

# The rate of weak convergence for $n$ -point motions of Harris flows

A. A. Dorogovtsev, V. V. Fomichov

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we discuss the Wasserstein distance between the distributions of the  $n$ -point motions of two Harris flows on the real line. For convenience let us recall the definition of a Harris flow.

**Definition 1.1.** A random field  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  is called a *Brownian stochastic flow* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- 1) for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  the stochastic process  $\{x(u, t), t \geq 0\}$  is a Brownian motion with respect to the common filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{x(u, s), u \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq s \leq t\})_{t \geq 0}$ ;
- 2) for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ , if  $u \leq v$ , then  $x(u, t) \leq x(v, t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**Definition 1.2.** A Brownian stochastic flow  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  is called a *Harris flow* with covariance function  $\Gamma$  if for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$  the joint characteristic of the martingales  $\{x(u, t), t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{x(v, t), t \geq 0\}$  is given by

$$\langle x(u, \cdot), x(v, \cdot) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(u, s) - x(v, s)) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Note that the function  $\Gamma$  is necessarily non-negative definite, symmetric, and

$$\Gamma(0) = 1.$$

The historically first example of a Brownian stochastic flow was constructed by Arratia in [1] as a weak limit of families of coalescing simple random walks. For the Arratia flow  $\{x_0(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  one has

$$\langle x_0(u, \cdot), x_0(v, \cdot) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \mathbb{I}_{\{0\}}(x_0(u, s) - x_0(v, s)) ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_{\{0\}}$  stands for the indicator function of the set  $\{0\}$ . Informally one can describe the Arratia flow as a Brownian stochastic flow in which each pair of particles move independently until they meet and after that coalesce and move together.

Later, in [2] Harris proved the existence of a generalisation of the Arratia flow for covariance functions  $\Gamma$  which are continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$  and satisfy the Lipschitz condition on all sets of the form  $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\delta; \delta)$ ,  $\delta > 0$ .

In the case when  $\Gamma$  is smooth enough the corresponding Harris flow can be obtained as the flow of solutions of a stochastic differential equation. To be more precise, let us take a function  $\varphi \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R})$  (i. e.  $\varphi$  belongs to  $C^2(\mathbb{R})$  and has compact support) such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi^2(q) dq = 1,$$

and consider the following Cauchy problem:

$$\begin{cases} dx(u, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x(u, t) - q) W(dq, dt), & t \geq 0, \\ x(u, 0) = u, \end{cases}$$

where  $W$  is a Wiener sheet on  $\mathbb{R} \times [0; +\infty)$  (on integration with respect to a Wiener sheet see [3], [4], [5]). The conditions on the function  $\varphi$  imply that for arbitrary  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  this Cauchy problem has a unique (strong) solution  $\{x(u, t), t \geq 0\}$ . It is easy to check that the random field  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  is a Harris flow with covariance function  $\Gamma$  given by

$$\Gamma(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(z - q)\varphi(-q) dq \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(z + q)\varphi(q) dq, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Indeed, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  the continuous (locally square-integrable) martingale  $\{x(u, t), t \geq 0\}$  has the characteristic  $t$ , and hence, by Lévy's characterising theorem [6, Theorem 3.3.16], it is a Brownian motion. Moreover, for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\langle x(u, \cdot), x(v, \cdot) \rangle_t = \int_0^t \Gamma(x(u, s) - x(v, s)) ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

and it remains to note that the condition  $\varphi \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R})$  implies that the random mappings

$$x(\cdot, t): \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

are diffeomorphisms (see [7]), and so, if  $u \leq v$ , then  $x(u, t) \leq x(v, t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

Let us note that

$$\Gamma(z) = 0, \quad |z| > \frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma),$$

where

$$d(\Gamma) := \text{diam}(\text{supp } \Gamma),$$

and hence

$$\langle x(u, \cdot), x(v, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \tau} = \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \Gamma(x(u, s) - x(v, s)) ds = 0, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where

$$\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid |x(u, t) - x(v, t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma)\}.$$

