

Extinction behaviour for a mutually interacting continuous-state population dynamics

Jie Xiong¹, Xu Yang² and Xiaowen Zhou³

Abstract. We consider a system of two stochastic differential equations (SDEs) with negative two-way interactions driven by Brownian motions and spectrally positive α -stable random measures. Such a SDE system can be identified as a Lotka-Volterra type population model. We find close to sharp conditions for one of the population to go extinct or extinguishing.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): 60J80; 92D25; 60G57; 60G17.

Key words and phrases: continuous-state branching process, nonlinear branching, mutually interaction, stochastic Lotka-Volterra type population, extinction, extinguishing.

1 Introduction and main result

Extinction behaviour is a key topic in the study of population models. For continuous-state branching process (CSBP for short) arising as scaling limits of Galton-Watson branching processes, a sufficient and necessary condition, called Grey's condition, is obtained in [5]. Generalizations of CSBPs have been introduced since. In [9] a class of CSBPs with state-dependent branching mechanism was obtained by Lamperti type time change of spectrally positive Lévy processes (SNLPs for short) stopped at the first time of hitting 0. Integral tests for extinction of such nonlinear CSBPs are obtained in [9] and [7]. The above nonlinear CSBPs were further generalized in [10] to solutions to stochastic differential equations (SDEs for short) driven by Brownian motion and spectrally positive Poisson random measures. Rather sharp conditions are obtained on extinction/non-extinction for these nonlinear CSBPs, see also [13] for results on critical cases and [1] for the nonlinear CSBPs with Neveu's branching. Similar to extinction, a process goes extinguishing if it converges to 0 but never reaches 0. A criterion in terms of integral test is found in [8] for the nonlinear CSBP as time changed SNLP to go extinguishing.

The study of extinction behaviour belongs to the class of problems of boundary classification for nonnegative valued Markov processes where the concern is whether 0 or ∞ is an entrance, exit or neutral boundary.

The main approach to develop the criteria for extinction/non-extinction the above work is an adaption of the approach for Chen's criteria on the uniqueness problem of Markov jump processes. These Chen's criteria are first proposed in [2, 3] and can also be found in [4, Theorems 2.25 and 2.27]. Such an approach typically involves identifying an appropriate test function that

¹Department of Mathematics and SUSTech International center for Mathematics, Southern University of Science & Technology, Shenzhen, China. Supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1006102). Email: xiongj@sustech.edu.cn

²School of Mathematics and Information Science, North Minzu University, Yinchuan, China. Supported by NSFC (No. 12471135). Email: xuyang@mail.bnu.edu.cn. Corresponding author.

³Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada. Supported by NSERC (RGPIN-2021-04100). Email: xiaowen.zhou@concordia.ca.

is applied to the infinitesimal generator of the nonlinear CSBP and proving the desired result using a martingale argument. It also finds successful applications in studying other boundary behaviours for Markov processes such as explosion/nonexplosion and coming down from infinity versus staying infinite. We refer to [14] for a similar approach of study boundary behaviours for Markov processes.

Compared with the one-dimensional models, the study of two-dimensional interacting population dynamics turns out to be much more challenging and there are rather few results available. In [16] a stochastic Lotka-Volterra type population dynamical system (X, Y) as solution to a two-dimensional SDEs with one sided interaction was proposed where the dynamics of process Y is affected by X . When the continuous-state population X is extinguishing, quite sharp conditions are found for population Y to go either extinct or extinguishing. The main approach of [16] is again an adaption of that for Chen's criteria technique from one-dimensional processes to two-dimensional processes.

Given the previous result on two-dimensional SDE models with one-sided interaction, it is natural to consider models with two-way interactions. We are not aware of systematic work on boundary behaviours of two-dimensional stochastic processes, not even two-dimensional interacting diffusions. As a first attempt, in this paper we start with the extinction behaviour of the following SDE system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} X_t = X_0 - \int_0^t [a_1 X_s^{p_1+1} + \eta_1 X_s^{\theta_1} Y_s^{\kappa_1}] ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2a_2 X_s^{p_2+2}} dB_1(s) \\ \quad + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty a_3 X_{s-}^{p_3+\alpha_1} z \tilde{N}_1(ds, dz, du), \\ Y_t = Y_0 - \int_0^t [b_1 Y_s^{q_1+1} + \eta_2 Y_s^{\theta_2} X_s^{\kappa_2}] ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2b_2 Y_s^{q_2+2}} dB_2(s) \\ \quad + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty b_3 Y_{s-}^{q_3+\alpha_2} z \tilde{N}_2(ds, dz, du), \end{array} \right. \quad (1.1)$$

where the constants $X_0, Y_0, \kappa_i, \eta_i > 0$ and $\theta_i, a_j, b_j, p_j, q_j \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$. For $i = 1, 2$, $(B_i(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motions and $N_i(ds, dz, du)$ is a compensated Poisson random measures with intensity $ds \mu_i(dz) du$. Here $\mu_i(dz) = \frac{\alpha_i(\alpha_i-1)}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)\Gamma(2-\alpha_i)} z^{-1-\alpha_i} dz, z > 0$, for $\alpha_i \in (1, 2), i = 1, 2$, and Γ denotes the Gamma function. We always assume that $a_2 + a_3 > 0$ and $b_2 + b_3 > 0$. We also assume that $(B_1(t))_{t \geq 0}, (B_2(t))_{t \geq 0}, \{\tilde{N}_1(ds, dz, du)\}$ and $\{\tilde{N}_2(ds, dz, du)\}$ are all independent of each other. For process $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $u > 0$ define stopping times

$$\tau_u^-(Z) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t \geq u\}, \quad \tau_u^+(Z) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t \leq u\},$$

$$\tau_0^-(Z) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\infty^+(Z) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t = \infty\}$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = \infty$.

We first present the definition of solution to SDE (1.1), which is defined up to the time that any of the two processes first hits 0 or reaches infinity. For the solution $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to SDE (1.1) let $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

Definition 1.1 *A two-dimensional càdlàg process $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is called a solution to SDE (1.1) if it is defined on the same filtered probability space as the Brownian motions $(B_1(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and $(B_2(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and compensated Poisson random measures $\{\tilde{N}_1(ds, dz, du)\}$ and $\{\tilde{N}_2(ds, dz, du)\}$, and satisfies SDE (1.1) up to $\sigma_n := \tau_{1/n}^-(X) \wedge \tau_{1/n}^-(Y) \wedge \tau_n^+(X) \wedge \tau_n^+(Y)$ for each $n \geq 1$ and $X_t = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{\sigma_n}$ and $Y_t = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_{\sigma_n}$ for $t \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n$.*

The above definition of solution to SDE (1.1) allows weaker conditions for uniqueness of solution. In particular, the existence and pathwise uniqueness holds by the same arguments as in [16, Lemma A.1]. Throughout this paper we assume that the càdlàg process $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the unique solution to (1.1), and consequently, the process $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has the strong Markov property. We also assume that $X_0, Y_0 > 0$ and all the stochastic processes are defined on the same filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbf{P})$. We use \mathbf{E} to denote the corresponding expectation.

The negative interacting terms represents the negative effects of competition between the two populations. If $\eta_1 = 0$ in (1.1), then process X is a CSBP with nonlinear branching mechanism. If $p_1 = 0, p_2 = -1$ and $p_3 = 1 - \alpha_1$, then X further reduces to a CSBP that is a scaling limit of the classical Galton-Watson branching process. We refer to [6] and [11] for comprehensive introductions on CSBPs.

The processes X and Y are extinguishing when $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$. Our aim of this paper is to find as sharp as possible conditions on the interaction terms for the extinction and extinguishing behaviours of the mutually interaction nonlinear CSBP (1.1). Write $\tau_0^- := \tau_0^-(X) \wedge \tau_0^-(Y)$,

$$p := \min\{p_1 1_{\{a_1 \neq 0\}}, p_2 1_{\{a_2 \neq 0\}}, p_3 1_{\{a_3 \neq 0\}}\}, \quad q := \min\{q_1 1_{\{b_1 \neq 0\}}, q_2 1_{\{b_2 \neq 0\}}, q_3 1_{\{b_3 \neq 0\}}\}$$

and

$$a := a_1 1_{\{p_1 = p\}} + a_2 1_{\{p_2 = p\}} + a_3 1_{\{p_3 = p\}}, \quad b := b_1 1_{\{q_1 = q\}} + b_2 1_{\{q_2 = q\}} + b_3 1_{\{q_3 = q\}}.$$

The following theorem is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.2 $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- < \infty\} = 0$ iff $\theta_1, \theta_2 \geq 1$. In addition, the following results hold for Y , and similar results hold for X by symmetry.

- (i) $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ for $\theta_2 \geq 1$.
- (ii) $0 < \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} < 1$ if $\theta_1 \geq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$, and one of the following holds:
 - (iia) $p < \frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2}$;
 - (iib) $p = q = 0$ and $b/a < \kappa_2/(1 - \theta_2)$;
 - (iic) $\theta_1 \geq 1, \theta_1 - 1 < \frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2}$;
 - (iid) $\theta_1 = 1, q = \kappa_1$, and $b/\eta_1 < \kappa_2/(\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2)$.
- (iii) $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 1$ if $\theta_1 \geq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$ and $\theta_1 - 1 > \frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2}$ and one of the following holds:
 - (iiia) $p > \frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2}$;
 - (iiib) $p = q = 0$ and $b/a > \kappa_2/(1 - \theta_2)$.

Remark 1.3 Note that neither X nor Y in (1.1) can reach 0 if $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$ by [10, Theorem 2.3(i)]. Therefore, the extinction is caused by the interaction between processes X and Y . If $\eta_1 = 0$, the results of Theorem 1.2 are given in [16, Example 1.12].

Theorem 1.2 leaves the extinction behaviors for (X, Y) in several critical cases unsettled for which we pose the following conjectures.

Conjecture 1.4 $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 1$ if $0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$ and one of the following holds:

$$(i) \theta_1 > 1, q > \kappa_1, \theta_1 - 1 = \frac{\kappa_2(q - \kappa_1)}{q + 1 - \theta_2},$$

$$\frac{(\theta_1 - 1)\eta_1}{q + 1 - \theta_2} < \eta_2^{\frac{q - \kappa_1}{q + 1 - \theta_2}} \cdot \left(\frac{b(q - \kappa_1)}{\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2} \right)^{\frac{1 + \kappa_1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}}$$

and at least one of the following hold

$$(ia') p > \frac{\kappa_2 q}{q + 1 - \theta_2};$$

$$(ib') p, q > 0, p = \frac{\kappa_2 q}{q + 1 - \theta_2} \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{ap}{q(q + 1 - \theta_2)} < \left(\frac{b}{1 - \theta_2} \right)^{\frac{1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta_2}{q} \right)^{\frac{q}{q + 1 - \theta_2}}$$

$$(ic') p = q = 0 \text{ and } b/a > \kappa_2/(1 - \theta_2).$$

(ii) $\theta_1 = 1, q = \kappa_1, b/\eta_1 > \kappa_2/(\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2)$ and and at least one of (ia'), (ib'), (ic') hold.

(iii) $\theta_1 - 1 > \frac{\kappa_2(q - \kappa_1)}{q + 1 - \theta_2}$ and (ib') holds.

Conjecture 1.5 $0 < \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} < 1$ if $\theta_1 \geq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$, and one of the following holds:

$$(i) p, q > 0, p = \frac{\kappa_2 q}{q + 1 - \theta_2} \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{ap}{q(q + 1 - \theta_2)} > \left(\frac{b}{1 - \theta_2} \right)^{\frac{1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}} \cdot \left(\frac{\eta_2}{q} \right)^{\frac{q}{q + 1 - \theta_2}};$$

$$(ii) \theta_1 > 1, q > \kappa_1, \theta_1 - 1 = \frac{\kappa_2(q - \kappa_1)}{q + 1 - \theta_2}, \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{(\theta_1 - 1)\eta_1}{q + 1 - \theta_2} > \eta_2^{\frac{q - \kappa_1}{q + 1 - \theta_2}} \cdot \left(\frac{b(q - \kappa_1)}{\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2} \right)^{\frac{1 + \kappa_1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}}.$$

Remark 1.6 Under the setup of SDE (1.1), both processes X and Y converge to 0, which facilitate the proofs for extinction/extinguishing. It would be more challenging to show similar results when both of the interacting terms are positive. The approach of this paper also finds successful applications in showing criteria for explosion/non-explosion of solution to one-dimensional SDE; see [13] and [12]. We expect that it can also be modified to show similar criteria for two-dimensional models with interaction.

