

**Imperial College
London**

BSc and MSci EXAMINATIONS (MATHEMATICS)

May-June 2009

This paper is also taken for the relevant examination for the Associateship.

M3S4/M4S4

Applied Probability (Solutions)

Setter's signature

.....

Checker's signature

.....

Editor's signature

.....

1. (i) Either of the following definitions, are appropriate for full marks. A counting Process, $\{N_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, is a Poisson Process of rate $\lambda > 0$ if

seen ↓

1. $N_0 = 0$.
2. The increments are independent, that is, for any $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$\mathbb{P}(\{N_t - N_s = k_1\} | \{N_r = k_2, 0 \leq r \leq s\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{N_t - N_s = k_1\}).$$

3. The increments are stationary: for any $l > 0, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$\mathbb{P}(\{N_t - N_s = k\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{N_{t+l} - N_{s+l} = k\})$$

4. There is a 'single arrival'

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\{N_{t+\delta} - N_t = 1\}) &= \lambda\delta + o(\delta) \\ \mathbb{P}(\{N_{t+\delta} - N_t \geq 2\}) &= o(\delta)\end{aligned}$$

Or: A counting Process, $\{N_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, is a Poisson Process of rate $\lambda > 0$ if

1. $N_0 = 0$
2. The increments are independent
3. For any $0 \leq s < t, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(N_t - N_s = k) = \frac{(\lambda(t-s))^k e^{-\lambda(t-s)}}{k!}.$$

That is, the number of events in $[s, t]$ is a Poisson random variable, with mean $\lambda(t-s)$.

5

- (ii) Here we seek to verify the properties of a Poisson process for \bar{N}_t . It is enough, to consider the second definition of a Poisson process.

Clearly $\bar{N}_0 = 0$, so let us consider the independence (or not) of the increments. Let $s > t$ then

$$\bar{N}_t - \bar{N}_s = N_t^1 - N_s^1 + N_t^2 - N_s^2$$

since both N_t^1 and N_t^2 have independent increments, so does \bar{N}_t . For full marks, one must show the following (or provide an alternative argument):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\bar{N}_t - \bar{N}_s = k_1 | \{\bar{N}_r\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) &= \mathbb{P}(N_t^1 - N_s^1 + N_t^2 - N_s^2 = k_1 | \{N_r^1 + N_r^2\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \\ &= \sum_{A_{k_1}} \mathbb{P}(N_t^1 - N_s^1 = j_1, N_t^2 - N_s^2 = j_2 | \{N_r^1 + N_r^2\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \\ &= \sum_{A_{k_1}} \mathbb{P}(N_t^1 - N_s^1 = j_1 | \{N_r^1\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \mathbb{P}(N_t^2 - N_s^2 = j_2 | \{N_r^2\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) \\ &= \sum_{A_{k_1}} \mathbb{P}(N_t^1 - N_s^1 = j_1) \mathbb{P}(N_t^2 - N_s^2 = j_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(N_t^1 - N_s^1 + N_t^2 - N_s^2 = k_1)\end{aligned}$$

where $A_{k_1} = \{j_1, j_2 \geq 0 : j_1 + j_2 = k_1\}$ and we have used the independence of $\{N_t^1\}$ and $\{N_t^2\}$ and the independence of their increments.

Let us consider the last property. $\bar{N}_t = N_t^1 + N_t^2$, so we simply need to find the distribution of the sum of two independent Poisson distributions. Let us use the Laplace transform.

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\bar{N}_t}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-s(N_t^1 + N_t^2)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-sN_t^1}]\mathbb{E}[e^{-sN_t^2}].$$

As

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-sN_t^1}] = \exp\{\alpha t(e^{-s} - 1)\} \quad \mathbb{E}[e^{-sN_t^2}] = \exp\{\beta t(e^{-s} - 1)\}$$

it follows

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-s\bar{N}_t}] = \exp\{(\alpha + \beta)t(e^{-s} - 1)\}$$

i.e. a Poisson random variable of parameter $(\alpha + \beta)t$ as required. 6

- (iii) Let X_1, X_2, \dots be the time that an individual spends queuing. By definition:

unseen ¶

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{Y_t}(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{is \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} X_j\right\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{is \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} X_j\right\} | N_t = n_t\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\phi_X(s)^{N_t}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_X(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{ixs} \rho e^{-\rho x} dx \\ &= \left[-\frac{\rho}{\rho - is} e^{-x(\rho - is)} \right]_0^\infty \quad s \neq \rho/i \\ &= \frac{\rho}{\rho - is}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, letting $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha + \beta$, $\tilde{\rho} = \frac{\rho}{\rho - is}$