So, informally one can say that the particles of this Harris flow move independently until the distance between them does not reach  $\frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma)$ . Thus, when  $d(\Gamma)$  is close to zero its  $n$ -point motions are similar to those of the Arratia flow. Moreover, it was proved in [8] that when  $d(\varphi) := \text{diam}(\text{supp } \varphi)$  (or, equivalently,  $d(\Gamma)$ ) tends to 0 they converge weakly to the  $n$ -point motions of the Arratia flow. Our aim in this paper is to estimate the rate of this convergence.

To formulate our main result we need some notations. They will be used throughout the rest of the paper.

For a complete separable metric space  $(X, d)$  denote by  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  the set of all Borel probability measures on  $X$  and define

$$\mathcal{M}_1(X) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) \mid \int_X d(u, u_0) \mu(du) < +\infty\},$$

where  $u_0$  is a fixed point in  $X$ . It can be easily checked that this set does not depend on the choice of this point. On  $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$  we will consider the standard Wasserstein metric  $W_1$  defined by

$$W_1(\mu', \mu'') := \inf_{\varkappa \in C(\mu', \mu'')} \iint_{X^2} d(u, v) \varkappa(du, dv), \quad \mu', \mu'' \in \mathcal{M}_1(X),$$

where  $C(\mu', \mu'')$  is the set of all Borel probability measures on  $X^2 \equiv X \times X$  with marginals  $\mu'$  and  $\mu''$ . It is well known that  $(\mathcal{M}_1(X), W_1)$  is also a complete separable metric space (see, for instance, [9]).

For a Brownian stochastic flow  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  and a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  set

$$\lambda := \mu \circ x^{-1}(\cdot, 1).$$

It can be easily shown that if  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $\lambda$  is a random element in  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R})$ . So, we can consider its distribution in this space setting

$$\Lambda := \mathbf{P} \circ \lambda^{-1}.$$

Note that  $\Lambda$  is an element of  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}))$ . With some abuse of notation we will use  $W_1$  to denote the Wasserstein distance in both spaces  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}))$ .

To avoid defining the corresponding measures each time we need them, let us agree on the convention that measures  $\lambda$  with an upper and/or lower index will always be defined as above with  $\mu$  having the same upper index and/or  $x$  having the same lower index, and measures  $\Lambda$  with these indices will always denote their distributions in the space  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}))$ .

The main results of this paper are the following theorem and its corollary, which is obtained by applying the triangle's inequality.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be a Harris flow with covariance function  $\Gamma$ , which has compact support, and  $\{x_0(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be the Arratia flow. Assume that*

$$\text{supp } \mu \subset [0; 1]$$

and

$$d(\Gamma) < \frac{1}{10}.$$

Then

$$W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda_0) \leq C \cdot d(\Gamma)^{1/11},$$

where the constant  $C > 0$  does not depend on  $\mu$  and  $\Gamma$ .

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let  $\{x_1(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{x_2(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be two Harris flows with covariance functions  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  respectively, which have compact support. Assume that*

$$\text{supp } \mu \subset [0; 1]$$

and

$$\max\{d(\Gamma_1), d(\Gamma_2)\} < \frac{1}{10}.$$

Then

$$W_1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \leq 2C \cdot \max\{d(\Gamma_1), d(\Gamma_2)\}^{1/11},$$

where  $C > 0$  is the constant from Theorem 1.3.

To prove Theorem 1.3 we approximate the initial measure  $\mu$  by discrete measures  $\mu^n$  and divide the proof into three steps. In the first step we estimate the Wasserstein distance between  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^n$  for arbitrary Brownian stochastic flows. In the second step we use some recursive procedure to construct a suitable coupling of  $\lambda^n$  and  $\lambda_0^n$ , allowing to estimate the Wasserstein distance between their distributions  $\Lambda^n$  and  $\Lambda_0^n$ . In the third step we combine these results and, optimising with respect to  $n$ , arrive at the desired assertion.

