

**EXACT ASYMPTOTICS FOR THE PROBABILITY OF  
EXIT FROM A DOMAIN AND APPLICATIONS TO  
SIMULATION**

By

**Paolo Baldi**

**IMA Preprint Series # 1222**

March 1994

# Exact asymptotics for the probability of exit from a domain and applications to simulation

Paolo Baldi  
*II Università di Roma*

*Abstract* We study the asymptotics of the exit probability  $P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\}$  where  $\tau$  is the exit time from an open set and  $P_{x,s}^\varepsilon$  is the law of a Diffusion Process with a small parameter  $\varepsilon$  multiplying the diffusion coefficient. We consider the case of the Brownian bridge in many dimensions, this choice being motivated by applications to numerical simulation. The method uses recent results reducing the problem to the solution of a system of linear first order PDE's.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open set and let us consider the Diffusion Process  $X^\varepsilon$  which is associated to the SDS

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} dX_t^\varepsilon &= b(X_t^\varepsilon, t) dt + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sigma(X_t^\varepsilon, t) dB_t \\ X_s^\varepsilon &= x \in D \end{aligned}$$

and let  $\tau$  denote the exit time of  $X^\varepsilon$  from  $D$ . In this paper we are concerned with the problem of finding the exact asymptotics of

$$(1.2) \quad P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\}$$

where  $T > 0$  and  $P_{x,s}^\varepsilon$  is the law of  $X^\varepsilon$ . Of course this quantity tends to 1 if the solution of the deterministic ODE

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_t &= b(x_t, t) \\ x_s &= x \end{aligned}$$

exits from  $D$  before ( $<$ ) time  $T$ . In any case the Ventsel-Freidlin theory of Large Deviations states that

$$(1.3) \quad \log P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\} \sim \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} u(x, s)$$

---

Dipartimento di Matematica, II Università di Roma, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133 Roma (Italy).  
Phone: 39 6 72594634; fax:72594699; e-mail:baldi@mat.utovrm.it

where the function  $u$  is defined in the following way: define the action functional  $I$  on the set of all continuous paths  $\gamma$  by

$$(1.4) \quad I_s(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^T \langle a(\gamma_t, t)^{-1}(\dot{\gamma}_t - b(\gamma_t, t)), \dot{\gamma}_t - b(\gamma_t, t) \rangle dt$$

if  $\gamma$  is absolutely continuous and  $I_s(\gamma) = +\infty$  otherwise (here  $a = \sigma\sigma^*$ ). Then  $u(x, s)$  is the infimum of  $I_s$  taken on the set of all paths starting at  $x$  at time  $s$  and such that  $\gamma(t) \in D^C$  for some  $t \leq T$ .

The Theory of Large Deviations, more precisely, states that if the path  $\gamma$  which minimizes the action functional  $I_s$  is unique, then the asymptotics of the quantity in (1.2) is the same as

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbb{P}_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{ \tau \leq T, X^\varepsilon \in B_\delta(\gamma) \}$$

where by  $B_\delta(\gamma)$  we denote the neighborhood (a *tube*) of radius  $\delta$  of  $\gamma$ . This suggests that the requested asymptotics should depend only on the behavior (curvature?) of the boundary near the point  $\phi$  at which the minimizer  $\gamma$  reaches  $\partial D$ .

The goal of this paper is to give an exact equivalent for  $\mathbb{P}_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{ \tau \leq T \}$  i.e. to remove the log in (1.3). More precisely we deal with the situation in which  $X^\varepsilon$  is a Brownian bridge in many dimensions with a small parameter multiplying the diffusion coefficient.

The interest for this particular situation, besides the natural question of determining how the boundary near the exit point affects the asymptotics, is motivated by the following application. Let  $W$  be a  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion, and  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a function on the open set  $D$ . Suppose we want to evaluate numerically the quantity

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbb{E}^x \left[ \int_0^\tau f(W_s) ds \right]$$

Such quantities appear naturally in the stochastic representation of the solutions of second order linear PDE's. One way to do that is to fix a step  $\varepsilon$  and to simulate the subsequent positions of a path  $W_0 = x, W_\varepsilon, W_{2\varepsilon}, \dots, W_{n\varepsilon}, \dots$ . If  $N$  is the first index such that  $W_{N\varepsilon} \notin D$ , one then approximates the functional

$$I(W) = \int_0^\tau f(W_s) ds$$

with the sum

$$I_\varepsilon(W) = \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} f(W_{k\varepsilon})$$

Then averaging over many independently simulated paths the functional  $I_\varepsilon$  one has the desired approximation of the expectation in (1.6).

The drawback in this procedure is that one implicitly assumes that  $N\varepsilon$  is a good approximation of the exit time  $\tau$ . Indeed this is not the case, since, if  $k < N$ , we know that  $W_{(k-1)\varepsilon}$  and  $W_{k\varepsilon}$  are still in  $D$ , but there is a strictly positive probability that the path has

performed an excursion out of  $D$  in the time interval  $[(k-1)\varepsilon, k\varepsilon]$ . If  $f$  is nonnegative this means that in the above described procedure  $I_\varepsilon$  systematically over-estimates the functional  $I$ .

One way to handle the problem is as follows: at each step,  $k$  say, first simulate  $W_{(k+1)\varepsilon}$ . If  $W_{(k+1)\varepsilon} \in D$  then compute the probability  $p$  that the process has gone out of  $D$  in the time interval  $[k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$ , given the positions  $W_{k\varepsilon}$  and  $W_{(k+1)\varepsilon}$ , and with probability  $p$  kill the process and choose  $(k+1)\varepsilon$  as an approximation of the exit time  $\tau$ , and with probability  $1-p$  continue the simulation of the path. The law of a Brownian motion on a given time interval  $[k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$  conditioned to its positions  $W_{k\varepsilon} = x$  and  $W_{(k+1)\varepsilon} = y$  is, up to a traslation in the time scale, a Brownian bridge conditioned to be in  $y$  at time  $\varepsilon$  and starting at  $x$ . Thus the killing probability  $p$  is the exit probability from  $D$  of such a process.

Unfortunately this is not an easy quantity to compute, so that we suggest to replace it with *its asymptotics as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$* . In the last section we produce results of simulations showing that the over-estimation above can actually produce inaccurate results, which can be considerably improved by the suggested correction with an acceptable price in terms of CPU time.

Of course it might be important to obtain the exact asymptotics also for other conditioned processes, in order to apply the above described technique to processes other than the Brownian motion. We think that the argument developed here, and which rely on recent results of W.H.Fleming and M.R.James, might be able to handle more general Diffusion Processes, but we do not know whether the results would be explicit enough to be effectively implemented in a computer program. Possibly these more general situations should be handled by approximating the conditioned diffusion with the bridge arising from the conditionment of the diffusion obtained by freezing its drift and diffusion coefficients, a situation that should be reduced to the Brownian bridge.

The above described procedure might be useful in other problems in numerical simulation. In particular it should improve existing techniques of simulation of Diffusion Processes with reflection, or other conditions, at the boundary.

The table of contents is as follows: in §2 we recall a result of W.H.Fleming and M.R.James, which, under suitable assumptions reduces the computation of the requested asymptotics to the solution of a linear partial differential problem of the first order. In §3 we study the geometry of the characteristics of this system for the (multidimensional) Brownian bridge and show that the results of Fleming and James are applicable in this situation. The asymptotics is computed in §4 (Theorem 4.4) and its dependence on the geometry of  $\partial D$  is made explicit; also some examples are given. In §5 the geometric meaning of the asymptotics is discussed whereas §6 contains the results of the simulations and some related questions.

The author wishes to thank G.Ben Arous and F.Marchetti for valuable suggestions.

## 2. A general result

Let  $X^\varepsilon$  be the solution of (1.1). We shall assume  $\sigma \equiv I$  (the identity matrix) and that the vector field  $b : D \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $x$  uniformly in  $t$ .

In this section we recall a result giving the asymptotics for the exit probability (1.2)

under suitable assumptions. Let us define the function  $u : D \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$u(x, s) = \inf I_s(\gamma)$$

where  $I_s$  is as in (1.4), the infimum being taken on the set of all continuous paths starting at  $x$  at time  $s$  and such that  $\gamma(t) \in D^C$  for some  $t \leq T$ . It can be shown that  $u$  solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + b Du - \frac{1}{2}|Du|^2 &= 0 && \text{in } D \times ]0, T[ \\ u(x, s) &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D \times [0, T] \\ u(x, s) &\rightarrow +\infty && \text{as } t \nearrow T, x \in D \end{aligned}$$

The above described equation should be considered in the sense of viscosity solutions (Fleming and Souganidis [1986]), and is intended in the classical sense at each point at which  $u$  is differentiable.

The next result, due to Fleming and James [1992], gives an expansion for the exit probability (1.2), at least for  $(x, s)$  in a set  $N \subset D \times [0, T]$  satisfying the following assumptions.

**Assumption (A)** a)  $N \subset D \times [0, T']$ ,  $T' < T$  and  $N$  is a relatively open subset.

b)  $u \in C^\infty(\overline{N})$ .

c) Let us denote

$$\beta(x, s) = b(x, s) - Du(x, s) \quad (x, s) \in \overline{N}$$

Let  $\gamma_{x,s}$  be the solution of

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}_{x,s}(t) &= \beta(t, \gamma_{x,s}(t)) \\ \gamma_{x,s}(s) &= x \end{aligned}$$

and  $z_{x,s}$  the first point at which  $\gamma_{x,s}$  first reaches  $\partial N$ . If

$$\Gamma_1 = \{z_{x,s}, (x, s) \in N\}$$

then  $\Gamma_1 \subset \partial D$ . Moreover  $\Gamma_1$  is a  $C^\infty$  manifold which is relatively open in  $\partial N$  and  $\gamma_{x,s}$  crosses  $\partial N$  non tangentially.

