



On Weak Lumpability in Markov Chains

Author(s): Gerardo Rubino and Bruno Sericola

Source: *Journal of Applied Probability*, Sep., 1989, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Sep., 1989), pp. 446-457

Published by: Applied Probability Trust

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3214403>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Applied Probability Trust is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Applied Probability*

ON WEAK LUMPABILITY IN MARKOV CHAINS

GERARDO RUBINO AND
 BRUNO SERICOLA,* *IRISA*

Abstract

We analyse the conditions under which the aggregated process constructed from an homogeneous Markov chain over a given partition of the state space is also Markov homogeneous. The past work on the subject is revised and new properties are obtained.

AGGREGATION; LUMPABILITY

1. Introduction

Let $X = (X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be an homogeneous irreducible Markov chain evolving in discrete time. To simplify the presentation, the state space is supposed finite and it is denoted by $E = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. The stationary distribution of X is denoted by π . Let us denote by $\mathcal{B} = \{B(1), B(2), \dots, B(M)\}$ a partition of the state space and by $n(i)$ the cardinal of $B(i)$. We suppose the states of E ordered such that:

$$\begin{aligned} B(1) &= \{1, \dots, n(1)\} \\ &\vdots \\ B(m) &= \{n(1) + \dots + n(m-1) + 1, \dots, n(1) + \dots + n(m)\} \\ &\vdots \\ B(M) &= \{n(1) + \dots + n(M-1) + 1, \dots, N\}. \end{aligned}$$

To the given process X we associate the aggregated stochastic process Y with values on $F = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, defined by

$$Y_n = m \Leftrightarrow X_n \in B(m), \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

It is easily checked from this definition and the irreducibility of X that the process Y is also irreducible. Y need not be Markov, not even homogeneous. The question here is under which conditions Y is another homogeneous Markov chain.

X is given by its transition probability matrix P and its initial distribution α ; when necessary we denote this Markov chain by (α, P) . The elements of P are denoted by $P(i, j)$. We denote by $\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ the aggregated chain constructed from (α, P) over \mathcal{B} . We shall often consider the family of all the homogeneous Markov chains over the same

Received 21 December 1987; revision received 28 June 1988.

* Postal address for both authors: IRISA Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France.

state space E sharing the same transition probability matrix P , which can be denoted by (\cdot, P) .

Let us denote by \mathcal{A} the set of all probability vectors with N entries. It is well known that $\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is an homogeneous Markov chain $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if a condition (see next section) is satisfied by the matrix P . Such a chain is called *lumpable* or *strongly lumpable* with respect to \mathcal{B} . A more general problem is to determine if there exists some initial distributions α such that $\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is an homogeneous Markov chain but not necessarily for every vector of \mathcal{A} . In this case, the Markov chain X is called *weakly lumpable* with respect to the partition \mathcal{B} . This problem has been discussed by Kemeny and Snell (1976) when X is regular. The authors show that it is possible to have such a situation, that is, $\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ Markov homogeneous for some α but not for every starting vector, a simple but strong sufficient condition is also given.

In Abdel-Moneim and Leysieffer (1982) this analysis is continued by working on a characterization of weak lumpability. A useful technique is introduced by the authors but they give a wrong theorem, and their supposed characterization can be seen only as another sufficient condition. In this paper we review these works; in particular, a counterexample to the main result of Abdel-Moneim and Leysieffer (1982) is given. The correct form of the condition will then be demonstrated, and we show that it is a particular case of a more general sufficient condition for weak lumpability. A characterization and some properties of the set of all the initial distributions leading to an homogeneous aggregated Markov chain are given. These results are valid in the more general case where X is only irreducible.

