



Weierstrass Institute for
Applied Analysis and Stochastics



Ordered random walks

Wolfgang König

WIAS Berlin and TU Berlin

joint work with Peter Eichelsbacher (Bochum), [EJP08]

The Goal

Consider k i.i.d. random walks $X_i = (X_i(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$) on \mathbb{R} .

Questions:

- What is the conditional version given that the walkers stay in strict order for ever?
- What is the asymptotic probability that they stay in strict order until a late time?
- What is the large-time behaviour of the k walkers given that they stay in strict order until a late time or for ever?

The Goal

Consider k i.i.d. random walks $X_i = (X_i(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$) on \mathbb{R} .

Questions:

- What is the conditional version given that the walkers stay in strict order for ever?
- What is the asymptotic probability that they stay in strict order until a late time?
- What is the large-time behaviour of the k walkers given that they stay in strict order until a late time or for ever?

Denote $X = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$, starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ under \mathbb{P}_x , and

$$W = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_k\} \quad \text{Weyl chamber}$$

$$\tau = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : X(n) \notin W\} \quad \text{exit time from } W,$$

The Goal

Consider k i.i.d. random walks $X_i = (X_i(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$) on \mathbb{R} .

Questions:

- What is the conditional version given that the walkers stay in strict order for ever?
- What is the asymptotic probability that they stay in strict order until a late time?
- What is the large-time behaviour of the k walkers given that they stay in strict order until a late time or for ever?

Denote $X = (X_1, \dots, X_k)$, starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ under \mathbb{P}_x , and

$$W = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_k\} \quad \text{Weyl chamber}$$

$$\tau = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : X(n) \notin W\} \quad \text{exit time from } W,$$

then our questions may be reformulated as follows.

- What is the conditional distribution of X given $\{\tau = \infty\}$?
- What are the asymptotics of $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau > n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$?
- Does the distribution of $X(n)/\sqrt{n}$ converge under $\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot \mid \tau > n)$ or $\mathbb{P}_x(\cdot \mid \tau = \infty)$?

- Appeared in JOHANSSON'S beautiful analysis of the **corner-growth model** (2002).
- Have remarkable connections to **tandem queues** (survey article [O'CONNELL '03]).
- Discrete version of **Dyson's Brownian motion** (see below).

- Appeared in JOHANSSON'S beautiful analysis of the **corner-growth model** (2002).
- Have remarkable connections to **tandem queues** (survey article [O'CONNELL '03]).
- Discrete version of **Dyson's Brownian motion** (see below).

Only rather special cases handled yet: nearest-neighbor random walks on \mathbb{Z}^k that satisfy the

$$\text{continuity property: } \mathbb{P}_x(X(\tau) \in \partial W) = 1.$$

Here, 'ordered' is equivalent to 'non-colliding'.

Examples: simple random walk [KATORI/TANEMURA '04], binomial walk, multinomial walk, Poisson walk [K./O'CONNELL/ROCH '02], Yule process [DOUMERC '05].

General random walks not considered before 2008.

Motivation B: Dyson's Brownian motion

Also called **non-colliding Brownian motions**: the continuous version of our question [Dyson 1962].

$H(t) = (H_{i,j}(t))_{i,j=1,\dots,k}$ **Hermitian Brownian motion** (GUE at time $t = 1$)

$\lambda_1(t) \leq \lambda_2(t) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k(t)$ eigenvalues of $H(t)$

$\lambda = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_k(t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ eigenvalue process in \overline{W}

Motivation B: Dyson's Brownian motion

Also called **non-colliding Brownian motions**: the continuous version of our question [Dyson 1962].

$H(t) = (H_{i,j}(t))_{i,j=1,\dots,k}$ **Hermitian Brownian motion** (GUE at time $t = 1$)

$\lambda_1(t) \leq \lambda_2(t) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k(t)$ eigenvalues of $H(t)$

$\lambda = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_k(t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ eigenvalue process in \overline{W}

Theorem. [DYSON 1962]

λ satisfies, for $\beta = 2$, the SDE

$$d\lambda_i(t) = dB_i(t) + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_j(t)} dt, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Furthermore, λ is a Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^k , conditioned on being non-colliding for ever.