One has then (Fleming and James [1992])

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $N \subset D \times [0, T[$  be such that Assumption (A) is satisfied. Then for  $(x, s) \in N$  the following expansion holds*

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\} = e^{-u(x,s)/\varepsilon} e^{-w(x,s)} \left( 1 + \psi_1(x, s)\varepsilon + \dots + \psi_m(x, s)\varepsilon^m + o(\varepsilon^m) \right)$$

where  $w : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w}{\partial s} + (b - Du)Dw &= -\frac{1}{2}\Delta u && \text{in } N \\ w &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D \times [0, T[\cap \bar{N} \end{aligned}$$

whereas the coefficients  $\psi_i$  are defined by iteration by  $\psi_0 = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial s} + (b - Du)D\psi_k &= -\left[ \frac{1}{2}(|Dw|^2 - \Delta w)\psi_{k-1} - \langle Dw, D\psi_{k-1} \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\psi_{k-1} \right] && \text{in } N \\ \psi_k &= 0 && \text{on } \partial D \times [0, T[\cap \bar{N} \end{aligned}$$

**Remark** The original result in Fleming and James [1992] deals with a more general situation ( $b$  also depending on  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\sigma$  non constant...).

Assumption (A) also insures that the differential systems for  $w$  and  $\psi_k$  can actually be solved by characteristics (the characteristics of both systems are moreover the same and coincide with the characteristics of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.1)).

Thus the solution of the differential system of Theorem 2.1 is simple: one has to solve the ordinary equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}_t &= \beta(t, \gamma_t) \\ \gamma_s &= x \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta = b - Du$  and then

$$(2.3) \quad w(x, s) = \exp \left( \int_s^\tau \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(\gamma_t, t) dt \right)$$

$\tau$  being the time at which  $\gamma$  reaches  $\partial N$ .

**Remark 2.2** One might ask whether the expansion of Theorem 2.1 still holds if Assumption (A) is not satisfied. To make this point clear let us consider the example of the Brownian motion (i.e  $b \equiv 0$ ). The exact asymptotics for the exit time in this situation can be found in Baldi [1991] or in Bellaïche [1981,p.185] and it is of the form

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\} \sim c_1 \sqrt{\varepsilon} e^{-u(x,s)/\varepsilon}$$

for some constant  $c_1 > 0$  (at least for “most” points  $x \in D$ ). Thus the first term before the exponential is *of order*  $\frac{1}{2}$  in  $\varepsilon$  whereas in the asymptotics of Theorem 2.1 the first term is necessarily a constant, i.e. of order 0 in  $\varepsilon$ .

These two situations show another difference: as pointed out in Fleming-James [1992] under Assumption (A) the minimizing path joining a point  $(x, s) \in N$  to the boundary reaches  $\partial D$  at a time  $T' < T$ . In the case of the Brownian motion instead the boundary is always reached exactly at time  $T$ . It seems that for the asymptotics of the exit time two typical situations appear, following that the expansion begins with a term of order 1 or not, and it might be interesting to classify these two situations. The time at which the minimizers reach the boundary seems to make a difference.

A related result worth mentioning is given in Azencott [1980]. He deals with expansions of quantities of the type

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{X^\varepsilon \in \Gamma\}$$

$\Gamma$  being a set of paths, for which certain hypothesis of regularity of the boundary (as an infinite dimensional manifold) hold. In principle these results might be applicable to our situation with  $\Gamma = \{\text{set of paths which reach } D^C \text{ before time } T\}$ . Whereas in general it is difficult to check Azencott's assumptions, however they are certainly not satisfied in the range of application of Theorem 2.1 because also Azencott's expansion begins with a term of order  $\frac{1}{2}$  in  $\varepsilon$ .

### 3. The geometry of the Brownian bridge

In this section we make some remarks concerning the geometry of the minimizers of the action functional  $I_s$  for the Brownian bridge, which will allow to determine for which points  $(x, s)$  Theorem 2.1 can be applied. Most of this section consists on the usual remarks connecting the uniqueness of the minimizers and the regularity of the solution  $u$  of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation.

We shall consider the following family of Diffusion processes (Brownian bridge with a small parameter)

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} dX^\varepsilon(t) &= -\frac{X^\varepsilon(t) - y}{1-t} dt + \sqrt{\varepsilon} dB_t \\ X^\varepsilon(s) &= x \end{aligned}$$

where  $y$  is a fixed point in the open set  $D$ . If by  $\Gamma_{x,s}$  we denote the set of all absolutely continuous paths  $\gamma$  such that  $\gamma(s) = x$  and  $\gamma(t) \in D^C$  for some  $0 < t < 1$ , and we write

$$J_{s,t}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \left| \dot{\gamma}(r) + \frac{\gamma(r) - y}{1-r} \right|^2 dr$$

then

$$u(x, s) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,s}} I_{s,1}(\gamma)$$

**Lemma 3.1**

$$(3.2) \quad u(x, s) = \inf_{\phi \in \partial D} \inf_{0 < t < 1} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{|x - \phi|^2}{t - s} + \frac{|y - \phi|^2}{1 - t} - \frac{|x - y|^2}{1 - s} \right\}$$

**Proof.** If  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{x,s}$  let  $0 < t < 1$  and  $\phi \in \partial D$  be such that  $\gamma(t) = \phi$ . The infimum of  $J_{s,1}$  over such paths is a typical problem of Calculus of Variations with fixed endpoints. The Lagrange equation is

$$\ddot{\gamma}(r) = 0$$

meaning that the minimum is attained by the line segment joining  $x$  to  $\phi$  at uniform speed. In order to minimize  $J_{s,1}$   $\gamma$  will be chosen to be a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}(r) &= -\frac{\gamma(r) - y}{1 - r} \\ \gamma(t) &= \phi \end{aligned}$$

on the time interval  $[t, 1]$  (by the way this gives the line segment from  $\phi$  to  $y$  driven at uniform speed). On this path the functional  $J_{s,1}$  takes the value

$$J_{s,1}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \left| \frac{\phi - x}{t - s} + \frac{1}{1 - r} \left[ x - y + \frac{r - s}{t - s} (\phi - x) \right] \right|^2 dr$$

(the integrand vanishes on  $[t, 1]$ ). Integration gives the value

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - t} - \frac{1}{1 - s} \right\} \left| (\phi - x) \frac{1 - s}{t - s} + x - y \right|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{|x - \phi|^2}{t - s} + \frac{|y - \phi|^2}{1 - t} - \frac{|x - y|^2}{1 - s}$$

Of course the minimum of  $J_{s,1}$  over all paths starting at  $x$  at time  $s$  and reaching the boundary before time 1 is given by the minimum of this quantity in  $\phi \in \partial D$  and  $t, s \leq t \leq 1$ .

It is easy to compute the infimum in  $t$  in the left-hand side of (3.2) for fixed  $\phi$ . The minimum indeed is attained for

$$(3.3) \quad t = t(x, s) := s + (1 - s) \frac{|x - \phi|}{|x - \phi| + |y - \phi|}$$

which gives

$$(3.4) \quad u(x, s) = \inf_{\phi \in \partial D} \frac{1}{2(1 - s)} \left\{ (|x - \phi| + |y - \phi|)^2 - |x - y|^2 \right\}$$

**Remark 3.2**  $t(x, s)$  is the time at which the path  $\gamma_{x,s}$  which minimizes the action functional starting at  $x$  at time  $s$  reaches the boundary. It is important to remark that  $t(x, s)$  is constant along  $\gamma_{x,s}$ ; more precisely  $t(\gamma_{x,s}(r), r) = t(x, s)$  for every  $s \leq r \leq t(x, s)$ . It is also clear that  $t(x, s) < 1$  for every  $s < 1$ .

**Remark 3.3** The drift for the Brownian bridge is

$$b(x, t) = -\frac{x - y}{1 - t}$$

and has a singularity at  $t = 1$ . This is not a real difficulty in view to apply Theorem 2.1, where the drift is supposed to be Lipschitz continuous. Indeed as remarked in the introduction one has

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T\} \sim P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq T, X^\varepsilon \in B_\delta(\gamma)\} \sim P_{x,s}^\varepsilon\{\tau \leq \eta\}$$

where  $\eta$  is the supremum of the exit times from  $D$  of the paths in  $B_\delta(\gamma)$ . If  $\delta$  is chosen smaller than  $d(y, \partial D)/2$  then  $\eta$  is strictly smaller than 1 and only the behaviour of the process in the time interval  $[0, \eta]$  is relevant, where the drift coefficient is regular.

We shall note in the following

$$(3.5) \quad I(x, \phi) = \frac{1}{2}((|x - \phi| + |y - \phi|)^2 - |x - y|^2)$$

$$(3.6) \quad t_0 = t_0(x) = \frac{|x - \phi|}{|x - \phi| + |y - \phi|}$$

One should remark that the level sets of  $I$  are ellipsoids of revolution whose foci are located in  $x$  and  $y$ .