2. Preliminaries

Following Kemeny and Snell (1976), we denote by α^B the vector of \mathcal{A} defined by: $\alpha^B(i) = \alpha(i)/K$ iff i belongs to the subset B of the state space E , where $K = \sum_{j \in B} \alpha(j)$, for all α and B such that $K \neq 0$. On the other hand, we denote by α_B the restriction of α to the subset B . We shall always consider subsets B belonging to \mathcal{B} ; so, the elements of B are consecutive integers and thus, if $B = \{j+1, \dots, j+k\}$ then $\alpha_B(i) = \alpha(j+i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. For each $l \in F$ the mapping $\alpha \mapsto \alpha_{B(l)}$ will be denoted by T_l , that is, $T_l \cdot \alpha = \alpha_{B(l)}$. Conversely, for any vector β with $n(l)$ entries, $T_l^{-1} \cdot \beta = \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\gamma(i) = 0$ if $i \notin B(l)$ and $\gamma(i) = \beta(i-j)$ for all $i \in B(l)$, with $B(l) = \{j+1, j+2, \dots\}$. Let us give some examples. Suppose $N = 5$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B(1), B(2)\}$ with $B(1) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $B(2) = \{4, 5\}$. Then, we have:

For $\alpha = (1/10, 1/10, 1/5, 2/5, 1/5)$:

$$\alpha^{B(1)} = (1/4, 1/4, 1/2, 0, 0), \quad \alpha^{B(2)} = (0, 0, 0, 2/3, 1/3),$$

$$\alpha_{B(1)} = (1/10, 1/10, 1/5), \quad \alpha_{B(2)} = (2/5, 1/5),$$

$$T_1 \cdot \alpha^{B(1)} = (1/4, 1/4, 1/2),$$

$$T_2^{-1} \cdot (1/4, 3/4) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 3/4).$$

For $\alpha = (1/2, 1/2, 0, 0, 0)$:

$$\alpha^{B(1)} = (1/2, 1/2, 0, 0, 0), \quad \alpha^{B(2)} \text{ is not defined,} \quad (\alpha_{B(2)} = (0, 0)).$$

All vectors used in the text are row vectors. Column vectors will be indicated by means of the operator $(\cdot)^T$. A vector with all its entries equal to 1 will be denoted simply by 1; its dimension will be defined by the context.

When we need to fix a particular chain of the family (\cdot, P) by choosing an initial distribution, it is usual to denote this choice explicitly when calculating probabilities by indexing the symbol associated to the probability measure with the initial distribution. For instance, $P_\beta(X_n \in B)$ means 'the probability that the state of the chain (β, P) will be in the subset B of E at step n (E and the transition matrix P are considered here as fixed)'.

We denote by $P(i, B)$ the transition probability of passing in one step from the state i to the subset B of E , that is $P(i, B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j \in B} P(i, j)$. If we consider the decomposition of matrix P in blocks generated by the partition \mathcal{B} , we denote by $P_{B(i)B(j)}$ the $n(i) \times n(j)$ block corresponding to the transitions from $B(i)$ to $B(j)$.

Let us now analyse the chain $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$. We say that the family (\cdot, P) is *lumpable* or *strongly lumpable* with respect to \mathcal{B} if for every initial distribution $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is a homogeneous Markov chain. The following well-known result characterises these Markov chains.

Theorem 2.1 (Kemeny and Snell (1976)). *(\cdot, P) is strongly lumpable with respect to \mathcal{B} if and only if for every pair of sets $D, B \in \mathcal{B}$, the probability $P(d, B)$ has the same value for any $d \in D$. This common value is the transition probability corresponding to the aggregated chain Y of moving from set D to set B .*

Let us introduce some more useful notation. A sequence (C_0, C_1, \dots, C_j) of subsets of E is called a *possible sequence* for α iff $P_\alpha(X_0 \in C_0, \dots, X_j \in C_j) > 0$. In particular, if $B \in \mathcal{B}$, (B) is a possible sequence for α if $\alpha_B \neq 0$. In what follows, every sequence of elements of \mathcal{B} considered will be possible for the corresponding starting distribution.

