arXiv:1911.04057v1 [math.DS] 11 Nov 2019

Periodic Solutions for SDEs through Upper and Lower Solutions *

Chunyan Ji[a,b] Xue Yang[a,c] Yong Li[c,d,a†]

[a] School of Mathematics and Statistics & Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, 130024, P.R. China.

[b] School of Mathematics and Statistics, Changshu Institute of Technology, Changshu 215500, P.R. China.

[c] School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun, 130012, P.R. China

[d] State Key Laboratory of Automotive Simulation and Control, Jilin University, 130025, P.R. China

Abstract: We study a kind of better recurrence than Kolmogorov's one: periodicity recurrence, which corresponds periodic solutions in distribution for stochastic differential equations. On the basis of technique of upper and lower solutions and comparison principle, we obtain the existence of periodic solutions in distribution for stochastic differential equations (SDEs). Hence this provides an effective method how to study the periodicity of stochastic systems by analyzing deterministic ones. We also illustrate our results.

Keywords: Upper and lower solutions; Comparison principle; Periodic solutions in distribution
2000 MR Subject Classification.

1 Introduction

This paper concerns a kind of better recurrence: periodicity recurrence, that is, periodic solutions in distribution of the following stochastic differential equation (SDE for short):

$$dX(t) = f(t, X(t))dt + g(t, X(t))dB(t). \tag{1.1}$$

So far this has been yet paid rare attention relative to the existence of stationary solutions. It is well known that the existence problem of periodic solutions is one of center topics in the qualitative theory of deterministic differential equations for its significance in the physical science[15]. There has been a large amount of work (see for example [4, 8, 27] and the references therein). However, for SDEs, the existence of periodic solutions is thought to be a challenging problem. Certainly, periodic solutions of a deterministic system are not always persistent under diffusion. Naturally, one asks when this better periodicity persists for stochastic systems; more precisely, when the ordinary differential equation (ODE for short)

$$dX = f(t, X)dt$$

has periodic solutions, does SDE (1.1) still admit periodic solutions in distribution?

*E-mail addresses: chunyanji80@hotmail.com(C. Ji), yangxuemath@163.com(X.Yang), liyongmath@163.com(Y.Li).
†Corresponding author at: School of Mathematics, Jilin University, Changchun, 130012, P.R. China.

In the present paper, we will touch the problem. We find that the answer will be affirmative if the ODE has upper and lower solutions. This conclusion is somewhat unexpected, because no additional condition is added to the diffusion term besides the usual one. We believe that it is best possible to pose periodic solutions in distribution. As one pointed out (see, for example, [21]), it is impossible to obtain periodic solutions in probability or moment for SDEs due to the effects of diffusion.

Let us recall that there are many topological and analytic methods, such as degree theory, fixed point theorems in studying the existence of periodic solutions of deterministic differential equations. But for SDEs, these nonlinear methods do not work in general, due to lack of compactness. Khasminskii [14] defined periodic solutions in the sense of periodic Markov process. Recently, Ji et al. [11] studied periodic probability solutions to be periodic analogs of stationary measures for stationary Fokker-Planck equations. Chen et al. [5] gave a criterion analogous to Halanay's criterion to prove the existence of periodic solutions in distribution. Liu and Sun [19] established the existence of solutions which are almost automorphic in distribution for some semilinear SDEs with Lévy noise. Liu and Wang [20] obtained almost periodicity in distribution by Favard separation method. Tudor [28] proved the almost periodicity of the one-dimensional distributions of solutions under some hypotheses. Prato and Tudor [24] showed the existence of periodic and almost periodic solutions in distribution of semilinear stochastic equations on a separable Hilbert space. Zhao and Zheng [29] and Feng and Zhao [6, 7] made some interesting investigation on periodic solutions for SDEs in a kind of local periodicity.

Additionally, there are a lot literature about monotone methods and comparison arguments in deterministic dynamical systems (see, for example, [26]). Especially, the upper and lower solutions method is an effective tool in dealing with periodic solutions [13, 16, 17, 18, 25]. In this paper, on the basis of upper and lower solutions, using stochastic comparison technique we try to prove the existence of periodic solutions in distribution. Of course comparison principle [1, 10, 23] is also powerful to investigate dynamics of nonlinear systems. However, to our knowledge, it seems the first time to give periodic solutions in distribution for SDEs by combining these technique. Therefore this paper provides some way to tackle the existence of periodic solutions in distribution.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some concepts and introduce some notations. In Sections 3 and 4, we show the existence of periodic solutions in distribution of scalar SDEs and multi-dimensional SDEs, respectively, via a stochastic comparison approach. In the last section, some examples are given to illustrate the theoretical results.

2 Preliminary

Throughout the paper, let $(\Omega, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, P)$ be a complete probability space with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions (i.e. it is right continuous and $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all P-null sets). $L^2(P, \mathbb{R}^n)$ stands for the space of all $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variables X such that $E|X|^2 = \int_\Omega |X|^2 dP < \infty$. For $X \in L^2(P, \mathbb{R}^n)$, let $\|X\|_2 := \left(\int_\Omega |X|^2 dP\right)^{1/2}$. Then $L^2(P, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a Hilbert space equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. For an $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random process $X = \{X(t) : t \in [0, K]\}$, if $\sup_{t\in[0,K]} \|X(t)\|_2 < \infty$, then X is L^2-bounded, where K is a positive constant. Then the set of L^2-bounded stochastic processes is a Banach space. Let $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_t}([0, K]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the family of all $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable $C^1([0, K]; \mathbb{R}^n)$-valued random variables X such that $\sup_{t\in[0,K]} \|X\|_2 < \infty$. If $X(k_1)$ and $X(k_2)$ are equal in distribution, we denote it by $X(k_1) \stackrel{d}{=} X(k_2)$, where k_1, k_2 are two constants. For two vectors $x = (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_l), y = (y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_l)$, we say $x < y$ (or $x \leq y$) if $x_i < y_i$ (or $x_i \leq y_i$), $i = 1, 2, \cdots, l$. $a \wedge b$ denotes $\min\{a, b\}$.

Consider the system

$$x' = h(t, x), \tag{2.1}$$

where $h : [0,\theta] \times \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R}^l$ is a continuous function.

We recall the conception about upper and lower solutions for (2.1):

Definition 2.1. [2] C^1-functions $\alpha, \beta : [0,\theta] \to \mathbb{R}^l$ are said to be a strictly lower solution and a strictly upper solution of system (2.1), respectively, if $\alpha(t) < \beta(t)$ for $t \in [0,\theta]$ and

$$\begin{cases} \alpha' < h(t,\alpha), \\ \alpha(0) \le \alpha(\theta); \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \beta' > h(t,\beta), \\ \beta(0) \ge \beta(\theta). \end{cases}$$

For settings below, we give the following function [3]:

$$\varphi_\epsilon(y) = \begin{cases} y^2, & y \le 0, \\ y^2 - \dfrac{y^3}{6\epsilon}, & 0 < y \le 3\epsilon, \\ 2\epsilon y - \dfrac{4}{3}\epsilon^2, & y > 2\epsilon. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

It is easy to see that $\varphi_\epsilon(y) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}), \varphi'_\epsilon(y) \to 2y^-$ uniformly with respect to y, $\varphi''_\epsilon(y) \to 2I_{y\le 0}$ and $\varphi_\epsilon(y) \to |y^-|^2$ provided that $\epsilon \to 0$, where $y^- = y \wedge 0$.