Motivation B: Dyson's Brownian motion

Also called **non-colliding Brownian motions**: the continuous version of our question [Dyson 1962].

$H(t) = (H_{i,j}(t))_{i,j=1,\dots,k}$ **Hermitian Brownian motion** (GUE at time $t = 1$)

$\lambda_1(t) \leq \lambda_2(t) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k(t)$ eigenvalues of $H(t)$

$\lambda = (\lambda_1(t), \dots, \lambda_k(t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ eigenvalue process in \overline{W}

Theorem. [DYSON 1962]

λ satisfies, for $\beta = 2$, the SDE

$$d\lambda_i(t) = dB_i(t) + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_j(t)} dt, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Furthermore, λ is a Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^k , conditioned on being non-colliding for ever.

Hence, if $T = \inf\{t > 0: B(t) \notin W\}$ is the **exit time** of a BM B in \mathbb{R}^k from the Weyl chamber W , then, formally,

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}(B \mid T = \infty).$$

(More about that later)

Motivation C: Fluctuation Theory

The special case $k = 2$ is equivalent to conditioning a random walk S on \mathbb{R} to stay positive at all times. **Fluctuation theory** studies conditioning on being nonnegative. The answer is given in terms of a **Doob h -transform**. If the walker's steps have finite mean, then

$$V(x) = \frac{x - \mathbb{E}_x[S_\sigma]}{-\mathbb{E}_0[S_\sigma]}, \quad \text{where } \sigma = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_n < 0\},$$

turns out to be a **positive regular function** for the restriction to $[0, \infty)$, i.e., $V > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_x[V(S_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma > 1\}}] = V(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

Motivation C: Fluctuation Theory

The special case $k = 2$ is equivalent to conditioning a random walk S on \mathbb{R} to stay positive at all times. **Fluctuation theory** studies conditioning on being nonnegative. The answer is given in terms of a **Doob h -transform**. If the walker's steps have finite mean, then

$$V(x) = \frac{x - \mathbb{E}_x[S_\sigma]}{-\mathbb{E}_0[S_\sigma]}, \quad \text{where } \sigma = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_n < 0\},$$

turns out to be a **positive regular function** for the restriction to $[0, \infty)$, i.e., $V > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_x[V(S_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma > 1\}}] = V(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

Hence, the Doob transform

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x((S_0, \dots, S_n) \in A) = \mathbb{P}_x((S_0, \dots, S_n) \in A, \sigma > n) \frac{V(S_n)}{V(S_0)}, \quad A \subset [0, \infty)^{n+1},$$

defines a consistent family of path measures; it is even a **Markov chain**.

Motivation C: Fluctuation Theory

The special case $k = 2$ is equivalent to conditioning a random walk S on \mathbb{R} to stay positive at all times. **Fluctuation theory** studies conditioning on being nonnegative. The answer is given in terms of a **Doob h -transform**. If the walker's steps have finite mean, then

$$V(x) = \frac{x - \mathbb{E}_x[S_\sigma]}{-\mathbb{E}_0[S_\sigma]}, \quad \text{where } \sigma = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_n < 0\},$$

turns out to be a **positive regular function** for the restriction to $[0, \infty)$, i.e., $V > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_x[V(S_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma > 1\}}] = V(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

Hence, the Doob transform

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_x((S_0, \dots, S_n) \in A) = \mathbb{P}_x((S_0, \dots, S_n) \in A, \sigma > n) \frac{V(S_n)}{V(S_0)}, \quad A \subset [0, \infty)^{n+1},$$

defines a consistent family of path measures; it is even a **Markov chain**.

Moreover, it is equal to the limiting process S , given that $\{\sigma > n\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} \mathbb{P}_x(\sigma > n) = V(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

Main tools: **duality** and **Sparre-Andersen identity** (see [FELLER '71], e.g.).

More on non-colliding BMs

Proper definition in terms of **Doob h -transform** with $h = \Delta$, where

$$\Delta(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_j - x_i) = \det \left[(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \right], \quad \text{Vandermonde determinant}$$

Main properties: Δ is **harmonic** for $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \partial_i^2$, and $\Delta > 0$ in W .

