S©MR

СИБИРСКИЕ ЭЛЕКТРОННЫЕ
МАТЕМАТИЧЕСКИЕ ИЗВЕСТИЯ

Siberian Electronic Mathematical Reports

http://semr.math.nsc.ru

ISSN 1813-3304

Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 1–12 (2025) УДК 519.21

https://doi.org/10.33048/semi.2023.20.??? MSC 60J65

ON ACCURACY OF APPROXIMATIONS FOR WIENER PROBABILITIES TO STAY BETWEEN SQUARE ROOT BOUNDARIES

A.I. SAKHANENKO

Communicated by P.P. Petrov???

Abstract: Several asymptotic formulas for probabilities of the Wiener process to stay between different square root boundaries are known after papers of Breiman (1965), Sato (1977), Novikov (1979, 1981), Gärtner (1982), Uchiyama (1980), Greenwood and Perkins (1983). In the present work we investigate accuracy of these approximations. We improve and generalize the estimate obtained earlier by Uchiyama in the case of one boundary.

Keywords: Brownian motion, square root boundaries, exit time, accuracy of approximation

1 Introduction and main results

1.1. Introduction. For a standard Brownian motion $B_t = B(t)$, defined for all $t \geq 0$, introduce into consideration the following stopping time:

$$\tau_{c_1,c_2} := \inf\{t > 0 : B_t \notin (c_1\sqrt{t}, c_2\sqrt{t})\} = \inf\{t > 0 : U_t \notin (c_1, c_2)\},$$

Sakhanenko, A.I., On Accuracy of Approximations for Wiener Probabilities to stay between square root boundaries.

Received October, 14, 2025, Published December, 31, 2025.

where $U_t = U(t) := B(t)/\sqrt{t}$ for $t > 0$ and $c_1 < c_2$. Our main aims are to approximate, for large $T > 1$, the probability

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\tau_{c_1,c_2} > T|B_1 = a) &= \mathbf{P}(\tau_{c_1,c_2} > T|U_1 = a)\\ &= \mathbf{P}(c_1 < U_t < c_2\ \forall t \in [1,T]|U_1 = a)\end{aligned}$$

and the more general probability

$$P_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) = \mathbf{P}(\tau_{c_1,c_2} > T \quad \text{and} \quad U_T \le y|U_1 = a) \tag{1}$$

for all parameters a, c_1, c_2, y, T satisfying the following relations:

$$T > 1, \quad -\infty < c_1 < c_2 \le \infty, \quad a, y < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad c_1 \le a, y \le c_2. \tag{2}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the set of all values a, c_1, c_2, y, T which satisfy conditions from (2). We fix the numbers c_1 and c_2 and we often omit the dependence of our notations on c_1, c_2.

The study of first-passage times over one of the two square root boundaries for the Brownian motion was initiated by Breiman [1]. After that several results in exit problems with one-sided boundaries were obtained by Sato [8], Novikov [6, 7], Gärtner [4], Uchiyama [9]. For more detailed history see also [2]. All these results were summarized by Greenwood and Perkins [5] in their Lemma 3. We recall the corresponding assertions below in our Lemmas 1 and 5. In particular, in domain $\mathcal{D}$ there exist functions

$$\lambda(c_1,c_2) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \quad \psi_{c_1,c_2}(x) > 0 \quad \forall x \in (c_1,c_2) \tag{3}$$

such that

$$T^{\lambda(c_1,c_2)}P_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \to \Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \ = \psi_{c_1,c_2}(a)\theta_{c_1,c_2}(y) \qquad \text{on} \ \ \mathcal{D} \tag{4}$$

as $T \to \infty$, where for all $y \in (c_1, c_2)$

$$\theta_{c_1,c_2}(c_1) = 0 < \theta_{c_1,c_2}(y) := \int_{c_1}^{y} \frac{\psi_{c_1,c_2}(x)}{||\psi_{c_1,c_2}||^2} e^{-x^2/2}dx < \theta_{c_1,c_2}(c_2) < \infty \tag{5}$$

and $0 < ||\psi_{c_1,c_2}||^2 := \int_{c_1}^{c_2} \psi^2_{c_1,c_2}(x)e^{-x^2/2}dx < \infty$.

