

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

MARKOV PROCESSES WITH STATIONARY MEASURE

SHAUL FOGUEL

MARKOV PROCESSES WITH STATIONARY MEASURE

S. R. FOGUEL

In [1] we studied Markov processes with a finite positive stationary measure. Here the process is assumed to have a positive stationary measure which might be infinite. Most of the results proved in [1] remain true also in this case. Some proofs that remain valid in this case will be replaced here by simpler proofs.

The main problem studied here, and in [1], is the behaviour at ∞ of $\mu(x_n \in A \cap x_0 \in B)$ where μ is the stationary measure and x_n is the Markov process.

In addition we study the quantities

$$\mu(x_n \in A \text{ for some } n \cap x_0 \in B), \quad \mu((x_n \in A \text{ infinitely often}) \cap x_0 \in B).$$

For Markov chains the results given here are well known even without the assumption of the existence of a stationary measure.

DEFINITIONS AND NOTATION. The notation here will be the same as in [1]. Let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a measure space where $\mu \geq 0$ but is not necessarily finite.

Let $x_n(\omega)$ be a sequence of measurable real functions defined on Ω .

Let the measure $\mu(x_0^{-1}(\cdot))$, on the real line, be σ finite.

ASSUMPTION 1. *The process is stationary:*

$$\mu(x_{n+k} \in A \cap x_{m+k} \in B) = \mu(x_n \in A \cap x_m \in B).$$

ASSUMPTION 2. *If $i < j < k$ let A be a Borel set on the line such that $\mu(x_k \in A) < \infty$ then:*

The conditional probability that $x_k \in A$, given x_j and x_i , is equal to the conditional probability that $x_k \in A$ given x_j .

$L_2 = L_2(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ will be the space of real square integrable function. Let B_n be the subspace of L_2 generated by functions of the form

$$I(x_n^{-1}(A)) \text{ where } \mu(x_n^{-1}(A)) < \infty.$$

By $I(\sigma)$ we denote the characteristic function of σ .

Let E_n be the self adjoint projection on B_n .

It was shown in [1] that Assumption 2 implies

$$1. \quad E_i E_j E_k = E_i E_k \quad i < j < k.$$

Received May 31, 1961. This work was supported by an air force contract no. AF 61(052)-187

Finally let $T(n)$ be the transformation from B_0 to B_n defined by

$$T(n)I(x_0 \in A) = I(x_n \in A) .$$

It is easily seen that $x \in B_n$ if and only if $x(\omega) = f(x_n(\omega))$ a.e. and $f(x_n(\omega))$ is square integrable.

Thus

$$T(n)f(x_0(\omega)) = f(x_n(\omega))$$

and

2. a. $\|T(n)x\| = \|x\|$
- b. $T(n)B_0 = B_n$
- c. $(T(n+k)x, T(m+k)y) = (T(n)x, T(m)y)$.

See [1] Lemma 2.4.

1. **Behaviour at ∞ .** Following [1] let us define

$$C_m = \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} B_n \quad C_{-m} = T(m)^{-1}C_0 \cap C_0$$

$$H = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{-m} .$$

Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 of [1] hold here thus:

$$\text{If } x \perp H \text{ then weak } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(n)x = 0 .$$

Also by Theorem 3.9 of [1] H is invariant under $T(n)$, and $T(n) = T^n$ is a unitary operator on H .

LEMMA 1. *The subspace H is generated by characteristic functions of a Boolean ring.*

Proof. It is enough to show that if $x \in H$ then $I(x^{-1}(A)) \in H$ and if $I(\sigma_1), I(\sigma_2) \in H$ then $I(\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2) \in H$.

If $x \in H$ then $x \in B_n$ so $I(x^{-1}(A)) \in B_n$. Also $x = T(n)y_n$ where $y_n \in C_0$.
Now

$$y_n(\omega) = f_n(x_0(\omega)) \quad \text{for } y_n \in B_0 .$$

Also $I(y_n^{-1}(A)) \in B_m$ for all m and n . Thus

$$x(\omega) = T(n)y_n(\omega) = f_n(x_n(\omega))$$

$$x^{-1}(A) = x_n^{-1}(f_n^{-1}(A))$$

and

$$I(x^{-1}(A)) = T(n)I(x_n^{-1}(f_n^{-1}(A)))$$

where

$$I(x_0^{-1}(f_n^{-1}(A))) = I(y_n^{-1}(A)) \in B_m \text{ for all } m .$$

Thus

$$I(x^{-1}(A)) \in H .$$

Finally if $I(\sigma_1) \in H$ and $I(\sigma_2) \in H$ then $I(\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2) \in B_n$ for all n . Also