The first assertion of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.2(i) are proved in Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9, respectively. The proof for Lemma 3.8 is given by using a non-extinction criterion established in Proposition 2.1. The proof for assertion “ $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} > 0$ if $\theta_1 \geq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$ ” in Theorem 1.2 is given in Lemmas 3.8 and 3.9. The proof of Lemma 3.9 is essentially the same as that of [16, Theorem 1.5] by using a extinction criterion established in [16] (see Proposition 2.2) and a complex exponential function (see (3.30)). The proof of Theorem 1.2(iii) is established by applying an extinction criterion established in [16] (see Corollary 2.3) to an exponential test function on a ratio of the two process.

The assertion in Theorem 1.2(ii) for the probability of extinction to be strictly less than one is proved by a new method different from that of [16]. To this end, we first prove a criterion for the

extinction probability to be strictly less than one for small initial values by considering a ratio U of processes Y and X^β for which both X_0 and Y_0 are small but U_0 is large; see Proposition 2.5. We then construct a test function and verify the criterion; see Subsection 3.3. We also establish an irreducibility criterion in Proposition 2.4, comparison theorem in Proposition 3.4 and apply the criterion to show the result for any initial values; see the end of the proof of Theorem 1.2(ii).

Throughout the paper $C^2((0, \infty))$ and $C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ denote the second-order continuous differentiable functions spaces on $(0, \infty)$ and $(0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$, respectively. The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, we prove some preparatory results on finiteness of the hitting time τ_0^- and irreducibility of (X, Y) . Section 1.2 contains proofs for the main results.

2 Criteria for the extinction behaviour

In this section we establish some preliminary results for Theorem 1.2. In the following let $(x_t, y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a two-dimensional process where $x = (x_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $y = (y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are two nonnegative processes defined up to the minimum of their first times of hitting zero or explosion. We assume that $x_0, y_0 > 0$.

Let \mathcal{L} denote the operator so that for each $g \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$, the process

$$t \mapsto M_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n}}^g \quad \text{is a local martingale,} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$M_t^g := g(x_t, y_t) - g(x_0, y_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) ds$$

and $\tau_{m,n} := \tau_{1/m}^- \wedge \tau_n^+$ with $\tau_{1/m}^- := \tau_{1/m}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{1/m}^-(y)$ and $\tau_n^+ := \tau_n^+(x) \wedge \tau_n^+(y)$. In this section we assume that $\tau_0^- := \tau_0^-(x) \wedge \tau_0^-(y)$.

We first state the non-extinction and extinction criteria which generalize Chen's criteria for the uniqueness problem of Markov jump processes. The following criterion is on non-extinction of process $(x_t, y_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

Proposition 2.1 *Assuming that $\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) < \infty$ a.s., $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(x) < \infty, \tau_0^-(y) < \infty\} = 0$ and for any $n \geq 1$, there is a nonnegative function $g_n \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ and a constant $d_n > 0$ such that*

- (i) $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} g_n(u, v) = +\infty$ for all $v > 0$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{L}g_n(u, v) \leq d_n g_n(u, v)$ for all $0 < u, v \leq n$,

we have $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(x) = \infty\} = 1$.

Proof. By (2.1), there are stopping times γ_k so that $\gamma_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $t \mapsto M_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}}^g$ is a martingale, where $\tau_{m,n,k} := \tau_{m,n} \wedge \gamma_k$. Thus for all $m, n, k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[g_n(x_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n}}, y_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}})] &= g_n(x_0, y_0) + \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}} \mathcal{L}g_n(x_s, y_s) ds\right] \\ &= g_n(x_0, y_0) + \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}g_n(x_s, y_s) 1_{\{s < \tau_{m,n,k}\}} ds\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq g_n(x_0, y_0) + d_n \int_0^t \mathbf{E}[g_n(x_{s \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}}, y_{s \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}})] ds,$$

where condition (ii) is used in the last inequality. It follows from Gronwall's inequality that

$$\mathbf{E}[g_n(x_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}})] \leq g_n(x_0, y_0) e^{d_n t}.$$

By Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left[g_n(x_{t \wedge \tau_0^-(x) \wedge \tau_0^-(y) \wedge \tau_n^+}, y_{t \wedge \tau_0^-(x) \wedge \tau_0^-(y) \wedge \tau_n^+})\right] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\liminf_{m,k \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}})\right] \\ &\leq \liminf_{m,k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[g_n(x_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \tau_{m,n,k}})] \leq g_n(x_0, y_0) e^{d_n t}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of condition (i) we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(x) > t \wedge \tau_0^-(y) \wedge \tau_n^+\} = 1, \quad t > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

By the assumption, $\tau_n^+ \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then letting $n, t \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $\tau_0^-(x) \geq \tau_0^-(y)$ almost surely. Then one concludes the assertion by the assumption $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(x) = \tau_0^-(y) < \infty\} = 0$ and the definition of $(x_t, y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ before the minimum of their first times of hitting zero. \square

The following two criteria on extinction of process $(x_t, y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can be found in [16].

Proposition 2.2 ([16, Proposition 2.2]) *Suppose that $\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) < \infty$ a.s. and in addition there exist a nonnegative function $g \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ and constants $d_n > 0$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) $0 < \sup_{u,v > 0} g(u, v) < \infty$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{L}g(u, v) \geq d_n g(u, v)$ for all $0 < u, v \leq n$.

Then $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- < \infty\} \geq g(x_0, y_0) / \sup_{x,y > 0} g(x, y)$.

Corollary 2.3 ([16, Corollary 2.3]) *Suppose that $\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) < \infty$ a.s. and $g \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ is a nonnegative function with $0 < \sup_{u,v > 0} g(u, v) < \infty$. If there exist a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and a nonnegative function h on $(0, \infty)$ so that $x_0, y_0 < \varepsilon$,*

$$\mathcal{L}g(x_t, y_t) \geq h(x_t)g(x_t, y_t), \quad 0 < t < \tau_\varepsilon^+$$

and $\int_0^\infty h(x_t \wedge \varepsilon) dt = \infty$ a.s., then

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+ < \infty\} \geq g(u_0, v_0) / \sup_{u,v > 0} g(u, v).$$

The next result concerns the irreducibility of process (X, Y) which we need for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 2.4 *For $u_2 > u_1 > 0$ and $v_2 > v_1 > 0$ let $D := [u_1, u_2] \times [v_1, v_2]$. Let $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq u_1, 0 < \varepsilon_2 \leq v_1, \delta_1 \geq u_2, \delta_2 \geq v_2$, and $\varepsilon_1 < x_0 < \delta_1, \varepsilon_2 < y_0 < \delta_2$ satisfy $(x_0, y_0) \notin D$. Define stopping time τ_D by*

$$\tau_D := \inf\{t \geq 0 : (x_t, y_t) \in D\}.$$

Suppose that there exists a function $g \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) $0 < \sup_{u,v>0} |g(u, v)| < \infty$ and $g(x_0, y_0) > 0$;
- (ii) $\sup_{\varepsilon_1 < u < \delta_1, \varepsilon_2 < v < \delta_2} |\mathcal{L}g(u, v)| < \infty$;
- (iii) $g(\varepsilon_1, v) = g(z_1, v) = g(u, \varepsilon_2) = g(u, z_2) = 0$ for all $u, v > 0$, $z_1 \geq \delta_1$ and $z_2 \geq \delta_2$;
- (iv) There is a constant $d > 0$ so that $\mathcal{L}g(u, v) \geq dg(u, v)$ for all $u \in (\varepsilon_1, \delta_1), v \in (\varepsilon_2, \delta_2)$ and $(u, v) \notin D$.

Then $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\} \geq g(x_0, y_0) / \sup_{u,v>0} |g(u, v)|$.

Proof. Define stopping time τ by $\tau := \tau_D \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_1}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_2}^-(y) \wedge \tau_{\delta_1}^+(x) \wedge \tau_{\delta_2}^+(y)$. By (2.1),

$$M_{t \wedge \tau}^g := g(x_{t \wedge \tau}, y_{t \wedge \tau}) - g(x_0, y_0) - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) ds \quad (2.3)$$

is a local martingale. By conditions (i) and (ii), there is a constant $C_t > 0$ so that

$$|M_{t \wedge \tau}^g| \leq |g(x_{t \wedge \tau}, y_{t \wedge \tau})| + |g(x_0, y_0)| + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} |\mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s)| ds \leq C_t.$$

It thus follows from [15, p.38] that $t \mapsto M_{t \wedge \tau}^g$ is a martingale. Taking expectation on both sides of (2.3) we get

$$\mathbf{E}[g(x_{t \wedge \tau}, y_{t \wedge \tau})] = g(x_0, y_0) + \int_0^t \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) 1_{\{s < \tau\}}] ds.$$

Taking integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-dt} \mathbf{E}[g(x_{t \wedge \tau}, y_{t \wedge \tau})] \\ &= g(x_0, y_0) - d \int_0^t e^{-ds} \mathbf{E}[g(x_{s \wedge \tau}, y_{s \wedge \tau})] ds + \int_0^t e^{-ds} d \left(\mathbf{E}[g(x_{s \wedge \tau}, y_{s \wedge \tau})] \right) \\ &= g(x_0, y_0) - d \int_0^t e^{-ds} \mathbf{E}[g(x_{s \wedge \tau}, y_{s \wedge \tau})] ds + \int_0^t e^{-ds} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) 1_{\{s < \tau\}}] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now we conclude by condition (iv) that

$$e^{-dt} \mathbf{E}[g(x_{t \wedge \tau}, y_{t \wedge \tau})] \geq g(x_0, y_0) - d \int_0^t e^{-ds} \mathbf{E}[g(x_\tau, y_\tau) 1_{\{s \geq \tau\}}] ds.$$

Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ and using condition (i),

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0, y_0) &\leq d \int_0^\infty e^{-ds} \mathbf{E}[g(x_\tau, y_\tau) 1_{\{s \geq \tau\}}] ds = \mathbf{E}[g(x_\tau, y_\tau) e^{-d\tau}] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[g(x_\tau, y_\tau) e^{-d\tau} \left[1_{\{\tau_{\varepsilon_1}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_2}^-(y) < \tau_D \wedge \tau_{\delta_1}^+(x) \wedge \tau_{\delta_2}^+(y)\}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 1_{\{\tau_{\delta_1}^+(x) \wedge \tau_{\delta_2}^+(y) < \tau_D \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_1}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_2}^-(y)\}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 1_{\{\tau_D < \tau_{\varepsilon_1}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_2}^-(y) \wedge \tau_{\delta_1}^+(x) \wedge \tau_{\delta_2}^+(y)\}} \right] \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{u,v>0} |g(u, v)| \mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \tau_{\varepsilon_1}^-(x) \wedge \tau_{\varepsilon_2}^-(y) \wedge \tau_{\delta_1}^+(x) \wedge \tau_{\delta_2}^+(y)\} \\ &\leq \sup_{u,v>0} |g(u, v)| \mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

where condition (iii) is used in the second inequality. One concludes the proof. \square

The following result concerns a criterion for the probability of extinction to be strictly less than one.

