Abstract. Consider a finite system of Lévy particles on the real line, where each particle moves as a Lévy process according to its current rank relative to other particles. We find a natural sufficient condition for convergence to a stationary distribution, which guarantees all particles move together in the long run, as opposed to eventually splitting into two or more groups. This extends the research in (Banner, Fernholz, Karatzas, 2005) to systems with jumps. We apply this result to financial modeling, plotting capital distribution curves for various parameters, and comparing them to the linearity result by (Chatterjee, Pal, 2010).

1. Introduction and the Main Results

1.1. The model. Assume the usual setting: a filtered probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})\), with the filtration satisfying the usual conditions. Fix \(N \geq 2\), the number of particles. Take a Lévy process \(L = (L(t), t \geq 0)\) in \(\mathbb{R}^N\) which makes a.s. finitely many jumps over any finite time interval. This process can be characterized by a triple \((g, A, \Lambda)\): Between jumps, the process \(L\) behaves as an \(N\)-dimensional Brownian motion with drift vector \(g\) and covariance matrix \(A\). The times of jumps form a Poisson point process on the half-line \(\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)\) with intensity \(\lambda_0 = \Lambda(\mathbb{R}^N)\). Each jump has an independent displacement distributed according to the normalized measure \(\lambda_0^{-1}\Lambda(\cdot)\) on \(\mathbb{R}^N\). Take an \(\mathbb{R}^N\)-valued adapted process \(X = (X(t), t \geq 0)\), \(X(t) = (X_1(t), \ldots, X_N(t))\).

For a vector \(x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N\), we define ranked components \(x^{(1)} \leq \ldots \leq x^{(n)}\). We say that \(x_i\) has rank \(k\) if \(x_i = x^{(k)}\), with ties resolved in lexicographic order: if \(x_i = x_j\) but \(i < j\), then we say \(x_i\) has rank strictly less than \(x_j\). This uniquely defines the ranking permutation \(p_x\) on \(\{1, \ldots, N\}\) such that \(k = p_x(i)\) is the rank of \(x_i\). Assume the components \(X_1, \ldots, X_N\) satisfy the system of stochastic differential equations:

\[
(1) \quad dX_i(t) = \sum_{k=1}^N 1(X_i \text{ has rank } k \text{ at time } t) \, dL_k(t), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

Then \(X\) is called a system of competing Lévy particles, governed by the triple \((g, A, \Lambda)\). Informally, the particle which currently has rank \(k\) moves as a Lévy process \(L_k\), with drift rate \(g_k\), and with diffusion component with diffusion coefficient \(a_{kk}\). For the case without jumps (that is, when \(L\) is a multidimensional Brownian motion), weak existence and uniqueness in law follows from [6]. By the standard argument of piecing out, see for example [23], it is straightforward to prove that for any initial condition \(X(0) = x \in \mathbb{R}^N\), the system \((1)\) has a unique weak solution.
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1.2. Main result. The main question of this paper is whether these particles move together in the long run or split into two or more separate “clouds.” To this end, we center the system. For a vector \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \), we denote by \( \bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_N) \) its centered version:

\[
\bar{x}_i := x_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

Centering \( X(t) \) using (2) produces the centered process \( \bar{X} = (\bar{X}(t), t \geq 0) \). Furthermore, \( \bar{X} \) is a Markov process \( \bar{X}(:, \cdot) \) on the hyperplane \( \Pi := \{ (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_1 + \ldots + x_N = 0 \} \). Denote its transition function by \( P^t(x, \cdot) \). Define effective drifts as

\[
m_k := g_k + f_k, \quad f_k := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z_k \Lambda(dz), \quad k = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

Each \( m_k \) is the sum of the “original drift” \( g_k \), corresponding to continuous movement of the \( k \)th ranked particle, and the “effective drift” \( f_k \) generated by jumps. Here, \( f_k \) is the average rate of displacement of the particle according to this jump dynamics. We impose the following stability condition:

\[
\frac{1}{k} (m_1 + \ldots + m_k) > \frac{1}{N} (m_1 + \ldots + m_N), \quad \text{for each } k = 1, \ldots, N - 1.
\]

This essentially states that the average effective drift of the bottom \( k \) particles is greater than the overall average effective drift. We will also use a technical second-moment condition:

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} z_k^2 \Lambda(dz) < \infty \text{ for } k = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

A probability measure \( \pi \) on \( \Pi \) is a stationary distribution for \( \bar{X} \) if \( \bar{X}(0) \sim \pi \) (where \( \sim \) means “distributed as”) implies \( \bar{X}(t) \sim \pi \).