$$\sigma_1 = x_n^{-1}(A_n) \quad \sigma_2 = x_n^{-1}(B_n)$$

where

$$I(x_0^{-1}(A_n)) \in C_0 \quad I(x_0^{-1}(B_n)) \in C_n .$$

Thus

$$I(\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2) = I(x_n^{-1}(A_n \cap B_n))$$

where

$$I(x_0^{-1}(A_n \cap B_n)) \in C_0 .$$

In the rest of the paper it is assumed that if $I(\sigma) \in H$ then $I(\sigma)$ contains an atom in H . This is equivalent to assuming that H is generated by $I(\sigma_i)$ where σ_i are disjoint measurable sets.

Notice that H may be empty.

The above assumption holds if x_0 has a countable range or if a ‘‘Doeblin Condition’’ holds:

There exists a measure η on Borel sets on the line and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

1. *If $\mu(x_0^{-1}(A)) < \infty$ then $\eta(A) < \infty$.*
2. *If $\eta(A) < \varepsilon$ then $T(n)I(x_0^{-1}(A)) \notin B_0$ for some n .*

This condition is enough for if $I(x_0^{-1}(A)) \in H$ then $\eta(A)$ is finite and by 2 contains only finitely many sets in H .

For every set σ_i $T(n)I(\sigma_i)$ is in H hence is either $I(\sigma_i)$ or is disjoint to $I(\sigma_i)$.

Ler Ω_1 be the union of all the σ_i for which

$$T(n)I(\sigma_i) = I(\sigma_i) \text{ for some } n .$$

Let Ω_2 be the union of all the sets σ_i such that

$$(T(n)I(\sigma_i), I(\sigma_i)) = 0 \text{ for all } n .$$

In this case

$$(T(n)I(\sigma_i), T(m)I(\sigma_i)) = 0 \quad \text{if } n \neq m ,$$

by 2.c.

Let Ω_3 be the complement set of $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$.

If μ is finite then $\Omega_1 = \Omega$.

THEOREM 1. *Let A be a Borel set on the line such that $x_0^{-1}(A) \subset \sigma_i$ for some i .*

If $\sigma_i \subset \Omega_1$ and n is the smallest integer such that $T(n)I(\sigma_i) = I(\sigma_i)$ then

$$\text{weak lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} T(kn + d)I(x_0^{-1}(A)) = \mu(\sigma_i)^{-1} \mu(x_0^{-1}(A))T(d)I(\sigma_i) .$$

If $\sigma_i \subset \Omega_2$ then

$$\text{weak lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(n)I(x_0^{-1}(A)) = 0 .$$

Proof. If $T(n)I(\sigma_i) = I(\sigma_i)$ define

$$g(\omega) = I(x_0^{-1}(A)) - \mu(\sigma_i)^{-1} \mu(x_0^{-1}(A))I(\sigma_i) .$$

Now $g(\omega) \perp H$ hence

$$T(kn + d)g(\omega) = T(kn + d)I(x_0^{-1}(A)) - \mu(\sigma_i)^{-1} \mu(x_0^{-1}(A))T(d)I(\sigma_i)$$

and this expression tends weakly to zero when $k \rightarrow \infty$. If $x_0^{-1}(A) \subset \sigma_i$ where $\sigma_i \subset \Omega_2$ then the functions $T(n)I(x_0^{-1}(A))$ are disjoint.

THEOREM 2. *If $x_0^{-1}(A) \subset \Omega_3$ then*

$$\text{weak lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(n)I(x_0^{-1}(A)) = 0 .$$

Proof. It is enough to note that $I(x_0^{-1}(A)) \perp H$, for $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ contains all the sets σ_i .

Let

$$U(n, A) = I\left(\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} x_m \in A\right)$$

$$U(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U(n, A) .$$

Thus

$$(U(0, A), I(x_0^{-1}(B))) = \mu(x_n \in A \text{ for some } n) \cap x_0 \in B$$

$$(U(A), I(x_0^{-1}(B))) = \mu(x_n \in A \text{ infinitely often}) \cap x_0 \in B .$$

THEOREM 3. *Let A be a Borel set such that $x_0^{-1}(A) \subset \sigma_i$ for some i . If $\sigma_i \subset \Omega_1$ and $T(n)I(\sigma_i) = I(\sigma_i)$ then*

$$U(m, A) = U(A) = \sum_{d=0}^{m-1} T(d)I(\sigma_i) .$$

If $\sigma_i \subset \Omega_2$ then $U(A) = 0$

Proof. If $T(n)I(\sigma_i) = I(\sigma_i)$ then

$$U(A) \leq U(0, A) \leq \sum_{d=0}^{n-1} T(d)I(\sigma_i).$$

On the other hand if $I(\sigma) \leq T(d)I(\sigma_i)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (U(A), I(\sigma)) &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (T(kn + d)I(x_0^{-1}(A)), I(\sigma)) \\ &= \mu(\sigma_i)^{-1} \mu(x_0^{-1}(A)) \mu(\sigma) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

