

List of topics in this lecture

- OU process (continued), solution of particle position $X(t)$
- Behavior of $X(t)$, diffusion coefficient, converging to $W(t)$
- Going backward in time using Bayes theorem
- Time reversibility of an equilibrium system
- Different interpretations of stochastic integrals

Recap

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (OU):

$$m dY = \underbrace{-bY dt}_{\text{dissipation}} + \underbrace{q dW}_{\text{fluctuation}}, \quad q = \sqrt{2k_B T b}$$

Four goals of the discussion

Goal 1: Solve for $Y(t)$, the particle velocity

$$(Y(t_0 + t) | Y(t_0) = y_0) \sim N\left(e^{-\beta t} y_0, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}(1 - e^{-2\beta t})\right) \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

$$\text{Equilibrium: } Y(t) \sim N\left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}\right) \quad \text{for large } t > 0$$

Goal 2A: $Y(t)$ is a colored noise

Goal 2B: $Y(t)$ converges to a white noise as “ m converges to zero”

Goal 3: Fluctuation-dissipation theorem: $q = \sqrt{2k_B T b}$.

Goal 4: Study the behavior of $X(t)$, the particle position

$$Y(t) = e^{-\beta t} Y(0) + e^{-\beta t} G(t), \quad G(t) \equiv \int_0^t \gamma e^{\beta s} dW(s)$$

$$X(t) - X(0) = \int_0^t Y(s) ds = \frac{1}{\beta}(1 - e^{-\beta t})Y(0) + \frac{\gamma}{\beta}G_2(t)$$

where $G_2(t) \equiv \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\beta(t-s)}) dW(s) \sim \text{normal}$.

Goal 4: (continued): We calculate the mean and variance of $G_2(t)$.

$$E(G_2(t)) = \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\beta(t-s)}) E(dW(s)) = 0$$

$$\text{var}(G_2(t)) = \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\beta(t-s)})^2 ds = t - \frac{2}{\beta}(1 - e^{-\beta t}) + \frac{1}{2\beta}(1 - e^{-2\beta t})$$

We write out the distribution of $(X(t) - X(0))$.

$$(X(t) - X(0)) \sim \frac{(1 - e^{-\beta t})}{\beta} Y(0) + \underbrace{\left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right) N \left(0, \left(t - \frac{2(1 - e^{-\beta t})}{\beta} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\beta t})}{2\beta} \right) \right)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [0, t]} \quad (\text{E01})$$

Remark:

We cannot integrate $G(t)$ directly because $G(t_1)$ and $G(t_2)$ are not independent. We need to write the integral as a sum of dW 's.

In Goal 4, we discuss two cases for $X(t)$.

Goal 4A: finite m

We show that over long time, $(X(t) - X(0))$ demonstrates a diffusion behavior.

The diffusion coefficient is defined as

$$D \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2t} \text{var}(X(t) - X(0))$$

We use (E01) to show the limit exists and to calculate the limit.

$$D \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2t} \text{var}(X(t) - X(0)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right)^2$$

Substituting $\beta = \frac{b}{m}$, $\gamma = \frac{q}{m}$, and $q = \sqrt{2k_B T b}$, we have

$$\left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right)^2 = \frac{q^2}{b^2} = \frac{2k_B T b}{b^2} = \frac{2k_B T}{b} \quad (\text{E02})$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$\boxed{D = \frac{k_B T}{b}}.$$

This is called the Einstein-Smoluchowski relation.

It relates the drag coefficient to the diffusion coefficient.

Remark: The diffusion coefficient is independent of the mass density of the particle. It is affected by the particle size via the drag coefficient b .

Goal 4B: $m \rightarrow 0$ (while b and q stay unchanged)

We show that $(X(t) - X(0))$ converges to $\sqrt{2D}W(t)$ on any discrete time grid.

Specifically, we show that for $t_2 > t_1 > 0$, as $m \rightarrow 0$, we have

- $X(t_1) - X(0) \rightarrow \sqrt{2D}N(0, t_1)$
- $X(t_1 + t_2) - X(t_1) \rightarrow \sqrt{2D}N(0, t_2)$
- $(X(t_1) - X(0))$ and $(X(t_1 + t_2) - X(t_1))$ are independent.