Unfortunately, the explicit forms of functions $\lambda(c_1, c_2)$ and $\psi_{c_1,c_2}(x)$ are known only in exceptional cases. For example, Breiman [1] pointed out that

$$\lambda(-1,1) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \quad \lambda(-c,c) = 2 \qquad \text{for} \quad c^2 = 3 - \sqrt{6}.$$

Several authors (see, for example, [3]) also noted that

$$\lambda(0,\infty) = 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{0,\infty}(x) = \sqrt{2/\pi}x \quad \text{with} \quad \theta_{0,\infty}(x) = 1 - e^{-x^2/2} \quad \text{for} \quad x \ge 0,$$

where $||\psi_{0,\infty}|| = \sqrt[4]{2/\pi}$.

1.2. Statement of the problem. There arises a natural task to obtain a rate of convergence in (4), i.e. to find estimates for the difference

$$\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) := T^{\lambda(c_1,c_2)} P_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) - \Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \tag{6}$$

In the particular case, when $c_2 = y = \infty$, such estimate was obtained by Uchiyama [9]. In his Theorem 1.1 for all $c := c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ he found a remarkable inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\Delta_{c,\infty}(a,T,\infty)\right| &= \left|T^{\lambda(c,\infty)}\mathbf{P}(\tau_{c,\infty} > T|U_1 = a) - \psi_{c,\infty}(a)\theta_{c,\infty}(\infty)\right| \qquad (7)\\ &< \frac{C_1(\varepsilon,c)}{T^{\varkappa(c)}}\exp(\varepsilon x^2) \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } T > T_1(\varepsilon,c) > 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants $C_1(\varepsilon,c)$ and $T_1(\varepsilon,c)$ depend only on the chosen numbers $\varepsilon > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ (for the implicit definitions of these constants see formula (1.10) in [9]); in addition

$$\text{the function } \varkappa(c) \text{ is continuous for all } c \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } \varkappa(c) > 1/2. \tag{8}$$

Our aim is to improve and generalize the estimate (7) of Uchiyama.

1.3. Main estimates. Below we consider only parameters from (2).

Theorem 1. *Suppose that*

$$u_a > 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad a \in (c_1, c_2). \tag{9}$$

Then there exists a number $\varkappa(c_1,c_2) > 0$ such that we have on $\mathcal{D}$ that

$$\left|\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\right| \le \sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda(c_1,c_2))}\,\frac{u_a^{\Lambda(c_1,c_2)}}{T^{\varkappa(c_1,c_2)}}\sqrt[4]{\frac{u_a^2}{u_a^2-1}}\exp\left(\frac{a^2}{2(u_a+1)}\right), \tag{10}$$

where $\Lambda(c_1,c_2) := \lambda(c_1,c_2) + \varkappa(c_1,c_2) > \varkappa(c_1,c_2) > 0$.

Now consider several partial cases. With $u_a = 2$ in (10) we immediately have

Corollary 1. *Let $c_2 < \infty$. Then*

$$\left|\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\right| \le \frac{C_2(c_1,c_2)}{T^{\varkappa(c_1,c_2)}} \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D},$$

where

$$C_2(c_1,c_2) := \sqrt[4]{4e(1+8\Lambda(c_1,c_2))}\,2^{\Lambda(c_1,c_2)}\exp\left(\frac{\max\{c_1^2,c_2^2\}}{6}\right) < \infty.$$

The case when $c_2 = \infty$ is more complicated. We emphasize that in this case

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_\infty := \{(T,c,a,y) : T > 1,\ -\infty < c := c_1 \le a, y < \infty\}$$

and $\varkappa(c,\infty) = \varkappa(c)$, where $\varkappa(c)$ satisfy conditions (8). We first present simpler results.

Corollary 2. *For any number* $b_a > 0$

$$\left|\Delta_{c,\infty}(a,T,y)\right| \le \sqrt{e^{1+1/b_a}(1+8\Lambda(c,\infty))}\,\frac{(1+b_a a^2)^{\Lambda(c,\infty)}}{T^{\varkappa(c)}} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_\infty. \tag{11}$$

Observe that in (11), (12), and (15) we have the coefficient $\sqrt{1+8\Lambda}$ instead of $\sqrt[4]{1+8\Lambda}$ in the other places of the paper (see the proof of Corollary 2 for the reason).

In particular, in the simplest case, when $b_a = 1$,

$$\left|\Delta_{c,\infty}(a,T,y)\right| \le e\sqrt{1+8\Lambda(c,\infty)}\,\frac{(1+a^2)^{\Lambda(c,\infty)}}{T^{\varkappa(c)}} \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_\infty. \tag{12}$$

On the other hand, with $b_a = 1+\varepsilon/\Lambda(c,\infty)$ we find from (11) the next two interesting estimates.

