

# Lecture notes of Stochastic Process

lectured by prof. Hsueh-I Lu

pishen

AlgoLab, CSIE, NTU

March 25, 2012

# Limiting Probabilities

# Outline

- 1 Limiting probabilities
- 2 Stationary distribution
- 3 Long-run proportion
- 4 (Inverse of) Expected return time

# Limiting Probabilities

## Definition

Number  $\pi_j$  is the *limiting probability* of  $j$  if

$$\pi_j = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{ij}^n$$

holds for all states  $i \in S$  ( $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is the state space).

- $\pi_j$  is independent of  $i$ .

- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P^n = \begin{pmatrix} \pi \\ \pi \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots)$

# Stationary Probability Distribution

## Definition

Non-negative row vector  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots)$  is a *stationary probability distribution* of  $\mathbb{X}$  if  $\pi \times P = \pi$  holds and  $\sum_{i \in S} \pi_i = 1$

- $\pi$  is a normalized left eigenvector with eigenvalue  $= 1$ .
- If  $X(0)$  has distribution  $\pi$ , then  $X(t)$  has the same distribution  $\pi$  for all  $t \geq 1$ .  $\pi$  is also called as *steady-state distribution*.
- It doesn't mean that each  $X(t)$  become independent.  $\pi$  only means the distribution of  $X(t)$  when the previous random variable's value is unknown.

# Theorem 1

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathbb{X}$  be an irreducible, aperiodic, positive recurrent Markov chain, then*

- *The limiting probability  $\pi_j$  of each state  $j$  exists.*
- *$\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots)$  is the unique stationary probability distribution.*
- The proof will be stated later.

# Expected return time

## Definition

The *expected return time* of state  $i \in S$  is

$$\mu_i = \sum_{n \geq 1} n \cdot f_i^{(n)}$$

where

$$f_i^{(n)} = P(\min\{t : X(t) = i, t \geq 1\} = n | X(0) = i)$$

$$\blacksquare f_i = \sum_{n \geq 1} f_i^{(n)}$$

# Positive recurrent & null recurrent

## Definition

State  $i$  is *positive recurrent* if  $\mu_i < \infty$

## Definition

State  $i$  is *null recurrent* if  $\mu_i = \infty$

- Both are recurrent states, and are *class properties*, which means that if state  $i$  and  $j$  communicate, they will share this property.
- If  $\mathbb{X}$  is finite, then each recurrent state of  $\mathbb{X}$  is positive recurrent. Proof stated at page 45.



# Example of null recurrent

## Example

For a Markov chain with  $n$  states  $(1, \dots, n)$ , if

$$P(X(t+1) = i+1 | X(t) = i) = 1 - 1/n$$

and

$$P(X(t+1) = 1 | X(t) = i) = 1/n$$

According to geometric distribution (taking  $p = 1/n$ ), the expectation value of “steps taken for state 1 to come back” will be  $1/p = n$ , hence  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n = \infty$ .

# Period of a chain

## Definition

The *period* of state  $i$  is  $d$  if  $d$  is the largest integer such that

$$P_{ii}^n = 0$$

holds for all  $n$  which is not divisible by  $d$ .

## Definition

If each state of  $\mathbb{X}$  has period 1, then  $\mathbb{X}$  is called *aperiodic*.

- If  $P_{ii} > 0$  for all  $i \in S$ , then  $\mathbb{X}$  is aperiodic.
- Period can be seen as the gcd of all  $n$  that have  $P_{ii}^n > 0$ , note that  $P_{ii}^{\text{gcd}} > 0$  is not necessary.
- The period of drunken man problem is 2.

# Lemma 1

## Lemma

*If state  $j$  is aperiodic and positive recurrent, then*

$$\pi_j \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{ij}^n$$

*exists and is positive for all states  $i \in S$ .*

- This can be proved by the Blackwell theorem in Renewal theory.
- It doesn't promise that each  $\pi_j$  for different  $i$  will be the same. But they will be the same if we add the irreducible property.

# Property of lim

- The position of lim cannot be switched arbitrarily in an equation.

## Example

$$1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m}{m+n} \neq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m}{m+n} = 0$$

- lim would not influence the inequality.

## Example

$$\text{If } f(n) \geq g(n), \text{ then } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n)$$

## Property of $\lim$ (cont.)

- $\lim$  is linear operator under finite number of functions.

### Example

For  $m < \infty$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_i(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(n)$$

- It may not work if we push  $m$  to  $\infty$  first, since  $\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(n)$  may influence the result. For example, if  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $f_i(n) = 1/n$ , then LHS will be 0, while RHS will be 1. But pushing  $m$  to  $\infty$  after pushing  $n$  to  $\infty$  first is OK.