Proposition 2.5 *Suppose that*

- (i) *there are a constant $\beta > 0$ and a strictly positive function \bar{g} on $(0, \infty)$ so that $g(u, v) \geq \bar{g}(vu^{-\beta})$ for all $u, v > 0$.*
- (ii) *there are constants $0 < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ and $u_* > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$,*

$$\mathcal{L}g(u, v) \leq 0, \quad 0 < u, v \leq \varepsilon, \quad vu^{-\beta} > u_* \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\inf_{z_1 \leq u, v \leq z_2} g(u, v) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{z_1 \leq u, v \leq z_2} |\mathcal{L}g(u, v)| < \infty, \quad \text{for all } z_2 > z_1 > 0; \quad (2.5)$$

- (iii) *$\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) < \infty$, $\tau_0^-(x) = \infty$ a.s. and there are constants $C, \delta > 0$ independent of $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) \geq \varepsilon\right\} \leq C\varepsilon^\delta. \quad (2.6)$$

Then there is a constant $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_0$ so that $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(y) < \infty\} < 1$ for all $x_0 = \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}$ and $y_0 = u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}$ for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ satisfying $g(x_0, y_0) < \bar{g}(u_*)$ and $u_0 > u_*$.

Proof. Define the process $U := (U_t)_{t \geq 0}$ by $U_t = y_t x_t^{-\beta}$. Since $x_0 = \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}$ and $y_0 = u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}$, then $U_0 = x_0^{-\beta} y_0 = u_0$. Under the assumption, there is a constant $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ so that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_1$ we have

$$1 - g(x_0, y_0)/\bar{g}(u_*) - C\varepsilon^\delta > 0, \quad (2.7)$$

where the constant C given in (2.6) does not depend on $\varepsilon > 0$. Using (2.1),

$$M_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}^g := g(x_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}, y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}) - g(x_0, y_0) - \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} \mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) ds$$

is a local martingale, where $\gamma_{m,n} := \tau_{m,n} \wedge \tau_{u_*}^-(U)$. Let

$$H_s := g(x_s, y_s)^{-1} \mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s).$$

Taking integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} & g(x_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}, y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}) e^{-\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_s ds} \\ &= g(x_0, y_0) + \int_0^t g(x_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}, y_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}) d\left(e^{-\int_0^{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_v dv}\right) + \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_v dv} dg(x_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}, y_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}) \\ &= g(x_0, y_0) - \int_0^t g(x_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}, y_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}) e^{-\int_0^{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_v dv} H_s 1_{\{s \leq \gamma_{m,n}\}} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_v dv} \mathcal{L}g(x_s, y_s) 1_{\{s \leq \gamma_{m,n}\}} ds + W_{m,n}(t) \\ &= g(x_0, y_0) + W_{m,n}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where $W_{m,n}(t) := \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}} H_v dv} dM_{s \wedge \gamma_{m,n}}^g$. By (2.5), $\sup_{v \geq 0} |H_v 1_{\{v < \gamma_{m,n}\}}| \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$. It follows from [15, p.128] that $t \mapsto W_{m,n}(t)$ is a local martingale. Then there

are stopping times γ_k so that $\gamma_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $t \mapsto W_{m,n}(t \wedge \gamma_k)$ is a martingale for each $k \geq 1$. Let $\gamma_{m,n,k} := \gamma_{m,n} \wedge \gamma_k$. It then follows from (2.8) that

$$g(x_0, y_0) = \mathbf{E} \left[g(x_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}) e^{-\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}} H_s ds} \right].$$

By the condition (iii), we have $\tau_0^-(x) = \tau_\infty^+(x) = \tau_\infty^+(y) = \infty$ and $\tau_{u_*}^-(U) \leq \tau_0^-(y)$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{m,n,k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{m,n,k} = \tau_0^-(x) \wedge \tau_0^-(y) \wedge \tau_\infty^+(x) \wedge \tau_\infty^+(y) \wedge \tau_{u_*}^-(U) = \tau_{u_*}^-(U).$$

It thus follows from Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0, y_0) &= \liminf_{t,m,n,k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left[g(x_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}) e^{-\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}} H_s ds} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E} \left[\liminf_{t,m,n,k \rightarrow \infty} g(x_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}, y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}) e^{-\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}} H_s ds} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E} \left[g(x_{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)}, y_{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty\}} e^{-\int_0^{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)} H_s ds} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{g}(U_{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)}) = \bar{g}(u_*)$ for $\tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty$, then under condition (i),

$$g(x_0, y_0) \geq \bar{g}(u_*) \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty\}} e^{-\int_0^{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)} H_s ds} \right].$$

For $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ and for $s \leq \tau_{u_*}^-(U)$ and $\sup_{t \geq 0} (x_t + y_t) \leq \varepsilon$, we have $H_s \leq 0$ by (2.4). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0, y_0) / \bar{g}(u_*) &\geq \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^{\tau_{u_*}^-(U)} H_v dv} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{s \geq 0} (x_s + y_s) \leq \varepsilon, \tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{s \geq 0} (x_s + y_s) \leq \varepsilon, \tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P} \{ \tau_{u_*}^-(U) = \infty \} = 1 - \mathbf{P} \{ \tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty \} \\ &\geq 1 - \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{s \geq 0} (x_s + y_s) \leq \varepsilon, \tau_{u_*}^-(U) < \infty \right\} - \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{s \geq 0} (x_s + y_s) > \varepsilon \right\} \\ &\geq 1 - g(x_0, y_0) / \bar{g}(u_*) - C\varepsilon^\delta > 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (2.6) and (2.7). Since $\tau_0^-(x) = \infty$ almost surely under condition (iii), then $\mathbf{P} \{ \tau_0^-(y) = \infty \} > 0$, which concludes the proof. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we use the propositions and corollary in Section 2 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. We always assume that $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a solution to (1.1). For $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $g \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$ define

$$K_z^1 g(x, y) := g(x + z, y) - g(x, y) - g'_x(x, y)z \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$K_z^2 g(x, y) := g(x, y + z) - g(x, y) - g'_y(x, y)z. \quad (3.2)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}g(x, y) := & -a_1x^{p_1+1}g'_x(x, y) + a_2x^{p_2+2}g''_{xx}(x, y) + a_3x^{p_3+\alpha_1} \int_0^\infty K_z^1g(x, y)\mu_1(dz) \\ & -b_1y^{q_1+1}g'_y(x, y) + b_2y^{q_2+2}g''_{yy}(x, y) + b_3y^{q_3+\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty K_z^2g(x, y)\mu_2(dz) \\ & -\eta_1x^{\theta_1}y^{\kappa_1}g'_x(x, y) - \eta_2y^{\theta_2}x^{\kappa_2}g'_y(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

For $g \in C^2((0, \infty))$ and $x, z > 0$ define

$$K_zg(x) := g(x+z) - g(x) - g'(x)z. \quad (3.4)$$

By Taylor's formula, for any bounded function g with continuous second derivative,

$$g(x+z) - g(x) = z \int_0^1 g'(x+zv)dv, \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$K_zg(x) = z^2 \int_0^1 g''(x+zv)(1-v)dv. \quad (3.6)$$

3.1 Preliminaries

In this subsection we present some lemmas that are needed for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 3.1 For any $u, v \geq 0$ and $p, q > 1$ with $1/p + 1/q = 1$, we have

$$u + v \geq p^{1/p}q^{1/q}u^{1/p}v^{1/q}.$$

Proof. It follows from the Young inequality immediately. \square

Lemma 3.2 Given $\mu(dz) := \frac{\alpha(\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(2-\alpha)}z^{-1-\alpha}dz$ for $1 < \alpha < 2$, for $\beta > 0$ we have

$$\int_0^\infty [1 - (1+z)^{-\beta}]z\mu(dz) = \frac{\alpha\beta\Gamma(\alpha+\beta-1)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta+1)} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty [(1+z)^{-\beta} - 1 + \beta z]\mu(dz) = \frac{\beta(\beta+1)\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta+2)}.$$

Moreover, for $0 < \beta < \alpha - 1$ we have

$$\int_0^\infty [(1+z)^\beta - 1]z\mu(dz) = \frac{\alpha\beta\Gamma(\alpha-\beta-1)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(1-\beta)}$$

and for $0 < \beta < 1$ we have

$$\int_0^\infty [(1+z)^\beta - 1 - \beta z]\mu(dz) = -\frac{\beta(1-\beta)\Gamma(\alpha-\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(2-\beta)}.$$

Proof. Since the proofs are similar, we only state that of (3.7). By integration by parts and change of variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty [1 - (1+z)^{-\beta}] z^{-\alpha} dz = (\alpha-1)^{-1} \beta \int_0^\infty (1+z)^{-\beta-1} z^{1-\alpha} dz \\ &= (\alpha-1)^{-1} \beta \int_1^\infty u^{-\beta-1} (u-1)^{1-\alpha} du = (\alpha-1)^{-1} \beta \int_0^1 z^{\beta+\alpha-2} (1-z)^{1-\alpha} dz \\ &= \frac{\beta \Gamma(\beta+\alpha-1) \Gamma(2-\alpha)}{(\alpha-1) \Gamma(\beta+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result. \square

Lemma 3.3 (i) $\sup_{t \geq 0} (X_t + Y_t) < \infty$ and $\tau_\infty^+(X) = \tau_\infty^+(Y) = \infty$ a.s.

(ii) Given $X_0, Y_0 > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of X_0, Y_0, ε satisfying

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} X_t \geq \varepsilon \right\} \leq C \varepsilon^{-\delta} X_0^\delta, \quad \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} Y_t \geq \varepsilon \right\} \leq C \varepsilon^{-\delta} Y_0^\delta.$$

Proof. (i) By [10, Theorem 2.3(i) and Proposition 2.6], $X_t \rightarrow 0$ and $Y_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\sup_{t \geq 0} (X_t + Y_t) < \infty$ a.s.

(ii) The proof is the same to that of [16, Lemma 3.3]. \square

In the following we present a comparison theorem for SDE system (1.1), which is used in the proof of Theorem 1.2(ii).

Proposition 3.4 (Comparison theorem) *If $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is another solution to (1.1) satisfying $\tilde{X}_0 \geq X_0$ and $\tilde{Y}_0 \leq Y_0$, then we have $\mathbf{P}\{\tilde{X}_t \geq X_t \text{ and } \tilde{Y}_t \leq Y_t \text{ for all } 0 \leq t < \tau\} = 1$, where*

$$\tau := \tau_0^-(X) \wedge \tau_0^-(Y) \wedge \tau_0^-(\tilde{X}) \wedge \tau_0^-(\tilde{Y}).$$

Proof. For $s \geq 0$ define $\bar{X}_s = X_s - \tilde{X}_s$ and $\bar{Y}_s = \tilde{Y}_s - Y_s$. For $s \geq 0$ let

$$\begin{aligned} U_{11}(s) &:= a_1(X_s^{p_1+1} - \tilde{X}_s^{p_1+1}), \quad U_{12}(s) := \sqrt{2a_2 X_s^{p_2+2}} - \sqrt{2a_2 \tilde{X}_s^{p_2+2}}, \\ U_{13}(s, u) &:= 1_{\{u \leq a_3 X_s^{p_3+\alpha_1}\}} - 1_{\{u \leq a_3 \tilde{X}_s^{p_3+\alpha_1}\}}, \quad U_{21}(s) := b_1(\tilde{Y}_s^{q_1+1} - Y_s^{q_1+1}), \\ U_{22}(s) &:= \sqrt{2b_2 \tilde{Y}_s^{q_2+2}} - \sqrt{2b_2 Y_s^{q_2+2}}, \quad U_{23}(s, u) := 1_{\{u \leq b_3 \tilde{Y}_s^{q_3+\alpha_2}\}} - 1_{\{u \leq b_3 Y_s^{q_3+\alpha_2}\}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$V_1(s) := \eta_1(X_s^{\theta_1} Y_s^{\kappa_1} - \tilde{X}_s^{\theta_1} \tilde{Y}_s^{\kappa_1}), \quad V_2(s) := \eta_2(\tilde{Y}_s^{\theta_2} \tilde{X}_s^{\kappa_2} - Y_s^{\theta_2} X_s^{\kappa_2}).$$