**Theorem 1.1.** Under conditions (4) and (5), the process \( \bar{X} \) has a unique stationary distribution \( \pi \), and the system is stable. That is, for every \( x \in \Pi \),

\[
\sup_{E \subseteq \Pi} \left| P^t(x, E) - \pi(E) \right| \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty.
\]

For any bounded measurable function \( f : \Pi \to \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(\bar{X}(t)) \, dt \to \int_{\Pi} f(z) \pi(dz), \quad \text{a.s. as } T \to \infty.
\]

Every permutation \( \mathbf{q} \) on \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \) is occupied an equal share of time in the asymptotic average. That is, a.s.

\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T 1 (\mathbf{p}_{X(t)} = \mathbf{q}) \, dt = \frac{1}{N!}.
\]

In the long run, \( X_i \) occupies each rank \( k \) on average \((1/N)\)th of the time. That is, a.s.

\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T 1 (X_i \text{ has rank } k \text{ at time } t) \, dt = \frac{1}{N} \quad \text{for each } i, k = 1, \ldots, N.
\]
1.3. Historical review and financial applications. In this model, jumps of individual ranked particles are, in general, dependent. To make jumps independent, with the jumps of the $k$th ranked particle governed by a finite Borel measure $\nu_k$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, we need to take

$$\Lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \Lambda_k, \quad \Lambda_k := \delta_0 \otimes \delta_0 \otimes \ldots \delta_0 \otimes \nu_k \otimes \delta_0 \otimes \ldots \otimes \delta_0.$$  

Here, the Dirac point mass measure at zero is denoted by $\delta_0$. For the measure $\Lambda_k$ in (10), the $\nu_k$ term is in the $k$th place. In this case, the expression (3) takes the form

$$m_k := g_k + f_k, \quad f_k := \int_{\mathbb{R}} z \nu_k(dz), \quad \text{for } k = 1, \ldots, N.$$  

In particular, there are no jumps if $\Lambda = 0$. If in addition the matrix $A$ is diagonal, then $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_N)$ is a system of competing Brownian particles. In this case, the stability result (under stability condition (4) with original drift $g_k$ instead of effective drifts $f_k$, without imposing the condition (5)) was solved in [3, 4, 18]. This model was introduced in [3] for financial modeling, with capitalizations of stocks given by

$$S_1(t) = e^{X_1(t)}, \ldots, S_N(t) = e^{X_N(t)},$$  

and market weights are defined as

$$\mu_i(t) := \frac{S_i(t)}{S_1(t) + \ldots + S_N(t)}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \quad t \geq 0.$$  

In the existing literature, the market weights are normally ranked from top to bottom:

$$\mu(1)(t) \geq \ldots \geq \mu(N)(t).$$  

It was noted in [11, Chapter 5] that the double logarithmic plot of real-world stocks (called the capital distribution curve) is linear. In [9] it was shown that systems of competing Brownian particles can exhibit this property (provided the system is in the stationary distribution), if the number $N$ of stocks is large.

In Figure 1, we simulated this capital distribution curve for various market models (11) of competing Lévy particles. We use various parameters, with $N = 1000$. We observe two features: (a) most simulations are concave; (b) they are mostly linear, except their ends (corresponding to the highest- and lowest-ranked particles). It would be great to state and prove these properties rigorously. But this is likely harder than the proof for no jumps from [9]. For competing Brownian particles (no jumps), if $\sigma_k^2$ is a linear function of $k$ (for example when $\sigma_k = 1$ for all $k$), then the stationary distribution of gaps between the ranked particles:

$$(X_{(2)} - X_{(1)}, \ldots, X_{(N)} - X_{(N-1)})$$  

is a product of exponential distributions; [4, 18]. From there we can derive the stationary distribution of ranked market weights [12], which then gives us this asymptotic linearity as $N \to \infty$. For competing Lévy particles, it was shown in [12] that $\pi$ does not have such product form (except the trivial case without jumps). We leave this topic for future research.