3 Scalar SDEs

Consider the following scalar SDE

$$dx(t) = f(t,x(t))dt + g(t,x(t))dB(t), \tag{3.1}$$

where $B(t)$ is a one dimensional Gaussian process with values in $\mathbb{R}$ which is $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted. Assume the drift term and the diffusion term $f, g : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}: \quad & f(t+\theta,x) = f(t,x), g(t+\theta,x) = g(t,x), \\ & |f(t,x) - f(t,y)| \le M|x-y|, t \in [0,\theta] \ \text{ for any } \ x,y \in [\alpha,\beta], \\ & |g(t,x) - g(t,y)|^2 \le L|x-y|^2, t \in [0,\theta] \ \text{ for any } \ x,y \in [\alpha,\beta], \end{aligned}$$

where θ, M and L are positive constants, $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$ are strictly lower and upper solutions of system $x' = f(t,x)$ defined by Definition 2.1.

We need a stochastic version of comparable principles, which is a key for our arguments. For this, define two SDEs by

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{\alpha}(t) &= [\alpha'(t) - M(\tilde{\alpha}(t) - \alpha(t))]dt + g(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t))dB(t) \\ &:= f_1(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t))dt + g(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t))dB(t), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{\beta}(t) &= [\beta'(t) - M(\tilde{\beta}(t) - \beta(t))]dt + g(t,\tilde{\beta}(t))dB(t) \\ &:= f_2(t,\tilde{\beta}(t))dt + g(t,\tilde{\beta}(t))dB(t) \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

with initial values $\tilde{\alpha}(0) = \alpha(0) + \xi$ and $\tilde{\beta}(0) = \beta(0) - \xi$, respectively and $t \in [0,\theta]$, where $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$ are defined by Definition 2.1 with $h(t,x) = f(t,x)$, $\xi > 0$ is a sufficiently small constant. Then there are solutions $\tilde{\alpha}(t), \tilde{\beta}(t)$ for $t \in [0,\theta]$, which have the following property.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\tilde{\alpha}(t), \tilde{\beta}(t)$ $(t \in [0,\theta])$ be solutions of equations (3.2) and (3.3) with initial values $\tilde{\alpha}(0)$ and $\tilde{\beta}(0)$, respectively. Assume the second condition in H holds. Then*

$$\alpha(t) \le \tilde{\alpha}(t) \le \tilde{\beta}(t) \le \beta(t), \ t \in [0,\theta] \ a.s.$$

Proof. We only need to prove $\tilde{\alpha}(t) \ge \alpha(t)$ a.s. The proof of $\tilde{\beta}(t) \le \beta(t)$ a.s. is similar. Since $\alpha(0) < \tilde{\alpha}(0)$, then $\alpha(t) < \tilde{\alpha}(t)$ for $t \in [0,\tau)$, where

$$\tau = \inf\{t \ge 0 : \alpha(t) \ge \tilde{\alpha}(t)\}.$$

We need to show that $\tau > \theta$. Let m_0 be a positive integer such that $\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0) \ge \dfrac{1}{m_0}$. For each integer $m \ge m_0$, define the stopping time

$$\tau_m = \inf\{t \in [0,\tau) : \tilde{\alpha}(t) - \alpha(t) \le 1/m\}.$$

Clearly, τ_m is increasing as $m \to \infty$. Set $\tau_\infty = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \tau_m$. Hence $\tau_\infty \le \tau$ a.s. If we can show that $\tau_\infty > \theta$ a.s., then $\tau > \theta$ a.s. and $\alpha(t) < \tilde{\alpha}(t)$ for $t \in [0,\theta]$ a.s. Suppose this statement is not true, then there is a pair of constant $0 < \gamma \le \theta$ and $0 < \zeta < 1$ such that

$$P\{\tau_\infty \le \gamma\} > \zeta.$$

Hence there is an integer $m_1 \ge m_0$ such that

$$P\{\tau_m \le \gamma\} \ge \zeta \ \text{ for all } \ m \ge m_1.$$

Integrating equation (3.2) from 0 to $\tau_m \wedge \gamma$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}&(\tilde{\alpha}(\tau_m \wedge \gamma) - \alpha(\tau_m \wedge \gamma)) - (\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0)) \\ &= \int_0^{\tau_m \wedge \gamma} -M(\tilde{\alpha}(t) - \alpha(t))dt + \int_0^{\tau_m \wedge \gamma} g(t, \tilde{\alpha}(t))dB(t).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$e^{M(\tau_m \wedge \gamma)}(\tilde{\alpha}(\tau_m \wedge \gamma) - \alpha(\tau_m \wedge \gamma)) - (\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0)) = \int_0^{\tau_m \wedge \gamma} e^{Mt} g(t, \tilde{\alpha}(t))dB(t).$$

Multiplying $I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}$ on the both side of it and taking expectation yield

$$E[I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}(\tilde{\alpha}(\tau_m \wedge \gamma) - \alpha(\tau_m \wedge \gamma))] = E[I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}(\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0))e^{-M\tau_m}].$$

Note that the left side

$$E[I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}(\tilde{\alpha}(\tau_m \wedge \gamma) - \alpha(\tau_m \wedge \gamma))] \le \frac{1}{m},$$

while the right side

$$E[I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}(\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0))e^{-M\tau_m}] \ge E[I_{\{\tau_m \le \gamma\}}(\tilde{\alpha}(0) - \alpha(0))]e^{-M\gamma} \ge \zeta\xi e^{-M\gamma}.$$

Letting $m \to \infty$ leads to a contradiction that $0 \ge \zeta\xi e^{-M\gamma} > 0$. Therefore we must have $\tau_\infty > \theta$ a.s.

As to the result $\tilde{\alpha}(t) \le \tilde{\beta}(t), \ t \in [0,\theta]$ a.s., it is obviously true through comparison theorem for stochastic differential equations under the second condition in H. This completes the proof. □

The following is the first main result about periodic solutions:

Theorem 3.1. *Let the hypothesis H hold, where* $M - L > \dfrac{\ln 2}{2\theta}$ *is satisfied, and assume there are strictly lower and upper solutions* α *and* β *of system* $x' = f(t,x)$ *with* $\alpha < \beta$. *Then there exist monotone sequences* $\{\tilde{\alpha}_n(t)\}, \{\tilde{\beta}_n(t)\}$ *with* $\alpha_0 = \tilde{\alpha}, \beta_0 = \tilde{\beta}$ *and functions* $a(t), b(t)$ *such that* $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\alpha}_n(t) = a(t)$, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\beta}_n(t) = b(t)$ *and*

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}_0 \le \tilde{\alpha}_1 \le \cdots \le \tilde{\alpha}_n \le a \le u \le b \le \tilde{\beta}_n \le \cdots \le \tilde{\beta}_1 \le \tilde{\beta}_0 = \tilde{\beta}$$

on $[0,\theta]$, *where* u *is a solution of system* (3.1) *such that* $\tilde{\alpha}(t) \le u(t) \le \tilde{\beta}(t)$ *on* $[0,\theta]$ *a.s., and* $u(0) \overset{d}{=} u(\theta)$. *Therefore, there is a* $\theta-$*periodic solution* $x^*(t)$ *in distribution of system* (3.1).

Proof. To prove the first result of this theorem, we divide it into three steps.

- Step 1: Construct an auxiliary equation, and prove that it has a unique solution.
- Step 2: From Step 1, we define a mapping, and show it has two order properties.
- Step 3: From Step 2, we can find monotone sequences, and so the result holds.