Corollary 3. *For any number* $b_a > 0$

$$\left|\Delta_{c,\infty}(a,T,y)\right| \le \frac{C_3(\varepsilon,\Lambda(c,\infty))}{T^{\varkappa(c)}}\left(1+\frac{\varepsilon a^2}{\Lambda(c,\infty)}\right)^{\Lambda(c,\infty)} \tag{13}$$

$$\le \frac{C_3(\varepsilon,\Lambda(c,\infty))}{T^{\varkappa(c)}}\exp\left(\varepsilon a^2\right) \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_\infty, \tag{14}$$

where

$$C_3(\varepsilon,\Lambda) := \sqrt{e(1+8\Lambda)}\exp\left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\varepsilon}\right) < \infty. \tag{15}$$

Remark 1. *Inequality (14) is better, than estimate (7) of Uchiyama because (14) takes place for all* $T>1$ *with explicit constant* C_3*. Moreover, inequalities (15) and (13) are sharper than (7) up to a constant.*

In addition, our considerations show that sharper estimates (15) and (13) would allow to simplify and shorten several proofs in [2] and [5].

1.4. Key estimates.

Introduce a special function:

$$\varphi_v(y) := \sqrt[4]{\frac{v^2}{v^2-1}}\exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2(v+1)}\right), \quad v>1, \quad y\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{16}$$

Theorem 2. *Suppose that functions* u_a *and* v_y *satisfy the next properties*

$$u_a > 1, \quad v_y > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad T \ge u_a v_y \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \tag{17}$$

Then we have the following estimate:

$$\left|\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\right| \le \frac{u_a^{\Lambda(c_1,c_2)}\varphi_{u_a}(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi}T^{\varkappa(c_1,c_2)}}\int_{c_1}^{y} v_y^{\Lambda(c_1,c_2)}\varphi_{v_y}(y)e^{-y^2/2}dy \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}, \tag{18}$$

where the numbers $\Lambda(c_1,c_2) > \varkappa(c_1,c_2) > 0$ *were introduced in Theorem 2.*

The following rough inequalities may be useful in the case of small values of T.

Theorem 3. *With the numbers $\varkappa(c_1, c_2)$ and $\Lambda(c_1, c_2)$ defined in Theorem 1*

$$T^{\lambda(c_1,c_2)} \geq \Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \geq -\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D}. \tag{19}$$

In addition, for all functions u_a and v_y such that

$$u_a > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad v_y > 1 \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D} \tag{20}$$

we have the next estimate:

$$0 \leq \Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \leq \frac{u_a^{\lambda(c_1,c_2)}\varphi_{u_a}(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{c_1}^{y} v_y^{\lambda(c_1,c_2)}\varphi_{v_y}(y)e^{-y^2/2}dy \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \tag{21}$$

We emphasize that condition (20) is weaker than (17).

Remark 2. *The limiting function Ψ_{c_1,c_2}, introduced in (4), always exists and is uniquely defined on $\mathcal{D}$. But the function ψ_{c_1,c_2}, used in all our results, may be defined only up to a positive constant multiplier. For example, we may put*

$$\psi_{c_1,c_2}(a) = C_{c_1,c_2}\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,c_2) \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D} \tag{22}$$

with an arbitrary constant C_{c_1,c_2} dependent only on c_1 and c_2.

These facts will be established in Lemma 5 below.

2 Proofs

2.1. Main representations. Introduce into consideration an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

$$\omega_t := U(e^t) = e^{-t/2}B(e^t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \geq 0, \quad \text{and let} \quad s := \log T > 0. \tag{23}$$

It is well-known that there exists a function $q_{c_1,c_2}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ such that in the domain (2) for all measurable $A \subset [c_1, c_2]$ and $\mu(y) := e^{-y^2/2}$

$$\mathbf{P}(c_1 < \omega_t < c_2 \ \forall t \in [0,s] \ \text{ and } \omega_s \in A | u_0 = a) = \int_A q_{c_1,c_2}(a, e^s, y)\mu(y)dy. \tag{24}$$

This is the probability that the Uhlenbeck process with the absorbing barriers at positions $c_1 < c_2$ is not absorbed until the time $s = \log T$. Here the function $q_{c_1,c_2}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ has several remarkable properties which were used, for example, in [1] and [9]. The next assertion follows from more general Proposition 2 and Lemma 3 in [5]. See also [9] for more details when $c_2 = \infty$.