For $n \geq 1$ define stopping times γ_n by

$$\gamma_n := \tau_{n-1}^-(X) \wedge \tau_{n-1}^-(\tilde{X}) \wedge \tau_{n-1}^-(Y) \wedge \tau_{n-1}^-(\tilde{Y}) \wedge \tau_n^+(X) \wedge \tau_n^+(\tilde{X}) \wedge \tau_n^+(Y) \wedge \tau_n^+(\tilde{Y}).$$

By Lemma 3.3(i), $\tau_\infty^+(X) = \tau_\infty^+(Y) = \tau_\infty^+(\tilde{X}) = \tau_\infty^+(\tilde{Y}) = \infty$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = \tau$. It follows from (1.1) that

$$\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n} = \bar{X}_0 - \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [U_{11}(s) + V_1(s)] ds + \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} U_{12}(s) dB_1(s)$$

$$+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty z U_{13}(s, u) \tilde{N}_1(ds, dz, du) \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n} &= \bar{Y}_0 - \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [U_{21}(s) + V_2(s)] ds + \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} U_{22}(s) dB_2(s) \\ &+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty z U_{23}(s, u) \tilde{N}_2(ds, dz, du). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

For $m \geq 1$ define

$$h_m := \exp\{-m(m+1)/2\}.$$

Let ψ_m be a nonnegative function on \mathbb{R} with support in (h_m, h_{m-1}) , $\int_{h_m}^{h_{m-1}} \psi_m(x) dx = 1$ and

$$\psi_m(x) \leq 2m^{-1} x^{-1} 1_{(h_m, h_{m-1})}(x).$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \geq 1$ let

$$\phi_m(x) := 1_{\{x > 0\}} \int_0^x dy \int_0^y \psi_m(z) dz.$$

For $m \geq 1$ and $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ put

$$\mathcal{D}_m(y, z) := \phi_m(y+z) - \phi_m(y) - z\phi'_m(y), \quad \mathcal{V}_m(y, z) := \phi_m(y+z) - \phi_m(y).$$

Let $x^+ := x \vee 0$. By [17, Lemma 2.1] for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi_m(x) = x^+, \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi'_m(x) = 1_{\{x > 0\}}, \quad |\phi'_m(x)| \leq 1 \text{ and } |x\phi''_m(x)| \leq 2/m \text{ for } m \geq 1 \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_m(x, z) \leq (2m^{-1}z^2/x) \wedge (2|z|) \quad \text{for all } m \geq 1 \text{ and } z \geq 0 \text{ with } x(x+z) > 0. \quad (3.11)$$

By Itô's formula and (3.8)–(3.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_m(\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}) + \phi_m(\bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}) \\ &= \phi_m(\bar{X}_0) + \phi_m(\bar{Y}_0) - \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi'_m(\bar{X}_s)U_{11}(s) + \phi'_m(\bar{Y}_s)U_{21}(s)] ds \\ &+ 2^{-1} \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi''_m(\bar{X}_s)U_{12}(s)^2 + \phi''_m(\bar{Y}_s)U_{22}(s)^2] ds \\ &+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} ds \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^\infty \mathcal{D}_m(\bar{X}_s, zU_{13}(s, u)) \mu_1(dz) + \int_0^\infty \mathcal{D}_m(\bar{Y}_s, zU_{23}(s, u)) \mu_2(dz) \right] du \\ &- \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi'_m(\bar{X}_s)V_1(s) + \phi'_m(\bar{Y}_s)V_2(s)] ds \\ &+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \phi'_m(\bar{X}_s)U_{12}(s) dB_1(s) + \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \phi'_m(\bar{Y}_s)U_{22}(s) dB_2(s) \\ &+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty z \mathcal{V}_m(\bar{X}_s, zU_{23}(s, u)) \tilde{N}_1(ds, dz, du) \\ &+ \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty z \mathcal{V}_m(\bar{Y}_s, zU_{33}(s, u)) \tilde{N}_2(ds, dz, du). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{X}_0, \bar{Y}_0 \leq 0$, taking expectation in the above equation we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}[\phi_m(\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n})] + \mathbf{E}[\phi_m(\bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n})] \\
&= -\mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi'_m(\bar{X}_s)U_{11}(s) + \phi'_m(\bar{Y}_s)U_{21}(s)]ds\right] \\
&+ 2^{-1}\mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi''_m(\bar{X}_s)U_{12}(s)^2 + \phi''_m(\bar{Y}_s)U_{22}(s)^2]ds\right] \\
&+ \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} ds \int_0^\infty \left[\int_0^\infty \mathcal{D}_m(\bar{X}_s, zU_{13}(s, u))\mu_1(dz)\right.\right. \\
&\left.\left.+ \int_0^\infty \mathcal{D}_m(\bar{Y}_s, zU_{23}(s, u))\mu_2(dz)\right]du\right] \\
&- \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [\phi'_m(\bar{X}_s)V_1(s) + \phi'_m(\bar{Y}_s)V_2(s)]ds\right] \\
&=: I_{1,m,n}(t) + I_{2,m,n}(t) + I_{3,m,n}(t) + I_{4,m,n}(t). \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

By the dominated convergence and (3.10),

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\phi_m(\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n})] + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\phi_m(\bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n})] = \mathbf{E}[\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+ + \bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+]. \tag{3.13}$$

Similarly,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_{1,m,n}(t) = -\mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}}U_{11}(s) + 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}}U_{21}(s)]ds\right] =: I_{1,n}(t) \tag{3.14}$$

and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_{4,m,n}(t) = -\mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_n} [1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}}V_1(s) + 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}}V_2(s)]ds\right] =: I_{4,n}(t). \tag{3.15}$$

By Taylor's formula,

$$U_{12}(s)^2 \leq 2a_2|X_s^{p_2+2} - \tilde{X}_s^{p_2+2}| \leq 2a_2(p_2 + 2)|X_s^{p_2+1} + \tilde{X}_s^{p_2+1}| \cdot |\bar{X}_s| \leq 4a_2(p_2 + 2)n^{p_2+1}|\bar{X}_s|$$

for all $s < \gamma_n$. It follows from (3.10) that

$$I_{2,m,n}(t) \leq 8a_2(p_2 + 2)n^{p_2+1}m^{-1}t. \tag{3.16}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{13}(s, u) &= 1_{\{a_3\tilde{X}_{s-}^{p_3+\alpha_1} < u \leq a_3X_{s-}^{p_3+\alpha_1}\}} & \text{if } \bar{X}_s > 0, \\
U_{13}(s, u) &= -1_{\{a_3X_{s-}^{p_3+\alpha_1} < u \leq a_3\tilde{X}_{s-}^{p_3+\alpha_1}\}} & \text{if } \bar{X}_s < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (3.11) and the dominated convergence again we obtain $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_{3,m,n}(t) = 0$. Combining this with (3.12)–(3.16) we get

$$\mathbf{E}[\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+ + \bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+] = I_{1,n}(t) + I_{4,n}(t). \tag{3.17}$$

Observe that

$$1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}}U_{11}(s) \geq 0, \quad 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}}U_{21}(s) \geq 0, \quad s \geq 0.$$

Thus

$$I_{1,n}(t) \leq 0, \quad t \geq 0, \quad n \geq 1, \tag{3.18}$$

If $\bar{X}_s > 0$ and $\bar{Y}_s > 0$, then using Taylor's formula again, for $s < \gamma_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}} V_1(s) &= \eta_1(\tilde{X}_s^{\theta_1} \tilde{Y}_s^{\kappa_1} - X_s^{\theta_1} Y_s^{\kappa_1}) \leq \eta_1 X_s^{\theta_1} [\tilde{Y}_s^{\kappa_1} - Y_s^{\kappa_1}] \\ &\leq \eta_1 \kappa_1 X_s^{\theta_1} [\tilde{Y}_s^{\kappa_1-1} + Y_s^{\kappa_1-1}] \tilde{Y}_s \leq 2\eta_1 \kappa_1 n^{\theta_1} n^{|\kappa_1-1|} \bar{Y}_s \end{aligned}$$

and

$$-1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}} V_2(s) = \eta_2(Y_s^{\theta_2} X_s^{\kappa_2} - \tilde{Y}_s^{\theta_2} \tilde{X}_s^{\kappa_2}) \leq \eta_2 \tilde{Y}_s^{\theta_2} (X_s^{\kappa_2} - \tilde{X}_s^{\kappa_2}) \leq 2\eta_2 \kappa_2 n^{\theta_2} n^{|\kappa_2-1|} \bar{X}_s.$$

If $\bar{X}_s < 0$ and $\bar{Y}_s > 0$, then

$$-1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}} V_1(s) - 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}} V_2(s) = \eta_2(Y_s^{\theta_2} X_s^{\kappa_2} - \tilde{Y}_s^{\theta_2} \tilde{X}_s^{\kappa_2}) \leq \eta_2 \tilde{X}_s^{\kappa_2} [Y_s^{\theta_2} - \tilde{Y}_s^{\theta_2}] < 0.$$

Therefore,

$$-1_{\{\bar{X}_s > 0\}} V_1(s) - 1_{\{\bar{Y}_s > 0\}} V_2(s) \leq c_n [\bar{X}_s^+ + \bar{Y}_s^+]$$

with $c_n := 2[\eta_1 \kappa_1 n^{\theta_1+|\kappa_1-1|} + \eta_2 \kappa_2 n^{\theta_2+|\kappa_2-1|}]$, which implies

$$I_{4,n}(t) \leq c_n \int_0^t \mathbf{E}[\bar{X}_{s \wedge \gamma_n}^+ + \bar{Y}_{s \wedge \gamma_n}^+] ds.$$

Combining this inequality with (3.17)–(3.18) we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}[\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+ + \bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+] \leq c_n \int_0^t \mathbf{E}[\bar{X}_{s \wedge \gamma_n}^+ + \bar{Y}_{s \wedge \gamma_n}^+] ds, \quad t \geq 0, n \geq 1.$$

Now by Gronwall's inequality, $\bar{X}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+ = \bar{Y}_{t \wedge \gamma_n}^+ = 0$ almost sure for all $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Thus letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using the right continuity of $t \mapsto (X_t, Y_t)$ and $t \mapsto (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)$ one gets the conclusion. \square

In the following we prove an irreducibility result for SDE system (1.1).

