

Yale University  
S&DS 551, Spring 2023  
Homework 2

Chang Feng (Felix) Zhou cz397

**Problem 1.**

(a)

Our goal is to determine

$$\mathbb{P}\{|Q_{n+1}| = j \mid |Q_n| = i_n, \dots, |Q_1| = i_1\}$$

and show that it only depends on  $Q_n$ . We assume that the trajectory has non-zero probability, so that  $j \in \{i_n \pm 1\}$  and  $i_k \in \{i_{k-1} \pm 1\}$ .

Firstly, we notice that if there is some  $k \in [n]$  such that  $i_k = 0$ , we may as well as consider

$$\mathbb{P}\{|Q_{n+1}| = j \mid |Q_n| = i_n, \dots, |Q_{k+1}| = i_{k+1}\}.$$

This is because  $|Q_k| = 0 \iff Q_k = 0$ . In other words, the trajectory of  $|Q_n|$  past  $k$  depends only on  $Q_n$ , which depends only on  $Q_{n-1}, \dots, Q_k$  and  $Q_k$  is fixed if we condition on  $|Q_k| = 0$ . Thus without loss of generality, we may assume that  $i_k > 0$  for all  $k \in [n]$ .

Case I:  $j = 0$  In this case, we must have  $|Q_n| = 1$  and  $Q_n \in \{\pm 1\}$ . In either of the two cases, the desired probability is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Case II:  $j > 0$  Since we assume that  $i_k > 0$  for all  $k \in [n]$ , there are exactly two trajectories for which  $|Q_n| = i_n, \dots, |Q_1| = i_1$ . either  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n > 0$  or  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n < 0$ .

Regardless of the two cases, the probability of moving from  $Q_n = \pm i_n$  to  $Q_{n+1} = \pm j$  is exactly  $\frac{1}{2}$  by symmetry.

All in all,  $\{|Q_n|\}$  is Markov with transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} P_{0,1} &= 1 \\ P_{i,i+1} &= \frac{1}{2} & i \neq 0 \\ P_{i,i-1} &= \frac{1}{2} & i \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

(b)

Consider  $M_{n+1}$ .

Case I:  $M_n = 0$  If  $M_n = 0$ , then  $\max_k Q_k = Q_n$  and either the maximum increases with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , in which case  $M_{n+1} = 0$  again, or  $Q_{n+1} = Q_n - 1$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , in which case  $M_{n+1} = 1$ .

Case II:  $M_n > 0$  If  $M_n > 0$ , then  $Q_n < \max_k Q_k$  so that  $Q_{n+1} \leq M_n$ . It follows that the maximum remains the same. So  $M_{n+1} = M_n \pm 1$ , each with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

All in all,  $\{M_n\}$  is indeed a Markov chain with transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} P_{0,0} &= \frac{1}{2} \\ P_{0,1} &= \frac{1}{2} \\ P_{i,i+1} &= \frac{1}{2} & i > 0 \\ P_{i,i-1} &= \frac{1}{2} & i > 0 \end{aligned}$$

## Problem 2.

We claim this is false. Take  $Q_n$  to be a simple random walk and  $P_n := \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} Q_k - Q_n$ . We already know that  $P_n, Q_n$  are Markov.

Now,

$$X_n := P_n + Q_n = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} Q_k$$

cannot be Markov. To see this, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{X_4 = 2 \mid X_0 = 0, X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1, X_3 = 1\} &= \frac{1}{4} \\ \mathbb{P}\{X_4 = 2 \mid X_0 = 0, X_1 = 1, X_2 = 2, X_3 = 1\} &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

The first conditional probability occurs with the  $Q_n$  trajectory  $0, 1, 0, 1$  or  $0, 1, 0, -1$ , where only the first trajectory has any chance to arrive at  $X_4 = 2$ . The second conditional probability occurs with the  $Q_n$  trajectory  $0, 1, 2, 1$ .

### Problem 3.

We argue by induction. The base  $n = 1$  holds by assumption. Suppose inductively that  $P^n$  is stochastic (double stochastic, sub-stochastic) and consider  $P^{n+1}$ .

Stochastic We have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j P_{ij}^{n+1} &= \sum_j \sum_k P_{ik} \cdot P_{kj}^n \\ &= \sum_k P_{ik} \sum_j P_{kj}^n \\ &= \sum_k P_{ik} \cdot 1 \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality holds by the induction hypothesis and the last inequality holds by assumption.

Double Stochastic We have already shown that the rows sum to 1. It suffices to show that the columns sum to 1. But we can reduce this to the row case. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i P_{ij}^{n+1} &= \sum_i (P_{ji}^{n+1})^T \\ &= \sum_i (P_{ji}^T)^{n+1} \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that  $P^T$  is stochastic and so its powers are also stochastic as proven above.

Sub-stochastic Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j P_{ij}^{n+1} &= \sum_j \sum_k P_{ik} \cdot P_{kj}^n \\ &= \sum_k P_{ik} \sum_j P_{kj}^n \\ &\leq \sum_k P_{ik} \cdot 1 \\ &\leq 1.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by the induction hypothesis and the last inequality by assumption.

By induction, we conclude the proofs.

**Problem 4.**

**Problem 5.**