Using (E01), we write $(X(t_1) - X(0))$ as

$$(X(t_1) - X(0)) \sim (1 - e^{-\beta t_1}) \frac{Y(0)}{\beta} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2D} N\left(0, \left(t_1 - \frac{2(1 - e^{-\beta t_1})}{\beta} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\beta t_1})}{2\beta}\right)\right)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [0, t_1]}$$

As $m \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\beta = \frac{b}{m} = O(m^{-1}), \quad \gamma = \frac{q}{m} = O(m^{-1}), \quad \frac{\gamma}{\beta} = O(1)$$

$$2D \equiv \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\right)^2 = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\beta}(1 - e^{-\beta t_1}) = O(m) \rightarrow 0$$

Caution: $\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} |Y(0)| = \infty$. The Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution gives

$$Y(0) \sim N\left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{\beta}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2}{\beta}}\right) = O(m^{-0.5})$$

$$\implies \frac{Y(0)}{\beta} = O(m^{0.5}) \rightarrow 0$$

Taking the limit as $m \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$(X(t_1) - X(0)) \xrightarrow{\text{as } m \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{2D} \underbrace{N(0, t_1)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [0, t_1]}$$

Similarly, we have

$$(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) \sim (1-e^{-\beta t_2})\frac{Y(t_1)}{\beta} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2D} N\left(0, \left(t_2 - \frac{2(1-e^{-\beta t_2})}{\beta} + \frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})}{2\beta}\right)\right)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [t_1, t_1+t_2]}$$

$$\bullet \quad (X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) \xrightarrow{\text{as } m \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{2D} \underbrace{N(0, t_2)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [t_1, t_1+t_2]}$$

Notice that $(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) - (1-e^{-\beta t_2})\frac{Y(t_1)}{\beta}$ contains dW 's in $[t_1, t_1+t_2]$.

Since $(1-e^{-\beta t_2})\frac{Y(t_1)}{\beta} = O(m^{0.5}) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow 0$, we arrive at

- $(X(t_1)-X(0))$ and $(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1))$ are independent in the limit of $m \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore, as $m \rightarrow 0$, $(X(t) - X(0))$ converges to $\sqrt{2D}W(t)$ on any discrete time grid.

Remarks:

1. The diffusion coefficient of the standard Wiener process is 1/2 (not 1).

$$D_{\text{Wiener}} \equiv \frac{1}{2t} \text{var}(W(t)) = \frac{1}{2}$$

2. In the limit of $m \rightarrow 0$, $(X(t) - X(0))$ exhibits the behavior of a scaled Wiener process, called the Brownian motion, named after Scottish botanist Robert Brown.
3. The derivation above is for the “simplified story”. The real story where radius $a \rightarrow 0$ while ρ_{mass} is fixed, is presented in Appendix A.

Going backward in time in an equilibrium OU process

In the discussion of Goals #1–4 above, we focused on going forward in time.

$$E(Y(t)|Y(0)) = e^{-\beta t}Y(0) \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

Question:

What happens for $(-t) < 0$? Do we have

$$E(Y(-t)|Y(0)) = e^{+\beta t}Y(0) ?$$

which diverges to infinity as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. That seems unreasonable.

Answer: $t_{\text{new}} = -t_{\text{old}}$ does not work in stochastic differential equations.

Recall that when we scale dW , it is best to work with $\frac{dW}{\sqrt{dt}}$

$$dW(t) = \sqrt{dt} \cdot \frac{dW(t)}{\sqrt{dt}}, \quad \frac{dW(t)}{\sqrt{dt}} \sim N(0,1) \text{ independent of } t \text{ and } dt$$

It is clear that this works only for $dt > 0$, not for $t_{\text{new}} = -t_{\text{old}}$.

Key point:

In stochastic differential equations, scaling $t_{\text{new}} = -t_{\text{old}}$ does not work!

Bayes theorem describes $\Pr(A | B)$ in terms of $\Pr(B | A)$. We use Bayes theorem to calculate the backward time evolution based on the forward time evolution.