Given any distribution vector $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and a possible sequence (C_0, C_1, \dots, C_j) , we define the vector $f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_j) \in \mathcal{A}$ recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha, C_0) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha^{C_0}, \\ f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1})P)^{C_k}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, B)$, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, the subset of all the probability distributions of the form $f(\alpha, C_1, \dots, B)$, that is

$$\mathcal{A}(\alpha, B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \beta \in \mathcal{A} \mid \exists j \geq 0 \text{ and a sequence } (C_1, \dots, C_j), \text{ empty if } j = 0, \text{ such that } \beta = f(\alpha, C_1, \dots, C_j, B) \}.$$

It is easy to verify that for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, the family $\mathcal{A}(\alpha, B)$ is not empty (consequence of the irreducibility of Y). With this notation, a first characterization of the fact that Y is an homogeneous Markov chain is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 (Kemeny and Snell (1976)). *The chain $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is a homogeneous Markov chain iff $\forall B, D \in \mathcal{B}$, the probability $P_\beta(X_1 \in B)$ is the same for every*

$\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha, D)$. This common value is the transition probability corresponding to the aggregated chain Y of moving from set D to set B .

Kemeny and Snell (1976) prove the unicity of the transition probability matrix of the aggregated homogeneous Markov chain when the chain X is regular (\mathcal{B} is fixed).

Corollary 2.3 (Kemeny and Snell (1976)). *If \hat{P} is the transition probability matrix of the aggregated homogeneous Markov chain $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ then \hat{P} is the same for every α leading to an aggregated homogeneous Markov chain.*

We see that if X is only irreducible, then Corollary 2.3 is still valid (Theorem 3.5 in the next section).

The set of initial distributions α leading to a homogeneous Markov chain for $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$, that is:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \mid Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B}) \text{ is a homogeneous Markov chain}\}.$$

The case $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \mathcal{A}$ exists, as shown in Kemeny and Snell (1976). It is also shown that when the chain X is regular, if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$ then $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$. This is a consequence of the fact that if $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ then $\alpha P \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let us consider now the following definitions and notation.

We shall say that (\cdot, P) is *weakly lumpable* with respect to the partition \mathcal{B} iff $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$, the aggregated chain $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is then a homogeneous Markov chain and we shall denote by \hat{P} its transition probability matrix which is the same for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ (Corollary 2.3).

For $i \in F$, we shall denote by \hat{P}_i the $n(i) \times M$ matrix with

$$\hat{P}_i(j, k) = P(n(1) + \dots + n(i-1) + j, B(k)), \quad 1 \leq j \leq n(i), \quad k \in F.$$

From Corollary 2.3, we easily deduce the relation: $\hat{P}_j = (T_j \cdot \pi^{B(i)}) \hat{P}_j$, where \hat{P}_j denotes the j th row of \hat{P} . In what follows, we shall always define \hat{P} according to the previous expression even if the aggregated chain is not a homogeneous Markov chain. That is, if Y is Markov homogeneous, \hat{P} is its transition probability matrix; otherwise, $\hat{P}_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (T_j \cdot \pi^{B(i)}) \hat{P}_j$, $\forall j \in F$.

For $j \in F$, we shall denote by σ_j the following linear system in the vector x_j : $x_j \hat{P}_j = \hat{P}_j$. It can be seen as a system in M equations and $n(j)$ scalar unknowns. It is easy to verify that if x_j is a solution to σ_j then $x_j 1^T = 1$. By construction, this system has, at least, the solution $x_j = T_j \cdot \pi^{B(i)}$.

$$\mathcal{A}^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \mid T_l \cdot \alpha^{B(l)} \text{ is a solution to } \sigma_l \text{ for every } l \in F \text{ such that } \alpha_{B(l)} \neq 0\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}^* \neq \emptyset$ because, by construction, $\pi \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

We shall say that a subset \mathcal{U} of \mathcal{A} is *stable by right product by P* iff $\forall x \in \mathcal{U}$ the vector $xP \in \mathcal{U}$.