Proper definition in terms of **Doob h -transform** with $h = \Delta$, where

$$\Delta(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_j - x_i) = \det \left[(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \right], \quad \text{Vandermonde determinant}$$

Main properties: Δ is **harmonic** for $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \partial_i^2$, and $\Delta > 0$ in W .

Transition probability density of the h -transform:

$$\hat{p}_t(x, y) dy = \mathbb{P}_x(B(t) \in dy; T > t) \frac{\Delta(y)}{\Delta(x)}, \quad x, y \in W.$$

Is this formula helpful?

More on non-colliding BMs

Proper definition in terms of **Doob h -transform** with $h = \Delta$, where

$$\Delta(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_j - x_i) = \det \left[(x_i^{j-1})_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \right], \quad \text{Vandermonde determinant}$$

Main properties: Δ is **harmonic** for $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \partial_i^2$, and $\Delta > 0$ in W .

Transition probability density of the h -transform:

$$\hat{p}_t(x, y) dy = \mathbb{P}_x(B(t) \in dy; T > t) \frac{\Delta(y)}{\Delta(x)}, \quad x, y \in W.$$

Is this formula helpful? **Yes!**

Lemma. [KARLIN/MCGREGOR 1958]

$$\mathbb{P}_x(B(t) \in dy; T > t) = \det \left[(p_t(x_i, y_j))_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \right] dy.$$

Main tools of the proof: reflection principle and a clever enumeration.

Corollary.

- (i) $\hat{p}_t(0, y) = Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}(2\pi t)^{-k/2}e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)^2$ Hermite ensemble
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}_x(T > t) \sim Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}\Delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ non-colliding probability
- (iii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_x(B(t)/\sqrt{t} \in dy \mid T > t) = Ce^{-|y|^2/2}\Delta(y)$
- (iv) $\mathbb{P}_0(B(t) \in dy \mid T > t) = C_t e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)$

Corollary.

- (i) $\hat{p}_t(0, y) = Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}(2\pi t)^{-k/2}e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)^2$ Hermite ensemble
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}_x(T > t) \sim Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}\Delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ non-colliding probability
- (iii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_x(B(t)/\sqrt{t} \in dy \mid T > t) = Ce^{-|y|^2/2}\Delta(y)$
- (iv) $\mathbb{P}_0(B(t) \in dy \mid T > t) = C_t e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)$

Sketch of proof of (i) and (ii): The KMcG-formula gives

$$\hat{p}_t(x, y) = C(2\pi t)^{-k/2}e^{-|x|^2/(2t)}e^{-|y|^2/(2t)} \det \left[\left(e^{x_i y_j / t} \right)_{i,j} \right] \frac{\Delta(y)}{\Delta(x)}.$$

Corollary.

- (i) $\hat{p}_t(0, y) = Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}(2\pi t)^{-k/2}e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)^2$ Hermite ensemble
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}_x(T > t) \sim Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}\Delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ non-colliding probability
- (iii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_x(B(t)/\sqrt{t} \in dy \mid T > t) = Ce^{-|y|^2/2}\Delta(y)$
- (iv) $\mathbb{P}_0(B(t) \in dy \mid T > t) = C_t e^{-|y|^2/(2t)}\Delta(y)$

Sketch of proof of (i) and (ii): The KMcG-formula gives

$$\hat{p}_t(x, y) = C(2\pi t)^{-k/2}e^{-|x|^2/(2t)}e^{-|y|^2/(2t)} \det \left[\left(e^{x_i y_j / t} \right)_{i,j} \right] \frac{\Delta(y)}{\Delta(x)}.$$

As $x \rightarrow 0$ or $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \det \left[\left(e^{x_i y_j / t} \right)_{i,j} \right] &\sim \det \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^k \frac{x_i^{l-1}}{(l-1)!t^{l-1}} y_j^{l-1} \right)_{i,j} \right] \\ &= \det \left[\left(\frac{x_i^{l-1}}{(l-1)!t^{l-1}} \right)_{i,l} \right] \det \left[\left(y_j^{l-1} \right)_{l,j} \right] = Ct^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}\Delta(x)\Delta(y). \end{aligned}$$

