



Sharp Conditions for Nonexplosions and Explosions in Markov Jump Processes

Author(s): G. Kersting and F. C. Klebaner

Source: *The Annals of Probability*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Jan., 1995), pp. 268-272

Published by: Institute of Mathematical Statistics

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2244789>

Accessed: 13-01-2025 14:25 UTC

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>



Institute of Mathematical Statistics is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annals of Probability*

SHARP CONDITIONS FOR NONEXPLOSIONS AND EXPLOSIONS IN MARKOV JUMP PROCESSES

BY G. KERSTING AND F. C. KLEBANER¹

Universität Frankfurt am Main and University of Melbourne

We give sharp sufficient conditions for nonexplosions and explosions in Markov pure jump processes in terms of the holding time parameters and moments of the jump distributions.

Introduction. We consider a time homogeneous Markov jump process $\{Z_t\}$ in continuous time with the state space S , a subset of nonnegative reals. For general description and construction of such processes, see, for example, Breiman [(1968), pages 328–338] and Chung (1967). If the process is in state z , then it stays there for an exponential length of time with parameter $\lambda(z)$, after which it jumps from z . Let T_n be the time of the n th jump of the process, $T_n = \inf\{t > T_{n-1} : Z_t \neq Z_{t-}\}$, $T_0 = 0$. It is said that the process does not explode if there are only finitely many jumps on finite time intervals, in other words, $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The question of explosion is an important one, since when there are no explosions the forward and backward equations are satisfied and the solutions are unique. To shorten notations, denote by Z_n the embedded jump chain, $Z_n = Z(T_n)$. The well-known necessary and sufficient condition for nonexplosion is

$$(1) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(Z_n)} = \infty \quad \text{a.s.};$$

see, for example, Chung [(1967), pages 259–260] and Breiman [(1968), page 337]. However, this condition is hard to check, in general, because it involves the embedded chain. Sufficient conditions for nonexplosion and explosion given below are formulated in terms of the parameters of the process: $\lambda(z)$ and moments of jumps from z . Let \mathcal{F}_t be the natural filtration of the process Z_t and $\mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{F}_{T_n}$.

Results.

THEOREM 1. *Let $\lambda(z)$, $z \geq 0$, be bounded on bounded intervals. Let $m(z) = E(Z_{n+1} - Z_n \mid Z_n = z)$ be the mean of jumps from z . Suppose there exists a positive, increasing function $f(z)$ such that for all $z \geq 0$,*

$$(2) \quad m(z)\lambda(z) \leq f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dz}{f(z)} = \infty.$$

Received December 1993.

¹Research supported by the Australian Research Council.

AMS 1991 subject classifications. 60J25, 60J27, 60J75.

Key words and phrases. Markov chains, regularity conditions, explosions.

Then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(Z_n)} = \infty \quad a.s.$$

The sufficient condition (2) is sharp in the sense that it is the best possible condition in terms of $\lambda(z)$ and $m(z)$ for a class of processes, as the following example shows.

EXAMPLE 1. Let $\lambda(z)$ and $m(z)$, $z \geq 0$, be positive. Define $0 = s_0 < s_1 < s_2 < \dots$ by $s_{n+1} = s_n + m(s_n)$. Let Z_t be the jump process that jumps from s_n to s_{n+1} after exponential waiting time with parameter $\lambda(s_n)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then

$$(3) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(Z_n)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(s_n)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\lambda(s_n)m(s_n)}.$$

If $m(z)$ is continuous, then $s_n \rightarrow \infty$. If, moreover, it satisfies the growth condition $s_{n+1} - s_n < C(s_n - s_{n-1})$ for some constant $C > 0$, then divergence of the series in (3) is equivalent to $\int_0^{\infty} dz/(m(z)\lambda(z)) = \infty$; for example, Knopp (1956).

As an application we now give an example of processes for which our theorems are directly applicable, whereas it is not easy, if at all possible, to verify explosions directly.