Now, Abdel-Moneim and Leysieffer (1982) give the following characterization of weak lumpability:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \text{ is stable by right product by } P. \text{ In this case, } \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{A}^*.$$

In fact, the condition proposed to characterize weak lumpability has, in their paper, the following less compact form (Abdel-Moneim and Leysieffer (1982), Theorem 3.1):

$$\forall l \in F, [y_l \text{ is a solution to } \sigma_l \Rightarrow \forall m \in F \text{ such that } ((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)_{B(m)} \neq 0, \\ T_m \cdot ((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)^{B(m)} \text{ is a solution to } \sigma_m].$$

In the Appendix we show that this is equivalent to the stability of \mathcal{A}^* by right product by P .

This theorem does not hold, as the following counterexample shows:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1/6 & 1/6 & 1/6 & 1/2 \\ 1/8 & 3/8 & 1/4 & 1/4 \\ 3/8 & 1/8 & 1/4 & 1/4 \\ 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/4 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\mathcal{B} = \{B(1), B(2)\}$, where $B(1) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $B(2) = \{4\}$. We have:

$$\pi = (3/13, 3/13, 3/13, 4/13).$$

Now, check first that

$$\pi^{B(1)} = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3, 0) \text{ and that } \pi^{B(1)}P = (2/9, 2/9, 2/9, 1/3).$$

Next, note that $(\pi^{B(i)}P)^{B(j)} = \pi^{B(j)}$ for every $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. So, it is evident from Theorem 2.2, as shown by Kemeny and Snell (1976), that this is sufficient for $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$, since we have $\mathcal{A}(\pi, B(i)) = \{\pi^{B(i)}\}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then:

$$\tilde{P}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 3/4 & 1/4 \\ 3/4 & 1/4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{P}_2 = (3/4 \quad 1/4),$$

which gives

$$\hat{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 2/3 & 1/3 \\ 3/4 & 1/4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The vector $u = (1/3, 0, 2/3, 0) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ since $T_1 \cdot u^{B(1)}$ is a solution to σ_1 ($u^{B(2)}$ is not defined).

Consider now $v = uP = (11/36, 5/36, 2/9, 1/3)$; $v^{B(1)} = (11/24, 5/24, 1/3, 0)$ and $T_1 \cdot v^{B(1)}\tilde{P}_1 = (61/96, 35/96) \neq \tilde{P}_1$. So, $T_1 \cdot v^{B(1)}$ is not a solution to σ_1 and thus $uP \notin \mathcal{A}^*$.

This is an example of an homogeneous Markov chain and a partition of the state space with $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$ and at the same time \mathcal{A}^* not stable by right product by P .

Moreover, Abdel-Moneim and Leysieffer (1982) derive some properties of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ such as the convexity of this set, but they use the preceding inexact characterization and in fact they only give properties of \mathcal{A}^* (see Section 3 for an analysis of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$).

3. Main results

All the results given in this section are under the sole hypothesis that the chain X is irreducible. We first give the correct form of the previous equivalence and then we exhibit a characterization of the set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Theorem 3.1. \mathcal{A}^* is stable by right product by $P \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{A}^*$.

Proof. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ being obviously stable by right product by P , the right-to-left implication becomes trivial. To prove the converse, let us remark first that Theorem 2.2 can be written as:

$\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is Markov homogeneous $\Leftrightarrow \forall l \in F, T_l \cdot \beta$ is a solution to σ_l for every $\beta \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l))$.

It follows clearly that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$. Let then $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and consider a possible sequence $(B(i), B(j), \dots)$ for α . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{B(i)} &\in \mathcal{A}^* \quad \text{trivially since } (\alpha^{B(i)})^{B(i)} = \alpha^{B(i)}, \\ \alpha^{B(i)}P &\in \mathcal{A}^* \quad \text{by hypothesis,} \\ (\alpha^{B(i)}P)^{B(j)} &\in \mathcal{A}^* \quad \text{for every } i, j \in F \text{ by definition of } \mathcal{A}^*, \\ (\alpha^{B(i)}P)^{B(j)}P &\in \mathcal{A}^* \quad \text{for every } i, j \in F \text{ by hypothesis.} \end{aligned}$$

By continuing in this way, a recurrence argument gives:

$\mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l)) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$ for every $l \in F$, which is equivalent to saying that $\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is Markov homogeneous (Theorem 2.2). So, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

We see then that the stability of \mathcal{A}^* by right product by P is not a characterization of weak lumpability but only a sufficient condition.