But $U(A)$ is a characteristic function therefore the above equation implies that $U(A) \geq T(d)I(\sigma_i)$. Thus

$$U(A) = \sum_{d=0}^{n-1} T(d)I(\sigma_i).$$

If $(T(n)I(\sigma_i), I(\sigma_i)) = 0$ for all n , then $U(n, A)$ is disjoint to $T(m)I(x_0^{-1}(A))$ $m < n$. Thus $U(A)$ is disjoint to $T(m)I(x_0^{-1}(A))$ for all m and therefore $U(A) = 0$.

COROLLARY. *In the first case studied above*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu((x_n \in A \text{ for some } n) \cap x_0 \in B) \\ = \mu((x_n \in A \text{ infinitely often}) \cap x_0 \in B). \end{aligned}$$

In the second case

$$\mu((x_n \in A \text{ infinitely often}) \cap x_0 \in B) = 0.$$

REMARKS. Let a Markov chain be defined by the matrix $(P_{i,j})$ $P_{i,i+1} = 1$ $P_{i,j} = 0$ if $j \neq i + 1$, $-\infty < i, j < \infty$. Then if $\mu(x_n = i) = 1$ Ω can be chosen as the union of countably many atoms. In this case $H = L_2(\Omega)$ and $\Omega = \Omega_2$. Let $(P_{i,j})$ be the matrix of a free random walk (See K. L. Chung Markov Chains p. 23) and again $\mu(x_n = i) = 1$ $-\infty < i < \infty$. In this case for every i and j there is a sufficiently large n such that $\mu(x_n = i \cap x_0 = j) = P_{ij}^{(n)} > 0$. Thus each set $x_0 = i$ is neither in Ω_1 nor in Ω_2 and $\Omega = \Omega_3$.

Let $P(x, A)$ be a transition function of a Markov process with the real numbers as state space. Let μ be a stationary measure that is not finite. One can construct a measure space Ω and the sequence $x_n(\omega)$ with

$$\mu(x_n \in A \cap x_0 \in B) = \int_{x \in B} P^n(x, A) \mu(dx).$$

Notice that we use alternatively $\mu(B)$ or $\mu(x_0 \in B)$ to mean the same thing. This construction is well known.

Let $\mu(x_0 = 1) > 0$ and let the set $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \{x | P^n(x, 1) = 0\}$ be empty. Then if $\mu(x_0 \in A) > 0$

(*) $\sup_n \mu(x_n = 1 \cap x_0 \in A) > 0$.

Otherwise $P^n(x, 1) = 0$ $x \in A$ except on a set of measure zero.

We will prove that in this case $H = 0$ hence $\Omega = \Omega_2$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x_n \in A \cap x_0 \in B) = 0.$$

If H contained any characteristic function of a set $\{\omega | x_0 \in A\}$ (always $H \subset B_0$) then this set intersects the set $\{\omega | x_n(\omega) = 1\}$ for some n . But $H \subset B_n$ and this set is an atom in B_n . Therefore $\{\omega | x_0 \in A\}$ contains the set $\{\omega | x_n(\omega) = 1\}$. There exists an atom in H that contains this set. This proves that H is generated by atoms. Let H be generated by σ_i where $\sigma_1 \supset \{\omega | x_n(\omega) = 1\}$. Now

$$\sup_m (I(\sigma_i), T(m)I(\sigma_1)) \geq \sup_m \mu(\sigma_i \cap x_{n+m} = 1).$$

But $\sigma_i = \{\omega | x_n(\omega) \in A_i\}$ for $I(\sigma_i) \in B_n$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_m (I(\sigma_i), T(m)I(\sigma_1)) &\geq \sup_m \mu(x_n \in A_i \cap x_{n+m} = 1) \\ &= \sup_m \mu(x_0 \in A_i \cap x_m = 1) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

By (*).