Lemma 1. *Let the real numbers a, c_1, c_2, y satisfy conditions (2). Then the function $q_{c_1,c_2}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$, defined in (24), has the following properties:*

(A) *for each fixed $T = e^s > 1$ we have the next representation:*

$$q_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_k s}\phi_k(a)\phi_k(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k(a)\phi_k(y)}{T^{\lambda_k}} \tag{25}$$

for some functions $\{\phi_k(\cdot) = \phi_k(\cdot, c_1, c_2)\}$ and numbers $\{\lambda_k = \lambda_k(c_1, c_2) > 0\}$ generated by the Uhlenbeck process, where the series converges absolutely, *uniformly for* (a, y) *in compact subsets of* $[c_1, c_2]^2$*. The convergence also holds in the space of all square-summable (with respect to the measure* $\mu(a)\mu(y)dady$*) functions in the plane domain* $c_1 < a, y < c_2$*.*

(B) *The function* $\lambda_0(c_1, c_2)$ *is strictly positive, jointly continuous on the set*

$$C := \{(c_1, c_2) : -\infty < c_1 < c_2 \le \infty\};$$

it is also strictly increasing in $c_l \in (-\infty, c_2]$*, and strictly decreasing in* $c_2 \in [c_1, \infty]$*. In addition,*

$$\lim_{(c_1,c_2)\to(-\infty,\infty)} \lambda_0(c_1, c_2) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{(c_1,c_2)\to(0,0)} \lambda_0(c_1, c_2) = \infty.$$

(C) *For each* $k > 0$ *and all* $(c_1, c_2) \in C$

$$0 < \lambda_0(c_1, c_2) < \cdots < \lambda_k(c_1, c_2) < \lambda_{k+1}(c_1, c_2) < \infty.$$

Moreover, all functions $\lambda_k(c_1, \infty)$ *are continuous on* $\mathbb{R}$ *with*

$$\lambda_{k+1}(c_1, \infty) - \lambda_k(c_1, \infty) > 1/2 \quad \textit{for all} \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad \textit{and} \quad c_1 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(D) *The function* $\phi_0(\cdot) = \phi_0(\cdot, c_1, c_2)$ *is positive on* (c_1, c_2)*, moreover*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \inf\{\phi_0(x, c_1, c_2) : c_1 - \varepsilon < x < c_2 - \varepsilon\} > 0.$$

In addition, the function $\phi_0(\cdot, c_1, \infty)$ *is continuous on* $[c_1, \infty)$*.*

(E) *functions* $\{\phi_k(\cdot) = \phi_k(\cdot, c_1, c_2)\}$ *form a complete orthonormal system in the space* $L^2_{c_1,c_2}$ *of all square-summable (with respect to the measure* $\mu(y)dy$*) functions on* (c_1, c_2)*; in particular, for all* $j > k \ge 0$

$$\int_{c_1}^{c_2} \phi_k^2(y, c_1, c_2)\mu(y)dy = 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_{c_1}^{c_2} \phi_k(y, c_1, c_2)\phi_j(y, c_1, c_2)\mu(y)dy = 0.$$

Note that by (23), (24), and (1)

$$P_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y) = \int_{c_1}^{y} q_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, x)\mu(x)dx \qquad \text{on} \ \ \mathcal{D}. \tag{26}$$

2.2. Corollaries from Lemma 1. Under conditions (2) consider the function:

$$r_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y) := T^{\lambda_0} q_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y) - \phi_0(a)\phi_0(y) = T^{\lambda_0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k(a)\phi_k(y)}{T^{\lambda_k}} \tag{27}$$

with the same functions $\{\phi_k(\cdot)\}$ and numbers $\{\lambda_k\}$ as in (25).

Lemma 2. *Suppose that conditions* (2) *and* (17) *are fulfilled. Then*

$$T^{2(\lambda_1-\lambda_0)} r^2_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y) \le (u_a v_y)^{2(\lambda_1-\lambda_0)} r_{c_1,c_2}(a, u_a^2, a) r_{c_1,c_2}(y, v_y^2, y) \tag{28}$$

$$\le (u_a v_y)^{2\lambda_1} q_{c_1,c_2}(a, u_a^2, a) q_{c_1,c_2}(y, v_y^2, y). \tag{29}$$

Proof. Note first of all that by Schwartz inequality

$$\Sigma := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\phi_k(x)|}{u_a^{\lambda_k}} \frac{|\phi_k(y)|}{v_y^{\lambda_k}} \le \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k^2(x)}{u_a^{2\lambda_k}}} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k^2(y)}{v_y^{2\lambda_k}}} \tag{30}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{r(u_a^2, x, x)}{u^{2\lambda_0}}} \sqrt{\frac{r(v_x^2, y, y)}{v^{2\lambda_0}}}.$$

Here and below we use simplified notation $r(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$ instead of $r_{c_1,c_2}(\cdot,\cdot,\cdot)$.