Let us mention some history. Systems of competing Lévy particles were introduced in [24] for the case (10) and a diagonal matrix $A$, with $\nu_1 = \ldots = \nu_N$. Systems of $N = 2$ competing Lévy particles (in the general case) were also studied in [20]. Theorem 1.1 generalizes the results of [24, Theorem 1.2(a), Theorem 1.3(a)], where stability was proved for systems of competing Lévy particles under more restrictive conditions. In [20] we studied stability of systems of two competing Lévy particles, as well as the explicit rate of exponential
Figure 1. Each graph displays 10 simulations of the capital distribution curve, with $N$ the number of stocks, time steps $k^{-1}$, time horizon $T$, so we have $kT$ time steps in simulations. Clockwise from the top left: (a) $k = N = 1000, T = 200$, the lowest ranked particle jumps up 1 with rate .5; (b) same as (a), but the lowest ranked particle has an additional drift of 5; (c) $N = 500, k = 1000, T = 200$, the lowest particle jumps up Exp(1) with unit rate; (d) $k = N = 1000, T = 200$, the first and second lowest-ranked particles jump independently up 1 at rate .5; (e) same as (d), but the lowest-ranked particle has an additional drift of 5.

convergence of the gap process to its stationary distribution. Finally, let us mention the papers [1, 12, 13, 14], which study stability for reflected diffusions with jumps.

In the general case of competing Brownian particles (no jumps), the stationary distribution for (13) is not known explicitly (only as a solution of a complicated intergo-differential equation), [4]. But this explicit product-of-exponential form in the most important case of $\sigma_k = 1$ allows to get nontrivial results about long-term behavior and scaling limits of infinite systems of competing Brownian particles; see [8, 10, 19, 22, 25]. For the infinite Atlas model: $g_1 = 1, g_2 = g_3 = \ldots = 0$, there are, in fact, infinitely many (a continuum of) stationary distributions for the gap process as in (13), and in one of them, the bottom-ranked particle [10] behaves in the long run as the fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H = 1/4$. We can hardly hope that such results will be available for infinite systems with jumps, for the reason above: Lack of explicit formulae for stationary distributions for (13).
2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We introduce some notation. The dot product of \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_d) \) and \( b = (b_1, \ldots, b_d) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is denoted by \( a \cdot b = a_1 b_1 + \ldots + a_d b_d \). The exponential distribution with rate \( \lambda \) is denoted by \( \text{Exp}(\lambda) \). For a vector \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and a permutation \( \mathbf{q} \) on \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \), we denote \( x_{\mathbf{q}} = ((x_{\mathbf{q}})_1, \ldots, (x_{\mathbf{q}})_N) \), \( (x_{\mathbf{q}})_k := x_{\mathbf{q}(k)}, k = 1, \ldots, N \). For any probability measure \( a \) on \([0, \infty)\), we define the kernel

\[
K_a(x, A) := \int_0^\infty P^t(x, A) a(dt) \geq T(x, A).
\]

We rewrite the stability condition (4) as

\[
\min_{k=1, \ldots, N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} m_j > 0, \quad \text{where} \quad m_k = g_k + f_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N.
\]

One key ingredient is the existence of constants \( b, k, r > 0 \) such that the function

\[
V(x) := [\|x\|^2 + 1]^{1/2}
\]

satisfies, for all \( x \in \Pi \)

\[
\mathcal{L}_x V(x) \leq -k + b_1 \mathbf{1}_{B_r^\Pi}(x), \quad \text{where} \quad B_r^\Pi := \{ x \in \Pi \mid \|x\| \leq r \}.
\]

We shall show (17), and then complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. The generator \( \overline{\mathcal{L}} \) consists of the continuous part \( \overline{\mathcal{A}} \) and the jump part \( \overline{\mathcal{N}} \). That is,

\[
\overline{\mathcal{L}} f(x) := \overline{\mathcal{A}} f(x) + \overline{\mathcal{N}} f(x), \quad f \in C^2(\Pi),
\]

\[
\overline{\mathcal{A}} f(x) := g(x) \cdot \nabla f(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \rho_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 f(x)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j},
\]

\[
\overline{\mathcal{N}} f(x) := \int_\Pi [f(y) - f(x)] \mu_x(dy),
\]

where for \( x \in \Pi \), \( \mu_x \) is the push-forward of the measure \( \Lambda \) with respect to the mapping

\[
F_x : \Pi \to \mathbb{R}^N, \quad F_x : w \mapsto x + \overline{w}_{p_{x^{-1}}}.
\]