Step 1: Consider the following equation

$$du = (f(t,\eta) - M(u-\eta))dt + g(t,u)dB(t), \tag{3.4}$$

where $\eta \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}] = \{u \in L^2([0,\theta];\mathbb{R}), \tilde{\alpha} \le u \le \tilde{\beta} \text{ a.s.}\}$. It is easy to see that

$$u(t) = u(0)e^{-Mt} + \int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(f(s,\eta(s)) + M\eta(s))ds + \int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}g(s,u(s))dB(s) \triangleq Tu,$$

where $T : \{u \in L^2([0,\theta];\mathbb{R}), \tilde{\alpha} \le u \le \tilde{\beta} \text{ a.s.}\} \to \{u \in L^2([0,\theta];\mathbb{R}), \tilde{\alpha} \le u \le \tilde{\beta} \text{ a.s.}\}$. Obviously, there is a unique solution $u(t), t \in [0,\theta]$ of system (3.4) from the continuity of its coefficients. That is to say, for each $\eta \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}]$ and the initial value $\gamma \in L^2([0,\theta];\mathbb{R}), \tilde{\alpha}(0) \le \gamma \le \tilde{\beta}(0)$, there exists a solution $\tilde{\alpha}(t) \le u_{\gamma,\eta}(t) \le \tilde{\beta}(t)$. Moreover, we can claim that for each fixed $\eta \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}]$, there exists a unique solution in distribution of (3.4) with $u(0) \overset{d}{=} u(\theta)$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} E|u(t) - v(t)|^2 &= E\left|(u(0) - v(0))e^{-Mt} + \int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(g(s,u(s)) - g(s,v(s)))dB(s)\right|^2 \\ &\le 2E\left|(u(0) - v(0))e^{-Mt}\right|^2 + 2E\int_0^t e^{-2M(t-s)}|g(s,u(s)) - g(s,v(s))|^2 ds \\ &\le 2e^{-2Mt}E\left|(u(0) - v(0))\right|^2 + 2L\int_0^t e^{-2M(t-s)}E|u(s) - v(s)|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

This together with Gronwall's inequality implies that

$$E|u(t) - v(t)|^2 \le 2e^{-2(M-L)t}E\left|(u(0) - v(0))\right|^2.$$

Then

$$E|u(\theta) - v(\theta)|^2 \le 2e^{-2(M-L)\theta}E\left|(u(0) - v(0))\right|^2.$$

Define $\tilde{T}u(0) = Tu(\theta)$. Noting that $\tilde{\alpha}(0) \le \tilde{\alpha}(\theta), \tilde{\beta}(0) \ge \tilde{\beta}(\theta)$ and by Lemma 3.1 we have $\tilde{T} : [\tilde{\alpha}(0),\ \tilde{\beta}(0)] \to [\tilde{\alpha}(0),\ \tilde{\beta}(0)]$. Together with $2e^{-2(M-L)\theta} < 1$, i.e. $M - L > \dfrac{\ln 2}{2\theta}$, we know that $\tilde{T}$ is contract. Therefore, according to Banach's contraction principle, there is a γ^*, such that $\tilde{\alpha}(t) \le u^*_{\gamma^*,\eta}(t) \le \tilde{\beta}(t)$ and $u^*_{\gamma^*,\eta}(0) \overset{d}{=} u^*_{\gamma^*,\eta}(\theta)$ of system (3.4).

Step 2: Now define a mapping $A(\eta) = u$, where u is the unique solution of (3.4) with $u(0) \overset{d}{=} u(\theta)$. The mapping A is continuous. In fact, for any $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}]$ and $\|\eta_1 - \eta_2\|_2 < \epsilon$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E|A(\eta_1) - A(\eta_2)|^2 \\
&= E\left|\int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(f(s,\eta_1(s) - f(s,\eta_2(s)) + M(\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(s))ds + \int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(g(s,u_1(s)) - g(s,u_2(s)))dB(s)\right|^2 \\
&\le 3E\left|\int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(f(s,\eta_1(s) - f(s,\eta_2(s))ds\right|^2 + 3E\left|\int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}M(\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(s))ds\right|^2 \\
&\quad + 3E\left|\int_0^t e^{-M(t-s)}(g(s,u_1(s)) - g(s,u_2(s)))dB(s)\right|^2 \\
&\le 3\int_0^t e^{-2M(t-s)}ds E\int_0^t |f(s,\eta_1(s)) - f(s,\eta_2(s))|^2 ds + 3\int_0^t e^{-2M(t-s)}ds E\int_0^t M^2|\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(s)|^2 ds \\
&\quad + 3E\int_0^t e^{-2M(t-s)}|g(s,u_1(s)) - g(s,u_2(s))|^2 ds \\
&\le 3ME\int_0^t |\eta_1(s) - \eta_2(s)|^2 ds + 3L\int_0^t E|A(\eta_1) - A(\eta_2)|^2 ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to see the result is true through Gronwall's inequality. Moreover A satisfies

(i) $\tilde{\alpha} \le A(\tilde{\alpha}), \tilde{\beta} \ge A(\tilde{\beta})$ a.s.;

(ii) for $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}]$, $\eta_1 \le \eta_2$ a.s. implies $A\eta_1 \le A\eta_2$ a.s., i.e., the mapping A possesses a monotone property on the segment $[\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}]$.

To prove (i), let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be a strictly decreasing sequence with $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. Define $f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(t,x) = f_1(t,x) - \varepsilon_n$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
d\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) &= f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t))dt + g(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t))dB(t) \\
&= (\alpha'(t) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) - \alpha(t)) - \varepsilon_n)dt + g(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t))dB(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

with the same initial value as the initial value of $\tilde{\alpha}(t)$. Obviously,

$$
f_1^{\varepsilon_1}(t,x) < f_1^{\varepsilon_2}(t,x) < \cdots < f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(t,x) < f_1(t,x). \tag{3.5}
$$

Comparison theorems and (3.5) imply that

$$
\tilde{\alpha}_{10}(t) \le \tilde{\alpha}_{20}(t) \le \cdots \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) \le \tilde{\alpha}(t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [0,\theta].
$$

We can show that

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) = \tilde{\alpha}(t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [0,\theta]. \tag{3.6}
$$

For this, let

$$\tilde{\alpha}^0(t) \triangleq \lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [0,\theta]. \tag{3.7}$$

We need to show that $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t) = \tilde{\alpha}(t)$ a.s. for $t \in [0,\theta]$, which reduce to check that $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$ satisfies (3.2) according to the uniqueness of the strong solution.

For this aim, we first prove that $\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)$ converges to $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$ uniformly in $t \in [0,\theta]$ a.s. as $n \to \infty$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le s\le t} |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2 \\
&= \sup_{0\le s\le t} \left| \int_0^s (f_1^{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))du + \int_0^s (g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))dB(u) \right|^2 \\
&= \sup_{0\le s\le t} \Big| (\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1})s - M\int_0^s [(\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \alpha(u)) - (\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u) - \alpha(u))]du \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_0^s (g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))dB(u) \Big|^2 \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + 3M^2 \left(\int_0^t |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)|du \right)^2 + 3 \sup_{0\le s\le t} \left| \int_0^s (g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))dB(u) \right|^2 \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + 3M^2\theta \int_0^t |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)|^2 du + 3 \sup_{0\le s\le t} \left| \int_0^s (g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))dB(u) \right|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \sup_{0\le s\le t} |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2 \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + 3M^2\theta E \int_0^t |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)|^2 du + 3E \sup_{0\le s\le t} \left| \int_0^s (g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)))dB(u) \right|^2 \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + 3M^2\theta E \int_0^t |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)|^2 du + 12E \int_0^t |g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u)) - g(u, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u))|^2 du \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + (3M^2\theta + 12L) \int_0^t E|\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(u) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(u)|^2 du \\
&\le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 + (3M^2\theta + 12L) \int_0^t E \sup_{0\le s\le u} |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2 du.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality yields

$$E \sup_{0\le s\le t} |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2 \le 3|\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}|^2\theta^2 e^{(3M^2\theta+12L)\theta}. \tag{3.8}$$