EXAMPLE 2. Consider population dependent Markov branching processes, where an individual in a population of size z lives for an exponentially distributed length of time with parameter $a(z)$ and has a random number of offspring $X(z)$ with distribution on nonnegative integers $p_z(\cdot)$. Then the parameters of the process are $\lambda(z) = za(z)$ and $m(z) = \sum_i ip_z(i)$. Essentially divergence of the integral $\int_1^{\infty} dz/(zm(z)a(z))$ is necessary and sufficient for nonexplosions of such population processes.

Theorem 1 can be generalized in such a way that symmetric sufficient conditions can be also given for explosions. To do so, note that the embedded chain $\{Z_n\}$ is time homogeneous and denote for $\alpha > 0$,

$$n_{\alpha}(z) = E\left(\left(\frac{Z_1}{z}\right)^{\alpha} - 1 \mid Z_0 = z\right),$$

$$n_{-\alpha}(z) = E\left(1 - \left(\frac{z}{Z_1}\right)^{\alpha} \mid Z_0 = z\right).$$

THEOREM 2. Let $\lambda(z)$, $z \geq 0$, be bounded on bounded intervals. Suppose there exists a positive function $f(z)$ such that for some $\alpha > 0$ $f(z)z^{\alpha-1}$ is

increasing and

$$(4) \quad zn_{\alpha}(z)\lambda(z) \leq f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dz}{f(z)} = \infty.$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(Z_n)} = \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

THEOREM 3. Suppose there exists a positive function $f(z)$ such that for some $\alpha > 0$, $f(z)z^{-\alpha-1}$ is decreasing and for all z sufficiently large,

$$(5) \quad zn_{-\alpha}(z)\lambda(z) \geq f(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dz}{f(z)} < \infty.$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(Z_n)} < \infty \quad \text{a.s. on } \{Z_n \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

REMARKS.

1. Theorem 1 is a particular case of Theorem 2 with $\alpha = 1$.
2. Conditions (4) and (5) get weaker with decrease in α . To see this use an elementary inequality $x^{\gamma} - 1 \geq \gamma(x - 1)$ for $\gamma \geq 1$ and all x , obtained from convexity. Letting $\gamma = \alpha/\beta$, $x = (Z_1/z)^{\beta}$, we obtain

$$\beta n_{\alpha}(z) \geq \alpha n_{\beta}(z) \quad \text{for } 0 < \beta < \alpha,$$

and with $x = (z/Z_1)^{\beta}$, we obtain

$$\beta n_{-\alpha}(z) \geq \alpha n_{-\beta}(z) \quad \text{for } 0 < \beta < \alpha.$$

3. Condition (5) implies that $\lambda(z)$ is unbounded. This follows from the bound $n_{-\alpha}(z) \leq 1$, which implies $1/f(z) \geq 1/(z\lambda(z))$. Thus $\int_0^{\infty} dz/f(z) < \infty$ implies that $\lambda(z)$ is unbounded.
4. A relation between conditions (4) and (5) is provided by the inequality

$$\alpha n_{\beta}(z) \geq \beta n_{-\alpha}(z) \quad \text{for any } \alpha, \beta > 0,$$

which follows from an elementary inequality $1 - x^{-\gamma} \leq \gamma(x - 1)$, $\gamma > 0$, by taking $x = (Z_1/z)^{\beta}$ and $\gamma = \alpha/\beta$.

5. To see how well conditions of Theorems 2 and 3 fit together, notice that if $Z_1/z \Rightarrow 1$ in distribution as $Z_0 = z \rightarrow \infty$ and Z_1 has no particularly long tails, then the following approximations (from a second order Taylor expansion) are valid for $z \rightarrow \infty$:

$$zn_{\alpha}(z)/\alpha \approx m(z) - 1/2(1 - \alpha)v(z)/z,$$

$$zn_{-\alpha}(z)/\alpha \approx m(z) - 1/2(1 + \alpha)v(z)/z,$$

where $v(z) = E((Z_1 - z)^2 | Z_0 = z)$.