On the other hand, we have from assumptions (17) that for all $k \ge 1$

$$\frac{1}{T^{\lambda_k}} = \frac{1}{T^{\lambda_1}} \frac{1}{T^{\lambda_k - \lambda_1}} \le \frac{1}{T^{\lambda_1}} \frac{1}{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_k - \lambda_1}} = \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_1}}{T^{\lambda_1}} \frac{1}{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_k}}.$$

This elementary relation together with the definition of $r(T, x, y)$ in (27) imply that

$$\frac{|r(T,x,y)|}{T^{\lambda_0}} \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\phi_k(x)\phi_k(y)|}{T^{\lambda_k}} \le \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_1}}{T^{\lambda_1}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\phi_k(x)\phi_k(y)|}{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_k}} = \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_1}}{T^{\lambda_1}} \Sigma. \tag{31}$$

Substituting now (30) into (31) we arrive to (28).

Next, it follows from representations (25) and (27) that

$$\frac{r_{c_1,c_2}(y,T,y)|}{T^{\lambda_0}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k^2(y)}{T^{\lambda_k}} \le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_k^2(y)}{T^{\lambda_k}} = q_{c_1,c_2}(y,T,y).$$

Using this inequality with $T = v_y^2$ and with $T = u_a^2$, when $y = a$, we obtain (29) as a corollary of (28). □

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > 0$ denote by $\varphi(t,x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2t}\right)$ the density of B_t.

Lemma 3. *Under conditions* (2)

$$q_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \le \varphi(1 - 1/T, y - a/\sqrt{T})/\mu(y). \tag{32}$$

In particular, when $a = y$ *and* $t = v^2$,

$$\frac{\psi_0^2(y)}{v^{2\lambda_0}} \le q_{c_1,c_2}(y, v^2, y) \le \frac{\varphi(1 - 1/v^2, y - y/v)}{\mu(y)} = \frac{\varphi_v^2(y)}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, \tag{33}$$

where $\varphi_v(y)$ *was defined in* (16).

Proof. Note that $\varphi(1-1/T, \cdot - a/\sqrt{T})$ is the density of $U_T = B_T/\sqrt{T}$ under condition that $B_1 = a$. Hence, under assumptions (2), we have from (24) and (23) that

$$\int_A q_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\mu(y)dy \le \mathbf{P}(\omega_{\log T} \in A | \omega_0 = a) \tag{34}$$

$$= \mathbf{P}(U_T \in A | B_1 = a) = \int_A \varphi(1 - 1/T, y - a/\sqrt{T})dy,$$

and, as a result, (32) follows for each $y \in (c_1, c_2)$ because (34) holds for all sets $A \subset (c_1, c_2)$.

Next, for $v > 1$

$$\frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{(y - y/v)^2}{2(1 - 1/v^2)} = \frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{y^2(v-1)^2}{2(v^2-1)} = \frac{y^2(v+1)}{2(v+1)} - \frac{y^2(v-1)}{2(v+1)} = \frac{y^2}{v+1}.$$

Hence, in this case

$$\frac{\varphi(1 - 1/v^2, y - y/v)}{\mu(y)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(1-1/v^2)}} \exp\left(\frac{y^2}{v+1}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \varphi_v^2(y).$$

So, (33) is also proved with $\varphi_v(y)$ introduced in (16). □

2.3. Proof of Theorem 2 . Below in the paper we use the next notations:

$$\lambda := \lambda(c_1, c_2) := \lambda_0(c_1, c_2) = \lambda_0 < \Lambda := \Lambda(c_1, c_2) := \lambda_1(c_1, c_2) = \lambda_1, \quad (35)$$

$$\varkappa := \varkappa(c_1, c_2) := \lambda_1 - \lambda_0 > 0, \quad \theta_0(y, c_1, c_2) := \int_{c_1}^{y} \psi_0(x, c_1, c_2)\mu(x)dx.$$

Lemma 4. *Suppose that the following equality*

$$\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a, y) = \psi_{c_1,c_2}(a)\theta_{c_1,c_2}(y) = \Psi_0(a, y, , c_1, c_2) := \psi_0(a, c_1, c_2)\theta_0(y, c_1, c_2) \quad (36)$$

holds in domain (2). Then estimate (18) and convergence (4) takes place. In particular, condition (36) is obviously fulfilled when $\psi_{c_1,c_2}(a) = \psi_0(a, c_1, c_2)$.