Also from (3.6) it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad |x - \phi(x)| = \frac{t_0}{1 - t_0} |y - \phi(x)|$$

If  $\tilde{D}$  is the set of all points  $x \in D$  such that the infimum in (3.4) is attained at only one point  $\phi \in \partial D$  then one can define a function  $\phi : \tilde{D} \rightarrow \partial D$  by

$$(3.8) \quad \phi(x) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\xi \in \partial D} I(x, \xi) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\xi \in \partial D} |x - \xi| + |y - \xi|$$

so that for  $x \in \tilde{D}$

$$(3.9) \quad u(x, s) = \frac{1}{(1 - s)} I(x, \phi(x))$$

Let  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function and let  $\phi_0 \in \partial D$  be a local minimum of  $\Psi$  on  $\partial D$ .  $\phi_0$  is said to be *non degenerate* if for some local system of coordinates  $G: \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \supset U \rightarrow \partial D$  the Hessian of  $\Psi \circ G$  is positive definite at  $G^{-1}(\phi_0)$ .

**Definition 3.4** A point  $x \in D$  is said to be regular if

- a) The line segment joining  $x$  to  $y$  is entirely contained in  $D$ .
- b) The minimum of  $\phi \rightarrow I(x, \phi)$  on  $\partial D$  is attained at a unique point  $\phi_0 = \phi(x)$ . Moreover  $\partial D$  is  $C^\infty$  in a neighborhood of  $\phi_0$  and  $\phi_0$  is a non degenerate minimum for  $\phi \rightarrow I(x, \phi)$ .

**Proposition 3.5** Let  $x \in D$  be a regular point. Then there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $x$  such that if  $p \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $p$  is a regular point. Moreover the mapping  $p \rightarrow \phi(p)$  is  $C^\infty$  on  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $u$  is  $C^\infty(\mathcal{U} \times [0, T])$ .

**Proof.** Because of (3.9) we only need to prove that there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $x$  such that if  $p \in \mathcal{U}$  then  $p$  is also a regular point and the mapping  $p \rightarrow \phi(p)$  is  $C^\infty(\mathcal{U})$ .

Let  $(U, G)$  be a local system of coordinates of  $\partial D$  near  $\phi_0 = \phi(x)$  and let us consider the function  $F : D \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $F(x, z) = I(x, G(z))$ . One has

$$D_z F(x, G^{-1}(\phi_0)) = 0$$

because  $G^{-1}(\phi_0)$  is a local minimum of  $z \rightarrow F(x, z)$ . Moreover the assumption of non degeneracy of the Hessian of  $z \rightarrow F(x, z)$  at  $z = G^{-1}(\phi_0)$  allows to apply the implicit functions theorem, obtaining that for  $p$  in a neighborhood  $U_1$  of  $x$  there exists a unique point  $z(p)$  in a neighborhood  $V_1$  of  $G^{-1}(\phi_0)$  such that

$$D_z F(p, z(p)) = 0$$

This means that  $z(p)$  is a critical point of  $z \rightarrow F(p, z)$ .

Now the assumption that  $\phi_0$  is the unique minimum of  $\phi \rightarrow I(x, \phi)$  allows easily to deduce that for any neighborhood  $W$  of  $\phi_0$  there exists a neighborhood  $U_2$  of  $x$  such that for every  $p \in U_2$  the minimum of  $\phi \rightarrow I(p, \phi)$  is attained in  $W$ .

Thus for  $p \in U_1 \cap U_2$  the minimum of  $z \rightarrow F(x, z) = I(x, G(z))$  is attained in  $V_1 \cap G^{-1}(W)$ . But in this set  $z(p)$  is the unique critical point of  $p \rightarrow F(p, z)$ , which is thus the minimum. The mapping  $p \rightarrow z(p)$  is  $C^\infty$  because of the implicit function theorem, and the same is true for  $p \rightarrow \phi(p) = G(z(p))$ .

In the next section we shall compute the asymptotics of the exit probability for the brownian bridge starting at a regular point. We see now that every  $x \in D$  “in general position” is regular.

Let  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  be two smooth hypersurfaces mutually tangent at a point  $\phi$  and let us denote by  $T_\phi$  the tangent hyperplane at the two surfaces at  $\phi$ . If  $w \in T_\phi$  let be  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  two paths on  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  respectively, such that

$$\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = \phi \quad \dot{\gamma}_1(0) = \dot{\gamma}_2(0) = w$$

Then

$$|\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| \leq \int_0^t |\dot{\gamma}_1(s) - \dot{\gamma}_2(s)| ds = O(t^2)$$

We say that at  $\phi$  there is a contact of order  $> 1$  between  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  if for some  $w \in T_\phi$  one has

$$|\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| = o(t^2)$$

as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

As we shall see in §5  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  have a contact of order  $> 1$  if and only if the Weingarten maps  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  at  $\phi$  of  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  respectively are such that  $L_1 - L_2$  is not invertible.

**Proposition 3.6** *Let  $\Psi$  be a smooth function whose gradient never vanishes on  $\partial D$  and let be  $\phi_0$  a local minimum of  $\Psi$  on  $\partial D$ . Then  $\phi_0$  is not a non degenerate minimum of  $\Psi$  on  $\partial D$  if and only if at  $\phi_0$  the two surfaces  $\partial D$  and  $\{\Psi = \Psi(\phi_0)\}$  have a contact of order  $> 1$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $(U, G)$  a local system of coordinates at  $\phi_0$ . If  $H = \text{Hess } \Psi(\phi_0)$  was not invertible there would be a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  such that

$$0 = \langle Hv, v \rangle = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2} \Psi \circ G(G^{-1}(\phi_0))$$

Let  $\frac{\partial G}{\partial v} \in T_{\phi_0}$  the corresponding tangent vector and let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  the paths on  $\partial D$  and  $\Psi = \Psi(\phi_0)$  respectively such that

$$\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = \phi_0 \quad \dot{\gamma}_1(0) = \dot{\gamma}_2(0) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial v}$$

Let us assume that there exists a neighborhood  $U_0$  of 0 such that  $\gamma_1(t) \neq \gamma_2(t)$  for  $t \in U_0$ ; otherwise there is nothing to prove. Then for some  $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) - \Psi(\gamma_2(t)) &= \langle \text{grad } \Psi(\gamma_1(t) + \tau(\gamma_2(t) - \gamma_1(t))), \gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t) \rangle = \\ &= \langle \text{grad } \Psi(\phi_0), \gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t) \rangle + o(t^2) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) - \Psi(\gamma_2(t)) \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dt} \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) \Big|_{t=0} = 0$$

since  $\phi_0$  is a minimum of  $\Psi$  on  $D$ . But also

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left( \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) - \Psi(\gamma_2(t)) \right) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) \Big|_{t=0} = \langle Hv, v \rangle = 0$$

so that  $\Psi(\gamma_1(t)) - \Psi(\gamma_2(t)) = o(t^2)$ . Putting this together with (3.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} o(t^2) &= \Psi(\gamma_1(t)) - \Psi(\gamma_2(t)) = |\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| \left\langle \text{grad } \Psi(\phi_0), \frac{\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)}{|\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)|} \right\rangle + o(t^2) = \\ &= |\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| \langle \text{grad } \Psi(\phi_0), n \rangle + o(t^2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $n$  denotes the normal at both surfaces at  $\phi_0$ . Since  $\text{grad } \Psi(\phi_0)$  doesn't vanish and points in the same direction of  $n$  this implies that  $|\gamma_1(t) - \gamma_2(t)| = o(t^2)$ .

**Remark 3.7** Because of (3.8)  $D_\phi I(x, \phi)$  is a vector which is orthogonal to  $\partial D$  at  $\phi = \phi(x)$ . If we denote by  $n(\phi)$  the *inner* normal to  $\partial D$  at  $\phi$ , computing the derivative  $D_\phi I(x, \phi)$  this implies

$$\frac{x - \phi}{|x - \phi|} + \frac{y - \phi}{|y - \phi|} = \lambda n(\phi)$$

for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is easy to see that

$$\lambda = 2 \left\langle \frac{y - \phi}{|y - \phi|}, n(\phi) \right\rangle$$

from which we derive

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{x - \phi}{|x - \phi|} = 2 \left\langle \frac{y - \phi}{|y - \phi|}, n(\phi) \right\rangle n(\phi) - \frac{y - \phi}{|y - \phi|}$$

In particular (3.11) implies that if  $x$  is a regular point and  $\gamma_{x,s}$  is the solution of (2.2), then  $\gamma_{x,s}$  reaches the boundary non tangentially. Indeed in the time interval  $[s, t(x, s)]$   $\gamma_{x,s}$  follows the line segment from  $x$  to  $\phi(x)$  at uniform speed. From (3.11) if  $\langle x - \phi, n(\phi) \rangle = 0$  then also  $\langle y - \phi, n(\phi) \rangle = 0$  and this implies that  $\phi$  lies on the line segment joining  $x$  to  $y$ , which is not possible since  $x$  is a regular point and the line segment joining  $x$  to  $y$  must lie entirely in  $D$ .

#### 4. The asymptotics for the Brownian bridge

In this section we compute the Laplacian of  $u$  at a point  $(x, s)$ , where  $x$  is assumed to be regular, and solve the differential system of Theorem 2.1 by computing  $w$  by (2.3).