The property of ε_n tells us that there is an $N_1 > 0$ that for $n \ge N_1$,

$$\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{3\theta^2 e^{(3M^2\theta+12L)\theta} 8^n}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Substituting (3.9) into (3.8), we get

$$E \sup_{0\le s\le \theta} |\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2 \le \frac{1}{8^n} \quad \text{for} \quad n \ge N_1.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\sum_{n=N_1}^{\infty} P\left(\sup_{0\le s\le\theta}|\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s)-\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|>2^{-(n+1)}\right)\le\sum_{n=N_1}^{\infty}\frac{E\sup\limits_{0\le s\le\theta}|\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s)-\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|^2}{2^{-2(n+1)}}\le\sum_{n=N_1}^{\infty}4\frac{1}{2^n}<\infty.$$

In view of the well-known Borel-Cantelli lemma, one sees that for almost all $\omega\in\Omega$

$$\sup_{0\le s\le\theta}|\tilde{\alpha}_{(n+1)0}(s)-\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)|\le 2^{-(n+1)}. \tag{3.10}$$

It tells us that there exists an $N_2(\omega)\ge N_1$, for all $\omega\in\Omega$ excluding a P-null set, for which (3.10) holds whenever $n\ge N_2$. Consequently, $\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)$ uniformly converges to $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$ is continuous on $[0,\theta]$ a.s.

Define

$$T_N\triangleq\inf\{t>0:|\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)|>N\ \text{ or }\ |\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)|>N\}\wedge N,\quad\text{for every}\quad N>0.$$

In terms of (3.7) and Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s,\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))ds=\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}f_1(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))ds\ \ a.s.$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty}E\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}|g(s,\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))-g(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))|^2ds=0,$$

which together with Proposition 3.2 in [12] implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}g(s,\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))dB(s)=\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}g(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))dB(s)\ \text{ in }\ L^2.$$

Hence

$$\tilde{\alpha}^0(t\wedge T_N)=\tilde{\alpha}(0)+\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}f_1(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))ds+\int_0^{t\wedge T_N}g(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))dB(s).$$

Note that $\lim\limits_{N\to\infty}T_N=\theta$, then

$$\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)=\tilde{\alpha}(0)+\int_0^{t}f_1(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))ds+\int_0^{t}g(s,\tilde{\alpha}^0(s))dB(s).$$

Therefore, (3.6) is true. It tells us that for $\varsigma=\frac{1}{2}\min\limits_{t\in[0,\theta]}\{\tilde{\alpha}(t)-\alpha(t)\}>0$, there is a $\tilde{N}_0$ such that for $n>\tilde{N}_0$, $|\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)-\tilde{\alpha}(t)|<\varsigma$ a.s., which implies that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)>\alpha(t)\ \text{ a.s. for }\ n>\tilde{N}_0. \tag{3.11}$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$ is a modification of the solution $\tilde{\alpha}(t)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)$ uniformly converges to $\tilde{\alpha}^0(t)$, then in order to verify that

$$\tilde{\alpha}\le A(\tilde{\alpha})\ \text{ a.s.}, \tag{3.12}$$

we only need to prove that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{n0} \le A(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for} \quad n > \tilde{N}_0.$$

For this, set $A(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}) = \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}$ is the unique solution of (3.4) with $\eta = \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}$. That is

$$d\tilde{\alpha}_{n1} = [f(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1} - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0})]dt + g(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n1})dB(t).$$

Set $Y_{n\alpha}(t) = \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(t) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)$. Then

$$dY_{n\alpha}(t) = [f(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1} - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}) - f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0})]dt + (g(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}) - g(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}))dB(t).$$

Define the stopping time

$$\tau_\alpha \triangleq \inf\{t > 0 : \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) > \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(t), n > \tilde{N}_0\}. \tag{3.13}$$

Obviously, $\tau_\alpha \le \theta$. In order to verify the conclusion, we have to show that

$$P(\{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}) = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

For this purpose, let

$$\kappa_\alpha \triangleq \inf\{t > \tau_\alpha : Z_{n\alpha}(t, \omega) \triangleq f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)) - [f(t, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(t) - Y_{n\alpha}^-(t) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t))] > 0, n > \tilde{N}_0\}.$$

It is easy to see that $Z_{n\alpha}(t, \omega)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted and its sample path is continuous. Then κ_α is a $\mathcal{F}_t$-stopping time.

We claim that

$$\kappa_\alpha > \tau_\alpha \quad \text{on} \quad \{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}. \tag{3.15}$$

From the definition of κ_α, we know that $\kappa_\alpha \ge \tau_\alpha$ and

$$f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - [f(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(\kappa_\alpha) - Y_{n\alpha}^-(\kappa_\alpha) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha))] \ge 0, n > \tilde{N}_0. \tag{3.16}$$

Hence if we show that the case $\kappa_\alpha = \tau_\alpha$ is impossible, then (3.15) is true. Suppose $\kappa_\alpha = \tau_\alpha$ on $\{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}$. Since $\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\tau_\alpha) = \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(\tau_\alpha)$, we have $Y_{n\alpha}^-(\tau_\alpha) = Y_{n\alpha}^-(\kappa_\alpha) = 0$. This together with (3.11) and the hypothesis H for f implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - [f(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(\kappa_\alpha) - Y_{n\alpha}^-(\kappa_\alpha) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha))] \\
&= \alpha'(\kappa_\alpha) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha) - \alpha(\kappa_\alpha)) - \varepsilon_n - [f(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(\kappa_\alpha) - Y_{n\alpha}^-(\kappa_\alpha) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha))] \\
&\le f(\kappa_\alpha, \alpha(\kappa_\alpha)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha) - \alpha(\kappa_\alpha)) - \varepsilon_n - f(\kappa_\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) \\
&\le -M(\alpha(\kappa_\alpha) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(\kappa_\alpha) - \alpha(\kappa_\alpha)) - \varepsilon_n < 0
\end{aligned}$$

on $\{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}$ for $n > \tilde{N}_0$, which contradicts (3.16). Hence (3.15) holds. Therefore, it can be seen that for $s \in [\tau_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha], n > \tilde{N}_0$

$$f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - [f(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - Y_{n\alpha}^-(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))] \le 0 \tag{3.17}$$

on $\{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}$.