## 2 Proof of the main result: first step

Let measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  be such that  $\text{supp } \mu \subset [0; 1]$ . Then, obviously,  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R})$  and it can be approximated by a sequence  $\{\mu^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R})$  of discrete measures defined by

$$\mu^n := \sum_{k=1}^n p_k^n \delta_{\frac{2k-1}{2^n}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where

$$p_k^n := \mu(I_k^n), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad n \geq 1,$$

with

$$I_k^n := \left[ \frac{k-1}{n}; \frac{k}{n} \right), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \quad n \geq 1,$$

$$I_n^n := \left[ \frac{n-1}{n}; 1 \right], \quad n \geq 1.$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be an arbitrary Brownian stochastic flow. Then*

$$W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda^n) \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where  $K = \sqrt{\frac{64}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{1}{2}}$ .

For the proof of this theorem we use the following lemma proved in [10] (there it was formulated for the case when  $t = 1$ , but the proof is valid for all  $t > 0$ ).

**Lemma 2.2.** *[10, Lemma 5] Let  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be an arbitrary Brownian stochastic flow. Then*

$$\mathbf{E}(x(u, t) - x(v, t))^2 \leq C_t |u - v| + |u - v|^2, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where  $C_t = \frac{128t^{3/2}}{3\sqrt{2\pi}}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* By definition of the Wasserstein distance  $W_1$  we have

$$W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda^n) = \inf_{\varkappa \in C(\Lambda, \Lambda^n)} \iint_{\mathcal{M}_1^2(\mathbb{R})} W_1(\mu', \mu'') \varkappa(d\mu', d\mu'') \leq \mathbf{E}W_1(\lambda, \lambda^n),$$

where for convenience we set

$$\mathcal{M}_1^2(\mathbb{R}) := \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}).$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}W_1(\lambda, \lambda^n) &= \mathbf{E} \inf_{\varkappa \in C(\lambda, \lambda^n)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u - v| \varkappa(du, dv) \leq \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{I_k^n} \left| x(u, 1) - x\left(\frac{2k-1}{2n}, 1\right) \right| \mu(du) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{I_k^n} \sqrt{\mathbf{E} \left| x(u, 1) - x\left(\frac{2k-1}{2n}, 1\right) \right|^2} \mu(du). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Lemma 2.2 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}W_1(\lambda, \lambda^n) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{I_k^n} \sqrt{C_1 \cdot \left| u - \frac{2k-1}{2n} \right| + \left| u - \frac{2k-1}{2n} \right|^2} \mu(du) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n p_k^n \cdot \sqrt{C_1 \cdot \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{1}{4n^2}} \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K := \sqrt{\frac{C_1+1}{2}}$ . The theorem is proved.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of the main result: second step

Let  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  be a Harris flow with covariance function  $\Gamma$ , which has compact support. Fix arbitrary initial points  $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , such that the distance between any two of them is strictly greater than some fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma)$ .

Set

$$(z_1(u_1, t), \dots, z_1(u_n, t)) := (x(u_1, t), \dots, x(u_n, t)), \quad t \geq 0,$$

and let us associate with this stochastic process a family  $\{\Pi_1(t) := \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_m\}, t \geq 0\}$  of random partitions of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  defined by the following condition: indices  $i$  and  $i + 1$  belong to the same set  $\pi_j$  if and only if  $|z_1(u_i, t) - z_1(u_{i+1}, t)| \leq \varepsilon$ . Obviously,  $\Pi_1(0) := \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$ .