Let us now introduce the following lemmas which will be useful later.

Lemma 3.2. The function $v \mapsto P_v(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k})$ for fixed $j, k, C_{j-1}, \dots, C_{j-k}$ and B , is continuous.

Proof. Let us denote by $g(v) = P_v(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k})$. Then

$$g(v) = \sum_{i \in E} v(i) P_v(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k}, X_0 = i).$$

But $P_v(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k}, X_0 = i)$ does not depend on v . We can then write

$$\begin{aligned} |g(v') - g(v)| &= \left| \sum_{i \in E} (v'(i) - v(i)) P(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k}, X_0 = i) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in E} |v'(i) - v(i)| P(X_j \in B \mid X_{j-1} \in C_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k} \in C_{j-k}, X_0 = i) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i \in E} |v'(i) - v(i)| \\ &= \|v' - v\| \end{aligned}$$

and the continuity of g follows.

Recall that for every $l, m \in F$, $P_{B(l)B(m)}$ is the block $n(l) \times n(m)$ of the matrix P corresponding to the transitions from the states of $B(l)$ to the states of $B(m)$. With this notation, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3.3. *The restriction of $\beta = f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_j)$ to the subset C_j is given by the following expression:*

$$\beta_{C_j} = K^{-1} \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} P_{C_1 C_2} \cdots P_{C_{j-1} C_j}$$

where

$$K = \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} P_{C_1 C_2} \cdots P_{C_{j-1} C_j} 1^\top.$$

Proof. The property is obvious for $j = 0$. Let us suppose that the relation holds for any sequence having n subsets and denote by $\gamma = f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{n-1})$. We have

$$\gamma_{C_{n-1}} = L^{-1} \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} P_{C_1 C_2} \cdots P_{C_{n-2} C_{n-1}}$$

where

$$L = \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} P_{C_1 C_2} \cdots P_{C_{n-2} C_{n-1}} 1^\top.$$

Then, if $\beta = f(\alpha, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_n) = (\gamma P)^{C_n}$, we have

$$\beta_{C_n} = H^{-1} (\gamma P)_{C_n} \quad \text{with } H = (\gamma P)_{C_n} 1^\top.$$

But $(\gamma P)_{C_n} = \gamma_{C_{n-1}} P_{C_{n-1} C_n}$ since $\gamma(i) = 0$ if $i \notin C_{n-1}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{C_n} &= H^{-1} \gamma_{C_{n-1}} P_{C_{n-1} C_n} \\ &= H^{-1} L^{-1} \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} P_{C_1 C_2} \cdots P_{C_{n-2} C_{n-1}} P_{C_{n-1} C_n} \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows since K^{-1} is simply a normalizing constant.

Lemma 3.4. *If $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ then:*

- (i) $\alpha^{B(k)} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ for every $k \in F$ such that the sequence $(B(k))$ is possible.
- (ii) $(1/n) \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $k \in F$ with $\alpha_{B(k)} \neq 0$. Verify first that

$$P_{\alpha^{B(k)}}(X_{n+1} \in B(m) \mid X_n \in B(l), X_{n-1} \in C_{n-1}, \dots, X_0 \in B(k)) = P_\delta(X_1 \in B(m))$$

where

$$\delta = f(\alpha^{B(k)}, B(k), \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l)) = f(\alpha, B(k), \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l)).$$

So

$$P_\delta(X_1 \in B(m)) = P_\alpha(X_{n+1} \in B(m) \mid X_n \in B(l), X_{n-1} \in C_{n-1}, \dots, X_0 \in B(k))$$

which proves that $\alpha^{B(k)} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let us denote