Proposition 3.5 *Given $x_2 > x_1 > 0$, $y_2 > y_1 > 0$ and $D = [x_1, x_2] \times [y_1, y_2]$ for $(X_0, Y_0) \notin D$ and $\tau_D := \inf\{t \geq 0 : (X_t, Y_t) \in D\}$ we have $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\} > 0$.*

Recall (3.4). Before proving Proposition 3.5, we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6 *Given $0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3$, $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and*

$$h(x) = e^{-\lambda/(x-x_1) - \lambda\lambda_1/(x_3-x)} 1_{\{x_1 < x < x_3\}}, \quad x > 0,$$

then

- (i) $h'(x) \leq \lambda h(x)(x - x_1)^{-2}$ for all $x_1 < x < x_3$ and $\lambda, \lambda_1 > 0$.
- (ii) there are constants $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, c_0 > 0$ so that for all $\lambda > \lambda_0$ and all $x_1 < x < x_2$, we have

$$h''(x)h(x)^{-1} \geq \lambda^2 c_0 (x - x_1)^{-4} \quad (3.19)$$

and

$$h(x)^{-1} \int_0^\infty K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq \lambda^\alpha c_0 (x - x_1)^{-2-\alpha}. \quad (3.20)$$

(iii) there are constants $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \tilde{c}_0, \tilde{c}_1 > 0$ so that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and all $x_1 < x < x_3$, we have

$$h''(x)h(x)^{-1} \geq \lambda^2 \tilde{c}_0 [(x - x_1)^{-4} - \tilde{c}_1] \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$h(x)^{-1} \int_0^\infty K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq \lambda^\alpha \tilde{c}_0 [(x - x_1)^{-2-\alpha} - \tilde{c}_1]. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. For simplicity we assume that $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 2, x_3 = 3$. Observe that for all $1 < x < 3$,

$$h'(x) = \lambda h(x) [(x - 1)^{-2} - \lambda_1 (x - 3)^{-2}] \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{-1} h''(x) h(x)^{-1} &= \lambda (x - 1)^{-4} + \lambda \lambda_1^2 (x - 3)^{-4} \\ &\quad - 2\lambda \lambda_1 (x - 1)^{-2} (x - 3)^{-2} - 2(x - 1)^{-3} + 2\lambda_1 (x - 3)^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Then assertion (i) follows. Observe that

$$2^{-1} \lambda (x - 1)^{-4} > 2(x - 1)^{-3}, \quad 2^{-1} \lambda \lambda_1^2 (x - 3)^{-4} > 2\lambda_1 (x - 3)^{-3}, \quad 1 < x < 3 \quad (3.25)$$

as $\lambda, \lambda \lambda_1 > 8$. It is easy to check that

$$[(x - 1)/(x - 3)]^4 + \lambda_1^2 - 8\lambda_1 [(x - 1)/(x - 3)]^2 \geq 0$$

for all $1 < x < 5/2$ and $\lambda_1 > 72$. It follows that for $\lambda > 8$ and $\lambda_1 > 72$,

$$h''(x)h(x)^{-1} \geq 4^{-1} \lambda^2 (x - 1)^{-4}, \quad 1 < x < 5/2, \quad (3.26)$$

which gives (3.19). For $0 < z < (\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1} \wedge 2^{-1}$ and $1 < x < 2$, we have $\lambda \lambda_1 z (3 - x - z)^{-1} (3 - x)^{-1} \leq 2$ and then $h(x + z) \geq h(x) e^{-2}$. Thus by (3.6) and (3.26), for all for $\lambda > 8$ and $\lambda_1 > 72$,

$$\int_0^{1/2} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz = \int_0^{1/2} h''(x + zv) z^{1-\alpha} dz \int_0^1 (1 - v) dv \geq 0, \quad 1 < x < 2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{(\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1}} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz &= \int_0^{(\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1}} h''(x + zv) z^{1-\alpha} dz \int_0^1 (1 - v) dv \\ &\geq h(x) e^{-2} 8^{-1} \lambda^2 \int_0^{(\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1}} (x + z - 1)^{-4} z^{1-\alpha} dz. \end{aligned}$$

By a change of variable, for $\lambda \lambda_1 \geq 1$ and $1 < x < 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{(\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1}} (x + z - 1)^{-4} z^{1-\alpha} dz &= (x - 1)^{-2-\alpha} \int_0^{[\lambda \lambda_1 (x - 1)]^{-1}} (1 + u)^{-4} u^{1-\alpha} du \\ &\geq (x - 1)^{-2-\alpha} 2^{-4} \int_0^{(\lambda \lambda_1)^{-1}} u^{1-\alpha} du = (x - 1)^{-2-\alpha} 2^{-4} (2 - \alpha)^{-1} (\lambda \lambda_1)^{\alpha-2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $\lambda > 8$ and $\lambda_1 > 72$,

$$\int_0^{1/2} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq e^{-2} 2^{-7} (2 - \alpha)^{-1} \lambda_1^{\alpha-2} \lambda^\alpha (x - 1)^{-2-\alpha} h(x), \quad 1 < x < 2. \quad (3.27)$$

By using (3.23), for $1 < x < 2$,

$$h(x)^{-1} \int_{1/2}^{\infty} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq - \int_{1/2}^{\infty} z^{-1-\alpha} dz - (x-1)^{-2} \lambda \int_{1/2}^{\infty} z^{-\alpha} dz.$$

Therefore, (3.20) follows.

In the following we prove assertion (iii) and take $\lambda_1 = 1$. By (3.24) and (3.25), there are constants $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\tilde{c}_0, \tilde{c}_1 > 0$ so that for all large enough $\lambda > 0$,

$$\lambda^{-2} h''(x) h(x)^{-1} \geq \tilde{c}_0 (x-1)^{-4}, \quad x \in (1, 1+2\delta) \cup (3-2\delta, 3). \quad (3.28)$$

Thus, (3.21) follows. For $x \in (1, 1+\delta) \cup (3-2\delta, 3)$, by (3.28) and the same arguments in (3.27), we have

$$\int_0^{\delta} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq \bar{c}_0 \lambda^{\alpha} h(x) (x-1)^{-2-\alpha}$$

for some constant $\bar{c}_0 > 0$. By the continuity of h , there is a constant \hat{c}_0 so that $|h''(x)| \leq \hat{c}_0$ for all $1+\delta \leq x \leq 3-\delta$. By (3.23), for all $1 < x < 3$,

$$h(x)^{-1} \int_{\delta}^{\infty} K_z h(x) z^{-1-\alpha} dz \geq - \int_{\delta}^{\infty} z^{-1-\alpha} dz - (x-1)^{-2} \lambda \int_{\delta}^{\infty} z^{-\alpha} dz.$$

Thus (3.22) holds for all large enough $\lambda > 0$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We first assume that $X_0 \in (x_1, x_2)$, $Y_0 \in (0, y_1)$ and $y_3 \in (0, Y_0)$. For $\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}, \lambda_1, \tilde{\lambda}_1, x, y > 0$ define

$$g_1(x) = e^{-\lambda/(x-x_1) - \lambda\lambda_1/(x_2-x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 < x < x_2\}}, \quad g_2(y) = e^{-\tilde{\lambda}/(y-y_3) - \tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\lambda}_1/(y_2-y)} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_3 < y < y_2\}}.$$

Then $g_1, g_2 \in C^2(0, \infty)$. Let $g(x, y) = g_1(x)g_2(y)$ for $x, y > 0$ and we use Proposition 2.4 to establish the assertion. The conditions (i)–(iii) in Proposition 2.4 are obviously. We verify the condition (iv) in the following. By (3.3) and Lemma 3.6, there are constants $\lambda, \tilde{\lambda}, \lambda_1, \tilde{\lambda}_1 > 0$ and $c_0, c_1, \tilde{c}_0, d > 0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} & g(x, y)^{-1} \mathcal{L}g(x, y) \\ & \geq -\lambda a_1 (x-x_1)^{-2} x^{p_1+1} - \lambda \eta_1 (x-x_1)^{-2} x^{\theta_1} y^{\kappa_1} + \lambda^2 c_0 a_2 [(x-x_1)^{-4} - c_1] x^{p_2+2} \\ & \quad + \lambda^{\alpha_1} c_0 a_3 [(x-x_1)^{-2-\alpha_1} - c_1] x^{p_3+\alpha_1} - \tilde{\lambda} b_1 (y-y_3)^{-2} y^{p_1+1} - \tilde{\lambda} \eta_2 (y-y_3)^{-2} y^{\theta_2} x^{\kappa_2} \\ & \quad + \tilde{\lambda}^2 \tilde{c}_0 b_2 (y-y_3)^{-4} y^{q_2+2} + \tilde{\lambda}^{\alpha_2} \tilde{c}_0 b_3 (y-y_3)^{-2-\alpha_2} y^{q_3+\alpha_2} \\ & \geq c_0 [\lambda^2 a_2 x_1^{p_2+2} (x-x_1)^{-4} + \lambda^{\alpha_1} a_3 x_1^{p_3+\alpha_1} (x-x_1)^{-2-\alpha_1}] \\ & \quad - \lambda a_1 (x-x_1)^{-2} x_2^{p_1+1} - \lambda \eta_1 (x-x_1)^{-2} x_2^{\theta_1} y_1^{\kappa_1} - c_0 c_1 [\lambda^2 a_2 x_2^{p_2+2} + \lambda^{\alpha_1} a_3 x_2^{p_3+\alpha_1}] \\ & \quad + \tilde{c}_0 [\tilde{\lambda}^2 b_2 (y-y_3)^{-4} y_3^{q_2+2} + \tilde{\lambda}^{\alpha_2} b_3 (y-y_3)^{-2-\alpha_2} y_3^{q_3+\alpha_2}] \\ & \quad - \tilde{\lambda} (y-y_3)^{-2} [b_1 y_1^{p_1+1} + \eta_2 y_1^{\theta_2} x_2^{\kappa_2}] > d, \quad x_1 < x < x_2, \quad y_3 < y < y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, condition (iv) in Proposition 2.4 is confirmed. Now $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\} > 0$ by Proposition 2.4. One can also get the assertion when $Y_0 \in (y_1, y_2)$ and $X_0 \in (0, x_1)$. By the similar arguments, one can obtain the conclusion when $(X_0, Y_0) \in ((x_1, x_2) \times (y_2, \infty)) \cup ((x_2, \infty) \times (y_1, y_2))$. Then by the strong Markov property one ends the proof for general $X_0, Y_0 > 0$. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.2(i)

In this subsection we apply Proposition 2.1 to prove Theorem 1.2(i).

Lemma 3.7 *If $\theta_1 \vee \theta_2 \geq 1$, then $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(X) = \tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 0$.*

Proof. We assume that $\theta_1 \geq 1$ and $\beta > [(1 - \theta_2)/\kappa_2] \vee 1$. Let $g_n(x, y) = \ln(n + n^\beta) - \ln(x + y^\beta)$ for $x, y > 0$. By Lemma 3.1, there are constants $0 < \delta_1 < 1 \wedge (\kappa_1/\beta)$, $(1 - \theta_2)/\beta < \delta_2 < \kappa_2 \wedge 1$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ so that for all $0 < x, y \leq n$ we have

$$(x + y^\beta)^{-1} x^{\theta_1} y^{\kappa_1} \leq c_1 x^{\theta_1 - (1 - \delta_1)} y^{\kappa_1 - \delta_1 \beta} \leq c_1 n^{\theta_1 - (1 - \delta_1) + \kappa_1 - \delta_1 \beta} =: c_1(n)$$

and

$$(x + y^\beta)^{-1} y^{\theta_2 + \beta - 1} x^{\kappa_2} \leq c_2 y^{\theta_2 + \beta - 1 - (1 - \delta_2 \beta)} x^{\kappa_2 - \delta_2} \leq c_2 n^{\theta_2 + \beta - 2 + \delta_2 \beta + \kappa_2 - \delta_2} =: c_2(n)$$

Recall (3.1) and (3.2). By a change of variable,

$$\int_0^\infty K_z^1 g_n(x, y) \mu_1(dz) = (x + y^\beta)^{-\alpha_1} \int_0^\infty [\ln(1 + z)^{-1} + z] \mu_1(dz) =: c_3(x + y^\beta)^{-\alpha_1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty K_z^2 g_n(x, y) \mu_2(dz) &= -y^{-\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty \left[\ln\left(1 + \frac{y^\beta((1+z)^\beta - 1)}{x + y^\beta}\right) - \frac{z\beta y^\beta}{x + y^\beta} \right] \mu_2(dz) \\ &\leq -y^{-\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty \left[\ln\left(1 + \frac{z\beta y^\beta}{x + y^\beta}\right) - \frac{z\beta y^\beta}{x + y^\beta} \right] \mu_2(dz) \\ &= \beta^{\alpha_2} y^{\alpha_2(\beta-1)} (x + y^\beta)^{-\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty [\ln(1 + z)^{-1} + z] \mu_2(dz) \\ &=: \tilde{c}_3 y^{\alpha_2(\beta-1)} (x + y^\beta)^{-\alpha_2}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}g_n(x, y) &= (x + y^\beta)^{-1} [\eta_1 x^{\theta_1} y^{\kappa_1} + \eta_2 \beta y^{\beta-1+\theta_2} x^{\kappa_2}] + (x + y^\beta)^{-1} [a_1 x^{p_1+1} + b_1 \beta y^{q_1+\beta}] \\ &\quad + (x + y^\beta)^{-2} [a_2 x^{p_2+2} + b_2 \beta^2 y^{q_2+2\beta}] - (x + y^\beta)^{-1} \beta(\beta - 1) b_2 y^{q_2+\beta} \\ &\quad + a_3 x^{p_3+\alpha_1} \int_0^\infty K_z^1 g(x, y) \mu_1(dz) + b_3 y^{q_3+\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty K_z^2 g(x, y) \mu_2(dz) \\ &\leq \eta_1 c_1(n) + \eta_2 \beta c_2(n) + a_1 n^{p_1} + b_1 \beta n^{q_1} + a_2 n^{p_2} + b_2 \beta^2 n^{q_2} \\ &\quad + (c_3 a_3 n^{p_3} + \tilde{c}_3 b_3 n^{q_3}) =: C(n), \quad 0 < x, y \leq n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Define stopping time τ_k by $\tau_k := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t + Y_t^\beta \leq k^{-1}\}$. Let $\gamma_{m,n,k} := \tau_{m,n} \wedge \tau_k$ with $\tau_{m,n} := \tau_{m-1}^-(X) \wedge \tau_{m-1}^-(Y) \wedge \tau_n^+$ and $\tau_n^+ := \tau_n^+(X) \wedge \tau_n^+(Y)$. Thus, by (1.1),

$$g_n(X_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}, Y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}) = g_n(X_0, Y_0) + \int_0^{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}} \mathcal{L}g_n(X_s, Y_s) ds + \text{mart.}$$