Proof. If condition (36) is true, then we see from (6), (26), and (27) that

$$\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y) = \int_{c_1}^{y} r_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, x)\mu(x)dx. \quad (37)$$

Using now (29), (33), and (35) we get

$$|r_{c_1,c_2}(a, T, y)| \le \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_1}}{T^{\lambda_1 - \lambda_0}} \sqrt{q_{c_1,c_2}(a, u_a^2, a) q_{c_1,c_2}(y, v_y^2, y)}$$
$$\le \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\lambda_1}}{T^{\lambda_1 - \lambda_0}} \frac{\varphi_{u_a}(a)\varphi_{v_y}(y)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{(u_a v_y)^{\Lambda(c_1,c_2)}}{T^{\varkappa(c_1,c_2)}} \frac{\varphi_{u_a}(a)\varphi_{v_y}(y)}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Plugging the last inequality into (37) we arrive to (18).

At last, note that convergence (4) follows from estimate (18) with $u_a = v_y = 2 > 1$. □

Lemma 5. *Convergence (4) takes place if and only if condition (36) is fulfilled. In addition, (36) holds if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of a and y, such that*

$$\psi_{c_1,c_2}(a) = C\psi_0(a, c_1, c_2) \qquad on \ \ \mathcal{D}. \quad (38)$$

In particular, formula (22) with $C_{c_1,c_2} = C/\theta_0(y, c_1, c_2)$ immediately follows from (38) and (36).

Proof. When $\psi_{c_1,c_2} = \psi_0$, convergence (4) takes place by Lemma 4 with $\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) = \Psi_0(a,y,c_1,c_2)$. So, this equality holds for all functions ψ_{c_1,c_2} which is possible to use in (4). But condition $\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) = \Psi_0(a,y,c_1,c_2)$ coincides with (36).

Next, assume that condition (36) is fulfilled. Recall that $||\psi_0||^2 := 1$ as it follows from assertion (E) of Lemma 1. Hence in this case we have from (5) that

$$||\psi_{c_1,c_2}||^2 = C^2 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{c_1,c_2}(y) := \int_{c_1}^{y} \frac{C\psi_0(x,c_1,c_2)}{C^2}\mu(x)dx.$$

Substituting these equalities into (36) we see that condition (36) holds because $C^2/C^2 = 1$ and the product $\psi_{c_1,c_2}(a)\theta_{c_1,c_2}(y)$ is independent of $C > 0$.

On the other hand, when condition (36) holds with some possible function ψ_{c_1,c_2}, we have from (36) with $y = c_2$ that identity (38) takes place with

$$C = \int_{c_1}^{c_2} \psi_0(x,c_1,c_2)\mu(x)dx \Big/ \theta_{c_1,c_2}(c_2) > 0.$$

□

So, there are no cases in Theorem 2 when condition (36) does not hold. Hence, Theorem 2 is proved in Lemma 4 in all cases.

2.4. Proof of Theorem 3. From (3) and (33) with $v = v_y$ and $v = u_a$ we immediately have that

$$0 \le \psi_0(y) \le \frac{v_y^{\lambda}\varphi_{v_y}(y)}{\sqrt[4]{2\pi}} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \le \psi_0(a) \le \frac{u_a^{\lambda}\varphi_{u_a}(a)}{\sqrt[4]{2\pi}} \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \tag{39}$$

Now, by definition (35)

$$0 \le \theta_0(y,c_1,c_2) = \int_{c_1}^{y} \psi_0(x)\mu(x)dx \le \int_{c_1}^{y} \frac{v_y^{\lambda}\varphi_{v_y}(y)}{\sqrt[4]{2\pi}}\mu(x)dx \tag{40}$$

Substituting (39) and (40) into the representation (36) for $\Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y)$ we arrive to (21).

At last, (19) is evident by (6), because the probability $P_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \le 1$. So, both assertions of Theorem 3 are proved.