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k.$$

We have

$$P_\gamma(X_{n+1} \in B(m) \mid X_n \in B(l), X_{n-1} \in C_{n-1}, \dots, X_0 \in C_0) = P_{\gamma'}(X_1 \in B(m))$$

where

$$\gamma' = f(\gamma, C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l)).$$

Let $\alpha'_k = f(\alpha P^k, C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l))$. From Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\gamma' = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{K_k}{K} \alpha'_k$$

where

$$K_k = (\alpha P^k)_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} \cdots P_{C_{n-1} B(l)} \mathbf{1}^T$$

and

$$K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n K_k.$$

So, we can write

$$P_{\gamma'}(X_1 \in B(m)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{K_k}{K} P_{\alpha'_k}(X_1 \in B(m)).$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha'_k}(X_1 \in B(m)) &= P_{\alpha P^k}(X_{n+1} \in B(m) \mid X_n \in B(l), \dots, X_0 \in C_0) \\ &= P_\alpha(X_{n+k+1} \in B(m) \mid X_{n+k} \in B(l), \dots, X_k \in C_0) \\ &= P_\alpha(X_{j+1} \in B(m) \mid X_j \in B(l)) \\ &\quad \forall j \text{ such that } P_\alpha(X_j \in B(l)) > 0, \text{ since } \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_M. \end{aligned}$$

So, for any j such that $P_\alpha(X_j \in B(l)) > 0$ we have

$$P_{\gamma'}(X_1 \in B(m)) = P_\alpha(X_{j+1} \in B(m) \mid X_j \in B(l))$$

which proves that $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_M$.

We are now ready to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 3.5. *If X is irreducible then Corollary 2.3 holds and if $\mathcal{A}_M \neq \emptyset$ then $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_M$.*

Proof. Remark first that \mathcal{A}_M is trivially stable by right product by P without any particular assumption about X such as regularity.

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Y = \text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is a homogeneous Markov chain (i.e. $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$) with transition probability matrix \hat{P} . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \text{ such that } P_{\alpha}(X_k \in B(l)) &> 0, \\ \hat{P}(l, m) &= P_{\alpha}(X_{k+1} \in B(m) \mid X_k \in B(l)) \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0 \\ &= P_{\alpha P^k}(X_1 \in B(m) \mid X_0 \in B(l)) \quad \text{for any } k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \quad \text{for every } n \geq 1, \text{ by Lemma 3.4.}$$

Let n be large enough such that $\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha P^k)_{B(l)} 1^T > 0$ (X is irreducible). To clarify the notation, let γ_k denote the quantity

$$\gamma_k = \frac{(\alpha P^k)_{B(l)} 1^T}{\sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha P^k)_{B(l)} 1^T} \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

$\hat{P}(l, m)$ can be written as follows:

$$\hat{P}(l, m) = \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k \hat{P}(l, m).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(l, m) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k P_{\alpha P^k}(X_1 \in B(m) \mid X_0 \in B(l)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k P_{(\alpha P^k)^{B(l)}}(X_1 \in B(m)) \\ &= P_{\sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k (\alpha P^k)^{B(l)}}(X_1 \in B(m)) \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript k in the sums concerns, of course, only the well-defined terms.

The sum in subscript can be written as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_k (\alpha P^k)^{B(l)} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k \right)^{B(l)} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k \right)^{B(l)}.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(l, m) &= P_{((1/n) \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k)^{B(l)}}(X_1 \in B(m)) \\ &= P_{(1/n) \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha P^k}(X_1 \in B(m) \mid X_0 \in B(l)). \end{aligned}$$

Now letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and thanks to the continuity Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\hat{P}(l, m) = P_{\pi}(X_1 \in B(m) \mid X_0 \in B(l))$$

which does not depend on α .

We can now establish the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a convex closed set.