We start with the first derivatives of  $u$  (we can assume  $s = 0$ ). From (3.9)

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(x, 0) = \frac{\partial I}{\partial x_i}(x, \phi(x)) + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial I}{\partial \phi_j}(x, \phi(x)) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i}(x)$$

But it is easy to recognise that in the previous formula the last term is equal to 0, because  $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i}(x)$  is a tangent vector to  $\partial D$  at  $\phi = \phi(x)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  whereas  $D_\phi I(x, \phi)$  is orthogonal to  $\partial D$ . Thus

$$(4.1) \quad Du(x, 0) = D_x I(x, \phi(x)) = \frac{x - \phi}{|x - \phi|} (|x - \phi| + |y - \phi|) - (x - y)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i^2}(x, 0) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[ -\phi_i + y_i + (x_i - \phi_i) \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \right] = -\frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i} + \left( 1 - \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i} \right) \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} + \\ &+ \frac{x_i - \phi_i}{|x - \phi|^2} \left[ -\frac{|x - \phi|}{|y - \phi|} \sum_{j=1}^n (y_j - \phi_j) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \sum_{j=1}^n (x_j - \phi_j) \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

In the calculus of the Laplacian we make use of the following Lemma 4.1 which implies that, after summation on  $i$ , the contribution of the term in the last line is equal to

$$-\frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|}$$

giving

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(x, s) = \frac{1}{2(1-s)} \left\{ - \left( 1 + \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i} + (n-1) \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \right\}$$

**Lemma 4.1** *If  $x$  is a regular point*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \phi_i) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i} = 0$$

for every  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Proof.** The solution of the problem

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial v}{\partial s} + (b - Du)Dv &= -h && \text{in } N \\ v &= v_0 && \text{on } \partial D \times [0, T] \cap \overline{N} \end{aligned}$$

is given by

$$(4.4) \quad v(x, s) = v_0(z_{x,s}) + \int_s^\tau h(\gamma_{x,s}(t), t) dt$$

where  $\gamma_{x,s}$  is the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\gamma}_t &= \beta(t, \gamma_t) \\ \gamma_s &= x \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta = b - Du$ ,  $\tau$  is the first time  $t$  for which  $\gamma_{x,s}(t) \in \partial N$  and  $z_{x,s} = \gamma_{x,s}(\tau)$ . But, for every  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\phi_j(x)$  is of the form (4.4) for  $h \equiv 0$ ,  $v_0(x) = x_j$ . This can be seen either by remarking that  $\gamma_{x,s}$  is also the system of characteristics of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.1), or directly by computing

$$b(x, s) - Du(x, s) = -\frac{x - \phi}{1 - s} \left( \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} + 1 \right)$$

which allows to check easily that

$$\gamma_{x,s}(r) = x + \frac{r - s}{t(x, s) - s} (\phi - x)$$

is a solution and that it reaches  $\partial D$  at  $\phi$  at time  $r = t(x, s)$ . Thus  $\phi_j(x)$  is a solution of (4.3) for this choice of  $h$  and  $v_0$ . In particular it must hold

$$0 = (b(x, s) - Du(x, s))D\phi(x) = \frac{1}{1-s} \frac{|x - \phi(x)| + |y - \phi(x)|}{|x - \phi(x)|} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \phi_i) \frac{\partial \phi_j}{\partial x_i}$$

In order to conclude the computation of  $\Delta u$  we want to obtain an expression for the quantity

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i}$$

This will be done by the implicit functions theorem, as hinted in the proof of Proposition 3.6. The fact that  $x$  is regular justifies all the derivatives we are going to do. We denote as before with  $(G, U)$  a local system of coordinates of  $\partial D$  at  $\phi(x)$ . Let  $z \in U$  be the point such that  $\phi(x) = G(z)$ . Thus  $z = z(x)$  is defined as

$$z = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in U} (|x - G(w)| + |y - G(w)|) := \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in U} F(x, w)$$

Since  $z(x)$  is in the interior of  $U$  it is necessary that all derivatives of  $H$  vanish at  $z(x)$ :

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_k}(x, z) := H_k(x, z) = - \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|} + \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle = 0$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, n-1$ . The relation (4.5) allows to state that the function  $x \rightarrow z(x)$  is defined implicitly by

$$H(x, z) = 0$$

where  $H(x, z) = (H_1(x, z), \dots, H_{n-1}(x, z))$ . The derivatives of  $z$  are thus given by the implicit function theorem

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial x} = - \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} &= \left( \frac{\partial z_k}{\partial x_i} \right)_{ki} \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} &= \left( \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial z_k} \right)_{jk} \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} &= \left( \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial x_i} \right)_{ji} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial G_i(z(x))}{\partial x_i} = - \operatorname{tr} \left\{ \frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \right\} = - \operatorname{tr} \left\{ \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \right\}$$

**Lemma 4.2** Let  $x$  be a point in  $\tilde{D}$  and let us define the matrices  $A = (a_{ij})_{ij}$  and  $B = (b_{ij})_{ij}$  by

$$a_{ij} = \frac{1}{|y - G(z)|} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle \right\}$$

$$b_{ij} = 2 \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, n \right\rangle \left\langle n, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{t_0} A - B$$

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \frac{\partial G}{\partial z} = -\frac{1 - t_0}{t_0} A$$

**Proof.** By a plain computation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial z_k} = & - \left\langle -\frac{\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}}{|x - G(z)|} + \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|^3} \left\langle x - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle + \right. \\ & \left. -\frac{\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}}{|y - G(z)|} + \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|^3} \left\langle y - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle + \\ & - \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|} + \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

and collecting the terms together

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial z_k} = & \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle \left\{ \frac{1}{|x - G(z)|} + \frac{1}{|y - G(z)|} \right\} + \\ & - \frac{1}{|x - G(z)|^3} \left\langle x - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle x - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle + \\ & - \frac{1}{|y - G(z)|^3} \left\langle y - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle y - G(z), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle + \\ & - \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Now we replace everywhere the quantity  $x - G(z)$  with a function of  $y - G(z)$  and  $t_0$ . More precisely we replace  $|x - \phi|$  with the left-hand side of (3.7) and

$$\frac{x - \phi}{|x - \phi|}$$

with the left-hand side of (3.11). Using the fact that for all  $k = 1, \dots, n-1$   $n$  is orthogonal to  $\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, n-1$  one gets finally

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_j}{\partial z_k} &= \frac{1}{t_0} \left\{ \frac{\left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle}{|y - G(z)|} - \frac{1}{|y - G(z)|} \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle \right\} + \\ &\quad - 2 \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, n \right\rangle \left\langle n, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{t_0} A - B \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial x_i} &= \\ \sum_{\ell} - \left\{ \frac{\delta_{i\ell}}{|x - G(z)|} - \frac{(x_{\ell} - G_{\ell}(z))(x_i - G_i(z))}{|x - G(z)|^3} \right\} \frac{\partial G_{\ell}}{\partial z_k} &= \\ = - \frac{1}{|x - G(z)|} \left\{ \frac{\partial G_i}{\partial z_k} - \frac{(x_i - G_i(z))}{|x - G(z)|} \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} \frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \right)_{jk} &= - \frac{1}{|x - G(z)|} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{x - G(z)}{|x - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle \right\} = \\ &= - \frac{1 - t_0}{t_0} \frac{1}{|y - G(z)|} \left\{ \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle - \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k} \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{y - G(z)}{|y - G(z)|}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle \right\} \\ &= - \frac{1 - t_0}{t_0} A \end{aligned}$$

Let  $x$  be a regular point and let  $q$  be a point in the line segment joining  $x$  to  $\phi(x)$ . It is easy to check that  $q$  is regular.

Indeed first it is easy to see that  $q \in \tilde{D}$  and that,  $\phi(q) = \phi(x)$ ; moreover the minimizing path of the action functional  $I_s$  starting at  $q$  is the polygonal formed by the line segments joining  $q$  to  $\phi(q) = \phi(x)$  and  $\phi(q)$  to  $y$ . This is a consequence of the fact that for the points in  $\tilde{D}$  the minimizer joining  $x$  to  $\partial D$  is unique. Moreover by Lemma 4.2 the Hessian of  $F(q, z)$  at  $z = G^{-1}(\phi(q)) = G^{-1}(\phi(x))$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{t_0(q)} A - B = \frac{1}{t_0(x)} A - B + \left( \frac{1}{t_0(q)} - \frac{1}{t_0(x)} \right) A = \text{Hess } F(x, G^{-1}(\phi(x))) + \left( \frac{1}{t_0(q)} - \frac{1}{t_0(x)} \right) A$$

Now  $A$  is a positive definite matrix and  $t_0(x) \geq t_0(q)$ , because of (3.5). This implies that also the Hessian of  $F(q, z)$  at  $z = G^{-1}(\phi(q))$  is positive definite, so that by Remark 3.7  $q$  is also regular.

If  $x$  is regular it is now easy to show a set  $N \subset D \times [0, T]$  containing  $x$  and satisfying Assumption (A): if  $\mathcal{U}$  is the neighborhood of  $x$  given by Proposition 3.5 and  $V \subset D$  is the set formed by the union of all line segments joining  $p$  to  $\phi(p)$  for  $p \in \mathcal{U}$ ; then one can choose  $N$  as the set of couples  $(x, s)$  for  $x \in V$  and for suitable values of  $s$ .

Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \phi_i}{\partial x_i} = \text{tr} [(A - t_0 B)^{-1} (1 - t_0) A]$$

and replacing into (4.2)

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta u = \frac{1}{2(1-s)} \left\{ - \left( 1 + \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \right) \text{tr} [(A - t_0 B)^{-1} (1 - t_0) A] + (n-1) \frac{|y - \phi|}{|x - \phi|} \right\}$$

so that by (3.7)

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta u = \frac{1}{2(1-s)} \left\{ - \frac{1}{t_0} \text{tr} [(A - t_0 B)^{-1} (1 - t_0) A] + (n-1) \frac{1-t_0}{t_0} \right\}$$

From (3.3) we have  $t_0(1-s) = (t(x, s) - s)$ , so that expressing  $t_0$  in terms of  $t$  and  $s$

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(x, s) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{(n-1)}{t-s} - \frac{(n-1)}{1-s} - \frac{1}{t-s} \text{tr} [((1-s)A - (t-s)B)^{-1} (1-t)A] \right]$$

From now on we shall write  $t$  instead of  $t(x, s)$ . It is convenient to simplify the expression above by remarking that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(n-1)}{t-s} - \frac{1}{t-s} \text{tr} [((1-s)A - (t-s)B)^{-1} (1-t)A] = \\ & = \frac{1}{t-s} \text{tr} [I - ((1-s)A - (t-s)B)^{-1} (1-t)A] = \\ & = \frac{1}{t-s} \text{tr} \left[ ((1-s)A - (t-s)B)^{-1} \{ (1-s)A - (t-s)B - (1-t)A \} \right] = \\ & = \text{tr} \left[ ((1-s)A - (t-s)B)^{-1} (A - B) \right] \\ & = \text{tr} \left[ ((1-s)I - (t-s)A^{-1}B)^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \right] \end{aligned}$$

so that finally

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(x, s) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ - \frac{(n-1)}{1-s} + \text{tr} \left( ((1-s)I - (t-s)A^{-1}B)^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \right) \right] = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ - \frac{(n-1)}{1-s} + \text{tr} \left( ((1-tA^{-1}B) - s(I - A^{-1}B))^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

We recall that our goal is to compute

$$e^{-w(x,s)} = \exp\left(-\int_s^t \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(\gamma_{x,s}(r), r) dr\right)$$

This is now easy since

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta u(\gamma_{x,s}(r), r) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ -\frac{(n-1)}{1-r} + \text{tr} \left( ((1-tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B))^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \right) \right]$$

(as remarked before  $t(\gamma_{x,s}(r), r) \equiv t(x, s)$  for  $s \leq r \leq t(x, s)$ ).

**Remark 4.3** The matrix  $\frac{1}{t_0}A - B$  is positive definite, being the Hessian of the function  $F(x, z) = |x - G(z)| + |y - G(z)|$  at  $z = G^{-1}(\phi(x))$ , since  $x$  is regular. But  $A$  is also positive definite so that for  $s \leq r \leq t$  the same is true for  $(1 - tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B)$  which can be written

$$(1-r)I - (t-r)A^{-1}B = (1-r)A^{-1}(A - t_0B)$$

This justifies the existence of the inverse of this matrix and the raising to the power  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the proof of the following theorem, which is our main result.

**Theorem 4.4** *Let  $x$  be a regular point (Definition 3.4) Then*

$$e^{-w(x,s)} = (1-s)^{(n-1)/2} \det \left( ((1-s)I - (t(x,s) - s)A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1/2}$$

so that for  $s = 0$

$$P_{x,0}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq T\} \sim e^{-u(x,0)/\varepsilon} \det(I - t_0A^{-1}B)^{-1/2}$$

**Proof.** Let us set

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_s^\lambda \left( ((1-tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B))^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \right) dr\right)$$

Then

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - \lambda(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{1/2} \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - s(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1/2}$$

Indeed the two left-hand sides agree for  $\lambda = s$  and both satisfy the differential equation

$$\Gamma'(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - \lambda(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) \Gamma(\lambda)$$

(in the computations we make use of the fact all that the matrices  $((1 - tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B))^{-1}$  and  $(I - A^{-1}B)$  commute as  $r$  varies being, up to scalar multiplicative constants, the resolvents of  $A^{-1}B$ ). Thus, recalling that  $\det e^A = e^{\text{tr} A}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-w(x,s)} &= \\
&= \left(\frac{1-s}{1-t}\right)^{(n-1)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \text{tr} \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) dr\right) = \\
&= \left(\frac{1-s}{1-t}\right)^{(n-1)/2} \det \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - r(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1} (I - A^{-1}B) dr\right) = \\
&= \left(\frac{1-s}{1-t}\right)^{(n-1)/2} \det \left( \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - t(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1/2} \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - s(I - A^{-1}B) \right)^{-1/2} \right) = \\
&= \left(\frac{1-s}{1-t}\right)^{(n-1)/2} \sqrt{\frac{\det \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - t(I - A^{-1}B) \right)}{\det \left( (1-tA^{-1}B) - s(I - A^{-1}B) \right)}} = \\
&= \left(\frac{1-s}{1-t}\right)^{(n-1)/2} \sqrt{\frac{\det((1-t)I)}{\det((1-s)I - (t-s)A^{-1}B)}} = \\
&= (1-s)^{(n-1)/2} \det((1-s) - (t-s)A^{-1}B)^{-1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

One should remark that as  $x$  approaches the boundary, and  $y$  remains fixed,  $t_0(x) \rightarrow 0$ , because of (3.5), so that for  $x$  near  $\partial D$  the quantity  $\det(I - t_0A^{-1}B)^{-1/2}$  is  $\sim 1$ .

**Example 4.5** (The case of the half-space) If  $D$  is a half space, then it is easy to see that all its points are regular: indeed an ellipsoid of revolution cannot have a contact of order  $> 1$  with a hyperplane. The computation of the first coefficient  $e^{-w(x,s)}$  is immediate in this case, because  $G$  can be chosen linear which gives  $B \equiv 0$ ; thus from Theorem 4.4

$$e^{-w(x,0)} \equiv 1$$

or equivalently  $w \equiv 0$ . It is immediate to see that in this case also all the other coefficients  $\psi_k$  in Theorem 2.1 vanish. Thus

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau < 1\} := q^\varepsilon(x,s) = e^{-u(x,s)/\varepsilon} (1 + o(\varepsilon^m))$$

for every  $m > 0$ . Indeed it is not difficult to check that the above equality holds *exactly*, since the function  $(x,s) \rightarrow e^{-u(x,s)/\varepsilon}$  solves the equation for  $q^\varepsilon$ , namely

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial q^\varepsilon}{\partial s} + \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{2} \Delta q^\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{in } D \times [0, 1[ \\
q^\varepsilon &= 1 && \text{on } \partial D \times [0, 1[ \\
q^\varepsilon(x, 1) &= 0 && \text{if } x \in D
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to remark that  $u$  satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and that, from (4.6),  $\Delta u \equiv 0$ .

In this situation it is also easy to compute explicitly  $u$ : if  $D$  is the hyperplane given by the equation

$$D = \{x, a - \langle x, v \rangle > 0\}$$

where  $v$  is a vector of length 1, then

$$u(x, s) = \frac{2}{1-s} (a - \langle y, v \rangle)(a - \langle x, v \rangle)$$

(such a function satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and its boundary condition). For this computation and the following it is sometimes useful to use Lemma 6.1 below, in order to compute the quasi-potential  $u$ .

For the sake of completeness we write here the asymptotics for the exit probability of a one dimensional Brownian bridge. If  $D = [a, b]$  and  $y \in D$  then (3.4) gives easily

$$u(x, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2(1-s)} (((x-a) + (y-a))^2 - (x-y)^2) & \text{if } x \leq a+b-y \\ \frac{1}{2(1-s)} (((b-x) + (b-y))^2 - (x-y)^2) & \text{if } x \geq a+b-y \end{cases}$$

Or, after simplification

$$u(x, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{(1-s)} (x-a)(y-a) & \text{if } x \leq a+b-y \\ \frac{2}{(1-s)} (b-x)(b-y) & \text{if } x \geq a+b-y \end{cases}$$

Every point excepted  $x = a + b - y$  is regular and at each regular point  $u$  is linear, which gives  $w \equiv 0$  and

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq 1\} = e^{u(x,s)/\varepsilon} (1 + o(\varepsilon^m))$$

for every  $m > 0$ . By repeating the arguments of the previous example if  $x = a + b - y$ , then from  $x$  there are two minimizers leading to the boundary and summing the contribution of each we have

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq 1\} = 2 e^{u(x,s)/\varepsilon} (1 + o(\varepsilon^m))$$

for every  $m > 0$ .

It is fair to remark that the asymptotics for the situation considered in this example should be considered already known. Indeed the multidimensional case can be easily reduced to one dimension by projecting the process in the direction of  $v$  and the one-dimensional case is easily treated directly, since for a Brownian motion  $B$  the joint distribution of  $\sup_{t \leq T} B_t$  and  $B_T$  is known.

In the following example we are able to handle situations in which the assumption of uniqueness of the minimizing path for the action functional is not satisfied (but there is still a finite number of such minimizers).




Figure 1

**Example 4.6** Suppose  $D =$  the square in Figure 1 with  $y$  located at the center. we suppose  $y = 0$  and that the sides of the square have length equal to 2.