Now we can show that (3.14) is ture. If not, assume that for some N

$$P(\mathcal{B}) \triangleq P(\{\tau_\alpha < \theta\}) > 0.$$

Since $Y_{n\alpha}(t)$ is a continuous semimartingale [22], applying Itô's formula yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}((\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta))\\
&=\varphi_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta))+\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))[f(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-M(\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s)-\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))]ds\\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))(g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s))-g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s)))dB(s)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))(g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s))-g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s)))^2ds\\
&=\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))[f(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-M(\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s)-\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))]ds\\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))(g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s))-g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s)))dB(s)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))(g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s))-g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s)))^2ds\\
&\triangleq\Delta_1+\Delta_2+\Delta_3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.18}
$$

where $\varphi_\epsilon(y)$ is defined by (2.2). Note that $E[\Delta_2|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\alpha}]=0$. This together with the fact that $I_{\mathcal{B}}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\alpha}$-measurable (see Lemma 1.2.16 in [12]) implies that

$$E[\Delta_2 I_{\mathcal{B}}]=E[E[\Delta_2 I_{\mathcal{B}}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\alpha}]]=E[I_{\mathcal{B}}E[\Delta_2|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_\alpha}]]=0.$$

Multiplying both sides of (3.18) by the indicator function $I_{\mathcal{B}}$, and then taking expectation, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[I_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}((\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta))]\\
&=E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))[f(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-M(\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s)-\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))-f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s))]ds\right]\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}}\int_{\tau_\alpha\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_\alpha+t)\wedge\kappa_\alpha\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{n\alpha}(s))(g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n1}(s))-g(s,\tilde\alpha_{n0}(s)))^2ds\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[I_{\mathcal{B}}(Y^-_{n\alpha}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta))^2] \\
&= E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} 2(Y^-_{n\alpha}(s))[f(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))]ds\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} I_{\{Y_{n\alpha}(s) \le 0\}}(g(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s)) - g(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)))^2 ds\right] \\
&\le -2ME\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} (Y^-_{n\alpha}(s))^2 ds\right] + \frac{L}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} I_{\{Y_{n\alpha}(s) \le 0\}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} 2(Y^-_{n\alpha}(s))[f(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - Y^-_{n\alpha}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))]ds\right] \\
&\le -2ME\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} (Y^-_{n\alpha}(s))^2 ds\right] + \frac{L}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} I_{\{Y_{\alpha}(s) \le 0\}}(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{L}{2} - 2M\right) E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\tau_\alpha \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta}^{(\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta} (Y^-_{n\alpha}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{L}{2} - 2M\right) E\left[I_{\mathcal{B}} \int_0^t (Y^-_{n\alpha}((\tau_\alpha + s) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta))^2 ds\right] \le 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality holds by $Y^-_{n\alpha}(s) \le 0$ and $f(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - M(\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(s) - Y^-_{n\alpha}(s) - \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) - f_1^{\varepsilon_n}(s, \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(s)) \ge 0$ for $s \in [\tau_\alpha, \kappa_\alpha], n > \tilde{N}_0$, the last inequality is by $\frac{L}{2} - 2M < 0$. Therefore

$$E[I_{\mathcal{B}}(Y^-_{n\alpha}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta))^2] = 0,$$

which tells us that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta)) \ge \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta)) \quad a.s.$$

for every $t \ge 0, n > \tilde{N}_0$ on $\mathcal{B}$. It follows from the continuity of $\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t), \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(t)$ that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{n1}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta)) \ge \tilde{\alpha}_{n0}((\tau_\alpha + t) \wedge \kappa_\alpha \wedge \theta)), t \ge 0, n > \tilde{N}_0 \quad a.s.$$

on $\mathcal{B}$. This contradicts (3.13), which shows that (3.14) holds. Hence we have $P(\{\tau_\alpha = \theta\}) = 1$. Therefore

$$P(\{\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}(t) \le \tilde{\alpha}_{n1}(t), t \ge 0, n > \tilde{N}_0\}) = 1,$$

i.e.

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{n0} \le A(\tilde{\alpha}_{n0}), n > \tilde{N}_0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Similarly, we can prove $\tilde{\beta} \ge A(\tilde{\beta})$ a.s.

To prove (ii), suppose that $u_1 = A(\eta_1)$ and $u_2 = A(\eta_2)$. In order to get $u_2 \ge u_1$ a.s., we consider the auxiliary system:

$$du_{n1}(t) = [f(t, \eta_1) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1} - \eta_1)]dt + g(t, u_{n1})dB(t) \tag{3.19}$$

with initial value $u_{n1}(0) = u_1(0)$, where ε_n is defined as previous.

Setting $Y_{nu}(t) = u_2(t) - u_{n1}(t)$, we get

$$dY_{nu}(t) = [(f(t,\eta_2) - M(u_2 - \eta_2)) - (f(t,\eta_1) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1} - \eta_1))]dt + (g(t,u_2) - g(t,u_{n1}))dB(t).$$

Define the stopping time

$$\tau_u \triangleq \inf\{t > 0 : u_{n1}(t) > u_2(t)\}. \tag{3.20}$$

It is clear that $\tau_u \leq \theta$. In order to verify the conclusion, we have to show that

$$P(\{\tau_u < \theta\}) = 0. \tag{3.21}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_u \triangleq \inf\{t > \tau_u : Z_{nu}(t,\omega) \triangleq\ & [f(t,\eta_1(t)) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1}(t) - \eta_1(t))] \\ & - [f(t,\eta_2(t)) - M(u_2(t) - Y_{nu}^-(t) - \eta_2(t))] > 0\},\end{aligned}$$

where $Z_{nu}(t,\omega)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted and it is continuous for a fixed ω. Hence κ_u is an $\mathcal{F}_t$ stopping time.

We claim that

$$\kappa_u > \tau_u \quad \text{on} \quad \{\tau_u < \theta\}. \tag{3.22}$$

By the definition of κ_u, we know that $\kappa_u \geq \tau_u$ and

$$[f(\kappa_u,\eta_1(\kappa_u)) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1}(\kappa_u) - \eta_1(\kappa_u))] - [f(\kappa_u,\eta_2(\kappa_u)) - M(u_2(\kappa_u) - Y_{nu}^-(\kappa_u) - \eta_2(\kappa_u))] \geq 0. \tag{3.23}$$

Then in order to prove (3.22), we only need to prove that the case $\kappa_u = \tau_u$ is impossible. If not, suppose $\kappa_u = \tau_u$ on $\{\tau_u < \theta\}$. Since $u_{n1}(\tau_u) = u_2(\tau_u)$, we have $Y_{nu}^-(\tau_u) = Y_{nu}^-(\kappa_u) = 0$. And then

$$\begin{aligned}&[f(\kappa_u,\eta_1(\kappa_u)) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1}(\kappa_u) - \eta_1(\kappa_u))] - [f(\kappa_u,\eta_2(\kappa_u)) - M(u_2(\kappa_u) - Y_{nu}^-(\kappa_u) - \eta_2(\kappa_u))] \\ &= f(\kappa_u,\eta_1(\kappa_u)) - f(\kappa_u,\eta_2(\kappa_u)) + M(\eta_1(\kappa_u) - \eta_2(\kappa_u)) - \varepsilon_n \\ &\leq -M(\eta_1(\kappa_u) - \eta_2(\kappa_u)) + M(\eta_1(\kappa_u) - \eta_2(\kappa_u)) - \varepsilon_n = -\varepsilon_n < 0\end{aligned}$$

on $\{\tau_u < \theta\}$, which contradicts (3.23). Hence (3.22) holds. Therefore, it can be seen that for $s \in [\tau_u, \kappa_u]$

$$[f(s,\eta_1(s)) - \varepsilon_n - M(u_{n1}(s) - \eta_1(s))] - [f(s,\eta_2(s)) - M(u_2(s) - Y_{nu}^-(s) - \eta_2(s))] \leq 0 \tag{3.24}$$

on $\{\tau_u < \theta\}$.