# Inequality 1

## Inequality

$$\sum_{j \in S} \pi_j \leq 1$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_j &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^m \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{ij}^n \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}^n \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in S} P_{ij}^n = 1\end{aligned}$$



- The last equation works since  $\sum_{j \in S} P_{ij}^n = 1$ .

# Inequality 2

## Inequality

*For state  $j \in S$ , we have*

$$\pi_j \geq \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i P_{ij}$$



Proof.

For  $m \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$P_{ij}^{n+1} = \sum_{k \in S} P_{ik}^n P_{kj} \geq \sum_{k=1}^m P_{ik}^n P_{kj}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_j &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{ij}^{n+1} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^m P_{ik}^n P_{kj} = \sum_{k=1}^m \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{ik}^n P_{kj} = \sum_{k=1}^m \pi_k P_{kj} \end{aligned}$$

hence, we know

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^m \pi_k P_{kj} = \sum_{k \in S} \pi_k P_{kj} \leq \pi_j$$



# Equality 1

## Equality

$$\pi_j = \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i P_{ij}$$

Proof.

Assume that for some  $j \in S$ ,  $\pi_j > \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i P_{ij}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in S} \pi_j &> \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i P_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i \sum_{j \in S} P_{ij} = \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i \end{aligned}$$

Since a value cannot be greater than itself, we got contradiction. □

- $\sum$  should be represented by  $\lim \sum$ , the equation will still work.

# Proof of theorem 1

- **Step 0:** existence of limiting probability.
- **Step 1:** existence of stationary probability distribution.
- **Step 2:** uniqueness.

## 0. Existence of limiting probability

### Proof.

By lemma 1, we know that there exists a  $\pi_j$  for row  $i$ . Since the Markov chain is irreducible and all the states are positive recurrent, for any state  $i'$  other than  $i$ , we know that  $i'$  surely will visit  $i$  in finite steps. Therefore, the  $\pi_j$  value at row  $i'$  will equal to the  $\pi_j$  value at row  $i$ , which means that all the  $\pi_j$  for column  $j$  are the same, and is the limiting probability.  $\square$

TODO: refine, check email

# 1. Existence of stationary probability distribution

We want to prove that

Target

*There's a vector  $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  such that*

1  $\sum_{i \in S} s_i = 1$

2  $s \times P = s$

## Proof.

By lemma 1, we know that there exists a  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots)$ .

And by equality 1, we know that

$$(\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots) \times P = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots)$$

Hence  $\pi$  can satisfy the 2nd part of our target.

Then, we take  $k = \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i$ . By inequality 1, we know that  $k < \infty$ , and can get

$$\left(\frac{\pi_1}{k}, \frac{\pi_2}{k}, \dots\right) \times P = \left(\frac{\pi_1}{k}, \frac{\pi_2}{k}, \dots\right)$$

where  $\sum_{i \in S} \frac{\pi_i}{k} = 1$  also satisfy the 1st part of our target.

Therefore, this vector can be  $s$ , which means that it exists. □

## 2. Uniqueness

### Target

*If  $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  is a stationary distribution of  $\mathbb{X}$ , then  $s = \pi$ .*

- We'll prove this by inequality 3 & 4.



# Inequality 3

Inequality

$$s_j \geq \pi_j, \forall j \in S$$

## Proof.

Let the distribution of  $X(0)$  be  $s$ , by the property of stationary distribution, we have

$$\begin{aligned}s_j &= P(X(n) = j) = \sum_{i \in S} P(X(n) = j | X(0) = i) P(X(0) = i) \\&= \sum_{i \in S} P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i \\&\geq \sum_{i=1}^m P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i \\&\Rightarrow s_j = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_j \\&\geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_j \cdot s_i = \pi_j\end{aligned}$$



# Inequality 4

Inequality

$$s_j \leq \pi_j, \forall j \in S$$

## Proof.

Similar in the proof above,  $\forall m, n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_j &= \sum_{i \in S} P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} s_i \\ \Rightarrow s_j &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_j \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m P_{ij}^n \cdot s_i + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} s_i \right) \\ &= \pi_j \end{aligned}$$



# An example Markov chain

## Example

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 1 - \alpha \\ \beta & 1 - \beta \end{pmatrix}, 0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$$

$$\pi = \left( \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta - \alpha}, \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \beta - \alpha} \right)$$

# Real world example: Hardy-Weinberg Law

## Example

There're two kinds of allele:

- dominant: **A**
- recessive: **a**

And three kinds of senotype with population proportion as follow:

- AA:  $p$
- aa:  $q$
- Aa:  $r = 1 - (p + q)$

## Example (cont.)

$$P = \begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{ccc} AA & aa & Aa \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} AA \\ aa \\ Aa \end{array} & \left( \begin{array}{ccc} p + \frac{r}{2} & 0 & q + \frac{r}{2} \\ 0 & q + \frac{r}{2} & p + \frac{r}{2} \\ \frac{p}{2} + \frac{r}{4} & \frac{p}{2} + \frac{r}{4} & \frac{p+q+r}{2} \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$

we get  $\pi = (p, q, r)$  when

- $p = (p + \frac{r}{2})^2$
- $q = (q + \frac{r}{2})^2$
- $r = 2(p + \frac{r}{2})(q + \frac{r}{2})$

# Long-run proportion

## Definition

We say that  $r_j$  is the *long-run proportion* of state  $j \in S$  if

$$r_j = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} P_{ij}^t$$

holds for each state  $i \in S$ .

- It represents the average appearance times of state  $j$  in the whole process.
- We will show that (in theorem 3) if  $\mathbb{X}$  is irreducible, then the long-run proportion of all states exist.



# Theorem 2

## Theorem (type 1)

*If  $r_j$  exists for each  $j \in S$  and  $\sum_{j \in S} r_j > 0$ , then  $r = (r_1, r_2, \dots)$  is the unique stationary distribution of  $\mathbb{X}$ .*

or

## Theorem (type 2)

*If  $r_j$  exists for each  $j \in S$  and **a stationary distribution exists**, then  $r = (r_1, r_2, \dots)$  is the unique stationary distribution of  $\mathbb{X}$ .*

# Proof

## Existence of stationary distribution in type 1:

Let

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r \\ r \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} P^t$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} R \times P &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} P^{t+1} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} P^t + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (P^{n+1} - P) \\ &= R \end{aligned}$$

As stated later,  $\sum_{j \in S} r_j \leq 1$ , hence by normalizing  $r$ , we prove that stationary distribution exist.

$$\blacksquare (\lim f(n)) \cdot g(n) = \lim f(n) \cdot g(n)?$$

## Proof (cont.)

### Uniqueness:

Let  $\pi$  be an arbitrary stationary distribution, then

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \pi \times R \\ &= \pi \times \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} P^t \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} \pi \times P^t \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} \pi \\ &= \pi \end{aligned}$$

## Proof (cont.)

**Prove that**  $\sum_{j \in S} r_j \leq 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j \in S} r_j &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^m \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n P_{ij}^t \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m P_{ij}^t \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j \in S} P_{ij}^t \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n 1 = 1\end{aligned}$$

# Example 1

On a highway, if we know the probability that

- A truck is followed by a truck:  $1/4$
- A truck is followed by a car:  $3/4$
- A car is followed by a truck:  $1/5$
- A car is followed by a car:  $4/5$

We can construct a matrix

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{cc} T & C \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} T \\ C \end{array} & \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 & 3/4 \\ 1/5 & 4/5 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

and get the portion of trucks and cars on the whole highway as the eigenvector  $(4/19, 15/19)$  (we will know that long-run proportion exists by Theorem 3).

## Example 2

For a system which has several good and bad states, we have a matrix  $P$ :

$$\begin{matrix} & g_1 & g_2 & \cdots & b_1 & b_2 & \cdots \\ \begin{matrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \\ \vdots \\ b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \vdots \end{matrix} & \left( \begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \end{array} \right) \end{matrix}$$

## Example 2 (cont.)

**Q1:** Breakdown rate (breakdown times / total time)

The long-run frequency of going to a bad state from a good state is

$$\sum_{i \in g} \sum_{j \in b} r_i P_{ij}$$

## Example 2 (cont.)

**Q2:** The expected time  $\mu_G$  (resp.  $\mu_B$ ) of staying in good (resp. bad) states once we reach a good (resp. bad) state?

**Ans:**

For each  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $G_t$  (resp.  $B_t$ ) be the length of the  $t$ -th good (resp. bad) phase of consecutive good (resp. bad) states. By the strong law of large numbers,

$$P\left(\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_1 + B_1 + G_2 + B_2 + \dots + G_t + B_t}{t} = \mu_G + \mu_B\right) = 1$$

Since the reciprocal of above is the breakdown rate, we get equation (1):

$$P\left(\sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in B} \pi_i P_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mu_G + \mu_B}\right) = 1$$



## Example 2 (cont.)

Also, with probability 1, we get equation (2):

$$P \left( \sum_{i \in G} r_i = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G_1 + G_2 + \cdots + G_t}{G_1 + B_1 + \cdots + G_t + B_t} = \frac{\mu_G}{\mu_G + \mu_B} \right) = 1$$

Then, by (2)/(1), we get that

$$P \left( \mu_G = \frac{\sum_{i \in G} r_i}{\sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in B} r_i P_{ij}} \right) = 1$$