Thus for some m $I(\sigma_i) = T(m)I(\sigma_1)$. Now

$$\sup_m \mu(\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_i) = \sup_m (I(\sigma_1), T(m)I(\sigma_i)) \geq \sup_m \mu(x_n = 1 \cap x_{n+m} = 1) > 0.$$

They can not be disjoint: for some m ,

$$T(m)I(\sigma_1) = I(\sigma_i).$$

Now

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma_i = \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} T(k)I(\sigma_1)$$

and this is a set of finite measure. But Ω had infinite measure. Since $\bigcup \sigma_i \subset B_0$ there is a set in B_0 disjoint to $\bigcup \sigma_i$ which contradicts (*).

REFERENCE

1. S. R. Foguel, *Weak and strong convergence for Markov processes*, Pacific J. Math., **10** (1960), 1221-1234.

JERUSALEM, ISRAEL.

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RALPH S. PHILLIPS

Stanford University
Stanford, California

M. G. ARSOVE

University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

A. L. WHITEMAN

University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

LOWELL J. PAIGE

University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

T. M. CHERRY

D. DERRY

M. OHTSUKA

H. L. ROYDEN

E. SPANIER

E. G. STRAUS

F. WOLF

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

* * *

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
CALIFORNIA RESEARCH CORPORATION
SPACE TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES
NAVAL ORDNANCE TEST STATION

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be typewritten (double spaced), and the author should keep a complete copy. Manuscripts may be sent to any one of the four editors. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, L. J. Paige at the University of California, Los Angeles 24, California.

50 reprints per author of each article are furnished free of charge; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published quarterly, in March, June, September, and December. Effective with Volume 13 the price per volume (4 numbers) is \$18.00; single issues, \$5.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$8.00 per volume; single issues \$2.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley 8, California.

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insa'susha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), No. 6, 2-chome, Fujimi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 12, No. 2

February, 1962

William George Bade and Robert S. Freeman, <i>Closed extensions of the Laplace operator determined by a general class of boundary conditions</i>	395
William Browder and Edwin Spanier, <i>H-spaces and duality</i>	411
Stewart S. Cairns, <i>On permutations induced by linear value functions</i>	415
Frank Sydney Cater, <i>On Hilbert space operators and operator roots of polynomials</i>	429
Stephen Urban Chase, <i>Torsion-free modules over $K[x, y]$</i>	437
Heron S. Collins, <i>Remarks on affine semigroups</i>	449
Peter Crawley, <i>Direct decompositions with finite dimensional factors</i>	457
Richard Brian Darst, <i>A continuity property for vector valued measurable functions</i>	469
R. P. Dilworth, <i>Abstract commutative ideal theory</i>	481
P. H. Doyle, III and John Gilbert Hocking, <i>Continuously invertible spaces</i>	499
Shaul Foguel, <i>Markov processes with stationary measure</i>	505
Andrew Mattei Gleason, <i>The abstract theorem of Cauchy-Weil</i>	511
Allan Brasted Gray, Jr., <i>Normal subgroups of monomial groups</i>	527
Melvin Henriksen and John Rolfe Isbell, <i>Lattice-ordered rings and function rings</i>	533
Amnon Jakimovski, <i>Tauberian constants for the $[J, f(x)]$ transformations</i>	567
Hubert Collings Kennedy, <i>Group membership in semigroups</i>	577
Eleanor Killam, <i>The spectrum and the radical in locally m-convex algebras</i>	581
Arthur H. Kruse, <i>Completion of mathematical systems</i>	589
Magnus Lindberg, <i>On two Tauberian remainder theorems</i>	607
Lionello A. Lombardi, <i>A general solution of Tonelli's problem of the calculus of variations</i>	617
Marvin David Marcus and Morris Newman, <i>The sum of the elements of the powers of a matrix</i>	627
Michael Bahir Maschler, <i>Derivatives of the harmonic measures in multiply-connected domains</i>	637
Deane Montgomery and Hans Samelson, <i>On the action of $SO(3)$ on S^n</i>	649
J. Barros-Neto, <i>Analytic composition kernels on Lie groups</i>	661
Mario Petrich, <i>Semicharacters of the Cartesian product of two semigroups</i>	679
John Sydney Pym, <i>Idempotent measures on semigroups</i>	685
K. Rogers and Ernst Gabor Straus, <i>A special class of matrices</i>	699
U. Shukla, <i>On the projective cover of a module and related results</i>	709
Don Harrell Tucker, <i>An existence theorem for a Goursat problem</i>	719
George Gustave Weill, <i>Reproducing kernels and orthogonal kernels for analytic differentials on Riemann surfaces</i>	729
George Gustave Weill, <i>Capacity differentials on open Riemann surfaces</i>	769
G. K. White, <i>Iterations of generalized Euler functions</i>	777
Adil Mohamed Yaqub, <i>On certain finite rings and ring-logics</i>	785