Now we prove (3.21). If not,

$$P(\mathcal{C}) \triangleq P(\{\tau_u < \theta\}) > 0.$$

By Itô's formula, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_\epsilon(Y_{nu}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)) = \varphi_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)) \\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))[f(s,\eta_2(s))-M(u_2(s)-\eta_2(s))-f(s,\eta_1(s))+\varepsilon_n+M(u_{n1}(s)-\eta_1(s))]ds \\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))(g(s,u_2(s))-g(s,u_{n1}(s)))dB(s) \\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))(g(s,u_2(s))-g(s,u_{n1}(s)))^2ds \\
&=\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))[f(s,\eta_2(s))-M(u_2(s)-\eta_2(s))-f(s,\eta_1(s))+\varepsilon_n+M(u_{n1}(s)-\eta_1(s))]ds \\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))(g(s,u_2(s))-g(s,u_{n1}(s)))dB(s) \\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))(g(s,u_2(s))-g(s,u_{n1}(s)))^2ds \\
&\triangleq \tilde{\Delta}_1+\tilde{\Delta}_2+\tilde{\Delta}_3.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.25}
$$

It is easy to verify that

$$E[\tilde{\Delta}_2 I_{\mathcal{C}}] = E[E[\tilde{\Delta}_2 I_{\mathcal{C}}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_u}]] = E[I_{\mathcal{C}}E[\tilde{\Delta}_2|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_u}]] = 0.$$

Multiplied by the indicator function $I_{\mathcal{C}}$ to the both sides of (3.25), and then taking expectation, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[I_{\mathcal{C}}\varphi_\epsilon(Y_{nu}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta))] \\
&= E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi'_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))[f(s,\eta_2(s))-M(u_2(s)-\eta_2(s))-f(s,\eta_1(s))+\varepsilon_n+M(u_{n1}(s)-\eta_1(s))]ds\right] \\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}\varphi''_\epsilon(Y_{nu}(s))(g(s,u_2(s))-g(s,u_{n1}(s)))^2ds\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[I_{\mathcal{C}}(Y_{nu}^{-}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta))^2] \\
&= E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} 2(Y_{nu}^{-}(s))[f(s,\eta_2(s)) - M(u_2(s)-\eta_2(s)) - f(s,\eta_1(s)) + \varepsilon_n + M(u_{n1}(s)-\eta_1(s))]ds\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} I_{\{Y_{nu}(s)\le 0\}}(g(s,u_2(s)) - g(s,u_{n1}(s)))^2 ds\right] \\
&\le -2ME\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} (Y_{nu}^{-}(s))^2 ds\right] + \frac{L}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} I_{\{Y_{nu}(s)\le 0\}}(u_2(s)-u_{n1}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} 2(Y_{nu}^{-}(s))[f(s,\eta_2(s)) - M(u_2(s) - Y_u^{-}(s) - \eta_2(s)) \right. \\
&\qquad\qquad \left. -f(s,\eta_1(s)) + \varepsilon_n + M(u_{n1}(s)-\eta_1(s))]ds\right] \\
&\le -2ME\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} (Y_{nu}^{-}(s))^2 ds\right] + \frac{L}{2}E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} I_{\{Y_{nu}(s)\le 0\}}(u_2(s)-u_{n1}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{L}{2} - 2M\right)E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{\tau_u\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta}^{(\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta} (Y_{nu}^{-}(s))^2 ds\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{L}{2} - 2M\right)E\left[I_{\mathcal{C}}\int_{0}^{t} (Y_{nu}^{-}((\tau_u+s)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta))^2 ds\right] \le 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last but one inequality holds by $Y_{nu}^{-}(s) \le 0$ and $f(s,\eta_2(s)) - M(u_2(s) - Y_{nu}^{-}(s) - \eta_2(s)) - f(s,\eta_1(s)) + \varepsilon_n + M(u_{n1}(s) - \eta_1(s)) \ge 0$ for $s \in [\tau_u, \kappa_u]$, the last inequality is by $\frac{L}{2} - 2M < 0$. Therefore

$$E[I_{\mathcal{C}}(Y_u^{-}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta))^2] = 0,$$

which tells us that

$$u_2((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)) \ge u_{n1}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)) \quad a.s.$$

for every $t \ge 0$ on $\mathcal{C}$. It follows from the continuity of $u_{n1}(t), u_2(t)$ that

$$u_2((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)) \ge u_{n1}((\tau_u+t)\wedge\kappa_u\wedge\theta)), t \ge 0 \quad a.s.$$

on $\mathcal{C}$. This contradicts (3.20), which shows $P(\mathcal{C}) = P(\{\tau_u < \theta\}) = 0$. Hence we have $P(\{\tau_u = \theta\}) = 1$. Therefore

$$P(\{u_{n1}(t) \le u_2(t), t \ge 0\}) = 1.$$

On the other hand, from (3.19) and stochastic comparison theorem, we have

$$u_{11}(t) \le u_{21}(t) \le \cdots \le u_{n1}(t) \le u_1(t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad t \ge 0.$$

Define

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u_{n1}(t) \triangleq \tilde{u}_1(t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{for all} \quad t \ge 0.$$

As in the previous proof, we can show that $u_{n1}(t)$ uniformly converges to $\tilde{u}_1(t)$ on $t \in [0,T]$ a.s. as $n \to \infty$. And thus $\tilde{u}_1(t)$ satisfies

$$d\tilde{u}_1(t) = [f(t,\eta_1) - M(\tilde{u}_1 - \eta_1)]dt + g(t,\tilde{u}_1)dB(t) \quad \text{a.s. for every} \quad t \in [0,\theta]$$

with initial value $\tilde{u}_1(0) = u_1(0)$. Therefore, by the uniqueness of strong solutions we get that $\tilde{u}_1(t)$ is a modification of the solution $u_1(t)$.

Consequently

$$P(\{u_1(t) \le u_2(t), t \ge 0\}) = 1,$$

i.e.

$$A(\eta_1) \le A(\eta_2) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Step 3: It is now easy to define the sequences $\{\tilde{\alpha}_n(t)\}, \{\tilde{\beta}_n(t)\}$ with $\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}_0, \tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}_0$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_n = A(\tilde{\alpha}_{n-1}), \tilde{\beta}_n = A(\tilde{\beta}_{n-1})$, we can conclude

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}_0 \le \tilde{\alpha}_1 \le \cdots \le \tilde{\alpha}_n \le \tilde{\beta}_n \le \cdots \le \tilde{\beta}_1 \le \tilde{\beta}_0 = \tilde{\beta} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Using the monotone convergence theorem yields $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\alpha}_n(t) = a(t)$, $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\beta}_n(t) = b(t)$ uniformly a.s. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} da(t) &= f(t,a(t))dt + g(t,a(t))dB(t), \\ db(t) &= f(t,b(t))dt + g(t,b(t))dB(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there is a solution $x_0^*(t) \in [a(t),b(t)]$ of system (3.1) for $t \in [0,\theta]$ and $x_0^*(0) \overset{d}{=} x_0^*(\theta)$.

Now we prove the second result of this theorem. For $t \in [\theta, 2\theta]$, let $s = t - \theta, s \in [0,\theta]$. Consider

$$dx_1(s) = f(s,x_1(s))ds + g(s,x_1(s))d\widetilde{B}(s), s \in [0,\theta] \tag{3.26}$$

with initial value $x_1(0) = x_0^*(\theta)$, where $\widetilde{B}(s) = B(s+\theta) - B(\theta)$ has the same distribution as $B(s)$. From the uniqueness of the weak solution, we can know $x_1(s) = x_0^*(s) \in [a(t),b(t)]$ is the solution of system (3.26) for $s \in [0,\theta]$ and $x_1(0) = x_0^*(\theta) \overset{d}{=} x_1(\theta) \overset{d}{=} x_0^*(0)$. Since $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ are θ-periodic, $x_1^*(t) \triangleq x_0^*(t-\theta), t \in [\theta, 2\theta]$ is still a solution of

$$dx(t) = f(t,x(t))dt + g(t,x(t))dB(t), \tag{3.27}$$

and $x_0^*(\theta) = x_1^*(\theta) \overset{d}{=} x_1^*(2\theta)$. Reaping this process, we can obtain a sequence $\{x_k^*(t)\}, t \in [k\theta, (k+1)\theta], k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $x_{k-1}^*(k\theta) = x_k^*(k\theta) \overset{d}{=} x_k^*((k+1)\theta)$. Obviously, they are the same in distribution. Therefore, by the uniqueness, $x^*(t) \triangleq x_k^*(t), t \in [k\theta, (k+1)\theta], k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the solution of system (3.1), and it is $\theta-$periodic in distribution.