The non-exit probability from the Weyl chamber W is **polynomial**, but the one from the **truncated chamber** $W \cap I^k$ with $I = (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ is **exponential**:

$$\mathbb{P}_x(B_{[0,t]} \subset W \cap I^k) \sim e^{-t\lambda^{(W \cap I^k)}} f^{(W \cap I^k)}(x) \langle f^{(W \cap I^k)}, \mathbb{1} \rangle, \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for } x \in W,$$

where $\lambda^{(U)}$ denotes the **principal eigenvalue** and $f^{(U)}$ the corresponding positive L^2 -normalised **eigenfunction** of $-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \partial_i^2$ in $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with zero boundary condition.

Brownian motion in a truncated Weyl chamber

The non-exit probability from the Weyl chamber W is **polynomial**, but the one from the **truncated chamber** $W \cap I^k$ with $I = (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ is **exponential**:

$$\mathbb{P}_x(B_{[0,t]} \subset W \cap I^k) \sim e^{-t\lambda^{(W \cap I^k)}} f^{(W \cap I^k)}(x) \langle f^{(W \cap I^k)}, \mathbb{1} \rangle, \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for } x \in W,$$

where $\lambda^{(U)}$ denotes the **principal eigenvalue** and $f^{(U)}$ the corresponding positive L^2 -normalised **eigenfunction** of $-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \partial_i^2$ in $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with zero boundary condition.

How can we interpolate between these regimes?

Theorem [K./SCHMID 2011]

For any $x \in W$ and any $r \in (0, \infty)$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(B_{[0,t]} \subset W \cap r(t)I^k) \sim \Delta(x) \begin{cases} K_0 r(t)^{-\frac{k}{2}(k-1)} e^{-\frac{t}{r(t)^2} \lambda^{(W \cap I^k)}}, & \text{if } 1 \ll r(t) \ll \sqrt{t}, \\ K_r t^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}, & \text{if } r(t) \sim r\sqrt{t}, \\ K_\infty t^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)}, & \text{if } \sqrt{t} \ll r(t). \end{cases}$$

Here $K_r \in (0, \infty)$ are constants for $r \in [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} K_r = K_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad K_r \sim K_0 r^{-\frac{k}{2}(k-1)} e^{-r^{-2} \lambda^{(W \cap I^k)}} \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0.$$

Back to the question

Hence, we are looking for a **positive regular function** $V : W \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for the restriction of the kernel of the walk X on \mathbb{R}^k . (Recall: W is the Weyl chamber, and τ its exit time.)

Under the above-mentioned continuity property, the Vandermonde determinant Δ is a positive regular function for the restriction to W , and the solution is similar to the Brownian case.

What is a suitable positive regular function in the general case?

Back to the question

Hence, we are looking for a **positive regular function** $V : W \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for the restriction of the kernel of the walk X on \mathbb{R}^k . (Recall: W is the Weyl chamber, and τ its exit time.)

Under the above-mentioned continuity property, the Vandermonde determinant Δ is a positive regular function for the restriction to W , and the solution is similar to the Brownian case.

What is a suitable positive regular function in the general case?

Here it is:

$$V(x) = \Delta(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Delta(X(\tau))], \quad x \in W.$$

Back to the question

Hence, we are looking for a **positive regular function** $V : W \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for the restriction of the kernel of the walk X on \mathbb{R}^k . (Recall: W is the Weyl chamber, and τ its exit time.)

Under the above-mentioned continuity property, the Vandermonde determinant Δ is a positive regular function for the restriction to W , and the solution is similar to the Brownian case.

What is a suitable positive regular function in the general case?

Here it is:

$$V(x) = \Delta(x) - \mathbb{E}_x[\Delta(X(\tau))], \quad x \in W.$$

Quite easily seen to be regular, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > 1\}} V(X(1))] = V(x), \quad x \in W.$$

Not easy to see: $V \geq 0$ on W .

more difficult to see: $V > 0$ on W .

very difficult to see: V is well-defined, i.e., $\Delta(X(\tau))$ is integrable!