Proof. From the continuity Lemma 3.2, it is immediate that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is closed. To prove the convexity, assume that $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and let $\gamma = \lambda\alpha + \mu\beta$, where $\lambda + \mu = 1$.

$$P_{\gamma}(X_{n+1} \in B(m) \mid X_n \in B(l), X_{n-1} \in C_{n-1}, \dots, X_0 \in C_0) = P_{\gamma'}(X_1 \in B(m))$$

where

$$\gamma' = f(\gamma, C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l)).$$

Let $\alpha' = f(\alpha, C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l))$ and $\beta' = f(\beta, C_0, \dots, C_{n-1}, B(l))$. From Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\gamma' = \lambda \frac{K_{\alpha}}{K} \alpha' + \mu \frac{K_{\beta}}{K} \beta'$$

where

$$K_{\alpha} = \alpha_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} \dots P_{C_{j-1} C_j} 1^T, \quad K_{\beta} = \beta_{C_0} P_{C_0 C_1} \dots P_{C_{j-1} C_j} 1^T$$

and

$$K = \lambda K_{\alpha} + \mu K_{\beta}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\gamma'}(X_1 \in B(m)) &= P_{(\lambda K_{\alpha} \alpha' + \mu K_{\beta} \beta') K}(X_1 \in B(m)) \\ &= \lambda \frac{K_{\alpha}}{K} P_{\alpha'}(X_1 \in B(m)) + \mu \frac{K_{\beta}}{K} P_{\beta'}(X_1 \in B(m)) \\ &= \lambda \frac{K_{\alpha}}{K} \hat{P}(l, m) + \mu \frac{K_{\beta}}{K} \hat{P}(l, m) \quad \text{by Theorem 3.5} \\ &= \hat{P}(l, m) \end{aligned}$$

which means that $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$. So $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a convex set.

To give a characterization of the set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we define for all $j \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{A}^j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^* \mid \forall \beta = f(\alpha, B(i_1), \dots, B(i_k)), \text{ with } k \leq j, \beta \in \mathcal{A}^*\}.$$

With this notation, we have

$$\mathcal{A}^1 = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^* \mid \forall m \in F \text{ such that } \alpha_{B(m)} \neq 0, \alpha^{B(m)} \in \mathcal{A}^*\} = \mathcal{A}^*.$$

$(\mathcal{A}^j)_{j \geq 1}$ is obviously a decreasing sequence:

$$\forall j \geq 1, \quad \mathcal{A}^{j+1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^j.$$

The following theorem gives then a characterization of the set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Theorem 3.7.

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} = \bigcap_{j \geq 1} \mathcal{A}^j.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we start from the equivalence:

$\text{agg}(\alpha, P, \mathcal{B})$ is Markov homogeneous $\Leftrightarrow \forall l \in F, \forall \beta \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l)), T_l \cdot \beta$ is a solution to σ_l .

In other words,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^* \mid \forall l \in F, \mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l)) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*\}.$$

So, we have: $\forall j \geq 1, \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^j$.

Conversely, if $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^j \forall j \geq 1$, then $\forall l \in F, \mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l)) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$; which means that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

An evident necessary condition for having weak lumpability (i.e. $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} \neq \emptyset$) is that $\forall j \geq 1, \mathcal{A}^j \neq \emptyset$.

A sufficient condition is given by the following corollary.

Corollary 3.8. If $\exists j \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{j+1} = \mathcal{A}^j$ then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{A}^{j+k}, \forall k \geq 0$.

Proof. If $\mathcal{A}^j = \emptyset$, the result is trivial.

Let us remark now that

$$\forall j \geq 1, (\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^j \Rightarrow \alpha^{B(l)} \in \mathcal{A}^j, \forall l \in F \text{ such that } \alpha_{B(l)} \neq 0).$$

Then, let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A}^j = \mathcal{A}^{j+1}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$. By definition, for any $i_1, \dots, i_{j+1} \in F$, $f(\alpha, B(i_1), \dots, B(i_{j+1})) \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

But $f(\alpha, B(i_1), \dots, B(i_{j+1})) = f(\alpha^{B(i_1)}P, B(i_2), \dots, B(i_{j+1}))$; so, $\alpha^{B(i_1)}P \in \mathcal{U}$ (since $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{A}^j$).