□

4 Multi-dimensional SDEs

Consider the following d-dimensional SDE

$$dX(t) = \mathbb{f}(t, X(t))dt + \mathbb{g}(t, X(t))dB(t), \tag{4.1}$$

where $X(t) = (X_1(t), X_2(t), \cdots, X_d(t))^\top, B(t) = (B_1(t), B_2(t), \cdots, B_r(t))^\top$ is an r-dimensional $\mathcal{F}_t$-adapted Gaussian process with values in $\mathbb{R}^r$, and $B_1(t), B_2(t), \cdots, B_r(t)$ are mutually independent. Assume the drift term and the diffusion term $\mathbb{f} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{g} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times r}$ are continuous and satisfy

$\mathbf{H}^*$: $\mathbb{f}(t+\theta, x) = \mathbb{f}(t, x), \mathbb{g}(t+\theta, x) = \mathbb{g}(t, x)$,
$\mathbb{f}_i(t, x) - \mathbb{f}_i(t, y) \geq -M(x_i - y_i), i = 1, 2, \cdots, d, t \in [0, \theta]$ for any x, y such that $\alpha \leq y \leq x \leq \beta$,
$\|\mathbb{f}(t, x) - \mathbb{f}(t, y)\| \leq M\|x - y\|$, for any $x, y \in [\alpha, \beta]$,
$\sum_{j=1}^{r} |\mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, x) - \mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, y)|^2 \leq L|x_i - y_i|^2, i = 1, 2, \cdots, d$ for any $x, y \in [\alpha, \beta]$,

where θ, M and L are positive constants, $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$ are defined by Definition 2.1 with $h(t, x) = \mathbb{f}(t, x)$.

Define two SDEs by

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\alpha}_i(t) &= [\alpha_i'(t) - M(\bar{\alpha}_i(t) - \alpha_i(t))]dt + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, \bar{\alpha}(t))dB_j(t) \\ &:= \mathbb{f}_{1i}(t, \bar{\alpha}(t))dt + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, \bar{\alpha}(t))dB_j(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\beta}_i(t) &= [\beta_i'(t) + M(\bar{\beta}_i(t) - \beta_i(t))]dt + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, \bar{\beta}(t))dB_j(t) \\ &:= \mathbb{f}_{2i}(t, \bar{\beta}(t))dt + \sum_{j=1}^{r} \mathbb{g}_{ij}(t, \bar{\beta}(t))dB_j(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, d \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

with initial values $\bar{\alpha}(0) = \alpha(0) + \zeta$ and $\bar{\beta}(0) = \beta(0) - \zeta$, respectively and $t \in [0, \theta]$, where $\bar{\alpha}(t) = (\bar{\alpha}_1(t), \bar{\alpha}_2(t), \cdots, \bar{\alpha}_d(t))^\top, \bar{\beta}(t) = (\bar{\beta}_1(t), \bar{\beta}_2(t), \cdots, \bar{\beta}_d(t))^\top$ and $\alpha(t), \beta(t)$ are defined by Definition 2.1 with $h(t, x) = \mathbb{f}(t, x)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d_+$ and $\|\zeta\|$ is sufficiently small (here $\|\cdot\|$ is the general Euclidean norm).

As the same argument as in Section 3, we can obtain the following results.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\bar{\alpha}(t), \bar{\beta}(t)$ $(t \in [0, \theta])$ be solutions of equations (4.2) and (4.3) with initial values $\bar{\alpha}(0)$ and $\bar{\beta}(0)$, respectively. Assume the second condition in hypothesis H^* is satisfied. Then*

$$\alpha(t) \leq \bar{\alpha}(t) \leq \bar{\beta}(t) \leq \beta(t) \quad a.s.$$

We now state the second main result as follows:

Theorem 4.1. *Let hypothesis H^* hold, and assume there are strict lower and upper solutions α and β for $h = \mathbb{f}$ with $\alpha < \beta$. Then there exit monotone sequences $\{\bar{\alpha}_n(t)\}, \{\bar{\beta}_n(t)\}$ with $\alpha_0 = \bar{\alpha}, \beta_0 = \bar{\beta}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{\alpha}_n(t) = \bar{a}(t)$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{\beta}_n(t) = \bar{b}(t)$ and*

$$\bar{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha}_0 \leq \bar{\alpha}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \bar{\alpha}_n \leq a \leq u \leq b \leq \bar{\beta}_n \leq \cdots \leq \bar{\beta}_1 \leq \bar{\beta}_0 = \bar{\beta}$$

on $[0, \theta]$, where u is a solution of system (4.1) such that $\bar{\alpha}(t) \leq u(t) \leq \bar{\beta}(t)$ on $[0, \theta]$ a.s., and $u(0) \overset{d}{=} u(\theta)$. Therefore, there is a $\theta-$periodic solution in distribution of system (4.1).

5 Applications

In this section, we give some examples to illustrate our results developed in this paper.

Example 5.1. Consider the following scalar SDE:

$$dx = \left(-a(t)x^{2n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i(t)x^i + e(t)\right)dt + xdB(t). \tag{5.1}$$

Here $a, a_i, e : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous $1-$periodic functions $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, 2n)$ and $a(t) \geq \sigma > 0$, B(t) is a one-dimensional Gaussian process. Let

$$\alpha(t) = c\left(-1 + \frac{t}{2}\right), \quad \beta(t) = c\left(1 - \frac{t}{2}\right), \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad c \gg 1.$$

Obviously, $\alpha(t) < \beta(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Besides, it is easy to check that $\alpha(0) \leq \alpha(1)$, $\beta(0) \geq \beta(1)$, and

$$\alpha' = \frac{c}{2} < f(t, \alpha), \quad \beta' = -\frac{c}{2} > f(t, \beta),$$

when c is sufficiently large. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(t,x) - f(t,y)| &= \left|\left(-a(t)x^{2n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i(t)x^i + e(t)\right) - \left(-a(t)y^{2n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i(t)y^i + e(t)\right)\right| \\
&= |x-y|\left|-a(t)\left(x^{2n} + x^{2n-1}y + \cdots + y^{2n}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i(t)\left(x^{i-1} + x^{i-2}y + \cdots + y^i\right)\right| \\
&\leq M|x-y| \quad \text{for any} \quad x, y \in [\alpha, \beta], \quad t \in [0, 1],
\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max\limits_{t\in[0,1], x,y\in[\alpha,\beta]} \left|-a(t)\left(x^{2n} + x^{2n-1}y + \cdots + y^{2n}\right) + \sum\limits_{i=1}^{2n} a_i(t)\left(x^{i-1} + x^{i-2}y + \cdots + y^i\right)\right| < \infty$, and

$$|g(t,x) - g(t,y)|^2 = |x-y|^2 \quad \text{for any} \quad x, y \in [\alpha, \beta], t \in [0, 1].$$

Therefore, by Theorems 3.1, there is a 1-periodic solution $x(t)$ in distribution of system (5.1).