Proofs.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Let $F(z) = \int_0^z 1/(f(x)) dx$. By monotonicity of $x^{\alpha-1}f(x)$, for any $y > x$,

$$\frac{1}{f(y)} \leq \frac{1}{f(x)} \frac{y^{\alpha-1}}{x^{\alpha-1}}.$$

Hence we obtain for any $x, z > 0$,

$$F(z) - F(x) = \int_x^z \frac{1}{f(y)} dy \leq \frac{1}{f(x)} x^{1-\alpha} \frac{(z^\alpha - x^\alpha)}{\alpha} = \frac{x}{\alpha f(x)} \left(\left(\frac{z}{x} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right).$$

Let now $U_n = F(Z_n)$ and use the above inequality to obtain

$$E(U_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq U_n + \frac{Z_n n_\alpha(Z_n)}{\alpha f(Z_n)}.$$

Assumption (4) now gives, with $C = \alpha^{-1}$,

$$E(U_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq U_n + C/\lambda(Z_n).$$

Thus

$$V_n = U_n - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{C}{\lambda(Z_k)}$$

is a supermartingale. Now let $D > 0$ and define a stopping time

$$\tau_D = \inf \{n: \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{C}{\lambda(Z_k)} \geq D\}.$$

Then $V_{n \wedge \tau_D}$ is also a supermartingale. Moreover, it is bounded from below by $-D$; thus it converges almost surely to a finite limit. On the event $\{\sum_{k=0}^\infty C/(\lambda(Z_k)) < D\}$: $\tau_D = \infty$ and $\lambda(Z_n) \rightarrow \infty$, implying $Z_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $F(Z_n) \rightarrow F(\infty) = \infty$. Thus $V_n \geq F(Z_n) - D \rightarrow \infty$ and $V_{n \wedge \tau_D} \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $P(\sum_{k=0}^\infty 1/(\lambda(Z_k)) < D) = 0$. Because D was arbitrary, the result follows. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Because $f(x)x^{-1-\alpha}$ is decreasing, we have the inequality for $y > x$,

$$\frac{1}{f(y)} \geq \frac{1}{f(x)} \left(\frac{y}{x} \right)^{-1-\alpha},$$

from which we obtain for any $x, z \geq 0$,

$$F(z) - F(x) \geq \frac{1}{f(x)} x^{1+\alpha} \int_x^z y^{-1-\alpha} dy = \frac{x}{\alpha f(x)} \left(1 - \left(\frac{x}{z} \right)^\alpha \right).$$

We obtain from this inequality with $U_n = F(Z_n)$,

$$E(U_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq U_n + \frac{Z_n n_{-\alpha}(Z_n)}{\alpha f(Z_n)}.$$

Assumption (5) gives

$$(6) \quad E(U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \geq U_n + C/\lambda(Z_n)$$

for sufficiently large Z_n , $Z_n > C_1$, say. Consider the martingale

$$(7) \quad W_n = -U_n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (E(U_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - U_k).$$

Let τ_N be the N th time that sequence Z_n falls below C_1 ,

$$\tau_N = \inf\{n > \tau_{N-1} : Z_n \leq C_1\},$$

and as usual $\tau_N = \infty$ if $\{Z_n\}$ falls below C_1 less than N times. Then as $-U_n \geq -F(\infty)$, it follows from (6) and (7) and condition (5) that

$$W_{n \wedge \tau_N} \geq -(N+1)F(\infty) > -\infty.$$

Thus $W_{n \wedge \tau_N}$ converges a.s. Thus W_n converges a.s. on the event $\{\tau_N = \infty\}$. Hence $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (E(U_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - U_k)$ converges a.s. on this event. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (E(U_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - U_k)$ converges a.s. on $\{Z_n \rightarrow \infty\}$. Using the bound in (6), the result follows.

REFERENCES

- [1] BREIMAN, L. (1968). *Probability*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- [2] CHUNG, K. L. (1967). *Markov Chains with Stationary Transition Probabilities*. Springer, New York.
- [3] KNOPP, K. (1956). *Infinite Sequences and Series*. Dover, New York.

FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK
UNIVERSITÄT FRANKFURT AM MAIN
ROBERT MAYER-STRASSE 10
D-6000, FRANKFURT
GERMANY

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
RICHARD BERRY BUILDING
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
PARKVILLE, VICTORIA
AUSTRALIA 3052