Bayes theorem for densities:

$$\rho(Y(-t) = y_1 | Y(0) = y_2) \propto \rho(Y(0) = y_2 | Y(-t) = y_1) \cdot \rho(Y(-t) = y_1)$$

Backward time evolution in an equilibrium OU process

We assume that the equilibrium has been reached long time ago (at $t = -\infty$) and $Y(t)$ is already a stationary process for all t (including negative t). In particular, the unconstrained $Y(t)$ has the equilibrium distribution for all t .

$$Y(-t) \sim N\left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \rho(Y(-t) = y_1) \propto \exp\left(\frac{-y_1^2}{2\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right)$$

For the forward time evolution, we already derived

$$(Y(t_1 + t) | Y(t_1) = y_1) \sim N\left(e^{-\beta t} y_1, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}(1 - e^{-2\beta t})\right) \quad \text{for } t > 0 \text{ and any } t_1$$

$$\Rightarrow \rho(Y(0) = y_2 | Y(-t) = y_1) \propto \exp\left(\frac{-(y_2 - e^{-\beta t} y_1)^2}{2(1 - e^{-2\beta t})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right)$$

Substituting into Bayes theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(Y(-t) = y_1 | Y(0) = y_2) &\propto \rho(Y(0) = y_2 | Y(-t) = y_1) \cdot \rho(Y(-t) = y_1) \\ &\propto \exp\left(\frac{-(y_2 - e^{-\beta t} y_1)^2}{2(1 - e^{-2\beta t})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-y_1^2}{2\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that here y_1 is the independent variable of the PDF and we only need to keep track factors that depend on y_1 .

$$\rho(Y(-t) = y_1 | Y(0) = y_2) \propto \exp\left(\frac{-[e^{-2\beta t} y_1^2 - 2e^{-\beta t} y_2 \cdot y_1 + (1 - e^{-2\beta t}) y_1^2]}{2(1 - e^{-2\beta t})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right)$$

$$\propto \exp\left(\frac{-[y_1^2 - 2e^{-\beta t} y_2 \cdot y_1]}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right) \propto \exp\left(\frac{-(y_1 - e^{-\beta t} y_2)^2}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right)$$

We recognize that this is a normal distribution.

It follows that in an equilibrium system, the backward time evolution is described by

$$(Y(-t)|Y(0)=y_2) \sim N\left(e^{-\beta t} y_2, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}(1-e^{-2\beta t})\right) \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

We compare it with the forward time evolution

$$(Y(t)|Y(0)=y_2) \sim N\left(e^{-\beta t} y_2, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}(1-e^{-2\beta t})\right) \quad \text{for } t > 0$$

Conclusions/remarks:

- At equilibrium, the evolution of going backward in time is statistically the same as the evolution of going forward in time. This is called the time reversibility of equilibrium.
- The time reversibility of equilibrium is a universal law applicable to all thermodynamic systems.
- The intuitive meaning of time reversibility is that if we are given a time series of a system in equilibrium, we won't be able to tell the direction of the time no matter how long and how detailed the time series is.
- Bayes theorem is very powerful in expressing the backward time evolution in terms of the forward time evolution.

Going backward in time in non-equilibrium OU process (optional)

Suppose the system starts with $Y(0) = 0$.

For $t_1 > 0$ and $t_2 > 0$, we use Bayes theorem to calculate $\rho(Y(t_1)=y_1|Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2)$.

Bayes theorem for densities:

$$\rho(Y(t_1)=y_1|Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2) \propto \rho(Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2|Y(t_1)=y_1) \cdot \rho(Y(t_1)=y_1)$$

We already derived

$$\bullet \quad (Y(t_1)|Y(0)=0) \sim N\left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta}(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})\right) \quad \text{for } t_1 > 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \rho(Y(t_1)=y_1) \propto \exp\left(\frac{-y_1^2}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})\gamma^2/(2\beta)}\right)$$

$$\bullet \quad \left(Y(t_1+t_2) | Y(t_1)=y_1 \right) \sim N \left(e^{-\beta t_2} y_1, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) \right) \text{ for } t_1 > 0, t_2 > 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \rho(Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2 | Y(t_1)=y_1) \propto \exp \left(\frac{-(y_2 - e^{-\beta t_2} y_1)^2}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})\gamma^2/(2\beta)} \right)$$