Example 5.2. Consider the following d-dimensional SDE:

$$dX = (-A(t)X + p(t))\,dt + XdB(t), \tag{5.2}$$

where $X = (x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_d)^\top$, $B(t) = (B_1(t), B_2(t), \cdots, B_d(t))$ are a $d-$dimensional Gaussian process, $A = (a_{ij})_{d\times d} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, $p = (p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_d)^\top : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ are continuous $\theta-$periodic functions and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_{ij} \leq 0, \quad i \neq j, \\
&a_{ii} \geq \sigma > 0, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \\
&a_{ii} \geq -\sum_{j\neq i} a_{ij}, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, d.
\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\alpha(t) = -c(1, 1, \cdots, 1)^\top, \quad \beta(t) = -\alpha(t), \quad t \in [0, \theta], \quad c \gg 1.$$

Obviously, $\alpha(t) < \beta(t)$ for $t \in [0, \theta]$, and $\alpha(0) \leq \alpha(1)$, $\beta(0) \geq \beta(1)$. Besides, it is easy to check that

$$\alpha' = (0, 0, \cdots, 0)^\top < \mathbb{f}(t, \alpha) = \left(c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{1j} + p_1(t), c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{2j} + p_2(t), \cdots, c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{dj} + p_d(t) \right)^\top,$$

$$\beta' = (0, 0, \cdots, 0)^\top > \mathbb{f}(t, \beta) = \left(-c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{1j} + p_1(t), -c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{2j} + p_2(t), \cdots, -c\sum_{j=1}^{d} a_{dj} + p_d(t) \right)^\top,$$

for c sufficiently large. Moreover, we have for any $\alpha \leq Y \leq X \leq \beta, t \in [0, \theta]$,

$$\mathbb{f}_i(t, X) - \mathbb{f}_i(t, Y) = -\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(x_j - y_j) \geq -a_{ii}(x_i - y_i), i = 1, 2, \cdots, d,$$

and for any $X, Y \in [\alpha, \beta], t \in [0, \theta]$,

$$\|\mathbb{f}(t, X) - \mathbb{f}(t, Y)\| = \|A(t)(X - Y)\| \leq M\|X - Y\|,$$
$$|\mathbb{g}_i(t, X) - \mathbb{g}_i(t, Y)|^2 = |x_i - y_i|^2, i = 1, 2, \cdots, d,$$

where $M = \max_{t \in [0,\theta]} \{\|A(t)\|\}$. Therefore, by Theorems 4.1, there is a θ-periodic solution $X(t)$ in distribution of system (5.1).

Acknowledgments

The first author was supported by NSFC grant 11601043, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No. 2016M590243, 2019T120226), Jiangsu Province "333 High-Level Personnel Training Project" (Grant No. BRA2017468) and Qing Lan Project of Jiangsu Province of 2016 and 2017. The second author was supported by NSFC grant 11201173. The third author was supported by National Basic Research Program of China (Grant No. 2013CB834100) and NSFC grants 11171132 and 11571065.

References

[1] X.M. Bai, J.F. Jiang, Comparison theorem for stochastic functional differential equations and applications. J. Dynam. Differential Equations 29 (2017) 1-24.

[2] S.R. Bernfeld, V. Lakshmtkantham, An Introduction to Nonlinear Boundary Value Problems. Mathematics in Science and Engineering 109, Academic Press, 1974.

[3] R. Buckdahn, S. Peng, Ergodic backward stochastic differential equations and associated partial differential equations. Prog. Probab. 45 (1999) 73-85.

[4] M. Candido, J. Llibre, D. Novaes, Persistence of periodic solutions for higher order perturbed differential systems via Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction. Nonlinearity 30 (2017) 3560-3586.

[5] F. Chen, Y. Han, Y. Li, X. Yang, Periodic solutions of Fokker-Planck equations. J. Differential Equations 263 (2017) 285-298.

[6] C. Feng, H. Zhao, B. Zhou, Pathwise random periodic solutions of stochastic differential equations. J. Differential Equations 251 (2011) 119-149.

[7] C. Feng, Y. Wu, H. Zhao, Anticipating random periodic solutions-I. SDEs with multiplicative linear noise. J. Funct. Anal. 271 (2016) 365-417.

[8] J. Fokam, Multiplicity and regularity of large periodic solutions with rational frequency for a class of semilinear monotone wave equations. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2017) 4283-4297.

[9] P. Gao, Some periodic type solutions for stochastic reaction-diffusion equation with cubic nonlinearities. Comput. Math. Appl. 74 (2017) 2281-2297.

[10] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe, A comparison theorem for solutions of stochastic differential equations and its applications. Osaka J. Math. 14 (1977) 619-633.

[11] M. Ji, W. Qi, Z. Shen, Y. Yi, Existence of periodic probability solutions to Fokker-Planck equations with applications. Journal of Functional Analysis (in press).

[12] I. Karatzas, S.E. Shreve, Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus. Springer, Berlin, 1991.

[13] S.K. Kaul, A.S. Vatsala, Monotone method for integro-differential equations with periodic boundary conditions. Appl. Anal. 21 (1986) 297-305.

[14] R.Z. Khasminskii, Stochastic Stability of Differential Equations, With contributions by G. N. Milstein and M. B. Nevelson, Completely revised and enlarged second edition, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, vol. 66, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.

[15] M. A. Krasnosel'skii, Translations along Trajectories of Differential Equations. AMS Trans. Math. Monographs 19, 1968.

[16] V. Lakshmtkantham, S. Leela, Remarks on first and second periodic boundary value problems. Nonlin. Anal. 8 (1984) 281-287.

[17] Y. Li, H.Z. Wang, X.R. Lü, X.G. Lu, Periodic solutions for functional-differential equations with infinite lead and delay. Appl. Math. Comput. 70 (1995) 1-28.

[18] Y. Li, F.Z. Cong, Z.H. Lin, W.B. Liu, Periodic solutions for evolution equations. Nonlinear Anal. 36 (1999) 275-293.

[19] Z. Liu, K. Sun, Almost automorphic solutions for stochastic differential equations driven by Lévy noise. J. Funct. Anal. 266 (2014) 1115-1149.

[20] Z. Liu, W. Wang, Favard separation method for almost periodic stochastic differential equations. J. Differential Equations 260 (2016) 8109-8136.

[21] O. Mellah, P.R. De Fitte, Counterexamples to mean square almost periodicity of the solutions of some SDEs with almost periodic coefficients. Electron. J. Differential Equations 91 (2013) 1-7.

[22] S.E.A. Mohammed, Stochastic Functional Differential Equations. Researsch Notes in Mathematics. Pitman, Boston, 1984.

[23] S. Peng, X. Zhu, Necessary and sufficient condition for comparison theorem of 1-dimensional stochastic differential equations. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 116 (2006) 370-380.

[24] G.D. Prato, C. Tudor, Periodic and almost periodic solutions for semilinear stochastic equations. Stochastic Anal. Appl. 13 (1995) 13-33.

[25] V. Seda, J.J. Nieto, M. Cera, Periodic boundary value problems for nonlinear higher order ordinary differential equations. Appl. Math. Comput. 48 (1992) 71-82.

[26] H.L. Smith, Monotone Dynamical Systems. An Introduction to the Theory of Competitive and Cooperative Systems. Amer Math Soc, Providence Rhode Island, 1996.

[27] M. Tarallo, Z. Zhou, Limit periodic upper and lower solutions in a generic sense. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 38 (2018) 293-309.

[28] C. Tudor, Almost periodic solutions of affine stochastic evolution equations. Stochastics Stochastics Rep. 38 (1992) 251-266.

[29] H. Zhao, Z. Zheng, Random periodic solutions of random dynamical systems. J. Differential Equations 246 (2009) 2020-2038.