Therefore, we can rewrite the integral in the right-hand side of (20) as

\[
\overline{\mathcal{N}} f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [f(F_x(w)) - f(x)] \Lambda(dw).
\]

Now, plug in \( f = V \) from (16) into (18). In [3, Appendix, Proof of (2.18)] (with notation slightly different than here), the expression \( \overline{\mathcal{A}} V \) is already calculated: It is the coefficient attached to \( dt \) in [3, Appendix, Proof of (2.18), (A.13)]. In our notation, we have:

\[
\overline{\mathcal{A}} V(x) := \frac{x \cdot G(x)}{V(x)} + \frac{1}{V(x)}(1 - N^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_k^2 - \frac{1}{V^3(x)} \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_k^2 x_{p_x(k)},
\]
where we define $G(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_{p_{x}(k)} g_{k}$ for $x \in \Pi$. We can rewrite (23) as

\[(24) \quad \overline{AV}(x) := \frac{x \cdot G(x)}{V(x)} + \delta_{*}(x), \quad \lim_{x \in \Pi \atop \|x\| \to \infty} |\delta_{*}(x)| = 0.\]

Consider the expression inside of the integral in (22) for $f := V$ from (16). The function $V$ is infinitely differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^N$, and

\[(25) \quad \nabla V(z) = \frac{z}{V(z)}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} = \frac{\delta_{ij} z_i z_j}{V^3(z)}, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, N.\]

Therefore,

\[(26) \quad \lim_{\|z\| \to \infty} \left| \frac{\partial^2 V(z)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} \right| = 0, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, N.\]

We can write the following Taylor decomposition for all $z, u \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

\[(27) \quad V(z + u) - V(z) = \frac{z \cdot u}{V(z)} + \theta(z, u).\]

The error term $\theta(z, u)$ is given by the following expression for some $\eta(z, u) \in [0, 1]$:

\[(28) \quad \theta(z, u) := \frac{\eta^2(z, u)}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_i u_j \frac{\partial^2 V(z)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j}.\]

From (26) and (28), we have

\[(29) \quad \lim_{\|z\| \to \infty} \theta(z, u) = 0 \text{ for every } u \in \mathbb{R}^N.\]

It follows from (26) that $C_* := \max_{z, i, j} \left| \frac{\partial^2 V(z)}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} \right| < \infty$. Therefore,

\[(30) \quad |\theta(z, u)| \leq \frac{C_*}{2} \|u\|^2.\]

Letting $z := x$ and $u := \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}}$ in (27),

\[(31) \quad V(F_{x}(w)) - V(x) = \frac{x \cdot \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}}}{V(x)} + \theta \left(x, \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}}\right).\]

From (30) and $\|\overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}}\| = \|\overline{w}\| \leq \|w\|$, we have

\[(32) \quad |\theta \left(x, \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}}\right)| \leq \frac{C_*}{2} \|w\|^2.\]

Combine (5), (29), (31), (32), and apply Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem to infer

\[(33) \quad \overline{NV}(x) = \frac{1}{V(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x \cdot \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}} \Lambda(dw) + \delta(x), \quad \lim_{x \in \Pi \atop \|x\| \to \infty} \delta(x) = 0.\]

Rewrite the expression inside the integral in (33) as follows:

\[x \cdot \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i \overline{w}_{p_{x}^{-1}(i)} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_{p_{x}(k)} \overline{w}_{k}.\]
Integrating with respect to \( \Lambda(dw) \), we get

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x \cdot \mathbf{w}_{p_x^{-1}} \, \Lambda(dw) = \sum_{k=1}^N x_{p_x(k)} f_k.
\]

Combining (33), (34),

\[
\mathcal{N} V(x) = \frac{1}{V(x)} \sum_{k=1}^N x_{p_x(k)} f_k + \delta(x).
\]

As calculated in [3, p.2302, (2.17)], via summation by parts,

\[
x \cdot G(x) = - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left( x_{p_x(k+1)} - x_{p_x(k)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{g}_j.
\]

Similarly, we can rewrite the sum in (35) as

\[
\sum_{k=1}^N x_{p_x(k)} f_k = - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left( x_{p_x(k+1)} - x_{p_x(k)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \bar{g}_j
\]