2.5. Two auxiliary lemmas. First of all note that for $v > 1$

$$\beta_2(v) := \sqrt[4]{1 - 1/v^2} = \sqrt[4]{\frac{v^2}{v^2-1}} = \sqrt[4]{\frac{v^2}{(v-1)(v+1)}} < \beta_1(v) := \sqrt[4]{\frac{v+1}{v-1}}. \tag{41}$$

Lemma 6. *For all* $y \ge c_1$

$$\overline{\theta}_v(y) := \int_{c_1}^{y} \varphi_v(y)\mu(y)dy \le \sqrt{2\pi}\beta_1(v), \quad v > 1. \tag{42}$$

Proof. From definition (16) we see that

$$\varphi_v(y)\mu(y) = \beta_2(v)\exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2(v+1)} - \frac{y^2}{2}\right) = \beta_2(v)\exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\sigma^2(v)}\right), \quad v > 1.$$

with $\sigma^2(v) := (v+1)/v$. Hence

$$\overline{\theta}_v(y) = \int_{c_1}^{y} \varphi_v(y)\mu(y)dy \le \beta_2(v)\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\sigma^2(v)}\right)dy = \sqrt{2\pi}\beta_2(v)\sigma(v) \tag{43}$$

for $v > 1$. where

$$\beta_2(v)\sigma(v) = \sqrt[4]{\frac{v^2}{v^2-1}} = \sqrt[4]{\frac{v^2}{(v-1)(v+1)} \cdot \frac{(v+1)^2}{v^2}} = \sqrt[4]{\frac{v+1}{v-1}} = \beta_1(v).$$

Thus, (42) follows from (43). □

For $i = 1, 2$ introduce special functions:

$$f_1(v) := \beta_1(v)v^{\Lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(v,y) := \beta_2(v)v^{\Lambda}\varphi_v(y), \quad v > 1, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{44}$$

where the value $\Lambda = \lambda_1$ was defined in (35). Note that

$$0 < \varkappa < \Lambda < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad 1 < v_* := 1 + \frac{1}{4\Lambda} < 1 + \frac{1}{\varkappa} < \infty.$$

Lemma 7. *For all $y \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$f_2(v,y) \le \sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}K^{\Lambda}\exp\left(\frac{y^2}{2v}\right) \quad \textit{when} \quad v_* \le v \le v_*K. \tag{45}$$

In addition, for all $y \ge c_1$

$$v_*^{\Lambda}\overline{\theta}_{v_*}(y) \le v_*^{\Lambda}\sqrt{2\pi}\beta_1(v_*) = \sqrt{2\pi}f_1(v_*) \le \sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}. \tag{46}$$

Proof. From definitions (41) and conditions (45) on number v we have:

$$\beta_2^4(v) < \beta_1^4(v) = 1 + \frac{2}{v-1} \le 1 + \frac{2}{v_*-1} = 1 + 8\Lambda,$$

$$v^{\Lambda} \le v_*^{\Lambda}K^{\Lambda} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{4\Lambda}\right)^{\Lambda}K^{\Lambda} \le e^{1/4}K^{\Lambda} = \sqrt[4]{e}K^{\Lambda}.$$

Substituting this estimates into definition (44) of functions f_i, we arrive to (45). When $K = 1$, these arguments and (42) also imply (46). □

2.6. Proof of Theorem 1 . We are going to show that under assumption (9)

$$\forall u_a > 1 \quad \left|\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\right| \le \frac{f_2(u_a,a)f_1(v_*)}{T^{\varkappa}} \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D}. \tag{47}$$

First of all we apply Theorem 2 with $v_y = v_*$. In this case the main condition (17) of this theorem has the next form:

$$u_a > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad T \ge u_a v_* \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D}, \tag{48}$$

and assertion (18) may be rewritten in the following way:

$$\left|\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y)\right| \le \frac{u_a^\Lambda \varphi_{u_a}(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi}T^\varkappa} v_*^\Lambda \theta_{v_*}(y) = \frac{f_2(u_a,a)}{\sqrt{2\pi}T^\varkappa} v_*^\Lambda \theta_{v_*}(y) \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}, \quad (49)$$

where we used simplified notations, introduced in (16), (42), and (44). But now (47) immediately follows from (49) and (46).