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{Y_t}(s) &= e^{-\tilde{\alpha}t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}t)^n}{n!} \\ &= \exp\{-\tilde{\alpha}t + \tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\rho}t\} \\ &= \exp\left\{\left(\frac{is}{\rho - is}\right)(\alpha + \beta)t\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating w.r.t s , setting $s = 0$ and dividing by i yields

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t | \alpha, \beta] = \frac{[\alpha + \beta]t}{\rho}. 6$$

(iv) As the expectation of α and β are both 1, it follows

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+} \mathbb{E}[Y_t | \alpha, \beta] e^{-\alpha} e^{-\beta} d\alpha d\beta = \frac{2t}{\rho}.$$

As ρ increases (for fixed t) the expectation goes to zero. This makes sense, as in this case, the expected waiting time in the queue is very small. 3

2. (i) A birth process with intensities $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots$ is a counting process $\{N_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ such that seen ↓

1. $N_0 = 0$
2. Conditionally independent increments: $\mathbb{P}(N_t - N_s | \{N_r\}_{0 \leq r \leq s}) = \mathbb{P}(N_t - N_s | N_s)$
3. There is a 'single arrival'

$$\mathbb{P}(N_{t+\delta} = n+m | N_t = n) = \begin{cases} 1 - \lambda_n \delta + o(\delta) & \text{if } m = 0 \\ \lambda_n \delta + o(\delta) & \text{if } m = 1 \\ o(\delta) & \text{o/w} \end{cases}$$
4

- (ii) Let $\{N_t\}$ be a birth process with positive intensities λ_0, \dots . Define the probabilities

$$p_n(t) = \mathbb{P}(N_t = n).$$

Now we can obtain the forward equations for a birth process:

$$p_n(t + \delta) = p_n(t)[1 - \lambda_n \delta] + p_{n-1}(t)\lambda_{n-1}\delta + o(\delta)$$

with $n \geq 1$. That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(t + \delta) &= \sum_{l \leq n} \mathbb{P}(N_{t+\delta} = n | N_t = l) \mathbb{P}(N_t = l) \\ &= \sum_{l \leq n} \mathbb{P}(N_{t+\delta} = j | N_t = l) p_l(t) \\ &= p_n(t)[1 - \lambda_n \delta] + p_{n-1}(t)\lambda_{n-1}\delta + o(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

where the final line follows from the fact that we can only be in the state where there are $n-1$ individuals, and there is a birth, or we have jumped from n already and there is no birth. Then rearranging and taking the limit $\delta \downarrow 0$ it follows

$$\frac{dp_n(t)}{dt} = -\lambda_n p_n(t) + \lambda_{n-1} p_{n-1}(t)$$

with the boundary condition $p_n(0) = 0$.

If $n = 0$ in a similar manner:

$$p_n(t + \delta) = p_n(t)[1 - \lambda_n \delta] + o(\delta)$$

i.e.

$$\frac{dp_n(t)}{dt} = -\lambda_n p_n(t)$$

with the boundary condition $p_n(0) = 1$.

- (iii) This is a linear birth process, that is, that $\lambda_n = n\lambda$. Suppose $n = I$ then the forward equations yield that

6

unseen ↓

$$p'_n(t) = -I\lambda p_n(t)$$

with $p_n(0) = 1$. This is a separable first order ODE:

$$\int \frac{1}{p_n(t)} dp_n(t) = I\lambda t + C$$

that is,

$$p_n(t) = e^{-I\lambda t}$$

as $C = 0$ due to the boundary condition. Now assume the result for $n = k$, $k \geq I$ and consider $k+1$:

$$p'_{k+1}(t) + (k+1)p_{k+1}(t) = \lambda k \binom{k-1}{I-1} e^{-\lambda It} (1 - e^{-\lambda It})^{k-I}$$

where we have used the induction hypothesis. The above ODE is a first order linear ODE and may be solved by using the integrating factor approach. The integrating factor is

$$M(t) = \exp\{\lambda(k+1)t\}.$$

Then we have that

$$p_{k+1}(t) = \exp\{-\lambda(k+1)t\} \left[\binom{k-1}{I-1} \lambda k \int_0^t (1 - e^{-\lambda s})^{k-I} e^{\lambda s(k+1-I)} ds + C \right].$$