Now we combine (24), (33), (35), (36), (37). Letting \( \delta^*(x) := \delta(x) + \delta_*(x) \), we have:

\[
\mathcal{I} V(x) = - \frac{1}{V(x)} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left( x_{p_x(k+1)} - x_{p_x(k)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} m_j + \delta^*(x).
\]

As in [3, p.2302], we have:

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left( x_{p_x(k+1)} - x_{p_x(k)} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} m_j \leq -k \|x\|, \quad k := -N^{-1/2} \min_{1 \leq k \leq N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} m_j > 0.
\]

Since \( V(x)/\|x\| \to 1 \), and \( \delta^*(x) \to 0 \) as \( \|x\| \to \infty \) for \( x \in \Pi \), from (39) and (38) it is straightforward to complete the proof of (17).

Having proved (17), which was the main step of this proof of (6), we complete this proof as follows. The centered system \( \bar{X} \) also forms a Feller continuous strong Markov process. This follows from the following observations: \( X \) is a Feller continuous strong Markov process, by [23, Theorem 2.4, Theorem 5.3, Example 1]; \( \bar{X} \) is a continuous function of \( X \).

Next, \( \bar{X} \) is a \( T \)-process in the terminology of [16, Subsection 3.2]: That is, there exists a nonzero function \( H : \Pi \times \mathcal{B}(\Pi) \to [0, \infty) \), lower semicontinuous in the first argumnet and a finite measure in the second argument, such that for some probability measure \( a \) on \([0, \infty)\), \( K_a(t, A) \geq H(t, A) \), where \( K_a \) is defined in (14). Let \( Q^t(x, \cdot) \) be the transition kernel of a (centered) system of competing Brownian particles with the same \( g \) and \( A \), but without any jumps. Then with probability \( e^{-\lambda_0 t} \) the system of competing \( \text{Lévy} \) particles does not jump until time \( t \), and behaves as a system of competing Brownian particles. Thus

\[
P^t(x, \cdot) \geq e^{-\lambda_0 t} Q^t(x, \cdot).
\]

Next, our claim is that all compact sets are petite for the discrete-time Markov chain \((\bar{X}(n))_{n \geq 0}\). The definition of a petite set \( A \) is taken from [16, Subsection 4.1]: There exists a nontrivial measure \( \nu \) on \( \Pi \) and a probability measure \( a \) on \([0, \infty)\) such that \( K_a(x, \cdot) \geq \nu(\cdot) \) for all \( x \in A \), where, again, \( K_a \) is defined in (14).
It follows from (40) that $P^t(x, A) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, $x \in \Pi$, and $A \subseteq \Pi$ of positive Lebesgue measure. By [21 Lemma 2.3], the discrete-time Markov chain $(X(n))_{n \geq 0}$ is irreducible with respect to Lebesgue measure: That is, for every subset $A \subseteq \Pi$ of positive Lebesgue measure, the average time spent in $A$ by this Markov chain is strictly positive, regardless of the starting point, see [15 Section 4.2]. By [15 Proposition 6.2.8(b)], all compact sets are petite for this discrete-time Markov chain (because the support of the Lebesgue measure is equal to $\Pi$ and trivially has a non-empty interior). Applying [17, Theorem 5.1], we complete the proof of (6).

Next, let us show (7). From (17) by [17, Theorem 4.2] it follows that the process $\bar{X}$ is positive Harris recurrent: That is, it has a unique (up to multiplication by a constant) invariant measure, and this measure is finite; it is equal to $\pi$. Applying [15, Theorem 17.1.7] (it is stated and proved for discrete-time Markov chains, but can be shown all the same for continuous-time Markov processes), we get (7).

The limit (8) follows from (7) in the same way as [3, (2.22)] follows from [3, (2.19)]. Namely, the limit exists because of (7). But in this system of competing Lévy particles, their dynamics depends only on their current ranks. Apply any fixed permutation $q$: Then the permuted system is still governed by the same law as the original system. Therefore, the limit in the right-hand side of (8) must be the same for all $N!$ permutations $q$.

Finally, (9) follows immediately from (8): There are $(N - 1)!$ permutations on $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ which map $i$ to $k$. Therefore, the right-hand side is the sum of $(N - 1)!$ terms, each of which is equal to $1/N!$; which, in turn, equals $N^{-1}$.
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