Substituting into Bayes theorem, we obtain

$$\rho(Y(t_1)=y_1 | Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2) \propto \rho(Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2 | Y(t_1)=y_1) \cdot \rho(Y(t_1)=y_1)$$

$$\propto \exp \left(\frac{-(y_2 - e^{-\beta t_2} y_1)^2}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})\gamma^2/(2\beta)} \right) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-y_1^2}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})\gamma^2/(2\beta)} \right)$$

(we only need to keep track factors that depend on y_1).

$$\propto \exp \left(\frac{-\left[(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})y_1^2 - 2(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})e^{-\beta t_2}y_2 \cdot y_1 \right]}{2(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})\gamma^2/(2\beta)} \right)$$

$$\propto \exp \left(\frac{-\left(y_1 - \frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} e^{-\beta t_2} y_2 \right)^2}{2 \frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} \gamma^2/(2\beta)} \right)$$

It follows that

$$\left(Y(t_1) | Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2 \right) \sim N \left(\frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} e^{-\beta t_2} y_2, \frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) \right)$$

We discuss two special cases for t_1 and t_2

Case i) $t_1 \rightarrow +\infty$ while t_2 = fixed

$$\frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} e^{-\beta t_2} y_2 \rightarrow e^{-\beta t_2} y_2 \quad \text{for large } t_1$$

$$\frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) \rightarrow \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) \quad \text{for large } t_1$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \left(Y(t_1) | Y(t_1+t_2)=y_2 \right) \sim N \left(e^{-\beta t_2} y_2, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) \right) \text{ for large } t_1$$

This is the same as the equilibrium case, not a surprise at all.

Case ii) $t_1 = t_2 = h$

$$\frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} e^{-\beta t_2} y_2 = \frac{e^{-\beta h} y_2}{1+e^{-2\beta h}}$$

$$\frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_1})}{(1-e^{-2\beta(t_1+t_2)})} \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta t_2}) = \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} \left(\frac{1-e^{-2\beta h}}{1+e^{-2\beta h}} \right)$$

$$(Y(h)|Y(2h)=y_2) \sim N\left(\frac{e^{-\beta h} y_2}{1+e^{-2\beta h}}, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} \left(\frac{1-e^{-2\beta h}}{1+e^{-2\beta h}} \right)\right)$$

We compare it with the forward time evolution

$$\rho(Y(2h)|Y(h)=y_1) \sim N\left(e^{-\beta h} y_1, \frac{\gamma^2}{2\beta} (1-e^{-2\beta h})\right)$$

When βh is not large, this case clearly demonstrates the difference between forward time evolution and backward time evolution in a non-equilibrium system.

Different interpretations of stochastic integrals

Beauty of the deterministic calculus

Consider the integral of a deterministic function $f(s)$.

$$\int_0^t f(s) ds = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j) \Delta s$$

where $\Delta s = \frac{t}{N}$, $s_j = j \Delta s$, $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$

Note: When $f(s)$ is piecewise continuous, the choice of $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$ does not affect the limit. We can use any $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$. In particular,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s_j) \Delta s = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s_{j+1}) \Delta s = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s_{j+1/2}) \Delta s$$

A simple stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t f(s) dW(s) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j) \Delta W_j$$

where $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$, $\Delta W_j = W(s_{j+1}) - W(s_j)$

The Riemann sum, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j) \Delta W_j$, is a normal RV with mean = 0 and

$$\text{variance} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j)^2 \Delta s = \int_0^t f(s)^2 ds$$

When $f(s)$ is piecewise continuous, the choice of $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$ does not affect the limit. We can use any $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$.

Another simple stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t f(s, W(s)) ds = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j, W(\tilde{s}_j)) \Delta s$$

When $f(s, w)$ is smooth, the choice of $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$ does not affect the limit (homework problem).

A more complicated stochastic integral:

$$\int_0^t f(s, W(s)) dW(s) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(\tilde{s}_j, W(\tilde{s}_j)) \Delta W_j$$

where $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$, $\Delta W_j = W(s_{j+1}) - W(s_j)$

Note that

- $f(s, W(s))$ is not a deterministic function of s .
- $f(\tilde{s}_j, W(\tilde{s}_j))$ is a random variable, potentially correlated with ΔW_j depending on the choice of $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$.
- As a result, different choices of $\tilde{s}_j \in [s_j, s_{j+1}]$ lead to different results.
- Thus, integral $\int_0^t f(s, W(s)) dW(s)$ is subject to different interpretations.