Thus, we proved (47) when assumption (48) is true. Now suppose that (48) is not fulfilled and assume instead that the next condition takes place:

$$u_a > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 < T \le u_a v_* \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \quad (50)$$

Now we will apply Theorem 3. From the first inequality in (19), using (50), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \le T^\lambda = \frac{T^\Lambda}{T^\varkappa} \le \frac{(u_a v_*)^\Lambda}{T^\varkappa} & \qquad (51) \\ \le \frac{(u_a v_*)^\Lambda}{T^\varkappa} \varphi_{u_a}(a)\beta_1(v_*) = \frac{f_2(u_a,a)f_1(v_*)}{T^\varkappa} & \end{aligned}$$

on $\mathcal{D}$, because $\varphi_u(a) > 1$ and $\beta_1(v) > 1$.

On the another hand, under assumption (50) we find from (19) and (21) that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) &\le \Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \le \frac{(u_a v_*)^\varkappa}{T^\varkappa} \Psi_{c_1,c_2}(a,y) \\ &\le \frac{(u_a v_*)^\varkappa}{T^\varkappa} \frac{u_a^\lambda \varphi_{u_a}(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} v_*^\lambda \overline{\theta}_{v_*}(y) = \frac{u_a^\Lambda \varphi_{u_a}(a)}{T^\varkappa\sqrt{2\pi}} v_*^\Lambda \overline{\theta}_{v_*}(y) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned}$$

Using now notations from (44) and estimate (46) we obtain:

$$-\Delta_{c_1,c_2}(a,T,y) \le \frac{f_2(u_a,a)}{T^\varkappa\sqrt{2\pi}} v_*^\Lambda \overline{\theta}_{v_*}(y) \le \frac{f_2(u_a,a)}{T^\varkappa} f_1(v_*) \qquad \text{on } \mathcal{D}.$$

Thus, it follows from the last inequality and (51) that estimate (47) is true under assumption (50).

So, (47) is proved in all cases. But the desired estimate (10) in Theorem 1 follows immediately from (47) and (46). Hence, Theorem 1 is also proved.

2.7. Proof of Corollary 2 . We are going to use inequality (45) for a instead of y and u_a instead of v, where

$$u_a = v_* K, \quad \text{where} \quad K = (1 + b_a a^2),\ b_a > 0.$$

Then $a^2/u_a \le a^2/K \le 1/b_a$. Hence, by (45),

$$f_2(u_a,a) \le \sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}(1+b_a a^2)^\Lambda \exp\left(\frac{1}{2b_a}\right) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_\infty.$$

Substituting this estimate into (10), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\Delta_{c,\infty}(a,T,y)\right| &\le \sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}\,\frac{f_2(u_a,a)}{T^{\varkappa}}\\ &\le \sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}\,\frac{\sqrt[4]{e(1+8\Lambda)}(1+b_a a^2)^{\Lambda}}{T^{\varkappa}}\exp\left(\frac{1}{2b_a}\right) \quad \text{on } \mathcal{D}_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the last inequality coincides with (11).

Thus, Corollary 2 is true. Hence, all the results of the paper are proved.

References

[1] L. Breiman, *First exit times from a square root boundary,* Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. Prob., **2** (1965), 1236–1249.

[2] D. Denisov, G. Hinrichs, A.I. Sakhanenko and V. Wachtel, *Crossing an asymptotically square root boundary by the Brownian motion,* Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics, **316** (2022), 105–120.

[3] D. Denisov, A.I. Sakhanenko, and V. Wachtel, *First-passage times for random walks with non-identically distributed increments,* Ann. Probab., **46**:6 (2018), 3313–3350.

[4] J. Gärtner, *Location of wave fronts for the multi-mimensional KPP equation and Brownian first exit densities,* Math. Nachr., **105** (1982), 317–351.

[5] P. Greenwood, and E. Perkins, *A conditioned limit theorem for random walk and Brownian local time on square root boundaries,* Ann. Probab., **11** (1983), 227–261.

[6] A.A. Novikov, *On estimates and the asymptotic behavior of nonexit probabilities of a Wiener process to a moving boundary,* *Mathematics of the USSR – Sbornik*, **38**:4 (1981), 495-505.

[7] A.A. Novikov, *Martingale approach to first passage problems of nonlinear boundaries,* Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., **158** (1981), 130–152.

[8] Sh. Sato, *Evaluation of the first-passage time probability to a square root boundary for the Wiener process,* J. Appl. Probab., **14** (1977), 850–856.

[9] K. Uchiyama, *Brownian first exit from and sojourn over one-sided moving boundary and application,* Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, **54** (1980), 75-116.

Alexander Ivanovich Sakhanenko
Sobolev Institute of Mathematics,
pr. Koptyuga, 4,
630090, Novosibirsk, Russia
Email address: aisakh@mail.ru