Suppose that  $x$  lies in the upper triangle (excluding the diagonals), then by an elementary computation the minimizer of the action functional is the line segment joining  $x = (x_1, x_2)$  to  $(\frac{x_1}{2-x_2}, 1)$ . Since the asymptotics of the exit time in (1.2) is the same as for the tube in (1.5) and the latter is unchanged if we replace  $D$  with the half-plane  $\{x_2 < 1\}$ , Example 4.5 gives

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq 1\} \sim \exp - \frac{2(1-x_2)}{\varepsilon(1-s)}$$

Conversely if  $x = (t, t)$  lies on the upper right diagonal (but not in the center) then there are two paths minimizing the action functional, one,  $\gamma_1$ , given by the line segment joining  $x$  to  $(\frac{t}{2-t}, 1)$  and a second one symmetric to the first,  $\gamma_2$ , reaching the boundary at  $(1, \frac{t}{2-t})$ . Again the Large Deviations Theory states that the asymptotics for the exit time is equal to the asymptotics of the sum of the two probabilities

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau^\varepsilon \leq 1, X^\varepsilon \in B_\delta(\gamma_1)\} + P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau^\varepsilon \leq 1, X^\varepsilon \in B_\delta(\gamma_2)\}$$

The first probability has the same asymptotics as the exit probability from  $\{x, x_2 < 1\}$ , whereas the second one has the same asymptotics as the exit probabilities from  $\{x, x_1 < 1\}$ . These were calculated in the previous example and are both equal to

$$\exp - \frac{2(1-t)}{\varepsilon(1-s)}$$

This argument obviously holds whenever  $x$  lies on the diagonals (excepted the point at the center), so that if  $x = (t, t)$ ,  $t \neq 0$  the asymptotics for the exit probability is

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq 1\} \sim 2 \exp - \frac{2(1-|t|)}{\varepsilon(1-s)}$$

Finally if  $x = 0$  there are four minimizers and the exit probability can be estimated by summing the contribution of the four tubes which gives

$$P_{x,s}^\varepsilon \{\tau \leq 1\} \sim 4 \exp - \frac{2}{\varepsilon(1-s)}$$

**Example 4.7**  $D$  = the ball of radius  $R$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with the conditioning point  $y$  at the origin.  $\partial D$  can be written locally as the graph of a function defined on the ball of radius  $R$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . For instance the upper half of  $S^{n-1}$  is the graph of

$$\psi(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) = \sqrt{R - z_1^2 - \dots - z_{n-1}^2}$$

$z = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1})$  being a point in the ball of radius  $R$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , so that a local system of coordinates is

$$G(z) = G(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, \sqrt{R - z_1^2 - \dots - z_{n-1}^2})$$

Since  $y = 0$  then of course  $|y - \phi(x)| \equiv R$  and  $\frac{y - \phi(x)}{|y - \phi(x)|}$  is the inner normal of  $\partial D$  at  $\phi(x)$ . In particular  $\langle \frac{y - \phi(x)}{|y - \phi(x)|}, n \rangle = 1$  and  $\langle y - \phi(x), \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \rangle = 0$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$ . A straightforward computation gives then

$$n = \frac{1}{R} \left( -z_1, \dots, -z_{n-1}, \sqrt{R - z_1^2 - \dots - z_{n-1}^2} \right)$$

$$\frac{1}{|y - \phi(x)|} \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_j} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{R} \left( \delta_{kj} + \frac{z_k z_j}{R - z_1^2 - \dots - z_{n-1}^2} \right) = \left\langle n, \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_k \partial z_j} \right\rangle$$

Thus

$$B = 2A$$

so that

$$e^{-w(x,0)} = \det(I - t_0 A^{-1} B)^{-1/2} = (1 - 2t_0)^{-(n-1)/2}$$

It is now easy to compute  $t_0(x)$ : the minimizing path is the one which goes first from  $x$  to the boundary following the radius at point  $\frac{x}{|x|}$  and then back to  $y = 0$  (again Lemma 6.1 is useful). Thus

$$t_0(x) = \frac{R - |x|}{2R - |x|}$$

$$e^{-w(x,0)} = \left( \frac{2R - |x|}{|x|} \right)^{(n-1)/2}$$

Moreover

$$u(x, s) = \frac{1}{2(1-s)} [(R - |x| + R)^2 - |x|^2] = \frac{2R(R - |x|)}{1-s}$$

so that

$$P_{x,0}^\varepsilon \{ \tau \leq 1 \} \sim e^{2R(R-|x|)/\varepsilon} \left( \frac{2R - |x|}{|x|} \right)^{(n-1)/2}$$

For a general domain  $D$  it might be impossible to do exact computations, the difficulty being the computation of  $\phi(x)$ . However the formulas are explicit enough to be used in simulations: the program should find numerically  $\phi(x)$  by local search, which enables a subsequent analytic computation of  $A$  and  $B$ .

## 5. Geometric interpretation

We are now going to interpret the meaning of the coefficient  $\det(I - t_0 A^{-1} B)^{-1/2}$  which has been derived in the previous section.

It is clear from the discussion of the previous sections that if  $x \in D$  is regular then the point  $\phi(x) \in \partial D$  of Definition 3.4 is also the point of  $\partial D$  at which the smallest ellipsoid  $E$  of the form  $\{z; |x - z| + |y - z| = \text{const}\}$  and  $\partial D$  are mutually tangent. We shall see that  $\det(I - t_0 A^{-1} B)^{-1/2}$  is a measure of the contact between  $\partial D$  and such ellipsoid at  $\phi(x)$ .

It is always possible by a rotation and a translation to assume that  $\phi = 0$  and that the common normal to both surfaces points upward in the direction of, say, the  $n$ -th axis. Thus both the surfaces  $E$  and  $\partial D$  can be described locally as the graph of two functions,  $f$  and  $g$  respectively, of the variables  $z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}$ . By the previous assumptions the differentials of  $f$  and  $g$  vanish at  $z = 0$ .

A system of coordinates on  $\partial D$  at  $z = 0$  is given by

$$(5.1) \quad G(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, g(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}))$$

so that

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i} &= (0, \dots, 0, \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ i\text{-th coordinate}}}{1}, 0, \dots, 0, \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_i}) \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}(0) &= (0, \dots, 0, \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ i\text{-th coordinate}}}{1}, 0, \dots, 0) \\ \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} &= (0, \dots, 0, \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover (remember that  $\phi = 0$ )

$$\left\langle \frac{y - \phi}{|y - \phi|}, n \right\rangle = \frac{y_n}{|y|}$$

and the matrices  $A$  and  $B$  of Lemma 4.2 take the form

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} A &= \left( \frac{1}{|y|} \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^2} \right) \right)_{ij} \\ B &= \left( 2 \frac{y_n}{|y|} \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} \right)_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

A natural way to compare the contact between  $E$  and  $\partial D$  is to compare the Hessians of  $f$  and  $g$  at 0. More precisely

**Lemma 5.1**

$$I - t_0 A^{-1} B = I - \text{Hess } f(0)^{-1} \text{Hess } g(0) = \text{Hess } f(0)^{-1} (\text{Hess } f(0) - \text{Hess } g(0))$$

**Proof.** We only need compute the Hessian of  $f$  at 0. Now  $f$  is defined implicitly by

$$F(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, f(z_1, \dots, z_{n-1})) = \text{const}$$

where  $F(z) = |x - z| + |y - z|$ . We already know that

$$DF(z) = - \left( \frac{x - z}{|x - z|} + \frac{y - z}{|y - z|} \right)$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad DF(0) = -\lambda n$$

where

$$\lambda = 2 \left\langle \frac{y}{|y|}, n \right\rangle = 2 \frac{y_n}{|y|}$$

By the implicit functions theorem

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} = - \frac{\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_i}}{\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_n}}$$

so that

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} = - \frac{\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_n} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_n \partial z_j}}{\left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_n} \right)^2}$$

At  $z = 0$  one has  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_i} = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ , because of (5.4) (recall that the normal  $n$  lies along the  $n$ -th axis) and  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_n} = -\lambda$ . Thus for  $i, j = 1 \dots, n - 1$

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(0)$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(0) &= \frac{1}{|x|} \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{x_i x_j}{|x|^2} \right) + \frac{1}{|y|} \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{y_i y_j}{|y|^2} \right) = \\ &= \frac{1}{t_0 |y|} \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{y_i y_j}{|x|^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

so that finally

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} = \frac{1}{\lambda t_0 |y|} \left( \delta_{ij} - \frac{y_i y_j}{|x|^2} \right)$$

and from (5.3) the statement follows.

We are now going to give a more intrinsic version of the previous Lemma.

Let  $M$  be a hypersurface of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\phi$  be a point on  $M$  and  $M_\phi$  the tangent space to  $M$  at  $\phi$ . Let  $n(x)$  be a  $C^\infty$  unit normal field around  $\phi$ . If  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$  is a vector in  $M_\phi$  consider the transformation

$$(5.5) \quad X \rightarrow Xn$$

where  $Xn$  is the vector whose  $j$ -th component is  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \frac{\partial n_j}{\partial x_i}(\phi)$ . Then  $Xn$  is still a vector in  $M_\phi$  so that (5.5) defines a transformation of  $M_\phi$  into itself which is called the Weingarten map (see Hicks [1965], p.21 e.g.). This map is closely related with the curvature of  $M$  at  $\phi$  (ibidem p.24).