Combining this with (3.29) one obtains

$$\mathbf{E}[g_n(X_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}}, Y_{t \wedge \gamma_{m,n,k}})] \leq g_n(X_0, Y_0) + tC(n).$$

Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$,

$$[\ln(n + n^\beta) + \ln k] \mathbf{P}\{\tau_k < t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_n^+\}$$

$$\leq \mathbf{E}[g_n(X_{t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_n^+ \wedge \tau_k}, Y_{t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_n^+ \wedge \tau_k})] \leq g_n(X_0, Y_0) + tC(n).$$

Then for large enough $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_k \leq t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_n^+\} = 0.$$

Taking $n, k \rightarrow \infty$ and using Lemma 3.3(i) we get $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- \leq t \wedge \tau_0^-\} = 0$ with $\tau_0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k = \tau_0^-(X) = \tau_0^-(Y)$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.8 $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(X) < \infty\} = 0$ if $\theta_1 \geq 1$, and $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ if $\theta_2 \geq 1$.

Proof. We first assume that $\theta_1 \geq 1$. For $n \geq 1$ let $g_n \in C^2((0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative function defined as $g_n(x) = 1 - \ln(x/n)$ for $0 < x < n$ and $g_n'(x) = 0$ for all $x \geq n+1$. Recall (3.4). Then $K_z g_n(x) = 0$ for all $x \geq n+1$ and $z > 0$. By (3.6) and a change of variable,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{1/2} |K_z g_n(x)| \mu_1(dz) &= \int_0^{1/2} z^2 \mu_1(dz) \int_0^1 (x+zv)^{-2} (1-v) dv \leq \int_0^\infty z^2 (x+z)^{-2} \mu_1(dz) \\ &= x^{-\alpha_1} \int_0^\infty z^2 (1+z)^{-2} \mu_1(dz) =: c_1 x^{-\alpha_1}, \quad 0 < x \leq 1/2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |K_z g_n(x)| \mu_1(dz) &= \int_0^{n+1} |K_z g_n(x)| \mu_1(dz) = \int_0^{n+1} z^2 |g_n''(x+zv)| \mu_1(dz) \int_0^1 (1-v) dv \\ &\leq \sup_{v \geq 1/2} |g_n''(v)| \int_0^{n+1} z^2 \mu_1(dz) =: c_{2,n}, \quad x > 1/2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for $0 < x \leq 1/2$,

$$\int_{1/2}^\infty K_z g_n(x) \mu_1(dz) \leq \sup_{x \geq 1/2} |g_n(x)| \int_{1/2}^{n+1} \mu_1(dz) + x^{-1} \sup_{x \geq 1/2} \int_{1/2}^{n+1} z \mu_1(dz) \leq c_{3,n} x^{-1}$$

for some constant $c_{3,n} > 0$. Thus

$$\int_0^\infty K_z g_n(x) \mu_1(dz) \leq c_{1,n} x^{-\alpha_1} + c_{3,n} x^{-1} + c_{2,n}, \quad x > 0.$$

Let $g_n(x, y) = g_n(x)$ for $x, y > 0$. Then by (3.3),

$$\mathcal{L}g_n(x, y) = \eta_1 x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1} + G_1(x) \leq \eta_1 n^{\theta_1 - 1 + \kappa_1} + G_1(n) =: d_n \leq d_n g_n(x, y), \quad 0 < x, y \leq n,$$

where $G_1(x) := a_1 x^{p_1} + a_2 x^{p_2} + a_3 [c_{1,n} x^{-\alpha_1} + c_{3,n} x^{-1} + c_{2,n}] x^{p_3 + \alpha_1}$. Then by Proposition 2.1 and Lemmas 3.3(i) and 3.7, $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(X) < \infty\} = 0$. By the same argument, we have $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ for $\theta_2 \geq 1$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.9 If $0 \leq \theta_2 < 1$, then $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- < \infty\} > 0$.

Proof. For simplicity we assume that $0 < X_0, Y_0 < 1$. We use Proposition 2.2 to establish the proof, which is similar to that of [16, Theorem 1.5]. Let $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$ and $\delta > (\theta_1 - 1) \vee (p+1 - \theta_1) \vee 1$. Let $g_0 \in C^2((0, 1))$ satisfy $g_0(x) = x^{-\delta}$ for $x \in (0, c_1)$ and $g_0(x) = (x-1)^{-2}$

for $x \in (c_2, 1)$. We choose function g_0 so that g_0, g_0' and g_0'' are all bounded in $[c_1, c_2]$. For $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 1$ and $0 < \rho < 1 - \theta_2$, define a nonnegative function

$$g(x, y) := \exp\{-\lambda_1 g_0(x) - \lambda_2 [\tan(y\pi/2)]^\rho\} 1_{\{x, y < 1\}}, \quad x, y > 0, \quad (3.30)$$

where we only need the properties of a tan function such that it is equivalent to x near zero and is infinite at $\pi/2$. Then by the same arguments in the proof of [16, Theorem 1.5], there are constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, d > 0$ so that $\mathcal{L}g(x, y) \geq dg(x, y)$ for all $0 < x, y < 1$. Using Proposition 2.2 one gets the conclusion. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2(i). By Lemma 3.9, $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^- < \infty\} > 0$ when $\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 < 1$. Then one concludes the conclusion from Lemma 3.8. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2(ii)

In this subsection we use Propositions 2.4 and 2.5 to establish the proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). For $\beta > 0, 0 < \delta < \beta^{-1}$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ let

$$g(x, y) = x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta} + y^\rho.$$

Lemma 3.10 *Let $x, y > 0$. Then*

$$g'_x(x, y) = \beta\delta x^{\beta\delta-1} y^{-\delta}, \quad g'_y(x, y) = -\delta x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta-1} + \rho y^{\rho-1} \quad (3.31)$$

and

$$g''_{xx}(x, y) = -\beta\delta(1 - \beta\delta)x^{\beta\delta-2} y^{-\delta}, \quad g''_{yy}(x, y) = \delta(\delta + 1)x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta-2} - \rho(1 - \rho)y^{\rho-2}. \quad (3.32)$$

Moreover,

$$\int_0^\infty K_z^1 g(x, y) \mu_1(dz) = -\frac{\beta\delta(1 - \beta\delta)\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \beta\delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(2 - \beta\delta)} x^{\beta\delta - \alpha_1} y^{-\delta} \quad (3.33)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty K_z^2 g(x, y) \mu_2(dz) = \frac{\delta(\delta + 1)\Gamma(\alpha_2 + \delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(\delta + 2)} x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta - \alpha_2} - \frac{\rho(1 - \rho)\Gamma(\alpha_2 - \rho)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(2 - \rho)} y^{\rho - \alpha_2}. \quad (3.34)$$

Proof. The assertions (3.31) and (3.32) are obvious. By a change of variable and Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty K_z^1 g(x, y) \mu_1(dz) &= y^{-\delta} \int_0^\infty [(x+z)^{\beta\delta} - x^{\beta\delta} - \beta\delta z x^{\beta\delta-1}] \mu_1(dz) \\ &= -\frac{\beta\delta(1 - \beta\delta)\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \beta\delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(2 - \beta\delta)} x^{\beta\delta - \alpha_1} y^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty K_z^2 g(x, y) \mu_2(dz) \\ &= x^{\beta\delta} \int_0^\infty [(y+z)^{-\delta} - y^{-\delta} + \delta z y^{-\delta-1}] \mu_2(dz) + \int_0^\infty [(y+z)^\rho - y^\rho - \rho z y^{\rho-1}] \mu_2(dz) \\ &= \frac{\delta(\delta + 1)\Gamma(\alpha_2 + \delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(\delta + 2)} x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta - \alpha_2} - \frac{\rho(1 - \rho)\Gamma(\alpha_2 - \rho)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(2 - \rho)} y^{\rho - \alpha_2}. \end{aligned}$$

(3.33) and (3.34) the follow. \square

Lemma 3.11 Suppose that condition (ii) holds. Then there are constants $\beta, \rho, \sigma_0, \varepsilon_0, z_* > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \beta^{-1}$ so that for all $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$, $0 < x, y \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $yx^{-\beta} \geq z_*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &:= \delta x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta} [\beta a(1-\sigma)x^p - (1+\sigma)by^q + \beta\eta_1 x^{\theta_1-1} y^{\kappa_1} - \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \\ &\quad + b\rho(1-\sigma)y^{\rho+q} + \rho\eta_2 y^{\rho+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $u = x^{-\beta}y$ in the following.

(i) Suppose that condition (ia) holds. Then

$$p(1-\theta_2) - q(\kappa_2 - p) = p(q+1-\theta_2) - \kappa_2 q < 0,$$

which implies $p/q < (\kappa_2 - p)/(1 - \theta_2)$. Thus, there is a constant $\beta > 0$ so that $p/q < \beta < (\kappa_2 - p)/(1 - \theta_2)$, which implies

$$\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) > p, \quad \beta q > p. \quad (3.35)$$

Moreover, there are constants $\rho, \rho_1 > 0$ so that

$$\beta q / (1 + \rho_1) > p \quad (3.36)$$

and

$$\rho_1 \delta > \rho. \quad (3.37)$$

For $u \leq y^{-\rho_1}$ we have $y \leq x^{\beta/(1+\rho_1)}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [\beta a(1-\sigma)x^p - (1+\sigma)by^q - \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \\ &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [\beta a(1-\sigma)x^p - (1+\sigma)bx^{q\beta/(1+\rho_1)} - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)}] \\ &= \delta u^{-\delta} x^p [\beta a(1-\sigma) - (1+\sigma)bx^{q\beta/(1+\rho_1)-p} - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)-p}]. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.35) and (3.36), there are constants $z_*, \varepsilon_0, \sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that for all $0 < x, y < \varepsilon_0$, $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$ and $z_* \leq u \leq y^{-\rho_1}$, we have

$$\tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) \geq \delta u^{-\delta} x^p [\beta a(1-\sigma) - (1+\sigma)b\varepsilon_0^{q\beta/(1+\rho_1)-p} - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2-1} \varepsilon_0^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)-p}] > 0.$$