■  $\lim \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = \frac{\lim f(n)}{\lim g(n)} ?$

# Theorem 3

## Theorem

*If  $\mathbb{X}$  is irreducible, then the long-run proportion  $r_i$  exists with probability 1, moreover,*

- 1 If state  $i$  is positive recurrent (i.e.  $0 < \mu_i < \infty$ ), then  $P(r_i = \frac{1}{\mu_i}) = 1$ .*
- 2 If state  $i$  is null recurrent (i.e.  $\mu_i = \infty$ ) or transient, then  $P(r_i = 0) = 1$ .*

## Part 1:

Suppose  $X(0) = i$ ,  $T_k$  is the number of steps required for the  $k$ -th  $i$  goes to  $(k+1)$ -st  $i$ , then by the strong law of large number,

$$P\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_1 + T_2 + \cdots + T_k}{k} = \mu_i\right) = 1$$
$$\Rightarrow P\left(r_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{T_1 + T_2 + \cdots + T_k} = \frac{1}{\mu_i}\right) = 1$$

■  $\lim(A/B) = \frac{1}{\lim(B/A)}$ ?

# Proof (cont.)

## Part 2:

- 1 If  $i$  is transient,  $i$  will only appear finite times in the long-run, hence

$$r_i = \frac{\text{finite}}{\infty} = 0$$

- 2 If  $i$  is null recurrent,  $\mu_i$  is  $\infty$ , then

$$P\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_1 + T_2 + \cdots + T_k}{k} = \infty\right) = 1$$

$$P\left(r_i = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{T_1 + T_2 + \cdots + T_k} = 0\right) = 1$$

(The first equation is not promised by the strong law of large number. But if it's not  $\infty$ , we can say that  $\mu_i$  is not  $\infty$ , which is a contradiction.)

# Example 1

## Example (type 1)

If  $\mathbb{X}$  is **irreducible** and finite, then  $\mathbb{X}$  has no null recurrent states.

## Example (type 2)

If  $\mathbb{X}$  is finite, then  $\mathbb{X}$  has no null recurrent states.

- Finite irreducible imply positive recurrent.

## ■ Type 1:

If there's a state which is null recurrent, by irreducible, all the states will be null recurrent. Then, all states have  $P(r_i = 0) = 1$ . By changing the proof in page 36 into finite states version, we know that  $\sum r_i = 1$ . So it's impossible for finite  $r_i$ , which are all close to 0, to sum up to 1.

## ■ Type 2:

If it's not irreducible, the finite set of communicated null recurrent states still form an irreducible and finite Markov chain, which can fit the requirement of type 1.

## Example 2

### Example

For an irreducible Markov chain  $\mathbb{X}$  with infinite states, no state will be positive recurrent.

- Infinite irreducible imply no positive recurrent.

If all the states are positive recurrent, then by theorem 3, we know that all the  $r_i > 0$  and is a finite value. We then set  $r_{\min} = \epsilon \cdot \min(r_1, r_2, \dots)$  ( $0 < \epsilon < 1$ ) such that  $r_i > r_{\min} > 0, \forall i$ . And get

$$\sum_{i \in S} r_i > \sum_{i \in S} r_{\min} = \infty > 1$$

which is contradiction to page 36.



## Example 3: Grand Hotel

### Example

There's a hotel, with  $N$  representing the number of newly occupied rooms each day ( $N$  is a poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda$ ). And the number of consecutive check-in days of each room is a geometric distribution with probability  $p$  ( $p$  is the probability of check-out).  $X(t)$  is the number of occupied rooms in day  $t$ .

## Q1: $P_{ij} = ?$

We set  $R_i$  as a binomial distribution with parameter  $(i, 1 - p)$ , which represents the number of rooms which will remain occupied in the next day, then

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ij} &= P(R_i + N = j) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 0} P(R_i + N = j | R_i = k) P(R_i = k) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 0} P(N = j - k) P(R_i = k) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \min(i, j)} \frac{e^{-\lambda} \cdot \lambda^{j-k}}{(j-k)!} \binom{i}{k} (1-p)^k p^{1-k} \end{aligned}$$

## Q2: $r_i = ?$

We guess there's a stationary distribution which is a poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda_0$ . Setting  $X(0)$  with this distribution. And let  $R$  as the number of rooms in  $X(0)$  which remain check-in in the next day ( $R$  is a poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda_0(1 - p)$ ).  $X(1)$  will have distribution  $R + N$ , which is a poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda_0(1 - p) + \lambda$ . Then since  $X(0)$  is a stationary distribution, it will have the same distribution with  $X(1)$ , which means that  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(1 - p) + \lambda$ , and we get  $\lambda_0 = \lambda/p$ .