI. Probability, Networks and Algorithms [PNA]*, (R 9815), 1998.
- [10] P. Krapivsky, E. Ben-Naim, and S. Redner. Kinetics of heterogeneous single-species annihilation. *Physical Review E*, 50(4):2474, 1994.
- [11] T. M. Liggett. Negative correlations and particle systems. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 8(4):547–564, 2002. MR:1957219. Zbl:1021.60084.
- [12] J. Lukins, R. Tribe, and O. Zaboronski. Multi-point correlations for two-dimensional coalescing or annihilating random walks. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 55(4):1158–1185, 2018.
- [13] C. Monthus. Exponents appearing in heterogeneous reaction-diffusion models in one dimension. *Physical Review E*, 54(5):4844, 1996.
- [14] C. M. Newman. Asymptotic independence and limit theorems for positively and negatively dependent random variables. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, pages 127–140, 1984.
- [15] R. Pemantle. Towards a theory of negative dependence. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 41(3):1371–1390, 2000.
- [16] R. Rajesh and O. Zaboronski. Survival probability of a diffusing test particle in a system of coagulating and annihilating random walkers. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 70(3):036111, 2004.

- [17] D. Reimer. Proof of the van den berg–kesten conjecture. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 9(1):27–32, 2000.
- [18] R. Tribe and O. Zaboronski. Pfaffian formulae for one dimensional coalescing and annihilating systems. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 16:2080–2103, 2011.
- [19] J. van den Berg and H. Kesten. *In and out of equilibrium, vol. 51 of Progress in Probability; Randomly coalescing random walk in dimension $d \geq 3$* . Birkhauser, Boston, 2002.