For $u > y^{-\rho_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [-(1+\sigma)by^q - \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] + b\rho(1-\sigma)y^{\rho+q} + \rho\eta_2 y^{\rho+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} \\ &\geq b\rho(1-\sigma)y^{\rho+q} - \delta(1+\sigma)by^{q+\rho_1\delta} + \rho\eta_2 y^{\rho+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} - \delta\eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1+\rho_1\delta} x^{\kappa_2} \\ &= by^{\rho+q} [\rho(1-\sigma) - \delta(1+\sigma)y^{\rho_1\delta-\rho}] + \eta_2 y^{\rho+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} [\rho - \delta y^{\rho_1\delta-\rho}]. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.37), there is a constant $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ so that for all $0 < x, y < \varepsilon_1$, $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$, we have

$$\tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) \geq y^{\rho+q} [\rho(1-\sigma) - \delta(1+\sigma)\varepsilon_1^{\rho_1\delta-\rho}] + \eta_2 y^{\rho+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} [\rho - \delta\varepsilon_1^{\rho_1\delta-\rho}] > 0, \quad u > y^{-\rho_1}. \quad (3.38)$$

(ii) Suppose that condition (iib) holds. Taking $b/a < \beta < \kappa_2/(1-\theta_2)$ we have $\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) > 0$ and $\beta a(1-\sigma) > (1+\sigma)b$ for all $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$ and some $\sigma_0 > 0$. Moreover, there are constants $z_*, \varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that for all $0 < x < \varepsilon_0$ and $u \geq z_*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq [\beta a(1-\sigma) - (1+\sigma)b - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)}] \\ &\geq [\beta a(1-\sigma) - (1+\sigma)b - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2-1} \varepsilon_0^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)}] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Suppose that condition (iic) holds. Then

$$(\theta_1 - 1)(\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2) - (\kappa_2 + 1 - \theta_1)(q - \kappa_1) = (\theta_1 - 1)(q + 1 - \theta_2) - \kappa_2(q - \kappa_1) < 0,$$

which gives $\frac{\theta_1 - 1}{q - \kappa_1} < \frac{\kappa_2 + 1 - \theta_1}{\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2}$. Thus there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ so that

$$\frac{\theta_1 - 1}{q - \kappa_1} < \beta < \frac{\kappa_2 + 1 - \theta_1}{\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2},$$

which implies

$$\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) > \theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1, \quad \beta q > \theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1. \quad (3.39)$$

Moreover, there are constants $\rho, \rho_1 > 0$ so that

$$\beta q / (1 + \rho_1) > \theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1 \quad (3.40)$$

and (3.37) holds. Observe that there is a constant $z_* > 0$ so that for $0 < z_* \leq u \leq y^{-\rho_1}$, we have $y \leq x^{\beta/(1+\rho_1)}$ and then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [\beta\eta_1 x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1} - (1 + \sigma)by^q - \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2}] \\ &= \delta u^{-\delta} [\beta\eta_1 u^{\kappa_1} x^{\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1} - (1 + \sigma)by^q - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1)}] \\ &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [\beta\eta_1 z_*^{\kappa_1} x^{\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1} - (1 + \sigma)bx^{\beta q / (1 + \rho_1)} - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1)}] \end{aligned}$$

In view of (3.39) and (3.40), there are constants $\varepsilon_0, \sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that for all $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$, $0 < x < \varepsilon_0$ and $0 < z_* \leq u \leq y^{-\rho_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} x^{\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1} [\beta\eta_1 z_*^{\kappa_1} - (1 + \sigma)bx^{\frac{\beta q}{(1 + \rho_1)} - (\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1)} - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) - (\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1)}] \\ &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} x^{\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1} [\beta\eta_1 z_*^{\kappa_1} - (1 + \sigma)b\varepsilon_0^{\frac{\beta q}{(1 + \rho_1)} - (\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1)} - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2 - 1} \varepsilon_0^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) - (\theta_1 - 1 + \beta\kappa_1)}] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.38), $\tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) > 0$ for some constant $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ when $0 < x, y < \varepsilon_1$, $0 < \sigma \leq \sigma_0$ and $u > y^{-\rho_1}$,

(iv) Suppose that condition (iid) holds. Taking $b/\eta_1 < \beta < \kappa_2/(\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2)$, we have $\beta\eta_1 > b$ and $\beta\kappa_1 < \kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1)$. It follows that there is a constant $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ so that $\beta\eta_1 - (1 + \sigma)b > 0$ for all $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$. Moreover, there are constants $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $z_* > 0$ so that for all $0 < \sigma < \sigma_0$, $0 < x < \varepsilon_0$ and $u \geq z_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} [u^{\kappa_1} [\beta\eta_1 - (1 + \sigma)b]x^{\beta\kappa_1} - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1)}] \\ &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} x^{\beta\kappa_1} [u^{\kappa_1} [\beta\eta_1 - (1 + \sigma)b] - \eta_2 u^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) - \beta\kappa_1}] \\ &\geq \delta u^{-\delta} x^{\beta\kappa_1} [z_*^{\kappa_1} [\beta\eta_1 - (1 + \sigma)b] - \eta_2 z_*^{\theta_2 - 1} \varepsilon_0^{\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) - \beta\kappa_1}] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2(ii). We use Proposition 2.5 to prove the assertion. In the following we verify the condition (2.4). Let

$$H(x, y) := \delta x^{\beta\delta} y^{-\delta} H_1(x, y) + \rho y^\rho H_2(x, y)$$

with

$$H_1(x, y) := a_1 \beta x^{\rho_1} + \beta(1 - \beta\delta)a_2 x^{\rho_2} + \frac{\beta(1 - \beta\delta)\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \beta\delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(2 - \beta\delta)} a_3 x^{\rho_3}$$

$$-b_1y^{q_1} - (\delta + 1)b_2y^{q_2} - \frac{\delta(\delta + 1)\Gamma(\alpha_2 + \delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(2 + \delta)}b_3y^{q_3} + \beta\delta\eta_1x^{\theta_1-1}y^{\kappa_1} - \delta\eta_2y^{\theta_2-1}x^{\kappa_2}$$

and

$$H_2(x, y) := b_1y^{q_1} + (1 - \rho)y^{q_2} + \frac{(1 - \rho)\Gamma(\alpha_2 - \rho)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(2 - \rho)}b_3y^{q_3} + \eta_2y^{\theta_2-1}x^{\kappa_2}.$$

Let $\tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y)$ be determined in Lemma 3.11. By Lemma 3.11, there are constants $\beta, \rho, \delta, \sigma, \varepsilon_0, u_* > 0$ so that

$$H(x, y) \geq \tilde{H}_\sigma(x, y) \geq 0, \quad 0 < x, y \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad yx^{-\beta} \geq u_*.$$

By (3.3) and Lemma 3.10, $\mathcal{L}g(x, y) \leq -H(x, y)$ for all $0 < x, y \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $x^{-\beta}y \geq u_*$, which gives condition (2.4). The condition (2.5) is obvious and the condition (iii) in Proposition 2.5 holds by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.8. Let $u_0 > u_*$ and $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ small enough so that $g(X_0, Y_0) < u_*^{-\delta}$ for $X_0 = \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}$ and $Y_0 = u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}$ with $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$. Now by Proposition 2.5, $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} < 1$ for $X_0 = \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}, Y_0 = u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$.

By the comparison theorem (Proposition 3.4) and Proposition 2.5, $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty\} > 0$ for $X_0 \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}$ and $Y_0 \geq u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}$. For general $X_0, Y_0 > 0$ let $D := \{(x, y) : x \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}, y \geq u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}\}$ and $\tau_D := \inf\{t \geq 0 : (X_t, Y_t) \in D\}$. It follows from Proposition 3.5 that $\mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\} > 0$. Applying the strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty\} &\geq \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) \circ \hat{\theta}(\tau_D) = \infty, \tau_D < \infty\} \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_0^-(Y) \circ \hat{\theta}(\tau_D) = \infty\}} 1_{\{\tau_D < \infty\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_D}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty \mid X_0 \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}, Y_0 \geq u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}\} 1_{\{\tau_D < \infty\}}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty \mid X_0 \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta^{-1}}, Y_0 \geq u_0\varepsilon^{\beta+1}\} \cdot \mathbf{P}\{\tau_D < \infty\} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\theta}(t)$ denotes the usual shift operator. This ends the proof. \square

3.4 Proof of Theorem 1.2(iii)

In this section we use Corollary 2.3 to prove the assertion. For $0 < r < 1$ and $\beta, \lambda > 0$ let $g(x) := e^{-\lambda x^r}$ and $g(x, y) := g(yx^{-\beta})$ for $x, y > 0$.

Lemma 3.12 *For $x, y > 0$ let $u := yx^{-\beta}$. Then*

$$g'_x(x, y) = \lambda r \beta u^r g(u) x^{-1}, \quad g'_y(x, y) = -\lambda r u^r g(u) y^{-1} \quad (3.41)$$

and

$$g''_{xx}(x, y) \geq -\lambda r \beta (r\beta + 1) u^r g(u) x^{-2}, \quad g''_{yy}(x, y) \geq \lambda r (1 - r) u^r g(u) y^{-2}. \quad (3.42)$$

Moreover,

$$\int_0^\infty K_z^1 g(x, y) \mu_1(dz) \geq -\lambda r u^r x^{-\alpha_1} \frac{\beta(r\beta + 1)\Gamma(\alpha_1 + r\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(2 + r\beta)}$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty K_z^2 g(x, y) \mu_2(dz) \geq \lambda r u^r y^{-\alpha_2} \frac{r(1 - r)\Gamma(\alpha_2 - r)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(2 - r)}.$$

Proof. It is elementary to see that

$$g'_x(x, y) = \lambda r \beta u^r g(u) x^{-1}, \quad g''_{xx}(x, y) = \lambda^2 r^2 \beta^2 u^{2r} g(u) x^{-2} - \lambda r \beta (r \beta + 1) u^r g(u) x^{-2}$$

and

$$g'_y(x, y) = -\lambda r u^r g(u) y^{-1}, \quad g''_{yy}(x, y) = \lambda^2 r^2 u^{2r} g(u) y^{-2} + \lambda r (1 - r) u^r g(u) y^{-2},$$

which give (3.41) and (3.42). Since $e^x - 1 \geq x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} K_z^1 g(x, y) &= g(u) [e^{-\lambda y^r (x+z)^{-r\beta} + \lambda y^r x^{-r\beta}} - 1 - \lambda r \beta u^r x^{-1} z] \\ &\geq -g(u) [\lambda y^r (x+z)^{-r\beta} - \lambda y^r x^{-r\beta} + \lambda r \beta u^r x^{-1} z] \\ &= -\lambda u^r g(u) [(1 + x^{-1} z)^{-r\beta} - 1 + r \beta x^{-1} z]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.2 and a change of variable that

$$\begin{aligned} [\lambda u^r g(u)]^{-1} \int_0^\infty K_z^1 g(x, y) \mu_1(dz) &\geq - \int_0^\infty [(1 + x^{-1} z)^{-r\beta} - 1 + r \beta x^{-1} z] \mu_1(dz) \\ &\geq -x^{-\alpha_1} \int_0^\infty [(1 + z)^{-r\beta} - 1 + r \beta z] \mu_1(dz) = -x^{-\alpha_1} \frac{r \beta (r \beta + 1) \Gamma(\alpha_1 + r \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \Gamma(2 + r \beta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} K_z^2 g(x, y) &= g(u) [e^{-\lambda (y+z)^r x^{-r\beta} + \lambda y^r x^{-r\beta}} - 1 + \lambda r u^r y^{-1} z] \\ &\geq -g(u) [\lambda (y+z)^r x^{-r\beta} - \lambda y^r x^{-r\beta} - \lambda r u^r y^{-1} z] \\ &= -\lambda u^r g(u) [(1 + y^{-1} z)^r - 1 - r y^{-1} z], \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} [\lambda u^r g(u)]^{-1} \int_0^\infty K_z^2 g(x, y) \mu_2(dz) \\ \geq -y^{-\alpha_2} \int_0^\infty [(1 + z)^r - 1 - r z] \mu_2(dz) = y^{-\alpha_2} \frac{r(1-r) \Gamma(\alpha_2 - r)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2) \Gamma(2 - r)}. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof. \square