Appendix A The limit of $X(t)$ as radius $a \rightarrow 0$ while ρ_{mass} is fixed.

Recall that in the “simplified story”, as $m \rightarrow 0$ while b and q are fixed, we have

$$2D = O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad (X(t) - X(0)) \text{ converges to } \sqrt{2D}W(t)$$

Now we consider the real story. As $a \rightarrow 0$ while ρ_{mass} is fixed, we have

$$m = O(a^3), \quad b = O(a), \quad q = \sqrt{2k_B T b} = O(\sqrt{a})$$

$$\beta = \frac{b}{m} = O(a^{-2}), \quad \gamma = \frac{q}{m} = O(a^{-2.5})$$

$$\frac{\gamma}{\beta} = O(a^{-0.5}), \quad D = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} \right)^2 = O(a^{-1}) \rightarrow \infty$$

The behavior of diffusion coefficient D suggests scaling the displacement by \sqrt{a} .

We show that $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1) - X(0))$ converges to $cW(t)$ on any discrete time grid where coefficient $c \equiv \sqrt{a}\sqrt{2D} = O(1)$. Specifically, we show that for $t_2 > t_1 > 0$, as $a \rightarrow 0$,

- $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1) - X(0)) \rightarrow cN(0, t_1)$
- $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1 + t_2) - X(t_1)) \rightarrow cN(0, t_2)$
- $(X(t_1) - X(0))$ and $(X(t_1 + t_2) - X(t_1))$ are independent.

Using (E01), we write $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1) - X(0))$ as

$$\sqrt{a}(X(t_1) - X(0)) \sim (1 - e^{-\beta t_1}) \frac{\sqrt{a}Y(0)}{\beta} + cN\left(0, \underbrace{\left(t_1 - \frac{2(1 - e^{-\beta t_1})}{\beta} + \frac{(1 - e^{-2\beta t_1})}{2\beta}\right)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [0, t_1]}\right)$$

The Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution gives

$$\begin{aligned} Y(t) &\sim N\left(0, \frac{\gamma^2}{\beta}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2}{\beta}}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{a^{-5}}{a^{-2}}}\right) = O(a^{-1.5}) \\ \implies \frac{\sqrt{a}Y(t)}{\beta} &= \frac{\sqrt{a}O(a^{-1.5})}{O(a^{-2})} = O(a) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $a \rightarrow 0$ and using $\frac{1}{\beta}(1 - e^{-\beta t_1}) \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

- $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1) - X(0)) \xrightarrow{\text{as } a \rightarrow 0} \underbrace{cN(0, t_1)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [0, t_1]}$

Similarly, we have

$$\sqrt{a}(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) \sim (1-e^{-\beta t_2}) \frac{\sqrt{a}Y(t_1)}{\beta} + \underbrace{cN\left(0, \left(t_2 - \frac{2(1-e^{-\beta t_2})}{\beta} + \frac{(1-e^{-2\beta t_2})}{2\beta}\right)\right)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [t_1, t_1+t_2]}$$

$$\bullet \quad \sqrt{a}(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) \xrightarrow{\text{as } a \rightarrow 0} \underbrace{c^2 N(0, t_2)}_{\text{containing } dW\text{'s in } [t_1, t_1+t_2]}$$

Again, $\sqrt{a}(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1)) - (1-e^{-\beta t_2}) \frac{\sqrt{a}Y(t_1)}{\beta}$ contains dW 's in $[t_1, t_1+t_2]$.

Since $(1-e^{-\beta t_2}) \frac{\sqrt{a}Y(t_1)}{\beta} = O(a) \rightarrow 0$ as $a \rightarrow 0$, we arrive at

- $(X(t_1)-X(0))$ and $(X(t_1+t_2)-X(t_1))$ are independent in the limit of $a \rightarrow 0$.

Therefore, we conclude that $\sqrt{a}(X(t)-X(0))$ converges to $cW(t)$ as $a \rightarrow 0$.

In other words, for a particle of small radius a , the displacement $(X(t) - X(0))$ is approximately $\frac{c}{\sqrt{a}}W(t)$ with the magnitude diverging to ∞ as $a \rightarrow 0$.