Using the identity in the question, it follows that

$$p_{k+1}(t) = \exp\{-\lambda(k+1)t\} \left[\binom{k}{I-1} e^{-\lambda It} (1 - e^{-\lambda It})^{k+1-I} \exp\{\lambda(k+1)t\} + C \right]$$

using $p_{k+1}(0) = 0$ it follows $C = 0$ and the desired result is obtained.

8

- (iv) To compute the expectation, it is easiest to notice that the distribution is a negative binomial and hence

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t] = Ie^{\lambda t}.$$

Alternatively, putting $p = e^{-\lambda t}$ the objective is to calculate:

$$\sum_{k=I}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{I-1} kp^I (1-p)^{k-I}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=I}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{I-1} p^I (1-p)^{k-I} &= 1 \\
 \frac{d}{dp} \sum_{k=I}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{I-1} p^I (1-p)^{k-I} &= 0 \\
 \Rightarrow \sum_{k=I}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{I-1} k p^I (1-p)^{k-I} &= I \sum_{k=I}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{I-1} p^{I-1} (1-p)^{k-I+1} + I \\
 &= I \left[\frac{1-p}{p} + 1 \right] \\
 &= \frac{I}{p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Substituting for p completes the manipulations.

2

3. (i) A discrete-time stochastic process $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ on E is a **Markov chain** if it satisfies the **Markov condition**

seen ↓

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = s | X_{n-1} = x_{n-1}, \dots, X_0 = x_0) = \mathbb{P}(X_n = s | X_{n-1} = x_{n-1})$$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $s, x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in E$.

2

- (ii) (a) This is a Markov chain, as consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(Y_n | \{Y_s\}_{-\infty < s \leq n-1}) &= \mathbb{P}(X_{-n} | \{X_s\}_{-n+1 \leq s < \infty}) \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\{X_s\}_{-n \leq s < \infty})}{\mathbb{P}(\{X_s\}_{-n+1 \leq s < \infty})} \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{-n}) \mathbb{P}(X_{-n+1} | X_{-n}) \times \dots}{\mathbb{P}(X_{-n+1}) \mathbb{P}(X_{-n+2} | X_{-n+1}) \times \dots} \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_{-n}) \mathbb{P}(X_{-n+1} | X_{-n})}{\mathbb{P}(X_{-n+1})} \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(X_{-n} | X_{-n+1}) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(Y_n | Y_{n-1})
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Markov property and Bayes theorem.

4

- (b) A Markov chain is **time-reversible** if the transition matrices of $\{X_n\}$ and $\{Y_n\}$ are the same.

2

- (c) Consider

$$\pi_i p_{ij} = \pi_j p_{ji}. \quad (1)$$

Let Q be the transition matrix of $\{Y_n\}$. Then from the above arguments, we have

$$q_{ij} = p_{ji} \frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}$$

thus $q_{ij} = p_{ij}$ iff (1) holds.

[2]

- (iii) (a) The process is a Markov chain as the number of molecules in container A at time n depends (stochastically) only on the number of molecules in container A at time $n - 1$. The transition probabilities are:

$$p_{i,i+1} = 1 - \frac{i}{m} \quad p_{i,i-1} = \frac{i}{m} \quad 0 \leq i \leq m.$$

(b) Using $\pi_i p_{i,i+1} = \pi_{i+1} p_{i+1,i}$ (due to the reversibility), we will write π_i ($1 \leq i \leq m$) in terms of π_0 and use the fact that the probabilities must sum to 1, to conclude. Let $i = 0$, then

$$\pi_0 = \pi_1 \frac{1}{m}$$

that is $\pi_1 = m\pi_0$. Then,

$$\pi_1 \left(\frac{m-1}{m} \right) = \pi_2 \frac{2}{m}$$

i.e.

$$\pi_2 = \left(\frac{m(m-1)}{2} \right) \pi_0.$$

Then

$$\pi_2 \left(\frac{m-2}{m} \right) = \pi_3 \frac{3}{m}$$

so

$$\pi_3 = \left(\frac{m(m-1)(m-2)}{2 \times 3} \right) \pi_0.$$

Thus, by induction (or simply by repeating the calculations)

$$\pi_i = \binom{m}{i} \pi_0.$$

As $\sum_{i=0}^m \pi_i = 1$:

$$\pi_0 [1 + \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{m}{i}] = 1$$

that is

$$\pi_0 = \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m$$

i.e.

$$\pi_i = \binom{m}{i} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \quad 0 \leq i \leq m$$

as required.