Why so delicate:

Consider

$$\mathbb{E}_x [|\Delta(X(\tau))|] = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\prod_{i < j} |X_j(n) - X_i(n)| \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=n\}} \right].$$

All the factors $|X_j(n) - X_i(n)|$ are $O(\sqrt{n})$ with the exception of one of them.

Why so delicate:

Consider

$$\mathbb{E}_x [|\Delta(X(\tau))|] = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\prod_{i < j} |X_j(n) - X_i(n)| \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=n\}} \right].$$

All the factors $|X_j(n) - X_i(n)|$ are $O(\sqrt{n})$ with the exception of one of them.

We expect (and later prove) that $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau > n) \approx n^{-\frac{1}{4}k(k-1)}$.

Hence, we should have (and do not prove) that $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau = n) \approx n^{-\frac{1}{4}k(k-1)-1}$.

Hence, we should have

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[\prod_{i < j} |X_j(n) - X_i(n)| \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=n\}} \right] \approx n^{-\frac{3}{2}},$$

which is enough.

The main result

Assume that the steps have mean zero and variance one, and that the local central limit theorem holds.

Theorem. [EICHELSBACHER/K. 08]

If sufficiently high step moments are finite, the following hold.

- (i) $\Delta(X(\tau))$ is integrable under \mathbb{P}_x for any $x \in W$.
- (ii) V is a positive regular function for the restriction of the transition kernel to W .
- (iii) The Doob h -transform with $h = V$ is equal to X , given $\{\tau > n\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(iv)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_x(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}X(n) \in A \mid \tau > n) = \frac{1}{Z_1} \int_A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|y|^2} \Delta(y) dy \quad \text{weakly.}$$

and, for some $K \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{\frac{k}{4}(k-1)} \mathbb{P}_x(\tau > n) = KV(x), \quad x \in W.$$

- (v) Uniformly on compacts, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\frac{k}{4}(k-1)} V(\sqrt{n}x) = \Delta(x)$.
- (vi) For any $x \in W$, the distribution of the process $(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}X(\lfloor nt \rfloor))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\sqrt{n}x}$ converges towards Dyson's Brownian motions started at x .

Comments

- Main tools of our proof: [generalisation of the Karlin-McGregor formula](#), [local central limit theorem](#) and [Hölder's inequality](#).
- Therefore loss of optimal moment condition.

- Main tools of our proof: [generalisation of the Karlin-McGregor formula](#), [local central limit theorem](#) and [Hölder's inequality](#).
- Therefore loss of optimal moment condition.
- DENISOV/WACHTEL (2009) prove the theorem under almost optimal moment condition: finite $(k - 1)$ -st moments of the steps. The main tools are [martingale](#) arguments, a clever [stopping time](#) $T = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \Delta(X(n)) < 0\}$ and an [embedding](#) of the walks on a Brownian space.

- Main tools of our proof: [generalisation of the Karlin-McGregor formula](#), [local central limit theorem](#) and [Hölder's inequality](#).
- Therefore loss of optimal moment condition.
- DENISOV/WACHTEL (2009) prove the theorem under almost optimal moment condition: finite $(k - 1)$ -st moments of the steps. The main tools are [martingale](#) arguments, a clever [stopping time](#) $T = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \Delta(X(n)) < 0\}$ and an [embedding](#) of the walks on a Brownian space.
- K. AND SCHMID (2009) extend Denisov/Wachtel's proof to the Weyl chambers of Type C and D ,

$$\begin{aligned}W_C &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : 0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k\}, \\W_D &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k : |x_1| < x_2 < \dots < x_k\}.\end{aligned}$$

The relevant positive regular functions are

$$V_C(x) = V_D(x) \prod_{i=1}^k x_i \quad \text{and} \quad V_D(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_j^2 - x_i^2).$$

- DENISOV/WACHTEL (2011) extend the theorem to less integrable steps.

Open questions

- Relation to the eigenvalue processes of some matrix-valued random walks?
- Relation to general corner-growth process?
- How to construct ordered random walks under infinite variance of the steps?
- Is there a useful duality principle?
- Behaviour of the k ordered random walks if $k \rightarrow \infty$? Convergence of the empirical measure of some marginal distribution (version of WIGNER's semicircle law)? (See [BAIK/SUIDAN 06] for some partial answer.)