Now let us define an  $n$ -dimensional stochastic process  $\{(z_2(u_1, t), \dots, z_2(u_n, t)), t \geq 0\}$  setting

$$z_2(u_k, t) = \begin{cases} z_1(u_k, t), & 0 \leq t \leq \sigma_1, \\ z_1(u_l, t) + (k - l)\varepsilon, & t \geq \sigma_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $\sigma_1$  is the first time moment when the partition  $\Pi_1(t)$  changes and  $l$  is the least index in the set  $\pi_j \in \Pi_1(\sigma_1)$ , to which  $k$  belongs. With this stochastic process we associate the corresponding family  $\{\Pi_2(t), t \geq 0\}$  of random partitions of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and the random time moment  $\sigma_2$ .

Continuing in this way we obtain the stochastic processes  $\{(z_i(u_1, t), \dots, z_i(u_n, t)), t \geq 0\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . It is clear that applying the above procedure to the stochastic process  $\{(z_n(u_1, t), \dots, z_n(u_n, t)), t \geq 0\}$  will leave it unchanged, since  $\Pi_n(t) = \{\{1, 2, \dots, n\}\}$  for  $t \geq \sigma_{n-1}$ .

To describe the properties of these stochastic processes we need to put this procedure on a more formal basis.

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\varepsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma)$  and let  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , be such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &< u_2 < \dots < u_n, \\ u_{k+1} - u_k &> \varepsilon, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Let us define recursively

$$\begin{aligned} z_1(u_k, t) &= x(u_k, t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \\ z_{i+1}(u_k, t) &= z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k (z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i}, \quad t \geq 0, \\ &1 \leq k \leq n, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k1}^i &= \{z_i(u_k, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_{k-1}, \sigma_i) = \varepsilon, \dots, z_i(u_3, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_2, \sigma_i) = \varepsilon, \\ &z_i(u_2, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_1, \sigma_i) = \varepsilon\}, \quad 2 \leq k \leq n, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, \\ A_{kj}^i &= \{z_i(u_k, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_{k-1}, \sigma_i) = \varepsilon, \dots, z_i(u_{j+1}, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_j, \sigma_i) = \varepsilon, \\ &z_i(u_j, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_{j-1}, \sigma_i) > \varepsilon\}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq k - 1, \quad 3 \leq k \leq n, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, \end{aligned}$$

$$A_{11}^i = \Omega, \quad A_{kk}^i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\overline{k-1}} A_{kj}^i, \quad 2 \leq k \leq n, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{i+1} &:= 1 \wedge \inf\{t \geq \sigma_i \mid \sharp\{l \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \mid z_i(u_{l+1}, t) - z_i(u_l, t) \leq \varepsilon\} \geq \\ &\geq \sharp\{l \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \mid z_i(u_{l+1}, \sigma_i) - z_i(u_l, \sigma_i) \leq \varepsilon\} + 1\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \end{aligned}$$

where the sign  $\sharp$  denotes the number of the elements of the corresponding set.

We will also use the following lemma, which is a simple extension of [11, Lemma 6.2] (its proof is similar to that of the latter and therefore omitted). (Recall that random variables  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  are said to be equal almost surely on a (measurable) set  $A$  if  $\mathbf{P}(\{\xi \neq \eta\} \cap A) = 0$ .)

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\xi \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  and let  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2 \subset \mathcal{F}$  be such that*

$$A \cap \mathcal{G}_1 \subset A \cap \mathcal{G}_2$$

for some  $A \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2$ . Then

$$\mathbf{E}[\xi | \mathcal{G}_1] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\xi | \mathcal{G}_2] | \mathcal{G}_1] \quad \text{a. s. on } A.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For any  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  the stochastic processes  $\{z_i(u_k, t), t \geq 0\}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , are Wiener processes with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{x(u, s), u \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq s \leq t\})_{t \geq 0}$ .*

*Proof.* We will use the principle of mathematical induction with respect to the index  $i$ .