[7]

4. (i) Let the process be denoted $\{X_t\}$ and suppose it satisfies:

seen ↓

1. $\{X_t\}$ is Markov chain on $E = \{0, 1, \dots\}$
2. for $n \geq 0$ the infinitesimal transition probabilities, for $\delta > 0$, are

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+\delta} = n+m | X_t = n) = \begin{cases} \lambda_n \delta + o(\delta) & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \mu_n \delta + o(\delta) & \text{if } m = -1 \\ o(\delta) & \text{if } |m| > 1 \end{cases}$$

3. the birth rates $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots$ and the death rates μ_0, μ_1, \dots satisfy

$$\lambda_i \geq 0 \quad \mu_i \geq 0 \quad \mu_0 = 0.$$

Then the process is called a birth-death process.

4

(ii) The generator is

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda_0 & \lambda_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \mu_1 & -(\lambda_1 + \mu_1) & \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \mu_2 & -(\lambda_2 + \mu_2) & \lambda_2 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_3 & -(\lambda_3 + \mu_3) & \lambda_3 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

To solve the second part of the question, note that the condition allows the π , given the equality holds, to be probabilities, so our main concern is verifying the given equation. We use strong induction. Since we have $\pi G = 0$, we can say:

$$\pi_1 = \frac{\lambda_0}{\mu_1} \pi_0.$$

Suppose then, the statement holds for every $n \leq k$, let us use induction to prove that this holds for any $n \leq k+1$; the base case has been proved. Since $\pi G = 0$ gives

$$\lambda_{k-1}\pi_{k-1} - (\lambda_k + \mu_k)\pi_k + \mu_{k+1}\pi_{k+1} = 0$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{\mu_{k+1}} \left[(\lambda_k + \mu_k)\pi_k - \lambda_{k-1}\pi_{k-1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_{k+1}} \left[(\lambda_k + \mu_k) \frac{\lambda_0 \times \dots \times \lambda_{k-1}}{\mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_k} \pi_0 - \lambda_{k-1} \frac{\lambda_0 \times \dots \times \lambda_{k-2}}{\mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_{k-1}} \pi_0 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu_{k+1}} \frac{\lambda_0 \times \dots \times \lambda_{k-1}}{\mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_{k-1}} \pi_0 \left[\frac{(\lambda_k + \mu_k)}{\mu_k} - 1 \right] \\ &= \frac{\lambda_0 \times \dots \times \lambda_k}{\mu_1 \times \dots \times \mu_{k+1}} \pi_0 \end{aligned}$$

so the result holds for every $n \leq k+1$. Thus by strong induction and the comment above, the result holds

6

unseen ↓

(iii) (a) By using the result in the previous question:

$$\pi_k = \pi_0 \frac{\lambda^k \exp\{1 + \dots + k\}}{\mu^k \exp\{1 + \dots + k\}}.$$

Thus:

$$\pi_k = \pi_0 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^k$$

where $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Thus, as

$$\pi_0 \left[1 + \frac{\lambda}{\mu} + \dots + \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^n\right] = 1$$

it follows ($\lambda < \mu$)

$$\pi_0 = \frac{\mu - \lambda}{\mu} \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^{n+1}}.$$

Hence, the probability that no investment is possible is:

$$\frac{\mu - \lambda}{\mu} \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^{n+1}} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\right)^n = \frac{(\mu - \lambda)\lambda^n}{\mu^{n+1} - \lambda^{n+1}}.$$

7

(b) By the lack of memory property of the exponential distribution the time until an investment position is available is an exponential random variable with parameter μe^{-n} . Therefore the time you would expect to wait is e^{-n}/μ units.

3