Therefore, we have

$$\alpha \in \mathcal{U} \Rightarrow \alpha^{B(l)}P \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall l \in F \text{ such that } \alpha_{B(l)} \neq 0.$$

This means that if $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ then $\forall l \in F, \mathcal{A}(\alpha, B(l)) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ which implies that $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Now, thanks to Theorem 3.7, the result follows.

Observe that the sufficient condition for weak lumpability of Theorem 3.1 reduces to the preceeding one with $j = 1$.

4. Conclusions

In this paper we analyse the set of initial distributions of a homogeneous Markov chain which lead to an homogeneous aggregated Markov chain, given the probability transition matrix and a partition of the state space. We give a characterization and some properties of this set. This characterization is rather theoretical since it involves an infinite product of sets. Further work seems necessary to find more efficient ways to decide whether a given Markov chain is weakly lumpable or not. Also, another direction to explore is the extension of this kind of result to the continuous-time case.

Appendix

Lemma. The two following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{A}^* is stable by right product by P .
- (ii) $\forall l \in F$, $[y_l \text{ is a solution to } \sigma_l \Rightarrow \forall m \in F \text{ such that } ((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)_{B(m)} \neq 0, T_m \cdot ((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)^{B(m)} \text{ is a solution to } \sigma_m]$.

Proof. Let us show first that \mathcal{A}^* is a convex set. Let α and β be two distributions of \mathcal{A}^* and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Consider the vector $\gamma = \lambda\alpha + (1 - \lambda)\beta$ and let $B(l)$ be any element of the partition such that $\gamma_{B(l)} \neq 0$. If $\alpha_{B(l)} = 0$ then $\gamma^{B(l)} = \beta^{B(l)}$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^*$; in the same way, if $\beta_{B(l)} = 0$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^*$. In the other case, it is easy to check that

$$\gamma^{B(l)} = \mu\alpha^{B(l)} + (1 - \mu)\beta^{B(l)} \quad \text{where } \mu = \frac{\lambda\alpha_{B(l)}1^T}{\lambda\alpha_{B(l)}1^T + (1 - \lambda)\beta_{B(l)}1^T}.$$

Then, as the set of the solutions to σ_l is convex, $T_l \cdot \gamma^{B(l)}$ is a solution to this linear system and the convexity of \mathcal{A}^* follows.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let y_l be a solution to σ_l and $m \in F$ such that $((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)_{B(m)} \neq 0$. As $T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l$ is obviously in \mathcal{A}^* , $(T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P \in \mathcal{A}^*$ since \mathcal{A}^* is stable by right product by P , so we have: $T_m \cdot ((T_l^{-1} \cdot y_l)P)^{B(m)}$ is a solution to σ_m , by definition of \mathcal{A}^* , which gives (ii).

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}^*$. For any $l \in F$ such that $\alpha_{B(l)} \neq 0$, (ii) says that $\forall m \in F$ with $(\alpha^{B(l)}P)_{B(m)} \neq 0$ we have: $T_m \cdot (\alpha^{B(l)}P)^{B(m)}$ is a solution to σ_m ; that is, $\alpha^{B(l)}P \in \mathcal{A}^*$. We can write (in a unique way) α as a convex combination of vectors $\alpha^{B(l)}$ which are all in \mathcal{A}^* :

$$\alpha = \sum_{l \in F | \alpha_{B(l)} \neq 0} \lambda_l \alpha^{B(l)} \quad \text{where } \lambda_l = \alpha_{B(l)} 1^T.$$

Then, the convexity of \mathcal{A}^* completes the proof.

References

- ABDEL-MONEIM, A. M. AND LEYSIEFFER, F. W. (1982) Weak lumpability in finite Markov chains. *J. Appl. Prob.* **19**, 685–691.
- KEMENY, J. G. AND SNELL, J. L. (1976) *Finite Markov Chains*. Springer-Verlag, New York.