For  $i = 1$  the assertion is obvious, since  $z_1(u_k, t) = x(u_k, t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

Now suppose that the assertion holds true for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, i\}$ . Let us show that then it holds true for  $j = i + 1$ . Fix  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . It is enough to show that the stochastic process  $\{z_{i+1}(u_k, t), t \geq 0\}$  satisfies the conditions of Lévy's characterising theorem. It can be easily seen from the definition of the stochastic process  $\{z_{i+1}(u_k, t), t \geq 0\}$  that it has a. s. continuous trajectories, is  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -adapted, and is such that

$$\mathbf{E} |z_{i+1}(u_k, t)|^2 < +\infty, \quad t \geq 0.$$

To prove that it is a martingale with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  we note that for any  $t \geq s \geq 0$

$$\mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) | \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} | \mathcal{F}_s] + \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{\sigma_i > s\} | \mathcal{F}_s].$$

On the one hand, since the sets  $A_{kj}^i$  belong to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}$  (here we use the progressive measurability of the Wiener processes  $\{z_i(u_l, t), t \geq 0\}$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq n$ ; see [11, Lemma 7.5]),

applying Doob's optional sampling theorem, for the first term we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbf{E} [z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] + \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left[ (z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s \right] = \\
& \quad = \mathbf{E} [z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} + \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} [(z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} = \\
& = z_i(u_k, s \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} + \sum_{j=1}^k (z_i(u_j, s) - z_i(u_j, s \wedge \sigma_i)) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\} = \\
& \quad = z_{i+1}(u_k, s) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i \leq s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}] = \mathbf{E} [z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}] + \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left[ (z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i} \right] = \\
& \quad = \mathbf{E} [z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}] \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} + \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} [(z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}] \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = \\
& \quad = z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\},
\end{aligned}$$

and so, using Lemma 3.1 in the second equality below, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = \\
& \quad = \mathbf{E} [\mathbf{E} [z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\sigma_i}] \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = \\
& \quad = \mathbf{E} [z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = \\
& \quad = z_i(u_k, s \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = z_i(u_k, s) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\} = z_{i+1}(u_k, s) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\sigma_i > s\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{E} (z_{i+1}(u_k, t) \mid \mathcal{F}_s) = z_{i+1}(u_k, s).$$

It remains to show that

$$\langle z_{i+1}(u_k, \cdot) \rangle_t = t, \quad t \geq 0.$$

For  $k = 1$  it is obvious. If  $2 \leq k \leq n$ , then from the equalities

$$\begin{aligned}
z_{i+1}(u_k, t) &= z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k (z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i)) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} = \\
&= z_i(u_k, t \wedge \sigma_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k z_i(u_j, t) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} - \sum_{j=1}^k z_i(u_j, t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i}
\end{aligned}$$



it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle z_{i+1}(u_k, \cdot) \rangle_t &= \langle z_i(u_k, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \sigma_i} + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^k \langle z_i(u_{j_1}, \cdot), z_i(u_{j_2}, \cdot) \rangle_t \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_1}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_2}^i} + \\
&+ \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^k \langle z_i(u_{j_1}, \cdot), z_i(u_{j_2}, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \sigma_i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_1}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_2}^i} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^k \langle z_i(u_k, \cdot), z_i(u_j, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \sigma_i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} - \\
&- 2 \sum_{j=1}^k \langle z_i(u_k, \cdot), z_i(u_j, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \sigma_i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} - 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^k \langle z_i(u_{j_1}, \cdot), z_i(u_{j_2}, \cdot) \rangle_{t \wedge \sigma_i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_1}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_2}^i} = \\
&= t \wedge \sigma_i + \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^k (t - t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_1}^i} \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj_2}^i} = t \wedge \sigma_i + \sum_{j=1}^k (t - t \wedge \sigma_i) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^i} = t.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, all conditions of Lévy's theorem are satisfied, and so, the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any  $n \geq 2$  the following estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_1(u_k, t) - z_2(u_k, t)| &\leq \frac{n^3}{3} \cdot \varepsilon, \\
\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_i(u_k, t) - z_{i+1}(u_k, t)| &\leq \frac{n^4}{3} \cdot \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* 1) To prove the first estimate let us note that the formula for  $z_2(u_k, t)$  implies that for  $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_1(u_k, t) - z_2(u_k, t)| &= \mathbf{E} \sup_{\sigma_1 \leq t \leq 1} |z_1(u_k, t) - z_2(u_k, t)| = \\
&= \mathbf{E} \sup_{\sigma_1 \leq t \leq 1} \sum_{j=1}^k \left( |x(u_k, t) - [x(u_j, t) + (k-j) \cdot \varepsilon]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) = \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{\sigma_1 \leq t \leq 1} |x(u_k, t) - [x(u_j, t) + (k-j) \cdot \varepsilon]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) = \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{\sigma_1 \leq t \leq 1} |x(u_k, t) - [x(u_j, t) + [x(u_k, \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1)]]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) = \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - \sigma_1} |[x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_k, \sigma_1)] - [x(u_j, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) \leq \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |[x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_k, \sigma_1)] - [x(u_j, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate a separate term. To do this, fix an arbitrary  $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$  (the  $k$ th