In our situation the two hypersurfaces  $E$  and  $D$  have the same tangent hyperplane at  $\phi$  on which the Weingarten maps  $L_1$  of  $E$  and  $L_2$  of  $\partial D$  both operate. Thus a measure of the contact between  $E$  and  $\partial D$  can be obtained by looking at the difference  $L_1 - L_2$ . The following statement gives an intrinsic expression for the quantity  $\det(I - t_0 A^{-1} B)^{-1/2}$

**Proposition 5.2**

$$I - t_0 A^{-1} B = L^{-1}(L_1 - L_2) = I - L_1^{-1} L_2$$

**Proof.** Let us choose the system of coordinates introduced before Lemma 5.1 and let  $n(z)$  be the  $C^\infty$  unit normal field pointing in the direction of the positive  $n$ -th axis. It is then an elementary exercise in differential geometry to check that in these coordinates

$$L_1 = -\text{Hess } f(0) \quad L_2 = -\text{Hess } g(0)$$

Indeed it suffices to remark that

$$\left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}(z), n(z) \right\rangle \equiv 0$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$  since  $\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}$  is always a tangent vector. Thus, if  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ , by derivation

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}(z), n(z) \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(z), n(z) \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}(z), \frac{\partial n}{\partial z_j}(z) \right\rangle$$

But at  $z = 0$   $n(z) = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$  so that by (5.2) at  $z = 0$  the previous identity becomes

$$\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(0) + \frac{\partial n_i}{\partial z_j}(0) = 0$$

which expresses the fact that  $-\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}(0)$  is the  $ij$ -th entry of the representative matrix of the Weingarten map in the given coordinate system.

One should remark that whereas the Weingarten map depends on the choice of the normal field (outer or inner), which makes that it is defined up to a multiplicative factor of  $-1$ , the quantity  $L_1^{-1}(L_1 - L_2)$  is intrinsic and does not depend on the choice of the normal field.

## 6. Computing the mean exit time by simulation

We have performed a set of simulations in order to obtain numerically the mean exit time from a ball  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  of radius 1 of a Brownian motion starting at the origin. The well-known exact value is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

As explained in the introduction a raw simulation scheme is biased by a systematic error. In order to get a correction of this error we compute the asymptotics in  $\varepsilon$  of the probability that a Brownian motion  $B$  goes out of  $D$  in the time interval  $[k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$ , given  $W_{k\varepsilon} = x$  and  $W_{(k+1)\varepsilon} = y$ ,  $x, y \in D$ . The conditioned Brownian motion, up to a translation in the time scale, has the same law as

$$\overset{\circ}{W}_s = x + \frac{s}{\varepsilon}(y - x) + B_s - \frac{s}{\varepsilon}B_\varepsilon \quad 0 \leq s \leq \varepsilon$$

Performing the time change  $t = s/\varepsilon$

$$Y_t = \overset{\circ}{W}_{t\varepsilon} = x + t(y - x) + B_{t\varepsilon} - tB_\varepsilon \stackrel{in\ law}{=} x + t(y - x) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}(B_t - tB_1) \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Thus the process  $Y$  has the same law as the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} dX^\varepsilon(t) &= -\frac{X^\varepsilon(t) - y}{1 - t} dt + \sqrt{\varepsilon} dB_t \\ X^\varepsilon(s) &= x \end{aligned}$$

Since the probability that  $\overset{\circ}{W}$  exits from  $D$  before time  $\varepsilon$  is the same as the probability that  $X^\varepsilon$  exits  $D$  before time 1, its asymptotics is given by Theorem 4.4.

The following table reports the results of three sets of numerical simulations, each based on 10,000 simulated paths. In the first set (crude 1) the paths were obtained by simple simulation with a step  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ . In the second (corrected) the paths, still with step  $\varepsilon = 0.01$  were killed with the procedure described in the introduction, using the asymptotics derived in the previous sections. The third set was again obtained by crude simulation but with the step reduced to 0.002, to increase precision.

It can be remarked that the enhancement of the performances provided by the correction procedure is considerable. The increase in CPU time might be taken into account, but is considerably less than the one observed in the third simulation, which denotes a less dramatic improvement in the results. It should be added that the second set of simulations, in which the correction procedure described in the introduction were applied, is the only one for which the true value ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) lied in a confidence interval, at any reasonable level. For instance at level 95% the confidence interval is  $[0.495, 0.509]$ .

Of course the results below should not be considered conclusive since more sophisticated simulation schemes might be considered for a comparison (using a variable step, for instance). They however suggest that the correction procedure which is proposed here deserves to be tried in real problems.

type	step	estimated mean time	error	CPU time
crude 1	0.01	0.557	11.4%	1.00
corrected	0.01	0.502	0.4%	2.90
crude 2	0.002	0.527	5.4%	4.85

The increase of the CPU time requested by the correction procedure is less considerable than it may be expected because one may ask the program to compute the the killing probability  $p$  (a demanding task in terms of computation time) only when the process is near the boundary. Otherwise  $p$  is too small to influence the simulation significantly.

It is fair however to point out that by far the most time consuming part in the computation of the killing probability is the determination of  $\phi(x)$ , which depends on the form of the boundary  $\partial D$ . One may expect that if  $D$  is more complicated than a ball the increase in CPU time might be heavier.

The point  $\phi(x)$  can be obtained by local search on the boundary ; a different procedure to the same goal can be derived easily from the following Lemma.

**Lemma 6.1** *Let  $\gamma(t) = x + t(y - x)$  be the uniform motion on the line segment joining  $x$  to  $y$ . Then*

$$(|x - z| + |y - z|)^2 - |x - y|^2 = \min_{\xi \in \partial D} \left\{ \frac{|\xi - \gamma(t)|^2}{t(1-t)}, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right\}$$

Moreover if  $x$  is regular and  $\bar{t}$  and  $\xi$  are respectively the time and the point of  $\partial D$  at which the minimum above is attained, then  $\bar{t} = t_0$  and  $\xi = \phi(x)$ .

The Lemma says that the cost function is also given by the minimum of

$$t \rightarrow \frac{d(\gamma(t), \partial D)^2}{t(1-t)} \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1$$

which might be easier obtain numerically if the boundary  $\partial D$  is such that the distance  $d(\gamma(t), \partial D)$  is easy to compute (e.g. if  $D$  is a ball).

Lemma 6.1 may be restated in terms of elementary geometry by saying that if for each  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  we consider a ball of radius  $const \cdot \sqrt{t(1-t)}$  and centered at  $\gamma(t)$ , then the union of all such balls is an ellipsoid of revolution having its foci in  $x$  and  $y$ .

**Proof** of Lemma 6.1. If

$$H(t) = \frac{|z - (x + t(y - x))|^2}{t(1-t)}$$

then

$$H'(t) = \frac{1}{t^2(1-t)^2} \left[ -2t(1-t)\langle z - (x + t(y - x)), y - x \rangle - (1-2t)|z - (x + t(y - x))|^2 \right]$$

Developing the quantity between brackets, the critical points of  $\phi$  are the solutions of

$$t^2[|y - x|^2 - 2\langle z - x, y - x \rangle] + 2t|z - x|^2 - |z - x|^2 = 0$$

This second order equation is easily solved and, having discarded the negative solution and after some simplifications, one finds that the critical point is

$$\bar{t} = \frac{|z - x|}{|z - x| + |z - y|}$$

which is of course also a minimizer. Substituting back in order to compute the minimum and performing some more tedious simplifications one gets finally

$$\frac{|z - (x + \bar{t}(y - x))|^2}{\bar{t}(1 - \bar{t})} = 2(|z - x||z - y| + \langle z - x, z - y \rangle) = (|x - z| + |y - z|)^2 - |x - y|^2$$

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Azencott R. [1985] *Petites perturbations aléatoires des systèmes dynamiques. Developpements asymptotiques.* Bull. Sci. Math. **109**,253-308.
- [2] Baldi P. [1991] *On the exact equivalent of the exit time of a Brownian motion from an open set.* Prépubl. Laboratoire des Probabilités Paris 71/91.
- [3] Bellaïche C. [1981] *Comportement asymptotique de  $p(t, x, y)$  quand  $t \rightarrow 0$  (points éloignés).* In *Géodesiques et diffusions en temps petit*, Astérisque 84-85, 151-188.
- [4] Fleming W.H., James M.R. [1992] *Asymptotic series and exit time probabilities.* Ann. Probab. **20**, 1369-1384.
- [5] Fleming W.H., Souganidis P.E. [1986] *PDE-viscosity solution approach to some problems of large deviations.* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **9**, 171-192.
- [6] Hicks N.J. [1965] *Notes on Differential Geometry.* Van Nostrand Math. Studies #3.