Lemma 3.13 *Suppose that condition (iii) holds. Then there are constants $r, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\beta > 0$ and $c_0 > 0$ so that*

$$H(x, y) \geq c_0, \quad 0 < x, y < \varepsilon, \quad (3.43)$$

where $u := x^{-\beta} y$ and

$$H(x, y) := b(r) u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} - a(r) \beta u^r x^p - \eta_1 \beta u^r x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1}$$

with

$$a(r) := a_1 1_{\{p_1=p\}} + a_2 (r \beta + 1) 1_{\{p_2=p\}} + a_3 \frac{(r \beta + 1) \Gamma(\alpha_1 + r \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \Gamma(2 + r \beta)} 1_{\{p_3=p\}}$$

and

$$b(r) := b_1 1_{\{q_1=q\}} + b_2 (1 - r) 1_{\{q_2=q\}} + b_3 \frac{(1 - r) \Gamma(\alpha_2 - r)}{\Gamma(\alpha_2) \Gamma(2 - r)} 1_{\{q_3=q\}}.$$

Proof. Let $0 < r < 1 - \theta_2$ and

$$\delta_1 := \frac{1 - \theta_2 - r}{q + 1 - \theta_2}, \quad \delta_2 := \frac{1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}, \quad \delta_3 := \frac{\kappa_1 + 1 - \theta_2}{q + 1 - \theta_2}, \quad c_i(r) := \delta_i^{-\delta_i} (1 - \delta_i)^{\delta_i - 1} b(r)^{\delta_i} \eta_2^{1 - \delta_i}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $q > \kappa_1$. By Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} b(r)u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} &\geq \delta_1^{-\delta_1} (1 - \delta_1)^{\delta_1 - 1} [b(r)u^r y^q]^{\delta_1} \cdot [\eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2}]^{1 - \delta_1} \\ &= c_1(r) x^{\frac{\kappa_2(r+q)}{q+1-\theta_2} - r\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b(r)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} &\geq \delta_2^{-\delta_2} (1 - \delta_2)^{\delta_2 - 1} [b(r)y^q]^{\delta_2} \cdot [\eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2}]^{1 - \delta_2} \\ &= c_2(r) x^{\frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Similarly, for $q > \kappa_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} b(r)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} &\geq \delta_3^{-\delta_3} (1 - \delta_3)^{\delta_3 - 1} [b(r)y^q]^{\delta_3} \cdot [\eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2}]^{1 - \delta_3} \\ &= c_3(r) u^{\kappa_1} x^{\frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2} + \beta\kappa_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

In the following we assume that condition (iia) holds. Since $a, b > 0$, there is a constant $r_1 \in (0, 1 - \theta_2)$ so that $\inf_{r \in (0, r_1)} [a(r) \vee b(r)] > 0$. Let $r_2 \in (0, r_1)$ and $\beta > \kappa_2 / (q + 1 - \theta_2)$ satisfy

$$\frac{\kappa_2(r_2 + q)}{q + 1 - \theta_2} - r_2\beta < 0. \quad (3.47)$$

Under condition (iia), there is a constant $\varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$ so that $c_2(r_2)[\beta a(r_2)]^{-1} \varepsilon_2^{\frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2} - p} \geq 3$ and $c_3(r_2)(\eta_1 \beta)^{-1} \varepsilon_2^{\frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2} - (\theta_1 - 1)} \geq 3$. It thus follows from (3.45) and (3.46) that

$$\begin{aligned} b(r_2)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} &\geq \beta a(r_2) x^p \cdot c_2(r_2) [\beta a(r_2)]^{-1} x^{\frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2} - p} \\ &\geq \beta a(r_2) x^p \cdot c_2(r_2) [\beta a(r_2)]^{-1} \varepsilon_2^{\frac{\kappa_2 q}{q+1-\theta_2} - p} \geq 3\beta a(r_2) x^p \end{aligned} \quad (3.48)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b(r_2)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} &\geq c_3(r_2) u^{\kappa_1} x^{\frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2} + \beta\kappa_1} \geq \eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1} \cdot c_3(r_2) [\eta_1 \beta]^{-1} x^{\frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2} - (\theta_1 - 1)} \\ &\geq \eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1} \cdot c_3(r_2) [\eta_1 \beta]^{-1} \varepsilon_2^{\frac{\kappa_2(q-\kappa_1)}{q+1-\theta_2} - (\theta_1 - 1)} \geq 3\eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon_3 < \varepsilon_2$ and all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_3$ and $0 < x < \varepsilon$ when $q > \kappa_1$. When $q < \kappa_1$,

$$b(r_2)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} \geq b(r_2)y^q \geq 3\eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1}, \quad 0 < y < \varepsilon$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon_4 < \varepsilon_3$ and all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_4$. When $q = \kappa_1$ and $\theta_1 > 1$,

$$b(r_2)y^q + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2} \geq b(r_2)y^q \geq 3\eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1 - 1} y^{\kappa_1}, \quad 0 < x < \varepsilon$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon_5 < \varepsilon_4$ and all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_5$. Thus (3.49) holds for all $0 < x, y < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_5$. Now by (3.44) and (3.47)–(3.48), for $r = r_2$, we obtain

$$H(x, y) = 3^{-1} [b(r)u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2 - 1} x^{\kappa_2}] - a(r)\beta u^r x^p$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +3^{-1}[b(r)u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] - \eta_1 \beta u^r x^{\theta_1-1} y^{\kappa_1} \\
& +3^{-1}[b(r)u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \geq 3^{-1}c_1(r), \quad 0 < x, y < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_5.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives (3.43).

Suppose that condition (iiib) holds. Let $\kappa_2/(1-\theta_2) < \beta < b/a$. Then $\kappa_2 + \beta(\theta_2 - 1) < 0$ and $b > a\beta$. Thus $b + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} > a\beta$. Moreover, for $0 < r < 1 - \theta_2$, $u^r [b + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] > a\beta$ when $u \geq 1$ and

$$u^r [b + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \geq \eta_2 u^{r+\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2+\beta(\theta_2-1)} \geq \eta_2, \quad 0 < x < 1$$

when $0 < u < 1$. It follows that

$$u^r [b + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \geq (a\beta) \wedge \eta_2, \quad u > 0, \quad 0 < x < 1.$$

By the continuities of $r \mapsto a(r)$ and $r \mapsto b(r)$, there are constants $r_3 \in (0, 1 - \theta_2)$, $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $d_1 > 0$ so that for all $0 < r < r_3$ and $0 < x, y < \varepsilon$, we have

$$(1 - 2\varepsilon_1)[b(r) + \eta_2 y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] > a(r)\beta, \quad \eta_1 \beta x^{\theta_1-1} y^{\kappa_1} \leq \eta_1 \beta \varepsilon^{\kappa_1} \leq b(r)\varepsilon_1$$

and

$$b(r)u^r + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2} \geq d_1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
H(x, y) &= (1 - 2\varepsilon_1)[b(r)u^r + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] - a(r)\beta u^r \\
&+ \varepsilon_1 [b(r)u^r + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] - \eta_1 \beta u^r x^{\theta_1-1} y^{\kappa_1} \\
&+ \varepsilon_1 [b(r)u^r y^q + \eta_2 u^r y^{\theta_2-1} x^{\kappa_2}] \geq \varepsilon_1 d_1, \quad 0 < x, y < \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.43). □

Proof of Theorem 1.2(iii). We first assume that $0 < X_0, Y_0 \leq \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon$. It follows from (3.3) and Lemmas 3.12–3.13 that

$$\mathcal{L}g(x_t, y_t) \geq c_0 g(x_t, y_t), \quad t < \tau_\varepsilon^+$$

for some constants $c_0 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Combining this with Lemma 3.3(i) and Corollary 2.3, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(X) \wedge \tau_0^-(Y) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(X) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} \geq e^{-\lambda(Y_0 X_0^{-\beta})^r}.$$

By Lemma 3.8, $\tau_0^-(X) = \infty$ almost surely. Then letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(X) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} = 1. \quad (3.50)$$

By Lemma 3.3(ii) we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(X) < \infty\} = \mathbf{P}\left\{\sup_{t \geq 0} X_t \geq \varepsilon\right\} \leq C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} \leq C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, which gives

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(X) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(X) < \infty\} + \mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} \leq 2C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4}.$$

Since

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) < \infty\} \geq \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(X) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\} - \mathbf{P}\{\tau_\varepsilon^+(X) \wedge \tau_\varepsilon^+(Y) < \infty\},$$

then by (3.50),

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty\} \leq 2C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4}. \quad (3.51)$$

In the following we assume that $X_0 > \varepsilon_1$ or $Y_0 > \varepsilon_1$, and $\sigma := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t + Y_t \geq \varepsilon_1\}$. By using Lemma 3.3(i) and the strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty\} &= \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty, \sigma < \infty\} = \mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) \circ \hat{\theta}(\sigma) = \infty, \sigma < \infty\} \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[1_{\{\tau_0^-(Y) \circ \hat{\theta}(\sigma) = \infty\}} 1_{\{\sigma < \infty\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty \mid X_0 + Y_0 \leq \varepsilon_1\} 1_{\{\sigma < \infty\}}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\theta}(t)$ denotes the usual shift operator. Now using (3.51),

$$\mathbf{P}\{\tau_0^-(Y) = \infty\} \leq 2C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4} \mathbf{P}\{\sigma < \infty\} \leq 2C(\varepsilon_1/\varepsilon)^{1/4}.$$

It means that (3.51) holds for all $X_0, Y_0 > 0$. Taking $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$ in (3.51) one concludes the assertion. \square

References

- [1] Bai, L. and Yang, X. (2024): Boundary behaviors for a continuous-state nonlinear Neveu's branching process. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, **40**, 2005–2016.
- [2] Chen, M. (1986a): Couplings of jump processes. *Acta Math. Sinica, New Series*. **2**, 121–136.
- [3] Chen, M. (1986b): *Jump Processes and Interacting Particle Systems* (in Chinese). Beijing Normal Univ. Press.
- [4] Chen, M.: *From Markov Chains to Non-Equilibrium Particle Systems*. Second ed., World Scientific, 2004
- [5] Grey, D. R. (1974). Asymptotic behaviour of continuous time, continuous state-space branching processes. *J. Appl. Probab.* **11**, 669-677.
- [6] Kyprianou, A. E. (2014): *Fluctuations of Lévy Processes with Applications*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [7] Li, B. and Zhou, X. (2021): On the explosion of a class of continuous-state nonlinear branching processes. *Electron. J. Probab.* **26**, no. 148, 1-25.
- [8] Li, J., Tang, Y. and Zhou, X. (2022): Extinguishing behaviors for continuous-state nonlinear branching processes. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **514**, 126326.
- [9] Li, P.-S. (2019): A continuous-state polynomial branching process. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **129**, 2941-2967.

- [10] Li, P.-S., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2019): A general continuous-state nonlinear branching process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **29**, 2523-2555.
- [11] Li, Z. (2020): *Continuous-state branching processes with immigration*. A Chapter in: From Probability to Finance, pp.1-69, edited by Y. Jiao. Mathematical Lectures from Peking University. Springer, Singapore.
- [12] Ma, R. and Zhou, X. (2024): Explosion of continuous-state branching processes with competition in Lévy environment. *J. Appl. Probab.* **61**, (2024), 68-81.
- [13] Ma, S., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2021): Boundary behaviors for a class of continuous-state nonlinear branching processes in critical cases. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **26**(6), 1–10.
- [14] Meyn, S. P. and Tweedie, R. L. (1993): Stability of Markovian processes. III. Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **25**, 518-548.
- [15] Protter, P. E. (2005): *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*. Second ed., Springer, Berlin.
- [16] Ren, Y., Xiong, J., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2022): On the extinction-extinguishing dichotomy for a stochastic Lotka-Volterra type population dynamical system. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **150**, 50-90.
- [17] Xiong, J. and Yang, X. (2019): Existence and pathwise uniqueness to an SPDE driven by α -stable colored noise. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **129**, 2681-2722.