term is obviously equal to zero) and set

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1(t) &= x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_k, \sigma_1), \quad t \geq 0, \\ \beta_2(t) &= x(u_j, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1), \quad t \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Due to the strong Markov property of the Brownian motion, the stochastic processes  $\{\beta_1(t), t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{\beta_2(t), t \geq 0\}$  are Wiener processes. By Knight's theorem [6, Theorem 3.4.13] there exists (maybe on an extended probability space) a Wiener process  $\{\beta(t), t \geq 0\}$  such that the representation

$$\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t) = \beta(\langle \beta_1 - \beta_2 \rangle_t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad \text{a. s.},$$

takes place. Furthermore, on the set  $A_{kj}^1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t) &= \\ &= [x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_k, \sigma_1)] - [x(u_j, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1)] = \\ &= [x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, t + \sigma_1)] - (k - j) \cdot \varepsilon \geq -(k - j) \cdot \varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$\langle \beta_1 - \beta_2 \rangle_t \leq \tau_\beta(c_{kj}), \quad t \geq 0, \quad \text{a. s. on } A_{kj}^1,$$

where

$$\tau_\beta(c) := \inf\{s \geq 0 \mid \beta(s) = c\}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}.$$

and

$$c_{kj} := -(k - j) \cdot \varepsilon > 0.$$

This implies that

$$\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t) = \beta(\langle \beta_1 - \beta_2 \rangle_t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj})), \quad t \geq 0, \quad \text{a. s. on } A_{kj}^1.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |[x(u_k, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_k, \sigma_1)] - [x(u_j, t + \sigma_1) - x(u_j, \sigma_1)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) = \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\beta_1(t) - \beta_2(t)| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) = \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\beta(\langle \beta_1 - \beta_2 \rangle_t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj}))| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) \leq \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{t \geq 0} |\beta(t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj}))| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{A_{kj}^1} \right) \leq \mathbf{E} \sup_{t \geq 0} |\beta(t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj}))|.\end{aligned}$$

Applying Doob's inequality to the martingale  $\{\beta(t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj})), t \geq 0\}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \geq 0} |\beta(t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj}))| \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \geq 0} |\beta(t \wedge \tau_\beta(c_{kj}))|^2} \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{E} |\beta(\tau_\beta(c_{kj}))|^2} = 2(k - j) \cdot \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we arrive at the estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_1(u_k, t) - z_2(u_k, t)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k 2(k - j) \cdot \varepsilon = \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{3} \cdot \varepsilon \leq \frac{n^3}{3} \cdot \varepsilon.$$