#	Author/s	Title
1135	Avner Friedman & J.L. Velázquez,	The analysis of coating flows in a strip
1136	Eduardo D. Sontag,	Control of systems without drift via generic loops
1137	Yuan Wang & Eduardo D. Sontag,	Orders of input/output differential equations and state space dimensions
1138	Scott W. Hansen,	Boundary control of a one-dimensional, linear, thermoelastic rod
1139	Robert Lipton & Bogdan Vernescu,	Homogenization of two phase emulsions with surface tension effects
1140	Scott Hansen & Enrique Zuazua,	Exact controllability and stabilization of a vibrating string with an interior point mass
1141	Bei Hu & Jiongmin Yong,	Pontryagin Maximum principle for semilinear and quasilinear parabolic equations with pointwise state constraints
1142	Mark H.A. Davis,	A deterministic approach to optimal stopping with application to a prophet inequality
1143	M.H.A. Davis & M. Zervos,	A problem of singular stochastic control with discretionary stopping
1144	Bernardo Cockburn & Pierre-Alain Gremaud,	An error estimate for finite element methods for scalar conservation laws
1145	David C. Dobson & Fadil Santosa,	An image enhancement technique for electrical impedance tomography
1146	Jin Ma, Philip Protter, & Jiongmin Yong,	Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly — a four step scheme
1147	Yong Liu,	The equilibrium plasma subject to skin effect
1148	Ulrich Hornung,	Models for flow and transport through porous media derived by homogenization
1149	Avner Friedman, Chaocheng Huang, & Jiongmin Yong,	Effective permeability of the boundary of a domain
1150	Gang Bao,	A uniqueness theorem for an inverse problem in periodic diffractive optics
1151	Angelo Favini, Mary Ann Horn, & Irena Lasiecka,	Global existence and uniqueness of regular solutions to the dynamic von Kármán system with nonlinear boundary dissipation
1152	E.G. Kalnins & Willard Miller, Jr.,	Models of $q$ -algebra representations: $q$ -integral transforms and “addition theorems”
1153	E.G. Kalnins, V.B. Kuznetsov & Willard Miller, Jr.,	Quadrics on complex Riemannian spaces of constant curvature, separation of variables and the Gaudin magnet
1154	A. Kersch, W. Morokoff & Chr. Werner,	Selfconsistent simulation of sputtering with the DSMC method
1155	Bing-Yu Zhang,	A remark on the Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation on a periodic domain
1156	Gang Bao,	Finite element approximation of time harmonic waves in periodic structures
1157	Tao Lin & Hong Wang,	Recovering the gradients of the solutions of second-order hyperbolic equations by interpolating the finite element solutions
1158	Zhangxin Chen,	$L^p$ -posteriori error analysis of mixed methods for linear and quasilinear elliptic problems
1159	Todd Arbogast & Zhangxin Chen,	Homogenization of compositional flow in fractured porous media
1160	L. Qiu, B. Bernhardsson, A. Rantzer, E.J. Davison, P.M. Young & J.C. Doyle,	A formula for computation of the real stability radius
1161	Maria Inés Troparevsky,	Adaptive control of linear discrete time systems with external disturbances under inaccurate modelling: A case study
1162	Petr Klouček & Franz S. Rys,	Stability of the fractional step $\Theta$ -scheme for the nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations
1163	Eduardo Casas, Luis A. Fernández & Jiongmin Yong,	Optimal control of quasilinear parabolic equations
1164	Darrell Duffie, Jin Ma & Jiongmin Yong,	Black’s consol rate conjecture
1165	D.G. Aronson & J.L. Vazquez,	Anomalous exponents in nonlinear diffusion
1166	Ruben D. Spies,	Local existence and regularity of solutions for a mathematical model of thermomechanical phase transitions in shape memory materials with Landau-Ginzburg free energy
1167	Pu Sun,	On circular pipe Poiseuille flow instabilities
1168	Angelo Favini, Mary Ann Horn, Irena Lasiecka & Daniel Tataru,	Global existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions to a Von Kármán system with nonlinear boundary dissipation
1169	A. Dontchev, Tz. Donchev & I. Slavov,	On the upper semicontinuity of the set of solutions of differential inclusions with a small parameter in the derivative
1170	Jin Ma & Jiongmin Yong,	Regular-singular stochastic controls for higher dimensional diffusions — dynamic programming approach
1171	Alex Solomonoff,	Bayes finite difference schemes
1172	Todd Arbogast & Zhangxin Chen,	On the implementation of mixed methods as nonconforming methods for second order elliptic problems
1173	Zhangxin Chen & Bernardo Cockburn,	Convergence of a finite element method for the drift-diffusion semiconductor device equations: The multidimensional case
1174	Boris Mordukhovich,	Optimization and finite difference approximations of nonconvex differential inclusions with free time

- 1175 **Avner Friedman, David S. Ross, and Jianhua Zhang**, A Stefan problem for reaction-diffusion system
- 1176 **Alex Solomonoff**, Fast algorithms for micromagnetic computations
- 1177 **Nikan B. Firoozye**, Homogenization on lattices: Small parameter limits,  $H$ -measures, and discrete Wigner measures
- 1178 **G. Yin**, Adaptive filtering with averaging
- 1179 **Wlodzimierz Byrc and Amir Dembo**, Large deviations for quadratic functionals of Gaussian processes
- 1180 **Ilja Schmelzer**, 3D anisotropic grid generation with intersection-based geometry interface
- 1181 **Alex Solomonoff**, Application of multipole methods to two matrix eigenproblems
- 1182 **A.M. Latypov**, Numerical solution of steady euler equations in streamline-aligned orthogonal coordinates
- 1183 **Bei Hu & Hong-Ming Yin**, Semilinear parabolic equations with prescribed energy
- 1184 **Bei Hu & Jianhua Zhang**, Global existence for a class of Non-Fickian polymer-penetrant systems
- 1185 **Rongze Zhao & Thomas A. Posbergh**, Robust stabilization of a uniformly rotating rigid body
- 1186 **Mary Ann Horn & Irena Lasiecka**, Uniform decay of weak solutions to a von Kármán plate with nonlinear boundary dissipation
- 1187 **Mary Ann Horn, Irena Lasiecka & Daniel Tataru**, Well-posedness and uniform decay rates for weak solutions to a von Kármán system with nonlinear dissipative boundary conditions
- 1188 **Mary Ann Horn**, Nonlinear boundary stabilization of a von Kármán plate via bending moments only
- 1189 **Frank H. Shaw & Charles J. Geyer**, Constrained covariance component models
- 1190 **Tomasz Luczaka**, A greedy algorithm estimating the height of random trees
- 1191 **Timo Seppäläinen**, Maximum entropy principles for disordered spins
- 1192 **Yuandan Lin, Eduardo D. Sontag & Yuan Wang**, Recent results on Lyapunov-theoretic techniques for nonlinear stability
- 1193 **Svante Janson**, Random regular graphs: Asymptotic distributions and contiguity
- 1194 **Rachid Ababou**, Random porous media flow on large 3-D grids: Numerics, performance, & application to homogenization
- 1195 **Moshe Fridman**, Hidden Markov model regression
- 1196 **Petr Klouček, Bo Li & Mitchell Luskin**, Analysis of a class of nonconforming finite elements for Crystalline microstructures
- 1197 **Steven P. Lalley**, Random series in inverse Pisot powers
- 1198 **Rudy Yaksick**, Expected optimal exercise time of a perpetual American option: A closed-form solution
- 1199 **Rudy Yaksick**, Valuation of an American put catastrophe insurance futures option: A Martingale approach
- 1200 **János Pach, Farhad Shahrokhi & Mario Szegedy**, Application of the crossing number
- 1201 **Avner Friedman & Chaocheng Huang**, Averaged motion of charged particles under their self-induced electric field
- 1202 **Joel Spencer**, The Erdős-Hanani conjecture via Talagrand's inequality
- 1203 **Zhangxin Chen**, Superconvergence results for Galerkin methods for wave propagation in various porous media
- 1204 **Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres**, When does a branching process grow like its mean? Conceptual proofs of  $L \log L$  criteria
- 1205 **Robin Pemantle**, Maximum variation of total risk
- 1206 **Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres**, Galton-Watson trees with the same mean have the same polar sets
- 1207 **Robin Pemantle**, A shuffle that mixes sets of any fixed size much faster than it mixes the whole deck
- 1208 **Itai Benjamini, Robin Pemantle & Yuval Peres**, Martin capacity for Markov chains and random walks in varying dimensions
- 1209 **Wlodzimierz Bryc & Amir Dembo**, On large deviations of empirical measures for stationary Gaussian processes
- 1210 **Martin Hildebrand**, Some random processes related to affine random walks
- 1211 **Alexander E. Mazel & Yurii M. Suhov**, Ground states of a Boson quantum lattice model
- 1212 **Roger L. Fosdick & Darren E. Mason**, Single phase energy minimizers for materials with nonlocal spatial dependence
- 1213 **Bruce Hajek**, Load balancing in infinite networks
- 1214 **Petr Klouček**, The transonic flow problems stability analysis and numerical results
- 1215 **Petr Klouček**, On the existence of the entropic solutions for the transonic flow problem
- 1216 **David A. Schmidt & Chjan C. Lim**, Full sign-invertibility and symplectic matrices
- 1217 **Piermarco Cannarsa & Maria Elisabetta Tessitore**, Infinite dimensional Hamilton-Jacobi equations and Dirichlet boundary control problems of parabolic type
- 1218 **Zhangxin Chen**, Multigrid algorithms for mixed methods for second order elliptic problems
- 1219 **Zhangxin Chen**, Expanded mixed finite element methods for linear second order elliptic problems I
- 1220 **Gang Bao**, A note on the uniqueness for an inverse diffraction problem
- 1221 **Moshe Fridman**, A two state capital asset pricing model
- 1222 **Paolo Baldi**, Exact asymptotics for the probability of exit from a domain and applications to simulation
- 1223 **Carl Dou & Martin Hildebrand**, Enumeration and random random walks on finite groups
- 1224 **Jaksa Cvitanic & Ioannis Karatzas**, On portfolio optimization under "drawdown" constraints
- 1225 **Avner Friedman & Yong Liu**, A free boundary problem arising in magnetohydrodynamic system