2) To prove the second estimate let us denote

$$B_{jl}^i = A_{kj}^i \cap A_{kl}^{i-1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq l \leq k \leq n, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_i(u_k, t) - z_{i+1}(u_k, t)| = \mathbf{E} \sup_{\sigma_i \leq t \leq 1} |z_{i+1}(u_k, t) - z_i(u_k, t)| = \\ & = \mathbf{E} \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l \left( \sup_{\sigma_i \leq t \leq 1} |[z_i(u_j, t) + (k-j) \cdot \varepsilon] - [z_i(u_l, t) + (k-l) \cdot \varepsilon]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{B_{jl}^i} \right) = \\ & = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{\sigma_i \leq t \leq 1} |[z_i(u_l, t) - z_i(u_j, t)] - (l-j) \cdot \varepsilon| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{B_{jl}^i} \right) = \\ & = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{\sigma_i \leq t \leq 1} |[z_i(u_l, t) - z_i(u_l, \sigma_i)] - [z_i(u_j, t) - z_i(u_j, \sigma_i)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{B_{jl}^i} \right) = \\ & = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1 - \sigma_i} |[z_i(u_l, t + \sigma_i) - z_i(u_l, \sigma_i)] - [z_i(u_j, t + \sigma_i) - z_i(u_j, \sigma_i)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{B_{jl}^i} \right) \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |[z_i(u_l, t + \sigma_i) - z_i(u_l, \sigma_i)] - [z_i(u_j, t + \sigma_i) - z_i(u_j, \sigma_i)]| \cdot \mathbb{I}_{B_{jl}^i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Further we proceed just as in the previous case, noting that for  $j \neq l$  the stochastic processes  $\{z_i(u_l, t), t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{z_i(u_j, t), t \geq 0\}$  do not intersect on the set  $B_{jl}^i$ . Thus, we arrive at the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_i(u_k, t) - z_{i+1}(u_k, t)| & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^l 2(l-j) \cdot \varepsilon = \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{k(k^2-1)}{3} \cdot \varepsilon \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{k^3}{3} \cdot \varepsilon \leq \frac{n^4}{3} \cdot \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved. □

**Theorem 3.4.** *If  $n \geq 2$  is such that*

$$d(\Gamma) < \frac{2}{n},$$

*then*

$$W_1(\Lambda^n, \Lambda_0^n) \leq \frac{n^5}{3} \cdot d(\Gamma).$$

*Proof.* Clearly, we may assume that  $d(\Gamma) > 0$ . If we set

$$u_k = \frac{2k-1}{2n}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

then

$$u_{k+1} - u_k = \frac{1}{n} > \varepsilon := \frac{1}{2}d(\Gamma), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

Let us note that for the initial Harris flow  $\{x(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  and the Arratia flow  $\{x_0(u, t), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  the corresponding stochastic processes  $\{(z_n(u_1, t), \dots, z_n(u_n, t)), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{(z_{0,n}(u_1, t), \dots, z_{0,n}(u_n, t)), u \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0\}$  constructed according to the procedure described above with  $\varepsilon > 0 = d(\Pi_{\{0\}})$  have the same distribution. Therefore, the distributions  $\tilde{\Lambda}^n$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}_0^n$  of the random measures

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}^n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{z_n(u_k, 1)}, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_0^n &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{z_{0,n}(u_k, 1)} \end{aligned}$$

coincide. Hence, by the triangle's inequality

$$W_1(\Lambda^n, \Lambda_0^n) \leq W_1(\Lambda^n, \tilde{\Lambda}^n) + W_1(\tilde{\Lambda}^n, \tilde{\Lambda}_0^n) + W_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_0^n, \Lambda_0^n) = W_1(\Lambda^n, \tilde{\Lambda}^n) + W_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_0^n, \Lambda_0^n).$$

However, using Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\Lambda^n, \tilde{\Lambda}^n) &= \inf_{\varkappa \in C(\Lambda^n, \tilde{\Lambda}^n)} \iint_{\mathcal{M}_1^2(\mathbb{R})} W_1(\mu', \mu'') \varkappa(d\mu', d\mu'') \leq \mathbf{E} W_1(\lambda^n, \tilde{\lambda}^n) = \\ &= \mathbf{E} \inf_{\varkappa \in C(\lambda^n, \tilde{\lambda}^n)} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u - v| \varkappa(du, dv) \leq \mathbf{E} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |x(u_k, 1) - z_n(u_k, 1)| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_1(u_k, t) - z_n(u_k, t)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |z_i(u_k, t) - z_{i+1}(u_k, t)| \leq \frac{n^5}{3} \cdot \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$W_1(\tilde{\Lambda}_0^n, \Lambda_0^n) \leq \frac{n^5}{3} \cdot \varepsilon.$$

This implies the desired result.  $\square$

## 4 Proof of the main result: third step

*Proof of theorem 1.3.* By the triangle's inequality we have

$$W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda_0) \leq W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda^n) + W_1(\Lambda^n, \Lambda_0^n) + W_1(\Lambda_0^n, \Lambda_0).$$

On the one hand, by Theorem 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda^n) &\leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}, \\ W_1(\Lambda_0^n, \Lambda_0) &= W_1(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0^n) \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 3.4,

$$W_1(\Lambda^n, \Lambda_0^n) \leq \frac{n^5}{3} \cdot d(\Gamma).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda_0) \leq 2K \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + n^5 \cdot d(\Gamma) \right),$$

since

$$2K > \frac{1}{3}.$$

The function

$$h(y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} + y^5 \cdot d(\Gamma), \quad y \geq 1.$$

attains its minimum at the point

$$y_0 = \frac{1}{(10d(\Gamma))^{2/11}}.$$

Therefore, we set

$$n_0 = \left( \left\lceil \frac{1}{(10d(\Gamma))^{2/11}} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \in \mathbb{N}$$

and note that, since by assumption  $d(\Gamma) < \frac{1}{10}$ , then  $n_0 \geq 2$  and  $d(\Gamma) < \frac{1}{n_0}$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\Lambda, \Lambda_0) &\leq 2K \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}} + n_0^5 \cdot d(\Gamma) \right) \leq \\ &\leq 2K \cdot \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{(10d(\Gamma))^{2/11}}}} + \left( 2 \cdot \frac{1}{(10d(\Gamma))^{2/11}} \right)^5 \cdot d(\Gamma) \right) = \\ &= 2K \cdot \left( 10^{1/11} \cdot d(\Gamma)^{1/11} + \left( \frac{2^9}{5^2} \right)^{5/11} \cdot d(\Gamma)^{1/11} \right) = C \cdot d(\Gamma)^{1/11}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = 2K \cdot (10^{1/11} + (2^9/5^2)^{5/11})$ . The theorem is proved.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Arratia, A. R. 1979. Coalescing Brownian motions on the line. Thesis (PhD), University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- [2] Harris, T. E. 1984. Coalescing and noncoalescing stochastic flows in  $R_1$ . *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 17:187–210.
- [3] Dorogovtsev, A. A. 2007. *Measure-valued Processes and Stochastic Flows*, Institute of Mathematics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kiev. (in Russian)

- [4] Kotelenez, P. 2008. *Stochastic ordinary and stochastic partial differential equations. Transition from microscopic to macroscopic equations*, Springer.
- [5] Walsh, J. B. 1986. An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XIV-1984*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1180; Hennequin, P. L., Ed.; Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 265–439.
- [6] Karatzas, I., and Shreve, S. E. 1991. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag.
- [7] Kunita, H. 1990. *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Dorogovtsev, A. A. 2004. One Brownian stochastic flow. *Theory of Stochastic Processes* 10(3-4):21–25.
- [9] Villani, C. 2008. *Optimal transport, old and new*, Springer.
- [10] Dorogovtsev, A. A. 2010. Entropy of stochastic flows. *Sbornik: Mathematics* 201(5):645–653.
- [11] Kallenberg, O. 2002. *Foundations of Modern Probability*, 2nd ed., Springer.